

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329585125>

A study on employee welfare and its impact on their performance at private hospitals and its research centre – cross sectional descriptive study

Article · December 2018

CITATION

1

READS

2,803

3 authors:



[Prof.\(Dr.\)Subhasish Chatterjee](#)

Sumandeep Vidyapeeth University

26 PUBLICATIONS 6 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



[Medha Wadhwa](#)

Sumandeep Vidyapeeth University

4 PUBLICATIONS 9 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



[Ms Dharshana Patel](#)

Sumandeep Vidyapeeth University

1 PUBLICATION 1 CITATION

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Study to determine the training effectiveness of nurses about needle stick injury using KAP analysis [View project](#)

A study on employee welfare and its impact on their performance at private hospitals and its research centre-cross sectional descriptive study.

Prof.Dr.Subhasish Chatterjee, Principal–HOD, Department of Management,Sumandeep Vidyapeeth(An Institution Deemed to be University).

Dr. Medha Wadhwa, Asst. Professor, Department of Management,Sumandeep Vidyapeeth(An Institution Deemed to be University).

Ms.Darshana Patel, 2nd year Student, MBA (Healthcare), Department of Management,Sumandeep Vidyapeeth(An Institution Deemed to be University).

Abstract

It is crystal clear that employee welfare is the most important machinery in any organizations to get the productive result from the workers. It has been understood that for last few decades the proper welfare facilities are constantly generating motivation of the workers towards their work and that ultimately is reducing the attrition rate in the organization. There are many statutory and non-statutory welfare facilities are being offered to workers such as establishing proper industrial harmony, examining working condition, consistent monitoring on disease, accident and unemployment of employees and their families. Despite that there are many gaps are being observed between employee welfare and its impact on job performance. Owing to that reason investigator on the process of her completing summer internship program tried to search out the authentic information from the nurse, paramedical staff and general staff from private hospitals and finally all authors have also taken an endeavour to produce an authentic research paper by providing proper language, and with the help statistical package, the authors have also presented exact statistical information and inference after compilation of informative data.

Key words: Welfare, Performance, Health Insurance, Accommodation, Hygiene, Stress, Safety, Harassment, Environment and Ventilation

1. Introduction:

Employee welfare is an extremely essential factor and that is the reason employer provides workers, statutory and non-statutory benefits along with proper compensation for enhancing their motivation, which may likewise bring more loyalty and trust of employees towards the organization.

In health care sector employee welfare plays an important role. Employers need to provide services to employees who are occupied with the patient's care and hospital maintenance & services because employees of the healthcare sectors are locked in with most troublesome errand i.e. treating and getting them busy in saving the human life, for which they require giving full attention towards their work. In this state of affairs, it is required to have stress free, motivated workplace.

A cross-sectional descriptive design using a self-report questionnaire will be applied to study employee welfare exercises and its impact on employee performance. Welfare activities don't just provide motivating forces in a money related frame yet in addition by giving them consideration, enhance their abilities, improve their skills,

understand their problems, allowances, housing, monitoring working conditions, creation of harmony through infrastructure for health, insurances against disease, accidents and unemployment of their families. The hospital can align employee goals with their goals and make them believe that the organization is their own organization and their work is also playing a role in the growth of hospitals with this we can enhance their working quality and in addition the general execution level. Precisely, the aims of employee welfare are.... i. It helps to improve the loyalty and morale of the employees. ii. The welfare measure helps to improve the goodwill and public image. iii. It helps to improve industrial relations with employee and industrial peace and iv. It also helps to improve employee productivity. As far as features of employee welfare are concerned..... I. Employee welfare terminology indicates services, facilities and amenities provided by the employer for employee's betterment. II. Employee welfare concerns with monetary and non-monetary both. III. The aim of employee welfare is to improve the employee's working attitude and make an employee a good and happy citizen. iv. Employee welfare is an essential part of social welfare that involves adjustment of working and family life of an employee.

2. Objectives of the study:

- i. To study the existing welfare facilities offered to the employee
- ii. To know the employee opinion about the present welfare facilities
- iii. To study the impact of welfare on employee's performance.
- iv. To improve intellectual and raise their standards of living by measuring their perception about requirement of welfare activities we can provide better life, health and to make the workers more satisfied towards their work by relieving their fatigue,.

3. Review of literature(Timeline 2002-2017):

Mrs. Ayesha M. (2017) conducted a study on role of welfare measures and its impact on employee productivity with the aim to find out the role of welfare measures and its impact by applying t-test, f-test. So far as sample is concerned, there were 1650 employees were selected out of the 2100. For interpretation of data they used t-test, f-test. The female employees were less satisfied with recreational facilities rather than male¹.

Mendis M (2016)² studied on welfare facilities and job satisfaction with the objective of to examine the welfare facilities and its impact on job satisfaction at operational level of employees in Shri Lanka by interviewing 100employee. He also concluded that by increasing welfare facilities organization can improve the job satisfaction².

Dr. Venkata Rao P. et al (2015)³ conducted a survey on employee welfare is the key: an insight after interviewing 60 respondents and found that welfare measures were considered as critical indicator which may influence the employee performance³.

Kasenga F. et al (2014) conducted a study on staff motivation and welfare in Adventist health facilities in Malawi they did a qualitative research study by group discussion with health care workers and supportive staff and finally concluded that Adventist health facilities need to be revised, training programs for further development must be programmed, they must increase the communication between management and the health care staff through schedule routine meetings⁴.

Dr. Lalitha K.(2014) did a research study on employee welfare measures he wants to study the welfare facilities provided to the employee and also conclude that employee's happiness on welfare facilities will increase the productivity⁵.

Dr. Tiwari U. (2014) conducted a study on employee welfare activities and its impact on employee's efficiency at Rewa and concluded that the management require giving an attention to the facilities provided to the employees in such a way that will increase the productivity, satisfaction, performance level, profitability of organization⁶.

Rama Satyanarayana and Jayaprakash Reddy (2012) found satisfaction of maximum employee concerning the welfare measure in cement division of KCP Ltd. They conducted the research to find out the satisfaction level and employee welfare measure⁷.

Vijaya Banu and Ashifa (2011) worked in public sector transportation's welfare measures where they analyzed different dimension of labour welfare measures perceived to workers. They also emphasized the awareness of labour about welfare measures, their satisfaction level and its technique of improvement⁸.

Swapna (2011) carried out a research in Singareni Collieries Company Limited where the special attention has been given on social responsibility of the business by linking labour welfare and ethical consideration⁹.

