Indian Journal of Management and Language (IJML)
ISSN: 2582-886X (Online), Volume-5 Issue-1, April, 2025

Impact of Workplace Alienation on Managers and Engineers

Gururaj B Urs, Kiran Kumar Thoti

Abstract: ***Workplace alienation is described as a state of being in which the employee is demotivated and disinterested in their individualized role and responsibilities at their place of work. The psychological feeling of alienation or separation from their employer and colleagues, and having very little or no passion at all towards their work. This kind of occupational scenario is observed as an implication of certain employer-based actions toward the employee. These actions may comprise being unable to recognize the drive and successes, criticizing the output and the employee, lack of empathy towards the employee, and other issues. This study focuses on understanding the Work Alienation (WA) of Engineers and Managers; and also analyses the influence of socio-demographic features on the OSE among the employee groups. The study was conducted in a major manufacturing Public Sector Unit, located in Mysore. The stratified random sample consisted of up to a hundred and twenty samples selected as per inclusion and exclusion criteria. The data was collected using the WA tool, along with a demographic data sheet. The data was analyzed using statistical tools like Regression analysis, Two-way ANOVA, and Duncan's Multiple Range Test (DMRT). The results of the study are Engineers and Managers did not differ significantly in their WA scores; the interaction effect between occupation type and different income, age, and years of work experience, are non-significant which shows that WA is similar in employees irrespective of the occupation they have. To conclude, WA influences employees' beliefs in their competencies in being able to control their work, thereby over such scenarios that impact them. Beliefs about one's efficacy influence choices in life, motivation levels, functioning levels, resilient behaviour towards adverse situations, and being vulnerable to stress and its life-threatening consequences.***

Keywords: Work Alienation, Engineers, Managers, Public Sector Unit, Demographic Variables

Abbreviations:
DMRT: Duncan's Multiple Range Test
WA: Work Alienation
WAS: Work Alienation Scale
ANOVA: Analysis of Variance

I. INTRODUCTION

Work alienation has been defined by Hoy as "the reflection of an individual's feelings brought about by dissatisfaction with working conditions at their place of employment" [1].

Manuscript received on 23 April 2025 | First Revised Manuscript received on 12 April 2025 | Manuscript Accepted on 15 April 2025 | Manuscript published on 30 April 2025.
***Correspondence Author(s)
Dr. Gururaj B Urs, Professor, Head Academics & Research, NITTE School of Management, Bengaluru (Karnataka), India. Email ID: gururaj@nsom.ac.in
Dr. Kiran Kumar Thoti*, Associate Professor, M.S. Ramaiah Institute of Management, Bangalore (Karnataka), India, Email ID: kiran.kt@msrim.org, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6678-9425

Also, it is said that this idea "expresses the dissatisfaction experienced by the individual as to the individual's status in terms of authority and the others in the organization, opportunities for professional development and change, recognition and acceptance by the superiors and doing his/her work consistently with career expectations" [2]. However, a lack of ability to create surroundings and conditions that demonstrate the importance of people as human beings—such as autonomy, responsibility, social interaction, and self-realization—can lead to job alienation [3].

Alienation at the workplace is a result of a series of scenarios where an employee withdraws from his role and responsibilities, and /or isolates himself from the workplace environment and colleagues. Employees displaying workplace alienation signs tend to reject loved ones and showcase emotional distancing and estrangement [4]. Workplace alienation represents an increasingly complex situation, but commonly observed. It's psycho-social in nature, affects health, and tends to aggravate existing medical and psychological conditions in an individual. A constant and consistent psychological feeling of being distanced in connection to one's work, family, and friends is a common symptom of alienation.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of the literature concerning work alienation has been done keeping in mind the manufacturing sector in particular and the industry scenario in general [5]. A sociological perspective of workplace alienation may be elaborated as a combination of a prolonged sense of being powerless, meaningless, and estranged because of being unable to come to terms with one's work [6]. This concept was structured in the earliest of Marx's writings and further linked itself with the various phases of the Industrial Revolution, in which the "predominantly agrarian cum handicraft economy" was substituted by "industry machine manufacture", [7]. In this perspective, Karl Marx saw that work, or a job, should be perceived as a means for workmen to showcase their creativity (in their respective jobs) and this issue is central to the nature of humans.

