

## GENDER AND OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION IN INDIA

*Dr. L.C.Mallaiah,*

*Department of Economics  
B.B.Ambedkar Central University  
Lucknow*

In a predominantly agricultural country like India women play a distinctive role in rural economic activities in earning a livelihood for the family. But until recently like many other developing countries, the role of women in the economic activity of the nation was practically ignored. In fact, the pre-occupation with specific pattern of economic development often resulted in the relative neglect of women's needs and the process of development itself often had some serious negative repercussions on the status of women, thus worsening rather than improving their condition.

The largest number of working women in India is engaged in farming operations either as cultivators or as agricultural laborers. They take up a wide variety of activities like sowing of seeds, transplanting, weeding, harvesting, preparation of compost and manure pits, application of manures, storage of seeds and food grains. An active farm woman spends eight to nine hours on the farm during the peak agricultural season. (Shanti Chakravarty, 1975).

Hence an attempt is made to analyse the work participation rates of women in Rural Labour Market and occupational distribution in India with special reference to state of Uttar Pradesh.

### GROWTH OF POPULATION

India is the second largest country in the world in terms of population. This is true of the female population also. Table-1 shows the rural population since 1971 to 1991. In 1971 the rural female population was **213.64 millions whereas it rose to**

**303.7 millions by 1991.** Thus over the decades (1971 to 1991), the female population increased by **90 millions.** Compared to this, the male population was 225.23 million in 1971 and raised to 323.14 millions by 1991, which shows an increase of 98, millions and the total rural population of the country was 626.9 millions by 1991. This shows that Indian women, constitute nearly half of the total population playing a vital role in the domestic sphere and also in the rural field, particularly in the agricultural sector.

The difference between the growth of male and female population has brought about a decline in the sex ratio-the number of females per 1000 males. According to the census of India 2001, the sex ratio stands at 933 for the country as a whole. This is a welcome improvement from the 1991 census, which had recorded 927 females for every 1000 males.

Table-2 presents the trend in sex ratio in India since 1901. The sex ratio in the country had always remained unfavourable to females. Moreover, barring some hiccups, it has shown a long term declining trend. The sex ratio at the beginning of the twentieth century was 972 and there after showed continuous decline, until 1941. In 1951 there was a marginal increase. But thereafter it again dropped for two consecutive decades to reach 930 in 1971. In fact, between 1961-71 the country saw the sharpest decline of 11 points in the sex ratio, thereafter it has fluctuated marginally around 930 in successive census.

## WORK FORCE PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN

Traditionally, it was not considered appropriate for women to work outside the home for wages. This normative value must be taken into consideration when assessing work-force participation of women. However, the participation rate of women in the labour market in India is highly reflecting their economic compulsion. The reasons of work for men and women may not be the same. It was found that "the primary reasons for work was economic for men and both economic and non-economic for women. By and large, women are forced to work to supplement family income. They have no choice but to work.

The factors and forces, which promote or prevent women participation, are wide and varied. Different authors also vary in their opinions regarding the influence of these factors, which may encourage or discourage women participation. However, several authors and studies have identified economic, political, legislative, technological, social demographic, cultural, religious, institutional, organizational and attitudinal factors as important determinants of women participation. (Jospeh, 1997, p.64)

What does the Indian case demonstrate regarding the Boserup thesis that development adversely affects the status of women? There is some evidence that before modern changes were introduced, women played active and productive role among some castes and in some places in the traditional Indian villages; women made distinctive contributions to cultivation, crafts, menial services and to the marketing of agricultural products and handicrafts besides as agricultural labourers. (Joyce Lebra, Joy Paulson, 1984 pp.16-18.)

Although most women in India work and contribute to the economy in one form or another much of their work is not documented or accounted for in official statistics. Women plough fields and harvest crops while working on farms, women weave and make handicrafts while working in

household industries. Women sell food and gather wood while working in the formal sector. Additionally women are traditionally responsible for the daily household chores (e.g., cooking, fetching water and looking after children).

Table-3 provides the shares of state in working population of various states at all India in rural areas for men and women. The share of male workers had been on the rise in Bihar, Rajasthan and West Bengal and on the other hand in Kerala and TamilNadu the corresponding shares were declining. Female workers participation as a percentage of total females registered a rise in Assam, Haryana, Karnataka and West Bengal, while they were declining in Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Himachal Pradesh and Kerala. It is also evident from this table that in Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu both male and female worker's share in the total workers population are high. Further the shares of female workers were higher than those of male workers in the states of Andhra Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu.

While female participation rates were raising in general states only. In Gujarat and Jammu and Kashmir the male participation rates were on rise. A look at womens' participation in the national economy in Table-4, there is a rising graph of the work participation rate (WPR) of women during the four census years of 1971, 1981 and 1991 and 2001. There was a big slump from 1961-1971 (from 28% to 14.22%) since then the growth of population and growth of economy during the last two decades seem to have contributed to rise of WPR during the decade (1981-91) from 19.67 per cent 22.73 per cent to 25.68 percent in 2001. The percentage increase in the number of female workers during this period is 42.26 in all areas, 40.25 in the rural areas and 60.99 in the urban areas. (Census of India, 1991, p.11) The percentages however, are deceptive if one looks at the absolute numbers involved. The main rise in the four census years comes from the rural sector, from 15.92 per cent to 23.06 per cent to 27.20 per cent respectively to 30.98 per cent. The urban sector, however, to which a large number of

people are migrating, shows a very slight increase in the four decades from 7.18 to 8.31 to 9.74 percent to 11.55 per cent, which means that the secondary and tertiary sectors are not showing the proper increase. The decline in employment, particularly in the manufacturing sector has been confirmed by the findings of Mundle (1991), Nagraj (1994), (Rao, 1994), and Gothoskar (1994).

Percentage increase of total workers from 1981 to 1991 in all areas however is only very slight from 30.70% to 37.68%. Percentage of workers among males has fallen from 52.62 percent to 51.56% while that of women has risen by 42.26 per cent. But however, the participation rates are higher for men than women. Increase in percentage of female workers also shows the increased work burden on women with low paid, low category jobs (Census, 1991, p.12).

Table-5 shows the female work participation rate across 22 Indian states during the census years 1961, 1971, 1981, 1991 and 2001. It reveals that in 1961, except in Sikkim (61.05), Nagaland (58.23), Meghalaya (55.02), Manipur (44.47), Madhya Pradesh (43.99), and Andhra Pradesh (41.31), female work participation rate was generally very low in the selected Indian states. Over the next three decades, but for the continuous decline in their participation rate in Haryana, Kerala, Meghalaya, Nagaland and Sikkim, the rest of the states registered a fall in 1971 and marginal improvement in 1981 and a further increase in 1991 and 2001. The decline in female work participation during the decade 1961-1971 corresponds to the period when the country witnessed Indo-China (1962) and Indo-Pak (1965) wars followed by drought and famines. The revival in their work participation rate in 1981 has been mainly due to the policies introduced by the Indian Government to improve the socio-economic conditions of women following the report of the committee on status of women in India (1974), which highlighted their miserable conditions. The decade also saw the celebration of International year for women 1975, which was subsequently extended over to a decade. The 1980s was also a period which witnessed the

launching of several schemes and programmes aimed at improving the overall conditions of women in the country. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that despite such efforts the 1991 female work participation rate could not reach the rate of 1961, except in Himachal Pradesh, which recorded a sustained rise over the decades. In 1991 census, the northeastern states of Nagaland (37.31), Manipur (32.65) and Meghalaya (30.67), had too highest female work participation rate, while Haryana (6.47), Jammu and Kashmir (7.35) and Uttar Pradesh (7.45) had the lowest rates.

Table-6 presents the female work participation rate in primary and non-primary sectors in 22 Indian states and the shifts across them during the census periods. The following results may be drawn from the table. The female work participation in the primary sector is higher around 80% compared to the non-primary sector in the Indian States, except in Punjab and female work participation in the primary sector has declined, but has enhanced in the non-primary sector during the census periods in all Indian states, except Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Manipur, Orissa and Tamil Nadu. The decline of female work participation in primary sector may be attributed to the increase in agricultural productivity, decline in the cultivated area, impact of government schemes and programmes leading to diversification of economic activities in rural areas and rising female literacy levels. This induces women to seek employment in the non-primary sector where the work is continuous and returns are relatively higher. These findings are supported by the studies of Chaudhri(1993) and Bhalla(1977).

