



ISSN: 0975-833X

RESEARCH ARTICLE

LABOUR AND OCCUPATIONAL TRANSFORMATION IN UTTAR PRADESH

Lakkineni Mallaiah and *Malti Singh

Department of Economics, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University (A Central University) Lucknow,
U. P., India

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 02nd October, 2014
Received in revised form
29th November, 2014
Accepted 15th December, 2014
Published online 23rd January, 2015

Key words:

Agriculture,
Prestige,
Land holdings,
Possession,
Rural transformation.

ABSTRACT

Agriculture sector is the mainstay of livelihood for rural people of India. It provides not only employment opportunity to the rural people but also manages food facility to the people. It is contributing nearly 12.02 percent in GDP to the nation income. Agricultural development is an integral part for the socio-economic development of the country. Land is a crucial denominator for estimation of the economic status of the people. The possession of land is a tantamount of power, prestige and prosperity in the Indian society but it's distribution among the social categories is typically based on hierarchy system. This paper will study 'Labour and Occupational Transformation in Uttar Pradesh'. Hence, the present study is based on secondary data. It will analyze labour and occupational transformation and its impact on economic conditions of the rural people of the state. The unequal distribution of agricultural land in the State is intrinsically based on the caste system. As a result, very few people have possessed a large size of land holdings while a bulk of people have small size of land holdings. Unequal distribution of land is responsible for the unemployment situation. Cultivators who have very few land and they are not capable to cultivate it. Hence, they are compelled to sell their agricultural land for their livelihood and became labour. Thus, cultivators and landless labour are not only converting as an agricultural laborer but also shifting from agricultural sector to non- agriculture sector like Manufacturing, Industry sector. Hence, this trend is increasing the insecure employment situation in the State. It finds almost 80 percent of marginal holdings accounted at 39 percent operated land while only 0.12 percent large holding possessed 2.38 percent operated land. Regular employment is decreasing while casual and self employment is increasing. Hence, the transformation of the surplus labour from agriculture sector to other sectors is the good symbol for the socio- economic development of the rural people in Uttar Pradesh.

Copyright © 2015 Lakkineni Mallaiah and Malti Singh. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

Agriculture sector is the mainstay of livelihood for rural people of India. It provides 62 percent employment to workforce in the country. It is contributing nearly 12.02 percent income in 2011-12 to the national income. Agriculture has also been a net earner of valuable foreign exchange. Agricultural development is a pre-requisite for industrial development in Indian economy. Having been a crucial role, Indian agriculture is still facing production, productivity, skewed distribution of landholdings, over pressure on land, lack of employment opportunity, illiteracy, unawareness of new agricultural technology and poverty. After six decades of India's Independence, there is no change in the conditions of agriculture. There are many factors responsible for the backwardness of agriculture. They are General factors, Institutional factors and Technological factors. The constant population pressure on landholdings leads to sub-division of land.

The small and marginal farmers are bound to lose their land and became landless labourers. There are some institutional factors like Land reforms, Tenancy reforms, Consolidation of land holdings, Small and Marginal landholdings in fragmentation form and Primitive tools and techniques, Farming system which are responsible for the backwardness of agriculture in India. Very few people possessed a large size of agricultural land while a bulk of people possessed a small size of land holdings in rural India. Thus, the existing small holdings are one of the evils for the poor agricultural development. After Independence, a series of attempts were made to improve the agrarian structure by abolishing large intermediaries, conferring ownership rights to tenants, minimizing the skewed distribution of land through imposition of Ceilings Act on landholdings and redistribution of surplus land to landless and organizing small and marginal holdings along with Co-operative lines and regulating the wages of agricultural labourers. But the progress is unsatisfactory. The same situation is also visible in the state of Uttar Pradesh. Agriculture plays a prominent role in the economic development of the State. Around 75 percent of it's population

*Corresponding author: Malti Singh

Department of Economics, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University (A Central University) Lucknow, U. P., India.

is depending on agriculture for their livelihood. The State has immense significance in the context of food security of the country. It contributes about one-fifth of the total food grain production of the country (Uttar Pradesh Development Report-2007, GOI). Regional disparities have created a lot of constraints for the agricultural development in the State. The past efforts towards the agricultural sector were very informal. There were no concentrated and integrated efforts to enhance the agricultural production in the State. Land reforms were introduced in the State as a ray of hope of development in the agriculture field. Hence, land reforms were one of the most important efforts to enhance the agricultural productivity in the State. The responsibility of land reforms is owned by the government with a view of benefiting the landless people. Uttar Pradesh got credit of becoming first in enacting land reforms act: Uttar Pradesh Zamindari Abolition Land Reforms (ZALR) Act, 1950. As a result there was hardly any significant change in land distribution pattern. Legislative measures regarding Abolition of Tenancy, Distribution of Surplus and Gram Samaj Land, Consolidation of holdings were taken up. It ensured that in most part of India, tenancy reforms and land ceiling laws, enacted in a diluted form which never be implemented properly" (Bagchi, 1988).

Agricultural land for cultivation in the state remained almost constant during the last decades. Utilisation of land in the State is at a snail's pace. The small size of land holdings and existing land tenancy laws are impeding investment and leading to inefficiencies in agriculture. Irrigation facilities in the State are very far ahead from the development in comparison with the National level. The state is characterised as inefficient and deficient in the irrigation development. The infrastructure like rural roads is not well developed in the State. Road density per lakh population in the State is 142 km., which is very low to compare with the National level of 246 km. Several programmes and policies have been taken to improve the conditions of agricultural sector in Uttar Pradesh. The state government adopted land distribution programme to increase the production and reduce the unemployment, labour and poverty in the state. But, the programmes and policies could not achieve the targets. There are several studies on these issues. Some of the studies are mentioned here.