The existence of millennial dilemmas and being triggered by a lack of ability to come up with solutions that can be an alternative/s vis-s-vis the problems triggered for/by the employees due to certain organizational processes, technological methods, and structures, by economic faults and weaknesses, fast chasing life rhythms, role and responsibilities encumbering the individual employee, differing production styles and lastly a sense of feeling and physically being isolated from the management in spite having job responsibilities and specifications. In the light of such dilemmas, work alienation is the state of

incapability, with a prolonged sense of meaningless, inconsistency of thoughts and behaviors, and a scenario of insolubility that has been created by the formation of unfavorable circumstances in place of ideal norms and regulations. The internal dilemmas in place of external responses, are the mindset of passivity in place of work/activity and replace means of working with the ends [6]. To idealize, work alienation is the result where of the things produced by the employees, professional relationships, the appearance that the organizational structure neglects humanism, administrative and inspectorial styles, and technological constructs are not in consonance with each other.

To remain competitive in today's market scenario, employers seek the highest efficiencies through technological and other related innovations. As a result, most of the routine production-related work has been either partially or fully automated. Consulting organizations report some of the information processing tasks and jobs along with tasks such as cashing checks and taking calls have also undergone complete automation or outsourced to cheap labour in other countries. This is a direct influence of faster connectivity and higher process capabilities of new technologies. Technology has displaced knowledge, skills, and competencies, thus creating new ones. The seeking to increase efficiency through the "disintegration" of the most highly paid jobs is another aspect of employers [8]. This only implies that monotonous tasks and routines are "taken away" from the concerned job and are in turn digitized or reassigned to a staff at a lower level. This is a practice observed in engineering, computer science, and healthcare-based jobs. Further it points out there is a "growing polarisation of opportunities in the labour market," with strong demand for both the highest (IT, engineering) and lowest-skill jobs (like food preparation, caregiving), but decreasing opportunities for those in between. This results in being accompanied by a widening income gap among the employees. This growing inequality and division of labour is reminiscent of the factors identified by Marx as contributing to alienation

Today, technology has supported automating or outsourcing those manual or lower-skilled jobs (to other countries), but factors contributing to workplace alienation remain. The factors include the disintegration of highly paid and skilled jobs, polarizing the demand for skills, and thus a wide gap in the incomes across employees [9]. These issues are to be systematically addressed and may result in employee deskilling and degradation. However, technology also provided means to increase this gap and also increase connectivity and work-based flexibility. A recent study informed that the factors contributing to alienation today bear some similarity to those found almost one hundred years ago and are linked to the commodification of workers by the capitalist system [10]. Overall, the link between workplace alienation and advancement in technology and its prowess remains relevant in today's work and in days to come. However, the social and economic-based contexts are the two principal determinants, which will influence how technology would alienate or de-alienate workers and their roles and responsibilities

III. RATIONALE

Previous researchers have worked on work alienation along with other aspects such as cynicism, commodification, polarization of workers, and other related aspects. Some of the researchers have worked on teachers too. Based on the review of the literature, there are hardly a few research studies conducted on work alienation, especially keeping in mind the type of employees, the specific industry, and other variables under consideration. Hence, the focus of this research study in Indian settings has been designed especially involving public sector units and their personnel. Hence, this study has been proposed.

IV. METHODOLOGY

A. Objective

To study the influence of secondary variables like income, age, experience, educational background, marital status, and family type on the Work Alienation (WA) of the employees of a Public Sector Unit.

B. Hypothesis

H1: There is no difference in the Work Alienation (WA) scores of employees belonging to different designations like engineers and managers.

H2: Income has no significant influence on the WA of the employees.

H3: Age has no significant influence on the WA of the employees.

H4: Experience has no significant influence on the WA of the employees.

H5: Family type has no significant influence on the WA of the employees.

H6: Educational has no significant influence on the WA of the employees

H7: Marital status has no significant influence on the WA of the employees.

C. Universe

The universe consisted of a major Public Sector Unit in the Mysore Industrial Area.

D. Sample Design

The sample design adopted was stratified random sampling and the distribution of samples is shown in the table as given in table No. 1.

