

# Critical Analysis of Profile of Industrial Employees in Andhra Pradesh, India

Gudivada Venakt Rao<sup>1</sup> and Prof. P.Devaki Devi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Andhra University, Visakhapatnam.

*Received: 12 December 2012 Accepted: 1 January 2013 Published: 15 January 2013*

---

## Abstract

The profile of the employees since globalization has undergone changes. The demographic studies show the influence of generation X in near future. The profile analysis of the workforce is useful in understanding the psychological, sociological and economic composition. The Human Resource processes and systems are influenced by the profile of the employees. A study was undertaken by administering a questionnaire on 570 female and 358 male employees who belong to 13 public sector and 5 private sector organizations in the State of Andhra Pradesh. The sex and sector-wise analysis is presented on personal factors such as age, religion and caste, marital status, structure of the family, housing, migration, urbanization, education, job position and experience, income and unionization to know the profiles of the industrial female, male, public and private sector employees.

---

## *Index terms—*

## 1 Introduction

he behavior of organization is viewed as the overall performance assessment on the basis of interaction between the individuals and groups in all fields of management, the key arena being human resource management. The managers are expected to understand the integrated systems, human resources profile and their activities and human resources processes as 'people systems' aiming at longevity of high performing individuals. In this process the factors at consideration may be said as (a) individual differences to recognize the diverse needs (b) perceptions that are built out of life time experiences and accumulated values (c) employee as a whole person being affected by job life (d) motivated personality being exhibited by the employee based on his profile as well by the profile of the organization (e) design of involvement for the employee self-efficacy and mutual benefit and (f) value of the person as people expect to be treated as humans differently from machines ??Stahl, 1995: 279). The psychological framework of the employees plays a pivotal role in designing and continuously improving the organizational processes and systems, the essence of the total quality management (Bratton, J and Gold J. 1994). The operating human resource management systems develop flexibility among the employees while adopting new work design, high product and process quality, high employee commitment and strategic integration which culminate and develop from the profile of the employees, both managers and operatives. All the more, it is presently expected that human resource management practices are based on 'unitarist' way of relationship between employer and the employed instead of 'pluralist' view of divergent interests between the 'two sides' ??Cave, 1994,71 : 78). In the background of the preceding theoretical base, the analysis of the profile of the employees in the work organizations under the changing global industrial scenario is considered meaningful.

The Personal factors among the socioeconomic characteristics treated under the employee profile are (1) age. (2) religion and caste, (3) marital status, (4) structure of the family, (5) housing, (6) migration, (7) urbanization, (8) educational level, (9) job position and experience, (10) income and (11) unionization.

## 2 II.

### 3 Method of the Study

The profile of the industrial employees is analysed based on the data collected by administering a questionnaire on 570 female and 358 male employees by frequency matching who belong to 13 public sector and 5 private sector organizations in the State of Andhra Pradesh under the UGC Major Research Project (2002). The distribution of sample is shown in Annexure -I. The sex and sector-wise analysis is presented. The tabular data are presented in Annexure -II i.e., Table 1 to Table 13. Some tables show the data of only those employees who revealed information and hence totals vary.

#### 4 a) Age

As behavioral dimensions change along with age, any profile at the outset is evidenced by the age. The average age of the employees is 36.69 years. The employees are distributed almost evenly in the age groups of 25 to 60 years (Table -1). Those who are aged below 40 years i.e., youth form 55.60 per cent and the rest 44.41 per cent are aged 40 years and above.

The majority of the female employees (62.28%) are associated with the age groups of below 40 years while the male employees in this category form only 44.98 per cent. The females under 30 years age come to 35.14 per cent and the male proportion in this category is 19.56 per cent. Male employees (53.92%) are highly located in 40-55 years age group. The average age of the female and the male employees work out to 35.23 years and 39.03 years respectively and the mean difference is significant ( $t: 5.84$ ). Sectorwise analysis indicates that the employee group who are under 40 years age forms 86.62 per cent in the private sector while this category in the public sector works out to only 40.86 per cent. The same trend is noticed even in the age groups of below 30 years (private sector: 59.53%; public sector: 15.58%). The average also shows that the mean age of the private sector employees is only 29.61 years while the same is 40.04 years in the case of the public sector employees and the mean difference is significant ( $t: 17.51$ ).

Sex and sector-wise analysis shows that among the males the private sector employees (50.73%) are more associated with the lower age groups (below 30 years) than the males of the public sector (12.11%). In case of the female employees also, the private sector females (62.18%) are more associated with lower age groups (below 30 years) than the public sector females (18.53%).

