

# **CHAPTER - XII**

## **LABOUR & EMPLOYMENT**

## CHAPTER XII

### LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

12.0. Labour being a primary factor of production, the size of the labour force is of great importance in determining the level of economic activity in any country. The level of employment, its composition and the growth in employment opportunities is a critical indicator of the process of development in any economy. It is also an indicator that, in most cases, directly captures the economic attainments and hence the level of well being of individuals (National Human Development Report, 2001).

Economic backwardness is the leading problem of the state as majority of the population is below the poverty line. Although the state is rich in mineral resources, the industrial linkages are virtually absent and government is the major source of employment in the organized sector. Activities like animal husbandry, fishery, poultry and horticulture have not been targeted as a major source of employment. Therefore, agriculture forms the only option for the people to seek gainful employment. This too is influenced by impediments such as shifting agriculture, poor productivity, land tenure system and traditional methods of cultivation. All these factors have resulted in poor land and labour productivity.

As unemployment and poverty are correlated, it becomes necessary to understand the occupational pattern of labour force and status of employment to analyse the development in the state. The data pertaining to social, economic, demographic, and labour force conditions helps in understanding the demand and supply of labour in the market.

#### **12.1 Work Force participation Rate**

The 1981 census defined worker as a person whose main activity is participation in any economically productive work by his physical or mental activity. Work involves not only actual work but also effective supervision and direction of work. The census classifies workers into main and marginal workers. Main workers are those who work for major part of the year, i.e. 6 months or more, while marginal workers are as those who do not work for major part of the year i.e. they work for less than 6 months. Here we have considered the total workers including main and marginal workers.

The term labour force or 'economically active' population refers to the population, which supplies or seeks to supply labour for production and therefore, includes both employed and unemployed. Work Participation rate refers to the number of persons usually employed. Unemployment rate on the other hand refers to the number of persons who are seeking or are available for work out of the total labour force.

## MEGHALAYA STATE DEVELOPMENT REPORT

The adoption in 1991 and 2001 census of almost the same definition and concept of workers (main and marginal) of 1981 census has rendered the direct comparison of the results possible. Table 12.1 reports the work force participation rate in the different districts of Meghalaya in 1981, 1991 and 2001.

**Table 12.1: Work Force Participation Rate in the Different Districts of Meghalaya in 1981, 1991 and 2001**  
(in percent)

Year	Districts	Total			Rural			Urban		
		Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females
1981	Jaintia Hills	49.36	55.90	42.67	50.61	56.76	44.31	35.49	46.30	24.60
	East Khasi Hills	41.62	52.44	30.17	46.41	54.88	37.66	32.85	48.11	16.04
	West Khasi Hills	51.24	54.05	48.28	51.48	54.05	48.79	41.55	54.23	25.60
	East Garo Hills	45.59	52.36	38.40	45.94	52.50	39.02	34.76	48.37	17.12
	West Garo Hills	48.21	55.85	40.29	50.44	57.25	43.44	29.55	44.62	12.56
	Meghalaya	45.92	54.12	37.49	48.85	55.09	42.05	32.63	61.66	16.12
1991	Jaintia Hills	46.44	52.65	40.05	47.66	53.64	41.50	34.62	43.04	25.98
	East Khasi Hills	39.20	49.70	28.11	42.43	50.63	33.97	33.14	48.03	16.70
	West Khasi Hills	43.82	47.46	40.00	44.67	47.93	41.23	31.70	40.68	22.15
	East Garo Hills	44.09	48.66	39.32	44.97	49.19	40.60	31.17	41.32	19.57
	West Garo Hills	44.66	51.15	37.90	46.68	52.46	40.70	28.04	40.72	14.00
	Meghalaya	43.06	49.09	36.69	45.95	50.63	41.07	30.47	42.59	17.06
2001	Jaintia Hills	42.42	47.95	36.86	43.56	49.01	38.06	29.95	36.00	24.16
	East Khasi Hills	38.82	48.54	28.92	43.15	50.56	35.53	32.85	45.71	19.88
	West Khasi Hills	43.61	46.36	40.76	44.96	47.33	42.50	33.39	38.96	27.73
	East Garo Hills	44.69	47.97	41.30	46.19	48.74	43.55	35.77	43.44	27.73
	West Garo Hills	40.19	47.80	32.34	41.78	48.77	34.57	27.86	40.27	14.83
	South Garo Hills	47.38	50.94	43.61	48.27	51.07	45.32	37.90	49.57	24.58
	Ri Bhoi	46.38	51.79	40.62	47.12	52.31	41.60	36.21	44.63	27.35
Meghalaya	41.84	48.34	35.15	44.11	49.43	38.62	32.51	43.82	20.98	

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

In 1981 the total work force participation rate in the rural and urban areas was 54.12 percent for men and 37.49 percent for women, respectively. The female participation rate was relatively less than the male participation rate. Again, we observe that the rural work force participation was higher in relation to the urban work force participation. For instance the rural work force participation in Meghalaya in 1981 was 48.85 percent and urban work force participation was 32.63 percent. The female workers in the urban sector were lower than the female workers in the rural sector i.e. 16.12 percent of the women in the urban areas were in the workforce while 42.05 percent of the women in the rural areas were in the work force.

This picture is seen in all the districts of Meghalaya. West Khasi Hills with the highest rate of work force participation of about 51.24 percent also shows the similar difference in men and

women participation in the work force. The male work force participation in this district was 54.05 percent and female work force participation was 48.79 percent i.e. a difference of 3 percentage points. However, the difference is seen to be the least in West Khasi Hills. The other districts had a difference of about 14-15 percentage points in male and female participation in the work force.

We also observe here that the Work Force Participation Rates of the rural women were higher than that of the urban women. This gap is wider in East Khasi Hills, East Garo Hills and West Garo Hills. The difference in these districts in the women participation in the rural and urban areas was that of 29-30 percentage points. The difference exists in the other districts like Jaintia Hills and West Khasi Hills also but the urban participation in these two districts is marginally higher. In Jaintia Hills the difference in women participation in the rural and urban areas was that of 20-percentage points while in West Khasi Hills it was 23 percentage points.

In 1991 the work force participation rate in Meghalaya was 42.67 percent, with 50.07 percent of males and 34.93 percent of females being in the work force. Accordingly, the rural participation in the workforce was 45.04 percent and urban participation was 32.3 percent for both males and females taken together. A difference in male and female work participation as well as rural and urban work participation rate is apparent in this period as well. This difference between male and female participation in the work force is evident in all the districts of Meghalaya, which we have noticed in 1981 as well. The difference is, however, wider in districts like East Khasi Hills and West Garo Hills.

In 2001, 41.8 percent of the population was reported as workers, 48.3 percent being male workers and 35.1 percent being female workers, i.e., a difference of 13 percentage points. In 1981 there was a difference of 16 percentage points. This implies that the gender disparity continued even in 2001 but it narrowed down significantly. Similarly, the rural and urban difference that we have seen earlier has also narrowed down in 2001. For instance, 44.1 percent of the population in the rural areas and 32.5 percent of the population in the urban areas was in the work force, i.e., a difference of 11 percentage points as against a difference of 13 percentage points in 1981.

