

Welfare Facilities in Sugar Mills of Punjab : An Empirical Study

Ashutosh Gupta* and Gurpreet Randhawa**

* *Dept. of Commerce and Business Management, DAV University, Jalandhar, Punjab*

** *University Business School, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, Punjab*

Abstract

The present study aims to examine and compare the welfare facilities as perceived by the administrative employees of the co-operative and private sugar mills situated in Punjab state of India. Data was collected from a sample of 111 employees working in administrative capacity (65 from co-operative sugar mills and 46 from private sugar mills of Punjab). The sample was drawn using referral sampling method. The results showed that out of 31 welfare facilities, only four facilities were satisfactory in both the types of sugar mills. Among all the facilities, canteen facility, facility of free coffee/tea, loan facility and cleanliness were found to be more satisfactory in private sugar mills whereas rest and break is found better in co-operative sugar mills. Statistically, eleven welfare facilities were found to be significantly different between co-operative and private sugar mills. Apart from these facilities, all the welfare facilities found to be dissatisfactory in both types of sugar mills. Result of Chi-square test has shown the association of low, moderate and high scores from the welfare facilities with the type of mill and salary of employees. In this regard, study emphasised for the regular monitoring of the welfare facilities by the state and willingness of the managements for the proper accessibility of welfare facilities.

Key Words

Punjab, Sugar Mills, Welfare, Co-operative, Private

INTRODUCTION

Employee welfare is intended towards improvement of health, efficiency,

economic condition and social status of employees (Andrews and Kalaiyarasi, 2016). Welfare amenities are beneficial for both parties at workplace as on one hand, they enhance satisfaction of employees and, on the other hand, increase industrial efficiency for the employer (ILO, 1947). Thus, employee welfare, if taken care properly, has a positive impact on the overall well-being (physical, mental, social, intellectual, and spiritual) of employees (Dhobale, 2012). In this regard, research studies have also shown positive relationship between welfare, productivity and quality of work life (Anand *et al.*, 2011; Prasad, 2011).

In the current business environment, the ability of the companies to satisfy the employees' needs is acknowledged significantly (Bosse, Philip and Harrison, 2009). Moreover, the organisations have realized that they can improve their economic capital after improving their human capital (Teti and Anderiotto, 2013). Hence, the amount spent for well-being of employees is, by and large-regarded as an investment rather than cost to the employer (Anand, Gopi and Shanker, 2011; Manasa and Krishnanaik, 2015). However, one ground reality is that the managements of the organisations have the conviction of providing good welfare facilities to the employees, but the employees are having different opinion on this issue (Renapurkar, 2013).

"The concept of labour welfare is flexible and widely differs with respect to time, region, industry, country, social values and custom, degree of industrialization and general socio-economic development of the people and political ideologies prevailing during a particular time frame"(Logasakthi and Rajagopal, 2013). Moreover, the diversity of the employees in the organisations has increased the importance of different type of welfare measures (Goad and Karen, 2001; Chaneta, 2011; Tetti and Anderiotto, 2013). It can be acknowledged that different categorical variables, like type of industry, ownership, country in which the employees work, position they hold and other socio-economic variables of employees, have significant association with their perception regarding welfare facilities (Tetti and Anderiotto, 2013).

In Indian context, the concept of employee welfare has gained its momentum after independence though its origin can be traced back to industrial revolution (Sheoran, 2013). In India, lot of constitutional provisions have been enacted on the recommendations of Royal Commission (1928), Labour Investigation Committee (1944-45) and National Commission on Labour (1966), for betterment of employees. Predominantly, the statutory welfare provisions, as recommended by various commissions/committees for employees, have been defined under the Factory Act, 1948, which has been amended from time to time. In addition, the non-statutory welfare facilities like transport facilities (ILO, Recommendation No. 102,

1956), medical facilities (ILO, Convention No. 130, 1969), recreation facilities (ILO, Recommendation No. 102, 1956), housing facility (ILO Recommendation No. 115, 1969) etc. are of great significance for the welfare of employees.