The males are slightly more aged than the females in the private sector. About half of the male employees (50.73%) in the private sector belong to less than 30 years age group while female employees in this category form 62.18 per cent. However, the mean difference is not significant ( $t: 1.01$ ) between males and females in the private sector. In the public sector, the male employees category under 30 years age group works out to 12.11 per cent while the females form 18.53 per cent. Males higher than the females are located in the age groups of 40 years and above. The mean difference between the males and females in the public sector is significant ( $t: 2.69$ ).

#### 5 b) Religion and Caste

The people in Andhra Pradesh internalize their religion and caste in their family and job life, which influence the functioning and performance of the organization. The data on religion indicate that most of the employees among those who revealed their religion are Hindus (88.38%), next higher proportion (7.01%) belongs to Islam, 3.40 per cent to Christianity and 1.20 per cent belongs to other religions. Those who do not like to reveal information form 1.62 per cent (Table ??2).

The caste analysis (Table ??2) indicates that most of the employees (74.68%) belong to the Forward castes, next proportion (18.53%) to Backward castes, next in order are the Scheduled Castes (5.60%) and the Scheduled Tribes (1.19%).

The female-male distribution reveals almost the similar trends. The public vs. private sector distribution shows that the Forward caste employees are in higher proportion in the Private sector (81.27%) than in the public sector (71.54%), hence reserved categories seem to be more in the public sector.

## 6 III.

### 7 Marital Status

Marital status is another factor which influences behaviour and forms one of the elements of the profile. The data on marital status (Table 3) indicate that 97.84 per cent of the sample (908) reveals information. Among them 81.50 per cent are married, 18.39 per cent live alone as they are either separated, widowed or divorced from the spouse and 0.11 per cent are unmarried.

The female-male distribution reveals that among the females 78.38 per cent are married, while this category in males is 86.40 per cent. A group of 21.62 per cent are either separated, widowed or divorced in case of the females and this group forms only 13.31 per cent among the males. Among this group, in case of both the males (95.74%) and females (88.33%), the separated are the highest. 'Others' category is higher in the private sector (34.50%) than in the public sector (10.84%).

---

## 8 IV.

### 9 Structure of the Family

In contemporary times, the nuclear family structure is a sociological phenomenon. As the people move away from native places in search of employment, it is common that nuclear family structure exists in case of industrial employees.

The analysis also depicts that 80.28 per cent of the responded employees have nuclear family. Of them, 65.34 per cent have complete family and the rest (14.95%) have incomplete family. Those who live in joint family form 19.72 per cent and of them 12.24 per cent have the vertical family structure and the rest (7.47%) has the lateral family structure (Table 4). The femalemale analysis reveals that in both the cases (82.17%) females and 77.38% males) nuclear family structure is common.

Sector-wise analysis depicts that more number of the employees in the public sector have nuclear family set up (83.73%) compared to the private sector (71.74%). Sector and sex-wise analysis indicates that in the private sector no difference exists between males and females while in the public sector male employees (21.22%) with joint-family set up are higher than the females (12.25%).

## 10 V.

### 11 Housing

As to how the employees in the industries have housing facilities is a matter of analysis. A group of 78.23 per cent of the sampled employees (726) reveals their housing facility. Among them, a majority of the employees (56.61%) own a house, the next higher proportion (38.98%) has rented accommodation and the rest (4.41%) reside in the company quarter (Table -5). The female-male distribution depicts that 61.26 per cent of the males, more than females (53.30%) have own house and more female employees (41.98%) than the males (34.77%) reside in rented house. The males (3.97%) and females (4.72%) who live in the company quarter are almost similar.

Sector-wise analysis indicates that while majority of the public sector employees (60.07%) have own house, majority of the private sector employees (53.51%) live in rented house. It is a fact that only public sector employees reside in the company quarter (5.91%).

Sector and sex-wise analysis shows that in the public sector, a majority of males (63.11%) and the females (57.58%) have their own house; in case of the private sector, majority of males (53.45%) have own house while majority of the females (56.69%) reside in rented house.

## 12 VI. Migration

The employees' mobility is known from the migratory character. The data analysis reveals that 87.15 per cent belong to the native State and those from other States form 12.85 per cent (Table -6). However, inter-district migration is found to be common.

It is noticed that the females (15.54%) more than the males (8.63%) come from other States. Sectorwise analysis depicts that more public sector males (10.18%) than the private sector males (1.54%) come from other States and more females in the private sector (20.55%) than the females in the public sector (12.20%) move from other states. Male-female differences are glaring only in the private sector, the females (20.55%) more than the men (1.54%) come from other States.

## 13 VII.

### 14 Urbanisation

The most of the sampled industries are urban based. As to how the employees are associated with nativity, either urban or rural is analysed. The data reveal that majority of the employees (68.15%) are urban by birth and about one-third (31.85%) have rural background indicating that the second generation employees emerged in the cities (Table -7).

