## CHAPTER: IV

## Data Analysis

### 4.1 Labour Force

In the recent period the employment situation underwent some significant changes in response to the accelerated capital inclusive growth in India. The National Sample Survey Organization (NSSO) has released the recently $61^{\text {st }}$ and $66^{\text {th }}$ Rounds information on employment and unemployment situation in India for the year 2004-05 and 2009-10 respectively, revealed that there have been notable changes in the labour force, work force and employment pattern in India for the period of 2004-05 and 2009-10. The gender wise trends in labour force, work force and unemployment in million and its compound average growth rate (CAGR) according to usual status (ps+ss), in rural and urban India, for the period of 2004-05 and 2009-10 have been presented in table 1. The table shows that labour force has declined from 469 to 468.8 million by 0.01 per cent per year due to a fall in female labour force ( -3.1 percent per annum) while male labour force has registered a marginal growth of 1.35 per cent per year. In rural India, labour force has declined from 348.7 million to 341.9 million by 0.39 per cent per annum due to the fall in female labour force ( -3.39 percent per annum) while male has accounted 1.16 per cent per year growth rate. In urban India, the labour force has increased from 120.3 million to 126.9 million by 1.07 per cent due to the rising in male workers of 1.81 percent per annum while it has declined in female workers of -1.73 per cent per year.

A comparison look reveals that the annualized growth rate of total labour force is negative in rural areas while that is positive in urban areas. The annual fall in rural areas female work force is more than, that in urban areas fall. Further, per year increase in rural male workforce is little lower than that in urban areas. Theseare also presented in chart no.1.

Thus all in all, it is clear that the female work force has declined both in rural and urban areas, but such fall is more prominent in rural than urban areas. The male workforce has increased in both rural and urban areas and this sink is more prominent in urban than rural areas and fall in total female workforce is more than increase in male workers. The work force has increased from 457.9 million to 459 million by a negligible annual growth rate of 0.05 percent against high
negative female annual growth rate of -3.05 percent while the male annual growth rate has increased by 1.41 per cent. In rural areas the workforce has decreased by 0.38 percent peryear due to a decrease in female ( -3.36 percent) while male workforce has increase by 1.16 percent annually. In urban areas,the workforce has increased by 1.29 percent per year due to increase in male workforce 2 percent per annum while there is a decrease in female workforce of -1.51 percent per year.

Table 1: Labourforce, Workforce, Unemployment and Unemployment rate according to usual status (ps+ss) and its CAGR.
The figures are in millions.

| People |  | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  | All |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2004- } \\ & 05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009- \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | CAGR <br> (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2004- \\ & 05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009- \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | CAGR <br> (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2004- \\ & 05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009- \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAGR } \\ & \text { (\%) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Labour force | Male | 222.5 | 235.7 | 1.16 | 93.9 | 102.7 | 1.81 | 316.4 | 338.4 | 1.35 |
|  | Female | 126.2 | 106.2 | -3.39 | 26.4 | 24.2 | -1.73 | 152.6 | 130.4 | -3.1 |
|  | Total | 348.7 | 341.9 | -0.39 | 120.3 | 126.9 | 1.07 | 469 | 468.8 | -0.01 |
| Workforces | Male | 218.9 | 231.9 | 1.16 | 90.4 | 99.8 | 2 | 309.3 | 331.7 | 1.41 |
|  | Female | 124 | 104.5 | -3.36 | 24.6 | 22.8 | -1.51 | 148.6 | 127.3 | -3.05 |
|  | Total | 342.9 | 336.4 | -0.38 | 115 | 122.6 | 1.29 | 457.9 | 459 | 0.05 |
| Unemployed | Male | 3.6 | 3.8 | 1.09 | 3.5 | 2.9 | -3.69 | 7.1 | 6.7 | -1.15 |
|  | Female | 2.2 | 1.7 | -5.03 | 1.8 | 1.4 | -4.9 | 4 | 3.1 | -4.97 |
|  | Total | 5.8 | 5.5 | -1.06 | 5.3 | 4.3 | -4.1 | 11.1 | 9.8 | -2.46 |
| Unemployment Rate | Male | 1.62 | 1.61 |  | 3.73 | 2.82 |  | 2.24 | 1.98 |  |
|  | Female | 1.74 | 1.6 |  | 6.82 | 5.79 |  | 2.62 | 2.38 |  |
|  | Total | 1.66 | 1.61 |  | 4.41 | 3.39 |  | 2.37 | 2.09 |  |

Source: NSS Report No. 515 and 537: Employment and Unemployment Situation in India: 2004-05 and 2009-10.



Chart no. 1.3: Gender wise CAGR of Unemployment in Rural and Urban India during 2004-05 to 2009-10


A location wise comparison look reveals that the annualized growth rate of workforce is negative in rural areas while it is positive in urban areas. The unemployment (that is calculated by labour force minus workforce) has declined from 11.1 million to 9.8 million by 2.46 percent per annum due to fall in both male ( -1.15 per annum) and female ( 4.97 per annum). The rural unemployed persons have also decline from 5.8 million to 5.5 million by 1.06 percent annually due to decline in female unemployed ( -5.31 percent) while rural male unemployed has accounted annual increase of 1.09 percent. The urban unemployed person has also declined from 5.3 million to 4.3 million by 4.1 percent annually due to decline in both male and female with 3.69 percent and 4.9 percent per annum respectively.

All in all it is clear that, there is a fall in unemployment in all over India except rural male, this fall in unemployment is more apparent in urban areas than rural areas, ultimately the fall is more prominent in rural female that is following by urban female and urban male unemployment this is also visibly presented in chart 1.3.

Further, the table shows that unemployment rate has depreciated from 2.37 million to 2.09 million by 0.28 million. This fall is more prominent in urban (1.02) than rural areas(0.05). This fall is marked in both male and female. This fall is higher in male (0.26) than female (0.24) in both rural as well as urban India.

Over all, a closer look at labour force, work force and unemployment shows that unemployment has significantly depreciated due to a decrease in labour force and subsidiary increase in work force.

| People |  | Rural |  |  | Urban |  |  | All |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2004- \\ & 05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009- \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAGR } \\ & \text { (\%) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2004- \\ & 05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009- } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAGR } \\ & \text { (\%) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2004- \\ & 05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009- } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAGR } \\ & \text { (\%) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| LFPR | Male | 55.5 | 55.6 | 0.04 | 57 | 55.9 | -0.39 | 55.9 | 55.7 | -0.07 |
|  | Female | 33.3 | 26.5 | -4.47 | 17.8 | 14.6 | -3.89 | 29.4 | 23.3 | -4.54 |
|  | Person | 44.6 | 41.4 | -1.48 | 38.2 | 36.2 | -1.07 | 43 | 40 | -1.44 |
| WPR | Male | 54.6 | 54.7 | 0.04 | 54.9 | 54.3 | -0.22 | 54.7 | 54.6 | -0.04 |
|  | Female | 32.7 | 26.1 | -4.41 | 16.6 | 13.8 | -3.63 | 28.7 | 22.8 | -4.5 |
|  | Person | 43.9 | 40.8 | -1.45 | 36.5 | 35 | -0.84 | 42 | 39.2 | -1.37 |
| PU | Male | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0 | 2.2 | 1.6 | -6.17 | 1.2 | 1.1 | -1.73 |
|  | Female | 0.6 | 0.4 | -7.79 | 1.2 | 0.8 | -7.79 | 0.8 | 0.5 | -8.97 |
|  | Person | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0 | 1.7 | 1.2 | -6.73 | 1 | 0.8 | -4.36 |

Source: Ibid

Chart No. 2.1: Gender wise CAGR of LFPR in Rural and Urban India during 2004-05 to 2009-10 Chart No. 2.2: Gender wise CAGR of WPR in Rural and Urban India during 2004-05 to 2009-10


Chart No. 2.3: Gender wise CAGR of PU in Rural and Urban India during 2004-05 to 2009-10


The trends in Labour Force Participation Ratio (LFPR), Worker Population Ratio (WPR) and Proportion Unemployed (PU) for the period of 2004-05 and 2009-10 have been presented in table 2. The table shows that the LFPR has declined from 43 percent to 40 percent by 1.44 percent per year due to the annual fall in both female ( 4.54 percent) and male ( 0.07 percent) which is more apparent in female than male workers.

