

SOCIAL INEQUALITY IN ACCESS TO LABOUR MARKET IN JHARKHAND: EVIDENCE FROM NSS UNIT-LEVEL DATA FROM 1999-2000 TO 2017-18

Bibek Kumar Rajak*

This paper attempts to analyze the structure of the labour market in Jharkhand since its inception as a separate state in a social (caste) perspective. First, it estimates those major labour market variables which primarily determine its structure including labour force participation rate, workforce participation rate, unemployment rates, and employment status among various caste (social) groups. NSS unit-level data of 55th round (1999-2000), 61st round (2004-05), 68th round (2011-12), and PLFS 2017-18 have been used to look at the situation on the eve of the creation of separate state and continuous changes that took place till 2017-18 as a surrogate of access to the labour market. This paper estimates these variables for rural and urban areas separately as well as for the overall state. Unfortunately, it found evidence of severe stress among the workers belonging to socially disadvantaged groups (ST, SC, and OBCs) both in rural and urban areas. The rural labour force among these groups faced enormous stress compared to urban areas. It was found that caste inequality exists in favour of upper caste groups, reflecting the social perceptions. The majority of the workers among socially disadvantaged caste groups are found to be either as self-employed or casual workers (out of compulsion not by conviction); whereas among others (non-SC-ST-OBCs) who form a large percentage as regular full-time workers. While concluding, this paper recommends that the government of Jharkhand should come out with an immediate and transparent action plan to fill up all the sanctioned vacancies (which is quite large in number) in all the government departments with judicious representations from all social groups to reduce the omnipresent gap and must create employment opportunities both as a direct employment provider as well as paly facilitating roles in this regard. It emerges out of the current study that the need to address the questions of social justice and equality in terms of employment is paramount to the concerns afflicting the labour market in Jharkhand.

Keywords: *Inequality, Discrimination, Labour Market, Employment, Social Groups, Development, Neoliberal policies, Tribe.*

“Inequality, being almost non- existent in the state of nature, derives its force and its growth from the development of our faculties and the progress of the human mind.”-J.J Rousseau.

INTRODUCTION

The manmade inequalities in general and social unevenness particularly the caste inequality is penitently pervasive across India and prevalent from the time immemorial. Unfortunately, the inequalities of accessing and seamless participation in the labour market also are not an India-centric phenomenon rather is a global truth (Dev, 2018). Nonetheless, working and living conditions of the labour class during various periods and spaces have been limpidly explained and are well documented by the labour market theorists. These experts, evidently submitted that present forms of globalization or neo-liberal economic policies have made the working class more vulnerable in respect of the in-formalization of work and deprivation of social securities in the garb of labour market reforms during the last couple of decades (Jha P. , 2016). This is amply evident that inequality

*Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Dyal Singh College, University of Delhi and Ph.D. scholar at Centre for Economic Studies and Planning, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.

of all forms (personal, social, religious, and regional) have increased in magnitude and scale in the last few decades at a very astonishingly alarming rate. As aptly remarked by Karl Polanyi, ‘ Free markets, far being a natural force are very much a human invention which must serve the interest of the larger society and humanity, not vice versa’. Hence this neo-liberal market-based system must be used as a vivacious instrument for the welfare of humanity rather than viciously against it. This article aims to analyze the social (caste) inequality that exists in the labour market in the state of Jharkhand.

Jharkhand was created as a separate state after a long and enduring struggle on 15th November 2000 from the erstwhile state of Bihar. The focal agenda of the struggle for the creation of a separate state, especially during the last couple of decades just before separation, was the development of this perennial backward region and its people, which was hampered due to a plethora of complex factors (Prakash, 2001). Existing literature indicates that there was a strong feeling among the native people of the region that this region and its native people are deprived of the huge potential benefit of its large reserve of nature gifted resources due to internal colonialism (Rothermund D. , 1980) (Corbridge, 1987) (Prakash, 2001) (Corbridge, 2002) (Firdos, 2005). The vast majority of the population is still living a sub-standard life and the outsiders (Dikus) are extracting a great share of the benefits from the state. The general socio-economic parameters of people in the state are abysmal vis-a-vis the major states as well as on the national average (NFHS-4, 2017). Conditions of socially deprived sections of the population such as SCs, STs, and OBCs are excruciating in the realm of the labour market inequalities (Sukhdeo Thorat, 1999). Inequality in access to common property resources like land, water, forest, etc. has been a major issue in states like Jharkhand. The structural flaws in this regard are impediments to equitable distributions of such resources across caste groups. This research paper is one of the very few attempts to look at caste inequality in access to the labour market in Jharkhand, one of the major states having a larger share of tribal population.

