



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

India's rural employment scenario: challenges opportunities

Majumder, Rajarshi

Department of Economics, University of Burdwan

2022

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/120108/>
MPRA Paper No. 120108, posted 16 Feb 2024 14:24 UTC

India's Rural Employment Scenario:

Challenges & Opportunities

Rajarshi Majumder¹

¹ Professor, Department of Economics, University of Burdwan, West Bengal, INDIA; email: rmajumder@eco.buruniv.ac.in.

India's Rural Employment Scenario: Challenges & Opportunities

Abstract

Sectoral transformation from a rural subsistence agriculture based economy to a urban monetised industrial and service led economy is generally accepted as signs of development. It is also expected that these changes will accompany the economic growth process in a reasonably capitalistic economy like India, at least after the neo-liberal structural adjustment programmes started since 1990s. However, India's rural employment scenario is an enigma. While GDP share of agriculture has dwindles remarkably, its share in employment does not show signs of similar decline. Whatever changes have taken place are also questioned as to whether they are signs of positive dynamism or that of distress. This paper attempts to examine the complexity of changes in rural labour market in India over the last decade to untangle this riddle. A multi-pronged strategy of human capital formation, transforming rural non-farm business and augment returns from agriculture is necessary to improve the scenario. Opportunities are there but structural challenges must be overcome to reach those goals.

I. INTRODUCTION

The necessity of converting a rural agrarian subsistence economy to a non-farm monetised economy for ushering in development is well accepted. This has to work on two fronts – the production system and the employment system. Importance of industrial and service sectors in GDP is expected to rise and that of primary activities decline as an economy matures. A similar movement of workers from primary to secondary and then to tertiary sectors is also expected to accompany this product side transformation. While India has succeeded in transforming its GDP composition, its performance in sectoral transformation of labour market is far from satisfactory. It is true that the share of agriculture and allied activities have come down from more than 85 per cent in early 1980s to little more than 50 per cent in 2018, but compared to the change in GDP composition or to other countries at similar levels of development, this reduction is too little. In addition, researchers have questioned the desirability of this process too as labour shift may be forced and distress-driven rather than due to pull factors (a forceful argument by Abraham, 2009 and also by Sen & Jatav, 2010). In recent years arguments have been put out regarding the job-less growth and even job-loss growth in India in which the brunt is borne by the rural labour market. Against that backdrop, this paper explores the changing pattern of rural employment scenario in India over the last decade using large sample survey data from National Sample Survey Office (NSSO) of India. We observe that the changes occurring in the countryside are dualistic in nature. While some of the transformations are in response to dynamism and opportunities, some others are due to stagnation and lack of opportunities in agriculture. Thus there are signs of both change and continuity. The fast changing economic situation are creating opportunities in the countryside but in absence of coherent strategies and adequate human capital formation, the challenges seem to be substantial.

II. CURRENT LITERATURE AND OBJECTIVES OF PRESENT STUDY

India's rural economy has been centred around agriculture ever since the beginning of settled life in the subcontinent social, political, and technological progress have occurred around this central activity. It is therefore no wonder that rural economy, especially the agricultural sector, and rural employment scenario has a rich and ever increasing body of research. Most of these have dwelt on the situation of rural labour, either briefly or at length [see Bardhan (1977) and Coppard (2001) for an excellent survey of literature focussed on rural non-farm sector]. Other notable ones include Sastry (2002), Bhaumik (2002), Chadha & Sahoo (2002),

Bhalla (2003), Deshingkar and Farrington (2006), Jha (2006), Abraham (2009), Eswaran et al (2009), Ranjan (2009), Himanshu et al (2011), Binswanger-Mkhize (2013), Thomas and Jayesh (2016), Kaur et al (2019), Swaminathan (2020).

