

CDE  
September, 2004

***The Poor in the Indian Labour Force  
in the 1990s***

K. SUNDARAM  
Email: [sundaram@econdse.org](mailto:sundaram@econdse.org)  
SURESH D. TENDULKAR  
Email: [suresh@econdse.org](mailto:suresh@econdse.org)  
Delhi School of Economics

**Working Paper No. 128**

**Centre for Development Economics  
Department of Economics, Delhi School of Economics**

## ***The Poor in the Indian Labour Force in the 1990s***

**K. SUNDARAM  
SURESH D. TENDULKAR**

### **Abstract**

Comparable all-India estimates of the number of workers and unemployed in 'below-poverty-line' households – together defining the poor in the Indian labour force – are presented for 1993-94 and 1999-2000. Also presented is the gender, activity-status and the rural-urban composition of this group for the two time points. From a level of 115 million (43 million females and 21 million urban) the number of working poor declined by a little over 12 million – almost entirely in rural India – over the six-year period. Over 51 (36) percent of the rural (urban) working poor were engaged in unskilled manual labour with a further 46 percent (44 percent in urban India) being absorbed by low-productivity self-employment.

**Keywords:** India, Working Poor, Poor in Labour Force

**JEL Classification:** I32, J21

### **Acknowledgements**

This paper is a revised version of Section II of Sundaram and Tendulkar (2002) carried out for the International Labour office, Geneva whose financial support is gratefully acknowledged. The authors would also like to place on record their appreciation of excellent programming support provided by Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Senior Programmer, CDE.

## I. Introduction

The contours of the poor persons in labour force can be explored from two distinct perspectives. In the first perspective, given the poverty line, poor and non-poor **households** are classified by their reported major source of household **earnings** during the previous year. These are 'household types' in the national Sample Survey (NSS) terminology. In the second perspective, **individual members** of poor and non-poor households are classified by their reported labour force activity status based on **major time** spent during the previous year in principal and subsidiary economic activities. The first perspective draws on household types in the NSS of consumer expenditure (CE) and the analysis based on the quinquennial 50<sup>th</sup> (July-June 1993-94) and the 55<sup>th</sup> (July-June 1999-2000) rounds of NSS is presented in Sundaram and Tendulkar (2003(c)).

The present paper presents an analysis based on the second perspective and draws on the NSS of employment and unemployment (EU) for the 50<sup>th</sup> and the 55<sup>th</sup> rounds. We may note that upto and including the 50<sup>th</sup> round of NSS quinquennial surveys canvassed *both* CE *and* EU on the same set of sample households. In the 55<sup>th</sup> round of NSS, CE and EU have been canvassed over two *independent samples* of households from the *identical* universe of Indian rural and urban households. Members of poor (below the poverty line) and non-poor households are classified into one of the following mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories of reported *economic* gainful activity status: (i) self-employed (SE) in agriculture or non-agriculture; (ii) receiving regular wages/salaries (RWS); (iii) working as casual labour (CL) in agriculture or non-agriculture; (iv) seeking and/or available for work or unemployed (UE) and (v) not engaged in any gainful economic activity or out of labour force (OLF). Among the population located in households below the pre-specified poverty line, categories (i) thru (iii) together constitute the **working poor**. The latter i.e. the working poor taken together with the unemployed (UE) in the below-poverty line (or BPL for short) households are defined as the **poor in labour force**.

Focusing on the poor in labour force, this paper analyses the demographic characteristics of the poor households that help us identify the demographic

determinants of poverty (section 2), presents the estimated size of the poor in labour force (section 3) and the changes in their magnitude between 1993-94 and 1999-2000 (section 4). Gender and economic activity status of the rural (section 5) and the urban (section 6) working poor are discussed next followed by their educational characteristics in section 7. Main findings are summarised in the last section.

## 2 Demographic Determinants

Two demographic factors shape the overall worker - (or labour force) population ratios in the poor and the non-poor households and, therefore, also determine the size of the population of the poor in labour force: the child-dependency ratio and the child-woman ratio. Now, the larger the proportion of children (with lower-than-average participation rates) in the population, the lower, *ceteris paribus*, will be the overall (or crude-) work force (and labour force) participation rate.

The child-woman ratio (CWR) or the ratio of the number of children in the 0-4 year age-group to the number of women in the reproductive age-group of 15-49 years, can also be viewed as a factor that constrains the participation in the labour force of women who, typically, have to carry the primary burden of child rearing and for whom, therefore, the demands on their time for child care are often met by reduced participation in labour force. Table 1 provides (lines 1 to 5) the details of the age-sex composition of the population located in poor and the non-poor households in rural and in urban India for 1999-2000. We have at once a striking result. **In both rural and urban India the child-dependency ratios (line 6) are significantly higher - by close to or above thirty percentage points - in the poor relative to the non-poor households. The child-woman ratios (line 7) in the poor households too are higher (relative to those in the non-poor households) by about 28 percentage points. In terms of their effect on Workers-Population-Ratios (WPRs) (Table 2) for males and for persons, the WPRs in poor households are lower - by between 4 and 7 percentage points for males - relative to the WPRs in the non-poor households.** This is a consequence of the much higher child-dependency ratios in the poor households.

In the case of women, however, both in rural and in urban India, on the average, **WPRs of women in the poor households are higher than those in the households above the poverty line**, though only marginally so in rural India. In Urban India, the differentials have narrowed but the WPRs for women in poor households continue to be higher than those in the non-poor households. That this should occur despite the considerably higher child-dependency ratio and the higher child-woman ratio in the poor households would suggest **the presence of a measure of what may be called compelling need-based participation of women in work force where it is their poverty status that, *ceteris paribus*, drives them to greater work participation<sup>1</sup>.**

#### **A related issue.**

In economic environments characterised by lower returns to labour for women relative to those for men - due to nature of industry/occupations in which they are engaged and/or differential returns for the same activity - a larger proportion of women workers to total workers could itself become a factor raising the probability of a household falling below the poverty line. Seen in this perspective it is significant that **the share of women workers to total workers in the poor households is noticeably higher than the corresponding proportion in the non-poor households.** This holds true for both the rural and the urban populations (Table 2, last line) and is so in both the years. In rural India this differential is of the order of 5 percentage points, while in urban India the share of women workers in the work force in poor households is higher by between 8 and 9 percentage points.