This article attempts to examine the caste inequalities in access to the labour market since the birth of the state. We analyzed the labour market variables immediately before Jharkhand was created as a separate state using the NSS 55th round (1999-2000) using unit-level data, subsequent NSS rounds (61st round, 2004-05, 68th round 2011-12, and PLFS 2017-18). For extracting the data for the 55th round, 1999-2000 (before separation) we separated the data of 18 districts of south Bihar which were carved out to create a separate state. All the calculations are made for the age group 15 years and above. It was observed while looking at the data of up to 14 years that the LFPR and WPR among this group are significantly low and declined over time due to an increase in enrollment rate in primary and upper primary level classes in the state. The main reason for looking at the data of 1999-2000 is to look at the pre-separation situation and compare it with the post-separation situation and see the continuous performance of the state in this regard till the present time. Labour market variables such as Labour Force Participation Rate (LFPR), Workforce Participation Rate (WPR), Unemployment Rate (UR), and Employment Status (Types of Employment) of workers among various caste (social) groups as classified in NSS has been used as a surrogate of access to the labour market.

This article is divided into three different parts, the first part deals with the labour market structure of the state based on castes or social groups. The second part examines the employment status of workers among different castes or social groups, the third, and the final part provides concluding remarks based on this analysis. We shall analyze these labour market variables for rural and urban areas separately and the overall state as well.

Labour Market Structure in Jharkhand: A Caste Perspective

The structure of the labour market is described by the labour force participation rate (LFPR), workforce participation rate (WPR), unemployment rates, and employment structure. A high population growth rate in past along with the continuous process of social development leads to an increase in the labour force and workforce participation rates. A higher growth rate of output is expected to increase the employment opportunities and subsequently increase the workforce participation rate or in other words, it can be said that the difference between LFPR and WPR decreases, meaning thereby reduce the unemployment rate.

The declining labour force participation rate in India in the last couple of years has become a severe challenge. PLFS 2017-18 shown the lowest LFPR in India as well as various states have attracted the attention of policymakers as well as intellectuals. The sharpest decline in the case of female participation in the labour force and workforce raised several questions when both literacy rates, as well as the education level of females, improved significantly in the last few decades. We shall see below the situation in Jharkhand among various caste (social) groups to analyze it from a caste perspective.

It is strongly evident from table 1 below that LFPR has declined very sharply after 2004-05 in Jharkhand after an initial increase between 1999-2000 and 2004-05. The decline in rural areas is much sharper than urban areas of the state during nearly the last two decades. There is a huge caste (social group) wise variation LFPR and WPR both in rural and urban areas. In rural Jharkhand, except SCs, LFPR among all other social groups increased up to 2004-05. The highest decline in LFPR in rural areas is among STs from 78.1 percent in 2004-05 to 51.8 percent in 2017-18 (26.3 percent) followed by OBCs from 66.4 percent to 43.4 percent (23 percent), Others 59.5 percent to 38.2 percent (21.3 percent), and SCs 65.7 percent to 47.5 percent (18.2 percent) during the same period. In urban areas, the highest declined in labour force participation rate can be seen among OBCs from 50.2 percent in 1999-2000 to 39.5 percent in 2017-18 (10.7 percent) followed by SCs 50.6 percent to 42.9 percent (7.7 percent), Others 43.6 percent to 37.3 percent (6.3 percent), and STs 51.3 percent to 47.3 percent (4 percent) during the same period.

Table 1: LFPR among Various Caste (Social) Groups in Rural and Urban Jharkhand, 1999-2000 to 2017-18

Social Groups	Rural				Urban			
	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18
ST	70.0	78.1	62.2	51.8	51.3	50.7	46.1	47.3
SC	69.4	65.7	56.8	47.5	50.6	50.7	46.5	42.9
OBC	57.3	66.4	57.2	43.4	50.2	48.4	40.5	39.5
Others	51.7	59.5	52.0	38.2	43.6	44.2	42.0	37.3
Total	62.0	68.8	57.9	46.4	47.6	47.3	42.4	40.2

Source: Authors Calculation from NSS Unit Level Data, 1999-2000, 2004-05, 2011-12 and PLFS 2017-18

The decline in LFPR has been explained by few experts is due to increase in enrollment in various education level as well as improvement in family income in rural area due to intervention by the central government through various rural development programs (C. Rangarajan, Seema and Vibeesh E. M., 2014), on the other hand, others opined that such a huge withdrawal of people from

labour force after 2004-05 is also seen as labour market stress due to unavailability of jobs (K. P. Kannan and G. Raveendran, 2012). Such a huge decline in LFPR in Jharkhand and rural areas of the state, in particular, cannot be justified by the first set of arguments as enrollment rates in education level above secondary education have not increased by the same proportions, hence the second set of arguments seems to be valid to some extent. However, Lack of employment opportunity in the rural areas of Jharkhand has caused rural urban migration (Deogharia 2012) causing decline in LFPR in rural Jharkhand.