Venkateshwarlu (2003) in his research paper 'Pattern of Land Distribution and Tenancy in Rural Andhra Pradesh' has analysed the changing pattern of distribution of land ownership, tenancy and ownership holdings and operational holdings. He found that average size of both ownership and operational holdings has been declining continuously. Similarly, the share of marginal farmers has been increasing during the period of 1953-1992 while the share of medium and large farmers have decreased in the State. B. B. Mohanty (2008) in his study 'Landholding and Use Pattern among Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in Maharashtra' has expressed views on changing pattern of land holdings among Scheduled Castes and Schedules Tribes and to assess the impact of land reform measures on landholding structure of the SC/ST communities. Finally, the major findings of his study are that the landholders of SC and ST Communities mostly belong to the small and marginal groups. The number and area of the marginal and small holdings of these communities are in increasing trend

while their contribution in medium and large holdings is declining in the state. It is also concluded that the number of large landholders among the Scheduled Castes is negligible. P. Prasad and Rodgers (1983) have suggested their views on "Class, Caste and Landholdings in the Analysis of the Rural Economy" that this paper has the aim to assess the relative merits of each of the three approaches as class, caste and landholdings. Thus, the multivariate analysis of the research paper finds out the result that (i) landholdings, while relevant, were the weakest of the three variables. Distinct effects could be identified associated with tenancy like ownership, (ii) Caste, although weaker than casual empiricism would suggest that caste had significant effects on the most aspects of behaviour, and dominated female labour force participation. (iii) Class was the most consistent, and in a majority of cases the strongest factor. Both landholdings and caste are shown to have independent effects.

Agrawal (2010) reveals his views on "Need for Recording of Sharecroppers and Distribution of Government Surplus land in Uttar Pradesh" he found that distribution of government Surplus land in the state is lags behind in distribution of surplus land. Chowdhury and Kashimi (1991) in their study on "Change in Landholdings Pattern and Its Impact among the Bhoksa of Nanital", have evaluated the changes in agricultural land holding pattern and its impact on socio-economic and biological aspects of Bhoksa community of Nanital. The study concludes that a majority of Bhoksa community have possessed 48 percent land from 1 to 5 acre for cultivation while only 1.5 percent number of household families have accounted for more than 20 acre of land holdings. It is found that there is a high level of inequality in the distribution of agricultural land in Nanital. Vikas Rawal (2008) has contributed his views on "Ownership Holdings of Land in Rural India: Putting the Record Straight". In this study, he estimates the landlessness and inequality in terms of ownership of land. The major findings of his study is that over 40 percent households in rural India do not have own land. The figure shows that about 40 percent of rural households do not have own land. The distribution of ownership of land holdings in India is extremely unequal. Hence, an attempt is made in this research paper to study 'Labour and Occupational Transformation in Uttar Pradesh' and its impact on the economic conditions of rural people in terms of land, education, literacy, employment and unemployment, poverty, occupational distribution in State. But here it is to study about labour and occupational transformation in Uttar Pradesh and its impact on labour, occupation, employment and poverty. It will also highlight the changes in the labour force participation. This study is confined to only Uttar Pradesh. A very high proportion of people are from lower, backward communities and dalits community. Most of the people are below poverty. The study is macro level study. The study is purely depends upon the secondary data. Some basic statistical tools are applied in the study. NSS reports, journals, research papers, Census reports, and U.P. State Government reports are being used for the study.

Agricultural land is the icon of prosperity, power and prestige in the agrarian societies. It is a tantamount of not only an economic status but also a symbol of social status. Indian society has been based on the caste system. The land

distribution is also associated with the caste system. Since Independence, various measures have been initiated to reduce the inequality in land distribution and make sure land to the tiller. The government has initiated to implement land reforms programmes. The main aim of this programme was to give the ownership of land to the landless or near landless persons. But, land reforms could not achieve its goal in Uttar Pradesh also. There is a skewed distribution of land in the State. As, most of the operational holdings and operated area of the land is governed by the General castes people while less area of land has been handled through the SC/ST since a long time in the State. Table 1 shows the percentage of the distribution of operational holdings and operated area in different categories of all size classes during 1970 to 2006. The marginal operational holdings are showing a continuous increasing trend at 66.8 percent to 77.96 percent from 1970-71 to 2005-06. The status of Small holdings is showing a continuous decreasing except the year 1990-91 in which shows a constant trend. The Semi-medium operational holdings are decreasing from 10.6 percent in 1971 to 6.19 percent in 2006, whereas medium operational holdings are also declining from 4.7 percent to 1.91 percent in the same time. The percentage of large operational holdings are also representing a decline trend at 0.7 to 0.2 from 1970 to 1991 but its status was constant during the period of 1995-2001 after it's percentage fall on at 0.12 from 0.2 in 2006.

The figures are reflecting a very remarkable thing that 66.8 percent marginal operational holdings have only 21.09 percent operated area of land whereas 17.2 percent small operational holdings possessed 20.8 percent of operated area in 1970-71. Similarly, 10.6 percent semi-medium number of operational holdings has possessed 24.99 percent operated area of land and 4.7 percent medium operational holdings possessed 23.22 percent operated. While only 0.7 percent large operational holdings are possessing 9.9 percent of operated land in the year. In 2005-06, 77.96 percent marginal holdings possessed 38.93 percent operated area of land and 13.82 percent small holdings accounted 24.24 percent operated area whereas 6.19 percent semi-medium holdings have 21.19 percent operated area of land. Medium operational holdings 1.91 percent and large operational holdings 0.12 percent accounted 13.26 and 2.38 percent respectively. The percentage of marginal operated area is increasing continuously from 21.09 in 1970-71 to 38.93 percent in 2005-06. Small operated area is showing the increasing trend from 20.8 percent in 1970-71 to 24.4 percent in 1990-91. Accordingly, the percentage of semi-medium operated area, medium and large operated area is decreasing continuously since 1970. The operated area is showing the decreasing status in all size classes. Because large size of operated area is now divided into different sizes of holdings however they are still possessed a high percentage of holdings.

