

## **Nature and Extent of Rural Unemployment in the Low Hill Zone Agrarian Economy of Himachal Pradesh: A Multi-dimensional Approach**

Sikander Kumar\*  
Rakesh Singh\*\*

### **INTRODUCTION**

There has been a general notion since long that the traditional agriculture provides employment to many more persons than is necessary to produce a given level of output. The notion was very strong during the fifties and sixties particularly in India, and it was regarded as an almost established fact that the agricultural sector of developing country like India suffers from large scale disguised unemployment and/ or underemployment which clearly indicates that the marginal productivity of labour in agriculture is zero or nearly zero. It has been further stated that the problem of disguised unemployment and/ or underemployment in the traditional agricultural sector is the problem of those landless agricultural labourers and small cultivators who are working on small plots, contributing virtually negligible or nothing to output but are sharing in the common joint family pool.<sup>1</sup>

Every country whatever its state of economic development has an employment problem to some extent. Intensive study of the problem on regional basis will always be helpful in order to know the nature and magnitude of unemployment of the particular region so that it might be easier to find out the solution to the problem with reference to local conditions<sup>2</sup>. The present micro level study on the magnitude of rural unemployment in the low hill agrarian economy of Himachal Pradesh has been undertaken with a view to achieve the following objectives.

### **OBJECTIVES:**

The main objectives of the study are:

To study the pattern of human labour time utilization in farm and non- farm activities by size class of holding.

---

\* Professor, Department of Economics, Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla (H.P.)

\*\* Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Swami Vivekananda Government College, Ghumarwin, District Bilaspur (H.P.)

- I) To estimate the magnitude of rural employment and unemployment among the sample population with the help of multi-dimensional approach viz., time, income and willingness criteria by size class of holdings;
- II) To pinpoint the causes of rural unemployment and to suggest measures for providing gainful employment opportunities to the people in the study area.

### **METHODOLOGY**

In order to achieve the above objectives of this study district Hamirpur has been selected randomly out of the areas/ districts follow in the low hill zone of the state. Further, two development blocks i.e. Bijhari and Nadaun of the Hamirpur district have been selected. A sample of 200 households has been selected with the help of multi-stage random sampling which constitute 50 marginal, 45 small, 40 semi-medium, 35 medium and 30 large farmers. The required information was collected from the sample households with the help of pre-tested schedule during the year 2009-10. For finding the results of the study the primary data has been classified in homogeneous groups and the respective percentage and average have been worked out. The magnitude of rural unemployment has been worked out with the help of 'time', 'income' and 'willingness' criteria. The full employment norm of 8 hours a day, 25 days in a month and 300 days in a year has been adopted to find out the extent of rural unemployment. But there are workers who are working at full employment norms and according to time criterion such workers are fully employed, but their earnings from the present work are not sufficient to meet out their basic requirements. Thus according to income' or 'poverty' criterion they are underemployed. The household income required to meet out their basic requirements (i.e. for both food and non-food items) have been worked out. Those households earning an income less than the minimum desirable income have been considered unemployed and/ or underemployed. Again there are workers who are willing to work for additional hours on the existing wage rate either due to higher dependency ratios, higher price levels or higher debt repayment burden etc. such workers are termed as underemployed and/ or unemployed according to 'willingness' criteria.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The result and discussion about the nature and extent of rural unemployment based on the first hand information are presented as follows:

**Socio-Economic Profile of the Sample Households**

The socio-economic characteristics of the sample households have been worked out by size class of holdings. The size distribution of holdings is taken as a proxy of economic status of the households. The total sample population is 1249 out of which 675 are males and 574 are females (see Table 1). In the sample as a whole the average holding size has been worked out 3.56 and the average family size came out 6.25. The average family size among the marginal, small, semi-medium, medium and large size of holdings shows an increasing tendency with the increase in the holding size mainly due to the reason that on the smaller size of holding groups single family system prevails, whereas, on the larger size of holding groups generally the joint family system is prevalent in the study area. In the sample as a whole the percentage of workforce and dependent came out to be 70.62 and 29.38 respectively. The total standard man-days has been worked out 885.75 and per household average standard man-days came out to be 4.42.

