3

Income, Employment and Poverty

Tamil Nadu is seen as a State that has been able to combine high levels of economic growth with high levels of social development in recent years (Dreze and Sen, 2013). Apart from investments in health and education, a key dimension of inclusive development is the relationship between growth and employment. If growth does not generate adequate employment, poverty levels are likely to remain high even as levels of inequality increase. Jobless growth has been found to be a key aspect of the recent growth process. However, mere employment generation does not ensure inclusive growth. The category, 'working poor' essentially captures this phenomenon. People continue to work for incomes that do not allow them to escape from poverty. Apart from the quantum of employment, the quality of employment too is therefore important in ensuring that benefits of the growth in income are shared equally between capital and labour, and between different segments of labour. It is the growing recognition of this phenomenon that has made decent work one of the key developmental goals of the International Labour Organization (ILO) over the last decade and a half. Importantly, it is now well-recognised that growth does not trickle down automatically, but is made possible through strong public action and a set of appropriate institutional interventions.

This chapter will profile the employment and income dimensions of human development and the extent of poverty reduction across social and economic groups in the State over the last decade or so. Following this introduction, the chapter maps the changing composition of sectoral income and employment shares in the State in a comparative perspective. Comparison will be done across six States that include the four south Indian States, Maharashtra and Gujarat. The choice has been guided partly by convention and partly by the fact that Maharashtra and Gujarat, along with Tamil Nadu, are among the major industrialised States in the country. Differences and discrepancies in income and employment growth across sectors will be identified. This will be followed by an examination of income levels across districts in the State. Subsequent sections will focus on changes in absolute and relative poverty as captured by income inequality. Changes across social (across SC [scheduled caste], ST [scheduled tribe], OBC [other backward class] and minorities) and economic groups (as categorised by the National Sample Survey Organisation [NSSO]) will be mapped. Apart from absolute poverty, relative poverty has been identified as a major concern in fast growing developing economies with implications for social exclusion. Income inequality can capture this dimension to an extent. Rural and urban differences across social and economic groups in consumption inequality will also be depicted, patterns summarised and implications drawn. In addition to NSSO estimates on MPCE (monthly per capita expenditure) with regard to district-level poverty, the chapter also uses the MPI (multidimensional poverty index) to analyse inter-district variations.

At the district level, differences in work participation rates, share of agricultural labour and share of marginal workers will be charted and analysed. Relationships between agricultural productivity, wage levels and poverty, composition of employment and poverty will be examined to identify possible means of public intervention. In the final section, the chapter identifies the key challenges emerging in the State across the three dimensions—employment, income and poverty—based on the analyses carried out in the previous sections. The chapter concludes by highlighting some possible directions for public intervention.

Growth in Sectoral Income

Tamil Nadu has the fourth highest PCI (per capita income) of ₹57,131 among the major States in 2011-12 after Maharashtra, Haryana and only slightly less than Gujarat (₹57,508) in 2004-05 prices.

Table 3.1

Per Capita Income (Rupees)

State	*2004-05*	*2011-12*
Tamil Nadu	30062	57131
Andhra Pradesh	25321	42119
Karnataka	26882	41959
Kerala	31871	53877
Maharashtra	36077	62457
Gujarat	32021	57508
India	24143	38037

Source: Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation (MOSPI), Government of India, (GoI).

In fact, the State's PCI has become higher than that of Kerala and has almost caught up with Gujarat over the 7-year period as indicated in Table 3.1. While the decline in fertility rates may have contributed to this growth, economic factors cannot be discounted. Looking at sectoral shifts in income generation, though an all-India phenomenon, the declining share of agriculture in the state's income is particularly acute in Tamil Nadu as Table 3.2 illustrates.

Table 3.2

Sector-wise Shares of Income (% NDP)

State	*Sector*	*2004-05*	*2011-12*
Tamil Nadu	Agriculture and Allied	11.65	8.71
	Industry	28.68	27.91
	a. Registered	9.29	11.81
	b. Unregistered	7.66	5.45
	c. Construction	9.69	10.09
	Services	59.67	63.38
Andhra Pradesh	Agriculture and Allied	28.84	22.58
	Industry	18.82	18.75
	a. Registered	6.84	6.92
	b. Unregistered	3.43	2.8
	c. Construction	7.25	7.8
	Services	52.34	58.67
Karnataka	Agriculture and Allied	19.51	16.63
	Industry	27.98	25.07
	a. Registered	11.96	9.94
	b. Unregistered	3.78	3.46
	c. Construction	9.17	9.61
	Services	53.12	58.3
Kerala	Agriculture and Allied	16.47	8.5
	Industry	22.31	19.46
	a. Registered	3.32	2.76
	b. Unregistered	4.4	3.7
	c. Construction	13.29	12.22
	Services	61.23	72.04
Maharashtra	Agriculture and Allied	11.17	8.76
	Industry	26.74	26.76
	a. Registered	11.67	11.94
	b. Unregistered	6.53	5.6
	c. Construction	6.79	7.63
	Services	62.09	64.47
Gujarat	Agriculture and Allied	17.71	13.49
	Industry	35.57	36.93
	a. Registered	17.13	19.23
	b. Unregistered	6.24	5.43
	c. Construction	7.27	7.93
	Services	46.71	49.58
India	Agriculture and Allied	19.89	14.65*
	Industry	25.24	24.18*
	a. Registered	7.76	8.44*
	b. Unregistered	5.3	4.73*
	c. Construction	8.24	8.29*
	Services	54.87	61.17*

Notes: i. All percentages to Net Domestic Product; ii. Constant prices with base-year 2004-05.

*: First revised estimates

Source: MOSPI, CSO, National Accounts Reports/Publication.

Even among comparable States, we find that it has the lowest share along with Kerala. Importantly, within the 8.7 per cent contribution of agriculture to the State's income in 2011-12, it has been pointed out that bulk of the growth in the sector in the last decade has emanated from fisheries, livestock, horticulture and floriculture. There has been a considerable shift in land under cultivation towards horticulture and floriculture in this period. The implications of this shift for improvements in rural poverty and employment are however not clear.

In the non-agricultural segment, we observe that the State has increased its share of income originating from the registered manufacturing sector in the past seven years, and in fact it is the only State, other than Gujarat, where the share has increased by more than two percentage points. This is definitely a positive sign in terms of quality of employment if the registered sector is able to also increase its share of manufacturing employment. The other striking aspect is the increasing share of the construction and the services sector. In the case of services sector, however, the increase in its contribution to income has not been to the extent noted in other States, except Maharashtra.

Trends in Work Participation Rate and Workforce Composition

The emphasis on 'demographic dividend' makes it important to understand additions made to the workforce. Table 3.3 maps the additions made to workforce and the changes in the share of workers in the total population.

