# Demographic Composition and Employment Security in Informal Sector : Empirical Evidence from India

**Prof. Sudhir Chandra Das**
Professor of OB and HR, Faculty of Commerce, BHU, Varanasi (U.P.)

**Shweta**
Research Scholar, Faculty of Commerce, BHU (U.P.)

## Abstract

The informal sector provides employment opportunity to a large proportion of population in India, still majority of informal workers do not have employment security. Employment security is the protection against loss of employment and the ensured possibility of continuing employment, even though not in the same job. In this paper an attempt was made to assess the demographic composition of informal sector in India and the level of employment security at individual level with the help of empirical evidence from India. The findings suggested that demographic have significant influence on economic security (Duration of current  Employment, Expectations to continue current  Employment, Perceived security of current employment, Expected time to find alternate employment, Easiness to Obtain alternate employment )of informal sector workers.

**Key Words :** Informal Sector, Employment Security, Demographic Composition, Informal Workers

## Introduction

The informal sector plays an elemental role in providing employment opportunities to a large proportion of population in the country. A high proportion of socially and economically under privileged sections of society are concentrated in the informal activities in India.  ILO launched the concept of the "informal sector" in development policy debate in a report published in 1972 following a multidisciplinary employment mission to Kenya. . The term informal sector was first used by British anthropologist Keith Hart in 1971 during a study on Ghana and described informal sector as that part of the urban labour force which falls outside the organised labour market (Hart, 1973).

Kantor (1997) stated that the informal sector workers include all workers in informal enterprises, some workers in formal enterprises, self- employed workers, and those doing contract work for informal and formal enterprises and contractors (ILO, 2002). The informal economy thrives in a context of high unemployment, underemployment, poverty, gender inequality and precarious work. It plays a significant role in such circumstances, especially

in income generation, because of the relative ease of entry and low requirements for education, skills, technology and capital. ILO defined the term "informal economy" as "all economic activities by workers and economic units that are not covered or insufficiently covered by formal arrangements. In 2003 the ILO adopted the concept of "informal employment" based on job characteristics, for which reason informality can exist in both the informal and formal sectors.

Unni and Rani (2003) described the nature of Indian informal workforce as heterogeneous and diverse. The Indian informal worker includes street vendors, daily-wage construction workers, domestic workers, small-scale entrepreneurs, piece-workers, as well as middle-class professionals running businesses from their homes. Despite variation in the type of work, earnings and education-levels, the majority of informal workers in India makes low earnings and lacks the benefits, social security and legal protections available to workers in formal employment. Chen (2005) stated that the India's informal economy can be understood as encompassing entrepreneurial as well as exploitative and dependent forms of economic activity. The main characteristics of informal sector are ease of entry, smaller scale of operation, local ownership, uncertain legal status, labour-intensive and operating using lower technology based methods, inadequate access to government schemes, finance and government aid (Raju, 1989). The mass of new employment in recent years, particularly in developing and transition countries, has been in the informal economy. Despite their large proportion, the majority of informal workers do not have stable avenues of employment (ILO, 2002). The seven essential securities for decent work are often denied to the informal sector workers; namely-labour market security, employment security, job security, work security, skill reproduction security, income security and representation security.

## Objectives of Study

i)   The objective of this paper is to inquire into the demographic composition of informal workers in informal sector workers,

ii)  To assess the relationship between demographic composition and employment security among informal sector workers.

iii) To ascertain the influence of demographic variables on economic security of informal sector workers.

## Hypothesis Formulation

On the basis of above objectives following hypothesis were formulated:

$H_{01}$ There is no relationship between demographic composition and employment security among informal sector workers.

$H_{02}$ There is no influence of demographic variables on economic security of informal sector workers.

## Demographic Composition of Informal Sector

61.2 percent of the world's employed population amounting to two billion workers are engaged in informal employment. A considerably high rate of informality exists in developing countries as compared to developed ones. Disassembling the share of employment according to gender, 63 percent of men across the globe are engaged in informal employment which is higher than the 58.1 percent of women. Young person and old people are found to be more affected by informality than persons belonging to the age group of 25 and 64 years (ILO, 2018).

