Society and Culture Development in India
Vol. 3, No. 1, 2023, pp. 123-157

ISSN: 2583-0694
URL: www.arfjournals.com
https://doi.org/10.47509/SCDI.2023.v03i01.10

Indian Working Professionals in the COVID-19 Lockdown Situation

Sanjoy Sarkar
Assistant Professor in Sociology, Sudhiranjan Lahiri Mahavidyalaya, Majdia, West Bengal 741507, India. E-mails: ssofsociology@gmail.com, san_joy17@rediffmail.com

Abstract: No doubt, the novel coronavirus has created turmoil stagnation around the globe; its threat to infect people segregated as well as intensely affected all the working sectors. The working professionals are under varied socio-economic as well as psycho-social pressure for the members of their primary social units as well as earnings to a safe life. In a situation, many of the working professionals are removed from the jobs, many are fighting to cope with the challenges of 'work from home' with digital medium. The paper is tried to elaborate the, nature of cope with such disruptive situation to keep stabilise the social institutions of India as 'functional' by the working professionals.

Keywords: Lockdown, Working professionals, Digital medium, COVID-19

Received : 29 April 2023
Revised : 23 May 2023
Accepted : 30 May 2023
Published : 29 June 2023

TO CITE THIS ARTICLE:

Sarkar, S. (2023). Indian Working Professionals in the COVID-19 Lockdown Situation, *Society and Culture Development in India,* 3: 1, pp. 123-157. *https://doi.org/10.47509/SCDI.2023.v03i01.10*

Introduction

In reality social change is a very broad concept and it can be simply defined as, a change as alterations that occur in the social structure and social relationships. Thus, social change refers to an alteration in the social structure of a social group or society which, according to, International Encyclopaedia of Social Science, are the change in the nature, social institutions, social behaviours or social relations of a society (Sills, 1972). The alteration may occur in norms, values, cultural products and symbols in a society. This alteration in the structure and function of a social system, institutions and patterns of interaction, work, leisure activities, roles and other aspects of society can be altered over the time as a result of the process of social change. As we experienced social change is a process of alteration with no reference to the quality of change. And changes in society are related to changes in culture. For instance, growth of modern technology as

part of the culture has been closely associated with alterations in the economic structures an important part of the society. Social change can vary in its scope and in speed. We can talk of small scale or large scale changes. As change varies in scope, it influences many aspects of a society and disrupt the whole social system. In the contemporary time, the COVID-19 outbreak crated rapid as well as speedy and disruptive changes within the society irrespective of gender, size, population, economy and weapon. Its consequences are variously labelled as a black swan event[1] and likened to the economic scene of World War Two[2], the outbreak of COVID-19 has had a detrimental effect on global healthcare systems with a ripple effect on every aspect of human life as we know it. Sohrabi et al. highlighted the extent of the outbreak with the World Health Organisation (WHO) declaring the COVID-19 outbreak as a global emergency on January 30, 2020[3]. In a response to 'flatten the curve'[4], governments have enforced border shutdowns, travel restrictions and quarantine[5,6] in countries which constitute the world's largest economies, sparking fears of an impending economic crisis and recession[7]. This article is an attempt to understand the turmoil effect on the *citizens* due to the emerged COVID-19 caused socio-structural changes in the *primary sectors*which include industries involved in the extraction of raw materials, *secondary sectors*involved in the production of finished products and *tertiary sectors*including all service provision industries.

As we know that the novel coronavirus (COVID-19) has created turmoil stagnation around the globe. This third zoonotic human coronavirus (CoV) of this century emerged in December 2019 in Wuhan, Hubei Province, PR China (Zhu et al., 2020). The novel Wuhan virus comes under different names (2019-nCoV in the research literature, SARS-CoV-2 by the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses, and COVID-19 by the WHO). After COVID-19 cases were first reported to the World Health Organization on December 31, 2019, within three and a half months it was declared a pandemic by WHO. India reported its first COVID-19 case from Kerala on January 30, 2020. On March 24, 2020, the Government of India declared a 21-day nationwide lockdown (March 25 to April 14, 2020, lockdown 1.0), then a 17-day lockdown (from April 15 to May 3, 2020, lockdown 2.0), which was again decided to continue up to June 30, 2020 (lockdown 5.0). Practically various popular and intensive research works are still going on that are mainly focused on medical (vaccines), nature, and spread of SARS-CoV-2, and also governmental policies. We could barely find any study on understanding the common people's sufferings during or after the lockdown period, either on a local, national, or global scale (Pramanick, 2020).

Socio-information of COVID-19 Pandemic

The main objective of the study was to explore the question, how the working professionals are coping with the 'COVID-19 lockdown situation'. Historically, it has been seen that during different pandemics, several types of belief systems and conceptions emerged. According to the Greek historian, Procopius, during the Justinian plague in 541 AD, people believed that the plague was caused by demons. To prevent the demon from entering the home, doors were kept locked. Many Christians thought (not rare even today) that getting a virulent infection was the result of God's punishment for their sins (Stafford and Flatley, 2018). The plague was caused by *Yersinia pestis* bacteria in black rats (*Rattus rattus*) and oriental rat fleas (*Xenopsylla cheopis*). The transmission occurred mainly due to black rats, which used to travel from North Africa to Constantinople in grain ships and carts (Horgan, 2014). The Black Death, was affected Europe in 1347 and claimed 200 million lives in four years, was caused by the same microbe, *Y. pestis*, which caused the Justinian plague. There was a lack of scientific understanding during that period, but people understood that it had something to do with proximity. So, newly arrived sailors at the port were kept in forced isolation in their ships for 40 days, which was known as *quarantino*, to prove that they were not sick. The word quarantine originated from this situation (Roos, 2020).

In the early 15th century, for the first time, plague-stricken London imposed laws for separation and isolation of infected people. Infected people and their homes were meticulously marked. There was also a belief that animals such as cats and dogs were the carriers of the disease and they were massacred ruthlessly (Roos, 2020). There are also many stories and theories regarding epidemics and pandemics that occurred later and currently COVID-19 are not an exception. A wide range of causes are being discussed on the internet and social media about their origin, such as habitat destruction and wild animal contact, astrological reasons, a bio weapon, and so on. There are also diverse opinions on how to combat COVID-19, such as social isolation and proper sanitization, consumption of indigenous medicines, herd immunity, vaccination, and so forth. Naturally, a flood of information in electronic, social, and print media, and 21st century information and rationality characteristics, are very different from the previous pandemics and also very chaotic. In such a situation, *"We're not just fighting an epidemic; we're fighting an infodemic,"* said Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, Director-General of the World Health Organization (WHO) at a gathering of foreign policy and security experts in Munich, Germany, in mid-February, referring to fake news that *"spreads faster and more easily than this virus."*[8].

In reality, the Novel Corona Virus (COVID-19) disease has labelled as a global pandemic. It was initially detected in December 2019 in Wuhan, China. The first case of COVID-19 in India was reported on 30th January, 2020 in the state of Kerala. The World Health Organization (WHO) reported that, more than 19.46 million people infected by the virus, 72285 among them are died across the globed as on 9th August 2020. Most of the developed countries had the maximum number of infected cases during the month of April onwards while India was at the early stage of the outbreak and recorded a comparatively lower number of cases. Currently, the top 10 infected countries are the United States, Brazil, India, Russia Federation, South Africa, Mexico, Peru, Columbia, Chile and Iran. Till 9th August 2020, India has the largest number of confirmed cases 2.22 million and 44386 deaths in South East Asian Region of WHO.

Considering the global critical condition and rapid spread of the disease the Government of India decided a nationwide lockdown. Initially, on 22 March a 24 hour voluntary curfew was declared after that a 3 week complete national lockdown was initiated. Again it was extended till 31st May. Thereafter, the Government has announced some relaxations and finally from 1st June started to unlock the country in a phased manner. But in this connection, the Government divided the entire country into three zones like Red Zone or Hotspot (having a high number of positive cases), Orange Zone or non-hotspot (having fewer positive cases) and Green Zone (no positive cases) and permitted relaxation accordingly. Hotspot or containment Zones are always strictly monitored by the Government. All the educational institutions irrespective of zones still now are closed and all transport modes in the country, barring few essential services, are also stopped. Mainly the major cities like Mumbai, Delhi, Ahmedabad, Chennai, Pune, Indore, Hyderabad and Kolkata are affected badly and have 60% of total reported cases. Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) assures no community transmission in the country yet.