Table-I: Distribution of the Sample – Designation Wise

Company	Designation		Total
	Managers	Engineers	
Major manufacturing PSU	60	60	120

E. Inclusion Criteria

- Respondents aged between 22 to 55 years
- Minimum qualification for; a. Managers: Degree and above; b. Engineers: Diploma and above
- Respondents should not have undergone the above test before
- Respondents should have worked in the PSU for a minimum of five years

F. Exclusion Criteria

- Respondents age below 22 and above 55 years

- Minimum qualification for; a. Managers: below Degree and above; b. Engineers: below Diploma
- Respondents should not have undergone the above test before
- Respondents if worked in the PSU for a minimum of less than five years

G. Tools Used

i. Socio-Demographic Data Sheet

This schedule was prepared by the researcher. This schedule consists of the name, age, sex, education, experience, religion, marital status, designation, income, grade and other related aspects.

ii. Work Alienation Scale (WAS)

WAS was developed by and it measures the alienated behaviours of workers on a five-point response format [11]. This scale has been developed on the basis of seven dimensions of alienation, which are belongingness, normlessness, meaninglessness, powerlessness, instrumental work orientation, isolation, and self-estrangement. The scale provides a total alienation score as well as a score on the above seven components. Regarding reliability, two indices were found. Firstly, its reliability was determined by the split-half method and was found 0.82. Secondly, it was calculated by test-retest method. The coefficient of correlation was found to be 0.70.

H. Pre-Testing of the Tools

The researcher administered the socio-demographic data sheet and the Work Alienation Scale (WAS) to ten employees at the PSU. The response sheets were collected back, scored, and statistically analyzed. The results of the pre-testing can be enumerated as follows

- Initially the respondents had some reservations about answering the questionnaire as the questions were directly related to the work.
- Some of the respondents had doubts regarding some questions, which were cleared by the researcher in their local language.
- Two of the ten respondents gave back an incompletely filled questionnaire.

The above-mentioned findings of the pre-testing were incorporated systematically into the main study.

I. Main Study

The main study was done in two phases. They are –

Phase 1:

The researcher introduced himself to groups of 10 employees each; these groups explained the need for the study and also explained the nature of WA and were assured about the confidentiality of their responses.

Phase 2:

The datasheet, and WA scale were administered to the respondents, and were asked to fill up each statement and return the complete questionnaire in about forty-five minutes to an hour. Similarly, the sample was divided equally among twelve groups and data was collected.

The respondents' sheets were collected from the respondents after they had completed the formalities. Those response sheets which were not properly / incorrectly / incompletely filled were discarded. The remaining response sheets were scored, coded and a master chart was prepared. The master chart was fed into the computer using IBM SPSS (25.01.1) and the needed statistical tests were applied to analyze the data.

J. Statistical Procedures Adopted for Analysis of Data

Following statistical techniques were applied to analyze the data. They are

- Descriptive statistics
- Two-way Analysis of Variance – General Linear Model
- Duncan's Multiple Range Test
- Regression – Step Wise Multiple

K. Analysis of Results

The results obtained from SPSS (25.01.1) were tabulated and with necessary analysis and interpretation are provided below.

Table-II: Mean WAS Score of Engineers and Managers Having Different Levels of Income

Occupation	Income in Rs	Mean	S. D
Engineers	<30,000	134.21	9.71
	30,001 to 45,000	135.27	6.35
	45,001 to 60,000	128.80	13.18
	Overall	133.77	9.48
Managers	<30,000	-	-
	30,001 to 45,000	128.75	3.06
	45,001 to 60,000	125.00	11.70
	Overall	126.50	9.29
Total	<30,000	133.28	9.14
	30,001 to 45,000	131.65	9.80
	45,001 to 60,000	128.80	13.18
	Overall	132.18	9.87

Table-III: Results of 2-way ANOVA for Mean WAS of Engineers and Managers Having Differing Levels of Income

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F Value	Significance
Occupation (A)	885.254	1	885.254	10.068	.002
Income (B)	335.822	2	167.911	1.910	.154
Interaction (A X B)	83.060	1	83.060	.945	.334
Error	7561.823	86	87.928	-	-

Engineers and Managers differed significantly in their work alienation scores. F value of 10.068 with 1 and 86 df's is found to be significant (P<.002). The mean work alienation scores for engineers and managers are 133.77 and 126.50 respectively, where we find managers to have significantly higher alienation towards work than engineers. Between income groups, a non-significant difference existed in the mean work alienation scores of employees (F=.006; P<.994). The employees with different levels of income like below 30,000, 30,0001 to 45,000, and 450001 to 60,0000 are 133.28, 131.65, 128.80, and 132.18 respectively., which are the same statistically to non-significant difference.

