

A STUDY ON LABOUR WELFARE AND INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTIVITY WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON TRAVANCORE TITANIUM INDUSTRY IN KERALA

By

***Kaveya, P., & **Sheela, M. C.**

**Research scholar, Department of Economics, University College, Trivandrum, Kerala, India.*

***Associate Professor, Department of Economics, University College, Trivandrum, Kerala, India.*

Abstract

The concept of labour welfare rests always as an important area to be dealt with. Labour welfare measures both monetary and non-monetary benefits which are incurred to provide ample working environment to labour population of the society. The study basically considers the welfare perspective of a public sector industrial unit. The population of the study includes all the employees of Trivandrum Titanium Limited Company. From the population researcher took sample 189 employees on their human resource book as at 20th Nov. 2023. All these employees were used as the sample for this research study. Goodness-of-fit statistical tool and other relevant and appropriate statistical techniques were used to test and validate the hypothesis. The study finds out that there exists positive association between the labour productivity and labour welfare that exists within a business unit.

Keywords: labour welfare, productivity, travancore, titanium industry.

Introduction

Sustainable development patterns and inclusive structures drive economic growth and development. They involve modernizing industrial units, improving technical capabilities, and promoting environmental sustainability. The 2030 Sustainable Development Goals emphasize collaboration between socio-economic and governance dimensions, focusing on the industrial framework. Implementing an eco-technology-based industrial unit requires a strong industrial basin.

During the British phase, the Indian economy faced challenges such as stagnant domestic markets, lack of investment climate, entrepreneurial development and inadequate infrastructure. This led to the need for a strong industrial basin to address

unemployment and promote self-sufficiency. Both underdeveloped and developed economies advocated for these basins, believing in high per capita and living standards. However, labor security was not adequately addressed during this period.

Workers are the foundation of any business, and their degree of pleasure affects how productive they are. A motivated employee is a happy and productive individual, and a contented worker is a motivated employee. It is impossible to overstate the value of having happy employees. It is imperative that upper management devise strategies for inspiring and fulfilling their workforce via thoughtful and organised benefits packages in order to attain optimal performance levels (Edison et al., 2017).

These welfare packages can take many forms, so businesses should determine what drives and pleases each person separately and as a group. This means that it's crucial to pay careful attention to how employees can be driven by the satisfaction that comes from working for a company (Kolte, n.d.).

Each employee has expectations from their employers, both personal and group-related. Every person in a company is subject to these expectations in a different way. Certain people have high expectations, whereas others have medium or low expectations. This is made feasible by the new generation of HR managers, who have detailed every employee's goals, responses to events, and situational shifts (*Employees Development and Productivity in Private Organization, n.d.*).

The Concept of Labour and Labour Welfare

Labor welfare can be defined as a term, which is understood to include such services, facilities, and amenities as may be established in or in the vicinity of undertakings to enable the persons employed in them to perform their work in healthy, congenial surroundings and to provide them with amenities conducive to good health and high morale-ILO

S E Thomas defines labour as that “which consists of all human effort of body or of mind, which is undertaken in the expectation of rewards”. It is the security or the welfare provided for the labour force which determines the working environment of an industrial unit.

Objective of the Study

1. To understand the basic concept of labour and labour welfare in industrial context
2. To give an overview of labour security measures and the determining factors
3. To understand about the contribution and existence of Travancore Titanium industry in Kerala
4. To examine the impact of labour security measures on productivity

Formulated Hypothesis

Ho: There is no significant relationship between motivation and productivity.

Review of Related Studies

The need for the services that the workers will provide was what initially made their employment necessary. Therefore, it is in every organization's best advantage to determine how to increase productivity by comprehending the incentives that employees are entitled to through welfare packages.

Onuoha and Odimegwu believe that in order to achieve effective productivity, the hygiene factor—as suggested by Herzberg—must be applied. They believe that in order to boost worker productivity, the following elements must exist.

1. Work that has purpose
2. Opportunity for advancement
3. Recognition
4. Competent leadership
5. Fair wages
6. Freedom from arbitrary action

7. A voice in matters affecting them
8. Satisfactory working conditions
9. Congenial associates

Productivity

According to Aderinto, Fashoyin, Osundahunsi and Ibraheem, the ratio between output and the total input of factors required to achieve production. Input is considered as products and services. Thus, productivity is the end result of a complex social process of production.

