## 1. INTRODUCTION

The National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO) has recently released the report containing key results of the NSS 55th Round Employment-Unemployment Survey covering the period July 1999 thru June 2000[1]. Being canvassed over a separate set of households, the results of the Employment-Unemployment Survey are also free of the controversies surrounding the NSS 55th Round Consumer Expenditure Survey[2]. They therefore provide an opportunity to review the changes in the size and structure of the work force and in the unemployment situation in the country in the 1990s through a comparative analysis of the results of the large-scale quinquennial surveys for 1993-94 and 1999-2000. The analysis will be primarily at the all-India level. But, at this level of aggregation, we will consider separately the four segments differentiated by gender and rural-urban location: rural males; rural females; urban males; and, urban females. We will examine the changes in the size of the work force and the underlying work force participation rates, the industrial distribution of this work force, the changes in labour productivity and, the changes in the extent of unemployment and underemployment in the country. Finally, we examine the changes in the average number of days worked by a worker on the usual status and the changes, in real terms, in the daily average wage earnings of casual wage labourers and in the average yearly "wage earnings" per capita.

## 2. SIZE OF THE WORK FORCE

For the country as a whole we have in the **Population Projections for India and States 1996-2016** of Registrar General of India (GOI, 1996), population estimates for 1st March of 1999 and 2000 separately for the four segments. By interpolation, we obtain estimates of population as on lst January 2000 - the mid-point of the Survey Year 1999-2000 - separately for rural males, rural females, urban males and urban females[3].

[1] NSSO, GOI, Report No. 455 (55/10) Employment and Unemployment in India 1999-2000 Key Results, NSS 55th Round July 1999-June 2000, December 2000. (Hereafter, referred to as NSS Employment Report).

[2] It needs to be stressed that the canvassing of the Consumer Expenditure and the Employment-Unemployment Surveys over different sets of households in the 55th Round Survey has not resulted in any dimunition of the number of persons surveyed in this Round relative to the 50th Round when both schedules were canvassed over the same set of households. If anything, the number of persons surveyed now is higher. Thus, at the all-India level, the number of persons surveyed in 1999-2000 was 509, 779 in rural India and 309,234 in Urban India, compared to, 356,351 and 208,389 in the two locations respectively in 1993-94.

[3] Using the implicit exponential growth rate, the total all-India population is interpolated. The overall urban share is similarly projected and the rural population is obtained as a residual. The share of males within each

Applying to these population estimates the segment-specific (crude) worker-population ratios (WPRs for short) as per the NSS 55th Round Survey, the estimates of work force as on 1.1.2000 by gender and rural-urban location are obtained. The WPRs and therefore also the work force estimates are those based on "Usual activity category taking also into consideration the subsidiary economic status of persons categorised 'not working'" or the Usual Status (PS+SS) categorisation for short.

Table 1 presents the estimates of population and work force as on lst January 2000 by rural-urban location and by gender along with corresponding estimates for lst January 1994 drawn from Visaria (1998) with WPRs drawn from the NSS 50th Round Employment-Unemployment Survey (July 1993-June 1994). Also presented in this table are the underlying (crude) worker-population ratios drawn from the two quinquennial surveys.

**A striking result is the near-stagnation in the number of female workers in the country as a whole and an absolute reduction in the number of women workers in rural India. This reduction in the number of women workers in rural India, by a little over 1.3 million is just about offset by a rise in the number of urban women workers (1.4 million)[4].**

The above is a consequence of a sharp reduction in the WPRs between 1993-94 and 1999-2000 for both rural and urban women. This decline in WPRs is, however, not confined to women. It is in fact present in each and all the 4 population-segments. This has the implication that, in every segment, the rate of growth of work force over the six-year period will be lower than the rate of growth of population over the same period. Thus, in the country as a whole, while the population is projected to have grown at a little over 1.75 percent per annum (pcpa) between 1994 and 2000, over the same period, the total (rural plus

location is separately interpolated and used to derive population estimates of rural males and urban males. The estimates for rural females and urban females are derived residually.

[4] Two notes of caution are in order in respect of this and all other results on the size of the work force - whether in the aggregate or in any given Industry division - in 1999-2000.

First, all estimates of work force size are conditional on the underlying population estimates in the four population segments which have been taken from the projections put out by the Registrar General of India in 1996. The results of the on-going Population Census could yield different sets of estimates for India's population as on 1st January, 2000.

Second, estimates of total work force in the four segments have been derived by using the crude worker-population ratios as revealed by the 55th Round Employment Survey. Since these WPRs are weighted averages of age-specific WPRs weighted by share of each age-group in the total population in a segment as

urban and males plus females) work force would have grown by just 0.81 pcpa. As already noted, the estimates for female workers as on 1.1.2000 imply virtually no growth in the aggregate and negative growth for women workers in rural India. Even in urban India, the rate of growth of women workers, at 1.30 pcpa is much lower than the rate of growth of the population of women in urban India which is projected to have grown at 3.05 pcpa.

Three points need to be noted in connection with the decline in the (crude) worker-population ratios noted above.

First, the declines in WPRs are not offset by any significant rise in the ratio of unemployed in the population on the Usual Status (PS+SS) categorisation. For rural females this ratio is unchanged at 3 per 1000, while for urban females there is a marginal decline from 10 per 1000 in 1993-94 to 8 per 1000 in 1999-2000. The increase in this ratio for rural males (from 8 per 1000 to 9 per 1000) and for urban males (from 22 to 24 per 1000) are also marginal. So that, crude labour force participation rates (WPRs) would also show a decline between 1993-94 and 1999-2000 in all the four population segments.

**Second, in each of the four segments, age-specific WPRs have declined between 1993-94 and 1999-2000 in each and every single age-group** (five-year age-groups between 5 and 59 years and the open-ended interval '60 years and above') distinguished in the NSS Report. (See Table 2). So that the observed decline in crude worker-population ratios is **not** due merely to shifts in the age-structure of the population.

Third, **to a significant extent, the reduction in worker-population ratios reflects a beneficial rise in the student-population ratios** - not only in the 5-9 and the 10-14 age-groups covering the primary and middle-school system but also in the 15-19 and the 20-24 age-groups indicating a rising participation in secondary and higher-level education[5]. These gains have been particularly impressive for rural girls below 20 years of age (See Table 3).

---

revealed by the survey, we are in effect assuming the survey-based age-distribution to be correct. This assumption too may be shown up as inappropriate by the results of the 2001 Population Census.

[5] Using the age-distribution as given in the Survey Report, for 1993-94 and 1999-2000, it can be shown that the decline in the WPRs in the 5-24 age-group accounted for the bulk of the decline in the overall WPR in three of the four population segments - with urban females as an exception. In the case of urban males, the decline in the WPRs in the 5-9, 10-14, 15-19 and the 20-24 age-groups, weighted by their respective population shares, more

In relation to the last noted point, however, two caveats are in order.

