

**LABOUR WELFARE & JOB SATISFACTION: A STUDY
OF SELECTED MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES
OF PUNJAB**

Dr. Baljinder Singh¹ & Mehul²

¹Assistant Professor and Head, Department of Commerce, Punjabi University T.P.D. Malwa
College, Rampura Phul, Mehraj, Punjab

²Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, Punjabi University, Patiala, Punjab

ABSTRACT

Recognizing the pivotal role of talent retention in sustaining a competitive edge, many organizations are placing increased emphasis on ensuring high levels of employee satisfaction and motivation. This paper delves into the intricacies of job satisfaction and explores its intricate relationship with various labor welfare facilities in diverse manufacturing industries. Primary data was meticulously gathered from 420 respondents, representing 70 employees each from six distinct manufacturing units, namely cotton textile, food processing, auto-components, paper mills, sugar mills, and steel industries, through the application of a structured questionnaire. The study discerns a significant positive correlation between job satisfaction and seven dimensions of labor welfare. Furthermore, the research unveils substantial differences in the job satisfaction level among distinct manufacturing units, shedding light on the detailed picture of employee contentment in these industries. The implications extend to providing invaluable guidance for industry leaders in formulating human resource policies aimed at enhancing employee job satisfaction, ultimately rendering their respective industries more appealing and potentially amplifying overall productivity.

KEYWORDS: Job satisfaction, labour, labour laws, labour welfare, manufacturing industries.

I. INTRODUCTION

Amidst the current dynamic work environment, human resources are acknowledged as the prime asset for every organization. Regardless of technological advancements, the value of human resources remains pivotal, as the prosperity of any organization or economic entity is contingent upon the efficient utilization of its labour force. Ensuring the quality of these human contributions stems from the appropriate management and provision of welfare facilities. This can significantly contribute to enhancing work environment, which will ultimately enhance their standard of living and productivity (Sridevi, 2006). The idea of labor welfare is flexible and has been understood in various ways across different countries and times. Even within the same country, it can differ based on things like social norms, how industrialized an area is, and the overall level of development. Welfare involves providing different benefits and comforts at and near the workplace to make employees' lives better. Labour welfare is recognized as a primary component of the industrialization to maintain satisfactory conditions between employer and employees (Choudhary, 2017). Once employees have been recruited, trained, and compensated, it becomes essential to ensure their continued presence and well-being to enhance their effectiveness within the organization. Welfare provisions are crafted with the purpose of looking after employees' overall welfare, which usually does not yield direct financial gains for them. Moreover, these facilities are not exclusively offered by employers. Various entities, including governmental bodies, non-governmental organizations, trade unions and labour unions, play a role in contributing to labour welfare (Kumari & Tatareddy, 2014).

Labour welfare measures can be categorized as statutory and non-statutory measures. Statutory measures are those that organizations are obligated to provide in adherence to prevailing laws related to labour welfare. These include essential services such as canteen facilities, adequate lighting, drinking water, seating arrangements, changing rooms, first aid provisions, restrooms, proper sanitation facilities, and areas for relaxation.

On the other hand, non-statutory welfare schemes encompass a range of offerings like personal healthcare services, schedule flexibility (flexi-time), employee support, anti-harassment policies, referral programs, and medical insurance coverage. These non-statutory initiatives can vary significantly between organizations and industries, tailored to meet specific needs and preferences. Employers offer welfare facilities to their employees with the aim of maintaining high morale and commitment, as there exists a positive correlation with labor welfare provisions (Logasakthi, & Rajagopal, 2013; Tiwari, 2014). Studies also show a positive relation between

labour welfare amenities and job satisfaction (Chaubey & Rawat, 2016; Beloor et. al. 2020).

Job satisfaction means feeling good about your work and everyone has their own way of deciding if they are satisfied with their job. Getting what you need from your job at the level you want is job satisfaction (Chelliah, 1998). Job satisfaction is not based on just one thing; it's a general positive feeling that comes from various experiences at work (Sharma and Bhaskar, 1991). These experiences accumulate over time and contribute to how satisfied someone feels with their job. A person can have varied attitudes and perspectives about the different aspects of job including work environment, work load, coworkers, superiors etc. Job satisfaction is more about how you feel than how you act (Manickavasagam and Sumathi, 2000). It comes from comparing what you actually get from your job, like pay, recognition, or opportunities, to what you expect or hope to receive. If what you get matches or exceeds your expectations, you're more satisfied with your job.