The interaction effect between occupation types and income is found to be non-significant (F=.945; P<.334) indicating that patterns of work alienation are the same in employees of different income groups irrespective of the occupation they have.

Table-IV: Mean WAS Score of Engineers and Managers Having Different Age Groups

Occupation	Age (in years)	Mean	S.D
Engineers	Below 30	137.33	11.93
	31-40	131.95	9.04
	41-50	134.00	5.88
	50 +	139.78	15.01
	Overall	133.77	9.48
Managers	Below 30	-	-
	31-40	128.43	3.31
	41-50	122.63	7.56
	50 +	130.00	15.54
	Overall	126.50	9.29
Total	Below 30	137.33	11.93
	31-40	131.40	8.48
	41-50	130.86	8.11
	50 +	136.20	15.38
	Overall	132.18	9.87

Table-V: Results of 2-way ANOVA for Mean WAS of Engineers and Managers Having Different Age Groups

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F Value	Significance
Occupation (A)	932.277	7	932.277	10.823	.001
Income (B)	381.750	3	127.250	1.477	.227
Interaction (A X B)	194.748	2	97.374	1.130	.328
Error	7235.706	84	86.139	-	-

Employees with different age groups differed significantly in their mean work alienation scores (F=10.823; P<.001). The mean scores of employees with different age groups like below 30, 31-40, 41-50, and 50 and above are 137.33, 131.40, 130.86, and 136.29 respectively, where we find no particular trend. However, we find maximum alienation scores in the age groups of 31-40 and 41-50. The interaction effect between occupation type and age groups is also found to be non-significant (F=1.130; P<.328) indicating that patterns of work alienation are same in employees of different age groups irrespective of the occupation they have.

Table-VI: Mean WAS Score of Engineers and Managers Having Different Years of Work Experience

Occupation	Experience (in Years)	Mean	S.D
Engineers	Below 4 years	132.00	-
	5 to 7	130.50	2.12
	8 to 12	133.52	10.39
	13-17	133.50	4.26
	17+	135.12	11.06
	Total	133.77	9.48
Managers	Below 4 years	-	-
	5 to 7	-	-
	8 to 12	133.00	.00
	13-17	126.00	.00
	17+	125.75	10.15
	Total	126.50	9.29
Total	Below 4 years	132.00	-
	5 to 7	130.50	2.12
	8 to 12	133.48	10.04
	13-17	131.69	4.54
	17+	131.46	11.55
	Total	132.18	9.87

Table-VII: Results of 2-Way ANOVA for Mean OSEs of Engineers and Managers Having Different Years of Work Experience

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F Value	Significance
Occupation (A)	222.227	1	222.227	2.382	.127
Income (B)	90.078	4	22.519	.241	.914
Interaction (A X B)	126.213	2	63.107	.676	.511
Error	7744.881	83	93.312	-	-

Employees with different levels of experience did not differ significantly in their mean work alienation scores (F=.241; P<.914). The mean scores of employees with different levels of experience like below 4, 5-7, 8-12, 13-17, and 17 and above are 132, 130.50, 133.48, 131.69, and 131.46 respectively, which are the same statistically contributed to a non-significant difference. The interaction effect between occupation type and experience is found to be non-significant (F=.676; P<.511) indicating that the pattern of work alienation is same in employees of different years of service irrespective of the occupation they have.

