

WORKING FORCE SIZE AND STRUCTURE IN INDIA, 1951 :  
A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND  
SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

By ALICE THORNER\*  
*Indian Statistical Institute*

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction ... ..	122
Comparability of Surveys with Census ... ..	123
Working Force Size : Discrepancies in Census Data ... ..	125
Working Force Size : Evidence from Sample Surveys ... ..	131
Occupational Structure of the Working Force ... ..	137
Occupational Dependence of the Entire Population ... ..	145
Appendix 1 : Census Natural Divisions and ALE Zones ... ..	152
Appendix 2 : Appendix Tables	

LIST OF TABLES IN TEXT

Table 1. Percentages of self-supporting persons plus earning dependents in 17 States compared with percentages of persons in working age group (15-64) .. ..	125
Table 2. Divisions arranged in rank order of percentages of self-supporting persons, earning dependents and non-earning dependents to all males .. ..	127
Table 3. Percentages of self-supporting persons, earning dependents and non-earning dependents to all males in three Census sub-regions .. ..	128
Table 4. Quartile ranks of divisions by percentages of self-supporting persons, earning dependents and non-earning dependents to all males in five Census jurisdictions .. ..	129
Table 5. Percentages of males returned under three economic categories in selected States according to the Censuses of 1931, 1941 and 1951 .. ..	130
Table 6. Frequency distribution of 48 divisions by percentages of rural males returned as earning or working in Census of 1951 and ALE .. ..	132
Table 7. Quartile ranks of divisions by percentages of self-supporting persons and earning dependents to all rural males recorded by Census; also by percentages of earners and helpers to all males recorded by ALE; in five States as of 1951 .. ..	133
Table 8. Percentage of earners to all rural males recorded by Census, ALE and NSS in 10 States (as of 1951) .. ..	135
Table 9. Percentage of earners to all urban males as recorded by Census and NSS in 10 States (as of 1951) .. ..	136
Table 10. Grouping of 52 divisions according to percentages of self-supporting persons and earning dependents (both sexes) returned in the Census of 1951 as workers in non-agriculture (including plantations) and as agricultural labourers .. ..	139
Table 11. Ranking of 17 States (as of 1951) by percentages of cultivators and agricultural labourers among all rural workers according to Census and ALE .. ..	143
Table 12. Quartile ranks of divisions by percentage of rural population in land-holding classes (or families) and agricultural labour class (or families), according to Census of 1951 and ALE .. ..	148

\* Now Sous-directeur d'Etudes in the Sixth Section of the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, Sorbonne, Paris.

## WORKING FORCE SIZE AND STRUCTURE IN INDIA, 1951 : A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

### 1. INTRODUCTION

This paper reports the findings of a region-by-region analysis of the 1951 Census economic returns, with particular respect to size of working force and balance between agricultural and non-agricultural occupations. Wherever possible, Census figures for States or parts of States have been critically compared with the results of three All-India sample surveys conducted between 1950 and 1955 : the Agricultural Labour Enquiry, the National Sample Survey, and the Rural Credit Survey. Our primary aim in examining the Census of 1951 materials has been to assess their value as a statistical base against which the 1961 Census returns may be appraised and interpreted. The study was carried on as one part of the research programme of the Census of 1961 Project of the Indian Statistical Institute.<sup>1</sup>

### 2. SUMMARY RESULTS

Summarizing our conclusions, we may say that internal as well as external evidence points to a high degree of unreliability in the Census of 1951 data on working force participation. The proportion of the population classed by the Census as earners varied sharply from State to State without relation to differences in age structure. Rather, the percentage of males and females recorded as self-supporting, partly dependent, or totally dependent tended to follow particular patterns according to the separate jurisdictions under which the census was conducted. Several of these census-taking jurisdictions, however, cut across tracts well known to be fairly uniform in geographic, social and economic characteristics, which would normally be reflected in fairly uniform working force proportions. It would appear that exogenous factors, chiefly of an administrative nature, seriously influenced the Census returns.

Working force percentages for States and parts of States obtained by two different sample surveys show practically no relation with the Census figures for the same areas. Both surveys found significantly larger proportions of workers in the rural population than did the Census. Taken together, the survey results suggest that the Census seriously under-enumerated the rural working force in the country as a whole, and particularly in the South. Since approximately five-sixths of the 1951 population was rural, it would seem that the Census figures for earners and partners provide a dependable guide neither to the actual numbers of workers in

---

<sup>1</sup>The Project was sponsored by the Indian Statistical Institute through its Bombay Branch as a contribution to the preparations for the ninth decennial Census of India. The scope of the Project may be indicated by mentioning the titles of some of the earlier reports: "Preliminary Memorandum — Economic Concepts in the Census of India, 1881-1951," cyclostylod, 1958; "Comparability of Census Economic Data, 1881-1951", cyclostylod, 1958; "Census Economic Questions and Tables: Some Alternative Tryout Proposals", cyclostylod, 1958; "Economic Recommendations for the Census of 1961," *Economic Weekly* (Bombay), Vol. XI, pp. 1230-1242, September 5, 1959.

Daniel Thorner served as Director of the Project, Alice Thorner as Joint Director, and Neena C. Shah as Computer. M. A. Tolang, Honorary Secretary of the Bombay Branch, provided advice and guidance at all stages of the work.

### A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

different regions of India, nor to the variation among regions in the proportion of the population engaged in economically productive activities.

By contrast, we have found the Census distribution of the working force of the several regions into broad occupational groups reasonably in accord not only with generally accepted accounts of local characteristics but also with relevant sample survey data. Putting together the evidence from the Census and the sample enquiries we are able to identify with some confidence rural tracts where the population consists primarily of peasant cultivators and their families, tracts with significant numbers of hired agricultural labourers, and tracts in which a sizeable fraction of the working force is engaged in non-agriculture.

High percentages of cultivators were typical of Himalayan border districts from Himachal Pradesh and Kangra on the west to Assam and Tripura on the east; of interior hilly regions in Madhya Pradesh and Bihar where substantial tribal populations dwell; of the Konkan and Deccan regions in Maharashtra; and of parts of the Gangetic and Trans-Gangetic Plains in Rajasthan, Punjab, and Uttar Pradesh. Agricultural labourers played an important role in the South (Andhra, Kerala and Madras); also in the easterly districts of Maharashtra (Berar and Marathwada), in the central region of Madhya Pradesh, and in North Bihar. Non-agricultural pursuits claimed significant proportions of the rural working force in the areas of Uttar Pradesh and Punjab adjacent to Delhi, and along almost the entire coastal rim from Kutch and Saurashtra down to the southernmost tip and up again to West Bengal.

### 3. COMPARABILITY OF SURVEYS WITH CENSUS

*Purposes of surveys.* The Agricultural Labour Enquiry (ALE)<sup>2</sup> was undertaken by the Ministry of Labour as a preliminary to drawing up measures to ameliorate the conditions of agricultural labour. The second stage, the results of which we have employed, was entitled the General Family Survey; it covered 103,548 families in 812 villages. The National Sample Survey (NSS)<sup>3</sup> has been conducted on a continuing basis since 1950 by the Government of India with the assistance of the Indian Statistical Institute. It is a multipurpose survey, gathering data on a wide variety of economic, social, and agricultural topics. The Ninth Round covered 16,000 households in 1624 villages and 32,000 households in 2108 urban blocks. The Rural Credit Survey (RCS)<sup>4</sup> was sponsored by the Reserve Bank of India with the aim of providing information required for the formulation of long-term agricultural credit policy. The RCS collected data from 120,000 families in 600 villages.

*Reference dates.* The Census was taken in March 1961; the General Family Survey of the Agricultural Labour Enquiry was conducted early in 1950; and the field work of the Rural Credit Survey extended from October 1961 through early 1962. It is not unreasonable to take the data from the latter two sources as referring to

<sup>2</sup> *Rural Manpower and Occupational Structure.* Ministry of Labour, Government of India, Delhi, 1954.

<sup>3</sup> National Sample Survey: Number 16: *Employment and Unemployment: Ninth Round, Preliminary, May-November, 1955* Cabinet Secretariat, Government of India, Delhi, 1959.

<sup>4</sup> All-India Rural Credit Survey: Survey Report Vol. I, Part I, *Rural Families*, Reserve Bank of India, Bombay, 1964.

roughly the same point in time as the Census. The Ninth Round of the National Sample Survey, however, covered the months May–November, 1955. We have nonetheless used the Ninth Round materials since this was the first NSS round large enough to yield estimates for separate States. We have been emboldened to ignore the four-year gap by the fact that the Ninth Round All-India data relating to the subjects included in our comparisons are highly consistent with the relevant All-India figures from the First Round (October 1950–March 1951) and the Fourth Round (April–September, 1952). It is, of course, possible that there may have been State-wise variations during this period, but we have not attempted to pursue this possibility.

*Geographical units.* While we have in effect assumed away any important influence of the time factor, we have taken some pains to bring the data into geographical equivalence. Each of the Surveys utilized a different break-down of the All-India figures by States, groups of States, and part of States. No one of the other sources followed exactly the procedure of the Census. Keeping in mind the needs of 1961, we have attempted, wherever possible, to draw up our tabulations in terms of the current States. This has involved recombination of Census "natural divisions" (groups of districts within the 1951 State boundaries) and ALE zones (parts of States).

Appendix 1 shows the districts included in each Census natural division, and the ALE zone or zones taken as equivalent to each division. For ease of reference we have given each division a descriptive, popular or historical name, e.g., Coastal Andhra, Telengana, Chhota Nagpur. The three-digit Census code numbers (e.g., 1.21 for Assam Valley, and 2.12 for North Bihar) denote the position of the division with regard to five major geographical regions (single-digit codes 1 to 5) and fifteen sub-regions (two-digit codes). The ALE zones are identified by roman numerals following the name of the State in which the area was included in 1951. From the names of the ALE zones, for example, we can understand at a glance that Andhra State has been constituted from parts of the former territories of Madras and Hyderabad.

Where we have been unable to obtain data referring to divisions we have presented comparisons in terms of States. In some cases this has been possible to do for the 17 major States which existed in 1951, in others for only the 9 "Part A" States plus Andhra, which was separated from Madras in 1953. Readers are cautioned that of these ten States, one (Bombay) has been broken up completely, another (Madhya Pradesh) is today constituted quite differently, three (Andhra, Madras and Punjab) have undergone changes of somewhat lesser magnitude, and another two (West Bengal and Bihar) have had minor border adjustments. Only Assam, Orissa and Uttar Pradesh have remained virtually unaffected. The comparison between Census and RCS materials has been made for individual districts because of the nature of the RCS sample.

As is only to be expected, each of the three Surveys has a different emphasis than the Census. Each employs its own set of definitions. We will take account of these conceptual discrepancies in the discussion of the particular comparisons for which they are relevant.

A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

4. WORKING FORCE SIZE : DISCREPANCIES IN CENSUS DATA

*Census economic classification.* The three categories into which the Census of 1951 classified the entire population were "self-supporting persons" (individuals in receipt of income sufficient at least for their own maintenance), "earning dependents" (individuals in receipt of income insufficient for their own maintenance), and "non-earning dependents." In the Census literature, these terms are referred to as indicating "household economic status." This is, of course, not exactly the same as a classification into workers and non-workers, or economically active and not economically active, since the focus is on receipt of income rather than work. However, the number of persons who receive income without working is very small. Only about 1 percent of the total population in 1951 were recorded as rent-receivers, beggars, pensioners, etc. The question of persons (such as family members helping in cultivation) who work but receive no overt income in wages or profits presents more difficulties. The Census instructions indicated that such individuals were to be classed as either self-supporting persons or earning dependents according to the share of the family income attributable to them. As we shall see, this instruction was interpreted in many different fashions.

We may begin our examination of the Census data by inspecting the percentage of all earners—self-supporting persons (SSP's) plus earning dependents (ED's)—identified in each of the major States. Table 1 shows these percentages for persons

TABLE 1. PERCENTAGES OF SELF-SUPPORTING PERSONS PLUS EARNING DEPENDENTS IN 17 STATES COMPARED WITH PERCENTAGES OF PERSONS IN WORKING AGE GROUP (15-64)

major States*	all persons		males only	
	persons in age group 15-64	SSP's+ED's per 100 persons	persons in age group 15-64	SSP's+ED's per 100 males
	per 100 persons	persons	per 100 males	males
1. West Bengal	62	35	64	55
2. Madras	61	31	61	47
3. Vindhya Pradesh	60	46	59	59
4. Madhya Bharat	59	41	60	57
5. Orissa	59	38	59	57
6. Madhya Pradesh	58	56	58	64
7. Hyderabad	58	46	58	60
8. Bombay	58	43	59	55
9. Uttar Pradesh	58	42	59	59
10. Travancore-Cochin	58	36	57	50
11. Mysore	58	29	59	48
12. Rajasthan	57	50	57	61
13. Saurashtra	56	42	56	53
14. Bihar	56	36	56	50
15. Assam	55	43	56	54
16. PEPFU	55	39	55	60
17. Punjab]	54	39	55	56
high	62	56	64	64
low	54	29	55	47
range	8	27	9	17

\*As of 1951.

of both sexes and also for males only. Percentages for females as well are presented in Appendix 2, Table A.1. Since Census of 1951 economic data were not cross-tabulated by age, we could not calculate age-specific working force proportions. Instead we have compared the percentages of workers with the percentages of persons in the age group 15-64.