A person's level of job satisfaction can be affected by several factors. These include the salary and benefits they receive, the nature of the job (such as the task burden, how interesting it is, challenges in job & how clear the job expectations are), relationships with leaders and colleagues, the quality of the work environment, and the perceived fairness of the company's promotion practices (Bennett, 1997; Cano & Miller, 1992; Savery, 1996). People are thought to be at ease when they are happy in their jobs. Since the human relations techniques has gained popularity, the concept of job satisfaction has grown more and more important. Job satisfaction is influenced by various complex factors, circumstances, emotions, and behavioural patterns (Parvin, & Kabir, 2011).

Job satisfaction encompasses the positive outcomes and sought-after fulfillment that individuals derive from their job experiences. Extensively explored by various researchers, this concept, its dimensions, and influencing factors have significantly contributed to the advancement of academic and business management domains (Bennett, 1997; Cano & Miller, 1992; Savery, 1996). Throughout the years, multiple theories of job satisfaction have surfaced, such as Locke's Affect theory (1976), Adams' Equity theory (1965), and Herzberg et al.'s Two-factor theory (1959).

Job satisfaction reflects the emotions employees feel about their work, whether positive or negative. When someone starts a job, they come with their own set of needs, desires, and previous experiences that form their expectations. Job satisfaction assesses how well the actual benefits and rewards of the job meet or exceed these expectations (Aziri, 2011). It is widely recognized that job satisfaction is directly correlated with both productivity and personal well-being (De Souza and

Noronha, 2011; Shaju & Subhashini, 2017; Sharma & Gupta, 2020). Job satisfaction has also shown negative relation with anxiety which subsequently results into improved productivity, reduced turnover and absenteeism (Nadinloyi, Sadeghi, & Hajloo, 2013).

On the other hand, Labor welfare encompasses the initiatives and measures taken by employers to go above and beyond the legally required minimums in order to improve the physical and mental health, safety, and overall well-being of their workforce. These efforts are geared towards creating a work environment where employees not only meet the basic legal requirements but also experience enhanced working conditions that contribute to their personal growth, job satisfaction, and overall efficiency (Venugopal et. al., 2011; Bhati & Muthukrishnan, 2013; Sree & Satyavathi, 2017).

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

- **Shrivastava (2004)** undertook a study to analyze the impact of labour welfare measures on the job satisfaction using a structured questionnaire and found that it results in a positive attitude among the employees toward job and hence increasing job satisfaction.
- **De Souza and Noronha (2011)** delved into job satisfaction using a seven-dimensional scale, encompassing aspects like the work itself, pay, promotion & training, job security, supervision, colleagues, and company practices. Their study aimed to gauge satisfaction across these dimensions.
- **Gurusamy and Princy (2012)** conducted a study to assess the satisfaction level of employees regarding welfare measures offered by textile industries. They collected data from 200 employees using a questionnaire and analyzed it using simple percentage and Chi-square analysis. The study revealed that employees were satisfied with statutory welfare measures such as storing and drying clothes facilities but were less satisfied with non-statutory measures like housing facilities. Additionally, the research found a significant relationship between employee satisfaction levels and the availability of canteen facilities.
- **Westover (2012)** conducted a research to analyse the differences in the job satisfaction and its determinants among different nations. For this OLS regression was applied and the findings showed that the nations who provide better labour welfare facilities are likely to have higher job satisfaction among the employees.
- **Senthilkumar (2013)** analyzed the different aspects of labor welfare measures and employees' awareness of these measures using various appropriate tools. The study found that

there was a very low level of awareness among employees, which was only 50 percent, and this was associated with a low level of satisfaction.