Table 1. Percentage Distribution of Number of Operational Holdings and Operated Area in U. P.

S. No.	Category of land holdings Year	Marginal Holdings		Small Holdings		Semi - Medium Holdings		Medium Holdings		Large Holdings	
		No. of Operational holdings	Operated Area								
1	1970-71	66.8	21.09	17.2	20.8	10.6	24.99	4.7	23.22	0.7	9.9
2	1976-77	69.4	23.9	16.4	21.6	9.6	24.8	4.1	22.3	0.5	7.4
3	1980-81	70.6	25.7	16.3	22.6	9.0	24.6	3.7	21.0	0.4	6.1
4	1985-86	72.6	28.3	15.6	23.3	8.3	24.5	3.2	19.1	0.3	4.8
5	1990-91	73.8	31.4	15.6	24.4	7.7	23.4	2.7	16.9	0.2	3.9
6	1995-96	75.6	34.1	14.5	23.8	7.3	23.1	2.4	15.8	0.2	3.2
7	2000-01	76.9	37.0	14.2	24.3	6.6	21.7	2.1	14.3	0.2	2.7
8	2005-06	77.96	38.93	13.82	24.24	6.19	21.19	1.91	13.26	0.12	2.38

Source: Agricultural Census Reports, Government of Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow.

Note: Marginal Holdings (Below 1.0 Hectare), Small Holdings (1.0-0.2 Hectare), Semi- Medium Holdings (2.0-4.0 Hectare), Medium Holdings (4.0-10.0 Hectare), Large Holdings (Above 10.0 Hectare).

Table 2. Category wise Percentages Distribution of Number of Operational Holdings and Operated Area in U.P. during 1980 to 2006

General Castes															
S.No.	Size classes	Year		1980-81		1985-86		1990-91		1995-96		2000-01		2005-06	
		No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area
1.	Marginal Holdings	100	100	81.72	83.63	80.43	82.01	80.14	82.45	79.66	82.02	79.24	82.57	79.13	81.58
2.	Small Holdings	100	100	86.78	87.21	86.38	87.06	86.01	87.25	86.29	87.05	87.27	87.91	87.41	86.85
3.	Semi-Medium	100	100	88.75	89.65	88.92	89.06	89.58	90.29	90.10	90.52	92.02	92.10	92.89	93.10
4.	Medium Holdings	100	100	95.18	95.36	94.82	94.97	94.90	95.04	94.99	95.27	95.00	95.78	95.05	94.35
5.	Large Holdings	100	100	96.57	96.69	96.18	96.21	96.98	97.31	96.67	96.77	96.59	96.61	93.06	93.12
6.	Total Holdings	100	100	84.07	89.00	83.01	87.21	82.03	86.30	81.53	85.95	80.31	84.07	79.89	83.62

Source: Agricultural Census Reports, Government of Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow.

Table 3. Category wise Percentages Distribution of Number of Operational Holdings and Operated Area in U.P. during 1980 to 2006

Scheduled Castes															
S.No.	Size classes	Year		1980-81		1985-86		1990-91		1995-96		2000-01		2005-06	
		No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area
1.	Marginal Holdings	100	100	17.07	15.30	18.31	16.75	18.71	16.49	19.07	16.54	19.13	16.08	19.22	16.41
2.	Small Holdings	100	100	11.57	11.13	11.90	11.16	12.31	11.09	11.95	11.17	10.58	10.07	11.08	10.70
3.	Semi-Medium	100	100	8.37	7.36	8.76	7.41	6.22	7.35	6.54	7.27	6.31	7.06	6.01	6.52
4.	Medium Holdings	100	100	4.29	4.11	4.55	4.37	4.36	4.18	4.24	3.92	4.26	3.39	4.20	4.87
5.	Large Holdings	100	100	2.94	2.88	3.20	3.27	2.34	2.13	2.59	2.61	3.35	3.34	5.33	5.54
6.	Total Holdings	100	100	14.34	8.98	15.33	9.72	16.38	10.48	16.79	10.76	17.01	10.78	17.62	12.43

Source: Agricultural Census Reports, Government of Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow.

Table 2 represents about the percentage distribution of number of operational holdings and operated area of General Castes in U.P among all size classes during the period of 1980-81 to 2005-06. Marginal operational holdings are declining continuously from 81.72 percent in 1981 to 79.13 percent in 2006. Small operational holdings, Semi-medium and Medium operational holding are continuously increasing over the period. But in case of large operational holdings, except 1990-91, it is continuously declining from 96.69 percent to 93.06 percent. In Total holdings, all size classes' of operational holdings are also showing a declining trend from 84.07 percent to 79.89 percent in the State. The table examines the status of possession of land by General category. Operated area of Marginal holdings, Small holdings and Semi-medium holdings are showing a fluctuating trend in the period. After 1991, it is showing a marginal increasing from 95.04 in 1991 to 95.78 percent in 2001 but after it, it is declining by 1.45 percent in 2006. In case of large holdings' operated area of land, the figures shows that except the year 1991, its operated area is continuously decreasing from 96.57 percent in 1981 to 93.12 percent in 2006. Operated area of total holdings is also showing a continuous declining trend from 89 percent in 1981 to 83.62 percent in 2006. Thus, the table shows all size classes are showing a marginal declining trend in number of operational holdings as well as in operated area in the State. However, the general category people have still possessed a higher percentage of land in Uttar Pradesh.