In rural India, the LFPR has declined from 44.6 to 41.4 percent by 1.48 percent annually due to decline in female LFPR of 4.47 percent per year while male LFPR has accounted a negligible annual increase of 0.04 percent.

In urban India, the LFPR has declined from 38.2 percent to 36.2 percent by 1.07 per cent per year due to decline in both male and female by 0.39 and 3.89 per cent per year respectively.

A comparison closer look reveals that the LFPR has declined in all segments except rural male. This fall is more apparent in female than male and same that in rural than urban areas as clear picture presented in chart 2.1.

Further, the table reveals that the WPR has reduced from 42 percent to 39.2 percent annually due to decline in both female and male by 4.5 and 0.04 percent per year. In urban areas, the WPR has declined from 36.5 to 35.0 percent by 0.84 percent per year due to the fall in both female and male by 3.63 and 0.22 percent per year. In rural areas the WPR has also decreased from 43.9 to 40.8 percent by 1.45 percent per annum due to a sharp decline in female ( -4.41 percent per year) while rural male has registered a negligible positive growth ( 0.04 per cent per annum).

A comparison look shows that the fall in WPR is more prominent in female than male workers in both rural and urban areas except rural male that has experienced of raise growth. The proportion of unemployed has declined from 1 to 0.08 percent per year due to the annual fall in both female (-4.5 percent) and male (-0.04 percent). This fall is more apparent in female than male. In rural areas, the PU is remaining same and rural female has negative experienced. In urban areas the PU has declined from 1.7 to 1.2 percent by 6.73 annually due to the decline in female and male by 7.79 percent and 6.17 percent respectively.

A comparison look reveals that the fall in PU is higher in female than male in both rural and urban areas that are also clearly presented in chart 2.3.

Table No. 3: Gender wise age specific labour force participation ratesper 1000 according to usual status (ps+ss) in rural and urban India.

| Age group (year) | Rural | Urban |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male |  |  | Female |  |  | Male |  |  | Female |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2004- } \\ & 05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009- } \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | CAGR (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2004- } \\ & 05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2009- \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | CAGR (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2004- } \\ & 05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009- } \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | CAGR (\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2004- } \\ & 05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009- } \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAGR } \\ & \text { (\%) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 15-19 | 529 | 390 | -5.91 | 331 | 195 | -10.04 | 381 | 263 | -7.14 | 144 | 85 | -10.01 |
| 20-24 | 891 | 813 | -1.82 | 435 | 314 | -6.31 | 769 | 682 | -2.37 | 250 | 197 | -4.65 |
| 25-29 | 982 | 975 | -0.14 | 530 | 404 | -5.28 | 957 | 947 | -0.21 | 261 | 222 | -3.19 |
| 30-34 | 988 | 990 | 0.04 | 593 | 434 | -6.05 | 987 | 985 | -0.04 | 308 | 239 | -4.95 |
| 35-39 | 991 | 992 | 0.02 | 642 | 497 | -4.99 | 984 | 991 | 0.14 | 340 | 278 | -3.95 |
| 40-44 | 985 | 994 | 0.18 | 627 | 498 | -4.50 | 983 | 987 | 0.08 | 317 | 256 | -4.18 |
| 45-49 | 982 | 984 | 0.04 | 616 | 492 | -4.40 | 976 | 979 | 0.06 | 269 | 231 | -3.00 |
| 50-54 | 963 | 967 | 0.08 | 562 | 485 | -2.90 | 939 | 948 | 0.19 | 259 | 228 | -2.52 |
| 55-59 | 931 | 934 | 0.06 | 509 | 411 | -4.19 | 832 | 855 | 0.55 | 218 | 191 | -2.61 |
| 60+ above | 645 | 647 | 0.06 | 254 | 226 | -2.31 | 366 | 342 | -1.35 | 100 | 70 | -6.89 |
| All | 555 | 556 | 0.04 | 333 | 265 | -4.47 | 570 | 559 | -0.39 | 178 | 146 | -3.89 |

Source: Ibid, P. 66


Table No. 4: Gender wise percentage distribution of LFPR according to (ps+ss) among different social groups.

| Social groups | Rural |  |  |  |  |  | Urban |  |  |  |  |  | rural + Urban |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male |  | Female |  | Person |  | Male |  | Female |  | Person |  | Male |  | Female |  | Person |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 200 \\ & 4-05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009- \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2004- \\ & 05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2009- \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2004- \\ & 05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009- \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2004- } \\ & 05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009- \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2004- } \\ & 05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009- \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2004- \\ & 05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2009- \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2004- \\ & 05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2009- \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2004- \\ & 05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009- \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2004- \\ & 05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009- \\ & 10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| ST | 56.8 | 56.9 | 46.6 | 36.2 | 51.8 | 46.8 | 53.8 | 53.4 | 25.4 | 21.2 | 39.6 | 37.8 | 56.6 | 56.5 | 44.6 | 34.9 | 50.7 | 46.0 |
| SC | 55.4 | 55.8 | 33.8 | 27.3 | 44.8 | 41.9 | 56.8 | 56.7 | 21.0 | 18.6 | 39.8 | 38.5 | 55.7 | 56.0 | 31.4 | 25.6 | 43.8 | 41.2 |
| OBC | 54.5 | 54.8 | 33.7 | 27.1 | 44.3 | 41.2 | 57.3 | 55.9 | 19.9 | 15.5 | 39.4 | 36.6 | 55.1 | 55.1 | 30.7 | 24.1 | 43.2 | 40.0 |
| Others | 56.8 | 56.3 | 27.0 | 20.4 | 42.2 | 39.1 | 57.1 | 55.8 | 14.7 | 12.1 | 36.8 | 35.0 | 56.9 | 56.1 | 22.3 | 17.1 | 40.1 | 37.5 |
| All | 55.5 | 55.6 | 33.3 | 26.5 | 44.6 | 41.4 | 57.0 | 55.9 | 17.8 | 14.6 | 38.2 | 36.2 | 55.9 | 55.7 | 29.4 | 23.3 | 43.0 | 40.0 |

Source: NSS Report No. 516 and 543: Employment and unemployment situation among social groups in India, 2004-05 and 2009-10
$\square$
Table No. 4.1:CAGR in percentage of LFPR according to usual status (ps+ss) for different social group.