**Table -1**  
**Family Composition, Average Family Size, Percentage of Workforce, Percentage of Dependents, Number of Standard Man-days, Number of Consumer Units and Sex-wise Literacy Percentage Among the Sample Households**

Sr. No.	Particulars	Size of Holdings					
		Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Semi-Medium Holdings	Medium Holdings	Large Holdings	All Holdings
1	Total Number of Households	50	45	40	35	30	200
2	Total Sample Population	277	259	256	247	210	1249
3	Average Size of Family	5.54	5.76	6.40	7.06	7.00	6.25
4	Average Size of Holdings (Hect.)	0.67	1.59	3.11	5.21	10.04	3.56
5	Percentage of Family Workforce	188 (67.87)	175 (67.57)	179 (69.92)	178 (72.06)	162 (77.14)	882 (70.62)
6	Percentage of Dependents	89 (32.13)	84 (32.43)	77 (30.08)	69 (27.94)	48 (22.86)	367 (29.38)
7	Total Standard Man-days	192.75	181	179.75	175.50	156.75	885.75
8	Per Household Average Standard Man-days	3.85	4.02	4.49	5.01	5.22	4.42
9	Total Number of Consumer Units	322.4	304.8	303.1	296.5	259.9	1486.7
10	Average Number of Per Household Consumer Units	6.44	6.77	7.57	8.47	8.66	7.43
11	Literacy Percentage						
	Male	115 (75.16)	121 (81.76)	123 (90.44)	119 (92.25)	102 (93.58)	580 (85.93)
	Female	80 (64.52)	75 (67.57)	83 (69.17)	82 (69.49)	71 (70.30)	391 (68.12)
	Total	195 (70.40)	196 (75.68)	206 (80.47)	201 (81.38)	173 (82.38)	971 (77.74)

**Note:** Figures in the parentheses denote percentages

**Source:** primary probe

The total number of consumer units has been worked out 1486.7 and per household average number of consumer units came out 7.43. The literacy percentage came out to be 77.74, while the literacy percentage among the males is high (i.e. 85.93 percent) as compared to females (i.e. 68.12 percent). The literacy percentage among the different holding groups shows an increasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings.

***Pattern of Family Human Labour Days Utilization***

The pattern of family human labour employment in different activities viz., farm, non-farm and necessary activities among the different holding groups have been presented in Table 2 which clearly indicates that the percentage of man-days spent in crop production shows an increasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. Among all the household together this percentage came out 20.70 percent. It happened mainly due to the reason that male members of the families falling on the smaller size of holding groups are not necessarily required on their own uneconomic size of holdings even during the peak agricultural seasons, and hence, they keep themselves busy in more remunerative regular jobs outside the agriculture. On the other hand the households falling on the larger holding groups due to gainful employment on their own economic size of holdings they devote maximum time in agricultural activities. The percentage of man-days spent in livestock activities also shows increasing tendency with an increase in the size of holding. Among all the holding together this percentage came out 18.48 percent. This happened mainly due to as reason that the large farmers have the more number of cattle, whereas, the smaller farmers due to their uneconomic size of holdings and meagre household income, cannot afford to keep cattle. Further, it has been observed that during the busy agricultural periods, less man-days are spent per household in looking after cattle, whereas, during the lean agricultural seasons, the farmers spent most of their time for looking after the animals. All this goes to suggest that probably a larger proportion of the man-days spent exclusively in looking of the livestock, is more in the nature of doing something since there was nothing to do. The percentage of man-days spent in forestry collection and other agricultural activities shows a decreasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 41.84 percent. Thus, the percentage of man-days spent in all agricultural activities shows an increasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. The percentage of man-days spent in services shows an increasing tendency (except minor fluctuations in between) with an increase in the size of holdings. This occurred on account of the higher literacy percentage among the households falling on the larger size of holdings as compared to the

smaller size of holdings. The percentage of man-days spent in business activities is the highest on the smaller holdings on account of the fact that these households have received loans at low rate of interest under the self employment scheme to start small business in order to supplement their meagre household income.

**Table - 2**  
**Pattern of Family Human Labour Days Utilization in Agricultural, Non-Agricultural and Necessary Household Activities Among the Sample Households**  
(Standard Man-days)