Table 3 explains the percentage of distribution of number of operational holdings and operated area among Scheduled Castes of U.P in all size classes since 1981 to 2006. As number of marginal holdings of Scheduled Castes are increasing continuously since 1980 to 2006 from 17.07 to 19.22 percent but their operated area showing the marginal fluctuate trend over all the period. The Marginal holdings operated area of land in SC community is moving around the figure of 16 percent over the time period. The percentage of small operational holdings of SC community is increasing slightly at 11.57 to 12.31 from 1981 to 1991 but the share of it's percentage is decreasing continuously. The percentage of operated area of small holdings is showing a fluctuating trend over the period among SCs community.

but its percentage increased at 1.48 percent in 2006. The percentage of large operational holdings is also showing fluctuations trend from 1981 to 1996 but after, its percentage increased at 1.98 percent in 2006. The number of SC operational holdings is increasing continuously from 14.34 in 1981 to 117.62 percent in 2006 whereas the operated area of SC community is also increasing.

The percentage of distribution of number of operational holdings and operated area among Scheduled Tribes is analysed in Table 4. The percentage of operational holdings of ST in marginal holdings is fluctuating from 1981 to 1996 after it is increasing continuously at 0.02 percent in 2006, but the area is fluctuating trend over the period. Small operational holdings of ST Community have been showing a fluctuating trend except 2001 year. The operated area is also showing a fluctuating from 1981 to 1996 but after it its share has increased marginally at 0.3 percent in 2006. Semi-medium operational holdings is showing an ups and down trend in the state excluding 2001 year whereas medium operational holdings is increasing continuously from 0.53 percent in 1981 to 0.84 percent in 2001 but it's percentage slightly decrease at 0.09 percent in 2006. The percentage of number of operational holdings is also increasing continuously from 0.49 percent in 1981 to 1.61 percent in 2006.

The percentage of semi-medium operated area is decreasing from 3.53 percent in 1986 to 0.84 percent in 2001 but its percentage increased at 0.37 percent in 2006. In medium holdings, the percentage of operated area is increasing from 0.53 percent in 1981 to 0.83 percent in 2001 however it's percentage slightly decreased at 0.05 percent in 2006. The large holdings operated area of ST is also increasing from 0.43 percent in 1981 to 0.62 percent in 1996. The percentage of operational holdings is fluctuating during 1981 -2006 whereas large holdings operated area is increasing continuously from 2.02 percent to 5.17 percent in 2001. The percentage of number of operational holdings and operated area among male and female in all social groups of Uttar Pradesh is analysed in Table 5. It is observed that the percentage of male group in marginal operational holdings was showing mixed results.

Table 4. Category wise Percentages Distribution of Number of Operational Holdings and Operated Area in U.P. during 1980 to 2006

S.No.	Size classes	Scheduled Tribes													
		Year		1980-81		1985-86		1990-91		1995-96		2000-01		2005-06	
		No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area	No.	Area
1.	Marginal Holdings	100	100	1.21	1.07	1.26	1.24	1.15	1.06	1.27	1.44	1.63	1.35	1.65	2.01
2.	Small Holdings	100	100	1.65	1.66	1.72	1.78	1.68	1.66	1.76	1.78	2.15	2.02	1.51	2.45
3.	Semi-Medium	100	100	2.88	2.99	2.32	3.53	4.20	2.36	3.36	2.21	0.83	0.84	1.10	1.21
4.	Medium Holdings	100	100	0.53	0.53	0.63	0.66	0.74	0.78	0.77	0.81	0.84	0.83	0.75	0.78
5.	Large Holdings	100	100	0.49	0.43	0.62	0.52	0.68	0.56	0.74	0.62	0.06	0.05	1.61	1.34
6.	Total Holdings	100	100	1.59	2.02	1.66	3.07	1.59	3.22	1.68	3.29	2.68	5.17	2.49	3.93

Source: Agricultural Census Reports, Government of Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow

The percentage of semi-medium operational holdings is fluctuating over the time period whereas its percentage in operated area shows declining from 7.41 in 1986 to 6.52 in 2006. In case of medium holdings, the number of operational holdings is also showing a fluctuating trend. The medium holdings operated area figures reveals the percentage of operated area is decreasing at the rate of 4.37 to 3.39 percent

The marginal operational holdings of male are declining and female share is increasing. Small and Medium operational holdings are showing fluctuations for both male and female groups. In case of Semi-medium, and Large operational holdings male percentage is decreasing while female percentage is increasing marginally.

Table 5. Percentage Distribution of Number of Operational holdings and Operated Area Between Male and Female in U.P.

(Social Group: General Castes)								
S. No.	Size Class	Male/ Female	No. of Operational	Operated	No. of	Operated	No. of Operational	Operated Area
			hold.	Area	Operational hold.	Area	hold.	
			1995-96	1995-96	2000-01	2000-01	2005-06	2005-06
1	Marginal Holdings	Male	94.39	94.68	93.75	94.24	93.14	93.57
		Female	5.61	5.32	6.25	5.76	6.86	6.43
		Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
2	Small Holdings	Male	95.44	95.53	94.89	94.89	95.00	95.09
		Female	4.56	4.47	5.11	5.11	5.00	4.91
		Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
3	Semi- Medium Holdings	Male	96.26	96.31	96.18	96.24	95.71	95.71
		Female	3.74	3.69	3.92	3.76	4.29	4.29
		Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
4	Medium Holdings	Male	96.92	96.99	96.97	97.05	96.80	96.88
		Female	3.08	3.01	3.03	2.95	3.20	3.12
		Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
5	Large Holdings	Male	97.86	97.89	97.72	97.59	97.69	97.54
		Female	2.14	2.11	2.28	2.41	2.31	2.46
		Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
6	All Classes	Male	94.75	95.73	94.15	95.32	93.63	94.92
		Female	5.25	4.27	5.85	4.68	6.37	5.08
		Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Source: Agricultural Census Reports, Government of Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow

Table 6. Percentage Distribution of Number of Operational holdings and Operated Area between Male and Female in U.P.