Among all these facilities, studies in the different sectors including financial services, education, health, telecommunication, manufacturing and police etc., found that appropriate health and medical facilities had a positive impact on the performance and motivation of the employees (Fuess, *et al.*, 2004; Wilter *et al.*, 2012; Balaji 2013). The effectiveness of communication in the form of information flow and recognition had affected the productivity of the employees as well (Ajala, 2012). But, the absence of these welfare facilities could be dissatisfactory for the employees (Chaudhay and Iqbal, 2011; Kulkanya, 2011). In this context, all statutory provisions have been examined for conducting the present study. In addition, voluntary welfare facilities which are valuable for the employees of the sugar industry are under the preview of the present study.

THE STUDY AND ITS OBJECTIVES

In the dynamic business environment, the need to accomplish more with less people constitutes a source of stress which may blemish the employees (Chowdhury and Alam, 2015). Under such circumstances, the employees deserve appropriate welfare measures so that their physical and mental health is not negatively affected. These welfare measures are in addition to regular salaries and other economic benefits. Attempts of some big companies to satisfy the workers by investing more in them are ever growing (Brenner, 2010). However, some organisations consider the employee benefits as a financial burden (Princitta and Amirtha, 2015).

In reference to sugar industry, several studies have been conducted in India (Singh and Singh, 1984; Satheeskumar, 2009; Khan and Islam, 2010; Satyanarayana, 2011; Subbaiah 2013). However, most of these studies are conducted in the states other than Punjab, inspite of the fact that there are fifteen co-operative and eight private sugar mills in Punjab. The sugar mills of Punjab are suffering from financial crunch and Punjab Government has condensed employee benefits, especially in the co-operative sector (Sugarfed, 2010; Nibber, 2015). The private sugar mills are also suffering from high cost of production (Randhawa and Gupta, 2017). Hence, the appropriateness of these welfare facilities is suspected as human resources are affected by the financial performance of organization (Husalid, 1995). In this regard, the present study is an endeavour to examine if the employees of the co-operative and private sugar mills in Punjab state perceive the welfare measures to be in good statue or not. In addition, the paper is focussed upon if there is any kind of association between the perception regarding the welfare

measures and the socio-economic profile of the employees. The following are the specific objectives of the study.

1. To examine and compare the perception of employees regarding welfare facilities in co-operative and private sugar mills of Punjab.
2. To examine the association of welfare facilities with the socio-economic characteristics of employees.

METHODOLOGY

The Sample and Data Collection

Data was collected from a sample of 111 employees working under administrative capacity (65 from co-operative sugar mills and 46 from private sugar mills of Punjab). The sample was drawn using referral sampling method. The administrative employees included managers, accountants, labour officers, accounts officers, security officers and other employees not engaged in production directly. The data has been obtained from sugar mills premises, accounts offices, security offices/rooms, administrative blocks, canteens during the lunch breaks, and also from employees residential areas. The following Table shows the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 1
Socio-Economic Profile of Administrative Employees

Socio-Economic Characteristics		Type of Mill				Total	
		Co-operative		Private			
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	62	95.38	45	97.83	107	96.40
	Female	3	4.62	1	2.17	4	3.60
Age Group	18-27 years	1	1.54	3	6.52	4	3.60
	28-37 years	2	3.08	7	15.22	9	8.11
	38-47 years	18	27.69	15	32.61	33	29.73
	48-58 years	42	64.62	18	39.13	60	54.05
	59 years & Above	2	3.08	3	6.52	5	4.50
Marital Status	Married	61	93.85	44	95.65	105	94.59
	Unmarried / Separated/ Widowed	4	6.15	2	4.35	6	5.41

Contd.