Looking at the workforce, there has been a steady rise in the supply of workers with an addition of more than 5 million workers over the last decade, leading to a total workforce of 32.88 million (Table 3.3). This increase in absolute number is considerably more than that in the previous decade (1991-2001) and has also been driven by a rise in the share of workforce in the total population from 44.76 per cent in 2001 to 45.58 per cent in 2011. In terms of the distinction between marginal and main workers, the share of marginal workers, i.e., workers who are employed for less than six months in a year, has increased slightly from 6.63 per cent in 2001 to 6.85 per cent in 2011. This increase is lesser than that in the previous decade, which saw a hike in the share of marginal workers by more than 2 per cent. However, the fact that nearly 5 million workers are marginally employed does not augur well for a fast-growing economy.

The work participation rate for both male and female workers continues to be high in the State relative to the all-India level (Table 3.4). Importantly, it has marginally increased by almost a percentage point to 45.6 per cent (from 44.7% in 2001). This increase, however, seems to be driven primarily by that in urban workers' participation as Table 3.4 shows.

Table 3.3

State-level Workforce Trends (1981-2011)

Category	1981		1991		2001		2011	
	Absolute	Per cent	Absolute	Per cent	Absolute	Per cent	Absolute	Per cent
Total Workers	20.2	41.7	24.2	43.3	27.88	44.76	32.88	45.58
Main Workers	19	39.3	22.8	40.8	23.76	38	27.94	38.73
Marginal Workers	1.2	2.42	1.4	2.5	4.12	6.63	4.94	6.85
Marginal (3-6 months)	---	---	---	---	---	---	4.22	5.85
Marginal (0-3 months)	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.72	1
Non-workers	28.21	58.27	31.7	56.7	34.53	55.06	39.26	54.42
Total Population	48.5	100	55.9	100	62.41	100	72.15	100

Notes: 1) Absolute values are in millions.
2) Percentage values are in terms of total population.
3) Missing data correspond to census years in which the question(s) were not enumerated.

Source: Census of India, 1981, 1991, 2001 and 2011.

Table 3.4

State-level Worker Population and Work Participation Rate by Region and Gender (1981-2011)

	1981	1991	2001	2011
	Number of Workers (million)			
	Rural			
Male	9.67	10.82	10.4	11.21
Female	5.41	7.01	7.18	7.65
Persons	15.08	17.83	17.58	18.86
	Urban			
Male	4.18	5.14	7.76	10.22
Female	0.93	1.22	2.48	3.80
Persons	5.11	6.36	10.24	14.02
	Total			
Male	13.85	15.96	18.16	21.43
Female	6.34	8.24	9.66	11.45
Persons	20.19	24.19	27.88	32.88
	Work Participation Rate			
	Rural			
Male	59.24	58.28	59.1	60
Female	33.55	38.5	41.4	41.2
Persons	46.48	48.49	50.3	50.7
	Urban			
Male	51.25	52.78	55.8	58.5
Female	11.97	13.1	18.9	21.8
Persons	32.05	33.34	37.5	40.2
	Total			
Male	56.58	56.39	57.6	59.3
Female	26.52	29.89	31.5	31.8
Persons	41.73	43.31	44.7	45.6

Source: Census of India, 1981, 1991, 2001 and 2011.

Disaggregating the worker population by gender and across rural and urban areas, an increase in the rural working population is noticed in the last decade, unlike in the previous decade, when there was an absolute decline in the number of male workers in rural Tamil Nadu (Table 3.4). Rural work participation rate has, however, remained almost stagnant with women's participation actually decreasing by 0.2 per cent and that of men increasing by only 0.9 per cent. This is suggestive of a tendency towards urbanisation of employment in the State. The stagnation of rural women's participation in work goes against the trend in the previous decades when work participation has increased. Overall, the share of women workers almost remained the same over the previous decade and has increased only by 0.1 per cent, unlike previously when the share of women workers increased by more than 3 percentage points. The reduction in work participation rate for women in rural areas can be explained by withdrawal of women workers from the labour force with increasing income levels of the households, as pointed out in micro-level studies (Jeyaranjan, 2011). In the case of urban Tamil Nadu, male and female workers' participation has increased from 55.8 to 58.5 per cent, and from 18.9 to 21.8 per cent respectively over the decade.

The next section maps the shifts in employment across sectors.

Shifts in Sectoral Employment

The dramatic decline in the share of agricultural sector income has not been matched by shifts in labour force

Table 3.5

Share of Employment across Sectors 2004-05 and 2009-10

States	Sector									
	2004-05					2009-10				
	Agri.	Manufac.	Non-Manu.	Industry	Service	Agri.	Manufac.	Non-Manu.	Industry	Service
AP	52.8	11.9	7	18.9	28.1	51.2	11	13.5	24.5	24.3
Gujarat	62.1	12.6	5.1	17.7	20.2	52.2	13.7	7.3	21	26.8
Karnataka	64.4	9.4	4.4	13.8	21.7	57.3	9.9	7.7	17.6	25.1
Kerala	40.1	13.5	11.6	25.1	34.8	32.1	12.4	16.3	28.7	39.2
MH	45.7	14.8	6.2	21	34.3	52.9	10.8	6.5	17.3	29.8
TN	46.4	19.6	7	26.6	27.1	41.8	17.2	14	31.2	27

Source: Planning Commission, GoI.

Table 3.6

Composition of Workforce by Industrial Classification (1981-2011)

Category	1981		1991		2001		2011	
	Absolute	Per cent	Absolute	Per cent	Absolute	Per cent	Absolute	Per cent
Cultivators	5.82	28.8	6.04	25	5.11	18.4	4.25	12.92
Agricultural Labourers	6.77	33.5	8.76	36.2	8.67	31.1	9.61	29.21
Household Industry and Manufacturing	0.97	4.8	0.87	3.6	1.46	5.3	1.36	4.15
Other Workers	6.64	32.9	8.53	35.2	12.57	45.2	17.66	53.72
Total Workers	20.2	100	24.19	100	27.81	100	32.88	100

Notes: 1) Absolute values are in millions.

2) Percentage values are in terms of total worker population.

Sources: Census of India, 1981, 1991, 2001 and 2011.

out of agriculture despite a decline in the share of agricultural employment as Table 3.5 illustrates.

The employment share has declined by 5 percentage points albeit from a high level (46.4%). The quantum of decline is much more than the decline in the share of agricultural income indicating a possible improvement in the returns of those dependent on agriculture. In terms of comparison across states, State's share of employment in agriculture is the lowest after Kerala.

