CHAPTER IV
LEVEL OF OCCUPATIONAL STRESS, PERCEIVED STRESS
AND JOB SATISFACTION

Occupational Stress is stress at work. Stress is defined in terms of its physical and physiological effects on a person. Stress is mental, physical or emotional strain or tension or it is a situation or factor that can cause this. Occupational stress occurs when there is a discrepancy between the demands of the workplace and an individual’s ability to carry out and complete these demands. Often a stressor can lead the body to have a physiological change which in turn will cause physical as well as mental strain.

Occupational stress is a major hazard for many workers. Increased workloads, downsizing, overtime, hostile work environments, and shift work are just a few of the many causes of stressful working conditions. Occupational stress is one of the major health hazards of the modern workplace. It accounts for much of the physical illness, substance abuse, and family problems experienced by millions of workers. Occupational stress can affect health of the employee when the stressors of the workplace exceed the employee’s ability to have some control over their situation or to cope in other ways. Also, occupational stress and stressful working conditions have been linked to low productivity, absenteeism, and increased rates of accidents on and off the job.

Acute, or short-term, stress causes an immediate reaction in the body. If the threat or demand passes quickly, the body generally returns to normal. However, with prolonged stress, many health problems can develop. Stress produces a range of undesirable, expensive, and debilitating consequences, which affect both individuals and organizations.
In organizational setting, stress is now a days becoming a major contributor to health and performance problems of individuals, and unwanted occurrences and costs for organizations. Consequences of occupational stress can be grouped into those on individual and those on organizational level. On the individual level, there are three main subgroups of strains:

Under the first sub group falls unwanted feelings and behaviours such as job dissatisfaction, lower motivation, low employee morale, less organizational commitment, lowered overall quality of work life, absenteeism, turnover, intention to leave the job, lower productivity, decreased quantity and quality of work, inability to make sound decisions, more theft, sabotage and work stoppage, occupational burnout, alienation, and increased smoking and alcohol intake.

As a second sub group physiological disease such as increased blood pressure and pulse rate, cardiovascular diseases, high cholesterol, high blood sugar, insomnia, headaches, infections, skin problems, suppressed immune system, injuries, and fatigue afflict the staff.

In the third sub groups psychological diseases such as psychological distress, depression, anxiousness, passiveness or aggressiveness, boredom, lose of self-confidence and self-esteem, lose of concentration, feelings of futility, impulsiveness and disregarding of social norms and values, dissatisfaction with job and live, losing of contact with reality, and emotional fatigue attack the labourers.

On the organizational level, consequences of occupational stress can be grouped into two major subgroups. They are organizational symptoms and organizational costs.
Organizational symptoms, often cause discontent and poor morale among the workforce, performance or productivity losses, low quality products and services, poorer relationship with clients, suppliers, partners and regulatory authorities, losing customers, bad publicity, damage to the corporate image and reputation, missed opportunities, disruption to production, high accident and mistake rates, high labour turnover, loss of valuable staff, increased sick-leave, permanent vacancies, premature retirement, diminished cooperation, poor internal communications, more internal conflicts, and dysfunctional workplace climate.

Organizational costs, on the other hand cause, costs of reduced performance or productivity, high replacement costs in connection with labour turnover (increase in recruitment, training and retraining costs), increased sick pay, increased health-care costs and disability payments, higher grievance and litigation or compensation costs, and costs of equipment damage.

As evident from the above, consequences of occupational stress, both on individual and organizational level are a real cost to BHEL. Because of its significant economic implications, stress is not only a huge burden, but one of the fastest growing concerns to this organization, especially given the high levels of competition and environmental turbulence, which do not allow the organization to bear costs such as those caused by stress. In addition to that in this organization, the occupational stress and stressful working conditions have been linked to low productivity, absenteeism, and increased rates of accidents on and off the job. Therefore the level of occupational stress experienced by the blue collar employees is assessed and analyzed in this chapter.
4.1 PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

Generally the level of occupational stress experienced by the respondents varies according to their individual demographic variables such as, sex, age, educational qualifications, experience, income and department wise distribution of the respondents. Therefore the profile of the respondents is given in the Tables on the basis of which the analysis has been made in the study.

4.1.1 AGE WISE CLASSIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENTS

The age wise classification of the sample respondents is given in Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group (Years)</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>Supporting Technical staff</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Artisans</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 45</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.81</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>23.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51.72</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>39.91</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45.61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>41.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 55</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>31.03</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>34.08</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>35.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 4.1 shows that out of 360 respondents as much as 23 per cent of the respondents are in the age group of below 45 years, followed by nearly 41 per cent of the respondents who are in the age group of 45-55 years. About 35 per cent of the respondents fall in the age group of above 55 years. It is understood from the Table the work force of the organization is dominated by the age group of above 45 years.
4.1.2 DEPARTMENT WISE DISTRIBUTION OF THE RESPONDENTS

The department wise distribution of the sample respondents in the study unit is given in Table 4.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>Supporting Technical staff</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Artisans</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boiler – Performance And Proposal</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>20.69</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>09.80</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>09.80</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30.04</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material planning</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17.22</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation, planning control</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15.83</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>07.84</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

It is observed from the Table 4.2 that out of 360 sample respondents, nearly 28 per cent of the respondents are working in the material planning department, followed by 17 per cent working in the engineering department, 16 per cent are working in the commercial department and 15 per cent of the employees are working in the Boiler – performance and proposal department.
4.1.3 LENGTH OF SERVICE

The experience of the sample respondents in the study unit is given in Table 4.3

### TABLE 4.3

LENGTH OF SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work experience (Years)</th>
<th>Supporting Technical staff</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Artisans</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>20.69</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16.59</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.81</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>15.69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 -20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48.28</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>51.56</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40.35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50.98</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>49.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>31.03</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>31.84</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>32.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 4.3 shows the working experience of the sample respondents in the organization. Out of 360 employees, nearly fifty per cent of the employees have the experience of 10 -20 years and 33 per cent of the employees have more than 20 years of experience, followed by 18 per cent who have below 10 years of experience. It is understood from the Table that out of 360 total respondents nearly three-fourth of the employees have more than 10 years of experience. It indicates that the organization has a large number of experienced workforces, which is a vital factor to the organization.
4.1.4 MONTHLY INCOME

The monthly income of the respondents in the organization is given in Table 4.4

TABLE 4.4
MONTHLY INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income(Rs)</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>Supporting Technical staff</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Artisans</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25,000</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>31.03</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>32.74</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.57</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>31.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 - 35,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44.83</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>41.26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43.86</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45.09</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 35,000</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.81</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>26.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 4.4 shows the income wise distribution of the employees. Out of 360 employees, as much as 43 per cent of the employees monthly income is in between Rs. 25,000 and Rs. 35,000. About 31 per cent of the employees’ monthly income is below Rs. 25,000 and one-fourth of the employees’ monthly income is more than Rs. 35,000.
4.1.5 NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS

The number of dependents of the respondents is presented in Table 4.5

**TABLE 4.5**

**NUMBER OF DEPENDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of dependents</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>Supporting Technical staff</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Artisans</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>63.23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43.86</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43.14</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26.46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.37</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>28.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>20.69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.49</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 4.5 shows the number of dependents who depend on the respondents. Out of 360 respondents, majority (56 per cent) of the respondents have less than 4 dependents. About 29 per cent of the respondents have 4 - 5 dependents and only 16 per cent of the respondents have more than 5 dependents. Table 4.5 indicates that irrespective of the category, majority of the respondents have small families.
4.1.6 EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

The educational qualifications of the respondents is given in Table 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational qualifications</th>
<th>Supporting Technical staff</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Artisans</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITI</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55.17</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>61.88</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>50.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29.15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Graduate</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>08.97</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>24.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 4.6 indicates the educational qualifications of the respondents. About 51 per cent of the respondents are ITI holders, one-fourth of the respondents are diploma holders in technical education. About 24 per cent of the respondents are undergraduates. The whole of clerical and office staff do not have any kind of technical education.
4.2 OCCUPATIONAL STRESS

Though occupational stress initially arises from constituent factors of job and its psycho-physical environment, these factors are not inherently stressors. In fact, personal characteristics of the employee and his cognitive appraisal of the job factor in the framework of his capacity and resources are the main reasons for the extent of stress he would experience from a job factor or situation. This is the reason why workers can only hypothetically predict the potency of the job factors or situation for causing stress. Workers cannot categorize or generalize any work-setting variable as a universal stressor. However, some job factors or work conditions such as extreme heat or cold, chronic dangers, demotion and loss of job are likely to cause stress to a majority of workers. But stress resulted from these factors also vary from one worker to another. The pressures caused from the job factors, in fact, are mediated by the personal characteristics of the focal worker. Moreover, certain psychological and behavioural specialties of the employee also become consistent sources of stress to him. Thus, the researcher has broadly classified all the sources of occupational stress in two categories, i.e., individual characteristics and work setting variables.

Individual Characteristics

Personality characteristics of the employees are one of the most prominent factors which interfere with their job behaviour. Employees’ responses to work demands and pressures are largely influenced by their personality characteristics, and psychological and behavioural patterns, such as beliefs and values, aspiration and expectancy, need structure, attributions, locus of control, personality traits, coping skills and cognitive patterns.
An important personal characteristic which influences the experience of stress is sense of control. Control refers to the perception by the individual worker that his or her action results in expected outcomes particularly those which are important for the workers. Sense of control has been found to have significant effect on people’s response to stress. Sense of control (ability to self-pace in work) over task and work environment cause fewer symptoms of stress. Individuals with hardy personality are likely to experience less stress and strains because of these characteristics of commitment, and capability of control and facing challenges. Low level of tolerance and patience, rigidity, low self-esteem, high anxiety, intra-psychic conflicts, external locus of control, and certain cognitive patterns enhance employee’s susceptibility, to experience more stress as well as strain.

**Work Setting Variables**

**Job Role:** Job role is a major source of satisfaction as well as frustration for the employees. Certain characteristics or inadequacies of job role have been noted as prominent source of occupational stress. The concept of role is the key concept in understanding the integration of the individual in a system. Every organization is composed of a number of positions and specific roles associated with these positions. Position or office is essentially a relational concept, defining one position in terms of its relationship to other and to the system as a whole.
Normally, performance of a role satisfies various needs of its occupant. But sometimes it becomes a potential source of stress too for the role-occupant. The problem a role-occupant faces today is that of managing the complex structure of roles by achieving an integration of one’s self with the system of other roles as well as integration of various roles a person may be occupying.

**Role Conflict:** Role conflict arises when various members of the role set, hold quite different or conflicting role expectations toward a focal person. They may impose pressures on that focal person toward different kinds of behaviour at a time. To the extent that these different role pressures (expectations) give rise to role forces within him, he will experience a psychological conflict. Actual degree of objective role conflict depends on the configuration of role pressures actually exerted by role senders (member of the role set) on the role-occupant.

**Role overload:** When the role occupant feels that there are too many expectations from the significant members in his role set, he experiences role overload. There are two aspects of this stress, quantitative and qualitative. The former refers to having ‘too much to do’ while latter refers to ‘too difficult to do’.

**Role Ambiguity:** Role ambiguity arises when the individual is not clear about various expectations people have from his role. Role ambiguity may also be due to lack of information regarding role and its enactment to the role occupant.

**Inter-Role Distance:** Individual occupies more than one role at a time. His occupational role may come into conflict with family or social roles. These conflicts among different roles represent inter-role distance.

**Role-Stagnation:** This kind of stress is the result of gap between demand outgrow of previous role to occupy new roles effectively. With advance of an individual his role also grows and changes. With this change in role, the need for
taking his new role becomes crucial. This is the problem of role growth. This becomes an acute problem specially when an individual enters new roles after occupying a role for a long period.

**Role Erosion:** This type of role stress is the function of the role occupant’s feeling that some functions which should properly be the part of his role are transferred to or being performed by some other. This can also happen when the functions are performed by the role occupant but the credit goes to someone else.

**Role Isolation:** This situation of role stress arises from psychological distance between the occupant’s role and other roles in the same role set. The main criterion of role isolation is frequency of interaction with other roles in the role set. In the absence of strong linkage, the stress of role isolation may be high. The gap between the desired and the existing linkage would indicate the degree of role isolation.

**Personal Inadequacy:** Role stress also arises when the role occupant feels that he does not have the necessary skills and training for effectively performing the function expected from his role. This is found to happen when proper placement are not made and the organization do not impart periodic training to enable the employee to cope with the fast changes both within and outside the organization.

**Self-Role Distance:** When the expectation from one’s role goes against his self-concept, he feels this kind of stress. This is essentially a conflict arising out of incongruence between personal attributes of an employee and the requirement of his job role.

**Resource Inadequacy:** This type of role stress is evident when the role occupant feels that he is not provided with adequate resources for smoothly performing the functions expected from his role.
Job Characteristics and Attributes: Characteristics of the job are a very common source of employees’ satisfactions, frustrations, and stress. Task complexity and difficulty, quantitative and qualitative demands of the job, and employees’ controllability over task are the frequent sources of occupational stress. The pace at which an employee is required to do work is one of the characteristics of the job causing stress to the employee. Work pace is concerned with whom or what controls the speed of work.

Another important characteristic of the job is its attributes, which refers to the extent of opportunity it provides to satisfy various needs of the employees, such as autonomy, social interaction, power and autonomy, use of knowledge and abilities. If the jobs lack enrichment and provide little opportunity to satisfy these needs, they become stressful to their incumbents.

Physical Work Condition: Another set of factors in work setting which cause stress are related to qualities of physical work environment. Inadequate, taxing, or hazardous physical conditions at work, such as insufficient or excessive lighting, continued loud noise, extreme cold or heat, fluctuation in temperature, and crowded workplace. These physical qualities of work environment cause direct sensory stress and indirect psychological stress through their potentiality for causing negative health consequences.

4.3 OCCUPATIONAL STRESS SCORE

A well developed and widely used Occupational Stress Index (OSI) in the Indian context (Srivastava and Singh, 1981) was chosen to assess the occupational stress of the sample. The occupational stress index consists of 46 statements. To estimate the levels of occupational stress add up the scores on all the statements. If the score is below 115, employees have low
occupational stress, if the score is between 116 and 161, employees are highly stressed.