## REASONS FOR LOW PARTICIPATION

The reasons as mentioned by many micro level studies for low work participation of women are as follows:

- i. To be employed in the modern trade and service one needs to be literate. Consequently, the fact that illiteracy rate are nearly always higher among women

- than among men is a major factor limiting womens' contribution to economic and social development. The failure to educate and train girls and women equally with men limits womens' roles and makes them inadequately trained for those employment opportunities that may be available.
- ii. Upgrading of the labour force during the process of economic development is likely to be a treat to female participation. It is seen that training women for jobs that men usually do create hostility between men and women. Types of occupations available and social conventions also determine the access of women to employment. In less developed areas, where the scope of self-employment for women is limited due to lack of skills among the female labourers, wage employment has better chances of involving female labour in the development activities.
  - iii. There are dissenting opinions also on the role of education on women participation. The increase in overall female educational participation has not led to the corresponding increase in female labour force participation. While Kerala has the highest female literacy rate in India, this has not guaranteed womens' economic power.
  - iv. It is being pointed out that the average sex ratio of female workers in non-household industry is less than that in household industry. The low social and economic position of women, their low literacy and technological levels, impediments in the way of development of skills and the social taboos against escorted women going out to work are being pointed out as the factors responsible for the employment of higher proportion of females in economic activities at the household level than in non-household economic activities.
  - v. Another reason for the low participation of women in economic activities is the belief among the employers that they can't expect the same level of job performance from women as from their male counterparts. According to them, most women employees consider their job as of secondary importance only. Thus "a belief in the universal subordination of women has continued to hamper efforts to take up systematic research of factors eroded womens' access to and control over re sources, the nature of their participation and value of their work."
  - vi. Women are being forced into unemployment more frequently than men when agriculture and industry went through economic changes. According to Subbarao "women face three types of uncertainty in employment. One is because of the seasonality of agriculture, the second is due to illness, maternity etc., and the third due to mechanization". Women work in the least skilled sections and when rationalization takes place, there will be reduced demand for the unskilled labour, which displaces women from their jobs.
  - vii. The welfare approach, which treats women as passive consumers of development, is another obstacle to women participation. Welfare oriented programmes exclude women as participants from the broader development programmes. In the model of economic growth followed by the Indian planners until recently, women are being included in the category of poor and treated primarily as beneficiaries and their participation in development not encouraged, for it was assumed that they are ignorant and irrational.

## OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF WOMEN

i. A large proportion of women workers in India are in the agricultural sector and labourers outweigh the other groups of women in agriculture. Table-7 shows the percentage share of workers to total population. From the table it is observed that the percentage of women workers to the total female population declined from 23.7 per cent in 1961 to 16.02 percent in 1991. During 1961-71 while the male and female population increased by 25 per cent and 24 per cent respectively and the number of men workers increased by 15.2 per cent and women workers declined by 41.4 per cent. The committee on the status of women in India (1975) observed that the continuous declining trend in womens' employment since the beginning of the century could not be entirely explained on the basis of anomalies and variations in definition and data collection. "This decline, particularly between 1961-1971 can't be explained by changes in the definition of workers adopted by the two censuses. Exclusion of secondary activity from the definition of workers in 1971 affected the recording of female workers due to the prevalence of unpaid family workers and marginal workers. In terms of numbers it would mean the exclusion of 2.3 million women workers from the workforce which does not make any substantial difference to the overall female participation rates in the labour force. Similarly, the female activity rate of 27.5% reported by the comparable round of the National sample survey of the same year. We, therefore, think that the declining participation trend of women has been a continuous one (Status Report, 1975, p.62). The 1981 and 1991 census survey in an attempt to arrive at current estimates of female workers tried to capture the economic status of marginal and unpaid workers by

adding direct questions in the census questionnaire and by sensitizing the enumerators "regarding unpaid workers on farm and family enterprises". It is pointed out that "most of such workers happen to be women. The increase in the female work participation rate in 1991 is to be viewed in the light of the above effort (Census of India, 1991 paper-2 of 1992).

- ii. The result of the efforts of the census enumerators is evident in terms of higher figures for female workers in the 1991 census (Table-8). It is to be noted that this increase has taken place on top of a very low base figure. Even in 1991, the rural female work force at nearly 27% stands in poor comparison with 53% for male workers. A large proportion of these women workers are marginal and casual workers. The existence of female marginal workers at 8 per cent for rural women in 1991 is much higher than 0.7 per cent for male workers. The proportion of female marginal workers to total female workers in 1991 is 30 per cent while for male workers it is only 1 per cent. Between 1981 and 1991 the proportion of female marginal workers to total female workers remained unchanged at 30 per cent while for male workers it has come down from 2 to 1 per cent.
- iii. The regional profiles of female workers based on the census data shows a high degree of variation as compared to that of male workers in terms of main and marginal workers as shown in Table-9. The proportion of women workers in 1991 varies from 4.4% in Punjab to 42.5% in Andhra Pradesh and for male workers the range is between 47.9 per cent in Kerala to 60.2% in Andhra Pradesh. Similarly, the proportion of marginal workers varies much more for women workers than that of men workers. All the states have shown a decline in male marginal workers and women marginal worker share increased in many of the states. It is observed that marginal

workers defined as “those who had worked for less than six months (183 days) in the year (census of India 1991). Varies between 12.9 per cent for Andhra Pradesh in 1991 to 54.1% for Rajasthan for the same year. The female marginal workers as a proportion of total female workers have gone up in Madhya Pradesh from 27.9% in 1981 to 31.4% in 1991, in Uttar Pradesh from 34.4 to 40.8% and in Maharashtra from 23.5 to 27 % during the same period. A sharp decline in female marginal workers in Punjab from 77% in 1981 to 50 per cent in 1991 can partly be explained by an increase in the proportion of women non-workers. Although the proportion of marginal women workers has declined in Haryana and Rajasthan between the two census. It is still at 48.8% and 54.1% in 1991. Male and female comparison for all the states in this case indicates a wide divergence and shows that male workers are not only larger in comparison but also have relatively more regular and stable employment.

Marginalisation of women workers is also observed in the NSS data since 1987-88 to 1993-94. Comparison with the census data is not attempted here due to variations in definition and data collection. The NSS data however indicates similar trends for (a) female and male workers and (b) female workers participation rates across the state. Table-10 indicates the labour force participation rates in rural areas on the basis of NSSO. The estimates were available for male and females separately for three broad approaches. Usual Status (US) [Principal Status (PS) + Subsidiary Status (S.S.)], Current Weekly Status (CWS) and Current Daily Status (CDS) from the table following observations are made. The labour force participation rates were rising as one moves from CDS to CWS and to US in 1987-88 and also maintained in 1993-94. The labour force participation rates for males are higher than for females. The proportion of female workers was participating in subsidiary status. Female labour participation rates were remarkably high in Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Rajasthan,

Madhya Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Gujarat, Karnataka and Kerala. The labour force participation rates for males and females had gone up by 1993-94 in most states except Haryana, Jammu and Kashmir and Orissa in respect of males. In case of female labour force participation rates in usual status (P.S. along) declined in 1993-94, however under usual status (SS) were higher than those of 1987-88 indicating that more and more women were increasingly getting engaged in subsidiary status whereas CDS based Labour force participation of females in 1993-94 were lower in Kerala, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh. This shows low level of women workers in rural India and within these a high degree of marginalization and actualization.

## COMPOSITION OF FEMALE WORKFORCE

The declining trend in economically active women is characterized by its changing composition. Macro-level data from the three censuses of 1961, 1981 and 1991 on the break-up of population on the basis of economic activity are fairly comparable due to similarities in definition of ‘work’ (though the 1961 census is said to be liberal in estimating women workers) from Table-11, a comparison of data from the three censuses bring out the following points (a) increasing dependence of women for employment on agriculture (b) decline in women cultivators and increase in women agricultural labourers (c) decline in the proportion of women workers in the manufacturing sector. West Bengal is the only state where women workers in the manufacturing sector have increased and this has happened as a result of reviving the household industry.