Looking at the composition of the workforce within agriculture (Table 3.6), while the share of agricultural labour in the total workforce has declined by almost 2 percentage points, in absolute terms, the segment has increased unlike in the previous decade when there was an absolute fall in the workforce. While there was steady increase from 1961 to 1991 from 18.4 per cent to 36.2 per cent in 1991, over the last two decades there has been a fall in the share to 29.21 per cent in 2011.

However unlike in the previous decade (1991-2001), there has been an increase in the absolute numbers of agricultural workers in the period 2001-2011. This rise can be attributed to either the growth in agricultural sector, or an inability of the modern sector to absorb the growing workforce, or proletarianisation of the peasantry in the State, a phenomenon that has been noticed earlier. In the case of cultivators, we find a continuing decline in their share over the decades from 18.4 per cent in 2001 to 12.92 per cent in 2011. Between 2001 and 2011, while the number of cultivators declined by 0.86 million, that of agricultural workers increased by 0.94 million. It therefore appears to be a combination of all the factors.

In the non-agricultural segments, among those engaged in household industry and manufacturing, there has again been a fall in both the share and absolute numbers. In the case of household industry and manufacturing, regardless of an increase in

Table 3.7

Statement Showing State-wise Employment in the Organised Sector (in lakhs), 2011

Organised emp	*TN*	*Maharashtra*	*Gujarat*	*Karnataka*	*AP*	*Kerala*	*India*
Public Sector	14.4	21.43	7.93	10.62	12.77	5.77	175.48
Share	8.2	12.21	4.52	6.05	7.28	3.29	100
Private Sector	8.87	25.34	13.07	12.33	7.82	5.11	114.52
Share	7.74	22.13	11.41	10.77	6.83	4.47	100
Total	23.27	46.78	21	22.95	20.6	10.88	289.99

Source: Employment Review 2013, Directorate General of Employment & Training, Ministry of Labour and Employment, Governemnt of India.

the decade 1991-2001, we find that there has been a marginal decline from 5.3 to 4.15 per cent in the last decade. In other words, the share of employment has fallen in the last decade for all categories, except the 'other workers' category which accounts for more than 53 per cent of all workers in 2011, compared to just 45.2 per cent in 2001. While this can be interpreted as a shift away from traditional to modern employment, the fact that the share of marginal workers continues to be high highlights the need to focus on the quality of employment in the modern sector.

The disaggregate picture of employment in the non-agricultural sector (Table 3.5) shows that despite an increase in the share of industrial employment, the rising share has happened primarily due to a tremendous increase in the share of 'non-manufacturing', which includes the construction sector. The construction sector, it appears, has absorbed bulk of the workforce exiting agriculture. Though there is a fall in the share of manufacturing employment between the two time periods by more than two percentage points, the state continues to rank the highest in terms of its share of employment in manufacturing. The decline seems to have been compensated solely by an increase in employment in non-manufacturing as the services share in employment has increased only marginally.

A more disaggregate picture of employment across the six states is given in Annexure A-3.1. In line with the aggregate data, it also shows: a) the relatively lower share of employment in agriculture; b) the importance of construction to employment generation, with the State having the largest share of employment in this sector, after Kerala; c) the relatively higher share of manufacturing employment as a whole; and d) wholesale trade, automobile repair, transportation and storage, and accommodation and food service activities accounting for the bulk of service sector employment. Given the not so high value additions in such services, it is all the more important to focus on enhancing employment in manufacturing, in addition to improving the returns to labour by appropriate investments. The information and communication sector is, however, absorbing a larger workforce among all the States, except Karnataka.

Next, we compare the extent of organised sector employment available in Tamil Nadu *vis-à-vis* other States (Table 3.7).

More than 23 lakh workers are employed in the organised sector in the State, which is the highest in the country after Maharashtra. However, in terms of the share of organised employment in the country, it is not high, with the State accounting for 7.74 per cent of private organised sector employment, which is low compared to all States, except Kerala. Within organised manufacturing, however, the State continues to account for the largest number of factories and also the highest number of workers employed in the factories sector (organised manufacturing) in the entire country. In 2010-11, according to the Annual Survey of Industries (ASI) data, the State housed 36,848 factories employing 1,943,319 workers, which accounts for 17.4 per cent of total factories and 15.3 per cent of the total organised manufacturing employment in the country. In fact, since 2000-01, the share of employment has increased by 1 per cent from 14.2 per cent and the share in the number of factories by close to 2 per cent. This indicates that despite the increasing share in the number of factories, that of employment has not increased as much, thereby implying a possible decline in employment absorption in the manufacturing sector. Also importantly, the State accounted for only 10.36 per cent of the gross value added in manufacturing, regardless of its higher share in employment indicative of lower labour productivity. Importantly, the fixed capital per factory at ₹56,300,000 is close to only half that of Maharashtra and one-third of Gujarat. Apart from being indicative of the smaller size of firms in the State, it also goes to

show that relative to the other highly industrialised States, capital intensity is lower with possible implications for labour productivity. The decline in share of manufacturing employment accompanied by lower labour productivity clearly demands policy attention. Next, we look at the quality of employment and changes in unemployment patterns in the State.

Trends in Unemployment and Modes of Employment

The NSSO reports on employment and unemployment trends are used to map the changes in quality of employment as expressed through regularity of employment. Considering distribution of the workforce between 2000 and 2011-12, the State has the highest share of casual labour and the lowest share of self-employment among the six States (Tables 3.8 and 3.9). Only 278 out of 1000 are self-employed in the State, which is lower than most States and much lower than the national average of 593. Interestingly, it is also a State that has a relatively higher share of people employed in regular salaried employment and a large share of population employed in casual work. In both the latter categories, the rates are not only higher than the all-India average (95 as compared to 56 at all-India level for regular employment and 628 as opposed to 351 for casual employment), but also exceeds that of most major States, other than Kerala and West Bengal, for regular employment and highest among major States for casual employment. These figures by and large hold good for both rural and urban employment.

Importantly, casualisation of the workforce in Tamil Nadu has increased relative to other States over the last decade, as Andhra Pradesh and Kerala had the same or more number of casual workers in 2000. The increase in casualisation of employment seems to have happened through reductions in self-employment as well as regular wage/salaried work. While the decline in self-employed may be due to small and marginal farmers exiting agriculture, the fall in share of the regular-waged workers is an aspect that needs to be taken into consideration. This is particularly important when the earlier observations on the share of income from registered manufacturing are taken into account. While the share of registered manufacturing has increased, it has not been accompanied by a corresponding rise in that of the regular wage/salaried employment.

