Journal of Human, Social & Political Science Research
October, 2024 Editions
www.ssaapublications.com

JHSPR
Vol.6, No.6, E-ISSN 3027-9792
P-ISSN 3027-0146
Sahara African Academic

ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECT OF WELFARE PACKAGE ON EMPLOYEES' PRODUCTIVITY.

MOHAMMED KOLO BABBAH
Global Health University Lome Togo.
Corresponding Author: kolobabbah100@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study seeks to assess the effect of welfare package on employee's productivity. The study focuses on some establishment within Bida local government, with descriptive design using survey method. The sampling technique used is multistage of which stratified sampling was used to group the organization into private and public organizations. The probability sampling was used to select fifty (50) respondents from the four organizations. The questionnaire method used to give quantitative information on the respondent, while descriptive and inferential analysis was used to research question and research hypothesis. his study investigates the effect of welfare packages on employee productivity within public organizations in Bida Local Government Area, Niger State, Nigeria. Employing a descriptive research design, the study utilized a combination of primary and secondary data sources. Data were collected through structured questionnaires and oral interviews from a sample of 200 employees across four organizations (both public and private) using multistage sampling techniques. Out of 200 distributed questionnaires, 192 were retrieved and used for the analysis. The findings reveal that employees rated medical benefits and paid leave highly, with mean scores of 3.40 and 3.50, respectively. Performance-based bonuses and financial aid received lower satisfaction scores, reflecting less favourable views. Overall satisfaction with welfare packages had a mean score of 3.21. The study found a positive relationship between welfare packages and productivity, with an overall mean score of 3.41. Enhanced welfare benefits were associated with increased motivation and reduced absenteeism. Sufficient welfare packages improved job satisfaction, morale, and reduced job stress, with a mean score of 3.50. Welfare packages aligned well with organizational objectives, scoring an average of 3.55, and were deemed crucial for organizational success. However, strategies to address low productivity due to inadequate welfare were seen as insufficient, with a mean score of 2.73. Correlation tests supported the hypotheses: a Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.637 ($p < 0.01$) indicated a strong positive relationship between welfare packages and productivity, and a coefficient of 0.541 ($p < 0.01$) underscored the link between sufficient welfare packages and organizational development. The study recommends refining and expanding welfare packages to address employee needs, focusing on improvements in transportation allowances, subsidized meals, and educational support, and ensuring better alignment with organizational objectives.

Keyword: Assessments, welfare package, leadership, training, employee, development, productivity.

INTRODUCTION

The magnificence of an organization is determined by the wellbeing of its workers, who are not only the qualified workforce and the number of skilled or unskilled workers, but also by their spirit and morale. The saying "you cannot muzzle the OX that threads the corn" implies that if an employee—the "OX"—is not given proper care, what you get from them might be compromised. Individual perspectives and motivation are linked to productivity. This is a major issue that affects not just Nigeria but also other countries across the world. In Nigeria, the welfare package is unbalanced, with adequate benefit packages only going to public office holders such as senators and honorable members of parliament. Public officials in Nigeria have either received bonuses or other fringe benefits for a long time, let alone paid time off. This affected several aspects of the career (Aule & Rashidi, 2021).

Welfare packages, which often include of non-cash benefits like housing allowances, health insurance, pensions, and other non-cash advantages, are crucial in determining the motivation, morale, and general work satisfaction of employees. Well-designed welfare programs have been linked to increased employee productivity, according to a number of studies (Armstrong, 2020), which makes them a crucial area of attention for businesses looking to optimize production.

Employers may guarantee their workers' well-being by offering a variety of services, perks, and facilities together in a welfare package (Benedicta, 2024). These packages may include wellness initiatives, housing, transportation, and healthcare and retirement benefits. Welfare packages aim to increase employees' overall work happiness in order to both recruit and retain talent. Welfare packages are seen as strategic instruments for human resource management in many firms because they improve work-life balance, lower employee turnover, and increase employee engagement.