Female-male distribution shows that more females (71.80%) than the males (62.61%) have the urban background. Sector-wise analysis depicts that glaring difference does not exist between public (69.31%) and the private sector (65.65%) employees. However, in both the sectors, females with urban background and males with rural background are higher.

## 15 VIII.

### 16 Education

Education is a key factor of the profile which influences the behaviour of the employees. The data on educational level reveal that most of the employees are highly educated, either up to collegiate (42.56%) or post-graduate level (47.74%) as they are urbanites. The average education level of the employees works out to 15.49 years.

Female-male distribution indicates that there is no variation ( $t : 1.41$ ) between the educational levels of the males ( $X : 15.72$  years) and the females ( $X : 15.34$  years).

Sector-wise analysis shows that education of the public sector employees (X: 15.75 years) is higher than the private sector employees (X: 14.93 years) and the mean difference is significant ( $t : 2.91$ ). There are no sex-wise glaring differences in between the sectors.

## 17 IX.

### 18 Job Position

The designation or the job position moulds the attitudinal and behavioral pattern of the employees and is another key element of the profile. The data indicate that the highest proportion of the employees (25.86%) is in junior management cadre, next higher proportion (18.43%) is workers (Table -9). The middle management cadre forms 17.89 per cent and the clerical staff work out to 16.16 per cent. The supervisory staff forms 10.88 per cent. The doctors, pharmacists, nurses etc., come to 8.73 per cent, and the top management employers in the sample form 2.05 per cent. Overall, the management cadre works out to 45.80 per cent. The presence of more managerial personnel is attributed to the inclusion of the software companies.

The female-male differences are not noticed. Sector-wise analysis indicates that the managers group is slightly higher in the private sector (50.84%) than in the public sector (43.41%). However, the workers category is more common in the private sector (34.75%) than in the public sector (10.81%). The clerical staff is in higher proportion in the public sector (22.42%) compared to the private sector (3.01%). The supervisory staff is found to be in higher proportion in the public sector (14.3%) than in the private sector (3.68%).

The item-wise analysis on job position and caste depicts that 89.47 per cent of the senior managers belong to Forward castes. Among the Backward castes, the highest proportion (28.49%) belongs to worker category and the next group (26.16%) to junior level management (Table -10). Among the Scheduled Castes, three-fifths (59.62%) belong to either clerical (34.62%) or worker cadre (25.00%). About one-fifth of the Scheduled caste employees (21.15%) are in managerial position. The Scheduled Tribe employees belong to either junior-management (45.45%) or supervisory cadre (36.36%). It is also true that among the managers, 81.41 per cent belong to Forward Castes while their presence in the sample is 74.68 per cent. ??11). The average experience level is 13.26 years.

The female-male analysis reveals that most of the females (88.95%) and the males (82.96%) have job experience of below 20 years. However, the females with job experience of below 10 years form 31.93 per cent while in male group it is only 15.64 per cent. The average experience of the males (15.56 years) and the females (12.70 years) vary significantly ( $t : 6.05$ ).

The sector-wise distribution indicates that while 85.62 per cent of the private sector employees have job experience of below 15 years, the group in the public sector forms only 33.86 per cent. The public sector employees (X: 13.82 years) and the private sector employees (X: 12.08 years) differ significantly in the job experience. It is also true that the males (X: 12.41 years) and the females (X: 11.98 years) of the private sector vary in case of job experience ( $t : 2.29$ ) while no significant difference is noticed in the public sector ( $t : 1.01$ ) between the males (X: 13.90 years) and the females (X : 13.82 years).

## 19 X.

### 20 Income

The economic level of the employee has impact on formation of his attitudes and behavioral pattern. The average salaried income of the employee is Rs.9, 321. The details (Table ??12) indicate that most of the employees (79.85%) receive salary between Rs.3, 000 and 15,000. The highest proportion of the employees (28.34%) has income of Rs. 6,000 -9,000. The next highest proportion (20.26%) gets monthly income of Rs. 12,000-15,000. Those who draw below Rs. 3,000 form only 6.79 per cent and Rs. 24,000 and above account to 0.86 per cent.

The female-male analysis depicts that the most of the employees among the females (79.64%) and the males (80.17%) get salary between Rs. 3,000-15,000. The variations in individual groups between females and males are marginal. The average income shows that the males draw more ( $X = \text{Rs.}10, 160$ ) than the females ( $x = \text{Rs.}8, 794/-$ ) and the difference is significant ( $t : 3.34$ ).

The sector-wise details indicate that the highest proportion of the private sector employees (32.44%) draw salary of Rs. 12,000 -15,000 and in case of the public sector, highest proportion (36.41%) draw income of Rs. 6,000-9,000. It is also noticed that the private sector employees who draw salary below Rs. 3,000 are higher (13.71%) than the public sector employees (3.50%). However, the mean difference in salary of the public and private sector employees is not significant ( $t : 1.02$ ). But the difference is noticed ( $t = 3.71$ ) in between the males and females of the public sector employees.

