INFLUENCE OF LABOUR WELFARE FACILITIES ON JOB SATISFACTION IN SUGAR INDUSTRY OF UTTAR PRADESH

Ajit Dhar Dubey
Department of Business Administration, DDU Gorakhpur University Gorakhpur India
E-mail:dr.ajit90@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper highlights the influence of labour welfare facilities on the job satisfaction of employees in Public Limited Companies and Private Companies in Uttar Pradesh. A stratified proportion sample of 201 employees was administered the Labour Welfare Inventory. The eight dimensions of labour welfare (including education/training, housing, subsidized loans, recreation, safety, canteen, medical facilities and others) were found to be positively and significantly correlated with the job satisfaction of employees in these companies. Regression analysis specified the dimensions of educations/training and others, as indicative of influencing the job satisfaction of employees in these sugar industries. The result also showed that the statutory labour welfare facilities constitute a better predictor of job satisfaction than the non-statutory labour welfare facilities in these companies. Employees in the Private Companies in Uttar Pradesh reported better provision of labour welfare facilities and were found to experience a higher level of job satisfaction than their fellow mates Public Limited Companies.

Keywords: satisfaction, welfare, training, education.

INTRODUCTION

The major growth in the sugar industry sector in Uttar Pradesh started in late 1990s. The sugar industry has emerged as a major component in the industrial development of the state. The five-year tax holiday for Uttar Pradesh announced in the Union Budget in the year 1993, which was further extended to the period up to 31 March 2008, as per Section 80-IB (4) of the Income Tax Act, and the conducive socio-economic environment gave further impetus to the development of the sugar industry in Uttar Pradesh. From 1995 onwards, an all-round development took place and today sugar industry in the state have over 120 registered units employing approximately 20,000 people directly, in addition to the 2000 to 3000 personnel employed in the marketing of sugar.

(Salgaocar, 2003) Uttar Pradesh, in fact, emerged as a hub for sugar industries. Indeed, sugar constitutes the sunrise industry of the state of the Uttar Pradesh. Uttar Pradesh was able to attract large Public Limited Companies and Private Companies during the decade 1993-2011. These included big players like Nyoli Sugar Mills,Nyoli,Etah, J.K.Sugar Mill Meerganj,Bareilly, Oswal Overseas Ltd .Sugar Ltd., Pilibhit, Pilibhit, Indo Gulf Industries Ltd.(Sugar Unit) Mezapur, Chilvaria Sugar Works Ltd.,Chilvaria, Bahraich, Balarampur Sugar Mills Ltd., Balarampur, Balarampur. (Sugar Industry of Uttar Pradesh, 2013) Most of the sugar units in Uttar Pradesh manufacture basically sugar formulations.

In a globalised and highly competitive world, sugar industries are engaged in stiff

competition with each other. They need to encourage their workers to perform better, improve their efficiency, and retain good employees. For this purpose, providing adequate labour welfare facilities and promoting job satisfaction assumes importance. The progress of an industry and the development of the nation depend, to a large extent, on the welfare of the workers and their attitude towards work. Against this background, for the purpose of the study, the researchers selected Public Limited Companies and Private Companies situated in industrial estates in Uttar Pradesh, and attempted to highlight the labour welfare facilities-both statutory and non-statutory-that influence the job satisfaction of employees in these companies.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Job satisfaction is derived from the Latin word sates and facers, meaning 'enough' and 'to do', respectively. Job satisfactions denote a process of gaining desired things at the desired level on the job. The term 'job satisfaction' implies a positive attitude towards one's work, which is global in nature and which results from many specific job-related experiences. According to Manickavasagam and Sumathi (2000), job satisfaction represents an attitude rather than behavior, and is hence the outcome of the difference between the actual and expected receipts of rewards from a job. Ganguli (1994) defines job satisfaction as an attitude that results from a balancing and summation of many specific likes and dislikes experienced in connection with the job. It signifies the employees' judgment of how well the job on the whole is satisfying his various needs.

