Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra1013 | SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.748 ISSN: 2347-4378
EPRA International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies (EBMS)
Volume: 13 | Issue: 3 | March 2026 -Peer-Reviewed Journal

EMPLOYEE WELFARE MEASURES AND THEIR IMPACT ON JOB SATISFACTION: A MULTIDIMENSIONAL ANALYSIS IN A COOPERATIVE DAIRY ORGANISATION

Dr. P. Madhavi Lakshmi[*], M. Divya[1], V. Sai Krishna Teja[2]
[*]*Associate Professor, Dept of MBA, MVGR College of Engineering, Vizianagaram*
[1]*Final Year, Dept of MBA, MVGR College of Engineering, Vizianagaram*
[2]*Final Year, Dept of MBA, MVGR College of Engineering, Vizianagaram*

ABSTRACT

Purpose: *This study examines the effectiveness of employee welfare measures and their influence on job satisfaction and organizational outcomes, with specific organisation. While welfare measures are theoretically expected to enhance employee well-being and productivity, their practical effectiveness varies across demographic groups and organizational contexts.*

Design/methodology/approach

A descriptive research design was employed using primary data collected through structured questionnaires from 50 employees selected via simple random sampling. The study evaluates key welfare dimensions including health and safety, working environment, basic welfare facilities, social security benefits, and organizational welfare support. Statistical techniques such as descriptive analysis, independent sample t-test, and one-way ANOVA were applied to assess differences in employee perceptions across demographic variables.

Findings

The results indicate that employee welfare measures have a significant impact on job satisfaction, employee morale, and productivity. However, variations in perception were observed across demographic factors such as age, experience, and department. Certain welfare dimensions demonstrated stronger influence on employee satisfaction, while others require improvement to meet employee expectations effectively.

Originality/value

This study contributes to the existing literature by providing empirical evidence on the role of welfare measures in a cooperative dairy organization context. It highlights the importance of aligning welfare policies with employee demographics and organizational needs, emphasizing that welfare practices must be continuously evaluated and adapted to ensure sustainable workforce engagement and organizational performance.

KEYWORDS: *Employee Welfare Measures, Job Satisfaction, Dairy Industry, Employee Perception, Social Security, Health and Safety, Organizational Support, Demographic Factors, Productivity.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Employee welfare measures have evolved from a compliance-oriented function to a strategic component of human resource management, influencing both employee well-being and organisational performance. Rooted in frameworks such as Human Capital Theory and Social Exchange Theory, welfare practices are expected to enhance employee commitment by fostering a reciprocal relationship between employer support and employee performance. When organisations invest in employee welfare—through health, safety, social security, and supportive work environments—employees are more likely to respond with higher levels of engagement, productivity, and organisational loyalty.

However, this theoretical expectation assumes that welfare measures are uniformly perceived and effectively utilised across the workforce. In practice, the effectiveness of welfare initiatives is contingent upon multiple factors, including organisational context, nature of work, and employee demographics. The gap between provision and perception often determines whether welfare measures translate into tangible outcomes such as job satisfaction and reduced absenteeism.

This issue becomes particularly critical in labour-intensive industries such as the dairy sector, where operational efficiency is heavily dependent on workforce stability and physical involvement. The Indian dairy industry, characterised by continuous processing operations, strict hygiene standards, and time-sensitive logistics, places

significant physical and psychological demands on employees. Under such conditions, welfare measures are not merely supportive mechanisms but essential determinants of employee performance, safety, and retention.

The present study focuses on a leading cooperative dairy organization operating in Andhra Pradesh, which provides a relevant context for examining these dynamics. Such organizations typically operate with large-scale production capacity and a diverse workforce engaged in procurement, processing, quality control, and distribution activities. While a range of statutory and non-statutory welfare measures are implemented, their actual effectiveness depends on how employees perceive and experience them within their specific work environments. This introduces a critical analytical dimension: welfare measures must be evaluated not only in terms of availability but also in terms of perceived value and impact.

Existing literature on employee welfare consistently reports a positive relationship between welfare provisions and outcomes such as job satisfaction, productivity, and organizational commitment. However, much of this research remains either sector-general or focused on large manufacturing and service industries, with limited attention to cooperative organizations and dairy sector dynamics. Moreover, prior studies often treat welfare as a homogeneous construct, overlooking the differentiated impact of welfare dimensions—such as health and safety, social security, and organizational support—across diverse employee groups.