Sr. No.	Particulars		Size of Holdings					
			Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Semi-Medium Holdings	Medium Holdings	Large Holdings	All Holdings
<b>1. Farm Activities</b>								
	A	Crop Production	84.50 (9.39)	102.90 (10.61)	212.20 (18.36)	364.08 (26.59)	445.83 (30.75)	241.83 (20.70)
	B	Livestock Activities	114.58 (12.74)	143.71 (14.81)	227.65 (19.69)	300.55 (21.95)	292.85 (20.20)	215.86 (18.48)
	C	Forestry Collection and Others*	35.25 (3.92)	33.75 (3.48)	31.30 (2.71)	28.45 (2.08)	27.12 (1.87)	31.17 (2.67)
	D	Sub-Total of Farm Activities (A to C)	234.33 (26.05)	280.36 (28.89)	471.15 (40.75)	693.08 (50.62)	765.80 (52.81)	488.87 (41.84)
<b>2. Non-Farm Activities</b>								
	A	Services	147.60 (16.41)	192.58 (19.85)	219.69 (19.00)	242.50 (17.71)	257.38 (17.75)	205.18 (17.56)
	B	Business	47.12 (5.24)	53.18 (5.48)	65.81 (5.69)	69.95 (5.11)	72.60 (5.01)	60.03 (5.14)
	C	Wage Work	138.48 (15.39)	93.15 (9.60)	57.10 (4.94)	31.69 (2.31)	23.36 (1.61)	76.04 (6.51)
	D	Household Industries	63.60 (7.06)	51.20 (5.28)	37.80 (3.27)	26.59 (1.94)	22.89 (1.58)	43.06 (3.69)
	E	Religious Work	4.32 (0.48)	6.76 (0.70)	6.28 (0.54)	7.24 (0.53)	9.23 (0.64)	6.50 (0.56)
	F	Other Occupations*	28.32 (3.15)	19.14 (1.97)	13.08 (1.13)	9.57 (0.70)	6.20 (0.43)	16.60 (1.42)
	G	Sub-Total of Non-Farm Activities (A to G)	429.44 (47.74)	416.01 (42.87)	399.76 (34.58)	387.54 (28.31)	391.66 (27.01)	407.45 (34.88)
<b>3. Necessary Activities</b>								
	A	Family Affairs	142.74 (15.87)	161.39 (16.63)	163.87 (14.17)	165.19 (12.07)	166.97 (11.52)	158.72 (13.59)
	B	Social Affaris	20.88 (2.32)	26.39 (2.72)	29.42 (2.54)	31.52 (2.30)	32.63 (2.25)	27.45 (2.35)
	C	Leisure, Rest and Sickness	52.32 (5.82)	64.87 (6.69)	69.82 (6.04)	70.12 (5.12)	71.05 (4.90)	64.56 (5.53)
	D	Others*	19.92 (2.21)	21.27 (2.19)	22.05 (1.91)	21.67 (1.58)	21.89 (1.51)	21.85 (1.87)
	E	Sub-Total of Necessary Activities (A to E)	235.86 (26.22)	273.92 (28.23)	285.16 (24.67)	288.50 (21.07)	292.54 (20.18)	271.99 (23.28)
<b>4.</b>	<b>Grand Total (1 to 3)</b>		899.63 (100.00)	970.29 (100.00)	1156.07 (100.00)	1369.12 (100.00)	1450.00 (100.00)	1168.31 (100.00)

**Note:** Figures in the parentheses denote percentages to column total. \* includes poultry, fisheries etc., \*\* includes barbers, blacksmiths, carpenters, physicians, artists, potters etc., \*\*\* includes care of sick and elderly, knitting and shopping etc.

**Source:** primary probe

But on the other hand, the larger farmers due to their sound and regular sources of household income as well as higher literacy percentage can afford to make investment in business activities. Contrary to it, most of smaller farmers due to their uneconomic size of holdings, meagre household income and higher illiteracy percentage are not prepared to take risk by taking Government loans against which their land and houses are kept as security by the donor agency. The percentage of man-days spent in wage work is the highest on the marginal size of holdings and it decreases with an increase in the size of holdings. Among all the holdings together this percentage came but 6.51 percent. The reasons behind it that smallest being poor, are ready to get work irrespective to the nature of work as well as the wage rate. Due to the higher dependency ratio uneconomic size of holdings and meagre household income, they cannot afford to remain unemployed during the lean agricultural season and/ or even during the peak agricultural season, when they are not necessarily required on their own uneconomic size of holdings. Whereas, on the large size of holdings due to higher percentage of literacy, sound and regular sources of income (mainly from agriculture and services) and status, most of the well-to-do families consider wage work below their status.