This index examines 12 particular dimensions:

1. **Role overload**: Role overload covers job situations like workload, staff insufficiency, lack of time, personal problems, job dissatisfaction.

2. **Role ambiguity**: Role ambiguity is characterized by vague and insufficient information related to job role, vague and poor planning of job, vague expectations by colleagues and supervisors.

3. **Role conflict**: Contradictory instructions from higher officers, interference of officials into the working conditions, vague instructions and insufficient facilities regarding new assignments, contradiction between office instructions and formal working procedures, difficulty in implementing new procedures and policies, etc., are included in this dimension.

4. **Group and political pressures**: This dimension covers the difficulty to adjust with the political and group pressures and formal rules and instructions, compulsion to perform unwillingly, maintenance of group conformity, violation of formal procedures and policies.

5. **Responsibility for persons**: This dimension covers such aspects as the thrust of responsibility of other persons, the responsibility of other employees' future, responsibility for the progress of organization.

6. **Under-participation**: This dimension covers job areas such as the position of the person in the organization - that with high or low power; the acceptance of suggestions made by other persons.
7. **Powerlessness:** This dimension covers areas such as acceptance of decisions taken by the person among employees, acceptance of suggestions regarding training programs of employees, lack of coordination of interest and opinion in making appointments for important posts.

8. **Poor peer relationships:** The area covered under this dimension refers to poor interpersonal relationships with colleagues, colleagues' attempt to defame and malign the employee as unsuccessful, colleagues' lack of cooperation in solving administrative and industrial problems, lack of cooperation and team spirit of employees of the organization.

9. **Intrinsic impoverishment:** Monotonous nature of assignments, opportunity to utilize abilities and experience independently, opportunity to develop aptitude and proficiency, place of suggestion in problem solving are included in this area.

10. **Low status:** This dimension covers respect received by an employee from others, the role of nature of the job in enhancing social status, due significance given by higher authorities to the post and work.

11. **Strenuous working conditions:** This dimension covers tense circumstances in which work has to be done, risky and complicated assignments, unsatisfactory working conditions from the point of view of welfare and convenience.

12. **Unprofitability:** Low salary, absence of rewards, and lack of motivation are included here.
The score obtained by the respondents for sources of occupational stress such as role overload, Role ambiguity, Role conflict, group pressure, Responsibility for persons, under participation, Powerlessness, Poor peer relations, Intrinsic Impoverishment, Low Status, Working condition and Low profitability are presented in the following Tables.

4.4 ROLE OVERLOAD

The occupational stress index consists of 46 statements, of which six statements are for role overload. If the score is below 15, employees have low occupational stress, if the score is between 16 and 21, employees’ occupational stress is of moderate level, and if the score is above 21, employees are highly stressed in relation to role overload. The level of occupational stress in relation to role overload experienced by the employees in the study unit is presented and analyzed in Table 4.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROLE OVERLOAD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Technical staff</td>
<td>24.21</td>
<td>80.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>77.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td>21.84</td>
<td>72.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>57.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N = 360)</td>
<td>22.29</td>
<td>74.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

From Table 4.7, the following observations may be made: The overall average mean score percentage obtained by all sample respondents (360) was 74.29 per cent. It was 80.70 per cent in respect of supporting technical staff, 77.76 per cent in respect artisans, 72.81 per cent in respect of unskilled and semiskilled staff and 57.13 per cent in respect of clerical and office staff.
It can be inferred from the Table that all the respondents have experienced high level of occupational stress with regard to role overload except clerical and office staff. They have experienced moderate level of occupational stress.

4.5 ROLE AMBIGUITY

There are four statements framed in the occupational stress index to measure the level of occupational stress in relation to role ambiguity. If the score is below 10, employees have low occupational stress, if the score is between 11 and 14, employees occupational stress is of moderate level, and if the score is above 14, employees are highly stressed in relation to role ambiguity. The level of occupational stress experienced by the employees in relation to role ambiguity is presented and analyzed in Table 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Technical staff</td>
<td>08.38</td>
<td>41.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>58.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td>09.44</td>
<td>47.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>38.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N = 360)</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>52.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

From Table 4.8, it is evident that the overall average score obtained in respect of role ambiguity was 52.32 per cent. It was 58.19 per cent (highest) among artisans and 47.19 per cent among Unskilled & Semiskilled staff. The Supporting Technical staff have secured the mean score of 41.90 per cent and clerical and office staff have obtained the mean score of about 39 per cent. Therefore it is presumed that the Supporting Technical staff, Unskilled & Semiskilled staff, Clerical & Office Staff have experienced low level of
occupational stress where as Artisans have affected moderate level of occupational stress.

4.6 ROLE CONFLICT

There are two statements framed to assess the level of occupational stress with regard to role conflict. If the score is below 05, employees have low occupational stress, if the score is between 06 and 07, employees' occupational stress is of moderate level, and if the score is above 07, employees are highly stressed in relation to role conflict. The level of occupational stress experienced by the employees in relation to role conflict is presented and analyzed in Table 4.9.

| TABLE 4.9 |
| ROLE CONFLICT |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Technical staff</td>
<td>07.24</td>
<td>72.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>06.02</td>
<td>60.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td>07.37</td>
<td>73.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>04.59</td>
<td>45.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N = 360)</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>61.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

It is understood from the Table 4.9 that the overall average score obtained by the sample respondents in respect of role conflict was 61.29 per cent. The mean score obtained by the Unskilled & Semiskilled staff was 73.68 per cent and the score obtained by the Supporting Technical staff was 72.41 per cent. The artisans have secured the mean score of 60.17 per cent and clerical and office staff have got only 45.90 per cent. It can be inferred from the Table that all the respondents have experienced moderate level of stress except Clerical & Office Staff. They have experienced low level of stress with regards to role conflict.
4.7 GROUP PRESSURE

To measure the level of occupational stress in relation to group pressure, three statements were framed in the occupational stress index. If the score is below 7.5, employees have low occupational stress, if the score is between 8 and 10.5, employees occupational stress is of moderate level, and if the score is above 10.5, employees are highly stressed in relation to group pressure. The level of occupational stress in relation to group pressure experienced by the employees is presented and analyzed in Table 4.10.