The concept of 'labour welfare' has received inspiration from the concepts of democracy and the welfare state. The term 'labour welfare' is very comprehensive and includes various types of activities undertaken for the economic, social, intellectual and moral benefit of the labour community (Kumar, 1994). Labour welfare implies the setting up of minimum desirable standards and the provision of facilities like healthcare, food, clothing, housing, medical assistance, education, insurance, job security, and recreation, among others, for the benefit of workers. Such facilities enable a worker and his family to lead a good work life, family life and social life (Sarma, 2012).

Report II of the ILO Asian Regional Conference (1947) defined labour welfare as a term which is understood to include such services, facilities and amenities as may be established in or outside the vicinity of undertakings to enable the persons employed in the latter to perform their work in healthy, congenial surrounding, and to provide them with amenities that are conducive to their good health and high moral. In the broader sense, labour welfare is a convenient term covering all thus aspects of industrial life that contribute to the well-being of the workers. Labour welfare refers to any agency either statutory or voluntary, which aims at the betterment of workers' conditions (ILO Resolution, 1947).

Labour welfare help in the development of better workers, which, in turn, helps in the development of a better community and society. The labour welfare, measures provided in an organization affect the attitudes of employees towards work. Labour welfare facilities satisfy the need of the employees, which can lead to an improvement in their working life, family life and overall welfare.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Employee satisfaction is one of the most

researched topics of organizational behavior in India and abroad (Hoppock, 1935; Herzbeg, et al., 1957; Ganguli, 1964; Sinha, 1981; Khandwalla, 1988; Sinha and Singh, 1995; Chelliah, 1998). Hoppock (1935) was the first industrial psychologist to introduce the concept of job satisfaction in his classic work, Job Satisfaction. According to Hoppock, job satisfaction is any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that cause a person to say, "I am satisfied with the job". He proposed the following six major components of job satisfaction: individual reactions to unpleasant situations; facility of adjusting with other individuals, standing in the socio-economic group with which one has identified relationship between the demands of the job and the worker's abilities interest and training and security loyalty. Hoppock determined that job satisfaction is a combination of psychological, physiological and environmental conditions emanating from his/her job that induce a sense of satisfaction in the person.

According to Herzberg,et al, (1957), it is necessary to identify the needs of the employee. The organization for which he works must recognize his needs and ensure that they are satisfied. As such, job satisfaction is positively related to the degree to which one's personal needs are fulfilled in the job situation. Studies have shown that an increase in job satisfaction is related not only to the satisfaction associated with the important components of a job but also to the satisfaction of the increasing number of job facets, irrespective of their importance.

Various studies have also determined the influence of labour welfare facilities provided by industries and their influence on the job satisfaction enjoyed by employees. One such study was undertaken by Goyal(1995) for six cotton textile industries in the private, public, and co-operative sectors in Punjab, based on a random sample of 350 textile workers. The results of the study revealed that the provision of various statutory labour welfare facilities lead to the job satisfaction of workers. The study suggested that an increase in labour welfare facilities would increase the level of job satisfaction, which, in turn, may help in increasing productivity of textile workers in Punjab.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The aims of the study are:

(1) To investigate the dimensions of labour welfare that influences the job satisfaction of in Public Limited Companies and Private Companies in Uttar Pradesh.
(2) To determine the relative importance of the statutory and non-statutory labour welfare facilities as a predictor of job satisfaction in Public Limited Companies and Private Companies in Uttar Pradesh.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

Ho1: The dimensions in the Labour Welfare Inventory do not influence the job satisfaction of employees in Public Limited Companies and Private Companies in Uttar Pradesh.
Ho2: The statutory labour welfare facilities are not better predictors of job satisfaction than non-statutory labour welfare facilities in sugar industry in Uttar Pradesh.

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Sample of the Study

The population of the study comprised 841 employees working in the ten selected sugar industry in Uttar Pradesh (including Public Limited Companies and Private Companies). Workers and managers were selected from these Public Limited Companies and Private Companies in Uttar Pradesh on the basis of proportionate stratified sampling. The sample represents 20 per cent of the managers and

workers in each of the selected sugar industry in Uttar Pradesh. The total sample of the study includes 201 respondents, which comprises 24 per cent of the population of the study. In Public Limited Companies, the sample comprised 115 respondents, while that in Private Companies in Uttar Pradesh included 86 respondents.