---

<sup>1</sup> For an early exploration of the relationship between female labour force participation rates, fertility-burden, average level of living and asset-base, see, Sundaram (1989).

### 3. Estimates of Magnitude of the Poor in Labour Force: 1993-94

We turn now to a presentation and discussion of the estimated magnitudes of the poor in labour force in India<sup>2</sup>.

At the outset, it is important to stress that all our estimates of the size of the work force, in poor households as well as all households, fully reflect the results of the 2001 Population Census in respect of the underlying estimates of population in the four segments - rural males, rural females, urban males and urban females - for the mid-points (January 01) of the survey years (July-June) 1993-94 and 1999-2000.

In Tables 3 (rural) and 4 (urban) we present, the distribution of the total population in all households (the poor and the non-poor) and separately for those located in households below the poverty line - the population of the poor - by gender and gainful activity status. In each Table, Panel A presents the estimates for 1993-94 while the estimates in Panel B relate to 1999-2000.

---

<sup>2</sup> All estimates in this section are based on Unit Record Data pertaining to the Employment-Unemployment Survey (EUS for short) for 1993-94 (the 50<sup>th</sup> Round) and 1999-2000 (the 55<sup>th</sup> Round). Unlike in the 50<sup>th</sup> Round, the 55<sup>th</sup> round EUS was canvassed on an independent sample of households but drawn from the same universe of households as the Consumer Expenditure Survey, with a highly abridged worksheet for recording the household consumer expenditure. In order to identify the poor households in the EUS for studying the size and structure of the working poor – and to do so in manner consistent with the poverty ratios computed from the detailed Consumer Expenditure Survey (CES) – the following two-step procedure has been used. In the first step, from the 55<sup>th</sup> Round CES, the proportion of households below the poverty line is estimated. In the next step, the level of monthly per capita expenditure at which, the same proportion of households (rounded to the nearest integer) that fall below the poverty line as estimated from the CES is computed from a ranking of households on consumer expenditure recorded on the basis of the abridged ‘worksheet in the 55<sup>th</sup> Round Employment-Unemployment Survey. The poverty-line so derived is used to identify the poor households in the Employment-Unemployment Survey to study their labour force characteristics. Now, in the 55<sup>th</sup> Round Consumer Expenditure Survey for 1999-2000, a mixed reference period (of 30-days for food items and of 365-days for expenditure on clothing, footwear, institutional medical expenses and durables) was used to collect details of consumption expenditure of the sample households. On the other hand, the published results of the 50<sup>th</sup> Round Consumer Expenditure (and Employment-Unemployment) Survey for 1993-94 are based on a uniform reference period of 30-days for all items of expenditure. Since the 50<sup>th</sup> Round Survey also canvassed details of consumer expenditure on a 365-days reference for the same set of goods and services for which the 365-day reference period was used in the 55<sup>th</sup> Round Survey and these details are available in the Unit Record Data for the 50<sup>th</sup> Round, one can re-construct a size-distribution of consumer expenditure on the mixed reference period. It is this re-constructed size-distribution that is used to generate estimates of the working poor and the poor in the labour force for 1993-94. So that, the estimates for 1993-94 and 1999-2000 are fully comparable. For a discussion of the issues of comparability of the 50<sup>th</sup> and the 55<sup>th</sup> Round Surveys and comparable estimates of poverty in the general population, see Sundaram and Tendulkar (2003(a), and 2003(b)).

Let us first examine the situation as on 1<sup>st</sup> January 1994.

As per our estimates, in rural India there were close to 225 million people living below the poverty line, more or less evenly split between males and females. A little under 42 percent, or about 94 million people located in the below poverty-line (BPL for short) households, were in the work force, with another 0.7 million being classified as unemployed. So that, **in rural India, the size of the poor in the labour force was estimated to be 94.6 million as on January 1, 1994.**

The corresponding estimates for urban India of the estimated total number of poor persons, the numbers in the work force and in the labour force in poor households are, respectively, 62.0 million; 20.9 million and 21.6 million. The magnitude of the rural-plus-urban poor in the labour force is thus estimated to be 116.2 million. After netting out the unemployed, **our estimate of the number of working poor as on 1<sup>st</sup> January 1994 is 114.8 million** or a little over 30 percent of the total work force.

In terms of gender composition, the share of women in the total (rural + urban) working poor (37.4 percent) is about 4 percentage points higher than their share in the total work force reflecting the fact that **the poverty prevalence rates among women workers are greater than those for male workers in both rural and the urban areas** (with Head Count Ratios (HCRs) of 35.3% and 30.4 percent for females and males in rural India, and 35.0 and 23.1 percent in urban India)<sup>3</sup>. (See Table 9).

Similarly, the workers in rural India are over-represented among the working poor because the share of rural workers in the total (rural plus urban) work force is 78.2 percent while the share of rural working poor, at 81.8 percent, is nearly four percentage points higher. The underlying factor is the same: a higher poverty ratio for rural workers (32.1 percent) relative to their urban counterparts (25.6 percent).

---

<sup>3</sup> See note 2 to Table 9 for a definition of HCR in each labour force or work force category.

#### **4. Changes between 1993-94 and 1999-2000**

Comparable estimates of workers/persons in labour force in below-poverty-line (BPL) households as on January 01, 2000 are presented in Panel B of Table 3 (Rural) and 4 (Urban). **The poor in labour force in rural India numbered a little under 83 million in 1999-2000 – recording a decline of 11.9 million.** With a small increase in the number of the unemployed in the below-poverty-line households (of a little under 0.3 million) the decline in the number of the rural working poor (to 81.8 million) was higher at 12 million over the six year period 1993-94 to 1999-2000.