**TABLE 4.10**

**GROUP PRESSURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Technical staff</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>60.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>07.34</td>
<td>48.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>52.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>51.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N = 360)</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>51.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 4.10 makes it clear that the overall mean score obtained by the 360 respondents in group pressure was 51.37 per cent. The Supporting Technical staff have secured the mean score of 60.78 per cent and Unskilled & Semiskilled staff have obtained the mean score of 52.51 per cent. The clerical and office staff have secured 51.40 per cent and artisans have obtained a mean score of 48.93 per cent. It indicates that the Supporting Technical staff have experienced high level of stress and Unskilled & Semiskilled and Clerical & Office Staff have been by affected moderate level of stress where as Artisans have been affected by low level of occupational stress in relation to group pressure.
4.8 RESPONSIBILITY FOR PERSONS

The occupational stress index consists of two statements for measuring the level of occupational stress in relation to responsibility for persons. If the score is below 05, employees have low occupational stress, if the score is between 06 and 07, employees' occupational stress is of moderate level, and if the score is above 07, employees are highly stressed in relation to responsibility for persons. The level of occupational stress experienced by the employees in relation to responsibility for persons is presented and analyzed in Table 4.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Technical staff</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>78.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>69.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>85.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>61.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N = 360)</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>71.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 4.11 indicates the mean score obtained by the respondents in respect of responsibility for persons. The average mean score obtained by all respondents is 71.41 per cent. The highest mean score i.e., 85.44 per cent was secured by Unskilled & Semiskilled staff. The Supporting Technical staff have obtained the mean score of 78.60 per cent. The artisans have secured the mean score of 69.07 per cent where as clerical and office staff have obtained the mean score of 61.80 per cent. It is presumed from the Table that all the respondents have high level of occupational stress except clerical and office staff; they have experienced moderate level stress in relation to responsibility for persons.
4.9 UNDER PARTICIPATION

There are six statements in the occupational stress index for assessing level of occupational stress in relation to under participation. If the score is below 15, employees have low occupational stress, if the score is between 16 and 21, employees’ occupational stress is of moderate level, and if the score is above 21, employees are highly stressed in relation to under participation. The level of occupational stress experienced by the employees in relation to under participation is presented and analyzed in Table 4.12.

**TABLE 4.12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Technical staff</td>
<td>20.41</td>
<td>68.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>88.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td>27.36</td>
<td>91.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>74.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N = 360)</td>
<td>25.63</td>
<td>85.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 4.12 reveals that the average mean score obtained by all the categories of respondents was 85.46 per cent in respect of under participation. Among the respondents unskilled and semiskilled staff have been highly affected by occupational stress in relation to under participation followed by artisans. The mean score obtained by the clerical and office staff and supporting technical staff are 74.07 per cent and 68.05 per cent respectively. Therefore it is presumed that all the respondents have been affected by high level of occupational stress except supporting technical staff who have been affected by moderate level of stress.
4.10 POWERLESSNESS

Five statements were framed in the occupational stress index for measuring the level of occupational stress with regard to powerlessness. If the score is below 12.5, employees have low occupational stress, if the score is between 13 and 17.5, employees’ occupational stress is of moderate level, and if the score is above 17.5, employees are highly stressed in relation to role overload.

The level of occupational stress experienced by the employees in relation to powerlessness is presented and analyzed in Table 4.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Technical staff</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>69.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>20.44</td>
<td>81.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td>20.85</td>
<td>83.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td>64.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N = 360)</td>
<td>19.64</td>
<td>78.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 4.13 shows that the overall mean score obtained by all the respondents for occupational stress with regard to powerlessness was 78.54 per cent. The Unskilled & Semiskilled staff have obtained the mean score of 83.44 per cent and Artisans have secured 47.80 per cent. The Supporting Technical staff have secured the mean score of 69.24 per cent and Clerical & Office Staff have obtained 64.32 per cent. The mean score obtained by the respondents indicates that the Artisans, unskilled and semiskilled staff and clerical and office staff have experienced high level of occupational stress where as Supporting Technical staff have experienced moderate level of stress in relation to powerlessness.
4.11 POOR PEER RELATIONS

There are four statements in the occupational stress index to measure occupation stress of the employees in relation to poor peer relations. If the score is below 10, employees have low occupational stress. If the score is between 11 and 14, employees’ occupational stress is of moderate level, and if the score is above 14, employees are highly stressed in relation to poor peer relations. The level of occupational stress experienced by the employees in relation to poor peer relations is presented and analyzed in Table 4.14.

**TABLE 4.14**

**POOR PEER RELATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Technical staff</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>52.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>09.52</td>
<td>47.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>57.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>33.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N = 360)</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>47.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 4.14 reveals that the average mean score obtained by all respondents for occupational stress with regards to poor peer relations was 47.63 per cent. Among the total respondents, supporting technical staff and Unskilled & Semiskilled staff have been affected by moderate level of stress and Artisans and Clerical & Office Staff have experienced low level of stress in relation to poor peer relations. Therefore it can be inferred from the Table that the good peer relations prevailed among the respondents in the organization.
4.12 INTRINSIC IMPOVERISHMENT

Three statements were framed in the occupational stress index for measuring the level of occupational stress with regard to intrinsic impoverishment. If the score is below 7.5, employees have low occupational stress, if the score is between 8 and 10.5, employees' occupational stress is of moderate level, and if the score is above 10.5, employees are highly stressed in relation to group pressure. The level of occupational stress in relation to intrinsic impoverishment experienced by the employees is presented and analyzed in Table 4.15.

**TABLE 4.15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Average score in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Technical staff</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>77.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>89.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>99.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>67.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N = 360)</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>86.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 4.15 reveals that the average mean score obtained by all the respondents was 86.72 per cent for occupational stress in relation to intrinsic impoverishment. Among 360 sample respondents, the Unskilled & Semiskilled have secured the mean score of 99.06 per cent and Artisans have obtained the mean score of 89.18 per cent. The Supporting Technical staff have obtained a mean score of 77.47 per cent and Clerical & Office Staff have secured 67.33 per cent. It can be inferred from the Table that all the respondents irrespective of category have been affected by occupational stress with regard to intrinsic impoverishment.
4.13 LOW STATUS

The occupational stress index consists of three statements for measuring occupational stress with regard to low status. If the score is below 7.5, employees have low occupational stress, if the score is between 8 and 10.5, employees occupational stress is of moderate level, and if the score is above 10.5, employees are highly stressed in relation to group pressure. The level of occupational stress in relation to low status experienced by the employees is presented and analyzed in Table 4.16.

**TABLE 4.16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Technical staff</td>
<td>08.00</td>
<td>53.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>73.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>78.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>08.22</td>
<td>54.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N = 360)</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>70.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

It is understood from the Table 4.16 that the mean score obtained by the respondents was 70.23 per cent for occupational stress in relation to low status. Out of 360 total respondents, the highest score was (78.48 per cent) secured by Unskilled & Semiskilled staff followed by Artisans who secured 73.85 per cent. The supporting technical staff have obtained the mean score of 53.33 per cent and clerical and office staff have secured 54.80 per cent. Among the respondents, Artisans and Unskilled & Semiskilled staff have experienced high level of stress whereas Supporting Technical staff and Clerical & Office Staff have experienced moderate level of stress in relation to low status.
4.14 WORKING CONDITION

The working condition prevailing in the organization is one of the main sources of occupational stress. Six statements were framed in the occupational stress index for assessing occupational stress in relation to working condition. If the score is below 15, employees have low occupational stress. If the score is between 16 and 21, employees occupational stress is of moderate level, and if the score is above 21, employees are highly stressed in relation to working condition. The level of occupational stress experienced by the employees in relation to working condition is presented and analyzed in Table 4.17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Technical staff</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>56.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>19.41</td>
<td>64.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>48.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>14.55</td>
<td>48.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N = 360)</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td>59.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

It is observed from the Table 4.17 that the mean score obtained by the respondents was 59.19 for occupational stress in respect of working conditions. Among them artisans have secured 64.69 per cent, supporting technical staff have obtained 56.90 per cent, clerical and office staff have obtained 48.50 per cent and unskilled and semiskilled staff have obtained 48.36 per cent. Therefore, it can be inferred from the Table that irrespective of categories all the respondents have experienced moderate level of occupational stress in relation to working conditions.
4.15 LOW PROFITABILITY

Low profitability is in the sense inadequate monetary resources for smoothly performing the functions expected from employee role, which is one of the prime source of occupational stress. Two statements were framed to assess the level of occupational stress in relation to low profitability. If the score is below 5, employees have low occupational stress. If the score is between 5 and 7, employees’ occupational stress is of moderate level, and if the score is above 7, employees are highly stressed in relation to low profitability. The level of occupational stress experienced by the employees in relation to low profitability is presented and analyzed in Table 4.18.