(Social Group: Scheduled Castes)								
S. No.	Size Class	Male/ Female	No. of	Operated	No. of Operational	Operated	No. of Operational	Operated
			Operational hold.	Area	hold.	Area	hold.	Area
			1995-96	1995-96	2000-01	2000-01	2005-06	2005-06
1	Marginal Holdings	Male	94.38	94.30	93.80	93.62	93.51	93.49
		Female	5.62	5.70	6.20	6.38	6.49	6.51
		Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
2	Small Holdings	Male	95.71	95.76	95.48	95.48	95.29	95.27
		Female	4.29	4.24	4.52	4.52	4.71	4.73
		Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
3	Semi- Medium Holdings	Male	96.49	96.44	96.19	96.17	96.09	96.14
		Female	3.51	3.56	3.81	3.83	3.91	3.86
		Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
4	Medium Holdings	Male	97.53	97.59	97.47	97.55	97.04	97.08
		Female	2.47	2.41	2.53	2.45	2.96	2.92
		Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
5	Large Holdings	Male	97.26	97.77	98.61	98.73	98.07	97.87
		Female	2.74	2.23	1.39	1.27	1.93	2.13
		Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
6	All Classes	Male	94.60	95.23	94.05	94.70	93.74	94.41
		Female	5.40	4.77	5.95	5.30	6.26	5.59
		Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Source: Agricultural Census Reports, Government of Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow

Table 7. Percentage Distribution of Number of Operational Holdings and Operated Area between Male and Female in U.P.

(Social Group: Scheduled Tribes)								
S. No.	Size Class	Male/ Female	No. of Operational	Operated	No. of	Operated	No. of Operational	Operated
			hold.	Area	Operational hold.	Area	hold.	Area
			1995-96	1995-96	2000-01	2000-01	2005-06	2005-06
1	Marginal Holdings	Male	95.34	95.57	97.01	97.07	94.68	94.39
		Female	4.66	4.43	2.99	2.93	5.32	5.61
		Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
2	Small Holdings	Male	96.13	96.28	97.19	97.39	95.56	95.61
		Female	3.87	3.72	2.81	2.61	4.44	4.39
		Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
3	Semi- Medium Holdings	Male	97.19	97.26	98.56	98.49	96.09	95.90
		Female	2.81	2.74	1.44	1.51	3.91	4.10
		Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
4	Medium Holdings	Male	98.13	98.22	97.70	97.80	97.20	97.20
		Female	1.87	1.78	2.30	2.20	2.80	2.80
		Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
5	Large Holdings	Male	98.29	98.54	97.80	97.33	98.35	98.43
		Female	1.71	1.46	2.20	2.67	1.65	1.57
		Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
6	All Classes	Male	96.09	97.39	97.27	97.58	95.18	96.03
		Female	3.91	2.61	2.73	2.42	4.82	3.97
		Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Source: Agricultural Census Reports, Government of Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow

The operated area for male group in marginal holdings is declining whereas female are better. The marginal operated area of female group increased marginally in 2006. The Small and medium operated area for male and female groups are showing fluctuations. The semi-medium and large operated area of male is declining while female is increasing at the same rate. All size classes represent that operational holdings as well as operated area of male group has decreased and female percentage has increased. Thus, the figures disclose the view that female share is increasing slightly. They are still discriminated because the male percentage in possession of land is still high.

Table 6 analyses the percentage of number of operational holdings and operated area to male and female groups of Scheduled Castes in Uttar Pradesh. The marginal operational holdings of male are decreasing from 94.38 percent in 1996 to 93.51 percent in 2006. The percentage of operational marginal holdings of female group is increasing from 5.62 percent to 6.49 percent in the same period. In case of small, semi-medium and medium operational holdings, the percentage of male group is declining while female group is increasing. The percentage of large operational holdings for male and female groups is fluctuating. The female percentage is very low in medium as well as large operational holdings whereas the percentage of male is around 97 to 99 percent. The operated area of male of marginal, small, semi-medium and medium is decreasing while female group is enhancing the possession of land. The large operated area of male and female is showing a fluctuating. The percentage of operational holdings and operated area of male group is higher than the female group. The SC male is also over ruling upon the female group. SC female group is also discriminated by the SC male group in the State.

The percentage distribution of number of operational holdings and operated area among male and female in Scheduled Tribes community of U.P. is represented by Table 7. The percentage of male and female group in marginal, small and semi- medium operational holding has been fluctuating. But, the percentage of male medium operational holding is decreasing from 98.13 in 1996 to 97.20 percent in 2006 whereas medium operational holdings of ST female group is rising up marginally from 1.87 percent to 2.80 percent. The percentage of operated area of male and female of marginal, small and semi-medium and large holdings has been showing a fluctuating over the time. On the contrary, medium operated area shows that there has come a minor change in the possession of land in ST female from 1.78 percent in 1996 to 2.80 percent in 2006. Now, females are taking interest in the possession of land holdings but their percentage is not sufficient as their presence in the society and their contribution in all holdings moves around 1 to 6 percent while male group is possessing land around 95 to 99 percent in the society.

