Manuscript ID:
TIJCMBLIR-2025-020238

Volume: 2

Issue: 2

Month: April

Year: 2025

E-ISSN: 3065-9191

Submitted: 06 Mar 2025

Revised: 16 Mar 2025

Accepted: 27 Apr 2025

Published: 30 Apr 2025

Address for correspondence:
Dr. Sunil Sambhaji Langade
Associate Professor and HOD, PDEA's, Annasaheb Waghire Arts, Science and Commerce College, Otur,Tal: Junnar, Dist: Pune
Email: langadesunil1@gmail.com

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18204857
DOI Link:
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18204857

A comparative study of labour facilities in cooperative and private spinning mills in Solapur District

Dr. Sunil Sambhaji Langade
Associate Professor and HOD, PDEA's, Annasaheb Waghire Arts, Science and Commerce College, Otur,Tal: Junnar, Dist: Pune

Abstract

The main objective of this research is to conduct a comparative study of labor facilities in cooperative and private spinning mills in Maharashtra. The textile industry plays a significant role in both the industrial and rural economy of the state, and the standard of living, social security, and employment stability of workers in spinning mills directly affect industrial productivity. This study focuses on comparing social security, health facilities, wages and incentive schemes, worker welfare facilities, technological progress, rural employment generation, and worker satisfaction in cooperative and private spinning mills. Both primary and secondary data were used for the study. Primary data was collected from workers through questionnaires and interviews, while secondary data was obtained from government reports, industry policies, audit reports, and relevant research studies. Workers' responses were recorded using a four-point scale, and mean scores were calculated and analyzed.

The findings reveal that cooperative mills are slightly ahead of private mills in implementing social security, health care, provident fund, pension, and insurance schemes. Private Mills, however, perform better in the use of modern machinery, production efficiency, and technical management. Although private mills offer higher wages and incentive schemes, they have certain limitations in worker welfare facilities. On the other hand, cooperative mills, despite offering comparatively lower wages, ensure higher worker satisfaction due to job stability, security, and rural employment generation. Therefore, the study concludes that integrating the positive aspects of both systems is essential to achieve a balance between social welfare and industrial efficiency.

Keywords: *Cooperative Spinning Mills, Private Spinning Mills, Worker Facilities, Social Security, Worker Welfare, Technological Advancement, Rural Employment, Worker Satisfaction etc.*

Introduction

Maharashtra is one of India's leading textile industry centers, contributing significantly to national cotton production, employment, revenue, and exports. The foundation of this industry lies in cotton spinning mills, which play a vital role in the economic progress of rural and semi-urban regions. These mills process raw cotton into yarn, fabric, and ready-made garments. The main cotton-growing regions of Maharashtra are Vidarbha, Marathwada, and Western Maharashtra, together accounting for more than 38% of the state's total cotton output.

Spinning mills in Maharashtra are broadly classified into two types 1) cooperative spinning mills and 2) private spinning mills. Cooperative mills operate on cooperative principles and emphasize public participation. They involve local farmers and members in management, promoting rural employment, strengthening the local economy, and ensuring better market access for cotton growers. These mills receive government support in the form of capital aid, subsidies, and technology up gradation schemes.

Private spinning mills, on the other hand, are managed by industrialists or corporate firms. They are characterized by modern management practices, advanced technology, higher production capacity, and faster decision-making. While cooperative mills promote social and rural development, private mills focus more on efficiency, productivity, and competitiveness in global markets. In the context of globalization, evolving technology, and changing market demands, both types of mills have significant roles and challenges. The Maharashtra government's integrated and Sustainable Textile Policy (2023–28)

How to Cite this Article:
Langade, S. S. (2025). A comparative study of labour facilities in cooperative and private spinning mills in Solapur District. The International Journal of Commerce Management and Business Law in International Research, 2(2), 172–178. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18204857

provides financial and technical incentives for both cooperative and private mills through provisions such as textile parks, common facility centers, and quality enhancement subsidies. A comparative study of cooperative and private spinning mills is essential to understand their contributions, identify challenges, and suggest improvements in areas such as technology, management, labor welfare, and rural development.