First, in the case of rural women in the 20-24 age-group, the decline in WPR (from 456 per 1000 in 1993-94 to 409 per 1000 in 1999-2000) is much greater than the 10 point rise in the corresponding student-population ratio from 19 to 29 per 1000. This is also the case for rural males in the three age-groups 10-14, 15-19, and 20-24, for urban males in the 10-14 and the 15-19 age-groups, and, to a lesser extent, in the 20-24 age-group as well.

Second, as noted earlier, the decline in the age-specific WPRs extends to all age-groups in all the four population segments. And, in age-groups 25 years and above, there are no offsetting beneficial rise in the student-population ratios. These declines in the 25 and above age-group accounted for over 40 percent of the decline in the crude WPR for rural women and for over 59 percent of the decline in overall WPR for urban women. However, at least for rural Women, WPRs on the Usual Principal status in the 25 and above age group (except 50-54) are higher in 1999-2000. So that, at least in their case the declines in the WPRs (on the principal Plus Subsidiary Status) in these groups is due to entirely to declines in WPrs on the Subsidiary Status. But, sizeable declines in the principal status WPRs in the 50-54, 55-59 and 60+ age groups for males in both rural and urban India remain an unresolved puzzle.

Our state-level review of changes in worker-population ratios between 1993-94 and 1999-2000, not reported here, shows that, in all the four segments the decline in WPRs has been widespread across states and, even though the declines have been quite sharp in a few states, the decline in WPRs observed at the all-India is not due to a sharp but concentrated decline in a few states.

## 3. INDUSTRIAL DISTRIBUTION OF WORK FORCE

The 55$^{th}$ Round report presents the industrial distribution of the work force separately for the four population segments but only at the 1-digit detail. For compactness, we have aggregated across gender for the rural and the urban locations and across rural-urban location

---

than offsets the increase in the contribution of the population aged 25 and above to the overall WPR in 1999-2000 relative to 1993-94).

for estimates for gender. Table 4 presents comparable estimates for 1993-94 drawn from Sundaram (2001).

In interpreting the changes in industrial distribution during the 1990s the changes in the rural-urban and the male-female composition of the work force need to be kept in view. The share of rural areas in the work force has eroded by a little over 2 percentage points from a level of 78 percent in 1993-94. The share of women workers in the work force has also fallen from 22.5 percent in 1993-94 to 21 percent in 1999-2000.

Both the above noted changes in the composition of the work force would tend to reduce the share of the agricultural and allied activities in the total work force even in the absence of any decline in the share of this sector in the individual segments. Thus, even with the 1993-94 shares, the 1999-2000 structure of work force would have reduced the share of Industry Division 0 (Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries) from 639 per 1000 to 623 per 1000. In actual fact, however, the share of this sector in the workforce has fallen in each and all of the four population segments. Consequently, in the total (rural plus urban and males plus females) work force, **the share of the Agriculture and allied activities sector records a significant decline of over 4 percentage points from 639 per 1000 in 1993-94 to 598 per 1000 in 1999-2000. This reduction in the share of the agriculture sector in the work force is in fact sharp enough to reduce marginally the absolute number of workers in agriculture for the first time since Independence: from 239 million in 1993-94 to under 236 million in 1999-2000.**

The Mining and Quarrying sector too suffers a reduction, albeit small, in the absolute number of workers. So that, over the period 1993-94 to 1999-2000, the work force in the Primary Sector is reduced by over 4 million.

Minor erosion in the share as well as the size of the work force is also suffered by the Electricity, Gas and Water supply sector where the number of workers is lower by a little over 350,000.

Another striking change in the industrial distribution of the work force is the reduction in the share and size of the work force in Industry Division 9 - Community, Social and Personal Services, including repair services. From a share of a little under 10 percent of

the work force with over 36 million workers in 1993-94, this sector now employs about 33 million workers and has a 8.4 percent share in the total work force in 1999-2000. In terms of gender, the share of this sector in female work force has gone up marginally.

The Manufacturing sector (excluding repair services) records a minor rise in its share in the aggregate work force - from 107 per 1000 to 111 per 1000 - between 1993-94 and 1999-2000. This is despite a 1 percentage point reduction in its share in the urban work force and is largely due to a rise in the urban share in the total work force. In the absence of such a shift the share of the Manufacturing sector would have remained virtually stagnant. In the aggregate, the number of workers in this sector has increased by 3.7 million over the 1990s.

Two sectors, Construction, and Trade, Hotels and Restaurants have increased their respective shares in the work force in each and all of the four population segments while two other sectors - Transport, Storage and Communication, and Finance, Insurance, Real Estate and Business Services - do so in three segments with unchanged shares in the rural female work force.

In the aggregate the biggest gainer in the share of work force has been the Trade, Hotels and Restaurant sector - from 7.6 percent in 1993-94 to 10.4 percent in 1999-2000. This sector has now emerged as the third largest in terms of work force - behind the Agriculture and the Manufacturing sectors. The size of work force in this sector has grown from 28.5 million to a little under 41 million over the period 1993-94 to 1999-2000 i.e. at a compound rate of 6.2 percent per annum.

In terms of gains in share of the work force, Construction sector is second only to the Trade, Hotels and Restaurant sector, with gains in all the four segments and a 12 (per 1000) point gain in the aggregate. Aggregate employment in this sector too has grown at 6.2 percent per annum in the period between the two surveys - from a little over 12 million in 1993-94 to 17.4 million in 1999-2000.

The Transport, Storage and Communications sector has raised its share from 29 to 37 per 1000 in the aggregate, though its share in female work force has remained virtually unchanged. In the rural areas, its share has increased by 50 percent - from 14 per 1000 to 21 per 1000, while the increase in its share in the urban work force is a more modest 10 percent

(from 79 per 1000 to 87 per 1000). In the aggregate, this sector has absorbed about 20 percent of the incremental work force.

The financial and business services sector, with a work force of little under 5 million - about 89 percent of them males - now has a larger share in the aggregate work force than the Mining and Quarrying and the Elctricity, Gas and Water Supply sectors taken together. This sector has added over 1.3 million people to its work force, which, on a base of 3.6 million, implies an employment growth at the rate of a little under 5.3 percent per annum.

## 4. GROWTH IN LABOUR PRODUCTIVITY

The just released quick estimates of GDP for 1999-2000 make it possible to assess the changes between 1993-94 and 1999-2000 in gross value added per (usual status) worker at constant 1993-94 prices by broad Industry-division. The estimates of the number of workers, gross value added (GVA) at 1993-94 prices and of GVA per worker as a measure of average productivity per worker for 1993-94 and 1999-2000, by Industry Division at 1-digit detail are presented in Table 5.

