

---

**“GENDER WISE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF WORK PARTICIPATION RATE IN INDIA AND ITS DEVELOPED STATES MAHARASHTRA AND GUJARAT”**

**YOGESH PRAKASH SURYAWANSHI.**

---

**Abstract:** An attempt has been made in this study to understand the male- female, as well as urban-rural work participation rates in India and its two developed states Maharashtra, Gujarat using Census of India (1991, 2001 and 2011) B1 series data. Analysis may show the better situation of the differentials in the work participation of the selected states of India by gender and by area which is Male-Female and Rural-Urban. Work participation rate studied using the indices like Main workers, Marginal workers and Total workers from Census of India data. The study concludes that the male- female, as well as urban-rural total work participation rates are increasing in every decade in India and Maharashtra, Gujarat. In India and its two developed state have continuous growth rate in work participation rate of urban-rural as well as male-female and total work participation.

**Keywords:** Main workers, Marginal Workers, Total Workers

---

**Introduction:** : The study of the economically active population or labour force occupies an important position in the field of population studies, and at present there is increasing interest in studying the various aspects of the labour force any nation/state. The economic and social development of a nation/state depends on the number of persons who are economically active, the quality of their work and the regularity of their employment. Labour force participation rates are useful for an understanding of the extent to which women, youth and the aged participate in economic activity. (Bhinde and Kanitkar, 2010)

Labour force is an integral part of development process. Variations in the quality of labour as well as quantity affect the specialization and division of labour. Labour force is directly related with the principal components of demography i.e., fertility, mortality and, migration.(ILO,2011). In 2001 census an attempt has been made to collect more accurate information about the working population.

The population of a country can be broadly divided into two categories i.e., (i) Economically active and (ii) Economically inactive. The previous one is known as working Population and the latter are known as non-working population. However, in 1951 census, the Categories of workers were termed as self-supporting persons, carrying- dependents and nonearning dependents. However, in 1961 and 1971 census the labour force approach come into force. Those persons were taken into the group of workers who were involved in any productive activity that might be physical or mental during the reference period. Since 1961 census the concepts of worker and non-worker came into existence. The major difference between the definitions of 1961 and 1971 census was in defining the marginal workers. In 1961 census the marginal-workers were considered in the workers category

whereas in the 1971 census they were considered as the non-workers. In the 1981 census, attempt was made to get the detailed profile of the working characteristics of the population. Hence in this census the usual status of the workers was given emphasis instead of the current status of the workers. The other important aspect of 1981 census was to obtain the details of participation of women and children in work. (Census of India 1951, 61, 71, 81)

In 1981 census the questions were formulated so as attempt to divide the population who have worked any time and not worked at all during the last year. After having this classification the population who worked during last year was divided into two sub-streams i.e., (i) who worked for six months or more and (ii) who worked for less than six months. The former was termed as main workers and the latter as marginal workers. For the first time in Indian census these Classifications came into existence. (Census of India, 1981)

1991 census adopted the same definition with a slight modification in the non-worker group. In this census an attempt was made to know how many people are seeking work or available for work in the market. So this is a new category added in 1991 census. In 2001 census almost the same definition of 1991 census for worker and non-worker has been adopted with slight modification. In 2001 census besides the milk-production, the household works, which gets remuneration, was also taken into the category of work, which is not considered as work in the previous census. (Census of India, 1991-2001)

As we know the agriculture comes under labour intensive economy and an industry comes under capital-intensive economy. Therefore, these two extreme points are taken to study the work participation. Maharashtra is selected as an agriculturally as well as industrially developed state and Gujarat as an industrially developed state.

Geographically these two states are neighboring states to one another. Both the states come in the mid-western part of India.

**Review of Literature:** There are number of studies available pertaining to the work participation, some of the studies are give more information on work force participation. Guy standing (1978) has been argued that any expansion of non-domestic employment opportunities for women would tend to reduce fertility and population growth, thereby raising per capita incomes and consumptions. Higher levels of female economic activity can be expected to reduce fertility is by raising the value of daughters relative to sons. He has been claimed that where children have an economic value as workers a high level of fertility has been encouraged. Labour force is not simply a direct function of the size, demographic composition and past growth of the population; it's a highly sensitive economic variable which has rarely received attention it deserves in formal models of development and underdevelopment.

According to Klein and Kosobud (2009), the over-all labour force participation rate, the proportion of the total population in the labour force, is practically a constant and thus one of the "great ratios of economics". Indices of labour force participation have two complementary functions, the first being to provide a measure of labour supply, the second to indicate the extent of labour utilization. The evidence from empirical studies in the United States is that female participation is inversely related to husband's wage, other family income, and other family income per equivalent adult.