Table-VIII: Mean WAS Score of Engineers and Managers Having Different Marital Status

Occupation	Marital Status	Mean	S.D
Engineers	Unmarried	131.50	6.19
	Married	133.91	9.66
	Overall	133.77	9.48
Managers	Unmarried	106.00	-
	Married	127.58	8.15
	Overall	126.50	9.29
Total	Unmarried	126.40	12.60
	Married	132.51	9.67
	Overall	132.18	9.87

Table-IX: Results of 2-way ANOVA for Mean WAS of Engineers and Managers Having Different Marital Status

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F Value	Significance
Occupation (A)	769.033	1	769.033	8.958	.004
Income (B)	436.786	1	436.786	5.088	.027
Interaction (A X B)	278.873	1	278.873	3.348	.075
Error	7469.094	87	85.852	-	-

Employees with different types of marital status differed significantly in their work alienation scores (F=5.088; P<.027). The mean scores of employees with different levels of marital status like married, are 126.40 and 132.51 respectively. From the mean values, it is certain that married employees had significantly lesser work alienation compared to unmarried employees. The interaction effect between occupation type and marital status is found to be non-significant (F=3.248; P<.075) indicating that the pattern of work alienation is the same in employees having different marital status irrespective of the occupation they have.

Retrieval Number: 100.1/ijml.B209205021025
DOI: 10.54105/ijml.B2092.05010425
Journal Website: www.ijml.latticescipub.com

Published By:
Lattice Science Publication (LSP)

Table-X: Mean WAS Score of Engineers and Managers Having Different Family Types

Occupation	Family Type	Mean	S. D
Engineers	Joint	134.11	1.49
	Nuclear	133.56	8.89
	Overall	133.77	9.48
Managers	Joint	130.30	10.47
	Nuclear	122.70	6.36
	Overall	126.50	9.29
Total	Joint	133.11	1.48
	Nuclear	131.51	9.45
	Overall	132.18	9.87

Table-XI: Results of 2-way ANOVA for Mean WAS of Engineers and Managers Having Different Family Types

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F Value	Significance
Occupation (A)	830.484	1	830.484	9.458	.003
Income (B)	256.424	1	256.424	2.920	.091
Interaction (A X B)	191.978	1	191.978	2.186	.143
Error	7639.483	87	87.810	-	-

Employees with different types of families did not differ significantly in their mean work alienation scores (F= 2.920; P<.091). The employees with different family types like joint nuclear type are 73.11 and 75.57 respectively, which are the same statistically and has contributed to the non-significant difference. The interaction effect between occupation type and experience is found to be non-significant (F=2.186; P<.143) indicating that pattern of work alienation is same among employees of different family types irrespective of the occupation they have.

Table-XII: Mean WAS Score of Engineers and Managers Having Different Levels of Education

Occupation	Education	Mean	S. D
Engineers	Tech (Lower)	134.25	9.06
	Tech	132.1	10.7
	Other	140	0
	Overall	133.77	9.48
Managers	Tech (Lower)	127.38	10.14
	Tech	-	-
	Other	123	3.46
	Overall	126.5	9.29
Total	Tech (Lower)	132.53	9.73
	Tech	132.1	10.7
	Other	128.67	9.18
	Overall	132.18	9.87

Table-XIII: Results of 2-Way ANOVA for Mean OSEs of Engineers and Managers Having Different Levels of Education

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F Value	Significance
Occupation (A)	684.019	1	684.019	7.615	.007
Income (B)	199.411	2	99.706	1.110	.334
Interaction (A X B)	123.019	1	123.019	1.370	.245
Error	7724.560	86	89.820	-	-

Employees with different levels of education did not differ significantly in their mean work alienation scores (F=1.110; P<.334). The mean scores of employees with different levels of education like Technical (Lower) level, technical and others are 132.53, 132.10 and 128.67 respectively, which are almost the same and these have contributed to the non-significant difference. The interaction effect between occupation type and education is found to be non-significant (F=1.370; P<.245) indicating that the pattern of work alienation is same in employees of different levels of education irrespective of the occupation they possess.

V. DISCUSSION

A. The Main Findings of the Study Are -

1. Managers were found to have significantly higher WA scores compared to engineers.
2. The interaction effect between occupation type and different income, age, and years of work experience, are found to be non-significant indicating that pattern of WA is same in employees irrespective of the occupation they have.

B. The Hypothesis Formulated, Has Been Tested and is as Follows –

H1: "There is no difference in the Work Alienation (WA) scores of employees belonging to different designations like engineers and managers". This hypothesis has been accepted on the basis that WA scores of employees belonging to various designations are not significant.

H2: "Income has no significant influence on the WA of the employees".

H3: "Age has no significant influence on the WA of the employees".

H4: "Experience has no significant influence on the WA of the employees".

H5: "Family type has no significant influence on the WA of the employees".