The majority of the people of the state are living below poverty line. The Planning Commission Government of India set up an expert group under the chairmanship of Prof. Suresh Tendulkar to examine the new poverty line and estimates. The expert group has suggested new methodology to estimate rural and urban poverty line. The percentage of poverty in Rural and Urban area of U.P. is analysed in Table 8. As a combined, the poverty was 57.07 percent in 1974 in which rural area poverty was 56.5 percent while urban area 60 percent in the State. In rural area of the State, the percentage of poverty is declining continuously from 56.5 in 1974 to 41.1 percent in 1988 but after that the rural poverty has been showing a fluctuating trend since 1988. On the other hand, urban area poverty is declining continuously from 60 percent in 1974 to 31.7 percent in 2010.

Table 8. Percentage of Poverty in Uttar Pradesh

S.No.	Year	Rural	Urban	Combined
		% of persons	% of persons	% of persons
1.	1973-74	56.53	60.09	57.07
2.	1977-78	47.60	56.23	49.05
3.	1983-84	46.45	49.82	47.07
4.	1987-88	41.10	42.96	41.46
5.	1993-94	42.28	35.39	40.85
6.	1999-00	31.22	30.89	31.15
7.	2004-05	42.70	34.1	38.40
8.	2009-10	39.4	31.70	35.55

Source: 10th, 11th & 12th Five Year Document Plan Vol-1 (Part-1), State Planning Commission, Government of U. P.

Table 9. Comparative Educational Status of Uttar Pradesh and All India

S.No	Year	Uttar Pradesh			All India		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1.	1971	31.5	10.55	21.7	39.5	18.7	29.5
2.	1981	38.76	14.04	27.2	56.5	29.9	43.7
3.	1991	55.73	25.31	41.6	64.1	39.3	52.2
4.	2001	68.80	42.20	56.3	75.3	53.7	64.4
5.	2011	79.24	59.26	69.72	82.14	65.46	74.4

Source: 11th Five Year Plan Document, Vol.1 (Part-II), State Planning Commission, Govt. of Uttar Pradesh.

Table 10. Rate of Unemployment in U.P.

(Current daily status)

S.No.	Year	% of Unemployment (Age 15-59)
1.	1972-73	3.75
2.	1977-78	4.33
3.	1983-84	4.71
4.	1987-88	3.73
5.	1993-94	3.46
6.	1999-00	4.48
7.	2004-05	4.61
8.	2009-10	5.35

Source: 10th, 11th & 12th Five Year Plan Document, (Vol-1) (part-1), State Planning Commission, Government of U.P.

The combined percentage of poverty is decreasing continuously from 57 percent in 1974 to 35.55 percent in 2010. But still nearly 36 percent of people are living below poverty line in the state.

Table 9 analyses the comparative study of educational status in U.P. and all India level since 1971. As per Census 2011, male education status is 79.24 percent whereas female percentage is 59.3 at U.P. level. On the other hand all India level, male education status is 82.14 percent and female 65.46 percent. After five decades, the education status between male and female have improved not only at State level but also at all India level. The condition of unemployment is a major constraint for the economic and social development of the State. Table 10 estimates about rate of unemployment in Uttar Pradesh on the CDS basis at the age group of 15-59 yrs. As the unemployment rate was 3.75 percent in 1973 and 4.33 percent in 1977 and 4.71 percent in 1983 in the State. The unemployment rate decreased at 0.98 percent in 1988 and 0.27 percent in 1994. This trend shows that persons are getting employment in the state. But after 2000 year, unemployment rate shows a continuous increasing trend from 4.48 percent in 2000 to 5.35 percent in 2010 in the State. Self employment covers a large spectrum of economic activities with high income professional services such as doctors, lawyers, consultants, architects, engineers etc. at one end while at the other end of the spectrum there are self employment activities involving much lower levels of skills and incomes, e.g. certain types of Khadi and Handloom activity, village and tiny industries and traditional services such as barbers, artisans, craftsmen, small retail outlets etc.

4.70 percent after this year self employment rate again decreased at 8 percent. On the contrary, regular salaried employment has fluctuated around 10 percent for the economy since 1994. However, there is a sharp increase of casual employment over time. This reflects the displacement of marginal cultivator's converting into agricultural labourer. As a result casual labour increased from 10.71 percent in 1973 to 24 percent in 2010 excluding 2005 year.

Table 12 represents the occupational distribution of total workers sector-wise in U.P. Total number of workers increased from 323.97 lakh in 1981 to 519.28 lakh in 2001. This reflects that number of workers in employment sector is increasing. The decadal growth rate of total workers rose up from 89.64 lakh to 105.67 lakh in 2001. The growth rate of total workers increased at 16.03 lakh. The Number of cultivators and agricultural labourers are increasing. The cultivator workers growth has increased from 30.73 lakh to 56.29 lakh while agricultural labourers growth rate are declining from 26.56 lakh to 20.02 lakh in the State. The figures reflect that agricultural labourers are shifting to manufacturing or service sector. The Number of workers in manufacturing sector including household industry is increasing from 29.22 lakh in 1981 to 40.24 lakh in 2001. In case of Trade/Commerce, the growth rate of workers has come down from 10.82 lakh in 1981-91 to 6.52 lakh in 1991-2001. Thus, the number of workers in other service sector has shown an increase trend from 26.79 to 51.82 lakh.

Table 13 represents the numbers of workers in different sectors of U.P. during the period 1970 to 2011. In organized sector, the wages and income are higher.

Table 11. Percentage Distributions of Workers in U.P.

S. No.	Category	1972-73	1987-88	1993-94	1999-2000	2004-05	2009-10
1.	Self Employed	76.78	71.95	71.69	69.41	74.11	66.28
2.	Regular Employed	12.51	9.27	8.68	10.56	9.02	9.72
3.	Causal Employed	10.71	18.78	19.63	20.03	16.87	24.00
4.	Total Employed	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Source: 10th, 11th & 12th Five Year Plan Document, Vol-1 (Part-1), State Planning Commission, Government of U.P.