Moving from the quality of employment to the quantum of employment and levels of unemployment in the State, it can be seen (Tables 3.10 and 3.11) that Tamil Nadu continued to have high levels of unemployment

Table 3.8

Distribution (per 1000) of Workers According to Usual Status (PS+SS) by Broad Employment Status 2011-12

		Total Workers						
No		*TN*	*AP*	*Gujarat*	*Karnataka*	*Kerala*	*Maharashtra*	*AI*
1	Self-employed	317	444	514	478	377	469	522
2	Regular Wage/Salaried	255	179	247	225	225	265	179
3	Casual Labour	428	377	239	297	398	266	299
4	Total	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000

Source: Key Indicators of Employment and Unemployment in India, NSS 68th Round.

Table 3.9

Per 1000 Distribution of Usually Employed by Category of Employment Across States, 2000

		Total Workers						
No		*TN*	*AP*	*Gujarat*	*Karnataka*	*Kerala*	*Maharashtra*	*AI*
1	Self-employed	345	403	456	436	359	381	469
2	Regular Wage/Salaried	286	228	210	229	238	301	244
3	Casual Labour	369	369	334	335	403	318	287
4	Total	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000

Source: Employment and Unemployment Situation in India, NSS 55th Round.

Table 3.10

Current Daily Status Unemployment Rates Across Key States, 2011-12

		AP	*Gujarat*	*Karnataka*	*Kerala*	*Maharashtra*	*TN*	*AI*
	Male	50	26	37	130	44	111	57
Rural	Female	46	35	33	293	42	119	63
	Person	48	28	35	180	43	114	59
	Male	54	14	39	89	30	63	50
Urban	Female	102	23	56	220	68	84	82
	Person	65	17	42	126	37	69	55

Source: Employment and Unemployment Situation in India, NSS 68th Round.

Table 3.11

Current Daily Status Unemployment Rates Across Key States, 2000

		AP	*Gujarat*	*Karnataka*	*Kerala*	*Maharashtra*	*TN*	*AI*
	Male	81	51	44	200	63	143	72
Rural	Female	81	42	40	261	69	123	70
	Person	81	48	43	217	65	135	71
	Male	72	40	53	155	77	90	73
Urban	Female	89	54	59	282	100	86	94
	Person	76	42	54	191	81	89	77

Source: Key Indicators of Employment and Unemployment in India, NSS 55th Round.

relative to other States (except Kerala), even though the levels have declined between the 2000 and 2011-2012.[1]

As Tables 3.10 and 3.11 suggest, unemployment levels have declined over the decade despite remaining relatively high in the state during both time points. Also, across all categories, male and female in rural and urban Tamil Nadu, the rate of unemployment is higher than all States except Kerala. However in the case of urban women, Andhra Pradesh has witnessed an increase in unemployment compared to the State. In fact, the NSSO report on youth employment also shows that among all the major metropolitan cities, the levels of unemployment are the highest for Chennai city. Although the factors driving this scenario are not clearly defined, an explanation based on micro-level observations can shed some light.

Rising aspirations for higher education have broad-based entry into tertiary education. According to the Annual Survey of Higher Education undertaken by the Ministry of Human Resources Development (MHRD), the State has the highest gross enrolment ratio at 38.2 per cent for the population in the age group of 18-23 among all major states in 2012-13.[2] If the increase in proportion of formally educated labour pool is not matched by adequate increases in employment, it can lead to the phenomenon of the educated unemployed. This has been observed in the context of Kerala in an earlier period, where despite labour shortages in the agricultural sector, there was a simultaneous presence of educated unemployed.

Trends in Wages and Salaries

This section will focus on wage levels across employment categories and across States, followed by

1. The unemployment rate based on current daily status has been used as it is the most inclusive measurement of unemployment.

2. *http://www.newindianexpress.com/states/tamil_nadu/TN-Tops-Higher-Education-Charts/2014/07/18/article2335713.ece* downloaded on June 15, 2015.

Table 3.12

Average Wage/Salary Earnings (₹) Per Day Received by Casual Labours of Age 15-59 Years, 2011-12

	TN	AP	Gujarat	Karnataka	Kerala	Maharashtra	AI
Rural							
Male Average Salary	196.65	167.65	115.77	162.94	345.14	133.69	149.32
Female Average Salary	110.41	111.19	104.96	99.86	169.61	92.83	103.28
Person Average Salary	169.93	141.53	112.84	142.4	314.88	117.36	138.67
Urban							
Male Average Salary	227.66	193.52	160.64	192.24	335.76	173.18	182.04
Female Average Salary	126.53	126.6	88.84	101.77	167.56	95.91	110.62
Person Average Salary	208.34	178.34	144.52	174.05	309.9	154.62	170.10

Source: Key Indicators of Employment and Unemployment in India, NSS 68th Round.

Table 3.13

Average Daily Wages (₹) for Casual Workers of Age 15 Years and Above Engaged in Non-public Works Across Key States, 2000

		AP	Gujarat	Karnataka	Kerala	Maharashtra	TN	AI
	Male	40.67	43.91	42.51	100.78	41.32	60.2	44.84
Rural	Female	26.48	34.43	27.14	56.65	25.28	30.78	29.01
	Person	34.14	40.73	36.23	90.59	34.01	48.14	39.64
	Male	56.75	67.13	61.01	102.35	61.7	72.27	62.26
Urban	Female	39.42	40.12	39.35	47.19	29.18	46.99	37.71
	Person	51.6	61.55	55.16	93.13	54.09	66.34	56.96

Source: Table S38, Key Indicators of Employment and Unemployment in India, NSS 55th Round.

a comparison of agricultural wage rates across Tamil Nadu districts. Firstly, the wage rates for casual labour working in rural and urban Tamil Nadu are examined comparatively (Tables 3.12 and 3.13).

Average wage/salary earnings (₹/day) received by urban male casual labourers of age 15-59 years engaged in activities other than public works was one of the highest in the country at ₹227.66 per day (Table 3.12). This wage rate can be taken to be closest to the market-determined wage rate and it was highest among major States, after Kerala. Although the difference between male and female wages continues to be high, yet the average wage for urban female workers is higher than the all-India average and ranks on the top. The high wage level is also true for rural male workers, and is again one of the highest in the country at ₹196.65. Rural female wages for casual work, even though above the all-India average, is relatively lower.

Although the wages for casual labour has been high for Tamil Nadu in relative terms even in 2000, the differences in levels *vis-à-vis* other States have not been that high. The hikes in casual wage rates may not imply better returns to labour, if the incremental increase is lower than the inflation rate. However, given the expansive social security net that the State has been known for, and the spread of universal PDS (public distribution system), it can be safely assumed that the increase in casual wage rates imply better real incomes in the State.