H6: "Educational has no significant influence on the WA of the employees".

H7: There is no difference in the work alienation scores of employees belonging to different designations like engineers and managers.

The Hypotheses H2, H3, H4, H5, H6 and H7 have been accepted on the basis that all these variables like income, age, experience, family type and different designations do not have any significant influence on the work alienation scores of the employees.

H8: "Marital status has no significant influence on the WA of the employees".

This hypothesis has been rejected on the basis that marital status has significantly influenced the work alienation of the employees. As is noticed by the fact that employees with different types of marital status differed significantly in their work alienation scores; it is clear that married employees had significantly lesser work alienation compared to unmarried employees. The reason could be that married employees experience satisfaction both in family and work life, whereas it is not the same in the case of unmarried employees.

Alienation exists at all levels and in almost all the organizations of social life bearing different causal factors, thus emerging in different types creating different results, and affecting the organization/system in which it exists. A 2012 study surveyed manufacturing units and found a strong correlation between alienation and the lack of meaningfulness of work, "not having a say over the work process," and not

having one's skills utilized. It also identified the need to understand and address these issues that "arise from a capitalist mode of production," that objectifies and commodifies work and workers. This indicates that the social context in which technology is used may be a greater determinant of alienation than the technology itself [12].

Research shows that the bureaucratic structure of schools, crowded classrooms, dense curriculum, heavy workload, lack of democratic processes in administrative structures [13], teaching information that will be useless in life [14], and external determination of teaching processes create alienation in education [15]. The long-term implications of such behaviors [16], can influence the functioning of a department and thereby impact a company's growth, leading to an increased rate of attrition of employees [17], culminating in the loss of valuable knowledge, skills, and competency for the concerned industry [18].

VI. CONCLUSION

Developing a strong sense of self-efficacy can play an important role in almost every aspect of your life. Life is full of challenges and high levels of self-efficacy can help you better deal with these difficulties more effectively. Your belief in your abilities can predict how motivated you feel, how you feel about yourself, and the amount of effort you put into achieving your goals.

DECLARATION STATEMENT

After aggregating input from all authors, I must verify the accuracy of the following information as the article's author.

- **Conflicts of Interest/ Competing Interests:** Based on my understanding, this article has no conflicts of interest.
- **Funding Support:** This article has not been funded by any organizations or agencies. This independence ensures that the research is conducted with objectivity and without any external influence.
- **Ethical Approval and Consent to Participate:** The content of this article does not necessitate ethical approval or consent to participate with supporting documentation.
- **Data Access Statement and Material Availability:** The adequate resources of this article are publicly accessible.
- **Authors Contributions:** The authorship of this article is contributed equally to all participating individuals.