The percentage of man-days spent in household industries shows decreasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. The reason behind it that the smaller holding groups have received loans on subsidized rates, training as well as instruments under the self-employment schemes to start such type of household industries (i.e. mainly weaving and spinning household industries) in order to supplement their meagre household income. The percentage of man-days spent in religious work' shows an increasing tendency whereas the percentage of man-days utilized in other occupations shows decreasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. Thus, the percentage of man-days spent in all non-agricultural activities shows a decreasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. It happened mainly due to the reason that the male members on the smaller holdings are not necessary required on their uneconomic size of holdings even during the peak agricultural seasons, hence, they keep themselves busy in the non-agricultural activities (mainly in wage work, household industries, religious and other activities). Further, the smaller farmers due to their meagre household income, high illiteracy and dependency ratio cannot afford to remain unemployed during the lean agricultural seasons, hence, they try to their levels to get such type of work preferably nearby as well as outside the home. Contrary to it, the larger farmers with their quite large and economic size of holdings cannot afford to spent more time in non-agricultural activities (mainly in household industries, religious and other occupations, etc.).

The percentage of man-days spent in family affairs is the highest on the small size of holdings (i.e. 16.63%) followed by the (marginal (i.e. 15.87%) semi-medium (i.e. 14.17%) medium (i.e. 12.07%) and on the large size of holdings (i.e. 11.52%) among all the holdings together this percentage came out to be 13.59 percent. The percentage of man-days spent in social affairs and leisure, rest and sickness and other activities shows decreasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. Thus, the percentage distribution of man-days spent in different activities by the sample households shows that the major proportion of man-days spent in agricultural activities followed by non-agricultural and necessary activities.

### **Nature and Extent of Unemployment in the Low Hill Zone Agrarian Economy of Himachal Pradesh: A Multi-Dimensional Approach**

The nature and extent of unemployment with the help of multi-dimensional approach i.e. 'time', 'willingness' and 'income criterion' for the sample population has been presented in Table 3.

#### *Time Criterion*

According to 'time criterion' a person may be termed unemployed or underemployed, if he is gainfully Occupied during the year for a number of days less than some normal or optimal days defined as full employment days.<sup>3</sup> In the present study a person working for less than 300 days in a year or less than 25 days in a month or less than 8 hours a day has been considered unemployed and/ or underemployed. Table 3 clearly indicates that the total number of available man-days per household has been worked out 1155, 1206, 1347, 1503 and 1567 on the marginal, small, semi-medium, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together the total man-days available come out to be 1326. The percentage of man-days utilized in agricultural activities to the total man-days available has been worked out 20.27, 23.34, 34.95, 46.08, 48.87 per cent on the marginal, small, semi-medium, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 36.80 percent. The percentage of man-days utilized in agricultural activities shows an increasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. The percentage of man-days utilized in non-agricultural activities viz., services, business, wage work, household industries, religious work, other activities etc. to the total available man-days has been worked out 37.14, 34.49, 29.65, 25.76 and 24.99 percent on the marginal, small, semi-medium, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 30.68 percent. The percentage of man-days utilized in non- agricultural activities shows a decreasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings.

The percentage of man-days utilized in necessary activities (i.e. family and social affairs, leisure, rest, sickness, and others) to the total man-days available, has been worked out 20.40, 22.71, 21.15, 19.18 and 18.66 percent on the marginal, small, semi-medium, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out to be 20.48 percent. The percentage of man-days utilized in all the agricultural, non-agricultural and necessary (i.e. both productive and necessary activities) during the year has been worked out 77.82, 80.45, 85.76, 91.03 and 92.53 percent on the marginal, small, semi-medium, medium and large size of holdings respectively.

**Table - 3**  
**Extent of Unemployment: A Multi-Dimensional Approach**

(Standard Mandavs)

Sr. No.	Particulars	Size of Holdings						
		Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Semi-Medium Holdings	Medium Holdings	Large Holdings	All Holdings	
1	Per Household total available annual Man-days (at full employment norms)	1155 (100.00)	1206 (100.00)	1347 (100.00)	1503 (100.00)	1566 (100.00)	1326 (100.00)	
2	Total Man-days Utilized in agricultural activities	234.33 (20.27)	280.36 (23.24)	471.15 (34.95)	693.08 (46.08)	765.80 (48.87)	488.77 (36.80)	
3	Total Man-days utilized in non-agricultural activities	429.44 (37.14)	416.01 (34.49)	399.76 (29.65)	387.54 (25.76)	391.66 (24.99)	407.45 (30.68)	
4	Total Man-days utilized in necessary activities	235.86 (20.40)	273.92 (22.71)	285.16 (21.15)	88.50 (19.18)	292.54 (18.66)	271.99 (20.48)	
5	Grand Total of Man-days utilized	899.63 (77.82)	970.29 (80.45)	1156.07 (85.76)	1369.12 (91.03)	1450.00 (92.53)	1168.31 (87.97)	
6	Number of Unemployed Man-days (Time Criterion)	256.37 (22.18)	235.71 (19.55)	191.93 (14.24)	134.88 (8.97)	117.00 (7.47)	159.69 (12.03)	
7	Per Household total number of annual man-days available for additional work (Willingness Criterion)	289.19 (25.01)	264.08 (21.89)	173.87 (12.89)	79.41 (5.27)	58.27 (3.71)	189.12 (14.24)	
<b>8 Type of Work Required by households (%)</b>								
	A	Wage work	53.42	22.49	-	-	-	18.42
	B	Service / Govt. Jobs	46.58	77.51	100.00	100.00	100.00	81.58
9		Number of Voluntary Unemployed (6-7)	-	-	18.06 (1.33)	55.47 (3.68)	58.73 (3.74)	22.12 (2.21)
10		Willingness for Over-Employment (6±7)	32.82 (2.83)	28.37 (2.35)	-	-	-	29.43 (2.21)
11		Unemployed (income or poverty criterion)	160.42 (49.76)	137.25 (45.03)	73.28 (24.18)	15.62 (5.27)	-	386.57 (26.00)

