

A STUDY ON SAFETY AND WELFARE MEASURES TOWARDS AMARAVATHI SRI VENKATESA PAPER MILLS LTD., COIMBATORE.

Mr. Manjesh S¹, Dr. Sivakumar V²

¹Student, Dept. of MBA, Jayam College of Engineering and Technology, Dharmapuri

²Professor, Dept. of MBA, Jayam College of Engineering and Technology, Dharmapuri

Abstract - Amaravathi Sri Vankatesa Paper Mills Limited was incorporated in the year 1960 at Madathukulam, about 85 kilometers from Coimbatore for the manufacturing of Writing and Printing paper. At present, the installed capacity of the mill is 24,000 tonnes per annum. The company has commissioned three windmills at the cost of Rs.30 million rupees for efficient Power Management. It has a workforce of about 1000 workers. The main objective of the study is to find out the Safety and Welfare of the employees in their job which is being influenced by various factors like pay, working conditions, supervision, subordinate relationship, job security participation in decision making, and welfare facilities. The data were collected through a survey method. A well-structured questionnaire was prepared and the sample size selected was 300 Employees in that company. The collected data were classified and analyzed using research methodology by adopting techniques such as percentage analysis. The study reveals that the employees have overall safety & welfare satisfaction. A few areas of dissatisfaction are also identified and relevant suggestions are also made to improve the position.

Key words: Employee welfare, Job satisfaction, Work environment, Organization policy, Health and Safety

INTRODUCTION

The national commission on labor observes that the concept of welfare is necessary and dynamic, bearing different interpretations from country to country and from time, and even in the same country based on its value, social institution,

industrialization degree, and general level of economic and social development. The directives principles of state policy in our constitution refer generally to the promotion of the welfare people. In its resolution of 1947, the ILO defines labor welfare as such services, facilities, and amenities as adequate contains, rest and recreation facilities, and arrangements for travel to and from work and the accommodations for the workers employed at a distance from their houses and such other services.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The study entitled " The safety and Welfare Measure Practiced In Amaravathi Sri Venkatesa Paper Mills Ltd At Coimbatore. The researcher has given intuition about an organization. This study will also help the management to minimize job-related issues, increase motivational activities, and also helps the employees to achieve their career goals. This is an opportunity for the employees to give their feedback, which will help the management to do some alterations in the welfare activities and other further facilities.

At the end of the report suggestions and recommendations are given which will help the management to know about the flaw in managing employees and that also encourage them to take action to reduce their flaws.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Primary Objective:

- To study safety and welfare measures for Amaravathi Sri Venkatesa Paper Mills Ltd., Coimbatore

Secondary Objective:

- To study the awareness of the workers about safety in the workplace.

- To find the occurrence of accidents that happened at the workplace.
- To identify the management role in implementing safety measures.
- To find out the satisfaction level of the peoples towards safety measures in the organization.
- To give suggestions to improve safety in the organization.

METHODOLOGY

Research is done by collecting the data using these methods,

1. Direct questions
2. Close end questions
3. Dichotomous questions
4. Multiple choice questions

SAMPLING

Considering only a few units of data from large data for analysis is called the sampling method.

Sample Size

The total number of samples collected by the researcher is 300, so the sample size is 300.

TOOLS FOR ANALYSIS

The tools used for analysis are,

1. Percentage Analysis
2. ANOVA Analysis
3. Chi-square Analysis

1. Percentage Analysis

Table -1.1: Showing the awareness of health and safety

S. No	Range	No. of Respondents	PERCENTAGE %
A	YES	159	53
B	NO	141	47
Total		300	100

Inference: In the survey, 53% of the respondents are aware of the health and safety measures, and 47% of the respondents

respond that they are not aware of the health and safety measures adopted in the company.

Table -1.2: Showing the medical facility type

S. No	Range	No. of Respondents	PERCENTAGE %
A	First aid	75	40
B	Ambulance service	41	22
C	Inside clinic	70	37
D	Others	3	1
Total		189	100

Inference: In the survey, 40% of the respondents say that the company is providing first aid, 22% of the respondents say that the company is providing ambulance service, 37% of the respondents say that the company is providing inside a clinic, and 1% of the respondents say that the company is providing other types of the medical facility.

Table -1.3: Showing the latrines and urinals are cleaned and maintained properly

S. No	Range	No. of Respondents	PERCENTAGE %
A	Strongly agree	48	16
B	Agree	141	47
C	Neutral	51	17
D	Disagree	42	14
E	Strongly disagree	18	6
Total		300	100

Inference: In the survey, 16% of the respondents strongly agreed, 47% of the respondents agreed, 17% of the respondents are neutral, 14% of respondents disagree and 6% of the respondents strongly disagreed on latrines and urinals are cleaned and maintained properly.