- **Malleeswari and Mani (2014)** conducted a study at TVS Company in the Coimbatore district, collecting primary data from 75 employees across various departments. They analyzed the employees' satisfaction levels regarding the labor welfare measures provided by the company. A self-structured questionnaire was used, based on a 5-point Likert scale. The main variables in the questionnaire are transport, medical facilities, drinking water, restrooms, canteens, housing, and working conditions. The study revealed that the majority of employees were satisfied with the available facilities.
- **Chaubey & Rawat (2016)** conducted an empirical research in small scale industries to analyze the relationship of labour welfare and job satisfaction. For this purpose, the data was collected from 153 respondents and collected data was then analyzed using SPSS software. The findings showed the significant positive influence of independent variable (labour welfare measures) on the dependent variable (job satisfaction).
- **Gopinath (2016)** conducted a study to measure the impact of welfare measures that are voluntarily provided by the BSNL to their employees using SEM model on the sample size of 928 employees. The study revealed that providing welfare facilities to the employees may result in enhanced job satisfaction.
- **Harshani and Welmilla (2017)** conducted a study in Sri Lankan Airlines to analyze the relationship between labour welfare facilities and job satisfaction. For this purpose, correlation and regression was applied to the collected primary data and a positive relation was found.
- **Shaju & Subhashini (2017)** undertook a study to analyze the impact of job satisfaction on the employee performance on the job. Study revealed that job satisfaction of employees is prerequisite as there is significant relationship between satisfaction level and job performance. They analyzed the job satisfaction on various dimensions which were job concrete factors, job abstract factors, psycho social factors, economic factors and national growth factors.
- **Bashir and Nika (2018)** conducted an empirical study in pharma companies of Jammu & Kashmir to get a detailed analysis on the impact of various dimensions of labour welfare and job satisfaction. The findings showed the significant positive impact on the dependent variable.

- **De Silva&Dayarathna (2019)** undertook a study in garments manufacturing industries of Sri Lanka and collected primary data from 113 employees. A positive relationship was found between labour welfare measures and job satisfaction of the employees.
- **Nanjundeswaraswamy (2019)** crafted a nuanced job satisfaction measurement model, surveying 697 participants from various sectors, including manufacturing. After meticulous analysis, they identified and retained eight dimensions and 52 items, showcasing robust relationships and construct validity.
- **Almeida & Perera (2020)** discussed about the impact of welfare facilities on the job satisfaction of the employees at lower level and concluded with the strong positive relation between these two variables. For the same sample was collected from the 138 respondents of an apparel industry. Analysis was done by applying correlation and regression. Statutory and non-statutory welfare facilities were taken for the study.
- **Sharma & Gupta (2020)** in their study focused on employee satisfaction across seven distinct service industries, revealing notable variations in satisfaction levels among them. However, the manufacturing industries, unfortunately, have often been overlooked and received limited attention in such analyses. Industrialization is an important driver of the employment growth and there arise a need to have a check on the implementation of laws and regulations in force for the labour welfare and their social security. Punjab is accelerating the pace of industrialization in the state. So this study attempted to measure job satisfaction from welfare measures and job satisfaction among the employees of different manufacturing industries.

III. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The objectives of the study are:

- A. To evaluate the job satisfaction levels of employees within selected industries.
- B. To study the impact of labour welfare measures on the job satisfaction of the employees in selected industries.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study uses primary data collection methods. The sample comprises 420 individuals drawn from six diverse industries in Punjab, including cotton textile, food processing, auto-components, paper mills, sugar mills, and steel industries. Each industry contributes 70 respondents, collectively

forming the sample with a minimum experience criterion of 5 years. The reliability of the pilot survey is assessed using Cronbach Alpha, with the obtained value surpassing the recommended threshold of ≥ 0.70 , indicating satisfactory reliability (Hair et al., 2017). Various statistical tools were applied for further analysis including mean, S.D., ANOVA and regression analysis.

V. DATA COLLECTION

The primary data for this research was systematically collected through a meticulously designed structured questionnaire, following an extensive review of relevant literature. Respondents were asked to share their opinions ranges from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree," allowing individuals to quantify their feelings about specific statements or questions. The questionnaire was intricately structured into three main sections: demographic profile (comprising 9 statements), labor welfare measures (consisting of 20 statements), and job satisfaction (comprising 22 statements).

The labor welfare measures section was further categorized into two dimensions: statutory welfare measures, which encompassed aspects like washing facilities, storing and drying wet clothes, seating facilities, first aid provisions, canteen amenities, restrooms, and crèche facilities (comprising 12 statements); and non-statutory welfare measures, covering areas such as transport facilities, housing provisions, medical amenities, loan facilities, and leave provisions (comprising 8 statements). Similarly, the job satisfaction scale comprised 22 statements, distributed across seven dimensions: pay and other financial benefits, promotional and training opportunities, work itself, job security, and supervision, colleagues/co S workers, and company practices. This comprehensive questionnaire facilitated a detailed exploration of respondents' perspectives on diverse aspects related to labor welfare and job satisfaction.