Labour Productivity

The term labour productivity is commonly used to refer to the volume of goods and services produced per worker within some specified unit of the year, month, day and hour. The difference between productivity and labour productivity is that while the former stresses relationship between input and output, the latter emphasizes result of it put. The practice of using labour, especially direct labour inputs and costs can be ascertained and quantified more easily than those of other factors, and partly due to a legacy of classical economics thought which not only tends to regard direct labour as the sole source of value but also tends to regard all forms of indirect labour as “unproductive labour”(Congress, 2008).

Types of Employee Welfare Programme

The types of benefits being produced for employees are numerous and differ from one organization to another and in varying names.

Added Leisure and Income

Most of employee benefits in this category can be traced to employee union policy. Reduction in what is usually described as normal hours of work, premium pay for second and third slug, paid holidays, collation and rest period have frequently been negotiated. Many of these benefits also express public policy items differentials paid holiday, paid vocations rest pauses and coffee break, leave for illness, leave or death of relation etc. All these constitute payment for time not worked. Their value however varies from one company to another. *(Employees Development and Productivity in Private Organization, n.d.)*

Personal Identification and Participation

A number of common benefits have been created by managers largely on their own initiatives. Behind these benefit managers in tend to encourage a reciprocal feeling of friendliness and personal beautification with the interest admission of the organization (Nusrat & Solaiman, 2016).

Employee Security

It is a matter of policy as employees; their vision is to provide reasonably steady and certain income from work. In other words, this policy proposed to relieve workers as much as possible from pains and worries about the employment and the loss of jobs and income benefits under. Severance pay or dismissal pay Unemployment Insurance Retagging (Edison et al., 2017).

Health and Welfare

Current public policy tends to protect employment income against the major health of workers and their department. Employers are now expected to develop for this purpose several types of benefits including those that provide compensation for industrial accidents and work connected illness, numerous forms of Insurance services (A Study on Awareness and Satisfaction towards Employee Welfare Measures, 2019).

Methodology

Population of the Study

The population of the study includes all the employees of Trivandrum Titanium Limited Company. From the population researcher took sample 189 employees on their human resource book as at 20th Nov. 2023. All these employees were used as the sample for this research study.

Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

Due to the nature of the population, Convenient sampling technique was adopted.

Hypothesis

Goodness-of-fit statistical tool and other relevant and appropriate statistical techniques were used to test and validate the hypothesis.

Ho: There is no significant relationship between labour welfare and productivity.

Decision Rule

The decision rule is, if the calculated value is less than the significant value of 0.05, the null hypothesis would be accepted; otherwise the alternative hypothesis would be rejected. The presentation, analysis and interpretation of all the data collected are presented and analyzed. They are based on the objectives, research questions and hypotheses that guided the research. It further conducts a detailed analysis with the aid of suitable statistical technique of the data collected.

Distribution of Questionnaire

The Table 1 shows the total number of questionnaires administered was 189, out of which 189 (100%) respondents received the questionnaire. This shows that all employees received a questionnaire. All the employees of received, completed and returned their questionnaires showing a success return rate of 100%.

Test of Hypotheses

In the section, a statistical test will be carried out to test hypothesis one. The data from questionnaire section A, Question 1 – 4 was used to test the hypothesis so as to validate the research study using a descriptive statistic, and other relevant statistical tools.

The responses of the employees' under-study. The YES RESPONSE has a statistical range of 11, minimum of 23, maximum of 34, mean of 29.75, standard error of 2.394, standard deviation of 4.787 and variance of 22.917 while the NO RESPONSE has a

statistical range of 11, minimum of 8, error of 2.394, standard deviation of 4.787 maximum of 19, mean of 12.25, standard and variance of 22.917.

Table 1. Pearson correlations of the responses

		Yes response	No response
Yes response	Pearson Correlation	1	-1.000**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	68.750	-68.750
	Covariance	22.917	-22.917
	N	4	4
No response	Pearson Correlation	-1.000**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	-68.750	68.750
	Covariance	-22.917	22.917
	N	4	4

From the above correlation analysis, the two variables are significant at 0.01 which is less than 0.05 significant levels for this research.

To further, validate the above analysis, the researcher will use another statistical tool to validate the variables.