Contd. Table 1

Educational Qualification	Matric	13	20.00	2	4.35	15	13.51
	Senior Secondary	4	6.15	2	4.35	6	5.41
	Graduation	33	50.77	22	47.83	55	49.55
	Post-Graduation	12	18.46	17	36.96	29	26.13
	Diploma	3	4.62	3	6.52	6	5.41
	4-6 Members	42	64.62	25	54.35	67	60.36
	7 Members & Above	7	10.77	8	17.39	15	13.51
Residential Status	Migrant	7	10.77	13	28.26	20	18.02
	Local Resident	58	89.23	33	71.74	91	81.98
Accommodation	Rented	3	4.62	5	10.87	8	7.21
	Owned	46	70.77	19	41.30	65	58.56
	Company Premises	16	24.62	22	47.83	38	34.23
Total Experience	1-10 years	3	4.62	10	21.74	13	11.71
	11-20 years	15	23.08	16	34.78	31	27.93
	21-30 years	41	63.08	17	36.96	58	52.25
	31 years & Above	6	9.23	3	6.52	9	8.11
Experience in the Present Mill	1-10 years	7	10.77	29	63.04	36	32.43
	11-20 years	18	27.69	13	28.26	31	27.93
	21-30 years	38	58.46	4	8.70	42	37.84
	31 years & Above	2	3.08	0	0.00	2	1.80
Salary (Monthly)	< ₹ 10000/-	3	4.62	5	10.87	8	7.21
	₹ 10000-20000/-	11	16.92	16	34.78	27	24.32
	₹ 20000-30000/-	41	63.08	6	13.04	47	42.34
	₹ 30000-40000/-	6	9.23	6	13.04	12	10.81
	Above ₹ 40000/-	4	6.16	13	28.27	17	15.32
Nature of Employment	Permanent	50	76.92	41	89.13	91	81.98
	Seasonal Permanent	12	18.46	2	4.35	14	12.61
	Contractual / Temporary	3	4.62	3	6.52	3	2.70

Source : Compiled from the primary data.

Characteristics of Sample

Table 1 shows the socio-economic profile of the administrative employees. Majority of the administrative employees are married males in co-operative and private sugar mills and belong to age group of 48 to 58 years. In both types of sugar mills, majority of the workers are graduates. Majority of the employees in both types of mills have total experience of twenty one to thirty years. As far as the experience in the present mill is concerned, the co-operative mill employees are more experienced in comparison to the private sugar mill employees. Salary-wise, most of the employees of co-operative sugar mills are drawing salary between twenty to thirty thousand per month. In case of private sugar mills the employees are getting salary between ten to twenty thousand or above forty thousand. A major chunk of employees in both types of the mills are local residents. Most of the employees of co-operative sugar mills are living in their own houses but in case of private sugar mills most of them are living in company-owned accommodation. Regarding nature of employment, majority of the workers are permanent or seasonal permanent in both types of sugar mills.

Measuring Instrument

The perception of employees regarding welfare measures has been examined by using a self-constructed scale, which consists of 31 items. These items have been selected on the basis of literature survey and doctoral studies conducted by Prasad (2011), Dhobale (2012) and Prabhu (2011). In addition, items from structured questionnaire on labour welfare developed by Srivastava (2004) have also been considered. The study has included intra and extra mural welfare facilities of statutory and non-statutory nature. These items have been examined through five point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5, where 5 indicates "Highly Satisfied" and 1 indicates "Highly Dissatisfied". The Cronbach Alpha Value (.851) represented the appropriate reliability of the scale.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study has been carried out in two parts. In Part I, the difference between the perception of co-operative and private sugar mill employees' regarding welfare facilities has been examined. Further, in Part II the association between perception of employees regarding welfare and socio-economic characteristics of the employees has been observed.

Part I

Perception Regarding Welfare Facilities

In this part, comparison has been made between the perception of co-operative and private sugar mill employees regarding welfare facilities by calculating Weighted Average Score and applying T-test. The weighted average scores have been calculated to examine the level of satisfaction of employees from various welfare facilities. T-test has been applied for calculating the statistical difference between the perception of co-operative and private sugar mill employees regarding welfare facilities by framing the following hypothesis.

H_{0a} : There is no significant difference between the perception of co-operative and private sugar mill administrative employees regarding welfare facilities.