Around the world, increase in level of education is related to decrease in the level of informality. People residing in rural areas are twice as likely to be in rural employment (80 per cent) than those residing in urban areas (43.7 percent). Formality of employment is positively related to socio-economic development  The majority of workers in India are in informal employment, behind this there are two diverging trends- the decrease in the share of informal worker in informal sector, the share of workers in the informal sector fell from 86.3 percent in 2004-05 to 82.2 percent in 2011-12 and the increase in share of informal workers (i.e. workers without access to social security) in organised sector; the share of informal workers in

the organized sector increased significantly because of a greater use of contract and other forms of casual labour. Because of these countervailing trends, the overall proportion of informal workers in total employment (informal sector workers plus informal workers in the organized sector) has remained relatively stable, at around 92 percent (ILO, 2017).

## Employment Security In Informal Sector

Employment Security is concerned with the protection of workers against fluctuations in earned income as a result of job loss. Job loss can be the result of economic downturns, as a part of restructuring, or due to various reasons of dismissal. ILO has included it as one of the seven forms of security for decent work.

According to ILO (1995), "Employment security means that worker has protection against arbitrary and short-notice dismissal from employment, as well as having long term employment relations that avoid casualisation". This definition covers only wage and salary workers excluding self-employed workers. Self employed category includes, employers, own account works and various other non- standard workers like contract workers.

According to ILO (2004), "Employment security is the protection against loss of income-earning work. For wage and salary workers, employment security exists in organizations and countries, in where there is strong protection against unfair or arbitrary dismissal and where workers can redress unfair dismissal. For the self- employed, it means protection against sudden loss of independent work, and/or business failure." Dasgupta (2001) defined employment security as protection against loss of employment and the ensured possibility of continuing employment, even though not in the same job.

## Materials and Methods

**The research design of the paper is as follows:**

1. **Participants -** The participants were labourers, working in the informal sector of Varanasi district, Uttar Pradesh. Varanasi district ranks 18th in the terms of population in Uttar Pradesh. It ranks 9th in literacy with 75.6 % which is higher than state average of 67.7% (Census 2011). Varanasi's economy is hugely dependent on informal sector which accounts for over a third of the workforce (Kumar, 2016). Simple random sampling technique is followed in the current paper with sample size of 200 workers.

2. **Measures -** To ascertain the demographic composition of informal sector, 8 demographic variables were used, namely- Gender, Age, Education level, Occupation, Employment status, Marital Status, Religion, Caste. For assessing the employment security of workers informal sector at individual level following variable were used: Perception of employment security it includes two variables-Perceived security of current employment and Seasonal nature of work; Perception of likelihood of finding alternate employment, it includes two variables- Expected time to find alternate employment and Ease of finding alternate employment. The economic security variables used here are taken from "Employment Security: Conceptual and Statistical Issues" by (Dasgupta, 2001).

3. **Analysis Procedure -** Data is collected from respondents using a questionnaire. It analysed using SPSS version 21. Descriptive statistics, Pearson Correlation and Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) were used to analyse the data

## Statistical Analysis and Discussions

Two set of variable demographic variables and employment security variable were analysed and the results are presented below:

1. **Demographic Variables -** Following variables were selected to ascertain the demographic composition of informal sector workers:-

(i) **Gender :** Out of the total respondents 69.5 percent were male and 30.5 percent were female. 24 percent respondents belonged to the 18-25 year age group in which, 29 percent

respondents were in the 25- 35 year age group in which, 30.5 respondents were in 35-45 year age group in which and 16.5 respondents were in 45-60 age group.

(ii) **Age :** Majority of respondents 30.5 percent belonged to 35-45 year age group, 29 percent respondent belonged to 25- 35 year age group, 24 percent comes under the category of 18 to 25 years of age group and rest 16.5 percent came from 45-60 years age group.

(iii) **Educational Level :** 25.5 per cent of respondents were educated till high school, 25.5 percent    were uneducated, 22 percent received primary education, 13 percent were intermediate, 9.5 percent were graduates and 4.5 percent were post graduate.

(v) **Employment Status:** 44.5 percent respondents were wage workers, 41 per cent respondents belonged to self employed category, and 14.5 percent respondents were home based workers.

(vi) **Marital Status :** Majority of participants, 69.5 percent were currently married; few, 21.5 per cent were unmarried and remainder, 7.5 percent were formerly married (widow/widower) and 1.5 percent were separated.

(vii) **Religion :** 88 percent of respondent belonged to the Hindu religion and 12 percent respondent were Muslim.

