

# NATURE AND MAGNITUDE OF EMPLOYMENT IN HIMACHAL PRADESH

**Dr. Surinder Singh**  
Associate Professor  
Department of Economics  
Government Degree College Bilaspur  
District Bilaspur, Himachal Pradesh, India

**Abstract:** This secondary data related study has been undertaken to study nature and magnitude of employment in Himachal Pradesh. As per National Sample Survey Organisation according to principal status 52 percent of rural males and 29 percent of rural females during 1999-2000 and 54 percent of rural males and 41 percent of rural females were available for employment. Urban male labour force participation rates are higher than the rural ones during both surveys. Fifty percent of males (urban as well as rural) were employed during 1999- 2000, and 52 percent of rural males and 62 percent of urban males were employed during 2004-2005. The proportion of rural women employed was 39 percent during 2004-2005 and 28 percent during 1999-2000. Urban females were less employed than the rural ones. According to 'all workers' among the rural males with graduate level of education the worker population ratio was 88 percent during 1999-2000, which decreased to 78 percent during 2004-2005, and it was 80 percent during 1999-2000 and 69 percent during 2004-2005 for urban males. Self-employment among rural female was higher (93 percent during 1999- 2000 and 91 percent during 2004-2005) than rural males (around sixty percent). Urban females were more self-employed than males during both years. The extent of regular employment for urban males and females is the same (59 percent during 1999-2000 and 39 percent during 2004-2005) according to usual principal status. Around 20 percent of rural males and 2 percent of rural females during 1999-2000 and 2004-2005 were in casual labour. Agriculture accounts for bulk of employment for rural females, as around 90 percent (higher than that for males). Construction is responsible for 18-19 percent of rural male employment and 12-22 percent of urban male employment. Services account for 54 percent of urban female employment during 1999-2000 and 41 percent during 2004-2005 (higher than that of urban male employment), according to usual principal status. As per 2001 Census, 51 percent of the total persons in rural areas and 37 percent in urban areas were engaged in any type of work one year preceding the enumeration.

**Keywords:** Employment, labour force, main and marginal worker, work participation rate.

## 1. Introduction

Many parts of the world are witnessing a new phenomenon-jobless growth. Even when output increases, increase in employment lags way behind (UNDP, Human Development Report, 1993). Economic development has been described in terms of the continuous transfer of economic activity and people from rural to urban areas, both within and between countries. Many developing countries are plagued by unique combination of massive rural-to-urban population movements stagnating agricultural productivity and growing urban and rural unemployment and under employment. Open unemployment especially in urban areas affects 10% to 20% of the labour force. The incidence of unemployment is much higher among the young and increasingly more educated in the 15-24-age bracket. Even longer fractions of both urban and rural labour forces suffer from underemployment. The dimensions of the employment problem go beyond the simple shortage of work opportunities or the underutilization and low productivity of people who work long. The three main reasons for the employment problem in developing countries are: (i) unemployment and underemployment regularly and chronically affect much larger proportions of LDC labour forces than unemployment did in the industrialized countries, (ii) Third world employment problems have much more complex causes than employment problem in the developed countries, (iii) whatever the dimensions and causes of unemployment in Third World Nations, it is associated with human circumstances of abject poverty and low levels of living.

Rapid industrial growth in many developing countries fails to generate initial new employment opportunities. A great number of people continue to migrate from rural areas to urban areas despite high and rising level of urban unemployment. During 1970s, interest in the widespread and growing problem of third world unemployment and underemployment on the part of individual development economists, national planning authorities, and international assistance agencies led to a much broader and more precise picture of the quantitative dimensions of the problem. The unique nature of the employment problem in developing countries is most vividly revealed in four areas; the educated unemployed, self-employment, women's work and youth unemployment. There exists a positive relationship between the levels of education and rate of unemployment in developing countries. The least educated cannot afford to be openly unemployed and must seek any kind of work in the urban informal sector. Even though they may be grossly underemployed-these people are not counted as being unemployed. Higher educated people can afford to search for higher paying jobs and are thus more likely to be counted among the openly unemployed.

In many developing countries, the inability of people to find salaried employment in the modern (formal sector) economy forces them to pursue self-employment in the traditional (informal) economy, in both rural and urban areas. While almost all of the self-employed in developed countries are involved in small businesses as sole proprietors, limited partners, or professionals (lawyers, doctors, accountants etc.), in developing countries the majority of the self-employed are street vendors, hawkers, small shop-owners, rickshaw drivers, and artisans. Their objective is day-to-day survival, and they constitute most of the

underemployed. In Third World women's participation in labour forces has increased, most women are employed in very limited range of low-productivity jobs where hours of work are long and pay is low. Most economically active women work either in agriculture or in the urban informal sector. They are also more likely to be unemployed than men.

The most conspicuous dimension of the unemployed problem in Third World Countries is its prevalence among people between ages of 15 and 24 years. Youth unemployment affects both educated and uneducated, women as well as men. Unemployed young people are to be concentrated in urban areas. There is another darker side to the question of jobs for young people. This is the problem of child labour. They work long hours for pitiable low wages under horrible working conditions. The number of people searching for work in less developed countries depends primarily on the size and age composition of its population. A close relationship exists between high levels of unemployment and underemployment, widespread poverty, and unequal distribution of income. For the most part, people without regular employment or with only scattered part-time employment are also among the very poor. Those with regular paid unemployment are typically among the middle and upper income groups.

There may be unemployed urban workers who are voluntarily unemployed in the sense that they are searching for a very specific kind of job, perhaps because of high expectations based on their presumed educational or skill qualifications. They refuse to accept jobs they feel to be inferior and are able to do this because they have outside sources of financial support. They may be unemployed, but they may not be poor. Many individuals may work full time in terms of hours per day but may nevertheless earn very little income, such as workers in the urban informal sector (traders, hawkers, petty service providers, workers in repair shops). The creation of more employment opportunities should not be regarded as the sole solution to the poverty problem. More far-reaching economic and social measures are needed. The provision of more work and the wider sharing of the work that is available would certainly go a long way toward solving the problem. Employment must be an essential ingredient in any poverty-focused development strategy.

Over the years, economists have formulated a number of economic models of employment determination. The majority of these models have focused on or been derived from the social, economic, and institutional circumstances of the developed nation. The first, the free-market classical model, forms the substance of the traditional theory of employment. The second, the output-employment macro-model, focuses on the relationship among capital accumulation, industrial output growth, and employment generation. The third, the ice-incentive micro-model, considers the impact of distorted factor prices on resource (especially labour) utilization. A fourth model or group of models called rural-urban migration model focuses on the determinants of both demand and supply. (i) The three economic models taken together reveal that factor prices do matter for resource allocation and employment creations (ii) that government policies designed to promote industrialization often at the expense of agricultural growth have typically exacerbated the unemployment and underemployment problems of both urban and rural areas;

and (iii) that policies intended to stimulate efficient, labour-intensive methods of production need not lead to lower levels of output growth. The urban bias has contributed directly and indirectly to both an excessive rate of rural-to-urban migration and a rapid size in urban employment.

Where subsistence farming is predominant and shifting cultivation remains important, nearly all tasks associated with subsistence food production are performed by women. Due to time-consuming nature of their diverse responsibilities women tend to work longer hours than their male counterparts. Women's work in the household involves a range of demanding tasks including processing and pounding raw grains, tending livestock, cooking over primitive stoves, and caring for children.

## 2. Background Characteristics

The findings are based on the NSS 55<sup>th</sup> round survey and 61<sup>st</sup> round survey conducted during July 1999 — June 2000 and July 2004 - June 2005, respectively. To study the employment and unemployment situation of the country and the states, it is necessary to look into the socio-economic structure of the households and the demographic pattern of the population.

### 2.1 Household composition

According to 1999-2000 Survey, 5.54 million people stayed in 1.23 million households in Himachal Pradesh and 6.06 million people stayed in the 1.38 households during 2004-05. About 87 percent in 1999-2000 and 85 percent in 2004-05 belonged to rural Himachal Pradesh and accounted for 91 percent of the total population (table 2.1).

**Table 2.1 Estimated number of households and number of persons during 1999-2000 and 2004-05 for Himachal Pradesh**

Estimated Rural	1999-2000		2004-05	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
Number of households (in thousands)	1071	158	1193	188
Number of persons (in thousands)	5037	500	4997	517

Table 2.2 gives the household size and the sex ratio during 1999-2000 and 2004-05. The sex ratio in rural areas was 1043 females per 1000 males in 1999-2000, which decreased to 1033 during 2004-05. The decline in sex ratio was higher in urban areas (931 in 1999-2000 and 756 in 2004-05) compared to rural areas. The household size was around 4.6 members for rural areas and around 3 for urban areas during the both surveys, though it has shown a marginal decline.