Among the districts, South Garo Hills had the largest work force participation rate with 47.4 percent workers. The male participation in the workforce was 50.9 percent and female participation in the workforce was 43.6 percent. The gender disparity and the difference in rural and urban participation in all the districts of Meghalaya are clearly evident.

Comparative analysis of the three census periods i.e., 1981, 1991 and 2001 shows a declining trend in the work force participation rate. The work force participation rate was 45.92 percent in 1981 and it declined to 41.8 percent in 2001. The decline in the work force participation rate is more perceptible in the rural areas where it declined from 48.85 percent in 1981 to 44.1 percent in 2001. The urban work force participation hovered around 32 percent. In case of male participation in the work force there has been a consistent decline from 54.35 percent in 1981 to 50.07 in 1991 and finally to 48.3 percent in 2001. The fall during this period is conspicuous both in the rural areas as well as in the urban areas. In the rural areas the male work force participation

declined from 55.65 percent in 1981 to 50.6 percent in 2001 while in the urban areas it declined from 49.14 percent in 1981 to 45.7 percent in 2001. The work force participation rate for females showed an increasing trend in the urban areas. During 1981-2001 the female work participation rate increased from 16.12 percent in 1981 to 21.2 percent in 2001 while in the rural areas there has been a slight decline from 42.05 percent to 38.6. This explains narrowing down the disparity among male and female participation in the work force.

Similar trend is pictured in all the districts of Meghalaya. The decline in work force participation is more obvious in the rural areas than in the urban areas. In Jaintia Hills there is a significant the decline in work force participation rate from 49.36 in 1981 to 42.4 percent in 2001. This decline in work participation rate is evident for both males and females. For example, there is a decline of 7 percentage points in case of males and 6 percentage points in case of females during the same period. Similarly, there is a decline of about 2 percentage points in rural and urban work participation.

In East Khasi Hills there is a decline in the work force participation rate of males by one percentage point but there is a significant increase in the female workforce participation rate by about 10 percentage points in the period 1981-2001. Again, in this district there has been a decline in the rural participation rate from 46.41 percent in 1981 to 43.1 percent in 2001. However the urban participation remained constant at around 32.85 percent in 1981 to 32.8 percent in 2001.

In West Khasi Hills the work force participation of both males and females declined by about 8-9 percentage points in the same period. The decline is evident in both the rural and urban sector. In the rural sector it declined from 51.48 in 1981 to 45 percent in 2001 and in the urban sector it declined from 41.55 in 1981 to 33.4 in 2001.

In East Garo Hills we find that the male work force participation rate declined by 4 percentage points. However, the female workforce participation rate increased by 2 percentage points. There has also been an increase in the work force participation in both the rural and urban sector from 45.59 and 34.76 percent respectively in 1981 to 46.2 and 35.8 in 2001. Similarly, in West Garo Hills the work force participation of both males and females declined by 4-5 percentage points. The work force participation in the rural and urban sector declined from 50.44 and 29.55 percent respectively in 1981 to 41.8 and 27.9 percent in 2001.

Thus, we find that the workforce participation rate declined for most of the districts. The decline in work force participation is more perceptible in case of males. The female participation rate has also declined barring few districts like East Khasi Hills and East Garo Hills. Therefore, the gender disparity in work participation, which we have noticed in all the three periods, has narrowed down gradually in 2001.

Table 12.2 reports the work force participation rate in all the northeastern states of India and the whole of India according to the 2001 census. Interestingly most of the northeastern states, barring Assam and Tripura have a much higher work force participation rate than the all India work force participation rate. Mizoram have the highest work force participation rate (52.57 percent) of all the northeastern states in India. About 57 percent of the men and 47 percent of the women are in the work force. Similarly Arunachal Pradesh and Nagaland also have a very high work force participation rate. The work force participation rate in Meghalaya is around 42 percent which is little lower than the above mentioned states but much higher than that of the all India work force participation rate (39.10 percent). **A noteworthy feature of the northeastern states is that the female work force participation in this region is very high.** Compared to 26 percent of the female work force participation rate in India most of the Northeastern States have higher than 35 percent female participation in the work force. However, Assam and Tripura stand much below the average where the work force participation rate is only 21 percent.

**Table 12.2: Work Force Participation Rate in the North Eastern States of India in 2001**

States	Total			Rural			Urban		
	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female
Arunachal Pradesh	43.98	50.63	36.54	46.20	50.66	41.33	35.50	50.53	17.15
Assam	35.78	49.87	20.71	36.17	49.41	22.15	33.20	52.90	10.61
Manipur	43.62	48.12	39.02	45.45	49.25	41.53	38.57	44.94	32.25
<b>Meghalaya</b>	<b>41.84</b>	<b>48.34</b>	<b>35.15</b>	<b>44.11</b>	<b>49.43</b>	<b>38.62</b>	<b>32.51</b>	<b>43.82</b>	<b>20.98</b>
Mizoram	52.57	57.29	47.54	57.21	59.66	54.55	47.87	54.84	40.52
Nagaland	42.60	46.70	38.06	45.01	47.32	42.48	31.03	43.81	15.61
Sikkim	48.64	57.44	38.57	49.69	57.69	40.60	40.16	55.51	21.67
Tripura	36.25	50.62	21.08	37.03	50.42	22.87	32.45	51.64	12.45
All India	39.10	51.68	25.63	41.75	52.11	30.79	32.25	50.60	11.88

Source: Census of India, 2001

Sectoral classification of the workforce participation rate shows that the rural work force participation for both males and females is significantly higher. For instance, in Meghalaya, the rural work force participation rate is 44 percent as against 42 percent in rural India. All the tribal dominated NE states exhibit higher rural work participation rates. Further, the difference in the work force participation rate in these states compared to the all India figures is mainly evident in the female work force participation rate. For instance the female work force participation rate in the rural India is only 31 percent while in rural Meghalaya it is about 39 percent.

On the other hand, the urban work force participation rates are lower. Mizoram with 48 percent has the highest urban workforce participation rate. In Meghalaya it is 32.5, more or less at the same level with the all India rate. However, female participation in the workforce in the urban areas of Meghalaya is significantly higher than the all India level.

As already mentioned, the Census classified workers as main and marginal workers. Main workers are those who had worked for the major part of the year i.e. 6 months or more while marginal workers are those who had not worked for major part of the year i.e. less than 6 months. Table 12.3 reports the distribution of main and marginal workers in the different districts of Meghalaya by gender and place of residence for the year 2001.

In 2001, out of the total working population, 78.03 percent of the workers were main workers while 21.97 percent were marginal workers. The proportion of marginal workers in the rural and urban sector was 23.83 percent and 11.61 percent respectively. Also the female marginal workers were found to be more than the male marginal workers. For example, 34.21 and 19.22 percent females in the rural and urban sectors, respectively, were marginal workers while the corresponding proportion for male marginal workers was 15.96 and 8.03 percent, respectively. Interestingly, the percentage of main workers out of the total working population has declined significantly since 1981. In 1981, 94.58 and 5.42 percent of the workers were main and marginal workers respectively while in 2001 the proportion of main workers declined to 78.03 percent and the proportion of marginal workers increased to 21.97 percent. This is apparent in all the districts in Meghalaya. This implies that underemployment is on the rise.