The sectoral composition of the female workforce based on the census data shows an increasing dependence on the primary sector for employment in rural areas. Majority of females and male main workers are employed in agriculture. Agriculture employment is divided into three categories in the census; cultivators, Agricultural Labourers and other agricultural workers. Cultivators usually have some right on the land, they

or their family own the land or lease it from the government, an institution or another individual. In addition, cultivators may supervise or direct others. In contrast, agricultural labourers work on another person's land for monetary wages or in-land compensation. These workers have no right on the land on which they work. Even with slightly higher figures for the 1961 census, the basic argument about the increased dependence on land or job in rural areas is still valid. For Punjab and Haryana, the most developed states in agriculture comparison between 1981 and 1991 labour force data shows an increase in primary sector women workers from nearly 54% to 58 per cent for Punjab and for Haryana it has gone up from nearly 86 to 87% for the same period. In Andhra Pradesh, women workers in the primary sector went up from nearly 79% in 1961 to 89 percent in 1991 in Karnataka from 82 percent to 89 percent, in Maharastra from 89 to 94% in Gujarat from 83 to 92%, in Tamil Nadu from 71 to 87% and in Kerala from 49 to 56%. In Bihar the proportion of female workers in primary sector have changed marginally given an allowance for workers in the mining sector in 1961 data, which have been added in the primary sector for that year. In 1991, women working in agriculture and related activities accounted for 94% and in 1961 this figure was at 95.5%. In West Bengal, the proportion of women workers in agriculture increased from 70% in 1961 to 76% in 1981 and declined to 73% in 1991. The two major categories of womens' employment in the primary sector are cultivators and agricultural labour. Table-12 shows the growth of agricultural labourers in India in major states since 1961 to 1991. It shows varying trends in regard to male and females. The female proportions were found to be much higher than the male proportions throughout the period of analysis. The male proportions show relatively lesser growth from 16.2% in 1961 to 21.6% in 1991. While the female proportion rose from 25.6% in 1981 to 49.3% in 1991.

The highest proportions of male agricultural labourers are found in the states of Andhra Pradesh (39.3%), Tamil Nadu (36.0), Bihar (35.9), Punjab (30.4%). The proportion of male agricultural

labourers during the census period 1981 in the states of Bihar, Arunachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh declined whereas in the states of Andhra Pradesh, Haryana, Tamil Nadu they remained constant.

The female agricultural labourers too increased in all the states since 1961. The highest proportion of female agricultural labourers are seen in the states of Andhra Pradesh (67.7%), Bihar (61.2%), Tamil Nadu (60.9%) and Gujarat (50.6%) from the table one interesting feature observed is that the female agricultural labourers constitute more than the male agricultural labourers in all the major states of the country. There has been a sharp decline in the proportion of female population reporting as cultivators and a rise in the category of agricultural labourers in past thirty years. Women agricultural labourers have increased much faster than the population growth. It is possible that a large number of women with marginal and small land holdings have joined the ranks of agricultural labourers. In the absence of employment opportunities in livestock related activities women fall back on the farm sector of employment. Gujarat is the only state where women workers in this sector have increased to 6.43% of the female workforce, increase of 3.5% points from 1981.

More than half (55%) of female agricultural workers are considered labourers, compared with just one-third of male agricultural workers. This suggests that most female workers are employed in lower skilled, lower paid position and are not the supervisors or owners of capital. Most female cultivators are members of a family that owns the land, rather than being the owners themselves (Kishwar and Vanitha, 1995). It is therefore, clear from the above data that there has been phenomenal increase in the size of this class and the process of casualisation is going on unabated in rural India.

There has been a decline in the proportion of women employed in manufacturing sector and an increase in the service, trade and construction sectors. These are often areas where exploitative

work conditions prevail with low wages and an unhealthy work environment. The employment potential of household and non-household manufacturing sector has gone down over the years. Employment in household manufacturing activity has declined from 10.5 per cent in 1961 to 5.21 percent in 1991 in Orissa; in Bihar the decline has been from 7.2 per cent in 1961 to 1.90 percent in 1991. This has not been compensated by increase in employment in the non-household sectors. In Orissa the number of women workers in the non-household has increased from 0.6 per cent in 1961 to 1.34 percent in 1991 and in Bihar from 0.6 per cent in 1961 to 0.68 percent in 1991. Punjab and Haryana, with high agricultural growth, have had a decline in the non-household sector workers between 1981 and 1991. In Punjab employment in the non-household sector declined and in Haryana there has been a marginal increase in the same. West Bengal provides an example of reviving the employment potential of the household sector. Women workers in the sector declined from 12.2 per cent in 1961 to 7.9 percent in 1981 but rose again to 11.84 percent in 1991. West Bengal also has witnessed an increase in women workers in the non-household manufacturing, from 4.9percent in 1961 to 6.4 percent in 1981 to 6.9 percent in 1991. The share of women workers in the non-household manufacturing sector has gone up in Kerala, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh. In no case, these increases compensated the decline in employment in the household-manufacturing sector. The declining trend of women participation in the workforce may be due to the following three development (S.R.Chowdhuri, 1995)

1. The technological and occupational structure of the economy has undergone a male-biased transformation to such an extent that there has been a smaller expansion of the sectors where women workers have a relative advantage.
2. Indian economy has failed to attract many of potential women workers into

the workforce. The growth in work participation is not in tune with growth in investment and output. This has naturally caused the composition of the labour force to be tilted in favour of the male and

3. Urbanization is found to have dealt a severe blow to the rural household industries where women are normally found in large numbers. Also there has been a declining trend in the sex ratio of the population.

## OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION IN INDIA'S LABOUR MARKET

---

Gender related segregation in occupations is one of the prominent and enduring aspects of labour market the world over. This phenomenon exists in two different forms, namely horizontal segregation and vertical segregation. The former refers to concentration of women and men in different types of jobs without reference to job hierarchies, while the latter concerns itself with concentration of men in higher-level jobs and women in lower ones, both within and between occupations and industries. What is also typical in segregated labor markets is that women cluster in few occupations than men do. (Anker 1998). Taken together, these factors account for women's lower levels of pay and present a substantial picture of equality (Bradley, 1989).

Gender-specific occupational segregation is regarded as a stable and rigid phenomenon that exists in traditional as well as modern societies. Various studies underline the persistence of gender segregated labour market globally, as being independent of the level of industrial development or occupational diversification (Jose, 1987) some studies even point out that there is a positive correlation between the level of occupational segregation, size of modern activities and diversification of occupations (Bakker, 1988).

Despite the fact that women, to an extent, have been able to catch up with men in education in

industrialized as well as newly industrialized countries occupational segregation by sex has not really decreased and it still remains a criterion that is central to women's employment opportunities (Tenell, 1992, Kingdon, 1998, Sacchi et al., 1999). From the economic viewpoint, this phenomenon is seen as inefficiency or market failure, since resources available in the form of female human capital are not allocated according to their productivity potential. From the sociology viewpoint it is the reconfirmation of accepted fact by the society, that women still are considered to be first responsible for reproduction and if they are working they are only as second earners for an additional income. This legitimizes their low wages and the disadvantages they face in moving up in the labour market (Treimann and Ross, 1983).

## THEORIES ON OCCUPATIONAL SEGREGATION

Numerous theories have tried to explain occupational segregation by sex. They can be divided into three broad categories. (Sandra Rath boeck and Sarthi Acharya, 1999, 1999).

- i. Institutional and labour market segmentation theories focus on the analysis of co-existence of different labour markets where men and women are concentrated, and on factors that, as a consequence, determine career mobility and job security.
- ii. At the individual level, researchers distinguish between labour demand and supply factors for explaining occupational segregation factors of labour demand usually concentrate on reasons why employers tend to choose men or women for specific occupations at the entry stage and on reasons why women tend to have less career opportunities than men within enterprises. Supply side

factors generally concentrate on factors why women choose specific jobs. These jobs, it is postulated, are easy to combine with their family duties and / or other the possibility to interrupt their career for a period of time without any severe effect on their re-entry into the labour market.

- iii. Lastly, there are the sociological theories that cover a large of gender issues among which labour market segregation is one such. As a rough common denominator, these approaches discuss the predominance of gender asymmetries that are rooted in the patriarchal society. The historical suppression of women in the family and society leads, in the end to the disadvantage of women in the labour market.

Segregation theories are also useful for India since they explain factors, which stand behind the persistence of gender inequalities in a labour market. There is a rich variety of theoretical approaches explaining segregation which are grouped into three categories:

- a) Institutional and labour market segmentation
- b) Individual and
- c) Cultural and gender related theories.

