

CHAPTER VI

RURAL INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT IN RAE BARELI DISTRICT

In order to examine the socio-economic profile of the industrial workers and their participation in development and management of industrial units, a survey of industrial workers including employees of the surveyed industrial units was conducted. In this part of the dissertation, the analysis of socio-economic profile of industrial workers and their view perception pertaining to the issues of industrial development and management has been given.

Most of the respondents were males (76.44 per cent). The proportion of female respondents was reported high in case of tiny industrial units (41.67 per cent) (Table 6.1).

Table 6.1: Gender of Respondents

Gender	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Male	35	56	81	172
	58.33	74.67	90.00	76.44
Female	25	19	9	53
	41.67	25.33	10.00	23.56
Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Age of respondents is shown in Table 6.2. Most of the respondents were from the middle age group. Around 58 per cent respondents were from the age group of 25 to 45 years. However, more than 1/4th respondents were also from the lower age group i.e. less than 25 years. The respondents belonging to lower age group were mainly from tiny and small industrial units.

Table 6.2: Age of Respondents

Age Group	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Less than 25 year	21	18	21	60
	35.00	24.00	23.33	26.67
25-35 years	12	26	31	69
	20.00	34.67	34.44	30.67
35-45 years	17	21	23	61
	28.33	28.00	25.56	27.11
45-55 years	8	10	12	30
	13.33	13.33	13.33	13.33
More than 55 years	2		3	5
	3.33	0.00	3.33	2.22
Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Caste-wise distribution of respondents is shown in Table 6.3. The respondents belonging to lower communities were mainly from lower age group. However, a significant proportion of respondents of Scheduled Caste and OBC communities were reported to be belonging to middle age group.

Table 6.3 : Caste-wise Age of Respondents

Age Group	General	OBC	SC/ST	Others	Total
Less than 25 year	21	15	19	5	60
	37.50	18.07	31.67	19.23	26.67
25-35 years	16	38	13	2	69
	28.57	45.78	21.67	7.69	30.67
35-45 years	14	20	15	12	61
	25.00	24.10	25.00	46.15	27.11
45-55 years	4	9	13	4	30
	7.14	10.84	21.67	15.38	13.33
More than 55 years	1	1		3	5
	1.79	1.20	0.00	11.54	2.22
Total	56	83	60	26	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

The marital status of respondents is shown in Table 6.4. Overwhelming majority of the respondents was found married (80 per cent). The proportion of

married respondents was reported significantly high in case of medium and large industrial units.

Table 6.4 : Marital Status of Respondents

Marital Status	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Married	41	57	82	180
	68.33	76.00	91.11	80.00
Unmarried	16	10	4	30
	26.67	13.33	4.44	13.33
Widow/Widower	3	6	3	12
	5.00	8.00	3.33	5.33
Divorced		2	1	3
	0.00	2.67	1.11	1.33
Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Around 37 per cent respondents were from OBC communities. This was found more pronouncing in case of medium and large industrial units (45.56 per cent). The proportion of Scheduled Caste, Scheduled Tribes respondents was reported significantly high in case of tiny and small industrial units (Table 6.5).

Table 6.5: Caste of Respondent

Caste	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
General	14	19	23	56
	23.33	25.33	25.56	24.89
OBC	18	24	41	83
	30.00	32.00	45.56	36.89
SC/ST	20	22	18	60
	33.33	29.33	20.00	26.67
Others	8	10	8	26
	13.33	13.33	8.89	11.56
Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Religion of respondents is shown in Table 6.6. Most of the respondents were Hindus (88 per cent). About 10 per cent respondents were Muslims while less than 2 per cent respondents were Sikh. The proportion of respondents belonging to minority communities was reported high in case of tiny and small industrial units.

Table 6.6: Religion of Respondents

Religion	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Hindu	52	64	82	198
	86.67	85.33	91.11	88.00
Muslim	7	8	8	23
	11.67	10.67	8.89	10.22
Sikh	1	3		4
	1.67	4.00	0.00	1.78
Others				0
	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Educational levels of respondents are shown in Table 6.7. Around 29 per cent respondents were having technical background. Slightly less than 1/4th respondents were intermediate while around 19 per cent respondents were graduates. The high educational level among respondents was reported significantly high in case of workers belonging to medium and large industrial units.