(viii) **Caste :** The majority of respondents, 49

**Table 1 : Demographic Composition of Unorganized Labourers**

| Demographic Variables | | Frequency | Demographic Variables | | Frequency |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gender | Male | 139 | Occupation | Vendor | 31 |
| | Female | 61 | | Rickshaw Puller | 35 |
| Age | 18-25 | 48 | | Carpenter | 15 |
| | 25-35 | 58 | | Rajgir | 23 |
| | 35-45 | 61 | | Weaver | 24 |
| | 45-60 | 33 | | Waiter | 7 |
| Education | Illiterate | 51 | | Ward Boy | 3 |
| | Primary | 44 | | Worker | 56 |
| | High School | 51 | | Paint worker | 3 |
| | Intermediate | 26 | | Electrician | 1 |
| | Graduate | 19 | | Other | 2 |
| | Post Graduate | 9 | Marital Status | Married | 139 |
| Employment Status | Self Employed | 82 | | Unmarried | 43 |
| | | | | Widow/Widower | 15 |
| | Wage Worker | 89 | | Separated | 3 |
| | | | Caste | General | 16 |
| | Home Based Worker | 29 | | OBC | 79 |
| | | | | SC | 98 |
| Religion | Hindu | 176 | | ST | 7 |
| | Muslim | 24 | | | |

**Source: Field Data**

(iv) **Occupation:** The participants were engaged in employment as construction workers, vendors, rickshaw pullers, rajgir, paint workers, ward boy, weaver, waiter, carpenter, electrician and other categories. The majority of respondents 28 percent belonged to construction workers.

percent belonged to scheduled caste category, 39.5 percent belonged to other backward caste category, 8 percent respondents were of general category and 3.5 percent belonged to scheduled tribe category.

1.    **Employment Security Variables-** Employment security can be assessed at three levels- national level, industry level and at individual level. At the individual level employment security can be assessed by two types of indicators- subjective indicators and objective indicators (Dasgupta, 2001).

**2.1    Subjective Indicator :** Subjective indicator of employment security is measured through    perception of continuance of individual's employment. It includes:

(a)    **Perception of employment security-** At individual level, perception about employment security is the feeling of an individual about continuing his employment. In survey, respondents were asked about how secure they feel about their current employment.

workers felt quite secure as compared with 23.6 percent of wage workers and 24.1 per cent of home based workers. 25.6 per cent self employed workers felt very secure about continuing their employment as against 23.6 per cent of the wage workers and 10.3 per cent home based workers.

The feeling of security may be affected by various factors; it includes the threat of job loss. The continuation of employment also depends upon the seasonal nature of employment. Majority of workers i.e. 76.8 per cent of wage workers; 83.1 per cent of self- employed and 75.9 percent of home based workers stated that their work is not of seasonal nature, which can be a sign of stability of continuance of their employment.

**(b) Perception of likelihood of finding alternate employment :** Following two indicators can be used to assess the likelihood of finding alternate employment:

**Table 2: Perceived Security of Current Employment within Employment Status**

| Employment Status | Perceived Security of Current Employment | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Very Insecure** | **Quite Insecure** | **Quite Secure** | **Very Secure** | **Total** |
| Self Employed | 21 | 28 | 12 | 21 | 82 |
| | 25.6% | 34.1% | 14.6% | 25.6% | 100.0% |
| Wage Workers | 24 | 23 | 21 | 21 | 89 |
| | 27.0% | 25.8% | 23.6% | 23.6% | 100.0% |
| Home Based Worker | 7 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 29 |
| | 24.1% | 41.4% | 24.1% | 10.3% | 100.0% |
| **Total** | 52 | 63 | 40 | 45 | 200 |
| | 26.0% | 31.5% | 20.0% | 22.5% | 100.0% |

**Source : Field Data**

Table 2 shows the frequency distribution of perceived security of current employment within employment status. Majority of workers, 31.5 per cent responded that they felt quite insecure about continuing their employment, 26 per cent felt very insecure, 20 percent felt quite secure and 22.5 per cent were feeling very secure about continuing their employment. Among self employed workers 25.6 per cent workers felt very insecure about continuing their employment as compared to 27 per cent of wage workers and 24.1 per cent of home based workers. 34.1 per cent self employed workers were quite insecure as compared with 25.8 percent wage workers and 41.4 per cent of home based workers. 14.6 per cent self employed