VI. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The collected data was initially tabulated, and subsequent statistical analysis was conducted in SPSS. The table 1 provides a demographic overview of the respondents, encompassing gender, age, experience, and annual income of employees in the manufacturing industries. The gender distribution reveals a significant disparity, with 86.7% (364) being male and 13.3% (56) female respondents. The majority, constituting 90% (378), are reported as married. Experience levels are categorized into four brackets, with 45.2% (190) having 5-10 years of experience and 40% (168)

having 10-15 years. Regarding annual income, 33.4% (140) reported less than ₹2,00,000, while 36.4% (153) fell within the ₹2,00,000-₹3,00,000 range, and 20.2% (85) reported ₹3,00,000-₹4,00,000. In terms of education, the majority (71%) has high school education or less, 18.8% (79) hold a two-year diploma, and 6.4% (27) have completed graduation.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents

Demographics		Frequency	Percent
Age (Years)	Below 30	42	10
	30-40	279	66.4
	Above 40	99	23.6
Gender	Male	364	86.7
	Female	56	13.3
Qualification	High school or less	298	71
	Two-year diploma	79	18.8
	Bachelor’s degree	27	6.4
	Master’s degree or more	16	3.8
Marital Status	Single	27	6.4
	Married	378	90
	Divorced	15	3.6
Experience	5-10 years	190	45.2
	10-15 years	168	40
	15-20 years	52	12.4
	Above 20 years	10	2.4
Income (p.a.)	Less than 2 lakh	140	33.4
	2 lakh-3 lakh	153	36.4
	3 lakh-4 lakh	85	20.2
	4 lakh or above	42	10

Source: Compiled By Author

In Table 2, a comprehensive set of descriptive statistics for the variable "Job Satisfaction" is presented, providing a nuanced understanding of the nuances of job satisfaction within different organizations. The metrics included in the data offer a thorough exploration of the central tendencies and variability of job satisfaction scores across the observed entities. Taking a closer

look at the specific case of "Fazilka Cooperative Sugar Mills," it becomes apparent that the organization holds an average job satisfaction score of 2.09, derived from a substantial dataset of 70 observations. Noteworthy is the organization's consistent job satisfaction levels, as evidenced by the relatively low standard deviation of 0.12, indicating a limited degree of variability among employee satisfaction scores. The 95% confidence interval for the mean, which spans from 2.06 to 2.12, shows how precise our estimation is. Examining the range of job satisfaction scores, which spans from 1.82 to 2.32, provides a comprehensive insight into the levels of job satisfaction among employees within organizations.

Table 2: Descriptive For Job Satisfaction

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min.	Max.
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Fazilka Cooperative Sugar Mills	70	2.09	.12	2.06	2.12	1.82	2.32
Satia Indutsries	70	2.41	.17	2.37	2.45	1.86	2.68
Nahar Industries	70	2.30	.27	2.24	2.37	1.55	2.91
Hlghway Industry	70	2.44	.12	2.41	2.47	2.18	2.73
Federal Mogul Geotze India	70	2.32	.16	2.28	2.36	1.68	2.59
Bonn Nutrients Pvt. Ltd.	70	2.50	.17	2.46	2.54	1.77	2.73
Total	420	2.34	.22	2.32	2.37	1.55	2.91

Source: Compiled By Author

When examining job satisfaction scores for individual organizations, Satia Industries stands out with an mean score of 2.41 and a moderate S.D. of 0.17. The 95% confidence interval, ranging from 2.37 to 2.45, provides a reliable estimate range. Scores within Satia Industries range from 1.86 to 2.68, showing a wide range of employee satisfaction. Similarly, Nahar Industries" has an average score of 2.30, but with a slightly higher S.D. of 0.27. The 95% confidence interval of this organization ranges from 2.24 to 2.37, indicating some uncertainty in the mean estimation. The overall dataset shows an average job satisfaction score of 2.34 across 420 observations. The standard deviation of 0.22 indicates variability in satisfaction levels. The mean's 95% confidence range of 2.32 to 2.37 reflects the preciseness of this overall estimation. The dataset covers job

satisfaction levels ranging from 1.55 to 2.91. Employees at Fazilka Cooperative Sugar Mills exhibit the highest satisfaction among the selected manufacturing industries, followed by Nahar Industries and Federal Mogul Geotze India.

Table 3: ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	7.432	5	1.486	47.281	.000
Within Groups	13.016	414	.031		
Total	20.448	419			

Source: Compiled By Author

Table 3 displays the outcomes of an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) used to examine differences in the Job Satisfaction variable across different groups, which could represent various organizations or industries. ANOVA is a powerful statistical tool used to determine differences in the means among these groups, providing detailed insights into how group membership affects job satisfaction levels. The obtained F-statistic of 47.281 indicates significant group differences, with a p-value < 0.001, highlighting high statistical significance. These findings confirm the presence of statistically significant variations in job satisfaction levels across the groups or categories studied. This demonstrates that factors associated to various organizations or industries greatly change employees' perceptions of job satisfaction, underscoring the considerable importance of group or organizational belief on these impressions.