Instruments used for Data Collection

The Labour Welfare Inventory, on Job Satisfaction, was administered to the sample studied. The items in these scales were assessed by using Likert's five-point rating scale ranging from 'strongly disagree' (1 point) to 'strongly agree' (5 points) for positive items and the reverse for negative items in the scales administered to the respondents.

Job Satisfaction Scale included seven dimensions; namely, work itself, pay and other financial benefits, promotional and training opportunities, job security, supervision, colleagues/co-workers, and company practices. These seven dimensions of job satisfaction were covered by 26 items, in which three were negative statements while the other was positive statements.

The reliability of the scale using the test-retest method was: R=0.90.The odd-even reliability after using Spearman-Brown's correlation was: R=0.81. The validity of the scale was checked through the internal consistency method, that is, item analysis showing low correlations between items and high correlations between item score and total test score.

The Labour Welfare Inventory constructed and standardized consisted of eight dimension, namely, education/training, recreation, medical, subsidized loans, canteen, housing, safety and other (related to the general well being of workers, including uniforms, drinking water, toilets, leave facilities, workman's

compensation, retirement benefits, rest rooms and bonus). These eight dimensions were covered under 47 items, all of which were positive statements. The reliability coefficient of the Inventory using the test-retest method was: R=0.76 and the index of reliability were 0.84, indicating that the Labour Welfare Inventory is highly reliable and valid. The split-half reliability coefficient was 0.83 and the index of reliability was 0.89, which makes the Inventory reliable and valid.

Method of Data Collection

Data was collected from both primary and secondary sources for the purpose of the research. Primary data was collected through field surveys using interview schedules and questionnaire method. Secondary data was collected from books, journals, monographs and unpublished thesis. A total of 500 scales were administered to the respondents, out of which 350 were received of these, the number of fully completed scaled was 201 (N=201), while in the other some items were left incomplete. The 201 usable responses represented a 40.2 per cent response rate.

Statistical Techniques Used

The data collected was analyses by using Pearson's coefficient of correlation and multiple regression analysis.

DATA ANALYSIS

Ho1: The dimensions of the Labour Welfare Inventory do not influence the job satisfaction of employees in Public Limited Companies and Private Companies (sugar industry) in Uttar Pradesh.

In order to test the null hypotheses, a correlation matrix between job satisfaction and labour welfare dimensions and within the labour

welfare dimensions was constructed as shown in Appendix Table A1. This was followed by a running of the multiple regression analysis. The finding in the correlation matrix would explain those dimensions in the Labour Welfare Inventory that are significantly correlated with the job satisfaction of employees in the sugar industry in Uttar Pradesh. The multiple regression analysis would identify the labour welfare dimensions that influence job satisfaction.

It can be observed from Appendix Table A1 that all the eight labour welfare dimensions are positively and significantly correlated with job satisfaction at the 0.001 level. This implies that an increase in any of the labour welfare dimensions is likely to significantly increase the job satisfaction of employees (N=201) in the sugar industry in Uttar Pradesh. For instance, an increase in education/training will significantly increase the job satisfaction of the employees. Similarly, any increase in recreation facilities, medical facilities, subsidized loans, canteen, safety, housing and other would have a significant influence on the job satisfaction of employees (N=201) in these industries in Uttar Pradesh. Thus, any effort made by the management of sugar industries in Uttar Pradesh to increase any labour welfare measure would significantly increase the job satisfaction of their employees.