I.    **Expected Time to Find Alternate Employment -** Majority of workers, 29 per cent workers did not know after how much time they will get alternate employment. Uncertainty has been identified as a major component in the experience of employment insecurity (Dasgupta, 2001). 20.5 percent workers responded that to find alternate employment they will require very long time, constituting of 24.4 percent of self employed, 19.1 percent of wage workers and 13.8 percent of home based workers. 22.5 per cent workers stated that, they will find alternate employment after long time; comprising of 17.1 percent self employed workers, 29.2 per

cent of wage workers and 17.2 per cent of home based workers. 16.5 per cent worker were of opinion that quite long time will be needed for finding alternate employment and 11.5 per cent of workers responded that it will be not long before they will find alternate employment, among which 11 percent were self employed, 7.9 per cent were wage worker and 17.2 per cent were home based worker (Table 3).

**Table 3: Expected Time to find Alternate employment within Employment Status**

| Employment Status | Expected Time to find Alternate employment | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Very Long Time** | **Long Time** | **Quite Long** | **Not Long** | **Don't Know** | **Total** |
| **Self Employed** | 20 | 14 | 10 | 9 | 29 | 82 |
| | 24.4% | 17.1% | 12.2% | 11.0% | 35.4% | 100.0% |
| **Wage Workers** | 17 | 26 | 15 | 7 | 24 | 89 |
| | 19.1% | 29.2% | 16.9% | 7.9% | 27.0% | 100.0% |
| **Home Based Worker** | 4 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 29 |
| | 13.8% | 17.2% | 27.6% | 24.1% | 17.2% | 100.0% |
| **Total** | 41 | 45 | 33 | 23 | 58 | 200 |
| | 20.5% | 22.5% | 16.5% | 11.5% | 29.0% | 100.0% |

**Source: Field data**

**Table 4: Ease of Finding Alternate Employment within Employment Status**

| Employment Status | Ease of Finding Alternate Employment | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Very Easy** | **Easy** | **Hard** | **Very Hard** | **Don't Know** | **Total** |
| **Self Employed** | 1 | 7 | 20 | 34 | 20 | 82 |
| | 1.2% | 8.5% | 24.4% | 41.5% | 24.4% | 100.0% |
| **Wage Workers** | 3 | 10 | 36 | 29 | 11 | 89 |
| | 3.4% | 11.2% | 40.4% | 32.6% | 12.4% | 100.0% |
| **Home Based Worker** | 0 | 0 | 18 | 9 | 2 | 29 |
| | 0.0% | 0.0% | 62.1% | 31.0% | 6.9% | 100.0% |
| **Total** | 4 | 17 | 74 | 72 | 33 | 200 |
| | 2.0% | 8.5% | 37.0% | 36.0% | 16.5% | 100.0% |

**Source: Field data**

**II. Ease of Finding Alternate Employment -** 36 per cent workers responded that it will be very hard to find alternate employment, among them 41.5 percent were self employed, 32.6 per cent wage workers and 31 per cent were home based workers. 37 per cent responded it will be hard to find alternate employment, which can be disaggregated into 24.4 percent of self employed, 40.4 per cent of wage workers and 62.1 percent of home based workers.16.5 percent worker did not know, constituting of 24.4 per cent of self employed 12.4 per cent of wage worker and 6.9 per cent of home based worker. 8.5 percent workers were of opinion that they will find alternate employment easily, in which 8.5 per cent were self employed and 112.2 percent of wage workers. Only 2 per cent workers stated that finding alternate employment will be very easy (Table: 4).

**Objective Indicators of Employment Security -** Objective indicators of employment security includes- contractual, behavioural and governance indicators. Behavioural indicators include length of present employment and skills. Governance indicator includes the institutional support for individual for continuation of employment. This paper uses only behavioural indicators of employment security:

**(a) Duration of Current Employment -** As shown in Table 5, 7.5 percent workers were in their current employment for 0-1 years. 24 percent were in their employment for 1-5 years. 31 percent for 5-10 years, 11.5 per cent were working for 10-15 years and more 26 per cent of workers were in employment for more than 15 years. (b) Skills: 77 percent participants responded that they did not receive training for their work and only 23 percent received training. However, this does not state that informal labours are unskilled but that there is a need to recognize that their skills are acquired outside the formal education system.