Before proceeding with the analysis, the following points may be noted:

Let us begin by noting that in implementing our measure of labour productivity namely, Gross Value-Added (GVA) per worker, we are dividing the total GVA in a given Industry-division by the number of workers reporting that industry as their principal (or subsidiary) economic activity on the majority time criterion. In doing so, we are implicitly assuming that the labour-time of each such worker is spent only in that industry and that the labour time of only those workers are utilized in that industry.

Staying within the Usual Status categorization, in respect of workers on the Subsidiary status, the assumption that their labour time is spent almost entirely in the Industry/occupation category assigned to them on the basis of time criterion would appear to be reasonable.

In the case of Usual Principal Status workers, the assignment of a worker to an Industry/Occupation category is done by reference to the activity in which they have spent

relatively larger time during the reference year. It is possible that at least some of them would be engaged in more than one economic activity. In fact, in 1993-94 the proportion of Usual Principal status workers reporting participating in another subsidiary economic activity was about 34 percent in rural areas and a little over 6 percent in urban areas. Also, both in principle and in practice, workers in Agriculture on the principal status could be engaged in non-agricultural work on the subsidiary status, while principal status workers in non-agriculture could be engaged in agricultural work on the subsidiary status[6].

Focusing on the rural segment where we have a sizeable proportion of principal status workers reporting participation in another subsidiary economic activity, it is seen that, while the participation in non-agricultural activities of principal status workers in agriculture was quite marginal (about 6 percent for rural males and 3 percent for rural females), 31 percent (21 percent) of rural male (rural female) principal status workers in non-agriculture were engaged in agriculture as an additional subsidiary economic activity.

While the above would suggest the need for caution in interpreting the estimates of GVA-per worker in a given Industry division as a strict measure of labour productivity in that Industry, there is no practical way of adjusting the estimate of workers in the different Industry divisions to reflect such cross-participation[7].

Second, since there is virtually no employment corresponding to gross value-added in the form of rentals from ownerships of dwellings, the same is omitted from the GDP-estimates for Industry Division 8 : Financing, Insurance, Real Estate and Business Services, and from aggregate GDP.

Third, since in our work force estimates workers engaged in Repair Services (Industry Group 97) are clubbed with the corresponding 1-digit Division 9 - Community, Social and Personal Services - while estimates of GVA in repair services are now merged with the estimates of GDP originating in Manufacturing (Industry Divisions 2+3), the GVA from repair services are deducted from the estimates for Manufacturing and merged with the GVA-

[6] The available tabulation permits only this broad, Agriculture/Non-Agriculture classification by Industry in respect of subsidiary economic activity of those similarly clasified on the Usual Principal Status.

[7] An alternative approach would be to generate an industrial distribution of employed person-days on the basis of the current daily status and derive estimates of GVA per person-day of employment for different industry-

estimates for Industry Division 9. So that the work force and the GVA estimates are consistent with one another.

Finally, in respect of the capital intensive infrastructure sectors, the low-level of context: employment, and the correspondingly high level of GVA per worker, must be seen in context: their role in employment generation in the economy is indirect by supporting the growth of other sectors of the economy.

We may now turn to an analysis of our estimates of GVA per worker presented in *Table 5.*

**Taking the economy as a whole, the GVA per worker has grown, in real terms, from Rs.19,708 to Rs.28,120 i.e. at a compound annual rate of over 6 percent per annum.**

In the agriculture (and allied activities) sector, which still employs 60 percent of the work force or a little over 235 million, the GVA per worker has grown at a little over 3.3 percent per annum from Rs.10,120 to Rs.12,323 at constant 1993-94 prices.

Apart from agriculture, the three largest employing sectors are Manufacturing (44 million), Trade, Hotels and Restaurants (41 million) and Community, Social and Personal Services (33 million). In these three sectors, average labour productivity measured by GVA per worker has grown at an annual compound rate of 6.1; 2.8; and 10.1 percent respectively.

Among the only two other sectors employing close to or above 15 million workers, namely, Construction (17.4 million workers) and Transport, Storage and Communication (14.6 million workers), the GVA per worker has virtually stagnated in the Construction sector. However, in the Transport, Storage and Communications sector, average labour productivity in real terms has grown at 3.3 percent per annum.

---

divisions. Presently available tabulations provide only a three-fold industrial categorisation of total employed person days: agriculture; mining, manufacturing, electricity, gas and water and construction; and, services.

In the two other infrastructure sectors (Electricity, Gas and Water) and Finance, Insurance and Business services, labour productivity has grown at, respectively, 12.2 and 6.3 percent per annum.

Overall, with the sole exception of the Construction Sector, labour productivity has grown in real terms at close to or over 3 percent per annum in all the sectors of the economy. In the economy as a whole and in two of the three largest employing sectors outside agriculture, real gross value-added per worker has grown at over 6 percent per annum over the six years from 1993-94 to 1999-2000.

## 5. UNEMPLOYMENT AND UNDEREMPLOYMENT

We present, in Table 6, estimates of current daily status unemployment rates by gender and rural-urban location for 1993-94 and 1999-2000.

At the all-India level, this widely accepted measure of open unemployment indicates a worsening of the unemployment situation over the 1990s in three out of the four population segments, with urban women as the sole exception. The increase in the daily-status unemployment rate is the steepest for rural males (29 percent) followed by rural females (21 percent). For urban males, at 7 percent the increase is relatively modest. This increase in the unemployment rate for rural males has to be seen in the context of the rise in the share of casual labour (from 338 to 362 per 1000) and a decline in the share of self-employed among rural male workers on the usual status (principal plus subsidiary). Given that the daily status unemployment rate better captures the unemployment among casual labourers than that among the self-employed (where we could be faced with the phenomenon of work spreading) the rise in the daily status unemployment rate among rural males could well be due to the change in the status-composition of the work force (see Sundaram & Tendulkar, 1988).

Before proceeding further, we may note a reduction in the unemployment rates on the usual principal status for the educated - those with 'Secondary and above' level of education as also for the sub-set of those with 'graduate and above' level of education - in almost all the four population segments. The exception was rural females with 'graduate and above' level of education who experienced an increase in usual status unemployment rate from 323 to 351 per 1000. (See Table 6, Panel B).

One of the indicators of underemployment among those classified as workers on the Usual (principal plus subsidiary) status available from the NSS Employment-Unemployment Surveys is the proportion of such workers (adults above 15 years of age) who had sought or were available for additional work - either on most days or on some days of the year. Those who reported themselves as seeking or available for additional work are further classified by reasons for seeking or being available for additional work, with 'to supplement income'; 'not enough work'; and, 'not enough work and to supplement income' as the principal rubrics of "reasons". In this Tabulation, the proportion of usual status workers reporting that they had not sought (nor available for) additional work may be treated as those who perceive themselves to be fully employed during the 365-day reference period.