Table 6.7: Education of Respondents

Educational Level	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Illiterate	0	0	0	0
	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Primary	6	3	0	9
	10.00	4.00	0.00	4.00
Jr. High School	5	12	9	26
	8.33	16.00	10.00	11.56
Intermediate	13	17	23	53
	21.67	22.67	25.56	23.56
Graduation	11	13	18	42
	18.33	17.33	20.00	18.67
Technical	18	21	26	65
	30.00	28.00	28.89	28.89
Others	7	9	14	30
	11.67	12.00	15.56	13.33
Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Age-wise educational levels of respondents are shown in Table 6.8. The low educational levels were reported high among the respondents belonging to higher age group while the respondents belonging to lower age group were found highly educated.

Table 6.8: Age-wise Education of Respondents

Educational Level	Less than 25 years	25-35 years	35-45 years	45-55 years	More than 55 years	Total
Illiterate						0
	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Primary		3	1	1	4	9
	0.00	4.35	1.64	3.33	80.00	4.00
Jr. High School	6	4	11	4	1	26
	10.00	5.80	18.03	13.33	20.00	11.56
Intermediate	15	18	14	6		53
	25.00	26.09	22.95	20.00	0.00	23.56
Graduation	12	10	13	7		42
	20.00	14.49	21.31	23.33	0.00	18.67
Technical	14	26	16	9		65
	23.33	37.68	26.23	30.00	0.00	28.89
Others	13	8	6	3		30
	21.67	11.59	9.84	10.00	0.00	13.33
Total	60	69	61	30	5	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Caste-wise educational levels of respondents is shown in Table 6.9. The educational levels were reported high among the respondents belonging to general communities however, the educational level among OBC communities were also found significantly higher as compared to respondents belonging to Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes communities.

Table 6.9 : Caste-wise Education of Respondents

Educational Levels	General	OBC	SC/ST	Others	Total
Illiterate					0
	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Primary			8	1	9
	0.00	0.00	13.33	3.85	4.00
Jr. High School	5	7	9	5	26
	8.93	8.43	15.00	19.23	11.56
Intermediate	13	22	10	8	53
	23.21	26.51	16.67	30.77	23.56
Graduation	18	12	9	3	42
	32.14	14.46	15.00	11.54	18.67
Technical	11	24	21	9	65
	19.64	28.92	35.00	34.62	28.89
Others	9	18	3		30
	16.07	21.69	5.00	0.00	13.33
Total	56	83	60	26	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Main occupation of family is shown in Table 6.10. Most of the respondents reported that the main occupation of their families is service (42.67 per cent). Slightly less than 1/4th respondents also admitted that agriculture is the main occupation of their families.

Table 6.10: Main Occupation of Family

Occupation	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Agriculture	12	18	23	53
	20.00	24.00	25.56	23.56
Business	19	3		22
	31.67	4.00	0.00	9.78
Service	17	33	46	96
	28.33	44.00	51.11	42.67
Labour	10	13	16	39
	16.67	17.33	17.78	17.33
Others	2	8	5	15
	3.33	10.67	5.56	6.67
Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Caste-wise main occupation of respondents is given in Table 6.11. The respondents belonging to General caste reported that the main occupation of their families is service (67.19 per cent). However, about 37 per cent respondents belonging to OBC communities reported that agriculture is the main occupation of their families. Similarly, about 42 per cent respondents belonging to SC/ST communities reported that labour is main occupation of their families.

Table 6.11: Caste-wise Main Occupation of Respondents

Occupation	General	OBC	SC/ST	Others	Total
Agriculture	12	28	11	2	53
	18.75	37.33	18.33	7.69	23.56
Business	3	7	8	4	22
	4.69	9.33	13.33	15.38	9.78
Service	43	35	5	13	96
	67.19	46.67	8.33	50.00	42.67
Labour	6	4	25	4	39
	9.38	5.33	41.67	15.38	17.33
Others		1	11	3	15
	0.00	1.33	18.33	11.54	6.67
Total	64	75	60	26	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

The subsidiary occupation of family is shown in Table 6.12. Agriculture, animal husbandry and small business are the main subsidiary occupations in majority of the cases. However, about 25 per cent respondents also admitted that service is the subsidiary occupation of their families.