**Table 2.2 Average household size and sex ratio during 1999-2000 and 2004-05 for Himachal Pradesh**

Year	Rural		Urban	
	Household	Sex ratio	Household	Sex ratio
1999-2000	4.7	1043	3.2	931
2004-2005	4.6	1033	3.0	756

Table 2.3 presents information on number of female-headed households, sex ratio and household size. Around 22 percent households in 1999-2000 in rural and urban areas, and 19 percent of rural households during 2004-05 were female headed, and it decreased to 13 percent during 2004-05 in urban areas. Compared to all households, female-headed households, on average, had smaller household size and much higher sex ratio during both quinquennial surveys.

**Table 2.3 Number of female-headed households, household size and sex ratio for female-headed household during 1999-2000 and 2004-05 for H.P.**

Characteristic	Rural		Urban	
	1999-2000	2004-05	1999-2000	2004-05
Number of female headed per 1000 house	220	194	222	129
House Household size	3.9	3.6	1.7	2.5
Sex ratio	1928	1783	3652	1930

## 2.2 Household Economic Activity

The nature and type of work from which a household derives its major income is an important indicator of the activity pattern of its members. The distribution of households by household type for Himachal Pradesh is presented in table 2.4. Around 55 percent of rural persons in 1999-2000 and 57 percent in 2004-05 were self-employed (an increase of 2 percentage points over time). The percentage of urban self-employment increased from 19 percent in 1999-2000 to 25 percent during 2004-05. Self-employment constituted 58 percent of the rural population during both years; and 26 percent and 34 percent of urban population during 1999-2000 and 2004-05, respectively. Regular wage employment was higher among urban households (39-40 percent) compared to rural households (21percent). Casual labour is also another source of income in urban areas (it was 6 percent in 1999-2000 and 24 percent during 2004-05).

**Table 2.4 Per 1000 distribution of household and population by household type during 1999-2000 and 2004-05.**

Household type	Households		Population	
	1999-2000	2004-05	1999-2000	2004-05
<b>Rural</b>				
<b>Self employed</b>	550	569	583	583
(i) Agriculture	427	428	452	429
(ii) Non-agriculture	123	142	131	154
<b>Rural labour</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>220</b>
(i) Agriculture labour	40	17	42	14
(ii) Other labour	174	193	175	206
<b>Others</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>197</b>
<b>Urban</b>				
<b>Self employed</b>	192	251	262	337
<b>Regular wage/ salary</b>	394	398	444	403
<b>Casual labour</b>	59	236	68	187
<b>Others</b>	354	115	223	73

### 2.3 Agricultural holdings

**Table 2.5 Per thousand distributions of rural households by size class of land owned for each household type.**

Size class of land owned (hectares)	1999-2000	2004-2005
0-0.40	590	552
0.41-1.00	256	288
1.01-2.00	103	109
2.01-4.00	38	39
4.01+	13	12
All	1000	1000

In Himachal Pradesh, a majority of households depends on agricultural and horticultural activities, and thus land is the main source of employment. Table 2.5 present the distribution of rural households by size class of land owned. The distribution of land among the rural households is highly skewed. During 1999-2000 only 59 percent of rural households owned land less than 0.41 hectares, and during 2004-05, the percentage owning this much of land reduced to 55 percent. Nearly 84 percent of the rural households



owned land between 0 to 1.00 hectares. The percentage of rural households owning land over 2.00 hectares was 5 percent during both surveys.

## 2.4 Households with usually employed persons

**Table 2.6: Per 1000 distribution of households having at least one member (age 16 years and above) by number of usually employed persons in those households during 1999-2000 and 2004-05**

Number of usually employed	All households		Female headed households	
	1999-2000	2004-05	1999-2000	2004-05
<b>Rural</b>				
None	37	44	94	123
Only 1 male	151	103	35	11
Only 1 female	90	78	381	359
Only 1 male & only 1 female	319	258	133	92
Other	403	516	357	416
All	1000	1000	1000	1000
<b>Urban</b>				
None	295	91	754	386
Only 1 male	452	552	26	15
Only 1 female	37	46	141	352
Only 1 male & only 1 female	90	132	41	72
Other	127	179	37	174
All	1000	1000	1000	1000

Household income depends directly on the type of work and the number of employed persons of the households. Table 2.6 presents the distribution of usually employed person age 15 years and above. Four percent of rural households during 1999-2000 and 2004-05; and 30 percent of urban households during 1999-2000 and 9 percent during 2004-05 had no usually employed member. Only 22 percent of urban households during 1999-2000 and 31 percent during 2004-05 had two or more employed members. Among female-headed households, the proportion of households with no usually employed was substantially higher (9 percent and 12 percent respectively) for rural households during 1999-2000 and 2004-05, and 75 percent and 39 percent among urban households in the same periods, had no usually employed member. Among female headed households, from 36 to 38 percent of rural households had one female usually employed, and the proportion of urban households with one female worker was 14 percent in 1999-2000 and 35 percent during 2004-05. It shows that female-headed households had higher proportion with usually one female employed member than among other headed households.

## 2.5 Literacy among household members

Literacy, together with educational attainment, determines the quality of population and is highly related to one's employment prospectus.

**Table 2.7: Per 1000 distribution of persons by general educational level for 1999-2000 and 2004-05.**

General education level	1999-2000		2004-05	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
<b>Rural</b>				
Not literate	269	414	209	359
Literate & up to primary	389	369	411	366
Middle	133	69	135	102
Secondary & above	208	126	244	173
<b>Urban</b>				
Not literate	343	115	190	219
Literate & up to primary	296	296	323	276
Middle	120	121	80	112
Secondary & above	111	464	407	394

Table 2.7 present the distribution of persons by no male member literate and 41 percent had no female member literate. During 2004-05, 21 percent of households in rural areas and 19 percentage 15 years and above who could read and write a single message with understanding. The proportion of urban household with no female literate was much higher compared to males who could not read and write. During 2004-05, 24 percent of households in rural areas and 41 percent in urban areas had male members of households with secondary and above level of education. Among females, this proportion was 17percent for rural households and 39 percent for urban households.

## 3. Labour Force and Employment

### 3.1 Labour Force (as per National Sample Survey Organization)

Labour force or economically active population refers to the population, which supplies or seeks to supply labour for production and, therefore, includes both 'employed' and 'unemployed' persons. Four different estimates of the labour obtained/based on the three approaches adopted in the National Sample. Surveys are usual status, current weekly status and current daily status. These are:

- (i) Number of persons in the labour force according to usual principal status considering usual principal activity only;
- (ii) Number of persons in the labour force according to usual status (principal as well as subsidiary) considering usual principal and subsidiary activities together;
- (iii) Number of persons in the labour force according to current weekly status approach; and



(iv) Number of persons in the labour force according to the current daily status approach.

### **Usual Principal Status**

The estimate of the labour force according to the usual principal status gives the number of persons who either worked or were looking for work for a relatively longer part of the 365 days preceding the date of survey.

### **Usual principal and subsidiary status**

The labour force includes the persons who (a) either worked or were looking for work for relatively longer part of the 365 days preceding the date of survey and (b) also those persons from among the remaining population who had worked at least for 30 days during the reference period of 365 days preceding the survey.

### **Current Weekly Status**

The labour force which worked in a short of one week during the survey period, i. e., number of persons who worked for at least one hour or was seeking/available for work for at least one hour on any day during the 7 days preceding the survey.

### **Current Daily Status**

The number of person-days in the labour force on a day during the survey period is obtained by dividing the person —days in the labour force in a week by 7. For each person, 7 person days were assigned for 7 days preceding the survey and the estimate of person days in the labour during the reference week was obtained by considering the number of person days worked or was available for work during the week by adopting current daily status approach.

### **Labour Force Participation Rates (LFPR)**

It is defined as the number of persons/person-days in the labour force per 1000 persons/person-days. The estimates of Labour Force Participation Rates for NSS 55<sup>th</sup> and 61<sup>st</sup> rounds are presented for Himachal Pradesh in table 3.1. According to the usual principal status, 40 per cent rural persons during 1999-2000 and 48 percent during 2004-05 were usually available for employment; whereas the respective rates for urban population were 33 and 45 (lower than the rural population). The LFPR according to usual principal and subsidiary status taken together was higher among rural as well as urban male population (55 per cent in rural and 53 persons in urban areas) than among female population (47 per cent in rural and only 14 per cent in urban areas) during 1999-2000. During the period of five years ending June 2005, the usual principal and subsidiary status LFPR increased by 3 percent points for rural persons and 13 percent points for urban population. During the same period of five years the increase in LFPR was higher for females (5 per cent in rural areas and 13 per cent in urban areas) than for males (2 per cent in rural areas

and 10 per cent in urban areas). The usual principal and subsidiary status LFPRs were higher in both areas and during both periods compared to LFPRs of the current statuses.