Boselie P. (2010) studied on high performance work practices in the health care sector aiming to check the commitment and behavior in health care sector when their work performance practices are high¹⁰.

McIntyre H et al (2010) conducted a survey on Implementation of the European working time directive in an NHS trust, impact on patient care and junior doctor welfare they did a retrospective observational survey in single district general hospital on non elective medical admission¹¹.

Gosliner W. et al (2010) conducted a study on Impact of a worksite wellness program on the nutrition and physical activity environment of child care centres, the purpose of the study was to test that wellness program implementation for the staff affects the nutrition and physical activity¹².

Randhir Kumar Singh (2009) establish that there is a relation between impact on manpower productivity and welfare measures when he conducted research on welfare measures and its impact on manpower productivity. According to him, if welfare measures are taken flawlessly than there is a possibility of enhancement of profit¹³. Getting higher side of the minimum wages go together with capital tax said Alok Kumar (2008). He also told with help of his research analysis that the minimum wage and capital tax come with the general equilibrium framework¹⁴.

Courtney Coile and Jonathan Gruber (2007) examined and established that "forward looking incentive measures for social security are significant determinants of retirement"¹⁵.

Alison Earle and Jody Heymann (2006) carried out a research on about workers availing time off if workers themselves or any members of their family fall sick. The study also surveyed and went for analysis about paid leave for health needs of the workers self or adult family member or children¹⁶.

Karl Aiginger (2005) reexamined the labour market regulations and its comparative effect. He concluded that the main reason for low growth in Europe is the inflexible labour market, which is linked with welfare cost¹⁷.

Goetzel R. et al (2002) did a research on the long term impact of Johnson & Johnson's health & wellness program on employee health risks they mainly did a study because they believed that corporate health promotion and disease prevention program can improve the employee's risk profile¹⁸.

4. Research methodology:

For this study cross-sectional descriptive research design using a Likert scale close ended structured questionnaire.

a. Unit of analysis

The study involved total 50 employees such as Nurses, Paramedical staff and non medical staff. It involves those who will on duty during research and who give willingness to participate in the study. This study includes only those employees who will on duty during 9 am to 5 pm.

b. Methods of data collection

In this study data collected through close ended structured questionnaire. Sufficient hard copy of English language questionnaire with informs consent given to 52 employees who give willingness to participate in the study and questionnaire filled by participators itself.

c. Sampling

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Sample Description: Total sample of will be taken using following formula:

Where, *Population Size = N (60) | sample size: n =52, but 2 respondents failed to respond perfectly, so 50 samples are considered for calculation.*

In a study total population is 60 employees where confidence interval is 95% and 5% is the error of margin, by using the formula 50 sample size is estimated.

Selection Criteria:

i. Inclusion Criteria:

The employees involving all the non medical, paramedical staff, nurses

ii. Exclusion Criteria:

The study exclude a staff who are Unwilling to participate and on a leave. b.All the doctors

Employee who are on duty at the time of survey (9 to 5)

d. **Appropriate tools for data analysis**

The close ended structured questionnaire designed to measure the absenteeism rate of employees and causes of absenteeism of employees in the KCHRC. In questionnaire absenteeism related questions asked to employees and through filled questionnaire analysed the data.

e. **The variables for the particular study.**

A variable is an element, feature or factor that is liable to vary or change and has a quality or quality that varies.

i. The dependent variable is a variable a researcher interested in and

ii. Independent variable is variable which affect the dependent variable.

Others are....such as Extraneous variable, Intervening variable, Moderating variable, Confounding variable.

Variables are the factors which may directly or indirectly affect the study.

In this study, the main aim is measurement of employee welfare and its impact on their performance. Here the **employee performance is a dependent variable**. This variable is measured, predicted or monitored and is expected to be affected by manipulation of an independent variable, where **employee welfare is an independent variable** which is manipulated and it causes an effect on the dependent variable, here, we select age, gender and the working experience of employee as moderating variable, which is a second independent variable, shows that their expectation level about welfare and the other factors may varies.

An almost infinite numbers of extraneous variables exists that might conceivably affect following relationship between two different variables.

A hidden factor such as employee life style affect their view, requirement, their mentality, which are in total termed as confounding variable that indirectly affect the study. Confounding variables are also affecting employee's welfare expectations and employee's performance.

f. **HYPOTHESIS:**

H1: There is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme saving for future and its impact on their performance

H2: There is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme extra discount and its impact on their performance.

H3: There is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme health insurance and its impact on their performance

H4: There is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme accommodation and its impact on their performance

H5: There is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme schedule flexibility and its impact on their performance

H6: There is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme stress mgt. and its impact on their performance Types of research design

H7: There is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme balance between family and work and its impact on their performance

H8: There is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme hygiene awareness and its impact on their performance

H9: There is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme educational training and its impact on their performance

H10: There is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme attention to referrals and its impact on their performance

H11: There is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme benefits for family and its impact on their performance

H12: There is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme drinking water facilities and its impact on their performance Types of research design

H13: There is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme latrines and urinals and its impact on their performance

H14: There is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme hygiene canteen facilities and its impact on their performance

H15: There is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme changing room and its impact on their performance

H16: There is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme lighting and its impact on their performance

H17: There is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme ventilation and its impact on their performance

H18: There is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme proper work environment and its impact on their performance

H19: There is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme action against sexual harassments and its impact on their performance

H20: There is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme overall health and safety facilities and its impact on their performance

5. Data collection & analysis:

i. Frequency distribution of Gender, Age, Marital status and Length of service:

Gender:

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent
MALE	1.00	31	59.62
FEMALE	2.00	19	36.54
.	.	2	3.85
Total	52	100.0	

	Valid	50	N
	Missing	2	
Minimum		1.00	Minimum
Maximum		2.00	Maximum
Percentiles	50 (Median)	1.00	Percentiles

Marital status:

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent
MARRIED	1.00	30	57.69
UNMARRIED	2.00	20	38.46
.	.	2	3.85
Total	52	100.0	

Age:

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent
	20.00	2	3.85
	21.00	3	5.77
	22.00	4	7.69
	23.00	4	7.69
	24.00	8	15.38
	25.00	2	3.85
	26.00	2	3.85
	27.00	8	15.38
	28.00	7	13.46
	29.00	3	5.77
	30.00	2	3.85
	31.00	1	1.92
	32.00	1	1.92
	34.00	1	1.92
	36.00	1	1.92
	40.00	1	1.92
	.	2	3.85
Total	52	100.0	