*Statewise variation in working force proportions.* We note with some surprise that whereas 56 of every 100 persons in Madhya Pradesh were returned as fully or partly self-supporting only 29 of every 100 were so returned in Mysore. As against 47 earners per 100 males in Madras, the ratio in neighbouring Hyderabad was 60 per 100. Difference from State to State in the proportions of persons in the working ages (15-64) provide no basis for such wide variations in working force size. On the contrary, Madras had a somewhat more favourable age structure (81 out of every 100 persons in the 15-64 group) than Hyderabad, while Mysore and Madhya Pradesh were practically identical in this respect. Nor do the discrepancies tally with other available information about conditions in the various States.

We may continue by studying the relative numbers of persons recorded respectively as SSP's (self-supporting persons), ED's (earning dependents) and NED's (non-earning dependents) in the 52 natural divisions. Table A. 2 in Appendix 2 presents the percentages separately for males and females. Our discussions focus primarily on the data for males, since they comprise the bulk of the working force and economic returns relating to males are well known to be more reliable than those for females.

*Difference among divisions.* Table 2 shows the extent of regional variation in the percentages of males assigned to each of the three categories. Let us for the moment leave out of consideration the two highly atypical divisions of Greater Bombay and Calcutta Industrial Area. We find that the proportion of males returned as self-supporting ranged from 55.9 in the hill tract of Himachal Pradesh on the northwest frontier to 39.5 in Manipur, a hill tract on the northeast frontier. With regard to earning dependents the highest percentage was that for the Himalayan principality of Sikkim, 19.4, while the lowest was 2.6 for the neighbouring Darjeeling-Duars area. The division with the largest percentage of non-earning dependents was the coastal Malabar-South Kanara area of the old Madras State, with a figure of 55.5; the smallest percentage of non-earners was 32.8 in Himachal Pradesh. In parts of Madras, in Mysore and in South Bihar, less than one out of every two males was recorded as an earner (either SSP or ED). By contrast, in Himachal Pradesh and the Chhattisgarh area of eastern Madhya Pradesh, approximately two out of every three males were classed as earners. Table A. 2 in Appendix 2 will show that the disparities in the percentages for females are still greater.

Yet we know that the Indian economy, while not of an uniform texture, is nonetheless characterized by a certain basic sameness. The agricultural villages which predominate in every part of the country offer, in point of fact, little scope for variation in the pattern of working and not working (or earning and not earning), especially

A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

TABLE 2. DIVISIONS ARRANGED IN RANK ORDER OF PERCENTAGES OF SELF-SUPPORTING PERSONS, EARNING DEPENDENTS AND NON-EARNING DEPENDENTS TO ALL MALES

rank number	self-supporting persons		earning dependents		non-earning dependents	
	division	percentage	division	percentage	division	percentage
1.	Greater Bombay	65.3	Sikkim	10.4	Malabar	65.5
2.	Calcutta Area	62.7	Madrhwada	10.9	Tamilnad	63.6
3.	Himachal	55.9	Chhattisgarh	14.7	Rayalaseema	63.1
4.	West U.P.	55.7	Kangra	14.3	South Bihar	63.1
5.	Delhi	53.0	Telangana	14.0	Mysore	52.3
6.	Kotah-Bundi	53.2	Manipur	13.7	Travancore-Cochin	50.3
7.	Ajmer	52.8	Borur-Nagpur	12.1	North Bihar	50.1
8.	Patiala	52.7	Jabalpur-Sagar	11.5	Coastal Andhra	49.2
9.	Jaipur-Alwar	52.5	Himachal	11.4	W. Bengal*	48.0
10.	Jodhpur-Bikaner	52.5	Assam Valley	11.4	Konkan	47.4
11.	Coorg	52.0	Saurashtra	11.4	Chhota Nagpur	47.1
12.	Bhopal	51.6	Mewar	10.7	Gujarat	46.9
13.	Darjeeling-Duara	51.6	Punjab Plain	10.6	Manipur	46.8
14.	Oudh	51.5	North Karnatak	10.4	Bombay Deccan	46.7
15.	South U.P.	51.3	Orissa Inland	9.8	Saurashtra	46.5
16.	Kumaon-Garhwal	50.8	Tripura	9.8	Assam Valley	46.0
17.	Gwalior	50.7	Bombay Deccan	9.7	Darjeeling-Duara	45.8
18.	Chhattisgarh	50.7	Assam Hills	9.6	Assam Hills	45.3
19.	Jabalpur-Sagar	50.6	Bundelkhand	9.5	Coorg	44.3
20.	East U.P.	50.0	Jaipur-Alwar	9.5	Kutch	44.7
21.	Malwa	49.8	Kotah-Bundi	9.2	North Karnatak	44.6
22.	Borur-Nagpur	49.8	Gujarat	9.0	Tripura	44.6
23.	Bundelkhand	49.6	Orissa Coastal	8.7	Punjab Plain	43.9
24.	Mewar	49.5	South U.P.	8.6	Orissa Coastal	43.7
25.	Dhar-Jhabua-Nimar	49.3	Konkan	8.4	Gwalior	43.5
26.	Chhota Nagpur	48.3	East U.P.	8.3	Bhopal	43.4
27.	Orissa Inland	48.2	Ajmer	8.1	Dhar-Jhabua-Nimar	43.4
28.	Orissa Coastal	47.6	Oudh	8.0	Malwa	42.9
29.	Kutch	47.3	Kutch	8.0	Orissa Inland	42.0
30.	Kangra	47.0	Kumaon-Garhwal	7.7	Jodhpur-Bikaner	41.8
31.	West Bengal*	47.0	Malwa	7.3	East U. P.	41.7
32.	Telangana	46.2	Dhar-Jhabua-Nimar	7.3	Marathwada	41.6
33.	North Bihar	45.7	Patiala	7.0	Kumaon-Garhwal	41.5
34.	Tripura	45.5	Andhra Coastal	6.6	Delhi	41.1
35.	Punjab Plain	45.5	Gwalior	5.8	West U.P.	40.9
36.	North Karnatak	45.0	Travancore-Cochin	5.8	Bundelkhand	40.9
37.	Assam Hills	44.6	Jodhpur-Bikaner	5.7	Oudh	40.5
38.	Konkan	44.2	Delhi	5.3	Patiala	40.3
39.	Coastal Andhra	44.2	Rayalaseema	5.1	South U.P.	40.1
40.	Gujarat	44.1	W. Bengal*	5.0	Telangana	39.8
41.	Travancore-Cochin	43.9	Bhopal	4.9	Mewar	39.7
42.	Mysore	43.7	Chhota Nagpur	4.7	Ajmer	39.2
43.	Bombay Deccan	43.6	North Bihar	4.2	Sikkim	38.9
44.	Tamilnad	42.9	South Bihar	4.2	Kangra	38.7
45.	South Bihar	42.7	Mysore	4.0	Borur-Nagpur	38.1
46.	Assam Valley	42.6	Tamilnad	3.5	Jaipur-Alwar	38.0
47.	Saurashtra	42.1	West U.P.	3.4	Jabalpur-Sagar	37.9
48.	Rayalaseema	41.8	Malabar	3.3	Kotah-Bundi	37.6
49.	Sikkim	41.7	Coorg	3.2	Calcutta Area	36.0
50.	Marathwada	41.5	Darjeeling-Duara	2.6	Chhattisgarh	34.6
51.	Malabar	41.2	Greater Bombay	2.3	Himachal	32.8
52.	Manipur	39.5	Calcutta Area	1.3	Greater Bombay	32.4

\* Excluding Calcutta.

for males. The unrealistic nature of the sharp divisional differences in the 1951 Census proportions of earners and dependents becomes even clearer when we compare the figures for adjacent divisions with many similar features. Table 3 presents this comparison for three Census sub-regions. In addition to the actual percentages of SSP's, ED's and NED's to all males we have indicated the quartile rank of each percentage, that is whether it falls into the first, second, third or fourth quarter of the ranked list of divisional percentages shown in Table 2. Thus in the rolling upland tract of Chhota Nagpur where a large part of the population is tribal, the percentage of non-earners was 47, which falls into Quartile I. Just to the south, in the Chhattisgarh division, another important tribal area, the percentage of non-earners was only 35, which falls into Quartile IV. Exactly the reverse quartile relationship is shown by the respective figures for earning dependents in these two neighbouring divisions.

Sharply contrasting patterns are also to be seen among the divisions constituting the North and South Deccan sub-regions. Thus for dry inland Rayalaseema relatively low percentages (that is, in the third and fourth quartiles of all percentages) of self-supporting persons and earning dependents were accompanied by a very high percentage (in Quartile I) of non-earning dependents; in Telengana, geographically and agriculturally much the same, the proportion of earning dependents was very high (Quartile I) and that of non-earning dependents very low (Quartile IV).

*Influence of exogenous factors.* If we do not accept the Census of 1951 figures for self-supporting persons and earning dependents as reflections of genuine differences between one area and another, how are we to explain the observed variations? One possibility suggests itself when we group the divisions not by geographical zones

TABLE 3. PERCENTAGES OF SELF-SUPPORTING PERSONS, EARNING DEPENDENTS AND NON-EARNING DEPENDENTS TO ALL MALES IN THREE CENSUS SUB-REGIONS

sub-region	division	State*	percentage of all males			quartile ranks of percentages		
			SSP	ED	NED	SSP	ED	NED
<b>3.3 North-East Plateau</b>								
3.31	Chhota Nagpur	Bihar	48	5	47	II	IV	I
3.32	Chhattisgarh	Madhya Pradesh	51	15	35	II	I	IV
3.33	Orissa Inland	Orissa	48	10	42	III	II	III
<b>3.4 North Deccan</b>								
3.41	Berar-Nagpur	Madhya Pradesh	50	12	38	II	I	IV
3.42	Marathwada	Hyderabad	41	17	42	IV	I	III
3.42	Bombay Deccan	Bombay	44	10	47	IV	II	II
<b>3.5 South Deccan</b>								
3.51	Telengana	Hyderabad	46	14	40	III	I	IV
3.52	North Karnataka	Bombay	45	10	45	III	II	II
3.53	Mysore	Mysore	44	4	52	IV	IV	I
3.54	Rayalaseema	Madras	42	5	53	IV	III	I

\*States as of 1951.



A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

but by census-taking jurisdictions, as in Table A. 2 in Appendix 2. In almost every case the figures for the various divisions included in a single jurisdiction (one or more States in which enumeration was under the charge of a single Superintendent) reveal striking consistencies. We see from Table 4 that in Bihar all three divisional percentages for ED's fall in the fourth Quartile, and all three percentages for NED's in the first quartile. In Madhya Pradesh, quite the other way, percentages of SSP's are uniformly in Quartile II, of ED's in Quartile I and of NED's in Quartile IV. Madras, Uttar Pradesh, and Rajasthan in turn show distinct jurisdictional patterns, each one different from the others.

It is at least arguable that differences in the recorded percentages of self-supporting persons and earning dependents reflect variations in Census administration rather than the interplay of economic factors. We suggest that this may well have happened because the economic questions, instructions and illustrations as handed down from the Centre in 1951 were ill-conceived and ambiguous.

TABLE 4. QUARTILE RANKS OF DIVISIONS BY PERCENTAGES OF SELF-SUPPORTING PERSONS, EARNING DEPENDENTS AND NON EARNING DEPENDENTS TO ALL MALES IN FIVE CENSUS JURISDICTIONS

census jurisdiction division	self- supporting persons	earning dependents	non- earning dependents
<i>Bihar</i>			
North Bihar	III	IV	I
South Bihar	IV	IV	I
Chhota Nagpur	II	IV	I
<i>Madhya Pradesh</i>			
Jabalpur-Sagar	II	I	IV
Chhattisgarh	II	I	IV
Berar-Nagpur	II	I	IV
<i>Madras (including Coorg)</i>			
Royalaseema	IV	III	I
Malabar-S. Kanara	IV	IV	I
Andhra Coastal	III	III	I
Tamilnad	IV	IV	I
Coorg	I	IV	II
<i>Rajasthan (including Ajmer)</i>			
Jaipur-Aiwar	I	II	IV
Jodhpur-Bikaner	I	III	III
Mewar	II	I	IV
Kotah-Bundi	I	II	IV
Ajmer	I	III	IV
<i>Uttar Pradesh</i>			
Kumaon-Garhwal	II	III	III
East U.P.	II	II	III
Oudh	II	III	III
West U.P.	I	IV	III
South U.P.	II	II	III

No satisfactory definitions of self-supporting persons or earning dependents were provided. Nor in fact could they have been provided, since the terms have little intrinsic meaning in an Indian setting. Responsibility for interpretation of these items devolved upon the State Superintendents, each of whom tried to make the best of a bad bargain.