## 21 XI.

### 22 Unionisation

An attempt is made to find out the pattern of the employee unionisation. The data indicate that among the total sample, only 28.66 per cent accept that they have membership in a union and most of the employees (71.34%) are not unionized (Table -13).

The male-female distribution depicts that slightly more males (3.40%) than the females (26.82%) are unionized. Sector-wise data show that higher proportion of the public sector employees (33.23%) compared to the private sector employees (19.06%) are unionized. It is also true that slightly more number of males (36.33%) than the females (30.59%) in the public sector and more number of females (20.00%) than the males (15.94%) in the private sector are unionized.

## 23 XII.

## 24 Conclusions

The profile of the industrial employee of Andhra Pradesh is characterized by the following features: The average age of the employees is 36.69 years and the female lower age and the private sector employees with significantly differ from the male and public sector employees. Most of the employees (88.38%) are Hindus and belong to Forward castes (74.68%). Sex-wise variation is not found.

However, Forward caste employees are noticed to be higher in the private sector (81.27%) than in the public sector (71.54%) as reserved categories find place more in the public sector. About four-fifths of the employees (81.50%) are married, and more females (21.62%) than the males (13.31%) are living without spouse and this is more common in the private sector.

The four-fifths of the employees live in nuclear family and no variation is found between the males and the females but more private sector employees compared to the public sector have nuclear family setup. Majority of employees (56.61%) own a house. More males and the public sector employees have own house. Most of the employees belong to the native State, females in more number migrate and intra-district migration is common.

About two-thirds of the employees are urban by birth indicating the second generation employees. More females than the males have urban background. The employees are highly educated with 15.49 years of average education with no variation between males and the females. However, public sector employees are more educated than the private sector employees.

The employees highly belong to the management cadre which may be due to the inclusion of software professionals and flat structure is common. The sex and sector-wise differences are absent. It is also true that most of the senior managers belong to Forward castes, workers group to Backward castes, Scheduled castes to supervisory cadre and Scheduled Tribes to junior management cadre. It is true that worker cadre is highly found in the private sector while supervisory cadre is more common in the public sector.

Most of the employees have below 20 years of job experience with average experience of 13.26 years and the males and females significantly differ in their experience as females have lower experience. The public sector employees with higher experience significantly differ from the private sector employees.

The salary level is Rs. 9,321 and females draw significantly lesser salary than the male employees and variation is found based on sector distribution. Surprisingly only 28.66 per cent of employees accept that they have membership in a union and most of them (71.34%) are not unionized. The males (32.40%) slightly higher than the females (26.82%) are unionized. The public sector employees are highly unionized (33.23%) than the private sector employees (19.06%).

## 25 Global Journal of Management and

1 2 3

<sup>1</sup>© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

<sup>2</sup>© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)Critical Analysis of Profile of Industrial Employees in Andhra Pradesh, India

<sup>3</sup>19.72% Total A & B 245 100% 302 100% 547 100% 60 100% 170 100% 230 100% 305 100% 471 100% 776 100%



Figure 1: A

1

2013  
ear  
Y  
Volume XIII Issue V Version I  
( ) A  
Business Research

Figure 2: Table 1 :

2

| Marital status Caste | Private Sector | Male Public Sector | Total Males   | Private Sector | Female Public Sector | Females Total | Total Private Sector | Total Public Sector |
|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Forward Castes    | 54<br>78.26%   | 206<br>71.29%      | 260<br>72.63% | 189<br>82.17%  | 244<br>71.76%        | 433<br>75.96% | 243<br>81.27%        | 450<br>71.54%       |
| 2. Backward Castes   | 13<br>18.84%   | 64<br>22.15%       | 77<br>21.51%  | 38<br>16.52%   | 57<br>16.76%         | 95<br>16.67%  | 51<br>17.06%         | 121<br>19.24%       |
| 3. Scheduled Castes  | 2<br>2.90%     | 17<br>5.88%        | 19<br>5.31%   | 2<br>0.87%     | 31<br>9.12%          | 33<br>5.79%   | 4<br>1.34%           | 48<br>7.63%         |
| 4. Scheduled Tribes  | 0<br>0         | 2<br>0.69%         | 1<br>0.56%    | 1<br>0.43%     | 8<br>2.35%           | 9<br>1.58%    | 1<br>0.33%           | 10<br>1.59%         |
| Total                | 69<br>100.00   | 289<br>100.00      | 358<br>100.00 | 230<br>100.00  | 340<br>100.00        | 570<br>100.00 | 299<br>100.00        | 629<br>100.00       |