Length of service:

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent
	0.50	3	5.77
	1.00	6	11.54
	1.20	1	1.92
	1.50	1	1.92
	2.00	14	26.92
	2.60	2	3.85
	3.00	5	9.62
	3.20	1	1.92
	4.00	7	13.46
	4.50	1	1.92
	5.00	6	11.54
	7.00	1	1.92
	9.00	1	1.92
	10.00	1	1.92
	.	2	3.85
Total	52	100.0	

ii. Frequency distributions of 2 scales and its outcome:

Questions	Frequency distributions of 1& 2 scales					
	1[Yes]	2[No]	3[Missing]	Total	Mean	SD
Availability finding to check saving for future.	39 [75%]	11 [21.15%]	2 [3.85%]	52 [100%]	1.22	0.42
Availability finding to check discount	36 [69.23%]	14 [26.92%]	2 [3.85%]	52 [100%]	1.28	0.45
Availability finding to check schedule flexibility	40 [76.92%]	10 [19.23%]	2 [3.85%]	52 [100%]	1.20	0.40
Availability finding to check stress management	18 [34.62%]	32 [61.54%]	2 [3.85%]	52 [100%]	1.64	0.48
Availability finding to check balance between family and work	16 [30.77%]	34 [65.38%]	2 [3.85%]	52 [100%]	1.68	0.47
Availability finding to check hygiene awareness	22 [42.31%]	28 [53.85%]	2 [3.85%]	52 [100%]	1.56	0.50
Availability finding to check educational training	39 [75%]	11 [21.15%]	2 [3.85%]	52 [100%]	1.22	0.42
Availability finding to check attention to referrals	40 [75%]	10 [21.15%]	2 [3.85%]	52 [100%]	1.20	0.40
Availability finding to check family benefits	34 [65.38]	16 [30.77]	2 [3.85%]	52 [100%]	1.38	0.47
Availability finding to check drinking water facilities	45 86.54	5 9.62	2 [3.85%]	52 [100%]	1.10	0.30
Availability finding to check latrine and urinals.	39 [75%]	11 [21.15%]	2 [3.85%]	52 [100%]	1.22	0.42
Availability finding to check canteen hygienist	37 [71.15]	13 [25.00]	2 [3.85%]	52 [100%]	1.26	0.44
Availability finding to check changing room	18 [34.62]	32 [61.54]	2 [3.85%]	52 [100%]	1.64	0.48
Availability finding to check lighting	46	4	2	52	1.08	0.27

	[88.46]	[7.69]	[3.85%]	[100%]		
Availability finding to check ventilation	30 [57.69]	20 [38.46]	2 [3.85%]	52 [100%]	1.40	0.49
Availability finding to check working environment.	38 [73.08]	12 [23.08]	2 [3.85%]	52 [100%]	1.43	0.43
Availability finding to check action against harassment	32 [61.54]	18 [34.62]	2 [3.85%]	52 [100%]	1.36	0.48
Availability finding to check health safety	34 [65.38]	16 [30.77]	2 [3.85%]	52 [100%]	1.32	0.47

In the aforesaid table it is understood that majority of the respondents said 'yes' except few criteria such as changing room, stress management, balance between family and work and check hygiene awareness.

iii. Frequency distributions of 3 scales and its outcome:

1. Highly Dissatisfied 2. Dissatisfied 3. Satisfied 4. Highly satisfied

Table no.	Questions	Frequency distributions of 1,2&3 scales							
		1	2	3	4	Missing	Total	Mean	SD
1	Perception about utilization of welfare schemes saving for future.	00	2 3.85	39 75	9 17.31	2 3.85	52 100	3.14	0.45
2	Perception about utilization of welfare schemes discount.	00	3 5.77	36 69.23	11 21.15	2 3.85	52 100	3.16	0.51
3	Perception about utilization of welfare schemes health insurance.	1 1.92	9 17.31	33 1.92	7 17.31	2 3.85	52 100	2.92	0.63
4	Perception about utilization of welfare schemes accommodation.	1 1.92	5 9.62	31 59.62	13 25	2 3.85	52 100	3.12	0.66
5	Perception about utilization of welfare schemes schedule flexibility.	00	3 5.77	38 73.08	9 17.31	2 3.85	52 100	3.12	0.48
6	Perception about utilization of welfare schemes stress management.	2 3.85	6 11.54	36 69.23	6 11.54	2 3.85	52 100	2.92	0.63
7	Perception about utilization of welfare schemes balance between family and work.	1 1.92	11 21.15	32 61.54	6 11.54	2 3.85	52 100	2.86	0.64
8	Perception about utilization of welfare schemes hygiene awareness.	1 1.92	11 21.15	33 63.46	5 9.62	2 3.85	52 100	2.84	0.62
9	Perception about utilization of welfare schemes educational training.	1 1.92	10 19.23	27 51.92	12 23.08	2 3.85	52 100	3.00	0.73
10	Perception about utilization of welfare schemes attention to referrals.	2 3.85	9 17.31	34 65.38	5 9.62	2 3.85	52 100	2.84	0.65
11	Perception about utilization of welfare schemes benefits for family.	00	12 23.08	28 53.85	10 19.23	2 3.85	52 100	2.96	0.67
12	Perception about utilization of welfare schemes drinking water.	2 3.85	3 5.77	33 63.46	12 23.08	2 3.85	52 100	3.08	0.68

13	Perception about utilization of welfare schemes latrines urinals.	00	3 5.77	34 65.38	13 25.0	2 3.85	52 100	3.20	0.53
14	Perception about utilization of welfare schemes canteen.	1 1.92	11 21.15	23 44.23	15 28.15	2 3.85	52 100	3.04	0.78
15	Perception about utilization of welfare schemes changing room.	0	12 23.08	27 51.92	11 21.15	2 3.85	52 100	2.98	0.68
16	Perception about utilization of welfare schemes lighting.	2 3.85	1 1.92	33 63.46	14 26.92	2 3.85	52 100	3.18	0.66
17	Perception about utilization of welfare schemes ventilation.	1 1.92	3 5.77	34 65.38	12 23.08	2 3.85	52 100	3.14	0.61
18	Perception about utilization of welfare schemes working environment.	1 1.92	7 13.46	28 53.85	14 26.92	2 3.85	52 100	3.10	0.71
19	Perception about utilization of welfare schemes action against harassment.	00	6 11.74	30 57.69	14 26.92	2 3.85	52 100	3.16	0.62
20	Perception about utilization of welfare schemes overall health safety.	5 9.62	30 57.69	15 28.85	2 3.85	2 3.85	52 100	3.20	0.61