Table 12. Distribution of Total Workers in Uttar Pradesh

S.No	Sectors	Workers (in lakh)			Decadal Growth	
		1981	1991	2001	1981-91	1991-2001
	Total Workers	323.97	413.61	519.28	89.64	105.67
1	Cultivators	189.58	220.31	276.60	30.73	56.29
2	Agricultural Labourers	51.77	78.33	98.35	26.56	20.02
3	Plantation/Forestry/Fisheries/ Live-Stock and Hunting.	1.77	2.96	3.71	1.19	0.75
4	Mining/Quarrying	0.20	0.35	0.47	0.15	0.12
5	Manufacturing including House hold Industry	29.22	32.06	40.24	2.84	8.18
6	Construction	3.30	5.10	6.41	1.80	1.31
7	Trade/ Commerce	14.69	25.51	32.03	10.82	6.52
8	Transport Storage/ Communication	6.50	7.71	9.68	1.06	1.97
9	Other Services	26.79	41.28	51.82	14.49	10.54

Source: 10th Five Year Plan Document, Vol-1 (Part-1), State Planning Commission, Government of Uttar Pradesh.

Changes in the composition of employment between self employment, regular salaried employment and casual employment are shown in Table 11 during the period of 1972-2010. The table analyses the different categories of employment in the State. The self employment has accounted a high percentage than the regular and casual employment. The percentage of self employed is declining from 76.78 in 1973 to 69.41 percent in 2000. But in 2005, its percentage increased at

The total employment in the organized sector was 18.47 lakh including public and private sector, in which public sector participation was 13.79 lakh and 4.68 lakh private sector. The figures reflect that earlier public sector was more popularize than the private sector. The number of workers in public sector is increasing continuously from 13.79 lakh in 1970 to 21.60 lakh in 1995 but it's trend changed after 1995.

Table 13. Numbers of Workers Different Sectors in U.P.

(Organized Sector)

Year	Number of Workers		
	Public Sector	Private Sector	Total
1970	13.79	4.68	18.47
1975	15.29	5.62	20.91
1980	17.38	5.53	22.91
1985	20.25	5.47	25.72
1990	21.13	5.43	26.56
1995	21.60	5.36	26.96
2001	17.58	4.66	22.24
2005	16.50	4.38	20.88
2009	16.15	5.06	21.21
2010	16.32	5.21	21.53
2011	16.29	5.62	21.91

Source: 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th & 12th Five Year Plan Document, State Planning Commission, Government of U.P.

Table 14. Percentage of Occupational Distribution of Workers in U.P. during 1971-2011

S.No.	Year	Occupational Distribution of Workers														
		Cultivator Workers			Agricultural workers			Household workers			Other workers			Total workers		
		M	F	P	M	F	P	M	F	P	M	F	P	M	F	P
1	1971	62.42	42.86	59.49	19.74	45.75	21.56	8.24	4.76	8.68	9.60	6.63	10.27	100	100	100
2	1981	55.47	39.37	47.42	13.88	32.50	23.19	7.98	8.38	8.18	22.67	19.75	21.21	100	100	100
3	1991	53.94	48.18	53.27	16.69	35.82	18.94	2.27	3.55	2.41	27.10	12.45	25.38	100	100	100
4	2001	42.97	34.32	43.90	20.13	41.22	19.47	4.39	8.30	6.89	32.51	16.16	29.74	100	100	100
5	2011	31.12	22.20	32.48	27.69	38.43	22.35	4.72	9.68	6.34	36.47	29.69	39.01	100	100	100

Source: 1971, 1981, 1991, 2001, & 2011, Statistical Abstract U.P., Economics and Statistics Division, State Planning Institute, U.P.

Number of workers decreased from 21.6 in 1995 to 16.27 lakh in 2011 in public sector. In case of private sector, no. of workers has been declining from 5.62 lakh in 1975 to 4.38 lakh in 2005 but private sector changed its direction after 2005. As a result, no. of workers has increased marginally from 5.06 to 5.42 lakh. The employment trend in both sector increased from 18.47 lakh in 1970 to 26.96 lakh in 1995. But after 1995, the employment trend in total decreased from 26.96 lakh in 1995 to 20.88 lakh in 2005. After 2005, number of total worker increased from 20.88 to 21.69 lakh in 2011.

The percentage of occupational distribution of workers in Uttar Pradesh has shown by Table 14 during the period of 1971 to 2011. The total workers are divided in to four categories such as Cultivators workers, Agricultural workers, Household workers and other workers. The workers in are also divided into male and female category. As male cultivator workers are declining continuously in 1971 from 62.42 percent to 31.12 percent and female workers are also declining from 42.86 percent in 1971 to 22.2 percent in 2011.

The male agriculture workers have shown a continuous increasing trend from 13.9 percent in 1981 to 27.69 percent in 2011 while female workers have fluctuated. The result reflects that male and female cultivator workers are converted in to agriculture labourers. The percentage of male household workers is increasing from 2.27 percent in 1991 to 4.72 percent in 2011. The female workers, percentage is increasing. As male percentage is rising continuously from 9.6 percent in 1971 to 36.47 percent in 2011 whereas female workers percentage as fluctuating from 1971 to 2001 but in 2011 it's percentage increased at 13.53 in the state. As combined, the percentage of both male and female is increasing continuously from

10.27 percent in 1971 to 39 percent in 2011. There is a change in the occupational distribution in Uttar Pradesh. The cultivators are becoming agricultural workers and agricultural workers are changing into household workers and other workers for the economic activities in the society. As a result, the percentage of household workers and other workers are rising up in the regime of Uttar Pradesh.