**Table 12.3: Distribution of Total workers into Main and Marginal Workers in Different Districts of Meghalaya in 2001**

(in percent)

District	Sector	Main Workers			Marginal Workers		
		Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female
Jaintia Hills	Total	75.38	82.67	65.84	24.62	17.33	34.16
	Rural	74.16	81.89	64.12	25.84	18.11	35.88
	Urban	94.68	94.61	94.79	5.32	5.39	5.21
East Khasi Hills	Total	85.43	89.93	77.74	14.57	10.07	22.26
	Rural	80.77	86.45	72.47	19.23	13.55	27.53
	Urban	93.88	95.30	90.60	6.12	4.70	9.40
West Khasi Hills	Total	75.75	80.08	70.65	24.25	19.92	29.35
	Rural	76.47	80.40	71.93	23.53	19.60	28.07
	Urban	68.40	77.08	56.02	31.60	22.92	43.98
East Garo Hills	Total	70.37	82.09	56.26	29.63	17.91	43.74
	Rural	70.56	82.31	56.98	29.44	17.69	43.02
	Urban	68.83	80.64	49.41	31.17	19.36	50.59
West Garo Hills	Total	78.23	86.68	65.34	21.77	13.32	34.66
	Rural	77.21	86.02	64.39	22.79	13.98	35.61
	Urban	90.21	92.85	82.68	9.79	7.15	17.32
South Garo Hills	Total	65.52	77.21	51.03	34.48	22.79	48.97
	Rural	65.25	76.92	51.39	34.75	23.08	48.61
	Urban	69.17	80.30	43.55	30.83	19.70	56.45
Ri Bhoi	Total	79.68	87.57	68.99	20.32	12.43	31.01

District	Sector	Main Workers			Marginal Workers		
		Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female
	Rural	79.58	87.64	68.81	20.42	12.36	31.19
	Urban	81.33	86.40	72.62	18.67	13.60	27.38
<b>Meghalaya</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>78.03</b>	<b>85.44</b>	<b>67.55</b>	<b>21.97</b>	<b>14.56</b>	<b>32.45</b>
	Rural	76.17	84.04	65.79	23.83	15.96	34.21
	Urban	88.39	91.97	80.78	11.61	8.03	19.22

Source: Census of India, 2001

## 12.2 Industrial classification of workers

The occupational structure of a country refers to the distribution or division of its population according to different occupations. Economic development is closely associated with the change in the occupational structure of a country.

The Census classified the main and marginal workers into four broad categories. For purposes of the census a person is classified as cultivator if he or she is engaged in cultivation of land owned or held from Government or held from private persons or institutions for payment in money, kind or share. A person who works on another person's land for wages in money or kind or share is regarded as agricultural labourers. Household Industry is defined as an industry conducted by one or more members of the household at home or within the village in rural areas and only within the precincts of the house where the household lives in urban areas. The type of workers that come under this category of 'OW' include all government servants, municipal employees, teachers, factory workers, plantation workers, those engaged in trade, commerce, business, transport banking, mining, construction, political or social work, priests, entertainment artists, etc.

Table 12.4 reports the industrial classification of the main workers into the above-mentioned four broad categories according to the 1981 census. Meghalaya being an agrarian economy majority of the main and marginal workers are seen to be cultivators. According to the 1981 census, 62.57 percent of the main workers in Meghalaya were cultivators. In the rural sector 71.8 percent of the workers were cultivators. In the urban areas the dominant group was 'other workers' where 9.7 percent of working population were categorized in this group. Women in the rural areas work mainly as cultivators and their proportion is higher than that of men. For instance in 1981, 76.34 percent of the females in the rural sector were cultivator as against 68.82 percent of males. The proportion of cultivators in the rural sector was highest in West Khasi Hills with 90.12 percent of the workers working as cultivators. East Garo Hills and West Garo Hills followed West Khasi Hills with 81.57 percent and 80.98 percent of the workers being cultivators. The proportion of agricultural labourers in East Khasi Hills was the highest (11.89 percent) followed by Jaintia Hills (11.47 percent). The proportion of workers in the household industry was very low for all the districts in Meghalaya. In the urban areas workers were mostly categorized as 'other workers'.

Table 12.5 pictures a similar industrial classification of main workers into four broad categories according to the 2001 census. In 2001 the proportion of cultivator declined to 50.24 percent from 62.57 percent in 1981. The shift has been mainly towards the 'other workers' where the proportion of workers has increased significantly from 26.62 percent in 1981 to 35.38 percent in 2001. In the rural areas a very high proportion of the workers are cultivators while in the urban areas the workers are mainly classified as 'other workers'. In the rural sector 60.03 percent of the workers were cultivators while in the urban sector 92.8 percent of the workers were categorized as 'other workers'. The proportion of cultivators has declined notably for all the districts in Meghalaya while the proportion of agricultural labourers has increased significantly.

**Table 12.4: Industrial classification of Main workers in 1981**

Districts	Sector	Cultivators			Agricultural Labourers			Household industry- manufacturing, processing, servicing & repairs			Other workers		
		Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female
Jaintia Hills	Total	66.33	64.15	69.32	11.47	9.28	14.47	0.62	0.56	0.71	21.57	26.01	15.50
	Rural	70.51	68.75	72.86	12.15	9.89	15.18	0.45	0.36	0.59	16.89	21.01	11.38
	Urban	1.00	1.13	0.76	0.89	1.00	0.70	3.25	3.33	3.10	94.85	94.53	95.45
East Khasi Hills	Total	35.85	31.55	44.11	11.89	11.04	13.51	1.36	0.99	2.07	50.90	56.41	40.31
	Rural	49.39	46.56	53.88	15.74	15.58	15.99	1.31	0.79	2.12	33.57	37.08	28.02
	Urban	1.45	1.29	2.00	2.12	1.90	2.85	1.51	1.40	1.85	94.92	95.40	93.30
West Khasi Hills	Total	88.92	85.54	93.03	5.22	5.75	4.57	0.15	0.16	0.14	5.71	8.55	2.26
	Rural	90.12	87.33	93.47	5.23	5.76	4.56	0.09	0.07	0.11	4.57	6.84	1.85
	Urban	29.96	20.05	56.52	4.91	4.78	5.26	3.23	3.58	2.29	61.90	71.59	35.93
East Garo Hills	Total	81.57	78.00	88.11	7.07	6.60	7.92	0.56	0.46	0.73	10.81	14.93	3.24
	Rural	83.39	80.33	88.90	6.82	6.45	7.48	0.51	0.39	0.72	9.28	12.83	2.89
	Urban	14.75	9.31	36.43	16.13	11.03	36.43	2.34	2.59	1.37	66.78	77.07	25.77
West Garo Hills	Total	75.65	71.24	83.47	10.19	9.88	10.73	0.70	0.82	0.51	13.46	18.07	5.29
	Rural	80.98	77.89	86.15	10.67	10.54	10.89	0.67	0.79	0.48	7.68	10.78	2.49
	Urban	6.43	4.44	15.16	3.95	3.31	6.81	1.08	1.04	1.26	88.53	91.21	76.77
Meghalaya	Total	62.57	57.83	70.49	9.98	9.42	10.91	0.84	0.74	1.01	26.62	32.01	17.59
	Rural	71.80	68.82	76.34	11.12	10.83	11.55	0.72	0.58	0.93	16.36	19.77	11.18
	Urban	3.00	2.29	5.36	2.64	2.31	3.74	1.60	1.51	1.89	92.77	93.89	89.02

Source: Census of India, 1981

The proportion of cultivators is highest in East Garo Hills with 66.79 percent of males and 77.52 percent of females being cultivators. West Khasi Hills is next in the row with 62.51 percent and 73.11 percent of males and females of the total workers being cultivators. The proportion of agricultural labourers is again higher in Jaintia Hills with 16.39 percent of the males and 20.23 percent of females being agricultural labourers. In the urban sector, in all the districts of Meghalaya, the major proportion of the workers is 'other workers'.