It is inferred that...in table no-1... 3.85% of respondents are highly satisfied, 75% of respondents are satisfied and 3.85% of respondents are dissatisfied. Tale no.2..1.15% of respondents are highly satisfied, 69.23% of respondents are satisfied and 5.77% of respondents are dissatisfied. No 3... 13.46% of respondents are highly satisfied, 63.46% of respondents are satisfied, 17.31% of respondents are dissatisfied and 1.92% of respondents are highly dissatisfied...in no 4..25% of respondents are highly satisfied, 59.62% of respondents are satisfied, 9.62% of respondents are dissatisfied and 1.92% of respondents are highly dissatisfied ---in no 5..17.31% of respondents are highly satisfied, 73.08% of respondents are satisfied, 5.77% of respondents are dissatisfied.

In no. 6..11.54% of respondents are highly satisfied, 69.23% of respondents are satisfied, 11.54% of respondents are dissatisfied and 3.85% of respondents are highly dissatisfied. No 7 inferred 11.54% of respondents are highly satisfied, 61.54% of respondents are satisfied, 21.15% of respondents are dissatisfied and 1.92% of respondents are highly dissatisfied. No 8 inferred that 9.62 % of respondents are highly satisfied, 63.46% of respondents are satisfied, 21.15% of respondents are dissatisfied and 1.92% of respondents are highly dissatisfied. In table no 9 says..23.08% of respondents are highly satisfied, 51.92% of respondents are satisfied, 19.23% of respondents are dissatisfied and 1.92% of respondents are highly dissatisfied. No 10 said that 9.62% of respondents are highly satisfied, 65.38% of respondents are satisfied, 17.31% of respondents are dissatisfied and 3.85% of respondents are highly dissatisfied. It is inferred in table no 11 that 19.23% of respondents are highly satisfied, 53.85% of respondents are satisfied, 23.08% of respondents are dissatisfied. Table no 12...23.08% of respondents are highly satisfied, 63.46% of respondents are satisfied, 5.77% of respondents are dissatisfied and 3.85% of respondents are highly dissatisfied. No 13 inferred that it is inferred that 25% of respondents are highly satisfied, 65.38% of respondents are satisfied, 5.77% of respondents are dissatisfied.

Table 14. Concluded that 28.15% of respondents are highly satisfied, 44.23% of respondents are satisfied, 21.12% of respondents are dissatisfied and 1.92% of respondents are highly dissatisfied. Table 15 says that 21.15% of respondents are highly satisfied, 51.92% of respondents are satisfied, 23.08% of respondents are dissatisfied. In table 16.....26.92% of respondents are highly satisfied, 63.46% of respondents are satisfied, 1.92% of respondents are dissatisfied and 3.85% of respondents are highly dissatisfied. it is inferred in table 17.. that 23.08% of respondents are highly satisfied, 65.38% of respondents are satisfied, 5.77% of respondents are dissatisfied and 1.92% of respondents are highly dissatisfied. In table no 18...26.92% of respondents are

highly satisfied, 53.85% of respondents are satisfied, 13.46% of respondents are dissatisfied and 1.92% of respondents are highly dissatisfied. it is inferred in table no. 19.. 26.92% of respondents are highly satisfied, 57.69% of respondents are satisfied, 11.54% of respondents are dissatisfied. it is inferred in table no. 20..28.85% of respondents are highly satisfied, 57.69% of respondents are satisfied, 9.62 of respondents are dissatisfied.

iv. Crosstabs

1. Perception about utilization of welfare schemes saving for future vs. availability finding to check saving for future.

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Perception about utilization of welfare schemes saving for future * availability finding to check to saving for future	50	96.2%	2	3.8%	52	100.0%

Perception about utilization of welfare schemes saving for future	Availability finding to check to saving for future		Total
	Yes	No	
Dissatisfied	1.00 50.00%	1.00 50.00%	2.00 100.00%
Satisfied	29.00 74.36%	10.00 25.64%	39.00 100.00%
Highly satisfied	9.00 100.00%	.00 .00%	9.00 100.00%
Total	39.00 78.00%	11.00 22.00%	50.00 100.00%

Chi-square tests.

Statistic	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	3.75	2	.153

From above table, it is observed that p value of chi square test is 0.153 which is more than significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis (H_0) i.e. “there is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme saving for future and its impact on their performance” is failed to reject.

Therefore, it is inferred that there is significant relationship between availability of welfare scheme saving for future and its impact on employee performance.

2. Perception about utilization of welfare scheme discount * availability finding to check discount.

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Perception about utilization of welfare scheme discount * availability finding to check discount	50	96.2%	2	3.8%	52	100.0%

Perception about utilization of welfare scheme discount	Availability finding to check discount		Total
	Yes	No	
Dissatisfied	1.00 33.33%	2.00 66.67%	3.00 100.00%
Satisfied	28.00 77.78%	8.00 22.22%	36.00 100.00%
Highly satisfied	11.00 100.00%	.00 .00%	11.00 100.00%
Total	40.00 80.00%	10.00 20.00%	50.00 100.00%

Chi-square tests.

Statistic	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	6.94	2	0.031

From above table, it is observed that p value of chi square test is 0.031 which is less than significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis (H_0) i.e. “there is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme extra discount and its impact on their performance” is rejected. Therefore, it is inferred that there is no significant relationship between availability of welfare scheme extra discount and its impact on employee performance.

3. Perception about utilization of welfare scheme health insurance vs. availability finding to check health insurance.

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Perception about utilization of welfare scheme health insurance * availability finding to check health insurance	50	96.2%	2	3.8%	52	100.0%

<i>Perception about utilization of welfare scheme health insurance</i>	<i>Availability finding to check health insurance</i>		Total
	Yes	No	
Highly dissatisfied	.00 .00%	1.00 100.00%	1.00 100.00%
Dissatisfied	2.00 22.22%	7.00 77.78%	9.00 100.00%
Satisfied	14.00 42.42%	19.00 57.58%	33.00 100.00%
Highly satisfied	3.00 42.86%	4.00 57.14%	7.00 100.00%
Total	19.00 38.00%	31.00 62.00%	50.00 100.00%

Chi-square tests.