Almost all these studies report a declining share of agriculture and farming among rural workers and movement onto secondary and tertiary sectors. In this paper we try to understand the current situation by looking at parameters like employment status, sectoral & occupational distributions, wage & consumption levels, and education & skill levels over the last decade, i.e. 2011-18 period using NSSO data.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Aggregate Employment Scenario

The study period of 2011-12 to 2018-19 has seen a decelerating trend in Indian economy when compared to the earlier decade. While in the earlier decade GDP grew at about 8.5 per cent per annum, in the decade under consideration, it dropped to less than 7 per cent per annum. However, even this moderate rise in production did not lead to any improvement in the employment situation. Aggregate worker-population ratio declined from 35.4 per cent in 2011 to 34 per cent in 2018. As a result Unemployment rate increased from 2.7 per cent to 6.3 per cent.

Using the labour market parameters from NSSO and using the estimated/projected population figures from MoHFW, absolute number of workers can be estimated. It is observed that while population increased by about 38 million during 2011-18, labourforce increased by about 11.5 million. However, number of workers declined by 6.4 million during this time, thereby adding about 18 million individuals to the rank of unemployed. This broad trend does not reveal that the problem is mainly a rural one – the job loss has been entirely in the rural areas (a decline of about 15 million workers) while urban areas have witnessed an increase of 8 million workers. While a part of this can be attributed to rural-urban migration (rural labourforce decreased by 3.5 million during this period), it does not account for majority of the job-loss witnessed. The core reason is that Agriculture is losing workers at a fast rate while the slack is not being picked up by other non-farm sectors in rural areas. The situation will be clearer if we dissect the anatomy of employment scenario in rural areas further.

2. Employment Status

A marginal drop in Labour Force Participation rate (LFPR) in rural India was witnessed during 2011-18 accompanied by a fall in employment rate as well, indicating lower

absorption of rural labour into productive jobs. This has resulted in a decline of about 15 million workers in the rural areas during this period. But what is more revealing is that the job-loss has been driven entirely by a decline in number of Casual Workers showing a decrease by 30 million during the period. While self-employed (cultivators, craftsmen, petty traders, professionals, etc) showed a marginal increase, regular workers increased by about 13 million. A large part of the increase in regular workers was because of employment of teachers and medical personnel in rural areas during the decade as part of the rural social sector push.

This is in sharp contrast to the trends of earlier decade where self-employment and regular salaried jobs had declined along with a rise in casual wage labour.

Thus the broad picture is that of decreased work participation, further slower labour absorption, increased unemployment and a reversal of the casualisation process witnessed earlier.

3. Sectoral & Occupational Changes

During this period the long trend of workers moving out of agriculture has continued, and agriculture now accounted for a little more than half of all rural workers compared to more than four-fifth in early 1980s. Sectors that have gained from this outflow are Construction (+2 percentage points), Trade, Hotel, & Restaurant (+1.8 pp), Community, Social & Personal Services (+1.6 pp) and Transport & Communication (+0.9 pp). But what is appalling is the decline in share of Manufacturing in total rural employment.

This has been paralleled by changes in occupational divisions also. While farming as an occupation declined in importance, major gainers have been Production & Construction related jobs and Administrative & Managerial jobs (share of both increased by 1.5 percentage points), Technical & Professional jobs (+1.4 pp), Sales and Transport sector jobs (both showing a 1.2 pp rise in share).

But the changes in structure and composition have been too small and too slow. Thus while Agriculture shed about 30 million jobs during the period, sectors like Construction, Trade, Hotels & Restaurant, and Transport that are traditional recourse of poor pushed-out rural workers could engage only about 13-14 additional workers during this time. The situation was not helped by an absolute decline of 3.5 million jobs in rural Manufacturing.

