Socio-Economic Background of Working Women in Faisalabad

REHANA QURESHI
Laboratory Girls High School, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad–38040, Pakistan

ABSTRACT

This study was aimed to know the socio-economic background of working women in Faisalabad. Residents of working women hostel, Faisalabad were selected for this purpose. All the working women residing in this hostel were included in the sample and interviewed. It was observed that 80% of the female workers belonged to the young age group, whereas 16% of them belonged to medium age group. About 62% respondents were from rural areas and 38% from urban areas. About 42% of the respondents were up to Matric, whereas, 30% of them were B.A./B.Sc. Majority (80%) of the working women were unmarried, whereas, 16% of them were married. Majority (82%) of the respondents was working in lower pay scale i.e., up to BPS-14, while 12% were posted in BPS-15 and 16. About 54% of the respondents were in the lowest income group i.e. Rs. 900/- to Rs. 1699/-, while 34% were in Rs. 1700/- to Rs. 2499/- income group. Majority of the respondents i.e., 56% had a medium family size (4-7 members). About 56% of the respondents' fathers were educated up to Matric, while 18% were F.A./F.Sc. About 50% of the respondents' husbands were B.A./B.Sc., whereas, 25% has postgraduate qualification. A total number of 41% of the respondents' fathers were agriculturists, followed by 21% who were in service and 18% were running their business. About 57% of the respondents' husbands were in service, followed by 29% who were doing their business and 14% who were in agriculture.

Key Words: Socio-economic status; Working women; Faisalabad

INTRODUCTION

All the advanced countries of the world not only utilize the full strength of the female force, but also make maximum efforts and provide a variety of facilities to enable its female population to contribute to national output. The status of women as second-class citizens is reinforced by the narrow vocational opportunities available to them. Through social pressure and prejudices in a male dominated environment, most educated women find openings mostly in teaching. They are discouraged from competing with men by their own up bringing and the almost overt discrimination they have to contend within the job market (Shah, 1986). Their drudgery in their kitchens and homes is taken for granted both by their families and the official statisticians. In rural areas, they toil as much as their men folk in the fields. At constriction sites across the country, they work just as hard as men but for only half the pay (Population and Housing Census of Pakistan, 1998). Their contribution remains invisible, unrecognized and uncompensated in national account. Therefore, this study was designed to investigate the socio-economic background of working women in Faisalabad.

METHODOLOGY

Universe and sample. This study was aimed to know the socio-economic background of working women. Residents of working women Hostel, Faisalabad were selected as a universe for the present study. All the working women were included in the sample and interviewed. These included teachers (60%), health workers (16%) and others (23%), which means Banks, State Life Insurance, Pakistan International Airlines, Police, Hosiery, Water and Power Development Authority, Pakistan Study Council, Telephone and Telegraph Department, Traveling Agency, Social Welfare Department and Fauji Foundation.

Interview schedule. Data were collected with the help of interviewing schedule i.e. questionnaire, where questions are asked, from the respondent and the answers are recorded by the interviewers.

Pre-testing. Before the actual data collection, pre-testing was done to check the workability of the interviewing schedule. Three respondents from the universe were randomly selected. After pre-testing, few modifications in the interviewing schedule were made to improve its workability.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data given in Table I show that overall 62% of the respondents were from rural areas, while 38% belonged to urban areas. A majority of the respondents i.e., 62.5% working in health professions had urban background, whereas, an equal percentage (66.67%) of the respondents working in teaching and other departments.

Table I. Distribution of the respondents with regard to their permanent residence

Profession	Rural		Urban		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teaching	20 (64.52)	66.67	10 (52.63)	33.33	30	60.0
Health	3 (9.68)	37.50	5 (26.32)	62.50	8	16.0
Others	8 (25.0)	66.67	4 (21.0)	33.33	12	24.0
Total	31	62.0	19	38.0	50	100.0

(Figures in parentheses are column percentages)

Data given in Table II show that 80% of the respondents belonged to younger age group (19-29 years), followed by 16% respondents who were in 30-40 years age group. It is also evident that among the younger working women, a large majority (87.5%) was working in health and health related departments. It is evident from Table III that 42% of the respondents were educated upto Matric, followed by B.A./B.Sc. who were 30%. Only 6% of the respondents were highly educated i.e. M.A/M.Sc. Data in Table IV show that overall 39 respondents gained the professional training for their jobs; 69.2% in the training related to teaching profession; 20.5% in health and 10.25% in other professions.