**TABLE 4.18**

**LOW PROFITABILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Technical staff</td>
<td>08.07</td>
<td>80.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>08.44</td>
<td>84.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td>08.23</td>
<td>82.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>08.80</td>
<td>88.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N = 360)</td>
<td>08.43</td>
<td>84.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

It is observed from the Table 4.18 that the mean score obtained by the respondents was 84.28 per cent for occupational stress in respect of low profitability. Out of 360 sample respondents, clerical and office staff have secured maximum score of 88 per cent, followed by artisans 84.37 per cent. The unskilled and semiskilled staff have secured 82.28 per cent and supporting technical staff have obtained 80.69 per cent. It is noteworthy to mention that all the respondents have secured the mean score of more than 80 per cent.
Therefore, it can be inferred that all the respondents have been affected by high level of occupational stress in respect of low profitability.

4.16 OVERALL OCCUPATIONAL STRESS

To estimate the levels of overall occupational stress 46 statements were framed in the occupational stress index, and the scores on all the statements were added up. If the score is below 115, employees have low occupational stress, if the score is between 116 and 161, employees occupational stress is of moderate level, and if the score is above 161, employees are highly stressed. The overall occupational stress experienced by the respondents is presented in Table 4.19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Technical staff</td>
<td>150.86</td>
<td>67.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>171.83</td>
<td>74.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td>164.17</td>
<td>71.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>129.96</td>
<td>57.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N = 360)</td>
<td>162.99</td>
<td>70.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 4.19 shows the overall occupational stress experienced by the sample respondents. The respondents have secured the mean score of 70.87 per cent for overall occupational stress. The artisans have obtained the maximum score of 74.71 per cent followed by unskilled and semiskilled staff who have secured 71.38 per cent. The supporting technical staff have obtained 67.05 per cent and clerical and office staff have secured 57.76 per cent. It is observed from the Table that the Artisans and Unskilled and semiskilled employees have been affected by high level of stress whereas Supporting Technical staff and Clerical & Office Staff have experienced moderate level of occupational stress.
The overall occupational stress experienced by the respondents is also presented in figure 4.1.

**FIGURE 4.1**

**OVERALL OCCUPATIONAL STRESS**

![Bar chart showing mean occupational stress scores for different categories of respondents](image-url)
4.17 CLASSIFICATION OF RATING

The occupational stress experienced by the respondents is classified into three categories namely low, moderate and high level. If the employee obtained the score below 115, it is considered as low. If the score is between 116 and 161, it is considered as moderate level, and if the score is above 161, employees are considered to be highly stressed.

**TABLE 4.20**
CLASSIFICATION OF RATING – OCCUPATIONAL STRESS SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of stress</th>
<th>Supporting Technical staff</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Artisans</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.37</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44.83</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>68.61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.82</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47.06</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>57.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37.93</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19.73</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49.12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.57</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>26.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 4.20 indicates the level of occupational stress experienced by the respondents. Out of 360 respondents about 58 per cent of the respondents have revealed moderate rating, 26 per cent of the respondents have obtained the high rating and nearly 16 per cent of the respondents have expressed low rating in respect of overall occupational stress. Nearly 45 per cent of the supporting technical staff, 69 per cent of the artisans, 30 per cent of the unskilled and semiskilled staff and 31 per cent of the clerical and office staff have obtained low rating.
Similarly 38 per cent of the supporting technical staff, 20 per cent of the artisans, 49 per cent of the unskilled and semiskilled staff, 21 per cent clerical and office staff have secured high rating. About 17 per cent of the supporting technical staff, 12 per cent of the artisans, 21 per cent of the unskilled and semiskilled staff, 21 per cent clerical and office staff have secured high rating. It is understood from the study that the majority of the respondents have experienced moderate rating and one-fourth of the respondents have experienced high occupational stress.

4.18 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS-OCCUPATIONAL STRESS

In order to find whether there is any significant relationship between categories of respondents and occupational stress experienced by them, a null hypothesis is framed and tested with the help ‘t’ test. ‘t’ test values were calculated for different combination of categories of respondents. The t – values calculated were compared with the Table ‘t’ values (at 5% level and at 1% level) to test the significance of variation in respect of occupational stress experienced by the different categories of the respondents.

The results were tabulated and interpreted in respect of overall occupational stress in Table 4.21.

Null hypothesis

Irrespective of categories, all the respondents experience the same level of occupational stress
TABLE 4.21

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS-OCCUPATIONAL STRESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting technical staff - Artisans</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>5.1424</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting and technical staff - Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>5.7568</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting and technical staff - Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>5.4212</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans - Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68.28</td>
<td>6.1725</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans - Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68.28</td>
<td>6.0514</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled - Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>1.3899</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 5% level; ** Significant both at 5% level and 1% level.

It is inferred from the Table 4.21 that there is a significant difference between level of occupational stress and the different categories of respondents except the category of unskilled & Semi-skilled and clerical & office staff.

4.19 INDIVIDUAL DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND LEVEL OF OCCUPATIONAL STRESS

To find out whether there is any significant difference between individual demographic variables such as, age, department wise distribution, experience, income, number of dependents and educational qualifications of the respondents and the occupational stress experienced by the respondents, a null hypothesis is framed and tested with the help of chi-square test.
Null hypothesis

There is no significant difference between individual demographic variables and the occupational stress experienced by the respondents.

The result is given in Table 4.22

**TABLE 4.22**

**CHI-SQUARE TEST RESULT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic variable</th>
<th>Chi-Square Test – Value</th>
<th>Table value 5% level</th>
<th>Table value 1% level</th>
<th>$H_0$ Accepted / Rejected</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>*Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department wise distribution</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>18.31</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>* Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of dependents</td>
<td>90.60</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualifications</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 5% level; ** Significant both at 5% level and 1% level.

It is clear from the Table 4.22 that there is a significant association between age, income, experience, number of dependents, educational qualifications and occupational stress experienced by the respondents. However there is no significant association between department wise distribution and occupational stress experienced by the respondents.

