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Organisations have evolved because the overall mission and objectives of most institutions are too large for any single person to accomplish. Consequently, the organisation must have a systematic way to determine which employees are expected to perform function or task that must accomplish. These jobs, in turn, provide the mechanism for coordinating and linking the various activities that are necessary for success.

We should, first of all, understand the meaning of ‘Job’. Job is a group of positions that are similar in their duties, such as computer programmer or compensation specialist. A job consists of a related set of tasks that are carried out by a person to fulfil a purpose. It can be regarded as a unit in an organisation structure that remains unchanged whoever is in the job. A job in this sense is a fixed entity, part of a machine that can be ‘designed’ like any other part of a machine. Routine or machine-controlled job do exist in most organisations but, increasingly, the work carried out by people is not mechanistic. The rigidity inherent in the notion of a job is not in accord with the realities of organisational life for many people. A flexible approach is often required to use and develop their skills in order to respond swiftly to the new demands they face every day. A job is “a group of positions that are identical with respect to their major or significant tasks and sufficiently alike to justify their being covered by a single analysis.”

Job satisfaction seems to be key driver of job performance, organisational commitment, and life satisfaction, it’s important for managers to understand just how satisfied their employees are. Job satisfaction has a moderately positive relationship with job performance and a strong positive relationship with the commitments of the organisation. It also has a strong positive relationship with life satisfaction.

Job satisfaction refers to the positive and negative feelings and attitudes we hold about our job. It depends on many work-related factors, ranging from our assigned parking space to the sense of fulfilment we get from our daily tasks. Personal factors can also influence job satisfaction. These factors include age, health, length of job experience, emotional stability, social status, leisure activities, and family and other social
relationships. Our motivations and aspirations, and how well these are satisfied by our work, also affect our attitudes towards our jobs. For some employees, job satisfaction is a stable, enduring characteristic, independent of the features of the job. Changes in job status, pay, working conditions and goals have little effect on the job satisfaction of these people. Their personal tendency toward happiness (satisfaction) or unhappiness (dissatisfaction) varies little over time and circumstances.\(^4\)

Job satisfaction is a method which is used by the managers to motivate their employee’s inorder to achieve the organisational goals in the best possible manner. Job satisfaction is one of the vital factors which have drawn attention of the managers in any organisation. Any personnel at work is considered to be happy when he is fully satisfied with his job and it is a crucial aspect as the employee spends most of his time at his workplace. Job satisfaction is the psychological feeling of favourableness which an employee has about his job. Many major studies have been conducted to find out the factors which determine job satisfaction and the way it influences productivity in the organisation. Though there is no conclusive evidence that job satisfaction affects output directly because output depends upon on many other unpredictable variables. Nevertheless, job satisfaction is the positive attitude and feeling which the employee holds towards his job.

Job satisfaction is a desirable outcome for organizations, yet there are other factors associated with job satisfaction remain abstract. Motivation is considered a precursor to job satisfaction. Job satisfaction has been considered as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job\(^5\); an affective reaction to one’s job\(^6\) and an attitude towards one’s job.\(^7\) However, job satisfaction is an attitude but points out that researchers should clearly distinguish the objects of cognitive evaluation which are affect (emotion), beliefs, and behaviors\(^8\).

But the factors that motivate employees are divergent and are likely influenced by culture. Job satisfaction, linked to positive employee outcomes and firm performance, has been the source of extensive scholastic research.\(^9\) Job satisfaction is a set of favourable or unfavourable feelings and emotions with which employees view their work. Job satisfaction is an affective attitude- a feeling of relative likes or dislikes towards
something. Job satisfaction is generally defined as an employee’s affective reaction to a job, based on comparing actual outcomes with desired outcomes.\textsuperscript{10}

Job satisfaction is an attitude towards outcomes on the job. Motivation is often associated with job satisfaction. A common belief among today’s practicing managers is that satisfied employees are likely to be motivated employees and that work-related satisfaction is an integral part of life satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is an outcome of the perception of how well their job provides them the things and incentives which are important for them.

Job satisfaction represents several related attitudes; there are five job dimensions that represent the most important characteristics of a job about which people have affective responses. These are:

- **The work itself:** the extent to which the job provides the individual with interesting tasks, opportunities for learning, and the chance to accept responsibility.
- **Pay:** the amount of financial remuneration that is received and the degree to which this is viewed as equitable vis-à-vis that of others in the organisation.
- **Supervision:** the abilities of the supervisor to provide technical assistance and behavioral support.
- **Co-workers:** the degree to which fellow workers are technically proficient.

Job satisfaction is the amount of overall positive effect or feeling that an individual employee have towards the job. It is a generalized attitude which is outcome of many specific attitudes in three areas i.e. specific job factors, individual adjustment, and group relationships. To satisfy the employees in the job is not easy task. Employees want good salaries, medical help, good working environment, training, performance appraisal, holidays, fixed working hours, counselling from the organisation. If any organisation is unable to care for these provisions than its employees will remain dissatisfied.
Chart 3.1 Job satisfaction levels

Job satisfaction is a pleasurable emotion state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences. It represents how you feel about your job and what you think about your job. Employees with high job satisfaction experience positive feelings when they think about their duties or take part in task activities. Employees with low job satisfaction experience negative feelings when they think about their duties or take part in their task activities. Unfortunately, workplace surveys suggest that satisfied employees are becoming rarer.

Job satisfaction also depends on the moods which are states of feelings that are often mild in intensity, last for an extended period of time, and are not explicitly directed at anything. Intense positive moods include being enthusiastic, excited and elated. Intense negative moods include being hostile, nervous and annoyed. Emotions are states of feeling that are often intense, last for only a few minutes, and are clearly directed at someone or some circumstance. Positive emotions include joy, pride, relief, hope, love and compassion. Negative emotions include anger, anxiety, fear, guilt, shame, sadness, envy and disgust.

Job satisfaction comes when one accepts a job what it is and exploits the source of satisfaction that come within it. Good feelings can come from high performance, quality
work, learning new skills, working as part of a team, assisting co-workers, demonstrating personal growth and receiving compliments.

Job satisfaction is achieved daily by digging out "satisfiers" whenever they can be found. This is true even if an individual is marking time until he or she gets into a better career area. The trick is to enjoy your present job while you prepare for a better one. Many people gain considerable satisfaction from doing ordinary jobs. They make quality time out of their working hours no matter what their assignments may be.

Sources of satisfaction come from two areas:

1. The satisfaction of doing a job rights the pride of craft – regardless of the work environment. A cabinet maker gets pleasure from building a quality cabinet no matter where the cabinet is built or with whom. A surgeon gets satisfaction from performing a difficult operation whether the operating theatre is in a highly rated hospital or an army tent. Of course, it is more difficult to find satisfaction in some jobs than in others, especially when you recognize that you are temporarily unemployed but need the job anyway.

2. The second area in which to find job satisfaction is the work environment, which includes the physical set up, people with whom you interact and the fun you can have when you aren’t concentrating on the work.

Once individuals receive the rewards of greater job satisfaction, they will form habits that will prolong their achievements. It is recommended, however, that all individuals should check periodically on whether any progress is sustained. Such a check should include a review of the job satisfaction sources so that those neglected can be restored. The problem comes even in the best organisations when employees don’t accept the responsibility of finding and creating their own satisfaction. In other words, employee attitude is the key. Management should do all that is possible and profitable to create a work environment where job satisfaction is easy to reach, but the effort must still come from the employees themselves. Management cannot force employees to seek job satisfaction. Attitude is a very private matter. No organisation or supervisor owns the attitude of an employee.
Human beings are the most important resource in an organisation. Organisations are managed and run by the people. An enterprise success greatly depends upon the capability of its employees. At the same time, Human Resource Management is also one of the toughest duties of a manager. This is because men and women differ in terms of attitudes, values, aspirations, motivations and life goals.13

We are living a global world today. The economic landscape is changing and we are facing hard competition. The tools, methods and philosophers of Human Resources that used to be relevant till some time back are no longer in a global environment. The entire function of HR is undergoing tremendous changes.14 Employees with higher job satisfaction:

❖ Believe that the organisation achieve its goals in the long run
❖ Care about the quality of their work
❖ Are more committed to the organisation and
❖ Have higher retention rates and are more productive.

Employees are more satisfied when they have challenging opportunities at work. This includes chances to participate in interesting projects, jobs with satisfying degree of challenge and opportunities for increased responsibility. Today’s employee loyalty needs to be earned, rather than assumed, and must be specific, rather than general employees are looking at their employment as a means of achieving personal goals rather than simply being the “good corporate soldier” of the past.15

In today’s organisations, competitive advantage depends not merely on the acquisition and development of superior human resources, but on the way in which human and social capital are organised, developed and sustained through time and space.16

Job characteristics theory suggests that five “core characteristics” - variety, identity, significance, autonomy, and feedback – combine to result in particularly high levels of satisfaction with the work itself.17
Job satisfaction is the fulfilment and gratification that comes from work. It is not the money, the benefits or the vacations. It is the good feelings you receive from doing the work itself. Virtually every job A supervisor who successfully performs the role as a team leader each day probably drives home after work with a feeling of satisfaction.

A technician who discovers and repairs a device that has stalled production probably takes a pride in the accomplishment.

A teacher who recognizes student’s achievement probably derives satisfaction from their progress.

Job satisfaction is axiomatic to state that the people differ in regards to the extent to which they are satisfied with their jobs. Among the factors influencing job satisfaction, the most widely examined are the supervision, the work group, job content, wages, promotional opportunities and hours of work. Job satisfaction doesn’t mean a ‘perpetual smirk on the face of the employees’. It doesn’t mean turning work into a hobby, undertaken just for the pleasure of it. However, satisfied the employee, they cannot be expected to find absolute and unalloyed pleasure in it. Job Satisfaction essentially means economy of effort, getting rid of avoidable tension, utilizing the energies of employees for better performance of work instead of allowing them to dissipate needlessly. Job satisfaction is thus derived from and is the result of many interrelated factors which cannot be completely isolated from one another for analytical purposes. Job satisfaction is influenced not only by the external environment but also by certain specific internal factors, including the experimental background of a person, his feelings and his values.18

Job satisfaction is a function of rewards in that is actually determined by how satisfied individuals are with the total package of rewards they receive as a result of working for an organisation. What is satisfying for one person may not be so for another. Given the existence of large individual differences in what people value, it is futile to debate whether ‘for example’ money, recognition, interesting work or promotion opportunities is the most, important determinant of job satisfaction. For some people, there is little doubt that money is the most important for others the work itself is key. For still
others it is the social relationship or may be the opportunity to learn new skills that is the most important determinant of job satisfaction. Thirdly, overtime, people tend to gravitate to work situations that meet their needs, and as a result, their overall job satisfaction goes up. This goes well for organisations that try to retain their people and develop a virtuous spiral relationship. The longer people stay with the company, the more satisfied they are likely to be.

Fourthly, increasing job satisfaction is unlikely to have a positive effect on performance. In fact, it may have a negative effect because, at least temporarily, people will cease to seek additional rewards because they will be satisfied with their reward level. In most cases, the effect is temporary; however, because they either try to satisfy other newly important needs or they decide they want more of the reward they thought they had enough of. The fact that satisfaction doesn’t drive individual motivation and performance doesn’t mean that it doesn’t influence organisational performance. When employee’s aren’t satisfied with their jobs, they are saying that they don’t see positive consequences associated with coming to work and remaining part of an organisation. Their current dissatisfaction is thus an indicator of their anticipated state of dissatisfaction in the future. Job satisfaction doesn’t have a direct impact on the job performance of most individuals; job dissatisfaction can have a serious impact on absenteeism and turnover. Job satisfaction is also quite important in the case of employees of relationship oriented services. Motivation and satisfaction are at the same time both complicated and simple topics – complicated because of the enormous individual differences that exist and the complexity of human beings. They are simple in that there are some key “truths” that can be used to guide the design of effective organisations when it comes to treating people right.¹⁹

Job satisfaction is a consequence of performance rather than a cause of it. Satisfaction strongly influences the productive efficiency of an organisation whereas absenteeism, employees turnover, alcoholism, irresponsibility, uncommitment are the result of job dissatisfaction. However, job satisfaction or dissatisfaction forms opinions about the job and the organisation which result in employees morale.²⁰

Job satisfaction is a positive feeling about a job resulting from an evaluation of its characteristics. Managers should be interested in their employees’ attitude because
attitudes give warnings of potential problems and they influence behaviour. Satisfied and committed employees, have lower rates of turnover, absenteeism, and withdrawal behaviours. They also perform better on the job. Given that managers want to keep resignations and absences down—especially among their most productive employees—they want to do things that generate positive job attitudes. A sound measurement of overall job attitude is one of the most useful pieces of information an organisation can have about its employees. The most important thing managers can do to raise employee satisfaction is focus on the intrinsic parts of the job, such as making the work challenging and interesting. Although paying employees poorly will likely not attract high-quality employees to the organisation, or keep high performers, managers should realize that high pay alone is unlikely to create a satisfying work environment. Creating a satisfied workforce is hardly a guarantee of successful organisational performance, but evidence strongly suggests that whatever managers can do to improve employee attitude will likely to result in heightened organisational effectiveness.21

In the present chapter, the aspect of Job Satisfaction among the women employees of the Punjab Telecom Circle of BSNL has been examined by posing certain statements to the selected sample of (200) female employees of the Punjab Telecom Circle.22
Table 3.1: My job gives me opportunities to learn new skills in my field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-28 (Age in years)</td>
<td>8 (36.4)</td>
<td>6 (27.3)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>6 (27.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>16 (27.6)</td>
<td>38 (65.5)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4 (6.9)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>10 (21.7)</td>
<td>32 (69.6)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4 (8.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>16 (21.6)</td>
<td>54 (73.0)</td>
<td>2 (2.7)</td>
<td>2 (2.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td>Graduate 28 (25.0)</td>
<td>72 (64.3)</td>
<td>2 (1.8)</td>
<td>10 (8.9)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate 19 (31.1)</td>
<td>38 (62.3)</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma holder 3 (27.3)</td>
<td>6 (54.5)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>2 (18.2)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others 0 (0.00)</td>
<td>14 (87.5)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>2 (12.5)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status Never Married</td>
<td>8 (40.0)</td>
<td>6 (30.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>6 (30.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married 42 (23.3)</td>
<td>124 (68.9)</td>
<td>4 (2.2)</td>
<td>10 (5.6)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in the job Less than 6 years</td>
<td>10 (33.3)</td>
<td>14 (46.7)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>4 (13.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 Years 8 (21.1)</td>
<td>24 (63.2)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>6 (15.8)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 Years 4 (18.2)</td>
<td>16 (72.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 Years 8 (26.7)</td>
<td>20 (66.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years 20 (25.0)</td>
<td>56 (70.0)</td>
<td>2 (2.5)</td>
<td>2 (2.5)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
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Table 3.1 (a): Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson’s R</th>
<th>Value Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-) 0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>(-) 1.419</td>
<td>0.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>1.038</td>
<td>0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.118</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>(-)1.667</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) 0.127</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>(-)1.796</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

On assessing the job satisfaction among the women employees the aspect which has been examined in the Table 3.1 for sure established that the job of the women employees provided them opportunities to learn new skills in their field. The responses varying from fair majority (above 60.00 percent) to highly significant majority (above 90.00 percent) were in agreement with the statement barring some disagreed responses (27.3 percent) from the younger most women employees who were yet beginner in their carrier.

The trend of the responses established that with the increase in age and the number of years in the service the proportion of responses also increased signifying that more of senior women employees in age and service agreed that their job provided them opportunities to learn new skills. Similarly, educational qualification of the respondents also made directly proportionate impact on the responses as higher proportion of respondents (93.4 percent) with higher qualifications (post graduates) agreed with the statement. Similar trends were visible in the variable marital status where more of ever married (92.2 percent) respondents were in agreement with the statement as compared to never married respondents (above 70.0 percent). Interestingly more of never married respondents (above 40.0 percent) strongly agreed with the statement showing their firm resolve. Agreed responses outmaneuvered the strongly agreed responses.

Statistically significant association was found between the variable age and the marital status.