Table 2 below shows the WPR among various caste (social) groups in rural and urban areas of the state from 1999-2000 to 2017-18. WPR in rural areas has a similar pattern as LFPR shown above. It increased initially between 1999-2000 and 2004-05 then declined sharply and continuously thereafter till 2017-18 among all social groups except SCs where it declined in every round starting 1999-2000. The decline in WPR in rural areas among all castes is higher compared to the decline in LFPR between 2004-05 and 2017-18. The highest decline in rural areas was among STs (27.9 percent) followed by OBCs (25.9 percent), others (21.6 percent), and SCs (21.5 percent) compared to urban areas where the decline was highest among OBCs (10.5 percent), followed by SCs (8.7 percent), other (7.1 percent) and STs (6.4 percent). Such a huge decline in WPR among social groups indicates that work is not available for all those who are in the labour force and wants to work. As discussed earlier the difference between LFPR and WPR is unemployment. The unemployment rate is defined as the percentage of people in the labour force unable to find work.

Table 2. WPR among Various Caste (Social) Groups in Rural and Urban Jharkhand, 1999-2000 to 2017-18

Social Groups	Rural				Urban			
	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18
ST	68.7	77.4	59.9	49.5	46.2	49.8	45.0	43.4
SC	66.8	64.6	56.3	43.1	46.0	46.0	44.8	37.3
OBC	55.1	65.7	56.4	39.8	46.5	45.7	38.7	35.2
Others	49.4	57.5	51.4	35.9	39.8	40.7	38.7	33.6
Total	60.0	67.9	56.7	43.2	43.6	44.2	40.2	36.0

Source: ibid

Employment growth in the last few decades has been low and declining in India since the 1980s has been a matter of concern. Given a high rate of growth of the population in general and higher growth of the working-age population, in particular, makes it important that all those who are attaining the working-age population and willing to work must find work for livelihood. It is important to underline here that the number of working poor in India is significantly large. The economy not only faces the unemployment problem but underemployment is even grave. The highest unemployment rate in recent years (PLFS 2017-18), probably the highest in the last five decades or so, have also become headlines of several newspapers and magazines when the report was made public in May 2019 after the general election. The problem of unemployment and underemployment have been even severe in states like Jharkhand due to which hundreds of thousands of youth migrate to metropolitan cities and industrial/ commercial towns of other states in search of better employment opportunities (Dayal, 2012). In the section below we will analyze the unemployment situation among various caste (social) groups in rural as well as in urban areas of the state.

The unemployment rate in rural areas of Jharkhand initially declined in 2004-05 compared to 1999-2000 but increased thereafter continuously in each of the NSS rounds up to 2017-18. It is obvious from Table 3 below that the unemployment rate increased very sharply (manifold) in 2017-18 compared to 2011-12 and reached an all-time high of 6.9 percent in rural areas and 10.4 percent in urban areas. As per PLFS 2017-18, the highest unemployment rate is among SCs in the rural as well as in urban areas. The unemployment rate among SCs was 9.3 percent and 13.1 percent in rural and urban areas respectively in 2017-18 followed by OBCs (8.3 percent and 10.9 percent), Others (6 percent and 9.9 percent), and STs (4.4 percent and 8.2 percent) during the same period. Unemployment rates in urban areas among all the caste (social) groups were higher than in rural areas. STs in Jharkhand seems to be in a better position as far as unemployment is concerned as unemployment among STs have been lower compared to other castes (social) groups both in rural as well as in urban areas.

Table 3. Unemployment Rates among Various Caste in Rural and Urban Jharkhand, 1999-2000 to 2017-18.

Social Groups	Rural				Urban			
	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18
ST	1.9	0.9	3.7	4.4	9.9	1.8	2.4	8.2
SC	3.7	1.7	0.9	9.3	9.1	9.3	3.7	13.1
OBC	3.8	1.1	1.4	8.3	7.4	5.6	4.4	10.9
Others	4.4	3.4	1.2	6.0	8.7	7.9	7.9	9.9
Total	3.2	1.3	2.1	6.9	8.4	6.6	5.2	10.4

Source: *ibid*

It is evident from the above analysis that there is inherent caste bias in the structure of the labour market and socially under-privileged groups have been more vulnerable to recent changes in the labour market in Jharkhand. Under-privileged groups such as STs, SCs, and OBCs are affected severely compared to others in terms of decline in both LFPR and WPR in rural as well as urban areas. If the decline of LFPR and WPR is considered stress in the labour market then STs are in greater stress compared to other caste groups since the formation of the state. Concerning the unemployment situation, SCs and OBCs in rural as well as urban areas are at disadvantage compared to others and STs.