Table -1.4: Showing the environment is safe to work

S. No	Range	No. of Respondents	Percentage %
A	Strongly agree	33	11
B	Agree	57	19
C	Neutral	99	33
D	Disagree	81	27
E	Strongly disagree	30	10
Total		300	100

Inference: In the survey, 11% of the respondents strongly agreed, 19% of the respondents agreed, 33% of the respondents are neutral, 27% of respondents disagree and 10% of the respondents strongly disagree on whether the environment is safe to work.

Table -1.5: Showing the enough training given to workers before handling the machines

S. No	Range	No. of Respondents	Percentage%
A	Strongly agree	141	47
B	Agree	111	37
C	Neutral	48	16
D	Disagree	-	-
E	Strongly disagree	-	-
Total		300	100

Inference: In the survey, 47% of the respondents strongly agreed, 37% of the respondents are agree, 16% of the respondents are neutral, none of the respondents disagree, and strongly disagree on enough training given to workers before handling the machines.

2. ANOVA Analysis

Table -2.1: Showing the age of the respondent(s)

S. No	Range	No. of Respondents	Percentage %
A	Below 25	9	3
B	26 – 30	60	20
C	31 – 35	150	50
D	36 – 40	60	20
E	Above 40	21	7
Total		300	100

Table -2.2: Showing the satisfactory level of workers towards health and safety

S. No	Range	No. of Respondents	Percentage %
A	Very much satisfied	69	23
B	Satisfied	141	47
C	Neutral	39	13
D	Dissatisfied	30	10
E	Highly dissatisfied	21	7
Total		300	100

Comparative study of the age of the respondents and the satisfaction level of the safety & welfare measures in the organization.

H0: There is no significant difference between the age of the respondents and the satisfaction level with the safety & welfare measures in the organization.

H1: There is a significant difference between the age of the respondents and the satisfaction level with the safety & welfare measures in the organization.

Table -2.3: Showing satisfaction of employee based on their age

Age /Satisfaction	Below 25	26-30	31-35	36-40	Above 40	Total
Very much satisfied	22	37	24	15	13	111
Satisfied	27	33	25	12	11	108
Neutral	11	12	10	7	8	48
Dissatisfied	4	6	13	4	3	30
Highly dissatisfied	1	2	0	0	0	3
TOTAL	65	90	72	38	35	300

$$\text{Correction factor (CF)} = \frac{T^2}{N} = \frac{300^2}{25} = 3600$$

$$\text{TSS} = \sum Y_1^2 + \sum Y_2^2 + \sum Y_3^2 + \sum Y_4^2 - \text{CF}$$

$$= 1315 + 2642 + 1470 + 434 + 363 - 3600$$

$$= 2660$$

$$\text{SSR} = \frac{(111)^2 + (108)^2 + (48)^2 + (30)^2 + (3)^2}{5} = 1839.6$$

$$\text{SSC} = \frac{(65)^2 + (90)^2 + (72)^2 + (38)^2 + (35)^2}{5} = 435.6$$

$$\text{SSE} = 2600 - 435.6 - 1039.6 = 348.8$$

$F_{0.05}$ with (4, 16) df = 3.01

$F_1 = 21.5 > 3.01$

We Reject H_0

$F_2 = 79.84 > 3.01$

We Reject H_0

Conclusion: From the above calculation, we reject H_0 . Hence there is a significant difference between the age of the respondents and the satisfaction level with the safety & welfare measures in the organization.

3. Chi-square Analysis

Table -3.1: Table showing the experience (in years) of the respondents

S. No	Range	No. of Respondents	Percentage %
A	Below 5	65	22
B	6 – 10	90	30
C	11 – 15	72	24
D	16 – 20	38	13
E	Above 20	35	11
Total		300	100

Table -3.2: Table showing the accidents happened

S. No	Range	No. of Respondents	Percentage %
A	Always	111	37
B	Sometimes	108	36
C	Often	48	16
D	Rarely	30	10
E	Not at all	3	1
Total		300	100

Comparative study of the experience of the employees and opinion about accidents that happened in the organization.

H_0 : There is no significant difference between the experience of the employees and opinion about accidents that happened in the organization

H_1 : There is a significant difference between the experience of the employees and opinions about accidents that happened in the organization.