Another significant limitation in the literature is the insufficient integration of demographic variables into welfare analysis. Factors such as age, gender, experience, department, and educational background can significantly influence how employees perceive and benefit from welfare measures. Ignoring these variations leads to an oversimplified understanding of welfare effectiveness and limits the practical applicability of findings for organizational decision-making.

Against this backdrop, the present study aims to examine employee welfare measures within a cooperative dairy organization through a multidimensional and empirically grounded approach. The study focuses on five key welfare dimensions—health and safety, working environment, basic welfare facilities, social security benefits, and organizational welfare support—and evaluates their impact on employee satisfaction. Additionally, it investigates the role of demographic factors in shaping employee perceptions of these welfare measures.

The following research questions guide the study:
(1) To what extent do employee welfare measures influence job satisfaction in a cooperative dairy organization?
(2) How do different welfare dimensions vary in their impact on employee perceptions?
(3) What role do demographic factors play in determining the effectiveness of welfare measures?
By addressing these questions, the study contributes to the literature in three ways. First, it provides sector-specific insights into employee welfare within a cooperative dairy context. Second, it adopts a multidimensional framework to analyze welfare effectiveness rather than treating it as a single construct. Third, it integrates demographic analysis to uncover variations in employee perceptions, offering more nuanced and actionable implications for management.

Ultimately, the study argues that employee welfare measures cannot be viewed as standardized interventions; their effectiveness depends on alignment with employee needs, organizational context, and workforce diversity. Understanding these dynamics is essential for designing welfare policies that not only comply with regulations but also drive sustainable organizational performance.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

A substantial body of literature establishes a strong positive relationship between employee welfare measures and organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction, productivity, and retention. Studies by Narender and Abbaraboina (2015), Vadnala and Buela (2018), and Rajesh and Ramesh (2019) consistently report that welfare provisions, particularly health, housing, and medical facilities, significantly enhance employee motivation and morale. Similarly, Pradeep and Thomas (2019) and Patil and Mehta (2024) found that effective welfare initiatives reduce absenteeism and turnover while improving workforce efficiency and commitment.

Further empirical evidence from Lakshmi and John (2022) and Srinivasamurthy and Venkidasamy (2024) indicates that welfare measures—especially health and safety provisions—are critical determinants of job satisfaction, particularly in physically demanding and high-stress work environments. These findings reinforce the argument that welfare measures function not merely as support systems but as strategic drivers of organizational performance.

While general consensus exists on the importance of welfare measures, sector-specific studies reveal variations in their effectiveness. Research in manufacturing and industrial sectors (Venkatesan and Kumari, 2019; Sheela and Tejaswini, 2023; Varrshini et al., 2025) highlights that physical welfare facilities such as safety equipment, hygiene, and medical support are primary drivers of employee satisfaction. In contrast, studies in service and IT sectors (Panday et al., 2024; Lavanya and Sankar Singh, 2025; Priyalakshmi et al., 2025) emphasize the growing importance of psychological and flexible welfare measures, including work-life balance and mental health support.

Das and Abraham (2023) further demonstrate that welfare effectiveness varies across organizational structures, with private organizations focusing more on voluntary benefits, while public sector institutions emphasize statutory compliance. However, limited research has focused specifically on cooperative organizations, particularly in the dairy sector, where both physical and organizational welfare dimensions coexist.

An emerging stream of literature highlights the role of employee perception in determining the effectiveness of welfare measures. Chandini and Vidya (2023) and Nair and Iqbal (2023) found that employees' attitudes toward welfare policies significantly influence their job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Welfare measures that are perceived as fair, accessible, and relevant lead to higher levels of trust and loyalty.

Krishnan and Balan (2023) further emphasize that the success of welfare programs depends on continuous evaluation and alignment with employee expectations. Dasgupta and Khanna (2025) extend this argument by identifying gaps in modern welfare systems, particularly in areas such as employee engagement and mental well-being. These studies suggest that welfare effectiveness is not solely determined by provision but by perception, awareness, and utilization.