Employment Status among Caste (Social) Groups in Jharkhand

The employment status of workers is the percentage distribution of workers (employed) as self-employed, regular workers, and casual workers. It shows the types of employment workers are employed in. The employment status employed in India is as follows; a little over half of the workers are self-employed, around 25 percent are casual workers, and 22 percent are regular workers (see the table in Appendix). Amongst the total workers, only 10 percent are in regular full-time employment with social security benefits (called formal employment). However, there is little improvement in formal employment in 2017-18 over 2011-12 and earlier periods due to continuous efforts and encouragement by the Governments at all levels in registering the workers from the unorganized sector under ESI-PF or some of the other forms of social safety net in the last couple of years. There is a real dearth of regular formal work in India, conditions of disadvantaged social groups such as

SCs, STs, and OBCs are even worse as most of them are concentrated in low-productive activities/sectors such as agriculture and construction and low paid jobs such as casual workers (IHD, 2014). The situation with regards to employment status in Jharkhand state is even worse compared all-India level. In Jharkhand (rural plus urban taken together) more than 61 percent of workers are self-employed, only 15 percent are regular workers, and 23 percent are casual workers.

Rural-urban variation in terms of the employment status of workers is also very prominent at an all-India level as well as in Jharkhand state. The share of self-employed as a percentage of total workers in rural Jharkhand is as high as 66 percent (though declined overtime after 2004-05) compared to their share of 38.3 percent in urban areas in 2017-18. Regular employment is available to 10 percent workers in rural areas compared to 39.7 percent in urban areas and casual employment in the rural and urban areas in Jharkhand is 24.1 percent and 21.9 percent respectively during the same period. Given the large share of SC and ST population together as a percentage of the total population in Jharkhand (38.3 percent compared to 25.2 percent in all-India as per Census 2011 data) as compared to their share in all-India level and most of the other major states, it is important to analyze the employment status among the workers from these disadvantaged groups in the state. The share of the tribal population in the total population of Jharkhand is 26.2 percent which is second highest among the major state in India after Chhattisgarh, over 30 percent tribal population.

Given this general condition of the employment status of workers, we shall analyze below the employment status of workers among various caste (social) groups in rural as well as in urban areas in Jharkhand. Tables 4 and 5 below show the caste (social) group-wise employment status of workers in rural and urban Jharkhand respectively. self-employed among ST and SC workers increased continuously in rural areas since the formation of the new state whereas among OBC and Other workers self-employment increased only between 1999-2000 and 2004-05 then declined very sharply till 2017-18. It can also be observed from the table that self-employed among ST workers are 78.6 percent in 2017-18 compared to 67.5 percent in 1999-2000 and are highest among all social groups in rural areas. Self-employed among SC workers increased from 41 percent to 54.5 percent, whereas among OBC workers declined from 62.4 percent to 59.3 percent, and among Other workers too declined from 68.4 percent to 60.2 percent respectively during the same period.

Regular employment in rural areas in Jharkhand has increased significantly among all caste groups in 2017-18 compared to 2011-12 and before when regular employment was abysmally low in the state. However, a definite caste hierarchy can be seen as one moves upwards (starting from STs) towards higher castes in the caste system in the rural areas. Share of regular employment among ST workers in 2017-18 was 6.1 percent compared to 6.7 percent among SCs, 12.3 percent among OBCs, and 25.6 percent among others. It is important to underline that regular employment among STs has been abysmally low (below 3 percent) in rural areas before 2017-18.

Casual employment too shows a caste bias except for the tribal. Casual employment among SC workers is higher compared to OBCs and it is higher among OBCs compared to others in rural areas. Looking at the changes over time, it is clear from the table 4 below that casual employment among ST workers declined from 29.7 percent in 1999-2000 to 15.4 percent in 2017-18. During the same period the decline among SCs from 52.8 percent to 38.7 percent, among OBCs from 29.9 percent to 28.4 percent, and among others 20.2 percent to 14.2 percent respectively. Among other workers, casual employment is lower compared to those belonging to SC, ST, and OBCs. It is more likely that an SC worker will be employed as a casual worker compared to other social groups in Jharkhand. The proportion of SC workers in casual employment is even higher during 2017-18 than what was

the proportion of casual employment among all other social groups on the eve of the creation of Jharkhand as a separate state. However, casual employment among SC workers has declined very sharply during the last two decades from more than 52 percent to the present level, still, it is highest compared to all caste groups. Casual employment among ST workers has declined the highest in percentage term in the last two decades or so and reached the second-lowest casual employment after others in 2017-18.