Table -3.3: Showing opinion of employee that Accidents happened based on their experience

Experience/Accidents Happened	< 5	6 -10	11-15	16-20	> 20	Total
Always	22	37	24	15	13	111
Sometimes	27	33	25	12	11	108
Often	11	12	10	7	8	48
Rarely	4	6	13	4	3	30
Not at all	1	2	0	0	0	3
TOTAL	65	90	72	38	35	300

$$\text{Correction factor (CF)} = \frac{T^2}{N} = \frac{300^2}{25} = 3600$$

$$\text{Sum of square of errors (SSE)} = \text{TSS} - \text{SSE} - \text{SSR}$$

$$= 1315 + 2642 + 1470 + 434 + 363 - 3600$$

$$= 2660$$

$$\text{SSR} = \frac{(111)^2 + (108)^2 + (48)^2 + (30)^2 + (3)^2}{5} = 1839.6$$

$$\text{SSC} = \frac{(65)^2 + (90)^2 + (72)^2 + (38)^2 + (35)^2}{5} = 435.6$$

$$\text{SSE} = \text{TSS} - \text{SSE} - \text{SSR}$$

$$= 2600 - 435.6 - 1039.6$$

$$= 348.8$$

$F_{0.05}$ with (4, 16) df = 3.01

$F_1 = 21.5 > 3.01$

We Reject H_0

$F_2 = 79.84 > 3.01$

We Reject H_0

Conclusion: From the above calculation, we reject H_0 . Hence there's a big difference between the experience of the staff and opinion about accidents that happened within the organization.

FINDINGS

- 50% of the respondents are comes under the age limit of 31-35, and 20% of the respondents are comes under the age limit of 36-40.
- 30% of the respondents are having experience of 6 – 10 years

- 53% of the respondents are aware of the health and safety measures.
- 64% of the respondents said that they have no effective arrangements for communicating health and safety matters in the company.
- 63% of the respondents said that the company is providing medical facilities to the workers.
- 86% of the respondents say that they have attended health and safety training.
- 54% of the respondents strongly agree on the awareness about first aid activities and the contents of the first aid kit.
- 47% of the respondents agree on latrines and urinals are cleaned and maintained properly.
- 33% of the respondents are neutral on whether the environment is safe to work in.
- 53% of the respondents say often about the stress of work in the company.
- 47% of the respondents say often about the machines maintained properly in the company
- 47% of the respondents are satisfied with health and safety measures.
- 40% of the respondents say better on the role of management in implementing health and safety.

SUGGESTIONS

1. The company needs to create a notice for the workers regarding health and safety.
2. It is best to produce frequent health and safety training, a minimum of once in an exceed year.
3. The management needs to take the necessary steps to scale back the strain level of the workers.
4. Orientation programs can be conducted to make the workers feel that their work environment is safe to work.
5. The maintenance department has to maintain the machines properly to reduce lead time.
6. Proper training has to be given to the workers to avoid frequent accidents.
7. A cordial relationship has to be maintained between the management and the workers to implement the health and safety policies and measures smoothly.

CONCLUSION

It is revealed from the study that, the health and safety measures adopted in Amaravathi Sri Venkatesa Paper Mills Ltd., Coimbatore, are provided to the workers in keeping with the provisions of the factories act. It reveals that the attention

of the workers to health and safety within the workplace is insufficient. Also repeated accidents like electric shocks, and finger injuries occur within the workplace. Suitable ideas were suggested to avoid those accidents and to enhance the health and safety measures. The role of management in implementing health and safety within the organization is incredibly effective. Most of the workers were satisfied with the health and safety measures adopted within the company. If the corporate implements effective disciplinary procedures; it'll help the corporate to travel with its policies and also to keep up health and safety within the organization.

REFERENCES

1. Federal agency "Human resource management" M/S Mc Graw Hill education private limited, New Delhi, Pg no:417, 4th edition.
2. Occupational safety and health administration act of 1970 "Human resource Management" M/S Mc Graw Hill education private limited, New Delhi, Pg no:418,4th edition.
3. Occupational safety and health administration act of 1970 "Human resource Management" M/S Mc Graw Hill education private limited, New Delhi, Pg no:423,4th edition.
4. CFR part 1904.5(b) "Human Resource Management" M/S Tata McGraw Hill, New Delhi, Pg.no:427,4th edition.
5. The factories act 1948 "Personnel Management" M/S Symbiosis center for distance learning, Pune, Pg.no:148,2002 edition.
6. The factories act 1948 "Personnel Management" M/S Symbiosis center for distance learning, Pune, Pg.no:148, 2002 edition.
7. Prof. Simonds & Grimaldi "Employee safety & industrial health, M/S Himalaya Publishing, Mumbai, Pg.no797,2002edition.
8. A Tripartite technical conference "Personnel Management" M/S Himalaya Publication House, Mumbai, Pg.no:802, 2002 edition.
9. W. H. O "Personnel Management" M/S Himalaya publication, New Delhi, Pg. No: 806, 2002 edition.
10. ILO Recommendation, 1959, "Personnel Management", M/S Himalaya Publication House, New Delhi, Pg.no: 807,