In a study by Acharya, (1983) it was found that beside their domestic work, women spend almost equal hours outside the household in gainful economic activity in agriculture, while their income goes largely unrecorded. One of the finding by Rachapaetayakom J, (1988), women's participation in the labor force is determined both by the stage of development of the country and by cultural factors. Thapa (2008) mentioned that women of Nepal contribute to sustainable development by actively producing agricultural products and livestock. About 60% of the agricultural labor force is comprised of women. About 90% of women were engaged in raising livestock and producing and managing agriculture. A study by Acharya M. and Bennett L, (1983) was found that women in the orthodox Hindu communities, who are largely confined to domestic and subsistence production, were found to play a less significant role in major household economic decisions than other women. According to Ahmad ZM,(1984), the small farmers development programme encourages the formation of women's groups as well as men's groups to engage in group income generating activities.

Indian labor market does not have a uniform pattern and is characterized by complex situations such as type of workers (full time and part time workers), variations in the availability of work round the year according to different seasons, workers engaging themselves in multiple jobs, huge differentials in wage rates, social and cultural factors restricting large number of women workers to participate in labour market, etc. (Mazumadar and Sarkar, 2008; Sarkar 2008). These features lead to varied estimates of total labor force and employment in India. Several studies (Mukhopadhyay et al, 2006; Chandrasekhar et al, 2006) have shown that work participation rate shows a declining trend with increase in the level of education. It is possible that decline in labour force participation among the youth result from their delayed entry into the workforce, partly because they are extending their years of education.

In a study examining the patterns of labour force growth in India concluded that "the rural labour force participation rate being high because of poverty and the necessity" (Bhalla and Kaur, 2011). A large proportion of population in India lives in rural areas. A study done by Deshpande (1985) found that most of the young workers reporting rural residence, reflecting the notion that in rural areas work participation is high among youth than in urban areas. In rural areas, the age of entry into the labour force of youth is lower than that of urban areas. Young female workers are more marginal workers compared to male workers. Young workers of both sexes had lower participation rates than workers of other age groups who have urban residence. This could be attributed largely to higher enrolment of this age group in educational institutions in urban areas (Deshpande, 1985).

The education is an important factor which determines the level of women's work participation. Among the illiterate women, work participation is high but it is low among the women who have primary or secondary education. The level of work participation rises with higher education among women. The U curve can be seen for women work participation since participation falls from the illiterate women to the next group and participation rises rapidly thereafter (Mathur, 1994). In rural areas, a large proportion of population depends on agriculture and the proportion of females is high in agriculture activities. The diversification of the rural workforce to non agriculture sector has been found very low and so is the diversification of female in non-farm activities (Annual Report-People on Employment, 2010).

**Need of Study:** Maharashtra and Gujarat are highly Urbanized and Industrialized states in India. Maharashtra and Gujarat have different demographic characteristics than each another. Their pattern of

work participation is also different than one another. And the states falling in traditional category may have some pattern of work participation having resemblance with them. Several of the findings mentioned above in review of literature are by and large acceptable, but the explanations for the trend and pattern of work participation rates are not easy to put forward due to the diversity of situations, as well as work participation rates being influenced by market and non-market factors like poverty and the prevailing norms of work by gender, age and social status in different parts of India.

The study of the participation of women in the work force is beset with many difficulties. The first and foremost problem is that measuring the extent of their participation in gainful employment. Not all women want to work. There are some who willingly choose to stay at home and look after their families. However, there are those who want to work but do not get the chance to do so.

#### Objectives:

On the basis of this striking feature, the present paper has the following objectives:-

- 1) To study the trends of work participation rates by gender wise in India, Maharashtra and Gujarat.
- 2) To examine the change in female work participation during in India, Maharashtra and Gujarat.
- 3) To study the differentials of work participation rate in Maharashtra and Gujarat.

#### Sources of Data:

- 1) Census of India (1991) B1 series of India, Maharashtra and Gujarat.
- 2) Census of India (2001) B1 series of India, Maharashtra and Gujarat.
- 3) Census of India (2011) Provisional data of India, Maharashtra and Gujarat.
- 4) Indiastat data for 2011 provisional data of workers population

#### Definitions of Some Terms According to the Census of India 2011:

- **Work:** - Work is defined as participation in any economically productive activity with or without compensation, wages or profit. Such participation may be physical and/or mental in nature. Work involves not only actual work but also includes effective supervision and direction of work. It even includes part time help or unpaid work on farm, family enterprise or in any other economic activity. All persons engaged in 'work' as defined above are **workers**. Persons who are engaged in cultivation or milk production even solely for domestic consumption are also treated as workers.