*Table 7* presents for 1993-94 and 1999-2000 the per 1000 distribution of adult usually working persons as between those who had not sought (nor were available for) aditional work, those who had sought or were available for additional work on most days, and, those who did so on some days. To focus on the self-perceived underutilisation of labour time, we also present the proportion of those who had sought additional work - separately for those who did so on most days and those who did so on some days - who reported either 'not enough work' or 'not enough work and to supplement income' as the reason. This is presented separately by gender and rural-urban location and within each population segment this information is presented separately for the self-employed workers and casual labourers in addition to all workers.

A striking result to emerge from Table 7 is the reduction over the 1990s in the proportion of usual status workers who had not sought additional work in every segment and category of workers distinguished. This points to an unambiguous increase in self-perceived underemployment among those classified as workers on the Usual Status (principal and subsidiary).

The decline in the proportion of workers who had not sought additional work or, equivalently, the rise in the proportion who had sought additional work either on most days or on most days, is the highest for casual labourers in each of the four segments. And, among casual labourers it is the highest for rural males, followed by rural females, urban males and urban females, in that order.

Significantly, except for rural female self-employed workers, a major portion of the reduction in the proportion who had not sought additional work is accounted for by an increase in the proportion of those who had sought additional work on 'some days'. This is overwhelmingly the case among all the categories of urban workers - males and females alike. In fact among urban casual labourers there is a reduction, albeit marginal, in the proportion who had sought or were available for additional work 'on most days'.

Also noteworthy is the fact that, even in rural areas where there is some rise in the proportion of those who had sought additional work 'on most days', among them, those citing either 'not enough work' or 'not enough work and to supplement income', accounted for only about a third of such cases. Those citing either of these reasons, however, accounted for 50 percent or more of the rise in the proportion of those who had sought additional work 'on some days' in almost all cases - with the category 'all urban female workers' as the exception.

**In sum, while there is clear evidence of increase in self-perceived underemployment, much of this is reflected in an increase in the proportion of usual status workers who sought additional work on "some days" rather than 'on most days'. Also, even among those adding to the proportion of workers who had sought additional work 'on most days', the principal reason was the need to supplement income rather than lack of work per se.** This leads us to consider next the changes in the average number of days worked and the changes in the average daily wage earnings of casual labourers in the four population segments.

## 6. DAYS WORKED AND AVERAGE DAILY WAGE EARNINGS

The NSS Employment Report provides estimates of average daily wage earnings received by casual labourers by gender and rural-urban location. For rural India, these estimates are separately available in respect of employment in public works, employment in agriculture and employment in non-agriculture. Within agriculture, estimates are separately available by operations. For urban India, these estimates are separately available by Industry - divisions at 1-digit detail.

Tables 8 and 9 present respectively for rural and urban India the estimates of average daily wage earnings of adult (15-59) casual labourers for 1993-94 and 1999-2000. For rural India, the 1999-2000 estimates have been adjusted for inflation between 1993-94 and 1999-2000 by reference to the Consumer Price Index for Agricultural Labourers (CPIAL with base 1986-87=100) while for urban India this adjustment has been made by reference to the Consumer Price Index for Industrial Workers (CPIIW with base 1982=100).

It is readily seen that, in rural India, the average daily wage earnings of adult male casual labourers finding employment in public works have grown, in real terms, by over 3.8 percent per annum and that the rate of growth of real average daily wage earnings of rural male casual labourers employed in non-agricultural activities is only marginally lower, at 3.70 percent per annum. The growth in real average daily wage earnings of male casual labourers in agriculture, though lower than that for those employed in non-agricultural activities by nearly 1 percentage point, is still quite significant at 2.8 percent per annum.

For rural female casual labourers, the rate of growth of real daily wage earnings of those employed in public works and in non-agricultural activities is substantially higher than that for males at a little over 5 percent per annum. For rural female casual labourers employed in agricultural activities, the rate of growth of their average daily wage earnings in real terms was over 2.9 percent per annum.

**Overall, for both males and females, real average daily wage earnings of casual labourers in rural India have grown at close to or above 3 percent per annum over the period 1993-94 to 1999-2000.**

For casual wage labourers in Urban India, with the exception of urban female workers employed in Industry Divisions 8 (Financial and Business Services) and 9 (Social, Community and personal services) who have suffered a decline in real average daily wage earnings[8], **real average daily wage earnings have grown for both males and females in all Industrial activity categories at close to or above 3 percent per annum in most cases**.

[8] This decline in daily average wage earnings for urban female workers in Industry Divisions 8 and 9, where labour productivity has grown, on the average, at over 6 and 10 percent per annum over the same period is indeed puzzling. By the same token, the rise in real average daily wage earnings of urban casual labourers engaged in construction activity (at 2 percent per annum for males and 3.5 percent per annum for females) in a situation where average labour productivity has remained virtually stagnant is equally puzzling.

The rate of growth in real average daily wage earnings of urban male casual labourers employed in construction and in Transport, Storage and Communication has been somewhat slower, but still significant at 2 percent per annum.

With the two exceptions noted above (Industry Divisions 8 and 9), urban female casual labourers have experienced a faster rate of growth of real average daily wage earnings relative to the male counterparts in all other cases. Taking all Industries together, real average daily wage earnings of urban female casual labourers have grown at close to 4 percent per annum, while for urban male casual wage labourers this growth rate is close to 3 percent per annum.

**Thus, in all the four population segments, average daily wage earnings of casual labourers have grown at a rate close to or above 3 percent per annum over the period covered by the two Surveys. This wide spread and significant growth in average daily wage earnings is fully consistent with the strong and generalised growth in labour productivity witnessed over the same period.**

Next, we examine the issue of average number of days worked during the year of usually employed (Principal plus Subsidiary status) workers. This is possible since the Surveys simultaneously canvass the activity status of the individual on the usual and the current daily (as well as the current weekly) statuses. In principle, this can be done for each category of usual status workers such as the self-employed (further distinguished by broad industry), the regular wage/salaried workers and the casual labourers[9]. However, published Tables reporting such a cross-tabulation (Usual (PS+SS) x Daily Status) restricts the scope of such analysis to the broad categories of workers, the unemployed and those outside the labour force[10].

[9] This 3x3 activity status classification is available only at the all-India level but separately for the four population segments. For the individual states we only have the per 1000 distribution of person days (as between employed person days, unemployed person days and person days not in labour force) of the usually employed (principal and subsidiary status) persons - but separately by gender and rural urban location. In this tabulation, the proportion employed on the daily status can be equivalently interpreted as the proportion of the week (7 person days per person) in that activity on the current daily status and thus converted to person days per year - in employment, unemployment and outside the labour force - of all usual status workers on the average.

[10] A simple mapping of usual status workers in a category - say casual labour in agriculture - into estimated person days in that same category will not be appropriate as the persons contributing those person days may not all or only come from the category of usual status workers in that category. This is sharply highlighted when we try and map person days in regular wage/salaried work in agriculture of rural males (21348) into usual status workers in that category (23440). Each one would have to work more than 9 days in a week!.

