

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Labour Force Survey provides data on (a) age, sex, marital status, literacy, level of education and migration of the population, (b) dimensions of country's labour force, viz (i) employed labour force classified by, industry, formal & informal sectors, occupation, employment status, hours worked and level of education, (ii) occupational safety and health information of the employed persons, and (iii) unemployed labour by level of education and previous experience. **In comparison with the LFS 2008-09, some of the main findings of LFS 2009-10 are outlined as under:**

### 1. Literacy and Employment

1(a) **Literacy rate** (57.7%) fares marginally higher than that of LFS 2008-09 (57.4%), more in the case of females and, in rural areas. However, rural-urban and male-female disparity seems to be closing a bit.

1(b) **Participation rate** (33.0%) suggests fractional improvement as compared to that of LFS 2008-09 (32.8%). However, improvement is more of rural than urban and female than male provenance.

1(c) **Employment by Major Industries** indicates increase in the share of *manufacturing* (13.2%) while *wholesale & retail trade* (16.3%) sheds some fractions as compared to the respective estimate of LFS 2008-09 (13.0%, 16.5%). All other industry divisions level same during the comparative periods.

1(d) **Employment Status** shows marginal changes-increase in the comparative profiles of own *account workers* and *employers* while decrease in the case of *employees* and *unpaid family workers*. Gender disaggregated figures indicate mixed trend.

1(e) **Unemployment Rate** (5.6%) is fractionally higher than that of the previous survey (5.5%). The change is visible in the case of females while males unemployment rates remain equivalent. Area wise unemployment rates gather steam equivalently.

1(f) **Formal Sector** employment remains same (26.7%) during the comparative periods. However, marginal changes decrease in the proportions of females and increase in the case of urban areas is observed.

### 2. Informal Sector

2(a) **Informal Sector** accounts for more than seven-tenth (73%) of the employment in main jobs outside agriculture, more in rural (76%) than in urban areas (71%). Formal and informal composition of the comparative surveys remains equivalent during the period.

2(b) **Employment by Major Industry Divisions** is mainly comprised of *wholesale and retail trade* (39.2%), *manufacturing* (21.4%), *construction* (15.8%), *community, social and personal services* (10.8%), and *transport* (10.8%). Comparative Labour Force Surveys indicate a mixed trend during the period.

2 (c) **Employment Status** constitutes *employees* (44%), *own account workers* (42%), *unpaid family workers* (11%) and *employers* (2.5%). Marginal changes—increase in the comparative profiles of *own account workers* and *employers* while decrease in the case of *employees* and *unpaid family workers*—are observed.

### 3. Occupational Safety & Health

3(a) **Percentage of Employed** reporting some sort of occupational injury/disease in the past twelve months that resulted in the loss of working time or doctor's consultation are about one in thirty three (2.9%). Male workers are more vulnerable (3.5%) relative to female workers (0.9%). Same is the case for rural workers (3.4%) compared to urban workers (1.8%). The profile of vulnerability during the comparative periods seems to be trending up for males and, more in rural than urban areas.

3(b) **Major Industry Division** puts sufferers mainly in the activities of *agriculture* (50.2%), *construction* (14.3%), *manufacturing* (12.8%), *wholesale & retail trade* (10.6%) and *transport/storage & communication* (8.0%). Comparative risk profiles of *agriculture*, *manufacturing* and *construction* improve while those of *community/ social & personal services* and *whole sale & retail trade* deteriorate. Remaining activities level same during the comparative periods.

3(c) **Major Occupational Grouping** finds the largest group of the sufferers (43.5%) in *skilled agriculture & fishery activities*. Comparative figures of the two surveys indicate improvement, for males only, though more than four-fifths (83.9%) of female sufferers belong to this group. The next major groupings are *elementary occupations* (22.3%) and *craft & related trades worker* (18.9%). Risk profile of the former is increasing more for males while the latter's decreasing, more for females. As for the masculine groups of *plant/machine operators & assemblers* and *legislators/senior officials & managers*, the former indicates lesser, while the latter, more vulnerability.

3(d) **Employment Status** finds majority of sufferers (79.2%) either *own account workers* (41.6%) or *employees* (37.6%). In comparison with the respective estimates of the LFS 2008-09 (38.8%, 38.3%), the former group gets a bit riskier for both genders while the latter betokens improvement more for females. *Unpaid family workers* (20.2%) also indicate improvement, even for both genders. *Employers* allude to a sort of deterioration in their risk profile.