In a developing country like India, the dualistic labour market approach is often discussed within the framework of an organized unorganized or formal-informal sector dichotomy. As more than 75% of the labour force works in the so-called unorganized sector in India (Mitra, 1998) it is important to address labour market segmentation in this reality. There are of course, certain weaknesses of the concept, as it tends to simplify the labour markets through splitting the economy into identified independent segments and therefore, neglects the strong inter linkages between those markets

(Breman, 1996). Keeping that in mind and since the quality of employment is higher in the formal and lower in the informal, it is useful to keep discussing gender segregation in this dichotomy of formal-informal or organized-unorganized..

Although the share of the organized sector employment has been shrinking over time, a significant section of the organized sector employees, which is predominantly male (Srivastava, 1999) has the status of regular waged workers, mostly engaged in large public or private enterprises. Careers in these kinds of employment are based on continuity and seniority within the same establishment. Along with regular incomes, this group has a contract, access to training and financial resources. Some regular employees might even have social security, but the major section, including the most vulnerable group in the labour market – casual workers- do not get any access to such social protection. Casual workers are predominantly women (previous section, same chapter) and they are hired and paid on a daily wage basis not covered by any contract or labour laws (Acharya and Jose, 1991).

Typical about the unorganized sector is by and large low level of skill up-gradation. The range of activities undertaken in some segments of the unorganized sector though being heterogeneous has relatively small vertical differentiation compared to the formal sector. Non-regular employees in particular, who constitute an important and yet weak position in the hierarchy lack specific long year experience within the same activity due to their occupational mobility. Most casual employees remain poorly skilled and develop the capacity of being quickly able to change to quite different types of work, which invariably require heavy and prolonged physical effort rather than skills or experience. (Breman, 1991)

Approaches describing institutional aspects and the issue of segmentation in labour markets are useful as they can, to a certain extent, describe the vertical gender related segmentation in occupation. The different segments are characterized to provide different qualities of jobs held by men or women.

But the weakness of these approaches is oversimplification. (S. Rothboeck and A. Archarya, 1999)

At the individual level, researchers distinguish between labour demand and supply factors while explaining occupational segregation. Supply side factors generally concentrate on the reason why women choose specific jobs, which are either easy to combine with their family duties or offer opportunities to interrupt their employment for a period of time. The human capital theory assumes that women, due to their biological difference, optimize their life cycles differently from men. They tend to invest on family related education and choose jobs in which return to education are immediate at the beginning of their work cycle. Keeping in mind, their family duties and a temporary break, women also concentrate in jobs where depreciation of human capital is relatively low and where they after some years of interruption can, easily re-join (Mincer and Polacek, quoted in England, 1984). As a consequence, women invest less in human capital and skill development, which in the end, has adverse effects on employment opportunities and thereby on wages.

Anker (1997) study points out human capital approaches are becoming weak, as empirical evidence is taken into account. First, the gender discrimination in the face of the steady increase of women's labour force participation being often continuous cannot be explained by this theory. Developing countries in particular and more and more industrialized countries too, working women simply cannot afford to stay at home or interrupt their working phase. Many working women have a continuous working career and yet the working experience has not proved to improve women's occupational performance. Lower returns to education lead to inequalities of wages and job mobility (Kingdon, 1998). Second what is in contrast with human capital theory, wage depreciation has proved to have negative effects for both men's as well as women's occupational performance (England, 1984 Conarn et.al., 1984).

Demand side theories emphasize the performance of employers for men in specific jobs.

At first, a women is considered to be supportive and caring while men are taken to be capable of doing skilled and professional jobs. In an inter-regional ILO project on employer's job recruiting in the formal sector, it was shown that employers tend to consider women as high cost workers because of higher absenteeism, high turnover rate and being late due to family responsibilities (Anker and Hein, 1985) Yet, there is hardly any empirical evidence that would support the fact that women are the cause for higher costs (Anker, 1997). Due to this discrimination, womens' employment opportunities are consequently, severely limited as employers have a clear preference for men in providing quality jobs. Limited access of women in male dominated occupations and positions, be it at the pre-entry level or within the institution, is therefore, based on stereotyped decisions rather than on rational choice. As a consequence, there are non-labour market factors, which crucially influence. The recruitment process and career chances after entering the labour market.

Gender theories discuss non-market factors that determine gender asymmetries in the labour market. At a rough common basis, they see the cause to be the patriarchal structure of the society. The roots of gender inequalities go back to pre-industrial times. When the division of labour between men and women moved away from a household system, towards a dichotomous from of activities, namely work in private and public spheres. Men left home for paid work, while women stayed back at home, being given the responsibility for reproductive work (Crompton and Mann, 1986). The familial and cultural environment engenders womens' or men's perceptions about their and other's capabilities. Women are expected to have skills related to household and family activities, be capable in manual dexterity work. Women therefore, conventionally are not considered suitable for sales, production, public service and supervisory occupations, as has been found out in several field studies. (Anker and Hein, 1985).

Uttar Pradesh is the largest state in India in terms of population comprising 16.2 percent of

country's population at 16.62 crores in UP in 2001 census. Only 60 percent of the people are literates. Majority of the people are depending on the agricultural sector. One third of the people are living below poverty line. The state reflect many contrast such as fertile lands, very considerable water sources, good rain fall and massive manpower on the one hand and poverty, unemployment , low income, low productivity and low quality of life, small agricultural land holdings. Most of the industries are technically outdated and financially non-viable.

Though, the percentage of poor was decreased from 57 percent in 1974 to 32 percent in 2001. But the poor people in absolute numbers remains almost same at 5.36 crores in 1974 and 5.30 crores 2000. The main reason of poverty is inadequate employment opportunities. Unemployment rate has increased from 3.7 percent in 1973 to 4.48 percent in 2001. The percentage of self – employed workers felt from 77 percent in 1994 to 69 percent in 2001 and that of regularly employed from 12 percent to 10 percent. This has increased the casual labour from 10 percent to 20 percent during the period. The unemployed and under employment is rather grim. It needs to be talked. The employment guarantee program may be a relief.

The male and female employment rate is much skewed. Nearly 39.6 percent of total male are main workers, only 6 percent are female workers according to 2001 census reports. But female workers have out placed male workers in the case of casual labour. The proportion of main workers to total population is more & less same in rural (23.8%), and urban area (23.5%) but it is declining. The phenomenon of marginal employment is largely to be seen in rural area apparently because of steady fragmentation of land holdings, landlessness, mechanizations of agriculture and lack of employment opportunities in rural areas.

During the decade 1991-2001, the percentage of total worker as proportion of total population has slightly increased. But composition of workforce indicates decline in the percentage of male workers, while percentage of female workers has increased.

In 1991 male worker constituted only 0.31 and female worker at 5 percent of the population.

In table 17, deployment of workers indicate that female workers are dominating the agriculture and household industry. Female cultivators are 36.8 percent where as male cultivators are 52 percent in rural area. Nearly, 44 percent of female labor force is working in agriculture where as male workers are only 24 percent. The Same Trend is continued in urban area also.

Table-16, explains the literacy rate and enrolment. Though, there has been sharp and substantial growth in literacy rate, it is still marked by acute disparities between male and female. Female literacy rate is very low at 43 percent where as male literacy rate at 70 percent. The enrolment rate of male and female in school is very noticable. The very low enrollment rate has been registered by the girls.

## CONCLUSION

Theories make a valuable contribution in explaining occupational segregation by sex, for the Indian

labour market. However, it is necessary to modify these approaches according to the labour market situation here as they tend to simplify the reality while using standardized occupational classifications. First, casualisation of employment has increased all over the world (Saasken, 1997) and has been a prominent from of hiring in a developing country like India. Therefore, to be able to capture the complexity of gender inequalities in the labour market, the concept has to be diversified, with inclusion of the status of employment in the measurement. Second the structure of the labour market reflects power relations, which cannot be captured by economic theories also. What can be concluded from the theories described here, is that the labour market per se is engendered, having incorporated discrimination within institutions and structures as well as at the individual levels. Till date class effect play a significant role for educational attainment as well as for occupational mobility. These are processes, which at all levels lead to control of womens' access to quality employment and their labour market performance.