The conceptual deficiencies of the Census of 1951 have been discussed in detail in an earlier paper prepared in this project. It may be worthwhile to quote a summary statement from that memorandum.<sup>5</sup>

"There were no doubt genuine economic and social differences among the States of India in 1951; but we can have no confidence that these have been accurately reflected in the Census returns...The economic categories used in the Census of 1951 were ill suited to India. It is perhaps not altogether surprising, therefore, that these categories were understood and administered differently in the various 1951 census jurisdictions."

*Categories used in earlier censuses.* The Census of 1951 was the third Census of India to use a three-fold economic classification. In 1931 the population had been divided into earners, working dependents and dependents. The terms used in the 1941 tables were independent persons, partly dependents, and total dependents. Prior to 1931, there were only two groups : "actual workers" and dependents. The question naturally arises as to the relationship of the three 1951 categories with the earlier sets of three categories each.

Table 5 presents for males the percentages returned under each rubric in 1931, 1941 and 1951 for five major States which were not affected by the partition

TABLE 5. PERCENTAGES OF MALES RETURNED UNDER THREE ECONOMIC CATEGORIES IN SELECTED STATES ACCORDING TO THE CENSUSES OF 1931, 1941 AND 1951

States	categories	1931	1941			1951		
			earners	working dependents	dependents	independent persons	partly dependents	total dependents
			self-supporting persons per 100 males	earning dependents per 100 males	non-earning dependents per 100 males			
Bihar and Orissa	1931	87	1	42				
	1941	61	6	43				
	1951	46	6	48				
Bombay	1931	60	5	45				
	1941	48	8	44				
	1951	46	9	45				
Madras	1931	55	4	41				
	1941	47	4	48				
	1951	43	4	53				
Uttar Pradesh	1931	63	2	35				
	1941	50	4	46				
	1951	53	6	41				

<sup>5</sup>Comparability of Census Economic Data, 1931-1951, Indian Statistical Institute, Bombay Branch, May 1958, paragraph 27.

## A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

of 1947. Bihar and Orissa are taken together since Orissa was not constituted as a separate State until 1936. Absolute numbers will be found in Table A.3 (Appendix 2) together with the respective figures for females and persons of both sexes. We note that in Bihar-Orissa, in Madras, and in Uttar Pradesh, the percentage of males classed in the first category (earners, independent persons, self-supporting persons) varied over a range of 10 to 13 points in the three Censuses. Differences of this order may also be observed among the several States in 1931 and 1951; the figures for independent persons and total dependents in 1941 are closer to each other. Bihar and Orissa apparently had a smaller ratio of part-earners to all males than did Madras in 1931, yet a larger ratio than Madras in 1941 and 1951. Bombay exceeded Uttar Pradesh in the proportion of non-earning males in 1931 and 1951, but the reverse was true in 1941. The trends for females are similarly erratic.

Although inconclusive, the evidence suggests that despite the superficial similarity of the names of the rubrics, the three sets of Census figures for 1931, 1941 and 1951 cannot safely be taken as counts of the same categories of persons at different points of time. It is possible that the terms used in 1931 and 1941 had, like those of 1951, different meanings in different States.

### 5. WORKING FORCE SIZE : EVIDENCE FROM SAMPLE SURVEYS

Let us now compare the Census data on regional variations in the size and composition of the working force with the findings of the Agricultural Labour Enquiry. Up to now we have been examining Census tabulations of SSP's, ED's and NED's in the general population, that is, the people living in both villages and towns. We shall now turn to the Census figures for the rural population, which means, in most cases, persons living in places with less than 5,000 inhabitants. Since most of the population of almost every division was rural, the All-India urban-rural ratio in 1951 being approximately 1 to 5, the percentages calculated for the rural population are very similar to those for the general population.

To obtain comparable percentages from the ALE for each division, we have taken the data for the zones or zones covering the same rural areas. Where it was necessary to combine two or, rarely, more than two ALE zones, we have simply added the figures without weighting them. It has been demonstrated that weighted and unweighted tabulations of ALE data for the Indian Union as a whole are in very close agreement.<sup>6</sup>

The ALE working force categories were earners (persons "who had earned income, however meagre") and helpers ("who assist earners without earning independently any income themselves"). Persons who were neither earners nor helpers were to be classed as dependents. Although these three terms are defined differently from the three terms used in the Census of 1951, a certain rough equivalence in the actual returns might reasonably have been expected. Even if the distinction between

---

<sup>6</sup>Rural Manpower and Occupational Structure, Ministry of Labour, Government of India, Delhi, 1964, p. 630.

earners and helpers cannot be equated with that between SSP's and ED's, the class of dependents might be somewhat similar in scope with the NED's.

Table A.4 in Appendix 2 sets out separately for males and females the Census percentages for SSP's, ED's and NED's in the rural population, together with the ALE percentages for earners, helpers and dependents. Excluding purely urban areas and tracts not covered by either the Census or the ALE, we find comparable sets of percentages for 48 divisions.

*Disagreement between Census and ALE.* The most striking feature of Table A.4 in Appendix 2 is that smaller percentages of dependents to all males were recorded by the ALE than by the Census in all but 6 divisions. In other words the ALE classified a much larger proportion of the rural males as either earners or helpers than the Census recorded as SSP's or ED's. Table 6 shows that whereas in 34 out of 48 Census Divisions, the composite percentage of SSP's+ED's falls below 60, all but 9 of the 48 ALE percentages of earners+helpers come to 60 or more.

With regard to the specific comparison between percentages of SSP's and percentages of earners, we note that the Census proportions are higher than those obtained by the ALE for divisions which formed part of the States of Assam, Bombay, Madhya Bharat, Punjab, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh. The reverse is shown by divisions which were formerly included in Madras, Hyderabad and Travancore-Cochin. Except for those divisions which belonged to Hyderabad and Madhya Pradesh, the proportion of male helpers recorded by the ALE was in every case higher than the proportion of ED's returned in the Census.

TABLE 6. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF 48 DIVISIONS BY PERCENTAGES OF RURAL MALES RETURNED AS EARNING OR WORKING IN CENSUS OF 1951 AND ALE

percentage of rural males earning or working	Census	ALE
	SSP's+ED's per 100 rural males number of divisions	earners+helpers per 100 rural males number of divisions
70-74	0	1
65-69	5	11
60-64	9	27
55-59	15	8
50-54	13	1
45-49	5	0.
40-44	1	0

With the ALE as well as with the Census we can discern patterns of classification which vary according to the separate States, which participated in the conduct of the survey. To bring out this character of the ALE results we have ranked

A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

the divisions twice : by percentages of SSP's and ED's in the rural population according to the Census, and by percentages of earners and helpers according to the ALE, and divided each ranked list into four quartiles. Table 7 shows the quartile rankings obtained in this manner for 19 divisions in five of the 1951 States. We note that whereas in Madhya Pradesh the Census percentages for SSP's rank in Quartile II and for ED's in Quartile I, the ALE pattern in two divisions of the three is high (I) for earners and low (IV) for helpers. In Uttar Pradesh, where the Census found relatively high percentages of SSP's and moderate percentages of ED's the ALE returns show moderate percentages of earners and fairly high percentages of helpers.

In sum the pattern of percentages obtained by the ALE was in almost every 1951 State different from the Census pattern for that State. As an indication of the degree of divergence we have calculated a product moment coefficient of correlation

TABLE 7. QUARTILE RANKS OF DIVISIONS BY PERCENTAGES OF SELF-SUPPORTING PERSONS AND EARNING DEPENDENTS TO ALL RURAL MALES RECORDED BY CENSUS; ALSO BY PERCENTAGES OF EARNERS AND HELPERS TO ALL MALES RECORDED BY ALE; IN FIVE STATES AS OF 1951

State division	Census		ALE	
	SSP's	ED's	earners	helpers
<i>Bihar</i>				
North Bihar	III	IV	II	III
South Bihar	IV	IV	II	II
Chhota Nagpur	II	IV	I	III
<i>Madhya Pradesh</i>				
Jabalpur-Sagar	II	I	I	IV
Chhattisgarh	II	I	II	II
Berar-Nagpur	II	I	I	IV
<i>Madras</i>				
Royalaseema	IV	IV	I	III
Malabar-S. Kanara	IV	IV	II	IV
Andhra Coastal	III	III	I	IV
Tamilnad	IV	IV	I	IV
<i>Rajasthan</i>				
Jaipur-Alwar	I	I	IV	I
Jodhpur-Bikaner	I	III	IV	I
Mewar	II	I	III	II
Kotah-Bundi	I	II	III	II
<i>Uttar Pradesh</i>				
Kumaon-Garhwal	II	III	III	II
East U.P.	II	II	III	I
Oudh	I	II	II	I
West U.P.	I	IV	III	I
South U.P.	I	II	II	III

from the 48 Census percentages of SSP's+ED's to all males and the 48 ALE percentages of earners and helpers to all males. It comes to only 0.20. This would imply almost complete lack of relationship between the two sets of data, although both of them are in effect measures of the same phenomenon—the extent of working force participation in various parts of the countryside.

*Comparison of rural data from three sources.* By shifting from 48 divisions to 10 States, we can make a three-fold comparison of Census, ALE and National Sample Survey (NSS) results relating to rural areas. We use the NSS data for earners and earning dependents rather than the NSS figures for persons in the labour force (gainfully employed plus unemployed), since the former were intended specifically to be comparable with the Census SSP's and ED's. In the NSS instructions, the category of earning dependents was defined explicitly to include unpaid family helpers.

A full comparison of the percentages obtained for rural males and females of all three categories by the three different sources is presented in Appendix 2, Table A.5. In most States the NSS figures for male earners are higher than the respective Census and ALE figures. The NSS figures for male ED's are, however, generally lower than the ALE figures for male helpers. With regard to dependents, the NSS proportions for males are closer to those of the ALE than to those of the Census.

*Extent of agreement between NSS and ALE.* In other words the NSS, like the ALE, identified a larger segment of the rural population as earners or workers than did the Census. We can state the position more exactly if we set out the percentages obtained for rural males in each State together with the percentages of rural males in the working ages (15 to 64). Table 8 shows that, with a single exception, both the ALE and the NSS classed in one or another of their working force categories at least as large a proportion of all males as would be accounted for by the men from the ages of 15 through 64. In other words, the data from both sample surveys would suggest that in most States, not only the whole or practically the whole number of adult males in their prime, but also a fraction of boys under 15 and elderly men were working. The Census ratio of SSP's and ED's to all males, by contrast, equals or exceeds the ratio of working-age men to all rural males in only three States: Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, and Punjab. By the same token the Census working force measure approaches that of the other two surveys only in these three cases. The extent of agreement between the ALE and the NSS findings is larger than that between either of these surveys and the Census. In fact, the returns from ALE and NSS for Madras, Orissa, Madhya Pradesh, Bombay and Assam are practically identical, while the discrepancies in the case of West Bengal and Andhra are small. But the two surveys fail to agree in respect of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Punjab.

We have previously noted the strong influence of State boundaries on the pattern of ALE percentages of earners, helpers and dependents. Nonetheless, we cannot ignore the marked consistency of the NSS and ALE findings for the rural male working force as a whole in 7 out of 10 States. The fact that the range of variation from State to State recorded by the ALE and NSS is narrower than that of the

## A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

Census in itself lends credence to the results of the two surveys. Whereas it is impossible to establish any meaningful relationship between age structure and the Census working force participation data, we may observe that in 7 States the figures for workers according to both surveys exceed the figures for males in the age group 15-64 by at least two percentage points.

*Dimensions of rural working force.* The concurrence of the two surveys in these several respects suggests that the overall dimensions of the rural male working force in the early 1950's may be more accurately reflected by the surveys than by the Census. If this is the case, we could say tentatively that rural Andhra, Madras and Orissa were characterized by relatively high proportions of male workers as well as of males in the working ages. In the villages of Madhya Pradesh and Assam the proportion of workers compared even more favourably with that of the men from 15 to 64. In Bombay a relatively low percentage of male workers went along with a relatively low percentage of working-age males.