The Issue to be Explored

From these perspectives, as a citizen as well as scholar of social science, I am trying to relate my 'lockdown' experiences with others fellow citizen's experiences. Generally, Indian social structure is basically family centric, it may be 'nuclear' or 'joint' in nature. Most of the husband-wife or one of them is engaged into a 'profession', residing in a 'geographical location', most of them are 'travelled' minimum a distance in their respective working day and 'interact' with others to meet the 'social' or 'basic needs' and finally interact with the family members directly or over phone or video

call. I think the so-called 'lockdown' ceased most of the above activities except the interaction with the family members directly or over phone or video call. If I share a working day of my, at around 7.00 am I wake up from bed, after fresh, take tea, then bath and eating some warm rice with curry. Then dressed for attend college, leave the residence by 8.35 am with an office bag, the railway station is just 3 minutes walking distance from my present residence and scheduled time of the local train is 9.44 am and it is a 68 KM journey and I has to get off the train at 17th number of station. After get on the train, in between the journey having a joyful conversation at least 65-70 people of different professional of public as well as private sector including the hawkers, sellers, businessmen etc. After getting off from the train, we, my colleagues were taken a break by taking tea from a tea stall of the station and then complete a journey of one KM by 'paddle van' to reach the college. After reaching my college around 10.25-35 am, I mate with my senior as well as younger colleagues, different staffs and the students. Here we share different academic, family and personal dialogue with more or less all of them along with scheduled class along with other academic or administrative work. 'We' leave the college around 3.35-40 pm, get the 'paddle van'/'auto'/'toto' to arrive at station, few fruit sellers are waiting for us, we buy as per our need, the scheduled time of the down train is 3.52 pm, get on the train, mate again few co-passengers of different professional of public as well as private sector including the hawkers, sellers, businessmen etc. and after complete the joyful journey get off the train by 5.25-25 pm. After returning at my residence, just change the dress and again start a one way journey of 11 km by bike to meet my mother by crossing three municipal areas and buying some needy items for my mother. She is aged about 67 years living with my elders at my parental house. Here we share few regular dialogues along with sharing the news of neighbour and relatives. Thereafter, it is time to return at my residence, in the way sometimes I spent few moments with my friends of school and university and reach at residence by 8.00 pm.

My wife, by profession is a psychological counsellor; she posted at a Block Hospital, about 400 meter distance from my residence. My daughter is student of Class – III, her schooling time is 9.00 am to 3.00 pm, after getting back from the school she used to return the house of my mother-in-law, it is nearer to my residence. My wife, after completing her assigned office work, she used to go her mother's house, they, three generations taking rest after completing their lunch and returned at residence by 7.30-8.00 pm. Thereafter we, I, my wife and our daughter share the day we spent along with her study, taken academic preparation and go to bed at almost 1.00-1.30 am after completing dinner at 12.00-12.30 am.

This was a normal schedule of a working day, and I think most of the working people have experienced more or less same kind of daily activities, timing and mode of communication may vary but we can't ignore anything. But we bound to 'stay home' for the sake of 'stay safe' from the COVID-19 infection. My college is closed, daughter's school is closed, only my wife is 'on duty' due to she is engaged in the 'emergency service'. I am taking classes in 'online mode, prepared videos, study materials, attend and organize webinars, meeting etc. from home by using Information Communication Technology (ICT); my daughter is also attending her classes through online mode and my wife is also sometimes attending the meetings and trainings in the online mode. We are working, as per the scope and opportunities as we have. As a teacher I tried to disseminate my 'academic instructions, study materials' via ICT, are the students really benefitted? And the other peoples, who are working at different 'unorganized sectors', to those, I meet almost regularly – how are they in this 'lockdown situation'? What about their earning? Activities of my daughter, mother and mother-in-law are as it is which we observed before the COVID-19 'lockdown'? Even, how I spending my 'time' in this 'lockdown situation'? I think all are also searching the answers of these types of questions from your geographical locations like me. Lastly, how I rescheduled my time when every outside movement is restricted? I have no answers, so I tried to assess the "Human Dimensions of COVID-19 – Citizen's Reflection' to explore the issue. From the above perspectives, this article tried to explore the question, how the working professionals are coping with the 'COVID-19 lockdown situation'?

Methods and Materials of the Present Study

The present study was initially started from 5th July by developing a questionnaire in 'google forms', at the first stage I started to circulate among my colleagues and friends via 'WhatsApp'; there after the questionnaire was circulated to other districts of West Bengal. After receiving a good number of responses from them, then the questionnaire started to other States and Union Territories of India. Within 40 days I have received 575 responses across the country. The questionnaire of the study designed in a 'gender neutral approach' as the population of the study 'working professionals', where the respondent's experiences in the so-called 'lockdown' is to be explored along with the locality, pin code, number of students, number of aged 60 or above 60, profession, monthly income and their mode of work. Due to 'lockdown', a conventional field research is too tough to conduct across the country and it is too expensive in terms of time and cost. In the other side, due to the advisory of

following social as well as physical distance from others in this ongoing COVID-19 situation, it is too convenient to conduct a social survey in a 'online mode'. The urge to conduct and explored such an issues from the citizens of India, the study followed the *convenience sampling*(Schonlau, 2002)method, whichis characterized by a non-systematic approach to recruiting respondents that often allows a potential respondent to self-select into the sample. This sampling approach was lower cost, less effort to administer, better response rates, greater accuracy and wide scope to maintain the COVID-19 guideline on social as well as physical distance. To get a wide as well as potential self-selected respondent into the sample, the researcher used the social media like 'WhatsApp', 'Email, and the 'Facebook'. The researcher directly sends the questionnaire 'link of google forms' to 648 'WhatsApp' users; 1974 Email IDs and since 5th July, 2020 and the questionnaire posted in the 'Facebook' on 29th July, 2020 and it is 'liked' by 13, the researcher is not a regular user of 'Facebook'. Now the total number of recipients of the questionnaire is 2635 and total number of potential self-selected respondent into the sample is 575 and the percentage of responses is 21.82.

Technique of Data Process and Analysis

As the present researcher used 'google forms' to develop the questionnaire; it composed of open as well closed ended questions for collecting the data for this study and the data come into view with variety in nature in the 'google drive'. Thereafter the entire data was 'imported' to the 'Microsoft Excel Worksheet' and then the entire dad was again 'export to the 'IBM SPSS' after necessary codification for drawing acceptable inferences.

Limitations of the Study

Conducting a social survey to explore an issue on a current issue is differently limited and when the issue like COVID-19 related it's limitations as well as questioning is wider than the conventional social issues. The wave of COVID-19 affected irrespective of gender, profession, geographical locations, economy and power; all of them are in some kind of needs like food, shelter, alternate source of earnings, medicines, treatment and ultimately an urge of 'safe' from its ill effects. Many of the recipients of the questionnaire were asked about the benefits of filling the questionnaire. Secondly, initiate a survey by using the internet, by nature it restricted to reach to a larger community and this kind of 'online survey' could only be responded by the people having computer, laptops, smart phones with good

internet facility, which are still absent in many parts of India. All the queries of the respondents about the questionnaire were answered over the phone, email and WhatsApp personally. Lastly technology friendly was a prerequisite to answer the questions in this 'online survey'. Although, overcoming the above limitations, the survey abled to receive a total 575 number of potentially self-selected respondents into the sample and the percentage of responses is 21.82. Now following section of this paper analysed the findings of the study to draw the generalization.

Findings of the Study

Asthe study followed the *convenience sampling* method, whichis characterized by a non-systematic approach to recruiting respondents that often allows a potential respondent to self-select into the sample, the data of open ended questions are gathered in wide variety of nature in terms of age, number of students in the family, number of 60 and above aged members in the family, professions, incomes, pin codes, districts, States or Union Territories (UT), mode of journey, mode of work etc. and they entire data were merged in terms of similarity and codified accordingly to draw inferences by using IBM SPSS. Finally 575 respondents from 430 Pin Codes, 159 Districts and 29 States / UTs are included as the self-select into the sample of this study. In the following sections vividly analysed the findings of the study.

Socio-Demographic Features of the Respondents

At the beginning of the analysis of the findings it is found in the table 1 that, 2.6 percent are 'academician'; 0.3 percent are 'accountant'; 0.7 percent are 'advocate'; 20.0 percent are 'assistant professor'; 1.6 percent are 'associate professor'; 0.3 percent are 'banker'; 1.7 percent are 'businessmen'; 0.7 percent are 'coach/trainer'; 4.7 percent are 'guest/part-time college teacher'; 0.9 percent are 'library professional' 1.6 percent are from 'medical service'; 1.0 percent are 'officers'; 1.7 percent from 'other profession'; 2.6 are professor/principal'; 7.8 are 'researcher'; 24.5 percent are 'school teacher'; 5.9 percent are from 'service sector' and 21.2 percent are 'sstudent/private tutor/self-employed' out of total respondents. Again out of the total respondents 18.8 percent are within the 'age group 18 – 25'; 21.4 percent are within 'age group 26 – 30'; 33.0 percent are within 'age group 31 – 40'; 18.1 percent are within 'age group 41 – 50'; 6.4 percent are within 'age group 51 – 36' and 2.3 percent are within the 'age group 61 and above'. **Table 1A** represented the statistical inferences of the available data.