**Table 5 : Duration of Current Employment within Employment Status**

| Employment Status | Duration of Current Employment | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **0-1** | **1-5** | **5-10** | **10-15** | **More than 15** | **Total** |
| **Self Employed** | 4 | 19 | 24 | 12 | 23 | 82 |
| | 4.9% | 23.2% | 29.3% | 14.6% | 28.0% | 100.0% |
| **Wage Workers** | 8 | 23 | 27 | 9 | 22 | 89 |
| | 9.0% | 25.8% | 30.3% | 10.1% | 24.7 | 100.0% |
| **Home Based Worker** | 3 | 6 | 11 | 2 | 7 | 29 |
| | 10.3% | 20.7% | 37.9% | 6.9% | 24.1% | 100.0% |
| **Total** | 15 | 48 | 62 | 23 | 52 | 200 |
| | 7.5% | 24.0% | 31.0% | 11.5% | 26.0% | 100.0% |

**Source: Field Data**

## Table 6: Relationship between Demographic Composition and Employment Security

| Variables | Mean | S.D. | 1. Gender(G) | 2. Age (A) | 3. Education (ED) | 4. Occupation (O) | 5. Employment (E) | 6. Marital Status (MS) | 7. Religion (R) | 8. Caste (C) | 9. Seasonal nature of work (SNW) | 10. Duration of current Employment (DCE) | 11. Expectations to continue current | 12. Perceived security of current employment | 13. Expected time to find alternate employment | 14. Easiness to Obtain alternate employment |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Gender(G) | .3050 | .46156 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Age(A) | 3.3950 | 1.02676 | .447 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Education(ED) | 2.7250 | 1.44562 | .131 | .000** | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Occupation(O) | 4.6350 | 2.76768 | .050 | .807 | .080 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Employment (E) | 1.7350 | .69801 | .000** | .022* | .250 | .000** | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Marital Status (MS) | 1.4100 | .69593 | .001** | .000** | .003** | .043* | .000** | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Religion (R) | 1.1200 | .32578 | .083 | .002** | .254 | .469 | .296 | .194 | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 8. Caste (C) | 2.4800 | .69427 | .874 | .368 | .001** | .972 | .168 | .842 | .000** | 1 | | | | | | |
| 9. SNW | .7950 | .40471 | .569 | .518 | .262 | .450 | .777 | .765 | .303 | .560 | 1 | | | | | |
| 10. DCE | 2.475 | 1.55288 | .620 | .000** | .000** | .287 | .105 | .000** | .006** | .254 | .957 | 1 | | | | |
| 11. ECCE | 3.11 | 1.17251 | .004* | .084 | .000** | .897 | .380 | .000** | .002** | .000** | 0.43* | .000** | 1 | | | |
| 12. PSCE | 2.39 | 1.10180 | .599 | .910 | .191 | .635 | .561 | .311 | .132 | .023 | .000** | .434 | .004** | 1 | | |
| 13. ETFAE | 3.06 | 1.52579 | .570 | .038* | .009** | .076 | .699 | .598 | .000** | .046* | .860 | .154 | .034* | .126 | 1 | |
| 14. ETOAE | 3.565 | .93281 | .930 | .051 | .011* | .000** | .016* | .045* | .738 | .892 | .731 | .001** | .978 | .038* | .024* | 1 |

Source : Statistical Analysis

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

## Relationship between Demographic Composition and Employment Security

A Pearson Product Movement Correlation was run to determine the relationship between demographic variables and economic security variables. As shown in Table 6,the relationship of Expectations To Continue Current Employment (ECCE) with Gender (G); Expected Time To Find Alternate Employment (ETFAE) with Age (A) and Caste (C); Easiness To Obtain Alternate Employment (ETOAE) with Education (ED), Employment (E) and Marital Status (MS) were found significant at 5% level of significance with p value less than.05.

The relationship of Duration of current employment (DCE) with Age (A) , Education (ED), Marital Status (MS) and Religion (R); Expectations to continue current employment (ECCE) with Education (ED), Marital Status (MS), Religion (R) and Caste (C); Easiness to find alternate employment (ETFAE) with Education (ED) and Religion; Expected time to find alternate employment (ETFAE) with Education (ED) and Religion (R); Easiness to obtain alternate employment (ETOAE) with Occupation (O) were found significant at 1% level of significance with p value less than .01. On the basis of above analysis, the H01 There is no relationship between demographic composition and employment security among informal sector workers has been rejected.