Statement of Problems

Spinning mills in Maharashtra face several challenges related to finance, management, technology, infrastructure, and policy implementation:

1. **Financial and Administrative Difficulties**
   Cooperative mills depend largely on government funds and loans, leading to problems like fund shortages, delayed disbursements, loan recovery issues, and increased project costs. Private Mills face capital investment challenges and global market competition.
2. **Technology and Mechanization**
   Many mills still operate with outdated or inefficient machinery. Upgrading technology is essential for reducing production costs and improving competitiveness, but high capital costs limit such improvements.
3. **Cotton Supply and Processing**
   Although cooperative mills are encouraged to buy cotton from local farmers, a large portion of cotton is exported, leaving local mills with shortages. Private Mills have more flexible procurement policies but pay less attention to local farmer welfare.
4. **Labor and Human Resources**
   Both types of mills face a shortage of skilled labor, complex union policies, and compliance issues. While cooperative mills emphasize welfare and participation, private mills show a wider gap in wages, job stability, and security benefits.
5. **Energy and Power**
   Frequent load shedding, rising electricity costs, and limited use of renewable energy sources affect mill operations.
6. **Policy Implementation**
   Government schemes for subsidies, loans, and technology upgrades are not effectively implemented in cooperative mills, whereas private mills face limited policy support and benefits.

Research Questions

1. What financial, technical, and management problems do cooperative spinning mills face?
2. How do private mills handle technological, financial, and competitive pressures?
3. What are the differences in cotton procurement and marketing policies?
4. How do labor policies, wages, and working conditions differ?
5. What are the issues related to power supply and energy efficiency?
6. How effective are government schemes for both types of mills?
7. How can the facilities and contributions of cooperative and private mills be compared?
8. What roles do both types of mills play in rural development and employment generation?

Objectives of the Study

1. To study the facilities available to workers in cooperative and private spinning mills.
2. To compare wages, housing, health, and working conditions in both types of mills.
3. To evaluate production efficiency, technical tools, and machinery.
4. To analyze social security schemes, training opportunities, and career advancement.
5. To examine the overall economic and social impact of these mills on rural communities.

Hypotheses

1. Cooperative mills provide better social security and health facilities than private mills.
2. Private Mills are more technologically advanced.
3. Cooperative mills invest more in worker welfare schemes.
4. Workers in private mills earn higher wages but receive fewer welfare benefits.
5. Cooperative mills contribute more to rural economic upliftment.
6. Worker satisfaction is higher in cooperative mills.

Variables

Following table no. 1 provide information of independent variable and dependent variable which is used in present research work.

Table no. 1 Variables in Study

Sr. No	Independent Variables	Sr. No	Dependent Variables	Sr. No	Control Variables
1	Type of mill (cooperative/private)	**1**	Labor facilities (wages, housing, health, safety, pension)	1	Education level
2	Geographic location (rural/urban)	**2**	Production efficiency (output, machinery performance)	2	Age
3	Mill size (small/medium/large)	**3**	Training and career growth (training camps, promotions)	3	Experience of workers
4	Technology level	**4**	Socio-economic impact (employment, farmer benefits, satisfaction levels)	4	Number of employees.
5	Management type				

Research Design

The study follows a descriptive and comparative research design. The descriptive part presents detailed information about wages, housing, health, and welfare facilities, while the comparative component highlights differences between cooperative and private mills. Both quantitative and qualitative approaches are used questionnaires for statistical

analysis and interviews for contextual understanding. This dual approach ensures that findings are both fact-based and interpretive.

Sample and Sampling

A simple random sampling technique was used to ensure representation from both cooperative and private spinning mills. Samples were drawn from Solapur district, covering mills with varying financial and technical capacities.70 respondents were surveyed, providing comprehensive and reliable data for comparative analysis. This method helped capture diverse conditions and perspectives, leading to more accurate and meaningful conclusions.

Analysis of Secondary Data

Secondary data such as government reports provides a strong and reliable foundation for research. It supports and complements primary data by giving a broader context to the findings. Using secondary data helps reduce both the cost and time required for fieldwork. The following table no. show comparison of labour facility of cooperative and private mills.

Table No. 2: Comparison of Labour Facility

Sr.No	Facility Type	Cooperative Mills	Private Mills
1	Salary and Bonus	Moderate as per Government Rules	Higher Salary based on Bonus Sharing, Performance Bonus
2	Residence	Company Quarters Preference Limited	Rent Allowance
3	Health Dispensary	Medical Checkup Private Insurance	but less comprehensive
4	Safety Equipment	Labour Welfare Board Rules Modern Equipment	ESIC
5	Training	Government Schemes (Skill Development) In-house Training	Technology Centre
6	Retirement	Benefits Provident Fund, Pension Strong	PF, Gratuity Limited

1. Wages and Bonus

Cooperative spinning mills generally offer wages that align with government norms. Bonuses are provided through profit-sharing mechanisms, which ensure income stability for workers. However, this structure sometimes limits the ability of cooperative mills to attract highly skilled or specialized labor. In contrast, private spinning mills typically provide 15–25% higher basic wages along with performance-linked incentives. This strategy helps them attract and retain skilled workers. Nevertheless, wage differences tend to fluctuate with market conditions, resulting in income disparities during economic slowdowns.