Although these eight labour welfare dimensions are significantly correlated with job satisfaction, it does not mean that all of them are independent of each other. This can be observed from the correlation matrix, wherein the eight dimensions of labour welfare are highly correlated with each other. For example, education/training is significantly correlated with the other seven labour welfare dimensions at the 0.01 level. Likewise, recreation has a significant correlation with the rest of the

dimensions of labour welfare. Thus, it can be said that all the labour welfare dimensions are highly correlated to each other at the 0.01 level of significance. This is but natural because each of these eight dimensions is indeed a composite labour welfare measure. These are the labour welfare facilities that employers provide and that employees expect to receive. An employee who receives good education/training would also like to acquire better recreation facilities, medical facilities, more subsidized loans, improved canteen facilities, housing, safety measures and others. This applies to each of the other labour welfare dimensions as well, which reveals that each of the labour welfare dimensions is significantly correlated with one another. These are very strongly correlated and so they are not independent variables by themselves. This means that the so-called independent variables are not really independent. This is an indication of a multi-co linearity problem, which could make the findings of the study unreliable and lead to large stand errors of the estimators. The problem of multi-collinearity was further realized when a multiple regression was run with job satisfaction as the dependent variable and the dimensions of labour welfare as the impendent variables, the result of which are revealed in Table 1. A glance at the Table confirms that there is a multi-collinearity problem, since the value of the R2 is very high (R2=0.67) but quite a few of the coefficients of labour welfare are not statistically significant at the 0.05 level (including medical facilities, subsidized loans, canteen, housing and safety). The rule of thumb is that if the correlation between the regresses is significant, and if the R2 is high but quite a few of the coefficients are not statically significant, it is a sign of the multi-collinerity problem.

In order to alleviate this problem of multi-collinearity, the researcher tried many specifications with different combinations of

the labour welfare dimensions. This finally led to selection of education/training, and other (uniform, water facilities, toilets, retirement benefits, compensation, rest-rooms, bonus, travelling allowance, crèche and leave facilities) as the labour welfare dimensions, since their coefficients were highly significant at the 0.01 level and are thus indicative of their influencing job satisfaction. Other independent variables

TABLE 1

Multiple Regression Analysis for Multi-collinearity

Model Summary

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of the estimate
1	.823a	.678	.656	10.308

Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients B	Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	T	Sig.
Constant	30.766	6.476		4.751	.000
Staff	14.559	2.283	.408	6.376	.000
Gender	2.561	1.575	.072	1.626	.106
Age	.271	.102	.127	2.649	.009
Education/training	1.300	.341	.407	3.808	.000
Recreation	-.789	.299	-.284	-2.639	.009
Medical	.325	.312	.069	1.043	.298
Subsidized loans	.131	.215	.038	.612	.542
Canteen	.272	.257	.068	1.061	.290
Housing	.211	.225	.067	.938	.349
Safety	-.016	.322	-.003	-.049	.961
Others	.374	.151	.158	2.475	.014

Dependent variable: Job satisfaction total.
Source: Primary data.

Such as the dummy variables, Public Sugar Companies (D1), gender (D2), staff (D3) and age, were also selected because of their high significant coefficients (0.01 level), which are suggestive that they too influence job satisfaction. These independent variables together would probably be able to explain the maximum variance in job satisfaction. The

a. Predictors: (constant), Staff MPCs. Gender, Age, Staff, Recreation, Subsidized loans, Safety, Canteen, Others, Medical, Housing, Education/Training

ANOVA

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	41822.148	13	3217.088	30.278	.000a
Residual	19868.847	187	106.251		
Total	61690.995	200			

a. Predictors: (constant), Staff, Gender, Age, Staff, Recreation, Subsidized loans, Safety, Canteen, Others, Medical, Housing, Education/ Training
b. Dependent variable: Job satisfaction

other independent variables (recreation, medical, subsidized loan, canteen, housing, safety) were dropped because their coefficient were not found to be significant in influencing job satisfaction or were found to be highly correlated with education/training and others. After having selected the independent variable that was indicative of influencing job

satisfaction, the researcher once again used the multiple regression analysis to test the null hypothesis Ho1, the results of which unfold in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Influence of Labour Welfare Dimensions on Job Satisfaction of Employees in Public Limited Companies and Private Companies in Uttar Pradesh