4. Sectoral Shifts – Dynamism or Distress?

It is sometimes argued that the sectoral movement from agriculture to other non-farm sectors is a sign of development and is bound to happen as an economy matures. But for that to be

true the movement should be demand pull rather than supply-push in nature. Only when the new jobs are better in terms of occupational hierarchy and more remunerative can we say that the shift of workers are voluntary, in response to economic incentive and therefore a sign of dynamism in the economy. However, if we find that the new jobs are occupationally at the same or lower status, and are not sufficiently remunerative, we have to accept that the shift is involuntary and forced and is therefore a sign of rural distress. We already know that there has been an absolute decline in rural workers during the study period – a sign of distress rather than progress. But even then, within the rural labour market the movements reveal further signs of grief in the countryside.

It is observed that while workers in agricultural sector have declined as a whole, there has been a rise in processing jobs within agro-sector indicating saturation, or even overflow, of farming/cultivation in terms of labour absorption. At the same time, this is also a sign of shift up the value chain. While share of manufacturing sector employment has declined, within the sector the share of labourers has increased compared to artisans and self-employeds. Almost all of the increase in construction and service sector jobs have been for labourers and service-providers rather than in administrative/managerial jobs. For trade & hotels etc. sector too, increase has been mainly in the form of sales workers and servicemen and not for managerial jobs. For the transport sector too we observe a relatively higher rise in transport operators.

It is therefore evident that the movement of workers away from the agricultural sector involves mainly a shift of surplus farm-labour into other non-farm manual work, especially in construction, manufacturing, and transport. If this shift is demand induced and growth-driven then it would be dynamic and is likely to lead to a virtuous development trajectory. However, if the shift is supply induced and distress-driven, then the process is likely to create stagnation and crisis in the countryside. Let us examine the data & evidence in this regard.

We can get some idea about the process if we look at sources of income and consumption pattern along with the employment trends. The myth that shift of workers from agro-labour to non-agro labour is *always* beneficial is perpetuated by the fact that households whose predominant source of income is agricultural labour have the least average consumption level among all types of households. There are also evidences to show that productivity, wages and working conditions is generally higher in the non-farm sector than in the farm sector (Fisher and Mahajan 1998). The hierarchy generally applicable in rural India runs as follows – Regular Salaried households are at the top of the pile, enjoying perhaps the highest socio-economic status in the countryside. They are followed by self-employed non-agricultural

households and self-employed agricultural households or cultivators in that order. Then comes the non-agricultural labourer households while the agricultural labourer households are at the bottom of the ladder. Shift of workers from the bottom towards the top would be a welcome trend and in reality we have witnessed a long run declining trend in proportion of households reporting cultivation as their predominant source of income and a rise in proportions of households reporting self-employment in non-agriculture and regular salaried job as their predominant sources of income. However, the period between 2011-18 has been quite different. While there is a substantial drop in proportion of households reporting agricultural labour as their predominant source of income, the proportion halved from over 20 per cent in 2011-12 to about 10 per cent in 2018-19, the share of self-employed in agriculture or cultivators has gone up. There is a drop in share of households reporting self-employment in non-agriculture as their predominant source of income. But when we look at the trend in MPCE, the results seem paradoxical. While average MPCE has remained stagnant at the aggregate level, we find that MPCE has declined for those types of households whose share has gone up! Thus, salaried job households, cultivator households and non-agricultural labour households have witnessed a fall in MPCE levels though proportions of households declaring these as their predominant source of income have increased. MPCE of agricultural labour households and self-employed in non-agriculture households are going up but proportion of households reporting these jobs as their major income source is declining. This is only possible if majority of the non-agricultural workers are engaged in low paying irregular jobs, and households have a diversified labour-use pattern with some family members (who are surplus farm labour) taking up whatever off-farm work is available to supplement family income. This logic is supported by the fact that wage increase during this decade has been lower in non-agricultural occupations compared to agricultural occupations (Table 10). The process at play is thus a distress driven supply push of surplus agricultural labourers into non-farm jobs that are irregular and ill-paid and does not contribute much to the gross household income. Added to this is the fact that while share of non-agro-labour households are going up, their average consumption level is going down. This is clearly leading to increased inequality in the countryside with pauperisation of the masses and increased riches for a select few.