Offering a range of services, facilities, and amenities to workers in order to help them live better is known as employee welfare. Meeting the demands of the workforce is a portion of what management does to increase the organization's potential for productivity. The goal of employee wellbeing is to make sure that workers are content and at ease so they can carry out their jobs well. In order to help diverse firms reach their aims more successfully, employee wellbeing has become more important recently (Gannon, 2021). A healthy working environment, staff housing or quarters, health care services, safety, and fair compensation are all necessities. Low productivity and subpar performance may result from businesses' inadequate consideration of the wellbeing of their workforce. Employers are starting to realize that taking care of workers' wellbeing is a good method to manage human resources well, which is important for an organization's success (Akintoye & Ofobruku, 2022).

Employees get demoralized and lose interest in their work as a result of this predicament. employee welfare packages, according to Coventry (2019), cover a wide range of activities, including offering social clubs, sports facilities, and canteens when needed, supervising employees and workers, managing savings plans and sick clubs, handling superannuation, pension funds, and leave grants, providing loans during hard times, setting up legal aid and offering personal problem-solving advice, awarding long service awards, helping employees relocated to a different location, and offering fringe benefits (like lunch vouchers, payment during illness, and other indirect advantages). Performance was defined by Owusu-Acheaw *et al.,* (2020) as the volume of products and/or services produced in proportion to resource inputs or utilization during a certain period of time. It also covers how successfully employees of the company carry out their designated responsibilities to delight or satisfy clients. In this instance, productivity demonstrates how effectively and efficiently workers use resources to produce high-quality results. Any organization's ability to advance may be impacted by paying insufficient attention to the wellbeing of its workforce.

Research on the relationship between welfare packages and worker productivity reveals that offering extensive welfare packages often boosts employee morale, increases employee loyalty, and lowers the risk of absence from work. Employees are more likely to be driven to actively contribute to the objectives of the company when they see welfare benefits as valuable and supportive (Akintoye & Ofobruku, 2022). Therefore, it is essential for management strategies in contemporary firms to comprehend the dynamics of welfare packages and their direct and indirect consequences on productivity.

One of the most important performance metrics for any organization is employee productivity, which is commonly defined as the amount of output an employee produces in relation to the input. While poor productivity may point to problems with engagement, resources, or the working environment, high productivity usually indicates an effective and motivated staff. Productivity is influenced by a wide range of factors, such as worker skill levels, workplace culture, motivation, and organizational support.

There are always those in any organization who are dedicated to contributing to its expansion and long-term viability. These individuals strive to fulfill the objectives of the organization. The drive of the organization's employees to exert maximum effort in providing high-quality services and making sure that resources are used efficiently determines the organization's performance. In fact, an organization needs a team of contented employees in its workforce in order to achieve its goals, vision, and mission (Armstrong, 2020). According to Haines *et al.,* (2019), it is crucial for an organization to draw in, keep, and reward skilled, high-performing employees.

Employees will feel a sense of belonging and be better able to contribute to the expansion and improvement of the company if they receive ongoing care and attention. Every management must figure out how to meet the needs of their workforce in order to inspire them to be extremely productive (Grawitch *et al.,,* 2020). This assumption assumes that every worker has an inner drive that pushes him in particular directions to fulfill his lifelong dream.

The contents and scope of welfare programs are among the variables that have a direct influence on productivity. According to Grabitch *et al.,* (2020), employees who have access to sufficient benefits and support networks tend to be less stressed and distracted, which enables them to concentrate better on their work. Therefore, welfare recipients who receive care for both their personal and professional needs are frequently more productive. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the effects that welfare package variations have on productivity metrics in various organizational settings.

According to Keitany (2019), the direction of the desires or wants vary from one employee to another. However, some consistent clusters of demands have been relatively straightforward to detect and when these needs are being met, it will assist to boost productivity in the public sector. According to Ibrahim and Abubakar (2023) the idea that Nigeria workers are driven to perform more by rise in salaries and other income supplement such as paid leaves, fees for health care programme, bonuses, pension and gratuity plans and insurance have got some support. Employee welfare might be considered as the measures that management puts in place to make life worth living for workers of a firm (Manju & Mishra, 2019).