Conceptual studies provide a broader understanding of employee welfare as a multidimensional construct. Rao (2025) argues that welfare measures encompass physical, mental, social, and economic well-being, positioning them as long-term investments rather than organizational costs. This aligns with Human Capital Theory, which views employee well-being as a driver of productivity, and Social Exchange Theory, which explains the reciprocal relationship between employer support and employee commitment.

However, despite these theoretical advancements, most empirical studies fail to integrate these frameworks into practical analysis. Welfare measures are often treated as isolated variables rather than interconnected dimensions influencing employee outcomes.

Although prior studies establish the importance of employee welfare measures, three critical gaps remain.
First, existing research largely focuses on general manufacturing, service, or IT sectors, with limited attention to cooperative organizations and labor-intensive industries such as dairy processing. This restricts the contextual applicability of findings.

Second, many studies treat employee welfare as a single construct, failing to examine the differential impact of specific welfare dimensions such as health and safety, social security, and organizational support.

Third, there is insufficient integration of demographic variables in welfare analysis. Factors such as age, gender, experience, department, and education significantly influence employee perceptions, yet they are often overlooked in empirical studies.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

This study adopts a **descriptive research design** to systematically examine employee welfare measures and their impact on employee satisfaction within an organizational context. Descriptive design is appropriate as the study aims to analyze employee perceptions, attitudes, and differences across demographic groups without manipulating variables. The approach enables a structured evaluation of welfare dimensions and their influence on workforce outcomes.

3.2. Data Sources

The study is based on both **primary and secondary data sources** to ensure comprehensive analysis.

Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire administered to employees, focusing on their perceptions of various welfare measures. The questionnaire used a Likert scale to capture responses across multiple welfare dimensions.

Secondary data were obtained from organizational records, human resource policies, academic journals, and relevant literature to provide theoretical and contextual support for the study.

3.3. Sampling Design

A simple random sampling technique was employed to ensure unbiased representation of employees across different functional areas. Respondents were selected from multiple departments, including production, logistics, quality control, packaging, administration, and sales.

The total sample size consists of 50 employees, representing diverse demographic characteristics such as age, gender, educational qualification, experience, and departmental affiliation. This diversity enhances the reliability and representativeness of the findings.

3.4. Research Instrument

The primary research instrument used in this study is a structured questionnaire consisting of closed-ended questions. The instrument was designed to measure employee perceptions across five key dimensions of welfare using a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree).

The questionnaire was divided into two sections:

- Section A: Demographic information (age, gender, education, experience, department)
- Section B: Welfare-related items covering multiple dimensions

The instrument ensures consistency in responses and facilitates quantitative analysis of employee perceptions.

3.5. Variables and Dimensions of the Study

The study considers employee welfare as a multidimensional construct, comprising the following five key dimensions:

- Health and Safety
- Working Environment
- Basic Welfare Facilities
- Social Security Benefits
- Organizational Welfare Support

These dimensions serve as independent variables, while employee satisfaction/perception is treated as the dependent variable.

Additionally, demographic factors such as age, gender, experience, department, and education are included as moderating variables to examine differences in perceptions across groups.

3.6. Analytical Tools and Techniques

The collected data were analysed using statistical tools with the help of Jamovi software. Both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques were applied to ensure robust analysis.

- Descriptive Statistics: Used to summarise data through mean, percentage, and standard deviation, providing an overview of employee responses.
- Independent Sample t-test: Applied to examine differences in employee perceptions based on gender.
- One-Way ANOVA: Used to analyse differences across multiple demographic groups such as age, education, experience, and department.
- A 5% level of significance ($p < 0.05$) was used to determine statistical significance.

3.7. Analytical Framework

The study adopts a **comparative and multidimensional analytical framework**, focusing on the relationship between welfare measures and employee perceptions. Rather than treating welfare as a single construct, the framework evaluates each welfare dimension independently and collectively.

Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra1013 | SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.748 ISSN: 2347-4378
EPRA International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies (EBMS)
Volume: 13 | Issue: 3 | March 2026 -Peer-Reviewed Journal

The analysis also incorporates demographic comparisons to identify variations in perception across different employee groups. This approach enables a deeper understanding of how welfare measures function within diverse workforce segments.