All these indicate that rural workers are not finding agricultural work and bereft of adequate human capital, the surplus labourers are either getting into low-productive, low-paid manual non-farm jobs or are falling back to self-cultivation of their marginal land holding for

livelihood. The transformation process is therefore completely under duress and not something to be proud of.

IV. CONCLUSION – STRUCTURAL CHALLENGES AND POLICY OPTIONS

What do we learn from the preceding analysis? Evidence clearly shows that the transformation process currently underway in the rural labour market in India is a distress driven one. The observed mobility of labour across sectors is mostly in response to declining demand of labour in agriculture and absence of remunerative non-farm jobs. The movements are thus from one low paying job to another with frequent seasonal switches between them. Such a transformation process is caused to a large extent by structural factors in the rural economy which we briefly enumerate below.

1. Structural Challenges

The structural challenges that are faced in the rural economy are mostly related to the agriculture sector since it is still the dominating livelihood option for the rural masses. The first factor that needs mention is the adverse land man ratio which is deteriorating further. The average size of land-holding has decreased from approximately 2.3 hectares in 1970-71 to about 1.1 hectares in 2015-16. Not only the average has come down, the share of marginal and small holdings (below 2 hectares of land parcel) have increased to more than 85 per cent in 2015-16 (Tenth Agricultural Census, MoA, 2016). This makes most operational holdings unsuitable for mechanised farming techniques or taking up cultivation of cash crops, trapping them perennially in low productive food-grains cultivation for self-consumption. The second factor is the lack of capital formation in agriculture in recent decades. National Accounts Statistics shows that during the period 2011-18, Gross Capital Formation in Agriculture and allied activities declined in real terms from Rs. 2738.7 billion to Rs. 2737.5 billion (at constant 2011-12 prices). The share of public sector in this is just about 15 per cent (NAS, various years). This has happened as the government at Centre and States are increasingly focussing on sectors other than agriculture and even within agriculture at revenue expenditure like subsidies on inputs, MSP support, loan waivers etc. While these schemes are populist and helps the state governments (agriculture being in the State List in our Constitution) garner votes, this myopic view has manifested itself as crumbling agricultural infrastructure. Medium and micro irrigation projects are non-starters, while major irrigation projects are suffering from silted canals, reservoirs and sliding embankments. The third factor, which also relates to infrastructure, is the lack of proper agricultural storage system in the country. The

storage and management of foodgrains are undertaken by Food Corporation of India, and there are ample reports of loss due to poor storage by FCI. According to NCCD (2015), India has 37.4 million tonnes of Cold Storage capacity in 2019-20, as opposed to a requirement of 35.1 million tonnes. However, more than two-third of these are for Potato only while multi-crop storage facility is just 32 per cent of the total. In addition, the regional distribution of storage capacities are also skewed and states like Karnataka, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu that have a huge horticultural export potential lack storage facilities. Not only storage, elements of supply chain management like pre-storage cooling facilities and refrigerated transport are virtually non-existent in the countryside. It is therefore no surprise that about 15 per cent of horticulture products and 6-10 per cent of meat & fish are wasted after harvest. This also makes farmers vulnerable and averse to diversify into crops other than those covered by MSP. The fourth structural problem is lack of both rural industrialisation and rural service sector growth. While MSMEs in rural India are thwarted by lack of reliable infrastructure (frequent power cuts and *brown-outs*, pot-holed roads, being some of them), rural services sector are stifled as people in rural areas prefer to visit the nearby towns for their service needs. This lack of demand for *local* non-farm products & services in the rural areas has prevented dynamic transformation of the rural economy. The fifth structural factor that inhibits rural transformation is lack of trained and skilled manpower in the rural areas. Education and training facilities in the rural areas are poor, stuck in decades old routine and traditional learning processes, and even within that quality of teachers and teaching leaves much to be satisfactory. There is no connect between the skill demand in the modern industrial and service sectors and those that are routinely meted out in the name of vocational education in rural areas. As a result, though industries often venture out to rural areas because of low price of land and other tax-sops, inadvertently the workers are either *immigrants* who put up in a *township* set up by the factory or commute from the nearby city. Locals, lacking the skill necessary to work in modern capital intensive machine-dominant factories, simply do not get any benefit of such industrialisation. Often, the inputs of the factories are also brought in from outside and as a result this industrialisation process does have neither forward nor backward linkage with the rural economy.