Table 6.12: **Subsidiary Occupation of Family**

Occupation	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Agriculture	20	26	33	79
	33.33	34.67	36.67	35.11
Animal husbandry	17	13	11	41
	28.33	17.33	12.22	18.22
Service	13	18	26	57
	21.67	24.00	28.89	25.33
Business/Self Employment	10	8	12	30
	16.67	10.67	13.33	13.33
Others		10	8	18
	0.00	13.33	8.89	8.00
Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Average land holding of the respondents is shown in Table 6.13. The size of average land holding was reported 0.9 acre. The land holding size was reported high in case of cultivated land and also in case of medium and large industrial units.

Table 6.13: **Average Land Holding**

(In Acre)

Land Holding	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Cultivated	0.5	1.2	2.3	1.3
Non cultivated	0.3	0.4	0.7	0.47
Total	0.4	0.8	1.5	0.9

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Monthly income of respondents is shown in Table 6.14. On an average, Rs.3585 monthly income was computed for each industrial worker. The average income was reported high in case of respondents belonging to medium and large industrial units as compared to tiny and small industrial units. Thus, around 55 per cent respondents were found belonging to the income group of Rs.2,500 to 5,000.

Table 6.14: Monthly Income of Respondent

(In Rs.)

Monthly Income	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Less than 2500	34	21	5	60
	56.67	28.00	5.56	26.67
2500—3500	19	27	22	68
	31.67	36.00	24.44	30.22
3500—5000	7	12	37	56
	11.67	16.00	41.11	24.89
More than 5000		15	26	41
	0.00	20.00	28.89	18.22
Total	60	75	90	225
Average Income	2175	3630	4950	3585

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

About 2/5th respondents reported that they belonged to joint families. However, about 43 per cent respondents admitted that they had nuclear families. The proportion of respondents belonging to joint families was reported slightly high in case of tiny and small industrial units (Table 6.15).

Table 6.15 : Type of Family

Type of Family	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Single	22	30	45	97
	36.67	40.00	50.00	43.11
Joint	28	33	37	98
	46.67	44.00	41.11	43.56
Extended	10	12	8	30
	16.67	16.00	8.89	13.33
Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Most of the respondents reported that they had families comprising of about 5 members. The family members are mainly males (53 per cent) (Table 6.16).

Table 6.16: **Number of Family Members**

Members	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Male	188	196	244	628
	54.97	52.27	52.14	53.00
Female	154	179	224	557
	45.03	47.73	47.86	47.00
Total	342	375	468	1185
Average Size	5.7	5	5.2	5.3

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

The age of household population is shown in Table 6.17. About 30 per cent population was reported belonging to lower age group i.e. less than 15 years. The population of working age group was reported to be about 38 per cent.

Table 6.17: **Age of Family Members**

Age	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Less than 15 years	118	112	124	354
	34.50	29.87	26.50	29.87
15-25 years	71	80	103	254
	20.76	21.33	22.01	21.43
25-35 years	86	99	71	256
	25.15	26.40	15.17	21.60
35-45 years	37	47	88	172
	10.82	12.53	18.80	14.51
45-55 years	30	25	62	117
	8.77	6.67	13.25	9.87
More than 55 years		12	20	32
	0.00	3.20	4.27	2.70
Total	342	375	468	1185

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

About 2/3rd household population was found married while about 1/4th population was found unmarried (Table 6.18).

Table 6.18 : Marital Status of Family Members

Marital Status	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Married	221	247	322	790
	64.62	65.87	68.80	66.67
Unmarried	90	106	115	311
	26.32	28.27	24.57	26.24
Widow/widower	19	17	23	59
	5.56	4.53	4.91	4.98
Divorced	12	5	8	25
	3.51	1.33	1.71	2.11
Total	342	375	468	1185

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

The educational levels of family members are shown in Table 6.19. About 22 per cent household population was found belonging to infants. The educational levels were reported high among the respondents belonging to medium and large industrial units as compared to the tiny and small industrial units.

Table 6.19: Education of Family Members

Educational Levels	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Infants	66	76	124	266
	19.30	20.27	26.50	22.45
Illiterate	34	55	63	152
	9.94	14.67	13.46	12.83
Primary	49	25	35	109
	14.33	6.67	7.48	9.20
Jr. High School	72	77	61	210
	21.05	20.53	13.03	17.72
Intermediate	43	49	75	167
	12.57	13.07	16.03	14.09
Graduation	40	35	45	120
	11.70	9.33	9.62	10.13
Technical	23	37	41	101
	6.73	9.87	8.76	8.52
Others	15	21	24	60
	4.39	5.60	5.13	5.06
Total	342	375	468	1185

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

The household annual income is shown in Table 6.20. On an average Rs.41130 annual income per family was reported. The average income was

reported high in case of respondents belonging to medium and large industrial units as compared to tiny and small industrial units.