The following Table reveals the perception of administrative employees regarding welfare facilities :-

Table 2
Perception of Administrative Employees Regarding Welfare Facilities

Sr. No.	Type of Welfare Facility	Mean Score		T Value	P Value	H ₀ Accepted/ Rejected
		Co-operative Sugar Mills	Private Sugar Mills			
1	Housing	4.12	3.86	.814	.421	Accepted
2	Canteen/Lunch Room	2.94	3.43	-2.062	.042**	Rejected
3	Creches	1.05	1.07	-.246	.806	Accepted
4	Recreation	1.72	1.30	1.877	.063	Accepted
5	Education	1.49	1.17	1.817	.072	Accepted
6	First aid	3.85	3.61	1.361	.176	Accepted
7	Rest and Breaks	3.52	2.54	3.532	.001*	Rejected
8	Parking 3.86	3.50	1.668	.099	Accepted	
9	Transport	1.94	2.28	-1.120	.265	Accepted
10	Uniforms	1.26	1.07	1.556	.123	Accepted
11	Free Coffee/Tea	1.62	3.80	-8.976	.000*	Rejected
12	Festival Advances	1.12	1.63	-2.562	.013**	Rejected
13	Leave Concessions for Appearing in Exams	1.03	1.33	-2.024	.048**	Rejected

14	Statutory Welfare Boards	1.60	1.13	2.423	.017**	Rejected
15	Training Programmes	2.51	2.40	.442	.659	Accepted
16	Active Participation in Decision-making	1.71	1.93	-.818	.415	Accepted
17	Research Activity	1.09	1.24	-1.097	.276	Accepted
18	Library	1.57	1.17	2.277	.025**	Rejected
19	Social Get Together / Celebrations	1.68	1.98	-1.056	.293	Accepted
20	Health Programmes	1.68	1.54	.522	.602	Accepted
21	Employee Assistance Programmes	1.05	1.33	-1.909	.062	Accepted
22	Counselling and Mentoring/ Stress Management Programmes	1.17	1.46	-1.531	.130	Accepted
23	Medical Insurance	1.37	1.89	-2.134	.036**	Rejected
24	Flexi Timings	1.00	1.13	-1.430	.160	Accepted
25	Holiday Homes & Leave Travel Concession	1.00	1.26	-2.070	.044**	Rejected
26	Financial Advisory Help Desk	1.00	1.20	-1.772	.083	Accepted
27	Loan Facility	1.54	3.37	-7.823	.000*	Rejected
28	Treatment of Dust and Fumes	1.12	2.52	-5.962	.000*	Rejected
29	Fire Brigade in Case of Accidents	2.11	2.65	-1.780	.078	Accepted
30	Cleanliness	2.89	3.41	-1.868	.064	Accepted
31	Drinking Water	4.14	3.89	1.312	.192	Accepted

Source : Compiled from primary data.

Note : * represents significant at 1 % level of significance, ** represents significant at 5 % level of significance.

The mean score of employees' perception regarding welfare facilities in co-operative sugar mills (X_1) and private sugar mills (X_2) as presented in the Table 2 reveals that out of total 31 welfare facilities, very few facilities are found satisfactory in both type of mills. This includes facilities such as housing facility ($X_1 = 4.12$, $X_2 = 3.86$), first aid ($X_1 = 3.85$, $X_2 = 3.61$), parking facility ($X_1 = 3.86$, $X_2 = 3.50$) and drinking water facility ($X_1 = 4.14$, $X_2 = 3.89$). All these facilities are found to be better in co-operative sugar mills. Statistically, there is no difference found among these facilities as per the perception of the co-operative and private sugar mill employees ($p > 0.05$).

