INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF NOVEL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (IJNRD)
© 2026 IJNRD | Volume 11, Issue 10, October 2026 | ISSN: 2456-4184 | IJNRD.ORG

LABOUR WELFARE MEASURES AND EMPLOYEE WELL-BEING: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY IN A PUBLIC SECTOR UNDERTAKING IN KERALA

Sabeer J M[1] and Dr. Saptarshi Sengupta[2]

[1] M.Sc. Psychology, Jain (Deemed-to-be University), Centre for Distance and Online Education, Bengaluru, India.

[2] Assistant Professor, Jain (Deemed-to-be University), Bengaluru, India.

Author: Sabeer J M

Co-author: Dr. Saptarshi Sengupta

Abstract

Labour welfare is an important organisational concern because the conditions in which employees work can shape their sense of safety, security, fairness and satisfaction. From an organisational psychology perspective, welfare measures are relevant not only as facilities or statutory provisions but also as aspects of the work environment experienced by employees. The present study examined employee perceptions of labour welfare measures at public sector undertaking, in , Kerala, with specific attention to occupational safety, machinery-related training, working time, leave, salary, wage increments, medical benefits, trade union representation, grievance redressal and satisfaction with the implementation of labour laws. A descriptive survey design was adopted. Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire from 200 respondents selected by convenience sampling. The project reports the use of percentage analysis and selected chi-square and correlation procedures. The findings show that 96.5% of respondents reported that safety equipment was provided, while 65.5% were satisfied or highly satisfied with safety provisions. A total of 94% reported comfort with shift timings, and 87.5% were satisfied or highly satisfied with ESI medical benefits. Salary and wage increments also received broadly favourable responses. However, all respondents indicated that the grievance redressal machinery required improvement. Although all respondents reported trade union membership, 21.5% disagreed or strongly disagreed that the union represented them when they faced workplace problems. Satisfaction with labour-law implementation was mixed: 46% were satisfied or highly satisfied, 28% were neutral and 26% were dissatisfied or highly dissatisfied. Pension was the most frequently selected additional welfare measure (52%). The findings highlight the importance of combining the provision of welfare facilities with accessible grievance procedures, systematic safety training and meaningful employee representation. The results are confined to the surveyed sample and should be interpreted cautiously because of limitations in sampling and inconsistencies identified in some source tables.

Keywords: labour welfare; employee well-being; job satisfaction; occupational safety; grievance redressal; trade union; organisational psychology.

1. Introduction

Work is a central part of adult life. It provides income and social identity, structures daily activity and creates opportunities for participation and achievement. At the same time, the workplace can expose employees to physical risks, demanding schedules, interpersonal conflict and uncertainty about employment conditions. Labour welfare measures are therefore relevant to the psychological as well as the physical experience of work. Safe equipment, adequate rest intervals, medical support, fair compensation, leave provisions and responsive grievance procedures may contribute to employees' perceptions that their organisation takes their welfare seriously.

In industrial and manufacturing settings, occupational safety is especially important because employees may work with machinery, tools, electrical systems and other potentially hazardous processes. The provision of protective equipment is one component of safety; employees also need appropriate instruction, practical training and confidence that unsafe conditions will be addressed. A workplace may formally provide protective devices while still requiring improvement in training, communication or the reporting of hazards. It is consequently useful to examine employees' perceptions of both the availability of welfare measures and their satisfaction with how those measures operate.

The organisational psychology perspective also draws attention to the relationship between working conditions and employees' subjective experiences. Perceived fairness, support, security and the ability to raise concerns can influence how employees evaluate their workplace. Grievance redressal is particularly important in this respect. When employees believe that complaints are heard and dealt with consistently, workplace communication may be strengthened. When the process is perceived as ineffective or inaccessible, dissatisfaction may persist even where other welfare facilities are available.

The present study, titled "A Study on Labour Welfare Measures in the selected public sector undertaking in Kerala", examines employee responses across several welfare dimensions. It focuses on the views of 200 respondents regarding safety equipment, safety provisions, training before handling new machinery, working hours, interval timings, shift comfort, annual leave, salary, wage increments, ESI benefits, trade union representation, grievance redressal and the implementation of labour laws. The article presents the findings through an employee well-being and organisational psychology lens while retaining the descriptive scope of the original project.

2. Review of Literature and Conceptual Background

The source project's review of literature discusses labour welfare, social security, industrial relations and the responsibilities of employers and workers. It draws on books and institutional publications attributed to authors including A. M. Sharma, R. C. Saxena, S. D. Punekar, S. S. Chauhan and K. N. Jetli, as well as publications of the International Labour Organization. These works provide a broad background to labour welfare and the development of employment-related protections. The project bibliography, however, contains a mixture of publication periods and incomplete bibliographic details. Those details should be checked against the original publications before a journal submission.