In the Table 3.1(a), the value r has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age, marital status and number of year’s variables whereas with educational qualifications variable there existed low positive relationship between the two.
Table 3.2: I get enough opportunities to use professional skills in my day to day job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un- Decided</th>
<th>Dis- Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagreed</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(54.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(6.9)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(75.9)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(8.7)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(60.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(13.5)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>(78.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(14.3)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>(67.9)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(6.6)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>(68.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(90.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(87.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(40.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(8.9)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>(74.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(66.7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(10.5)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(68.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(72.7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(66.7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(15.0)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(75.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
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Table 3.2 (a): Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson’s R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.222</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>(-)3.209</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.177</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>(-)2.526</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.193</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>(-)2.770</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

On examining the aspect that whether women employees get enough opportunities to use their professional skills in their day-to-day job, it was established through the projection of the responses that women employees got enough opportunities to use their skills. The proportion of responses varying from fair majority (above 60.0 percent) to highly significant majority (above 90.0 percent) was in agreement with the statement.

The women employees senior in age and experience were convinced in higher proportion to support the statement than the respondents younger in age and service. However, the inverse relationship of responses in educational qualification variable was established as more of the respondents with lower qualifications (90.9 percent) were in agreement with the statement than with higher qualifications (75.5 percent). Similarly more of ever married women respondents (83.3 percent) were in agreement with the statement than never married respondent (60.0 percent). However, the maximum proportion of never married respondents (40.0 percent) was in disagreement with the statement.

Statistically highly significant association was found between the variables of age, marital status, number of years in job and the statement.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.2(a), the value r has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age, marital status and number of year’s variables whereas with educational qualification variable there existed low positive relationship between the two.
Table 3.3: The environment of my work group is conducive for working.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un-Decided</th>
<th>Dis-Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagreed</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>(63.6)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6.9)</td>
<td>(75.9)</td>
<td>(6.9)</td>
<td>(6.9)</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13.0)</td>
<td>(56.5)</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td>(21.7)</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24.3)</td>
<td>(64.9)</td>
<td>(8.1)</td>
<td>(2.7)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17.9)</td>
<td>(64.3)</td>
<td>(5.4)</td>
<td>(12.5)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13.1)</td>
<td>(68.9)</td>
<td>(6.6)</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
<td>(8.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(54.5)</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12.5)</td>
<td>(75.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(12.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>(10.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14.4)</td>
<td>(67.8)</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>(7.8)</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>(80.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10.5)</td>
<td>(68.4)</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td>(10.5)</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(81.8)</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td>(66.7)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 Years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25.0)</td>
<td>(55.0)</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>(12.5)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
Table 3.3(a) Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson’s R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.157</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>(-)2.231</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.112</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>(-)1.585</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.202</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>(-)2.907</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The responses to the statement that the environment of their work group has been work conducive, has been analysed and examined in the Table 3.3. The majority of the responses varying from majority (50.0 percent) to significant majority (above 80.0 percent) were in agreement with the statement that the environment was work conducive. The variation in the responses in the age and number of years in job variables did not show any specific trend. However, clear trend was available in the educational qualification variable as it was found that high majority of respondents (above 80.0 percent) with higher qualifications (above graduation) agreed with the statement. Similarly more of ever married women respondents (82.0 percent) than never married women respondents (70.0 percent) agreed with the statement.

Statistically highly significant association was found between the variable age, number of years in the job and marital status and the statement where as significant association was found between the educational qualification and the statement.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.3(a), the value r has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age, marital status and number of year’s variables whereas with educational qualification variable there existed low positive relationship between the two.
Table 3.4 Employees in my organization complete only those assigned tasks for which they are expected to be compensated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagreed</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>18-28 Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>12 (54.5)</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>8 (13.8)</td>
<td>24 (41.4)</td>
<td>10 (17.2)</td>
<td>16 (27.6)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>10 (21.7)</td>
<td>20 (43.5)</td>
<td>6 (13.0)</td>
<td>6 (13.0)</td>
<td>4 (8.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>12 (16.2)</td>
<td>48 (64.9)</td>
<td>4 (5.4)</td>
<td>8 (10.8)</td>
<td>2 (2.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>20 (17.9)</td>
<td>54 (48.2)</td>
<td>16 (14.3)</td>
<td>16 (14.3)</td>
<td>6 (5.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>7 (11.5)</td>
<td>34 (55.7)</td>
<td>8 (13.1)</td>
<td>12 (19.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>3 (27.3)</td>
<td>6 (54.5)</td>
<td>8 (00.0)</td>
<td>2 (18.2)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5 (25.0)</td>
<td>10 (62.5)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>2 (12.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
<td>14 (70.0)</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>32 (17.8)</td>
<td>90 (50.0)</td>
<td>22 (12.2)</td>
<td>30 (16.7)</td>
<td>6 (3.3)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>20 (66.7)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>4 (13.3)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-12 Years</td>
<td>8 (21.1)</td>
<td>14 (36.8)</td>
<td>6 (15.8)</td>
<td>10 (26.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>14 (63.6)</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
<td>14 (46.7)</td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-30 Years</td>
<td>16 (20.0)</td>
<td>42 (52.5)</td>
<td>6 (7.5)</td>
<td>12 (15.0)</td>
<td>4 (5.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
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To the statement that women employees in the organisation complete those assigned tasks for which they are expected to be compensated, the available trend of the responses indicated that they were individualistic and only did that job for which they were expected to be compensated. The responses varying from majority (50.0 percent) to high majority (above 70.0 percent) were in agreement with the statement in all the variables. However, there were some variations in the responses within each variable except that more of never married respondents (80.0 percent) categorically supported the statement in comparison to ever married respondents (67.8 percent).

Statistically highly significant association was found between the variable age and the statement whereas in other variables low intensity association was seen.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.4(a), the value r has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age, marital status and number of year’s variables whereas with educational qualification variable there existed low positive relationship between the two.

Table 3.4 (a): Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson’s R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-) 0.099</td>
<td>(-) 0.067</td>
<td>(-) 1.395</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) 0.081</td>
<td>(-) 0.075</td>
<td>(-) 1.146</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) 0.056</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>(-) 0.790</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.
Table 3.5: Employees in my organization are treated according to their work assignments and not on kinship, caste, language and gender basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(45.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(20.7)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(58.6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>6 (10.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(13.0)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(39.1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td>14 (30.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(8.1)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(32.4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(5.4)</td>
<td>28 (37.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(14.3)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(52.5)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(5.4)</td>
<td>28 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(21.3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(54.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>14 (23.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(37.5)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(17.5)</td>
<td>4 (36.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(12.5)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(37.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>4 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(12.5)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(37.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>4 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(70.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(15.6)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>(40.0)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
<td>48 (26.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(26.7)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(53.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>4 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(21.1)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(52.6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>2 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(72.7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(46.7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>8 (26.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(10.0)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(25.0)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
<td>34 (42.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
Table 3.5(a): Pearson's correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson's R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>4.781</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.044)</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>(-0.617)</td>
<td>0.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>2.179</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>4.419</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The data presented in the Table 3.5 has been analyzed in the context of the statement that employees in the organisation are treated according to their work assignment and not on other considerations like kinship, caste, language and gender. The available projection of the responses clearly presented cross horizontal and sharp division of responses in age and experience variables.

The women employees younger in age and experience in majority were in agreement with the statement that employees were treated according to their work assignment not on other consideration whereas on contrary the respondents senior-in-age and experience were in disagreement with the issue signifying that other considerations did matter in the organisation. Likewise in relation to education variable the majority respondents with other qualifications disagreed with the statement in comparison to other categories of the same variable who were rather in varying majority were in agreement with it.

Interestingly, highly significant majority (above 90.0 percent) of the never married respondents were in agreement with the statement, in comparison to significant majority (55.6 percent) of ever married respondents who were in agreement with the statement establishing that more of never married respondents found that only work assignment was the consideration for dealing with the employees than ever married respondents who were though in majority, but in much lower proportion were in agreement with the statement.

Statistically highly significant association was found between the variable age, number of years in the job whereas in case of marital status variable significant association was found.
In the Table 3.5(a), the value r has exhibited low positive relationship between the statement and age, marital status and number of year’s variables whereas with educational qualification variable there existed low negative relationship between the two.

### Table 3.6 Repetitive nature of my job does not have any effect on my working.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Response</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un-Decided</th>
<th>Dis-Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(27.3)</td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10.3)</td>
<td>(55.2)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(34.5)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td>(65.2)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(26.1)</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.4)</td>
<td>(29.7)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(54.1)</td>
<td>(10.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.9)</td>
<td>(41.1)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(42.9)</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11.5)</td>
<td>(52.5)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(32.8)</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>(72.7)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(37.5)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(62.5)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>(60.0)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.8)</td>
<td>(44.4)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(42.2)</td>
<td>(5.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>(33.3)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(46.7)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td>(73.7)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(21.1)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>(54.5)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td>(40.0)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(46.7)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
<td>(37.5)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(45.0)</td>
<td>(12.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. *P*<0.05, *n*=200
### Table 3.6 (a): Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson's R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>4.182</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.036)</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>(-0.504)</td>
<td>0.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>2.662</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>3.318</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The data presented in the Table 3.6 has been analyzed in the context of the statement that repetitive natures of job did not affect the working of the employees. The trend of responses established interesting finding as senior most respondents in age (64.9 percent) and experience (57.5 percent) and fair majority of respondents with other qualifications (62.5 percent) were in disagreement with the statement which indicated that repetitive nature of job did affect the working of these employees, may be they got bore with job profile. However, all other categories, barring those mentioned above were in agreement with the statement proving thereby that repetitive natures of job did not have any effect on their working. Comparison of responses in case of marital status further established that more of never married respondents (81.8 percent) were in agreement with the statement than ever married respondents (52.2 percent) indicating that somehow ever married respondents were affected by the repetitive nature of the job as significant proportion of respondents (47.8 percent) were in disagreement with the query.

Statistically highly significant association was found between the variable age, number of years in the job and the statement only.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.6 (a), the value r has exhibited low positive relationship between the statement and age, marital status and number of year’s variables whereas with educational qualification variable there existed low negative relationship between the two.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/ Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un- Decided</th>
<th>Dis- Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagreed</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>14 (63.6)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>8 (13.8)</td>
<td>42 (72.4)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>8 (13.8)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>12 (26.1)</td>
<td>30 (65.2)</td>
<td>2 (4.3)</td>
<td>2 (4.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>14 (18.9)</td>
<td>50 (67.6)</td>
<td>2 (2.7)</td>
<td>4 (5.4)</td>
<td>4 (5.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>20 (17.9)</td>
<td>78 (69.6)</td>
<td>2 (1.8)</td>
<td>4 (3.6)</td>
<td>8 (7.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>14 (23.0)</td>
<td>36 (59.0)</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
<td>9 (14.8)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>10 (90.9)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (12.5)</td>
<td>12 (75.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (12.5)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>4 (20.0)</td>
<td>10 (50.0)</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>32 (17.8)</td>
<td>126 (70.0)</td>
<td>2 (1.1)</td>
<td>14 (7.8)</td>
<td>6 (3.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
<td>18 (60.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>4 (13.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 years</td>
<td>2 (5.3)</td>
<td>28 (73.7)</td>
<td>2 (5.3)</td>
<td>6 (15.8)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 years</td>
<td>6 (27.3)</td>
<td>14 (63.6)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 years</td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
<td>22 (73.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>16 (20.0)</td>
<td>54 (67.5)</td>
<td>2 (2.5)</td>
<td>4 (5.0)</td>
<td>4 (5.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200

Table 3.7: I am satisfied with assigned quantum of work.
Table 3.7(a): Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson’s R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-) 0.127</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>(-) 1.807</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-) 0.100</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>(-) 1.419</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-) 0.116</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>(-) 1.649</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The women employee’s respondents were satisfied with the assigned quantum of work as the responses varying from high majority (above 70.0 percent) to highly significant majority (above 90.0 percent) were in agreement with the statement signifying their satisfaction with the assigned work load. There were no significant variations in the responses thus no specific descending or ascending trends were available.

Statistically significant association was found between the variable age, marital status only in other variables low intensity association was found.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.7 (a), the value r has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age, marital status and number of year’s variables whereas with educational qualification variable there existed low positive relationship between the two.
Table 3.8: I am satisfied with the extent of authority given to me to fulfil my responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un-Decided</th>
<th>Dis Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagreed</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 Years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
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Table 3.8 (a): Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson's R</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.111</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>(-)1.577</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.011</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.093</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>(-)1.317</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.122</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>(-)1.729</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

On asking about the satisfaction regarding the extent of authority given to the women employees respondents to fulfill their responsibilities, it was seen that responses reflected opposite trends as were seen in the preceding Tables (3.5 and 3.6). The employees younger in age and experience in lesser proportion were in agreement with the statement in comparison to the other categories of these variables. The highly significant majority of respondents (above 90.0 percent) with post graduate qualifications and significant majority of respondents (above 80.0 percent) who were ever married were in agreement with the statement. The trend reflected that respondents younger in age (36.3 percent), never married (30.0 percent), diploma holders (36.0 percent) and less than 6 years experience (26.7 percent) found the extent of authority given to them not that satisfactory as compared to the other categories of these variables since these above mentioned categories registered the disagreement with the statement.

Statistically highly significant association was found between the age, marital status and the statement whereas significant association was established with number of years variable.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.8 (a), the value r has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age, marital status, number of years and educational qualification variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10 (45.5)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40 (69.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34 (73.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52 (70.3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80 (71.4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36 (59.0)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 (54.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14 (87.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10 (50.0)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>126 (70.0)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14 (46.7)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30 (78.9)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16 (72.7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24 (80.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 Years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52 (65.0)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p < 0.05, n=200
Table 3.9 (a): Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson’s R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)0.279</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>(-)4.094</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)0.142</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>(-)2.015</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)0.282</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>(-)4.134</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The analysis of the Table 3.9 suggested that the respondents varying from majority (above 50.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) in all the variables found that the nature of their work profile kept their interest alive in the work. The only noticeable trend was observed that there were variations in the proportion of responses. The employee respondents younger in age (54.6 percent) and experience (66.7 percent) found the work interesting in nature whereas either highly significant majority of respondents or cent percent of them in the higher age groups or with more experience were in agreement with the statement. Furthermore ever married respondents (92.2 percent) found their work to be interesting than never married respondents (70.7 percent). The maximum of disagreed responses (18.2 percent) were received from the Diploma holders while analyzing educational variable.

Statistically highly significant association was found between the variable age, number of years in service and significant association was observed with marital status.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.9 (a), the value r has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age, marital status and number of year’s variables whereas with educational qualification variable there existed low positive relationship between the two.
### Table 3.10: My job involves much of challenge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un-Decided</th>
<th>Dis-Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(27.3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(65.5)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(13.8)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(26.1)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(39.1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(16.2)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>(70.3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(8.1)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(17.9)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>(51.8)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(8.9)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(6.6)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(65.6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(9.8)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(12.5)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(75.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(10.0)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(40.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(10.0)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(14.4)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>(58.9)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(8.9)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(46.7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(10.5)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(52.6)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(26.3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(54.5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(66.7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 Years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(60.0)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. \( p < 0.05, n = 200 \)
Table 3.10 (a): Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson's R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.328)</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>(-0.4.883)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.031)</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>(-0.0.443)</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.0.138)</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>(-0.1.954)</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.0.261)</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>(-0.3.800)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

On assessing the responses presented in the Table 3.10, it was evident from the projected trend that majority respondents expressed that their job did not involve much of the challenge. However, the young respondents (54.6 percent), diploma holders (27.3 percent), never married (40.0 percent) and the respondents with lesser experience (46.6 percent) were in disagreement with the statement indicating that women employees of these mentioned categories found their job challenging, and this could be attributed to their being new to the job and job being technical in nature (diploma holders). However, the respondent’s senior in age and experience and as well with higher qualifications found the job non-challenging in nature which could be reasoned out to their longer experience in the job which made it possible to tackle the challenges in much easier way.