| Social <br> groups | Uural |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Male | Female | Person | Male | Female | Person | Male | Female | Person |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ST | 0.04 | -4.93 | -2.01 | -0.15 | -3.55 | -0.93 | -0.04 | -4.79 | -1.93 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SC | 0.14 | -4.18 | -1.33 | -0.04 | -2.40 | -0.66 | 0.11 | -4.00 | -1.22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OBC | 0.11 | -4.27 | -1.44 | -0.49 | -4.87 | -1.46 | 0.00 | -4.73 | -1.53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Others | -0.18 | -5.45 | -1.51 | -0.46 | -3.82 | -1.00 | -0.28 | -5.17 | -1.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All | 0.04 | -4.47 | -1.48 | -0.39 | -3.89 | -1.07 | -0.07 | -4.54 | -1.44 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^0]

Age specific labour force participation rates according to usual status (ps+ss) between 2004-05 and 2009-10 are presented in the table no.3. The table shows that rural male labour force has increased by negligible rate of 0.04 percent per annum. While rural female labour has significantly declined by 4.47 percent annually. The youth ( 15 to 29 years old) age group of rural male labour force has accounted an annual negative growth rate while 5 to 9 and 30 and above age groups of rural male has registered a positive growth rate, on account of which rural male labour force has accounted a negligible annual growth rate. All age groups except 5-9 years old, rural female labour force has declined.In urban areas, the male labour force has declined by 0.39 percent due to decline in 05-09 to 30-34 and (60+above) years old age groups while 35-39 to 5559 years old age group male labour force has registered a little growth rate.The urban female has also decreased by 3.89 percent year over year that is apparent in all age groups; it is more in 0509 to 15-19 years old age groups.A closer scrutiny reveals that significantly decreased in both rural and urban areas. This fall is more prominent in female than male and that same in urban than rural areas. Thus total labour force has declined except rural male in India. These pictures are also clearly presented in chart no.3.1 and 3.2.

Table no. 4 shows the gender wise percentage distribution of LFPR according to usual status ( $\mathrm{pp}+\mathrm{ss}$ ) among social groups and its CAGR, in percentage, has been shown in table no. 4.1. Both table shows that the percentage distribution of the LFPR is often higher in male than female in both rural and urban areas. According to table 4.1 the CAGR, in all groups have declined both in rural and urban areas except rural ST, SC, OBC and other male which have accountedpositive annualgrowth rate. In both rural and urban, SC and OBC have also shown positive growth rate per annum.This fall is more prominent in rural than urban areas. The fall is more prominent in rural female than urban female. The rural female LFPR has higher negative annual growth rate than rural male which has virtual zero positive growth rate and that same in urban areas. This picture is also clearly presented in chart no. 4.1.1. In rural female others have highest declining experience of 5.45 percent that is following by ST, OBC and SC of 4.93, 4.27 and -4.18 percent respectively while rural male OBC, SC and ST have increased by $0.11,0.14$ and 0.14 percent annually but rural male others have declined by 0.18 percent.

In urban India, the female OBC has registered highest declining rate of -4.87 percent per annum that is following by Others, ST and SC and same pattern appeared in male. These are also presented in chart no. 4.1.1.

Table No. 5: Gender wise age specific percentage distribution of usually employed in rural and urban India.

| Age group (year) | Rural |  |  |  |  |  | Urban |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male |  |  | Female |  |  | Male |  |  | Female |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2004- \\ & 05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2009- \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAGR } \\ & \text { (\%) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2004- } \\ & 05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2009- } \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAGR } \\ & (\%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2004- } \\ & 05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2009- \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAGR } \\ & (\%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2004- } \\ & 05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009- \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { CAGR } \\ & (\%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 5 to 9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 14.87 | 1.0 | 0 | -100 | 2.0 | 0 | -100 |
| 10 to 14 | 16.0 | 10.0 | -8.97 | 26.0 | 15.0 | -10.42 | 26.0 | 5.0 | -28.09 | 22.0 | 8.0 | -18.32 |
| 15-19 | 9.2 | 7.2 | -4.78 | 8.8 | 6.5 | -5.88 | 8.8 | 4.5 | -12.55 | 7.6 | 5.3 | -6.96 |
| 20-24 | 12.5 | 11.1 | -2.35 | 11.1 | 9.9 | -2.26 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 0 | 12.0 | 11.5 | -0.85 |
| 25-29 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 0 | 12.4 | 29.1 | 18.6 | 12.4 | 14.8 | 3.6 | 11.9 | 13.4 | 2.40 |
| 30-34 | 11.9 | 12.6 | 1.15 | 14.2 | 13.0 | -1.75 | 14.2 | 14.4 | 0.28 | 14.5 | 14.5 | 0.00 |
| 35-39 | 12.4 | 12.7 | 0.48 | 14.2 | 14.7 | 0.69 | 14.2 | 14.1 | -0.14 | 15.7 | 16.7 | 1.24 |
| 40-44 | 10.3 | 10.8 | 0.95 | 10.7 | 11.6 | 1.63 | 10.7 | 12.0 | 2.32 | 12.2 | 11.8 | -0.67 |
| 45-49 | 9.2 | 9.9 | 1.48 | 9.0 | 10 | 2.13 | 9.0 | 10.9 | 3.91 | 8.8 | 10.3 | 3.19 |
| 50-54 | 6.8 | 7.3 | 1.43 | 6.4 | 7.5 | 3.22 | 6.4 | 8.0 | 4.56 | 6.3 | 6.7 | 1.24 |
| 55-59 | 5.1 | 5.7 | 2.25 | 4.8 | 5.5 | 2.76 | 4.8 | 5.1 | 1.22 | 4.2 | 4.7 | 2.28 |
| 60+ above | 8.3 | 9.1 | 1.86 | 5.8 | 7.0 | 3.83 | 5.8 | 4.6 | -4.53 | 4.6 | 4.4 | -0.89 |



Table No. 6: Gender wise percentage distribution of usually employed of age 15 years and above by education category in rural and urban India.

| Education Category | Rural <br> Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Female |  |  | Male |  |  | Female |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2004- \\ & 05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2009- \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAGR } \\ & (\%) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2004- } \\ & 05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009- \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAGR } \\ & \text { (\%) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2004- \\ & 05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2009- \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAGR } \\ & \text { (\%) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2004- } \\ & 05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009- \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAGR } \\ & \text { (\%) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Not Literate | 33.8 | 28 | -3.70 | 664 | 578 | -2.74 | 13.1 | 11.4 | -0.027 | 37.3 | 29.7 | -4.45 |
| Literate upto Primary | 29.4 | 28.1 | -0.90 | 18.4 | 22.6 | 4.20 | 22.7 | 18.3 | -4.218 | 20.3 | 19.3 | -1.01 |
| Middle | 18.1 | 19.7 | 1.71 | 8.8 | 10.7 | 3.99 | 19.4 | 17.9 | -1.597 | 11.9 | 12.9 | 1.63 |
| Secondary | 9.3 | 12.6 | 6.26 | 3.6 | 4.9 | 6.36 | 15 | 17.6 | 3.249 | 7.3 | 8.4 | 2.85 |
| Higher Secondary | 4.6 | 6.3 | 6.49 | 1.4 | 2.1 | 8.45 | 9.2 | 10.8 | 3.259 | 5.1 | 6.2 | 3.98 |
| Diploma Certificated | 1 | 0.9 | -2.09 | 0.5 | 0.4 | -4.36 | 3.7 | 2.9 | -4.756 | 3.4 | 2.8 | -3.81 |
| Graduation and above | 3.8 | 4.4 | 2.98 | 0.9 | 1.5 | 10.76 | 16.9 | 21.1 | 4.539 | 14.7 | 20.7 | 7.09 |



### 4.2 Workforce

Table No. 5 shows the gender wise age specific percentage distribution of usually employed in rural and urban India during 2004-05 to 2009-10. It has been observed here that youth (15 to 29 years old) employed persons have significantly declined. This annual fall is more prominent in female in not rural and urban areas. All age groups except youth,rural male (5 to 14), rural female (10-14, 30-34), urban male (5-14, 35-39 and 60+above), urban female (5-14, 40-44 and $60+$ above) have increase. This increased is more apparent in female than male that is same appeared in rural than urban.