**TABLE-1**

**Rural Population: Sex Wise**  
(in Millions)

States	1971			1981			1991		
	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total
Andhra Pradesh	17.2	17.4	35.1	20.7	20.36	41.08	24.5	24	28.5
Assam	7.13	6.5	13.63	9.31	8.54	17.85	10.2	9.6	19.8
Bihar	25.73	24.99	50.72	31.17	30.02	61.19	39	36	75
Gujarat	9.84	9.36	19.2	11.99	11.5	23.48	13.8	13.1	26.9
Haryana	4.42	3.84	8.26	5.38	4.71	10.1	6.5	5.7	12.2
Himachala Pradesh	1.63	1.59	3.22	1.99	1.97	3.95	2.3	2.3	4.6
Jammu & Kashmir	2.00	1.76	3.76	2.49	2.23	4.73	3.0	2.8	5.8
Karnataka	11.25	10.93	22.18	13.35	13.05	26.42	15.7	15.3	31
Kerala	8.85	9.03	17.88	10.17	10.51	20.68	10.5	10.9	21.4
Madhya	17.82	17.05	34.71	20.53	20.26	40.8	24.5	23.8	48.3

Pradesh									
Maharastra	17.48	17.23	34.71	20.53	20.26	40.8	24.5	23.8	48.3
Orissa	10.08	10.06	20.1	11.64	11.62	23.26	13.7	13.6	23.7
Punjab	5.53	4.8	10.34	6.44	5.7	12.15	7.5	6.7	14.2
Rajasthan	11.06	10.16	21.22	14.01	13.04	27.05	17.6	16.2	33.8
Tamil Nadu	14.44	14.3	28.73	16.33	16.12	32.46	18.5	18.1	36.6
Uttar Pradesh	40.21	35.74	75.95	48.04	42.92	90.96	59.1	52.3	111.4
West Bengal	17.17	16.17	23.25	20.62	19.52	40.13	25.4	23.9	49.3
India	225.23	213.64	438.86	269.36	256.09	525.5	323.14	305.7	626.9

Source: Final Population totals paper-2 of 1992, Vol.1, Census of India and Various population census.

**TABLE-2**

**SEX RATIO**

Census year	Sex Ratio Females per 1000 males
1901	972
1911	964
1921	955
1931	950
1941	945
1951	946
1961	941
1971	930
1981	934
1991	922
2001	933

Source: Census of India, 2001, Paper-1 Provisional Population census.

**TABLE-3**

**PERCENTAGE OF WORKING POPULATION: RURAL AREAS**

States	Male workers			Female workers		
	1971	1981	1991	1971	1981	1991
Andhra Pradesh	9.95	9.01	8.56	17.02	16.43	15.58
Assam	2.88	3.04	2.95	1.29	2.32	2.58
Bihar	11.3	11.39	11.43	8.33	7.35	7.75
Gujarat	4.32	4.66	4.59	4.04	3.91	4.18
Haryana	1.74	1.91	1.86	0.32	0.58	0.70

Himachal Pradesh	0.71	0.72	0.67	1.22	0.96	0.84
Jammu & Kashmir	0.89	0.96	--	0.25	0.35	--
Karnataka	5.27	4.64	5.27	6.15	7.35	7.38
Kerala	3.33	3.06	2.8	4.54	3.59	2.54
Madhya Pradesh	8.18	8.59	8.43	12.66	13.23	11.68
Maharashtra	7.63	8.08	8.43	12.66	13.23	11.68
Orissa	4.65	4.68	4.45	2.47	2.36	3.08
Punjab	2.47	2.53	2.43	0.11	0.25	0.41
Rajasthan	4.92	5.22	5.24	3.36	3.48	4.40
Tamil Nadu	7.02	6.96	6.43	4.01	11.34	10.39
Uttar Pradesh	17.70	17.90	17.76	9.30	6.39	8.32
West Bengal	6.91	7.34	7.91	2.65	3.05	3.67
Manipur	0.18	0.18	0.18	0.43	0.50	0.4
Meghalaya	0.20	0.12	0.22	0.57	0.50	0.45
Nagaland	0.11	0.13	0.14	0.39	0.38	0.33
Sikkim	--	0.06	0.06	--	0.12	0.09
Tripura	0.30	0.34	0.33	0.29	0.20	0.21
India	100 (120.4)	100 (136.8)	100 (164.2)	100 (28.0)	100 (39.6)	100 (57.4)

Source: K. Hanumantha Rao, 2000.

**TABLE – 4**  
**WORK PARTICIPATION IN INDIA – 1971-2001**

Year	Total Rural Urban	Persons	Males	Females
1971	Total	34.17	52.75	14.22
	Rural	35.33	53.78	15.92
	Urban	29.61	48.88	7.18
1981	Total	36.70	52.62	19.67
	Rural	38.79	53.22	23.06
	Urban	29.99	49.06	8.31
1991	Total	37.68	51.56	22.73
	Rural	40.24	52.50	27.20
	Urban	30.44	48.95	9.74
2001	Total	39.26	51.93	25.68
	Rural	41.97	52.36	30.98
	Urban	32.23	50.85	11.55

Source: Census of India, 1991, P.11 and Census of India 2001.

Note:

(1) 1981 Census excludes Assam and 1991 Census excludes Jammu and Kashmir.

(2) The 1971 Census figures include workers and non-workers with secondary Work. The 1981 and 1991 census includes main workers and marginal workers.

**TABLE-5**  
**CRUDE FEMALE WORK PARTICIPATION RATES IN INDIAN STATES**

Status	1961	1971	1981	1991	2001
Andhra Pradesh	41.31	25.84	27.01	30.5	34.93
Assam	30.90	6.18	7.70	12.56	20.80
Bihar	27.11	9.11	9.05	9.17	18.84
Gujarat	27.89	10.09	11.03	13.73	28.03
Haryana	13.09	8.02	6.56	17.97	27.03
Himachal Pradesh	13.09	8.02	6.56	6.47	43.69
Karnataka	32.01	14.12	18.95	21.73	31.88
Kerala	19.70	13.14	12.68	12.80	15.28
Madhya Pradesh	43.99	20.17	22.34	22.82	33.10
Maharashtra	38.10	21.15	23.97	26.46	32.59
Manipur	44.47	25.03	34.58	32.65	40.51
Meghalaya	55.02	38.30	33.28	30.62	35.02
Nagaland	58.23	72.60	42.45	37.31	38.25
Oissa	26.57	6.88	10.69	12.09	24.62
Punjab	14.19	1.19	2.26	2.79	18.68
Rajasthan	35/88	8.64	9.32	13.03	33.48
Sikkim	61.05	41.56	34.68	28.62	38.59
Tamil Nadu	31.28	15.16	22.36	25.12	31.32
Tripura	20.19	5.55	8.94	10.13	21.02
Uttar Pradesh	18.14	7.10	5.39	7.45	16.28
West Bengal	9.43	4.74	5.80	5.06	18.08
Jammu and Kashmir	25.63	3.71	5.90	7.35	21.96

Census: Various Census Report, 1961, 71, 81 and 91. Population census 2001.

**TABLE-6**  
**FEMALE WORK PARTICIPATION IN PRIMARY AND NON-PRIMARY SECTORS IN INDIAN STATES DURING THE CENSUS PERIOD**

State	Primary					Non-Primary				
	1961	1971	1981	1991	Change 1961-91	1961	1971	1981	1991	Change 1961-91
Andhra Pradesh	78.89	83.47	83.58	83.37	4.48	21.1	16.17	16.22	16.62	-4.48
Assam	81.08	83.52	45.78	86.39	5.31	19.0	14.93	12.01	13.69	-5.31
Bihar	85.85	91.32	89.35	91.07	5.22	14.14	7.61	9.74	8.92	-5.22
Gujarat	82.59	45.18	53.74	81.42	-1.17	17.40	16.62	18.97	18.57	1.17
Haryana	94.11	94.56	92.15	89.60	-4.51	5.87	5.42	7.82	10.38	4.51
Himachal Pradesh	87.42	64.34	71.70	72.10	-15.32	11.77	35.12	28.15	27.09	15.32
Karnataka	81.78	76.94	78.02	78.39	-3.39	18.20	22.59	21.54	21.59	3.39
Kerala	48.94	59.10	55.29	47.89	-1.05	51.05	40.89	45.03	52.10	1.05
Madhya Pradesh	89.30	90.41	88.64	89.01	-0.29	10.69	9.19	10.93	10.98	0.29
Maharashtra	88.55	85.73	84.92	83.43	-5.12	11.43	13.84	20.81	16.5	5.12
Manipur	53.90	69.03	70.70	76.48	22.58	46.08	30.95	29.24	23.50	-22.58
Meghalaya	93.36	90.99	87.65	83.47	-14.89	4.08	8.89	12.03	18.97	14.89
Nagaland	99.36	97.72	94.27	92.13	-7.23	0.81	2.26	5.70	8.04	7.23
Orissa	72.96	76.27	80.30	81.68	8.72	27.03	24.29	18.45	18.31	-8.72
Punjab	80.33	77.17	32.23	34.18	-46.15	19.40	82.81	68.85	65.55	46.15
Rajasthan	88.94	88.01	85.78	88.90	-0.04	11.04	11.58	13.25	11.08	0.04
Sikkim	97.44	95.84	83.78	80.69	-16.75	2.55	4.14	16.49	19.30	16.75
Tamil Nadu	70.80	76.72	78.56	76.58	5.78	28.21	23.35	25.03	23.41	-5.78
Tripura	77.78	76.65	74.94	72.56	-5.22	22.21	23.35	25.07	28.57	5.22
West Bengal	66.95	68.35	63.02	55.09	-11.86	33.03	30.96	36.32	44.89	11.86
<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>	<b>84.40</b>	<b>87.59</b>	<b>83.37</b>	<b>84.50</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>15.59</b>	<b>12.35</b>	<b>16.56</b>	<b>15.49</b>	<b>-0.10</b>
Jammu and Kashmir	85.27	79.46	68.60	64.98	-20.29	14.60	20.55	31.33	34.89	20.29

Source : Various Censes reports.