Statistically highly significant association was found between the variable age, number of years in the job and the statement.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.10 (a), the value r has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age, educational qualifications, marital status and number of year’s variables.
Table 3.11: Achievement in the office is attributed to the teamwork and not to the individual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un-</th>
<th>Dis-</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6 (27.3)</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40 (69.0)</td>
<td>6 (3.4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(10.3)</td>
<td>2 (3.4)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32 (69.6)</td>
<td>6 (4.3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(13.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60 (81.1)</td>
<td>4 (5.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70 (62.5)</td>
<td>4 (3.6)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(8.9)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45 (73.8)</td>
<td>6 (9.8)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(6.6)</td>
<td>4 (6.6)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 (81.8)</td>
<td>2 (18.2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14 (87.5)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6 (30.0)</td>
<td>4 (20.0)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(30.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>132 (73.3)</td>
<td>8 (4.4)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(4.4)</td>
<td>4 (2.2)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12 (40.0)</td>
<td>4 (13.3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 Years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22 (57.9)</td>
<td>2 (5.3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td>2 (5.3)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18 (81.8)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26 (86.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 Years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60 (75.0)</td>
<td>4 (3.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
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Table 3.11(a): Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson’s R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)0.160</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>(-)2.279</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)0.060</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)0.204</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>(-)2.926</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)0.213</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>(-)3.067</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The data presented in the Table 3.11 has been analyzed in the context of the statement that whether achievements in the office were attributed to the teamwork or to the individual. It was established by the majority responses, irrespective of the variables, that woman employee believed that the accomplishments of the goals were due to the team spirit not due to the some individual efforts. However, there have been scuttle variation in the responses varying from fair majority (50.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) and the variation suggested certain trends. The respondents younger in age (63.7 percent) and experience (60.0 percent) and never married (50.0 percent) in majority though in low proportion were in agreement with the statement than other categories indicating some reservations towards the statement. However, the women employee’s senior in age and experience were sure about the fact that the achievements in the office were attributed to the teamwork and not to the individual efforts.

Statistically highly significant association was established between all the variables and the statement.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.11 (a), the value r has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age, educational qualification, marital status and number of year’s variables.
Table 3.12: I get clear instructions from my superiors regarding my work profile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(54.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(10.3)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(75.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(6.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(21.7)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(52.2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(8.7)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(13.5)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>(78.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(5.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(21.4)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>(64.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(8.2)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>(75.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(6.6)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(45.5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(40.0)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(14.4)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>(71.1)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(66.7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(15.8)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(63.2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(81.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(80.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>(65.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
Table 3.12 (a): Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson's R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>1.595</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.038)</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>(-0.536)</td>
<td>0.592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

On analyzing the data presented in the Table 3.12, it was found that majority of respondents varying from high majority (above 70.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent), in all the variables, were in agreement with the statement that the employees received clear instructions from their seniors regarding their work profile. The statement received solid support through the responses as there were hardly any noticeable proportions of dissenting or responses in disagreement. The variations in the responses within variables didn’t indicate any specific trend. Interestingly there were not much of variations in the responses in the marital status variable as well thus establishing clearly that women employee’s received clear instructions from their seniors regarding their work profile.

Statistically highly significant association was found between the age, education, marital status and the statement.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.12 (a), the value r has exhibited low positive relationship between the statement and age, educational qualification and marital status variables whereas with number of years in the job variable there existed low negative relationship between the two.
Table 3.13: My suggestions are valued by my supervisors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un-Decided</th>
<th>Dis-Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>8 (36.4)</td>
<td>8 (36.4)</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>4 (6.9)</td>
<td>32 (55.2)</td>
<td>12 (20.7)</td>
<td>10 (17.2)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>2 (4.3)</td>
<td>24 (52.2)</td>
<td>10 (21.7)</td>
<td>8 (17.4)</td>
<td>2 (4.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>6 (8.1)</td>
<td>46 (62.2)</td>
<td>8 (10.8)</td>
<td>8 (10.8)</td>
<td>6 (8.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>10 (8.9)</td>
<td>58 (51.8)</td>
<td>26 (23.2)</td>
<td>12 (10.7)</td>
<td>6 (5.4)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
<td>40 (65.6)</td>
<td>7 (11.5)</td>
<td>12 (19.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4 (36.4)</td>
<td>5 (45.5)</td>
<td>2 (18.2)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>8 (50.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4 (25.0)</td>
<td>4 (25.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
<td>12 (60.0)</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>10 (5.6)</td>
<td>98 (54.4)</td>
<td>36 (20.0)</td>
<td>28 (15.6)</td>
<td>8 (4.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in the job</td>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>14 (46.7)</td>
<td>8 (26.7)</td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-12 Years</td>
<td>4 (10.5)</td>
<td>18 (47.4)</td>
<td>6 (15.8)</td>
<td>8 (21.1)</td>
<td>2 (5.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>12 (54.5)</td>
<td>6 (27.3)</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>20 (66.7)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>8 (10.0)</td>
<td>46 (57.5)</td>
<td>16 (20.0)</td>
<td>6 (7.5)</td>
<td>4 (5.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
The data presented in the Table 3.13 has been analyzed in relation to the poser that whether the suggestions of the women employees are valued by the supervisors. The respondents in majority, in all the variables, were in agreement with the statement that the suggestions of the women employees were valued by their supervisors in the organization. The exceptions to the agreement were registered by the respondents with other qualifications as they in majority (50.0 percent) were in disagreement with the statement. The respondents younger in age and experience, however, in noticeable proportion (above 30.0 percent) were in agreement but good proportion of respondents remained undecided to the issue. It was further observed that respondents senior in age and experience were in agreement with the poser in higher proportion. The maximum percentage of diploma holders remained undecided (45.5 percent) with the issue followed by the younger most employees (36.4 percent) in the age variable indicating that employees were not sure of themselves.

Statistically highly significant association was established between the education variable and the statement.

In the Table 3.13 (a), the value r has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age and number of years in the job variables whereas with educational qualification and marital status variables there existed low positive relationship between the two.

**Table 3.13 (a): Pearson’s correlation between the variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson’s R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.097</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>(-)1.369</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.151</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>(-)2.155</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.
### Table 3.14: My Supervisor wants that official work should be done in way and manner he desired.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>10 (45.5)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>8 (36.4)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (3.4)</td>
<td>16 (27.6)</td>
<td>6 (10.3)</td>
<td>32 (55.2)</td>
<td>2 (3.4)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>16 (34.8)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>26 (56.5)</td>
<td>4 (8.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (2.7)</td>
<td>24 (32.4)</td>
<td>4 (5.4)</td>
<td>38 (51.4)</td>
<td>6 (8.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>6 (5.4)</td>
<td>38 (33.9)</td>
<td>2 (1.8)</td>
<td>58 (51.8)</td>
<td>8 (7.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>15 (24.6)</td>
<td>10 (16.4)</td>
<td>34 (55.7)</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>7 (63.6)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>4 (36.4)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>6 (37.5)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>8 (30.0)</td>
<td>2 (12.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>12 (60.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>8 (40.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>6 (3.3)</td>
<td>54 (30.0)</td>
<td>12 (6.7)</td>
<td>96 (53.3)</td>
<td>12 (6.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>12 (40.0)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>14 (46.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>12 (31.6)</td>
<td>2 (5.3)</td>
<td>22 (57.9)</td>
<td>2 (5.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>16 (72.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>12 (40.0)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>14 (46.7)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>2 (2.5)</td>
<td>28 (35.0)</td>
<td>4 (5.0)</td>
<td>38 (47.5)</td>
<td>8 (10.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
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Table 3.14 (a) Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson’s R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>1.990</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.465</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The analysis of the data presented in the Table 3.14 has tested the statement that whether supervisor wants that every action in the office be done in way and manner he desired. The women respondents in varying majority were in disagreement with the statement establishing that the supervisor never forced the employees to work in a way and manner he desired. There were some exceptions in some of the variables as was found on the basis of majority responses that the respondents younger in age (54.6 percent) and the diploma holders (63.6 percent) and the never married (60.0 percent) were in agreement with the statement that their supervisors wanted the office activities to happen in the way and manner they desired.

Marital status in the analysis presented cross trends of responses as the majority of never married women employees were in agreement whereas majority of ever married women employees were in disagreement with the statement. Thus, there were mixed responses ‘though’ overall results were in disagreement with the statement.

Statistically highly significant association was found between the variable education and the statement.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.14 (a), the value $r$ has exhibited low positive relationship between the statement and age, educational qualification, marital status and number of years in the job variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un- Decided</th>
<th>Dis- Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>(72.7)</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(13.8)</td>
<td>(75.9)</td>
<td>(6.9)</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(13.0)</td>
<td>(65.2)</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td>(17.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(13.5)</td>
<td>(81.1)</td>
<td>(2.7)</td>
<td>(2.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(14.3)</td>
<td>(71.4)</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(13.1)</td>
<td>(75.4)</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
<td>(8.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(90.9)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(12.5)</td>
<td>(87.5)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10.0)</td>
<td>(60.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(30.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td>(76.7)</td>
<td>(5.6)</td>
<td>(4.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td>(73.3)</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10.5)</td>
<td>(73.7)</td>
<td>(10.5)</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(90.9)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>(60.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(15.0)</td>
<td>(77.5)</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. $p<0.05$, $n=200$
### Table 3.15 (a): Pearson's correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson's R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.073</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>(-)1.037</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.048</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>(-)0.676</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.217</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>(-)3.127</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.075</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>(-)1.062</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The analysis of the data presented in the Table 3.15 have enough reasons to suggest that high proportion of responses varying from high majority (above 70.0 percent) to highly significant majority (above 90.0 percent) were in agreement with the statement in all the variables that the women employees got unbiased feedback from their supervisors about their work. There were not significant variations in the proportion of responses thus no ascending or descending trends available. But yet there were indications that higher proportion of women respondents' senior-in-age and experience supported the statement. However, highly significant majority of ever married employees (above 90.0 percent) were in agreement with the statement in comparison to the never married women respondents (70.0 percent). There were some disagreed responses, though insignificant in nature, as well.

Statistically highly significant association was established between the variable marital status and the statement whereas in case of number of years in the job significant association was found.

Karl Pearson's coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.15 (a), the value r has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age, educational qualification and marital status and number of years in the job variables.
Table 3.16: HR Department is in place for your Circle office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
<td>(62.1)</td>
<td>(13.8)</td>
<td>(10.3)</td>
<td>(10.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td>(60.9)</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td>(26.1)</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>(16.2)</td>
<td>(62.2)</td>
<td>(8.1)</td>
<td>(8.1)</td>
<td>(5.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>12 (10.7)</td>
<td>(64.3)</td>
<td>4 (3.6)</td>
<td>16 (14.3)</td>
<td>8 (7.1)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>4 (6.6)</td>
<td>(39.3)</td>
<td>11 (18.0)</td>
<td>16 (26.2)</td>
<td>6 (9.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>2 (18.2)</td>
<td>(54.5)</td>
<td>3 (27.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>16 (100.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
<td>(40.0)</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
<td>8 (40.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>16 (8.9)</td>
<td>(61.1)</td>
<td>16 (8.9)</td>
<td>24 (13.3)</td>
<td>14 (7.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in the job</td>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>(60.0)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-12 Years</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>(52.6)</td>
<td>6 (15.8)</td>
<td>6 (15.8)</td>
<td>6 (15.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>(45.5)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>6 (27.3)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>(60.0)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>10 (33.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-30 Years</td>
<td>14 (17.5)</td>
<td>(65.0)</td>
<td>6 (7.5)</td>
<td>4 (5.0)</td>
<td>4 (5.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
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Table 3.16 (a): Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson’s R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-)0.210</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>(-)3.019</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-)0.053</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>(-)0.752</td>
<td>0.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-)0.083</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>(-)1.175</td>
<td>0.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-)0.227</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>(-)3.273</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The trend of the responses towards the statement that HR Department was in place for their Circle office. It was further found that younger most women employees in the age group of (18-28 years) were not clear in their responses except that in all other variables and the categories within the majority of the respondents varying from fair majority (above 60.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) were in agreement with the statement indicating that HR Department was in place for their office rather the trend of the responses suggested employees senior-in-age and experience and ever married in higher proportion were in agreement with the statement. Agreed responses outmaneuvered the strongly agreed responses. However, the respondents with post graduate qualifications (45.9 percent) were unsure about the statement whereas 54.0 percent of the respondents either were in disagreement or remained undecided indicating that Post-graduates were not sure about the statement.

Statistically highly significant association was found between the variables education, number of years and the statement and significant association was found between the variable age, marital status and the statement.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.16 (a), the value r has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age, educational qualification and marital status and number of years in the job variables.
Table 3.17: HR Department is contributing to increase the performance of the employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un-Decided</th>
<th>Dis-Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>10 (45.3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>2 (3.4)</td>
<td>34 (58.6)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>20 (43.5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>6 (8.1)</td>
<td>46 (62.2)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>8 (7.1)</td>
<td>60 (53.6)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>4 (6.6)</td>
<td>29 (47.5)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>5 (45.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>16 (100.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
<td>12 (60.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>10 (5.6)</td>
<td>98 (54.4)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 Years</td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
<td>14 (46.7)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 Years</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>18 (47.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>12 (54.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>12 (53.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 Years</td>
<td>6 (7.5)</td>
<td>50 (62.5)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. \( p<0.05, n=200 \)
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The table below shows the Pearson's correlation between the variables of interest. The data was computed from primary data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson's R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-0.064)</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>(-0.906)</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-0.028)</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>(-0.388)</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-0.101)</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>(-1.426)</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The projected responses to the statement whether HR Department was contributing to increase their performance have shown strange pattern of trends where majority of the Diploma holders and the respondents in the age group of 39-48 years were in disagreement with the statement indicating that the HR Department was not contributing to improve their performance but on the other hand the respondents younger and senior-in-age and experience were in agreement with the statement that HR Department was contributing to increase their performance. The variable marital status had not shown much impact on the responses as in both the categories the respondents in majority were in agreement with statement. The Diploma holders were in disagreement with the statement whereas the respondents in all the other three categories were in agreement with the statement.

Statistically highly significant association was found between the variable age, education, number of years and the statement.

Karl Pearson's coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.17 (a), the value r has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age, educational qualification and number of years in the job variables whereas with marital status variable there existed low positive relationship between the two.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un- Decided</th>
<th>Dis-Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>6 (27.3)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>8 (36.4)</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>34 (58.6)</td>
<td>8 (13.8)</td>
<td>10 (17.2)</td>
<td>6 (10.3)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>26 (56.5)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>20 (43.5)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>6 (8.1)</td>
<td>50 (67.6)</td>
<td>8 (10.8)</td>
<td>10 (13.5)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>6 (5.4)</td>
<td>66 (58.9)</td>
<td>12 (10.7)</td>
<td>24 (21.4)</td>
<td>4 (3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
<td>30 (49.2)</td>
<td>6 (9.8)</td>
<td>17 (27.9)</td>
<td>6 (9.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4 (36.4)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>7 (63.6)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>16 (100.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
<td>8 (40.0)</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
<td>8 (40.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>6 (3.3)</td>
<td>108 (60.0)</td>
<td>16 (8.9)</td>
<td>40 (22.2)</td>
<td>10 (5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>14 (46.7)</td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
<td>4 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7-12 Years</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>18 (47.4)</td>
<td>2 (5.3)</td>
<td>12 (31.6)</td>
<td>6 (15.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>10 (45.5)</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>8 (36.4)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>18 (60.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>12 (40.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-30 Years</td>
<td>6 (7.5)</td>
<td>56 (70.0)</td>
<td>8 (10.0)</td>
<td>10 (12.5)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200

Table 3.18: Human Resource Department is utilizing potential of its employees by positioning them at the right place.
The data of the Table 3.18 has been analyzed in the context of the statement that Human Resource Department was utilizing potential of its employees by positioning them at the right place. There was couple of categories of two variables where the trends of the responses were found to be in disagreement. However, in majority of the categories within each variable, the respondents were in agreement with the statement implying that Human Resource Department was utilizing potential of its employees by positioning them at the right place. The diploma holders in majority (63.6 percent) were in disagreement with the statement implying that Human Resource Department was not utilizing potential of its employees by positioning them at the right place. However, cent percent respondents (100.0 percent) with other qualification were in agreement with the statement.

In relation to the age variable, it was found that the respondents in the younger age group (18-28 years) in majority were in disagreement whereas in all other categories of the age the respondents were in agreement with the statement. The trend of the responses established that with the increase in the age the proportion of the responses also increased signifying that higher proportion of senior in age respondents were in agreement with the statement. Similar trends were available in number of years in the job variable. The variable marital status didn’t have much impact on the responses as both the categories in majority were in agreement with the statement.

Statistically highly significant association between the variable age, educational qualifications number of years and the statement.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson’s R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.282</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>(-)4.144</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.027</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>(-)0.381</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.039</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>(-)0.543</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.286</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>(-)4.198</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.
In the Table 3.18 (a), the value r has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age, educational qualification, marital status and number of years in the job variables.