Note: Figures in parentheses denote percentages to column total.

Among all the holdings together the percentage of man-days utilized in all these activities came out 87.97 percent. Hence, the percentage of unemployed man-days to the full employment norm, i.e. 8 hours in a day, 25 days in a month or 300 days in a year according to time criterion, has been worked out 22.18, 19.55, 14.24, 8.97 and 7.47 percent on the marginal, small, semi-medium; medium and large size of holdings respectively. Thus, the percentage of unemployed man-days to

the total available man-days shows an inverse relationship between unemployment and the size of holding. Among all the holdings together the percentage of unemployed man-days according to 'time criterion' came out 12.03 percent.

*Willingness Criterion*

A person may be called unemployed or underemployed according to 'willingness criterion', if he is willing to do more work than he is doing at present, he may either be actively searching for more work or be available for more work, if it is offered on terms to which he is accustomed.<sup>4</sup> Table 3 clearly indicates that the percentage of man-days available/willing for additional work to the total available man-days, has been worked out 25.01, 21.89, 12.89, 5.27 and 3.71 percent on the marginal, small, semi-medium, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together the percentage of man-days willing for additional work to the total available man-days came out 14.24 percent. Thus, the percentage of man-days willing for additional work also shows a decreasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. The percentage of available man-days willing for wage work (casual and/ or seasonal wage work) to the total man-days willing for additional work has been worked out 53.42, 22.49 and 18.42 percent on the marginal, small and on all the holdings together respectively. The percentage of man-days willing for services (i.e. white collar jobs) to the total available man-days has been worked out 46.58, 77.51, 100.00, 100.00 and 100.00 percent on the marginal, small, semi-medium, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together the percentage of man-days willing for services to the total available man-days came out 81.58 percent. Thus, it is clear from the table that the percentage of man-days willing for wage work shows a decreasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings, whereas, the percentage of man-days willing for services shows an increasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. It happened mainly on account of the higher illiteracy and dependency percentage, uneconomic size of holdings and meagre sources of household income on the marginal and small size of holdings, where all the family workers are not necessarily required on their own farm throughout the year and even during the peak agricultural seasons as compared to the larger size of holdings where the family workers are gainfully employed on their own farms. The percentage of man-days willing for services, is the highest on the larger holdings, mainly due to higher literacy percentage as compared to smaller size of holdings. Due to higher literacy percentage and regular sources of income the household falling on the larger size of holdings are interested only to get white collar jobs and consider wage work below status. As a result of it, the percentage of voluntarily unemployed man-days has been worked out 1.33, 3.68 and 3.74 percent on the semi-medium,

medium and large size of holdings respectively. On the other hand, contrary to it, the percentage of man-days willing for over employment come out 2.83 and 2.35 percent on the marginal and small size of holdings respectively. The workers falling on the smaller size of holdings 'are willing to work for longer hours mainly due to the higher dependency ratio, meagre household income and higher burden of debt repayment. Among all the holdings together the percentage of man-days willing for over employment came out 2.21 percent. This clearly confirms the fact that smallest suffer the most and the least smaller suffer the least from involuntary unemployment according to 'willingness criterion'.