Figure 3: Table 2 :

3

| Marital Status                  | Public Sector |         |        | Private Sector |         |        | Total  | Total   | Total     |        |
|---------------------------------|---------------|---------|--------|----------------|---------|--------|--------|---------|-----------|--------|
|                                 | Males         | Females | Total  | Males          | Females | Total  | Males  | Females | Employees |        |
| 1. Married                      | 264           | 91.99%  | 287    | 551            | 41      | 148    | 189    | 305     | 435       | 740    |
|                                 |               |         | 89.71% | 89.16%         | 62.12%  | 66.07% | 65.17% | 86.40%  | 78.38%    | 81.50% |
| 2. Unmar-<br>ried               | 0             |         | 0      | 0              | 1       | 0      | 1      | 1       | 0         | 1      |
|                                 |               |         |        |                | 1.52%   |        | 0.34%  |         |           | 0.11%  |
| 3. Oth-<br>ers a. Di-<br>vorces | 1             | 0.35%   | 3      | 4              | 0       | 0      | 0      | 1       | 3         | 4      |
|                                 |               |         | 0.91%  | 0.65%          |         |        |        | 0.28%   | 0.54%     | 0.44%  |
| b. Wid-<br>owed                 | 1             | 0.35%   | 9      | 10             | 0       | 2      | 2      | 1       | 3         | 12     |
|                                 |               |         | 2.72%  | 1.62%          |         | 0.89%  | 0.69%  | 0.28%   | 0.54%     | 1.32%  |
| c. Sepa-<br>rated               | 21            | 7.32%   | 32     | 53             | 24      | 74     | 98     | 45      | 106       | 151    |
|                                 |               |         | 9.67%  | 8.58%          | 36.36%  | 33.04% | 33.79% | 12.75%  | 19.1%     | 16.63% |
| Others To-<br>tal               | 23            | 8.01%   | 44     | 67             | 24      | 76     | 100    | 47      | 120       | 167    |
|                                 |               |         | 13.29% | 10.84%         | 36.36%  | 33.93% | 34.48% | 13.31%  | 21.62%    | 18.39% |
| Total                           | 287           | 100%    | 331    | 618            | 66      | 224    | 290    | 353     | 555       | 908    |
|                                 |               |         | 100%   | 100%           | 100%    | 100%   | 100%   | 100%    | 100%      | 100%   |

Figure 4: Table 3 :

4

© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

Figure 5: Table 4 :

| Structure of the family | Public Sector |         |       | Private Sector |         |       | Total | Total   | Total     |     |     |
|-------------------------|---------------|---------|-------|----------------|---------|-------|-------|---------|-----------|-----|-----|
|                         | Males         | Females | Total | Males          | Females | Total | Males | Females | Employees |     |     |
| Nuclear Family          |               |         |       |                |         |       |       |         |           |     |     |
| a) Complete             | 156           | 63.67%  | 217   | 373            | 39      | 95    | 134   | 195     | 312       | 507 |     |
| b) Incomplete           | 37            | 15.1%   | 48    | 85             | 4       | 6.67% | 27    | 31      | 42        | 75  | 116 |
| Total A                 | 193           | 78.78%  | 265   | 458            | 43      | 122   | 165   | 236     | 387       | 623 |     |
| Joint Family            |               |         |       |                |         |       |       |         |           |     |     |
| a) Vertical             | 32            | 13.06%  | 27    | 59             | 10      | 27    | 37    | 42      | 53        | 95  |     |
| b) Lateral              | 20            | 8.16%   | 10    | 30             | 7       | 21    | 28    | 27      | 31        | 58  |     |
| Total B                 | 52            | 21.22%  | 37    | 89             | 17      | 48    | 65    | 69      | 84        |     |     |
|                         |               |         |       |                |         |       |       |         |           |     |     |

Figure 6: A

5

: Housing

Figure 7: Table 5

6

: Migration

Figure 8: Table 6

7

| Category | Public Sector | Males  | Females | Total  | Males  | Females | Total  | Private Sector | Total  | Total   | Total     |
|----------|---------------|--------|---------|--------|--------|---------|--------|----------------|--------|---------|-----------|
|          |               |        |         |        |        |         |        |                | Males  | Females | Employees |
| Urban    | 172           | 64.18% | 221     | 393    | 34     | 138     | 172    |                | 206    | 359     | 565       |
|          |               |        | 73.91%  | 69.31% | 55.74% | 65.66%  | 65.65% |                | 62.61% | 71.80%  | 68.15%    |
| Rural    | 96            | 35.82% | 78      | 174    | 27     | 90      | 90     |                | 123    | 141     | 264       |
|          |               |        | 26.09%  | 30.69% | 44.26% | 34.34%  | 34.35% |                | 37.39% | 28.20%  | 31.85%    |
| Total    | 268           | 100%   | 299     | 567    | 61     | 201     | 262    |                | 329    | 500     | 829       |
|          |               |        | 100%    | 100%   | 100%   | 100%    | 100%   |                | 100%   | 100%    | 100%      |