<i>Statistic</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Do</i>	<i>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</i>
Pearson chi-square	1.91	3	0.592

From above table, it is observed that p value of chi square test is 0.592 which is more than significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis (H_0) i.e. “there is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme health insurance and its impact on their performance” is failed to reject. Therefore, it is inferred that there is significant relationship between availability of welfare scheme health insurance and its impact on employee performance.

4.Perception about utilization of welfare scheme accommodation vs. availability finding to check accommodation

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Perception about utilization of welfare scheme accommodation * availability finding to check accommodation	50	96.2%	2	3.8%	52	100.0%

Perception about utilization of welfare scheme accommodation.	Availability finding to check accommodation		Total
	Yes	No	
Highly dissatisfied	1.00 100.00%	.00 .00%	1.00 100.00%
Dissatisfied	2.00 40.00%	3.00 60.00%	5.00 100.00%
Satisfied	24.00 77.42%	7.00 22.58%	31.00 100.00%
Highly satisfied	9.00 69.23%	4.00 30.77%	13.00 100.00%
Total	36.00 72.00%	14.00 28.00%	50.00 100.00%

Chi-square tests.

Statistic	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	3.43	3	0.330

From above table, it is observed that p value of chi square test is 0.330 which is more than significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis (H_0) i.e. “there is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme accommodation and its impact on their performance” is failed to reject. Therefore, it is inferred that there is significant relationship between availability of welfare scheme accommodation and its impact on employee performance.

5. Perception about utilization of welfare scheme schedule flexibility * availability finding to check schedule flexibility.

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Perception about utilization of welfare scheme schedule flexibility * availability finding to check schedule flexibility	50	96.2%	2	3.8%	52	100.0%

Perception about utilization of welfare scheme schedule flexibility	Availability finding to check schedule flexibility		Total
	Yes	No	
Dissatisfied	3.00 100.00%	.00 .00%	3.00 100.00%
Satisfied	29.00 76.32%	9.00 23.68%	38.00 100.00%
Highly satisfied	8.00 88.89%	1.00 11.11%	9.00 100.00%
Total	40.00 80.00%	10.00 20.00%	50.00 100.00%

Chi-square tests.

Statistic	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	1.52	2	0.468

From above table, it is observed that p value of chi square test is 0.468 which is more than significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis (H_0) i.e. “there is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme schedule flexibility and its impact on their performance” is failed to reject.

Therefore, it is inferred that there is significant relationship between availability of welfare scheme schedule flexibility and its impact on employee performance.

6. Perception about utilization of welfare schemes stress mgt * availability finding to check stress management.

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Perception about utilization of welfare schemes stress mgt * availability finding to check stress mgt.	50	96.2%	2	3.8%	52	100.0%

Perception about utilization of welfare schemes stress mgt	Availability finding to check stress mgt.		Total
	Yes	No	
Highly dissatisfied	.00 .00%	2.00 100.00%	2.00 100.00%
Dissatisfied	1.00 16.67%	5.00 83.33%	6.00 100.00%
Satisfied	17.00 47.22%	19.00 52.78%	36.00 100.00%
Highly satisfied	.00 .00%	6.00 100.00%	6.00 100.00%
Total	18.00 36.00%	32.00 64.00%	50.00 100.00%

Chi-square tests.

Statistic	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	7.44	3	0.059

From above table, it is observed that p value of chi square test is 0.059 which is more than significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis (H_0) i.e. “there is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme stress management and its impact on their performance” is failed to reject. Therefore, it is inferred that there is significant relationship between availability of welfare scheme stress management and its impact on employee performance.

6. Perception about utilization of welfare scheme balance between family and work * availability finding to check balance between family work.

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Perception about utilization of welfare scheme balance bw family and work * availability finding to check balance bw family work	50	96.2%	2	3.8%	52	100.0%

Perception about utilization of welfare scheme balance between family and work	Availability finding to check balance bw family work		Total
	E	No	
Highly dissatisfied	1.00 .00%	1.00 100.00%	1.00 100.00%
Dissatisfied	7.00 63.64%	4.00 36.36%	11.00 100.00%
Satisfied	8.00 25.00%	24.00 75.00%	32.00 100.00%
Highly satisfied	1.00 16.67%	5.00 83.33%	6.00 100.00%
Total	16.00 32.00%	34.00 68.00%	50.00 100.00%

--	--	--	--

Chi-square tests.

Statistic	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	6.90	3	0.075

From above table, it is observed that p value of chi square test is 0.075 which is more than significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis (H_0) i.e. “there is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme balance between family and work and its impact on their performance” is failed to reject. Therefore, it is inferred that there is significant relationship between availability of welfare scheme balance between family and work and its impact on employee performance.

8. Perception about utilization of welfare scheme hygiene awareness * availability finding to check hygiene awareness.

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Perception about utilization of welfare scheme hygiene awareness * availability finding to check hygiene awareness	50	96.2%	2	3.8%	52	100.0%

Perception about utilization of welfare scheme hygiene awareness	Availability finding to check hygiene awareness		Total
	Yes	No	
Highly dissatisfied	.00 .00%	1.00 100.00%	1.00 100.00%
Dissatisfied	4.00 36.36%	7.00 63.64%	11.00 100.00%
Satisfied	16.00 48.48%	17.00 51.52%	33.00 100.00%

Highly satisfied	2.00 40.00%	3.00 60.00%	5.00 100.00%
Total	22.00 44.00%	28.00 56.00%	50.00 100.00%

Chi-square tests.

<i>Statistic</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</i>
Pearson chi-square	1.35	3	0.718

From above table, it is observed that p value of chi square test is 0.718 which is more than significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis (H_0) i.e. “there is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme hygiene awareness and its impact on their performance” is failed to reject. Therefore, it is inferred that there is significant relationship between availability of welfare scheme hygiene awareness and its impact on employee performance.

9. Perception about utilization of welfare schemes educational training * availability finding to check educational.

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Perception about utilization of welfare schemes educational training * availability finding to check educational training	50	96.2%	2	3.8%	52	100.0%

Training

Perception about utilization of welfare schemes educational training	Availability finding to check educational training		Total
	Yes	No	
Highly dissatisfied	.00 .00%	1.00 100.00%	1.00 100.00%
Dissatisfied	6.00 60.00%	4.00 40.00%	10.00 100.00%
Satisfied	23.00 85.19%	4.00 14.81%	27.00 100.00%
Highly satisfied	10.00 83.33%	2.00 16.67%	12.00 100.00%
Total	39.00 78.00%	11.00 22.00%	50.00 100.00%

Chi square test

Statistic	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	6.44	3	0.092

From above table, it is observed that p value of chi square test is 0.092 which is more than significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis (H_0) i.e. “there is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme educational training and its impact on their performance” is failed to reject. Therefore, it is inferred that there is significant relationship between availability of welfare scheme educational training and its impact on employee performance.