## Influence of Demographic Composition on Employment Security

To ascertain the influence of demographic variables on economic security variables MANOVA has been carried out.  The one- way MANOVA is used to determine whether there are any differences between Independent groups on more than one continuous dependent variable.

For the analysis, five (5) economic security variables (Duration of current  Employment, Expectations to continue current  Employment, Perceived security of current employment, Expected time to find alternate employment, Easiness to Obtain alternate employment) are considered as dependent variables and 8 demographic variables (Gender, Age, Education, Occupation, Employment , Marital Status ,Religion, Caste) are considered as independent variables.

Results of MANOVA (Table:7) shows that there was a statistically significant difference in economic security based on age, $F(15,582)=4.579$; $p<.005$; Wilk's Lambda= .715, partial $n2=.101$., respondents belonging to the age group of 45-60 had highest mean score of 3.9610, from which it can be concluded that workers belonging to 45-60 age group have more economic security.

There was a statistical significant difference in economic security based on  education level, $F(25,707.321)=2.462$, $p<.005$;Wilk's Lambda=.733, partial $n2=.060$, respondents having education up to primary level had highest mean score of 3.777, depicting influence of primary education on employment security ; occupation, $F(50,847) = 2.016$, $p<.005$; Wilk's Lambda = .599, partial $n2=.097$ and marital status, $F(15,582) = 3.959$,$p<.005$; Wilk's Lambda = .746, partial $n2 = .093$, married respondents had the highest mean score of 3.6835, portraying married workers have more  economic security.