Table 3.14 gives the average earnings for regular workers/employees. Interestingly, unlike in the case of casual labour, the wage levels for regular waged/salaried employment in Tamil Nadu were lower than that of the all-India average (₹389 against ₹449.65 for all-India), although in comparison to casual labour wages, it is much higher. The increase in wage rates, coupled with a better spread of social security net, is likely to have implications for poverty reduction that are discussed in the next section.

Table 3.14

Average Wage/Salary Earnings (₹ per day) Received by Regular Wage/Salaried Employees—Rural + Urban—in 2011-12

	TN	*AP*	*Gujarat*	*Karnataka*	*Kerala*	*Maharashtra*	*AI*
Male Average Salary	356.65	339.55	311.39	416.69	432.23	483.37	417.08
Female Average Salary	264.53	238.41	241.5	312.17	308.28	360.68	307.72
Person Average Salary	349.75	346.87	302.38	391.45	384.81	459.32	395.82

Source: Key Indicators of Employment and Unemployment in India, NSS 68th Round.

Going by the district-wise income, there are wide disparities across districts (Table 3.15).

Table 3.15

Districts Ranked on Per Capita Income (2011-12)
(Top 10 and Bottom 10 Districts)

1	Kanyakumari
2	Kancheepuram
3	Tiruppur
4	Virudhunagar
5	Thiruvallur
6	Coimbatore
7	Erode
8	Tiruchirapalli
9	Thoothukudi
10	Karur
23	Thanjavur
24	Ramanathapuram
25	Pudukottai
26	Tiruvannamalai
27	Nagapattinam
28	Theni
29	Villupuram
30	Thiruvarur
31	Perambalur
32	Ariyalur

Source: DOES,Tamil Nadu.

High income districts like Kanyakumari and Erode have more than three times the incomes of low income ones like Ariyalur and Perambalur. Other low income districts like Villupuram, Tiruvannamalai, Theni and Thiruvarur too have per capita incomes less than half of that of the highest income districts. Importantly, there have hardly been any changes in the rankings of districts, based on per capita income, in the earlier Human Development Report (HDR) with the exception of Thanjavur district. Inter-district disparities continue to persist.

Inter-district differences can also be observed in levels of urbanisation which partly overlaps with differences in PCI. Despite the fact that urbanisation levels are the highest in the country, in five districts, Villupuram, Theni, Dharmapuri, Perambalur, Cuddalore, rural population has grown at a higher rate than that of all-India. Clearly, these are also districts that rank low in terms of PCI. There are also few districts that have witnessed negative population growth in rural Tamil Nadu in the last decade; Virudhunagar, Coimbatore, Nilgiris, Thoothukudi, Kanyakumari, Karur and Tiruppur showing near zero growth. Except the Nilgiris, the other districts are home to vibrant urban growth centres driven by varying levels of manufacturing and tertiary sector growth. The Nilgiris district appears to have witnessed a phenomenon of overall out-migration as it is the only district that has seen negative urban growth as well.

The highest increments in urban population over the last decade have taken place in the following districts—Kancheepuram, Krishnagiri, Thiruvallur, Tiruppur, Kanyakumari and Karur. As mentioned earlier, Karur and Tiruppur are dynamic industrialising/urbanising regions. Kancheepuram and Thiruvallur are on the outskirts of Chennai and have witnessed rapid transformations through expansion of the Chennai metropolitan region and active efforts by the State to promote industries in sections of these districts. They have attracted in-migration considerably in the last decade with population densities growing by more than 300 and 200 persons/sq km in the last 10 years. The most slowly urbanising districts (other than Chennai which is almost 100 per cent urbanised and the Nilgiris) are Ariyalur, Thiruvarur, Nagapattinam, Theni and Thanjavur. These are also districts that have low levels of PCI. In fact, other than Thanjavur that is

ranked eleventh, all the other four districts are among the 10 poorest districts in the State in terms of PCI.

We also observe that the average literacy levels tend to increase along with rising PCIs. In terms of PCI, 10 districts that fall under the lowest one-third have an average literacy of 77.33 per cent compared to that of more than 82 per cent for the top 10 districts. The causal relationship can however work both ways. While higher incomes can lead to better investments in education, it is also possible that higher literacy levels can enable better per capita incomes due to greater labour productivity. Nevertheless, in the context of specific districts, we do observe a few with high incomes but relatively lower literacy rates and vice-versa.

Trends in Poverty Reduction

This section will map changes in poverty levels (based on Tendulkar committee recommendations) using the HCR (headcount ratio) across social groups (SC, ST, OBC and minorities) and also by livelihood categories (as categorised by the NSSO) within Tamil Nadu.

Table 3.16

Changes in Incidence of Poverty (HCR) for Social Groups (Rural)

	1993-94	*2004-05*	*2011-12*
SC/ST	65.8	51.2	24.0
OBC		32.6	13.0
General*	45.6	22.2	1.0

Note: *General includes OBC population in 1993-94 as the latter was not counted separately.

Source: Kalaiyarasan (2014). Calculated using NSS CES unit record data for the respective years.

As Table 3.16 shows, the more recent phase 2004-05 to 2011-12 has witnessed sharper reductions in rural poverty compared to the previous decade across all social groups. While the poverty levels have more than halved for the SC/STs during the more recent phase, levels continue to be the highest for this group and the percentage decline has been lesser compared to other groups. It is however possible that the increase in rural casual wage rates has contributed to this decline in poverty levels.

Table 3.17 depicts changes in rural poverty levels across livelihood categories.

Table 3.17

Changes in Poverty Incidence (HCR) by Rural Livelihood Categories in Tamil Nadu

Livelihood Categories	*1993-94*	*2004-05*	*2011-12*
Self-employed in Non-agriculture	37.2	24.6	7.7
Wage Labour Engaged in Agriculture	69.5	54.3	25.5
Wage Labour in Non-agriculture	44.0	34.2	10.0
Self-employed in Agriculture	42.7	23.8	17.5
Others	24.2	17.1	6.4
All	51.2	37.5	15.8

Note: Others: Households which have more than one income source.

Source: Same as in previous table.

Interestingly, the levels and extent of reduction of poverty for wage labour in agriculture corresponds quite closely to those for SC/STs in the State (Table 3.16). However, while the poverty levels have declined at much faster rates for all other livelihood categories, those self-employed in agriculture have not done too well in the recent phase. In fact, as can be seen, the degree of reduction in poverty in this category has been comparatively slower in the recent phase and the associated poverty levels are closer to that of the agricultural labourers. This phenomenon does tie up with the observations made in the context of small peasant farming in the State. In fact, in 2002-03, the average income for farmer households in the State from cultivation (₹7,908) was lower than that spent on cultivation (₹8,597) (Narayanamoorthy, 2006: 471). Under such cost-price conditions, it is not surprising to find high levels of indebtedness. Seventy-five per cent of the rural households are indebted, which is next only to Andhra Pradesh in the country (Narayanamoorthy, 2006: 471). This difference in income and cost of cultivation is also higher than the all-India average. It is another aspect that warrants policy attention. Given that there has been a revival in the agricultural sector since 2005, the relatively slower reduction in poverty levels among cultivators calls for a relook at the strategies targeted at improving the incomes for farmers.