Figure 9: Table 7 :

8

| Education                               | Private Sector | Male Public Sector | Total Males   | Private Sector | Female Public Sector | Females       | Total | Total Private Sector | Total Public Sector |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------|-------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Primary (5 years and below)          | 4<br>5.80%     | 1<br>0.35%         | 5<br>1.40%    | 10<br>4.35%    | 1<br>0.29%           | 11<br>1.93%   |       | 14<br>4.68%          | 2<br>0.32%          |
| 2. Secondary (6 -10 years)              | 10<br>14.49%   | 17<br>5.88%        | 27<br>7.54%   | 21<br>9.13%    | 26<br>7.65%          | 47<br>8.25%   |       | 31<br>10.37%         | 43<br>6.84%         |
| 3. Collegiate (11 -15 years)            | 28<br>48.58%   | 137<br>47.40%      | 165<br>46.09% | 64<br>27.83%   | 166<br>48.82%        | 230<br>40.35% |       | 92<br>30.77%         | 303<br>48.1%        |
| 4. Post-graduation (16 years and above) | 27<br>39.13%   | 134<br>46.37%      | 161<br>44.97% | 135<br>58.70%  | 147<br>43.24%        | 282<br>49.47% |       | 162<br>54.18%        | 281<br>44.6%        |
| Total                                   | 69<br>100.00   | 289<br>100.00      | 358<br>100.00 | 230<br>100.00  | 340<br>100.00        | 570<br>100.00 |       | 299<br>100.00        | 629<br>100.00       |

Figure 10: Table 8 :

9

| Job position                                   | Private Sector | Male Public Sector | Total Males  | Private Sector | Female Public Sector | Females       | Total | Total Private Sector | Total Public Sector |
|------------------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------|-------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Senior manager                              | 4<br>5.80%     | 4<br>1.38%         | 8<br>2.23%   | 4<br>1.74%     | 7<br>2.06%           | 11<br>1.93%   |       | 8<br>2.68%           | 11<br>1.75%         |
| 2. Middle manager                              | 11<br>15.94%   | 57<br>19.72%       | 68<br>18.99% | 52<br>22.61%   | 46<br>13.53%         | 98<br>17.19%  |       | 63<br>21.07%         | 103<br>16.38%       |
| 3. Junior manager                              | 9<br>13.04%    | 79<br>27.34%       | 88<br>24.58% | 72<br>31.30%   | 80<br>23.53%         | 152<br>26.67% |       | 81<br>27.09%         | 159<br>25.28%       |
| 4. Supervisory staff                           | 7<br>10.14%    | 45<br>15.57%       | 52<br>14.53% | 4<br>1.74%     | 45<br>13.24%         | 49<br>8.60%   |       | 11<br>3.68%          | 90<br>14.31%        |
| 5. Worker                                      | 22<br>31.88%   | 34<br>11.76%       | 56<br>15.64% | 81<br>35.22%   | 34<br>10.00%         | 115<br>20.18% |       | 103<br>34.45%        | 68<br>10.81%        |
| 6. Clerical staff                              | 9<br>13.04%    | 47<br>16.26%       | 56<br>15.64% | 0              | 94<br>27.65%         | 94<br>16.49%  |       | 9<br>3.01%           | 141<br>22.42%       |
| 7. Others (Doctors, Pharmacists, nurses, etc.) | 7<br>10.14%    | 23<br>7.96%        | 30<br>8.38%  | 17<br>7.39%    | 34<br>10.00%         | 51<br>8.95%   |       | 24<br>8.03%          | 57<br>9.06%         |
| Total                                          | 69<br>100%     | 289<br>100%        | 358<br>100%  | 230<br>100%    | 340<br>100%          | 570<br>100%   |       | 299<br>100%          | 629<br>100%         |

Figure 11: Table 9 :