Table 1: Profession and Age Group of the Respondents

Profession of the Respondents	*Age Group*						*Total*
	Age Group 18 - 25	*Age Group 26 - 30*	*Age Group 31 - 40*	*Age Group 41 - 50*	*Age Group 51 - 60*	*Age Group 61 & above*	
Academician	0.2%	0.5%	0.7%	1.0%		0.2%	2.6%
Accountant			0.3%				0.3%
Advocate						0.7%	0.7%
Assistant Professor	0.3%	3.5%	9.9%	5.2%	1.0%		20.0%
Associate Professor			0.2%	0.7%	0.7%		1.6%
Banker				0.3%			0.3%
Business		0.9%	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%		1.7%
Coach / Trainer		0.2%	0.3%	0.2%			0.7%
Guest/Part-time College Teacher		1.7%	2.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	4.7%
Library Professional		0.3%	0.3%	0.2%			0.9%
Medical Service	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	1.6%
Officers		0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%		1.0%
Other Professionals	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%		1.7%
Professor/Principal		0.3%	0.5%	0.5%	0.9%	0.3%	2.6%
Researcher	0.2%	4.7%	1.9%	0.9%		0.2%	7.8%
School Teacher	1.2%	4.2%	10.8%	5.6%	2.4%	0.3%	24.5%
Service	0.2%	0.5%	3.3%	1.7%	0.2%		5.9%
Student/Private Tutor/Self Employed	15.8%	3.5%	1.0%	0.7%	0.2%		21.2%
Total	18.8%	21.4%	33.0%	18.1%	6.4%	2.3%	100.0%
Data source: Own survey data							

Table 1.A

Chi-Square Tests				*Measures of Central Tendency*		
	Value	*df*	*Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)*		*Profession of the Respondents*	*Age Group*
Pearson Chi-Square	670.127[a]	85	.000	Mean	12.45	2.79
Likelihood Ratio	473.168	85	.000	Std. Deviation	5.701	1.251
Linear-by-Linear Association	65.251	1	.000	Skewness	-.697	.305
N of Valid Cases	575			Kurtosis	-1.182	-.394
Data source: Own survey data						

In the **Table 2**, is explored that 18.1 percent are belongs to a family without 'any student'; 37.0 percent are percent are belongs to a family with 'one student'; 22.1 percent are belongs to a family with 'two students'; 8.9 percent are belongs to a family with 'three students' and 13.9 percent are belongs to a family with 'more than three students' out of total respondents. Significantly, here it was also found that 4.7 percent of the 'assistant professor' and 4.9 percent of the 'school teacher' are belongs to a family without 'any student'; but a great majority of the respondents that is 10.3 percent of the 'school teacher' are belongs to a family with 'one student' and 4.7 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employed' are belongs to a family with 'more than three students' out of total respondents. **Table 2A** represented the statistical inferences of the available data.

The **Table 3**, is explored that 26.4 percent are belongs to a family without 'any 60 and above aged member'; 39.0 percent are percent are belongs to a family with 'one 60 and above aged member'; 27.1 percent are belongs to a family with 'two 60 and above aged members'; 4.3 percent are belongs to a family with 'three 60 and above aged members' and 3.1 percent are belongs to a family with 'four 60 and above aged members' out of total respondents. Interestingly, here it was also found that 4.0 percent of the 'assistant professor' and 5.9 percent of the 'school teacher' are belongs to a family without 'any 60 and above aged member'; but a great majority of the respondents that is 9.2 and 8.3 percent of the 'school teacher' are belongs to a family with 'one and two 60 and above aged members'; again, 1.7 percent of the 'assistant professor' belongs to a family with 'three 60 and above aged members' and 0.7 percent of the each 'assistant professor', 'school teacher' and 'student/private tutor/self-employed' are belonging to a family with 'four 60 and above aged members' out of total respondents. **Table 3A** represented the statistical inferences of the available data.

In the **Table 4A and B**, it is depicted that .2 percent are engaged with 'autonomous sector'; 1.7 percent are engaged with 'business sector'; .2 percent are engaged with 'contract basis'; 7.3 percent are engaged with 'government aided universities'; 41.9 percent are engaged with 'government service'; 21.6 percent are engaged with 'private sector' 2.1 are 'self-employed'; .2 percent are engaged with 'semi-government'; .2 percent are engaged with 'state aided sector'; 3.5 percent are engaged with 'state aided college' and 21.2 percent are 'student/private tutor/self-employed' out of total respondents. Here in the tables it is also explored that, 17.4 percent of the 'school teachers' are engaged with 'government service' 4.9 percent of the 'assistant professors', 6.6 percent of the 'school teachers', 1.2 percent of the 'guest/part-time college teacher', 1.4 percent of the 'medical service', 1.7 percent of

Table 2: Profession and Number of Students in Respondent's Family

Profession of the Respondents	*Number of Students in Respondent's Family*					*Total*
	0.	*1.*	*2.*	*3.*	*More Than 3*	
Academician	0.2%	1.2%	0.9%		0.3%	2.6%
Accountant	0.2%			0.2%		0.3%
Advocate	0.7%					0.7%
Assistant Professor	4.7%	7.5%	3.3%	1.6%	3.0%	20.0%
Associate Professor		0.9%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	1.6%
Banker		0.2%	0.2%			0.3%
Business	0.5%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.5%	1.7%
Coach / Trainer	0.2%		0.5%			0.7%
Guest/Part-time College Teacher	1.2%	1.6%	1.0%	0.5%	0.3%	4.7%
Library Professional	0.3%	0.3%		0.2%		0.9%
Medical Service	0.2%	0.7%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	1.6%
Officers	0.2%	0.9%				1.0%
Other Professionals	0.7%	0.2%	0.3%		0.5%	1.7%
Professor/Principal	1.0%	1.2%	0.2%		0.2%	2.6%
Researcher	1.6%	1.4%	2.3%	1.4%	1.2%	7.8%
School Teacher	4.9%	10.3%	6.4%	1.0%	1.9%	24.5%
Service	0.9%	1.9%	1.4%	0.9%	0.9%	5.9%
Student/Private Tutor/Self Employed	0.7%	8.7%	4.7%	2.4%	4.7%	21.2%
Total	18.1%	37.0%	22.1%	8.9%	13.9%	100.0%
Data source: Own survey data						

Table 2.A

Chi-Square Tests				*Measures of Central Tendency*	
	Value	*df*	*Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)*		*Number of Students in Respondent's Family*
Pearson Chi-Square	121.201[a]	68	.000	Mean	2.63
Likelihood Ratio	132.411	68	.000	Std. Deviation	1.268
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.929	1	.026	Skewness	.588
N of Valid Cases	575			Kurtosis	-.661
Data source: Own survey data					

Table 3: Profession and Number of 60 and above Aged Member in Respondent's Family

Profession of the Respondents	*Number of 60 and above Aged Member in Respondent's Family*					***Total***
	0	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	
Academician	0.7%	0.5%	0.9%	0.2%	0.3%	2.6%
Accountant				0.2%	0.2%	0.3%
Advocate			0.7%			0.7%
Assistant Professor	4.0%	8.0%	5.9%	1.4%	0.7%	20.0%
Associate Professor		0.9%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	1.6%
Banker	0.2%		0.2%			0.3%
Business		0.9%	0.7%	0.2%		1.7%
Coach / Trainer	0.7%					0.7%
Guest/Part-time College Teacher	1.4%	2.4%	0.9%			4.7%
Library Professional	0.3%		0.5%			0.9%
Medical Service	0.3%	0.7%	0.5%			1.6%
Officers	0.2%	0.5%	0.3%			1.0%
Other Professionals	0.5%	1.2%				1.7%
Professor/Principal	1.0%	0.7%	0.5%		0.3%	2.6%
Researcher	1.9%	3.7%	2.1%	0.2%		7.8%
School Teacher	5.9%	9.2%	8.3%	0.3%	0.7%	24.5%
Service	2.1%	2.3%	1.2%	0.3%		5.9%
Student/Private Tutor/Self Employed	7.1%	8.0%	4.2%	1.2%	0.7%	21.2%
Total	26.4%	39.0%	27.1%	4.3%	3.1%	100.0%
Data source: Own survey data						

Table 3.A

Chi-Square Tests				*Measures of Central Tendency*	
	Value	*df*	*Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)*		*Number of 60 and above Aged Member in Respondent's Family*
Pearson Chi-Square	117.349[a]	68	.000	Mean	2.19
Likelihood Ratio	110.863	68	.001	Std. Deviation	.979
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.285	1	.001	Skewness	.702
N of Valid Cases	575			Kurtosis	.374
Data source: Own survey data					