2. Opportunities and Policy Options

Even with such herculean challenges, there are opportunities galore. The size of the rural population itself is a large potential market – both for labour input and for selling the non-farm commodities. India's projected rural population in 2021 was about 900 million

(MoHFW, 2015) – slightly higher than the entire population of Europe and three times the population of USA! If properly nurtured, this segment can drive India's economy to new heights. Second, the aspirations of rural India has increased in leaps and bounds and this drive for better lives can be tapped by the State to create an atmosphere of entrepreneurship in the rural areas. Third, the global economy is staring at a looming food crisis and there is great scope for exporting surplus foodgrains after keeping emergency food-stock. Fourth, there is a growing urban demand for organic eatables and traditional handwoven textiles and handicrafts. This provides ample scope for expansion of rural non-farm sector.

Under such situation, the policy thrust has to be multi-pronged. First, public capital formation in agriculture should be revived at the earliest since the small and marginal farmers (the largest segment in the countryside) lack private capital to make farming productive and profitable. Within that broad policy, thrust must be on creation and maintenance of fixed capital like agro infrastructure. Second, the agricultural input supply chain presently has been mostly privatised and left to the vagaries of open market, whereas information asymmetry and bottlenecks plague the marketing segment of agricultural produce. This was sought to be remedied by the introduction of farm sector reforms in recent years, but could not be implemented due to intense opposition from a section of the farmers who want the exclusivity of APMCs to continue. A pragmatic way out can be to expand the scope of APMCs and decentralising procurement of crops. Allowing contract farming under close monitoring of the government to prevent exploitation of rural farmers by corporates can also bring more income to the farmers. Third, skill formation among rural youth and imparting saleable technical and vocational skill will improve the human capital base of rural India and enable the rural workers shift to 'in-demand' jobs rather than queuing up for the already overcrowded low paying non-farm job market (mostly in construction, hotels, and transport sectors). Fourth, better infrastructure and credit facilities would also facilitate rural youth to take up entrepreneurial ventures. The group credit schemes linked to SHGs are mostly used for consumption and tiding over emergency medical expenses. Linking SHGs to productive activities like food processing, textile products, handicrafts and setting up a marketing chain to showcase and sale these products would help in rural income generation. The SARAS project of the Ministry of Rural Development of Union government has made fairly good progress in the last decade but its success is limited to specific regions and products. This has to be broad-based and integrated with KVIC programmes. In fact, Khadi as a brand has huge potential but its linkage with local artisans is again very region specific. The SABALA fairs

in West Bengal, organised from block to taluka to district and to state levels have enabled SHGs throughout the state to have a stable income and may be replicated in other parts of the country. Fifth, setting up multi-utility service centres in the villages that would provide repair & maintenance services to myriad of farm and household machineries and gadgets can open up new vistas of job opportunities. However, contrary to popular perception, the changes in rural labour dynamics cannot neglect the agricultural sector though apparently its share in employment is declining. It is to be remembered that agricultural income is the driver of rural non-farm demand and only a sustained rise in agricultural profitability and income can usher in a growth spurt in rural transformation process. 75 years after the death of Mahatma Gandhi, it is time to revisit his idea of Gram Swaraj and embrace its spirit.