Table 6.20: Annual Income of Family

(In Rs.)

Annual Income	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Less than 25000	20	12	9	41
	33.33	16.00	10.00	18.22
25000—35000	13	17	23	53
	21.67	22.67	25.56	23.56
35000—50000	15	22	30	67
	25.00	29.33	33.33	29.78
50000-75000	8	14	15	37
	13.33	18.67	16.67	16.44
More than 75000	4	10	13	27
	6.67	13.33	14.44	12.00
Total	60	75	90	225
Average income	26500	37650	59240	41130

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

The higher annual income was reported high in case of respondents belonging to General communities as compared to the respondents belonging to lower communities (Table 6.21).

Table 6.21: Caste-wise Annual Income of Respondents' Family

Annual Income	General	OBC	SC/ST	Others	Total
Less than 25000	2	18	13	8	41
	3.57	21.69	21.67	30.77	18.22
25000—35000	6	20	20	7	53
	10.71	24.10	33.33	26.92	23.56
35000—50000	21	21	15	10	67
	37.50	25.30	25.00	38.46	29.78
50000-75000	10	17	9	1	37
	17.86	20.48	15.00	3.85	16.44
More than 75000	17	7	3		27
	30.36	8.43	5.00	0.00	12.00
Total	56	83	60	26	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Education-wise annual income of respondents' family is shown in Table 6.22. The respondents having technical education admitted that their family income is higher. Similarly, the higher educated industrial workers belong to high income group families.

Table 6.22: Education-wise Annual Income of Respondents' Family

Annual Income	Illiterate	Primary	Jr. High School	Intermediate	Graduation	Technical	Others	Total
Less than 25000		5	8	13	9	6		41
	0.00	55.56	30.77	24.53	21.43	9.23	0.00	18.22
25000—35000		2	15	16	7	9	4	53
	0.00	22.22	57.69	30.19	16.67	13.85	13.33	23.56
35000—50000		2	2	15	9	28	11	67
	0.00	22.22	7.69	28.30	21.43	43.08	36.67	29.78
50000-75000			1	8	10	9	9	37
	0.00	0.00	3.85	15.09	23.81	13.85	30.00	16.44
More than 75000				1	7	13	6	27
	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.89	16.67	20.00	20.00	12.00
Total	0	9	26	53	42	65	30	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Status of training is given in Table 6.23. About 37 per cent respondents reported that they are trained. This was found significantly high in case of medium and large industrial units (45.56 per cent) as compared to tiny industrial units (20 per cent).

Table 6.23: Status of Training

Status of Training	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Trained	12	31	41	84
	20.00	41.33	45.56	37.33
Untrained	48	44	49	141
	80.00	58.67	54.44	62.67
Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

The proportion of trained industrial workers was found significantly high in case of minority communities and OBCs as compared to other communities (Table 6.24).

Table 6.24: Caste-wise Status of Respondents

Status	General	OBC	SC/ST	Others	Total
Trained	13	34	22	15	84
	23.21	40.96	36.67	57.69	37.33
Untrained	43	49	38	11	141
	76.79	59.04	63.33	42.31	62.67
Total	56	83	60	26	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

The trained industrial workers are getting higher salary and wages. This is also proved with this survey. About 73 per cent respondents having monthly income of above Rs. 5,000 reported that they had received some kind of training (Table 6.25).

Table 6.25: Monthly Income-wise Status of Training

Status	Less than 2500	2500—3500	3500—5000	More than 5000	Total
Trained	4	12	38	30	84
	6.67	17.65	67.86	73.17	37.33
Untrained	56	56	18	11	141
	93.33	82.35	32.14	26.83	62.67
Total	60	68	56	41	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Age-wise status of training is shown in Table 6.26. The proportion of trained persons was found high in case of higher age group and lower age group as compared to medium age group.