**Table 3.1: Labour force participation rate per 1000 persons according to status during 1999-2000 and 2004-05 for Himachal Pradesh.**

Status	Number of persons/ person-days in labour force					
	1999-2000			2004-2005		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
<b>Rural</b>						
Principal	520	286	400	541	412	475
Principal & subsidiary	546	474	509	565	516	540
Current weekly	524	427	475	540	449	494
Current daily	516	316	414	525	338	430
<b>Urban</b>						
Principal	531	109	328	621	231	453
Principal & subsidiary	533	142	344	630	268	474
Current weekly	532	130	338	622	254	464
Current daily	533	114	330	598	227	438

Table 3.2 present the LFPRs according to usual status. Sixty percent of total persons during 1999-2000 and 68 per cent during 2004-05 in rural areas and 46 per cent during 1999-2000 and 62 per cent during 2004-05 in urban areas were employed or available for work according to usual principal status. All usual principal and subsidiary status LFPRs showed higher rates for males compared to females in both areas.

**Table 3.2: Labour force participation rate per 1000 persons according to usual status of persons age 15 years and above for Himachal Pradesh.**

Status	Numbers of persons/person-days in labour force					
	1999-2000			2004-2005		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
<b>Rural</b>						
Principal	796	414	500	787	572	676
Principal & subsidiary	825	675	746	818	713	763
<b>Urban</b>						
Principal	735	156	460	845	313	617
Principal & subsidiary	738	203	484	861	360	644

The all LFPRs according to usual principal and subsidiary status for rural males marginally decreased from 83 percent points during 1999-2000 to 82 during 2004-05 and increased to 86 per cent from 74 per cent for urban males during the same period. All labour participants rates for rural and urban females showed an increase (by 3 per cent in rural area and 16 per cent in urban areas during 2004-05 over 1999-2000).

### 3.2 Employment: Nature and Magnitude (as per NSSO)

The National Sample Surveys have generated four different estimates of the employed based on three approaches used in classification of the activity status of the person. These are (i) usual principal status (ii) usual principal and subsidiary status (iii) current weekly status, and (iv) current daily status. The number of persons/person days employed per 1000 persons/person-days is referred to as work force participation rates (WFPR) or worker-population ratio (WPR).

#### Usually Employed

Table 3.3 present the worker population ratio for workers categorized as usual principal status workers and usual principal and subsidiary (both taken together) status workers. These two categories together constitute the total usually employed (all workers). The first category pertains to those with more a less stable employment.

**Table 3.3: Number of persons usually employed per 1000 persons for H. P.**

Status	Numbers of persons/person-days employed					
	1999-2000			2004-2005		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
<b>Rural</b>						
Principal	504	281	390	518	390	453
Principal & subsidiary	536	471	503	555	506	530
<b>Urban</b>						
Principal	498	96	304	609	204	435
Principal & subsidiary	499	130	322	619	241	456

Work population ratio figures corresponding to all workers show that it increased to 53 per cent in 2004-05 from 50 per cent in 1999-2000 for rural persons in Himachal Pradesh. The increase was higher for urban population as it increased to 46 percent points during 2004-05 from 32 per cent during 1999-2000. Fifty-four percent of rural males and 47 per cent of rural females were usually employed according to 1999-2000, whereas these figures increased to 56 per cent and 51 per cent, respectively during 2004-05. Male urban worker population ratio was much higher than female work population ratio for both 1999-

2000 and 2004-05 years. Fifty per cent of urban males in 1999-2000 and 62 per cent in 2004-05 were workers whereas the corresponding figures for urban females were 13 per cent and 24 per cent only. During both in 1999-2000 and 2004-05, half or more of males were workers classified according to usual principal status.

### Age-Specific Usual Status Worker-Population Ratio

The number of persons usually employed in particular age-group per 1000 persons in that age-group is defined as age-specific worker population ratio (ASWPR). Based on the age-recorded, the ASWPR has been estimated for age groups of five-year interval up to the age of 60 years and for the age group 60 years and above, for both principal status workers and 'all' (principal & subsidiary workers taken together) workers. The results are given separately for rural and urban areas in Table 3.4 and Table 3.5. The age groups covered are from 5-9 years to 60 years and above. Among persons below 15 years, nearly 2 per cent were workers according to usual principal status (Table 3.4) during both quinquennial surveys. In rural areas, more than 90 per cent of males age 20- 59 years during 1999-2000 were usual principal workers. Only 32 per cent of 20-24 years and 68 per cent in age of 50-54 years were in 1999-2000, this percentage is much lower than their counterparts. Among persons aged 60 years and above. There was no difference (54 per cent) in percentage of workers employed as principal workers during both quinquennial surveys. All the urban males aged 35-54 years were workers during 2004-05. There was great gender-variation in employment (work force) in urban areas; women were less employed compared to male population during both 1999-2000 and 2004-05 years. As a whole, the urban female worker-population ratio has increased to 20 per cent points in 2004-05 from 10 per cent in 1999-2000 and increase higher than that for male population.

**Table 3.4: Age-specific usual principal worker-population ratio.**

Age group (in years)	Numbers of persons/person-days employed					
	1999-2000			2004-2005		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
<b>Rural</b>						
5-9	0	0	0	2	2	2
10-14	13	19	16	15	28	21
15-19	243	103	176	188	183	186
20-24	712	320	485	629	510	566
25-29	935	422	670	897	625	751
30-34	967	456	699	984	624	792
35-39	977	544	729	981	695	828
40-44	978	599	773	977	746	851
45-49	969	543	750	986	731	860
50-54	946	676	790	990	686	830
55-59	932	585	766	937	624	768
60+	743	303	536	708	382	542

All (0+)	504	281	390	518	390	453
<b>Urban</b>						
5-9	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-14	29	1	14	0	4	2
15-19	94	23	57	402	6	218
20-24	519	95	317	748	20	408
25-29	783	81	431	886	396	708
30-34	992	198	600	973	428	704
35-39	877	197	568	1000	444	714
40-44	975	243	602	1000	580	877
45-49	998	165	655	1000	325	697
50-54	934	284	730	1000	483	840
55-59	856	345	647	925	302	723
60+	365	105	230	466	179	309
All (0+)	498	96	304	609	204	435

Table 3.5 presents the age-specific all usual worker-population ratios for the year 1999-2000 and 2004-05 for Himachal Pradesh. Nearly one-third of rural persons age 15-19 years was usual workers during both years. Among rural males age 25-59 years, the percentage of usual workers varied between 94 to 99 per cent, whereas it was between 75 and 88 per cent for rural females of the same age group during 2004-05. All the urban males aged 35-54 years were usual workers during 2004-05, whereas over half of the urban females were usual workers during this period. Rural as well urban employment rates increased for male as well females.

**Table 3.5: Age-specific usual (all) worker-population ratio for Himachal Pradesh.**

Age group (in years)	Numbers of persons/person-days employed					
	1999-2000			2004-2005		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
<b>Rural</b>						
5-9	2	2	2	11	0	6
10-14	39	69	53	65	97	81
15-19	340	351	345	379	310	346
20-24	769	714	740	779	668	715
25-29	938	833	882	953	745	846
30-34	992	818	899	981	783	877
35-39	984	859	917	980	815	886
40-44	977	875	921	978	876	923
45-49	986	841	914	969	830	898
50-54	990	793	887	946	880	908
55-59	940	752	838	932	824	881
60+	719	471	593	758	425	602
All (0+)	555	506	530	536	471	503
<b>Urban</b>						
5-9	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-14	0	19	8	29	3	15
15-19	420	6	227	106	52	78
20-24	811	130	493	525	136	340
25-29	893	403	715	783	163	473
30-34	973	422	711	992	282	642

35-39	1000	527	756	877	258	596
40-44	1000	595	882	975	273	617
45-49	1000	372	718	998	222	679
50-54	1000	539	857	934	350	751
55-59	925	472	778	856	347	647
60+	493	233	351	365	128	242
All (0+)	619	241	456	499	130	322

### Education-Specific usual Status Worker-Population Ratio

Among persons of age 15 years and above, the number of persons who are usually employed in a particular education per 1000 persons in that category is defined as the education level specific worker population ratio. The persons of age 15 years and above have been classified into seven categories (during 2004-05) and into six categories during 1999-2000, namely, illiterate, literate and up to primary, middle, secondary, higher secondary, diploma/ certificate and graduate and above. Diploma/ certificate is the educational level below graduation level.

Table 3.6 presents the information relating to education specific usual principal worker-population ratio. For rural population with educational qualification of graduate and above the usual principal worker-population ratio has increased to 65 per cent in 2004-05 from 60 per cent in 1999-2000, but the male worker-population ratio declined by 4 per cent points and there was an increase of female worker population ratio by more than 30 percentage points.