TABLE 8. PERCENTAGES OF EARNERS TO ALL RURAL MALES RECORDED BY CENSUS, ALE AND NSS IN 10 STATES (AS OF 1951)

States	men in age group 15-64 per 100 rural males	Census	ALE	NSS-9th round
		SSP's + ED's per 100 rural males	earners + helpers per 100 rural males	earners + ED's per 100 rural males
West Bengal	81	62	62	69
Andhra	81	50	64	67
Madras	80	46	63	62
Orissa	59	57	63	62
Uttar Pradesh	58	60	64	58
Madhya Pradesh	58	66	64	63
Bihar	68	50	64	58
Bombay	66	64	59	58
Assam	55	64	60	61
Punjab	54	57	62	57
high	81	66	64	67
low	54	46	59	58
range	7	20	5	11

All of these conclusions are, of course, highly tentative. They refer solely to the figures for the total number of men counted as working and leave altogether out of consideration any distinction between earners and helpers or earners and ED's. The implication would be that the Census of 1951 under-enumerated the rural male working force in most of India, particularly in the areas which were included in the State of Madras, and to a lesser extent in Assam, Bihar, Bombay, Orissa and West Bengal.

*Dimensions of urban working force.* With regard to urban workers, we can compare the Census data only with those of the NSS. Full details for both sexes are to be found in Appendix 2, Table A.6. In West Bengal, Bombay, Uttar Pradesh

and Assam the Census percentages for SSP's to all males exceed the NSS percentages for earners. In Orissa, Madhya Pradesh and Punjab, the Census proportions of male ED's are higher than the respective NSS proportions. To our surprise we find in Table 9 that for each one of the seven States just named the total Census figure for SSP's plus ED's is greater than the NSS figures for earners plus ED's. Only in Madras, Andhra and Bihar did the NSS find a larger percentage of urban males working than did the Census. In every State the percentage of urban males classed as earning by the NSS as well as by the Census was less—typically much less—than the percentage in the working ages.

TABLE 9. PERCENTAGE OF EARNERS TO ALL URBAN MALES AS RECORDED BY CENSUS AND NSS IN 10 STATES (AS OF 1961)

States	men in age group 15-64 per 100 urban males	census	NSS 9th round
		SSP's + ED's per 100 urban males	earners + ED's per 100 urban males
West Bengal	72	61	60
Assam	66	54	50
Bombay	65	57	55
Madras	63	49	53
Uttar Pradesh	62	58	54
Andhra	61	50	59
Madhya Pradesh	61	55	52
Bihar	61	48	56
Orissa	61	57	56
Punjab	58	54	50
high	72	61	60
low	58	49	50
range	14	12	10

It may also be noted that the Census percentage of workers among rural males equalled or exceeded the percentage for urban males in all but three States. In these States—West Bengal, Bombay and Madras—were located the great cities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras. This aspect of the Census findings is supported by the trend in the NSS percentages of earners and earning dependents to all males for three strata of urban blocks. Thus 60 of every 100 males were classed as earning in stratum 1 consisting of blocks in Calcutta, Bombay, Madras and Delhi, while only 54 of every 100 were so classed in strata 2 and 3, representing smaller cities and towns.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup>National Sample Survey: Number 10, *Employment and Unemployment: Ninth Round Preliminary, May-November 1955*, p.106.



## A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

Confirmation of this kind is, however, suggestive rather than definitive. The available materials do not permit a positive statement as to whether the urban working force data collected by the Census of 1951 are in whole or in part more reliable than the rural.

One conclusion which is strongly suggested by the data we have examined is that attempts to enumerate two classes of workers—e.g., self-supporting persons and earning dependents; independent persons and partly dependents; earners and helpers—have proved unrewarding.

### 6. OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURE OF WORKING FORCE

*Nature of occupational breakdown.* In the analysis of occupational distribution, we have found it practicable to take account specifically of only three categories: owner cultivation, tenant cultivation and agricultural labour. All other kinds of work have been treated together under the broad and not quite accurate head of "non-agriculture". We have been constrained to employ this particular breakdown by the way in which the Census of 1951 occupational data were treated. Although the returns for principal "means of livelihood" of self-supporting persons were sorted and tabulated under approximately 100 rubrics, the work of earning dependents was set out only in terms of eight "livelihood classes". Similarly, data on secondary employment of self-supporting persons was presented only by livelihood classes.

Of these eight "livelihood classes", two were reserved for cultivators (of mainly owned land and of mainly unowned land, i.e., owners and tenants), one for agricultural labourers, one for non-cultivating receivers of agricultural rent, and the remaining four for occupations in all industries other than cultivation. The four "non-agricultural" classes varied widely in the range of industrial and occupational groupings which they included. Class V, Production, lumped together livestock keeping, plantation industries, hunting, fishing and forestry (usually treated in conjunction with, if not as part of, agriculture) with all extractive, processing, and manufacturing industries. Class VI, Commerce, was restricted, as in standard usage, to wholesale and retail trade, banking, insurance, and real estate. Class VII, Transport, was severely limited to carriers by road, rail, sea and air. It excluded storage, warehousing, postal, telephone and telegraph services. Class VIII, by contrast, represented a catch-all category for construction, utilities, communications, public administration, domestic and all other services. Into this class were also thrown persons dependent on unproductive sources of livelihood such as income from investments or begging. In sum, the four "non-agricultural" classes were neither occupational, nor industrial, nor socio-economic groupings.

It seemed to us that no purpose would be served in perpetuating this anomalous set of rubrics. On the other hand, no more detailed breakdowns were available for the sector of the working population returned as earning dependents or for the

secondary occupations of "self-supporting persons". It was not possible to extract from the Census even approximate figures to compare with the two-fold ALE classification of all occupations apart from the land into "non-agricultural labour" and "other non-agricultural work".

*Distinction between owners and tenants.* A further problem arose in the classification of cultivators with regard to landholding status since the lines of demarcation between owners and tenants were differently drawn. The Census took as owners all tenants with permanent heritable occupancy rights, with or without right of unrestricted transfer. The Agricultural Labour Enquiry, by contrast, considered as owners only persons holding directly from Government. We shall note the effects of this conceptual difference on the percentages of owners and tenants shown in the two sets of findings.

The first of the occupational tables, Table A.8 in Appendix 2 shows for the general population (rural plus urban) of each Census division the proportions of earners (self-supporting persons plus earning dependents of both sexes) returned in the Census as owner-cultivators, tenant-cultivators, cultivating labourers, and rent receivers. All other occupations are grouped, as we have explained, in a residual category which may very roughly be considered as non-agricultural. It must be kept in mind that this category includes plantation work, livestock keeping, forestry and fishing as well as genuinely non-agricultural activities. In every case, earning dependents have been assigned to the occupation in which they themselves were active rather than (as in the main Census tables) the occupation of the person upon whom they were returned as partly dependent.

Using as the primary criterion the percentage of workers in non-agriculture we have sorted the 52 divisions into three broad classes: A—divisions with diversified economies, B—mainly agricultural divisions, and C—preponderantly agricultural divisions. Within the first class, we have distinguished two sub-classes on the same basis: relative prevalence of workers in non-agriculture. Within the second and third classes, we have distinguished three sub-classes each in accordance with the prevalence of cultivating labourers or, conversely, of owner and tenant cultivators. We have set out no comparison of divisions in respect of the percentages of persons returned as non-cultivating rent receivers since these were in almost all cases extremely small. Table 10 shows the grouping of the divisions into these classes and sub-classes.

*Factors affecting occupational percentages.* In so far as concerns the various percentages recorded for owner-cultivators and tenant-cultivators, it must be kept in mind that the Census of 1951 did not use these terms in the way they are normally understood. According to the instructions, all tenants with permanent or heritable possession were to be taken as owners, whether or not they had the right of transfer. As for cropsharers, no all-India directions were issued as to whether or not they were to be classed as tenants. In the result, it appears that the line dividing owners from

A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

TABLE 10. GROUPING OF 62 DIVISIONS ACCORDING TO PERCENTAGES OF SELF-SUPPORTING PERSONS AND EARNING DEPENDENTS (BOTH SEXES) RETURNED IN THE CENSUS OF 1951 AS WORKERS IN NON-AGRICULTURE (INCLUDING PLANTATIONS), AND AS AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS

divisions	percentage of workers in non-agriculture	percentage of agricultural labourers	percentage of tenant cultivators	percentage of owner cultivators	percentage of all cultivators
<b>A : divisions with diversified economies</b>					
<b>1. highly urbanized</b>					
Greater Bombay	90.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2
Delhi	90.1	2.2	0.6	6.6	7.2
Chandernagore	94.4	—	—	—	—
<b>2. relatively diversified</b>					
Durjooling-Duars	57.7	3.9	17.4	20.2	37.6
Coorg	56.5	12.0	6.5	18.5	25.0
Kutch	54.5	12.8	7.4	24.0	31.4
Travancore-Cochin	51.7	23.9	5.1	18.3	23.4
West Bengal Plain	51.7	16.2	8.9	22.8	31.7
Malabar	51.4	24.1	16.6	5.9	22.5
Ajmer	44.9	17.6	3.2	32.5	35.7
Saurashtra	44.0	15.9	7.4	31.5	38.9
<b>B : mainly agricultural divisions</b>					
<b>3. significant use of hired labourers</b>					
Bhopal	33.1	25.6	7.2	32.0	39.2
Telegana	32.4	35.7	5.4	25.5	30.9
Malwa	30.9	25.1	9.0	34.2	43.2
Coastal Andhra	30.7	31.5	6.1	29.9	36.0
Jabalpur-Nagar	25.6	41.7	2.7	29.3	32.0
<b>4. moderate use of hired labourers</b>					
Tamilnad	38.1	21.5	6.9	31.9	38.8
Rayalaseema	35.5	19.4	4.3	38.8	43.1
Coastal Orissa	34.5	14.5	7.0	42.3	49.3
Gujarat	34.0	18.8	8.3	37.6	45.9
Inland Orissa	27.2	20.5	3.5	48.2	51.7
Deccan	27.1	20.5	4.1	47.2	51.3
<b>5. chiefly owner and tenant farming</b>					
Assam Valley	30.3	3.1	12.6	44.5	57.1
Manipur	36.9	0.0	7.6	53.5	61.1
Punjab Plain	36.8	12.0	14.8	34.1	48.9
Mysore	35.9	10.0	4.0	46.9	51.8
West Uttar Pradesh	34.0	5.8	3.5	54.9	58.4
Konkan	31.7	11.0	30.0	26.6	56.6
Tripura	28.8	9.1	8.3	52.5	60.8
Orwalior	28.0	7.8	17.2	45.5	62.7
Jaipur-Alwar	27.9	7.0	21.1	42.9	64.0
Patinis	27.1	10.5	11.4	48.8	60.2
Jodhpur-Bikaner	26.4	4.9	43.9	24.1	69.0
Kotah-Bundi	25.8	13.0	2.6	56.8	39.4

## SANKHYĀ : THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF STATISTICS : SERIES B

TABLE 10. GROUPING OF 68 DIVISIONS ACCORDING TO PERCENTAGES OF SELF-SUPPORTING PERSONS AND EARNING DEPENDENTS (BOTH SEXES) RETURNED IN THE CENSUS 1951 AS WORKERS IN NON-AGRICULTURE (INCLUDING PLANTATIONS), AND AS AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS (concluded)

divisions	percentage of workers in non-agriculture	percentage of agricultural labourers	percentage of tenant cultivators	percentage of owner cultivators	percentage of all cultivators
C: preponderantly agricultural divisions					
<b>6. cultivation largely through hired labour</b>					
Marathwada	23.5	38.5	4.6	31.7	36.8
Berar Nagpur	22.6	58.3	3.7	14.4	18.1
Chhattisgarh	18.1	41.0	2.0	38.4	40.4
Sikkim	10.1	48.1	6.3	34.2	40.6
<b>7. self-cultivation plus hired labour</b>					
North Karnataka	29.9	24.9	10.7	38.8	49.6
South Uttar Pradesh	23.7	14.4	6.8	54.1	60.9
South Bihar	21.5	23.4	7.6	46.2	53.8
Dhar-Jhabua-Nimar	16.8	23.8	7.9	50.8	58.7
Bundelkhand	16.6	23.3	6.1	54.5	60.6
North Bihar	11.4	31.6	11.8	44.5	56.3
<b>8. ownership cultivation predominant</b>					
Oadh (Central U.P.)	24.2	6.9	5.8	62.2	68.0
Punjab Hills	22.3	4.5	14.6	57.1	71.7
Mowar	21.7	5.6	5.4	66.6	71.9
Chhota Nagpur	17.0	10.9	3.0	67.8	70.8
Kumson-Garkwal	17.7	1.4	4.8	76.0	80.8
East Uttar Pradesh	17.3	9.2	6.5	66.5	73.0
Assam Hills	16.6	4.3	6.8	74.5	78.4
Himachal	10.4	2.6	6.6	79.9	86.5

tenants was drawn differently in different States, and that cropsharers were recorded as tenants in some States but not in others. Although we have calculated separately the percentages of owners and tenants, we do not attach much significance to the distinction.