**In Urban-India too, the number of both the working poor and the poor in labour force recorded a decline - albeit a marginal one.** This marginal decline for urban persons hides a marginal rise (of 0.3 million in the number of working poor and of 0.5 million of poor in the labour force) for urban males that is more than offset by the decline in the number of both the working poor and the poor in labour force among urban females.

**Overall, taking both segments together, there is a decline in the number of the working poor in the country as a whole: from 114.8 million in 1993-94 to 102.3 million in 1999-2000 i.e. by 12.6 million. Also, the share of women workers in the working poor has come down - from 37.4 percent to 35.8 percent - over the same period. The rural share too has come down (from 81.8 to 80.0 percent) between 1<sup>st</sup> January 1994 and 1<sup>st</sup> January 2000<sup>4</sup>.**

#### **5. Rural Working Poor: Gender and Economic Activity Dimensions**

Table 5 presents the estimates for 1993-94 of the rural workers in all households and in poor households classified by gender and economic activity status distinguished in the survey.

---

<sup>4</sup> Since the share of women (and of rural areas) in the total work force has also come down to 31 (76.4) percent over the same period, both women and the rural areas continue to be over-represented among the working poor with higher headcount ratios than the comparator groups.

This information is re-arranged to obtain the composition of the workers (per 1000) in the poor and the non-poor households by gender and broad activity composition. This is presented in Table 6 so as to highlight the contrasts between the two-sets of households.

**This brings out a significant feature of the working poor in rural India: the proportion working in mainly self-employed activities, at 45.5 percent, though lower than the proportion of them working as casual labourers (51.4 percent), was very substantial in 1993-94.**

In contrasting the economic activity composition of the working poor with that of the workers located in non-poor households, two points emerge.

First, the share of the casual labourers in the working poor is substantially higher (by 23 percentage points) than their share in the work force located in non-poor households. Predominantly, this reflects a much greater proportion of the self-employed among the workers located in above poverty line (APL for short) households.

Secondly, the estimated proportion of those reporting regular wage/salaried employment in non-agriculture is significantly higher (by five percentage points) in the non-poor households relative to those in the BPL-households.

Parallel estimates of the number of workers in all households and in poor households and of the per 1000 distribution of the workers in the poor and the non-poor households, by gender and broad activity status in rural India for 1999-2000 are presented in Tables 7 and 8 respectively.

We had noted above an absolute reduction in the number of working poor in rural India of close to 12.0 million between 1993-94 and 1999-2000. When we examine the changes in the number of working poor by activity categories, we have a striking result. **Except women workers self-employed in non-agriculture and male (and total,**

**male plus female) casual labourers – also in non-agricultural activities - all other categories distinguished in this exercise experienced a decline in the number of working poor in rural India.**

The self-employed, as a group, form the major contributor to the reduction in the number of the working poor in rural India. There is a reduction of about 7.4 million in the estimated number of self-employed workers in agriculture who are located in poor households. This reduction is partly facilitated by the reduction in the total number of self-employed workers in agriculture in rural India (from 136.6 million in 1993-94 to 134.0 million in 1999-2000), with the reduction in the head count ratios in the group by 5 percentage points from 32 percent to 27 percent being the key factor. (See Table 9).

The role of the (sharp) decline in head count ratios in reducing the number of the working poor can be seen more clearly in the case of the casual labourers engaged in agriculture. Given the fact that between 1993-94 and 1999-2000 the estimated number of casual labourers in agriculture in rural India *increased* from 87.6 to 94.6 million, if the head count ratio among such workers had remained unchanged at the 1993-94 level of 48.9 percent, the number of such workers in the below-poverty-line (BPL for short) households would have increased by a little under 3.5 million. Instead, thanks to a reduction in the head count ratio among such workers (to 41 percent in 1999-2000), the number of casual labourers in agriculture in BPL households *declined* by a little over 4 million between 1993-94 and 1999-2000. This **significant reduction in head count ratio among casual workers in rural India has been made possible by the strong growth in real wages experienced by casual labourers in rural India.** (See Sundaram (2001(a) and (2001(b)).

In terms of the broad economic activity composition of the working poor, the situation in 1999-2000 (See Table 8) reflects the growing share of casual labourers in the total rural work force. In the total rural workforce, for casual labourers in agriculture and the casual labourers in non-agriculture, this increase was of the order of about 1 percentage point each. This is partially offset by a marginal decline in the share of

casual labourers in Public Works, so that we have an overall increase of a little over 2 percentage points in the share of casual labourers as a group. In the case of the working poor in rural India, the share of casual labourers, as a group, has increased from about 51.4 percent to 54.2 percent (Tables 6 and 8) with a 2 percentage point rise in the share of casual labourers in agriculture among the working poor. This is despite the sizeable reduction in the poverty ratios for this class of workers that we had noted above.

With an unchanged share of workers receiving regular wages/salaries of a little over 3 percent, the rise in the share of casual labourers in the rural working poor is matched by a decline in the share of the self-employed as a group. The broad pattern of change - rise in the share of casual labourers and a fall in the share of the self-employed - noted above for the working poor also holds true for the workers located in above-poverty line (APL for short) households.

The significantly higher share of the regular wage/salaried workers in the non-agricultural sector among the workers in APL households (relative to their share in the working poor) continues to be true in 1999-2000: if any thing, this divergence has increased slightly.

## **6. Urban Working Poor: Gender and Economic Activity Dimensions**

**We turn next to an examination of the activity-composition of the working poor in urban India and the changes therein between 1993-94 and 1999-2000 (See Tables 10, 11, 12, and 13).**

Unlike in rural India, **it is the self-employed**, as a group, (and not casual labourers), **who contributed the largest share of 44 percent to the working poor in urban India in 1999-2000**. These are mostly urban informal sector self-employment activities having very low productivity and absorbing unskilled workers with inadequate physical or human capital endowment. With a share of 36 percent, casual labourers have a distinctly lower share among the working poor. Also, as one would expect in the

urban context, workers in non-agricultural activities, with a 83 percent share, dominate the working poor. (Table 13)

Another significant feature of the activity composition of the working poor in urban India is the fact that regular wage/salaried workers accounted for a little under one-fifth (19.6 percent) of the working poor. However, as in the case of rural India, the share of such workers among the working poor is distinctly smaller (by 26 percentage points) than their share among the workers in non-poor (APL) households.