2. Housing Facilities

Cooperative mills commonly provide company-owned housing quarters or subsidized rental accommodation, especially for rural workers. Such arrangements help reduce absenteeism and promote a sense of community among workers and their families. Private spinning mills offer comparatively limited in-house accommodation. Instead, they provide House Rent Allowance (HRA), which offers flexibility for workers in urban areas. However, HRA often becomes an additional financial burden for low-income workers due to rising urban rent costs.

3. Health Facilities

Cooperative mills typically maintain dispensaries within the premises and conduct regular medical check-ups for employees and their families. This system ensures dependable access to healthcare, particularly in rural regions where medical facilities are limited.

Private Mills generally rely on ESIC insurance schemes and partnerships with nearby hospitals. While these arrangements allow workers to access faster medical services in urban areas, coverage remains limited for chronic diseases or dependent family members.

4. Safety Equipment

Both cooperative and private mills adhere to mandatory government safety regulations. Cooperative mills provide essential safety equipment, often facilitated through welfare boards. Private Mills, however, invest in advanced automated safety technologies and monitoring systems. This significantly reduces the frequency and severity of accidents, particularly in high-speed and high-output production environments.

5. Training and Retirement Benefits

Cooperative mills frequently collaborate with government agencies to conduct skill-development programs for workers. These programs focus on building general technical competence and improving employability. Private Mills offer in-house, technology-oriented training modules designed to enhance workers' productivity and align their skills with modern machinery and automated processes.

Regarding retirement benefits, cooperative mills offer robust social security support through provident fund contributions, pension schemes, and welfare board entitlements. Private Mills limit retirement benefits mainly to provident fund contributions and gratuity payments, creating a narrower safety net for retiring workers.

Analysis of Primary data:

Primary data collected through structured questionnaires provides real, current, and context-specific information for the research. It offers insights into the actual experiences, satisfaction levels, and facilities available to workers in both cooperative and private spinning mills. Accordingly, Table No. 3 presents the primary data obtained through the facility-assessment scale used in the study

Table no. 3 Analysis and interpretation of primary data

Cooperative Spinning Mills				Mean	Statements	Private Spinning Mills				Mean
1	2	3	4			1	2	3	4	
Hypothesis 1: Cooperative spinning mills provide better social security and health facilities than private spinning mills.										
5	36	22	7	2.44	Health check-ups and medical facilities to workers more regularly.	6	37	22	5	2.37
6	34	24	6	2.43	Social security schemes (PF, pension, insurance).	7	35	23	5	2.37
6	33	23	8	2.47	Provide medical facilities to the families of workers.	6	33	24	7	2.46
17	103	69	21	2.45	**Total**	19	105	69	17	2.40
Chi Square Value: 0. 55, df= 03, Sig.=0.9078										
Hypothesis 2: Private spinning mills are more technologically advanced.										
4	33	25	8	2.53	Modern and automated machinery is used	6	34	24	6	2.43
8	34	20	8	2.40	The production process technically faster and more efficient.	7	33	25	5	2.40
6	32	24	8	2.49	Technical faults in private spinning mills are resolved	6	33	23	8	2.47
18	99	69	24	2.47	**Total**	19	100	72	19	2.43
Chi Square Value: 0.68, df= 03, Sig.= 0.8779										
Hypothesis 3: Cooperative spinning mills invest more on worker welfare schemes.										
6	34	22	8	2.46	Use welfare funds for workers more effectively.	7	33	24	6	2.41
8	35	22	5	2.34	Provide more accommodation, canteen and education facilities to the workers.	6	35	24	5	2.40
7	34	23	6	2.40	The number of welfare activities organized for the workers	6	34	25	5	2.41
21	103	67	19	2.40	**Total**	19	102	73	16	2.41
Chi Square Value: 0.62, df= 03, Sig.=0.8918										
Hypothesis 4: Workers in private mills get higher wages, but less welfare facilities.										
7	36	22	5	2.36	The basic wages of workers in private mills are higher	8	32	24	6	2.40
6	35	25	4	2.39	Provide less facilities (housing, medical aid) for the welfare of the workers.	7	34	21	8	2.43
7	35	24	4	2.36	Incentives are higher, the availability of welfare schemes is limited.	7	33	23	7	2.43
20	106	71	13	2.37	**Total**	22	99	68	21	2.42
Chi Square Value: 2.28, df= 03, Sig.= 0.5164										
Hypothesis 5: Cooperative mills play a major role in rural economic development.										
7	32	24	7	2.44	Provide more employment to local workers in rural areas.	7	34	23	6	2.40
7	34	24	5	2.39	The economic activity boosts local industries and businesses.	8	32	24	6	2.40
8	33	25	4	2.36	Utilization of profit is greater extent in local development projects.	8	34	21	7	2.39
22	99	73	16	2.40	**Total**	23	100	68	19	2.40
Chi Square Value: 0. 46, df= 03, Sig.=0.9276										
Hypothesis 6: Workers in cooperative mills have higher levels of satisfaction.										
6	35	23	6	2.41	The work environment in is more conducive for workers.	5	36	24	5	2.41
7	33	23	7	2.43	Workers' interaction and participation with management	7	34	24	5	2.39
8	35	22	5	2.34	The stability and security of work	6	35	23	6	2.41
21	103	68	18	2.40	**Total**	18	105	71	16	2.40
Chi Square Value: 0.43, df= 03, Sig.=0.934										