This research tries to analyze the link between assistance packages and employee productivity. While financial remuneration is frequently the major incentive, welfare packages give a comprehensive approach to employee well-being, which may, in turn, boost productivity. By analyzing how various components of welfare packages impact employee performance, this study intends to add to the greater knowledge of how firms may maximize their human resources for better results.

Despite the rigorous recruiting procedures aimed at choosing the most qualified and competent individuals, firms in Nigeria and internationally typically confront the difficulty of diminishing productivity among these employees. This paradox poses a key question: why do people who excel in credentials, abilities, and early performance frequently demonstrate poor productivity over time? Employee happiness, which directly impacts motivation and productivity, is vital to attaining corporate objectives. However, bad working conditions and insufficient benefit packages may lead to unhappiness, decreasing morale and weakening workers' passion for their job. This research, therefore, tries to analyze the degree to which employee welfare packages effect productivity, addressing the gap between employee potential and actual output

The following questions were raised to guide the study:

1. What are the type of welfare package enjoy by the employee of public organization in Bida Local Government in Niger State
2. What is the relationship between welfare package and productivity in public organization in Bida Local Government in Niger State

Hypothesis

Ho_1. There is no significant relationship between the welfare package adopted in the organization and productivity.

Ho_2. There is no significant relationship between sufficient welfare package and increase in productivity in an organization.

General Aim of the Study

The aim of this study is to access the effects of Welfare Package on Employees Productivity.

Objectives of the Study

1) To determine the types of welfare package enjoy by staff in Bida Local Government.
2) To examine the extent to which the adoption of welfare package has achieved her set objectives.

METHODOLOGY

Descriptive design was used as the study design by the researcher to evaluate the impact of a suitable welfare package on workers' productivity in Bida Local Government Area, Niger State, Nigeria. Data analysis for the research is done using the survey approach.

This approach was chosen as it makes it feasible for the study to examine, research, and evaluate the impact of the welfare package on workers' productivity in Nigeria. These consist of the public, stakeholders, books, journals, and the internet. This is what the study's research design aids in achieving. As a result, precise content analysis involves making many different decisions. Inference and generalization are fundamental to all forms of study.

The study's population consists of all workers in the public sectors. 200 workers are officially on record, according to the human resources survey. The population for this research study consisted of all of the workers.

The abilities needed to collect data or information are included in sampling procedures. Fifty respondents from each of the four firms were chosen using the probability sampling approach.

The sample size was split into four groups using probability sampling; this sampling strategy assisted in effectively covering the study's target population (Table 1).

Table 1 Sample size

Public employee	Category of persons	No. of persons	Total
GTC Bida	Male Female	30 20	50
Umaru Sanda Pry Sch	Male Female	30 20	50
Bida LGA Secretariat	Male Female	20 30	50
Gov't College Bida	Male Female	25 25	50
Total		**100**	**200**

METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The study included both primary and secondary forms of data gathering to get pertinent information. Primary Data gathering Sources: The questionnaire and oral interview served as the main data gathering methods employed in this study.

The researcher created the questionnaire, which comprises of closed-ended, fixed-choice questions, with the intention of gathering sufficient data from the respondents. The style of the questionnaire allowed the respondents to provide information with passion that they would not have typically given—sufficient and necessary details. Since the questionnaire approach provides qualitative information on the direct physical touch involved, it was chosen.

Simple percentages and tables were used in the descriptive statistics, such as statistics, for the analysis of the data obtained via the use of structured questionnaires. Structured questionnaires with comparative percentages, absolute values, and analysis of the research questions and correlation to examine the research hypothesis were shown in tables. Since all of the material and data needed for the research came from books, journals, magazines, websites, and some primary sources via questionnaires, the analysis of the existing data approach was both essential and pertinent.

