

## **Study of Personal and Background Factors of The Respondents of Study Units**

**Dr. Pradeep Kumar**

*(M.Com, Ph.d), Head of Deptt. of Commerce, Siddhartha Degree College  
, Akhlor Kheri, Deoband Saharanpur*

**Abstract:-**

*Personal, socio economic and other characteristics as Independent variable has been considered a significant aspect, in order to know their influence in determining union Interest and participation. The classification of the sample respondents was done on the basis of sex, marital status, age, experience, Number of dependents, education, background and monthly remuneration in order to know the impact of such characteristics over the workers' union membership and participative behavior*

**Keywords:-** *Socio -Economic, significant, Influence, determining*

Reference to this paper  
should be made as follows:

**Dr. Pradeep Kumar**

*Study of Personal and  
Background Factors  
of The Respondents of  
Study Units*

Journal Global Values,  
Vol. VIII, No.2,  
Article -3, pp. 18-24,

[http://anubooks.com/  
?page\\_id=285](http://anubooks.com/?page_id=285)

## Introduction

Studies conducted in the field report that age, experience, education, rural-urban upbringing, marital status, number of dependents, salary and job satisfaction have substantial bearing on determining membership and involvement of workers in their unions. Personal, socio-economic and other factors have got their substantial bearing on the perception, thinking, attitudes and value systems etc. of the employees. A person who is older in age should have his different outlook about his job, his boss, colleagues and company etc. in comparison to one who is a comparatively young. Similarly, an employee who is married and having more economic liability of dependents should be a different person in his thinking and perception from the one who is unmarried and having lesser responsibilities of the family.

### (A): Classification on the basis of Sex:

All the respondents in both Units were male, so this variable was not considered to be significant one in case of sample respondents

### (B): Classification on the basis of Marital Status:

Following table 2 reveals classification of respondents on the basis of their marital status :

*Showing classification of respondents of Unit A (N=189)  
and Unit B (N=99) on the basis of Marital Status*

Marital Status	Unit A (N=189) (N=99)	Unit B
(i) Married(ii) Unmarried	18207	918
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>99</b>

It is presumed that after marriage there increases heavy social and economic burden on a person. All the respondents in Unit A were married except 7 persons and in Unit B also 91 workers were married and 8 were unmarried. So 96% respondents in Unit A and 92% in Unit B were married.

### (C): Classification on the basis of Age:

The following table reveals the classification of the respondents of the study units on the basis of age.

**Table 2**

*Showing classification of respondents of Unit A (N=189)  
 and Unit B (N=99) on the basis of Age*

<b>Age group</b>	<b>No. of respondents in Unit A (N=189)</b>	<b>No. of respondent Unit B (N=99)</b>
(i) 18 to 33 years	17	13
(ii) 34 to 48 years	113	59
(iii) 49 years and above	59	23
<b>Total</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>99</b>

From the above table it is clear that:

- (i) In the age group between 18 to 33 years there were 17 (9%) respondents in Unit A and 13 respondents in Unit B. So in unit B higher was the percentage of young respondents.
- (ii) In the next age group of 34 to 48 years, the number of respondents in Unit A and Unit B was 113 and 63 respectively. So 60 to 64 percent workers were in this age group in both the study units.
- (iii) In the senior most age i.e. 49 years and above there were 59 (31%) and 23 (23.2%) respondents in Unit A and Unit B respectively. So higher percentage of workers in this age group was in Unit A.

**(D): Classification on the basis of Experience:**

Following table 3 exhibits the classification of respondents of both study units on the basis of length of service.

**Table 3**

*Showing classification of respondents of Unit A (N=189)  
 and Unit B (N=99) on the basis of Length of Service*

<b>Experiencee in years (N=99)</b>	<b>No. of respondents in Unit A (N=189)</b>	<b>No. of respondent Unit B</b>
(i) Below 14 years	24	21
(ii) 15 to 29 years	124	60
(iii) 30 years and above	41	18
<b>Total</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>99</b>

From the table 3 it is clear that:

- (i) The number of respondents who had gained job experience up to 14 years and less in their service were 24 (12.7%) and 21 (21.21%) in Unit A and Unit B respectively.

- (ii) The number of workers in study sample was 124 (65.61%) and 60 (60.61%) in Unit A and Unit B respectively who were having length of service from 15 to 29 years.
- iii) Those workers who were in highest bracket of length of i.e.30 years and above were 41 (21.69%) in Unit A and 18 (18.18%) in Unit B respectively.

**(E): Classification of workers on the basis of number of dependents:**

Here the number of dependents means mother, father, brother and children who were economically dependent on the worker.

Following table 4 reveals classification of the respondents on the basis of number of dependents.

**Table. 4**

*Showing classification of respondents of Unit A (N=189) and Unit B (N=99) on the basis of Number of dependents*

Number of dependents	No. of respondents in Unit A (N=189)	No. of respondent in Unit B (N=99)
(i) Upto 02	11	02
(ii) 03 to 04	32	7
(iii) 05 and above	56	11
<b>Total</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>99</b>

Above table disclosed that:

- (i) Out of total 189 respondents in unit A, 187 (98.94%) were such who were having 3 and more than 3 dependents. More than 60% respondents were having 5 and more dependents who were being looked after economically by such respondents.
- (ii) In unit B, out of 99 respondents, about 89% were having 3 and more than 3 members in their families who were economically dependent on them.
- (iii) Thus, in both the samples, 60 to 89% respondents were having 3 and more than 3 dependents who were economic burden on them.