Table 10 presents our compution of average number of days worked, average days in unemployment and days outside the labour force, of those classified as workers on the Usual (principal plus subsidiary) status per year in 1993-94 and 1999-2000 at the all-India level for the four population segments.

For rural males, there is a reduction of days at work of 4 days in the year, on the average, in 1999-2000 compared to 1993-94 and an off-setting increase in the number of days in unemployment with no change in the number of days not in the labour force. In the case of urban males the reduction in the number of days worked by 2 days is offset by an increase in the number of days outside the labour force, with no change in the number of days in unemployment. So that, at least for the urban male workers on the usual status, the rise in the average rate of daily-status unemployment would follow not from an increase in the number of days in unemployment but from a reduction in the number of days spent in the labour force.

In the case of female usual status workers, both among rural women and among urban women, there is a reduction in the number of days in the year that is spent outside the labour force on the average. In the case of rural females, a reduction of 9-days in the number of days outside the labour force is offset by an increase in the number of days worked (of 5 days from 241 to 246 days) and an increase in the number of days in unemployment. This would suggest that, at least among the usual status workers among rural females, the increased number of days in unemployment is not due to any fall in the average number of days worked - which in fact, shows an increase - but is due to a shift in daily status from the category 'outside the labour force' to both components - the employed and the unemployed - of labour force.

In the case of usual status workers among urban women, there was an increase of 9 days in employment on the average during the year - largely reflecting a shift out of days not in the labour force (a reduction of 8 days) and a small (1-day) reduction in the number of days in unemployment.

What about the overall impact on income per worker and income per capita?

The significant reduction in the worker-population ratios in all the four population segments combined with the increase in current daily status unemployment rate noted earlier have evoked concerns about whether the worker population can support a much larger proportion of dependent population at rising levels of real income per capita. Indirectly, this concern also has a bearing on the on going debate on the genuiness or otherwise of the decline in rural and urban poverty between 1993-94 and 1999-2000 revealed by the results of the 55$^{th}$ Round Consumer Expenditure Survey for 1999-2000.

We have already noted that at the all-India level there has been a fairly robust growth, in real terms, in the average daily wage earnings of adult casual wage labourers - at close to or over 3 percent per annum - in all the four population segments. There has also been a rise in the number of days worked, on the average, by female usual status workers among both rural and the urban populations. Tending to offset this has been the reduction in the average number of days worked, by about 1 percent or less, among male usual status workers in both rural and the urban areas of the country. What would be the net effect not only on the average earnings per worker but, more importantly, on earnings per capita?

In order to answer this question we construct a synthetic estimate of "yearly wage earnings" of the usual status workers in the four population segments. From this, combining across gender, estimates of "wage earnings" per capita are derived separately for the rural and the urban populations.

Essentially, we assume that all usual status workers in a population segment derive a labour income equal to the product of the number of days worked in the year times the average daily average wage earnings - averaged across all activities/industries excluding public works - received by casual wage labourers in that segment. For this purpose, we take the average daily wage earnings reported for casual wage labourers for "all ages"- rather than that for adult, prime age (15-59) workers discussed earlier.

On a view that the average wage incomes of all regular wage/salaried workers would be higher than that received by the casual labourers and that, the growth in labour productivity and hence in labour incomes of those (self employed with asset-base) who hire the casual wage labourers would be at least as much as that implied by the growth in average daily wage earnings in real terms, the estimates of average "wage earnings" derived as

outlined above, can be taken as indicative of the direction and broad order of magnitude of the extent of change in earnings per worker and per head of the rural and the urban populations in the country. These estimates are presented in Table 11.

It is readily seen that, in rural India, while average yearly "wage earnings" per (usual status) worker has grown at close to 3.6 percent per annum in real terms, on a per capita basis these earnings at constant 1993-94 prices have grown at over 2.5 percent per annum over the six years 1993-94 - 1999-2000.

Over the same period, in urban India too, average wage earnings, in real terms, have grown at 3.2 per cent per annum on a per worker basis and at 2.7 percent per annum on a per capita basis.

Directionally at least, the above results on "wage earnings" per capita are consistent with a decline in poverty ratios in both rural and urban India. Further analysis at the state-level is in progress to see whether and how far this result would hold good at the level of individual states. Needless to say, we also need more data and more analysis of the employment survey results cross-tabulated by household per capita consumer expenditure based on the abridged schedule canvassed over the same set of households[11].

To summarize the key results:

Between 1993-94 and 1999-2000 there has been a significant decline in the crude worker-population ratios in all the 4 population segments resulting in a slower growth of work force relative to the growth in population and an absolute reduction in the number of women workers in rural India which is just about offset by a rise in the number of urban

[11] Incidentally, since the reference period for the abridged schedule was a uniform 30-day reference period for all items of expenditure and in the case of the NSS 50th Round Survey for 1993-94 these estimates would be free from problems of comparability on this count. Admittedly these are not entirely free from problems of comparability - arising from the use of an 'abridged' schedule rather than a detailed schedule. However, given that the direction of the bias in the resultant estimates would be to push down rather than push up the per capita consumer expenditure, a decline in poverty ratios established by reference to estimate of consumer expenditure from the employment survey canvassed over a separate set of households, would be robust. Fuller analysis of the rich data set generated by the 55th Round Employment-Unemployment Survey is absolutely essential before entertaining suggestions of a fresh large scale survey using up very scarce resources of money and trained survey manpower.

women workers. To a significant extent, the reduction in worker-population ratios reflects a beneficial rise in the student-population ratios.

In terms of Industrial distribution, the share of the agriculture sector records a significant decline to just below 60 percent to reduce marginally the absolute number of workers in agriculture for the first time since Independence. Also, recording a decline in share and in the number of workers in the Community, Social and Personal Services sector with Trade, Hotels and Restaurants; Construction; and, Transport, Communications and Storage sectors recording sizeable growth in both share and number of workers.

In terms of labour productivity, except for the Construction Sector, the gross value-added per worker has grown significantly in all the sectors with a 6 percent per annum growth in the economy as a whole and in two of the three largest employing sectors outside of agriculture. This significant growth in labour productivity has translated into an equally significant and widespread growth in daily average wage earnings of casual wage labourers both for males and females and in both rural and urban India. In turn, this growth in real wage earnings, and a rise in the number of days worked by females, has been sufficient to more than offset both a reduction in the crude worker-population ratios and a marginal reduction in the average number of days worked for male workers, to raise average wage earnings per capita at over 2.5 percent per annum in both rural and urban India over the period 1993-94 and 1999-2000. This result is consistent with a decline, over the same period, in poverty ratios in both rural and urban India.

Further analysis, especially of data cross-tabulated by household per capita consumer expenditure, is needed to see whether and how far the all-India results presented above hold good at the level of individual states.