Next, the chapter turns to examine poverty incidence in the urban areas (Tables 3.18 and 3.19).

Table 3.18

Changes in Poverty Incidence (HCR) for Social-Religious Groups (Urban)

Social Groups	*1993-94*	*2004-05*	*2011-12*
SC/ST	54.0	40.5	9.0
OBC		17.3	6.4
General*	30.0	6.5	1.8

Note: *General includes OBC population in 1993-94 as the latter was not counted separately.

Source: Same as in previous table.

Clearly, the urban has been a site of greater reductions in poverty, particularly in the recent phase. In the case of SC/STs living in urban areas, the reduction has been sharper and in terms of levels, they along with OBCs account for bulk of poor. Breaking up urban poverty across livelihood categories (Table 3.19), we find that *the poverty levels are the highest and also substantially higher for casual labourers than other categories*. This is however again not to deny the sharp fall in the poverty levels across all groups including casual labourers in the more recent phase.

Table 3.19

Changes in Poverty Incidence (HCR) for Urban Livelihoods Categories

Livelihood Categories	*1993-94*	*2004-05*	*2011-12*
Self-employed	32.1	18.6	5.2
Wage/salary earners	21.2	12.2	2.8
Casual labour	59.3	49.9	14.5
Others	41.4	10.1	4.4
Total	33.8	19.7	6.6

Note: Others- Other households with multiple sources of income.

Source: Same as in previous table.

The fact, that HCR is the least for the regular wage/salary earners, points out the importance of ensuring quality of employment. Also, more than 5 per cent of the self-employed continue to be poor.

Next, the chapter focuses on inter-district variations in poverty. In addition to NSSO estimates on MPCE for determining district-level poverty, the chapter also uses the parameters used to compute the MPI so as to analyse inter-district variations. Given the bifurcation of districts in the State between the two time periods, inferences need to be carefully drawn with regard to changes over time at the district level.

NREGA and Rural Poverty

Nationally, the NREGA is held to have considerable impacts on poverty. Given Tamil Nadu's reputation as one of the best implementing states of the Act, the impact on rural employment generation and poverty reduction is likely to be high. A study done by Princeton University (2012)[3] shows that Tamil Nadu has been ranked high in: a) ensuring women participation, b) average number of person-days worked in the programme; and c) more inclusive in terms of participation by SCs and OBCs. In 2011-12, according to the report of NSSO, 40 per cent of rural households in the State have participated in NREGA for more than 60 days. Forty-six per cent of SCs and 39 per cent of OBCs have participated for more than 60 days in Tamil Nadu.

Inter-District Patterns in Poverty Levels and Workforce Composition

To relate the poverty incidence to levels of multi-dimensional poverty across the districts, Table 3.20 provides information on MPIs for 10 districts with the highest levels of poverty incidence.

Table 3.20

Ten Districts with Highest Poverty Levels Based on Multidimensional Poverty Index

Districts	*MPI*	*Rank*
Krishnagiri	0.609	23
Nagapattinam	0.618	24
Pudukottai	0.638	25
Thanjavur	0.670	26
Vellore	0.672	27
Perambalur	0.702	28
Villupuram	0.714	29
Thirvanamalai	0.719	30
Thiruvarur	0.737	31
Ariyalur	0.747	32

Source: As calculated in Chapter 2.

There are clear overlaps between low PCI districts and those with low ranks on the MPI. Thanjavur, Vellore and Krishnagiri, despite a low rank on the MPI, do not belong to the 10 districts with the lowest

3. Cited in Kalaiyarasan (2014).

incomes, possibly due to higher inequalities in income distribution.

Considering that rural and urban poverty alleviation may require different kinds of policy interventions, the present chapter goes on to address inter-district differences in regard to rural and urban poverty. This exercise is once again based on extraction of unit-level NSSO data. Classification is done based on the absolute values obtained. Given the lower levels of urban poverty, districts with urban poverty levels greater than 10 per cent and rural poverty levels greater than 15 per cent have been identified (Tables 3.21 and 3.22).

Table 3.21

Districts with High Urban Poverty Levels in 2011-12 (>10 %)

Districts	*Percentage of Poor*
Vellore	16.3
Tiruvannamalai	20.5
Viluppuram	22.6
Salem	17.1
The Nilgiris	17.1
Ariyalur	11.4
Cuddalore	31.0
Thiruvarur	11.4
Thoothukudi	10.1
Tirunelveli	12.5
Krishnagiri	11.2
Tamil Nadu	6.6

Note: Dharmapuri and Theni have poverty levels close to 10%.

Source: Calculated using unit record data from consumption expenditure survey (CES) conducted by the NSSO, 2011-12.

Table 3.22

Districts with High Rural Poverty Levels in 2011-12 (>15%)

Districts	*Percentage of Poor*
Vellore	24.1
Tiruvannamalai	16.3
Viluppuram	58.6
The Nilgiris	28.1
Cuddalore	46.0
Sivaganga	33.1
Virudhunagar	17.7
Ramanathapuram	17.8
Thoothukudi	30.1
Tamil Nadu	15.8

Source: Calculated using unit record data from consumption expenditure survey (CES) conducted by the NSSO, 2011-12.

Though Cuddalore does not appear in the low income districts, its high urban poverty levels, along with that of Villupuram and Tiruvannamalai, are striking (Table 3.21). To understand the relationship between poverty levels and diversification of employment away from agriculture, Table 3.23 lists the districts that have high levels of agricultural labour within their working population.

Table 3.23

Districts with Highest Shares of Agricultural Labourers

Ranks	*Districts*	*Corresponding Rank for 2001*
23	Pudukkottai	19
24	Dindigul	25
25	Tiruvannamalai	24
26	Thanjavur	26
27	Cuddalore	28
28	Ariyalur	32
29	Viluppuram	26
30	Nagapattinam	29
31	Theni	25
32	Thiruvarur	31

Source: Calculated using unit record data from consumption expenditure survey (CES) conducted by the NSSO, 2011-12.