For the purposes of this study, labour welfare is considered through employees' reported experience of the work environment and employment-related support. The relevant dimensions include: (a) physical safety and prevention of occupational harm; (b) working-time arrangements and rest; (c) monetary and medical benefits; (d) collective representation; and (e) grievance handling and perceptions of labour-law implementation. These dimensions are connected to organisational psychology because they relate to employees' perceptions of safety, support, fairness and satisfaction.

The project's empirical contribution is its organisation-specific description of these dimensions among a sample of employees associated with the selected public sector undertaking. In particular, the simultaneous presence of favourable responses on several facilities and a unanimous call for improvement in grievance redressal provides a useful basis for examining the difference between welfare provision and employees' experience of welfare administration. The study is descriptive and does not establish that any particular welfare measure causes changes in psychological well-being, motivation or productivity.

3. Statement of the Problem

Industrial employees may experience concerns relating to occupational safety, machinery training, working schedules, compensation, medical benefits, representation and the resolution of workplace complaints. The existence of formal welfare arrangements does not necessarily mean that employees experience all arrangements as adequate or responsive. The problem addressed by this study is to understand how employees at the selected public sector undertaking perceive the welfare measures available to them, how satisfied they are with selected provisions, and which areas they identify as requiring improvement.

4. Objectives of the Study

1. To identify the health, safety and welfare benefits reported by employees.
2. To assess employee satisfaction regarding work timings, shift arrangements, monetary benefits and related employment provisions.
3. To examine the perceived role of trade unions in labour welfare and workplace problem-solving.
4. To assess employee views regarding existing welfare-handling and grievance-redressal arrangements.
5. To identify areas in which labour welfare measures may be improved.

5. Research Methodology

5.1 Research design and setting

The study adopted a descriptive research design and survey method. The setting was the selected public sector undertaking in Kerala. The purpose was to describe respondents' views about existing welfare arrangements and their satisfaction with selected employment-related provisions.

5.2 Sample and sampling technique

The project reports a sample of 200 respondents selected through non-probability convenience sampling. Respondents were approached based on accessibility and willingness to participate. Because probability sampling was not used, the findings describe the participating sample and should not be treated as statistically representative of the entire workforce.

5.3 Data collection instrument and sources

Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire covered demographic and employment characteristics and included items relating to safety equipment, safety provisions, machinery training, working hours, interval timings, shift comfort, annual leave, salary, wage increments, ESI medical benefits, trade union membership and representation, grievance redressal, labour-law implementation and preferred welfare improvements. The project also identifies organisational records, annual reports, brochures and the company website as secondary sources.

5.4 Data analysis

The project reports the use of frequency and percentage analysis, graphical presentation, chi-square tests, correlation analysis and weighted-average techniques. This article presents the frequency and percentage findings that can be traced to the project tables. The two reported chi-square results are described with caution. The project's correlation calculations are not interpreted as valid respondent-level correlations because the displayed calculations use aggregated category frequencies rather than paired individual-level observations. The correlation coefficients should therefore not be reported as inferential evidence unless recalculated from the original respondent-level dataset.

5.5 Ethical considerations

The original project contains a student declaration and university/guide certification. It does not provide sufficient detail in the material reviewed to establish the precise consent procedure, confidentiality safeguards or a separate ethics approval or exemption reference. These details must be accurately supplied by the author in accordance with the university's requirements and the target journal's policy. No ethics approval number or procedure is assumed in this article.

6. Results

The following tables reproduce selected numerical results from the project report. Percentages are presented as reported in the source tables. Where a discrepancy exists between counts and percentages, it is explicitly identified rather than silently corrected.

6.1 Profile of respondents

Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage
Educational qualification		
Diploma	78	39.0
Undergraduate	49	24.5
Postgraduate	65	32.5
Other	8	4.0
Age group		
20–25 years	11	5.5

26–30 years	67	33.5
31–35 years	55	27.5
36–40 years	55	27.5
Above 40 years	12	6.0
Work experience		
Less than 1 year	7	3.5
1–3 years	66	33.0
3–5 years	67	33.5
Above 5 years	60	30.0

The sample included respondents from different educational backgrounds and experience groups. Diploma holders formed the largest educational category (39%). The most frequently represented age group was 26–30 years (33.5%). In terms of experience, 33.5% reported 3–5 years and 33% reported 1–3 years of experience. The source table on marital status requires correction: it records 148 married and 57 unmarried respondents, which totals 205, while the stated sample size is 200; its percentages also total 102.5%. Marital status is therefore not reproduced as a valid result in this article.