**Table 3.6: Education-specific worker population ratio for persons age 15 years and above according to principal status.**

General education	1999-2000			2004-2005		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
<b>Rural</b>						
Illiterate	866	473	593	802	616	670
Literate & up to primary	885	44	662	881	604	748
Middle	673	296	519	628	396	526
Secondary	719	293	550	680	476	595
Higher secondary	446	183	346	601	303	457
Diploma/certificate course	-	-	-	818	555	732
Graduate+	774	226	601	727	530	651
All (0+)	772	407	581	753	542	644
<b>Urban</b>						
Illiterate	883	185	424	972	544	752
Literate & up to primary	794	125	456	872	316	663
Middle	580	85	329	641	136	411
Secondary	633	118	427	825	138	562
Higher secondary	508	64	281	598	91	359
Diploma/certificate course	-	-	-	966	470	777
Graduate+	799	247	586	944	287	647
All (0+)	689	138	427	832	276	592



Among the urban persons with educational qualification graduate and above, the usual principal Worker-population ratio increased from 59 per cent in 1999-2000 to 65 per cent in 2004-05, and the female worker-population increased by 4 percent during 2004-05 over 1999-2000. An increase in usual principal worker-population was also observed among persons with educational qualification literate and above both in rural and urban areas. The increase in usual principal worker population was more among females as compared to males in both areas.

Table 3.7 presents educational-specific 'all' worker-population ratio for persons age 15 years and above. Among the rural illiterate males, the worker- population ratio was higher both during 1999-2000 (87 per cent) and 2004-05 (80 per cent) than the corresponding years for the females (74 per cent and 71 per cent respectively).

**Table 3.7: Education-specific all worker population ratio for persons age 15 years and above**

General education level	1999-2000			2004-2005		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
<b>Rural</b>						
Illiterate	871	737	778	803	707	735
Literate & up to primary	903	717	809	90	783	844
Middle	716	541	644	685	585	641
Secondary	777	570	695	780	677	137
Higher secondary	564	418	508	699	551	628
Diploma/certificate course	-	-	-	890	803	862
Graduate+	883	423	738	826	714	783
All (0+)	810	671	737	804	699	749
<b>Urban</b>						
Illiterate	883	265	477	972	580	771
Literate & up to primary	794	194	491	888	350	685
Middle	586	133	356	647	175	432
Secondary	635	157	443	825	183	580
Higher secondary	516	86	296	670	91	397
Diploma/certificate course	-	-	-	966	693	862
Graduate+	800	283	601	952	369	688
All (0+)	691	186	452	846	323	620

For the rural males, with graduate and above education, the worker- population ratio decreased to 80 per cent during 2004-2005 from 88 percent in 1999-2000, and it increased drastically from 42 per cent during 1999-2000 to 71 per cent during the year 2004-2005 for rural females. During 1999-2000 the worker population ratio among the urban persons was about 48 percent for illiterate and 60 percent for graduate and above educational level. Among the employed urban females, the worker-population ratio was 27 per cent with no education during 1999-2000, which increased to 58 per cent during 2004-2005, whereas it was 28 per cent with graduate level of education during 1999-2000 and 37 per cent during 2004-2005.

## Usually employed by status of Employment

Employment persons are categorized into three groups according to their status of employment. These broad groups include (i) self-employed, (ii) regular employees, and (iii) casual labour. Table 3.8 shows the distribution of usually employed persons per 1000 persons by category of status of employment for Himachal Pradesh for both principal status and 'all' workers. During 2004-05, for rural areas, among the workers with principal status, 73 percent were self-employed, the percentage being 59 per cent for males and 91 per cent for females. The corresponding proportion in urban areas was 32 per cent for all persons, 31 per cent for males and 35 per cent for females. During 1999-2000, in rural areas 61 per cent of males and 93 per cent of females were self-employed, and the percentage of self-employed in urban areas was 33 per cent and 38 per cent, respectively.

**Table 3.8: Per 1000 distribution of usually employed by category of employment.**

Category of employment	1999-2000			2004-2005		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
<b>Rural</b>						
<b>Principal status</b>						
Self employed	606	934	727	591	914	732
Regular employed	178	48	130	195	66	138
Casual labour	216	18	143	214	20	129
<b>Principal subsidiary status</b>						
Self employed	629	959	787	614	929	767
Regular employed	167	29	101	182	51	119
Casual labour	204	12	112	204	20	115
<b>Urban</b>						
<b>Principal status</b>						
Self employed	334	384	342	306	349	315
Regular employed	545	547	546	387	390	388
Casual labour	121	69	112	307	259	297
<b>Principal subsidiary status</b>						
Self employed	337	533	376	317	424	341
Regular employed	543	406	516	381	356	375
Casual labour	120	61	108	302	220	283

This shows that the proportion of self-employed persons as a whole as well as for males and females decreased over time. The proportion of regular employees in urban areas was almost the same during 1999-2000 (55 per cent for males and females) and during 2004-05 (39 per cent each for males and females). Proportion of regular employees in rural areas was relatively higher for males (18 per cent) as compared to females (5 per cent) during 1999-2000 as well as 2004-2005 (20 per cent for males and 7 per cent for females). Only 2 Per cent of rural females were in casual labour during both quinquennial surveys, whereas it was about 21 per cent for male during both years. The proportion of casual labour among urban female, increased to 26 per cent during 2004-2005 from only 7 per cent in 1999-2000. Among urban persons, the proportion of casual labour increase over the years.

This Table also shows that 79 per cent of rural 'all' workers were self-employed during 1999-2000, which marginally decreased to 77 per cent during 2004-05. Rural females were relatively more self-employed than the rural males during both years. Only 1 per cent of rural females during 1999-2000 and 2 per cent during 2004-05 were working as casual labour. During 2004-05, among the 'all' urban workers, about 32 per cent of the males and 42 per cent of females were self-employed, 38 per cent of males and 36 per cent of females were regular employees, and 30 per cent of the males and 22 per cent of the females were in casual labour. The corresponding figures for males and females during 1999-2000 were 34 per cent and 53 per cent for self-employed, 54 per cent and 41 per cent for regular employees, and 12 per cent and 6 per cent for casual labour. The proportion of 'all' workers (all persons taken together) decreased from 38 per cent during 1999-2000 to 34 per cent during 2004-05 for self-employed, and from 52 per cent during 1999-2000 to 38 per cent during 2004-05 for regular employees. The proportion of 'all' workers increased to 28 per cent during 2004-05 from 11 per cent during 1999-2000 for casual labour.

### **Usually Employed by Broad Industry Division**

Broad industry divisions include agriculture; mining & quarrying; manufacturing; electricity; water; construction; trade; hotel; restaurant; transport. Services include finance, business, and public administration, education and commerce. During 1999-2000, in rural areas, 66 per cent of all persons in the principal status were engaged in agriculture, the proportion of females was higher (92 per cent) compared to males (51 per cent). The proportion of all persons in the principal status who were engaged in agriculture decreased during 2004-05 for both males and females over the years. In rural areas, an increase in the proportion of males engaged in 'electricity & water', 'construction', 'trade', hotel and restaurant' and transport was noticed, though it was only small in magnitude, (Table 3.9). In urban areas, 25 per cent of all persons in the principal status were engaged in 'hotel, trade and restaurant' during 2004-05, while construction was responsible for 22 per cent of employment of the persons. Manufacturing was the third main source of employment, accounting for 14 per cent of employment. The proportion of males engaged in 'trade, hotel, 'restaurant', 'construction' and 'manufacturing' increased over the years. Service sector accounted for 40 per cent of males and 55 per cent of the females during 1999-2000, which decreased to 18 per cent and 43 per cent, respectively, during 2004-05.

**Table 3.9: Per 1000 distribution of usually working persons according to principal status by broad division.**

Broad Category division	1999-2000			2004-2005		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
<b>Rural</b>						
Agriculture etc.	510	921	661	464	895	653
Mining & quarrying	0	0	0	2	0	1
Manufacturing	71	16	51	78	22	53
Electricity, water etc.	21	2	14	28	2	16
Construction	183	6	118	192	9	112
Trade, hotel, restaurant	64	9	44	82	9	50
Transport etc.	45	2	29	61	6	37
Fin, business etc.	8	1	5	9	0	5
Pub adm., edu., com.	98	43	78	85	56	72
All	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000
<b>Urban</b>						
Agriculture etc.	40	224	68	25	251	70
Mining & quarrying	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	9	24	84	165	46	141
Electricity, water etc.	41	29	39	36	1	29
Construction	18	23	108	219	208	217
Trade, hotel, restaurant	246	129	228	291	65	245
Transport etc.	59	19	53	80	1	64
Fin, business etc.	57	14	51	28	18	25
Pub adm., edu., com.	343	538	373	156	411	208
All	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000

Table 3.10 shows distribution of usually working persons of 'all workers by broad industry division. As a whole, in rural areas, 74 per cent were engaged in agriculture during 1999-2000, which decreased to 70 percent during 2004-05. The proportion of males and females engaged in agriculture was 54 per cent and 95 per cent, respectively during 1999- 2000, that decreased to 49 per cent and 91 per cent, respectively during 2004-05. 'Construction' alone accounted for 17 per cent of rural male employment during 1999-2000 and 18 per cent during 2004-05; it was male-dominated 'economic' activity.