As Table 3.23 shows, there are some overlaps between the share of agricultural labourers in the district and extent of rural poverty in case of districts like Tiruvannamalai, Thiruvarur, Cuddalore, Ariyalur, Villupuram and Nagapattinam. In fact, there are a few districts where the share of agricultural labour has increased between 2001 and 2011. In Tiruvannamalai, Villupuram and the Nilgiris, there has been an increase of almost 9 per cent. Ariyalur and Pudukottai have witnessed a rise of almost 6.5 per cent, and Dindigul, Perambalur and Sivaganga districts registered a growth of 4-5 per cent. Most of the districts also rank high in terms of poverty levels. In other words, poverty levels are influenced in these districts by an inability of its residents to find more remunerative employment in the non-agricultural sector.

However other districts with high levels of rural poverty like Vellore, Nilgiris, Sivaganga, Virudhunagar, Thoothukudi and Ramanathapuram do not have significant shares of population working as agricultural labour. Given that most of these districts are dry regions, reasons for poverty may have to be sought

Table 3.24

Gini Coefficient of Distribution of Consumption: 1999-2000 to 2009-10

(MRP method for 2004-05 to 2009-10)

States	Urban			Rural		
	1999-00	2004-05	2009-10	1999-00	2004-05	2009-10
AP	0.313	0.342	0.353	0.235	0.252	0.269
Gujarat	0.286	0.295	0.309	0.234	0.251	0.252
Karnataka	0.323	0.358	0.375	0.241	0.232	0.231
Kerala	0.321	0.353	0.4	0.27	0.294	0.35
Maharashtra	0.348	0.35	0.38	0.258	0.27	0.244
TN	0.381	0.345	0.327	0.279	0.258	0.257
All India	0.342	0.348	0.371	0.26	0.266	0.276

Source: *http://planningcommission.gov.in/data/datatable/data_2312/DatabookDec2014%20106.pdf*

in agricultural productivity. In fact, four of these districts—Sivaganga, Virudhunagar, Thoothukudi and Ramanathapuram—are among the 10 districts with the lowest agricultural productivity levels in the State (Ramesh Chand *et al*., 2011).

Inequality

Apart from absolute poverty, relative poverty has been identified as a major concern in fast developing economies with implications on social exclusion. The emphasis on inclusive growth emphasises not only reductions in absolute poverty, but importantly also relative poverty, i.e., the economic differences between the high and the low income earners. Income inequality can capture this dimension to an extent. Following earlier studies on inequality, this report also uses the Gini co-efficient and its changes in order to understand income inequality. Rural and urban differences noted across social and economic groups in consumption inequality will be mapped so as to understand the patterns. In this section, inequality trends across the six States during the period 1999-2000 to 2009-10 (Table 3.24).

Tamil Nadu has had the highest levels of both rural and urban inequality in 1999-2000 compared to any other State. Yet since then, incidence of inequality has declined in both rural and urban Tamil Nadu. At present, the levels are not the highest among the six States; and more importantly, it is the only State where urban inequality has declined during this period and is the lowest after Gujarat. The factors driving this process are however not clear, except for the possibility of increments in wages for casual labour and the not-so-high levels of wages/salaries for regular employees/workers that the chapter has documented earlier. Next, attention is directed towards urban and rural inequalities across districts.

Table 3.25 presents districts with above average urban inequality.

Table 3.25

Districts with Above Average Urban Income Inequality 2011-12

District	Urban	
	Mean Consumption (URP) in Rs	Inequality (Gini)
Erode	2767	0.364
The Nilgiris	1872	0.361
Coimbatore	3033	0.383
Karur	2304	0.353
Tiruchirappalli	3182	0.435
Ariyalur	1977	0.346
Tamil Nadu	2380	0.338

Source: Calculated using unit record data from consumption expenditure survey (CES) conducted by the NSSO, 2011-12.

Ariyalur not only ranks among the lowest in terms of PCI and MPI, but also exhibits high income inequality. In addition to the districts listed in Table 3.25, Chennai, Kancheepuram and Krishnagiri too have Gini co-

efficients of urban inequality greater than 0.3. The rest of the districts belong either to high income or fast urbanising categories, with the exception of Niligiris. In terms of rural inequality, the following districts are found to have above average levels of Gini co-efficients (Table 3.26).

Table 3.26

Districts with Above Average Rural Income Inequality, 2011-12

District	Rural	
	Mean Consumption (URP)	*Inequality (Gini)*
Thiruvallur	1739	0.327
Vellore	1478	0.332
Dharmapuri	1857	0.317
Perambalur	2816	0.319
Ariyalur	1711	0.320
Pudukkottai	1979	0.367
Madurai	2107	0.418
Tamil Nadu	1505	0.301

Source: Calculated using unit record data from consumption expenditure survey (CES) conducted by the NSSO, 2011-12.

Ariyalur's presence in both the lists of districts with urban and rural inequalities needs to be noted. Perambalur, Vellore, Dharmapuri and Pudukottai are other districts that in addition to high levels of rural inequality, also have high levels of poverty as measured by the MPI.

Key Issues in Employment and the Way Forward

Based on the above analyses, the following are the key issues that need policy attention.

Poverty among Cultivators

Despite a revival in the growth of agricultural sector in the last decade, particularly in the last 7-8 years, the poverty levels among cultivators have not substantially declined. The lowering of returns from agriculture can clearly be a contributing factor. This, along with the lower incomes of agricultural labourers, either due to low labour productivity or an inability to support transition to more productive employment in some districts, are the major issues as far as rural poverty is concerned. In the case of cultivators, incomes suffer on the account of vagaries of both production and prices. In the domain of production, access to assured water has become a major problem all across the State. Depleting ground water tables, encroachment of irrigation channels, decline of community involvement in maintenance of irrigation structures, water disputes and consequent difficulties in investing in canal irrigation have collectively led to this situation, apart from erosion of soil quality due to excessive use of chemical technologies. Ensuring water, therefore, is of utmost importance, in addition to facilitating progress towards more sustainable but efficient agricultural practices.

On the prices front, there is a need to reduce the number of intermediaries in agricultural markets, while simultaneously ensuring that marketing services are rendered efficiently. Farmers' markets have worked well in some areas, but not everywhere. The reasons for non-functioning of such markets need to be explored and addressed. Importantly, as has often been noted, value addition to agricultural produce continues to be low. Interventions in this area by linking up producers to processors and to larger markets are again critical. Value additions are particularly essential, given the linkage effects generated for both labour and other inputs in the regional economy.

Issues in Manufacturing Sector Employment

Development theory has always privileged manufacturing for its much higher employment and other linkage effects. However, there is a growing realisation that manufacturing has not been able to generate as much employment in recent years as that in the past. Nevertheless, there are sectors that are more labour intensive, such as textiles and other light consumer goods, which need to be promoted. Importantly, efforts should be taken to ensure that firms in these sectors upgrade, i.e., to move into more value-adding segments, progressively with time. This will create conditions for better returns to labour. Further, there is inadequate emphasis on understanding the changing skill requirements in the ever expanding services sector on one hand, and on the segments within services sector that are more value adding and labour absorbing on the other. The extent to which the education and health sector for example can generate income, employment and other linkages and the institutional interventions required to enhance these linkages need to be identified. Steps in this direction are absolutely necessary in order to facilitate employment absorption. A sectoral approach to promotion of the segments in manufacturing and services is, therefore, suggested.