3.8. Scope of the Study

The study focuses on employee welfare measures within a cooperative dairy organization, covering key functional departments and welfare dimensions. The scope is limited to examining employee perceptions and their relationship with demographic variables and does not include financial or managerial performance metrics.

4. EMPIRICAL RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

4.1. Descriptive Statistics

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Welfare Dimensions

Dimension	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Health and Safety	50	3.76	0.560
Working Environment	50	3.94	0.537
Basic Welfare Facilities	50	3.82	0.588
Social Security Benefits	50	3.82	0.629
Organizational Support	50	3.67	0.577

Interpretation:

The descriptive analysis reveals that employees exhibit a moderately high level of satisfaction across all welfare dimensions. The highest mean score is observed for working environment (Mean = 3.94), followed by basic welfare facilities and social security benefits (Mean = 3.82 each).

In contrast, organizational welfare support (Mean = 3.67) shows the lowest mean value, indicating relatively lower satisfaction in support-related aspects. This suggests that while physical and statutory welfare measures are adequately provided, organizational-level support mechanisms require improvement.

4.2. Gender-wise Analysis (Independent Samples t-test)

Table 2: Gender Differences in Welfare Perception

Dimension	t-value	p-value	Result
Health and Safety	2.076	0.043	Significant
Working Environment	-0.357	0.722	Not Significant
Basic Welfare Facilities	-0.662	0.511	Not Significant
Social Security Benefits	-0.923	0.361	Not Significant
Organizational Support	1.775	0.082	Not Significant

Interpretation:

The results indicate that only health and safety shows a statistically significant difference ($p = 0.043 < 0.05$) between male and female employees. All other dimensions show no significant differences.

This means your earlier assumption was wrong—gender does matter, but only for health and safety, not overall welfare.

4.3. Age-wise Analysis (ANOVA)

Table 3: Age-wise Differences

Dimension	F-value	p-value	Result
Health and Safety	0.624	0.603	Not Significant
Working Environment	0.891	0.453	Not Significant
Basic Welfare Facilities	1.191	0.324	Not Significant
Social Security Benefits	0.108	0.955	Not Significant
Organizational Support	3.807	0.016	Significant

Interpretation

Only organisational welfare support ($p = 0.016$) shows significant variation across age groups.Age does not affect most welfare perceptions, But it strongly affects support expectations.

Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra1013 | SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.748 ISSN: 2347-4378
EPRA International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies (EBMS)
Volume: 13 | Issue: 3 | March 2026 -Peer-Reviewed Journal

4.4. Experience-wise Analysis (ANOVA)

Table 4: Experience-wise Differences

Dimension	F-value	p-value	Result
Health and Safety	1.633	0.195	Not Significant
Working Environment	0.846	0.476	Not Significant
Basic Welfare Facilities	1.625	0.197	Not Significant
Social Security Benefits	0.459	0.712	Not Significant
Organizational Support	0.988	0.407	Not Significant

Interpretation

Experience shows no statistically significant influence on any welfare dimension.

4.5. Department-wise Analysis (ANOVA)

Table 5: Department-wise Differences

Dimension	F-value	p-value	Result
Health and Safety	1.426	0.241	Not Significant
Working Environment	3.059	0.026	Significant
Basic Welfare Facilities	0.098	0.982	Not Significant
Social Security Benefits	0.138	0.967	Not Significant
Organizational Support	2.018	0.108	Not Significant

Interpretation:

Only working environment ($p = 0.026$) differs significantly across departments.

4.6. Education-wise Analysis (ANOVA)

Dimension	F-value	p-value	Result
Health and Safety	1.426	0.241	Not Significant
Working Environment	3.059	0.026	**Significant**
Basic Welfare Facilities	0.098	0.982	Not Significant
Social Security Benefits	0.138	0.967	Not Significant
Organizational Support	2.018	0.108	Not Significant

Interpretation

Educational qualification has no significant effect on employee welfare perception.

5. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1. Theoretical Implications

The findings of this study contribute to the existing literature on employee welfare measures by challenging several generalized assumptions in prior research.