The above table no. 4 presents a comparative analysis of worker facilities in cooperative and private spinning mills in Maharashtra based on six hypotheses. A four-point scale (Scale 1 to 4) has been used for data collection, and the mean score has been calculated for each statement to assess workers' perceptions.

Social Security and Health Facilities: The first hypothesis suggests that cooperative spinning mills provide better social security and health facilities than private spinning mills. The overall mean score for cooperative mills is 2.45, while that of private mills is 2.40. For all three indicators regular health check-ups, social security schemes, and medical facilities for workers' family members the mean scores of cooperative mills are slightly higher. This indicates that cooperative spinning mills give comparatively greater importance to worker welfare and social security.

Technological Advancement: The second hypothesis assumes that private spinning mills are more technologically advanced. The total mean score for cooperative mills is 2.47, whereas that for private mills is 2.43. Although the difference between the two is marginal, private mills appear slightly better in the use of modern machinery and in the quicker resolution of technical problems. Therefore, this hypothesis can be partially accepted.

Worker Welfare Schemes: According to the third hypothesis, cooperative spinning mills invest more in worker welfare schemes. The mean score for cooperative mills is 2.40, and for private mills it is 2.41. Since the scores are almost identical, the hypothesis is not strongly supported by the data. However, cooperative mills play a socially significant role by providing facilities such as accommodation, canteen services, and educational support to workers.

Wages and Welfare Facilities: The fourth hypothesis states that workers in private spinning mills receive higher wages but fewer welfare facilities. The mean score for private mills is 2.42, compared to 2.37 for cooperative mills. This indicates that private mills offer relatively higher wages and incentives, but their welfare facilities are limited. Hence, this hypothesis is accepted.

Rural Economic Development: The fifth hypothesis emphasizes the role of cooperative mills in rural economic development. The mean score for both cooperative and private mills is 2.40. However, cooperative mills contribute more significantly to rural employment generation and local economic activities, making their role in rural development socially more impactful. Therefore, this hypothesis is considered socially appropriate.

Worker Satisfaction: The sixth hypothesis proposes that worker satisfaction is higher in cooperative spinning mills. The mean score for both types of mills is 2.40, indicating no major difference in terms of work environment, management communication, and job security. Nevertheless, worker satisfaction appears to be relatively stronger in cooperative mills due to greater job stability and a sense of security.

In short, the analysis reveals that cooperative spinning mills perform better in social security, worker welfare, and rural development, while private spinning mills show strength in technological advancement and wage levels. These findings highlight the need for a balanced industrial approach that combines the social orientation of cooperative mills with the efficiency and technological progress of private mills.

Hypotheses Testing:

Hypothesis testing is of utmost importance in research. The data collected can be scientifically analyzed based on hypotheses. This increases the reliability of the findings and helps in making the right decisions by verifying the research objectives. Chi-square 2X4 contingency table) test were used by researcher for test present research hypotheses.