Some of the facilities are found to be satisfactory either in the co-operative sugar mills or in the private sugar mills. In this regard, as depicted by the mean score values, facility of rest and break found to be better for the co-operative sugar mill employees than the private sugar mill employees ($X_1 = 3.52$, $X_2 = 2.54$). On the other hand, canteen facility ($X_1 = 2.94$, $X_2 = 3.43$), facility of free coffee/tea ($X_1 = 1.62$, $X_2 = 3.80$), loan facility ($X_1 = 1.54$, $X_2 = 3.37$) and cleanliness ($X_1 = 2.89$, $X_2 = 3.41$) are found to be better in the private sugar mills. Statistically, the difference is found between the co-operative and private sugar mill employees for rest and breaks, free coffee/tea and loan facility at one percent level of significance ($p < .01$). For the canteen facility, the difference is observed at five percent level of significance ($p < .05$).

Most of the other welfare facilities are not perceived as satisfactory by the administrative employees of both types of sugar mills. However, in case of the co-operative sugar mills, facilities like recreation ($X_1 = 1.72$, $X_2 = 1.30$), education ($X_1 = 1.49$, $X_2 = 1.17$), uniform ($X_1 = 1.26$, $X_2 = 1.07$), statutory welfare boards ($X_1 = 1.60$, $X_2 = 1.13$), training programs ($X_1 = 2.51$, $X_2 = 2.40$), library ($X_1 = 1.57$, $X_2 = 1.17$) and health programs ($X_1 = 1.68$, $X_2 = 1.54$) are found to be better than the private sugar mills. The other facilities like crèches ($X_1 = 1.05$, $X_2 = 1.07$), transport ($X_1 = 1.94$, $X_2 = 2.28$), festival advances ($X_1 = 1.12$, $X_2 = 1.63$), leave concessions for appearing in exams ($X_1 = 1.03$, $X_2 = 1.33$), active participation in decision-making ($X_1 = 1.71$, $X_2 = 1.93$), research activity ($X_1 = 1.09$, $X_2 = 1.24$), social gettogether/celebrations ($X_1 = 1.68$, $X_2 = 1.98$), employee assistance programmes ($X_1 = 1.05$, $X_2 = 1.33$), counselling and mentoring/stress management programmes ($X_1 = 1.17$, $X_2 = 1.46$), medical insurance ($X_1 = 1.37$, $X_2 = 1.89$), flexi timings ($X_1 = 1.00$, $X_2 = 1.13$), holiday homes & leave travel concession ($X_1 = 1$, $X_2 = 1.26$), financial advisory help desk ($X_1 = 1$, $X_2 = 1.20$), treatment of dust and fumes ($X_1 = 1.12$, $X_2 = 2.52$) and fire brigade in case of accidents ($X_1 = 2.11$, $X_2 = 2.65$) are found better in the private

sugar mills. Among these facilities, the statistical difference is found for festival advances, leave concessions for appearing in exams, statutory welfare boards, library, medical insurance, holiday homes & leave travel concession at five percent level of significance ($p < 0.05$). The treatment of dust and fumes is found significantly different at one percent level of significance ($p < 0.01$). For the remaining welfare facilities, no significant difference is observed ($p > 0.05$). Hence, for these facilities null hypothesis (H_0a) is accepted.

Overall, the study found significant difference in eleven welfare facilities for co-operative and private sugar mills. Hence, null hypothesis (H_0a) is rejected for these eleven welfare facilities. On the other hand, no significant difference was found for the remaining twenty welfare facilities. So, the null hypothesis (H_0a) is accepted for the remaining twenty welfare facilities.

The study has shown that although there are a number of statutory welfare provisions need to comply, but sugar mills of Punjab are not able to comply with these provisions. Especially, the extramural welfare facilities are not at all taken care by these mills.

Part II

Association of Perception Scores with Personal Characteristics of Employees

The satisfaction regarding welfare facilities is highly correlated with demographics of the labour and only the satisfied employees can be the source of growth (Prabhu, 2011; Sekar *et al.*, 2012). In the present study, Chi-square Test of association has been applied to find the association between perception of administrative employees regarding welfare facilities and socio-economic characteristics of respondents namely, type of mill, gender, age group, marital status, educational qualification, residential status, accommodation, total experience, experience in the present mill, salary and nature of employment. Hence, perception scores are categorized into three different groups namely, Low (below 62), Moderate (63-94) and High (94 or above). The following hypothesis has been framed for applying the Chi-square Test.