Table 4: Regression Analysis

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.509 ^a	.279	.267	.19039
a. Predictors: (Constant), Labour_Welfare				

Source: Compiled By Author

The table 4 presents the conclusions drawn from a regression analysis model, highlighting the complex interactions between the variables that are being examined. The R² 0.279 indicates that approx. 27.9% of the variance in the dependent variable is elucidated by the independent

variable(s). This explanatory power remains notably consistent, even after accounting for the number of predictors, as evidenced by the adjusted R Square of 0.267. The model proves its mettle in accurate predictions, evident from a standard error of the estimate of 0.19039. Within this model, two predictors take the stage – a constant term and the variable Labour Welfare. However, a more nuanced understanding of the coefficient ".509a" linked to Labour Welfare necessitates additional context about the dataset and research question, signifying a positive impact of this predictor on the dependent variable.

VII. CONCLUSION, LIMITATION AND FUTURE SCOPE

Managing the human resource within an organization poses a critical and intricate challenge for management, and unlike machines or algorithms, there is no automated optimization for its productivity. Central to an employee's productivity is job satisfaction, prompting organizations to continually strive for its enhancement. While organizations strive to enhance job satisfaction, the initial step involves understanding the current status of job satisfaction levels within the industry. This study, employing empirical data sourced from various organizations spanning six industries, underwent meticulous analysis, including the application of an ANOVA test. The obtained findings pointed to moderate levels of job satisfaction. The main conclusion of the study emphasizes a strong and positive relationship between various aspects of labor welfare and job satisfaction. Advocating for the substantial impact of improved welfare measures in manufacturing companies, the study suggests that augmenting labor welfare dimensions and facilities could markedly elevate job satisfaction.

The implications extend to providing invaluable guidance for industry leaders in formulating human resource policies aimed at enhancing employee job satisfaction, ultimately rendering their respective industries more appealing and potentially amplifying overall productivity. Nevertheless, the authors candidly recognize the study's limitations, notably the constrained number of respondents and the specific factors under scrutiny. Future research endeavors could enrich the study's scope by encompassing a more extensive array of industries with larger respondent samples. The introduction of a control group would contribute to a deep understanding of the impact of extraneous variables on employee job satisfaction in these industries. Furthermore, investigating demographic variables like age and gender may provide detailed understanding of the dynamics of job satisfaction prevailing in different manufacturing industries.

VIII. REFERENCES

- I. Almeida, N. A. D. H., & Perera, G. D. N. (2015). The impact of welfare on job satisfaction among non managerial employees in the apparel industry in Sri Lanka. In *Proceedings of International HR Conference* 2(1), 109-115.
- II. Aziri, B. (2011). Job Satisfaction: A Literature Review. *Management Research & Practice*, 3(4), 77-86.
- III. Bashir, I., & Nika, F. A. (2018). Labour Welfare Practices and Job Satisfaction: A Study of Multinational Pharmaceutical Companies in Jammu and Kashmir. *International Journal of Social Science and Economic Research*, 3(12), 7437-7483.
- IV. Beloor, V., Swamy, C. J., Nanjundeswaraswamy, T. S., Swamy, D. R., & Nagesh, P. (2020). A Study On Job Satisfaction And Employee Welfare In Garment Industries. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, 13(33), 3445-3456.
- V. Bennett, R. (1997). Job Satisfaction Among Police Constables: A Comparative Study in Three Developing Nations. *Justice Quarterly*, 14, 295–323.
- VI. Bhati, P. P. & Muthukrishnan, A. (2013). Provision of Welfare Under Factories Act & Its Impact on Employee Satisfaction. *Journal of Business Management & Social Sciences Research*, 2(2), 57-69.
- VII. Cano, J., & Miller, G. (1992). A Gender Analysis of Job Satisfaction, Job Satisfier Factors, And Job Dissatisfier Factors Of Agricultural Education Teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 33, 40–46.
- VIII. Chaubey, D. S., & Rawat, B. (2016). Analysis of Labour Welfare Schemes and Its Impact on Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Study. *Management Convergence*, 7(2), 45-53.
- IX. Choudhary, S. (2017). Employee Welfare: A Scheme of Wise Investment. *International Journal of Advanced Education and Research*, 2(1), 01-06.
- X. De Silva, L. S. H. D. P., & Dayarathna, N. W. K. D. K. (2019). Impact of Employee Welfare Facilities on Job Satisfaction of Non-Managerial Employees in Selected Garment Factories in Matara District in Sri Lanka. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 7(1), 25.
- XI. De Souza, C. & Noronha, S. (2011). Influence of Labour Welfare Facilities on Job Satisfaction: A Study of Pharmaceutical Companies in Goa. *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 54(2), 285-299.