Table 2. Goodness-of-fit test for Poisson distribution

Yes		Poisson Contribution		
Response	Observed	Probability	Expected	Chi-Square
<=23	19	0.182490	8.94201	11.3132
24	0	0.057085	2.79717	2.7972
25	0	0.064728	3.17165	3.1717
26	0	0.070570	3.45795	3.4579
27	0	0.074091	3.63045	3.6305
28	0	0.075009	3.67544	3.6754
29	0	0.073320	3.59267	3.5927
30	12	0.069280	3.39470	21.8137
31	0	0.063351	3.10418	3.1042

32	10	0.056119	2.74981	19.1160
33	0	0.048206	2.36208	2.3621
>=34	8	0.165753	8.12189	0.0018
N	N*	DF	Chi-Sq	P-Value
189	0	10	78.0363	< 0.000

Poisson mean for YES RESPONSE = 28.3469

From the data sheet it was evident that the responses of the employees' under-study. The YES RESPONSE has a statistical range of 11, minimum of 25, maximum of 36, mean of 30.75, standard error of 2.287, standard deviation of 4.573 and variance of 20.917 while the NO RESPONSE has a statistical range of 11, minimum of 6, maximum of 17, mean of 11.25, standard error of 2.287, standard deviation of 4.573 and variance of 20.917. From the above correlation analysis, the two variables are significant at 0.01 which is less than 0.05 significant levels for this research. To further, validate the above analysis, the researcher will use another statistical tool to validate the variables. Decision Rule: If the calculated value is less than the significant value of 0.05, the null hypothesis would be accepted; otherwise the alternative hypothesis would be rejected. From the above rule, it is safe to reject the null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis which states that "there is a significant relationship between motivation and productivity".

Findings

From the above analysis, the researcher observed the obvious fact that workers need to be motivated for higher/increased productivity. Many of the respondents are of

the opinion that a proper reward system for the employees for a job well done would increase their productivity rate. Also, many of the respondents were of the opinion that the retirement system in their organization affects their level of productivity. Furthermore, many of the employees' under28 - 29 26 - 27 30 - 31 32 - 33 34 - 35 <=25 >=36 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 YES RESPONSE Contributed Value Chart of Contribution to the Chi-Square Value.

Conclusion

From the findings, the researchers are of the opinion that the general incentives and motivational packages of an organization affect the total productivity level of their employees. With this, it is safe to say that, a motivated worker is a happy worker and a happy worker is a productive worker. Therefore, the welfare package of an organization for its employees affects their level of productivity. The research work is recommended to the case study for their application and evaluation. It's further recommended for wider use and applicability to other similar establishments for their usage and application which will aim to promote their organizational growth and development.

References

- A Study on Awareness and Satisfaction towards Employee Welfare Measures.* (2019). 4(August), 155–160.
- Congress, W. (2008). *Labour productivity ratio and international comparisons of economic performance.* Formalization of the PPP theory and preliminary examinations Author: Mieczyslaw Dobija Cracow University of Economics. 29.
- Edison, A., Raj, A., & Julius, S. (2017). *Analysis of Labour Welfare Measures and Its Impact on Employee'S Commitment.* 04, 73–83.
- Employees Development and Productivity in Private Organization. (n.d.).
- Kolte, P. S. (n.d.). *Labour Productivity and Work Study in Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act.*
- Nusrat, M., & Solaiman, M. (2016). *A Study of Employee Welfare Leading to Corporate Sustainability in Garments Industries of Bangladesh.* 2613.

To cite this article

Kaveya, P. & Sheela M.C, (2023). A Study on Labour Welfare and Industrial Productivity with Special Emphasis on Travancore Titanium Industry in Kerala. *Sparkling International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Studies*, 6(4), 13-19.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS



Kaveya, P. is a Research Scholar in the Department of Economics, University College, Trivandrum, Kerala, India. She is a rank holder in M.A and B.A Economics and had qualified NET, SET, CTET, APS. She has participated in various seminars and workshops at the national levels and had also conducted various webinars. She has published 26 articles in various national and international journals. She is the recipient of INSC and IIAR Young Researcher Award.



Dr. Sheela, M. C., is an Associate Professor of Economics in University College, Trivandrum, Kerala, India. She had presented many papers and also had attended many international and national conferences. She had published articles in journals. She had 15 years experience in teaching field.