**4.20 INTER CORRELATION MATRIX FOR OCCUPATIONAL STRESS**

In order to analyze whether there is any positive or negative correlation between overall occupational stress and the different sources of stress, a null hypotheses is framed and tested with the help of inter correlation, which is shown in Table 4.23, 24, 25, 26.
**TABLE 4.23**

**INTER CORRELATION MATRIX FOR OCCUPATIONAL STRESS – SUPPORTING TECHNICAL STAFF (N = 29)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>ROL</th>
<th>RA</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>UP</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>PPR</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>LP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>X4</td>
<td>X5</td>
<td>X6</td>
<td>X7</td>
<td>X8</td>
<td>X9</td>
<td>X10</td>
<td>X11</td>
<td>X12</td>
<td>X13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROL</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>0.88**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>0.95**</td>
<td>0.93**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>0.79**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.87**</td>
<td>0.91**</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>0.96**</td>
<td>0.93**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>0.71**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>0.86**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.94**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.89**</td>
<td>0.95**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPR</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.81**</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.91**</td>
<td>0.94**</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
<td>0.87**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.76**</td>
<td>0.92**</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.93**</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
<td>0.94**</td>
<td>0.85**</td>
<td>0.41*</td>
<td>0.93**</td>
<td>0.78**</td>
<td>0.96**</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.79**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>0.93**</td>
<td>0.89**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.95**</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.91**</td>
<td>0.86**</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>0.97**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at 5% and 1% level. * Significant at 1% level.**
Where: OS = overall occupational stress; ROL = Role overload; RA = Role Ambiguity; RC = Role Conflict; GP = Group Pressure; RP = Responsibility of person; UP = Under Participation; PL = Powerlessness; PPR = Poor peer relations; II = Intrinsic impoverishment; LS = Low status; WC = Working condition; LP = Low Profitability.

**Null Hypothesis Ho:**

There is no correlation between overall occupational stress and the different sources of stress.

The test statistic used to test the null hypothesis is

\[ t = \frac{r}{\sqrt{\frac{1-r^2}{N-2}}} \]

Table 4.23 shows that there is no significant relationship between Low status and overall occupational stress, responsibility of person, Intrinsic Impoverishment. There is a positive correlation between overall occupational stress and poor peer relations, low status and role ambiguity, role conflict, group pressure and powerlessness, but they are not statistically significant and other source of occupational stress are statistically significant with each other.
### TABLE 4.24

**INTER CORRELATION MATRIX FOR OCCUPATIONAL STRESS – ARTISANS (N = 223)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>ROL</th>
<th>RA</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>UP</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>PPR</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>LP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.96**</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>0.95**</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X8</td>
<td>0.88**</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X9</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.96**</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X10</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.95**</td>
<td>0.73**</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.93**</td>
<td>0.89**</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X11</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X12</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X13</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.97**</td>
<td>0.95**</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at 5% and 1% level. * Significant at 1% level.**
Table 4.24 reveals that there is no significant relationship between low status and overall occupational stress, responsibility of person and intrinsic impoverishment. There is a positive correlation between overall occupational stress and poor peer relations, low status and role ambiguity, role conflict, group pressure and powerlessness, but they are not statistically significant and other source of occupational stress are statistically significant with each other.
### TABLE 4.25

**INTER CORRELATION MATRIX FOR OCCUPATIONAL STRESS – UNSKILLED & SEMISKILLED (N = 57)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>ROL</th>
<th>RA</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>UP</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>PPR</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>LP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>X4</td>
<td>X5</td>
<td>X6</td>
<td>X7</td>
<td>X8</td>
<td>X9</td>
<td>X10</td>
<td>X11</td>
<td>X12</td>
<td>X13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROL</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPR</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>0.93**</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.97**</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.96**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.95**</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>0.96**</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.96**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at 5% and 1% level. * Significant at 1% level.
Table 4.25 reveals that there is no significant relationship between overall occupational stress and role ambiguity, group pressure, poor peer relations and working conditions. Similarly, role ambiguity is also not significantly related to role overload, role conflict, responsibility of persons, under participation, powerlessness, intrinsic impoverishment, and low profitability. The role conflict is also not significantly correlated to group pressure and working condition. Group pressure is negatively correlated with role conflict, under participation, powerlessness, poor peer relations, intrinsic impoverishment, low status, working conditions, and low profitability.

Poor peer relations is negatively correlated with Powerlessness, intrinsic impoverishment, low status and low profitability. In addition to that the working condition is also negatively correlated with powerlessness, intrinsic impoverishment and low status.

Further, the Table indicates that there is a positive correlation between role overload and overall occupational stress, working condition and low profitability, overall occupational stress and role conflict, role ambiguity and poor peer relations and responsibility of person and under participation. Role conflict is also positively correlated with responsibility of person, under participation, powerlessness, intrinsic impoverishment and low status.
### TABLE 4.26

**INTER CORRELATION MATRIX FOR OCCUPATIONAL STRESS – CLERICAL AND OFFICE STAFF (N = 51)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>ROL</th>
<th>RA</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>UP</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>PPR</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>LP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.92**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.97**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.97**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X8</td>
<td>0.95**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X9</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.93**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X10</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X11</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X12</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.97**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X13</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.89**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at 5% and 1% level.
It is understood from the Table 4.26 that there is a significant relationship between overall occupational stress and role overload, role ambiguity, powerlessness, intrinsic impoverishment and low status. Role overload is significantly related with powerless, intrinsic impoverishment and low status. Role ambiguity is significantly related with role conflict, group pressure, responsibility of person, poor peer relations and working condition.

Role conflict is positively associated with group pressure, responsibility of person, poor peer relations and working conditions. Group pressure is significantly related with the responsibility of persons and working condition. Responsibility of person is significantly related to poor peer relation and working conditions. Under participation is related to low profitability alone. Powerlessness is significantly related to intrinsic impoverishment and low status. Poor peer relation is positively correlated with working conditions and intrinsic impoverishment is also positively correlated with low status and low profitability.

4.21 LEVEL OF PERCEIVED STRESS

The perceived stress is the stress arising from the personal life. It is the perception of the employees about the amount of stress they have experienced in their life. The basic fact is that whatever might be the reason, stress can impact an individual's as well as professional life.

Perceived stress was measured by using the Perceived Stress Scale, PSS (Cohen et al. 1983)- a 10 item, self-reported unidimensional instrument developed to measure a perceived stress in response to situation’s in a person’s life. Respondents report the prevalence of an item within the last month on a 5-point scale, ranging from never to very often.
The Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) is the most widely used psychological instrument for measuring the perception of stress. It is a measure of the degree to which situations in one’s life are appraised as stressful. Items were designed to tap how unpredictable, uncontrollable, and overloaded respondents find their lives. The scale also includes a number of direct queries about current levels of experienced stress. Moreover, the questions are of a general nature and hence are relatively free of content specific to any sub-population group. The questions in the PSS ask about feelings and thoughts during the last month. In each case, respondents are asked how often they felt a certain way.

While the scale does not have specific score cut offs, the total score obtained by the employee does give their perception of the amount of stress in their life. Total scores will range from zero to 40 points, with the higher scores indicating greater stress. The range of PSS scores was also divided into stratified quartiles. The upper two and lower two quartiles were combined (20 being the operational cut off value for the upper bound) and were labeled as stressed and not stressed respectively.