REFERENCES

1. Hoy, W., K. Blazovsky, R., and Newland, W., (1983). Bureaucracy And Alienation: A Comparative Analysis. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 21 (2), ss.109-121. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/eb009872
2. Bayındır, B. (2003). *Relation between Professional Alienation of High School Branch Teachers and Their Behaviours throughout the Teaching-Learning Process*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Anadolu University. Institute of Educational Science. (Unpublished Master Degree Thesis)
3. Blauner, R. (1964) *Alienation and Freedom: The Factory Worker and His Industry*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1965-06019-000
4. Elma, C. (2003). *Teachers Work Alienation in Elementary School (Ankara case study)* Unpublished PhD Thesis., Ankara: Ankara University. Institute of Social Science. (Unpublished Master Degree Thesis)
5. Subberwal R. (2009). *Alienation. Dictionary of Sociology*. (pp. 9-12). Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill. (Dictionary). https://www.amazon.in/Sociology-Dictionary-Ranjana-Subberwal/dp/007066031X
6. Fulcher, J., & Scott, J. (2003). *Sociology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://global.oup.com/academic/product/sociology-9780199563753?cc=in&lang=en&
7. Britannica, Encyclopaedia (May 19, 2015). *Industrial Revolution*. Encyclopaedia Britannica. Retrieved March 10 from http://www.britannica.com/event/Industrial-Revoluton. https://www.britannica.com/event/Industrial-Revolution
8. McKinsey Global Institute (March 2012). *Help wanted: The future of work in advanced economies*. Discussion paper. McKinsey & Company. https://www.mckinsey.com/~/media/mckinsey/featured%20insights/employment%20and%20growth/future%20of%20work%20in%20advanced%20economies/help_wanted_future_of_work_full_report.pdf
9. Kellner D. (2006). *New Technologies and Alienation: Some Critical Reflections*. (2006). *The evolution of alienation: Trauma, promise, and the millennium*, Langman, L., & Kalekin-Fishman, D. (Eds) (pp.47-67). Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. https://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/essays/technologyalienation.pdf
10. Lawson T., Garrod J. (2001) *Deskilling. Dictionary of Sociology*. Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers. (Dictionary of sociology : Lawson, Tony : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive
11. Asthana V and Verma K (1985). *The Work Alienation Scale*. Agra Psychological Corporation. India. (A Scale, from Agra Psychological Corporation).
12. Shantza A., Alfes K. and Truss K. (2012) Alienation from work: Marxist ideologies and twenty-first-century practice. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management.*, 25:18, (pp.2529-2550). London: Routledge. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.667431
13. Erjem, Y. (2005). The Fenomen of Alienation in Education: A Sociological Research on the High School Teachers. (Elektronik Sürüm). *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi.* 4(3), 2005, from http://www.tebd.gazi.edu.tr/c3s4.html
14. Akgün, E. (1999). *Participation in the Management as an Effective Means of Conflict and Estrangement in Organization*. Unpublished Master Thesis, İstanbul: İstanbul University. Institute of Social Science. (Unpublished Master Degree Thesis).
15. Keerthika. R, Anli Suresh, Role of Public Sector Bank in Financial Inclusion of Low or Middle Income Group in Chennai. (2019). In International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering (Vol. 8, Issue 4S3, pp. 40–44). DOI: https://doi.org/10.35940/ijrte.d1040.1284s319
16. Bandaru, D., & Shaik, A. G. (2019). Wavelet-Alienation Coefficient based Protection of Distribution System. In International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology (Vol. 8, Issue 6s3, pp. 828–835). DOI: https://doi.org/10.35940/ijeat.f1160.0986s319
17. Sharma, A., & Singh, B. J. (2020). Evolution of Industrial Revolutions: A Review. In International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering (Vol. 9, Issue 11, pp. 66–73). DOI: https://doi.org/10.35940/ijitee.i7144.0991120
18. Kaur, K. (2022). The Dilemma of Isolation and Emotional Turmoil: the After Effects of the Pandemic. In Indian Journal of Management and Language (Vol. 2, Issue 2, pp. 1–8). DOI: https://doi.org/10.54105/ijml.d2046.101422

AUTHOR'S PROFILE

Dr. Kiran Kumar Thoti, holds a Ph.D. in Human Resource Management from Universiti Malaysia Kelantan, Malaysia, an MBA from Madurai Kamaraj University, and a B.E. from Anna University's MIT Campus. With 17 years of teaching experience, he is currently Associate Professor & Head–IQAC & FPM at M.S. Ramaiah Institute of Management, Bangalore. He previously served at Universiti Malaysia Kelantan and KLH Business School, KLEF University. He has engaged with Malaysian academia since 2011. Dr. Thoti has earned 20+ certifications and contributed to 90+ conferences, 13 FDPs, 150 articles, and authored four textbooks in the field of management and HR.

About Dr. Gururaj B Urs, With over 25 years of experience, he is a multifaceted professional—a Teacher, Trainer, Clinician, Researcher, Doctoral Guide, and Administrator. His expertise spans Organizational Learning Change and Development, HR Audit, Business Ethics, Industrial-Organizational Psychology, along Mental Health & Behavioural Science. He has spearheaded PhD/FPM programs and thereby mentors postgraduate and doctoral students (in Management, Mental Health & Behavioural Sciences), in Research activities and Thesis Development, while publishing scholarly papers in leading journals, and leading large-scale funded Research Projects and Consulting Assignments. A skilled Clinician, he conducts Psycho-diagnostic Assessments and Psycho-therapeutic interventions for Mental Health and Physical Illnesses. He has led Quality Accreditation teams and has implemented Total Quality Management systems in various Higher Educational Institutions. His qualifications include dual PhDs in Management and Mental Health/Behavioral Science and with other degrees and certifications.