Closer look at the table reveals that 5 to 9 years ole age group has accounted 100 percent fall in it remained same for male while in female it has increased by 14.87 percent annually. These are also clearly presented in chart no. 5.1.

The gender wise percentage distribution of usually employed of age 15 years and above by education category in rural and urban India for the period of 2004-05 and 2009-10 and its point to point annualized growth rate have been shown in table no.6. The table reveals that illiterate usually employed has fell in both male and female in India. This annual fall is more prominent in urban female of 4.45 percent that is following by rural male, rural female and urban male with 3.70, 2.74 and 0.03 percent per year respectively. Literate up to primary has also decreased except rural female. This fall is more apparent in urban male of 4.22 percent per annum that is following by urban female and rural male with 1.01 and 0.90 percent per year respectively. The rural female has increased by 4.20 percent per annum.

Middle category education, usually employed has increased except urban male that is accounted a decline of 1.597 percent per year. This annually increase is mostly apparent in rural female of 3.99 percent that is following by rural male (1.71 percent) and urban female (1.63 percent).

Secondary education category of usually employed has accounted annualized increase. This increase is more prominent in rural female ( 6.36 percent) that is following by rural male (6.26), urban male ( 3.245 percent) and urban female ( 2.85 percent). Higher secondary education category has annually increased. This increase is mostly prominent in rural female ( 8.45 percent)
that is following by rural male (6.49 percent), urban female ( 3.98 percent) and urban male (3.26 percent).

Diploma certificate usually employed has annually declined. This is mostly apparent in urban male ( -4.76 percent) that is following by rural female ( -4.36 percent), urban female ( -3.81 percent) and rural male (-2.09 percent).

Graduation and above education category of usually employed has increased in all segments of population. This increase is mostly apparent in rural female (10.76 percent) that is following by urban female ( 7.09 percent), urban male ( 4.54 percent) and rural male ( 2.98 percent).

A comparison closer look at the table reveals that the increase in rural female in all education categories except illiterate and diploma certificated (where it has declined) is higher than rural male except not literate, literate up to primary and diploma certificated which have declined .And in comparison of urban female it is higher. The highest increase is registered by graduation and above category except rural maleand it is following by higher secondary and middle education category in all segments. It is also clearly showed in chart no.6.1.

Table No. 7: Percentage distribution of workers according to usual status by statuses in employment and broad industries of work in 2009-10.

| Location wise social groups | Selfemployment | Regular wage/salaried employees | Casual Labour | Primary | Secondary | Tertiary | Source: Ibid |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RMST | 48.9 | 6.9 | 44.2 | 76.4 | 14.5 | 9.1 | distribution of workers according to |
| RMSC | 34.1 | 7.7 | 58.2 | 57.6 | 27.1 | 15.3 |  |
| RMOBC | 57.9 | 8.8 | 34.2 | 62.6 | 18.9 | 18.5 | 2009-10 |
| RMOthers | 64.9 | 11.0 | 24.1 | 61.6 | 15.4 | 22.9 |  |
| RMAll | 53.5 | 8.5 | 38.0 | 62.8 | 19.3 | 17.9 |  |
| RFST | 53.6 | 2.5 | 43.8 | 85.1 | 11.0 | 3.9 |  |
| RFSC | 38.6 | 4.9 | 56.5 | 78.5 | 14.2 | 7.3 |  |
| RFOBC | 58.7 | 3.8 | 37.5 | 79.2 | 13.0 | 7.8 |  |
| RFOthers | 71.2 | 6.7 | 22.1 | 76.3 | 13.1 | 10.7 |  |
| RFAll | 55.7 | 4.4 | 39.9 | 79.4 | 13.0 | 7.6 |  |
| RPST | 50.7 | 5.2 | 44.1 | 79.7 | 13.2 | 7.1 | Chart no. 7.3 and 7.4: Percentage |
| RPSC | 35.6 | 6.8 | 57.6 | 64.3 | 23.0 | 12.8 | distribution of workers according to |
| RPOBC | 58.1 | 6.6 | 35.2 | 67.9 | 17.0 | 15.1 | industries among social groups in 2009- |
| RPOthers | 66.5 | 9.9 | 23.6 | 65.3 | 14.8 | 19.9 | 10. |
| RPAll | 54.2 | 7.3 | 38.6 | 67.9 | 17.4 | 14.7 |  |
| UMST | 28.5 | 42.9 | 28.6 | 12.3 | 37.4 | 50.3 |  |
| UMSC | 28.2 | 41.4 | 30.4 | 5.9 | 40.3 | 53.9 |  |
| UMOBC | 42.7 | 36.4 | 20.9 | 8.0 | 37.0 | 55.0 |  |
| UMOthers | 44.7 | 47.0 | 8.3 | 3.8 | 30.6 | 65.6 |  |
| UMAll | 41.1 | 41.9 | 17.0 | 6.0 | 34.7 | 59.3 |  |
| UFST | 30.8 | 33.7 | 35.5 | 22.2 | 22.6 | 55.3 |  |
| UFSC | 32.6 | 36.0 | 31.4 | 14.9 | 32.9 | 52.2 |  |
| UFOBC | 47.0 | 30.4 | 22.5 | 19.0 | 39.6 | 41.4 |  |
| UFOthers | 39.8 | 52.2 | 8.0 | 6.4 | 27.1 | 66.5 |  |
| UFAll | 41.1 | 39.3 | 19.6 | 13.9 | 33.2 | 52.9 |  |
| UPST | 29.1 | 40.4 | 30.4 | 15.0 | 33.4 | 51.7 |  |
| UPSC | 29.2 | 40.2 | 30.6 | 7.9 | 38.6 | 53.5 | 19 \| Page |
| UPOBC | 43.6 | 35.3 | 21.2 | 10.2 | 37.5 | 52.3 |  |
| UPOthers | 43.9 | 47.8 | 8.3 | 4.2 | 30.0 | 65.8 |  |
| UPAll | 41.1 | 41.4 | 17.5 | 7.5 | 34.4 | 58.1 |  |

Table no. 7 shows the percentage distribution of workers according to status by statuses in employment and broad industries of work in 2009-10. The table reveals that the share of self employment is highest ( 66.5 to 34.1 percent) among all social groups in rural areas that is following by casual labour ( 22.1 to 58.2 percent) and regular wage/ salaried employees ( 2.5 to 11.0 percent) In terms of aggregate the scheme of self employment is 54.2 percent that is following by casual labour 38.6 percent and a regular wage /salaried employees 7.3 percent. A gender wise comparison look reveals that the female self-employment is higher than male selfemployment in all social groups in rural areas. The male regular wage/ salaried employees are higher than that female regular wage/salaried employees. The male casual labour is higher than female casual labour among all social groups except rural male OBC in rural areas. In urban areas, the share of regular wage / salaried employees is mostly prominent that is following by self- employment ( 29.1 to 43.9 percent) casual labour ( 8.3 to 30.6 percent). Female selfemployed workers are higher than male self-employment workers in all social groups in rural areas except others. The male regular wage / salaried employees is more prominent than female wage/salaried employees in all social groups except others. In the sense of casual labour, female workers are higher than male works except others. All in all, total rural self- employment is much higher than urban areas for all social groups and same for causal labour. But in the case of regular wage/ salaried employment urban areas, are more prominent than rural areas that are clearly shown in chart no 7.1 and 7.2.