(NOTE: Reference period for determining a person as a worker and non worker is one year preceding the date of enumeration.)

- **Main Workers**

All those workers who had worked for the major part of the year preceding the date of enumeration i.e. those who were engaged in any economically productive activity for 183 days (six months) and more during the last year are termed as main workers.

- **Marginal Workers**

All those workers who had worked any time in the year preceding enumeration but did not work for a major part the year i.e. those who worked less than 183 days or less than six months were termed as marginal workers.

#### Methodology:

The methodology that is used in this paper is simple percentile and cross tab. The percentage for the total, male, female work participation rate is calculated with respect to the total population and the percentage for the urban, rural, total and main workers, marginal workers, and total workers by cross tabulation.

#### Crude work participation rates (CWPR):

Crude work participation rate is defined as the ratio of total workers to the total population multiplied by 100. The crude work participation rates were calculated for the total, main, and marginal workers by sex and rural and urban residence.

Symbolically-

$$CWPR = \frac{TW}{TP} * 100$$

Where

CWPR= Crude Work Participation Rate

TW=Total workers

TP=Total population

#### Findings: Main Workers:

Table 1 shows that, In the Indian context we can see the Main work participation rate is always higher as compare to marginal work participation rate. This situation we can see in the states of India also. Because majority of workers are engaged in economic activities more than six months (183 days) in India.

Table 1 shows the female main work participation rate is always lower as compare to male main work participation. It may possible that majority of women are working in household activities but there work is not taken as economic activity in India. But in state of Maharashtra we can see female main work participation rate is higher as compare to Gujarat and the national female work participation. In Maharashtra female work participation rate is 26.47 percent in 1991 and it decline up to 22.23 percent in 2001 but afterwards its increases up to 25.44 percent in 2011. In Gujarat female work participation rate was 13.74 percent, and it 14.6 percent, 13.12 percent respectively in 1991, 2001, and 2011. (Table 1)

Table 1 shows the male main work participation rate situation is contrast in female work participation rate it is higher in state of Gujarat as compare to Maharashtra and National level. Male participation rate of Gujarat was 53.17 percent, 51.09 percent, 52.61 percent respectively in 1991, 2001, and 2011. In Maharashtra male work participation rate was 51.25 percent, 48.44 percent, 51.49 percent respectively in 1991, 2001, and 2011. In India male work participation rate was 50.93 percent, 45.13 percent, 43.84 percent respectively in 1991, 2001, and 2011 which shows gradually decline.

**Marginal Workers:** Table 2 shows the Gujarat marginal work participation rate is always higher as compare to Maharashtra and India marginal work participation rate. It is possible that majority of workers from Gujarat are working in informal sectors of economic activities and not able to get permanent occupation. Only in male marginal work participation of Maharashtra is higher as compare to Gujarat. In Gujarat Table 2 shows the female marginal work rate is higher as compare to Maharashtra. It is in Gujarat 12.23 percent in 1991 but it decreases up to 10.26 percent in 2011. In Maharashtra it is 6.64 percent in 1991 and increases in 2001 up to 8.58 percent but in 2011 it is decreases up to 5.61 percent. Female marginal work participation rate is higher in Gujarat and Maharashtra as compare to national work participation rate of female work participation.

Table 2 also shows that Male marginal work participation rate is lower in Gujarat as compare to Maharashtra. It is 0.4 percent in Gujarat in 1991 and it increases up to 4.55 percent in 2011. In Maharashtra it is 0.92 percent in 1991 and increases up to 4.51 percent in 2011. Male marginal work rate is lower in both the states as compare to national marginal work rate.

**Total Workers:** Table 3 shows the female total work participation rate of Maharashtra is higher as compare to Gujarat and national level. In Maharashtra we can see the female work participation rate was 33.11 percent in 1991 but it is gradually decline in 2011 and decreases up to 31.06 percent. In Gujarat female work participation rate was 25.96 percent in 1991 and it gradually declines in 2011 up to 23.38 percent. For India female work

participation rate was 22.25 percent in 1991 and it is gradually increases up to 25.63 percent and 25.51 percent in 2001 and 2011 respectively.