Micro-level studies also indicate a mismatch between supply and demand for skills in the labour market in the State, especially among the formally trained. The phenomenon of the 'educated unemployed' has to be studied and addressed so as to ensure that the investments made in education by households are matched by adequate returns. Part of the mismatch arises from quality issues in formal education, especially in the private sector in the case of tertiary and vocational education. There have been a series of initiatives taken by the State targeted at skill formation among the semi-literate in order to improve employability of the workforce, as the Pudhu Vaazhvu Thittam case illustrates. Sustainability and scalability of such initiatives should be given utmost attention.

Quality of Employment: Growing Casualisation

In addition to the quantum of employment, the chapter has also highlighted the growing casualisation of employment in the State over the last decade. Although casual wage rates are one of the highest in the country and poverty levels have declined among those employed in this category, this is a segment that has been expanding and one where poverty levels are relatively high compared to other segments of the workforce. Even in the organised sector, other studies have pointed to a growing reliance on contract employment and casualisation of work. The insecurity of such employment contracts clearly militates against the tenets of decent work that is seen as critical to the idea of inclusive development. Given the large-scale out-migration and in-migration of workers from and into the State, the governance of labour market arrangements becomes vital. Governance should focus not only on human capital formation, but also in protecting the rights of labour. A simultaneous focus on skill development and ensuring employment security will enable the State to take advantage of its demographic dividend.

Suggestions for a Multi-Scalar Approach to Public Intervention

The chapter, while highlighting the broad patterns and issues in employment, poverty and inequality, has sought to identify a set of issues that needs to be addressed at the State level. Simultaneously, the analyses have also revealed issues that are specific to certain districts. For instance, low agricultural productivity does not correlate completely with high levels of rural poverty, just as districts with high agricultural productivity do not necessarily have low poverty levels. Similarly, high levels of urbanisation alone do not ensure better income for labour. The chapter, therefore, makes a case for simultaneous engagement at several levels—sectoral, district and State—to tackle the problems foregrounded.

Employment Generation for Rural Youth: The Case of Pudhu Vaazhvu Thittam

Aided by the World Bank (75%) and implemented by the Ministry of Rural Development and *panchayat raj* of the State government, the Pudhu Vaazhvu Thittam has been in operation since 2006, covering 26 districts over two phases. It aims to empower the marginalised like Dalits, disabled and women by helping them design programmes for improving their livelihoods. As a part of the scheme, several youth including women have been trained and placed in the private sector. A successful example has been the case of youth being trained in repair and production of mobile phones. Members of common livelihood groups formed under the scheme through the village poverty reduction committee linked to large manufacturing firms, which then as part of its CSR (corporate social responsibility) efforts place the trainees in jobs. Similarly, there are also instances of women trainees being employed in export garment factories, and women's groups setting up tailoring units, which are then helped to market through MBA students in colleges. Another important and successful intervention has been made by way of training them for driving JCB machines used in construction. In addition, the project also helps them procure a license to help them get a job. Motorola India Private Ltd, Hyundai Motor India Ltd, India Pistons Ltd, and Rane Brakes Lining Limited are among the other firms in corporate sector that have been involved under this scheme. According to the implementing agency, close to 1,40,000 out of a total of 1,70,000 trained under this scheme have been placed in jobs with salaries ranging from ₹3,500 to ₹12,000. An advantage of this project lies in its ability to link the marginalised with the private sector for employment, allowing for a better match of skills provided and demanded. Training is done through reputed institutions in the State for various courses for youth from poor households. Importantly, the programme seeks to combine training with employment assurance. Quality assurance is done through assessment post training through National Council of Vocational Training (NCVT) approved agencies.

Annexure A-3.1

Distribution (per 10000) of Workers According to Usual Status (PS+SS) by Industry Sections of NIC-2008 for Each State/Union Territory

2011-12		TN	AP	Gujarat	Karnataka	Kerala	Maharashtra	AI
Section A:	Agriculture, forestry and fishing	3516	5292	4878	4994	2553	4910	4890
Section B:	Mining and quarrying	57	92	50	32	61	14	54
Section C:	Manufacturing	1995	999	1967	1231	1344	1217	1260
Section D:	Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply	42	32	15	32	40	27	27
Section E:	Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities	26	4	125	10	7	19	25
Section F:	Construction	1267	807	480	606	1729	628	1060
Section G:	Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	977	871	999	913	1311	953	932
Section H:	Transportation and storage	499	511	379	426	801	486	406
Section I:	Accommodation and food service activities	286	149	189	297	295	173	164
Section J:	Information and communication	143	105	41	247	115	128	77
Section K:	Financial and insurance activities	155	86	72	99	196	174	91
Section L:	Real estate activities	39	20	8	29	34	35	20
Section M:	Professional, scientific and technical activities	43	49	54	105	83	77	55
Section N:	Administrative and support service activities	87	65	59	104	117	94	66
Section O:	Public administration and defence; compulsory social security	137	192	172	162	227	199	167
Section P:	Education	260	288	217	334	388	324	298
Section Q:	Human health and social work activities	85	91	102	95	283	112	92
Section R:	Arts, entertainment and recreation	23	18	4	45	51	27	22
Section S:	Other service activities	259	246	139	136	248	223	213
Section T:	Activities of households as employers; undifferentiated goods and services	107	83	48	103	115	181	83
Section U:	Activities of extraterritorial organisations and bodies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	10003	10000	9998	10000	9998	10001	10002

Source: Key Indicators of Employment and Unemployment in India, NSS 68th Round.

References

Drèze, J. and A. Sen (2013). *An Uncertain Glory: India and its Contradictions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Jeyaranjan, J. (2011). "Women and Pro-poor Policies in Rural Tamil Nadu: An Examination of Practices and Responses", *Economic and Political Weekly* 46(43): 64-74.

Kalaiyarasan, A. (2014). "A Comparison of Developmental Outcomes in Gujarat and Tamilnadu", *Economic and Political Weekly* 49(15): 55-63.

Narayanamoorthy, A. (2006). "State of India's Farmers", *Economic and Political Weekly* 41 (6): 471-73.

Ramesh Chand, S.S. Raju, Sanjeev Garg and Lal Mani Pandy (2011). "Instability and Regional Variation in Indian Agriculture", *Policy Paper* no 26. New Delhi: National Centre for Agricultural Economics and Policy Research.