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.807a	.652	.641	10.524

COFFICIENTS

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients B	Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	T	Sig.
Constant	37.530	4.636		8.095	.000
Education/ Training	.862	.0177	.270	4.872	.000
Other	.392	.130	.165	3.008	.003
Age	.321	.101	.150	3.191	.002
Gender	3.008	1.575	.084	1.910	.058
Staff	11.316	1.678	.317	6.761	.000

Dependent variable: Job satisfaction

The following multiple regression model emerges on the basis of Table 2

$$Y = \alpha + \beta1\,X1 + \beta2\,X2 + \beta3\,X3 + \beta4\,D1 + \beta5\,D2 + \beta6\,D3 + €$$

Where,
Y = Dependent variable (job satisfaction)
α = Constant term
$\beta1\,\beta2\ldots\ldots\beta6$ = Regression coefficient
X1 X2 = Dimensions of labour welfare
X1 = Education/ training
X2 = Other
X3 = Age
D1 = 1 for Public Limited Companies
      0 for Private Companies
D2 = 1 for Female

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Staff, Other, Education/Training

ANOVA

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	40203.393	6	6700.566	60.496	.000a
Residual	21487.602	194	110.761		
Total	61690.995	200			

a. Predictors: (constant), Staff, Gender, Age, Staff, Recreation, Subsidized loans, Safety, Canteen, Others, Medical, Housing, Education/Training

b. Dependent variable: Job satisfaction

      0 for Male
D3 = 1 for Manager
      0 for Worker
€ = Error term
The regression equation is:
$$Y = 37.5 + .86\,X1 + .39\,X2 + .32\,X3 + 10.5\,D1 + 3\,D2 + 11.3\,D3 \qquad (1)$$
Adjusted R2 = 0.64
N = 201
For Public Limited Companies, the regression equation is:
$$Y = (D1=1) = 48 + .86\,X1 + .39X2 + .32\,X3 + 3\,D2 + 11.3D3 \qquad (2)$$
For Private Companies regression equation is:
$$Y\,(D1 = 0) = 37.5 + .86\,X1 + .39\,X2 + .32\,X3 + 3\,D2 + 11.3\,D3 \qquad (3)$$
Table 2 and Equation (1) emphasis that the

coefficient education/training (X1) and other (X2) influence job satisfaction. The finding show that a one-unit increase in education/training is likely to increase the level of job satisfaction of respondents in Public Limited Companies and Private Companies by 0.86 units, while a one-unit increase in other is most likely to increase the level of job satisfaction in these companies by 0.39 units. Moreover, the standardized coefficient of 'education/training' (0.27) is higher than that of 'other' (0.16). This signifies that 'education/training' has a higher influence on job satisfaction than others. Furthermore, the coefficients of education/training (X1) and other (X2) are statistically significant at the 0.01 level, as can be observed for their respective t-values. Thus, the null hypothesis, Ho1, which states that the dimensions in the Labour Welfare Inventory do not influence the job satisfaction of employees in Public Limited Companies and Private Companies in Uttar Pradesh in not accepted.

Given that the labour welfare dimensions of 'education/training' and 'other' influence the job satisfaction of respondents in the sugar industries in Uttar Pradesh; a glimpse at regression Equation (2) and (3) indicates that there is a difference in the level of job satisfaction in Public Limited Companies and Private Companies in Uttar Pradesh. The intercept of Public Limited is much higher than that of Private Companies, signifying that the respondents in Public Limited enjoy a higher level of job satisfaction than their counterpart in Private Companies in Uttar Pradesh. Moreover, the adjusted R2 is 0.64 per cent of the variance in the perceived level of job satisfaction is explained by the independent variables. This maker the model a good fit.

It can be concluded from the above discussion that there is a difference in the dimensions of the

labour welfare inventory- education/training and other- that influence the job satisfaction of employees in Public Limited Companies and Private Companies in Uttar Pradesh. The labour welfare dimension of education/training has more influence on job satisfaction than others.

Ho2: The statutory labour welfare facilities are not better predictors of job satisfaction than non-statutory labour welfare facilities in sugar industries in Uttar Pradesh.