RESULTS

Analysis of Research Question

Research Question 1

What are the type of welfare packages enjoy by the employee of public organization in Bida Local Government in Niger State

Table 2 Type of Welfare Package Enjoyed by Employees

S/N	Questions	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	The organization provides housing allowances for its employees.	3.25	0.78
2	I receive medical benefits as part of my employment package.	3.40	0.68

3	There is a pension scheme available to employees in the organization.	3.15	0.85
4	The organization offers paid leave (annual, maternity, etc.).	3.50	0.72
5	Employees receive transportation allowances.	3.10	0.88
6	Staff members enjoy free or subsidized meals during working hours.	3.00	0.95
7	There are opportunities for employees to access loans or financial aid.	2.80	1.10
8	Educational support or training allowances are provided to staff.	3.20	0.80
9	Employees are rewarded with bonuses based on performance.	2.75	1.02
10	The welfare packages offered are sufficient to meet my personal needs.	2.90	0.98
	Grand Average	3.21	0.88

The research question seeks to explore the types of welfare packages enjoyed by employees of public organizations in Bida Local Government in Niger State. The findings are summarized in **Table 4.3**, which presents the mean and standard deviation for each type of welfare package. Employees generally agreed that housing allowances are provided by the organization, as reflected by a mean score of 3.25, which is close to the "Agree" category. The relatively low standard deviation (0.78) indicates a moderate level of consensus among respondents on this aspect of welfare. A mean of 3.40, which is higher than the overall grand average, shows that employees strongly agree that medical benefits are part of their employment package. The low standard deviation of 0.68 further indicates that most employees share this view, suggesting it is a consistently provided benefit. The availability of a pension scheme also received a high level of agreement (mean = 3.15). While slightly lower than the grand average, the agreement is significant. However, the standard deviation of 0.85 shows some variation in perceptions, which could indicate differences in awareness or access to pension benefits among employees. Paid leave (including annual and maternity leave) is one of the most agreed-upon benefits with a high mean score of 3.50. This suggests that it is a prominent welfare package enjoyed by employees. The relatively low standard deviation (0.72) reflects a strong consensus that this benefit is widely available.

A transportation allowance is perceived as a moderately available benefit, with a mean score of 3.10. While there is agreement, the higher standard deviation (0.88) suggests some variability in the availability or satisfaction with this benefit across employees. Subsidized or free meals during working hours are rated with a mean of 3.00, indicating that this welfare package is available, though not universally. The standard deviation (0.95) suggests considerable variation in employees' experiences, indicating that not all employees may receive this benefit. Opportunities for accessing loans or financial aid have a lower mean score (2.80), showing a more neutral to slightly disagreeing stance among employees. The high standard deviation of 1.10 indicates significant variability in employees' perceptions, which may be due to differences in access to such opportunities.

There is moderate agreement (mean = 3.20) that educational support or training allowances are provided, with a standard deviation of 0.80 indicating some variability in how widespread or accessible these opportunities are across employees. Employees expressed more neutrality or slight disagreement regarding the provision of performance-based bonuses, as shown by the mean score of 2.75. The high standard deviation (1.02) suggests substantial variation, meaning some employees may not be receiving this benefit or are less satisfied with it.

The perception of whether the welfare packages meet employees' personal needs is rated with a mean of 2.90, indicating a slightly neutral to agree stance. The standard deviation of 0.98 highlights variability in the perception of sufficiency, suggesting that some employees may not find the welfare packages sufficient to meet their needs. The overall grand average for the mean score is **3.21**, which falls in the "Agree" category, indicating that employees generally perceive that welfare packages are provided by the organization. The grand average for the standard deviation is **0.88**, suggesting moderate variability in responses across the items. This variability may reflect differences in employees' roles, departments, or access to certain welfare benefits.