As per industries a large chunk of the work force is engaged in primary sector in rural areas that is more prominent in female than male that is following by secondary and tertiary sector. Within secondary sector, male workers are higher than female workers and same that in tertiary sector but in primary sector that is opposite in rural India.

In urban areas, the large chunk of work force is engaged in tertiary sector that this following by secondary and primary sector. A gender wise comparison look reveals that, within tertiary sector mostly workers are male and same that in secondary sector but in sense of primary sector its opposite situation has been noted. These situations are also shown in chart no 7.3 and 7.4.

Table no. 8 shows the CAGR of WPR for persons of age 15 years and above according to usual status (ps+ss) for different general education levels for each social group during 2004-05 and 2009-10. The results report that the negative CAGR has been registered by all education
categories in each social group, in both rural and urban India except SC, OBC, others and all in rural male, urban male others for literate up to primary, urban male OBC for not literate. SC, ST and all in male and urban female ST and SC, urban person ST- SC and all for middle education category, rural male ST, rural female ST, rural person ST, urban male ST, SC for higher secondary education level, rural male SC, urban male SC, urban female SC, urban person ST and urban person ST-SC for diploma certificated, rural male ST, urban male SC-OBC, urban female ST-SC, urban person ST-SC for graduation category.

Rural male ST, others, rural female ST, SC, rural person ST, SC and urban male ST, SC, urban female OBC, all and urban person SC for post graduation and above category. For the not literate category this annual fall is mostly apparent in urban female OBC, others and all that is following by all rural female social groups, rural male and urban male in all social groups. For the literate up to primary category, the year over year fall is mostly prominent in rural female for all social groups that is following by urban female, urban male and rural male.

As per middle education category, the rural female workers have registered the highest CAGR, that is following by urban female, rural male and urban male.

For the secondary category, the rural female workers have declined sharply year over year that is following by urban female, rural male and urban male.

For the higher secondary category, the urban female workers have accounted highest negative CAGR that is following by rural female, rural male and urban male.

For the diploma certificated category, rural female workers have experienced of highest fall year over year that is following by urban female, urban male and rural male and same that in graduation and post graduation and above category for all social groups.

Table No. 8: CAGR of wpr for persons of age 15 years and above according to usual status ( $\mathrm{ps}+\mathrm{ss}$ ) for different general education levels for each social group during 2004-05 to 2009-10.

| Location wise social groups | Not literate | Literate up to primary | Middle | Secondary | Higher Secondary | Diploma Certificated | Graduate | Post graduation and above | Source: Ibid |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RMST | -0.26 | -0.17 | -0.15 | -1.00 | 0.94 | -2.91 | 0.40 | 0.84 | Table No. 9: Trend of |
| RMSC | -0.07 | 0.13 | -0.48 | -1.74 | -3.78 | 0.58 | -0.48 | -0.07 | industrial employment |
| RMOBC | -0.46 | 0.20 | -0.47 | -0.50 | -3.00 | -3.24 | -2.54 | -0.60 | according to usual |
| RMOthers | -0.88 | 0.02 | -0.51 | -1.10 | -1.40 | -2.08 | -1.40 | 0.07 | status(ps+ss), |
| RMAll | -0.41 | 0.11 | -0.45 | -0.98 | -2.21 | -2.32 | -1.65 | -0.18 | employment elasticity |
| RFST | -4.67 | -3.68 | -7.19 | -4.47 | 2.06 | -4.44 | -11.19 | 8.59 | and growth in labour |
| RFSC | -4.54 | -3.30 | -5.07 | -4.04 | -9.60 | -6.54 | -5.11 | 8.90 | productivity. |
| RFOBC | -4.58 | -2.19 | -4.42 | -6.91 | -7.42 | -9.02 | -0.66 | -1.73 |  |
| RFOthers | -5.92 | -5.64 | -4.25 | -7.39 | -5.78 | -10.35 | -5.71 | -3.32 | Эrowth |
| RFAll | -4.72 | -3.08 | -4.55 | -6.16 | -6.20 | -8.31 | -3.65 | -0.77 | ıLabour <br> activity (\%) |
| RPST | -2.70 | -2.02 | -2.02 | -1.99 | 1.08 | -4.03 | -2.38 | 4.42 | 15 to 2009- |
| RPSC | -2.37 | -1.28 | -1.87 | -2.84 | -4.87 | -0.20 | -1.51 | 0.82 |  |
| RPOBC | -2.74 | -1.01 | -1.62 | -1.65 | -3.68 | -3.73 | -3.22 | -2.67 |  |
| RPOthers | -3.30 | -2.00 | -1.54 | -1.98 | -2.36 | -3.57 | -2.47 | -0.88 |  |
| RPAll | -2.70 | -1.33 | -1.61 | -1.96 | -2.93 | -3.19 | -2.60 | -1.23 | 1.84 |
| UMST | -2.19 | -0.05 | 1.29 | -4.46 | 0.12 | -0.51 | -1.09 | 0.27 | 10.17 |
| UMSC | -0.14 | -0.33 | 0.80 | -0.56 | 1.94 | 1.36 | 2.01 | 3.05 |  |
| UMOBC | 0.05 | -0.83 | -0.43 | -0.15 | -2.11 | -0.81 | 0.05 | -0.58 | 0.56 |
| UMOthers | -0.95 | 0.46 | -0.25 | 0.03 | -0.93 | -3.09 | -0.41 | -0.48 | -0.89 |
| UMAll | -0.36 | -0.26 | 0.00 | -0.18 | -1.08 | -1.77 | -0.21 | -0.17 | 3.71 |
| UFST | -2.84 | -6.96 | 0.58 | -6.59 | -12.09 | -5.20 | 4.34 | -0.30 | 9.52 |
| UFSC | -3.70 | -0.37 | 1.69 | -1.69 | -8.49 | 3.35 | 2.10 | -6.56 |  |
| UFOBC | -6.00 | -2.79 | -0.89 | -6.21 | -5.45 | -9.37 | -6.01 | 19.24 | 7.24 |
| UFOthers | -6.63 | -4.85 | -3.21 | -5.47 | -6.01 | -2.04 | -3.58 | -1.71 | 4.73 |
| UFAll | -5.34 | -2.52 | -0.89 | -4.64 | -6.13 | -4.16 | -3.38 | 0.11 |  |
| UPST | -2.64 | -2.86 | 1.15 | -5.37 | -0.25 | 0.20 | 0.77 | -0.53 |  |
| UPSC | -0.99 | -1.25 | 0.51 | -1.90 | -0.51 | 2.34 | 1.14 | 0.52 | 22 \| Page |
| UPOBC | -2.75 | -1.75 | -0.53 | -1.02 | -3.45 | -3.13 | -1.72 | -1.26 |  |
| UPOthers | -3.14 | -1.11 | -0.82 | -0.53 | -2.48 | -2.55 | -1.11 | -0.10 |  |
| UPAll | -2.40 | -1.28 | 0.29 | -0.92 | -2.42 | -2.25 | -1.02 | -0.12 |  |


| 10 | Community, Social | and | 37.59 | 38.69 | 0.58 | 0.07 | 11.34 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 11 | Personal Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Services $(7+8+9+10)$ | 113.51 | 120.38 | 1.18 | 0.12 | 6.94 |  |  |
| 12 | Total | 458.45 | 457.85 | -0.03 | -0.003 | 8.60 |  |
| Source: Ibid |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Ibid