## REFERENCES

Government of India, Registrar General of India, *Census of India 1991, Population Projections for India and States 1998-2016, Report of the Technical Group on Population Projections constituted by the Planning Commission*, August 1996, New Delhi.

National Sample Survey Organisation, *Sarvekshana*, Vol.20, No.1, 68th Issue, July-September, 1996.

National Sample Survey Organisation, *Report on 455 (55/10) Employment and Unemployment in India 1999-2000, Key Results NSS 55th Round July 1999-June 2000,* December, 2000.

Pravin Visaria, *Unemployment and Youth in India: Level, Nature and Policy Implication,* Employment and Training Papers No.:36, ILO, Geneva, 1998.

Sundaram, K., "Economic Development: Employment and Occupational Diversification" in K. Srinivasan and M. Viassoff (eds.) *Population-Development Nexus in India: Challenges for the New Millennium,* Tata McGraw Hill, New Delhi, 2001.

Sundaram, K. and Suresh D. Tendulkar, "Toward an Explanation of Inter-regional Variations in Poverty and Unemployment in Rural India", in T.N. Srinivasan and P.K. Bardhan (Eds.), *Rural Poverty in South Asia,* New York, Columbia University Press, 1988.

**Table 1:**
**Population, Work Force and Crude Worker-Population Ratios (WPRs) by Rural - Urban Residence and Gender in India: 1993-94 - 1999-2000**

| Segment | Population | | Work Force | | WPRs | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1993-94 | 1999-2000 | 1993-94 | 1999-2000 | 1993-94 | 1999-2000 |
| Rural Males | 339,360 | 367,240 | 187,660 | 195,000 | 553 | 531 |
| Rural Females | 317,950 | 344,640 | 104,290 | 103,050 | 328 | 299 |
| Rural Persons | 657,310 | 711,880 | 291,950 | 298050 | 444 | 419 |
| Urban Males | 125,200 | 147,440 | 65,100 | 76,370 | 520 | 518 |
| Urban Females | 112,590 | 135,010 | 17,340 | 18,770 | 154 | 139 |
| Urban Persons | 237,790 | 282,440 | 82,440 | 95,140 | 347 | 337 |
| Males | 464,560 | 514,680 | 252,760 | 271,370 | 545 | 527 |
| Females | 430,540 | 479,650 | 121,630 | 121,820 | 286 | 254 |
| Persons | 895,100 | 994,330 | 374,390 | 393,190 | 420 | 395 |

Sources: 1993-94: Pravin Visaria, *Unemployment among Youth in India: level, Nature and Policy Implications*, ILO, Employment & Training Papers, 36, Geneva, 1998.

1999-2000: Estimates of population as on 1.1.2000, by segment are obtained by interpolation from estimates for lst March 1999 and lst March, 2000 in, *Population Projections for India and States, 1996-2016*, Registrar General of India, New Delhi.

Work-force figures computed by applying (segment-specific) work worker-population ratios given in the NSSO Report (December, 2000).

**Table 2:**
**Age-Specific WPRs by Location and Gender in India: 1993-94 -**
**1999-2000 Per 1000 Work force Participation Rates on the Usual Status (PS+SS)**

| Age-Group | 1993-94 | | | | 1999-2000 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Rm | Rf | Um | Uf | Rm | Rf | Um | Uf |
| 5-9 | 11 | 14 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 2 |
| 10-14 | 138 | 141 | 66 | 45 | 91 | 96 | 49 | 36 |
| 15-19 | 577 | 364 | 356 | 123 | 503 | 304 | 314 | 105 |
| 20-14 | 859 | 456 | 674 | 183 | 844 | 409 | 658 | 155 |
| 25-29 | 957 | 525 | 904 | 224 | 950 | 491 | 883 | 194 |
| 30-34 | 983 | 585 | 964 | 272 | 979 | 555 | 960 | 235 |
| 35-39 | 989 | 608 | 983 | 301 | 984 | 579 | 975 | 285 |
| 40-44 | 987 | 606 | 981 | 320 | 983 | 586 | 974 | 283 |
| 45-49 | 983 | 594 | 973 | 317 | 980 | 566 | 969 | 267 |
| 50-54 | 970 | 542 | 942 | 286 | 953 | 515 | 935 | 262 |
| 55-59 | 942 | 467 | 856 | 226 | 929 | 450 | 809 | 207 |
| 60+ | 699 | 247 | 442 | 113 | 639 | 218 | 402 | 94 |
| **All Ages** | **553** | **328** | **521** | **155** | **531** | **299** | **518** | **139** |

Rm : Rural Males; Rf : Rural Females;
Um : Urban Males; Uf : Urban Females

Source: 1993-94: *Sarvekshana,* Vol. 20, No. 1, July-Sept. 1996.
1999-2000: NSSO, Employment-Unemployment Report (December 2000)

**Table 3:**
**Age-specific Student-Population Ratios by Gender and Rural-Urban Location inIndia: 1993-94 - 1999-2000**

Student-Population Ratios

(Per 1000)

| | Rural Males | | Rural Females | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | SPRs | | SPRs | |
| Age-group | 1993-94 | 1999-2000 | 1993-94 | 1999-2000 |
| 5-9 | 670 | 707 | 561 | 631 |
| 10-14 | 743 | 777 | 546 | 635 |
| 15-19 | 368 | 413 | 190 | 258 |
| 20-24 | 80 | 86 | 19 | 29 |

| | Urban Males | | Urban Females | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | SPRs | | SPRs | |
| Age-group | 1993-94 | 1999-2000 | 1993-94 | 1999-2000 |
| 5-9 | 841 | 838 | 801 | 810 |
| 10-14 | 866 | 873 | 812 | 821 |
| 15-19 | 559 | 585 | 490 | 517 |
| 20-24 | 205 | 218 | 122 | 158 |

Source: 1993-94: *Sarvekshana Vol.20, No.1, July-Sept. 1996.*
*1999-2000: Employment and Unemployment in India 1999-2001 Key Results, NSS 55$^{th}$ Round (July 1999-June 2000), NSSO, GOI, December 2000.*

**Table 4:**
**Per 1000 Industrial Distribution of Work force by Location and Gender, All-India, 1993-94 - 1999-2000**

**Panel A: By Rural-Urban Location**

| Industry-Division | 1993-94 | | | 1999-2000 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Rural | Urban | Total | Rural | Urban | Total |
| 0. Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries | 784 | 123 | 639 | 761 | 88 | 598 |
| 1. Mining & Quarrying | 6 | 12 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 6 |
| 2-3. Manufacturing | 70 | 236 | 107 | 74 | 227 | 111 |
| 4. Electricity, Gas & Water | 2 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 3 |
| 5. Construction | 24 | 63 | 32 | 33 | 79 | 44 |
| 6. Trade, Hotels & Restaurants | 43 | 194 | 76 | 51 | 269 | 104 |
| 7. Trspt, Storage & Communication | 14 | 79 | 29 | 21 | 87 | 37 |
| 8. Finance, Insurance, Real Estate and Business Services | 3 | 34 | 10 | 4 | 41 | 13 |
| 9. Community, Social and Personal Services | 54 | 248 | 97 | 49 | 195 | 84 |
| Work force ('000) | 291,950 | 82,440 | 374,390 | 298,050 | 95,140 | 393,190 |