#### *Income Criterion*

The workers are inadequately employed not because they devote less time to work but because their earnings from the existing work are not sufficient to meet our basic needs of their family members. This point of view is strongly stated by Dandekar and Rath in their study 'Poverty in India'. They stated that, an inadequate level of employment be defined in terms of its capacity to provide minimum living to the population.<sup>5</sup> In the context of employment, under-nutrition is of crucial importance as it affects the ability to work and the efficiency of work. According to Raj Krishana, a person may be called unemployed and/ or underemployed if, he earns an income per year/month less than some desirable minimum.<sup>6</sup> The number of underemployed workers earning less than the minimum desirable monthly income, has been presented in Table 3. In the present study the minimum desirable level of per month income in order to meet out the minimum food and non-food requirements of a person at 2003-04 local prices has been worked out Rs.360.88. The percentage of underemployed workers, who are earning less than the minimum desirable income, is the highest on the marginal size of holdings (i.e. 49.76%) as compared to small size of holdings (i.e. 45.03%) semi-medium (i.e. 24.18%) and medium (i.e. 5.27%). Among all the holdings together the percentage of underemployed workers according to 'income criterion' came out 26 percent. Thus, the percentage of underemployment is highest on the smaller holding groups mainly due to their uneconomic size of holdings, higher dependency and low literacy ratio, higher burden of debt repayments etc. whereas, the percentage of unemployment among the households falling on the semi-medium and medium holding groups is quite low and no longer household suffers from underemployment mainly due to their higher literacy percentage, low dependency ratio, sound and regular sources of household income as well as the availability of gainful employment on their own farms.

## **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS**

Almost in all the plan documents of India, emphasis has been placed on the common man, weaker sections and less privileged of the society and the main objectives of all the Five Year Plans of India included increase in national income, expansion of employment opportunities, reduction in income inequalities and removal of unemployment and poverty. But in spite of these efforts growth of massive unemployment has posed a serious threat to development. Economic development reduces poverty: unemployment and inequality. Employment is one of the, important indicators of economic development because it generates income and raises the standard of living and reduces inequality. So, if we want to know about the economic development of any country, we must be familiar with the extent and degree of employment/unemployment of that country. The study of the problem of unemployment is complex and full of difficulties. Therefore, intensive study of the problem on regional state level will be helpful in order to know the magnitude of unemployment of that particular region as well as to find out the solution to the problem with reference to local condition of the area under study. It can be concluded from the present empirical study that among all the households together as well as by size class of holding in the study area there exist a lot of variations in the literacy percentage, distribution of household assets, income and consumption expenditure which resulted wide variations in the extent of unemployment. The better off households are engaged in gainful activities on their own farms whereas, the worst-off household are suffering from involuntary unemployment and underemployment, the extent of which is very high on the marginal size of holdings and shows a decreasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. Thus, the empirical investigation on the pattern of rural employment and unemployment has established the facts that uneconomic size of holdings, lack of regular and seasonal gainful employment opportunities, higher dependency and low literacy percentage, lack of irrigation facilities, uncertainty of rains and higher accounts of debt repayment lack of small scale and cottage industries, .skills and infrastructural facilities)'population growth, rural urban migration, defective employment policy, labour unrest, imbalance in demand and supply are the main causes of unemployment in the study area. Hence, in order to reduce the extent of unemployment and for creating more employment avenues in the study area the emphasis should be placed on the minor irrigation, soil and water conservation, co-operation and rural roads in the infrastructural sector, drinking water supply general education and health in the social services sector, horticulture, animal husbandry, dairy development, forestry and land

reforms in the agricultural sector and small as well as cottage industries by using the local skill and raw materials in the industrial sector.

#### REFERENCES

R.N. Rosenstien Rodan, "Disguised Unemployment and Underemployment", Monthly Bulletin of Agricultural Economics & Statistics, Rome, July-August, 1957, pp.1-7.

S.c. Mathur, "Agricultural Employment and Industrialisation" edited by B.N. Ghosh in, Economics of Underdevelopment, ICPS, New Delhi, 1977.

Raj Krishna, "Unemployment in India", Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. XXVIII, No.1, Bombay, Jan.-March, 1973, p.1.

4. Ibid., p.1.

V.M. Dandekar, "Transforming Traditional Agriculture - A Critique of Professor Schultz", Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. I, No.1, Bombay, Aug. 20, 1966, pp.25-36;

For details see Dandekar M. and Nilkantna Rath, ( Poverty in India, Statistical Publishing Society, Bombay, 1971; ~ Kanta Ahuja, Idle Labour in Village India, Manohar Publication, New Delhi, 1978; Raj Krishna, "Unemployment in India", Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. XXVIII, No.1973; A.K. Sen, "Employment Technology and Development", Oxford University Press, 1975.