**TABLE – 7**  
**PERCENTAGE SHARE OF WORKERS TO TOTAL POPULATION**

Year	Female	Male
1901	31.70	61.10
1911	33.73	61.90
1921	32.67	60.50
1931	27.63	58.30
1951	23.30	54.00
1961	27.96	57.10
1971	11.85	53.80
1981	13.99	51.60
1991	16.02	51.00
2001	33.71	66.29

Source: Statistical Profile of Women Labour Ministry of Labour 1990, Col.4, Census of India, population census 2001.

Note: 1981 and 1991 census does not include Assam and Jammu and Kashmir.

**TABLE –8**  
**DISTRIBUTION OF RURAL WORKERS BY OCCUPATION 1981 & 1991**

Occupation	1981			1991		
	Persons	Males	Females	Percents	Males	Females
I. Main Workers	34.8	52.6	16.1	35.8	51.9	18.8
(a) Cultivators	51.0	55.2	36.9	48.2	51.4	38.6
(b) Agricultural Labourers	30.1	24.0	50.4	32.2	26.4	49.3
(c) Household Industry	3.1	2.9	3.8	2.2	2.0	2.9
(d) Others	15.9	18.0	8.9	17.5	20.3	9.2
II. Marginal workers	4.0	1.2	7.0	4.3	0.7	8.0
III. Total Workers	38.8	53.8	23.1	40.1	52.6	26.8

Source: Final Population Totals Paper 2 of 1992, Census of India.

**TABLE-9**  
**PROPORTION OF MAIN AND MARGINAL WORKERS IN MAJOR STATES**

States	Year	Female			Male		
		Main Workers	Marginal Workers	% of Female Marginal to Total Female Workers	Main workers	Marginal Workers	% of male marginal to total male workers
Andhra Pradesh	1981	27.0	6.5	20.2	57.1	0.6	1.0
	1991	30.1	4.3	12.9	55.1	0.4	0.7
Bihar	1981	9.7	5.0	36.5	50.0	1.1	2.2
	1991	10.8	5.5	33.7	48.5	0.4	0.8
Gujarat	1981	11.0	9.6	49.8	52.2	0.7	1.7
	1991	13.7	12.2	50.3	53.2	0.4	0.9
Haryana	1981	4.9	7.4	60.1	48.6	1.2	2.4
	1991	6.5	6.2	48.8	48.2	0.3	0.6
Karnataka	1981	22.3	8.4	27.4	56.4	0.8	1.4
	1991	27.4	9.2	25.1	55.4	0.7	1.2
Kerala	1981	13.5	4.3	24.7	41.2	4.0	5.8
	1982	13.3	3.5	20.8	44.9	3.0	6.3
Madhya Pradesh	1981	25.8	10.0	27.9	55.3	1.1	2.0
	1991	26.9	12.3	31.4	53.1	0.9	1.7
Maharashtra	1981	31.4	9.5	23.5	53.9	1.5	2.7
	1991	36.1	10.0	27.0	52.1	1.1	2.1
Orissa	1981	11.1	10.0	47.4	55.1	1.6	2.8
	1991	12.8	9.8	43.4	53.7	1.0	1.8
Punjab	1981	2.2	5.7	77.0	53.7	0.8	1.5
	1991	2.2	2.2	50.0	54.9	0.1	0.2
Rajasthan	1981	10.6	14.4	57.6	51.0	1.2	2.3
	1991	15.3	18.0	54.1	49.2	0.4	1.8
Tamil Nadu	1981	27.9	5.7	17.0	5.4	0.9	1.5
	1991	32.0	6.5	16.9	57.9	0.4	0.7
Uttar Pradesh	<b>1981</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>34.4</b>	<b>51.0</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1.0</b>
	1991	8.4	5.8	40.8	50.1	0.4	0.8
West Bengal	1981	6.2	2.7	30.3	48.7	1.8	0.6
	1991	8.7	4.3	33.1	51.2	0.9	1.7

*Source: Census of India, 1991.*

Table-10

## LABOUR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES RURAL AREAS

States	Males								Females							
	1987-88				1993-94				1987-88				1993-94			
	Usual Status		C.W .S	C.D. S	Usual Status		C.W .S	C.D.S. Prin cipal Statu s + S.S	Usual Status		C.W .S	C.D. S	Usual Status		C.W .S	C.D. S
	Prin cipa l Stat us (PS)	Prin cipa l Stat us + S.S			Prin cipa l Stat us (PS)	P.S. + S.S.			Prin cipa l Stat us (PS)	Prin cipa l Stat us (PS)			P.S. + SS	Prin cipa l Stat us (PS)		
1. Andhra Pradesh	59.0	60.4	57.5	57.3	62.7	63.5	61.6	60.3	42.8	48.6	37.6	36.1	46.4	52.1	45.1	40.5
2. Assam	50.6	53.2	50.5	50.4	52.5	54.1	52.8	50.0	7.1	16.8	7.5	7.4	10.1	17.2	14.9	10.8
3. Bihar	49.5	50.7	49.0	49.0	51.4	52.1	51.5	50.7	12.6	19.5	11.8	11.7	13.2	17.3	14.2	12.8
4. Gujarat	54.3	56.6	53.6	53.5	57.3	58.1	57.3	56.6	29.2	38.5	26.0	23.9	22.5	39.7	34.2	27.0
5. Haryana	47.9	49.2	48.1	48.1	45.7	47.0	46.2	45.7	11.5	30.2	12.6	10.9	6.0	27.2	21.2	13.8
6. Himachal Pradesh	51.5	54.7	51.0	51.0	52.2	59.5	54.7	52.9	35.2	48.2	33.8	32.2	3.6	52.0	46.4	36.3
7. Jammu & Kashmir	51.0	54.2	50.7	50.7	50.6	52.4	51.1	50.5	10.3	34.8	10.0	9.9	9.8	39.3	26.3	17.8
8. Karnataka	56.4	57.7	55.5	55.5	59.3	60.9	59.5	57.5	31.2	38.1	29.7	26.6	32.8	43.2	36.7	31.3
9. Kerala	53.6	55.8	52.6	52.3	55.5	56.8	55.7	52.5	23.6	33.6	21.8	21.1	18.1	26.4	22.7	17.9
10. Madhya Pradesh	53.8	54.9	52.4	52.2	56.3	57.6	55.6	54.5	43.6	41.3	29.2	28.5	30.2	41.1	32.2	28.5
11. Maharastra	53.0	55.2	52.3	56.3	54.6	55.8	54.1	52.3	41.3	46.6	35.6	34.2	40.6	47.8	40.6	36.4
12. Orissa	57.4	57.9	56.3	56.3	56.8	57.7	55.9	54.4	22.3	28.6	19.6	19.6	21.3	32.9	22.6	19.4
13. Punjab	55.3	57.1	55.1	55.0	55.0	55.4	55.1	54.8	8.1	32.1	8.3	7.6	4.0	22.3	20.2	12.0
14. Rajasthan	50.6	52.2	50.4	50.4	53.0	54.2	53.1	52.7*	39.3	54.5	36.7	36.7	30.0	45.8	38.8	33.8

15. Tamil Nadu	59.4	60.4	58.4	58.2	60.4	61.3	59.4	57.5	41.8	47.7	38.7	27.5	41.0	48.1	42.2	36.6
<b>16. Uttar Pradesh</b>	<b>50/6</b>	<b>52.4</b>	<b>50.6</b>	<b>50.6</b>	<b>51.2</b>	<b>52.7</b>	<b>51.2</b>	<b>50.1</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>22.1</b>	<b>15.3</b>	<b>15.3</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>22.9</b>	<b>17.9</b>	<b>14.0</b>
17. West Bengal	52.9	56.0	52.8	52.7	55.4	56.7	55.5	54.4	11.3	20.7	10.9	10.5	8.8	18.9	15.0	10.8
18. India	53.2	54.9	52.6	52.5	54.9	56.1	54.7	53.4	25.4	33.1	22.9	22.3	23.7	33.0	27.6	23.2

Source : Various rounds of NSSO.