Table 4. A: Profession and Sector of Profession of the Respondents

Profession of the Respondents	*Sector of Profession*											*Total*
	Autonomous	*Business*	*Contract basis*	*Government Aided University*	*Government Service*	*Private Sector*	*Self-employed*	*Semi-Government*	*State Aided*	*State Aided College Teacher*	*Student/Private Tutor/Self Employed*	
Academician					1.70%	0.90%						2.60%
Accountant						0.30%						0.30%
Advocate							0.70%					0.70%
Assistant Professor			0.20%		14.30%	4.90%	0.30%	0.20%	0.20%			20.00%
Associate Professor				0.20%	1.20%	0.20%						1.60%
Banker					0.20%	0.20%						0.30%
Business		1.70%										1.70%
Coach / Trainer						0.30%	0.30%					0.70%
Guest/Part-time College Teacher						1.20%				3.50%		4.70%
Data source: Own survey data												

Table 4. B: Profession and Sector of Profession of the Respondents

Profession of the Respondents	*Sector of Profession*											*Total*
	Autonomous	*Business*	*Contract basis*	*Government Aided University*	*Government Service*	*Private Sector*	*Self-employed*	*Semi-Government*	*State Aided*	*State Aided College Teacher*	*Student/Private Tutor/Self Employed*	
Library Professional	.2%				.5%	.2%						.9%
Medical Service						1.4%	.2%					1.6%
Officers					.9%	.2%						1.0%
Other Professionals						1.7%						1.7%
Professor/Principal					1.9%	.7%						2.6%
Researcher				7.1%		.7%						7.8%
School Teacher					17.4%	6.6%	.5%					24.5%
Service					3.8%	2.1%						5.9%
Student/Private Tutor/Self Employed											21.2%	21.2%
Total of A & B	.2%	1.7%	.2%	7.3%	41.9%	21.6%	2.1%	.2%	.2%	3.5%	21.2%	100.0%
Data source: Own survey data												

Table 4.C

Chi-Square Tests				*Measures of Central Tendency*	
	Value	*df*	*Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)*		*Sector of Professional Sector of the Respondents*
Pearson Chi-Square	2519.016[a]	170	.000	Mean	6.58
Likelihood Ratio	1205.680	170	.000	Std. Deviation	2.574
Linear-by-Linear Association	97.823	1	.000	Skewness	.868
N of Valid Cases	575			Kurtosis	-.682
Data source: Own survey data					

the 'other professionals', 2.1 percent of the 'service sector' are engaged with 'private sector' out of the respondents. **Table 4.C** represented the statistical inferences of the available data. From the **Table 5**, it is cleared that, 13.7 percent monthly earned around 'INR 5000/-'; 16.3 percent monthly earned around 'INR 5000/- to INR 15000/-'; 16.3 percent monthly earned around 'INR 15000/- to INR 30000/-'; 13.6 percent monthly earned around 'INR 30000/- to INR 50000/-'; 33.0 percent monthly earned around 'INR 50000/- to INR 100000/-'; 5.6 percent monthly earned around 'INR 100000/- to INR 200000/-' and 1.4 percent monthly earned around 'more than INR 200000/-' out of the total respondents. Significantly, 13.7 percent of the 'assistant professor' are monthly earned an amount around 'INR 50000/- to INR 100000/-', 12.2 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employed' are monthly earned an amount around 'INR 5000/-' but 1.0 percent of them are monthly earned an amount around 'INR 50000/- to INR 100000/-' and 9.7 percent of the 'school teachers' are monthly earned an amount around 'INR 50000/- to INR 100000/-' out of the total respondents before the COVID-19 situation. **Table 5.A** represented the statistical inferences of the available data.

Profession, Travelling to Work Place and Time Spent at Work Place

The **Table 6** is portrayed that 22.8 percent are travelled around a distance of 'less than 10 kilometres'; 37.2 percent are travelled around a distance of '10 to 30 kilometres'; 12.3 percent are travelled around a distance of '30 to 50 kilometres'; 8.2 percent are travelled around a distance of '50 to 75 kilometres'; 5.6 percent are travelled around a distance of '75 to 100 kilometres' and 13.9 percent are travelled around a distance of 'more than 100 kilometres' to work place out of the total respondents.

Table 5: Profession and Monthly Income Before COVID-19 Situation of the Respondents

Profession of the Respondents	*Monthly Income Before COVID-19 Situation of the Respondents*							*Total*
	Upto Rs. 5000/- (INR)	*More than Rs. 5000/- &Upto Rs. 15000/- (INR)*	*More than Rs. 15000/- &Upto Rs. 30000/- (INR)*	*More than Rs. 30000/- &Upto Rs. 50000/- (INR)*	*More than Rs. 50000/- &Upto Rs. 100000/- (INR)*	*More than Rs. 100000/- &Upto Rs. 200000/- (INR)*	*More than Rs. 200000/- (INR)*	
Academician		.5%	.5%	.3%	.9%	.3%		2.6%
Accountant			.2%		.2%			.3%
Advocate		.3%		.3%				.7%
Assistant Professor		.2%	1.7%	1.7%	13.7%	2.1%	.5%	20.0%
Associate Professor				.2%	.7%	.5%	.2%	1.6%
Banker					.3%			.3%
Business		.7%	.3%	.3%	.2%		.2%	1.7%
Coach / Trainer	.3%	.2%	.2%					.7%
Guest/Part-time College Teacher		1.6%	.9%	.3%	1.7%	.2%		4.7%
Library Professional		.2%			.7%			.9%
Medical Service		.3%	.2%	.2%	.5%	.2%	.2%	1.6%
Officers			.2%	.2%	.3%	.3%		1.0%
Other Professionals	.2%	.5%	.5%	.2%	.2%		.2%	1.7%
Professor/Principal			.3%		1.0%	1.2%		2.6%
Researcher	.5%	2.4%	2.6%	1.7%	.3%	.2%		7.8%
School Teacher	.5%	3.3%	5.2%	5.6%	9.7%		.2%	24.5%
Service		.7%	1.7%	1.6%	1.4%	.5%		5.9%
Student/Private Tutor/Self Employed	12.2%	5.4%	1.7%	.9%	1.0%			21.2%
Total	13.7%	16.3%	16.3%	13.6%	33.0%	5.6%	1.4%	100.0%

Data source: Own survey data

Table 5

Chi-Square Tests				*Measures of Central Tendency*	
	Value	*df*	*Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)*		*Monthly Income Before COVID-19 Situation*
Pearson Chi-Square	555.561[a]	102	.000	Mean	4.73
Likelihood Ratio	519.592	102	.000	Std. Deviation	1.834
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.067	1	.044	Skewness	-.658
N of Valid Cases	575			Kurtosis	-.826
Data source: Own survey data					

Table 6: Profession and Distance from Home to Working Place of the Respondents

Profession of the Respondents	*Distance from Home to Working Place of the Respondents*						*Total*
	Less than 10 Kilometres	*More than 10 and less than 30 Kilometres*	*More than 30 and less than 50 Kilometres*	*More than 50 and less than 75 Kilometres*	*More than 75 and less than 100 Kilometres*	*More than 100 Kilometres*	
Academician	0.5%	1.0%	0.3%	0.3%		0.3%	2.6%
Accountant			0.2%	0.2%			0.3%
Advocate		0.2%		0.5%			0.7%
Assistant Professor	4.0%	7.5%	2.6%	1.2%	1.0%	3.7%	20.0%
Associate Professor	0.5%	0.7%		0.2%		0.2%	1.6%
Banker		0.2%				0.2%	0.3%
Business	0.3%	0.7%	0.5%	0.2%			1.7%
Coach / Trainer	0.3%		0.2%	0.2%			0.7%
Guest/Part-time College Teacher	1.4%	1.7%	0.5%	0.9%		0.2%	4.7%
Library Professional		0.7%		0.2%			0.9%
Medical Service	0.2%	0.9%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%		1.6%
Officers	0.7%	0.2%				0.2%	1.0%
Other Professionals	0.2%	1.2%	0.2%			0.2%	1.7%
Professor/Principal	1.2%	1.0%	0.2%			0.2%	2.6%
Researcher	1.0%	3.0%	1.2%	0.2%	0.3%	2.1%	7.8%
School Teacher	4.7%	8.3%	3.0%	1.9%	2.6%	4.0%	24.5%
Service	1.0%	1.7%	0.9%	0.9%	0.3%	1.0%	5.9%
Student/Private Tutor/Self Employed	6.6%	8.2%	2.4%	1.2%	1.0%	1.7%	21.2%
Total	22.8%	37.2%	12.3%	8.2%	5.6%	13.9%	100.0%
Data source: Own survey data							

Table 6. A

Chi-Square Tests				*Measures of Central Tendency*	
	Value	*df*	*Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)*		*Distance from Home to Working Place*
Pearson Chi-Square	116.652[a]	85	.013	Mean	2.63
Likelihood Ratio	113.459	85	.021	Std. Deviation	1.449
Linear-by-Linear Association	.156	1	.693	Skewness	.822
N of Valid Cases	575			Kurtosis	-.281
Data source: Own survey data					

Again, interestingly 8.3 and 2.6 percent of the 'school teachers' are travelled around a distance of '10 to 30 and 75 to 100 kilometres' respectively and significantly 17' percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employed' are travelled around a distance of 'more than 100 kilometres' out of the total respondents. **Table 6 A-** represented the statistical inferences of the available data.