Table 12.6 shows the industrial classification of marginal workers into four broad categories according to the 2001 census. A significant proportion of the marginal workers are

seen as agricultural labourers and cultivators. In 2001, 40.67 percent of the marginal workers were cultivators and 36.01 percent of the workers are agricultural labourers. In all the districts majority of the marginal workers in the rural areas work as agricultural labourers while in the urban areas majority of them are 'other workers'. A very small proportion of the marginal workers are engaged in the household industry. However, the proportion of marginal workers in this category is higher than that of the main workers.

Thus, we see that a very large proportion of the marginal workers working as agricultural labourers indicates prevalence of large-scale under unemployment in agriculture and consequently of low per capita labour productivity and prevalence of widespread poverty. *There is no significant change in the occupational structure in the state since 1981.* The Cultivators continue to dominate the rural structure while in the urban sector the major proportions of the workers are classified as 'other workers'.

**Table 12.5: Industrial Classification of Main Workers (2001 census)**

District	Sector	Cultivators			Agricultural Labourers			Household industry- manufacturing, processing, servicing & repairs			Other workers		
		Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female
Jaintia Hills	T	54.62	56.41	51.69	17.85	16.39	20.23	1.99	1.82	2.27	25.54	25.37	25.81
	R	58.97	60.65	56.19	19.27	17.62	22.00	2.11	1.91	2.43	19.65	19.82	19.38
	U	0.42	0.38	0.48	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.56	0.60	0.51	98.87	98.87	98.87
East Khasi Hills	T	24.14	20.89	30.57	10.24	10.10	10.53	1.41	1.26	1.70	64.21	67.76	57.20
	R	39.44	35.66	46.02	16.53	17.06	15.62	1.44	1.14	1.96	42.59	46.15	36.40
	U	0.29	0.26	0.37	0.43	0.37	0.57	1.36	1.43	1.20	97.92	97.94	97.86
West Khasi Hills	T	67.06	62.51	73.11	15.49	16.02	14.79	1.42	1.44	1.39	16.03	20.03	10.70
	R	71.81	67.78	77.01	15.74	16.52	14.74	1.37	1.33	1.42	11.07	14.37	6.83
	U	12.97	11.57	15.72	12.63	11.12	15.60	1.99	2.52	0.94	72.41	74.79	67.74
South Garo Hills	T	63.07	56.03	76.27	9.17	9.06	9.39	1.81	1.94	1.58	25.95	32.97	12.76
	R	67.87	61.41	79.36	9.79	9.84	9.68	1.80	1.91	1.60	20.55	26.83	9.36
	U	1.41	1.42	1.39	1.32	1.09	2.31	1.99	2.18	1.16	95.28	95.31	95.14
Ri Bhoi	T	59.23	54.45	67.45	14.82	14.73	14.96	1.36	1.41	1.27	24.59	29.40	16.31
	R	61.17	56.38	69.33	14.40	14.33	14.53	1.37	1.41	1.30	23.06	27.88	14.83
	U	25.53	22.96	30.80	22.00	21.34	23.35	1.24	1.54	0.63	51.22	54.17	45.22
East Garo Hills	T	70.69	66.79	77.52	8.81	9.14	8.24	1.86	1.27	2.90	18.64	22.80	11.33
	R	77.29	74.33	82.23	8.65	9.18	7.77	1.78	1.18	2.79	12.28	15.31	7.21
	U	18.44	15.56	26.16	10.08	8.84	13.41	2.49	1.86	4.16	69.00	73.74	56.27
West Garo Hills	T	56.39	51.49	66.34	12.21	12.58	11.46	2.78	1.92	4.54	28.62	34.02	17.67
	R	61.86	57.25	70.83	13.33	13.94	12.14	2.92	2.03	4.65	21.89	26.78	12.38
	U	1.73	1.58	2.24	0.96	0.75	1.64	1.39	0.90	2.95	95.91	96.77	93.17
Meghalaya	T	50.24	46.23	57.41	12.54	12.39	12.81	1.84	1.54	2.37	35.38	39.84	27.41
	R	60.03	56.43	66.11	14.63	14.78	14.37	1.92	1.56	2.52	23.42	27.23	17.00
	U	3.23	2.80	4.27	2.52	2.21	3.28	1.44	1.44	1.46	92.80	93.55	90.99

Source: Census of India, 2001

**Table 12.6: Industrial Classification of Marginal Workers (2001 census)**

District	Sector	Cultivators			Agricultural Labourers			Household industry- manufacturing, processing, servicing & repairs			Other workers		
		Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female
Jaintia Hills	T	24.14	18.71	27.74	61.54	62.59	60.84	2.41	1.69	2.89	11.91	17.00	8.53
	R	24.45	19.07	27.98	62.31	63.76	61.36	2.39	1.64	2.88	10.85	15.53	7.78
	U	0.25	0.42	0.00	1.75	2.52	0.62	4.26	4.62	3.73	93.73	92.44	95.65
East Khasi Hills	T	19.59	16.58	21.91	33.71	33.43	33.93	2.98	1.40	4.20	43.72	48.59	39.95
	R	22.91	20.21	24.85	39.32	40.63	38.37	2.67	0.91	3.94	35.10	38.25	32.83
	U	0.66	0.47	0.89	1.77	1.47	2.13	4.73	3.57	6.08	92.83	94.49	90.91
West Khasi Hills	T	38.83	36.80	40.44	47.85	49.91	46.21	1.97	1.89	2.04	11.35	11.40	11.31
	R	41.95	40.22	43.34	46.46	47.55	45.59	2.12	2.04	2.19	9.46	10.19	8.88
	U	15.15	9.70	19.21	58.38	68.59	50.79	0.85	0.77	0.91	25.62	20.94	29.10
South Garo Hills	T	57.58	51.62	61.02	19.09	19.63	18.79	2.24	2.10	2.32	21.08	26.65	17.87
	R	61.10	55.31	64.36	20.28	21.05	19.84	2.34	2.22	2.41	16.28	21.42	13.39
	U	3.66	5.78	1.96	0.99	2.00	0.18	0.69	0.67	0.71	94.65	91.56	97.14
Ri Bhoi	T	46.55	45.37	47.20	32.48	32.49	32.48	3.63	3.08	3.93	17.33	19.06	16.39
	R	47.31	46.59	47.68	32.12	31.99	32.19	3.73	3.09	4.06	16.85	18.33	16.06
	U	31.99	27.56	35.76	39.51	39.76	39.29	1.80	2.93	0.83	26.71	29.76	24.12
East Garo Hills	T	61.27	60.23	61.78	20.01	21.43	19.31	5.22	2.95	6.34	13.50	15.39	12.57
	R	65.15	64.77	65.33	18.84	20.98	17.82	5.13	2.74	6.27	10.88	11.51	10.58
	U	32.94	32.60	33.16	28.55	24.19	31.29	5.89	4.20	6.96	32.62	39.00	28.60
West Garo Hills	T	47.13	45.96	47.83	31.43	29.30	32.68	4.54	3.18	5.34	16.90	21.57	14.16
	R	48.78	48.37	49.01	32.49	30.86	33.43	4.60	3.24	5.37	14.13	17.52	12.18
	U	2.36	1.72	3.11	2.49	0.80	4.47	2.86	1.95	3.92	92.29	95.52	88.50
Meghalaya													
	T	40.67	36.80	43.14	36.01	37.08	35.34	3.43	2.27	4.16	19.89	23.85	17.37
	R	43.07	39.67	45.17	37.23	38.84	36.24	3.41	2.21	4.15	16.28	19.27	14.44
	U	13.24	10.22	15.93	22.06	20.72	23.26	3.60	2.81	4.30	61.10	66.25	56.51