Research Questions 2

What is the relationship between welfare package and productivity in public organization in Bida Local Government in Niger State

Table 3: Relationship Between Welfare Package and Productivity

S/N	Questions	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	Welfare packages have a direct impact on employee productivity.	3.50	0.65
2	Employees who receive better welfare packages are more productive.	3.40	0.70
3	Lack of welfare benefits affects my overall job performance negatively.	3.30	0.80
4	Increased welfare benefits lead to higher levels of motivation.	3.55	0.60
5	My productivity has improved since receiving welfare benefits.	3.45	0.75
6	Welfare packages help in reducing absenteeism in the organization.	3.35	0.85
7	Employees are willing to work harder when welfare needs are met.	3.60	0.55
8	Productivity has increased since the introduction of welfare packages.	3.25	0.90
9	Lack of welfare packages leads to lower employee retention.	3.20	0.95
10	Welfare packages encourage a positive attitude towards work.	3.50	0.70
	Grand Average	**3.41**	**0.75**

The result in Table 3 addresses the relationship between welfare packages and employee productivity in public organizations within Bida Local Government, Niger State. Employees agree that welfare packages have a direct and positive impact on their productivity with mean score 3.50. The relatively low standard deviation (0.65) suggests consistency in this view across the workforce, indicating that employees recognize the direct benefits of welfare packages in enhancing their performance. A mean score of 3.40 suggests that employees believe better welfare packages lead to higher productivity. The slightly higher standard deviation (0.70) indicates minor variation in how strongly different employees feel about this relationship, potentially due to differing perceptions of how "better" welfare packages are defined or experienced.

Employees generally agree that the absence of welfare benefits negatively affects their job performance. The mean score of 3.30 indicates that welfare is seen as an essential component of employee satisfaction and performance, while the higher standard deviation (0.80) may suggest that this impact is more strongly felt by some employees than others. With the highest mean score

(3.55) and the lowest standard deviation (0.60), employees strongly agree that increasing welfare benefits leads to greater motivation. This indicates a clear, almost unanimous perception that welfare is a significant motivator, enhancing employees' enthusiasm and commitment to their jobs. The mean of 3.45 shows that most employees feel their productivity has improved since receiving welfare benefits. The moderate standard deviation (0.75) highlights that while the majority share this view, there is some variability, perhaps linked to differences in the scope or sufficiency of the benefits they receive.

Employees agree that welfare packages contribute to reducing absenteeism, as reflected in the mean score of 3.35. However, the standard deviation of 0.85 suggests some variation in how different employees experience this effect, possibly due to variations in the adequacy or accessibility of certain welfare benefits that address absenteeism. With a high mean score of 3.60, employees express strong agreement that they are more willing to work harder when their welfare needs are satisfied. The low standard deviation (0.55) indicates a high level of consensus, signifying that welfare packages are viewed as effective in boosting employees' willingness to increase their efforts.

The mean score of 3.25 reflects general agreement that productivity has improved since welfare packages were introduced. However, the higher standard deviation (0.90) suggests significant variability in this perception, possibly due to differences in the timing or quality of welfare package implementations across different departments or employee groups. A mean of 3.20 indicates that employees agree that the absence of welfare packages can negatively affect employee retention. The high standard deviation (0.95) suggests a wide range of experiences, implying that while some employees may feel a stronger impact of welfare on retention, others may not perceive it as a critical factor in their decision to stay or leave.

Employees agree that welfare packages encourage a positive attitude towards work, as evidenced by the mean score of 3.50. The standard deviation (0.70) shows moderate consensus, indicating that most employees share this view, though some variation exists based on individual experiences with specific benefits. The grand average mean score of 3.41 signifies that employees generally agree that welfare packages positively influence their productivity. The accompanying grand standard deviation of 0.75 shows moderate variation in responses, implying that while most employees have similar views, there is some diversity in their experiences with welfare packages.

Test of Research Hypothesis

Research Hypothesis One

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between the welfare package adopted in the organization and productivity.