Table 4. Employment Status among Various Caste (Social) Groups in Rural Jharkhand, 1999-2000 to 2017-18

Social Groups	Self-Employed				Regular Workers				Casual Workers			
	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18
ST	67.5	75.2	75.5	78.6	2.8	2.6	2.5	6.1	29.7	22.2	22.0	15.4
SC	41.0	53.6	51.3	54.5	6.1	3.7	2.3	6.7	52.8	42.7	46.4	38.7
OBC	62.4	72.3	68.1	59.3	7.6	4.9	5.1	12.3	29.9	22.8	26.8	28.4
Others	68.4	73.6	72.2	60.2	11.3	7.7	9.1	25.6	20.2	18.8	18.7	14.2
Total	61.3	71.0	68.3	66.0	6.2	4.3	4.2	10.0	32.5	24.7	27.5	24.1

Source: *ibid*

As mentioned earlier, the employment status of workers is different in urban areas compared to rural areas because both self-employment and casual employment are less and regular employment is high in urban than in rural areas. But when we look at in terms of caste angle, the urban labour market provides evidence of caste inequality especially when we look at in terms of the presence of self-employment, regular, and casual employment among different caste groups. Self-employment among ST and OBC workers declined in the urban areas between 1999-2000 and 2017-18 whereas it increased among SCs and Others (though marginally). It is evident from the table that regular employment among ST workers in urban areas fluctuated very significantly in all the NSS rounds but declined sharply from 49.6 percent in 2011-12 to 37.6 percent in 2017-18 whereas among SC workers it declined continuously till 2011-12 but suddenly increased very sharply to reach more than 50 percent in 2017-18. Among OBCs regular employment increased overall by 5 percentage points between 1999-2000 and 2017-18 but declined by 4 percentage points between the last two rounds whereas among Others it remained almost stable between the first two rounds but declined sharply by 10 percentage points in 2011-12 and again increased to reach 48.5 percent in 2017-18. If we compare changes during the last two NSS rounds when regular employment overall increased by almost two percentage point, caste wise analysis shows that it actually increased only among SCs and Other but declined sharply among STs and OBCs in the urban areas.

Casual employment among STs is 38.7 percent compared to only 11.9 percent among Others but among OBCs and SCs it is around little over one-fifth of their respective workforce in the urban area in 2017-18. Looking at overtime changes since the formation of the state, it is evident that casual employment among STs and OBCs increased significantly between 1999-2000 and 2017-18, it also increased marginally among Others whereas declined significantly among SCs during the last round.

Table 5. Employment Status among Caste (Social) groups in Urban Jharkhand, 1999-2000 to 2017-18

Social Groups	Self-Employed				Regular Workers				Casual Workers			
	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18
ST	34.4	33.5	28.7	23.7	35.5	17.9	49.6	37.6	30.1	48.6	21.8	38.7
SC	27.4	32.6	29.0	28.4	43.7	39.6	30.1	50.7	28.9	27.8	40.8	20.9
OBC	58.1	59.7	51.2	45.5	27.3	26.9	36.2	32.4	14.6	13.3	12.7	22.2
Others	37.7	38.3	48.1	39.6	51.5	51.8	41.3	48.5	10.8	9.8	10.6	11.9
Total	42.4	44.8	44.0	38.3	40.1	36.9	37.8	39.7	17.4	18.3	18.2	21.9

Source: ibid

Caste inequality in the labour market does exist in both rural as well as urban areas in the state of Jharkhand, but it is more prominent in rural areas compared to urban areas. Most of the workers among socially disadvantaged groups in rural areas are in low-productive and low-paid activities such as agriculture & allied activities including (collection of forest produce etc. in the case of Tribes) and construction as self-employed and casual workers. Self-employed among STs and SCs in urban areas are less compared to OBCs and Others signify that in urban areas one has to have some amount of working capital to establish their own business (economic activity) as the presence of agricultural and allied activities is less. The proportion of regular and casual workers among the STs in urban areas is almost equal signifies that those who are educated and skilled are absorbed in regular employment and the rest are in casual employment in sectors like construction and service activities as informal casual workers.

Their presence in regular full-time employment has been very less in rural areas. In the urban areas too their presence in regular employment has been less compared too socially advantaged groups. However, their presence in regular employment improved marginally over time compared to the time when the state was separated.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The above analysis finds clear evidence of caste inequality in access to the labour market in Jharkhand. Unfortunately, this trend of caste inequality exists both in rural as well as in the urban areas of the state, however, with varying magnitude and characteristics. The cascading stress on work opportunities recently felt (in terms of large withdrawal of working-age people from the labour market) by the entire working class, regrettably (even in this pandemic crisis) the impact on various caste groups has been quite different, socially disadvantaged caste groups felt the hardest burden of this stress due to inherent caste biases. In the rural areas, STs and OBCs are affected most severely compared to equally marginalized SCs and others whereas in the urban areas OBCs and SCs are impacted more than others and STs in terms of decline in the LFPR and WPR. On the unemployment situation, SCs and OBCs are worse affected both in rural and urban areas among various caste groups.