In terms of changes over the 1990s, as we had noted earlier, the number of the working poor in urban India for both sexes taken together had declined – albeit marginally. In terms of the three broad activity groups (self-employment, regular wage/salaried employment, and casual labour) for both sexes together, there is a slight (1 percentage point) rise in the share of the self-employed offset by a similar decline in the share of the regular wage/salaried employees, with the share of the casual labour households remaining virtually constant. However, the share of women in the working poor, and of these working as casual labourers among them, has declined by a little under 3 percentage points. This decline is compensated by a similar rise in the share of male casual labourers in non-agricultural activities among the working poor in Urban India.

## **7. Working Poor: Educational Characteristics**

Before we conclude this discussion of the working poor in India, we wish to focus on the differences in the educational characteristics of the working poor and the workers in the above-poverty line households. We present in Table 14 a distribution of usual status (principal plus subsidiary) workers located in poor and non-poor households by level of education, gender and rural-urban location for 1993-94. The contrasts by poverty status (given gender and location), by gender (given location and poverty status) and by rural-urban location (given gender and poverty status) are rather striking.

Consider first the poor-non-poor contrast. In rural India, the proportion of illiterate workers in poor households (i.e. among the working poor) is 20 percentage points more than that among the workers in the non-poor households. Further, among the workers in non-poor households, the proportion with education upto and above secondary level of education (24 percent) is much higher - relative to the 10 percent share among the rural working poor.

The above noted contrasts in the education levels of the working poor and of the workers in the non-poor households are even sharper in urban India. Thus, while 48 percent of the working poor are illiterates, the proportion of illiterates among the workers in non-poor households is much lower at 18 percent. Equally, if not more significant is the fact that while the proportion of workers with above secondary level of education is less than 4 percent among the working poor, close to 27 percent of the workers in the non-poor households have this level of education.

The gender contrasts too are rather stark. Among the working poor in rural India, the proportion of illiterates among women workers (at 88 percent) is higher than the corresponding proportion among males by nearly 30 percentage points. Even among the workers in non-poor households in urban India the share of illiterates among women workers is nearly three times as large as the proportion of illiterates among male workers in these households.

Across the rural-urban divide, both for males and females and in both poor and non-poor households, the proportion of illiterate workers is smaller and those with education upto or above secondary level is sharply higher in urban India.

The level of worker's education does matter in conditioning the probability of a household falling below the poverty line. **So that, the redressal of inequalities in workers' education across gender and location is important - not only as a goal by itself but also as a key instrumental variable in reducing poverty.**

## 8. Main Findings

The time criterion used in classifying the labour force status of individual members of the households provides the perspective for analysing the contours of the poor in labour force in this paper. In this perspective, the poor in labour force are defined as those who are located in households below poverty line (BPL) and are classified as workers (defining the working poor) as well as unemployed on the usual (principal and subsidiary) status over the long reference period of 365 days. This enables us to draw sharp contrasts between the labour force characteristics of the poor and non-poor, with reference to demographic characteristics, gender, broad economic activity status and educational characteristics of individual members in the labour force. Levels as well as changes between 1993-04 and 1999-2000 are presented for the rural and urban poor in labour force separately.

Starting with household demographic characteristics (section 2), both the child dependency ratios and the child-woman ratios are higher in the poor households by upwards of 20 percentage points than those in the non-poor households. This holds for both the rural and the urban population (Table 1). Worker population ratios are lower for males but *higher* for females in poor households *despite higher* child-woman ratio and dependency burden (Table 2). This suggests the presence of what may be called a compelling need-based participation in work force where it is their poverty status that, *ceteris paribus* drives them to greater work participation. A further accentuating factor is lower returns to female labour compared to male labour. It is no wonder that the poverty-prevalence rates<sup>5</sup> among rural as well as urban women workers are higher than those for males (Table 9).

The aggregate magnitude of the working poor (section 3) was estimated to be 93.9 million in rural India of whom 36.9 million were females, and 20.9 million in urban India with 6.0 million female as on January 01, 1994. So that, taking both population segments together, the number of working poor totaled 114.8 million forming 30 percent

---

<sup>5</sup> Defined as women workers located in BPL households as a proportion of women workers in all (poor and non-poor) households.

of the total work force. There was a decline in the estimated number of working poor by 12 million in rural India and 0.4 million in urban India between January 01, 1994 and 1<sup>st</sup> January, 2000. The share of women workers among the working poor declined from 37.4 percent to 35.8 percent over the same period (Table 3 and 4).

**There was a decline in the magnitude of rural working poor (Tables 5 and 7) engaged in *all* the broad economic activities with two exceptions of a marginal rise: male (and total, male plus female) casual labourers in non-agriculture and for self-employed female workers in non-agricultural activities (section 5).** The *decline* in the number of working poor agricultural labourers is remarkable in view of the fact that their absolute magnitude in the total rural population *increased* by 7.7 million between 1993-94 and 1999-2000. Their absolute decline among the rural working poor was made possible by a 8 percentage point decline in the headcount ratio in this category (Table 9) which, in turn, was driven by a strong rise in real wage rates of male as well as female casual labourers.

There was a marginal reduction of 0.4 million in the number of urban working poor (Tables 10 and 12) with a reduction of 0.5 million female casual labourers being partially offset by a rise in the number of male casual labourers in urban BPL households. Within the broad category of the self-employed workers we have a reduction of a little under 0.6 million workers (of both gender taken together) engaged in agricultural activities offset by an equivalent rise in the number of such workers in non-agricultural activities. Urban headcount ratios (Table 9) declined for all economic activities and for both males and females with two exceptions: females self-employed in agriculture and, both males and females working as casual labour in public works. Relatively few workers in urban India were engaged as casual labourers in public works. In respect of female workers self-employed in agriculture, with a reduction in the number of such workers (by 0.7 million) between 1<sup>st</sup> January 1994 and 1<sup>st</sup> January 2000, we have a reduction in the number of these workers in poor households despite the rise in the poverty-prevalence rates for them.