Note: US= Usual Status, P.S. Principal Status, S.S. Subsidiary Status,

C.W.S.= Current Weekly Status

C.D.S.= Current Daily Status.

**TABLE – 11**  
**OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF RURAL FEMALE WORKFORCE IN MAJOR STATES**

States	Year	1	2	3	4	5a	5b	6	7	8	9
Andhra Pradesh	1961	38.50	39.10	--	--	9.0	1.20	0.60	0.30	0.10	7.40
	1981	25.71	62.01	0.75	0.17	4.44	1.62	0.29	1.79	0.04	3.20
	1991	24.49	63.73	0.67	0.38	3.91	1.71	0.23	1.63	0.04	3.21
Bihar	1961	54.70	39.10	--	--	7.20	0.60	0.10	1.20	0.00	4.90
	1981	26.73	65.61	0.45	0.58	2.62	1.43	0.11	0.80	0.05	1.62
	1991	32.93	61.22	0.18	0.28	1.90	0.68	0.14	0.57	0.04	2.06
Gujarat	1961	61.00	20.50	--	--	7.60	1.30	0.60	1.10	0.10	6.70
	1981	34.61	53.98	2.82	0.30	1.82	1.77	0.59	0.93	0.17	3.01
	1991	35.17	50.56	6.43	0.26	1.22	1.70	0.27	0.88	0.08	3.43
Haryana	1961	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	1981	59.39	25.72	0.43	0.11	2.09	3.28	1.16	0.87	0.12	6.83
	1991	56.90	28.58	0.34	0.05	1.00	3.50	0.76	0.53	0.09	7.26
Karnataka	1961	55.60	23.70	--	--	7.00	1.70	1.00	1.70	0.00	6.80
	1981	28.36	55.62	3.99	0.39	5.32	2.80	0.57	1.46	0.18	1.89
	1991	29.62	27.40	3.32	0.44	1.46	5.03	0.26	1.47	0.06	2.72
Kerala	1961	16.30	27.40	--	--	17.80	8.10	0.20	1.40	0.50	23.10
	1981	5.53	48.38	2.27	0.28	8.02	11.82	0.69	2.42	1.30	14.29
	1991	6.53	42.25	7.56	0.78	5.56	13.75	0.6	3.21	1.09	18.61
Madhya Pradesh	1961	67.30	20.40	--	--	4.50	0.50	0.40	0.80	0.10	4.40
	1981	5.34	42.34	0.70	0.35	3.19	0.67	0.84	0.54	0.03	1.00
	1991	54.88	39.26	0.45	0.22	2.33	0.88	0.19	0.45	0.02	1.32
Maharashtra	1961	54.80	32.90	--	--	3.70	1.50	0.50	1.20	0.30	4.20
	1981	43.53	49.77	0.82	0.11	1.82	1.06	0.96	0.58	0.05	1.30
	1991	45.03	48.70	0.64	0.14	1.17	1.24	0.31	0.73	0.04	2.00
Orissa	1961	50.10	21.40	--	--	10.50	0.60	1.50	0.10	14.20	
	1981	26.25	57.21	1.43	1.15	5.60	1.87	0.67	1.92	0.06	3.84

	1991	27.54	57.85	0.71	0.89	5.21	1.34	0.17	1.71	0.08	4.45
Punjab	1961	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	1981	9.72	42.59	1.29	0.01	5.72	8.69	1.61	1.36	0.56	28.45
	1991	14.99	41.46	1.00	0.00	3.43	6.45	0.80	2.38	0.32	29.17
Rajasthan	1961	82.40	4.70	--	--	5.80	0.60	0.40	0.40	0.00	3.80
	1981	72.13	16.60	3.58	0.84	2.02	1.32	0.79	0.49	0.09	2.14
	1991	74.52	19.27	1.35	0.50	1.18	0.65	0.29	0.32	0.03	1.89
Tamil Nadu	1961	42.50	26.40	--	--	10.00	1.90	0.60	1.70	0.10	14.80
	1981	26.50	60.07	1.76	0.17	4.40	2.68	0.36	1.37	0.06	2.61
	1991	24.27	60.89	1.43	0.16	4.02	3.22	0.27	1.12	0.08	4.49

**OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF RURAL FEMALE WORKFORCE  
IN MAJOR STATES**

Contd. table-12

States	Year	1	2	3	4	5a	5b	6	7	8	9
Uttar Pradesh	1961	<b>64.80</b>	<b>19.20</b>	--	--	<b>7.60</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>1.10</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>6.40</b>
	1981	<b>52.42</b>	<b>38.02</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>1.47</b>	<b>0.19</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>13.00</b>
	1991	<b>52.72</b>	<b>38.61</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>2.43</b>	<b>1.58</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.77</b>	<b>0.66</b>	<b>3.06</b>
West Bengal	1961	36.80	21.10	--	--	12.20	4.90	0.30	2.30	0.40	13.00
	1981	18.09	48.44	11.01	0.59	7.90	6.37	0.26	1.58	0.17	5.59
	1991	19.87	45.89	7.09	0.21	11.84	6.91	0.19	1.92	0.12	5.96

Note: Occupational categories.

1. Cultivators
2. Agricultural Labourers
3. Livestock, fishing and allied activities
4. Mining and Quarring
5. Household Manufacturing
6. Commerce
7. Trade
8. Construction
9. Transport, Communication
10. Other services.

Source: Census of India, 1991, paper 2 of 1992.

**TABLE-12**  
**GROWTH OF AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS IN RURAL INDIA**  
**MAJOR STATES (1961-1991)**

States	1961			1971			1981			1991		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Andhra Pradesh	24.63	40.83	31.33	31.90	66.22	42.50	31.53	60.42	41.82	39.3	67.7	47.5
Bihar	21.50	29.94	24.37	35.89	75.93	41.75	33.60	64.75	38.61	35.4	61.2	40.2
Gujarat	15.22	21.90	17.69	22.77	53.96	28.34	23.61	52.74	29.65	24.5	50.6	30.7
Haryana	7.38	5.57	6.90	15.78	25.96	16.21	15.89	22.20	16.40	22.7	29.6	23.4
Himachal Pradesh	1.48	1.01	1.47	4.48	4.14	4.38	3.50	2.05	3.08	4.1	2.0	3.5
Karnataka	12.60	23.67	16.42	21.12	49.01	26.70	18.93	49.11	26.11	26.4	55.6	35.9
Kerala	13.10	27.42	17.38	25.10	49.06	30.70	23.38	43.03	28.19	27.0	42.3	30.6
Madhya Pradesh	15.90	21.07	18.14	21.95	50.63	29.52	20.70	42.08	27.36	2.12	29.3	27.0
Maharashtra	24.46	34.55	28.95	29.97	56.06	38.15	26.90	49.71	35.39	28.5	48.7	36.6
Orissa	16.02	21.88	17.86	27.08	55.68	30.21	24.5	56.33	30.03	25.2	57.9	31.4
Punjab	12.47	6.40	11.94	24.84	21.66	24.80	28.97	41.94	29.51	30.4	41.5	30.8
Rajasthan	4.19	4.80	4.43	8.52	21.88	10.35	6.72	16.58	8.38	9.3	19.3	11.5
Tamil Nadu	17.75	28.59	21.81	30.91	62.21	38.10	30.81	58.78	39.88	36.0	60.9	44.7
<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>	<b>19.59</b>	<b>23.70</b>	<b>20.24</b>	<b>33.26</b>	<b>54.51</b>	<b>35.00</b>	<b>33.26</b>	<b>54.51</b>	<b>35.00</b>	<b>30.0</b>	<b>45.8</b>	<b>32.2</b>
India	16.19	25.64	19.42	25.81	24.98	31.42	24.26	49.57	30.12	32.2	49.3	32.2