References

- Abraham, Vinoj (2009), "Employment Growth in Rural India: Distress Driven?" *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 44, no. 16, April 18, 2009, pp. 97–104.
- Bhalla, Sheila (2003) India's Rural Economy: Issues and Evidence, Institute for Human Development, mimeo
- Bhaumik, SK (2002) Employment Diversification in Rural India: A State Level Analysis, *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol. 45, No 4
- Binswanger-Mkhize, Hans P (2013) The Stunted Structural Transformation of the Indian Economy: Agriculture, Manufacturing and the Rural Non-Farm Sector, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 48, No. 26-27, pp, June 29, 2013
- Brajesh Jha (2006) Rural Non-Farm Employment in India: Macro-trends, Micro-evidences and Policy. Options, *IEG Working Paper Series No. E/272/2006*, IEG, New Delhi, [available from iegindia.org/workpap/wp267.pdf, accessed on 12-10-2013]
- Chadha, G.K. and Sahu, P.P. (2002) Post-reform Setbacks in Rural Employment: Issues that need further Scrutiny, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 37, No. 21, May 25, 2002, pp1998-2026
- Coppard, Daniel (2001): "The Rural Non-farm Economy in India: A Review of the Literature", Natural Resource Institute, Department for International Development (DFID), World Bank, NRI Report No 2662, November.
- Deshingkar, Priya and John Farrington (2006) Rural Labour Markets and Migration in South Asia: Evidence from India and Bangladesh, *Background Paper for the World Development Report 2008*,
- Eswaran, M. A. Kotwal, B. Ramaswami and W. Wadhwa (2009) Sectoral Labour Flows and Agricultural Wages in India, 1983-2004: Has Growth Trickled Down?, *Economic & Political Weekly*, Vol. 44, No. 2, January 10, 2009, pp. 46-55
- Fisher, T. and V. Mahajan (1998) *The Forgotten Sector: Non-farm Employment and Enterprises in Rural India*, Intermediate Technology Publications, London.
- Himanshu, H., Lanjouw, P., Mukhopadhyay, A., and Murgai, R. (2011). Non-Farm Diversification and Rural Poverty Decline: A Perspective from Indian Sample Survey and Village Study Data. Working Paper (44). Asia Research Centre Working Paper. London: London School of Economics & Political Science.
- Jatav, Manoj and Sucharita Sen (2013) Drivers of Non-Farm Employment in Rural India: Evidence from the 2009-10 NSSO Round, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 48, No. 26-27, pp, June 29, 2013
- Kaur, A., Arora, A., and Singh, S. P. (2019). Employment Diversification in Rural India: Nature, Pattern and Determinants. *AGER: Revista de Estudios sobre Despoblación y Desarrollo Rural (Journal of Depopulation and Rural Development Studies)*, 27, 189-226. DOI: 10.4422/ager.2019.02

- Madhura Swaminathan, 2020. "Contemporary Features of Rural Workers in India with a Focus on Gender and Caste," *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol. 63(1), pages 67-79, March.
- MoA (2016) Tenth Agricultural Census 2015-16, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India
- NAS (Various years) National Accounts Statistics of India, Central Statistical Office, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India
- NCCD (2015) All India Cold-chain Infrastructure Capacity (Assessment of Status and Gap) Report, National Centre for Cold-chain Development, Government of India
- Ranjan, Sharad (2009) Rural Non-Farm Employment in India: A Review Based on Recent Evidence, *Journal of Rural Development*, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 73 - 84.
- Sastry, N.S. (2002) Work Opportunities for Indian Rural Labour Force: Recent Knowledge and Thinking, *Journal of Indian Society of Agricultural Statistics*, Vol 55, No. 3, pp288-96
- Thomas, Jayan Jose & M. P. Jayesh, 2016. "Changes in India's Rural Labour Market in the 2000s: Evidence from the Census of India and the National Sample Survey," *Review of Agrarian Studies*, vol. 6(1), pages 81-115, January-J
- Verick, Sher Singh (2018) The Puzzles and Contradictions of the Indian Labour Market: What Will the Future of Work Look Like?, IZA Discussion Paper No. 11376, <https://ftp.iza.org/dp11376.pdf>