The level of perceived stress experienced by the respondents is presented and analyzed in Table 4.27.
Table 4.27 indicates the level of perceived stress experienced by the respondents. The overall mean score obtained by the respondents is 71.63 percent; it shows that all the respondents were influenced by the perceived stress to some extent. Out of 360 respondents, unskilled and semiskilled workers have secured the mean score of 79.65 percent (highest), artisans have secured the mean score of 73.62 percent, clerical and office staff have obtained the mean score of 61.91 percent and supporting technical staff have obtained the mean score of 57.67 percent. It is inferred from the Table that among the different category of blue collar employees unskilled and semi skilled employees have experienced high level of perceived stress followed by Artisans as compared to other two categories. The level of perceived stress experienced by the respondents is also presented in figure 4.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Technical staff</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>57.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>29.45</td>
<td>73.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td>31.86</td>
<td>79.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>24.76</td>
<td>61.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N = 360)</td>
<td>28.65</td>
<td>71.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data
FIGURE 4.2
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4.22 CLASSIFICATION OF RATING

The perceived stress experienced by the respondents is classified into two categories namely stressed and not stressed. If the employee obtained the mean score below 20, it is considered as not stressed and if the mean score is above 20, it means employees are stressed. Table 4.28 shows the classification of rating obtained by the respondents in respect of perceived stress.

| TABLE 4.28 |
| CLASSIFICATION OF RATING – PERCEIVED STRESS |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of stress</th>
<th>Supporting Technical staff</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Artisans</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stressed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72.41</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>78.03</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80.71</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62.75</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>75.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stressed</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21.97</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37.25</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>24.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

It is understood from the Table 4.28 that out of 360 respondents about 76 per cent of the respondents experienced perceived stress. Among the respondents, nearly 81 per cent of the unskilled and semi skilled workers were stressed and 19 per cent were not stressed. In case of artisans 78 per cent were stressed and 22 per cent were not stressed. Nearly 63 per cent of the clerical and office staff were stressed and 37 per cent were not stressed. Out of 29 supporting technical staff about 72 per cent were stressed and 28 per cent were not stressed. It can be inferred from the Table that irrespective of the category of the blue collar employees, majority of the employees are influenced by the stress arising from their personal life.
4.23 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS - PERCEIVED STRESS

In order to find whether there is any significant relationship between categories of respondents and perceived stress experienced by them, a null hypothesis is framed and tested with the help of ‘t’ test. ‘t’ test values were calculated for different combination of categories of respondents. The t – values calculated were compared with the Table ‘t’ values (at 5% level and at 1% level) to test the significance of variation in respect of perceived stress experienced by the different categories of the respondents. The results were tabulated and interpreted in respect of overall perceived stress.

Null hypothesis

There is no significant difference between categories of the respondents and their level of perceived stress.

**TABLE 4.29**

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS-PERCEIVED STRESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting and technical staff - Artisans</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>5.8955</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td>88.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting and technical staff - Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>2.9377</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting and technical staff - Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>5.1466</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans - Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td>88.39</td>
<td>7.011</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans - Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td>88.39</td>
<td>6.9301</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled - Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>0.8164</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 5% level; ** Significant both at 5% level and 1% level.
It is inferred from the Table 4.29 that irrespective of different categories, the level of perceived stress experienced by all the respondents significantly differ except that of the categories of unskilled & semi-skilled and clerical & office staff.

**4.24 INDIVIDUAL DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND LEVEL OF PERCEIVED STRESS**

To find out whether there is any significant difference between individual demographic variables such as, age, department wise distribution, experience, income, number of dependents and educational qualifications of the respondents and the perceived stress experienced by the respondents, a null hypothesis is framed and tested with the help of chi-square test.

**Null hypothesis:**

There is no significant difference between individual demographic variables and the perceived stress experienced by the respondents.

The result is given in Table 4.30

**TABLE 4.30**

**CHI-SQUARE TEST RESULT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic variable</th>
<th>Chi-Square Test – Value</th>
<th>Table value 5% level</th>
<th>Table value 1% level</th>
<th>H₀ Accepted / Rejected</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>19.70</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department wise distribution</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>*Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of dependents</td>
<td>25.40</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualifications</td>
<td>36.70</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 5% level; ** Significant both at 5% level and 1% level.
Table 4.30 shows that there is a significant relationship between age, department wise distribution, experience, number of dependents, educational qualifications and perceived stress experienced by the respondents. However there is no significant association between income and perceived stress experienced by the respondents.

4.25 JOB SATISFACTION

Job satisfaction is a complex phenomenon. It is related to various factors like personal nature, social atmosphere, cultural impact, environmental and financial conditions. The nature of the job is also an important factor in deciding the level of job satisfaction of employees. Job satisfaction is the long-term prospect of employment in an organization, which creates a sense of involvement and commitment to the job among employees.

Job satisfaction is in regard to one's feelings or state-of-mind regarding the nature of their work. It is an individual's attitude towards the job or it is an individual's reaction to the job itself. Job satisfaction is also a positive emotional state when a person gets fulfilled of his needs and aspirations. Job satisfaction may be general or specific.

Job satisfaction plays a vital role in the life of a man, because it affects positively on the personal and social adjustment of the individual. On the contrary, job dissatisfaction adversely affects on the physical and mental health of the individual. A highly satisfied employee need not necessarily be a profound performer. However, an employee, who is dissatisfied, can cause irreparable damage to the organizational effectiveness.

Job satisfaction leads to various problems. Some of these are absenteeism, turnover and negative publicity. Absenteeism is inversely related to
the level of job satisfaction. Job dissatisfaction produces a lack of will to work and forces the employee to go away from work as far as possible. It is also found that dissatisfied worker quits the job over time and seeks satisfaction elsewhere.

The study of job satisfaction helps to know the preference and problems of the employees. Many factors influence job satisfaction of employees such as the quality of one's relationship with their supervisor, the quality of the physical environment in which they work and degree of fulfillment in their work. First and the most important determinant is supervision and style of leadership. Employee oriented leadership style enhances a greater amount of job satisfaction. On the other hand production oriented leadership may cause low job satisfaction. Job content factors like achievement, responsibility, recognition and advancement leads to job satisfaction. The factors mainly influenced on the job satisfaction of employees are work environment, supervision, pay, promotion and fair rewards and relationship with co-workers.

The stress arising from these factors is considered as occupational stress and also known as organizational (occupational) stress where as stress arising from personal life of the employees is considered as extra-organizational (personal) stress. The basic fact is that whatever might be the reason, stress can impact on the job satisfaction, which ultimately affects the well-being of the employees.

If these above mentioned factors are high, Job satisfaction is high in all organizations. If these five factors are very low, Job satisfaction is also low. Therefore, in this chapter, the needs of the employees are carefully studied by conducting a survey on job satisfaction in the study unit.
Job Descriptive Index (Smith and Kendal, 1966) developed and widely used questionnaire was used to assess the job satisfaction of the sample. The job descriptive index contains a series of statements for each of these five area and individuals are asked to mark yes (Y) or no (N) or doubtful (?) related to the job. Positive statements gets a score of 2 for yes, doubtful gets 1 and 0 for No. Negative statements get 2 for No, 1 for doubtful and 0 for yes. Only the total score obtained for the five areas was considered as a measure of job satisfaction. High score indicates high job satisfaction. The mean score obtained by the respondents in respect of the job satisfaction is analyzed and presented in Table 4.31.