In terms of the broad economic activities (section 5) rural (section 6) urban, in 1993-94 only 3 percent of the rural working poor received regular wages/salaries compared to 8 percent for the non-poor (Table 6). The proportion among the urban working poor was higher at 20.7 percent but still less than half of the 45.9 percent among the workers in above poverty line households (Table 11). As high as 51.4 percent of the rural working poor and 35.8 percent of urban working poor were engaged in unskilled manual labour with low returns. The other major economic activity of the working poor was low-productivity self-employment with inadequate endowments of physical and human capital absorbing 45.5 percent of the rural and 43.5 percent of the urban working poor in 1993-94. The economic activity composition showed marginal changes in 1999-2000 for the urban working poor. However, the share of women among the urban working poor and of these working as casual labourers among them *declined* by slightly under 3 percentage points. This is compensated by a similar rise in the share of male casual labourers in non-agriculture. (Table 13). With the low share of regular wage/salary earning workers remaining unchanged for the rural working poor, the only change was a rise in the share of manual workers at the cost of self-employment in 1999-2000 (Table 8).

Educational endowments are known to raise productivity of work force and help reduce poverty. The poor-non-poor contrasts in this dimension (section 7) are very sharp (Table 14). The proportion of illiterate working poor (71 percent, rural and 47.5 percents urban) is 20 to 30 percentage points higher than that among the non-poor workers. Similar contrast emerges at the upper-end of above-secondary educated workers in urban work force. Male-female contrasts are sharper among working poor than among the non-poor workers. The same also holds across the rural-urban divide.

We may note, however, that the improved educational composition of the workforce is only a necessary condition for improving the lot of the working poor. In the absence of adequate employment opportunities that can result only from rapid growth, improvement in the economic conditions of the working poor would not materialise.

## References

Sundaram, K. (1989): "Inter-State Variations in Workforce Participation Rates of Women in India: An Analysis", in A.V. Jose (ed.), Limited Options: Women Workers in India, ILO-ARTEP, New Delhi, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2001(a)): "Employment-Unemployment Situation in Nineties: Some Results from NSS 55<sup>th</sup> Round Survey", Economic and Political Weekly, March 17, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2001(b)): "Employment and Poverty in 1990s: Further Results from NSS 55<sup>th</sup> Round Employment-Unemployment Survey, 1999-2000", Economic and Political Weekly, August 11, 2001.

Sundaram, K. and Suresh D. Tendulkar (2002): "The Working Poor in India: Employment-Poverty Linkages and Employment Policy Options", ILO Issues in Employment and Poverty Discussion Paper 4, ILO, Geneva, September 2002.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2003(a)): "Poverty has Declined in the 1990s: A Resolution of Comparability Problems in NSS Consumer Expenditure Data", Economic and Political Weekly, January 25, 2003.

\_\_\_\_\_ 2003(b): "Poverty in India in the 1990s: Revised Results for All-India and 15 Major States for 1993-94", Economic and Political Weekly, November 15, 2003.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2003(c)): "Poverty among Social and Economic Groups in India in 1990s", Economic and Political Weekly, December 13, 2003.

Table 1: Age-Sex Composition of Population in **Poor & Non-Poor Households** in Rural and Urban Areas: All-India, 1999-2000

(Percent)

	Share in Population			
	Rural		Urban	
	Poor	Non-Poor	Poor	Non-Poor
1. Male Child (0-14)	22.83	17.99	21.58	15.05
2. Girl Child (0-14)	22.80	15.62	21.33	12.99
3. Adult Male (15-64)	24.81	31.11	26.98	35.71
4. Adult Female (15-64)	26.07	30.43	26.57	31.83
5. Old	3.49	4.86	3.53	4.42
6. Child-Dependency Ratio ((1+2) / (3+4)x1000)	897	546	801	415
7. Child Woman Ratio (Per 1000)	685	399	577	291

Table 2: Worker-Population Ratios in **Poor and non-Poor Households** by Gender and Rural-Urban Location: All-India, 1993-94 - 1999-2000

Worker-Population Ratios  
(Per 1000)

	Rural				Urban			
	Poor Household		Non-Poor Households		Poor Household		Non-Poor Households	
	1993-94	1999-2000	1993-94	1999-2000	1993-94	1999-2000	1993-94	1999-2000
Males	503	480	578	550	477	464	536	533
Females	330	297	327	299	196	163	139	131
Persons	417	388	458	430	338	315	352	346
Share of Female Workers in Work Force	393	385	341	334	287	256	183	177

Notes: Worker-Population Ratios are based on the Usual (Principal plus Subsidiary) Status Categorisation

Table 3: Distribution of Population in **All Households and Poor Households** by Gender and Labour Force Category: All-India, Rural: 1993-94 - 1999-2000

Panel A: 1993-94

('000)

Labour Force Category	All Households			Poor Households		
	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
Workers	187,765	104,716	292,481	<b>56,976</b>	<b>36,945</b>	<b>93,921</b>
Unemployed	2,710	831	3,541	550	119	669
Labour Force	190,475	105,547	296,022	57,526	37,064	94,590
Outside Labour Force	149,128	213,875	363,003	55,853	74,796	130,649
Total Population	339,603	319,422	659,025	<b>113,379</b>	<b>111,860</b>	<b>225,239</b>

Panel B: 1999-2000

('000)

Labour Force Category	All Households			Poor Households		
	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
Workers	198,591	105,057	303,648	<b>50,424</b>	<b>31,362</b>	<b>81,786</b>
Unemployed	3,571	1,112	4,693	844	107	951
Labour Force	202,162	106,179	308,341	51,268	31,469	82,737
Outside Labour Force	171,926	247,344	419,270	53,718	74,533	128,251
Total Population	374,088	353,523	727,611	<b>104,986</b>	<b>106,002</b>	<b>210,988</b>