**(F): Classification on the basis of Education:**

The respondents of both study samples were classified into three categories on the base of education variable as is being shown in the following table. Those workers who were literates and having primary class education less than high school level were placed in Ist category and others were placed as exhibited in the table.

**Table.**

*Showing classification of respondents of Unit A (N=189) and Unit B (N=99) on the basis of Educational Qualifications*

<b>Educational qualification.</b>	<b>No. of respondents in Unit A (N=189)</b>	<b>No. of respondent Unit B (N=99)</b>
<b>(i) Below High School</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>(ii) High School</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>(iii) Intermediate &amp; above</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>99</b>

Table shows that:

- (i) In unit A, 51 (26.98%) were the respondents whose educational qualification was below High school which included the number of illiterates whereas only 13 (13.11%) were such respondents in unit B. So higher was the percentage of the respondents in unit A who were having educational level below High School.
- (ii) Out of 189 respondents in Unit A, 101 (53.44%) were having High School level education whereas 64 (64.65%) were such respondents in unit B.
- (iii) Out of 189 and 99 respondents in unit A and unit B, 37 (19.18%) and 22 (22.22%) respectively were such who had intermediate level education and very few included in this category were having Graduate level qualification.

***(G): Classification of respondents on the basis of Background:***

The respondents in both the study units were classified on the base of rural and urban upbringing. Following table reveals the classification.

**Table**  
*Showing classification of respondents of Unit A (N=189) and Unit B (N=99) on the basis of background*

<b>Background Rural/urban</b>	<b>No. of respondents in Unit A (N=189)</b>	<b>No. of respondents Unit B (N=99)</b>
<b>(i) Rural</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>(ii) Urban</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>99</b>

From the above table it is clear that:

- (i) the respondents in unit A were 97 (51.32%) out of total 189 who had come from rural background. In this sample 92 (48.68%) respondents hailed from urban background.
- (ii) in another sample of unit B, 61.62% respondents had come from rural background where as 38.38% hailed from urban background.
- (iii) so, the respondents in unit A were nearly same in percentage who had their rural and urban background. But higher was the percentage of the respondents in unit B who hailed from rural background.

**(H): Classification of respondents on the basis of Monthly Remuneration:**

On the base of monthly remuneration the respondents were categorized into three as in the table given below:

*Table*

*Showing classification of respondents of Unit A (N=189) and*

*Unit B (N=99) on the basis of monthly remuneration*

<b>Monthly Income (in Rs.)</b>	<b>No. of respondents in Unit A (N=189)</b>	<b>No. of respondents Unit B (N=99)</b>
<b>(i) Upto Rs.3999</b>	<b>523</b>	<b>040</b>
<b>(ii) Rs.4000 to Rs.4999</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>(iii) Rs.5000 and above</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>99</b>

The table exhibits that:

- (i) In unit A there were 47% respondents who were getting upto Rs.4999/- p.m. remuneration. More than Rs.5000/- per month remuneration was being obtained by 53% respondents in unit A.
- (ii) In unit B, nearly 93% persons were getting per month remuneration more than Rs.5000/-. Only 7 percent were such who were being paid per month salary less than Rs.5000/-. So far as the respondents of both the units are observed from the point of per month earnings, the position seems better in unit B.

**Conclusion:**

1. All the respondents of both the study samples were males.
2. Nearly 98% workers of both the samples were married.
3. Majority of workers (61 to 66%) in both the units were having job experience from 15 years to 29 years. Nearly 20% workers in both the units were having job experience 30 years.
4. Between 89 to 98% workers in both the samples were having socio-economic responsibility of three and more dependents.
5. Majority of the workers in both the samples were having High School level qualification.
6. Workers in majority (nearly 93%) in both the units were being paid monthly remuneration more than Rs.5000/-.
7. Those having intermediate and above level educational qualification were 20% to 22% in both her samples.
8. In Unit A out of 189 samples workers, 97(51.30) hailed from rural. And 92(48.7%) from urban background out of 97 workers having rural background. In Unit B of sample worker 61.62% rural and 38.38%. Hailed from urban background.

9. Larger was the percentage of the worker in both study units who hailed from rural background.

**References**

- Arya, P.P., “*Involvement in Trade Unions*”, Indian Journal of Labour Economics”, 23 (3) : 115-139, 1980.
- Arya, P.P., “*Workers Involvement in Trade Unions*”, Indian Journal of Labour, Economics”, 1980.
- Block, R.N. and Premack, S.L., “*The Unionisation Process : a review of the Literature*”, in D.B. Lipsky and J.M. Douglas (Eds.) Advances in Industrial and Labour Relations, 1, Greenwich, Conn:JAI Press, 1983.
- Canlon, E.J. and Gallagher, D.G., “*Commitment to Employer and Union: Effects of Membership Status*”, Academy of Management Journal 30(1) :151-162, 1987.
- Cheako, T.I., “*Membership Participation in Union Activities : Perceptions of Union Priorities Performance and Satisfaction*”, Journal of Labour Research, 6:363-373, 1985.
- Cheema, “*Industrial Relations in Public Sector : A Case Study of Punjab Roadways*”, unpublished thesis paper, GNDU, Amritsar, 1990.
- Clegg, H.A., “*Industrial Democracy and Nationalization*”, New York, Blackwell, 1961.
- Clerk, K.B., “*The Impact of Unionization of Productivity: A case Study*”, Industrial and Labour Reform Review, Vol.33, 1980.
- Cooke, W.N., “*Determinants of the outcome of Union Certification election*”, Industrial and Labour Relations Review, 36: 402-414, 1983.
- Crouch, “*Trade Union and Policies in India*”, Manaktalas, Bombay, 1996.