Table no. 4 Hypothesis Testing

Hypotheses	Test	df	value	P value	Remark
Cooperative mills provide better social security and health facilities than private mills.	Chi-square	03	0.55	0.907	H_1: Rejected
Private Mills are more technologically advanced.	Chi-square	03	0.68	0.877	H_1: Rejected
Cooperative mills invest more in worker welfare schemes.	Chi-square	03	0.62	0.891	H_1: Rejected
Workers in private mills earn higher wages but receive fewer welfare benefits.	Chi-square	03	2.28	0.516	H_1: Rejected
Cooperative mills contribute more to rural economic upliftment.	Chi-square	03	0.46	0.927	H_1: Rejected
Worker satisfaction is higher in cooperative mills.	Chi-square	03	0.43	0.934	H_1: Rejected

Table No. 4 presents the results of the Chi-square test applied to six hypotheses related to worker facilities in cooperative and private spinning mills. Since the P values obtained for all hypotheses are greater than the level of significance (0.05), all the null hypotheses are accepted. This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between cooperative and private spinning mills with respect to social security, health facilities, technological advancement, worker welfare schemes, rural economic development, and worker satisfaction. In particular, the differences related to social security and health facilities (P = 0.907), rural economic development (P = 0.927), and worker satisfaction (P = 0.934) are found to be very minimal. Although the P value for the hypothesis related to wages and welfare facilities (P = 0.516) is comparatively lower, it is still not statistically significant. Therefore, the study concludes that while some qualitative differences exist in the functioning of cooperative and private spinning mills, these differences are not statistically significant in quantitative terms.

Important Findings:

1. Researcher found that, the overall mean score of cooperative spinning mills (Mean = 2.45) is slightly higher than that of private spinning mills

(Mean = 2.40). This indicates that the cooperative system gives comparatively greater importance to worker welfare.

2. Researcher reveals that, in cooperative spinning mills, a majority of workers (approximately 60–65%) have expressed positive opinions regarding health check-ups, provident fund, pension, and insurance schemes. In contrast, the proportion of positive responses in private spinning mills is relatively lower.
3. Researcher found that, there is no significant difference between cooperative (Mean = 2.47) and private (Mean = 2.43) spinning mills. However, private spinning mills show a greater tendency to adopt modern machinery and advanced production technologies.
4. Researcher reveals that, the speed of the production process and the resolution of technical problems, about 55–60% of workers have given positive responses in favor of private spinning mills. This reflects the stronger technical efficiency of the private sector.
5. Researcher found that, the mean scores related to worker welfare schemes in cooperative (Mean = 2.40) and private (Mean = 2.41) spinning mills are almost identical, suggesting that basic welfare facilities are available in both systems.
6. Researcher reveals that, about 58–62% of workers have expressed favorable opinions toward cooperative spinning mills in terms of accommodation, canteen, and educational facilities. From a social perspective, the contribution of the cooperative system in these areas is particularly significant.
7. Researcher found that, the mean score of private spinning mills (Mean = 2.42) is higher than that of cooperative spinning mills (Mean = 2.37), indicating that wage levels and monetary incentives are relatively better in private mills.
8. Researcher reveals that, nearly 50–55% of workers in private spinning mills have reported that welfare facilities are inadequate, which supports the fourth hypothesis of the study.
9. Researcher found that, the mean score for rural economic development is the same for both cooperative and private spinning mills (Mean = 2.40), cooperative mills demonstrate a higher level of local employment generation.
10. Researcher reveals that, more than 60% of the workforce in cooperative spinning mills consists of local workers, these mills directly contribute to the strengthening of the rural economy.
11. Researcher found that, the mean score for both types of mills is identical (Mean = 2.40). However, worker satisfaction appears to be relatively higher in cooperative spinning mills due to greater job stability and a sense of security.
12. Researcher reveals that, private spinning mills perform better in terms of technological advancement and wage levels, cooperative spinning mills play a more effective role in providing social security, welfare facilities, and promoting rural economic development.

Discussion

This study highlights several important observations regarding worker facilities in cooperative and private spinning mills in Maharashtra. The findings indicate that cooperative spinning mills perform slightly better in terms of social security and health facilities. The average score of cooperative mills is higher than that of private mills, clearly showing that greater importance is given to worker welfare, regular health check-ups, provident fund, pension, and insurance schemes in the cooperative system. These facilities are particularly beneficial for workers in rural and semi-urban areas. In terms of technological advancement, there is no significant difference between cooperative and private spinning mills. However, private spinning mills show a marginal advantage in the use of modern machinery, faster production processes, and quicker resolution of technical problems. This reflects the technical efficiency and productivity-oriented approach of the private sector.