Table 4: Distribution of Population in **All Households and Poor Households** by Gender and Labour Force Category: All-India, Urban: 1993-94 - 1999-2000

Panel A: 1993-94

('000)

Labour Force Category	All Households			Poor Households		
	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
Workers	64,592	17,166	81,758	<b>14,918</b>	<b>6,008</b>	<b>20,926</b>
Unemployed	2,726	1,144	3,870	<b>562</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>723</b>
Labour Force	67,318	18,310	85,628	<b>15,480</b>	<b>6,169</b>	<b>21,649</b>
Outside Labour Force	56,634	92,717	149,353	<b>15,819</b>	<b>24,485</b>	<b>40,304</b>
Total Population	123,954	111,027	234,981	<b>31,299</b>	<b>30,654</b>	<b>61,953</b>

Panel B: 1999-2000

('000)

Labour Force Category	All Households			Poor Households		
	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
Workers	75,406	18,192	93,598	<b>15,251</b>	<b>5,243</b>	<b>20,494</b>
Unemployed	3,636	1,096	4,732	<b>738</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>854</b>
Labour Force	79,042	19,288	98,330	<b>15,989</b>	<b>5,359</b>	<b>21,348</b>
Outside Labour Force	66,483	111,662	178,145	<b>16,841</b>	<b>26,838</b>	<b>43,679</b>
Total Population	145,525	130,950	276,475	<b>32,830</b>	<b>32,197</b>	<b>65,027</b>

Table 5: Distribution of Workers in **All Households and Poor Households** by Gender and Economic Activity Status: All-India, Rural: 1993-94

Distribution of Workers by Activity  
(’000)

Activity	All Households			Poor Households		
	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
Self-Employed in Agriculture	83,927	52,665	136,592	20,614	13,800	34,414
Self-Employed in Non-Agriculture	24,174	8,793	32,967	5,803	2,500	8,303
<b>Self-Employed Total</b>	<b>108,101</b>	<b>61,458</b>	<b>169,559</b>	<b>26,417</b>	<b>16,300</b>	<b>42,717</b>
Regular Wage/Salaried: Agriculture	2,492	491	3,983	889	154	1,043
Regular Wage/Salaried: Non-Agriculture	13,584	2,311	15,895	1,431	426	1,857
<b>Regular Wage/Salaried: Total</b>	<b>16,076</b>	<b>2,802</b>	<b>18,878</b>	<b>2,320</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>2,900</b>
Casual Labour: Public Works	620	372	992	316	209	525
Casual Labour: Agriculture	51,109	36,508	87,617	24,296	18,572	42,868
Casual Labour: Non-Agriculture	11,860	3,575	15,435	3,629	1,283	4,912
<b>Casual Labour: Total</b>	<b>63,589</b>	<b>40,455</b>	<b>104,044</b>	<b>28,241</b>	<b>20,064</b>	<b>48,305</b>
<b>Total Work Force</b>	<b>187,765</b>	<b>104,716</b>	<b>292,481</b>	<b>56,976</b>	<b>36,945</b>	<b>93,921</b>

Table 6: Per 1000 Distribution of Workers in **Poor and Non-Poor Households** by Gender and Economic Activity Status: All India, Rural 1993-94

Activity	Poor Households			Non-Poor Households		
	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
Self-Employed in Agriculture	219	147	366	319	196	515
Self-Employed in Non-Agriculture	62	27	88	93	32	124
<b>Self-Employed Total</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>639</b>
Regular Wage/Salaried: Agriculture	9	2	11	8	2	10
Regular Wage/Salaried: Non-Agriculture	15	5	20	61	9	71
<b>Regular Wage/Salaried: Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>80</b>
Casual Labour: Public Works	3	2	6	2	0.8	2
Casual Labour: Agriculture	259	198	456	135	90	225
Casual Labour: Non-Agriculture	39	14	52	41	12	53
<b>Casual Labour: Total</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>514</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>281</b>
All Activities	607	393	1000	659	341	1000
<b>Total Work Force (000)</b>	<b>56,976</b>	<b>36,945</b>	<b>93,921</b>	<b>130,789</b>	<b>67,771</b>	<b>198,560</b>

Table 7: Distribution of Workers in **All Households and Poor Households** by Gender and Activity Status: All India, Rural 1999-2000

('000)

Activity	All Households			Poor Households		
	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
Self-Employed in Agriculture	82,825	50,473	133,298	16,179	10,765	26,944
Self-Employed in Non-Agriculture	25,755	9,040	34,795	5,403	2,542	7,945
<b>Self-Employed Total</b>	<b>108,580</b>	<b>59,513</b>	<b>168,093</b>	<b>21,582</b>	<b>13,307</b>	<b>34,889</b>
Regular Wage/Salaried: Agriculture	2,485	694	3,179	730	213	943
Regular Wage/Salaried: Non-Agriculture	15,145	2,658	17,803	1,318	337	1,655
<b>Regular Wage/Salaried: Total</b>	<b>17,630</b>	<b>3,352</b>	<b>20,982</b>	<b>2,048</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>2,598</b>
Casual Labour: Public Works	450	188	638	143	83	226
Casual Labour: Agriculture	56,352	38,931	95,283	22,678	16,371	39,049
Casual Labour: Non-Agriculture	15,579	3,073	18,652	3,973	1,051	5,024
<b>Casual Labour: Total</b>	<b>72,381</b>	<b>42,192</b>	<b>114,573</b>	<b>26,794</b>	<b>17,505</b>	<b>44,299</b>
<b>Total Work Force</b>	<b>198,591</b>	<b>105,057</b>	<b>303,648</b>	<b>50,424</b>	<b>31,362</b>	<b>81,786</b>