10. Perception about utilization of welfare schemes attention to referrals * availability finding to check attention to referrals.

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Perception about utilization of welfare schemes attention to referrals * availability finding to check attention to referrals	50	96.2%	2	3.8%	52	100.0%

Perception about utilization of welfare schemes attention to referrals	Availability finding to check attention to referrals		Total
	Yes	No	
Highly dissatisfied	.00 .00%	2.00 100.00%	2.00 100.00%
Dissatisfied	8.00 88.89%	1.00 11.11%	9.00 100.00%
Satisfied	28.00 82.35%	6.00 17.65%	34.00 100.00%
Highly satisfied	4.00 80.00%	1.00 20.00%	5.00 100.00%
Total	40.00 80.00%	10.00 20.00%	50.00 100.00%

Chi-square tests.

Statistic	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	8.56	3	0.036

From above table, it is observed that p value of chi square test is 0.036 which is less than significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis (H_0) i.e. “there is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme balance attention to referrals and its impact on their performance” is rejected. Therefore, it is inferred that there is no significant relationship between availability of welfare scheme attention to referrals and its impact on employee performance

11. Perception about utilization of welfare schemes benefits for family vs. availability finding to check family benefits.

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Perception about utilization of welfare schemes benefits for family * availability finding to check family benefits	50	96.2%	2	3.8%	52	100.0%

Perception about utilization of welfare schemes benefits for family	Availability finding to check family benefits		Total
	Yes	No	
Dissatisfied	10.00 83.33%	2.00 16.67%	12.00 100.00%
Satisfied	20.00 71.43%	8.00 28.57%	28.00 100.00%
Highly satisfied	4.00 40.00%	6.00 60.00%	10.00 100.00%
Total	34.00 68.00%	16.00 32.00%	50.00 100.00%

Chi-square tests.

Statistic	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	5.05	2	0.080

From above table, it is observed that p value of chi square test is 0.080 which is more than significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis (H_0) i.e. “there is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme benefits for family and its impact on their performance” is failed to reject. Therefore, it is inferred that there is significant relationship between availability of welfare scheme benefits for family and its impact on employee performance.

12.Perception about utilization of welfare schemes drinking water * availability finding to check drinking water facilities

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Perception about utilization of welfare schemes drinking water * availability finding to check drinking water facilities	50	96.2%	2	3.8%	52	100.0%

Perception about utilization of welfare schemes drinking water	Availability finding to check drinking water facilities		Total
	Yes	No	
Highly dissatisfied	.00 .00%	2.00 100.00%	2.00 100.00%
Dissatisfied	2.00 66.67%	1.00 33.33%	3.00 100.00%
Satisfied	32.00 96.97%	1.00 3.03%	33.00 100.00%
Highly satisfied	11.00 91.67%	1.00 8.33%	12.00 100.00%
Total	45.00 90.00%	5.00 10.00%	50.00 100.00%

Chi-square tests.

Statistic	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	21.63	3	.000

From above table, it is observed that p value of chi square test is 0.00 which is less than significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis (h012) i.e. “there is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme drinking water facilities and its impact on their performance” is rejected. Therefore, it is inferred that there is no significant relationship between availability of welfare scheme drinking water facilities and its impact on employee performance.

13. Perception about utilization of welfare scheme latrines urinals vs. availability finding to check latrine and urinals.

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Perception about utilization of welfare scheme latrines urinals * availability finding to check latrine and urinals	50	96.2%	2	3.8%	52	100.0%

Perception about utilization of welfare scheme latrines urinals	Availability finding to check latrine and urinals		Total
	Yes	No	
Dissatisfied	3.00 100.00%	.00 .00%	3.00 100.00%
Satisfied	25.00 73.53%	9.00 26.47%	34.00 100.00%
Highly satisfied	11.00 84.62%	2.00 15.38%	13.00 100.00%
Total	39.00 78.00%	11.00 22.00%	50.00 100.00%

Chi-square tests.

Statistic	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	1.57	2	.455

From above table, it is observed that p value of chi square test is 0.455 which is more than significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis (h013) i.e. “there is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme latrines and urinals and its impact on their performance” is failed to reject. Therefore, it is inferred that there is significant relationship between availability of welfare scheme drinking water facilities and its impact on employee performance.

14. Perception about utilization of welfare schemes canteen * availability findings to check canteen hygienist.

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Perception about utilization of welfare schemes canteen * availability findings to check canteen hygienist	50	96.2%	2	3.8%	52	100.0%

Perception about utilization of welfare schemes canteen	Availability findings to check canteen hygienist		Total
	Yes	No	
Highly dissatisfied	.00 .00%	1.00 100.00%	1.00 100.00%
Dissatisfied	7.00 63.64%	4.00 36.36%	11.00 100.00%
Satisfied	20.00 86.96%	3.00 13.04%	23.00 100.00%
Highly satisfied	10.00 66.67%	5.00 33.33%	15.00 100.00%
Total	37.00 74.00%	13.00 26.00%	50.00 100.00%

Chi-square tests.

Statistic	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	5.89	3	0.117

From above table, it is observed that p value of chi square test is 0.117 which is more than significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis (h014) i.e. “there is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme canteen facilities and its impact on their performance” is failed to reject. Therefore, it is inferred that there is significant relationship between availability of welfare scheme canteen facilities and its impact on employee performance.

15. Perception about utilization of welfare schemes changing room * availability finding to check changing room.

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Perception about utilization of welfare schemes changing room * availability finding to check changing room	50	96.2%	2	3.8%	52	100.0%

Perception about utilization of welfare schemes changing room	Availability finding to check changing room		Total
	Yes	No	
Dissatisfied	3.00 25.00%	9.00 75.00%	12.00 100.00%
Satisfied	13.00 48.15%	14.00 51.85%	27.00 100.00%
Highly satisfied	2.00 18.18%	9.00 81.82%	11.00 100.00%
Total	18.00 36.00%	32.00 64.00%	50.00 100.00%

Chi-square tests.