In urban areas, 'service' sector was responsible for 41 per cent of 'all' workers during 1999-2000 and 23 per cent during 2004-2005, recording a decrease of 18 percentage points. The proportion of the females in 'service' sector was higher during both periods (43 per cent for female and 40 per cent for males during 1999-2000 and 40 per cent for females and 18 per cent for males during 2004-05). In urban areas only 4 per cent of the males and 39 per cent of females during 1999-2000 and 3 per cent the males and 28 per cent of the females during 2004-05 were engaged in agriculture. 'Construction', 'trade', hotel and restaurant' and 'transport accounted for 12 per cent, 25 per cent and 6 per cent, respectively of urban males during 1999-2000, and 22 per cent, 30 per cent and 8 per cent during 2004-05. The proportion of urban males engaged in 'manufacturing' increased over years from 10 per cent in 1999-2000 to 16 per cent in 2004-05.

**Table 3.10: Per 1000 distribution of usually working persons in the principal and subsidiary status taken together by broad industry division.**

Broad industry division	1999-2000			2004-2005		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
<b>Rural</b>						
Agriculture etc.	538	951	736	494	910	696
Mining & quarrying	0	0	0	2	0	1
Manufacturing	67	11	40	72	24	49
Electricity, water etc.	20	1	11	26	2	14
Construction	172	4	92	183	9	98
Trade, hotel, restaurant	61	6	34	77	7	43
Transport etc.	43	1	23	58	5	32
Fin, business etc.	7	1	4	8	0	4
Pub adm, edu, com	92	25	60	79	44	62
All	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000
<b>Urban</b>						
Agriculture etc.	42	391	110	26	284	85
Mining & quarrying	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	95	18	80	164	58	140
Electricity, water etc.	41	21	37	35	1	27
Construction	117	17	98	215	176	206
Trade, hotel, restaurant	246	109	219	299	80	249
Transport etc.	59	14	50	79	1	61
Fin, business etc.	57	10	48	128	16	25
Pub adm, edu, com	343	419	358	154	385	205
All	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000

### Employed According to Current Status

The usual status approach is unable to capture the changes in the activity pattern caused by seasonal fluctuations. But the estimates obtained by adopting the current weekly status and current daily status approaches are expected to reflect the overall effect caused by the intermittent changes in the activity pattern during the year. The latter also reflects the changes that take place even during a week. The estimates of the employed based on current weekly status give the general picture of employment in a period of 7 days while those based on current daily status give the general picture of employment on a day. The difference between the current weekly and current daily statuses rates indicates the under employment of those who had some employment in a week.

Table 3.11 presents the estimates of the employed population according to current weekly and current daily statuses for Himachal Pradesh. The rates in the current weekly status and current daily status obtained for the 61<sup>st</sup> round have shown an increase in the urban areas for both males and females over 55<sup>th</sup> round. In rural areas, there is hardly any difference between the worker-population ratio according to current weekly and current daily statuses from 1999-2000 to 2004-05. In urban areas the worker-

population ratio according to weekly status was 31 per cent during 1999-2000, which increased to 44 per cent this registering an increase of 13 percentage points. The worker-population ratio according to weekly status in urban areas was 50 per cent and 12 per cent, respectively for males and females in 1999-2000, which increased to 61 per cent and 22 per cent, respectively for males and females during 2004-05.

**Table 3.11: Number of persons (person-days) employed per 1000 persons (person-days) according to current weekly and daily status.**

Current status	1999-2000			2004-2005		
	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female	Persons
<b>Rural</b>						
Weekly	510	424	466	516	433	474
Daily	498	313	404	491	323	405
<b>Urban</b>						
Weekly	497	117	314	610	221	443
Daily	494	101	101	584	196	417

### Daily Wage Rates

Regular wage/salaried persons; Data on the average wage earnings per day received by regular wage/salaried persons of age 15 years and above during each of the seven days of the reference week are presented in Table 3.12. It is observed that, apart from the rural-urban differences, the gender-differential is quite substantial in the daily wage earnings of the regular wage/salaried persons. Urban daily wage earnings are higher by Rs. 88 compared to rural wage earnings during 2004-05. There is a difference of Rs. 90 in urban-rural daily wage earnings for males and Rs. 75 for females.

**Table 3.12: Average wage/salary earnings (Rs.) per day received by regular wage salaried employees of age 15-59 years.**

Sex	1999-2000		2004-2005	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
Male	NA	NA	205.18	295.47
Female	NA	NA	151.71	226.65
All persons	NA	NA	193.94	281.69

NA= Not Available

### Casual workers

Table 3.13 gives the daily wage rate to casual workers of age 15-59 years engaged in public work in rural areas. The average daily wage rate of casual labourer engaged in public works was Rs. 75 during 1999-2000 and surprisingly Rs. 73 during 2004-05 (a decline of Rs 2). The average daily wage rate for



males was around Rs. 75 during both periods, but there was an increase of Rs 10 for females in 2004-05 over 1999-2000, but it was still lower than that of males.

**Table 3.13: Average daily wages for rural casual worker of age 15-59 years employed in public works.**

Sex	1999-2000		2004-2005	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
Male	NA	NA	75.70	74.91
Female	NA	NA	51.00	61.24
All persons	NA	NA	75.15	73.20

Casual labourers in other types of work: The daily wage rates for casual labourers of age 15-59 years engaged in works other than public works are shown in Table 3.14 for both rural and urban areas. The average wage rates for the males are higher than those for females. In both rural and urban areas during both years. The daily wage rate was Rs, 66 in 1999-2000 and Rs. 87 in 2004-05. There was a difference of Rs. 12 between rural male-female wage rates during 1995-2000 and that of Rs. 27 during 2004-05. The urban male- female wage differential was Rs. 21 during 1999-2000, which narrowed down to Rs. 4 during 2004-05,

**Table 3.14: Average daily wages (Rs.) for 15-59 years engaged in other than public works.**

Sex	1999-2000		2004-2005	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
Male	67.06	70.99	88.88	69.67
Female	50.36	50.30	62.00	65.92
All persons	66.23	69.18	87.14	69.04

### 3.3 Employment as per Census 2001

According to census, work is defined as participation in any economically productive activity with or without compensation, wages or profit. Such participation may be physical and/or mental in nature. Work involves not only actual work but also includes effective supervision and direction of work. It even includes part time help or unpaid work on farm, family enterprise or in any other economic activity. All persons engaged in 'work' are workers. Persons who are engaged in cultivation or milk production even solely for domestic consumption are also treated as workers. Reference period for determining a person as worker and non-worker is one year preceding the date of enumeration.

## Work participation rate

It is defined as the ratio of persons engaged in work to the total persons. Table 3.15 presents the information about work-participation rates according to sex and residence for all the districts of Himachal Pradesh and the state. Fifty-one percent of the total persons in the rural areas and 37 percent in urban areas were engaged in any type of work one year preceding the enumeration. Participation rates among males are higher compared to females in rural as well in urban areas, and also higher in all the districts. The work Participation rates for rural males varied between 68 percent (the highest in district Lahul & Spiti) and 51 percent (the lowest in Kangra and Hamirpur district) the corresponding figures for rural females are 57 percent (for district district Lahul & Spiti) and 39 percent (for Kangra and Una districts). The overall urban male and female work participation rates are 54 percent and 15 percent respectively.