Chart no. 9.2: Elasticity of Employment according to industries



The employment trend, elasticity of employed and growth in labour productivity according to usual status for the period of 2004-05 and 2009-10 have been shown in table 9. The table shows that a large chunk of work force is engaged in agriculture and allied sector that has declined from 258.71 million to 236.96 million by 1.74 percent per annum and manufacturing industry has also experienced of negative CAGR of -1.33 percent. In other hand all remaining industries have experienced of positive CAGR. This increase is mostly prominent in construction industry of 10.67 percent per annum with 17.54 million jobs having been added in the five years period that is following by financing, insurance, real estate and business services ( 5.48 percent per annum, in absolute terms the workforce in the sector increased by 2.39 million), electricity, gas and water supply ( 3.59 percent per annum adding 0.23 million workers), Industry ( 3.26 percent per annum adding 14.88 million workers), Transport, storage and communication ( 1.85 percent per annum adding 1.79 million), mining and quarrying ( 1.39 percent, adding 0.19 million), services sector (1.18 percent, adding 6.8 million), trade, hotels and restaurants( 0.62 percent adding 1.56 million) and community, social and personal services ( 0.58 percent per annum adding 1.1 million). This sectoral disaggregation of work force shows the elasticity of employment to GDP has increased in all industries except for agriculture and allied section and manufacturing which have negative experienced of -0.54 and -0.14 respectively. As per aggregate, the highest employment elasticity is having by construction of 1.16 that is following by electricity, gas and water supply (0.51), financing, insurance, real estate and business services (0.46), industry (0.37), mining and quarrying ( 0.33 ), transport, storage and communication (0.14), services ( 0.12 ), trade, hotels and restaurants (0.07). The aggregate growth rate in labour productivity has increased by 8.60 percent per annum. In the case labour productivity is seem in all sectors except for construction where the productivity has declined. This annualized increase is mostly prominent in community, social and personal services of 11.34 percent that is following by manufacturing ( 10.17 percent), trade, hotels and restaurants ( 9.52 percent), transport, storage and communication ( 7.24 percent), services ( 6.94 percent), agriculture and allied ( 5.05 percent), financing, insurance, real estate and business services ( 4.73 percent), industry ( 3.71 percent), mining and quarrying (1.84 percent) and electricity gas and water supply ( 0.56 percent). These are clearly presented in charts $9.1,9.2$ and 9.3.

Table No. 10: Sectoral distribution of work force (million) according to usual status between organized and unorganized sector.

| Sector | Organized |  |  | Unorganized |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2004-05 | 2009-10 | CAGR (\%) | 2004-05 | 2009-10 | CAGR (\%) |
| Agriculture | 6.09 | 2.74 | -14.76 | 252.80 | 242.11 | -0.86 |
| Manufacturing | 16.06 | 16.03 | -0.04 | 39.71 | 34.71 | -2.66 |
| Mining and Quarrying | 1.75 | 1.86 | 1.23 | 0.89 | 1.09 | 4.14 |
| Electricity, Gas and Water supply | 1.21 | 1.13 | -1.36 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 5.92 |
| Construction | 6.35 | 13.00 | 15.41 | 19.66 | 31.10 | 9.61 |
| Non-manufacturing | 9.32 | 17.90 | 13.94 | 20.64 | 30.38 | 8.04 |
| Wholesale and Retail Trade | 1.93 | 2.98 | 9.08 | 41.43 | 40.55 | -0.43 |
| Hotels and Restaurants | 0.81 | 0.91 | 2.36 | 5.29 | 5.22 | -0.27 |
| Transport, Storage and Communication | 4.45 | 4.88 | 1.86 | 14.02 | 15.09 | 1.48 |
| Banking and Insurance | 2.30 | 2.93 | 4.96 | 0.80 | 0.89 | 2.16 |
| Real Estate and renting | 1.36 | 2.40 | 12.03 | 3.29 | 3.35 | 0.36 |
| Public administration and Defense; Compulsory social security | 8.76 | 9.46 | 1.55 | 0.08 | 0.00 | -100.00 |
| Education | 8.36 | 9.17 | 1.87 | 3.07 | 2.68 | -2.68 |
| Health | 1.76 | 2.20 | 4.56 | 1.58 | 1.39 | -2.53 |
| Other Community, social and personal services | 1.30 | 1.24 | -0.94 | 7.45 | 11.00 | 8.11 |


| Total Services | 31.09 | 36.17 | 3.07 | 81.72 | 80.17 | -0.38 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Workforce | 62.57 | 72.84 | 3.09 | 394.90 | 387.38 | -0.38 |
| Source Ibid |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Ibid

Chart no. 10.1: sectoral wise CAGR in organised and unorganised sector during 2004-05 to 2009-10.


Table no. 10, displays the sectoral distribution of work force in million according to usual status between organized and unorganized sector during 2004-05 to 2009-10. The table shows that the unorganized portion of total workforce is much higher than organized sector, a figure which has declined from 394.9 million to 387.38 million with 0.38 percent per annum. In the other hand organized employment is portion in total work force has increased from 62.57 million to 72.84 million with 3.09 percent per year in the period of five years. At the disaggregated level, in agriculture industry almost workers are unorganized which is declined from 252.8 to 242.11 million by 0.86 percent per year and in another side a very little figures of employment are organized which has also declined from 6.09 million to 2.74 million by 14.76 percent per year. This fall is more prominent in organized sector than unorganized i.e. total work force has declined who are engaged in agriculture industry.

In case of manufacturing, both organized and unorganized sector have experienced a decline. Organized sector has declined from 16.06 million to 16.03 million, that is, by 0.04 percent per annum and unorganized sector has declined from 39.71 million to 34.71 million by 2.66 percent per annum, that is, this decline is more prominent in unorganized sector than organized sector.

In case of mining and quarrying, both organized and unorganized sectors have experienced a positive growth. This positive experience is more apparent in unorganized sector of 4.14 percent per year than organized sector (1.23 percent per year).

In the field of electricity, gas and water supply organized sector has declined by 1.36 percent per annum while unorganized employment has increased by 5.92 percent per annum.

In construction zone, organized employment has rapidly increased by 15.41 percent annually followed by unorganized employment which has increased by 5.92 percent per year.

In the area of non-manufacturing industry both the sectors organized and unorganized have increased and this is more prominent in organized sector than unorganized sector.

In the sphere of whole sale and retail trade the employment of organized sector has increased by 9.08 percent annually while in unorganized sector it has declined with 0.43 percent annually.

In the belt of hotels and restaurants organized sector has positive growth experienced of 2.36 percent per annum while unorganized sector has negative growth experienced of -0.27 percent.

In the case of transport, storage and communication both the organized and unorganized sectors have increased with 1.86 percent and 1.48 percent per year respectively.