Table IV. Break-down of the respondents in different professions

Professional training	Number	Percentage
Teachers (P.T.C., C.T., B.Ed. etc.)	27	69.2
Health (L.H.V. Nursing, Homeopathic)	8	20.5
Others (Sales representative, typing & computer childcare work etc.)	4	10.25
Total	39	100.0

Table II. Distribution of the respondents with respect to their age group

Profession	Age group (years)						Total
	19-29		30-40		41-51		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N (%)
Teaching	24 (60.0)	80.0	5 (62.5)	16.67	1 (50.0)	3.33	30 (60.0)
Health	7 (17.5)	87.5	-	-	1 (50.0)	12.5	8 (16.0)
Others	9 (22.5)	75.0	3 (37.5)	25.0	-	-	12 (24.0)
Total	40	80.0	8	16.0	2	4.0	50 (100.0)

Table III. Education of the respondents

Professions	Educational level								Total
	Upto matric		F.A/ F.Sc.		B.A./ B.Sc.		M.A/M.Sc.		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N (%)
Teaching	12 (57.14)	40.0	7 (63.64)	23.33	10 (66.67)	33.33	1 (33.33)	3.33	30 (60.0)
Health	5 (23.80)	62.50	2 (18.18)	25.0	1 (6.67)	12.50	-	-	8 (16.0)
Others	4 (19.50)	33.33	2 (18.18)	16.67	4 (26.67)	33.33	2 (66.67)	16.67	12 (24.0)
Total	21	42.00	11	22.00	15	30.00	3	6.00	50

{Figures given in parentheses are column percentage)

Table V. Marital status of the respondents

Professions	Marital Status								Total
	Single		Married		Widow		Divorced		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N (%)
Teaching	25 (62.50)	83.33	4 (50.0)	23.33	-	-	1 (100.0)	3.33	30 (60.0)
Health	6 (15.0)	75.00	2 (25.0)	25.00	-	-	-	-	8 (16.0)
Others	9 (22.5)	75.00	2 (25.0)	16.67	1	8.33	-	-	12 (24.0)
Total	40	80.0	8	16.00	1	2.00	1	2.00	50

Table VI. Pay scales of the respondents

Professions	Basic Pay Scale						Total
	Upto 14		15-16		17 & above		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N (%)
Teaching	25 (60.98)	83.3	5 (83.33)	16.67	-	-	30 (60.0)
Health	7 (17.07)	87.5	1 (16.67)	12.50	-	-	8 (16.0)
Others	9 (21.95)	75.0	-	-	3 (100)	25.0	12 (24.0)
Total	41	82.0	6	12.00	3	6.0	50 (100.0)

(Figures in parentheses are column percentage)

Data in Table V depicts that 80% of the respondents were un-married, followed by 16% married, and widow and divorced were 4% of the total respondents. Table VI indicates that a large majority i.e. 82% of the respondents was working in lower pay scales (upto 14), while 12% were in pay scales 15 and 16. Only 6% of the respondents were in pay scales 17 and above. Data given in Table VII depict that 54% of the respondents were earning an income upto rupee 1699/- per month, while 34% of the respondents had salary between rupees 1700-2499. Only 12% of the respondents were earning rupees 2500 and more per month. Majority (75%) of the respondents from Health and an equal percentage (50%) in teaching and other departments were in the lowest income group.

Table VII. Present salary of the respondents

Professions	Salary (Rs.)						Total
	900-1699		1700-2499		2500 & above		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N (%)
Teaching	15 (55.56)	50.0	13 (76.47)	43.33	2 (33.33)	6.67	30 (60.0)
Health	6 (22.22)	75.0	1 (5.88)	12.50	1 (16.67)	12.50	8 (16.0)
Others	6 (22.22)	50.0	3 (17.65)	25.00	3 (50.0)	25.00	12 (24.0)
Total	27	54.0	14	34.0	6	12.0	50 (100.0)

(Figures in parentheses are column percentage)