Employment status also shows a substantial amount of inequality both in rural and urban areas, with a very insignificant percentage among SC and ST workers in regular employment, OBCs being in the middle in rural areas. Tribal workers facing it severely and most harshly in comparison to all caste groups. One-fourth workers among non-ST-SC-OBCs are regular workers compared to only 6.1 percent among STs in 2017-18 simply implies that 94 percent of tribal workers are either self-employed or casual workers in rural areas. In the urban areas, tribes are marginally better position compared to OBCs and SCs. However, employment status among SCs has improved substantially in the urban areas during the last round whereas STs suffered during the same round, but overall there is some improvement in regular employment among ST, SC, and OBC workers if compared with the year when Jharkhand was created as a separate state.

Based on the above analysis, this research provides the following policy suggestions and cortical imperatives in the form of government interventions. Benevolent and transparent policies, with a clear objective of social justice, to reduce unequal access to the labour market. There are two ways through which the government of Jharkhand can intervene in reducing the caste inequality in the labour market. Firstly, by providing direct employment and secondly, by creating a conducive business environment through which more and more economic activities, especially in the secondary sector, are promoted and subsequently new employment opportunities are generated. For the first objective, a twin-fold strategy may be; one, it should fill-up all the vacant posts within the government with proportionate representation from all caste groups as per constitutionally defined provisions. Moreover, additional employment may also be created especially in the social sectors like education and health and also in public services to improve its level of human development index, there is an urgent need to invest in such areas in Jharkhand. This will provide a large number of full-time regular/ secured jobs to all sections of the society thereby contributing a bit to narrow down the gap. Secondly, it can implement the central-government sponsored employment programs such as MGNREGA more effectively as there has been evidence of under-utilization of capacity/ provisions of these schemes in the past, thereby enabling more employment opportunities. The state government may initiate its employment schemes in addition to the central government schemes for the furtherance of opportunities to reduce the high unemployment rates, especially in the urban areas.

Additionally, the government should focus on attracting new investments both public and private for industrialization, with a special focus on public sector undertakings, for more and sustainable utilization of the huge mineral resources to develop the region as one of the new industrial areas. We also suggest that for equitable development, the government must pay special attention to formulating policies that are inclusive so that benefit of the process of growth and development reaches all sections of the society with special focus on such groups which have been left out from such benefits in the past. Therefore, it is suggested that the question of social justice and equality of opportunity in employment, as envisaged in the constitution of India, need to be addressed with paramount importance not only for social harmony but also to fulfill the core objective of the creation of the state of Jharkhand.

Acknowledgment: *The author is thankful to Prof. Praveen Jha at the Centre for Economic Studies and Planning, Jawaharlal Nehru University for his valuable comments and guidance in revising the draft of this article. This article is based around a small part of the author's Ph.D. thesis which the author is likely to submit soon. The author is also thankful to Dr. Bibhuti Bhusan Mahapatra, Associate Professor in Economics at Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi, and Dr. Jaikishan Associate Professor at Department of Economics, Zakir Husain Delhi College (E), University of Delhi for their comments and suggestions on the draft.*