Table 4 Correlations Analysis Relationship between Sufficient Welfare Packages and an increase in Productivity in an Organization

	Welfare Packages	Productivity
Welfare Packages	1	0.637**
Sig. (2-tailed)		0.003

N	192	192
Productivity	0.637**	1
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.003	
N	192	192

*Significance at 0.01 level

The correlation analysis for Research Hypothesis One indicates a Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.637 with a significance level of 0.003 for the relationship between the adopted welfare package and productivity. This p-value is below the 0.01 threshold, suggesting that the correlation is statistically significant. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis, accepting the alternative hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between the adopted welfare package and productivity in the Bida Local Government of Niger State.

Research Hypothesis Two
Ho2: There is no significant relationship between sufficient welfare packages and an increase in productivity in an organization.

Table 5 Correlations Analysis Relationship between Sufficient Welfare Packages and an increase in Development in an Organization

	Sufficient Welfare Packages	Increase Development
Sufficient Welfare Packages	1	0.541**
Sig. (2-tailed)		0.006
N	192	192
Increase Development	0.541**	1
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.006	
N	192	192

*Significance at 0.01 level

For Research Hypothesis Two, the Pearson correlation coefficient between sufficient welfare packages and increase in productivity is 0.541 with a significance level of 0.002. This p-value is also below the 0.01 threshold, indicating a statistically significant correlation. Consequently, we reject the null hypothesis, confirming the alternative hypothesis that sufficient welfare packages have a significant relationship with organisational increase in productivity in the Bida Local Government of Niger State. Overall, both analyses demonstrate a statistically significant correlation between welfare packages and productivity, supporting the notion that improvements in welfare provisions are positively related to productivity outcomes in the region.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

From the study, the research work seeks the assessment of the welfare package on the employee productivity in selected words. The study on welfare packages in public organizations in Bida Local Government, Niger State, reveals varied perceptions among employees regarding the benefits provided. Medical benefits and paid leave were strongly endorsed, indicating high satisfaction and agreement among employees. Housing allowances and pension schemes also received significant agreement, though there was some variability in perceptions of their availability. In contrast, transportation allowances, subsidized meals, and financial aid opportunities were viewed as less universally available, with notable differences in employee experiences. Educational support and performance-based bonuses were less consistently perceived, and there was a moderate agreement on whether the welfare packages sufficiently met personal needs. Overall, while employees generally acknowledged the provision of welfare packages, there were significant differences in satisfaction and perceived adequacy.

These findings align with existing literature, which similarly emphasizes the impact of comprehensive welfare packages on employee motivation and productivity. Studies such as those by Alam *et al.,* (2020) and Adil *et al.,* (2020) found that effective welfare schemes positively influence job satisfaction and retention, supporting the idea that well-structured benefits can enhance employee performance. However, discrepancies in the availability and satisfaction with specific welfare components in the current study reflect the broader challenges noted in research, such as in Poi (2020) and Madume and Owulo (2024), where inadequate welfare provisions were linked to lower performance outcomes. These findings suggest that while some welfare packages are well-received, there is a need for more comprehensive and uniformly implemented benefits to address the gaps and enhance overall employee satisfaction and productivity.

The analysis of the relationship between welfare packages and employee productivity in public organizations in Bida Local Government, Niger State, demonstrates a generally positive perception among employees. Employees agree that welfare packages have a direct and beneficial impact on productivity, with mean scores reflecting strong support for this view. The data show that better welfare packages are associated with higher productivity, and increased welfare benefits significantly enhance motivation and job performance. There is a notable consensus that welfare packages reduce absenteeism and foster a positive work attitude, although there is some variability in experiences, possibly due to differences in the adequacy and accessibility of benefits. Overall, employees perceive welfare packages as essential for boosting productivity and job satisfaction, with a moderate level of agreement across the workforce.