Statistic	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	3.88	2	0.144

From above table, it is observed that p value of chi square test is 0.144 which is more than significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis (h015) i.e. “there is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme changing room and its impact on their performance” is failed to reject. Therefore, it is inferred that there is significant relationship between availability of welfare scheme changing room and its impact on employee performance.

16. Perception about utilization of welfare schemes lighting vs. availability finding to check lighting.

	Cases					
	Valid			Missing		Total
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Perception about utilization of welfare schemes lighting * availability finding to check lighting	50	96.2%	2	3.8%	52	100.0%

Perception about utilization of welfare schemes lighting	Availability finding to check lighting		Total
	Yes	No	
Highly dissatisfied	1.00 50.00%	1.00 50.00%	2.00 100.00%
Dissatisfied	.00 .00%	1.00 100.00%	1.00 100.00%
Satisfied	32.00 96.97%	1.00 3.03%	33.00 100.00%
Highly satisfied	13.00 92.86%	1.00 7.14%	14.00 100.00%
Total	46.00 92.00%	4.00 8.00%	50.00 100.00%

Chi-square tests.

Statistic	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	17.41	3	.001

From above table, it is observed that p value of chi square test is 0.001 which is less than significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis (h016) i.e. “there is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme lighting facilities and its impact on their performance” is rejected. Therefore, it is inferred that there is no significant relationship between availability of welfare scheme lighting facilities and its impact on employee performance.

17. Perception about utilization of welfare schemes ventilation vs. availability finding to check ventilation.

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Perception about utilization of welfare schemes ventilation * availability finding to check ventilation	50	96.2%	2	3.8%	52	100.0%

Perception about utilization of welfare schemes ventilation	Availability finding to check ventilation		Total
	Yes	No	
Highly dissatisfied	.00 .00%	1.00 100.00%	1.00 100.00%
Dissatisfied	2.00 66.67%	1.00 33.33%	3.00 100.00%
Satisfied	22.00 64.71%	12.00 35.29%	34.00 100.00%
Highly satisfied	6.00 50.00%	6.00 50.00%	12.00 100.00%
Total	30.00 60.00%	20.00 40.00%	50.00 100.00%

Chi-square tests.

Statistic	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	2.37	3	.499

From above table, it is observed that p value of chi square test is 0.499 which is more than significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis (H_0) i.e. “there is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme ventilation facilities and its impact on their performance” is failed to reject. Therefore, it is inferred that there is significant relationship between availability of welfare scheme ventilation facilities and its impact on employee performance.

18. Perception about utilization of welfare schemes working environment vs. availability finding to check working environment.

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Perception about utilization of welfare schemes working environment * availability finding to check working environment	50	96.2%	2	3.8%	52	100.0%

Perception about utilization of welfare schemes working environment.	Availability finding to check working environment.		Total
	Yes	No	
Highly satisfied	.00 .00%	1.00 100.00%	1.00 100.00%
Dissatisfied	3.00 42.86%	4.00 57.14%	7.00 100.00%
Satisfied	24.00 85.71%	4.00 14.29%	28.00 100.00%
Highly satisfied	11.00 78.57%	3.00 21.43%	14.00 100.00%
Total	38.00 76.00%	12.00 24.00%	50.00 100.00%

Chi-square tests.

Statistic	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	8.88	3	.031

From above table, it is observed that p value of chi square test is 0.031 which is less than significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis (H_0) i.e. “there is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme working environment facilities and its impact on their performance” is rejected. Therefore, it is inferred that there is no significant relationship between availability of welfare scheme working environment facilities and its impact on employee performance.

19. Perception about utilization of welfare schemes action against harassment vs. availability finding to check action against harassment.

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Perception about utilization of welfare scheme harassment * availability finding to check action against harassment	50	96.2%	2	3.8%	52	100.0%

Perception about utilization of welfare scheme harassment	Availability finding to check action against harassment		Total
	Yes	No	
Dissatisfied	2.00 33.33%	4.00 66.67%	6.00 100.00%
Satisfied	20.00 66.67%	10.00 33.33%	30.00 100.00%
Highly satisfied	10.00 71.43%	4.00 28.57%	14.00 100.00%
Total	32.00 64.00%	18.00 36.00%	50.00 100.00%

Chi-square tests.

Statistic	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	2.88	2	.237

From above table, it is observed that p value of chi square test is 0.237 which is more than significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis (H_0) i.e. “there is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme action against sexual harassment and its impact on their performance” is failed to reject. Therefore, it is inferred that there is significant relationship between availability of welfare scheme action against sexual harassment and its impact on employee performance.

20. Perception about utilization of welfare schemes overall health safety vs. availability finding to check overall health safety.

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Perception about utilization of overall health-safety * availability finding to check health safety	50	96.2%	2	3.8%	52	100.0%

Perception about utilization of overall health safety	Availability finding to check health safety		Total
	Yes	No	
Dissatisfied	.00 .00%	5.00 100.00%	5.00 100.00%
Satisfied	25.00 83.33%	5.00 16.67%	30.00 100.00%
Highly satisfied	9.00 60.00%	6.00 40.00%	15.00 100.00%
Total	34.00 68.00%	16.00 32.00%	50.00 100.00%

Chi-square tests.

Statistic	Value	Df	Sump. Sig. (2-tailed)
Pearson chi-square	14.31	2	.001

From above table, it is observed that p value of chi square test is 0.001 which is less than significance level of 0.05. Thus the null hypothesis (H_0) i.e. “there is significant relationship between availability of employee welfare scheme overall health safety facilities and its impact on their performance” is rejected. Therefore, it is inferred that there is no significant relationship between availability of welfare scheme overall health safety facilities and its impact on employee performance.