H_{0b} : There is no significant association between perception scores and various socio-economic characteristics of administrative employees.

The following Table represents the association of the perception score regarding welfare with the socio-economic characteristics employees.

Table 3
Association of Perception Scores with Socio-Economic Characteristics of Administrative Employees

Sr. No.	Hypotheses	d.f.	Chi-Value	p Value	Hypotheses Accepted/ Rejected
1	H _{0b1} : There is no significant association between perception scores and type of sugar mill	2	9.819	.007*	Rejected
2	H _{0b2} : There is no significant association between perception scores and gender	2	5.109	.078	Accepted
3	H _{0b3} : There is no significant association between perception scores and age group	8	8.598	.377	Accepted
4	H _{0b4} : There is no significant association between perception scores and marital status	6	5.263	.511	Accepted
5	H _{0b5} : There is no significant association between perception scores and educational qualification	10	14.678	.144	Accepted
6	H _{0b6} : There is no significant association between perception scores and residential status	2	1.770	.413	Accepted
7	H _{0b7} : There is no significant association between perception scores and accommodation	4	6.378	.173	Accepted
8	H _{0b8} : There is no significant association between perception scores and total experience	6	7.048	.316	Accepted
9	H _{0b9} : There is no significant association between perception scores and experience in the present mill	6	5.943	.430	Accepted
10	H _{0b10} : There is no significant association between perception scores and salary	10	18.600	.046**	Rejected
11	H _{0b11} : There is no significant association between perception scores and nature of employment	6	7.489	.278	Accepted

Source : Compiled from primary data.

Note : * represents significant at 1 % level of significance, ** represents significant at 5 % level of significance.

Data in the Table 3 shows that type of sugar mill ($\chi_2 = 9.819$, $p = .007$) and salary ($\chi_2 = 18.600$, $p = .046$) has significant association with low, moderate and high perception scores. Hence, null hypotheses for these variables (H_{0b1} and H_{0b10}) are rejected. On the other hand, gender ($\chi_2 = 5.109$, $p = .78$), age group ($\chi_2 = 8.598$, $p = .377$), marital status ($\chi_2 = 5.263$, $p = .511$), educational qualification ($\chi_2 = 14.678$, $p = .144$), residential status ($\chi_2 = 1.770$, $p = .413$), accommodation ($\chi_2 = 6.378$, $p = .173$), total experience ($\chi_2 = 7.048$, $p = .316$), experience in the present mill ($\chi_2 = 5.943$, $p = .430$) and nature of employment ($\chi_2 = 7.489$, $p = .278$) have no significant association with low, moderate and high perception scores at 5% level of significance. Hence, null hypotheses for these variables (H_{0b2} , H_{0b3} , H_{0b4} , H_{0b5} , H_{0b6} , H_{0b7} , H_{0b8} , H_{0b9} and H_{0b11}) are accepted. Overall, the result of Chi-square test has shown the association of low, moderate and high scores from the welfare facilities with the type of mill and salary of employees.

SUGGESTIONS

The study has advocated the wretched position for most of the welfare facilities in the sugar mills of Punjab. In this context, the following are some of the suggestions as policy recommendations for the government/authorities and other concerned stakeholders to look upon :-

- The study has shown that the welfare of the employees is not in good sculpture. Especially, the non-statutory intramural welfare provisions (festival advances, research activities, library, health programmes, employee assistance programmes, counseling and mentoring/stress management programmes) have been overlooked. In addition, the extra mural facilities like holiday homes & leave travel concession, education and recreation are in the dying state. Hence, the government must frame the policy for successful implementation of the non-statutory welfare provisions. Moreover, some mechanism should be formed so that non-statutory welfare provisions are not completely ignored.
- State government should keep on ensuring that employers and employees are properly complying with the various labour welfare laws. Hence, periodical evaluation of the welfare facilities by the government authorities/regulatory bodies must be done on the basis of written feedback of the employees and necessary action must be taken.
- The managements and the employee unions should be proactive

towards employee welfare practices. In this regard, the management should treat the welfare expenses as the investment rather than the cost to the mills. Moreover, the labour unions should ensure the availability and appropriateness of welfare facilities for the employees as well.