6.2 Occupational safety and machinery training

Measure	Response	Frequency	Percentage
Safety equipment provided	Yes	193	96.5
	No	7	3.5
Satisfaction with safety provisions	Highly satisfied	53	26.5
	Satisfied	78	39.0
	Neutral	52	26.0
	Dissatisfied	12	6.0
	Highly dissatisfied	5	2.5
Training before handling new machinery	Strongly agree	46	23.0
	Agree	66	33.0
	Neutral	70	35.0
	Disagree	14	7.0
	Strongly disagree	4	2.0

Almost all respondents (96.5%) reported that safety equipment was provided. In relation to satisfaction with safety provisions, 65.5% were either highly satisfied or satisfied, while 26% were neutral and 8.5% expressed dissatisfaction. This indicates a generally favourable assessment, alongside a sizeable neutral group and a smaller group reporting dissatisfaction.

Regarding training before handling new machinery, 56% either strongly agreed or agreed with the statement that adequate training should be provided. A further 35% were neutral, while 9% disagreed or strongly disagreed. The response pattern supports the need to examine how consistently employees receive practical instruction and refresher training before operating unfamiliar machinery. The survey item measures agreement with a training statement; it does not independently establish the actual training frequency or its effect on accident rates.

6.3 Working time, intervals and leave

Measure	Response	Frequency	Percentage
Working hours per day	7 hours	2	1.0
	8 hours	45	22.5
	9 hours	153	76.5
Satisfaction with interval timings	Highly satisfied	29	14.5
	Satisfied	138	69.0
	Neutral	19	9.5
	Dissatisfied	13	6.5
	Highly dissatisfied	1	0.5
Comfortable with shift timings	Yes	188	94.0
	No	12	6.0
Annual leave as per government norms	Strongly agree	71	35.5
	Agree	74	37.0
	Neutral	35	17.5
	Disagree	15	7.5
	Strongly disagree	5	2.5

A majority of respondents (76.5%) reported working nine hours per day. Satisfaction with interval timings was high: 83.5% were satisfied or highly satisfied. Similarly, 94% reported that they were comfortable with shift timings. On annual leave, 72.5% strongly agreed or agreed that leave was provided according to government norms. These are self-reported perceptions and should not be interpreted as an independent legal compliance audit of working hours or leave records.

6.4 Salary, wage increments and medical benefits

Measure	Response	Frequency	Percentage
Satisfaction with salary	Highly satisfied	66	33.0
	Satisfied	82	41.0
	Neutral	24	12.0
	Dissatisfied	14	7.0
	Highly dissatisfied	4	2.0
Satisfaction with wage increments	Highly satisfied	77	38.5
	Satisfied	95	47.5
	Neutral	10	5.0
	Dissatisfied	12	6.0
	Highly dissatisfied	6	3.0
Satisfaction with ESI medical benefits	Highly satisfied	87	43.5
	Satisfied	88	44.0
	Neutral	9	4.5
	Dissatisfied	16	8.0
	Highly dissatisfied	2	1.0

Salary satisfaction was favourable, with 74% reporting that they were satisfied or highly satisfied. Wage increments received a similarly positive response, with 86% satisfied or highly satisfied. ESI medical benefits were viewed favourably by 87.5% of respondents. These findings suggest that monetary and medical benefit arrangements were positively perceived by most participants, although a smaller proportion expressed neutral or negative views.

6.5 Trade union representation and grievance redressal

Measure	Response	Frequency	Percentage
Trade union membership	Yes	200	100.0
	No	0	0.0
Union represents employees with workplace problems	Strongly agree	20	10.0
	Agree	104	52.0
	Neutral	33	16.5
	Disagree	23	11.5
	Strongly disagree	20	10.0
Improvement required in grievance redressal	Yes	200	100.0

	No	0	0.0

All respondents reported trade union membership. However, perceptions of representation were not unanimous: 62% strongly agreed or agreed that the union represented them when they faced workplace problems, 16.5% were neutral and 21.5% disagreed or strongly disagreed. The most striking finding is that all 200 respondents indicated that improvement was required in the grievance redressal machinery. This result makes grievance handling the clearest improvement priority identified by the survey.