Source: Census of India, 2001

### 12.3 Child Labour

A child is classified as labourer if the child is in the age group 5-14 years and is 'economically active'. In India, despite acceptance of international standards and commitments on restricting the use of child labour, the existence of a national child labour policy, wide-spread national and state level laws and regulations, millions of children are engaged in work, often under hardship or hazardous conditions. It deprives them of their childhood and their dignity and is detrimental to their health, education, and more importantly, in developing capabilities and availing opportunities as normal individuals in the society.

The problem of child labour is also widespread in Meghalaya. The statistics on child labourers in Meghalaya shows that the problem of child labour in Meghalaya cannot be ignored. Table 12.7 reports the proportion of children working in Meghalaya as well as in the seven districts by gender and place of residence in 1991.

**Table 12.7: Percentage of Child Labourers in the Different Districts of Meghalaya in 1991**

Districts	Total			Rural			Urban		
	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female
Jaintia Hills	10.48	12.88	8.12	11.21	13.92	8.53	2.89	2.00	3.77
East Khasi Hills	4.80	5.46	4.13	6.37	7.32	5.40	1.33	1.32	1.34
West Khasi Hills	8.36	9.12	7.59	8.84	9.63	8.02	1.66	1.65	1.67
East Garo Hills	8.52	9.15	7.90	9.03	9.69	8.37	0.84	0.91	0.76
West Garo Hills	8.52	9.00	8.02	9.33	9.84	8.81	1.59	1.69	1.50
Meghalaya	7.39	8.23	6.54	8.59	9.59	7.57	1.48	1.43	1.52

Source: Census of India, 1991

Clearly, the proportion of children working in the rural areas was more than that in the urban areas. According to the 1991 census 8.59 percent of the children in rural sector were working. The proportion of male child labourers was again higher than the female child labourers. This is because a significant proportion of the girl child is found to be ‘no-where’ child, i.e. they neither go to school nor seen in the labour market as they are more engaged in the household duty or in other words engaged in non-wage work.

The proportion of child labourers in Jaintia Hills was high in comparison to the other districts of Meghalaya. In 1991 the percentage of child labourers in Jaintia Hills was 10.48 percent with 12.88 percent being male children and 8.12 percent being female children. This is followed by West Garo Hills and East Garo Hills with 8.52 percent child labourers in both the district. The proportion of boy and girl child labourers in West Garo Hills was 9 and 8.02 percent, respectively. The corresponding proportion in East Garo Hills was 9.69 and 8.37 percent, respectively. In West Khasi Hills, 8.36 percent of the children were labourers with 9.12 percent being boys and 7.59 percent being girls. The proportion of child labourers is least in East Khasi Hills, i.e., 4.8 percent out of which 5.46 percent were boys and 4.13 percent were girls. The proportion of child labour was high in the rural sector in all the districts of Meghalaya. Jaintia Hills reports the largest proportion of child labour both in the rural as well as in the urban sector. In the rural sector 13.92 percent of boys and 8.53 percent of girls were reportedly child labourers. In the urban sector 2 percent and 3.77 percent of girls and boys respectively were workers in the district. East Khasi Hills reports the lowest proportion of child labourers in the rural sector. Similarly, in the urban sector the proportion of child labour was very low in East Garo Hills where only 0.84 percent of the children were workers, 0.91 percent of them being boys and 0.76 percent being girls.

The Institute of Applied Manpower Research (IAMR), New Delhi conducted a survey in the entire NE region in 2003. The study entitled “Benchmarking Human Development in North Eastern Region of India” aimed at building a database at the sub-state level related to employment and unemployment, human development and development options for the state. The survey found that 4 percent of workers in the rural areas of Meghalaya are below 15 years. The corresponding figure in the urban areas (Shillong and Nongstoin) is 1.1 percent. In rural areas, highest incidence of child labour is found in West Khasi Hills (9.14 percent) followed by Jaintia Hills (7.6 percent). The other districts of East Khasi Hills (2.9 percent), West Garo Hills (2.8 percent), Ri Bhoi (2.6 percent),

East Garo Hills (0.4 percent) and South Garo Hills (0.4 percent) show lower proportions of children among workers in 2003.

**Table 12.8: Proportion of Child Laborers in 2001 in the North Eastern States of India by Sex and Place of Residence**

States	Total			Rural			Urban		
	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female
Arunachal Pradesh	6.06	5.22	6.94	6.80	5.95	7.69	3.04	2.19	3.90
Assam	5.07	6.03	4.06	5.30	6.37	4.17	3.03	3.00	3.06
Manipur	5.75	5.57	5.94	6.73	6.50	6.96	2.72	2.64	2.80
Meghalaya	8.22	8.64	7.79	9.36	9.86	8.84	2.75	2.68	2.82
Mizoram	12.34	11.86	12.83	16.52	15.63	17.45	7.42	7.37	7.47
Nagaland	8.48	8.25	8.73	9.44	9.14	9.76	3.58	3.68	3.47
Tripura	2.79	2.85	2.72	2.91	3.05	2.77	1.94	1.52	2.37
India	5.00	5.14	4.85	5.94	5.94	5.95	2.12	2.69	1.49

Source: Census of India, 2001

Table 12.8 reveals that among all the north eastern states Mizoram and Meghalaya have the highest proportion of child labourers. For instance in Meghalaya and Mizoram about 8 percent and 12 percent of the children respectively are in the work force. The proportion in these two states is also higher than that of the all India rate, which is only 5 percent. Again the proportion of both boys and girls in the labour force in Meghalaya is exceedingly high. The proportion of child labourers in the rural sector of Meghalaya is much higher than that of entire rural India. Among the north eastern states the proportion of child labourers in the urban sector of Meghalaya is the third lowest next to Tripura and Manipur, while in the rural sector it is second only to Mizoram.