Table 8: Per 1000 Distribution of Workers in **Poor and Non-Poor Households** by Gender and Activity Status: All India, Rural 1999-2000

Activity	Poor Households			Non-Poor Households		
	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
Self-Employed in Agriculture	198	132	329	300	179	479
Self-Employed in Non-Agriculture	66	31	97	92	29	121
<b>Self-Employed Total</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>427</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>600</b>
Regular Wage/Salaried: Agriculture	9	3	12	8	2	10
Regular Wage/Salaried: Non-Agriculture	16	4	20	62	11	73
<b>Regular Wage/Salaried: Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>83</b>
Casual Labour: Public Works	2	1	3	1.4	0.5	2
Casual Labour: Agriculture	277	200	477	152	102	253
Casual Labour: Non-Agriculture	49	13	61	52	9	61
<b>Casual Labour: Total</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>542</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>317</b>
<b>All Activities</b>	<b>617</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>332</b>	<b>1000</b>
<b>Work Force (000)</b>	<b>50,424</b>	<b>31,362</b>	<b>81,786</b>	<b>148,167</b>	<b>73,695</b>	<b>221,862</b>

Table 9: Proportion of Persons by Labour Force Category and of Workers by Activity Status located in Households below the Poverty Line by Gender, and Rural-Urban Location: All-India, 1993-94 - 1999-2000

Panel A: Rural  
Head Count Ratio  
(Percent)

	1993-94			1999-2000		
	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
I. Persons by LF Category						
<b>Workers</b>	<b>30.35</b>	<b>35.28</b>	<b>32.11</b>	<b>25.39</b>	<b>29.85</b>	<b>26.93</b>
Unemployed	20.29	14.27	18.89	23.63	9.54	20.26
Labour Force	30.20	35.12	31.95	25.36	29.64	26.83
<b>Total Population</b>	<b>33.39</b>	<b>35.02</b>	<b>34.18</b>	<b>28.06</b>	<b>29.98</b>	<b>29.00</b>
II. Workers by Activity Status						
S.E. Ag	24.56	26.20	25.19	19.53	21.33	20.21
S.E. Non-Ag	24.01	28.43	25.19	20.98	28.12	22.83
<b>S.E. Total</b>	<b>24.44</b>	<b>26.52</b>	<b>25.19</b>	<b>19.88</b>	<b>22.36</b>	<b>20.76</b>
RWS Ag	35.66	31.44	34.96	29.38	30.69	29.66
RWS Non Ag	10.53	18.43	11.68	8.70	12.68	9.30
<b>RWS Total</b>	<b>14.43</b>	<b>20.71</b>	<b>15.36</b>	<b>11.62</b>	<b>16.41</b>	<b>12.38</b>
CL Public Works	50.95	56.06	52.92	31.78	44.15	35.42
CL Ag	47.54	50.87	48.93	40.24	42.05	40.98
CL Non Ag	30.60	35.89	31.82	25.50	34.20	26.94
<b>CL Total</b>	<b>44.41</b>	<b>49.59</b>	<b>46.43</b>	<b>37.02</b>	<b>41.49</b>	<b>38.66</b>
<b>Total WF</b>	<b>30.55</b>	<b>35.28</b>	<b>32.11</b>	<b>25.39</b>	<b>29.85</b>	<b>26.93</b>

Panel B: Urban  
Head Count Ratio  
(Percent)

	1993-94			1999-2000		
	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
I. Persons by LF Category Status						
<b>Workers</b>	<b>23.10</b>	<b>35.00</b>	<b>25.60</b>	<b>20.23</b>	<b>28.82</b>	<b>21.90</b>
Unemployed	20.62	14.07	18.68	20.30	10.58	18.05
Labour Force	23.00	33.69	25.28	20.23	27.78	21.71
<b>Total Population</b>	<b>25.25</b>	<b>27.61</b>	<b>26.37</b>	<b>22.56</b>	<b>24.59</b>	<b>23.52</b>
II. Workers by Activity						
S.E. Ag	33.65	33.22	33.47	27.42	34.19	29.88
S.E. Non-Ag	22.67	34.60	24.85	20.26	30.47	22.16
<b>S.E. Total</b>	<b>24.08</b>	<b>34.16</b>	<b>26.33</b>	<b>20.95</b>	<b>31.25</b>	<b>23.09</b>
RWS Ag	33.33	35.71	33.64	23.15	17.28	21.98
RWS Non Ag	12.54	16.90	13.22	10.42	11.88	10.66
<b>RWS Total</b>	<b>12.76</b>	<b>17.06</b>	<b>13.43</b>	<b>10.55</b>	<b>11.95</b>	<b>10.78</b>
CL Public Works	37.04	40.00	37.40	41.87	47.83	42.11
CL Ag	67.10	70.62	68.72	59.66	57.88	58.83
CL Non Ag	42.77	47.59	43.95	39.00	44.52	39.98
<b>CL Total</b>	<b>47.40</b>	<b>56.52</b>	<b>50.13</b>	<b>40.80</b>	<b>49.80</b>	<b>43.72</b>
<b>Total WF</b>	<b>23.10</b>	<b>35.00</b>	<b>25.60</b>	<b>20.23</b>	<b>28.82</b>	<b>21.90</b>

Notes: 1. Abbreviations: LF: Labour Force; S.E.: Self-employed; Ag: Agriculture; RWS: Regular and Wage and Salary; CL: Casual Labour

2. Headcount ratio in each LF economic activity status category is defined by the number in a given category that is located in below poverty line households as a proportion of the total number in that category located in all (poor-plus-non-poor) households.