Table 7 depicted that, mode of Journey to work place before COVID-19 situation of the 17.0 percent are 'dependent on local buses'; 11.3 percent are 'dependent on local bus and train'; 13.2 percent are 'dependent on local transport - train - local transport'; 38.8 percent are 'dependent on own bike/car/by-cycle'; 1.7 percent are 'employer transportation'; 3.5 percent are 'residing near to work place'; 4.5 percent are 'dependent on Walk - train – walk' and 9.9 percent are 'dependent on walk / local transport / percent are own vehicle' out of total respondents. Significantly a majority that is 5.7 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employed' are 'dependent on local buses'; 3.1 percent of 'assistant professor' and 'school teachers' both are 'dependent on local bus and train'; 3.8 percent of the 'school teachers' are 'dependent on local transport - train - local transport'; 9.6 percent of the 'school teachers' are 'dependent on own bike/car/by-cycle'; .7 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employed' are 'dependent on employer transportations'; 1.4 percent of the 'school teachers' are 'residing near to work place'; 1.6 percent of the 'school teachers' are 'dependent 'walk - train – walk' and 3.5 percent of the 'student/private tutor/ self-employed' are 'dependent on walk / local transport / own vehicle' out of the total respondents. **Table 7 A** represented the statistical inferences of the available data.

Table 7: Profession and Mode of Journey to Work Place before COVID-19 Situation of the Respondents

Profession of the Respondents	*Mode of Journey to Work Place before COVID-19 Situation of the Respondents*								*Total*
	Dependent on Local Bus	*Dependent on local bus and train*	*Dependent on local transport - train - local transport*	*Dependent on own bike/car/ by-cycle*	*Employer Transportation*	*Residing Near to Work Place*	*Walk - train - walk*	*Walk / Local Transport / Own Vehicle*	
Academician	1.0%	0.2%	0.7%	0.5%	0.2%				2.6%
Accountant	0.2%		0.2%						0.3%
Advocate	0.2%	0.2%		0.3%					0.7%
Assistant Professor	3.7%	3.1%	2.3%	7.8%	0.3%	0.7%	0.3%	1.7%	20.2%
Associate Professor		0.2%		1.0%			0.2%	0.2%	1.6%
Banker		0.2%		0.2%					0.3%
Business	0.2%		0.5%	0.9%				0.2%	1.7%
Coach / Trainer		0.2%		0.5%					0.7%
Guest/Part-time College Teacher	1.2%	0.9%	0.5%	1.6%			0.3%	0.2%	4.7%
Library Professional	0.2%			0.5%	0.2%				0.9%
Medical Service			0.3%	0.7%	0.2%			0.3%	1.6%
Officers		0.2%	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%				1.0%
Other Professionals	0.2%	0.2%		1.0%			0.2%	0.2%	1.7%
Professor/Principal	0.2%		0.2%	1.6%		0.2%		0.5%	2.6%
Researcher	1.0%	1.6%	1.0%	3.5%		0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	7.8%
School Teacher	2.8%	3.1%	3.8%	9.6%		1.4%	1.6%	2.3%	24.5%
Service	0.5%	0.3%	0.90	2.4%		0.7%	0.5%	0.5%	5.9%
Student/Private Tutor/ Self Employed	5.7%	1.0%	2.3%	6.4%	0.7%	0.3%	1.2%	3.5%	21.2%
Total	17.0%	11.3%	13.2%	38.8%	1.7%	3.5%	4.5%	9.9%	100%
Data source: Own survey data									

Table 7.A

Chi-Square Tests				*Measures of Central Tendency*	
	Value	*df*	*Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)*		*Mode of Journey to Work Place before COVID-19 Situation*
Pearson Chi-Square	149.156[a]	119	.032	Mean	3.75
Likelihood Ratio	153.008	119	.019	Std. Deviation	2.052
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.562	1	.006	Skewness	.628
N of Valid Cases	575			Kurtosis	-.210
Data source: Own survey data					

Table 8 explored that, 6.4 percent are spends 'less than one hour'; 16.5 percent are spends 'one hour to four hours'; 75.1 percent are spends 'four hours to eight hours' and 1.9 percent are spends 'more than eight hours' time at working place before COVID-19 situation out of the respondents. Pointedly, a majority that is 0.9 percent of the 'assistant professors' are spends 'less than one hour'; 6.8 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employers' are spends 'one hour to four hours'; 20.7 percent of the 'school teachers' are spends 'four hours to eight hours' and 0.3 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employers' and 'school teachers' both are 'more than eight hours' time at working place before COVID-19 situation out of the respondents. Table 8.A represented the statistical inferences of the available data.

The **Table 9** depicted that, 45.9 percent are completed a journey of around 'less than one hour'; 18.8 percent are completed a journey of around 'one hour to two hours'; 15.0 8 percent are completed a journey of around 'two hours to three hours'; 11.1 8 percent are completed a journey of around 'three hours to five hours' and 9.2 8 percent are completed a journey of around 'more than five hours' to work place before COVID-19 situation by the respondents. Interestingly 12.2 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employed' and 9.2 percent of the 'assistant professors' are completed a journey of around 'less than one hour'; again 4.3 percent and 4.2 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employed' and 'assistant professors' are completed a journey of around 'one hour to two hours' respectively; 4.5 percent, 3.7 percent and 2.6 percent of the 'school teachers' are completed a journey of around 'two hours to three hours', 'three hours to five hours' and 'more than five hours' to work place before COVID-19 situation by the respondents. **Table 9.A** represented the statistical inferences of the available data.

Profession and Nature of Work from Home in the Lockdown Situation

In the **Table 10**, it is cleared that, 3.5 percent of the respondents are 'both - work from home and attend the office'; 21.7 percent of the respondents are 'not working from home neither attend office' and 74.8 percent of the respondents are 'working from home' in the Lockdown Situation. Significantly 1.2 percent of the 'assistant professors'; 0.5 percent of the 'professors/principals' and 0.9 percent of the 'school teachers' are 'both - work from home and attend the office'. 2.4 percent of the 'assistant professors', 1.2 percent of the 'businessman', 1.4 percent of the 'researchers', 2.8 percent of the 'school teachers', 2.8 percent of the 'service' sector and 7.0 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employed' are 'not working from home neither attend the office'. 2.4 percent of the 'academicians', 16.3 percent of the 'assistant

Table 8: Profession and Time Spend at Working Place Before COVID-19 Situation by the Respondents

Profession of the Respondents	*Time Spend at Working Place Before COVID-19 Situation by the Respondents*				*Total*
	Less than 1 Hour	*More than 1 Hour to 4 Hours*	*More than 4 Hours to 8 Hours*	*More than 8 Hours*	
Academician	0.2%		2.4%		2.6%
Accountant			0.3%		0.3%
Advocate		0.2%	0.5%		0.7%
Assistant Professor	0.9%	1.9%	17.0%	0.2%	20.0%
Associate Professor	0.3%	0.2%	1.0%		1.6%
Banker			0.2%	0.2%	0.3%
Business	0.2%	0.2%	1.2%	0.2%	1.7%
Coach / Trainer		0.2%	0.5%		0.7%
Guest/Part-time College Teacher		1.4%	3.3%		4.7%
Library Professional			0.9%		0.9%
Medical Service			1.2%	0.3%	1.6%
Officers			1.0%		1.0%
Other Professionals		0.5%	1.0%	0.2%	1.7%
Professor/Principal	0.3%	0.2%	2.1%		2.6%
Researcher	0.3%	1.0%	6.1%	0.3%	7.8%
School Teacher	0.7%	3.1%	20.7%		24.5%
Service	0.3%	0.9%	4.5%	0.2%	5.9%
Student/Private Tutor/Self Employed	3.1%	6.8%	11.0%	0.3%	21.2%
Total	6.4%	16.5%	75.1%	1.9%	100.0%