**Table 3.15: Total work participation rates as per 2001 census.**

District/ state	Rural			Urban			Total		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Chamba	54.3	48.3	51.3	49.2	15.4	33.5	53.9	46.0	50.0
Kangra	50.8	38.6	44.6	48.8	15.1	32.8	50.7	37.4	44.0
Lahul & Spiti	68.3	57.4	63.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	68.3	57.4	63.5
Kullu	60.6	55.7	58.2	56.9	17.1	39.4	60.3	55.7	58.2
Mandi	52.9	50.3	51.6	49.4	16.6	33.9	52.6	48.2	50.4
Hamirpur	51.2	51.0	51.1	47.8	16.6	33.4	50.9	48.7	49.8
Una	53.1	39.1	46.1	51.0	14.1	33.6	52.9	37.0	45.0
Bilaspur	52.3	47.1	49.7	51.3	22.0	37.8	52.2	45.6	48.9
Solan	59.9	47.8	54.1	66.0	13.6	45.9	61.1	42.6	52.6
Sirmaur	57.4	44.8	51.4	47.7	10.3	30.4	56.4	41.3	49.3
Shimla	58.2	51.8	55.1	55.5	15.8	38.5	57.5	44.2	51.2
Kinnaur	66.5	54.7	61.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.5	54.7	61.0
Himachal Pradesh	54.7	46.4	50.6	54.2	15.2	37.0	54.6	43.7	49.2

## Main and marginal workers

The workers who had worked for the major part of the reference period, i.e., 6 months or more, are termed as main workers. Those workers who had not worked for the major part of the reference period, i.e., less than 6 months are termed as marginal workers. Table 3.16 presents the percent distribution of total workers by main and marginal categories according to sex and residence for all the districts and the state. In Himachal Pradesh, 32 percent of the total rural workers are main workers and 19 percent are marginal workers. The proportion of rural male main workers in Himachal Pradesh is higher as compared to that of rural females, whereas the percentage of female rural marginal workers is higher than that of males.

**Table 3.16: Percent distribution of total workers by main and marginal category**

District/ state	Main workers			Marginal workers		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
	<b>Rural</b>					
Chamba	39.8	15.1	27.6	14.3	33.2	23.7
Kangra	36.8	14.0	24.9	14.7	24.6	19.7
Lahul & Spiti	64.0	50.2	57.8	4.4	7.2	5.7
Kullu	50.2	38.8	44.3	10.4	17.7	13.9
Mandi	39.0	20.9	29.9	13.9	29.4	21.7
Hamirpur	34.7	24.1	29.1	16.5	26.8	22.0
Una	40.6	12.2	26.3	12.5	26.9	19.8
Bilaspur	40.0	24.3	32.3	12.3	22.4	17.3
Solan	47.3	15.8	32.2	12.6	32.1	21.9
Sirmaur	49.2	28.6	39.5	8.2	16.2	12.0
Shimla	50.8	36.5	43.8	7.4	15.3	11.3
Kinnaur	59.4	42.3	51.5	7.1	12.4	9.6
Himachal Pradesh	42.2	21.9	32.1	12.5	24.6	18.5
	<b>Urban</b>					
Chamba	46.3	12.9	30.8	2.9	2.5	2.7
Kangra	45.0	12.0	29.4	3.8	3.1	3.5
Lahul & Spiti	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kullu	54.2	14.4	36.7	2.7	2.6	2.7
Mandi	45.1	12.8	29.8	4.3	3.8	4.0
Hamirpur	42.8	11.6	28.3	5.0	5.0	5.0
Una	45.9	9.9	28.9	5.1	4.2	4.7
Bilaspur	46.8	19.7	34.3	4.5	2.3	3.5
Solan	64.0	12.3	44.1	2.0	1.3	1.7
Sirmaur	45.4	9.7	28.9	2.3	0.6	1.5
Shimla	54.1	14.8	37.3	1.3	1.0	1.2
Kinnaur	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Himachal Pradesh	51.4	13.0	34.4	2.8	2.2	2.5
	<b>Total</b>					
Chamba	40.3	14.9	27.9	23.6	31.0	22.1
Kangra	36.6	1.9	25.1	14.1	23.5	18.8
Lahul & Spiti	64.0	50.2	57.8	4.4	7.2	5.7
Kullu	50.6	36.3	43.7	9.7	16.6	13.1
Mandi	39.4	20.4	29.9	13.2	27.8	20.5
Hamirpur	35.4	23.3	29.0	15.6	25.4	20.7
Una	41.1	12.0	26.6	11.8	25.1	18.4
Bilaspur	40.5	24.3	32.5	11.7	21.2	16.4
Solan	50.8	15.2	34.4	10.4	27.4	18.2
Sirmaur	48.8	26.7	38.4	7.5	14.6	10.9
Shimla	51.6	31.9	42.3	5.9	12.3	8.9
Kinnaur	59.4	42.3	51.5	7.1	12.4	9.6
Himachal Pradesh	43.2	21.1	32.3	11.4	22.6	16.9

In urban areas, the proportion of Male main as well marginal workers is considerably higher than that of female workers. In Himachal Pradesh, 32 percent of total persons are main workers and 17 percent are marginal workers. Around 60 percent of males in tribal districts are main workers. In Kullu, Solan and Shimla districts, nearly half of the males are main workers.

Total workers according to category: Total workers have been classified into four categories, namely, cultivators, agricultural labourers, household industry Workers and other workers. A cultivator is he or she who is engaged in cultivation of land owned or held from government or held from private persons or institutions for payment in money, kind or share. Cultivation also includes effective supervision or direction in cultivation. A person working on another person's land for wages is not treated as cultivator. A person who works on other person's land for wages in money or kind or share is regarded as an agricultural labourer. Agricultural labourer has no right of lease or contract on and 1 which he or she works. Household industry is defined as an industry conducted by one or more members of the household at home or within the village in rural areas and only within the precincts of the house where the household lives in urban areas. Household industry relates to production, processing, servicing, repairing or making and selling (but not merely selling) of goods. It does not include professions such as pleader, doctor, musician, dancer, waterman, astrologer, dhobi, barber etc. All workers who are engaged in some economic activity during the last one-year, but are not cultivators or agricultural labourers or in household industry are 'other workers'. These include all government servants, municipal employees, teachers, factory workers, plantation workers, those engaged in trade, commerce, business, transport, banking, mining, construction, political or social work, priests, entertainment, artists etc.

Table 3.17 gives the percent distribution of total workers by category according to sex and residence for all districts of Himachal Pradesh and the state, as a whole. Around 70 percent of the total rural workers and only 4 percent of the total urban workers are engaged in cultivation, the proportion being higher for females compared to males. The proportion of total rural workers engaged as agricultural labourers, workers in household industry and other activities is 3, 2 and 25 percent, respectively, and the corresponding Proportion for urban labourers is 1, 2, and 94 percent. As a whole, 65 percent of total workers are engaged in agriculture, 3 percent in agricultural labour, 1 Percent in household industry and 30 percent in other activities. The proportion of Ural females engaged in cultivation is more than 90 percent in Chamba, Kullu, Mandi, Hamirpur, Bilaspur, Sirmaur and Shimla.

**Table 3.17: Percent distribution of total workers by category**

District/ state	Cultivators			Agricultural labourers			Working in household industry			Other workers		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
	<b>Rural</b>											
Chamba	63.5	91.4	76.4	0.8	0.7	0.8	1.2	1.2	1.2	34.4	6.8	21.6
Kangra	42.3	80.6	59.1	7.4	6.3	6.9	3.5	3.1	3.3	46.7	10.1	30.6
Lahul & Spiti	37.7	75.5	52.9	1.4	2.0	1.6	0.4	1.0	0.6	60.6	21.5	44.8
Kullu	71.6	9.5	80.4	2.6	2.8	2.7	1.4	1.1	1.3	24.4	5.6	15.7
Mandi	59.8	92.1	75.7	1.4	1.5	1.5	2.0	0.9	1.5	36.8	5.5	21.3
Hamirpur	50.5	93.2	73.0	1.8	1.4	1.6	2.1	0.6	1.3	45.6	4.8	24.0
Una	44.6	81.6	60.3	6.3	5.2	5.8	2.1	1.8	2.0	47.1	11.4	31.9
Bilaspur	52.6	92.5	71.5	2.1	1.5	1.8	2.5	0.7	1.6	42.8	5.3	25.1
Solan	49.0	86.2	64.6	2.8	2.7	2.8	1.4	1.1	1.3	46.8	10.0	31.3
Sirmaur	65.9	91.1	76.3	2.8	2.5	2.7	1.5	0.7	1.2	29.9	5.7	19.8
Shimla	66.3	90.3	77.3	3.4	2.8	3.1	1.5	0.8	1.2	28.8	6.0	18.4
Kinnaur	50.0	85.8	64.8	2.71	1.7	2.3	2.1	1.5	1.8	45.2	11.0	31.1
Himachal Pradesh	55.1	88.2	70.2	3.6	3.0	3.3	2.1	1.4	1.8	39.2	7.4	24.7