Table 3 shows the Total male work participation rate of Gujarat is higher as compare to Maharashtra and national level. It shows the male dominated industries are present over in Gujarat as compare to Maharashtra. Gujarat having 53.57 percent male work participation rate in 1991 and it increases gradually up to 54.87 percent and 57.16 percent in 2001 and 2011 respectively. In Maharashtra male work participation was 52.17 percent in 1991 and it gradually increases up to 53.28 percent and 56 percent in 2001 and 2011 respectively. For India male work participation rate was 51.55 percent in 1991 and it increases up to 51.68 percent and 53.26 percent in 2001 and 2011 respectively.

**Conclusion:** This study shows the male- female, as well as urban-rural total work participation rates are increasing in every decade in India and Maharashtra, Gujarat. In India and its two developed state have continuous growth rate in work participation rate of urban-rural as well as male-female and total work participation. It's interesting in this study Work participation rate of Maharashtra is increasing as compare to Gujarat by every decade in India. But in **the work participation of males in Gujarat is higher as compare to Maharashtra whereas work participation rate of females in Maharashtra is higher as compare to Gujarat.** It may possible that in Gujarat majority of industries are male workers dominated and literacy and small scale industries is in favour to women in Maharashtra so it may impact on the WPR in both states. **In Maharashtra we can see the rural female work participation rate is high as compare to rural female work participation rate of Gujarat.** In main and marginal work participation rate we can see high variation between urban and rural for female work participation, but for males main work participation it is near about same, less variation found in urban-rural male work participation rate for total WPR and marginal WPR. It may possible that women's are busy in their household activities and therefore they are not able to get permanent employment.

#### Tables of Work Participation Rate:

		INDIA			MAHARASHTRA			GUJARAT		
	YEAR	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE
	1991	34.10	50.93	15.93	39.29	51.25	26.47	34.12	53.17	13.74
<b>TOTAL</b>	2001	30.43	45.13	14.68	35.87	48.44	22.23	33.60	51.09	14.60
	2011	29.94	43.84	15.20	38.94	51.49	25.44	33.70	52.61	13.12
	1991	35.69	51.76	18.97	44.19	52.07	36.10	36.54	54.42	17.70
<b>RURAL</b>	2001	30.87	44.31	16.65	39.18	47.54	30.47	35.02	50.31	18.83



	2011	29.49	41.63	16.69	43.07	51.33	34.39	34.24	51.36	16.2
	1991	29.50	48.59	8.13	31.52	50.02	10.37	29.53	50.85	6.03
<b>URBAN</b>	2001	29.29	47.19	9.42	31.37	49.62	10.47	31.23	52.35	7.23
	2011	30.95	48.65	11.88	33.95	51.68	14.32	32.97	54.24	8.80

		INDIA			MAHARASHTRA			GUJARAT		
	YE A R	TOTA L	MAL E	FEMAL E	TOTA L	MAL E	FEMAL E	TOTA L	MAL E	FEMA LE
	1991	3.36	0.62	6.32	3.68	0.92	6.64	6.11	0.4	12.23
<b>TOTA L</b>	2001	8.67	6.55	10.95	6.63	4.83	8.58	8.35	3.78	13.32
	2011	9.85	9.42	10.31	5.04	4.51	5.61	7.28	4.55	10.26
	1991	4.29	0.72	8.1	5.48	1.12	9.97	8.97	0.49	17.9
<b>RURA L</b>	2001	10.88	7.79	14.14	9.69	6.4	13.13	12.22	5.14	19.71
	2011	12.34	11.39	13.34	6.73	5.38	8.14	10.64	5.79	15.75
	1991	0.68	0.35	1.04	0.82	0.61	1.07	0.69	0.23	1.19
<b>URBA N</b>	2001	2.96	3.41	2.46	2.48	2.81	2.10	1.86	1.56	2.19
	2011	4.36	5.11	3.56	3.00	3.48	2.47	2.76	2.94	2.55

		INDIA			MAHARASHTRA			GUJARAT		
	YE A R	TOTA L	MAL E	FEMAL E	TOTA L	MAL E	FEMAL E	TOTA L	MAL E	FEMA LE
	1991	37.46	51.55	22.25	42.97	52.17	33.11	40.23	53.57	25.96
<b>TOTA L</b>	2001	39.10	51.68	25.63	42.50	53.28	30.81	41.95	54.87	27.91
	2011	39.79	53.26	25.51	43.99	56.00	31.06	40.98	57.16	23.38
	1991	39.99	52.48	26.67	49.68	53.19	46.06	45.51	54.91	35.6
<b>RURA L</b>	2001	41.75	52.11	30.79	48.88	53.93	43.61	47.24	55.46	38.54
	2011	41.83	53.03	30.02	49.79	56.71	42.52	44.88	57.15	31.95
	1991	30.17	48.94	9.17	32.34	50.62	11.44	30.22	51.08	7.21
<b>URBA N</b>	2001	32.25	50.60	11.88	33.85	52.43	12.57	33.08	53.91	9.41
	2011	35.31	53.76	15.44	36.95	55.16	16.78	35.73	57.18	11.35

(Source: Census Of India, 1991,2001 and 2011.)