**Panel B: By Gender**

| | 1993-94 | | 1999-2000 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Males | Females | Males | Females |
| 0. Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries | 573 | 774 | 531 | 748 |
| 1. Mining & Quarrying | 9 | 4 | 7 | 3 |
| 2-3. Manufacturing | 112 | 94 | 115 | 101 |
| 4. Electricity, Gas & Water | 5 | 0.4 | 4 | 0.3 |
| 5. Construction | 42 | 14 | 57 | 17 |
| 6. Trade, Hotels & Restaurants | 97 | 32 | 131 | 43 |
| 7. Transport, Storage, Communication | 41 | 3 | 52 | 4 |
| 8. Finance, Insurance, Real Estate & Business Services | 13 | 4 | 16 | 5 |
| 9. Community, Social and Personal Services | 107 | 76 | 87 | 79 |
| Work force ('000) | 252,760 | 121,630 | 271,370 | 121,820 |

**Table 5:**
**Workers, Gross Domestic Product (at 1993-94 Prices) and Labour Productivity By Industry Division in India: 1993-94 - 1999-2000**

| Industry Division | 1993-94 | | | 1999-2000 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | GDP at 1993-94 prices Rs. Crores | Work Force ('000) | GVA Per Worker | GDP at 1993-94 Prices Rs. Crores | Work force ('000) | GVA Per Worker (Rs.) | Rog of GVA Per Worker (pcpa) |
| 0: Agriculture & Allied Activities | 241967 | 239096 | 10120 | 290334 | 235597 | 12323 | 3.34 |
| 1: Mining & Quarrying | 20092 | 2681 | 74942 | 26446 | 2241 | 118010 | 7.86 |
| 2 & 3: Manufacturing<br>Less Repair Services 97 | 125493<br>2691 | | | 196763<br>4706 | | | |
| 2&3 - excluding Repair Service | 122802 | 39914 | 30767 | 192057 | 43679 | 43970 | 6.13 |
| 4: Electricity, gas & Water | 18984 | 1396 | 135989 | 28225 | 1039 | 271655 | 12.22 |
| 5: Construction | 40593 | 12147 | 33418 | 58728 | 17454 | 33647 | 0.11 |
| 6: Trade, Hotels + Restaurants | 99369 | 28502 | 34864 | 168355 | 40946 | 41116 | 2.79 |
| 7: Transport, Storage & Communication | 51131 | 10773 | 47462 | 84477 | 14623 | 57770 | 3.33 |
| 8: Financing, Insurance etc.<br>less: GDP in Dwellings | 90084<br>43507 | | | 146546<br>51391 | | | |
| (8) - less GDP on Dwelling | 46577 | 3658 | 127329 | 95155 | 4984 | 190921 | 6.98 |
| 9: Community + Social Services including Repair Services | 93632<br>2691 | | | 152117<br>4706 | | | |
| 9 (including 97) | 96323 | 36281 | 26549 | 156823 | 33181 | 47263 | 10.01 |
| All Activity (excluding GDP in Dwelling) | 737838 | 374390 | 19708 | 1100600 | 393,190 | 28120 | 6.10 |

**Table 6:**
**Dimensions of Unemployment by Gender and Rural-Urban Location: India: 1993-94 - 1999-2000**

**Panel A: Current Daily Status Unemployment Rates**

| | Rural Males | Rural Females | Urban Males | Urban Females |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1993-94 | 56 | 56 | 67 | 105 |
| 1999-2000 | 72 | 68 | 72 | 98 |

**Panel B: Usual Status Unemployment Rates for the Educated**

(Per 1000)

| Segment | Secondary and Above | | Graduate and Above | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1993-94 | 1999-2000 | 1993-94 | 1999-2000 |
| Rural Males | 89 | 69 | 134 | 107 |
| Rural Females | 243 | 204 | 323 | 351 |
| Urban Males | 69 | 66 | 64 | 66 |
| Urban Females | 207 | 163 | 203 | 163 |

Source: Table 16, NSS Employment Report, December 2000.

**Table 7:**
**Per 1000 Distribution of Adult (15 and above) Usually Working Persons (Principal and Subsidiary) Who had sought or were available for additional work by Gender and Rural-Urban Location: All-India, 1993-94 - 1999-2000**

| Category | 1993-94 | | | 1999-2000 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Not sought | Sought on most days | Sought on some days | Not sought | Sought on most days | Sought on some days |
| Rural Males | | | | | | |
| Self-Employed | 948 | 22(8) | 30(11) | 925 | 28(10) | 47(20) |
| Casual Labourers | 887 | 44(15) | 69(27) | 829 | 71(21) | 99(46) |
| All Workers | 929 | 29(9) | 42(16) | 894 | 43(14) | 64(28) |
| Rural Females | | | | | | |
| Self-Employed | 968 | 12(5) | 20(8) | 957 | 20(5) | 23(10) |
| Casual Labourers | 912 | 35(13) | 53(21) | 874 | 47(19) | 79(35) |
| All Workers | 945 | 22(8) | 33(12) | 924 | 31(11) | 45(20) |
| Urban Males | | | | | | |
| Self-employed | 959 | 23(11) | 19(8) | 940 | 24(11) | 37(15) |
| Casual Laboruers | 890 | 55(21) | 55(18) | 861 | 53(18) | 86(38) |
| All Workers | 955 | 24(9) | 21(7) | 938 | 25(10) | 37(15) |
| Urban Females | | | | | | |
| Self-Employed | 953 | 23(10) | 24(10) | 943 | 24(10) | 33(15) |
| Casual Labourers | 903 | 47(19) | 50(12) | 884 | 46(13) | 70(23) |
| All Workers | 945 | 29(11) | 26(8) | 939 | 27(10) | 34(10) |

Notes and Sources

Figures within brackets relates to the sum of the proportion of persons (per 1000) who sought or were available for additional work for reasons of (i) 'not enough work' or (ii) 'not enough work and to supplement income'.