#### 12.4 Unemployment

Unemployment refers to the unutilized labour force that is willing to or available for work. Unemployment arises when there is inadequate productive capacity to create enough jobs for all those able and willing to work. In this section we attempt to explain the magnitude of unemployment in Meghalaya and compare with the rest of the NE states and the all India level.

**Table 12.9: Unemployment Rate in the North Eastern States of India in 1991**

(in percent)

States	Total			Rural			Urban		
	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female
Arunachal Pradesh	0.61	0.53	0.74	0.57	0.49	0.69	0.93	0.72	2.25
Assam	4.50	3.74	6.34	3.86	3.29	5.13	10.20	6.95	29.86
Manipur	2.03	1.84	2.26	1.60	1.50	1.72	3.49	2.90	4.36
Mizoram	0.80	0.69	0.95	0.58	0.50	0.68	1.08	0.92	1.32
Nagaland	1.53	1.58	1.47	1.15	1.13	1.18	3.97	3.44	6.71
Tripura	11.21	6.70	24.54	10.09	6.06	21.72	17.42	10.12	22.49
Meghalaya	0.54	0.39	0.76	0.43	0.32	0.56	1.21	0.67	2.75
India	3.24	2.43	5.22	2.46	1.87	3.66	6.14	4.08	16.80

Source: Census of India, 1991.

In 1991, among the northeastern states of India, Tripura has a very high unemployment

rate followed by Assam (Table 12.9). Meghalaya has the lowest unemployment rate among all the states in the northeast. The unemployment rate of Meghalaya in both rural and urban sector for both males and females is much lower compared to the other north eastern states. Further the unemployment rate of Meghalaya in the rural sector is less than 1 percent as against 2 percent in the rural India. Similarly in the urban sector the unemployment rate of Meghalaya is around 1 percent while in the urban India it is 6 percent.

**Table 12.10: Unemployment Rate in the North Eastern States of India in 2001**  
(in percent)

States	Unemployment Rate			Adjusted Unemployment Rate		
	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female
Arunachal Pradesh	10.78	8.57	14.02	7.53	5.69	10.24
Assam	23.00	16.59	36.31	16.42	10.81	28.06
Manipur	22.20	18.94	26.16	14.15	12.57	16.06
Meghalaya	12.57	9.55	16.62	7.68	5.56	10.52
Mizoram	7.05	6.27	8.05	3.81	3.19	4.60
Nagaland	16.31	14.93	18.14	12.43	11.24	14.01
Sikkim	8.83	6.22	13.01	6.37	4.22	9.81
Tripura	30.15	19.02	49.62	23.08	13.34	40.13
India	15.86	12.64	22.12	10.22	7.32	15.86

Note: The unemployed are those who are seeking work or available for work. The unemployment rate is calculated by dividing the Number of Unemployed by the total Labour Force (i.e. working + unemployed). The adjusted unemployment rate excludes the marginal workers who are seeking/ available for work from the numerator.

Source: Calculated for the Report based on Census Reference Tables, B Series, Census of India, 2001.

Table 12.10 reveals that unemployment has increased substantially during the period 1991 to 2001 for all the NE states as well as for the country as a whole. Unemployment in Meghalaya is however, slightly lower than the all India level. Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram and Sikkim exhibit unemployment rates that are lower than Meghalaya. The situation in Tripura is alarming, to say the least. The tremendous economic growth of India after 1991 seems to be a jobless growth. This is a matter of grave concern.

The NSSO uses four concepts to estimate the unemployment in the country. The Usual Status Approach measures chronic or long-term unemployment during the reference year. However, some people who are reported to be unemployed on the basis of the usual status might be working in a subsidiary capacity during the reference period. Therefore, in order to capture the exact degree of unemployment prevailing in the state, we have excluded those working in a subsidiary capacity from the usually unemployed. This approach is also called the Usual Status Adjusted Approach.

Table 12.11 shows the unemployment rate in Meghalaya in the most recent five rounds of NSS survey. We observe that the unemployment rate has decreased from 1.42 percent in 1983 to 0.18 percent in 1987-88. However, the unemployment rate increased marginally from

0.18 percent in 1987-88 to 0.21 percent in 1993-94 and further to 0.83 percent in 1999-00. The decline in unemployment rate was perceptible both in the rural and urban areas. In the urban sector the unemployment rate declined from 8.50 percent in 1983 to 1.42 percent in 1987-88 and then increased to 1.68 in 1993-94. It further increased to 4.35 percent in 1999-00. Similarly, in the rural sector there was a decline from 0.42 percent in 1983 to 0.01 percent in 1987-88. Thereafter, it increased to 0.06 percent in 1993-94 and further to 0.37 percent in 1999-00. The urban unemployment rate in all the rounds of survey was higher than the rural unemployment rate. A possible explanation for this might be the people migrating from rural areas to urban areas in search of work and also due to the presence of large-scale disguised unemployment in the rural areas. The prevalence of unemployment among the educated youth also leads to higher unemployment rate in the urban sector.

**Table 12.11: Unemployment Rate in Meghalaya (NSSO)**

(in percent)

Year	Sector	Male	Female	Person
1983	Rural	0.65	0.09	0.42
	Urban	8.32	8.98	8.50
	Total	1.83	0.81	1.42
1987-88	Rural	0.02	0.00	0.01
	Urban	1.63	1.09	1.42
	Total	0.23	0.11	0.18
1993-94	Rural	0.10	0.00	0.06
	Urban	1.05	3.37	1.68
	Total	0.21	0.20	0.21
1999-00	Rural	0.31	0.44	0.37
	Urban	3.60	5.86	4.35
	Total	0.76	0.93	0.83
2004-05	Rural	0.07	0.54	0.28
	Urban	3.53	3.43	3.49
	Total	0.45	0.84	0.62

Source: Special tabulation by Minakshi Chakraborty and Veronica Pala using unit record data on Employment and Unemployment conducted by the National Sample Survey Organisation.

Again, we find that in the rural as well as the urban sector the unemployment rate of the females was higher than that of the males. For instance in 1999-00, 5.86 percent of the females were unemployed as against 3.6 percent of males. In the rural sector, on the other hand, 0.44 percent of females were unemployed as against 0.31 percent of males.

Coming to youth unemployment, the unemployment rate in Meghalaya as per the 1991 census was relatively high at 4.4 percent in the age group 15-19 with 3.14 percent of males and 7.74 percent of females being unemployed. The unemployment rate of the female youth was also high in the age group 20-24 with 3.5 percent being unemployed. In Table 12.12 we report the unemployment rate of the youth as per estimates based on the NSS data in 1983, 1987-88, 1993-94, 1999-00 and 2004-05.