Table 3.19: The HR Department make arrangements to provide training to the employees of the Circle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un- Decided</th>
<th>Dis- Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(27.3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(55.2)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(17.2)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(17.4)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(30.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.7)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(40.5)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(10.8)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(5.4)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(35.7)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(16.1)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(36.1)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(26.2)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(10.0)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(36.7)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(18.9)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(40.0)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(63.2)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(21.1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(27.3)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(45.5)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(33.3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(30.0)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(12.5)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
On testing the statement that the HR Department make arrangements to provide training to the employees of the Circle, it was found that responses were unevenly distributed between all the options though with a tilt towards responses in agreement. However, the available projections of the responses suggested that more of respondent’s senior in age and experience were in disagreement with the statement. Similarly, more of never married (60.0 percent) respondents in comparison to ever married respondents (40.0 percent) were in agreement with the statement. However, more of respondents younger in age and with less of experience had shown their agreement with the statement. The proportion of the undecided responses made significant difference to the findings. In case of education variable, the trends were different altogether as majority of the respondents (62.5 percent) with other qualifications were in agreement with the statement whereas the respondents in other categories had opposing viewpoint.

Statistically highly significant association was found between the variable age, number of years and the statement.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.19 (a), the value r has exhibited low positive relationship between the statement and age, marital status and number of years in the job variables whereas with educational qualification variable there existed low negative relationship between the two.
Table 3.20: The Human Resource Department transfers the employees keeping in view their qualifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un-Decision</th>
<th>Dis-Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 (27.3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8 (36.4)</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34 (56.8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10 (17.2)</td>
<td>6 (10.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(13.8)</td>
<td>(17.2)</td>
<td>(10.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26 (56.5)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20 (43.5)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(43.5)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50 (67.6)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10 (13.5)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(10.8)</td>
<td>(13.5)</td>
<td>(13.5)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66 (58.9)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24 (21.4)</td>
<td>4 (3.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(10.7)</td>
<td>(21.4)</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30 (49.2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17 (27.9)</td>
<td>6 (9.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(9.8)</td>
<td>(27.9)</td>
<td>(9.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (36.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (63.6)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(63.6)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16 (100.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8 (40.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8 (40.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(10.0)</td>
<td>(40.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>108 (60.0)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40 (22.2)</td>
<td>10 (5.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(8.9)</td>
<td>(22.2)</td>
<td>(5.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14 (46.7)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
<td>4 (13.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18 (47.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12 (31.6)</td>
<td>6 (15.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td>(31.6)</td>
<td>(15.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 (45.5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8 (36.4)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18 (60.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 (40.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(40.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56 (70.0)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10 (12.5)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(10.0)</td>
<td>(12.5)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
Table 3.20 (a): Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson’s R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.282)</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>(-4.144)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.027)</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>(-0.381)</td>
<td>0.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.039)</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>(-0.543)</td>
<td>0.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.286)</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>(-4.198)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The data of the Table 3.20 has been analyzed in the context of the statement that Human Resource Department transfers the employees keeping in view their qualifications. There was couple of categories of two variables where the trends of the responses were found to be in disagreement. However, in majority of the categories within each variable, the respondents were in agreement with the statement implying that HR Department transfers the employees keeping in view their qualifications. The Diploma holders in majority were in disagreement with the statement that department was not transferring them keeping in view their qualifications. The trend of the responses established that with the increase in the age and the experience the proportion of the responses also increased signifying that higher portion of senior respondents both in age and experience were in agreement with the statement signifying that Human Resource Department transferred the women employees keeping in view their qualifications. The variable marital status did not have much impact on the responses as both the categories in majority were in agreement with the statement.

Statistically highly significant association was seen between the variable age, number of years and educational qualification and the statement.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.20 (a), the value $r$ has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age, educational qualification, marital status and number of years in the job variables.
Table 3.21: I have access to my supervisors seeking consultation in matters for which I want some professional advice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un- Decided</th>
<th>Dis-Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagreed</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(27.3)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(63.6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(6.9)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(86.2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(21.7)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(78.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(18.9)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>(78.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(23.2)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>(75.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(6.9)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(83.6)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(81.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(12.5)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(87.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(30.0)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(70.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(15.6)</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>(80.0)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(80.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(15.8)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(73.7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(90.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(80.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(77.5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. \( p < 0.05, n=200 \)
Table 3.21(a): Pearson's correlation between the variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson's R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)0.124</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>(-)1.757</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>1.607</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>1.769</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)0.154</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>(-)2.194</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The statement that the women employees have access to their supervisors regarding expert consultation in matters for which they wanted professional advice has been examined with the help of analysis of the responses in the Table 3.21. It was established by overwhelming proportion of responses in favour of the statement that irrespective of the variables the highly significant majority (above 90.0 percent) of the respondents were in agreement with the statement that the employees had access to their supervisors for seeking professional advice from them. There was not much of variation in responses and even if it was there, it had no trend to suggest. The agreed responses outmaneuvered the strongly agreed responses. However, there were no strongly disagreed responses to the statement.

Statistically significant association was established between the variable age, education and the statement where as in case of other variables weak relationship was found.

Karl Pearson's coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.21 (a), the value r has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age and number of years in the job variables whereas with educational qualification and marital status variables there existed low positive relationship between the two.
Table 3.22: I enjoy cordial relationship with my subordinates and supervisors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>6 (27.3)</td>
<td>14 (63.6)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>10 (17.2)</td>
<td>48 (82.8)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>18 (39.1)</td>
<td>28 (60.9)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>20 (27.0)</td>
<td>54 (73.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>36 (32.1)</td>
<td>76 (67.9)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>12 (19.7)</td>
<td>48 (78.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>4 (36.4)</td>
<td>6 (54.5)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (12.5)</td>
<td>4 (87.5)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>4 (20.0)</td>
<td>14 (70.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever married</td>
<td>50 (27.8)</td>
<td>130 (72.2)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
<td>24 (80.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 years</td>
<td>8 (21.1)</td>
<td>30 (78.9)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 years</td>
<td>8 (36.4)</td>
<td>14 (63.6)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 years</td>
<td>8 (26.7)</td>
<td>20 (66.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>24 (30.0)</td>
<td>56 (70.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=102
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Table 3.22(a): Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson’s R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Assumption std error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.146</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.206</td>
<td>0.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.047</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The statement that the women employees enjoyed cordial relations with their subordinates and supervisors has been examined as per the data presented in the Table 3.22. The overwhelming majority of responses varying from high majority (above 70.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) were in agreement with the statement that women employees enjoyed cordial relationship with both their seniors and subordinates. There was not much of variation in the responses signifying no trend as such. The variables like marital status and education also didn’t make much impact on the responses as all the categories had almost similar proportion of responses supporting the statement. Noteworthy was that there was increase in the proportion of strongly agreed responses yet the agreed responses outmaneuvered the strongly agreed responses.

Statistically highly significant association was established between the statement and the age, marital status variables whereas the variable education had significant association with the statement.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.22 (a), the value $r$ has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age, marital status variables and number of years in the job whereas with educational qualification variable there existed low positive relationship between the two.
Table 3.23: Work cooperation is highly valued in my office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>14 (63.6)</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 (13.8)</td>
<td>44 (75.9)</td>
<td>2 (3.4)</td>
<td>4 (6.9)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 (30.4)</td>
<td>30 (65.2)</td>
<td>2 (4.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 (21.6)</td>
<td>56 (75.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>2 (2.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 (25.0)</td>
<td>78 (69.6)</td>
<td>4 (3.6)</td>
<td>2 (1.8)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 (16.4)</td>
<td>44 (72.1)</td>
<td>3 (4.9)</td>
<td>4 (6.6)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (36.4)</td>
<td>6 (54.5)</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>16 (100.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (20.0)</td>
<td>12 (60.0)</td>
<td>4 (20.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td></td>
<td>38 (21.1)</td>
<td>132 (73.3)</td>
<td>4 (2.2)</td>
<td>6 (3.3)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
<td>24 (80.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 (21.1)</td>
<td>22 (57.9)</td>
<td>4 (10.5)</td>
<td>4 (10.5)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>20 (90.9)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 (33.3)</td>
<td>18 (60.0)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 (22.5)</td>
<td>60 (75.0)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td>2 (2.5)</td>
<td>0 (00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. P < 0.05, n=200
The value of the work cooperation has been tested through the analyzed data as presented in the Table 3.23. The trend of the responses indicated that with the increase in age the proportion of the responses in agreement also increased suggesting that senior in age employees expressed that cooperation was in the office has been highly valued the work cooperation. Similarly higher proportion of ever married respondents (94.4 percent) valued work cooperation as against never married respondents (80.0 percent).

There was no trend as such available in the variable number of years though in majority of the respondents were in agreement with the statement. Incidentally there were none who strongly disagreed with the statement. Overall, it was found that work cooperation was valued in the circle office.

Statistically highly significant association was found between the age, variable marital status, number of years and the statement.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.23 (a), the value $r$ has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age, marital status and number of years in the job variables whereas with educational qualification variable there existed low positive relationship between the two.
Table 3.24: I can discuss work related issues with members of my work group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/ Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un Decided</th>
<th>Dis-Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagreed</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(27.3)</td>
<td>(45.5)</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13.8)</td>
<td>(86.2)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(39.1)</td>
<td>(56.5)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(32.4)</td>
<td>(64.9)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 Years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 Years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
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The poser that the women employees could discuss their work related issues with the members of their work group has been tested in the Table 3.24 through the elicited responses. The overwhelming majority of the responses in agreement with the statement established that employees could discuss their work related issues with the members of the work group. It was found that, in some proportion the youngest most employees remained undecided to the issue. However, irrespective of any variable or the categories within these variables, the respondents varying from high majority (above 70.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) were in agreement with the statement that employees could discuss work related issues with their group members. There was increase in the proportion of strongly agreed responses out proportioned the agreed responses.

Statistically highly significant association was found between the variable age, number of years and the statement whereas significant association was found between the variable marital status and the statement.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.24 (a), the value r has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age, marital status and number of years in the job variables whereas with educational qualification variable there existed low positive relationship between the two.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson's R</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.195</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>(-)2.802</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.119</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>(-)1.687</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.093</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>(-)1.313</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.
### Table 3.25: I am satisfied with problems solving methods of my work group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un-Decision</th>
<th>Dis-Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td>8 (36.4)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>6 (27.3)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>2 (3.4)</td>
<td>52 (89.7)</td>
<td>2 (3.4)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (3.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>12 (26.1)</td>
<td>28 (60.9)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>6 (13.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>20 (27.0)</td>
<td>48 (64.9)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>6 (8.1)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>26 (23.2)</td>
<td>72 (64.3)</td>
<td>2 (1.8)</td>
<td>12 (10.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>8 (13.1)</td>
<td>44 (72.1)</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
<td>4 (6.6)</td>
<td>3 (4.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>8 (72.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (18.2)</td>
<td>1 (9.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4 (25.0)</td>
<td>12 (75.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
<td>10 (50.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>6 (30.0)</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>36 (20.0)</td>
<td>126 (70.0)</td>
<td>4 (2.2)</td>
<td>12 (6.7)</td>
<td>2 (1.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>4 (13.3)</td>
<td>20 (66.7)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>4 (13.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 years</td>
<td>2 (5.3)</td>
<td>30 (78.9)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4 (10.5)</td>
<td>2 (5.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 years</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>16 (72.7)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 years</td>
<td>8 (26.7)</td>
<td>8 (60.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>22 (27.5)</td>
<td>52 (65.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>6 (7.5)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200*
The women employees have expressed their satisfaction towards the problem solving method of solving their work related problems as there have been overwhelming responses supporting the statement. The responses varying from majority (50.0 percent) to highly significant majority (above 90.0 percent), irrespective of any variable, were in agreement with the statement. However, the responses suggested the trends that with the increase in age and experience and education there was increase in the proportion of responses suggesting that more of respondents senior in age and experience were in agreement with the statement. The marital status also made difference to the responses as higher proportion of ever married respondents (90.0 percent) as against never married (60.0 percent) were in agreement with the statement posing that younger in age and never married respondents were satisfied but not to the extent as their counterparts were. There were some noticeable proportions of disagreed responses though insignificant in nature.

Statistically highly significant association was found between the age, marital status and number of years variables.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.25 (a), the value r has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age, marital status and number of years in the job variables whereas with educational qualification variable there existed low positive relationship between the two.

### Table 3.25(a): Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.245</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>(-)3.562</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.282</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>(-)4.134</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.184</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>(-)2.632</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.
Table 3.26: Two way communications channel works smoothly in the circle office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un- Decided</th>
<th>Dis- Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagreed</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(27.3)</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>(27.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(13.8)</td>
<td>(41.4)</td>
<td>(37.9)</td>
<td>(6.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13.0)</td>
<td>(17.4)</td>
<td>(30.4)</td>
<td>(30.4)</td>
<td>(8.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16.2)</td>
<td>(2.7)</td>
<td>(43.2)</td>
<td>(35.1)</td>
<td>(2.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16.1)</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
<td>(37.5)</td>
<td>(32.1)</td>
<td>(7.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.8)</td>
<td>(19.7)</td>
<td>(31.1)</td>
<td>(32.8)</td>
<td>(6.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(63.6)</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(37.5)</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
<td>(12.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10.0)</td>
<td>(10.0)</td>
<td>(40.0)</td>
<td>(30.0)</td>
<td>(10.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.2)</td>
<td>(33.3)</td>
<td>(36.7)</td>
<td>(10.0)</td>
<td>(7.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>(33.3)</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td>(42.1)</td>
<td>(36.8)</td>
<td>(10.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(27.3)</td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>(40.0)</td>
<td>(33.3)</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17.5)</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>(42.5)</td>
<td>(30.0)</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
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Table 3.26(a): Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson’s R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.140</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>(-)1.983</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>1.851</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.005</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>(-)0.077</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.218</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>(-)3.138</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The case of mixed responses was visible in context of the statement that whether two way communications channel works smoothly in the circle office. There were registered majority responses both in favour and against the statement. There were six categories of different variables which in majority were in agreement with the statement. The majority of senior most respondents (59.4 percent) in the age group of 49-60 years, graduates (53.6 percent), diploma holders (63.6 percent) and fair majority (above 60.0 percent) with maximum years of service (19-30 years) were in agreement with the statement whereas the majority of least experienced (53.3 percent) and majority respondents with other qualifications (62.5 percent) were in disagreement with the statement.

In all other categories of each variable the responses were unequally divided between the favourable and disfavourable responses thus indicating that the two way communication was not working smoothly in the circle office. The trend of the responses suggested that respondent’s senior-in-age and experience were in agreement with the statement and this can be interpreted that two way communication may not be a problem for the seniors. However, the respondents younger-in-age and with less experience and those with other qualification found it other way round that two way communication was not working smoothly for them.

Statistically highly significant relationship was found between the variable age and the statement where significant association was established between the variable number of years and education and the statement.

In the Table 3.26 (a), the value r has exhibited low positive relationship between the statement and educational qualification variable whereas with age, marital status and number of years in the job variables there existed low negative relationship between the two.
Table 3.27:- The job is described to the employees before they are asked to perform it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un-Decided</th>
<th>Dis-Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagreed</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(27.3)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(54.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>(72.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(17.4)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(56.5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(8.7)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>(21.6)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>(70.3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.7)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(23.2)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>(66.1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1.8)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(59.0)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(9.8)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(72.7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(12.5)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(87.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(10.0)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(70.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(15.6)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>(65.6)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(4.4)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(66.7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(63.2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(72.7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(9.1)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(53.3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(22.5)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(70.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
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Table 3.27(a): Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson’s R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.197</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>(-)2.821</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>1.609</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.059</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>(-)0.825</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)0.234</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>(-)3.388</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

Interestingly, the women employee respondents in majority varying from fair majority (above 60.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) were in agreement with the statement that job was described to them before being asked to perform it. The fair majority of respondents with post-graduate qualifications (62.3 percent) and with 7-12 years of experience (63.2 percent) were in agreement yet there were some dissenting responses (above 27.8 percent) in both the categories which could be possibly attributed to their position and education as they were not sure what job they were to perform. The variable marital status had no influence on the responses in both categories. Interestingly, highly significant majority of respondents (above 90.0 percent) senior in age and experience were in agreement with the statement. Undecided responses had no influence on the responses.