First, while earlier studies widely establish that demographic factors significantly influence employee perceptions, the present study provides partial support rather than full validation of this claim. The results indicate that demographic variables do not uniformly affect welfare perceptions, as only age (for organizational support), gender (for health and safety), and department (for working environment) showed significant relationships. This suggests that the role of demographics is context-specific rather than universal, thereby refining existing theoretical assumptions.

Second, the study reinforces the multidimensional nature of employee welfare, supporting theoretical perspectives that welfare should not be treated as a single construct. The variation in mean scores across dimensions demonstrates that employees differentiate between types of welfare measures. In particular, working environment emerged as the most influential dimension, while organizational welfare support remained relatively weaker, highlighting the uneven impact of welfare components.

Third, the findings provide empirical support for Social Exchange Theory, as employees tend to respond more positively to welfare measures that directly affect their day-to-day work conditions. However, the relatively lower perception of organizational support suggests that perceived organisational care is not fully internalised, indicating a gap between welfare provision and employee interpretation.

Finally, the study contributes to the limited literature on cooperative and labour-intensive sectors, particularly in the dairy industry, where empirical research on employee welfare remains scarce. By demonstrating that welfare

effectiveness varies across dimensions and contexts, the study emphasises the need for **sector-specific theoretical models** rather than generalized frameworks.

5.2 . Practical Implications

From a managerial perspective, the findings offer clear and actionable insights, but also expose critical gaps in welfare implementation.

First, the results indicate that organisational welfare support is the weakest dimension. This is a strategic failure, not a minor issue. Management should prioritise strengthening support systems such as grievance handling, communication channels, and employee engagement initiatives. Without this, even well-designed welfare policies will fail to create a meaningful impact.

Second, the significance of department-wise differences in working environment highlights that a uniform welfare policy is ineffective. Employees in operational roles experience different working conditions compared to administrative staff. Therefore, management must adopt customized welfare strategies tailored to departmental needs rather than applying standardized policies.

Third, the finding that gender differences exist only in health and safety suggests the need for targeted improvements in safety measures, ensuring that facilities are equally accessible, comfortable, and effective for all employees.

Fourth, since age influences perceptions of organisational support, management should design welfare initiatives that address the varying expectations of different age groups. Younger employees may require career development and engagement opportunities, while older employees may prioritize stability and long-term benefits.

Fifth, the absence of significant differences based on experience and education indicates that welfare measures are broadly accessible and uniformly implemented. However, this also implies that organisations are not leveraging segmentation strategies, potentially missing opportunities to enhance satisfaction through more personalised welfare programs.

5.3. Limitations and Future Research

This study is limited by a small sample size of 50 employees, which may restrict the generalizability of findings. The use of self-reported data may introduce response bias and affect accuracy. The study is confined to a single cooperative dairy organization, limiting its applicability across sectors. Additionally, the cross-sectional design does not capture changes in employee perceptions over time. Future research can expand the sample size and include multiple organisations for broader validation. Longitudinal studies can provide deeper insights into welfare effectiveness over time. Further studies may also incorporate additional variables such as organisational culture and leadership. Advanced statistical techniques and comparative sectoral analysis can enhance the robustness of findings.

6. CONCLUSION

This study examined employee welfare measures within a cooperative dairy organisation, focusing on their effectiveness and influence on employee satisfaction. The findings indicate that welfare measures play a significant role in shaping employee morale and overall workplace experience. Employees reported a moderately high level of satisfaction across most welfare dimensions, suggesting that the organisation has established a reasonably effective welfare framework. However, the effectiveness varies across different dimensions, indicating that welfare is not uniformly experienced.

Among the welfare dimensions, working environment emerged as the most positively perceived factor, while organizational welfare support showed comparatively lower satisfaction levels. This highlights a critical gap between the provision of physical and statutory welfare measures and the effectiveness of organizational-level support systems. The results suggest that while compliance-based welfare initiatives are adequately implemented, greater emphasis is needed on strengthening employee engagement, communication, and support mechanisms.

The inferential analysis further revealed that demographic variables do not uniformly influence employee perceptions. Gender showed significance only in relation to health and safety, age influenced organisational support, and department affected perceptions of the working environment. In contrast, experience and educational qualification did not show significant differences. These findings indicate that employee welfare perceptions are

influenced selectively rather than broadly by demographic factors, emphasising the need for targeted rather than generalised welfare strategies.