Table VIII. Service duration of the respondents

Professions	Service duration (in years)								Total
	Upto 3		4-7		8-11		12 & above		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N (%)
Teaching	17 (60.71)	56.67	10 (58.82)	33.33	1 (50.0)	3.33	2 (66.67)	6.67	30 (60.0)
Health	4 (14.29)	50.00	3 (17.65)	37.50	-	-	1 (33.33)	12.50	8 (16.0)
Others	7 (25.0)	58.33	4 (23.53)	33.33	1 (50.0)	8.33	-	-	12 (24.0)
Total	28	56.00	17	37.00	2	4.00	3	6.00	50

Table IX. Size of the family of the respondents

Professions	Size of family						Total
	Up to 3		4-7		8 & above		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N (%)
Teaching	5 (45.45)	16.67	21 (75.00)	70.00	4 (36.36)	13.33	30 (60.0)
Health	2 (18.18)	33.33	5 (17.86)	41.67	3 (27.27)	25.00	8 (16.0)
Others	4 (36.36)	33.33	5 (17.86)	41.67	3 (27.27)	25.00	12 (24.0)
Total	11	22.00	28	56.00	11	22.00	50 (100.0)

Table X. Education of the father of the respondents

Professions	Education of the father								Total
	Illiterate		Upto Matric		F.A.		B.A.		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N (%)
Teaching	5 (71.43)	20.83	16 (80.0)	66.67	2 (28.57)	8.33	1 (20.00)	4.17	24 (61.54)
Health	2 (28.57)	28.57	1 (5.00)	14.29	3 (42.86)	42.86	1 (20.0)	14.29	7 (17.95)
Others	-	-	3 (15.00)	37.5	2 (28.57)	25.00	3 (60.00)	37.5	8 (20.51)
Total	7	17.95	20	51.28	7	17.95	5	12.82	39

Note: Eleven respondents, who were fatherless, were excluded; {Figures given in parentheses are column percentage)

Table XI. Occupation of the head (father) of the family

Profession	Occupation of the head (father)										Total
	Agriculture		Service		Business		Retired		1+4		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N (%)
Teaching	12 (75.0)	50.0	3 (37.5)	12.5	5 (71.43)	20.83	2 (33.33)	8.33	2 (100)	8.33	24 (61.54)
Health	2 (12.5	28.57	3 (37.5)	72.86	1 (14.29)	14.29	1 (16.67)	14.29	-	-	7 (17.95
Others	2 (12.5)	25.00	2 (25.0)	25.00	1 (14.29)	12.5	3 (50.0)	37.5	-	-	8 (20.51)
Total	16	41.03	8	51.28	7	17.95	5	12.82	-	-	39

Note: Eleven respondents, who were fatherless, were excluded.

Data in Table VIII reveal that 56% of the respondents has service experience up to 3 years, while, 34% of them had an experience of 4 to 7 years. The respondents, who had served for more than 12 years, were 6%. Data in Table IX reflect that 56% of the respondents had medium size family i.e. 4-7 members. Fifty per cent of the respondents from health profession had large families. It is evident from

Table X that the education of 51.28% of the respondents' father was upto Matric. About 28% of the respondents' fathers were illiterate, whereas, only 12.82% of the respondents' fathers had education upto B.A. level. The data given in Table XI indicate that 41% of the fathers of the respondents were agriculturists, followed by 20.51% who were in some service and about 18% were running

Table XII. Income of the families of the respondents (In Rupees)

Profession	Income (Rs.)										Total
	Up to 2000		2001-4000		4001-6000		6002 & above		No income		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Teaching	4 (50.0)	13.33	5 (50.0)	16.67	11 (84.62)	36.67	9 (64.29)	30.0	1 (20.0)	3.33	24(61.54)
Health	2 (25.0)	25.00	3 (30.0)	37.50	1 (7.69)	12.50	1 (7.14)	12.5	1 (20.0)	12.5	8 (16.0)
Others	2 (25.0)	16.67	2 (20.0)	16.67	1 (7.69)	8.33	7 (28.57)	33.33	3 (60.0)	25.0	8 (20.51)
Total	8	16.00	10	20.00	13	26.00	14	28.00	5	10.0	50

Note: Respondent's income was excluded from the family

Table XIII. Education of the mothers of the respondents

Professions	Education of the mothers						Total
	Illiterate		Up to Matric		F.A.		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N (%)
Teaching	15 (65.22)	51.72	13 (68.42)	44.83	1 (33.33)	3.45	29 (64.44)
Health	4 (17.39)	66.67	2 (5.26)	33.33	-	-	6 (13.33)
Others	4 (17.39)	40.00	4 (21.0)	40.00	2 (66.67)	20.00	10 (22.22)
Total	23	51.11	19	42.22	3	6.67	45