Table 1
Rural Work Participation and Employment Types (as proportion of 6+ population)

Category	2011-12			2018-19		
	Male	Female	All	Male	Female	All
Not in Labourforce [@]	45.3	81.9	63.2	45.3	83.0	63.8
Unemployed [#]	1.2	0.5	0.8	3.2	0.7	2.0
Self Employed [^]	29.0	9.4	19.4	29.4	9.1	19.5
Casual Labourer [^]	19.1	6.8	13.1	14.7	5.1	9.9
Regular Salaried Worker [^]	5.4	1.3	3.4	7.4	2.1	4.8

Source: Authors' calculation based on NSSO (2012, 2018).

Table 2
Absolute Changes in Rural Labour Market – 2011-18 (in millions)

Category	Change between 2011-18		
	Male	Female	All
LABOURFORCE	0.8	(-)4.3	(-)3.5
ALL WORKERS	(-)9.3	(-)5.4	(-)14.7
Self Employed	2.5	(-)0.7	1.8
Casual Labourer	(-)21.5	(-)8.0	(-)29.5
Regular Salaried Worker	9.6	3.4	13.0
UNEMPLOYED	10.1	1.0	11.1

Source: Same as Table 1.

Table 3
Proportion of Rural Employment by Major NIC Sectors

Category	2011-12			2018-19		
	Male	Female	All	Male	Female	All
Agriculture, incl F & F	59.3	74.6	63.0	53.0	69.9	56.9
Mining	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.4
Construction	13.1	5.1	11.2	15.6	5.3	13.2
Manufacturing	8.2	9.6	8.5	7.4	9.2	7.8
Elec, Gas & Water	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.4
Transport, St & Comm	4.3	0.2	3.3	5.5	0.2	4.2
Fin & Business Services	1.0	0.2	0.9	1.6	0.4	1.4
Trade, Hotel & Resta	7.8	3.5	6.7	9.7	4.8	8.5
CS&P Services	5.4	6.4	5.6	6.4	9.8	7.2

Source: Same as Table 1.

Note: Columns do not add up to 100 due to rounding off and leaving out of minor sectors.

Table 4
Growth in Rural Employment by Major NIC Sectors – 2011-18 (CAGR)

Category	% per annum		
	Male	Female	All
Agricultural incl F & F	(-)2.1	(-)1.9	(-)2.0
Mining	(-)4.4	(-)7.5	(-)4.9
Construction	2.0	(-)0.4	1.7
Manufacturing	(-)2.0	(-)1.5	(-)1.8
Elec, Gas & Water	3.8	8.2	4.2
Transport, St & Comm	3.0	1.3	3.0
Fin & Business Services	6.2	7.3	6.3
Trade, Hotel & Resta	2.6	3.8	2.8
CS&P Services	2.0	5.2	2.9

Source: Same as Table 1.

Table 5
Rural Employment by Major Occupation Groups

<i>Category</i>	<i>2011-12</i>			<i>2018-19</i>		
	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>All</i>
Admin & Managerial	4.2	2.3	3.8	5.8	3.7	5.3
Technical & Professional	4.3	3.8	4.1	5.3	6.0	5.5
Clerical	1.0	0.3	0.8	1.2	0.6	1.1
Sales	4.9	2.0	4.2	6.2	2.6	5.4
Service	2.5	2.9	2.6	2.8	3.8	3.1
Farming	59.8	74.5	63.3	52.1	70.1	56.3
Production	13.0	11.6	12.7	15.1	11.2	14.2
Transport	3.7	0.1	2.8	5.2	0.1	4.0
Others nec	6.7	2.5	5.7	6.2	1.7	5.1

Source: Same as Table 1.

Note: Columns do not add up to 100 due to rounding off.