7. Findings and conclusion

	Highly satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Highly dissatisfied	P – value	Hypothesis
Saving for future	17.31	75	3.85	-	0.153	<i>Null hypothesis is failed to reject</i>
Extra discount	21.15	69.23	5.77	-	0.031	<i>Null hypothesis is rejected</i>
Health insurance	13.46	63.46	17.31	1.92	0.592	<i>Null hypothesis is failed to reject</i>
Accommodation	25	59.62	9.62	1.92	0.330	<i>Null hypothesis is failed to reject</i>
Schedule flexibility	17.31	73.08	5.77	-	0.468	<i>Null hypothesis is failed to reject</i>
Stress mgt.	11.54	69.23	11.54	3.85	0.059	<i>Null hypothesis is failed to reject</i>
Balance bw work and family	11.54	61.54	21.15	1.92	0.075	<i>Null hypothesis is failed to reject</i>
Hygiene awareness	9.62	63.46	21.15	1.92	0.718	<i>Null hypothesis is failed to reject</i>
Educational training	23.08	51.92	19.23	1.92	0.092	<i>Null hypothesis is failed to reject</i>
Attention to referrals	9.62	65.38	17.31	3.85	0.036	<i>Null hypothesis is rejected</i>
Benefits for family	19.23	53.85	23.08	-	0.080	<i>Null hypothesis is failed to reject</i>
Drinking water facilities	23.08	63.46	5.77	3.85	0.000	<i>Null hypothesis is rejected</i>
Latrines urinals	25	65.38	5.77	-	0.455	<i>Null hypothesis is failed to reject</i>
Hygiene canteen	23.85	44.23	21.15	1.92	0.117	<i>Null hypothesis is failed to reject</i>
Changing room	21.15	51.92	23.08	-	0.144	<i>Null hypothesis is failed to reject</i>
Lighting	26.92	63.46	1.92	3.85	0.001	<i>Null hypothesis is rejected</i>
Ventilation	23.08	65.38	5.77	1.92	0.499	<i>Null hypothesis is failed to reject</i>
Proper work environment	26.92	53.85	13.46	1.92	0.031	<i>Null hypothesis is rejected</i>
Action against harassments	26.92	57.69	11.54	-	0.237	<i>Null hypothesis is failed to reject</i>
Overall health and safety	28.85	57.69	9.62	-	0.001	<i>Null hypothesis is rejected</i>

Most of the respondents are satisfied with overall welfare facilities. Based on the analysis of welfare schemes such as discount, attention to referrals, drinking water facilities, lighting, working environment, overall health safety are not having a significant impact on the employee's performance. The rest of the facilities like saving

for future, provident fund schemes, health insurance, accommodation for staying, transportation, canteen hygienist, changing room, schedule flexibility have an impact on the employee's performance that shows positive correlation.

8. Suggestions:

Workers are the fundamental resource for functioning health care area. They are the components go into keeping patients healthy, fulfilled and safe inclination with the consideration they're given to the patients and helping the association for smooth working for these worker motivation and welfare is a significant responsibility of hospitals and nursing homes towards their employees. Welfare isn't just about giving motivating forces in fiscal shape yet in addition by giving them special attention towards their health and recreation, enhances their skills, understand their various issues.

Work environment, wellbeing and prosperity programs, not just positively affect employees ' health that can likewise prompt a noteworthy increment of individual and group's commitment, and overall productivity.

It has been understood from above stated conclusion that few of the important issues such as saving for future, provident fund schemes, health insurance, accommodation for staying, transportation, canteen hygienist, changing room, schedule flexibility are significantly affecting the employee's performance, but it is presumed little irrational by understanding the concluding statement concerning working environment and overall health safety that do not impact the worker's performance. So it would be right steps to re-examine those two features and its impact on work performance.

9. References:

1. Mrs. Ayesha M. (2017). A study on role of welfare measures and its impact on employee productivity. *EPRA International Journal of Economic And Business Review* 2017(5) pp: 189-195.
2. Mendis M (2016). Welfare facilities and job satisfaction: A study of operational level employees in the apparel industry of Sri Lanka. *Kelaniya Journal of Human Resource Management* 2016(11), pp: 128-136.
3. Dr. Venkata Rao P. et al (2015) employee welfare is the key : an insight. *International Journal of Business and Administration Research Review*, 2015(3), pp: 40.
4. Kasenga F. et al (2014): A study on staff motivation and welfare in Adventist health facilities in Malawi: A Qualitative study *BMC Health Service Research* 2014(14), pp: 486.
5. Dr. Lalitha K.(2014). A study on employee welfare measures they want to study the welfare facilities provided to the employee. *International Journal of Engineering Technology, Management and Applied Science* 2014(2), pp: 191-195.
6. Dr. Tiara U. (2014). A study on employee welfare activities and its impact on employee's efficiency at REWA, *Abhinav International Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Management & Technology* 2014(3).
7. Rama Satyanarayana, M and Jayaprakash Reddy, R (2012). "Labour Welfare Measures in Cement Industries in India", *International Journal of Physical and Social Sciences*, Vol.2, No.7, July.
8. Vijaya Banu, C and Ashifa, M. J (2011). "A Study on Labour Welfare Measures in Public Sector Transport Corporation," *International Journal of Business Economics and Management Research*, Vol.2, No.2, February.
9. Swapna, P (2011). Social Responsibility y towards Labour Welfare in Subgareni Collieries Company Limited", *International Journal of Business & Management Research*, Vol.1, No.5, pp.290-298.
10. Boselie P. (2010). a study on High performance work practices in the health care sector through descriptive case study. *International Journal of Manpower* 2010(31), pp: 42-58.
11. McIntyre H et al (2010) Implementation of the European working time directive in an NHS trust: impact on patient care and junior doctor welfare. *Royal College of Physicians*, 2010(10), pp: 134.
12. Gosliner W. et al (2010). A study on Impact of a worksite wellness program on the nutrition and physical activity environment of child care centers. *American Journal of Health Promotions* 2010(4), pp: 0890-1171.
13. Randhir Kumar Singh and Gaur Hari (2009). "Welfare Measures and its Impact on Manpower Productivity".
14. Alok Kumar (2008). "Capital Tax, Minimum Wage and Labour Market Outcomes", *Review of Economic Dynamics*, Vol.11, No. I.
15. Courtney Coile and Jonathan Gruber (2007).Future Social Security Entitlements and the Retirement Decision", *The Review of Economics and Statistics* , Vol.89, No.2
16. Alison Earle and Jody Heymann (2006). "A Comparative Analysis of Paid Leave for the Health Needs of Workers and their Families around the World", *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis* Vol.8, No.3, p.241.
17. Karl Aiginger (2005). "Labour Market Reforms and Economic Growth: The European Experience in the 1990s", *Journal of Economic Studies*, Vol.32, No.6.
18. Goetzel R. et al (2002). the long term impact of Johnson & Johnson's health & wellness program on employee health risks. *J Occuo Enviorn Med.* 2002(44).

Web Engine

1. www.greenashram.org
2. http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/21420/10/10_chapter%202.pdf