In the field of banking and insurance, the organized sector has sharply increased by 4.96 percent year over year that is following by unorganized(2.16 percent annually).

In the area of real estate and renting, a higher CAGR has been accounted by organized sector (12.03 percent) than unorganized sector (2.16 percent).

In the public administration and defense; compulsory social security, the organized sector has declined by 1.55 percent per annum and on the other hand the unorganized sector has absolutely declined by 100 percent per year.

In the sphere of education, the CAGR is positive (1.87 percent) in organized sector while this is negative (-2.68 percent) in unorganized sector.

In the case of health, the employment of organized sector has increased with 4.56 percent per annum and its opposite occurred in unorganized sector (- 2.53 percent annually).

In the belt of other community, social and personal services, the unorganized sector has declined by 0.94 percent per annum while unorganized sector has increased with 8.11 percent per year.

In the area of total services organized sector has increased with 3.07 percent per annum while unorganized sector has declined with 0.38 percent per year.

A closer scrutiny reveals that the highest positive CAGR has been registered by construction while highest negative CAGR has been registered by agriculture industry in unorganized sector. There are only four industries agriculture, manufacturing, electricity, gas and water supply and other community, personal and social industries where organized sector has declined. In unorganized sector, the highest CAGR has been accounted by construction. There are no unorganized employment in public administration and defense; compulsory social security. In agriculture industry both the sectors have declined. But in services industry organized employment has increased while unorganized employment has decreased in the period of five years. These are clearly shown in Chart 10.1

Table11: Distribution of workers (million) according to usual status (ps+ss) by industry groups/divisions.

| Areas/ sector | Category of workers | Industry groups / Divisions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Formal Sector |  |  | Informal Sector |  |  |  |  |  | Total Informal Sector |  |  |
|  |  | AGGC |  |  | AGEGC |  |  | Non- agriculture |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2004-05 | 2009-10 | CAGR <br> (\%) | 2004-05 | 2009-10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAGR } \\ & \text { (\%) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 2004-05 | 2009-10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAGR } \\ & \text { (\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 2004-05 | 2009-10 | CAGR <br> (\%) |
|  | Male | 288.93 | 276.78 | -0.856 | 15.57 | 11.93 | -5.178 | 153.4 | 170.29 | 2.111 | 168.97 | 182.22 | 1.522 |
| Rural | Female | 315.95 | 316.71 | 0.048 | 65.48 | 47.28 | -6.307 | 76.47 | 95.01 | 4.438 | 141.95 | 142.29 | 0.048 |
|  | Person | 299.01 | 289.17 | -0.667 | 33.88 | 22.95 | -7.497 | 125.01 | 146.88 | 3.278 | 158.89 | 169.83 | 1.34 |
|  | Male | 22.44 | 22.49 | 0.048 | 5.95 | 4.59 | -5.066 | 429.97 | 431.92 | 0.091 | 435.92 | 436.51 | 0.027 |
| Urban | Female | 59.07 | 46.82 | -4.542 | 23.81 | 16.52 | -7.046 | 375.02 | 395.66 | 1.077 | 398.83 | 412.18 | 0.661 |
|  | Person | 30.22 | 27.08 | -2.17 | 9.62 | 7.34 | -5.248 | 417.6 | 424.58 | 0.332 | 427.22 | 431.92 | 0.219 |
| Rural | Male | 219.79 | 206.55 | -1.235 | 12.82 | 10.1 | -4.663 | 225.29 | 242.35 | 1.471 | 238.11 | 252.45 | 1.177 |
| + | Female | 278.86 | 273.11 | -0.416 | 59.53 | 42.23 | -6.636 | 119.51 | 143.67 | 3.75 | 179.04 | 185.9 | 0.754 |
| Urban | Person | 239.48 | 225.37 | -1.207 | 28.39 | 18.82 | -7.894 | 190.03 | 214.81 | 2.482 | 218.42 | 233.63 | 1.356 |

Source: Ibid

## Chart no.11.1: CAGR of workforce according to usual status (ps+ss) by industry groups/divisions during 2004-05 to 2009-10



Table No. 11 shows the distribution of workers according to usual status (ps+ss) by industry groups/ divisions during 2004-05 to 2009-10. The table reveals that the formal sector in agriculture with growing crops has experienced the decline in all categories in both rural and urban areas except urban male which has increased with 0.5 percent per annum.

The informal employment in agriculture except growing crops has also declined in all categories the annual fall varied from 4.66 percent to 7.89 percent. This fall is more prominent in female than in male in both rural and urban areas.

The informal employment in non-agriculture sector has significantly increased in all categories in both rural and urban areas. This annualized increase is more apparent in female than in male in both rural and urban areas. This annualized increase is more prominent in rural area rather than urban areas. As per total, informal employment has increased in all categories. This increase is prominent in female than in male except rural male in both rural and urban areas and is same that in rural and urban areas. It has been shown clearly in Chart No. 11.1.

The table 12 shows the distribution of usual status of workers by activity status, gender and rural-urban location during 2004-05 to 2009-10. The table displays that there has been significantly higher proportion in total female workforce of self-employed, this high proportion is more apparent in rural areas than urban areas. The workforce of self-employed has significantly declined except urban male. This fall is more prominent in female than in male and same that in rural than urban area. With regard to regular wage/ salaried employees, it is dominantly more in urban areas and also here the males are marginally more than the female. Most remarking fact is that the self-employed workers have decreased while regular wage/salaried employees have increased. This annualized increase is more apparent in urban that in rural areas. In the sense of all regular wage/salaried employees is more prominent in male (1.99 percent per annum) than female ( 0.83 percent per annum) while it's the opposite in rural India. In the case of casual labours in public work, it is dominantly more in rural areas than in urban and also here females are marginally more than male except urban male. Most remarking fact is that it has increased significantly over the years. In the field of casual labours in other types of works there have been significantly higher proportion in total male work force of casual labours and this high proportion is more apparent in rural areas than in urban areas. It has annually increased except rural female. This increase is more prominent in urban than in rural
sector and same is in the case of male than $n$ female. The total proportion of casual labour in work force have significantly higher in rural than in urban sector and the same is the case that in male than in female in both rural and urban areas. It has increased. This annual increase is more prominent in urban than in rural areas and same that in male than in female. A closer look reveals that among the three major categories of worker's status, the self-employed workers rank first, casual workers rank second and regular wage/ salaried employees rank third. Regular wage/ salaried employees and casual labours both have increased while self-employment has decreased except urban male that is clearly presented in Chart No. 12.1.