## Table 7 : Influence of Demographic Composition on Employment Security

| Independent Variable | Dependent Variable | Levene's Test | Test of between subject effect | | | | | Box Test | Multivariate Test | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | F | d.f. | Mean square | Sig. | Partial ETA Squared | | d.f. | F | P | Wilks Lambda | Partial ETA |
| Gender | Duration of current Employment (DCE) | .474 | .145 | 1 | .225 | .704 | .001 | 317 | 5;194 | 2.064 | .072 | .949 | .051 |
| | Expectations to continue current Employment (ECCE) | .003 | 8.387 | 1 | 11.117 | .004 | .041 | | | | | | |
| | Perceived security of current employment (PSCE) | .079 | .278 | 1 | .339 | .599 | .001 | | | | | | |
| | Expected time to find alternate employment (ETFAE) | .428 | .323 | 1 | .756 | .570 | .002 | | | | | | |
| | Easiness to Obtain alternate employment (ETOAE) | .691 | .008 | 1 | .007 | .930 | .000 | | | | | | |
| Age | DCE | .061 | 16.446 | 3 | 21.920 | .000 | .201 | .106 | 15;582 | 4.579 | .000 | .715 | .101 |
| | ECCE | .003 | 8.161 | 3 | 10.127 | .000 | .111 | | | | | | |
| | PSCE | .596 | .206 | 3 | .253 | .892 | .003 | | | | | | |
| | ETFAE | .065 | 2.007 | 3 | 4.603 | .114 | .030 | | | | | | |
| | ETOAE | .640 | 1.373 | 3 | 1.188 | .252 | .021 | | | | | | |
| Educational Level | DCE | .112 | 4.876 | 5 | 7.302 | .000 | .112 | .087 | 25;707 | 2.462 | .000 | .733 | .060 |
| | ECCE | .000 | 5.124 | 5 | 6.383 | .000 | .117 | | | | | | |
| | PSCE | .844 | 7.50 | 5 | .917 | .587 | .019 | | | | | | |
| | ETFAE | .006 | 2.181 | 5 | 4.931 | .058 | .053 | | | | | | |
| | ETOAE | .759 | 1.829 | 5 | 1.559 | .109 | .045 | | | | | | |
| Occupation | DCE | .879 | 1.052 | 10 | 1.725 | .401 | .053 | .165 | 50;847 | 2.016 | .000 | .599 | .097 |
| | ECCE | .855 | 2.427 | 10 | 3.114 | .010 | .114 | | | | | | |
| | PSCE | .069 | 1.255 | 10 | 1.504 | .259 | .062 | | | | | | |
| | ETFAE | .015 | 3.054 | 10 | 6.445 | .001 | .139 | | | | | | |
| | ETOAE | .102 | 2.913 | 10 | 2.312 | .002 | .134 | | | | | | |
| Employment Status | DCE | .879 | .749 | 2 | 1.234 | .474 | .008 | .273 | 10;386 | 1.443 | .159 | .929 | .036 |
| | ECCE | .855 | 2.211 | 2 | 3.003 | .112 | .022 | | | | | | |
| | PSCE | .069 | .488 | 2 | .596 | .614 | .005 | | | | | | |
| | ETFAE | .015 | .464 | 2 | 1.087 | .629 | .005 | | | | | | |
| | ETOAE | .102 | 4.317 | 2 | 3.636 | .015 | .042 | | | | | | |
| Marital Status | DCE | 0.13 | 10.588 | 3 | 15.201 | .000 | .139 | .118 | 15;582 | 3.959 | .000 | .746 | .093 |
| | ECCE | .011 | 6.667 | 3 | 8.444 | .000 | .093 | | | | | | |
| | PSCE | .025 | 1.401 | 3 | 1.690 | .244 | .021 | | | | | | |
| | ETFAE | .038 | 2.727 | 3 | 6.188 | .045 | .040 | | | | | | |
| | ETOAE | .023 | 2.985 | 3 | 2.522 | .032 | .044 | | | | | | |
| Religion | DCE | .191 | 5.682 | 1 | 9.122 | 0.18 | .028 | .013 | 5;194 | 5.391 | .000 | .878 | .122 |
| | ECCE | .796 | 9.966 | 1 | 13.110 | .002 | .048 | | | | | | |
| | PSCE | .158 | 2.291 | 1 | 2.764 | .132 | .011 | | | | | | |
| | ETFAE | .001 | 13.008 | 1 | 28.560 | .000 | .062 | | | | | | |
| | ETOAE | .019 | .112 | 1 | .098 | .738 | .001 | | | | | | |
| Caste | DCE | .858 | 1.398 | 3 | 2.284 | .245 | .021 | .027 | 15;582 | 4.277 | .000 | .728 | .101 |
| | ECCE | .000 | 6.479 | 3 | 8.227 | .000 | .090 | | | | | | |
| | PSCE | .225 | 2.248 | 3 | 2.678 | .084 | .033 | | | | | | |
| | ETFAE | .020 | 5.852 | 3 | 12.695 | .001 | .082 | | | | | | |
| | ETOAE | .015 | 5.096 | 3 | 4.176 | .002 | .072 | | | | | | |

**Source : Field data, Statistical Analysis**

There was a statistical significant difference in economic security based on religion, $F(5,194)=5.391, p<.005$; Wilk's Lambda=.878, partial n2=.122; respondents belonging to Muslim community had highest mean score of 4.0833, from which it can ascertained that Muslim workers have more economic security same was the case with caste, $F(15,582)=4.277$, $p<.005$; Wilk's Lambda=.728., partial n2=101, respondent belonging to the OBC category had highest mean score of 3.6962, portraying OBC category workers have more economic security.

The difference in economic security based on the gender was found statistically not significant, $F(5,194)=2.064$, $p>.005$; Wilk's Lambda= .949, partial n2=.051, same was the case with employment, $F(10;386)=1.443$, $p>.005$; Wilk's Lambda=.929, partial n2 =.036.

On the basis of above discussion, the hypothesis: $H_0 2$. There is no influence of demographic variables on economic security of informal sector workers, is rejected.

## Conclusion

From the analysis it can be concluded there is an existence of relationship between demographic composition and employment security among informal sector workers. Further, economic security is significantly influenced by the age, education level, occupation, employment, marital status, religion and caste. However, gender and employment status does not significantly influence economic security.

## Further Research and Policy Implications

This paper tried to assess the demographic features of informal workers and the level of employment security of informal sector workers at individual level through the subjective and objective indicators of employment security. Future research prospects include assessing the level of employment security among informal sector in India at macro level through behavioural, contractual and governance indicators. The lack of reliable statistics on the size, distribution and economic contribution of the sector has been a major constraint in proving a realistic understanding of the Indian economy, leading to its neglect in development planning (NCEUS, 2008).