Another caution must be sounded. It will be recalled that the percentages of self-supporting persons and earning dependents recorded in the various census divisions differed widely from each other. Thus 60 percent of all persons (males and females) in Chhattisgarh and Himachal divisions were returned as earners, but only 30 percent of all persons in Tamilnad, Malabar and the old Mysore State. As we have pointed out, it is extremely unlikely that the true variation in the proportions of workers in different areas should be of this magnitude. We have presented arguments to the effect that the higher figures are more likely to be reliable, and that the lower ones represent serious under-enumeration of the labour force.

It appears probable that the persons whose work activity was not recorded in the Census of 1951 were in large part family helpers in cultivation or persons working irregularly as farm labourers. Where enumeration of the working force has been

## A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

fairly complete, the percentage of workers engaged in cultivation and agricultural labour may be presumed to be reasonably accurate. Where the working force has been under-counted, we may guess that the percentages of persons engaged in agricultural pursuits should really be higher and, as a result, the percentage of non-agricultural workers should really be lower. Thus it may be noted that if figures were available for the entire working population of Travancore-Cochin and Malabar (rather than for what may be only one-half to two-thirds of the full number), the degree of economic diversification shown in these two divisions might be somewhat less marked. Similarly, Oudh and South Uttar Pradesh, both of which can boast of several good-sized cities with some industrial development, would presumably rank by comparison as less preponderantly agricultural, if a full count of cultivators and labourers had been taken in such divisions as Mysore and Rayalaseema.

One more factor affecting the percentages is the size of the unit for which they are calculated. Since each State which existed in 1951 was taken as a separate division, a few divisions such as Kutch, Coorg, Ajmer, Manipur, Tripura and Chandernagore are extremely small. In these cases, the existence of a single town with its inevitable array of urban occupations may be enough to over-balance the pattern of the area in which the town is situated. Hence the high proportions of non-agricultural workers in Ajmer and Coorg.

*Regional variation in occupational structure.* Observing all of these precautions, it is nonetheless possible to make a few generalizations about the distribution of the major divisions by economic type, according to the Census occupational data. Apart from the great urban centres of Calcutta, Bombay and Delhi, relatively high percentages—ranging from 44 to 58—of "non-agricultural" workers were found in plantation areas (Darjeeling-Duars and Coorg) or in coastal tracts with a long commercial tradition (Saurashtra and Kutch). Malabar and Travancore-Cochin fit both of these descriptions.

Among the large number of divisions in which the working population was mainly, although not overwhelmingly, engaged in agricultural pursuits (i.e., with 25 to 40 percent engaged in non-agricultural), Bhopal, Telengana, Malwa, Coastal Andhra and Jabalpur-Sagar divisions stand out with 26 to 33 percent of all earners returned as cultivating labourers. This would suggest larger holdings or an important degree of commercial agriculture, or both.

Tamilnad, Rayalaseema, Coastal and Inland Orissa, Gujarat, and Deccan comprised another group of mainly but not preponderantly agricultural regions. These divisions are not readily characterized since the percentages of workers in non-agriculture, cultivating labourers, and cultivating owner or tenant holders were all intermediate. Nor is it necessarily the case that the constellation of percentages has the same significance in one division as in another. A relatively high percentage of non-agricultural workers in a backward tract such as Inland Orissa may have reflected primarily the low productivity of agriculture. The picture was of course quite different in Gujarat with its business-like farmers and important textile industry.

In the third sub-class of divisions where non-agriculture accounted for one quarter to two-fifths of the working force, self-cultivation by owners and tenant was more typical than use of hired labour. This group included a fairly large block of divisions in North and North-West India : West Uttar Pradesh, Gwalior, Jaipur Alwar, Kotah-Bundi, Jodhpur-Bikaner, Punjab Plain and Patiala and, from further south, Mysore and the Konkan. In Assam Valley "non-agriculture" consisted to an important degree in plantation work. Substantial proportions of tenants were returned among the cultivators in Jodhpur-Bikaner, Jaipur-Alwar, and the Konkan.

In the eighteen remaining divisions, agriculture supplied the occupation for three-quarters or more of the working force. It may be noted that these are all inland areas. Large concentrations of hired labourers characterized farm operations in the sub-class comprising Marathwada, Berar-Nagpur, Chhattisgarh and Sikkim Divisions. A combination of self-cultivation, primarily by owners, with some use of hired labour was found in the preponderantly agricultural divisions of North and South Bihar, South Uttar Pradesh, Bundelkhand, Dhar-Jhabua-Nimar, and North Karnatak. The final sub-class consisted, apart from East and Central Uttar Pradesh, of hilly and peripheral tracts where a small percentage of non-agricultural workers went along with a high percentage of cultivating owners. In this group were Assam Hills, Punjab Hills, Himachal, Kumaon-Garhwal, Chhota Nagpur and Mewar. Relative inaccessibility perhaps helped to insulate these areas against the spread of tenancy, cultivation through hired labour, and economic diversification.

*Census and ALE data on rural occupational distribution.* So far we have been considering the occupational distribution of the general population, that is of all workers whether in villages or in towns, in order to obtain an overall view of the economic structure of the various divisions. Let us now turn our attention to the rural working force, data which is available from the ALE as well as from the Census. Since the ALE presented no direct occupational information on helpers, we have taken ALE figures for earners and Census figures for self-supporting persons. Territorially, the ALE occupational data have been given for entire States rather than for zones within each State. Accordingly we have set out the comparison in terms of the 17 major States as they were constituted in 1951. The respective percentages of Census SSP's and ALE earners in cultivation, agricultural labour and other occupations are shown in Table 9 in the Appendix.

Many differences between the ALE occupational findings and the Census results are immediately apparent. In almost every State, the percentage of agricultural labourers found by ALE is much greater than that found by the Census. On the other hand, the percentages of owners recorded by the ALE are consistently and strikingly less than those reported in the Census. The proportion of tenants is in some cases greater and some smaller. The same is true of the percentage of workers in non-agriculture.

*Conceptual differences.* These discrepancies may be ascribed in the first place to the difference in the definitions of owner and tenant to which we have already

A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

referred, and to the broader conception by the ALE of the class of labourers. In responding to the Census enumerator, a petty cultivator who also hired out regularly as a field labourer was free to describe himself as primarily an owner or a tenant. The ALE investigators, by contrast, were instructed to record as a labourer anyone who, they ascertained, had spent more than half of his working days during the past year in that capacity, whether or not he also cultivated on his own account.

We may also recall that in almost every division the percentages of males and females returned as earners in the ALE differed from the percentages returned as SSP's in the Census. Proportions returned in particular occupations may well be affected by variations in the size and composition of the group taken as the base. For example, in a particular division the Census may show a larger percentage of persons engaged in non-agriculture than the ALE because a substantial number of women who work as agricultural labourers have been returned by their husbands as non-earning dependents. Or the ALE may arrive at a higher percentage of cultivators than the Census because it has counted as earners a considerable number of persons who help only from time to time in the cultivation of family land.

*Relative prevalence of cultivators and agricultural labourers.* Nonetheless, taking the whole array of percentages together and considering not so much the actual figures as the relative position of each State, we discover an important area of agreement between the Census and the ALE. Table 11 shows the respective rank orders of the States by proportions of cultivators and proportions of agricultural labourers.

TABLE 11. RANKING OF 17 STATES (AS OF 1951) BY PERCENTAGES OF CULTIVATORS AND AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS AMONG ALL RURAL WORKERS ACCORDING TO CENSUS AND ALE

rank order	owners and tenants		agricultural labourers	
	census	ALE	census	ALE
1	Rajasthan	Rajasthan	Madhya Pradesh	Madras
2	Uttar Pradesh	Assam	Travancore-Cochin	Hyderabad
3	Vindhya-Pradesh	Uttar Pradesh	Madras	Madhya Pradesh
4	Mysore	PEPSU	Hyderabad	Mysore
5	PEPSU	Bombay	Bihar	Orissa
6	Punjab	Vindhya Pradesh	Vindhya Pradesh	Bihar
7	Bihar	Madhya Bharat	West Bengal	Travancore-Cochin
8	Bombay	Punjab	Orissa	Naurashtra
9	Orissa	West Bengal	Bombay	Madhya Bharat
10	Assam	Mysore	Madhya Bharat	Bombay
11	Naurashtra	Naurashtra	PEPSU	Vindhya Pradesh
12	Madhya Bharat	Madhya Pradesh	Mysore	West Bengal
13	Madhya Pradesh	Orissa	Punjab	Uttar Pradesh
14	Hyderabad	Bihar	Uttar Pradesh	PEPSU
15	Madras	Hyderabad	Naurashtra	Rajasthan
16	West Bengal	Madras	Rajasthan	Assam
17	Travancore-Cochin	Travancore-Cochin	Assam	Punjab
	highest 80 percent	86 percent	29 percent	61 percent
	lowest 31 percent	15 percent	2 percent	11 percent

It becomes clear that relatively high percentages of cultivators were recorded in the rural tracts of Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Vindhya Pradesh (Bundelkhand), PEPSU (Patiala), and Punjab by both the Census and the ALE. Relatively low percentages of agricultural labourers were found in both cases in Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, PEPSU, Punjab and Assam. A quite different economic picture—low percentages of cultivators and high proportions of labourers—was indicated by both Census and ALE in Madhya Pradesh, Hyderabad, Madras, and Travancore-Cochin.

Both sources also showed concentration of agricultural labourers in Bihar, although the ranking by percentage of cultivators was disparate. Again both showed a relatively low proportion of cultivators in Saurashtra, accompanied by a high percentage of non-agricultural workers. Census as well as ALE figures for Bombay, Orissa and Madhya Bharat are intermediate. Sharp disagreement is registered with regard to Mysore where the Census found a high proportion of cultivators and the ALE a high proportion of labourers. On the whole, the occupational distribution of ALE earners tends to support the Census evidence that cultivation by owners and tenants prevailed in the greater part of north and north-west India, while agricultural labour had its chief economic importance in south and central India.

*Distribution unaffected by inclusion of secondary occupations.* If we take account of secondary as well as principal occupations of Census SSP's and ALE earners in these same seventeen States, the picture remains substantially unchanged. Table A.10 in Appendix 2 allows us to compare the total importance of each of the three occupational categories: cultivation, agricultural labour, and non-agriculture, by taking account of all workers in each category whether it is their sole occupation or only one of two occupations. In this way we can assess the full strength of the working population engaged in cultivation of land or the maximum extent of the hired agricultural labour force. The total percentages, of course, add up to more than 100 percent since each person with two occupations is included twice.

In constructing this table we have taken cultivation as a single occupation, regardless of whether the cultivator has been returned as an owner or tenant. Persons appearing in Census and ALE tabulations as primarily cultivating owners with a secondary occupation as cultivating tenants or vice versa (cultivating tenants with a secondary occupation as cultivating owners), we have treated uniformly as cultivators with no subsidiary work. Similarly, for persons returned in the Census as primarily subsisting on receipt of rents but having a secondary economic activity or vice versa, we have taken the actual work as the sole occupation. For these reasons, our final figures for the percentages of workers who have more than one occupation are somewhat less than the published Census and ALE figures. Although the ALE figures refer to the rural area, we have had to use Census data for the general population (rural plus urban), since Census information on secondary occupations was not tabulated separately for urban and rural areas.

The ALE percentages for earners with more than one occupation run consistently higher than the Census figures. But this might well be the result of the more



## A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

intensive questioning which is possible in a sample survey and not in a general population census. Whereas the Census percentages for the 17 States range from 2.6 percent in Saurashtra to 22.6 percent in Orissa, the ALE figures vary from 9.3 percent for PEPSU to 47.4 percent for Bihar. Census and ALE both found low percentages of workers engaged in two occupations in PEPSU, and high percentages in Orissa. But sharp disagreement may be noted between the Census and ALE percentages for Bihar and Saurashtra.

When we look at the figures for the *total* percentage under each occupation, we find once again that Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Vindhya Pradesh and PEPSU rank high in proportion of cultivators while Saurashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Hyderabad, Madras and Travancore-Cochin rank low. As before, agricultural labour looms large in the last-mentioned four States plus Bihar, but is relatively minor in Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, PEPSU, Punjab and Assam. Despite the varying proportions of workers for whom a second occupation was recorded by the Census and the ALE, there is clear agreement on the relative positions of the seventeen States with regard to the *total* strength of the three types of work.

*Differing proportions of agricultural labourers.* In the discussion of distribution by principal occupation we noted that in practically all States the ALE identified a much greater proportion of the working force as agricultural labourers than the Census. We attributed these discrepancies primarily to differences in definition. To our surprise, it appears that even when secondary occupations are taken into account the ALE percentages for agricultural labourers are twice or more than twice the Census percentages in 11 of the 17 States. This is the case in States with relatively high percentages of labourers according to both sources (e.g. Hyderabad and Madras) as well as in States where both Census and ALE found relatively low percentages of labourers (e.g. Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan). We shall return to this topic after considering the ALE data on landholding by agricultural labour families.