- XII. Gopinath, R. (2016). How the Compensation Management and Welfare Measure Influence Job Satisfaction? A study with special reference in BSNL to three different SSAs using Modeling. *Management*, 5(8), 305-308.
- XIII. Gurusamy, P., & Princy, J. (2012). A Study on Welfare Facilities with Reference to Textile Industries. *Indian Journal of Applied Research*, 2(1), 97-99.
- XIV. Hair, J. F., Matthews, L. M., Matthews, R. L., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). PLS-SEM or CB-SEM: Updated Guidelines on Which Method to Use. *International Journal of Multivariate Data Analysis*, 1(2), 107-123.
- XV. Harshani, M. D. R., & Welmilla, I. (2017). Effect of Employee Welfare Facilities on Employee Retention: A Study of Cabin Crew Employees In Sri Lankan Airlines. *Kelaniya Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(2), 128-146.
- XVI. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley.
- XVII. Kumari, M. S., & Tatareddy, M. (2014). Impact Of Employee Welfare Facilities On Job Satisfaction: A Study With Reference To Secunderabad Division Of South Central Railway. *EPR International Journal of Economic and Bussiness Review*, 2(12), 189-197.
- XVIII. Logasakthi, K., & Rajagopal, K. (2013). A Study on Employee Health, Safety and Welfare Measures of Chemical Industry in the View of Salem Region. *International Journal of Research in Business Management*, 1(1), 1-9.
- XIX. Nadinloyi, K. B., Sadeghi, H., & Hajloo, N. (2013). Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Employees Mental Health. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 84, 293-297.
- XX. Nanjundeswaraswamy, T. (2019). Development and Validation of Job Satisfaction Scale for different Sectors. *International Journal for Quality Research*, 13(1), 193-220.
- XXI. Parvin, M. M., & Kabir, M. N. (2011). Factors affecting employee job satisfaction of pharmaceutical sector. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(9), 113-123.
- XXII. Savery, L. K. (1996). The Congruence between the Importance Of Job Satisfaction And The Perceived Level Of Achievement. *Journal of Management Development*, 15, 18-27.
- XXIII. Senthilkumar, M. (2013). A Study on Labour Welfare Measures and Industrial Relations In Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation Limited (Villupuram Division). *PhD Thesis*, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, Tamil Nadu. Retrieved from-
<http://hdl.handle.net/10603/73709>.

- XXIV. Shaju K., & Subhashini D. (2017). A Study on the Impact of Job Satisfaction on Job Performance of Employees Working In Automobile Industry, Punjab, India. *Journal of Management Research*, 9(1), 117-130.
- XXV. Sharma, S. C., & Gupta, R. (2020). Job Satisfaction: Difference in Levels among Selected Industries. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 8(6), 5698-5703.
- XXVI. Sree, R. N. B., & Satyavathi, R. (2017). Employee Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Research*, 7(5), 85-94.
- XXVII. Sridevi, M.S. (2006). Role of HRD in the New Economic Environment. *Southern Economist*. 45 (7): 7-8.
- XXVIII. Srivastava, S. K. (2004). Impact of Labour Welfare on Employee Attitudes and Job Satisfaction. *Management and Labour Studies*, 29(1), 31-41.
- XXIX. Tiwari, U. (2014). A Study on Employee Welfare Facilities and Its Impact on Employees' Efficiency At Vindhatelelinks Ltd. Rewa (MP) India. *Abhinav International Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Management and Technology*, 3(11), 1-7.
- XXX. Venugopal, P., Bhaskar, T., & Usha P. (2011). Employee Welfare Activities with Respective Measures in Industrial Sector- A Study on Industrial Cluster at Chittoor District. *International Journal of Research in Commerce, IT and Management*, 1(6), 78-83.
- XXXI. Westover, J. H. (2012). Comparative Welfare State Impacts on Work Quality And Job Satisfaction: A Cross-National Analysis. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 39(7), 503-525.