References

- Arun Kumar Ghosh, R. D. (2012). *The Other Side of Development: The Tribal Story*. New Delhi: Konark Publishers Pvt. Ltd.
- Arup Maharatna and Rasika Chikte. (2004). Demography of Tribal Population in Jharkhand 1951-1991. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 39(46/47), pp. 5053-5062. DOI:
- C. P. Chandrasekhar, and Jayati Ghosh. (2007). Self-Employment as Opportunity or Challenges.
- C. Rangarajan, Seema and Vibeesh E. M. (2014, June 7). Developments in the Workforce between 2009-20 and 2011-12. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 49(23).
- Census. (2011). *Census*. Delhi: Govt. of India.
- Corbridge, S. (1987). Industrialisation, internal colonialism and ethnoregionalism: the Jharkhand, India, 1880-1980. *Journal of Historical Geography* 13, 3, 249-266.
- Corbridge, S. (1988). The Ideology of Tribal Economy and Society: Politics in the Jharkhand, 1950 - 1980. *Modern Asian Studies Vol. 22, No. 1*, 1-42. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/312490>
- Corbridge, S. (2002). The Continuing Struggle for India's Jharkhand: Democracy, Decentralisation and the Politics of Names and Numbers. *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics*, 55-71. doi:10.1080/713999595
- Deogharia PC (2012b). *Seasonal Migration from Rural Areas of Jharkhand*, *Journal of Economic and Social Development*, Vol VII (2), Dec 2012
- Deogharia PC (2012a). Migration from Remote Tribal Villages of Jharkhand : An Evidence from South Chotanagpur, *Jharkhand Journal of Development and Management Studies*, Vol X (3), XISS, Ranchi
- Dev, S. M. (2018). *Inequality, Employment and Public Policy*. Mumbai: Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research.
- Firdos, S. (2005). Forest Degradation, Changing Workforce Structure and Population Redistribution: The Case of Birhors in Jharkhand. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 40(8), pp. 773-778. Retrieved June 25, 2019, from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4416243>
- Hirway, I. (2012, September 15). Missing Labour Force An Explanation. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 47(37), 67-72.
- IHD. (2014). *India Labour and Employment Report 2014: Workers in the Era of Globalization*. New Delhi: Academic Foundation and Institute for Human Development.
- Jha, J. C. (1987). *The Tribal Revolt of Chotanagpur (1831-1832)*. Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Jha, P. (2016). *Labour in Contemporary India*. New Delhi: Oxford.
- K. P. KANNAN and G. RAVEENDRAN. (2011). India's Common People: The Regional Profile. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 46(38), 60-73. Retrieved September 23, 2019, from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23047335>
- K. P. Kannan and G. Raveendran. (2012, February 11). Counting and Profiling the Missing Labour Force. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 47(6), 77-80.
- Kannan, K. P. (1998). Political Economy of Labour and Development in Kerala. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 33(52), L61-L70.
- Kannan, K. P. (2019, August 17). Growth, Employment and Labour through a Budget Lens. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 54(33), 40-43.
- Kannan, K. P. (2020, February 29). A Low Growth, No Employment and No Hope Budget for Aspirational India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 55(9), 27-31.
- Munda, R. D. (2012). Globalisation and the Crisis in Tribal Life. In A. K. Ghosh, & R. D. Munda, *The Other Side of Development: The Tribal Story* (pp. 19-25). New Delhi: Konark Publishers Pvt. Ltd.

- NCEUS. (2007). *Report on Conditions of Work and Promotion of Livelihoods in the Unorganised Sector*. New Delhi: NCEUS.
- NCEUS. (2008). *Report on Definitional and Statistical Issues Relating to Informal Economy*. New Delhi: NCEUS.
- NCEUS. (2009). *The Challenge of Employment in India: An Informal Economy Perspective*. New Delhi: Academic Foundation.
- NFHS-4. (2017). *National Family Health Survey Report 2015-16*. Mumbai: International Institute for Population Sciences.
- NHFS-3. (2007). *National Family Health Survey Report 2005-06*. Mumbai: International Institute for Population Sciences.
- Papola, T. S. (2014). *An Assessment of the Labour Statistics System in India*. New Delhi: ILO.
- Patnaik, P. (2011). Economic Growth and Employment. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 46(26/27), 171-176. Retrieved December 2, 2019, from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23018643>
- Prakash, A. (2001). *Jharkhand: Politics of Development and Identity*. New Delhi: Orient Longman Limited.
- Praveen Jha, S. K. (2001). *Development of Bihar and Jharkhand: Problems and Prospects*. New Delhi: SHIPRA PUBLICATIONS.
- Report, N. C. (1981). *Report on Development of Tribal Areas*. New Delhi: Planning Commission.
- Rothermund, D. (1980). *Urban Growth and Rural Stagnation: Studies in the Economy of an Indian Coalfield and its Rural Hinterland*. New Delhi: Manohar Publication.
- Rothermund, D. W. (1978). *Zamindars, Mines and Peasants Studies in the History of an Indian Coalfield and its Hinterland*. New Delhi: Manohar Publication.
- Sarkar, S. a. (2010). Income Inequality in India: Pre- and Post-Reform Periods. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 45(37), 45-55. Retrieved November 26, 2019, from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25742070>
- Sukhdeo Thorat, N. S. (2006). *Rural Non-Farm Employment of Scheduled Castes _ A Comparative Study*. New Delhi: Indian Institute of Dalit Studies.
- Sukhdeo Thorat, R. D. (1999). Caste and Labour Market Discrimination. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 100-120.
- Survey, J. E. (2016-17). *Jharkhand Economic Survey 2016-17*. Ranchi, Jharkhand: Planning Cum Finance Department, Finance Division, Government of Jharkhand.
- Survey, J. E. (2018-19). *Jharkhand Economic Survey 2018-19*. Ranchi, Jharkhand: Centre for Fiscal Studies, Planning Cum Finance Department, Finance Division, Government of Jharkhand.
- Vikas Rawal, M. S. (2012, January). Income Inequality and Caste in Village India. *ResearchGate*, 108-133. Retrieved October 15, 2019, from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/241758106>
- Vinita Singh, K. N. (2004). Migration of Tribal Women from Jharkhand: The Price of Development. *Indian Anthropologist*, 34(2), 69-78. Retrieved June 25, 2019, from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41919966>