Data source: Own survey data

Table 8.A

Chi-Square Tests				*Measures of Central Tendency*	
	Value	*df*	*Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)*		*Time Spend at Working Place Before COVID-19 Situation*
Pearson Chi-Square	132.613[a]	51	.000	Mean	2.73
Likelihood Ratio	104.311	51	.000	Std. Deviation	.606
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.359	1	.000	Skewness	-1.530
N of Valid Cases	575			Kurtosis	2.027

Data source: Own survey data

Table 9: Profession and Time Spend for Journey to Work Place before COVID-19 Situation by the Respondents

Profession of the Respondents	*Time Spend for Journey Before COVID-19 Situation by the Respondents*					*Total*
	Less than 1 Hour	*More than 1 Hour and less than 2 Hours*	*More than 2 Hours and less than 3 Hours*	*More than 3 Hours and less than 5 Hours*	*More than 5 Hours*	
Academician	1.0%		0.9%	0.5%	0.2%	2.6%
Accountant		0.2%	0.2%			0.3%
Advocate			0.3%	0.3%		0.7%
Assistant Professor	9.2%	4.2%	3.3%	1.6%	1.7%	20.0%
Associate Professor	0.9%	0.5%		0.2%		1.6%
Banker	0.2%				0.2%	0.3%
Business	0.9%	0.7%		0.2%		1.7%
Coach / Trainer	0.5%			0.2%		0.7%
Guest/Part-time College Teacher	1.4%	1.4%	0.7%	0.2%	1.0%	4.7%
Library Professional	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%			0.9%
Medical Service	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	1.6%
Officers	0.2%	0.2%		0.5%	0.2%	1.0%
Other Professionals	0.9%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	1.7%
Professor/ Principal	1.7%	0.5%		0.2%	0.2%	2.6%
Researcher	3.0%	1.6%	1.9%	0.5%	0.9%	7.8%
School Teacher	9.9%	3.8%	4.5%	3.7%	2.6%	24.5%
Service	3.0%	0.7%	0.3%	1.2%	0.7%	5.9%
Student/Private Tutor/Self Employed	12.2%	4.3%	2.3%	1.2%	1.2%	21.2%
Total	45.9%	18.8%	15.0%	11.1%	9.2%	100.0%
Data source: Own survey data						

Table 9.A

Chi-Square Tests				*Measures of Central Tendency*	
	Value	*df*	*Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)*		*Time Spend for Journey to Work Place before COVID-19 Situation*
Pearson Chi-Square	94.064[a]	68	.020	Mean	2.19
Likelihood Ratio	99.552	68	.008	Std. Deviation	1.360
Linear-by-Linear Association	.644	1	.422	Skewness	.803
N of Valid Cases	575			Kurtosis	-.672
Data source: Own survey data					

Table 10: Profession and Respondents are Working From Home or Not in the Lockdown Situation

Profession of the Respondents	*Respondents are Working From Home or Not*			*Total*
	Both - Work from Home and Attend Office	*Not Working from Home Neither Attend Office*	*Work from Home*	
Academician		0.2%	2.4%	2.6%
Accountant		0.2%	0.2%	0.3%
Advocate			0.7%	0.7%
Assistant Professor	1.2%	2.4%	16.3%	20.0%
Associate Professor	0.3%	0.3%	0.9%	1.6%
Banker		0.2%	0.2%	0.3%
Business		1.2%	0.5%	1.7%
Coach / Trainer		0.3%	0.3%	0.7%
Guest/Part-time College Teacher		0.5%	4.2%	4.7%
Library Professional		0.2%	0.7%	0.9%
Medical Service		0.9%	0.7%	1.6%
Officers		0.7%	0.3%	1.0%
Other Professionals		0.3%	1.4%	1.7%
Professor/Principal	0.5%	0.3%	1.7%	2.6%
Researcher	0.2%	1.4%	6.3%	7.8%
School Teacher	0.9%	2.8%	20.9%	24.5%
Service	0.3%	2.8%	2.8%	5.9%
Student/Private Tutor/Self Employed		7.0%	14.3%	21.2%
Total	3.5%	21.7%	74.8%	100.0%
Data source: Own survey data				

Table 10.A

Chi-Square Tests				*Measures of Central Tendency*	
	Value	*df*	*Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)*		*Respondents are Working From Home or Not*
Pearson Chi-Square	104.301[a]	34	.000	Mean	2.71
Likelihood Ratio	94.467	34	.000	Std. Deviation	.524
Linear-by-Linear Association	.842	1	.359	Skewness	-1.648
N of Valid Cases	575			Kurtosis	1.826
Data source: Own survey data					

professors', 4.2 percent of the 'guest/part-time college teachers', 1.4 percent of the 'other professionals', 1.7 percent of the 'professor/principals', 6.3 percent of the 'researcher', 20.9 percent of the 'school teachers', 2.8 percent of the 'service' sector and 14.3 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employed' respondents are 'working from home' in the Lockdown Situation. **Table 10.A** represented the statistical inferences of the available data.

The **Table 11** explored that, 21.9 percent are spending 'less than one hour'; 31.3 percent are spending 'one hour to three hours'; 26.4 percent are spending 'three hours to five hours'; 19.7 percent are spending 'five hours to eight hours' and 0.7 percent are spending 'more than eight hours' time for 'work from home' in the COVID-19 lockdown situation. Remarkably 1.4 percent of the 'assistant professors', 1.3 percent of the 'businessmen', 1.9 percent of the 'service' sector professionals and 8.2 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employed' professionals are spending 'less than one hour' or 'not working from home'. Again, 7.5 percent of the 'assistant professors', 2.3 percent of the 'guest/part-time college teachers', 2.3 percent of the 'researchers', 9.4 percent of the 'school teachers', 1.0 percent of the 'service' sector professionals and 6.1 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employed' professionals are spending 'one hour to three hours' time for 'work from home' in the COVID-19 lockdown situation. 7.0 percent of the 'assistant professors', 3.8 percent of the 'researchers', 7.3 percent of the 'school teachers', 1.2 percent of the 'service' sector professionals and 2.4 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employed' professionals are spending 'three hours to five hours' time for 'work from home' in the COVID-19 lockdown situation. Significantly, 1 percent of the 'academicians', 4.0 percent of the 'assistant professors', 3.8 percent of the 'school teachers', 1.6 percent of the 'service' sector professionals and 4.5 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employed' professionals are spending 'five hours to eight hours' and 0.2 percent of each of the 'assistant professors', 'bankers', 'researchers' and 'school teachers' professionals

Table 11: Profession and Respondents are Spending Time for Work From Home

Profession of the Respondents	*Respondents are Spending Time for Work From Home*					
	Less than 1 Hour	*More than 1 Hour and less than 3 Hours*	*More than 3 Hours and less than 5 Hours*	*More than 5 Hours and less than 8 Hours*	*More than 8 Hours*	*Total*
Academician	0.3%	0.7%	0.5%	1.0%		2.6%
Accountant				0.3%		0.3%
Advocate			0.5%	0.2%		0.7%
Assistant Professor	1.4%	7.5%	7.0%	4.0%	0.2%	20.0%
Associate Professor	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%	0.2%		1.6%
Banker	0.2%				0.2%	0.3%
Business	1.3%	0.3%				1.7%
Coach / Trainer	0.4%	0.2%		0.2%		0.7%
Guest/Part-time College Teacher	0.9%	2.3%	0.9%	0.7%		4.7%
Library Professional	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%		0.9%
Medical Service	0.3%		0.7%	0.5%		1.6%
Officers	.7%	0.2%	0.2%			1.0%
Other Professionals	0.3%		0.5%	0.9%		1.7%
Professor/Principal	0.5%	0.5%	0.7%	0.9%		2.6%
Researcher	0.8%	2.3%	3.8%	0.7%	0.2%	7.8%
School Teacher	4%	9.4%	7.3%	3.8%		24.5%
Service	1.9%	1.0%	1.2%	1.6%	0.2%	5.9%
Student/Private Tutor/Self Employed	8.2%	6.1%	2.4%	4.5%		21.2%
Total	21.9%	31.3%	26.4%	19.7%	0.7%	100.0%
Data source: Own survey data						

Table 11.A

Chi-Square Tests				*Measures of Central Tendency*	
	Value	*df*	*Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)*		*Spending Time for Work From Home*
Pearson Chi-Square	246.748[a]	85	.000	Mean	2.89
Likelihood Ratio	177.949	85	.000	Std. Deviation	1.353
Linear-by-Linear Association	.004	1	.951	Skewness	.731
N of Valid Cases	575			Kurtosis	.112
Data source: Own survey data.					

are spending 'more than eight hours' time for 'work from home' in the COVID-19 lockdown situation. **Table 11.A** represented the statistical inferences of the available data.