Source: L.C. Mallaiah(2000)

**Table 13**  
 Percentage Distribution of workers by category of employment in UP during 1972 - 2001

S.No	Category	1972-74	1987-88	1993-94	1999-2000
1	Self Employed	76.68	71.80	71.59	69.36
2	Reglr Employed	12.51	9.76	8.78	10.64
3	Casul Employed	10.71	18.44	19.63	20.00
4	Labor force	3.75	3.73	3.46	4.46

Source: Tenth plan document and statistical dairies of UP

**Table 14**  
Category wise Percentage of Main and Marginal workers in UP

S.No	Particulars	1981		1991		2001	
		Main workers	Margnl workers	Main workers	Margnl workers	Main workers	Margnl workers
1	Rural	29.71	1.75	30.20	2.79	23.81	10.29
2	Urban	26.99	0.31	26.36	0.57	23.47	3.45
3	Males	50.31	0.45	49.42	0.31	39.58	7.68
4	Females	5.39	2.67	6.64	4.68	6.10	10.18
5	Total	29.22	1.49	29.44	2.35	23.74	8.86

Source: Census of India -2001

**Table 15**  
Gender wise enrolment rate in education in UP

S.No	Year/ Class	Class 1-5		Class 6-8		Class 9-12	
		Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
1	1991-92	78.45	39.34	30.32	10.66	22.36	5.98
2	2000-01	85.37	48.31	32.37	14.35	24.47	8.71
3	2002-03	95.06	60.98	36.41	18.07	27.73	10.97

Source: Tenth plan document and statistical dairies of UP and UP Human development of Index Report 2001

**Table: 16**  
Literacy rate of Gender in UP

S.No	State/ Year	1991			2001		
		Persons	Male	Female	Persons	Male	Female
1	UP	41.60	55.73	25.31	57.36	70.23	42.98
2	India	52.21	64.13	39.29	65.38	75.85	54.16

Source: Tenth plan document and statistical dairies of UP and UP Human development of Index Report 2001

**Table: 17**  
Status of Occupational Distribution in UP in 2001

S.No	Particulars	Total No of workers(000)	Cultivators	Agri Labor	H Hold Industry	Other Service	Total
1	Rural	44865	48.4	29.3	4.5	17.7	100
A	Male	33.66	52.6	24.1	3.7	19.7	100
B	Female	11799	36.8	43.9	6.9	12.4	100
2	Urban	9315	4.8	5.0	9.1	81.1	100
A	Male	8315	4.8	4.5	7.1	83.6	100
B	Female	1000	4.8	9.1	25.6	60.5	100
3	Total	54180	41.0	25.1	5.3	28.6	100
A	Male	41380	43.0	20.1	4.4	32.5	100
B	Female	12800	34.3	41.2	8.3	16.1	100

Source: Census of India -2001

## REFERENCES

1. Archarya.S & Jose.A.V.(1991), Employment and Mobility: A Study Among, Workers of Low-Income Households in Bombay City, ARTEP Working Paper, ILO, New Delhi.
2. Anker, Richard (1997)“Theories of Occupational Segregation by Sex: an Overview” International Labour Review, Vol.136, No.3, p.315-340.
3. Anker, Richard (1998), Gender and Jobsisex Segregation of Occupations in the World, ILO, Geneva.
4. Anker and Catherine Hein (1985), “Why Third World Urban Employers Usually Prefer Men”, International Labour Review, Vol.124, No.1, pp.73-90.
5. Bakker, Isabel (1988), “Womens’ Employment in Comparative perspective” in Jenson, E.Hegen and C.Reddy(eds.) Feminization of the Labour Force: Paradoxes and Promises, Oxford University, Press, New York.
6. Bhalla Sheila (1997), “The rise and fall of workforce Diversification Process in Rural India” in Chandha G.K. and Alakn N. Sharma (eds.) Growth Employment and Poverty Change and Continuity in Rural India: Vikas Publishing Ltd., New Delhi.
7. Boserup Esten (1970), “Womens’ Role in Economic Development”, St. Martin’s Press, New York.
8. Bradley Harriet (1989), Men’s Work, Womens’ Work, University of Minesota Press, Minneapolis.
9. Breman, Jan (1996), “Footloose Labour: Working in India’s formal Economy” Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
10. Census of India, (1991), Office of Registrar General, GOI, New Delhi.
11. Chakravarthy Shanti (1975), “Women Power in Agriculture”, Kuruksheetra, Nov.16, 1975, p.8
12. Chowdhari.S.R.(1995), “Womens’ Place in the Labour Market”, Indian Express, May 13, 1995.
13. Chaudhri.D.P. (1993), Productivity Trends in Asian Agriculture: 1950-190, IJLE, Vol.36, No.2, April-June, pp.169-189.
14. Crompton and Michel Mann Rosemany(1986) Gender and Stratification, Polity Press, Oxford.
15. 15. Concoran, Mary, Greg.J. Duncay, “Work Experience, Job Segregation and Pronza Michael (1984) and Wages”, in B. Reskin (ed.) Sex Segregation in the Workplace National Academy Press, Washington, D.C. (pp.171-91).
16. 16.England, Paula (1984), “Wage Appreciation and Depreciation: A Test of Neo-classical Economic Explanations of Occupational Sex Segregation: Social Forces, Vol.62, No.3, (pp.727-745).
17. 17. Gothoskar Sujata (1994), Alternative Economic Survey (1993-94), 1994, Delhi, PIRG (p.140).
18. 18. Hanumantha Rao.K. (2000), “Changes in the Structure of Employment in Rural Areas”, NIRD, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad, 30.
19. 19. Jose.A.V.(1987), Employment and Wages of Women Workers in Asian Countries : An Assessment, ARTEP working paper, ILO, New Delhi.
20. 20. Joyee Lebra, (1984)et., al.“Women and Work in India” Okhla industrial Area, New Delhi, 1984.

21. Joseph Moluy (1997), "Women Participation and Development Strategy" Kanishka Publishers and Distributors, New Delh.
22. Kingdom, Geeta Gandhi(1998), "Labour Force Participation, Returns to Education and Sex Discremination" in Papola and Sharma (eds.) Gender and Employment in India, Vikas Publishers, New Delhi.
23. Kishwar madhu & Ruth Vanitha(1985)(eds.) In Search of Ansvars: Indian Womens' Voice' Manushi London
24. Mallaiah L.C. (2000), "The Relevance of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar's Views on Indian Agricultural" unpublished Ph.D. Thesis submitted to the University of Hyderabad.
25. Mitra, Arup (1998), "Employment in the Informal Sector" Indian Journal of Labour Economics Vol.41. No.3, pp.475-482.
26. Mundle.S.(1991) (Minco), "The Employment Effects of Stabilisation and Related Policy changes in India: 1921-92 to 1993-94" paper presented at the Workshop on Social Dimensions of Structural Change, ILO, Delhi.
27. Nagraj.R. (1994), Employment and Wages in Manufacturing Industries: Trends, Hypothesis and Evidence", EPW, Vol.XXIX, No.4, Jan 22, pp.177-186.
28. Rao.S.L. (1994), "LabourAdjustment as part of Industrial Restructuring: Human Dimensions of Liberalization" EPW, Vol.XXIX, No.6, Feb.5, pp.313-320.
29. Saasken Saskia (1997), Informalisation in Advanced Market Economics, Working paper, Series-20, ILO, Geneva.
30. Sandra Rathbeck and Sarthi Acharya(1999) "Gender-Based Segregation in the Indian Labour Market", IJLE, Vol.42, No.4, 1999.
31. Srivastava Nisha (1999), "Striking for a Toe-hold: Women in the Organised Sector" in Papola and Sharma(ed.) Gender and Employment in India, Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi, (pp.181 to 205).
32. GOI, Ministry of Education and Social Status of Women in India, Dept. of Social Welfare (1974) Welfare, New Delhi, Dec.1974.
33. Terrell, Katherine (1992), "Female-Male Earnings Differentials and Occupational Structure", International Labour Review, Vol.131, No.4-5, (pp.387-405).
34. Treimann Donald and Patrica Ross (1983)"Sex and Earnings in Industrial Society: A Nine Nations Comparison" American Sociological Review, Vol.89, No.3, (pp.612-650).

---

*Copyright © 2014, Dr. L.C.Mallaiah. This is an open access refereed article distributed under the creative common attribution license which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.*