Appendix

Table A1: Demographic Indicators of Jharkhand and India

Indicators	Jharkhand		India	
Years	2001	2011	2001	2011
Demographic				
Total Population (In Million)	26.9	33	1028.7	1210.2
Scheduled Caste Population (%)	11.83	12.08	16.2	16.6
Scheduled Tribe Population (%)	26.3	26.2	8.2	8.6
Density of population/sq km	338	414	325	382
Decadal population growth rate	23.36	22.42	21.54	17.7
Sex ratio (females/1000 males)	941	948	933	943
Birth rate (per thousand)	26.3	22.9*	25.4	20.4*
Death rate (per thousand)	8.8	5.5*	8.4	6.4*
% of population living in Urban Area	22.2	24	27.8	31.2

Source: Sample Registration System, Bulletin, various issues, Office of the Registrar General and Census Commissioner, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, Census Data 2001 & 2011 and RBI Handbook of Statistics on Indian States various issues.

*Figures are of 2016

Table A2: Employment Status of Workers among various caste groups in Jharkhand (R+U), 1999-2000 to 2017-18

Social Groups	Self-Employed				Regular Workers				Casual Workers			
	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18
ST	65.3	73.2	72.5	73.8	5.0	5.5	5.5	8.8	29.7	23.5	22.0	17.4
SC	39.1	50.5	46.5	51.1	11.5	9.0	8.3	12.5	49.4	40.5	45.2	36.4
OBC	61.8	70.9	65.5	56.6	10.4	7.3	10.1	16.2	27.7	21.7	24.4	27.2
Others	57.2	61.6	61.9	50.6	26.0	22.7	22.8	36.4	16.8	15.7	15.3	13.0
Total	58.3	67.6	63.7	61.2	11.6	8.5	10.4	15.1	30.1	23.9	25.9	23.7

Source: Calculated from NSS Unit Level Data. 1999-2000, 2004-05, 2011-12 and PLFS 2017-18

Table A3: Employment Status of Workers among various caste groups in India (R+U), 1999-2000 to 2017-18

Social Groups	Self-Employed				Regular Workers				Casual Workers			
	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18
ST	48.7	53.5	53.3	55.9	7.1	6.9	8.9	13.0	44.3	39.6	37.8	31.1
SC	34.9	39.7	36.6	39.0	10.5	12.5	15.4	19.8	54.6	47.8	48.0	41.2
OBC	56.9	61.5	55.3	55.5	11.6	12.1	15.9	21.5	31.5	26.4	28.8	23.0
Others	60.0	62.8	57.8	55.1	21.9	21.7	26.5	31.1	18.1	15.5	15.8	13.8
Total	52.5	56.7	52.1	52.1	14.3	14.4	17.9	22.9	33.2	28.9	30.0	25.0

Source: Calculated from NSS Unit Level Data. 1999-2000.2004-05.2011-12 and PLFS 2017-18

Table A4: Employment Status of Workers among various caste groups in Rural India, 1999-2000 to 2017-18

Social Groups	Self-Employed				Regular Workers				Casual Workers			
	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18
ST	50.3	55.0	56.0	59.2	4.5	4.4	4.9	9.1	45.2	40.6	39.0	31.8
SC	35.3	41.3	38.3	41.7	6.1	6.7	7.7	11.9	58.6	52.0	53.9	46.4
OBC	59.8	64.6	58.7	61.5	6.3	6.7	8.4	13.1	33.9	28.6	32.9	25.4
Others	68.0	71.0	66.3	65.5	9.8	9.7	12.7	16.9	22.2	19.3	21.0	17.6
Total	55.5	60.0	55.8	57.8	7.0	7.2	8.8	13.1	37.5	32.8	35.4	29.1

Source: Calculated from NSS Unit Level Data. 1999-2000.2004-05.2011-12 and PLFS 2017-18

Table A5: Employment Status of Workers among various caste groups in Urban India, 1999-2000 to 2017-18

Social Groups	Self-Employed				Regular Workers				Casual Workers			
	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18	1999-00	2004-05	2011-12	2017-18
ST	29.9	35.2	26.3	26.4	36.0	38.3	47.9	49.9	34.1	26.6	25.9	23.7
SC	33.0	32.7	30.1	29.3	33.6	40.5	45.4	47.3	33.4	26.8	24.5	23.4
OBC	45.3	49.0	44.7	40.4	33.9	33.8	38.2	42.7	20.8	17.2	17.1	16.9
Others	43.5	47.5	44.8	40.5	47.0	44.5	47.7	51.2	9.5	8.1	7.5	8.3
Total	42.0	45.3	41.9	38.3	40.1	39.7	43.4	47.2	17.9	15.0	14.7	14.6

Source: Calculated from NSS Unit Level Data. 1999-2000.2004-05.2011-12 and PLFS 2017-18