Table 6
Growth in Rural Employment by Major Occupation Groups – 2011-18 (CAGR)

<i>Category</i>	<i>% per annum</i>		
	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>All</i>
Admin & Managerial	4.2	6.0	4.5
Technical & Professional	2.6	5.9	3.4
Clerical	2.4	8.4	3.1
Sales	2.9	3.0	2.9
Service	1.5	3.0	1.9
Farming	-2.4	-1.8	-2.3
Production	1.7	-1.4	1.1
Transport	4.7	2.3	4.7
Others nec	-1.6	-5.9	-2.0

Source: Same as Table 1.

Table 7
Employment Share by Industry and Occupation

<i>NIC Category</i>	<i>1983</i>	<i>2009</i>	<i>2011</i>	<i>2018</i>
Agriculture	85.2	66.6	63.0	56.9
Farming	85.1	66.0	62.0	55.4
Food Processing	0.1	0.6	1.0	1.5
Manufacturing	4.1	6.7	8.5	7.8
Labourers	0.2	1.0	4.1	3.9
Artisans	3.8	5.1	3.4	2.8
Admin	0.1	0.6	1.0	1.1
Construction	3.1	8.9	11.2	13.2
Labourers	3.0	8.8	11.0	12.9
Admin	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3
Trade & Hotels	2.8	5.3	6.7	8.5
Workers	2.7	3.9	4.8	6.2
Admin	0.1	1.4	1.9	2.3
Transport, St & Comm	0.6	2.6	3.3	4.2
Operators	0.5	0.9	2.9	3.6
Admin	0.1	1.7	0.4	0.6
Services	4.1	4.4	6.5	8.6
Operators	1.8	3.8	6.1	8.0
Admin	0.1	0.6	0.4	0.6
Others	2.2	5.3	0.8	0.7

Source: Same as Table 1.

Table 8
Households by Predominant Source of Income

	<i>2011</i>	<i>2018</i>
Regular Salaried	10.0	13.4
Self employed in Non-Agriculture	17.3	16.0
Self Employed in Agriculture	38.3	39.7
Non-Agricultural Labourer	14.4	20.1
Agricultural Labourer	20.0	10.8
All Total	100.0	100.0

Source: Same as Table 1.

Table 9
MPCE by Predominant Source of Income (constant 2011-12 prices)

	<i>MPCE (Rs per month)</i>		<i>CAGR</i> <i>(% per annum)</i>
	<i>2011</i>	<i>2018</i>	
Regular Salaried	1615	1611	-0.04
Self employed in Non-Agriculture	1240	1296	0.63
Self Employed in Agriculture	1218	1132	-1.04
Non-Agricultural Labourer	1043	1035	-0.11
Agricultural Labourer	963	1026	0.91
Aggregate	1192	1216	0.29

Source: Same as Table 1.

Note: At constant 2011-12 prices, deflated using CPIAL/RL linked series

Table 10
Real Wage by Activities (constant 2011-12 prices)

Occupation	<i>Daily Wage</i> <i>(Rs per day)</i>		<i>CAGR</i> <i>(%)</i>
	<i>2013-14</i>	<i>2018-19</i>	
<i>Agricultural Occupations</i>			
Ploughing	178	208	3.2
Sowing (incl Transplanting)	154	188	4.1
Harvesting (incl Threshing)	157	185	3.4
Picking (incl commercial crops)	139	171	4.3
<i>Non-agricultural Occupations</i>			
Carpenter	258	277	1.5
Blacksmith	208	228	1.9
Mason	284	307	1.6
Weavers	188	195	0.8
Beedi Makers	131	133	0.4
Bamboo/Cane basket weavers	169	164	-0.6
Handicraft workers	229	252	1.9
Plumbers	308	288	-1.3
Electrician	289	278	-0.8
Construction workers	211	216	0.5
LMV & Tractor drivers	223	234	1.0
Unskilled Non-agro labourers	185	187	0.2
Sweepers	141	151	1.3

Source: Same as Table 1.

Note: At constant 2011-12 prices, deflated using CPIAL/RL linked series