The NSSO figures also show high unemployment rate in the age group 15-19 and 20-24. In 1983 the unemployment rate in the age group 15-19 years and 20-24 years was 1.90 percent and 3.98 percent respectively. The unemployment rate was mainly high in the urban sector in this age group. During the same period 26.06 percent of the urban population in the age group 15-19 years was unemployed. The female unemployment rate was high in the age group 15-19 years with 43.13 percent of females being unemployed as against 18.97 percent males. The unemployment rate was also high in the age group 25-29 years with 20.38 percent of the urban population being unemployed. The proportion of unemployed males in this age group was 21.49 percent as against 16.97 percent of females. In 1987 the unemployment rate in the age group 15-19 years declined significantly to 2.49 percent in the urban sector. The female unemployment rate in the urban sector, which was very high in 1983, declined to 2.77 percent for the age group 15-19 years. Similarly, there was a decline in the unemployment rate of males in the age group 15-19 years from 18.97 percent in 1983 to 2.20 percent in 1987-88 in the urban sector. In 1993-94, the unemployment rate in the urban sector increased to 6.64 percent for the age group 15-19 years. We observe a similar increase in the unemployment rate in the urban sector in the age group 20-24 years from 6.18 percent in 1987-88 to 10.53 percent in 1999-93. In 1999-00 the urban unemployment rate further increased to 8.56 percent for the age group 15-19 years and 11.58 percent for the age group 20-24. The unemployment rates in the urban sector for the age group 25-29 years was also significant at 14.73 percent in 1999-00. This undoubtedly reflects the existence of youth unemployment in the urban sector of Meghalaya.

**Table 12.12: Unemployment Rate by Age Group in Meghalaya**

Age Group	Rural			Urban			Total		
	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person
<b>1983</b>									
15-19	0.00	0.00	0.00	18.97	43.13	26.06	1.64	2.29	1.90
20-24	1.32	0.61	0.96	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.92	1.89	3.98
25-29	1.38	0.00	0.77	21.49	16.97	20.38	2.81	0.89	2.01
<b>1987-88</b>									
15-19	0.04	0.00	0.02	2.20	2.77	2.49	0.26	0.28	0.27
20-24	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.49	1.42	6.18	1.12	0.16	0.66
25-29	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.21	4.19	2.42	0.17	0.39	0.28
<b>1993-94</b>									
15-19	0.05	0.00	0.03	9.71	0.00	6.64	0.53	0.00	0.33
20-24	0.65	0.00	0.30	6.70	16.10	10.53	0.98	0.50	0.72
25-29	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.84	11.41	3.66	0.08	0.56	0.28
<b>1999-00</b>									
15-19	1.23	0.00	0.69	3.25	16.19	8.56	1.34	0.76	1.09
20-24	1.00	2.30	1.62	13.28	8.83	11.58	2.87	3.00	2.93
25-29	0.00	0.53	0.26	11.40	18.75	14.73	1.17	2.20	1.67
<b>2004-05</b>									
15-19	0.00	0.00	0.00	29.41	3.01	14.33	1.55	0.35	1.10
20-24	0.42	2.49	1.48	2.56	14.86	8.08	0.61	3.38	2.02
25-29	0.06	1.08	0.53	11.12	10.36	10.75	1.27	2.14	1.68

Source: As in Table 12.11

Therefore, we find that the urban unemployment rate, which showed a decline in the period 1983 to 1987-88 reversed in the period 1993-94 to 1999-00. The rural unemployment rate has been insignificant, as we have observed in the four rounds of survey. The unemployment rate of the youth is increasing. Therefore the unemployment rate of the youth is a matter of serious concern.

Unemployment rate and Education: Tables 12.13 and 12.14 show the unemployment rate at different levels of educational attainment. In 1983 and 1987-88 we find that with the increase in the level of educational attainment the unemployment rate increases. The unemployment rate of the educated tends to be high. We observe that the unemployment rate of the illiterate is almost negligible while the unemployment rates of the graduates are relatively very high. In 1983 the unemployment rate of the illiterates was 0.06 percent while that of the graduates was 4.19 percent. Unemployment rate was observed to be very high among the people with secondary level of educational attainment with 12.15 percent of them being unemployed in 1983. In 1987-88 the unemployment rate of the graduates declined to 2.75 percent. The unemployment rate in this period was high for the graduates in professional subjects at 4.21 percent. In 1993-94 the unemployment rate of the graduates increased to 4.48 percent and in 1999-00 it increased further to 12.89 percent.

**Table 12.13: Unemployment Rate by Education in Meghalaya in 1983 and 1987-88**

Education Code	Rural			Urban			Total		
	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person
<b>1983</b>									
1	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.86	0.00	1.97	0.10	0.00	0.05
2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	0.81	0.00	0.51	4.12	24.54	9.84	1.18	1.87	1.43
4	1.40	1.24	1.35	7.17	19.84	8.82	3.27	3.78	3.40
5	2.15	0.00	1.49	21.21	14.64	20.10	12.72	5.32	10.97
6	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.39	1.91	0.00	3.32	1.17
7	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.87	4.26	3.99	3.37	3.42	3.39
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>8.57</b>	<b>10.06</b>	<b>8.93</b>	<b>1.73</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>1.38</b>
<b>1987-88</b>									
1	0.01	0.00	0.00	2.55	0.00	1.28	0.06	0.00	0.03
2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.64	3.81	3.02	0.63	0.90	0.72
5	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.48	0.00	0.90	0.77	0.00	0.50
6	12.83	0.00	10.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.10	0.00	3.65
7	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.77	3.58	3.00	2.47	2.72	2.55
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>1.75</b>	<b>1.23</b>	<b>1.55</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>0.21</b>

Note: (i) 1-illiterate, 2-literate below primary, 3-primary, 4-middle, 5-secondary, 6-graduate and above in professional subjects, 7- graduate and above in general subjects

(ii) The Unemployment rate is calculated for the age group 15 and above.

Source: As in Table 12.11

**Table 12.14: Unemployment Rate by Education in Meghalaya in 1993-94, 1999-00 and 2004-05**

Education Code	Rural			Urban			Total		
	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person
<b>1993-94</b>									
1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	0.03	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.02
3	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.47	0.00	1.06	0.12	0.00	0.08
4	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.01	0.00	0.79	0.22	0.00	0.16
5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.46	4.95	0.00	5.85	1.60
6	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.73	0.00	0.57	0.43	0.00	0.33
7	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
8	12.00	0.00	7.15	2.27	6.72	3.39	4.66	4.05	4.48
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>1.68</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>0.21</b>
<b>1999-00</b>									
1	0.11	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.06
2	0.65	0.00	0.38	0.00	2.11	0.94	0.63	0.08	0.40
3	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.09	3.15	3.80	0.21	0.10	0.16

## MEGHALAYA STATE DEVELOPMENT REPORT

4	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.32	1.06	1.93	0.70	0.21	0.50
5	0.00	8.84	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.39	2.75
6	4.03	0.00	2.86	3.46	8.04	4.79	3.68	4.94	4.05
7	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
8	5.29	32.29	16.31	11.16	13.86	12.33	10.31	16.33	12.89
Total	0.32	0.44	0.37	3.60	5.95	4.37	0.78	0.94	0.85
2004-05									
1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.28	4.45	1.72	0.01	0.09	0.05
3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4	0.00	1.75	0.62	5.32	6.10	5.54	0.71	2.18	1.22
5*	0.78	1.36	0.96	3.97	0.00	2.42	2.00	0.73	1.56
7	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
8	1.87	22.26	13.86	4.34	7.43	6.06	3.76	11.29	8.01
Total	0.07	0.55	0.29	3.57	3.62	3.59	0.46	0.85	0.64

Note: (i) 1-illiterate, 2-literate below primary, 3-primary, 4-middle, 5-secondary, 6-higher secondary, 7-graduate and above in professional subjects, 8- graduate and above in general subjects

\* includes higher secondary

(ii) The Unemployment rate is calculated for the age group 15 and above

Source: As in Table 12.11

This shows the prevalence of unemployment of the educated in the urban sector of Meghalaya. With the growing number of educated people in the labour force there is a need to increase the employment opportunities in the state so that the human capital can be utilized. This will be possible by increasing the growth rate of the economy, which will in turn increase the employment opportunities of the state.