6.6 Satisfaction with implementation of labour laws and preferred improvements

Satisfaction level	Frequency	Percentage reported in table
Highly satisfied	44	22.0
Satisfied	48	24.0
Neutral	56	28.0
Dissatisfied	26	13.0
Highly dissatisfied	26	13.0
Total	200	100.0

The distribution shows that 46% were satisfied or highly satisfied with the implementation of labour laws, 28% were neutral and 26% were dissatisfied or highly dissatisfied. This is a mixed pattern and contrasts with the more favourable responses to specific provisions such as shift timings and ESI benefits. It may indicate that employees evaluate the broader implementation of labour laws differently from their experience of individual facilities.

Preferred additional welfare measure	Frequency	Percentage
Housing	20	10.0
Pension	104	52.0
Accident compensation for family (excluding medical compensation)	33	16.5
Education facilities for children	23	11.5
Leave encashment	20	10.0
Total	200	100.0

Pension was the most frequently selected additional welfare measure (52%). Accident compensation for family members was selected by 16.5%, education facilities for children by 11.5%, and housing and leave encashment by 10% each. The pattern suggests that respondents attach importance to long-term financial security and family-oriented welfare in addition to immediate workplace facilities.

6.7 Reported tests of association

The project reports a chi-square test examining the association between employees' views of adequate training before handling new machinery and their overall satisfaction with implementation of labour laws. After regrouping response categories, the reported statistic was $\chi^2 = 22.364$ with 8 degrees of freedom at the 5% significance level. The project compares this value with a critical value of approximately 15.5 and rejects the null hypothesis.

A second chi-square test examined the association between perceived trade union representation when employees experienced workplace problems and overall satisfaction with implementation of labour laws. The project reports $\chi^2 = 26.85$ with 8 degrees of freedom at the 5% level and rejects the null hypothesis. These results are reported as presented in the project. Before journal submission, both tests should be recalculated from the original respondent-level cross-tabulations, with expected cell frequencies, exact p-values and an appropriate effect-size measure reported. The published article should not rely solely on the project's summary calculations.

The project also reports positive correlation coefficients for safety satisfaction and salary satisfaction in relation to satisfaction with labour-law implementation. However, the displayed calculations aggregate category frequencies and do not show paired scores for individual respondents. Such calculations do not establish a respondent-level correlation. Accordingly, these coefficients are not treated as valid evidence in the present article and should be omitted unless recalculated using the original respondent-level dataset.

7. Discussion

The findings present a differentiated picture of labour welfare at the selected public sector undertaking. Several specific provisions were viewed favourably. Most respondents reported the availability of safety equipment, and a majority were satisfied with the safety provisions, interval timings, shift arrangements, salary, wage increments and ESI medical benefits. From an organisational psychology perspective, such responses may reflect positive evaluations of aspects of the work environment that contribute to employees' sense of security and support. Nevertheless, the descriptive design does not allow conclusions about the causal effect of these provisions on psychological well-being, motivation or performance.

The results relating to machinery training deserve particular attention. Although 56% agreed or strongly agreed with the need for adequate training before handling new machinery, 35% remained neutral. In a manufacturing setting, training is not merely a technical requirement; it may also support employees' confidence and perceived control when performing potentially hazardous tasks. The organisation may therefore benefit from clear training protocols, practical demonstrations, competency checks and refresher sessions. The present survey, however, did not directly measure training quality or accident frequency, so these implications should be viewed as areas for organisational review rather than proven effects.

A key finding concerns grievance redressal. Every respondent indicated that the grievance redressal machinery required improvement. This is notable because other areas received relatively favourable assessments. The result suggests that the overall experience of welfare is not determined only by the availability of facilities. Employees also need a credible process through which concerns can be raised, reviewed and resolved. The responses concerning trade union representation reinforce this point: while membership was universal, more than one-fifth of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that the union represented them when they faced workplace problems. Membership alone, therefore, should not be assumed to indicate effective representation.

Satisfaction with the implementation of labour laws was also mixed. Less than half of the respondents were satisfied or highly satisfied (46%), while 28% were neutral and 26% were dissatisfied or highly dissatisfied. This broader assessment may reflect concerns that are not captured by individual questions about leave, salary or medical benefits. It also highlights the importance of communicating employee entitlements and making implementation processes transparent. The study did not audit statutory records and cannot determine legal compliance; it records employee perceptions.

The preference for pension as an additional welfare measure was prominent. This may reflect the importance respondents place on long-term economic security. Preferences for accident compensation, education support, housing and leave encashment also show that employees consider welfare in relation to family needs and future security, not only immediate workplace conditions. These preferences can inform management discussions, subject to organisational feasibility and applicable rules.