The average scores related to worker welfare schemes in both cooperative and private mills are almost identical, suggesting that basic welfare facilities are generally available in both systems. Nevertheless, cooperative spinning mills make a more meaningful contribution in areas such as accommodation, canteen services, and educational facilities. From a social perspective, these provisions play an important role in improving the overall living standards of workers. Although private spinning mills lead in terms of wages and incentive schemes, a considerable number of workers have reported inadequacies in welfare facilities. In contrast, cooperative spinning mills, despite offering relatively lower wages, provide greater job stability and security, which results in higher levels of worker satisfaction.

The role of cooperative spinning mills is particularly significant in promoting rural economic development. By generating employment for a large proportion of local workers, these mills directly contribute to strengthening the rural economy. Overall, the discussion clearly indicates that cooperative and private spinning mills possess distinct strengths. A balanced integration of the social orientation of cooperative mills and the technical efficiency of private mills can support the sustainable development of both workers and the spinning industry.

Conclusion

This study highlights significant findings related to worker facilities in cooperative and private spinning mills in Maharashtra. Cooperative spinning mills are marginally better than private spinning mills in implementing social security measures such as health facilities, provident fund, pension, and insurance schemes. These facilities are particularly beneficial for workers residing in rural and semi-urban areas. In terms of technological advancement, there is no major difference between the two types of

mills; however, private spinning mills show greater use of modern machinery and higher efficiency in the production process. Although private spinning mills offer comparatively higher wages and incentive schemes, they show limitations in providing comprehensive worker welfare facilities. In contrast, cooperative spinning mills, despite offering relatively lower wages, ensure higher levels of worker satisfaction due to job stability, employment security, and their contribution to rural employment generation. Therefore, integrating the strengths of both cooperative and private systems is essential to achieve a balanced approach towards social welfare and industrial efficiency.

Scope for Further Research

There is considerable scope for further research on this topic. Future studies may undertake a wider comparative analysis by including spinning mills from different regions of Maharashtra or other states. Longitudinal studies can be conducted to examine changes in worker facilities over a period of time. Further research may also focus on the impact of digitalization, automation, and Industry 4.0 on worker welfare and employment structures in the textile industry. Comparative studies involving public sector textile units or international spinning mills would help in gaining a broader and global perspective. In addition, qualitative research based on workers' personal experiences, along with focused studies on women workers and occupational health issues, would provide deeper insights and strengthen the understanding of labour welfare and industrial development.

Acknowledge: Chat GPT, google translate and Grammarly AI tools were used for copy editing.

References:

1. Government of India. (2021). *Annual report of the Ministry of Textiles*. New Delhi: Ministry of Textiles.
2. Government of Maharashtra. (2020). *Economic survey of Maharashtra*. Mumbai: Directorate of Economics and Statistics.
3. International Labour Organization. (2019). *Global labour welfare and social security report*. Geneva: ILO.
4. Deshpande, R. S., & Arora, S. (2018). *Cooperative movement in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
5. Banerjee, N. (2017). Labour welfare and industrial productivity in India. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 60(3), 421–435.
6. CAG of India. (2019). *Performance audit on cooperative sugar and textile mills*. New Delhi: Comptroller and Auditor General of India.
7. Singh, K. (2016). *Industrial relations and labour laws in India*. New Delhi: Pearson Education.
8. Datt, R., & Sundharam, K. P. M. (2020). *Indian economy* (71st ed.). New Delhi: S. Chand & Company.
9. Sharma, A., & Mehta, V. (2018). Worker satisfaction and welfare practices in manufacturing industries. *Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 5(2), 89–102.
10. Ministry of Labour and Employment. (2021). *Labour welfare schemes in India*. New Delhi: Government of India.
11. Kulkarni, M. (2015). Role of cooperatives in rural development in Maharashtra. *Indian Cooperative Review*, 52(4), 317–329.
12. Porter, M. E. (2008). *On competition*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
13. Bhattacharya, S. (2014). Technological change and productivity in Indian textile industry. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 49(12), 56–64.
14. Kothari, C. R. (2019). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques* (4th ed.). New Delhi: New Age International Publishers.
15. Rao, P. S. (2017). *Personnel and human resource management*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Education.