Due to the heterogeneity of informal sector in India, a single policy to solve all the concerned problems of informal sector is not feasible. This paper made an addition in the literature of unorganised employment and also contributes in the policy making by providing data about the employment security of informal workers at individual level which can be used by the concerned authorities to formulate tailored policy according to the various needs of informal sector workers.

## References

Banerjee, S. (2016). Aadhaar: Digital Inclusion and Public Services in India. World Development Report.

Chen, M. A. (2005). Rethinking the informal economy: Linkages with the formal economy and the formal regulatory environment. Tokyo: United Nations University, World Institute for Development Economics Research.

Dasgupta, S. (2001). Employment security: conceptual and statistical issues (Vol. 10). International Labour Office Geneva.

Dutta, G. (2012). A Socio Legal Study on the Right to Food in Assam with Special Reference to Kamrup District. Gauhati University.

Hart, K. (1973). Informal income opportunities and urban employment in Ghana. The journal of modern African studies, 11(01), 61-89.

ILO.(2004). Economic security for a better world. International Labour Office, Geneva.

ILO.(1995). Labour Market Indicators Questionnaire 1995 (Geneva, EMPFORM, ILO)

ILO.(2002). Conclusions concerning decent work and the informal economy, International Labour Conference, 90th Session, Geneva.

ILO.(2002). Decent work and informal economy (Report No. 6).International Labour Office, Geneva.

ILO.(2017). Indian Labour Market Update, International Labour Office, Country Office for India. Retrieved from http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/pub lic/---asia/---ro-bangkok/---sro-new_delhi/ documents/ publication/ wcms_496510.pdf

ILO. (2018). Women and men in the informal economy. A statistical picture. International Labour Organization.

Kumar, T.M.V. (2016). Smart Economy in Smart Cities: International Collaborative Research: Ottawa, St.Louis, Stuttgart, Bologna, Cape Town, Nairobi, Dakar, Lagos, New Delhi, Varanasi, Vijayawada, Kozhikode, Hong Kong. Advances in 21st Century Human Settlements. Springer Singapore. Retrieved from https:// books. google. co.in/ books? id= fhDpDAAAQBAJ.

Kantor, P. (1997). Informal Sector: Lifting the Shroud. Economic and Political Weekly, 2512-2515.

Kavitha, T. (2014). Developing Urban Informal Sector A socio Economic Study of Home Based Workers in Hydrabad. Osmania University.

Malik, S., & Khan, T. (2009). Family Size, Composition and Women Work in Informal Sector. Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences (PJSS), 29(2).

Mitra, R. K. (2009). Trash has Crashed: Impact of Financial Crisis on Waste Pickers of Ahmedabad City. UNDP India.

Mohanty, R. K. (2009). Craft Artisans in Urban Informal Sector. Anamika Publishers & Distributors. Retrieved from https://books.google.co.in/books?id=4lWt 6REp-rgC

Narayana, N. (2015). Impact Of Public Distribution System On Food Secuirty And Economic Empowerment Of Weaker Sections In Karnataka – A Case Study Of Mysore District. University of Mysore.

NCEUS. (2008). Report on Definitional and Statistical Issues Relating to Informal Economy, New Delhi, http:// nceus.gov.in/ Report_Statistical_ Issues_ Informal_ Economy.pdf

Raju, R. S. (1989). Urban Unorganised Sector in India. Mittal Publications. Retrieved from https:// books. google. co.in/ books?id= K7fDs9fV3TsC

Robert, S. P. (2010). A Study on the socio economic status of the street vendors in the unorganised/ informal sector at Tiruchirappalli Town, Tamil Nadu, India. Bharathidasan University.

Sastry, N. (2004). Estimating informal employment & poverty in India. Human Development Resource Centre New Delhi, India.

Shinde, B. S. (2016). Social Changes In The Nandiwale Tribe In Western Maharashtra With Special Reference To Sangli, Satara And Kolhapur District. Shri Jagdish Prasad Jhabarmal Tibrewala University, Rajasthan.

Unni, J., & Rani, U. (2003). Social protection for informal workers in India: Insecurities, instruments and institutional mechanisms. Development and Change, 34(1), 127-161.

Venkatesh, P., & others. (2013). Recent trends in rural employment and wages in India: has the growth benefitted the agricultural labours? Agricultural Economics Research Review, 26(2013).