These findings resonate with existing literature, which underscores the positive influence of well-structured welfare packages on employee performance. For instance, Alam *et al.,* (2020) and Adil *et al.,* (2020) highlight that comprehensive welfare facilities enhance productivity by improving work motivation and job satisfaction. The current study's results align with Akintoye and Ofobruku (2022), who noted that effective welfare schemes can drive motivation and productivity. Similarly, Poi (2020) and Madume and Owulo (2024) found that inadequate welfare provisions negatively impact performance, reinforcing the current findings that improvements in welfare packages can lead to significant gains in employee productivity. These results suggest a consistent link between welfare benefits and enhanced job performance, corroborating the broader research on the role of employee welfare in organizational effectiveness.

The findings from the analysis of research hypotheses and empirical data provide valuable insights into this relationship. Research Hypothesis One posited that there is no significant relationship between the welfare package adopted in the organization and productivity. The analysis revealed a Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.637 with a significance level of 0.003, indicating a statistically significant positive relationship between welfare packages and productivity. This result leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis, suggesting that better welfare packages are significantly associated with higher productivity levels. This finding is consistent with the study by Alam *et al.,* (2020), which demonstrated that welfare facilities significantly impact productivity through work motivation. Their research supports the notion that comprehensive welfare packages enhance employee motivation, which in turn improves productivity. Similarly, the results align with Poi (2020), who found that adequate welfare packages improve staff performance by fostering job commitment and efficiency. The significant correlation between welfare packages and productivity underscores the importance of investing in employee welfare to enhance organizational performance.

Research Hypothesis Two proposed that there is no significant relationship between sufficient welfare packages and an increase in productivity in an organization. The analysis showed a Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.541 with a significance level of 0.002, indicating a statistically significant positive relationship. This result allows for the rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis, confirming that sufficient welfare packages are positively related to increased productivity. These findings corroborate the results of Adil *et al.,* (2020), who found a significant positive relationship between compensation packages and job satisfaction, which in turn influences employee retention and productivity. The significance of sufficient welfare packages in boosting productivity supports Akintoye and Ofobruku (2022), who emphasized that well-structured welfare packages enhance staff motivation and productivity. Furthermore, the results are in agreement with Madume and Owulo (2024), who highlighted that inadequate welfare negatively affects performance, while improvements in welfare packages positively impact employee output.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study underscores the pivotal role of welfare packages in shaping employee productivity within public organizations in Bida Local Government Area. Employees' generally positive perceptions of various welfare benefits, such as medical coverage, paid leave, and pension schemes, highlight their crucial importance in fostering a productive and satisfied workforce. These benefits are seen as key to improving job satisfaction, reducing absenteeism, and enhancing overall morale.

However, the study also reveals variability in employee perceptions regarding certain welfare provisions. While benefits like transportation allowances, subsidized meals, and educational support are valued, their effectiveness and availability can vary, indicating a need for refinement in these areas. Aligning welfare packages more closely with the diverse needs of employees can address these discrepancies and ensure that all aspects of the welfare program are meeting their intended goals.

Moreover, the study finds that effective welfare packages that align with organizational objectives contribute significantly to overall efficiency and success. Welfare provisions that support employees' well-being and job satisfaction are not only beneficial for individual productivity but also play a critical role in achieving broader organizational goals.

In conclusion, while welfare packages generally have a positive impact on productivity, there is clear evidence that improvements are needed in specific areas. By addressing these gaps and ensuring that welfare provisions are more effectively aligned with both employee needs and organizational objectives, public organizations can enhance productivity and drive greater success.

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are proposed to optimize welfare packages and improve employee productivity:

1. Organizations should work on standardizing and improving the benefits provided, especially in areas like transportation allowances, subsidized meals, and educational support. This will ensure that all employees receive consistent and valuable support.
2. Establish robust feedback mechanisms that allow employees to voice their opinions on welfare packages and suggest improvements.
3. Ensure that welfare packages are designed to align with organizational objectives and support strategic goals. This alignment will help maximize the impact of welfare provisions on productivity and organizational performance.