**Acknowledgement:** I would like to take this opportunity for expressing my sincere thanks and deepest sense of gratitude to my guide, Prof. Sunil Sarode, Department of Migration and Urban Studies, who took immense interest in my work and equipped me with all the moral strength required to complete this work successfully. As a Guide he has not only made possible the completion of this paper, but also made me to learn from his knowledge.

My special thanks and gratitude are due to Prof. F. Ram, the Director of IIPS for creating the kind of

learning environment and grooming intellectual creativity. Thanks are also due to Dr. Ratnakar, Chairman, ICWE conference and the peer review committee to give me chance to present and publish my research paper in ICWE.

Last but not the least, I express my deep sense of gratitude and obligations to my parents and other family members whose love, affection and blessings have made it possible for me to reach this level.

#### References:

1. Luciana Sandhyarani. Jyothula, Stress and Coping Among Women; Human Rights International Research Journal : ISSN 2320-6942 Volume 1 Issue 1 (2013), Pg 193-202
2. Acharya, M., & Bennett, L. (1983): Women and the subsistence sector. Economic participation and household decision making in Nepal.

3. Acharya, S. (1983): "Informal sector in developing countries: a macro view", in *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 13(4).
4. AHMAD, Z. (1995): *Womens' Work and their Struggle to Organize. Developing Areas: A Book of Readings and Research*, Pp. 229.
5. Annual Report - People on Employment (2010): Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment.
6. S. Shaheen Taj, *Psychological Struggle of Native Women*; Human Rights International Research Journal : ISSN 2320-6942 Volume 1 Issue 1 (2013), Pg 211-214
7. Bhide A. and T. Kanitkar (2010): *Principles of Population Studies*, Himalaya Publishing House.
8. Bhalla, S. and R. Kaur (2011): "Labour Force Participation of Women in India: Some facts, some queries". Asia Research Centre, wp 40.
9. Chandrasekhar, C., Ghosh, J., & A. Roychowdhury (2006): *The 'Demographic Dividend' and Young India's Economic Future*. Economic and Political Weekly, Pp. 5055-5064.
10. Deshpande, S. and L. Deshpande (1997): "Gender-based Discrimination in the Urban Labour Market in India." *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 40(3).
11. *Global Employment Trends* (2011): International Labour Organisation.
12. Guy S. (1978): *Labour Force Participation and Development*, International Labour Organisation.
13. Majumdar, V. (1990): *Women Workers in India*. Chanakya Publications, New Delhi.
14. Mathur, A. (1994): *Work participation, gender and economic development: a quantitative anatomy of the Indian scenario*. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 30(2), Pp. 466-504.
15. Mazumadar, D. and S.Sarkar (2008): *Globalisation, Labour Markets and Inequality in India*, Routledge, New York.
16. Mills, T. C. (2008): *Revisiting Klein & Kosobud's great ratios*. mimeo., *Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis in Social Sciences* 3(3), pp.12-42.
17. Mukhopadhyay, S. and S. Tendulkar (2006): "Gender differences in Labour Force Participation in India: An Analysis of NSS data, MIMAP Gender Network Project, Institute of Social Studies Trust, New Delhi.
18. Amrit Pal Kaur, *NRI Marriages: Issues and Ramifications*; Human Rights International Research Journal : ISSN 2320-6942 Volume 2 Issue 1 (2014), Pg 62-66
19. Rachapaetayakom, J. (1988): *Changing roles of women: reproduction to production*. *POPULATION MANAGER: ICOMP REVIEW*, 2(2), Pp.18-27.
20. Thapa, S. (2008): *Gender differentials in agricultural productivity: evidence from Nepalese household data*.
21. Dr.E.Brijesh, *Role of Non-Governmental Organizations and Scope*; Human Rights International Research Journal : ISSN 2320-6942 Volume 2 Issue 1 (2014), Pg 89-94

Yogesh Prakash Suryawanshi.

14, Aaradhana Building, Hareshwar Nagar, Ring Road, Jalgaon. (Maharashtra)

MPS (Batch 2013-14)

International Institute for Population Sciences, Deonar, Mumbai. (Maharashtra)

yograjupsc@gmail.com

+91-8956312265