### 7. OCCUPATIONAL DEPENDENCE OF THE ENTIRE POPULATION

*Distribution by occupation of head of household.* It is possible to classify the entire population, non-workers as well as workers, by the occupations upon which they depend for their livelihood. In effect this amounts to a classification of all household members by the type of work done by the head of the household. We have used this method despite its somewhat crude nature, because it bypasses the problem of differences from State to State in the proportion of persons classed as earners or workers. An additional advantage is that we are able to prepare distributions of this nature from the ALE for the rural population of 48 divisions.

From the Census we have calculated percentages in agriculture, agricultural labour, etc., by using the total numbers of persons returned under one or another of the eight Livelihood Classes. From the ALE we have used the total numbers of persons in families assigned to one or another occupational group. Each Census Livelihood Class consisted of all self-supporting persons in a particular occupational category—

such as cultivating owners—and all earning or non-earning dependents who derived partial or full support from these self-supporting persons. In the great majority of cases only a single self-supporting person was returned for each household. Other working members, if any, were typically taken as earning dependents. Thus, whether or not their own work was the same as that of the head of the household, they were automatically assigned to his livelihood class. Only if a member of the household other than the head were returned as a self-supporting person and if this person's work fell into a different occupational category would he be assigned to a different livelihood class. Thus distribution of population by livelihood classes is roughly equivalent to distribution of population on the basis of the principal occupation of the head of the household.

Similarly, for the Agricultural Labour Enquiry, the family occupation appears to have been determined primarily by the principal employment of the head of the family. The only exception to this practice which is specifically mentioned is that families in which the majority of the earners were agricultural labourers were classed as agricultural labour families even if the head himself had a different occupation. However, it seems unlikely that this could have affected the classification of any significant number of persons.

*Apparent contrast between Census and ALE results.* Table A.11 in Appendix 2 presents for the rural population of 48 divisions the respective Census and ALE proportions of persons in families of owners, tenants, agricultural labourers and workers in all other occupations. At first glance the percentages calculated from the two sets of data for each of these categories appear to follow altogether different patterns. For example, in the rural areas of Coastal Andhra the Census found half of the population to belong to families of owners and tenants, and only about one-quarter to families of agricultural labourers. The respective ALE percentages are almost exactly the reverse.

But it is possible to put together a composite figure for all persons in landholding families which includes non-cultivating landholders (who were separately tabulated in the Census) and agricultural labour families with land (which were separately tabulated by the ALE). When compiled in this fashion, the Census and ALE proportions for landholders in Coastal Andhra (54.3 and 55.5 respectively) are almost identical. The same striking concurrence may be noted in the Census and ALE figures for the percentage of landholders and their families in the rural population of the other two divisions now included in the State of Andhra: Telengana (58.8 and 60.7) and Rayalaseema (61.7 and 64.3). In fact, Census and ALE figures run closely parallel in about half of the divisions. Even where the actual numbers differ, the relative position of the various divisions according to both Census and ALE tends to agree. The product moment correlation for ratio of persons in landholding families to all persons according to Census and according to ALE is .729.

## A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

With regard to the percentage of the population dependent upon agricultural labour, the ALE figures are for most divisions approximately twice as high as the Census figures. Nonetheless, there is mutual confirmation as to the relative ranking of divisions by prevalence of agricultural labour as a means of subsistence. For example, Berar-Nagpur has the highest proportion of persons dependent on agricultural labour according to both Census and ALE, but the respective figures are 38.4 percent and 57.6 percent. The product moment correlation between the two sets of percentages under the rubric agricultural labour is .738. Much less agreement is exhibited in respect of the proportions of the population whose support is attributed to non-agriculture, the correlation in this case amounting only to .572.

*Significance of landholding by agricultural labour families.* We note with interest that for Berar-Nagpur the ALE percentage for persons in agricultural labour families *without land* is 38.3; in other words, it is practically identical with the Census percentage of 38.4 for all persons in the agricultural labour class. The same phenomenon may be observed for Coastal Andhra where the ALE percentage for dependence on landless agricultural labour is 26.5 and the Census figure for all agricultural labour is 25.7. Reasonably close agreement of these two scores (within a range of five percentage points) is found in 33 of the 48 divisions. It would appear that in most parts of India only persons who had no land of their own tended to return themselves in the Census as agricultural labourers. By contrast, the ALE included in its count large numbers of petty cultivators for whom agricultural labour provided an additional source of employment and income. Roughly, the Census and ALE percentages for each division may be taken as indicating the range from the proportion of the working force dependent almost exclusively upon opportunities for paid agricultural labour to the proportion available from time to time for hire as field labourers.

The implications of the high correlations between the Census and the ALE on the relative importance of landholding and agricultural labour can be brought out by a comparison of quartile rankings of the four percentages for each division. This procedure will also allow us to make tentative statements about the economic structure of the rural areas of those divisions for which the Census and ALE data fall into the same pattern.

*Regional patterns of occupational dependence.* Table 12 shows the respective quartile ranking of the divisions by percentage of rural persons in landholding classes and percentage in agricultural labour class according to, first, the Census and, second, the ALE. The substantial agreement between the two sets of data on the characteristic patterns of divisions and groups of divisions is immediately apparent. We see at once that all three divisions in Andhra have low scores for landholders and high scores for agricultural labour. A similar pattern can be observed in the quartiles for North Bihar, Berar-Nagpur and Marathwada divisions of Maharashtra; both parts of Kerala; Bhopal, Jabalpur-Sagar and Malwa divisions of Madhya Pradesh; Tamilnad, and the West Bengal Plain. Agricultural labour percentages in the upper quartiles

## SANKHYĀ : THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF STATISTICS : SERIES B

TABLE 12. QUARTILE RANKS OF DIVISIONS BY PERCENTAGE OF RURAL POPULATION IN LANDHOLDING CLASSES (OR FAMILIES) AND AGRICULTURAL LABOUR CLASS (OR FAMILIES), ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1951 AND ALE

State	division	census		ALE	
		quartile rank by percentage in landholding class	quartile rank by percentage in cultivating labour class	quartile rank by percentage in landholding families	quartile rank by percentage in agricultural labour families
Andhra	Coastal Andhra	IV	I	IV	I
	Telengana	IV	I	IV	I
	Rajalaseema	III	II	III	I
Assam	Assam Valley	II	IV	I	IV
	Assam Hills	I	IV	II	IV
	Manipur	I	IV	I	IV
	Tripura	II	III	I	III
Bihar	North Bihar	III	I	III	II
	South Bihar	III	I	II	II
	Chhota Nagpur	I	III	III	I
Gujarat	Gujarat	III	III	III	III
	Saurashtra	III	III	IV	III
	Kutch	IV	IV	IV	III
Kerala	Travancore-Cochin	IV	I	IV	I
	Malabar	IV	I	IV	I
Madhya Pradesh	Gwalior	I	IV	I	IV
	Malwa	III	II	III	II
	Dhar-Jhabua-Nimar	II	II	III	II
	Bhopal	IV	I	IV	I
	Jabalpur-Sagar	III	I	IV	II
Bundelkhand	Chhatargarh	III	II	II	II
	Bundelkhand	II	I	I	III
Madras	Tamilnad	IV	I	III	I
Maharashtra	Konkan	II	III	I	II
	Deccan	II	II	I	II
	Berar-Nagpur	IV	I	IV	I
	Marathwada	III	I	III	I
Mysore	Old Mysore	I	III	II	I
	Coorg	IV	II	II	III
	North Karnatak	III	II	I	II
Orissa	Coastal Orissa	III	II	II	II
	Inland Orissa	II	II	III	I
Punjab	Punjab Plain	III	III	III	IV
	Patiala	II	II	III	III
	Delhi	IV	III	IV	IV
	Himachal	I	IV	II	IV
Rajasthan	Jaipur-Alwar	I	IV	II	IV
	Ajmer	II	IV	II	IV
	Jodhpur-Bikaner	I	IV	I	IV
	Mewar	I	IV	I	IV
	Kotah-Bundi	II	III	II	III
Uttar Pradesh	Kumaon-Garhwal	I	IV	I	IV
	East U.P.	I	III	II	III
	Orith	I	III	II	III
	West U.P.	II	III	III	III
South U.P.	II	II	IV	III	
West Bengal	Darjeeling-Duars	IV	IV	I	II
	W. Bengal Plain	IV	II	IV	II

## A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

according to both Census and ALE are also to be found in South Bihar, both tracts of Orissa, Deccan, North-Karnatak, Dhar-Jhabun-Nimar and Chhattisgarh.

Rural Assam shows an altogether contrasting configuration : high percentages of landholders and low percentages of labourers. Other divisions of this type are Gwalior, Himachal Pradesh, Kumaon-Garhwal, East Uttar Pradesh, Oudh, and all of Rajasthan. High proportions of landholders were also recorded in Konkan. Gujarat occupied a median position with regard both to landholders and to agricultural labourers. Conflicting patterns in respect of landholders and labourers are presented by the Census and ALE data for Chhota Nagpur, Bundelkhand, Mysore and South Uttar Pradesh. In Darjeeling-Duars and Coorg the comparison is obscured because the ALE did not cover the plantations.

In a few divisions relatively low proportions of both landholders and labourers are associated with a high proportion of persons dependent on non-agriculture. This is the case in the rural areas of Saurashtra, Kutch, Punjab Plain, West Uttar Pradesh and Delhi. High percentages for non-agriculture are also typical of West Bengal Plain, Malabar, Travancore-Cochin, Tamilnad, Telengana and Coastal Andhra, where high agricultural labour percentages have already been noted. Low figures for non-agriculture were recorded in Mysore and Bundelkhand as well as in three divisions with high percentages of landholders : Assam Hills, Kumaon-Garhwal, Gwalior, and six divisions with high percentages of labourers : Borar-Nagpur, Marathwada, Deccan, North Karnatak, Dhar-Jhabua-Nimar and Chhattisgarh.

*RCS data on cultivating families.* The third All-India enquiry which we have used to check the Census of 1951 data is the Rural Credit Survey (RCS). We have taken from the RCS the percentages of cultivating families to all families in the sample villages, and from the Census the percentage of cultivating owners and tenants plus their dependents (Livelihood Classes I and II) to the whole rural population. The RCS counted as a cultivating family every household in possession of a plot of land larger than a mere garden patch. Since the RCS data is available only for 75 districts, we have calculated the Census proportions for these particular districts. Table A.12 in Appendix 2 shows the comparison, the districts being listed according to the States and divisions in which they are now included.

It must be noted that percentages calculated with the family as the unit are not precisely comparable with figures which take into account the number of persons in the families. The RCS percentages are of the former type; the Census percentages of the latter. Nonetheless, the differences arising from this particular incompatibility should not be great. In most districts, the RCS found a somewhat higher proportion of cultivators than the Census. The overall extent of agreement is indicated by the product moment coefficient of correlation between the two series of 75 district percentage: .448. This is much less than the correlation between the Census and ALE figures for landholders and their dependents in 48 divisions.

*Conformity with patterns indicated by Census and ALE.* It is difficult to compare all three (Census, ALE, RCS) simultaneously since figures for individual districts cannot be equated with figures for the divisions in which the districts are included. For nine of the smaller divisions there is no RCS data at all. In all but half a dozen of the remaining divisions, however, we may observe evidence of a general tendency toward agreement. Thus the RCS figures tend to support the Census and ALE in the sense of identifying relatively high percentages (70 or over) of cultivators' families in Tripura, Chhota Nagpur, Konkan, Dhar-Jhabua-Nimar, Old Mysore State, Himachal, Jodhpur-Bikaner, Kotah-Bundi and five of the six sample districts in East and Central Uttar Pradesh. Again, we find relatively low percentages (59 or less) of cultivators according to all three sources in Coastal Andhra, Berar-Nagpur and Bhopal.

Shifting to the district level, we note that both Census and RCS give high percentages of cultivators for Kamrup (Assam Valley), Kolhapur (Deccan), Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh), and Sawsimadhopur (Jaipur). ALE percentages for the four divisions in which these districts are located are also high. In addition, Census and RCS indicate high proportions of cultivators in Shivpuri (Malwa Division), Hisaar (Punjab Plain), Mohindergarh (Patiala), Shahjahanpur (West U.P.), and Midnapur (West Bengal Plain). The high RCS figure for cultivators in Jalpaiguri (Darjeeling-Duars) conforms closely to the ALE figure for the division; the low Census percentages for district and division result from the inclusion of plantation areas.

Low district percentages of cultivators were found by Census and RCS in Mahbubnagar (Telengana), Monghyr North (N. Bihar), Parbhani and Osmanabad (Marathwada), Ahmedabad and Broach (Gujarat), Bhilsa (Malwa), Coimbatore (Tamilnad), Jullunder (Punjab Plain) and Burdwan (West Bengal Plain). For these nine divisions the ALE also found relatively low proportions of cultivating families.