Table 12 depicted that, 0.9 percent uses 'both, the paper and digital work'; 79.0 percent uses 'digital work by using internet, laptop/computer/smartphone and other electronic gadgets'; 8.9 percent uses 'paper work' as the mode of 'work from home' in the COVID-19 lockdown situation and 11.3 percent 'not replied' on the issue. Interestingly, 0.2 percent of each of the professionals like 'academicians', 'associate professors', 'businessmen', 'researchers' and 'service' sector professionals are uses 'both, the paper and digital work'; 2.3 percent of the 'academicians', 18.1 percent of the 'assistant Professors', 1.4 percent of the 'associate Professors', 4.2 percent of the 'guest/part-time college teachers', 1.6 percent of the 'other professionals', 2.1 percent of the 'professors/principals', 6.1 percent of the 'researchers', 20.7 percent of the 'school teachers', 4.2 percent of the 'service' sector professionals and 14.4 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employed' are uses 'digital work by using internet, laptop/computer/smartphone and other electronic gadgets' and 1.00 percent of the 'researchers', 2.1000 percent of the'school teachers' and 3.30 00 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employed' are uses 'paper work' as the mode of 'work from home' in the COVID-19 lockdown situation. But significantly, 1.00 percent of the 'assistant Professors', 1.70 percent of the 'school teachers', 1.20 percent of the 'service' sector professionals and 3.50 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employed' are 'not replied' on the issue. **Table 12.A** represented the statistical inferences of the available data.

Table 13 shows that the 70.80 percent of the respondents are 'prepared office work and upload/email/send via WhatsApp' and 29.20 percent of the respondents are 'not uses' this mode of 'work from home' in the COVID-19 lockdown situation. Here interesting figures are that, 2.60 percent of the 'academicians', 16.00 percent of the 'assistant professors', 1.20 percent of the 'associate professors', 2.60 percent of the 'guest/part-time college teachers', 1.20 percent of the 'other professionals', 2.10 percent of the 'professors/principals', 5.70 percent of the 'researchers', 20.30 percent of the 'school teachers', 4.30 percent of the 'service' sector professionals and 10.80 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employed' are 'prepared office work and upload/email/send via WhatsApp' uses this mode of 'work from home' in the COVID-19 lockdown situation. Again, 4.00 percent of the 'assistant professors', 1.00 percent of the 'businessmen', 2.10 percent of the 'guest/part-time college teachers', 2.10 percent of the 'researchers', 4.20 percent of the 'school teachers', 1.60 percent of the 'service' sector professionals and 10.40 percent of the 'student/

Table 12: Profession and Respondent's Mode of 'Work From Home'

Profession of the Respondents	*Respondent's Mode of 'Work From Home'*				*Total*
	Both, the Paper & Digital Work	*Digital work by using internet, laptop/ computer/ smartphone and other electronic gadgets*	*Paper Work*	*No Response*	
Academician	0.2%	2.3%	0.20%		2.6%
Accountant		0.3%			0.3%
Advocate		0.2%	0.50%		0.7%
Assistant Professor		18.1%	0.90%	1.00%	20.0%
Associate Professor	0.2%	1.4%			1.6%
Banker		0.2%		0.20%	0.3%
Business	0.2%	0.9%		0.70%	1.7%
Coach / Trainer		0.5%		0.20%	0.7%
Guest/Part-time College Teacher		4.2%	0.20%	0.30%	4.7%
Library Professional		0.7%		0.20%	0.9%
Medical Service		0.9%		0.70%	1.6%
Officers		0.3%	0.20%	0.50%	1.0%
Other Professionals		1.6%		0.20%	1.7%
Professor/Principal		2.1%	0.20%	0.30%	2.6%
Researcher	0.2%	6.1%	1.00%	0.50%	7.8%
School Teacher		20.7%	2.10%	1.70%	24.5%
Service	0.2%	4.2%	0.30%	1.20%	5.9%
Student/Private Tutor/Self Employed		14.4%	3.30%	3.50%	21.2%
Total	0.9%	79.0%	8.90%	11.30%	100.0%

Data source: Own survey data.

Table 12.A

Chi-Square Tests				*Measures of Central Tendency*	
	Value	*df*	*Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)*		*Mode of 'Work From Home'*
Pearson Chi-Square	122.791[a]	51	.000	Mean	2.28
Likelihood Ratio	93.585	51	.000	Std. Deviation	.631
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.794	1	.001	Skewness	1.826
N of Valid Cases	575			Kurtosis	2.303

Data source: Own survey data.

Table 13: Profession and Respondents Prepared Office Work and Upload/Email/Send via WhatsApp Mode of 'Work From Home'

Profession of the Respondents	*Respondents Prepared Office Work and Upload/ Email/Send via WhatsApp*		*Total*
	Yes	*No*	
Academician	2.60%		2.6%
Accountant	0.30%		0.3%
Advocate	0.70%		0.7%
Assistant Professor	16.00%	4.00%	20.0%
Associate Professor	1.20%	0.30%	1.6%
Banker		0.30%	0.3%
Business	0.70%	1.00%	1.7%
Coach / Trainer	0.30%	0.30%	0.7%
Guest/Part-time College Teacher	2.60%	2.10%	4.7%
Library Professional	0.50%	0.30%	0.9%
Medical Service	0.90%	0.70%	1.6%
Officers	0.30%	0.70%	1.0%
Other Professionals	1.20%	0.50%	1.7%
Professor/Principal	2.10%	0.50%	2.6%
Researcher	5.70%	2.10%	7.8%
School Teacher	20.30%	4.20%	24.5%
Service	4.30%	1.60%	5.9%
Student/Private Tutor/Self Employed	10.80%	10.40%	21.2%
Total	70.80%	29.20%	100.0%
Data source: Own survey data.			

Table 13.A

Chi-Square Tests				*Measures of Central Tendency*	
	Value	*df*	*Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)*		*Prepared Office Work and Upload/Email/ Send via WhatsApp*
Pearson Chi-Square	66.790[a]	17	.000	Mean	1.71
Likelihood Ratio	70.767	17	.000	Std. Deviation	.455
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.229	1	.004	Skewness	-.916
N of Valid Cases	575			Kurtosis	-1.164
Data source: Own survey data.					

private tutor/self-employed' are 'not uses' this mode of 'work from home' in the COVID-19 lockdown situation. **Table 13.A** represented the statistical inferences of the available data.

The **Table 14** highlighted that, 10.6 percent of the respondents are doing 'administrative, academic, research and webinar', 10.6 percent of the respondents are using 'email, mobile, WhatsApp', 17.0 percent of the respondents are using 'jio meet, Facebook, YouTube, google meet, zoom', 3.0 percent of the respondents are doing 'paper work' as the mode of work from home in the COVID-19 lockdown situation and 58.8 percent of the respondents does' not replied' on the issue 'followed other process of work from home' in the COVID-19 lockdown situation. Remarkably, 2.60 percent of the 'assistant professors', 1.60 percent of the 'researchers' and 2.80 percent of the 'school teachers' are doing 'administrative, academic, research and webinar'; 2.30 percent of the 'assistant professors', 3.10 percent of the 'school teachers' and 2.30 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employed' are using 'email, mobile, WhatsApp'; 5.20 percent of the 'assistant professors', 1.00 percent of the 'professors/ principals', 4.20 percent of the 'school teachers', 1.40 percent of the 'service' sector professionals and 2.30 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employed' are using 'jio meet, Facebook, YouTube, google meet, zoom'; 1.40 percent of the 'assistant professors' are doing 'paper work' in the COVID-19 lockdown situation. But 1.60 percent of the 'academicians', 8.50 percent of the 'assistant Professors', 1.70 percent of the 'businessmen', 2.40 percent of the 'guest/part-time college teachers', 1.60 percent of the 'medical service' professionals, 1.00 percent of the 'officers', 1.40 percent of the 'other professionals' 4.30 percent of the 'researchers', 13.60 percent of the 'school teachers', 3.80 percent of the 'service' sector professionals and 15.70 percent of the 'student/private tutor/self-employed' are 'not replied' on the issue of 'followed other process of work from home' in the COVID-19 lockdown situation. **Table 14.A** represented the statistical inferences of the available data.