As mentioned earlier, the eight dimensions in the Labour Welfare Inventory include education/training, recreation, medical, subsidized loans, canteen, housing, safety and others (comprising uniforms, water facilities, toilets, retirement benefits, workman's compensation, rest rooms, bonus, travelling allowance, leave facilities and crèche).

TABLE 3

Statutory and Non-statutory Labour Welfare Facilities as Predictors of Job Satisfaction of Employees in sugar industry in Uttar Pradesh Model Summary

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.802a	.644	.633	10.646

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Staff, Non-Statutory labour welfare facilities, Statutory labour welfare facilities.

ANOVA

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	39703.542	6	6617.257	58.385	.000a
Residual	21987.453	194	113.337		
Total	61690.995	200			

a. Predictors: (constant), Staff, Gender, Age, Non-Statutory labour welfare facilities, Statutory labour welfare facilities

b. Dependent variable: Job satisfaction

COFFICIENT

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients B	Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	T	Sig.
Constant	33.296	5.794		5.746	.000
Non-Statutory	.143	.067	.158	2.131	.034
Statutory	.276	.084	.251	3.293	.001
Age	.335	.101	.157	3.320	.001
Gender	2.893	1.605	.081	1.802	.073
Staff	11.225	1.699	.315	6.607	.000

Dependent variable: Job satisfaction
Source: Primary Data.

These labour welfare dimensions were categorized into statutory and non-statutory labour welfare facilities. The statutory labour welfare facilities (SLWFs) include medical facilities, canteen, safety and others, while the non-statutory labour welfare faculties (NSLWFs) incorporate education/training, recreation, subsidized loans and housing. An attempt is made here to examine whether the SWLFs or the NSWLFs are predictors of job satisfaction in the sugar industries in Uttar Pradesh. In order to test this hypothesis, a regression analysis is run that would specify whether the SLWFs or the NSLWFs are predictors of job satisfaction in these companies.

The following multiple regression mode emerges on the basis of Table 3.

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 D_1 + \beta_5 D_2 + \beta_6 D_3 + \text{€}$$

Where,
Y = Dependent variable (job satisfaction)
α = Constant term
$\beta_1 \beta_2 \ldots \ldots \beta_6$ = Regression coefficient
X_1 = Non-statutory labour welfare facilities
X_2 = Statutory labour welfare facilities

X_3 = Age
D_1 = 1 for Public Limited Companies
       0 for Private Companies
D_2 = 1 for Female
       0 for Male
D_3 = 1 for Manager
       0 for Worker
€ = Error term
The regression equation is:
$$Y = 33.2 + .14\,X_1 + .27\,X_2 + .33\,X_3 + 9.8\,D_1 + 2.8\,D_2 + 11.2\,D_3 \quad (4)$$
Adjusted R^2 = 0.63
N = 201

For Public Limited Companies, the regression equation is:

$$Y = (D_1=1) = 43 + .14\,X_1 + .27\,X_2 + .33\,X_3 + 2.8\,D_2 + 11.2\,D_3 \quad (5)$$

For Private Companies regression equation is:
$$Y\,(D_1 = 0) = 33.2 + .14\,X_1 + .27\,X_2 + .33\,X_3 + 2.8\,D_2 + 11.2\,D_3 \quad (6)$$

From Table 3 and regression Equation (4), it is obvious that the SLWFs (X_2) are better predictors of job satisfaction than the NSLWFs (X_1) in the sugar industries in Uttar Pradesh. This is because a one-unit increase in the SLWFs is likely to increase the job satisfaction of the respondents in the sugar industries by 0.27 units, while a one-unit increase in the NSLWFs is likely to increase the job

satisfaction of the respondents in these companies by 0.14 units. Moreover, in the sugar industries, the SLWFs have a better influence on job satisfaction than the NSLWFs, as the standard coefficient of SLWFs (0.25) is greater than the standard coefficient if NSLWFs (0.15). This signifies that the SLWFs have a large influence on job satisfaction than the NSLWFs in the sugar industries in Uttar Pradesh. Since the SLWFs constitute a better predictor of job satisfaction than NSWLFs in sugar industries in Uttar Pradesh, the null hypothesis Ho2 is not accepted.