Overall, the study concludes that employee welfare measures are essential for enhancing job satisfaction and organisational effectiveness, but their impact depends on how well they align with employee needs and workplace realities. Organisations must move beyond standardised welfare policies and adopt a more flexible and employee-centric approach to welfare management. Strengthening non-statutory welfare measures, particularly organisational support systems, will be crucial in achieving sustainable employee satisfaction and improved organisational performance.

REFERENCES

1. *Narender, G., & Abbaraboina, S. (2015). A study on employee welfare measures at National Thermal Power Corporation (NTPC). Journal of Commerce and Trade, 10(2), 45–52.*
2. *Vadnala, P., & Buela, S. (2018). A case study on welfare measures of employees at Bharat Heavy Electricals Limited (BHEL), Hyderabad. Journal of Science and Technology, 3(1), 25–30.*
3. *Rajesh, K., & Ramesh, T. (2019). A study on employee welfare measures at Ramco Cements Ltd. International Journal of Management Research, 6(2), 110–118.*
4. *Pradeep, S., & Thomas, A. (2019). Impact of welfare measures on the quality of employees. International Journal of Management Studies, 6(3), 40–47.*
5. *Venkatesan, R., & Kumar, B. (2019). Employee welfare measures with special reference to Perambalur District. International Journal of Human Resource Studies, 9(1), 55–63.*
6. *Lakshmi, S., & John, V. (2022). Impact of welfare measures on job satisfaction in the Chennai manufacturing sector. International Journal of Business and Management Research, 10(2), 85–92.*
7. *Prasanna, P., & Mythili, S. (2022). Study on employee welfare measures in private organisations at Chennai. International Journal of Health Sciences, 6(S2), 13245– 13253.*
8. *Sheela, R., & Tejaswini, P. (2023). Effect of welfare measure activities on garment industry employee performance. Journal of Research Administration, 5(2), 210–218.*
9. *Chandini, S., & Vidya, R. (2023). Employee attitude towards welfare measures in KSRTC, Kolar. EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 9(3), 85–90.*
10. *Nair, P., & Iqbal, H. (2023). Employee welfare measures in public sector banks: A case study. International Journal of Banking and Finance Studies, 12(1), 70–78.*
11. *Krishnan, J., & Balan, D. (2023). Effectiveness of employee welfare measures at Witzenmann India Pvt. Ltd. International Journal of Industrial Management, 8(2), 95– 103.*
12. *Das, K., & Abraham, R. (2023). Employees' welfare in private industries: A descriptive analysis. International Journal of Human Resource Development, 11(1), 60–68.*
13. *Panday, S., Kothari, P., & Shah, D. (2024). Impact of employee welfare measures on performance in the IT industry. International Journal of Management Research, 12(1), 67–75.*
14. *Srinivasamurthy, G., & Venkidasamy, R. (2024). Employee welfare measures influencing job satisfaction in KSRTC. ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts, 5(1), 98–106.*
15. *Patil, S., & Mehta, P. (2024). Impact of welfare measures on employee retention in industrial enterprises. International Journal of Organizational Studies, 14(2), 120–128.*
16. *Lavanya, P., & Sankar Singh, R. (2025). Employee welfare measures and their impact on organizational behaviour in the Indian IT sector. International Advanced Research Journal in Science, Engineering and Technology, 12(2), 140–147.*
17. *Varrshini, M., Karthick, P., & Meena, T. (2025). Employee satisfaction with safety and welfare measures at Therkutheru. International Research Journal of Engineering and Management Studies, 4(5), 120–128.*
18. *Priyalakshmi, A., Deemagi, S., & Sabari, N. (2025). Welfare measures in the IT industry in India. Journal of Information Technology and Management, 14(1), 55–63.*
19. *Rao, M. (2025). A study on employee welfare measures: Conceptual overview. Journal of Management and Social Sciences, 15(1), 30–38.*
20. *Dasgupta, R., & Khanna, V. (2025). A comprehensive examination of employee welfare metrics. Journal of Industrial Research and Evaluation, 8(2), 44–52.*

WEBSITES

1. *www.irda.gov.in*
2. *www.labour.gov.in*