Conclusion

To assess the "Human Dimensions of COVID-19 – Citizen's Reflection', this article tried to explore the research question, how the working professionals are cope with the 'COVID-19 lockdown situation'?Many socio-economic issues came up as problems during the COVID-19 pandemic as well as lockdown situation which are directly and variedly affected the working professionals, their family members and people who are directly or indirectly related in financial exchange during the journey to work place and in domestic financial exchange around the

Table 14: Profession and Respondents Followed other Process of Work From Home

Profession of the Respondents	*Respondents Followed other Process of Work From Home*					*Total*
	Administrative, Academic, Research and Webinar	*Uses Email, Mobile, WhatsApp*	*Uses Jio Meet, Facebook, YouTube, Google Meet, Zoom Meet*	*Uses Paper Work - Work From Home*	*No Response*	
Academician	0.20%	0.20%	0.70%		1.60%	2.6%
Accountant					0.30%	0.3%
Advocate	0.50%				0.20%	0.7%
Assistant Professor	2.60%	2.30%	5.20%	1.40%	8.50%	20.0%
Associate Professor	0.90%		0.30%		0.30%	1.6%
Banker			0.20%		0.20%	0.3%
Business					1.70%	1.7%
Coach / Trainer					0.70%	0.7%
Guest/Part-time College Teacher	0.70%	0.90%	0.70%		2.40%	4.7%
Library Professional		0.20%			0.70%	0.9%
Medical Service					1.60%	1.6%
Officers					1.00%	1.0%
Other Professionals		0.20%	0.20%		1.40%	1.7%
Professor/Principal	0.50%	0.30%	1.00%		0.70%	2.6%
Researcher	1.60%	0.50%	0.90%	0.50%	4.30%	7.8%
School Teacher	2.80%	3.10%	4.20%	0.90%	13.60%	24.5%
Service		0.70%	1.40%		3.80%	5.9%
Student/Private Tutor/Self Employed	0.90%	2.30%	2.30%	0.20%	15.70%	21.2%
Total	10.60%	10.60%	17.00%	3.00%	58.80%	100.0%

Data source: Own survey data.

Table 14.A

Chi-Square Tests				*Measures of Central Tendency*	
	Value	*df*	*Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)*		*Followed other Process of Work From Home*
Pearson Chi-Square	126.599[a]	68	.000	Mean	2.43
Likelihood Ratio	130.304	68	.000	Std. Deviation	.989
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.566	1	.109	Skewness	.859
N of Valid Cases	575			Kurtosis	-.046

Data source: Own survey data.

world, which need to be address properly to in the era of *Sustainable Development Goals* (SDGs). Apart from the above data, as per telephonic conversations with many of the respondents, I experienced that, the working professionals of different sector was not familiar with the modern mode of Information Communication Technologies (ICT) due to its gadgets operation and workable internet facility, but the COVID-19 situations bound them to learn the modern mode of Information Communication Technologies and execute the 'work' assignments from home to protect the earning; many are removed from the 'job'. Some are very doubtful about the probable long-time effects of this pandemic for arrangements survival earnings.

Apart from that the study explored the socio-demographic features, distance from home to working place, mode of journey and time spend at and for working place and nature of work in the COVID-19 situation of the working professionals. The study explored that, 2.6 percent are 'academician'; 0.3 percent are 'accountant'; 0.7 percent are 'advocate'; 20.0 percent are 'assistant professor'; 1.6 percent are 'associate professor'; 0.3 percent are 'banker'; 1.7 percent are 'businessmen'; 0.7 percent are 'coach/trainer'; 4.7 percent are 'guest/part-time college teacher'; 0.9 percent are 'library professional' 1.6 percent are from 'medical service'; 1.0 percent are 'officers'; 1.7 percent from 'other profession'; 2.6 are professor/principal'; 7.8 are 'researcher'; 24.5 percent are 'school teacher'; 5.9 percent are from 'service sector' and 21.2 percent are 'sstudent/private tutor/self-employed' out of total respondents. Again out of the total respondents 18.8 percent are within the 'age group 18 – 25'; 21.4 percent are within 'age group 26 – 30'; 33.0 percent are within 'age group 31 – 40'; 18.1 percent are within 'age group 41 – 50'; 6.4 percent are within 'age group 51 – 36' and 2.3 percent are within the 'age group 61 and above'. From the study it may be concluded that, the working professionals are accept the challenge of hardness to cope with the situation emerged due to COVID-19 pandemic. The hardness is not only around the external world but within 'own self of the working professionals' to combat ill effects of COVID-19 as well as to ensure the psycho-social protection along with the economic protection of the dependents. The working professionals are coping with the hardness of availability of ICT gadgets with strong internet facility, its operation and executing the assignments. By considering the performance variation of the working professionals, it may be summarized that by maintaining a social as well as physical distance with a limited transportation over one hundred fifty days of so-called varied chaos lockdown situation, all the essential social institution and their 'socio-economic functioning' still not affected throughout the country India due to the socio-psychological strength along with the anxiety of uncertain economic stability and 'joblessness' of the working professionals of India.

Scope of Further Research

Many hidden as well as unexplored events are needed to be explored through the experience of working professionals. Their views on work and place of work; effect on the students, senior and women citizens needed to explore. The policies on the migrant and unorganized workers in CIOVID-19 situation are to be reviewed by the working professionals. Review the people and officials who are working 'to rise above the situations' by the working professionals. All these review are required to frame the special policy to revive the 'human dimensions'. The 'COVID-19 lockdown situation' is intensely affected the 'patterned culture' of work, earning, education by generating new format of work, earning, education and the human behaviour.

Notes

1. Resilient leadership responding to COVID-19, deloitte insights, [Internet, cited on 18.08.2020]. Available from:https://www2.deloitte.com/global/en/insights/economy/covid-19/heart-of-resilient-leadership-responding-to-covid-19.html.
2. Reuters. ECB Asset Purchase Programme Boosts Euro, The Guardian [Internet, cited on 18.08.2020]. Available from:https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/mar/19/ecb-asset-purchase-programme-boosts-euro.
3. C. Sohrabi, Z. Alsafi, N. O'Neill, M. Khan, A. Kerwan, A. Al-Jabir, et al., World Health Organization declares global emergency: a review of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19), Int. J. Surg. 76 (2020 Apr) 71–76. [Internet, cited on 18.08.2020]. Available from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1743919120301977
4. AB Avi Loeb, Flattening the COVID-19 curves, Scientific American Blog Network, [Internet, cited on 18.08.2020]. Available from:https://blogs.scientificamerican.
5. Coronavirus: travel restrictions, border shutdowns by country | Coronavirus pandemic News, Al Jazeera, [Internet, cited on 18.08.2020]. Available from: https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2020/03/coronavirus-travel-restrictionsborder-shutdowns-country-200318091505922.html.
6. Guidance on social distancing for everyone in the UK, GOV.UK. [Internet, cited on 18.08.2020]. Available from:https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-guidance-on-social-distancing-and-for-vulnerable-people/guidance-onsocial-distancing-for-everyone-in-the-uk-and-protecting-older-people-andvulnerable-adults.
7. T. Buck, M. Arnold, G. Chazan, C. Cookson, Coronavirus declared a pandemic asfears of economic crisis mount, [Internet, cited on 18.08.2020]. Available from:https://www.ft.com/content/d72f1e54-6396-11ea-b3f3-fe4680ea68b5.
8. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, Director-General of the World Health Organization (WHO) at

a gathering of foreign policy and security experts in Munich, Germany, in mid- February, referring to fake news that *"spreads faster and more easily than this virus."*[Internet, cited on 18.08.2020] Available from:https://www.un.org/en/un-coronavirus-communications-team/un-tackling-%E2%80%98infodemic%E2%80%99-misinformation-and-cybercrime-covid-19)

References

David L Sills, (1972). International Encyclopaedia of Social Science, New York : The Macmillan Co. & the Free Press ; London : Collier-Macmillan.

Horgan, J. (2014). *Justinian's Plague (541–542 CE).* 'Ancient History Encyclopaedia'. [Internet, cited on 18.08.2020]. Available from: https://www.ancient.eu/article/782/justinians-plague-541-542-ce/

Kousik Pramanik *et al,* (2020). *Analysis of Youths' Perspective in India on and During the Pandemic of COVID-19*, pp, 1-10, 'Social Science Quarterly', the South western Social Science Association.

Matthias Schonlau, Ronald D., Jr. Fricker, Marc N. Elliott, (2002). *Conducting Research Surveys via E-mail and the Web,* '*Choosing Among the Various Types of Internet Surveys*' pp. 33-40, Rand Corporation.

Roos, D. (2020). H*istory News Network*, 'How 5 of History's Worst Pandemics Finally Ended.'[Internet, cited on 18.08.2020]. Available from: https://www.history.com/news/pandemics-end-plague-cholera-black-death-smallpox

Stafford, D., and R. Flatley (2018). "Internet History Sourcebooks Project." *Charleston Advisor* 19(3):23–25.

Zhu, N., D. Zhang, W. Wang, L. Xingwang, B. Yang, J. Song, X. Zhao, B. Huang, W. Shi, R. Lu, P. Niu, F.Zhan, X. Ma, D. Wang, W. Xu, G. Wu, G. F. Gao, and W. Tan. 2020. *A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China*.'New England Journal of Medicine'382(8):727–33.