Figure 12: A

10

| S.No. | Designation/<br>position                                        | Forward<br>Castes | Backward<br>Castes | Scheduled<br>Castes | Scheduled<br>Tribes | Total<br>Employees |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| 1     | Senior Manager                                                  | 17 2.45%          | 2 1.16%            | 0                   | 0                   | 19 2.05%           |
| 2     | Middle Manager                                                  | 144 20.78%        | 16 9.30%           | 6 11.54%            | 0                   | 166 17.89%         |
| 3     | Junior Manager                                                  | 185 26.70%        | 45 26.16%          | 5 9.62%             | 5                   | 240 25.86%         |
|       |                                                                 |                   |                    |                     | 45.45%              |                    |
| 4     | Supervisory staff                                               | 75 10.82%         | 19 11.05%          | 6 11.54%            | 1 9.09%             | 101 10.88%         |
| 5     | Worker                                                          | 108 15.58%        | 49 28.49%          | 13 25.00%           | 1 9.09%             | 171 18.43%         |
| 6     | Clerical Staff                                                  | 104 15.01%        | 24 13.95%          | 18 34.62%           | 4                   | 150 16.16%         |
|       |                                                                 |                   |                    |                     | 36.36%              |                    |
| 7     | Others<br>(Doctors,<br>Phar-<br>macists,<br>Nurses<br>and etc.) | 60 8.66%          | 17 9.88%           | 4 7.69%             | 0                   | 81 8.73%           |
|       | Total                                                           | 693 100.00%       | 172 100.00%        | 52<br>100.00%       | 11<br>100.00%       | 928 100.00%        |

Figure 13: Table 10 :

11

| Job Expe-<br>rience  | Private<br>Sector | Male<br>Public<br>Sector | Total<br>Males | Private<br>Sector | Female<br>Public<br>Sector | Total<br>Fe-<br>males | Total<br>Private<br>Sector | Total<br>Public<br>Sector | Total<br>Em-<br>ployees |
|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Below 5<br>years  | 20<br>28.29%      | 7<br>2.42%               | 27<br>7.54%    | 131<br>56.96%     | 11<br>3.24%                | 142<br>24.91%         | 151<br>50.50%              | 18<br>2.86%               | 169<br>18.21%           |
| 2. 5 -10<br>years    | 18<br>26.09%      | 11<br>3.81%              | 29<br>8.10%    | 26<br>11.30%      | 14<br>4.12%                | 40<br>7.02%           | 44<br>14.72%               | 25<br>3.97%               | 69<br>7.44%             |
| 3. 10 -15<br>years   | 18<br>26.09%      | 75<br>25.95%             | 93<br>25.98%   | 43<br>18.70%      | 95<br>27.94%               | 138<br>24.21%         | 61<br>20.40%               | 170<br>27.03%             | 231<br>24.89%           |
| 4. 15 -20<br>years   | 11<br>15.94%      | 137<br>47.90%            | 148<br>41.34%  | 19<br>8.26%       | 168<br>49.41%              | 187<br>32.81%         | 30<br>10.03%               | 305<br>48.49%             | 335<br>36.10%           |
| 5. 20 -25<br>years   | 1<br>1.45%        | 37<br>12.80%             | 38<br>10.61%   | 4 1.74%           | 37<br>10.88%               | 41<br>7.19%           | 5 1.67%                    | 74<br>11.76%              | 79<br>8.51%             |
| 6. 25 -30<br>years   | 0                 | 14<br>4.84%              | 14<br>3.91%    | 3 1.30%           | 10<br>2.94%                | 13<br>2.28%           | 3 1.00%                    | 24<br>3.82%               | 27<br>2.91%             |
| 627. 30 -35<br>years | 1.45%<br>1        | 2.77%<br>8               | 2.51%<br>9     | 1.30% 3           | 0.88% 3                    | 1.05% 6               | 1.34% 4                    | 1.75%<br>11               | 1.62%<br>15             |
| 8. 35 -40<br>years   | 0                 | 0                        | 0              | 1 0.43%           | 2 0.59%                    | 3 0.53%               | 1 0.33%                    | 2 0.32%                   | 3 0.32%                 |
| Total                | 69<br>100.00      | 289<br>100.00            | 358<br>100.00  | 230<br>100.00     | 340<br>100.00              | 570<br>100.00         | 299<br>100.00              | 629<br>100.00             | 928<br>100.00           |

Figure 14: Table 11 :

**13**

| Members in<br>union | Public Sector |         |        | Private Sector |         |        |        | Total  | Total   | Total     |
|---------------------|---------------|---------|--------|----------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|---------|-----------|
|                     | Males         | Females | Total  | Males          | Females | Total  |        | Males  | Females | Employees |
| 1. Yes              | 105           | 36.33%  | 104    | 209            | 11      | 46     | 57     | 116    | 150     | 266       |
|                     |               |         | 30.59% | 32.23%         | 15.94%  | 20.00% | 19.06% | 32.40% | 26.32%  | 28.66%    |
| 2. No               | 184           | 63.67%  | 236    | 420            | 58      | 184    | 242    | 242    | 420     | 662       |
|                     |               |         | 69.41% | 66.77%         | 84.06%  | 80.00% | 80.94% | 67.60% | 73.68%  | 71.34%    |
| Total               | 289           | 100%    | 340    | 629            | 69      | 100%   | 230    | 299    | 358     | 928       |
|                     |               |         | 100%   | 100%           |         |        | 100%   | 100%   | 100%    | 100%      |