Statistically highly significant association was found between the variables age, education, number of years and the statement.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.27 (a), the value r has exhibited low positive relationship between the statement and educational qualification variable whereas with age, marital status and number of years in the job variables there existed low negative relationship between the two.
Table 3.28: The kind of leave applied is never refused to me whenever requested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un- Decided</th>
<th>Dis- Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagreed</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
<td>(45.5)</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20.7)</td>
<td>(75.9)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(56.5)</td>
<td>(39.1)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(32.4)</td>
<td>(59.5)</td>
<td>(2.7)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(5.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(37.5)</td>
<td>(55.4)</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(29.5)</td>
<td>(67.2)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
<td>(45.5)</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(37.5)</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(12.5)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30.0)</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(35.6)</td>
<td>(58.9)</td>
<td>(11.1)</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>(66.7)</td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(42.1)</td>
<td>(52.6)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(27.3)</td>
<td>(72.7)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(40.0)</td>
<td>(53.3)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(6.7)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 Years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(37.5)</td>
<td>(55.0)</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
Table 3.28 (a): Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson’s R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)0.001</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>(-)0.014</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)0.052</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>(-)0.733</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)0.016</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>(-)0.225</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

Analysing leave sanctioning in the organization it appears to be an affair without fuss as could be seen from the high projection of the responses in all the variables and the categories within. Nearly similar proportions of respondents in all the variables were in agreement with the statement. The possible trend emerged that senior-in-age and experiences as well as ever married respondents in higher proportion were in agreement with the statement. Due to seniority in age or more experience some or other kind of leave was due to them therefore they always got the leave whenever applied. Interestingly there was increase in the strongly agreed responses however agreed responses outmaneuvered strongly agreed responses. Thus, majority of the respondents in all the variables varying from high majority (above 80.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) were in agreement with the statement that they were not refused leave whenever they requested for it.

Statistically highly significant association was found between the variables age, marital status education, number of years and the statement.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.28 (a) the value $r$ has exhibited low positive relationship between the statement and educational qualification variable whereas with age, marital status and number of years in the job variables there existed low negative relationship between the two.
Table 3.29: Women employees get promotion whenever they are due for it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un- Decided</th>
<th>Dis- Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(45.5)</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>(6.9)</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.4)</td>
<td>(58.6)</td>
<td>(9.8)</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td>(3.3)</td>
<td>(20.7)</td>
<td>(10.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(52.2)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td>(43.5)</td>
<td>(16.2)</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td>(8.8)</td>
<td>(10.8)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.1)</td>
<td>(62.2)</td>
<td>(16.2)</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td>(8.8)</td>
<td>(20.1)</td>
<td>(2.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7.1)</td>
<td>(53.6)</td>
<td>(14.3)</td>
<td>(25.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6.6)</td>
<td>(47.5)</td>
<td>(9.8)</td>
<td>(26.2)</td>
<td>(9.8)</td>
<td>(18.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(36.4)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5.6)</td>
<td>(60.0)</td>
<td>(10.0)</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10.0)</td>
<td>(54.4)</td>
<td>(11.1)</td>
<td>(24.4)</td>
<td>(4.4)</td>
<td>(4.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(46.7)</td>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20.0)</td>
<td>(47.4)</td>
<td>(5.3)</td>
<td>(31.6)</td>
<td>(15.8)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(54.6)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(45.5)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(53.3)</td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td>(46.7)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td>(00.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>(62.5)</td>
<td>(17.5)</td>
<td>(10.0)</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. $p<0.05, n=200$
Table 3.29 (a): Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson’s R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)0.064</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>(-)0.906</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)0.028</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>(-)0.388</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)0.101</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>(-)1.426</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

The views of the women employees have been solicited on the statement that they get the promotion whenever they are due for promotion. The analysis of the data presented in the Table 3.29 has shown some criss-cross pattern. The employee’s respondents with less than 6 years experience (47.4 percent) were in agreement with the statement showing their reservation to the statement. Similarly, diploma holders (54.6 percent) and the employees respondents (52.2 percent) in the middle age groups (39-48 years) in clear majority were in disagreement with the statement showing that women employees did not get promotion whenever they were due for it. Even in case of number of year’s variable the trend of the responses had shown reservation while considering the responses in disagreement. Thus, women employees in some categories of the variable got the promotion as and when it was due whereas in other categories it was not the case. Thus, no clear cut finding emerged from the analysis of the data though going by majority principle the responses projected that women employees did get promotion as and when it was due to them except the middle aged, diploma holders and the women employees with less than 6 years experience who disagreed with the statement.

Statistically highly significant association was found between the variable age, education, marital status and the statement.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.29 (a), the value r has exhibited low positive relationship between the statement and educational marital status variable whereas with age, educational qualification and number of years in the job variables there existed low negative relationship between the two.
Table 3.30: I am satisfied with leave travelling concession provided to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un-Decided</th>
<th>Dis-Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagreed</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 (27.3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 (18.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34 (58.6)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6 (10.3)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26 (56.5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50 (67.6)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66 (58.9)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (3.6)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30 (49.2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 (9.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (36.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16 (100.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8 (40.0)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>108 (60.0)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 (5.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14 (46.7)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (13.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18 (47.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 (15.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10 (45.5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18 (60.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56 (70.0)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson's R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson's (-)</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>(-)4.144</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R (-)</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>(-)0.381</td>
<td>0.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>(-)0.543</td>
<td>0.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-)0.286</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>(-)4.198</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

On examining the issue whether the women employees are satisfied with leave travelling concession provided to them by the organization, it was found from the responses presented in the Table 3.30 that employees younger in age and experience were not satisfied with the concession whereas the majority of respondents senior in age and experience were in agreement with the statement. As per the analysis of the marital status variable more of ever married respondents (63.3 percent) than never married respondents (50.0 percent) were satisfied with the provided concession. Similarly in educational qualification variable except diploma holders (36.4 percent) all other categories in varying majority were in agreement with the statement. The reason for the respondents young in age and experience to disagree with the statement was perhaps due to fact that it was too early for them to avail such concession.

Statistically highly significant association was found between the variables age, number of years in the job and the statement and significant association was established with educational qualification variable.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.30 (a), the value $r$ has exhibited low negative relationship between the statement and age, educational qualification, marital status and number of years in the job variables.
Table 3.31: I am satisfied with my salary as it provides me enough funds to support my family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un-Decided</th>
<th>Dis-Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-28 (27.3)</td>
<td>6 (26.6)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (9.1)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38 (17.2)</td>
<td>10 (82.8)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48 (39.1)</td>
<td>18 (60.9)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60 (27.0)</td>
<td>20 (73.0)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate (32.1)</td>
<td>36 (67.9)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate (19.7)</td>
<td>12 (78.7)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder (36.4)</td>
<td>4 (54.5)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (12.5)</td>
<td>2 (87.5)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married (20.0)</td>
<td>4 (70.0)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married (27.8)</td>
<td>50 (72.2)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 Years (21.1)</td>
<td>8 (78.9)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 Years (36.4)</td>
<td>8 (63.6)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 Years (26.7)</td>
<td>8 (66.7)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 Years (30.0)</td>
<td>24 (70.0)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200

183
The women employees of the BSNL were found more than satisfied with their salary as it provided them enough funds to support the families. There were very high percentages of favourable responses to the statement irrespective of the variables and the categories within it. The responses varying from highly significant majority (above 90.0 percent) to the cent percent (100.00 percent) supported the statement signifying the satisfaction with the salary. Interestingly there were no undecided responses to the statement only few strongly disagreed responses were registered by the young employees, never married respondents and the respondents with high experience. The variable marital status didn’t make much of influence on the responses as in either case the responses were favourable. Therefore, it got established that majority respondents varying from highly significant (above 90.0 percent) association to cent percent (100.0 percent) were found satisfied with the salary the reason could be attributed to regular pay-revisions through pay commissions and supplement enhancement through release of dearness allowance (DA).

Statistically highly significant association was established between the variable age, marital status and the statement whereas significant association was established with educational qualifications variable.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.31 (a), the value r has exhibited low positive relationship between the statement and educational qualification variable whereas with age, marital status and number of years in the job variables there existed low negative relationship between the two.
Table 3.32: I am satisfied with the medical provisions made by the BSNL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Un-Decided</th>
<th>Dis-Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagreed</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (in years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>6 (27.3)</td>
<td>16 (72.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>10 (17.2)</td>
<td>46 (79.3)</td>
<td>2 (3.4)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>16 (34.8)</td>
<td>30 (65.2)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60</td>
<td>18 (24.3)</td>
<td>54 (73.0)</td>
<td>2 (2.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>34 (30.4)</td>
<td>76 (67.9)</td>
<td>2 (1.8)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>10 (16.4)</td>
<td>49 (80.3)</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Holder</td>
<td>4 (36.4)</td>
<td>7 (63.6)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (12.5)</td>
<td>14 (87.5)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
<td>18 (90.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>48 (26.7)</td>
<td>128 (71.1)</td>
<td>4 (2.2)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of years in the job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
<td>24 (80.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 Years</td>
<td>6 (15.8)</td>
<td>30 (78.9)</td>
<td>2 (3.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18 Years</td>
<td>8 (36.4)</td>
<td>14 (63.6)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24 Years</td>
<td>8 (26.7)</td>
<td>22 (73.3)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 Years</td>
<td>22 (27.5)</td>
<td>56 (70.0)</td>
<td>2 (2.5)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
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Table 3.32 (a): Pearson’s correlation between the variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval by interval</th>
<th>Pearson's R</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Assumption std error</th>
<th>Approx. T.</th>
<th>Approx. Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.017)</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>(-0.238)</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>1.097</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.069)</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>(-0.967)</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.065)</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>(-0.923)</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from Primary Data.

On examining the satisfaction levels of the women employees towards medical facilities provided by the BSNL, it was found that very high proportion of responses varying from highly significant majority (above 90.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) were in agreement with the statement that the women employees were satisfied with the medical facilities provided to them by their organisation. There was not much of variation in the responses so specific trend couldn’t be established except that the employees were satisfied with the facilities. As usual agreed responses outmaneuvered the strongly agreed responses. However, there were no undecided and strongly disagreed responses to the statement. There were seven categories in all the variables where cent percent respondents were in agreement with the statement whereas in other variables in majority were in agreement. Thus, emphasizing that women employees were satisfied with the provided medical facilities.

Statistically no significant association was established between any of the variables and the statement.

Karl Pearson’s coefficient of correlation has been applied to measure the strength and direction of linear relationship between two variables.

In the Table 3.32 (a), the value r has exhibited low positive relationship between the statement and educational qualification variable whereas with age, marital status and number of years in the job variables there existed low negative relationship between the two.
Major findings of women employees Working Conditions and suggestions

1. The majority of the respondents varying from fair majority (above 60.0 percent) to highly significant majority (above 90.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement that their job provided them opportunities to learn new skills in their field.

2. The majority of the respondents varying from fair majority (above 60.0 percent) to highly significant (above 90.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the query that women employees got enough opportunities to use their professional skills in their day to day job. Except maximum proportion of never married respondents (40.0 percent) who were in disagreement with the query.

3. The majority of the respondents varying from majority (above 50.0 percent) to significant majority (above 90.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement that the environment was work conducive.

4. The majority of the respondents varying from majority (above 50.0 percent) to significant majority (above 80.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement that women employees were highly individualistic and only completed those assigned tasks for which they were expected to be compensated.

5. The majority of the respondents varying from highly noticeable proportion (above 40.0 percent) to highly significant majority (above 90.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement that employees in the organisation were treated according to their work assignment not on kinship, caste, language and gender basis.

6. The majority of the respondents varying from noticeable proportion (above 30.0 percent) to significant majority (80.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the query that repetitive nature of job did not affect their working. Except majority of ever married respondents (52.2 percent) who were in
disagreement indicating that somehow ever married respondents were affected by the repetitive nature of the job.

7. The majority of the respondents varying from high majority (above 70.0 percent) to highly significant majority (above 90.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the query that they were satisfied with the assigned quantum of work.

8. The majority of respondents varying from highly noticeable proportion (above 40.0 percent) to highly significant majority (above 90.0 percent) were in agreement with the statement that women employees were satisfied with the extent of authority given to them to fulfill their responsibilities.

9. The majority the respondents varying from majority (above 50.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement that their job profile kept their interest alive in their work.

10. The majority of the respondents varying from majority (above 50.0 percent) to significant majority (above 80.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement that their job involved much of the challenge. Except, majority of the young respondents (54.6 percent), diploma holders (27.3 percent), never married (40.0 percent) and the respondents with lesser experience (46.6 percent) were in disagreement with the query.

11. The majority of the respondents varying from majority (above 50.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement that achievement in the office were attributed to the teamwork and not to the individuals.

12. The majority of the respondents varying from high majority (above 70.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement that women employees received clear instructions from their supervisors regarding their work profile.
13. The majority of the respondents varying from noticeable proportion (above 30.0 percent) to high majority (above 70.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the query that the suggestions of the women employees were valued by their supervisors in the organisation.

14. The majority of the respondents varying from noticeable proportion (above 30.0 percent) to high majority (above 70.0 percent) were in disagreement with the statement that their supervisor wanted that every action in the office to be done in way and manner he desired. Except the majority of respondents (above 50.0 percent) younger in age and the diploma holders (63.6 percent) and the never married respondents (60.0 percent) who were in agreement with the raised query.

15. The majority of the respondents varying from high majority (above 70.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the query that women employees got unbiased feedback from their seniors about their work.

16. The majority of the respondents varying from highly noticeable proportion (above 40.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement that women employees found the HR Department was in place for their Circle office.

17. The majority of the respondents varying from highly noticeable proportion (above 40.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement that HRD was contributing to increase the performance of the employees.

18. The majority of the respondents varying from noticeable proportion of respondents (20.0 percent) to cent percent (above 100.0 percent) were in agreement with the statement that HR Department utilized potential of its employees by positioning them at the right place. Except fair majority (above 60.0 percent) of diploma holders who were in disagreement with the statement.
19. The majority of the respondents varying from negligible proportion of respondent (above 10.0 percent) to fair majority (100.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement that the **HRD makes arrangements to provide training to the employees of the Punjab Circle.**

20. The majority of the respondents varying from noticeable proportion of respondent (above 30.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement that the **HRD transfers the employees keeping in their qualifications.**

21. The majority of the respondents varying from significant majority (above 80.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement that **employees had sufficient access to their supervisor for seeking professional advice.**

22. The majority of the respondents varying from highly significant majority (above 90.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement that **women employees enjoyed cordial relationship with both their superiors and subordinates.**

23. The majority of the respondents varying from significant majority (above 80.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement that **work cooperation was highly valued in their office.**

24. The majority of the respondents varying from high majority (above 70.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) were in agreement with the statement that **women employees could discuss their work related issues with the members of the work group.**

25. The majority of the respondents varying from majority (above 50.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement regarding the **women employees' satisfaction towards the problem solving method of their work group.**
26. No clear cut trends were available in all categories of each variable the responses were unequally divided between the favourable and disfavourable responses thus indicating that the two way communication channels did smoothly work in the circle office.

27. The majority of the respondents varying from fair majority (above 50.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement that job were described to them before being asked to perform it.

28. The majority of the respondents varying from significant majority (above 80.0 percent) to cent percent majority (100.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement that they were sanctioned leave whenever they requested for it.

29. The majority of the respondents varying from noticeable proportion (above 30.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement that women employees got promoted whenever they were due for it.

30. The majority of the respondents varying from highly significant majority (above 90.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement that women employees were satisfied with the leave travelling concessions provided to them by the organisation.

31. The majority of the respondents varying from highly significant majority (above 90.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the salary provided by the BSNL as it provided them funds to support their family.

32. The majority of the respondents varying from highly significant majority (above 90.0 percent) to cent percent (100.0 percent) in all the variables were in agreement with the statement that women employees were satisfied with the medical provisions made by the BSNL.
Statistical Methods

Statistical analysis was carried out with the help of SPSS package Version 16.0. Statistical analysis included solution of regression model, analysis of variance (ANOVA), testing of various regression coefficients, 95% confidence and for satisfaction level and t-statistic.