Sources: 1993-94*: Sarvekshana,* Vol. 20, No. 1, July-Sept. 1996.
1999-2000: NSSO (December 2000)

**Table 8:**
**Average Daily Wage Earnings received by Adult (15-59) Casual Wage Labourers in Rural India by Gender and Activity: All-India, 1993-94 - 1999-2000**

Average Daily Wage Earnings

(Rs.0.00)

| Activity | Rural Males | | | Rural Females | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1993-94 | 1999-2000 at 1993-94 prices | Rate of Growth (percent per annum) | 1993-94 | 1999-2000 at 1993-94 prices | Rate of growth (percent per annum) |
| 1. Public Works | 24.65 | 30.89 | 3.83 | 18.52 | 24.87 | 5.04 |
| 2. Casual Labour in Agriculture | 21.59 | 25.48 | 2.80 | 15.12 | 17.99 | 2.94 |
| 3. Casual Labour in Non-Agriculture | 30.15 | 37.49 | 3.70 | 17.46 | 23.49 | 5.07 |
| 4. Casual labour in All activities | 23.18 | 28.65 | 3.59 | 15.33 | 18.51 | 3.19 |

Notes and Sources:

Adjustment for Inflation between 1993-94 and 1999-2000 has been made by reference to Consumer Price Index for Agricultural Labourers (CPIAL with base 1986-87=100). The value of CPIAL (monthly figures averaged over the 12-months, July thru June of the Survey Year) for 1993-94 and 1999-2000, were, respectively, 194.74; and, 309.17.

Sources: 1993-94: Sarvekshana, Vol. 20, No. 1, July-Sept. 1996.
1999-2000: NSSO (December 2000)

**Table 9:**
**Average Wage Earnings per day received by Adult (15-59) Casual Wage Labourers in Urban Areas by Industry and Gender: All-India 1993-94 - 1999-2000**

Average Daily Earnings of Adult

(Rs.0.00)

| Industry Group | Urban Males | | | Urban Females | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1993-94 | 1999-2000 (at 1993-94 prices) | Rate of Growth percent per annum | 1993-94 | 1999-2000 (at 1993-94 prices) | Rate of Growth percent per annum |
| 0 | 25.50 | 30.29 | 2.91 | 16.49 | 19.64 | 2.96 |
| 1 | 29.60 | 47.81 | 8.32 | 22.59 | 34.80 | 7.47 |
| 2-3 | 33.27 | 40.19 | 3.20 | 16.09 | 26.07 | 8.38 |
| 4 | 39.09 | 45.23 | 2.46 | 23.17 | NA | NA |
| 5 | 37.62 | 42.34 | 1.99 | 24.84 | 30.61 | 3.54 |
| 6 | 28.67 | 34.28 | 3.02 | 21.31 | 28.84 | 5.17 |
| 7 | 34.65 | 39.06 | 2.02 | 19.93 | 30.69 | 7.46 |
| 8 | 28.57 | 40.35 | 5.92 | 31.43 | 30.00 | (-)0.77 |
| 9 | 28.16 | 34.06 | 3.22 | 19.31 | 17.75 | (-)1.39 |
| 1-9 | 33.79 | 39.75 | 2.74 | 19.51 | 24.94 | 4.18 |
| 0-9 | 32.38 | 38.53 | 2.94 | 18.49 | 23.28 | 3.91 |

Notes and Sources:

Adjustment for inflation between 1993-94 and 1999-2000 has been made by reference to Consumer Price Index for Industrial Workers (CPIIW with base 1982=100). The value of CPIIW (monthly figures averaged over the 12-months, July thru June of the Survey Year) for 1993-94 and 1999-2000, were, respectively, 264 and 433.33.

Sources: 1993-94: *Sarvekshana*, Vol. 20, No. 1, July-Sept. 1996.
1999-2000: NSSO (December 2000)

**Table 10:**
**Activity-Status Distribution of person-days per year of Usually Employed (Principal plus Subsidiary Status) Workers by Gender and Rural-Urban Location : All-India, 1993-94 - 1999-2000.**

Person-days Per year

| Activity Status | Rural Males | | Rural Females | | Urban Males | | Urban Females | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1993-94 | 1999-2000 | 1993-94 | 1999-2000 | 1993-94 | 1999-2000 | 1993-94 | 1999-2000 |
| At Work | 331 | 327 | 241 | 246 | 345 | 343 | 279 | 288 |
| Unemployed | 15 | 19 | 11 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 8 |
| Outside Labour Force | 19 | 19 | 112 | 103 | 9 | 11 | 76 | 68 |

Notes and Sources:

The above numbers are based on Table 22 of the NSS Employment Report (Dec. 2000) on: Per 1000 distribution of person-days of Usually employed (principal and subsidiary status) by their broad current daily status for various survey periods.

**Table 11:**
**Estimated Average yearly "Wage Earnings" Per Worker and Per Capita (at Constant 1993-94 Prices) in Rural and Urban India: 1993-94 - 1999-2000**

| | | Rural Males | Rural Females | Rural Persons | Urban Males | Urban Females | Urban Persons |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Population ('000) | 1993-94 | 339,360 | 317,950 | 657,310 | 125,200 | 112,590 | 237,790 |
| | 1999-2000 | 367,240 | 344,640 | 711,880 | 147,440 | 135,010 | 282,440 |
| Work Force ('000) | 1993-94 | 187,660 | 104,290 | 291,950 | 65,100 | 17,340 | 82,440 |
| | 1999-2000 | 195,000 | 103,050 | 298,050 | 76,370 | 18,770 | 95,140 |
| Average No. of Days worked | 1993-94 | 331 | 241 | NA | 345 | 279 | NA |
| | 1999-2000 | 327 | 246 | NA | 343 | 288 | NA |
| Average Daily Wage Earnings of Casual Labour (all ages) | 1993-94 | 22.82 | 15.15 | 20.21 | 31.81 | 18.07 | 28.15 |
| | 1999-2000 | 28.24 | 18.27 | 24.97 | 37.93 | 22.97 | 34.70 |
| Yearly "Wage Earnings" (Rs. Crores) | 1993-94 | 141748 | 38078 | 179825 | 71444 | 8742 | 80185 |
| | 1999-2000 | 180072 | 46315 | 226387 | 99357 | 12417 | 111774 |
| Earnings Per Worker (Rs.) | 1993-94 | 7553 | 3651 | 6159 | 10975 | 5042 | 9726 |
| | 1999-2000 | 9234 | 4494 | 7596 | 13010 | 6615 | 11748 |
| Earnings Per Capita (Rs.) | 1993-94 | 4177 | 1198 | 2736 | 5706 | 776 | 3372 |
| | 1999-2000 | 4903 | 1344 | 3180 | 6739 | 920 | 3958 |
| Rate of Growth (Percent Per annum) Earnings Per Worker | | 3.41 | 3.52 | 3.56 | 2.88 | 4.63 | 3.20 |
| Rate of Growth (Percent Per annum) of Earnings Per Capita | | 2.71 | 1.95 | 2.54 | 2.81 | 2.86 | 2.70 |

Notes: Inflation-Adjustment for Rural India has been made by reference to Consumer Price Index for Agricultural Labourers (CPIAL with base 1986-87 = 100). For Urban India, this adjustment has been made by reference to Consumer Price Index for Industrial Workers (CPIIW with base, 1982=100).