Figure 15: Table 13 :



- 
- 247 [Korman et al. ()] , A K Korman , Behaviour , N J Engle Wood Cliffs , Printice Hall . 1977. p. .
- 248 [ Human Development Report ()] , *Human Development Report* 1993. Oxford University Press. (UNDP)
- 249 [Government Of ()] , India Government Of . *Annual Survey of Industries* 2011. 2. (Labour Bureau)
- 250 [Priyanka] ‘A comparative study of Job Stress and Organizational Commitment among Managers, Supervisors
- 251 in a Private Sector Organization’. G Priyanka . *Indian Psychologist* 7 p. .
- 252 [Udai ()] ‘A Conceptual Model of Work Motivation’. Pareek Udai . *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations* 1974.
- 253 10 p. .
- 254 [Hall ()] *Dimensions of Work*, Richard Hall , H . 1956. Sage Publications. p. 12.
- 255 [Mouldy ()] *Employee Organisation Linkages*, Mouldy . 1982. New York: Academic Press.
- 256 [Mitra and Sen (1993)] ‘Executives Under Stress: A comparison between Men and Women’. A S Mitra , A Sen
- 257 . *Journal of Indian Academy of Applied Psychology* January -July, 1993. 19 (1-2) p. .
- 258 [Montouri and Conti ()] *From Power to Partnership*, A Montouri , I Conti . 1993. Harper San Francisco. p. .
- 259 [Jagdish (1993)] ‘Group Oriented Attitude as a Moderator variable of Intrinsic Job Satisfaction Occupational
- 260 Relationship’. Srivatsava Jagdish . *Indian Journal of Behaviour* May 1993. 17 (3) p. .
- 261 [Duxbury et al. ()] ‘Head-nurse Leadership Style with Staff-nurse Burnout and Job Satisfaction in Neonatal
- 262 Intensive Care Units’. M Duxbury , G D Armstrong , D G Drew , S J Henley . *Nursing Research* 1984. 33
- 263 (2) p. .
- 264 [Bratton and Gold ()] *Human Resource Management*, Bratton , J Gold . 1994. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- 265 [Pradhan and Mishra ()] ‘Life Stress and Burnout Among Couples in Medical Profession’. M Pradhan , P K
- 266 Mishra . *Indian Journal of Clinical Psychology* 1995. 22 (2) p. .
- 267 [Pareek ()] *Making Organisational Roles Effective*, TMH, U Pareek . 1993. New Delhi.
- 268 [Mishra and Somani ()] ‘Occupational Stress in Relation to Mental Health of Supervisors’. P C Mishra , H R
- 269 Somani . *Indian Journal of Behaviour* 1993. 17 (4) p. .
- 270 [Wisdom ()] ‘Primary Sources of Hospital Administrator Stress’. B Wisdom . *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*
- 271 1984. 5 (3) p. .
- 272 [Dijkhuizen and Reiche ()] ‘Psychosocial Stress in Industry. A Heartache for Middle Management?’. N V
- 273 Dijkhuizen , H Reiche . *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics* 1980. 34 (2-3) p. .
- 274 [Singh and Dillan (2003)] ‘Role Effectiveness: A comparative study of Male and Female Newspaper Reporters’.
- 275 S K Singh , P K Dillan . *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations* July, 2003. 39 (1) p. .
- 276 [Sayeed ()] ‘Role Making Behaviour, Organisational Priorities, and Managerial Situational Control’. O B Sayeed
- 277 . *Indian journal of Industrial Relations* 1992. (4) p. 27.
- 278 [Singh and Mohanty ()] P Singh , M Mohanty . *Role Efficacy in Relation to Job Anxiety and Job Status*, 1996.
- 279 26 p. .
- 280 [Surti ()] *Some Psychological Correlates of Role Stress and Coping Styles in Working Women*, K Surti . 1982.
- 281 Ahmedabad. Gujarat University (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation)
- 282 [Hay and Oken ()] ‘The Psychological Stresses of Intensive Care Nursing’. D Hay , D Oken . *Psychosomatic*
- 283 *Medicine* 1972. 34 p. .
- 284 [Rosenthal ()] ‘The Relationship Between Work Environment Attributes and Burnout’. D Rosenthal . *Journal of*
- 285 *Leisure Research* 1983. 15 (2) p. .
- 286 [Orpen ()] ‘Type A Personality as a Moderator for the Effects of Role Conflict, Role Ambiguity and Role Overload
- 287 on Individual Strain’. C Orpen . *Journal of Human Stress* 1982. 8 (2) p. .
- 288 [Vroom ()] *Work and Motivation*, V Vroom . 1964. New York: Wiley. p. 17.