Conclusion

Labour and occupation transformation have a great impact on the economic development of the people. Land is the icon of the power in the society. Land distribution is unequal in the State. Marginal & Small land holdings are increasing. The average size of the land is decreasing. Majority of the people are controlling minor share of land and minority of the people controlling majority share of the land in the U.P. But dependent on the land is decreasing in the state. Rural people are migrating from agriculture sector to others sectors. Lower castes people are still involved with a high ratio in the agricultural activities. Hence, there is an immediate need to focus on creation of alternative economic activities for the lower castes people in Uttar Pradesh. Education is an important component of development factor. Education is not only improving the skills of people leading to increase in the level of productivity but also acts as an agent of social change. There is a positive change in the educational level in the state even though technical and vocational education required in the state. But employment opportunities are very less compare to it's growing population. As a result the unemployment is alarming in the state. Regular employment is decreasing while casual and self employment is increasing. Hence, the transformation of the surplus labour from agriculture sector to other sectors is

the good sign for the socio- economic development of the State of Uttar Pradesh.

REFERENCES

- Banchi, A. K. 1988. “*Economy Society and Policy*”, Oxford University, New Delhi.
- Chowdhury, A.K. and Kashimi, M.H.R. 1991. “Change in Landholdings Pattern and Its Impact among the Bhoksa of Nanital”, in Upadhyay (eds.), *Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes in India, A Socio-Economic Profile*”, Anmol Publications, New Delhi.
- Government of India 2007. *Uttar Pradesh Development Report*, Vol-1 and Vol-2, Planning Commission, New Delhi.
- Government of India, Census Reports 2011, <http://censusindia.gov>
- Government of Uttar Pradesh, 1975-76. Agriculture Census, Board of Revenue, U. P.
- Government of Uttar Pradesh, 1980-81. Agriculture Census, Board of Revenue, U. P.
- Government of Uttar Pradesh, 1985-86. Agriculture Census, Board of Revenue, U. P.
- Government of Uttar Pradesh, 1990-91. Agriculture Census, Board of Revenue, U. P.
- Government of Uttar Pradesh, 1995-96. Agriculture Census, Board of Revenue, U. P.
- Government of Uttar Pradesh, 2005-06. Agriculture Census, Board of Revenue, U. P.
- Govt. of Uttar Pradesh, 1985-90. Seventh Five Year Plan, Vol-1(Part-1), State Planning Commission, Government of U.P.
- Govt. of Uttar Pradesh, 1992-97. Eight Five Year Plan, Vol-1(Part-1), State Planning Commission, Government of U.P.
- Govt. of Uttar Pradesh, 1997-02. Ninth Five Year Plan, Vol-1(Part-1), State Planning Commission, Government of U.P.
- Govt. of Uttar Pradesh, 2002-07. Tenth Five Year Plan, Vol-1(Part-1), State Planning Commission, Government of U.P.
- Govt. of Uttar Pradesh, 2007-12. Eleventh Five Year Plan, Vol-1(Part-1), State Planning Commission, Government of U.P.
- Mishra G.P. 1996. “*Distribution of Surplus Land and Rural Poor*”, APH Publishing Corporation, New Delhi.
- Mishra, G.P. and Diwakar, D.M. 2005. “*Land Reforms: An Introduction in Land Reforms and Human Development*”, Manak Publication Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi.
- Mohanty, B.B. 2008. “Landholding and Use Pattern among Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in Maharashtra”, in Deshpande, R.S., Vijay Paul Sharma, R.P.S. Malik, Brijesh Jha, S.A. Ansari (eds.), ‘*Glimpses of Indian Agriculture, (Macro and Micro Aspects)*’, Vol-2, Academic Foundation, New Delhi.
- Nageswara Rao, K. 2008. “Dalits and Agricultural Land holdings in Andhra Pradesh”, in Karunyakara, L., L.C.Mallaiah, K.B. Ratna Kumari (eds.), ‘*Dalits and Human Development (Contemporary Issues and Emerging Patterns)*’, Abhijeet Publications, New Delhi.
- Nair, K.N., and Banerjee, Arindam, 2011. “Structural Changes in Land Distribution and Their Implications for Improving Access to Land”, in Narayana, D., Raman Mahadevan (eds.), ‘*Shaping India (Economic Change in Historical Perspective)*’, Publication; Routledge, India.
- Planning Commission Report 2002, on “*Labour and Employment*”, Published by Academic Foundation.
- Prasad, P.H., Rodgers, G.B. 1983. “*Class, Caste and Landholdings in the Analysis of the Rural Economy*”, in Population and Labour Policies Programme, Working Paper No. 140.
- Rawal, Vikas 2008. “*Ownership Holdings of Land in Rural India: Putting the Record Straight*”, Economic & Political Weekly (EPW).
- Sharma, H. R. 1998. “*Distribution of Landholdings in Rural India: A Comparative Study of Scheduled Castes, Tribes and Non- Scheduled Caste and Tribes*”, Artha Vijnana , Vol. XL, No.1, Journal of the Gokhale Institute on Politics and Economics Pune, India.
- State Planning Commission, 2013-14. Annual Plan Vol. 1 (Part-II), Government of Uttar Pradesh.
- State Planning Institute, Statistical abstract 1971, 1981, 1991, 2001, & 2011. Economics and Statistics Division, Government of Uttar Pradesh.
- Uttar Pradesh 2009. “Information and Public Relation Department Uttar Pradesh”, Lucknow.
- Venkateshwarlu, A. 2003. “*Pattern of Land Distribution and Tenancy in Rural Andhra Pradesh*” Working Paper No. 51, Published in Centre for Economic and Social Studies, Begumpet, Hyderabad.