- The employees themselves should initiate the participation for enhancing the level of welfare activities such as social get-togethers, celebration of festivals, formation of welfare boards etc. They must eagerly support the management and the government in successful implementation of such welfare provisions.
- The scheme of flexi option basket may be formed containing different welfare facilities. The employees may select the basket as per their requirement and accordingly, the benefits may be provided. However, the facilities not required by any of the employees or minimal number of employees may be discarded. In this way, the resources may be utilized in an efficient way by sugar mills and it will further avoid any unnecessary burden on these mills.
- Workshops and seminars should be conducted by the government or concerned authorities to educate the employees regarding the welfare facilities. Moreover, the information regarding available welfare facilities must be publicized by the respective mills/regulatory bodies so that no one should be deprived of any facility due to unawareness.
- The financial condition of the sugar mills in Punjab is in a sorry state especially in case of the co-operative sugar mills (Gupta and Randhawa, 2018). So, it may not be viable for the sugar mills to provide the welfare facilities as it will require more funds. Hence, the government should assist the mills financially or make the policies to ensure more revenues for these sugar mills.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

To sum up, the study examined the perception of administrative employees regarding 31 welfare facilities in the sugar mills of Punjab. These facilities included both statutory and non-statutory welfare facilities. The study through statistical analysis, revealed that very few welfare facilities are provided appropriately in both co-operative and private sugar mills as perceived by the administrative employees. These welfare facilities include housing facility, first

aid, parking facility and drinking water facility. These facilities had the mean score of 3 or more both in case of co-operative and private sugar mills. In this context, some facilities are better provided in the co-operative sugar mills whereas some are provided well in the private sugar mills. For instance, facilities like canteen facility, facility of free coffee/tea, loan facility and cleanliness are found to be better in the private sugar mills. On the other hand, rest and break is found better in co-operative sugar mills. Apart from these facilities all the welfare facilities are found to be dissatisfactory in both types of sugar mills. Statistical difference between the co-operative and private sugar mills has been found for eleven welfare facilities and perception of administrative employees about the welfare measures has been found to be associated to type of mill and salary.

To conclude, employee welfare facilities in the sugar mills of Punjab state have been found to be very disappointing. Even the statutory welfare facilities are not provided appropriately to the employees. The reason behind may be that these sugar mills are not financially sound because of high Minimum Support Prices (MSP), high cost of production and low recovery percentage (Randhawa and Gupta, 2017). This may have affected the ability of the mills for providing good welfare facilities as the financial performance and employee welfare is positively correlated (Singh, 2003; Faleye and Trahan, 2011; Watson, 2000). So, the managements of these sugar mills should exert necessary efforts in order to provide appropriate welfare facilities to administrative employees and controlling the cost components. In particular, the welfare officers and state legislations should be strict in ensuring the appropriate welfare for these employees.

As the study has reflected the dying state of the welfare facilities in sugar mills of Punjab, it might have affected the physical, moral and economic well-being of respective employees. In this regard, human resource department should assess the needs of the employees and present it to the concerned authorities which may help to solve such problems (Hayes, 2002). Moreover, employee welfare should be considered as a structured program so that the employees and their families should feel satisfied on account of reduced health risks, increased efficiency and better quality of work life (Berry *et al.*, 2010).

References

- Ajala, E. M. (2012), "The Influence of Workplace Environment on Workers' Welfare, Performance and Productivity", *The African Symposium : An Online Journal of the African Educational Research Network*, Vol. 12, No. 1. Retrieved from <http://www.ncsu.edu/aern/TAS12.1/TAS12.1Ajala.pdf> on 26th June, 2016.