While comparing Private Companies and Public Limited Companies in Uttar Pradesh, the –regression Equations (5) and (6) specify the Public Limited Companies in Uttar Pradesh experience a higher level job satisfaction than the Private Companies, given than the SLWFs are better predictor of job satisfaction than the NSLWFs. This can be noticed from the intercepts of the Public Limited Companies, which are higher than those of Private Companies. Moreover, the adjusted R^2 is 0.63, which make the regression a good fit, since 63 per cent of the variance in the perceived level of job satisfaction is explained by the independent variables.

It can thus be said that the SLWFs are better predicators of job satisfaction than NSLWFs in sugar industries in Uttar Pradesh. Thus, if the employers of sugar industries want to increase the job satisfaction level of their employees, then they to pay special attention to the SLWFs, which have emerged as better predictors of the job satisfaction of employees than NSLWFSs.

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions can be drawn on the basis of the above finding are delineated below. The eight dimensions of labour welfare were positively and significantly correlated with job satisfaction. An increase in any of the labour welfare dimensions and improvement in labour welfare facilities would significantly increase the job satisfaction of employees in sugar industries in Uttar Pradesh. If the sugar industries improve the welfare facilities for their employees then the job satisfaction of their employees would greatly increase.

Two labour welfare dimensions, namely 'education/training' and 'others' were found to be indicative of influencing job satisfaction. Education/training were more influential in influencing the job satisfaction of employees than the dimension 'others' in the Private Limited Company and Public Limited Company in Uttar Pradesh.

The SLWFs emerged as better predictors of job satisfaction than NSLWFs in sugar industries in Uttar Pradesh. This was because the SLWFs influenced the job satisfaction of employees to a greater extent the NSLWFs in these companies. The employees in Public Limited Company were found to experience a higher level of job satisfaction than their counterparts in Private Limited Company, given than labour welfare facilities, including the SLWFs and NSLWFs. The Private Limited Company, therefore, need to work towards increasing the job satisfaction of their employees.

References

(1) Agnihotri, M. (2002), "Labour Welfare Activities and Its Impact Behavior", Ph.D. Thesis, University of Guru Nanak, Amritsar.
(2) Chelliah, C. (1998), "Job Satisfaction in Fertilizers Limited- A Study", The Journal of Institute of Public Enterprises, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 77-83.
(3) Christiona De Souze & Silvia Noronha (2011) The Indian Journal of Labour Economics, Vol.54, No.2, pp.285-296.
(4) Ganguli, H.C. (1964), in A.S. Lather and S. Gain (2005), "Motivation and Job Satisfaction", Delhi Business Review, Vol. 6, No. 1 pp. 77-83.
(5) Goyal, P, (1995), Labour Welfare and Job Satisfaction, Deep and Deep Publications, New Delhi, pp. 1-45.
(6) Gujarati, D(2004), Basic Econometrics, Fourth edition, Tata McGraw Hill, New Delhi, pp. 47-57.

(7) Herzberg, F; Mausner, B.; Peterson, R.O. and Capwell, D.F.(1957), Job Attitudes: Review of Research and opinions, Pittsburgh Psychological Services, Pittsburgh.

(8) Hoppock, R, (1935), Job Satisfaction, Harper, New York, pp. 1-25.

(9) ILO Resolution (1947), in C.B. Mamoria and S. Mamoria (1983), Dynamics of Industrial Relations, Himalaya Publishing House, Bombay, p. 368.

(10) Kare, R, (2004), in Economic Survey 2003-04, Directorate of Planning, Statics and Evaluation, Government of Uttar Pradesh.

(11) Khaleque and Rehman (1987), in A. N. Nazir (1998), "Perceived Importance of Job Facets and Overall Job Satisfaction of Bank Employees", The Indian Jouranal of Industrial Relations, Vol, 33, No. 4, pp. 479-89.

****