Working Conditions

Further to cross check the findings derived from the analysis of the tables regarding level of satisfaction among the women employees viz-a-viz working conditions in BSNL, the prediction equation was derived by applying Regression Model. For the application of regression model the working conditions were drawn into five dependable variables (five domains) and the analysis has been presented in the Table 3.1.1 of this chapter.

| Table-3.1.1: Regression model on Age |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Dependent Variables           | Equation for Prediction         | Multiple R      | S E of Estimate | 95% Confidential Interval for B | F-value | (p-value) | t-value | (p-value) |
| Working Activities            | Working Activities =49.927+1.015Age | .184           | 5.664           | (256-1.774)       | 6.955   | .009**   | 2.637   | .009**   |
| Supervision                   | Supervision =17.650 + .063 Age  | .031           | 2.098           | (-218-344)        | .193    | .661ns  | .440    | .661ns  |
| Inter Personal Relations      | Inter Personal Relations =52.841 + 1.041Age | .263           | 3.991           | (.507-1.576)      | 14.750  | .000**  | 3.841   | .0001** |
| Salary and Other benefits     | Salary and other benefits =27.882 + 1.111Age | .315           | 3.498           | (18.887-21.749)   | 21.838  | .000**  | 4.673   | .0001** |

As can be seen that between variable age and all the domains of the Working Conditions there existed positive slopes which meant that in all the four categories of the age, the equation for prediction indicated that as the age will increase the satisfaction levels of the employees will increase.

The regression coefficient was found to be highly significant in three domains; Working Activities (0.09**), Inter Personal Relations (0.00**) and Salary and Other benefits (0.00**) indicating that there were significant variations in the proportion of
responses whereas in other two domains Supervision (0.661ns) and Human Resource Activities (0.472ns) there existed positive slope but non-significant p-value (above 0.05).

Thus, in all the domains of the Working Conditions, there existed positive slope between the domains and the age sub-groups implying that the increase in age increased the satisfaction levels of the women employees as well. Thus, accepting the hypothesis that higher the age of the women employees the higher is the satisfaction levels.

Table 3.1.2 Regression model on Educational qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Equation for Prediction</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>S E of Estimate</th>
<th>95% Confidential Interval for B</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>(p-value)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>(p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working Activities</td>
<td>Working Activities =53.03-.114 Education</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>5.762</td>
<td>(-.979-.751)</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.795ns</td>
<td>-2.61</td>
<td>.795ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Supervision =18.21 -.228 Education</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>2.088</td>
<td>(-.542-.085)</td>
<td>2.062</td>
<td>.153ns</td>
<td>-1.436</td>
<td>.153ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Activities</td>
<td>Human Resource Activities =9.628 +.181 Education</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>2.278</td>
<td>(-.161-.523)</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>.297ns</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td>.297ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter Personal Relations</td>
<td>Inter Personal Relations =37.117 -.773 Education</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>4.073</td>
<td>(-1.385-.162)</td>
<td>6.215</td>
<td>.013*</td>
<td>-2.493</td>
<td>.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary and Other benefits</td>
<td>Salary and Other benefits =31.929 -.636 Education</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>3.638</td>
<td>(-1.182-.09)</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>.023*</td>
<td>-2.296</td>
<td>.023*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the Table 3.1.2 that variable Educational qualification and the Working Conditions had negative slope in four domains; Working Activities, Supervision, Inter Personal Relations and Salary and Other benefits indicating that as qualifications will increase the satisfaction levels of the women employees will decrease. In case of HRA there existed positive slope indicating that with the increase in Educational qualifications the satisfaction level will also increase.

The regression coefficient was found to be highly significant in the two domains Inter Personal Relations (0.013) and Salary and Other benefits (0.023) indicating that there were significant variations in the proportion of responses in these two domains whereas in other three domains; Working Activities (0.795ns), Supervision (.153ns) and HRA (0.297ns) p-value was non-significant indicating no significant variations in the responses of these three domains.
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In four domains Working Activities, Supervision, Inter Personal Relations and Salary and Other benefits there existed negative slope indicating that as educational qualification increased the satisfaction decreased except Human Resource Activities where positive slope was seen. The application of regression has established that educational qualification had non significant impact on four domains of Working Conditions; Working Activities, Supervision, IPR and Salary and Other benefits except the domain of HRA.

Thus, hypothesis that higher the qualification the higher is the satisfaction level stands rejected except in one domain i.e. HRA.

Table-3.1.3 Regression model on Number of years in the job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Equation for Prediction</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>S E of Estimate</th>
<th>95% Confidential Interval for B</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>(p-value)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>(p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working Activities</td>
<td>Working Activities =50.645+.631 No Years of Job</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>5.681</td>
<td>(.109-1.152)</td>
<td>5.694</td>
<td>.018*</td>
<td>2.386</td>
<td>.018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Supervision =17.240+.170 No Years of Job</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>(-.022-.361)</td>
<td>3.061</td>
<td>.082&quot;</td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>.082M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Activities</td>
<td>Human Resource Activities=10.226-.085 No Years of Job</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>2.280</td>
<td>(-.294-.124)</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.424&quot;</td>
<td>-.801</td>
<td>.424ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter Personal Relations</td>
<td>Inter Personal Relations =33.417+.693 No Years of Job</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>3.999</td>
<td>(.327-1.060)</td>
<td>13.891</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>3.727</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary and Other benefits</td>
<td>Salary and Other benefits =28.079+.802 No Years of Job</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>3.477</td>
<td>(.483-1.121)</td>
<td>24.581</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>4.958</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200

It is evident from the Table 3.1.3 that the domains like Working Activities, Supervision, Interpersonal Relations and Salary and Other Benefits have positive slopes with the independent variable Number of years in the job which indicates that as the Number of Years in the job will increase the levels of satisfaction with respect to four domains of Working Conditions i.e. Working Activities, Supervision, Interpersonal relations and Salary and other Benefits will also increase. However, it is observed that
since HRA has a negative slope with number of years in the job which indicated that with increase in the Number of Years in the job the satisfaction levels with respect to HRA will decline.

The regression coefficients with respect to Working Condition (p=.018), Interpersonal Relation (p=.0001), Salary and Fringe Benefits (p=.0001) were found to be significant indicating variations in the responses. While in other two domains of satisfaction i.e. Supervision (.082 ns), HRA (424 ns) the p-value were above 0.05 indicating no significant variation in the responses.

In four domains of Working Conditions i.e. Working Activities, Supervision, Interpersonal Relations and Salary and Other benefits there existed positive slope except Human Resource Activities which had negative slope suggesting that as the Number of years increases the satisfaction with the above mentioned domains will also increase.

Thus hypothesis stands accepted that Higher the experience in the job of the women employees higher is the job satisfaction level in the four domains except one domain.

Table 3.1.4: ANOVA on Age variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>461.153</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>153.718</td>
<td>4.928</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>6113.727</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>31.192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6574.880</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>23.033</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.678</td>
<td>1.772</td>
<td>0.154ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>849.187</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>872.220</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Resource Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>52.858</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.619</td>
<td>3.523</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>980.162</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>5.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1033.020</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inter Personal Relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>256.023</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85.341</td>
<td>5.340</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3132.197</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>15.981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3388.220</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary and Other benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>276.563</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92.188</td>
<td>7.485</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2414.057</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>12.317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2690.620</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
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The ANOVA result related to different aspects of working conditions and the four age groups has been presented in the Table 3.1.4. The analysis of this table reflected that satisfaction levels of respondents in all the aspects of Working Conditions except Supervision were significantly different between each group (p value below 0.05) whereas in case of Supervision the p-value was found to be non significant (0.154).

Thus, simply it can be interpreted that the satisfaction level of respondents in four domains (Working Activities, Human Resource Activities, Interpersonal Relations, Salary and Other benefits) were different from each other in all the age groups whereas there were no difference in satisfaction levels of respondents in all the four sub groups of age in supervision domain (p=0.154ns).

Thus, age had significant impact on all the domains of Working Conditions except Supervision.

Further, the satisfaction levels of the employees in the Salary and Other benefits domain was highest followed by Interpersonal Relations than Working Activities and HRA and Supervision.

ANOVA test applied in the Table 3.1.4 has shown that there has been significant difference of responses between all the four sub-groups of age with respect to Working Activities, Human Resource Activities, Interpersonal Relations and Salary and Other Benefits. However, no difference was observed between all the sub-groups of age with Supervision domain. Going by the requirement of Post-Hoc test application, the Post-Hoc test (LSD) is being applied wherever the ANOVA tests were significant (p-value below 0.05). Thus, Post-Hoc was carried out to find out the correlation between the satisfactions levels of the women employees with different domains of Working Conditions where there existed significant p-value (ANOVA).
Table 3.1.5: Post Hoc Test on Age in the four domains of Working Conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Activities</td>
<td>1 (18-28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (29-38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (39-48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (49-60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Activities</td>
<td>1 (18-28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (29-38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (39-48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (49-60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter Personal Relations</td>
<td>1 (18-28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (29-38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (18-28)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.952*</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.519*</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. $p<0.05$, $n=200$

The discussion of Post hoc test includes correlation within and between each group.

The Table 3.1.5 reveals that satisfaction levels of women employees were highly correlated with each other in all the four domains of Working Conditions where Post-Hoc was carried out.

Further a multiple comparison Post Hoc test (LSD) Least Significant Difference reflected that significant difference has been observed between age sub-groups and the different domains of Working Conditions:

**Age and Working Activities**

1, 2, 3 & 4 (age groups) $p$-value $<$0.05 (significant)

Non Significant difference has been observed between the age groups.

2, 3 & 4 and 3 & 4 (age groups) $p$-value $>$ 0.05 (non-significant in the working activities domain).
Thus, the findings of the Post-Hoc test revealed that Working Activities domain of the respondents were significantly correlated with each other in the Age group 1, 2, 3 & 4, signifying the definite effects of Age on Working Activities whereas there existed poor correlation between the respondents of Age group 2, 3 & 4 and 3 & 4 signifying weak or no effects of Age.

Age: HRA: the significant difference has been observed between age sub groups:

2 & 3 and 3 & 4 (age groups) p-value <0.05 (significant).

Non-significant difference has been observed between in age groups:

1, 2, 3 & 4 and 2 & 4 (age group) p value > 0.05 (non-significant) in HRA domain signifying weak or no effects of Age.

Thus, the findings of the Post-Hoc test revealed that HRA of the respondents were significantly correlated with each other in the Age group 2 & 3 and 3 & 4 signifying the definite effects of Age on HRA whereas there existed poor correlation between the respondents of Age group 1, 2, 3 & 4 and 2 & 4 signifying weak or no effects of Age.

Age: Inter Personal Relations (IPR): significant difference has been observed between the age groups

1, 3 & 4 and 2, 3 & 4 (age groups) p-value < 0.05 (significant)

Non-significant difference has been observed between the age groups

1, 2, 3 & 4 (age groups) p value > 0.05 (non-significant)

Thus, the findings of the Post-Hoc test revealed that Inter Personal Relations of the respondents were significantly correlated with each other in the Age group 1, 3 & 4 and 2, 3 & 4 signifying the definite effects of Age on Inter Personal Relations whereas there existed poor correlation between the respondents of Age group 1, 2, 3 & 4 signifying weak or no effects of Age.

Age: Salary and Other benefits: significant difference has been observed between the age groups

1, 3 & 4 and 2, 3 & 4 (age groups) p-value < 0.05 (significant).
Non-significant difference has been observed between the age groups:

1 & 2 and 3 & 4 (age groups) p-value > 0.05 (non-significant) in the Salary and Other benefits.

Thus, the findings of the Post-Hoc test revealed that Salary and Other benefits of the respondents were significantly correlated with each other in the Age group 1, 3 & 4 and 2, 3 & 4 whereas there existed poor correlation between the respondents of Age group 1 & 2 and 3 & 4 signifying weak or no effects of Age.

Table: 3.1.6 ANOVA on Educational qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>29.850</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.950</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>0.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>6545.030</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>33.393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6574.880</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>18.246</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.082</td>
<td>1.396</td>
<td>0.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>853.974</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>4.357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>872.220</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Resource Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>47.063</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.688</td>
<td>3.119</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>985.957</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>5.030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1033.020</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inter Personal Relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>192.018</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64.006</td>
<td>3.925</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3196.202</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>16.307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3388.220</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary and Other benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>199.362</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66.454</td>
<td>5.228</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2491.258</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>12.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2690.620</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200

The Table 3.1.6 signifies the results of the ANOVA between satisfaction levels of women employees in four sub groups of Educational qualifications and Working Conditions. It has been found that the satisfaction levels in three domains: Human Resource Activities (0.027), Inter Personal Relations (0.009) and Salary and Other Benefits (0.002) of working conditions were found significantly different from each other.
whereas in other two domains (Working Activities (p. value .827) and Supervision) no significant difference was found in the satisfaction level (p=.827ns and .245ns).

The analysis indicated that the Educational qualification had significant effect on the satisfaction level of employees in three domains of Working Conditions (Human Resource Activities, Inter Personal Relations and Salary and Other Benefits).

The satisfaction levels of the respondents in Salary and Other benefits domain was found to be statistically higher than other domains followed by Inter Personal Relations and Human Resource Activities and Supervision. It was found to be least in the domain of Working Activities.

Since the ANOVA results in the Table 3.1.6 reflected that there has been significant difference of responses between all the sub-groups of Educational qualifications with respect to Human Resource Activities, Inter Personal Relations and Salary and Other Benefits. Thus, Post-Hoc test was applied in these above mentioned domains. The Post-Hoc test was applied to find out the correlation between satisfaction levels of the women employees with their Educational Qualifications. The data presented in the Table 3.1.7 illustrates that satisfaction level of women employees were highly correlated with each other in all the three domains of Working Conditions where Post-Hoc was carried out.

**Table 3.1.7: Post Hoc Tests on Educational qualifications.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>LSD</th>
<th>(I) edu</th>
<th>(J) edu</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Activities</td>
<td>1 Graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>- .01</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>- .982</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>-2.44</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.760</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Post-Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>-.696</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1.678*</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-3.19</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1.456*</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-2.65</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Diploma holders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.678*</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>- .36</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.456*</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further a multiple comparison Post Hoc test (LSD) reflected that significant difference has been observed between Educational qualification groups and the three domains of Working Conditions.

**Educational qualification and HRA**

Significance difference has been observed between Educational qualification groups and HRA

1 & 2 and 2, 3 & 4 (educational qualification groups) p-value < 0.05 (significant).

However, non-significant difference was observed between Educational qualification groups 1, 3 & 4 and 3 & 4 (Educational qualification group) p-value >0.05 (non-significant, in the HRA domain)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Graduate</th>
<th>2 Post-Graduate</th>
<th>3 Diploma holders</th>
<th>4 Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inter Personal Relations</strong></td>
<td>3 -2.22 0.885 0.802 -1.97 1.52</td>
<td>2 2.027* 0.649 0.002 0.75 3.31</td>
<td>4 2.082* 1.025 0.044 0.06 4.10</td>
<td>1 -2.027* 0.649 0.002 -3.31 -0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 0.437 1.332 0.743 -2.19 3.06</td>
<td>3 -1.590 1.381 0.251 -4.31 1.13</td>
<td>4 0.055 1.087 0.960 -2.09 2.20</td>
<td>2 0.437 1.332 0.743 -2.19 3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary and Other benefits</strong></td>
<td>3 -0.437 1.332 0.743 -3.06 2.19</td>
<td>2 1.590 1.381 0.251 -1.13 4.31</td>
<td>4 1.644 1.593 0.303 -1.50 4.79</td>
<td>1 -2.082* 1.025 0.044 -4.10 -0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 -2.027* 0.649 0.002 -3.31 -0.75</td>
<td>3 -0.942 1.219 0.440 -3.35 1.46</td>
<td>4 -1.098 0.960 0.254 -2.99 0.80</td>
<td>3 0.437 1.332 0.743 -2.19 3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1.590 1.381 0.251 -1.13 4.31</td>
<td>4 1.644 1.593 0.303 -1.50 4.79</td>
<td>3 -1.644 1.593 0.303 -4.79 1.50</td>
<td>1 -2.082* 1.025 0.044 -4.10 -0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 1.644 1.593 0.303 -1.50 4.79</td>
<td>3 -1.644 1.593 0.303 -4.79 1.50</td>
<td>3 0.437 1.332 0.743 -2.19 3.06</td>
<td>2 0.437 1.332 0.743 -2.19 3.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
Thus, the *findings* of the Post-Hoc test revealed that HRA of the respondents were significantly correlated with each other in the Educational qualification groups 1 & 2 and 2, 3 & 4 signifying the definite effects of Educational qualification on HRA whereas there existed poor correlation between the respondents of Educational qualification groups 1, 3 & 4 and 3 & 4 signifying weak or no effects of Educational qualification.

*Educational qualification and IPR*

Significant difference has been observed between Educational qualification groups 1, 2 & 4 (Educational qualification groups) p-value < 0.05 (significant)

Non-significant difference was observed between 1 & 3 and 2, 3 & 4 (Educational qualification groups) p-value > 0.05 (non-significant) in the IPR domain.