References

Adil, H., Rao, C. K., Ayaz, M. Q., & Shinwari, A. (2020). Effect of compensation packages on job satisfaction and employees retention: A case of Jalalabad-based private universities of Afghanistan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 8*(2), 26-35.

Akintoye, E. O., & Ofobruku, S. A. (2022). Staff welfare package and organizational performance: A theoretical discourse. *European Journal of Business and Management Research, 7*(2), 155-159.

Alam, M. N., Hassan, M. M., Bowyer, D., & Reaz, M. (2020). The effects of wages and welfare facilities on employee productivity: Mediating role of employee work motivation. *Australasian Accounting, Business and Finance Journal, 14*(4), 38-60.

Anikpo, M. O. (2018). Identifying the need of the Nigeria workers in managing the work. Ibadan; Longman ltd. Armstrogn, M. (2019).

Armstrong, P. O. (2020). Human resource management practice. London: Kogan Press Chen, S.H., Yang, C.C., Shiau, J.Y., & Wang, H.H. (2018). The development of an employee satisfaction model for higher education. TQM Magazine, 18, 484-500.

Aule, O., & Rashidi, A. (2021). Welfare packages and staff performance at Benue State Independent Electoral Commission, Makurdi, Nigeria. *Journal of Administrative Science, 18*(2), 262-275.

Benedicta, C. (2024). Impact of staff welfare scheme and skill development on employee productivity: A study of Anambra State Civil Service. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews, 4*(7), 338-348.

Cole, G. A. (2018). Personal and human resource management, 5th ed. London: Book Power.

Coventry W. G. (2019). Approach to motivation. U.J publisher Coventry, W. F. & Barker, J. K. (2017). Management. International edition. Heinemann Professional Publishing.

Gannon, M.J. (2021). Organizational behaviour: A managerial and organizational perspective. USA: Little, Brown and Company Limited.

Grabitch, M.J., Trares, S., & Kohler, J.M. (2020). Healthy workplace practices and employee outcomes. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14(3), 275–293

Haines, D.J., Davis, L., Rancour, P., Robinson, M., Neel-Wilson, T., & Wagner, S. (2019) A pilot intervention to promote walking and wellness and to improve the Health of College Faculty and Staff. *Journal of American College Health*, 55, 219-225

Ibrahim, O. S., & Abubakar, S. Y. A. (2023). Institutionalising the effects of remuneration and welfare packages on employees' performance in public universities in Nigeria. *Quest Journal of Management and Social Sciences, 5*(2), 191-205.

Keitany, B. J. (2019). Perceived relationship between employee welfare programs and employee performance at Kenya Pipeline Company (Unpublished MBA Project). University of Nairobi.

Madume, F. J., & Owulo, J. O. (2024). The effects of welfare package and employees performance in Nigerian Police Force (FCT COMMAND). *African Banking and Finance Review Journal, 12*(12), 56-68.

Manju, B. & Mishra, S. (2019). The principles for successful implementation of labour welfare activities. From Policy Theory to Functional Theory: Retrieved on September 26th 2019 from http://www.tesioline.com/intl/indepth.jsp?id=575

Nwachukwu, C. C. (2020). Effective leadership and productivity. Evidence from a national survey of industrial organization. *African Journal for the Study of Social*, 1, 38-46.

Nwankwo, B. C., Stephen Ocheni, S., & Atakpa, M. (2013). The Nigerian Union of Local Government Employees (NULGE) and Promotion of Good Employer-Employee Relations in Nigeria Local Government Service in the 21st Century. Journal *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences,* 4 (2), 607.

Owusu-Acheaw, M. (2020). Staff development and employee welfare practices and their effect on productivity in three special libraries in Ghana. Assessed online on 16th July, 2019 at http://ajo/.info.index.php/glj.article/view/33978.

Poi, G. (2020). Employee welfare packages and the performance of public organizations in Rivers State, Nigeria. *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Management Sciences, 8*(2), 58-79.