8. Practical Implications and Recommendations

6. Establish a clearly documented grievance procedure with accessible channels, defined response timelines, escalation levels and periodic review of unresolved complaints.
7. Communicate the grievance process to employees and explain how confidentiality, impartiality and protection against retaliation are maintained.
8. Review the effectiveness of trade union representation and create regular, structured opportunities for employee–management dialogue.
9. Provide documented induction and refresher training before employees operate new machinery; include practical demonstrations and confirmation of competency.
10. Continue periodic review of personal protective equipment, hazard reporting, accident-prevention practices and employee awareness.
11. Review working-time and rest arrangements with reference to applicable legal requirements and the actual duties and shifts of employees.
12. Communicate clearly the eligibility, scope and procedures relating to ESI, leave, salary-related benefits and other welfare provisions.
13. Consider employee preferences for pension-related security, accident compensation for families, education support, housing and leave encashment when reviewing future welfare initiatives.
14. Use periodic employee feedback surveys to monitor changes in perceived safety, support, representation and grievance resolution.

9. Limitations of the Study

The study is confined to the selected public sector undertaking in Kerala, and includes 200 respondents selected through convenience sampling. The findings cannot be generalised automatically to all employees of the unit, other the public sector undertaking locations or other manufacturing organisations. The data are based on self-reported questionnaire responses and may be influenced by recall, response or social desirability bias. Work schedules and shift arrangements were reported as practical challenges during data collection. The article relies on the tables and summary results in the submitted project report; respondent-level raw data were not available for independent verification of all statistical tests.

The source report also contains internal inconsistencies that must be resolved before submission. The marital-status frequencies total 205 despite a stated sample of 200. The questionnaire refers in several places to “the organisation” and “the organisation”, although the project title and methodology identify the selected public sector undertaking. The fieldwork period is also not consistently stated across all project materials. The present article has not silently corrected these issues. The marital-status result has been excluded, and the organisation and actual data-collection dates must be confirmed against the original field records. The labour-law satisfaction table is internally consistent in its frequency distribution, but the narrative in the source report gives 12.5% for dissatisfaction while the table gives 13%; this article follows the table values.

The study is descriptive and cross-sectional. It does not establish causal relationships between welfare measures and psychological outcomes such as stress, morale, motivation, job satisfaction or productivity. No validated psychological scale for these constructs is identified in the project questionnaire. The findings should therefore be understood as employee perceptions of welfare measures rather than direct measurement of psychological well-being.

10. Conclusion

This study examined employee perceptions of labour welfare measures at the selected public sector undertaking, across occupational safety, machinery training, working-time arrangements, leave, salary, wage increments, ESI medical benefits, trade union representation, grievance redressal and labour-law implementation. The reported responses were generally favourable in relation to the provision of safety equipment, shift comfort, interval timings, salary, wage increments and ESI benefits. At the same time, the study identified important areas for improvement.

The most consistent concern was grievance redressal: all respondents indicated that the existing machinery required improvement. The findings also point to the need for systematic machinery training and closer attention to the effectiveness of employee representation. Satisfaction with the broader implementation of labour laws was mixed, while pension emerged as the most preferred additional welfare measure. From an organisational psychology perspective, the findings underline that employee welfare involves more than the physical availability of facilities. It also includes employees’ experience of voice, responsiveness, security and fair treatment.

The study offers an organisation-specific description of employee perceptions and provides practical areas for review. Its findings should be interpreted within the limits of convenience sampling and the data inconsistencies noted above. Future research may use probability sampling, validated measures of job satisfaction and perceived organisational support, and respondent-level statistical analysis to examine more rigorously how welfare experiences relate to psychological well-being and work outcomes.

References

The following entries are drawn from the bibliography of the original project. Several entries have incomplete or inconsistent publication details. They are retained here as provisional source references and must be verified against the original publications and formatted to the target journal’s required style before submission.

15. Chauhan, S. S. (1993). Labour welfare administration in India. Kanishka Publishers. [Verify full author name and edition details].
16. Jetli, K. N. (2006). Manpower, employment policy and labour welfare: 1947 to 2007. New Century Publications.
17. Punekar, S. D. (2007). Labour welfare, trade unionism and industrial relations. [Verify edition and publisher details].
18. Saxena, R. C. (1999). Labour problems and social welfare. [Verify title, edition and publisher details].
19. Sharma, A. M. (2006). Aspects of labour welfare and social security. [Verify publisher and edition details].
20. International Labour Organization. (1957). Systems of social security—Great Britain. International Labour Office. [Verify exact title and publication details].
21. Tyagi, B. P. (n.d.). Labour economics and social welfare. [Publication details to be verified].
22. Sinha, P. K. (1980). Social security measures in India. Classical Publications. [Verify edition details].
23. Bhatnagar, D. (1984). Labour welfare and social security legislation in India. Deep & Deep Publications.
24.