The *findings* of the Post-Hoc test revealed that Inter Personal Relations of the respondents were significantly correlated with each other in the Educational qualification groups 1, 2 & 4 signifying the definite effects of Educational qualification on Inter Personal Relations whereas there existed poor correlation between the respondents of Educational qualification groups 1 & 3 and 2, 3 & 4 signifying weak or no effects of Educational qualification.

*Educational qualification and Salary and Other benefits*

Highly significant difference has been observed between Educational qualifications and Salary and other benefits 1 & 2

Non-significant difference was observed between 1, 3 & 4 and 2, 3 & 4

The *findings* of the Post-Hoc test revealed that Salary and other benefits of the respondents were significantly correlated with each other in the Educational qualification groups 1 & 2 signifying the definite effects of Educational qualification on Salary and Other benefits whereas there existed poor correlation between the respondents of Educational qualification groups 1, 3 & 4 and 2, 3 & 4 signifying weak or no effects of Educational qualification.
The overall satisfaction levels of the women employees in the sub-group (1) of Educational qualification were found highest followed by 3, 4 and 2.

Table 3.1.8: ANOVA on Number of years in job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>224.718</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56.179</td>
<td>1.725</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>6350.162</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>32.565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6574.880</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>29.252</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.313</td>
<td>1.692</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>842.968</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>4.323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>872.220</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Resource Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>38.895</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.724</td>
<td>1.907</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>994.125</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>5.098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1033.020</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inter Personal Relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>276.667</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>69.167</td>
<td>4.335</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3111.553</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>15.957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3388.220</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary and Other benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>350.522</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>87.631</td>
<td>7.302</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2340.098</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>12.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2690.620</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. \( p<0.05 \), \( n=200 \)

In the Table 3.1.8, as per the results of ANOVA between satisfaction levels of women employees in five sub-group of number of years in job variable, it has been drawn from the analysis that in two domains of Working Conditions i.e. Inter Personal Relations (0.02) and Salary and Other Benefits (0.00) the satisfaction levels were found different as the p-value was found significant (below 0.05) whereas in other three domains Working Activities, Supervision and Human Relation Activities the satisfaction levels of women employees were not found significantly different.

Thus, it was evident that Number of years in the job had definite impact on two domains of the Working Conditions i.e. Salary and Other benefits and Inter Personal Relations.

The satisfaction level of the respondents in Salary and Other benefits domains was found to be statistically higher (7.30) followed by Inter Personal Relations (4.32) followed by HRA (1.90) Working Activities (1.72) and Supervision (1.69).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>(I) NUMBER OF YEARS IN JOB</th>
<th>(J) NUMBER OF YEARS IN JOB</th>
<th>MEAN DIFFERENCE (I-J)</th>
<th>STD. ERROR</th>
<th>SIG.</th>
<th>95% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL</th>
<th>LOWER BOUND</th>
<th>UPPER BOUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTER PERSONAL RELATIONS</td>
<td>1 (LESS THAN 6 YEARS)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>-2.01</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1.032</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>-3.08</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2.052</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-3.76</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (7-12)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.877</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>-2.82</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1.660</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>-2.77</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1.909</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-2.83</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2.929</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-4.48</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (13-18)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.216</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>-2.44</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2.660</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>-3.46</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1.248</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2.268</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-4.16</td>
<td>-3.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (19-24)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.032</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.909</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-2.02</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.248</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1.020</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>-2.70</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 (25-30)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.052</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.268</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-3.37</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1.140</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-2.92</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARY AND OTHER BENEFITS</td>
<td>1 (LESS THAN 6 YEARS)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.793</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.298</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>-.96</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-2.92</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2.528</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-4.01</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (7-12)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.793</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>-2.48</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1.091</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>-2.92</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1.933</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-3.60</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-3.321</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-4.66</td>
<td>-1.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (13-18)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.298</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>-2.63</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.842</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>-2.76</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2.230</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-3.87</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (19-24)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.933</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-2.60</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1.388</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-2.85</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 (25-30)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.528</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.321</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.230</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.388</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* THE MEAN DIFFERENCE IS SIGNIFICANT AT THE 0.05 LEVEL.

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
The Table 3.1.9 reveals the satisfaction levels of women employees were highly correlated with each other in two domains of Working Conditions i.e. IPR (Inter Personal Relations) and Salary and Other benefits where Post-Hoc test was carried out.

Further a multiple comparison Post-Hoc Test (LSD) reflected that

**Number of years in the job and Inter Personal Relations**

Significant difference was observed between sub-groups of Number of years in the job and two domains

1 & 5 and 2 & 5 and 3 & 5 (years in job groups) p-value < 0.05 (significant).

However, non-significant difference was observed between groups of number of years 1 & 2, 3, 4 and 2 & 3 and 4 and 3 & 4 and 4 & 5 (job groups) p-value >0.05 (non-significant) in the IPR domain.

The findings of the Post-Hoc test revealed that Inter Personal Relations of the respondents were significantly correlated with each other in the Number of years in the job groups 1 & 5 and 2 & 5 and 3 & 5 signifying the definite effects of Number of years in the job on Inter Personal Relations whereas there existed poor correlation between the respondents of Number of years in the job groups 1 & 2, 3 & 4 and 2 & 3 and 4 and 3 & 4 and 4 & 5 signifying weak or no effects of Number of years in the job.

**Number of years in the job and Salary and other benefits**

Significant difference was observed between number of years in the job groups and Salary and Other benefits

1 & 5 and 2 & 4 & 5 and
3 & 5 and
4 & 5.

Non-significant difference was observed between number of years in the job groups and salary and other benefits

1, 2, 3 & 4 and
2 & 3 and
3 & 4 and
4 & 5 (number of years in the job) p-value > 0.05 (non-significant) in the Salary and Other benefits domain. The overall satisfaction levels of the women employees were found highest in the group 5 followed by group 4, 3, 1 and 2.

The findings of the Post-Hoc test revealed that Salary and Other benefits of the respondents were significantly correlated with each other in the Number of years in the job groups 1 & 5 and 2, 4 & 5 and 4 & 5 signifying the definite effects of Number of years in the job on Salary and other benefits whereas there existed poor correlation between the respondents of Number of years in the job groups 1, 2, 3 & 4 and 2, 3 and 4 and 4 & 5 signifying weak or no effects of Number of years in the job.

Hence, the analysis of data implied that status of Number of years in the job had significant effect on their satisfaction levels in the above analyzed two domains IPR and Salary and Other benefits.

Table 3.1.10: t-test on Marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working Activities</td>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.60</td>
<td>8.016</td>
<td>-1.848</td>
<td>.066ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>53.09</td>
<td>5.412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.70</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>2.088</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>17.73</td>
<td>2.092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Activities</td>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>2.437</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.369ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>2.261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter Personal Relations</td>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.90</td>
<td>3.768</td>
<td>-2.391</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>36.04</td>
<td>4.118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary and Other benefits</td>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>3.649</td>
<td>-1.769</td>
<td>.009**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>31.02</td>
<td>3.659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200

The t-statistic virtual comparison of marital status and satisfaction levels of women employees with working conditions has been conducted in the Table 3.1.10. The analysis
of the table indicates that satisfaction levels in three domains of Working Conditions i.e. Supervision (0.048) and Interpersonal Relations (0.025) and Salary and Other benefits were found to be statistically different as the p value was found to be significant (p < 0.05) whereas in other two domains: Working Activities and Human Relations Activities, p-value was found to be non-significant reflecting that there were not much of variation in the responses of the never married and ever married women employees-respondents in these three domains.

Further, the mean value established that in three domains; Supervision, Inter Personal Relations and Salary and Other benefits, the ever married respondents were more satisfied than never married respondents whereas in other two domains Working Activities and HRA the never married were more satisfied than ever married.

Table 3.1.11: Distribution scores according on Age (Working Activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/ Responses</th>
<th>Working Activities (scores)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 - 42</td>
<td>43 - 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p < 0.05, n = 200

The distribution scores of the Table 3.1.11 reflected that overall 72.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to Working Activities in comparison to 23.0 percent respondents who strongly agreed with the posers. However, it was amply clear that maximum of 78.7 percent of the respondents in the age group of 49-60 years agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction levels with working activities. Whereas on contrary the respondents in the youngest age group (54.5 percent) were minimum in proportion to have agreed with the statements. The analysis further ratified the finding that higher proportions of women employees' senior-in-age (49-60 years) than employee's younger-in-age were satisfied with working activities.
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The distribution scores of the Table 3.1.12 reflected that overall 79.0 percent of employees agreed with the statements signifying their satisfaction with the Supervision. Maximum of 92.0 percent of the respondents in the age group of 49-60 years agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction levels of women employees with Supervision, whereas, on contrary the 63.6 percent respondents youngest age group (18-28 years) in minimum proportion agreed with the statements. Again ratifying that women employee’s senior-in-age were satisfied with supervision than employees younger in age.

The distribution scores of the Table 3.1.12 reflected that overall 79.0 percent of employees agreed with the statements signifying their satisfaction with the Supervision. Maximum of 92.0 percent of the respondents in the age group of 49-60 years agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction levels of women employees with Supervision, whereas, on contrary the 63.6 percent respondents youngest age group (18-28 years) in minimum proportion agreed with the statements. Again ratifying that women employee’s senior-in-age were satisfied with supervision than employees younger in age.

### Table 3.1.13: Distribution scores on Age (Human Resource Activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Human Resource Activities (scores)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;=3</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 18-28 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
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The distribution of scores reflected that overall 57.0 percent of the respondents agreed with the statements ratifying their satisfaction with the HRA in the organisation whereas 28.0 percent of the respondents remained undecided. Maximum of 68.4 percent and 68.0 percent of the respondents in 29-38 years and 49-60 years age group respectively agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction levels of women employees with HRA. Whereas, on contrary no trends were available in the age group of 18-28 years and 39-48 years as the undecided responses in substantial proportion influenced the trend of the responses. However, again ratifying that higher proportion of women employee's senior-in-age than younger in age were satisfied with HRA.

Table 3.1.14: Distribution scores on Age (Inter Personal Relations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Inter Personal Relations (scores)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 - 27</td>
<td>28 - 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-28 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29-38 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39-48 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49-60 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200

The distribution of scores reflected that overall 68.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statement relating to Inter Personal Relations. The maximum of 78.9 percent of the respondents in the age group of 29-38 years agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction levels of women employees with supervision; whereas on contrary, the 60.0 percent respondents in the senior most age group (49-60 years) were minimum in proportion to have agreed with the statements. Thus, there were not much of variations in the responses signifying the overall satisfaction with the Inter-Personal relations.
Table 3.1.15: Distribution scores on Age (Salary and Other benefits).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Salary and Other benefits (scores)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 - 24</td>
<td>25 - 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-28 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200

The distribution of scores reflected that overall 73.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statement relating to *Salary and other benefits* in addition to 22.0 percent respondents who strongly agreed with the posers signifying their satisfaction with the Salary and Other benefits. However, on the basis of scores indicated that higher proportion (82.5 percent) of women employees in the age group of 29-38 years were in agreement with the statement. Further the trend established that women employees senior-in-age (39-60 years) were in agreement with the statements establishing that women employees senior in age were satisfied than the employees younger-in-age with the Salary and Other benefits.

Table 3.1.16: Distribution scores on Educational qualification (Working Activities).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Working Activities (scores)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29 - 42</td>
<td>43 - 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Graduate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma holders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200

211
The distribution of scores reflected that overall 72.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to Working Activities in addition to 23.0 percent respondents who strongly agreed with the posers. However, it could be seen that maximum of 88.9 percent of the respondents with higher qualifications agreed with the statements attesting satisfaction of the women employees with Working Activities. The available trends established that cent percent respondents with Diploma qualifications were satisfied with the working activities.

Table 3.1.17: Distribution scores on Educational qualification (Supervision).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>21+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Graduate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma holders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200

The distribution of scores reflected that over all 79.0 percent of the respondents were in the agreement with the statement establishing their satisfaction with the Supervision domain. More of respondents with lower qualifications were satisfied with Supervision domain. Further, it can be seen with the statements that cent percent of the respondents with Diploma qualifications agreed with the statement affirming high satisfaction levels of the employees with supervision. Whereas on contrary 76.3 percent of the respondents with Post-Graduate qualification were in minimum proportion to have agreed with the statements. Thus, the trend of the scores established that more of respondents with lower qualifications were satisfied with supervision domain.
Table 3.1.18: Distribution scores on Educational qualification (Human Resource Activities).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Human Resource Activities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;=3</td>
<td>4 – 6</td>
<td>7 – 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma holders</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200

The distribution of scores reflected that overall 57.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to HRA in addition to 28.0 percent respondents who remained undecided to the posers. The cent percent respondents with Diploma qualification agreed with the statement followed by 88.9 percent of the respondents with Diploma qualifications who agreed with the statements affirming their satisfaction with HRA.

Table 3.1.19: Distribution scores on Educational qualification (Inter Personal Relations).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Inter Personal Relations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 – 27</td>
<td>28 – 36</td>
<td>37+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Qualifications</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Graduate</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma holders</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
The distribution of scores reflected that overall 68.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to IPR in addition to 29.0 percent respondents who strongly agreed with the posers. However, it was clear that maximum of 76.3 percent of the respondents with Post-Graduation qualifications agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction of the women employees with IPR. On contrary 40.0 percent respondents with Diploma qualifications strongly agreed with the statements indicating their strong affirmation to the statements

Table 3.1.20: Distribution scores on Educational qualification (Salary and Other Benefits).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/ Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Salary and Other benefits</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 - 24</td>
<td>25 - 32</td>
<td>33+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post- Graduate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma holders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200

The distribution of scores reflected that overall 73.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to Salary and other benefits in comparison to 22.0 percent respondents who remained in addition strongly agreed with the poser. However, it was clear that maximum of 79.7 percent of the Post-graduate respondents agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction of the women employees with Salary and Other benefits
### Table 3.1.21: Distribution scores on Number of years in the job (Working Activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Working Activities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 – 42</td>
<td>43 – 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200

The distribution of scores reflected that overall 72.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statement relating to Working Activities in addition to 23.0 percent respondents who remained strongly agreed with the posers. However, it was clear that maximum of 90.9 percent of the respondents with 13-18 years experience and 33.3 percent of the respondents with 19-24 years experience strongly agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction of the women employees with Working Activities. On contrary 27.6 percent respondents with less than six years in the job remained undecided as they were not sure about Working Activities because of their short experience.

### Table 3.1.22 Distribution scores on Educational qualification (Human Resource Activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Human Resource Activities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;= 3</td>
<td>4 – 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200
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The distribution of scores reflected that overall 57.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to HRA in addition to 28.0 percent respondents who remained strongly agreed with the posers. However, it was clear that maximum of 63.0 percent of the respondents with 25-30 years experience and 33.3 percent of the respondents with 19-24 years experience strongly agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction of the women employees with HRA. On contrary 27.2 percent respondents with 25-30 years in the job remained undecided as they were not sure about HRA. However, 20.0 percent of the respondents with 19-24 years and 13.8 percent of the respondents with less than six years strongly disagreed with the statements indicating that younger and senior employees were not much aware of HRA activities in the organisation.

Table 3.1.23: Distribution scores on Educational qualification (I P R).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Number of years in the job</th>
<th>19-27</th>
<th>28-36</th>
<th>37+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200

The distribution of scores reflected that overall 68.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to IPR in addition to 29.0 percent respondents who strongly agreed with the posers. However, it was clear that maximum of 79.3 percent of the respondents with less than 6 years experience and 33.3 percent of the respondents with 19-24 years strongly agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction of the women employees with IPR. At the same time 34.6 percent respondents with 25-30 years experience strongly agreed with the statements relating to IPR.
Table 3.1.24: Distribution scores on Educational qualification (Salary and Other benefits).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Salary and Other benefits</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17–24</td>
<td>25–32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. \(p<0.05\), \(n=200\)

The distribution of scores reflected that overall 73.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to Salary and Other benefits in addition to 22.0 percent respondents who strongly agreed with the posers. However, it was clear that cent percent of respondents with 13-18 years experience were in agreement with the statements signifying their satisfaction with salary and other benefits.