**TABLE 4.31**

**MEAN SCORE FOR JOB SATISFACTION FACTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Supporting Technical staff</th>
<th>Artisans</th>
<th>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</th>
<th>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>21.07</td>
<td>58.53</td>
<td>21.84</td>
<td>60.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>42.72</td>
<td>16.74</td>
<td>46.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>05.72</td>
<td>31.80</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>41.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>06.24</td>
<td>34.67</td>
<td>05.85</td>
<td>32.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>26.86</td>
<td>74.62</td>
<td>28.89</td>
<td>80.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 4.31 shows the mean score obtained by the respondents in respect of job satisfaction factors. Out of five variables selected to assess the level of job satisfaction, all the respondents have secured a high mean score for relationship with co-workers.
Supporting and technical staff have obtained nearly 59 per cent for work environment, 43 per cent for supervision, 32 per cent for pay and 35 per cent for promotion. The artisans have secured the mean score of nearly 61 per cent for work environment, 46 per cent for supervision, 41 per cent for pay and 33 per cent for promotions. The unskilled and semiskilled workers have got the mean score of 54 per cent for work environment, 47 per cent for supervision, 37 per cent for pay and 40 per cent for promotions. The clerical and office staff have secured the mean score of nearly 67 per cent for work environment, 61 per cent for supervision, 46 per cent for pay and 42 per cent for promotions.

The mean score obtained by the different categories of the blue collar employees indicates that all of them have job satisfaction in respect of work environment. Similarly all the respondents except clerical and office staff are dissatisfied with their job in relation to supervision.

The common factors which affect the job satisfaction of employees is pay and promotion, for which all the respondents got the mean score of below fifty per cent. It indicates their strong job dissatisfaction in respect of pay and promotions in the organization.

**4.26 OVER ALL JOB SATISFACTION**

The Job Descriptive Index reveals that high score indicates high job satisfaction. In this study, if the employees secure the mean score below 50 per cent, the job satisfaction is low. If they have secured the mean score between 50 – 75 per cent, their job satisfaction is moderate and if they have secured the mean score of more than 75 per cent, their level of job satisfaction is high.

The overall job satisfaction of the respondents is shown in the Table 4.32
TABLE 4.32
OVER ALL JOB SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Average score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Technical staff</td>
<td>75.28</td>
<td>52.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>80.77</td>
<td>56.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td>76.33</td>
<td>53.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>93.24</td>
<td>64.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N = 360)</td>
<td>81.39</td>
<td>56.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

It is understood from the Table 4.32 that all the respondents have secured an average mean score of 56.52 per cent in respect of over all job satisfaction. Among them the supporting and technical staff have secured the mean score of nearly 52 per cent, artisan have secured 56 per cent, Unskilled & Semiskilled have obtained 53 per cent and clerical and office staff have secured 65 per cent. It is inferred from the Table that all the respondents have moderate job satisfaction. In addition to that the non technical staff have more job satisfaction as compared to technical staff. The overall job satisfaction of the respondents is also shown in figure 4.3.
FIGURE 4.3
OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION
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4.27 CLASSIFICATION OF RATING

The Job Descriptive Index does not have specific score cut offs, the total score obtained by the employees for job satisfaction were classified into three levels namely low, medium and high. The score percentage falling below fifty percent was considered as low level; those whose score percentage falls between 50 per cent and 75 per cent were considered as moderate rating and those whose score percentage was more than 75 per cent was considered as high in the study.

The rating revealed by the respondents for the work is presented in the Table 4.33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of stress</th>
<th>Supporting &amp; Technical staff</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Artisans</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Clerical &amp; Office Staff</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26.46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>23.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58.62</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>61.43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56.14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56.86</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>59.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.37</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

It is understood from the Table 4.33 that out of 360 respondents, irrespective of the category majority of the respondents have secured moderate rating, about one-fourth of the respondents have expressed low rating and 17 per cent have obtained high rating. Among the total respondents, nearly 28 per cent of the supporting and technical staff have secured low rating and 14 per cent of the staff expressed high rating. Out of 223 Artisans, nearly 26 per cent have secured low rating and 12 per cent have obtained rating. About 19 and 25 per cent of the unskilled and semiskilled worker have obtained low and high rating. Nearly 12 and 31 per cent of the clerical and office staff have expressed low and high rating for over all job satisfaction.
4.28 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS – JOB SATISFACTION

In order to find whether there is any significant relationship between categories of respondents and their level of job satisfaction, a null hypothesis is framed and tested with the help of ‘t’ test. ‘t’ test values were calculated for different combination of categories of respondents. The t – values calculated were compared with the Table ‘t’ values (at 5% level and at 1% level) to test the significance of variation in respect of job satisfaction of the respondents. The results were tabulated and interpreted in respect of overall perceived stress.

**Null hypothesis**

There is no significant difference between categories of the respondents and their level of job satisfaction.

**TABLE 4.34**

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS-JOB SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting and technical staff - Artisans</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>6.1382</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
<td>74.33</td>
<td>56.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting and technical staff - Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>4.0738</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting and technical staff - Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>3.1339</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans - Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>74.33</td>
<td>56.58</td>
<td>7.336</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans - Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>74.33</td>
<td>56.58</td>
<td>7.1923</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled &amp; Semiskilled - Clerical &amp; Office Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 5% level; ** Significant both at 5% level and 1% level.
It is inferred from the Table 4.34 that irrespective of different categories, the level of job satisfaction of all the respondents significantly differs except that of the categories of unskilled & semi-skilled and clerical & office staff.

4.29 INDIVIDUAL DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND LEVEL OF JOB SATISFACTION

To find out whether there is any significant difference between individual demographic variables such as, age, department wise distribution, experience, income, number of dependents and educational qualifications of the respondents and the level of job satisfaction of the respondents, a null hypothesis is framed and tested with the help of chi-square test.

Null hypothesis

There is no significant difference between individual demographic variables and the level of job satisfaction of the respondents.

The result is given in Table 4.35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic variable</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>Table value 5% level</th>
<th>Table value 1% level</th>
<th>( H_0 ) Accepted / Rejected</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department wise distribution,</td>
<td>19.70</td>
<td>18.31</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>*Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>25.40</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>83.21</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of dependents of educational qualifications</td>
<td>17.40</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualifications</td>
<td>49.40</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>**Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 5% level; ** Significant both at 5% level and 1% level.
Table 4.35 shows that there is a significant relationship between department wise distribution, income, experience, number of dependents, educational qualifications and the level of job satisfaction of the respondents. However there is no significant association between age and level of job satisfaction of the respondents.

### 4.30 OCCUPATIONAL STRESS, PERCEIVED STRESS AND JOB SATISFACTION

The relationship between occupational stress, perceived stress and job satisfaction is analyzed in Table 4.36

**Null: Hypothesis**

There is no significant association between occupational stress and perceived stress, occupational stress and job satisfaction and job satisfaction and perceived stress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.36</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OCCUPATIONAL STRESS, PERCEIVED STRESS AND JOB SATISFACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational and Perceived stress</td>
<td>0.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational stress and job satisfaction</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived stress and job satisfaction</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 5% level; ** Significant both at 5% level and 1% level.

Table 4.36 shows the relationship between occupational stress, perceived stress and job satisfaction. It can be inferred that there is no significant relationship between occupational stress and perceived stress and perceived stress and job satisfaction whereas there is a significant relationship between occupational stress and job satisfaction.