The prevailing employment market scenario and the relative status of various occupations in the society greatly influence the job aspirations of the persons entering the active working life. The IAMR has found that regular salaried job in government is the most sought after work by the unemployed, followed by self employment in business or trade.

**Table 12.15: Desired Type of Work by the Unemployed in Meghalaya, 2003**

Type of work desired	Rural			Urban		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Self-employment in business/trade	30.1	14.0	22.6	11.8	7.7	9.5
Self-employment in agriculture	8.3	12.5	10.2	0.8	0.7	0.7
Regular salaried job in govt sector	46.3	63.2	54.2	71.4	77.4	74.8
Regular salaried job in pvt sector	4.6	2.6	3.7	4.2	7.1	5.8
Agricultural wage labour	3.8	3.8	3.8	NA	NA	NA
Non-agricultural wage labour	4.6	2.6	3.7	0.8	0.0	0.4
Any other	2.3	1.3	1.8	10.9	7.1	8.8
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Institute of Applied Manpower Research, New Delhi, IAMR Report No. 8/2006.

### 12.5 Summary and Some Suggestions for Employment Generation

- The work participation rate in the three census period i.e.1981, 1991 and 2001 shows a declining trend in both the rural and urban sector. The male work participation rate declined while that of the female participation rate increased in some of the districts in Meghalaya.
- Work Participation Rate of females in Meghalaya is much higher than the all India level.
- The proportion of marginal workers increased in the period 1981 to 2001 while the proportion of main workers declined. This implies that underemployment is on the rise.
- The occupational structure of the labour force shows that in the rural sector majority of the main workers were cultivators while in the urban sector major proportion of the workers are categorized as 'other workers'. The marginal workers in the rural areas mainly work as agricultural labourers.
- There has not been a significant change in the occupational structure of the labour force since 1981 to 2001 as the agriculture is the dominant group in the rural sector and in the urban sector the 'other workers' constitute the dominant group.
- We observe a high incidence of child labour in the rural sector in all the districts of Meghalaya. There is high prevalence of youth unemployment in the state. Unemployment of the educated in Meghalaya as a whole has increased in the recent years.
- Various economic activities in the service sector are urban based. One measure to increase economic growth and productivity is decentralized urbanization or rather Providing Urban amenities and services in the Rural Areas (PURA).
- The type of employment that is desired by most youth is in the government sector and the rate of unemployment is highest among general graduates. Therefore, there is a need to give high priority to vocational and technical education including professional courses in the state so that people have better scope and wider choices to exercise. This is an imperative since there is a serious shortage of skilled professionals amongst the people of Meghalaya working in different fields.
- A strategy for employment generation for the state has to be in line with the strengths of the state and its resource base. Majority of the population in the state is engaged in agriculture and allied activities. There is tremendous scope of improvement in these sectors. Training can be imparted in areas like Seed production technology, Plantation and management of crops, floriculture, crop cultivation, plant protection etc.
- Fisheries also have a huge potential in generating employment opportunities in the state. Fish processing, inland fisheries, fish seed production and fishing technology are some areas where greater employment opportunities can be explored.
- As most of the people are non-vegetarian there is a lot of scope in sheep, pig and goat rearing, dairying, poultry production, veterinary pharmacist-cum-Artificial insemination assistant, etc.

- Other than the above mentioned, agro-based industries, sericulture, apiculture, repair and maintenance of power driven farm machinery, medicinal and aromatic plant industry and soil conservation are some other areas that can be focused to generate employment opportunities in the state.
- Even though Meghalaya is not an industrial state, areas like travel, banking, marketing and salesmanship, export-import practices and documentation, and purchasing and store keeping can be focused and training can be provided to those seeking jobs but do not have the requisite skills.
- The institutes providing vocational training can include courses like civil construction and maintenance, mechanical servicing, audio-visual technician, maintenance and repair of Electrical Domestic Appliances and road construction. Candidates who pass out from these institutes can then be motivated to form groups like 'Dial-a-service'. This may help in addressing the problem of unemployment persisting in the state.
- People can be motivated to take up courses like Medical Laboratory/Technology Assistant, Health Worker, Nursing, Health Sanitary Inspector/Surveyor, Hospital Documentation, Hospital Housekeeping, X-ray Technician, Bio Medical Equipment and Technician, Multi Purpose Health Worker, Auxiliary Nurse and Mid Wives, Primary Health Worker. This will not only provide job opportunities to the needy but will also help in the development of better medical infrastructure in the state.
- A revolution has been brought about in the banking and telecom sectors by private sector participation in these sectors. Growth of these sectors has created a large demand for IT-Enabled services in the areas of back-office processing, collections, customer care and call services, etc. This is a major opportunity for Meghalaya to emerge as a hub for the delivery of these services to the entire region. This will however require the creation of necessary infrastructure and an enabling environment for encouraging private sector investment in the IT-Enabled Services.
- The state has immense tourism potential most of which is at present unexploited. There has been a tremendous spurt in the travel and tourism industry around the world. India is among the fastest growing travel and tourism economies in the world. The "Incredible India" campaign has brought a lot of recognition to the country among international holiday seekers. The state can capitalize on this recognition to promote itself as a favoured ecotourism destination. Tourism industry is also known to generate the highest employment per rupee of investment. As the state's effort to promote tourism bears fruit, a large number of jobs are expected to be created in the hospitality industry. This will however require the creation of requisite infrastructure for capacity building to serve the tourism industry.
- The state has very rich mineral resources, especially coal, limestone, granite, silimanite, clay, kaolin and uranium. However, coal and limestone are the only minerals that are being widely exploited. Even for these two minerals the mining practices are largely unscientific and sub-

optimal. The mining operations are concentrated in a few hands preventing the benefits of the state's mineral resources to flow to the masses. Regularization and modernization of mining practices in the state can provide a large number of employment opportunities in the state. This is a must since the present mining practices are unattractive to the residents of the state leading to influx and change in the demographic pattern of the mining areas.

- As a conclusion, the above suggestions in creating employment opportunities can be implemented only if the infrastructure base of the state is strengthened. Therefore, *development of basic amenities and infrastructure* especially in the rural areas has to be accorded high priority.