Table 6.26: Age-wise Status of Training

Status	Less than 25 year	25-35 year	35-45 year	45-55 year	More than 55 year	Total
Trained	35	15	17	13	4	84
	58.33	21.74	27.87	43.33	80.00	37.33
Untrained	25	54	44	17	1	141
	41.67	78.26	72.13	56.67	20.00	62.67
Total	60	69	61	30	5	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Length of service of respondents is shown in Table 6.27. Most of the respondents reported that the length of their service is above 5 years. The length of service was reported high in case of industrial workers belonging to medium and large industrial units

Table 6.27: Length of Service of Respondents

Length of Service	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Less than 1 year	3	2	6	11
	5.00	2.67	6.67	4.89
1—5 years	16	18	15	49
	26.67	24.00	16.67	21.78
5—10 years	30	33	38	101
	50.00	44.00	42.22	44.89
10—15 years	8	13	19	40
	13.33	17.33	21.11	17.78
More than 15 years	3	9	12	24
	5.00	12.00	13.33	10.67
Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Monthly income-wise length of service of respondents is shown in Table 6.28. The respondents having higher length of service get higher monthly income. This is also proved by the research findings.

Table 6.28: Monthly Income-wise Length of Service of Respondents

Length of Service	Less than 2500	2500—3500	3500—5000	More than 5000	Total
Less than 1 year	10	1			11
	16.67	1.47	0.00	0.00	4.89
1—5 years	26	12	3	8	49
	43.33	17.65	5.36	19.51	21.78
5—10 years	13	31	44	13	101
	21.67	45.59	78.57	31.71	44.89
10—15 years	11	24	5		40
	18.33	35.29	8.93	0.00	17.78
More than 15 years			4	20	24
	0.00	0.00	7.14	48.78	10.67
Total	60	68	56	41	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Most of the respondents were found living in pucca houses. It is because of the fact that most of the workers working in medium and large scale units are also living in the industrial campus (Table 6.29).

Table 6.29: Type of House

Type of House	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Kachcha	16	12	5	33
	26.67	16.00	5.56	14.67
Pucca	35	56	82	173
	58.33	74.67	91.11	76.89
Mixed	9	7	3	19
	15.00	9.33	3.33	8.44
Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

The respondents were asked regarding their present domicile. Most of the respondents reported that they are living in their family and own house. Around 19 per cent respondents admitted that they are living in factory allotted house. It was found significantly high in case of medium and large industrial units (37.78 per cent) (Table 6.30).

Table 6.30: Present Domicile of Respondents

Domicile	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Family House	35	31	12	78
	58.33	41.33	13.33	34.67
Own House	17	25	27	69
	28.33	33.33	30.00	30.67
Factory Allotted House		8	34	42
	0.00	10.67	37.78	18.67
Rent House	5	9	13	27
	8.33	12.00	14.44	12.00
Other	3	2	4	9
	5.00	2.67	4.44	4.00
Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Most of the workers living in factory allotted houses are getting higher monthly income. However, the respondents living in their own house or family house reported that their monthly income is low (Table 6.31).

Table 6.31: Monthly Income-wise Present Domicile of Respondents

Domicile	Less than 2500	2500— 3500	3500— 5000	More than 5000	Total
Family House	30	26	19	3	78
	50.00	38.24	33.93	7.32	34.67
Own House	17	21	11	20	69
	28.33	30.88	19.64	48.78	30.67
Factory Allotted House	6	8	16	12	42
	10.00	11.76	28.57	29.27	18.67
Rent House	4	11	7	5	27
	6.67	16.18	12.50	12.20	12.00
Other	3	2	3	1	9
	5.00	2.94	5.36	2.44	4.00
Total	60	68	56	41	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

The housing facilities are shown in Table 6.32. A large number of respondents reported that they are not availing the facility of electricity, toilet and separate bathroom. This is because of the fact that most of the surveyed workers are belonging to rural areas.

Table 6.32: Housing Facility

Facility		Tiny	Small	Medium/ Large	Total
Electricity	Yes	25	53	60	138
		41.67	70.67	66.67	61.33
	No	35	22	30	87
		58.33	29.33	33.33	38.67
	Total	60	75	90	225
Latrine	Yes	12	32	52	96
		20.00	42.67	57.78	42.67
	No	48	43	38	129
		80.00	57.33	42.22	57.33
	Total	60	75	90	225
Separate bathroom	Yes	3	21	33	57
		5.00	28.00	36.67	25.33
	No	57	54	57	168
		95.00	72.00	63.33	74.67
	Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

The respondents were asked whether they received vocational training. Around 58 per cent respondents admitted that they had received vocational training. It was found significantly high in case of medium and large industrial units (Table 6.33).