In an additional ten districts, the percentages calculated from Census and RCS data fall in the median range (60-69). These are Bhagalpur (South Bihar), West Khandeesh (Deccan), Sorath (Saurashtra), Shajapur (Malwa), Rewa (Bundelkhand), Puri (Coastal Orissa), Sambalpur (Inland Orissa), Ballia (East U.P.), Hamirpur and Mirzapur (South U.P.).

There are a few RCS figures which appear totally out of line with both Census and ALE. The RCS classed 70 percent or more of the families as cultivating in three Andhra districts, both Kerala districts, one Tamilnad district, and Sagar district in Madhya Pradesh. We recognise these as areas in which the Census and ALE reported relatively low proportions of landholders and correspondingly high proportions of agricultural labourers or non-agriculturists or both. By contrast, the RCS reported a very low percentage of cultivators in Nainital district of Kumaon-Garhwal division, where Census and ALE found high percentages. These discrepancies may reflect the nature of the RCS sample.

*Recapitulation of argument.* Apart from these particular cases, we may say that the Census and the RCS show a substantial degree of convergence in the charac-

## A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

terization of the 75 districts according to the prevalence of cultivating families among the rural population. We have already seen that there is considerable agreement between the Census and the ALE in respect of the *relative* proportions of landholding families, agricultural labour families, and non-agricultural families in the 48 divisions. We have also shown that the Census and the ALE tend to concur on the *ranking* of the 17 major 1951 States by the percentages of the working force employed in cultivation of own land, in agricultural labour, and in other work. We find approximately the same agreement between the two sources whether we calculated the percentages in terms of principal occupation alone or whether we also take secondary employment into consideration.

On the strength of these findings the 1951 Census percentages for three broad occupational bands—cultivators, agricultural labourers, and non-agriculturists—may be accepted as fairly reliable indications of regional differences. To this extent the 1951 occupational distribution constitutes a base against which the 1961 returns may fruitfully be viewed.

Our analysis of the two chief aspects of the Census of 1951 economic data has led to two sharply distinct evaluations. On the one hand, we have found cause for rejecting the apparent variation from State to State and division to division in size of working force. On the other, we have presented reasons for crediting the Census of 1951 returns as a guide to the variation from region to region in occupational pattern.

## Appendix I

## CENSUS NATURAL DIVISIONS AND ALE ZONES

States as of 1960 natural divisions	districts included	census code	ALE zones
<i>Andhra</i>			
Coastal Andhra	Srikakulam, Vishakhapatnam, East Godavari, West Godavari, Krishna, Guntur, Nellore	5.12	Madras I+VII
Telengana	Hyderabad, Mahbubnagar, Nizamabad, Medak, Karimnagar, Khammam, War- angal, Nalgonda, Raichur, <sup>1</sup> Gulbarga, <sup>1</sup> Adilabad <sup>1</sup>	3.51	Hyderabad II
Rayalaseema	Bellary, <sup>2</sup> Anantapur, Cuddapah, Kurnool	3.54	Madras III
<i>Assam</i>			
Assam Valley	Cachar, Goalpara, Kamrup, Darrang, Now- gong, Sivasagar, Lakhimpur	1.21	Assam I+II
Assam Hills	Garo Hills, United Khasi Jaintia Hills, Mithi and North Cachar Hills, Mizo, Naga Hills, and North East Frontier Agency	1.22	Assam III
Manipur	Single unit	1.23	Manipur
Tripura	Single unit	1.24	Tripura
<i>Bihar</i>			
North Bihar	Saran, Champaran, Muzaffarpur, Darbhanga, Purnea, <sup>1</sup> Monghyr North, Saharsa	2.12	Bihar I+II
South Bihar	Patna, Gays, Shahabad, Bhagalpur, Monghyr South	2.13	Bihar III
Chhota Nagpur	Hazaribagh, Ranchi, Dhanbad, Palamau, Singhbhum, Manbhum, <sup>1</sup> Santal Parganas	3.31	Bihar IV
<i>Gujarat</i>			
Gujarat	Banskantha, Sabarkantha, Mehsana, Ahmedabad, Kaira, Panch Mahals, Baroda, Broach, Surat, Amreli	4.11	Bombay I
Saurashtra	Halar, Central Saurashtra, Zalaamd, Gohil- wad, Sorath	4.12	Saurashtra
Kutch	Single unit	4.13	Kutch
<i>Jammu and Kashmir</i>			
Jammu and Kashmir	Jammu, Kathun, Mirpur, Udhampur, Doda, Rejouri, Baramulla, Anantnag, Muzaffarabad, Srinagar	1.14	Jammu and Kashmir I, II

<sup>1</sup> Parts of this district have been covered and are now included in another State or States.

<sup>2</sup> This district is now included in another State: Mysore.



A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

CENSUS NATURAL DIVISIONS AND ALE ZONES—(continued)

States as of 1900 natural divisions	districts included	census code	ALE zones
<b>Kerala</b>			
Travancore-Cochin	Trivandrum, <sup>1</sup> Quilon, <sup>1</sup> Kottayam, Trichur	4.24	Travancore-Cochin I, II
Malabar	Malabar, South Kanara, <sup>2</sup> Nilgiris <sup>3</sup>	4.23	Madras V + VI
<b>Madhya Pradesh</b>			
Gwalior	Bhind, Gwalior Gird, Morana	2.35	Madhya Bharat I
Malwa	(Shivpur), <sup>3</sup> Guna, Mandasaur, Rajgarh, Shajapur, Ujjain, Ratlam, Bhilsa, Indore, Dewas	3.13	Madhya Bharat II
Dhar-Jhabua-Nimar	(Dhar), <sup>3</sup> Jhabua, Nimar	3.14	Madhya Bharat III and IV
Bhopal	Sehore, Raosen	3.23	Bhopal
Jabalpur-Sagar	Mandla, Sagar, Jabalpur, Hoshangabad, Betul, Chhindwara, (Nimar) <sup>3</sup>	3.24	Madhya Pradesh II
Chhattisgarh	Balaghat, Bhandara, <sup>2</sup> Chanda, <sup>2</sup> Raipur, Bilaspur, Durg, Bhatar, Raigarh, Surguja	3.32	Madhya Pradesh III
Bundelkhand	Sidhi, Rewa, Satna, Shahdol, Datia, Chhatrapur, Tikamgarh, Panna	3.22	Vindhya Pradesh
<b>Madras</b>			
Tamilnad	Chittoor, <sup>2</sup> North Arcot, Salem, Coimbatore, <sup>1</sup> Tiruchirappalli, Madurai, Chingleput, Madras, South Arcot, Tanjore, Ramnad, Tirunelveli	5.21	Madras II + IV
<b>Maharashtra</b>			
Greater Bombay	Greater Bombay	4.21	
Konkan	Thana, Kolaba, Ratnagiri, Kanara <sup>2</sup>	4.22	Bombay V
Deccan	West Khandesh, East Khandesh, Dangs, Nasik, Ahmednagar, Poona, Satara North, Satara South, (Kolhapur), <sup>3</sup> Sholapur	3.43	Bombay II + III
Berar-Nagpur	Amravati, Buldana, Akola, Yectmal, Wardha, Nagpur	3.41	Madhya Pradesh I
Marathwada	Aurangabad, Parbhani, Nanded, <sup>1</sup> Bidar, <sup>2</sup> Bhir, Osmanabad	3.42	Hyderabad I
<b>Mysore</b>			
Mysore	Bangalore, Kolar, Tumkur, Mysore, Mandya, Chitaldrug, Hassan, Chickmagalur, Shimoga	3.53	Mysore I, II, III
Coorg	Sir gte unit	4.25	Coorg
North Karnatak	Belgaum, <sup>1</sup> Bijapur, Dharwar	3.52	Bombay IV
<b>Orissa</b>			
Coastal	Balasore, Cuttack, Puri, Ganjam, Paliiss (Mayurbhanj), <sup>2</sup> (Keonjhar), <sup>3</sup> Dhenkanal, Sundergarh, Phulbani, Ganjam Agency, Sambalpur, Bolangir, Kalahandi, Koraput	5.11	Orissa I
Inland		3.33	Orissa II + III

<sup>1</sup>Parts of this district have been severed and are now included in another State or States.

<sup>2</sup>This district is now included in another State: Bidar, Kanara and South Kanara in Mysore; Nilgiris in Madras; Bhandara and Chanda in Maharashtra; Chittoor in Andhra.

<sup>3</sup>Parentheses indicate that this district was classified in another zone in the Agricultural Labour Enquiry.

## SANKHYĀ : THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF STATISTICS : SERIES B

## CENSUS NATURAL DIVISIONS AND ALE ZONES—(concluded)

States as of 1951 natural divisions	districts included	census ratio	ALE zones
<i>Punjab</i>			
Punjab Plain	Ambala, Gurgaonpur, Hoshiarpur, Amritsar, Jullundur, Ludhiana, Ferozepur, Karnal, Hissar, Rohtak, Gurgaon	2.31	Punjab
Patiala	Patiala, Naraina, Bhatinda, Mohindergarh, Kapurthala, Sangrur, Kohistan, Fategarh Sahib	2.32	PEPSU
Kangra	(Kangra) <sup>1</sup> , (Nainital) <sup>1</sup>	1.13	Included in Punjab
Delhi	Single unit	2.33	Delhi.
Himachal	Chamba, Mandi, Sirmoor, Mahasu, Bilaspur	1.12	Himachal, Bilaspur
<i>Rajasthan</i>			
Jaipur-Alwar	Jaipur, Tonk, Bharatpur, Sawaimadhopur, Alwar, Sikar, Bhilwara, Jhunjhunu	2.34	Rajasthan I
Ajmer	Firgola unit	2.36	Ajmer
Jodhpur-Bikaner	Bikaner, Churu, Jodhpur, (Jangnagar, Jalore, Pali, Nagore, Jaisalmer	2.41	Rajasthan II, IV
Mewar	Udaipur, Dungarpur, Hanawara, Sirohi	3.11	Rajasthan III
Kotah-Bundi	Chittorgarh, Kotah, Bundi, Jhalawar	3.12	Rajasthan V
<i>Uttar Pradesh</i>			
Kumaon-Garhwal	Garhwal, Tehri-Garhwal, Nainital, Almora, (Dehra Dun) <sup>1</sup>	1.11	U.P. IV
East U.P.	Gorakhpur, Basti, Gonda, Bahrnich, Dooria, Banaras, Jaunpur, Ghazipur, Ballia, Azamgarh	2.14	U.P. I-V
Oudh	Kanpur, Fatehpur, (Allahabad) <sup>1</sup> , Lucknow, Unao, Rai-Bareilly, Sitapur, Haridoi, Faizabad, Sultanpur, Pratapgarh, Bara Banki	2.21	U.P. II
West U.P.	Saharanpur, Bareilly, Unjore, Rampur, Muzaffernagar, Halaudshahr, (Pilibhit), (Kheri) <sup>1</sup> , Meerut, Aligarh, Mathura, Agra, Mainpuri, Etah, Buland, Moradabad, Shahjahanpur, Etawah, Farrukhabad	2.22	U.P. III
South U.P.	Jhansi, Jhalaur, Banda, Hamirpur, Mirzapur	3.21	U.P. VI
<i>West Bengal</i>			
Darjeeling-Duars	Darjeeling, Jalpaiguri, Cooch Behar	1.25	W. Bengal I, II, VIII
West Bengal Plain	Hooghly, Howrah, 24 Parganas, Calcutta, Burdwan, Birbhum, Bankura, Midnapore, Nadia, Murshidabad, Malda, West-Dinajpur	2.11	W. Bengal III, IV, V, VI, VII
Chandernagore	Single unit	..	
Sikkim	Single unit	1.26	

<sup>1</sup> Parentheses indicate that this district was classified in another zone in the Agricultural Labour Enquiry.