	Urban											
Chamba	1.3	6.8	2.5	0.0	0.1	0.1	1.6	1.4	1.6	97.1	91.7	95.9
Kangra	2.5	13.8	5.0	1.3	1.4	1.4	2.1	3.7	2.4	94.1	81.1	91.2
Lahul & Spiti	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kullu	0.9	2.7	1.2	0.6	0.8	0.6	1.3	2.0	1.4	97.3	94.5	96.8
Mandi	2.9	14.9	5.7	0.4	0.8	0.5	1.4	4.2	2.0	95.4	80.1	91.8
Hamirpur	3.2	27.4	8.7	1.3	1.2	1.3	4.1	2.2	3.6	91.4	69.3	86.3
Una	8.1	24.2	11.3	2.4	5.3	3.0	2.0	1.9	2.0	87.5	68.6	83.7
Bilaspur	4.2	35.2	12.6	0.5	0.7	0.5	1.6	1.1	1.5	93.8	63.0	85.4
Solan	0.8	1.9	0.9	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.9	2.5	1.1	98.1	95.3	97.7
Sirmaur	1.8	3.7	2.1	0.6	0.7	0.6	1.0	0.6	0.9	96.6	95.1	96.4
Shimla	1.1	4.5	1.7	0.4	0.4	0.4	1.0	1.2	1.0	97.4	93.9	96.8
Kinnaur	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Himachal Pradesh	2.0	10.9	3.6	0.7	1.4	0.7	1.0	2.1	1.5	96.0	85.9	94.1
	Total											
Chamba	59.1	89.4	72.7	0.8	0.6	0.7	1.2	1.2	1.2	38.9	8.8	25.4
Kangra	40.1	79.2	56.9	7.1	6.2	6.7	3.4	3.1	3.3	49.3	11.5	33.1
Lahul & Spiti	37.7	75.5	52.9	1.4	2.0	1.6	0.4	1.0	0.6	60.6	21.5	44.8
Kullu	65.9	88.5	76.0	2.5	2.7	2.6	1.4	1.2	1.3	32.2	7.7	20.1
Mandi	55.9	90.4	72.5	1.4	1.5	1.4	2.0	1.0	1.5	40.7	7.1	40.7
Hamirpur	46.9	91.7	69.9	1.8	1.4	1.6	2.2	0.6	1.4	49.1	66.2	27.1
Una	41.3	79.8	57.1	5.9	5.2	5.6	2.1	1.8	2.0	50.7	13.2	35.8
Bilaspur	49.3	90.8	68.5	23.0	1.8	1.5	2.4	0.7	1.6	46.3	7.0	28.1
Solan	38.2	82.1	54.5	2.3	2.6	2.3	1.3	1.2	1.2	58.3	14.1	41.8
Sirmaur	60.1	88.9	71.5	2.6	2.5	2.6	1.4	0.7	1.1	35.9	7.9	24.8
Shimla	50.5	83.9	64.1	2.7	2.6	2.7	1.4	0.9	1.2	45.4	12.6	32.2
Kinnaur	50.0	85.8	64.8	2.7	1.7	2.3	2.1	1.5	1.8	45.2	11.0	31.1
Himachal Pradesh	49.5	85.5	65.3	3.3	2.9	3.1	2.0	1.4	1.8	45.2	9.8	29.8

### Main workers according to category

Main workers have been classified as cultivator, agriculture labourers, workers in household in household industry and other workers. Table 3.18 shows that 62 percent of rural total main workers are engaged as cultivators 2 percent work each as agriculture labourers and household industry workers and 35 percent are 'other workers'. The respective proportion of urban total main workers engaged as cultivator, agricultural labourers, household, industry and other workers is 2 percent, less than 1 percent, 1 per cent and 96 percent. The proportion of urban male and female main workers engaged, as 'other workers' is around 93 percent.

**Table 3.18: Percent distribution of main workers by category**

District/ state	Cultivators			Agricultural labourers			Working in household industry			Other workers		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
	Rural											
Chamba	54.2	82.1	61.7	0.6	0.6	0.6	1.2	1.1	1.2	44.0	16.2	36.6
Kangra	34.8	74.1	45.8	3.8	2.9	3.5	3.8	2.5	3.4	58.1	20.3	47.2
Lahul & Spiti	36.3	76.8	52.0	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.3	0.8	0.5	62.3	21.5	46.5
Kullu	68.4	90.6	77.6	2.1	1.6	1.9	1.4	1.0	1.2	28.1	6.8	19.3
Mandi	52.4	88.3	65.1	0.6	0.5	0.6	2.1	0.8	1.6	44.8	10.5	32.7
Hamirpur	38.4	91.0	61.4	0.7	0.5	0.6	2.5	0.5	1.6	58.4	8.0	36.3
Una	39.3	70.8	46.6	3.8	2.3	3.4	2.3	1.7	2.2	54.7	25.1	47.8
Bilaspur	47.0	90.4	63.6	1.1	0.7	1.0	2.7	0.8	2.0	49.2	8.1	33.5
Solan	41.4	75.0	49.2	2.5	2.4	2.5	1.5	1.9	1.6	54.5	20.8	46.7
Sirmaur	64.2	91.5	73.6	1.9	1.2	1.7	1.5	0.5	1.2	32.4	6.9	23.6
Shimla	63.9	89.4	74.2	3.0	2.4	2.8	1.5	0.8	1.2	31.6	7.4	21.8
Kinnaur	45.8	84.1	60.3	2.5	1.4	2.1	2.2	1.4	1.9	49.5	13.1	35.7
Himachal Pradesh	49.6	85.2	61.7	2.2	1.6	2.0	2.2	1.1	1.8	46.0	12.0	34.5

	Urban											
Chamba	0.9	2.5	1.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	1.6	1.2	1.6	97.4	96.2	97.2
Kangra	1.6	4.1	2.1	0.8	0.6	0.8	1.9	2.8	2.0	95.7	92.5	95.1
Lahul & Spiti	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kullu	0.8	3.0	1.2	0.3	0.4	0.3	1.0	1.6	1.1	97.8	95.0	97.3
Mandi	1.6	4.4	2.2	0.1	0.3	0.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	93.9	94.0	96.4
Hamirpur	1.6	11.1	3.4	0.4	0.2	0.4	4.2	1.4	3.6	89.5	87.3	92.7
Una	7.1	13.1	8.1	1.3	2.7	1.5	2.1	1.8	2.0	93.9	82.4	88.4
Bilaspur	4.3	35.1	12.5	0.3	0.3	0.3	1.5	1.0	1.3	98.2	63.6	85.9
Solan	0.7	0.4	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.8	1.5	0.9	98.2	97.9	98.2
Sirmaur	1.9	3.5	2.1	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.9	0.3	0.8	96.7	96.1	96.6
Shimla	1.0	3.0	1.3	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.9	0.6	0.9	97.7	96.2	97.4
Kinnaur	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Himachal Pradesh	1.6	5.8	2.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	1.3	1.2	1.3	96.7	92.6	96.0
	Total											
Chamba	49.4	77.2	56.7	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.2	1.1	1.2	48.9	21.2	41.6
Kangra	32.0	71.2	43.0	3.5	2.8	3.3	3.7	2.5	3.3	60.8	23.4	50.3
Lahul & Spiti	36.3	76.8	52.0	1.0	0.9	1.0	0.3	0.8	0.5	62.3	21.5	46.5
Kullu	62.2	88.1	72.6	1.9	1.6	1.8	1.4	1.0	1.2	34.5	9.3	24.4
Mandi	48.3	84.9	60.9	0.5	0.5	0.5	2.1	0.8	1.6	49.1	13.8	37.0
Hamirpur	34.7	88.4	57.3	0.7	0.5	0.6	2.7	0.5	1.8	61.9	10.5	40.3
Una	35.9	66.9	42.9	3.5	2.4	3.2	2.3	1.7	2.1	58.3	29.0	51.7
Bilaspur	43.7	87.7	60.1	1.1	0.7	0.9	2.6	0.8	1.9	52.7	10.8	37.1
Solan	30.7	65.8	37.9	1.9	2.1	2.0	1.4	1.8	1.5	66.0	30.3	58.7
Sirmaur	58.0	88.2	68.0	1.8	1.1	1.6	1.5	0.5	1.1	38.7	10.2	29.3
Shimla	47.3	81.0	59.3	2.3	2.2	2.3	1.3	1.3	0.8	49.0	16.0	37.2
Kinnaur	45.8	84.1	60.3	2.5	1.4	2.1	2.2	2.2	1.4	49.5	13.1	35.7
Himachal Pradesh	43.4	80.9	55.5	2.0	1.5	1.8	2.1	1.1	1.8	52.5	16.4	40.9

The proportion of main workers engaged as cultivator, agricultural labourers, household industry workers and other workers is 56 percent 2 percent 1percent and 41percent respectively for the state as a whole. The proportion of rural main workers against in cultivation varied between 46percent for Kangra district and 78 percent for Kullu district.