Table XIV. Distribution of the spouses with regard to their age

Professions	Age (in years)						Total
	Up to 30		31-40		41-50		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N (%)
Teaching	2 (60.67)	50.0	2 (50.0)	50.0	-	-	4 (50.0)
Health	-	-	1 (25.0)	50.0	1 (100)	50.0	2 (25.0)
Others	1 (33.33)	50.0	1 (25.0)	50.0)	-	-	10 (22.22)
Total	3	37.5	4	50.0	1	12.5	8

Note: Respondents, who were widow and divorced, were excluded.

Table XV. Distribution of the spouses with regard to their education

Professions	Education								Total
	Upto Matric		F.A./F.Sc.		B.A./B.Sc.		M.A./M.Sc.		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N (%)
Teaching	1 (100)	25	1 (100)	25	2 (50)	50.0	-	-	4 (50.0)
Health	-	-	-	-	1 (25)	50.0	1 (50)	50.0	2 (25.0)
Others	-	-	-	-	1 (25)	50.0	1 (50)	50.0	2 (25.0)
Total	1	12.5	1	12.5	4	50.0	2	25.0	8

Note: Respondents, who were widow divorced, were excluded.

Table XVI. Distribution of the spouses with regard to their occupation

Professions	Occupation						Total
	Agriculture		Service		Business		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N (%)
Teaching	-	-	3 (75)	75	1 (50)	25	4 (57.14)
Health	1 (100)	50.0	1 (25)	50	-	-	2 (28.57)
Others	-	-	-	-	1 (50)	100.0	1 (14.29
Total	1	14.29	4	57.14	2	28.57	7

Note: Respondents who were widow, divorced and one respondent whose husband was jobless were excluded

Table XVII. Distribution of the spouses with regard to their monthly income

Professions	Income Group (Rs.)						Total
	900-1699		1700-2499		2500 & above		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N (%)
Teaching	1 (50)	25.0	2 (100)	50.0	1 (33.33)	25	4 (57.14)
Health	1 (50.0)	50.0	-	-	1 (33.33)	50.0	2 (28.57)
Others	-	-	-	-	1 (33.33)	100.0	1 (14.29)
Total	2	28.57	2	28.57	3	42.86	7

Note: Respondents who were widow, divorced and one respondent whose husband was jobless were excluded

some business. The percentage of the heads of the families enjoying retired life was 15.38. Table XII shows that monthly income of 28% of the respondents' families was more than Rs. 6000.00. About 37% of the teachers' families were having income within Rs. 3001 to 6000 per month. While the monthly income of about 38% of the families of the respondents working in health departments was Rs. 2001-4000. In other professions, 33% of the respondent's families belonged to the higher income group. There were 10% families who had no income and the respondents were the only earning members. It is evident from the Table XIII that 51% of the respondents' mothers were illiterate. About 42% mothers were educated up to Matric and only 6.67% of the respondents' mothers got education upto F.A. level. Table XIV reveals that 50% of the respondents' husbands belonged to the medium age group (31-40 years). Whereas, 37.5% of them belonged to younger age group i.e., up to 30 years and remaining 12.5% of spouses were in the old-age group (41.50 years). Data in Table XV indicate that 50% of the respondents' husbands were B.A./B.Sc. Only 12.5%

of the spouses were F.A./F.Sc., and the same number was educated up to Matric level. Table XVI reflects that 51.14% of the respondents' husbands were in service, followed by businessmen (28.57%) and agriculturists (14.29%). It was generally observed that people in service were more open-minded and less traditional. They encouraged their dependent females to adopt any profession of their liking. Table XVII shows that about 43% of the respondents' husbands were in the category of higher income group, whereas, 28.57% were in the category of middle income group and the same number was in the category of low income group.

REFERENCES

Population and Housing Census of Pakistan, 1998. *Population Census Organization,* Statistics Division, Govt. of Pakistan.

Shah, N.M., 1986. *Female Employment Trends, Structure, Utilization and Constraints: Pakistani Women.* Pakistan Institute of Development Economics, Islamabad, Pakistan.