Table 10: Distribution of Workers in All Households and Poor Households by Gender and Activity  
 Status: All India, Urban 1993-1994

Distribution of Workers by Broad Activities  
 ('000)

Activity	All Households			Poor Households		
	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
Self-Employed in Agriculture	3453	2456	5909	1162	816	1978
Self-Employed in Non-Agriculture	23,423	5237	28,660	5311	1812	7123
<b>Self-Employed Total</b>	<b>26,876</b>	<b>7693</b>	<b>34,569</b>	<b>6473</b>	<b>2628</b>	<b>9101</b>
Regular Wage/Salaried: Agriculture	288	42	330	96	15	111
Regular Wage/Salaried: Non-Agriculture	26,945	4959	31,904	3380	838	4218
<b>Regular Wage/Salaried: Total</b>	<b>27,233</b>	<b>5001</b>	<b>32,234</b>	<b>3476</b>	<b>853</b>	<b>4329</b>
Casual Labour: Public Works	108	15	123	40	6	46
Casual Labour: Agriculture	2021	1739	3760	1356	1228	2584
Casual Labour: Non-Agriculture	8354	2719	11,073	3573	1294	4867
<b>Casual Labour: Total</b>	<b>10,483</b>	<b>4473</b>	<b>14,956</b>	<b>4969</b>	<b>2528</b>	<b>7497</b>
<b>Total Work Force</b>	<b>64,592</b>	<b>17,167</b>	<b>81,759</b>	<b>14,918</b>	<b>6009</b>	<b>20,927</b>

Table 11: Per 1000 Distribution of Workers in Poor and Non-Poor Households by Gender and Activity Status: All India, Urban 1993-1994

Distribution of Workers by Broad Activities

Activity	Poor Households			Non-Poor Households		
	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
Self-Employed in Agriculture	56	39	95	38	27	65
Self-Employed in Non-Agriculture	254	87	340	298	56	354
<b>Self-Employed Total</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>419</b>
Regular Wage/Salaried: Agriculture	5	0.7	5	3	0.4	4
Regular Wage/Salaried: Non-Agriculture	162	40	202	387	68	455
<b>Regular Wage/Salaried: Total</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>459</b>
Casual Labour: Public Works	2	0.3	2	1	0.15	1
Casual Labour: Agriculture	65	59	123	11	8	19
Casual Labour: Non-Agriculture	171	62	233	79	23	102
<b>Casual Labour: Total</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>123</b>
All Activities	713	287	1000	817	183	1000
<b>Total Work Force (000)</b>	<b>14,918</b>	<b>6009</b>	<b>20,927</b>	<b>49,674</b>	<b>11,158</b>	<b>60,832</b>

Table 12: Distribution of Workers in all Households and Poor Households by Gender and Activity  
Status: All India, Urban 1999-2000

Distribution of Workers by Broad Activities  
(‘000)

Activity	All Households			Poor Households		
	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
Self-Employed in Agriculture	3005	1717	4772	824	587	1411
Self-Employed in Non-Agriculture	28,126	6440	34,566	5698	1962	7660
<b>Self-Employed Total</b>	<b>31,131</b>	<b>8157</b>	<b>39,288</b>	<b>6522</b>	<b>2549</b>	<b>9071</b>
Regular Wage/Salaried: Agriculture	324	81	405	75	14	89
Regular Wage/Salaried: Non-Agriculture	30,993	6003	36,996	3229	713	3942
<b>Regular Wage/Salaried: Total</b>	<b>31,317</b>	<b>6084</b>	<b>37,401</b>	<b>3304</b>	<b>727</b>	<b>4031</b>
Casual Labour: Public Works	201	46	247	82	22	104
Casual Labour: Agriculture	1780	1548	3328	1062	896	1958
Casual Labour: Non-Agriculture	10,977	2356	13,333	4281	1049	5330
<b>Casual Labour: Total</b>	<b>12,958</b>	<b>3950</b>	<b>16,908</b>	<b>5425</b>	<b>1967</b>	<b>7392</b>
<b>Total Work Force</b>	<b>75,406</b>	<b>18,192</b>	<b>93,598</b>	<b>15,251</b>	<b>5243</b>	<b>20,494</b>

Table 13: Per 1000 Distribution of Workers in Poor and Non-Poor Households by Gender and Activity Status: All India, Urban 1999-2000

Per 1000 Distribution of Workers by Broad Activities  
(‘000)

Activity	Poor Households			Non-Poor Households		
	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
Self-Employed in Agriculture	40	29	69	30	15	45
Self-Employed in Non-Agriculture	278	96	373	307	61	368
<b>Self-Employed Total</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>443</b>	<b>337</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>413</b>
Regular Wage/Salaried: Agriculture	3	0.7	4	3	1	4
Regular Wage/Salaried: Non-Agriculture	158	35	192	380	72	452
<b>Regular Wage/Salaried: Total</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>456</b>
Casual Labour: Public Works	4	1	5	1.6	0.3	2
Casual Labour: Agriculture	51	44	95	10	9	19
Casual Labour: Non-Agriculture	209	51	260	92	18	109
<b>Casual Labour: Total</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>130</b>
All Activities	744	256	1000	823	177	1000
<b>Work Force (000)</b>	<b>15,251</b>	<b>5243</b>	<b>20,494</b>	<b>60,155</b>	<b>12,949</b>	<b>73,104+</b>

Table 14: Percentage Distribution of Usual (Principal plus Subsidiary) Status Workers in Poor and Non-Poor Households by Level of Education, by Gender and Rural-Urban Location, All-India, 1993-94

Panel A: Rural India

Level of Education	Poor Households			Non-Poor Households		
	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
Illiterate	59.74	87.82	70.81	37.38	72.96	49.55
Literate upto Primary	25.87	9.54	19.43	30.94	17.60	26.38
Upto Secondary	12.38	2.46	8.47	24.33	8.07	18.77
Above Secondary	2.01	0.19	1.29	7.36	1.36	5.31

Panel B: Urban India

Level of Education	Poor Households			Non-Poor Households		
	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
Illiterate	37.88	71.16	47.50	13.04	37.27	17.52
Literate upto Primary	33.96	19.99	29.92	23.81	20.73	23.24
Upto Secondary	23.45	7.35	18.79	35.10	20.13	32.33
Above Secondary	4.72	1.51	3.79	28.05	21.87	26.91

\* Complete list of working papers is available at the CDE website:  
<http://www.cdedse.org/worklist.pdf>