### Marginal workers according to category

**Table 3.19: Percent distribution of marginal workers by category.**

District/ state	Cultivators			Agricultural labourers			Working in household industry			Other workers		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
	Rural											
Chamba	89.1	95.7	93.6	1.6	0.7	1.0	1.3	1.2	1.2	8.1	2.4	4.2
Kangra	61.9	84.1	76.0	16.5	8.2	11.3	2.8	3.4	3.2	18.8	4.2	9.6
Lahul & Spiti	57.5	66.7	62.7	6.3	9.5	8.1	1.1	2.3	1.8	35.1	21.4	27.3
Kullu	87.2	90.4	89.1	5.3	5.1	5.2	1.2	1.5	1.4	6.4	3.0	4.3
Mandi	80.4	94.8	90.3	33.8	2.2	2.7	1.6	1.0	1.2	14.1	2.0	5.8
Hamirpur	76.1	95.2	88.4	4.2	2.3	2.9	1.2	10.7	0.9	18.6	1.9	7.8
Una	61.7	86.5	78.6	14.4	6.5	9.0	1.4	1.9	1.7	22.5	5.2	10.7
Bilaspur	70.6	94.7	86.2	5.4	2.4	3.4	1.8	0.6	1.0	22.2	2.3	9.4
Solan	77.4	91.7	87.4	3.9	2.9	3.2	0.9	0.7	0.8	17.8	4.7	8.6
Sirmaur	76.1	90.4	85.3	7.9	5.0	6.0	1.2	1.1	1.2	14.8	3.5	7.6
Shimla	82.8	92.6	89.3	5.9	3.6	4.4	1.9	0.9	1.2	9.4	2.9	5.1
Kinnaur	84.8	91.5	88.8	4.3	2.7	3.3	1.1	1.6	1.4	9.8	4.2	6.4
Himachal Pradesh	74.0	90.8	85.1	8.3	4.3	5.6	1.8	16	1.7	159	3.3	7.6
	Urban											
Chamba	6.9	29.5	16.5	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.9	2.8	1.7	92.1	67.4	81.7
Kangra	12.4	51.4	28.9	7.5	4.4	6.2	5.1	7.1	5.9	74.9	37.1	58.9
Lahul & Spiti	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kullu	1.5	0.6	1.1	5.7	3.2	4.6	5.7	4.3	5.1	87.0	92.0	89.1



Mandi	15.9	505	310	3.1	2.4	2.8	2.5	14.4	7.7	78.4	32.8	58.5
Hamirpur	16.9	65.1	39.2	9.3	3.4	6.6	3.3	3.8	3.6	70.5	27.6	50.7
Una	16.7	50.4	31.0	12.7	11.15	12.2	1.7	2.0	1.8	69.0	36.1	55.1
Bilaspur	3.0	36.3	13.3	2.1	3.4	2.5	3.0	2.1	2.7	91.9	58.2	81.5
Solan	2.4	15.8	6.3	2.7	2.2	2.5	2.2	11.6	4.9	92.7	70.5	86.3
Sirmaur	0.9	7.1	12.	3.4	10.2	4.7	1.9	5.5	2.5	93.8	77.2	90.8
Shimla	6.6	27.4	14.0	4.3	3.7	4.1	2.5	9.5	5.0	86.6	59.4	76.9
Kinnaur	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Himachal Pradesh	9.7	41.1	21.9	5.5	4.3	5.0	2.9	7.3	4.6	81.9	47.3	68.4
	<b>Total</b>											
Chamba	87.7	95.3	92.9	1.6	0.7	1.0	1.3	1.2	1.2	9.5	2.8	4.9
Kangra	61.2	83.9	75.5	16.3	8.2	11.2	2.8	3.4	3.2	19.7	4.5	10.1
Lahul & Spiti	57.5	66.7	62.7	6.3	9.5	8.1	1.1	2.3	1.8	35.1	21.4	27.3
Kullu	85.2	89.3	87.7	53	5.1	5.2	1.3	1.5	1.4	8.3	4.0	5.7
Mandi	78.9	94.4	89.5	3.8	2.2	2.7	1.7	1.1	1.3	15.6	2.2	6.5
Hamirpur	74.5	94.8	87.5	4.3	2.3	3.0	1.3	0.7	0.9	19.9	2.2	8.5
Una	50.9	86.0	77.6	14.3	6.5	9.0	1.5	1.9	1.7	24.3	5.6	1.7
Bilaspur	68.8	94.3	85.2	5.3	2.4	3.4	1.9	0.6	1.0	24.1	2.7	10.4
Solan	74.4	91.1	86.0	3.9	2.9	3.2	1.0	0.8	0.9	20.8	5.2	10.0
Sirmaur	73.7	90.1	84.1	7.8	5.0	6.0	1.2	1.2	1.2	17.3	3.8	8.7
Shimla	78.5	91.5	87.0	5.8	3.5	4.4	1.9	1.0	1.2	13.7	3.8	7.3
Kinnaur	84.8	91.5	88.8	4.3	2.7	3.3	1.1	1.6	1.4	9.8	4.2	6.4
Himachal Pradesh	72.3	90.4	84.2	8.3	4.3	5.6	1.8	1.7	1.7	17.6	3.7	8.5

Table 3.19 shows that the proportion of total rural marginal workers in cultivation, agricultural labour, household industry and other work is 85, 6, 2 and 8 percent, respectively. The percentage of urban total marginal workers engaged in other work is 68 percent, followed by cultivation (22 Percent), agricultural labour and household industry (5 percent each). Cultivation is the female dominant activity in rural areas. Ninety one percent of the total female rural marginal workers compared to male (74 percent) are engaged in cultivation. The proportion of rural marginal workers working in cultivation is as high as 94 percent for Chamba district and as low as 63 percent for Lahul & Spiti district. As a whole 90 percent or more of female marginal workers are engaged as cultivator in eight districts of the state (except Kangra, Lahul & Spiti, Kullu and Una).

### ***Bibliography***

- Bhati, J. P., and D. V. Singh. "Women's Contribution to Agricultural Economy in Hill Region of North-West India." *Economic and Political weekly*, Vol. XXII, N0.17, Bombay, April17, 1987, pp. 7-11.
- Bhattacharya, B.B., and S. Sakthivel. "Employment, Wage and Output Relationship in India: A Comparison of Pre and Post Reform Behaviour." *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol. 48, No. 2, April- June 2005, pp. 243-258.
- Government of Himachal Pradesh. Planning Department. **Draft Five-Year Plan and Draft Tribal Sub-Plan**. Shimla, 1978, pp. 5-6.
- Government of India. Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation. **Report of the Committee of Unemployment Estimates**. New Delhi, May 1973, P. 135.

- Government of India National Sample Survey Organization **Employment, Unemployment in India. 9<sup>th</sup>** National Sample Survey Round Report, No- 16, Vol.62 Delhi, 1955, p.14.
- Government of India National Sample Survey Organization **Employment, Unemployment in India 1999-2000 (Part-1)**. NSS 55<sup>th</sup> Round Report, No-458, Delhi, July 1999- June 2000.
- Government of India National Sample Survey Organization **Employment, Unemployment situation in India 2004-05 (Part-1)**. NSS 61<sup>th</sup> Round Report, No-515, Delhi, July 2004- June 2005.
- Government of India. Office of the Registrar and Census Commissioner of India. Census of India 2001, Series. India.
- Hansda, Sanjay K, and Partha Ray. "Employment and Poverty in India During the 1990's: Is There a Diverging Trend." *Economic and Political Weekly*, July 8-15, 2006, pp 3014-3023.
- International Institute for Population Sciences. **National Family Health Survey H.P.**, Bombay, IIPS, 1992-93.
- International Institute for Population Sciences. **National Family Health Survey H.P.**, Mumbai, IIPS, 1998-99.
- International Institute for Population Sciences. **National Family Health Survey H.P.**, Mumbai, IIPS, 2004-05.
- Kumar, Sikander, and Dalip S. Thakur. "Dimension and Extent of Female Labour Participation in Low Hill Zone Agrarian Economy of Himachal Pradesh- A case study." *Manpower Journal*, Vol. XXIX, No.2, New Delhi, July —Sept. 1993, pp. 7-11.
- Kumar, Virender, and J.S. Guleria. "Non-farm Occupation and employment in Himachal Pradesh." *The Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol.50, No.3, Bombay, July-Sept. 1995, p, 450.
- Rao, V.K.R.V." "Changing Structure of Indian Economy: A Seen Through National Income Data." **Economic and Political Weekly**, Vol. XIV, No. 50, December 15,1979, pp. 2049-2058.
- Reserve Bank of India. "Indian Economy Through National Income Statistics." **RBI Bulletin**, Vol. XXXIII, No. 7, July 1979, pp. 446-461.
- Sharma, H.R. "Employment and Wage Earnings of Agricultural Labourers: A State Wise Analysis." *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol. 44, No.2, Delhi, 2001, pp. 27-37,