Table 6.33: Whether Vocational Training Received

Training	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Yes	31	30	69	130
	51.67	40.00	76.67	57.78
No	29	45	21	95
	48.33	60.00	23.33	42.22
Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Education-wise status of vocational training is shown in Table 6.34. Most of the highly educated respondents received vocational training however; a large proportion of respondents having low education level also received vocational training.

Table 6.34: Education-wise Status of Vocational Training

Status	Illiterate	Primary	Jr. High School	Inter-mediate	Graduation	Technical	Others	Total
Trained		4	14	15	19	31	1	84
	0.00	44.44	53.85	28.30	45.24	47.69	3.33	37.33
Untrained		5	12	38	23	34	29	141
	0.00	55.56	46.15	71.70	54.76	52.31	96.67	62.67
Total	0	9	26	53	42	65	30	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

The involvement of the workers in decision making process is shown in Table 6.35. About 59 per cent respondents admitted that they are involved in decision making process of their industrial units. This was found more pronouncing in case of medium and large industrial units.

Table 6.35: Involvement of the Workers in Decision Making

Decision Making	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Yes	24	45	63	132
	40.00	60.00	70.00	58.67
No	36	30	27	93
	60.00	40.00	30.00	41.33
Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Channels of communication are shown in Table 6.36. About 40 per cent respondents reported that formal communication channel is being used in their industrial units. However, 35 per cent respondents said that formal and informal communication channels are also applied.

Table 6.36: Channels of Communication

Channels	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Formal Channel	14	33	42	89
	23.33	44.00	46.67	39.56
Informal Channel	25	15	18	58
	41.67	20.00	20.00	25.78
Both Channel	21	27	30	78
	35.00	36.00	33.33	34.67
Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

2/5th respondents reported that they are depend on trade unions for solution of their problems. This was found more pronouncing in case of tiny and small industrial units (Table 6.37).

Table 6.37: Dependency on Unions for Solution of Problems

Dependency	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Yes	39	29	32	100
	65.00	38.67	35.56	44.44
No	21	46	58	125
	35.00	61.33	64.44	55.56
Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Type of supervision is shown in Table 6.38. Most of the workers reported that there is no supervision of their work. Perhaps they are not engaged in production activities. About 1/4th respondents admitted that friendly supervision is prevailing in their industrial units.

Table 6.38: Type of Supervision

Supervision	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Strict Supervision	9	7	8	24
	15.00	9.33	8.89	10.67
Friendly Supervision	20	18	15	53
	33.33	24.00	16.67	23.56
No Supervision	31	50	67	148
	51.67	66.67	74.44	65.78
Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Attitude of supervisors towards workers is shown in Table 6.39. About 40 per cent respondents reported that formal attitude of supervisors towards workers is prevailing. However, 36 per cent respondents admitted that authoritarian attitude of supervisors towards workers has been observed.

Table 6.39: Attitude of Supervisors towards Workers

Attitude	Tiny	Small	Medium/Large	Total
Friendly	17	19	16	52
	28.33	25.33	17.78	23.11
Authoritarian	20	34	27	81
	33.33	45.33	30.00	36.00
Formal	23	22	47	92
	38.33	29.33	52.22	40.89
Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Discussions of existing problems are shown in Table 6.40. The respondents reported that they generally discussed their problems with managers, co-workers and supervisors. However, about 20 per cent respondents admitted that they do not discuss their problems with any one.

Table 6.40: Discussions of Problems

Particular	Tiny	Small	Medium	Total
Supervisor	18	12	10	40
	30.00	16.00	11.11	17.78
Managers	17	20	20	57
	28.33	26.67	22.22	25.33
Co-workers	12	18	16	46
	20.00	24.00	17.78	20.44
Friends (Not in the same)	10	14	14	38
	16.67	18.67	15.56	16.89
No One	3	11	30	44
	5.00	14.67	33.33	19.56
Total	60	75	90	225

Source: Field Survey, 2009.

Overall analysis reveals that industrial workers are mainly from medium age group. Their educational profile is somehow good. They have also received vocational training and having technical background however, their monthly income is reported to be low. The industrial workers also participate in the decision making process of the industrial units and they witness friendly supervision however, most of them are depend on trade unions for solution of their existing problems.