Table 3.1.25: Distribution scores on Marital status (Working Activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Working Activities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29–42</td>
<td>43–56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. \(p<0.05\), \(n=200\)

The distribution of scores reflected that overall 72.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to Working Activities in addition to 23.0 percent respondents who strongly agreed with the posers. However, it was clear that maximum of 72.2 percent of the respondents who were ever married agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction of the women employees with Working Activities whereas 23.0 percent of the ever married strongly agreed with the statements. On the
contrary 10.0 percent never married respondents remained undecided as they were not sure about Working Activities.

### Table 3.1.26: Distribution scores on Marital status (Supervision).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>16 - 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever married</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200

The distribution of scores reflected that overall 79.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to Supervision in addition to 13.0 percent respondents who strongly agreed with the posers. However, it was clear that maximum of 80.0 percent of the respondents who were ever married agreed whereas 20.0 percent of the never married respondents strongly agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction of the women employees with Supervision. On contrary 13.3 percent ever married respondents remained undecided on the issue as they were not sure about Supervision domain.

### Table 3.1.27: Distribution scores on Marital status (Human Resource Activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Human Resource Activities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;=3</td>
<td>4 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200

The distribution of scores reflected that overall 57.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to HRA in addition to 28.0 percent respondents who strongly agreed with the posers and 9.0 percent of the respondents disagreed with statement. However, it was clear that maximum of 58.9 percent of the ever married respondents agreed whereas 25.6 percent remained undecided and 10.0 percent...
strongly disagreed with the statements affirming satisfaction of the women employees with HRA. On contrary 50.0 percent never married respondents remained undecided as they were not sure about HRA domain.

Table 3.1.28: Distribution scores on Marital status (Inter Personal Relations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Inter Personal Relations</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Pearson Chi-Square</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19–27 28–36 37+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Married</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>10.0% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.0% 68.0% 29.0% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200

The distribution of scores reflected that overall 68.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to Inter Personal Relation in addition to 29.0 percent respondents who strongly agreed with the posers. However, it was clear that maximum of 80.0 percent of the respondents who were never married agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction of the women employees with IPR. On contrary 31.1 percent ever married respondents strongly agreed with the statements. However, 10.0 percent of the never married respondents remained undecided.

Table 3.1.29: Distribution scores on Marital status (Salary and Other benefits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes/Responses</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Salary and Other benefits</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17–24 25–32 33+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>20.0% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever married</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>22.2% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>22.0% 100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed from primary data. Figures in parentheses are percentages. p<0.05, n=200

The distribution of scores reflected that overall 73.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to Salary and other benefits whereas 22.0 percent of the women employees strongly agreed with statements relating to Salary and Other benefits. However, it was clear that maximum of 73.3 percent of the ever married
respondents agreed in addition to 22.2 percent of the ever married respondents who strongly agreed with the statements.

The above applied statistical tests have given us the detailed information to support the findings based on cross-tabulations.

Major findings

Regression model on Age variable

3.1.1 In all the domains of the Working Conditions, there existed positive slope between the domains and the age sub-groups implying that the increase in age increased the satisfaction levels of the women employees as well. Thus, accepting the hypothesis that higher the age of the women employees the higher is the satisfaction levels.

Regression model on Educational qualification

3.1.2 In four domains Working Activities, Supervision, Inter Personal Relations and Salary and Other benefits there existed negative slope indicating that as educational qualification increased the satisfaction decreased except Human Resource Activities where positive slope was seen. The application of regression has established that Educational qualification had non significant impact on four domains of Working Conditions; Working Activities, Supervision, IPR and Salary and Other benefits except the domain of HRA.

Thus, hypothesis that higher the qualification the higher is the satisfaction level stands rejected except in one domain i.e. HRA.

Regression model on Number of years in the job

3.1.3 The equation for prediction was positive in case of Working Activities, Supervision, Inter Personal Relations and Salary and Other Benefits domains of the Working Conditions indicating that with the increase in the number of years in the job the satisfaction levels increased whereas in case of Human Resource Activities due to negative equation the trend suggested that satisfaction will decrease with the increase in the number of years in the job. Thus, hypothesis stands accepted in all the domains except in HRA.
ANOVA on Age variable

3.1.4. Age had significant effect on all the domains of Working Conditions except Supervision.

Post Hoc test on Age variable

3.1.5. The findings of the Post-Hoc test revealed that Working Activities of the respondents were significantly correlated with each other in the Age groups 1, 2, 3 & 4 signifying the definite effects of Age on Working Activities. Whereas there existed poor correlation between the respondents of Age groups 2, 3 & 4 and 3 & 4 signifying weak or no effects of Age.

The findings of the Post-Hoc test revealed that HRA of the respondents were significantly correlated with each other in the Age groups 2 & 3 and 3 & 4 signifying the definite effects of Age on HRA whereas there existed poor correlation between the respondents of Age groups 1, 2, 3 & 4 and 2 & 4 signifying weak or no effects of Age.

The findings of the Post-Hoc test revealed that Inter Personal Relations of the respondents were significantly correlated with each other in the Age groups 1, 3 & 4 and 2, 3 & 4 signifying the definite effects of Age on Inter Personal Relations whereas there existed poor correlation between the respondents of Age groups 1, 2, 3 & 4 signifying weak or no effects of Age.

The findings of the Post-Hoc test revealed that Salary and Other benefits of the respondents were significantly correlated with each other in the Age groups 1, 3 & 4 and 2, 3 & 4 signifying the definite effects of Age on Salary and Other benefits whereas there existed poor correlation between the respondents of Age groups 1 & 2 and 3 & 4 signifying weak or no effects of Age.

ANOVA on Educational qualification

3.1.6. The satisfaction levels of the respondents in Salary and Other benefits domain was found to be statistically higher than other domains followed by Inter Personal
Relations and Human Resource Activities and Supervision. It was found to be least in the domain of Working Activities.

**Post Hoc test on Educational qualification**

3.1.7. The *findings* of the Post-Hoc test revealed that HRA of the respondents were significantly correlated with each other in the Educational qualification groups 1 & 2 and 2, 3 & 4 signifying the definite effects of Educational qualification on HRA whereas there existed poor correlation between the respondents of Educational qualification groups 1, 3 & 4 and 3 & 4 signifying weak or no effects of Educational qualification.

The *findings* of the Post-Hoc test revealed that Inter Personal Relations of the respondents were significantly correlated with each other in the Educational qualification groups 1, 2 & 4 signifying the definite effects of Educational qualification on Inter Personal Relations whereas there existed poor correlation between the respondents of Educational qualification groups 1 & 3 and 2, 3 & 4 signifying weak or no effects of Educational qualification.

The *findings* of the Post-Hoc test revealed that Salary and other benefits of the respondents were significantly correlated with each other in the Educational qualification groups 1 & 2 signifying the definite effects of Educational qualification on Salary and Other benefits whereas there existed poor correlation between the respondents of Educational qualification groups 1, 3 & 4 and 2, 3 & 4 signifying weak or no effects of Educational qualification.

**ANOVA on Number of years in the job**

3.1.8. The satisfaction levels of the respondents in Salary and Other benefits domains was found to be statistically higher followed by Inter Personal Relations followed by HRA Working Activities and Supervision.

**Post Hoc test on Number of years in the job**

3.1.9. The *findings* of the Post-Hoc test revealed that Inter Personal Relations of the respondents were significantly correlated with each other in the Number of years in the job groups 1 & 5 and 2 & 5 and 3 & 5 signifying the definite effects of Number of years in the job on Inter Personal Relations whereas there existed poor correlation between the
respondents of Number of years in the job groups 1, 2, 3 & 4 and 2 & 3 and 4 and 3 & 4 and 4 & 5 signifying weak or no effects of Number of years in the job.

The findings of the Post-Hoc test revealed that Salary and Other benefits of the respondents were significantly correlated with each other in the Number of years in the job groups 1 & 5 and 2, 4 & 5 and 4 & 5 signifying the definite effects of Number of years in the job on Salary and other benefits whereas there existed poor correlation between the respondents of Number of years in the job groups 1, 2, 3 & 4 and 2, 3 and 4 and 4 & 5 signifying weak or no effects of Number of years in the job.

t-test on marital status

3.1.10. The analysis of the table indicates that satisfaction levels in three domains of Working Conditions i.e. Supervision (0.048) and Interpersonal Relations (0.025) and Salary and Other benefits were found to be statistically different as the p value was found to be significant (p <0.05) whereas in other two domains: Working Activities and Human Relations Activities, p-value was found to be non-significant reflecting that there were not much of variation in the responses of the never married and ever married women employees- respondents in these three domains.

Distribution of scores on the Age variable.

3.1.11 Overall 72.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to Working Activities in comparison to 23.0 percent respondents who strongly agreed with the posers. However, it was amply clear that maximum of 78.7 percent of the respondents in the age group of 49-60 years agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction levels with working activities. Whereas on contrary the respondents in the youngest age group (54.5 percent) were minimum in proportion to have agreed with the statements. The analysis further ratified the finding that higher proportions of women employees’ senior-in-age (49-60 years) than employee’s younger-in-age were satisfied with working activities.

3.1.12 Overall 79.0 percent of employees agreed with the statements signifying their satisfaction with the Supervision. Maximum of 92.0 percent of the respondents in the age group of 49-60 years agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction levels of women
employees with *Supervision*, whereas, on contrary the 63.6 percent respondents youngest age group (18-28 years) in minimum proportion agreed with the statements. Again ratifying that women employee's senior-in-age were satisfied with supervision than employees younger in age.

3.1.13 Overall 57.0 percent of the respondents agreed with the statements ratifying their satisfaction with the HRA in the organisation whereas 28.0 percent of the respondents remained undecided. Maximum of 68.4 percent and 68.0 percent of the respondents in 29-38 years and 49-60 years age group respectively agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction levels of women employees with *HRA*. Whereas, on contrary no trends were available in the age group of 18-28 years and 39-48 years as the undecided responses in substantial proportion influenced the trend of the responses. However, again ratifying that higher proportion of women employee's senior-in-age than younger in age were satisfied with HRA.

3.1.14 Overall 68.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statement relating to *Inter Personal Relations*. The maximum of 78.9 percent of the respondents in the age group of 29-38 years agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction levels of women employees with supervision; whereas on contrary, the 60.0 percent respondents in the senior most age group (49-60 years) were minimum in proportion to have agreed with the statements. Thus, there were not much of variations in the responses signifying the overall satisfaction with the Inter-Personal relations.

3.1.15 Overall 73.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statement relating to *Salary and other benefits* in addition to 22.0 percent respondents who strongly agreed with the posers signifying their satisfaction with the Salary and Other benefits. However, on the basis of scores indicated that higher proportion (82.5 percent) of women employees in the age group of 29-38 years were in agreement with the statement. Further the trend established that women employees senior-in-age (39-60 years) were in agreement with the statements establishing that women employees senior in age were satisfied than the employees younger-in-age with the Salary and Other benefits.
Distribution of scores on the Educational qualifications variable.

3.1.16 Overall 72.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to Working Activities in addition to 23.0 percent respondents who strongly agreed with the posers. However, it could be seen that maximum of 88.9 percent of the respondents with higher qualifications agreed with the statements attesting satisfaction of the women employees with Working Activities. The available trends established that cent percent respondents with Diploma qualifications were satisfied with the working activities.

3.1.17 Overall 79.0 percent of the respondents were in the agreement with the statement establishing their satisfaction with the Supervision domain. More of respondents with lower qualifications were satisfied with Supervision domain. Further, it can be seen with the statements that cent percent of the respondents with Diploma qualifications agreed with the statement affirming high satisfaction levels of the employees with supervision. Whereas on contrary 76.3 percent of the respondents with Post-Graduate qualification were in minimum proportion to have agreed with the statements. Thus, the trend of the scores established that more of respondents with lower qualifications were satisfied with supervision domain.

3.1.18 Overall 57.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to HRA in addition to 28.0 percent respondents who remained undecided to the posers. The cent percent respondents with Diploma qualification agreed with the statement followed by 88.9 percent of the respondents with Diploma qualifications who agreed with the statements affirming their satisfaction with HRA.

3.1.19 Overall 68.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to IPR in addition to 29.0 percent respondents who strongly agreed with the posers. However, it was clear that maximum of 76.3 percent of the respondents with Post-Graduation qualifications agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction of the women employees with IPR. On contrary 40.0 percent respondents with Diploma qualifications strongly agreed with the statements indicating their strong affirmation to the statements.

3.1.20 Overall 73.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to Salary and other benefits in comparison to 22.0 percent respondents who
remained in addition strongly agreed with the posers. However, it was clear that maximum of 79.7 percent of the Post-graduate respondents agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction of the women employees with Salary and Other benefits.

**Distribution of scores on the Number of years in the job variable.**

3.1.21 Overall 72.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statement relating to Working Activities in addition to 23.0 percent respondents who remained strongly agreed with the posers. However, it was clear that maximum of 90.9 percent of the respondents with 13-18 years experience and 33.3 percent of the respondents with 19-24 years experience strongly agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction of the women employees with Working Activities. On contrary 27.6 percent respondents with less than six years in the job remained undecided as they were not sure about Working Activities because of their short experience.

3.1.22 Overall 57.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to HRA in addition to 28.0 percent respondents who remained strongly agreed with the posers. However, it was clear that maximum of 63.0 percent of the respondents with 25-30 years experience and 33.3 percent of the respondents with 19-24 years experience strongly agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction of the women employees with HRA. On contrary 27.2 percent respondents with 25-30 years in the job remained undecided as they were not sure about HRA. However, 20.0 percent of the respondents with 19-24 years and 13.8 percent of the respondents with less than six years strongly disagreed with the statements indicating that younger and senior employees were not much aware of HRA activities in the organisation

3.1.23 Overall 68.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to IPR in addition to 29.0 percent respondents who strongly agreed with the posers. However, it was clear that maximum of 79.3 percent of the respondents with less than 6 years experience and 33.3 percent of the respondents with 19-24 years strongly agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction of the women employees with IPR. At the same time 34.6 percent respondents with 25-30 years experience strongly agreed with the statements relating to IPR.
3.1.24 Overall 73.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to Salary and Other benefits in addition to 22.0 percent respondents who strongly agreed with the posers. However, it was clear that cent percent of respondents with 13-18 years experience were in agreement with the statements signifying their satisfaction with salary and other benefits.

Distribution of scores on the Marital status variable

3.1.25 Overall 72.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to Working Activities in addition to 23.0 percent respondents who strongly agreed with the posers. However, it was clear that maximum of 72.2 percent of the respondents who were ever married agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction of the women employees with Working Activities whereas 23.0 percent of the ever married strongly agreed with the statements. On the contrary 10.0 percent never married respondents remained undecided as they were not sure about Working Activities.

3.1.26 Overall 79.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to Supervision in addition to 13.0 percent respondents who strongly agreed with the posers. However, it was clear that maximum of 80.0 percent of the respondents who were ever married agreed whereas 20.0 percent of the never married respondents strongly agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction of the women employees with Supervision. On contrary 13.3 percent ever married respondents remained undecided on the issue as they were not sure about Supervision domain. (See Chapter III, Table Number 3.1.26)

3.1.27 Overall 57.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to HRA in addition to 28.0 percent respondents who strongly agreed with the posers and 9.0 percent of the respondents disagreed with statement. However, it was clear that maximum of 58.9 percent of the ever married respondents agreed whereas 25.6 percent remained undecided and 10.0 percent strongly disagreed with the statements affirming satisfaction of the women employees with HRA. On contrary 50.0 percent never married respondents remained undecided as they were not sure about HRA domain.
3.1.28 Overall 68.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to Inter Personal Relation in addition to 29.0 percent respondents who strongly agreed with the posers. However, it was clear that maximum of 80.0 percent of the respondents who were never married agreed with the statements affirming satisfaction of the women employees with IPR. On contrary 31.1 percent ever married respondents strongly agreed with the statements. However, 10.0 percent of the never married respondents remained undecided.

3.1.29 Overall 73.0 percent of the women employees agreed with the statements relating to Salary and other benefits whereas 22.0 percent of the women employees strongly agreed with statements relating to Salary and Other benefits. However, it was clear that maximum of 73.3 percent of the ever married respondents agreed in addition to 22.2 percent of the ever married respondents who strongly agreed with the statements.

Summary

From the trend of responses available to the statement raised to the respondents it was out rightly established that the majority of the women employees working in Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited, Punjab Telecom Circle, Chandigarh were satisfied with their job.
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