Table 12: Distribution of usual status workers (in million) by activity-status, gender and rural-urban location.

| Locat ion | Category of workers | Self- employment |  |  | Regular wage/salaried employees |  |  | Casual labours in public works |  |  | Casual labours in other type of works |  |  | Casual labours |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2004 \\ & -05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009- \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { CAG } \\ & \text { R } \\ & \text { (\%) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 200 \\ & 4-05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009 \\ & -10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAG } \\ & \text { R } \\ & \text { (\%) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 200 \\ & 4- \\ & 05 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 200 \\ & 9-10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAG } \\ & \text { R } \\ & \text { (\%) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2004 \\ & -05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009- \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAG } \\ & \text { R } \\ & \text { (\%) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2004- \\ & 05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2009- \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CAG } \\ & \text { R (\%) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Rural | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 127 . \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 124.0 \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | $0.49$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.7 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.7 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | 0.01 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.4 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | 1.86 | $\begin{aligned} & 33.4 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71.5 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | 86.27 | 3.80 | 72.02 | 88.12 | 4.12 |
|  | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 78.9 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | 58.21 | 5.92 | 4.59 | 4.60 | 0.04 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | 2.51 | $\begin{aligned} & 58.8 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40.1 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | 39.19 | 0.50 | 40.42 | 41.70 | 0.62 |
|  | All | $\begin{aligned} & 206 . \\ & 43 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 182.3 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $2.45$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24.3 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24.5 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | 0.17 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.6 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | 4.37 | $\begin{aligned} & 44.8 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 111 . \\ & 79 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 125.4 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | 2.34 | ${ }_{7}^{112.4}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 129.8 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | 2.92 |
| Urba n | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 40.5 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 41.02 | 0.25 | $\begin{aligned} & 36.7 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41.8 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | 2.64 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | 0.40 | $\begin{aligned} & 34.5 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.1 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | 16.57 | 4.79 | 13.20 | 16.97 | 5.15 |
|  | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 11.7 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | 9.37 | 4.40 | 8.76 | 8.96 | 0.46 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | 0.09 | $\begin{aligned} & 29.9 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | 4.08 | 4.38 | 1.40 | 4.11 | 4.47 | 1.70 |
|  | All | $\begin{aligned} & 52.2 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | 50.39 | $0.71$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45.4 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50.7 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | 2.24 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \\ & 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 0.49 | $\begin{aligned} & 33.6 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.2 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | 20.96 | 3.98 | 17.37 | 21.46 | 4.32 |
| All | Male | $\begin{aligned} & +169 . \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 165.8 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{-} 0.40$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53.2 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58.7 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | 1.99 | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | 2.32 | $\begin{aligned} & 49.6 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 86.6 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 104.4 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | 3.83 | 86.91 | $\begin{aligned} & 106.8 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | 4.21 |
|  | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 91.2 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | 67.85 | - 5.75 | $\begin{aligned} & 12.3 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.8 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | 0.83 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 2.67 | $55.1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44.8 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | 43.92 | $\overline{0.43}$ | 45.17 | 46.59 | 0.62 |
|  | All | $\begin{aligned} & 260 . \\ & 55 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 234.0 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | 2.12 | $\begin{aligned} & 65.4 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71.6 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 1.80 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.4 \\ & 6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 5.05 | $\begin{aligned} & 61.6 \\ & 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 131 . \\ & 42 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 148.7 \\ & 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 2.50 | $\begin{aligned} & 131.8 \\ & 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 153.7 \\ & 7 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 3.12 |

Source: Ibid

Chart no. 12.1: CAGR usual status workers (million) by activity-status, gender and rural-urban location during 2004-05 to 2009-10


To measure the quality of employment, the percentage distribution of usual status workers by nature and educational qualifications in 2009-10 is presented in table 13. It has been observed that in the case of self-employment there is higher proportion of the literate up to middle (42.6 percent) that is followed by non-literate ( 30.2 percent), secondary, higher secondary and diploma certificated (21.2 percent) and lastly graduation and above. Thus it is clear that the probability of being in a self-employment is relative decline with having a higher education.

In the case of regular wage/ salaried employees, the higher proportion of this job category is secondary, higher secondary and diploma certificated ( 32.4 percent), followed by graduation and above ( 30.1 percent), literate up to middle ( 29.2 percent) and not literate ( 8.3 percent), that is, positive relation between education and being a regular wage/ salaried employees has relatively increased with having higher education. In the case of casual labours, the higher proportion of this job category are not literate ( 44.2 percent), with 45.8 percent workers are literate up to middle, secondary, higher secondary and diploma certificated are 9.3 percent and graduation and above is only 0.7 percent.

Thus it is clear that there is reciprocal relationship between probability of being in casual labour and general education level. Overall the probability of being a self-employment and casual labours is relatively moving in opposite direction with higher level of education while for regular wage/ salaried moves in the same direction. This is clearly shown in the chart No.13.1

Table 13: Percentage distribution of usual status workers by nature of work and educational qualifications in 2009-10

| Education Level | Self- <br> employment | Regular <br> wage/salaried <br> employees | Casual <br> labours |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Not literate | 30.2 | 8.3 | 44.2 |
| Literate up to Middle | 42.6 | 29.2 | 45.8 |
| Secondary, Higher <br> secondary and diploma <br> certificate | 21.2 | 32.4 | 9.3 |
| $\left.\begin{array}{lcr}\text { Graduation and above } & 6 & 30.1 \\ \hline \text { Total } & 100 & 100\end{array}\right] 0.7$ |  |  |  |

Source: Ibid
Chart no. 13.1: Percentage of usual status workers by nature of work and educational qualifications in 2009-10


Table No. 14: Percentage distribution of industrial employment by status.

| sector | nature of work | $\mathbf{2 0 0 4 - 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 - 1 0}$ | CAGR(\%) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agriculture | Self-employment | 64.2 | 60.1 | $\mathbf{- 1 . 3 1}$ |
|  | Regular wage/salaried employees | 1.2 | 1.0 | -3.58 |
|  | Casual labour | 34.6 | 38.9 | 2.37 |
| Industry | Self-employment | 40.8 | 32.5 | -4.45 |
|  | Regular wage/salaried employees | 22.4 | 21.2 | -1.10 |
|  | Casual labour | 36.8 | 46.2 | 4.65 |
| services | Self-employment | Regular wage/salaried employees | 52.1 | 49.5 |
|  | Casual labour | 40.8 | 42.4 | -1.02 |
|  |  | 7.1 | 8.1 | 0.77 |
|  |  |  |  | 2.67 |

Source: Ibid

Chart no. 14.1: CAGR (\%) of industrial employment by nature of work during 2004-05 to 2009-10


The percentage distribution of industrial employment status wise, during 2004-05 and 2009-10, has been shown in table 14. The table displays that, in the case of agriculture sector, the selfemployment has accounted higher employment (64.2 percent in 2004-05 and 60.1 in 2009-10) that has declined with 13.1 percent per annum. This is followed by casual labour ( 34.6 percent in 2004-05 and 38.9 percent in 2009-10) which has increased by 2.37 percent per annum and regular wage/ salaried employees (1.2 percent in 2004-05 and 1 percent in 2009-10) that have declined by 3.58 percent per annum.

In the field of industry sector, the self-employment has accounted higher share of industry's work force that has declined from 40.8 percent to 32.5 percent by 4.45 percent per annum. Casual labour has accounted a significant increase of 4.46 percent per annum while regular wage/ salaried employees have declined by 1.10 percent per annum. Thus considering agriculture and industry sectors, both self-employed and regular wage/ salaried employees have declined in both sectors while casual labour has increased. This increase is more prominent in industry sector than in agriculture sector. This fall is more apparent in regular wage/ salaried employees than selfemployment in agriculture sector and it's vice versa appeared in industry sector.

In the sphere of services sector, the self-employment has declined from 52.1 percent to 49.5 percent by 1.02percent per annum while regular wage/ salaried employees and casual labour have increased. This increase is more prominent in casual than regular wage/ salaried employees. Thus it is clear that maximum casual workers are engaged in industry sector that has rapidly increased followed by agriculture and services sector which are clearly shown in chart 14.1


[^0]:    Source: Ibid