## Appendix 2: Tables

### LIST OF APPENDIX TABLES

TABLE A.1. Percentage of general population in 17 States returned as self-supporting persons or earning dependents compared with percentages in working age group (15-64) according to Census of 1951 .. .. .	156
TABLE A.2. Percentage distribution of general population by household economic status according to Census of 1951 (51 divisions): (a) males, (b) female .. .. .	157
TABLE A.3. Distribution of general population by economic status in selected States: Censuses of 1931, 1941, and 1951: (a) males, (b) females, (c) persons .. .. .	161
TABLE A.4. Percentage distribution of rural population by economic status—according to Census of 1951 and Agricultural Labour Enquiry (52 divisions): (a) males, (b) females .. .. .	164
TABLE A.5. Percentage distribution of rural population by economic status: Census of 1951, National Sample Survey (9th round 1955), and Agricultural Labour Enquiry (1951), for Part A States before 1956 reorganization: (a) males, (b) females, (c) persons .. .. .	170
TABLE A.6. Percentage distribution of urban population by economic status: Census of 1951 and National Sample Survey (9th round 1955) for Part A States before 1956 reorganization: (a) males, (b) females, (c) persons .. .. .	173
TABLE A.7. Percentage of rural and urban population in working age group (15-64) compared with percentages returned as self-supporting and earning dependents in Census of 1951 and National Sample Survey (9th round 1955) for Part A States before 1956 reorganization .. .. .	175
TABLE A.8. Percentage distribution of occupied population in agriculture and other occupations (rural plus urban, 52 divisions) according to Census of 1951: (a) males, (b) females, (c) persons .. .. .	177
TABLE A.9. Percentage distribution of self-supporting persons (Census of 1951) and earners (Agricultural Labour Enquiry) by principal occupation for 17 States—rural population .. .. .	183
TABLE A.10. Percentage distribution of self-supporting persons (Census of 1951) and earners (Agricultural Labour Enquiry) by single and combined occupations in cultivation, agricultural labour, and non-agriculture for 17 States .. .. .	185
TABLE A.11. Percentage distribution of rural population in 52 divisions by principal occupation of head of household—Census of 1951 and Agricultural Labour Enquiry .. .. .	187
TABLE A.12. Proportion of cultivating classes (families) to all classes (families), rural population, 75 districts, Census of 1951 and Rural Credit Survey, 1961-1962 .. .. .	192

SANKHYĀ : THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF STATISTICS : Series B

TABLE A.1. PERCENTAGE OF GENERAL POPULATION IN 17 STATES RETURNED AS SELF-SUPPORTING PERSONS OR EARNING DEPENDENTS COMPARED WITH PERCENTAGES IN WORKING-AGE GROUP (15-64) ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1951

major States*	males			females			persons	
	all males (000)	age-15-64 per 100 males	SSP's + ED's per 100 males	all females (000)	age-group 15-64 per 100 females	SSP's + ED's per 100 females	age-group 15-64 persons	SSP's + ED's per 100 persons
Assam	4,812	55.89	54.00	4,232	58.58	30.78	54.70	43.13
Bihar	20,224	56.32	49.90	20,902	58.70	21.28	58.46	35.88
Bombay	18,815	58.82	64.80	17,341	57.58	29.93	58.22	42.80
Hyderabad	9,431	57.82	69.61	9,224	57.35	31.42	57.69	45.87
Madhya Bharat	4,183	59.87	58.89	3,821	57.85	24.38	58.90	41.27
Madhya Pradesh	10,853	58.40	63.60	10,585	58.47	47.75	58.43	55.70
Madras	28,419	60.56	47.32	28,597	60.77	14.72	60.67	30.97
Mysore	4,857	59.38	47.74	4,418	58.52	10.05	57.98	29.39
Orissa	7,243	59.02	57.24	7,403	59.66	19.59	59.34	38.21
PEPSU	1,895	55.15	59.73	1,099	54.02	14.40	54.96	38.99
Punjab	8,648	54.83	58.50	5,742	63.42	19.56	54.18	39.38
Rajasthan	7,962	57.00	60.68	7,329	57.21	39.30	57.10	50.43
Scandhra	2,094	55.88	63.46	2,043	58.17	29.72	55.92	41.74
Travancore-Cochin	4,821	57.15	49.74	4,860	58.02	22.87	57.59	36.15
Uttar Pradesh	33,099	58.79	59.00	30,117	57.88	24.27	58.27	42.45
Vindhya Pradesh	1,833	59.41	59.10	1,742	59.80	32.52	59.60	46.15
West Bengal	13,345	63.71	54.77	11,485	59.83	11.29	61.93	34.88

\* As of 1951.

Sources : Census of India, 1951, Vol. 1, Part II-B Economic Tables (General Population) and Volume 1, Part I.A Demographic Tables. The age distribution is based on a 10% sample tabulation.

A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

TABLE A.2. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF GENERAL POPULATION\* BY HOUSEHOLD ECONOMIC STATUS ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1961

census jurisdiction		all males (000)	self supporting persons		earning dependents		non-earning dependents	
code natural division			as % of all males	quar-tile*	as % of all males	quar-tile*	as % of all males	quar-tile*
(a) males								
<i>Assam, Manipur, Tripura</i>								
1.21	Assam Valley	4,179	42.6	IV	11.4	I	48.0	II
1.22	Assam Hills	633	44.6	III	9.6	II	46.8	II
1.23	Manipur	284	39.8	IV	13.7	I	46.8	I
1.24	Tripura	336	46.5	III	9.8	II	44.6	II
<i>Bihar</i>								
2.12	North Bihar	9,001	45.7	III	4.2	IV	50.1	I
2.13	South Bihar	5,689	42.7	IV	4.2	IV	53.1	I
3.31	Chhota Nagpur	5,534	48.3	II	4.7	IV	47.1	I
<i>Bombay, Saurashtra, Kutch</i>								
3.43	Bombay Deccan	6,284	43.6	IV	9.7	II	46.7	II
3.62	North Karnatak	2,392	45.0	III	10.4	II	44.6	II
4.11	Gujarat	5,888	44.1	IV	9.0	II	48.9	I
4.21	Greater Bombay	1,779	65.3	I	2.3	IV	32.4	IV
4.22	Konkan	2,274	44.2	III	8.4	II	47.4	I
4.12	Saurashtra	2,094	42.1	IV	11.4	I	46.6	II
4.13	Kutch	373	47.3	III	8.0	III	44.7	II
<i>Hyderabad</i>								
3.42	Marathwada	3,016	41.5	IV	16.9	I	41.6	III
3.51	Telengana	5,416	46.2	III	14.0	I	39.8	IV
<i>Madhya Bharat and Bhopal</i>								
3.36	Gwalior	910	50.7	II	5.8	III	43.5	II
3.13	Malwa	2,385	40.8	II	7.3	III	42.9	III
3.14	Dhar-Jhabua-Nimar	839	49.3	II	7.3	III	43.4	III
3.23	Bhopal	438	51.6	I	4.9	IV	43.4	II
<i>Madhya Pradesh</i>								
3.24	Jabalpur-Sagar	2,784	50.6	II	11.5	I	37.9	IV
3.32	Chhattisgarh	5,056	50.7	II	14.7	I	34.8	IV
3.41	Berar-Nagpur	2,822	49.8	II	12.1	I	38.1	IV
<i>Madras, Coorg</i>								
3.54	Raynikeswara	2,672	41.8	IV	5.1	III	53.1	I
4.23	Malabar, S. Kanara	3,310	41.2	IV	3.3	IV	56.5	I
5.12	Andhra Coastal	7,212	44.2	III	6.6	III	49.2	I
6.21	Tamilnad	15,316	42.9	IV	3.5	IV	53.6	I
4.25	Coorg	125	52.0	I	3.2	IV	44.8	II
<i>Mysore</i>								
3.53	Mysore	4,657	48.7	IV	4.0	IV	52.3	I
<i>Orissa</i>								
3.33	Orissa Inland	3,972	48.8	III	9.8	II	43.0	III
5.11	Orissa Coastal	3,271	47.6	III	8.7	II	43.7	II

\* Notes given on p. 160.

## SANKHYĀ : THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF STATISTICS : SERIES B

TABLE A.2. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF GENERAL POPULATION BY HOUSEHOLD ECONOMIC STATUS ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1951—(continued)

census jurisdiction		all males (000)	self-supporting persons	earning dependents	non-earning dependents			
code	natural division		as % of all males	as % of all males	as % of all males			
			quar-tile*	quar-tile*	quar-tile*			
<i>Punjab, PEPSU, Delhi, Himachal, Rajasthan</i>								
1.13	Kangre	509	47.0	III	14.3	I	38.7	IV
2.31	Punjab	5,139	45.5	III	10.5	I	43.9	II
2.32	Patiala	1,895	52.7	I	7.0	III	40.3	III
2.33	Delhi	987	53.6	I	5.3	III	41.1	III
1.12	Himachal	580	55.9	I	11.4	I	32.8	IV
<i>Rajasthan, Ajmer</i>								
2.34	Jaipur-Ajmer	3,448	52.5	I	9.5	II	38.0	IV
2.41	Jodhpur-Bikaner	2,415	52.5	I	5.7	III	41.8	III
3.11	Mewar	1,062	49.5	II	10.7	I	39.7	IV
3.12	Kotah-Bundi	1,036	53.2	I	9.2	II	37.6	IV
2.36	Ajmer	360	52.8	I	8.1	III	39.2	IV
<i>Travancore-Cochin</i>								
4.24	Travancore-Cochin	4,821	43.9	IV	5.8	III	50.3	I
<i>Uttar Pradesh</i>								
1.11	Kumaon-Garhwal	1,284	50.8	II	7.7	III	41.5	III
2.14	East U.P.	9,037	50.0	II	8.3	II	41.7	III
2.21	Oudh	8,451	51.5	II	8.0	III	40.5	III
2.22	West U.P.	12,312	55.7	I	3.4	IV	40.9	III
3.21	South U.P.	2,015	51.3	II	9.6	II	40.1	III
<i>Vindhya Pradesh</i>								
3.22	Vindhya Pradesh	1,833	49.0	II	9.5	II	40.9	III
<i>West Bengal and Sikkim</i>								
1.25	Darjeeling	1,102	51.6	I	2.6	IV	45.8	II
2.11	Calcutta Industrial Area	2,857	52.7	I	1.3	IV	36.0	IV
2.11	W. Bengal excluding Calcutta	0,386	47.0	III	5.0	IV	48.0	I
1.26	Sikkim	72	41.7	IV	10.4	I	38.9	IV
(b) females								
<i>Assam, Manipur, Tripura</i>								
1.21	Assam Valley	3,626	11.7	II	17.1	II	71.2	II
1.22	Assam Hills	605	21.2	I	21.6	II	57.2	IV
1.23	Manipur	294	15.3	II	35.7	I	49.0	IV
1.24	Tripura	303	16.2	I	13.5	III	70.3	III
<i>Bihar</i>								
2.12	North Bihar	9,117	16.8	I	2.5	IV	81.7	II
2.13	South Bihar	5,562	16.9	I	4.7	IV	78.4	II
3.31	Chhota Nagpur	5,333	20.9	I	5.1	IV	74.0	II

\* Notes given on p. 150.

A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

\* TABLE A.1. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF GENERAL POPULATION BY HOUSEHOLD ECONOMIC STATUS ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1951—(continued)

census jurisdiction	all females (000)	self-supporting persons		earning dependents		non-earning dependents	
		as % of all females	quar- tile*	as % of all females	quar- tile*	as % of all females	quar- tile*
<i>Bombay, Saurashtra, Kutch</i>							
3.43 Bombay-Deccan	6,081	6.2	IV	24.6	II	89.2	III
3.52 North Karnatak	2,808	9.7	II	22.8	II	87.5	III
4.11 Gujarat	5,612	5.7	IV	23.7	II	70.6	II
4.21 Greater Bombay	1,060	9.4	III	1.8	IV	88.7	I
4.22 Konkan	2,382	8.6	III	26.3	I	85.1	III
4.12 Saurashtra	2,043	4.6	IV	25.1	II	70.3	III
4.13 Kutch	295	10.8	II	20.0	II	89.2	III
<i>Hyderabad</i>							
3.42 Marathwada	2,930	5.1	IV	27.6	I	67.3	III
3.51 Telangana	6,294	7.2	IV	23.7	II	89.1	III
<i>Madhya Bharat and Bhopal</i>							
2.35 Gwalior	782	6.3	IV	6.1	III	88.6	I
3.13 Malwa	2,231	10.1	II	13.4	IV	76.5	II
3.14 Dhar-Jhabua-Nimar	808	22.5	I	17.0	III	80.5	IV
3.23 Bhopal	399	18.0	I	6.8	III	75.2	II
<i>Madhya Pradesh</i>							
3.24 Jabalpur-Sagar	2,708	8.8	III	32.4	I	68.8	IV
3.32 Chhattisgarh	5,143	11.9	II	42.1	I	46.0	IV
3.41 Berar-Nagpur	2,735	7.8	III	34.8	I	67.4	IV
<i>Madras Coorg</i>							
3.54 Rayalaseema	2,465	11.5	II	5.8	III	82.7	I
4.23 Malabar, S. Kanara	3,590	11.8	II	3.5	IV	84.7	I
5.12 Andhra Coastal	7,221	8.4	III	8.3	III	83.3	I
5.21 Tutuclid	15,410	9.5	III	3.7	IV	86.7	I
4.25 Coorg	104	16.3	I	5.8	III	77.9	II
<i>Mysore</i>							
3.53 Mysore	4,418	7.3	III	2.7	IV	90.0	I
<i>Orissa</i>							
3.33 Orissa Inland	4,901	9.5	III	14.4	III	76.1	II
5.11 Orissa Coastal	3,402	9.7	III	4.8	IV	85.5	I
<i>Punjab, PEPSU, Delhi, Himachal, Bilaspur</i>							
1.13 Kangra	464	11.4	II	32.3	I	56.3	IV
2.31 Punjab	5,278	4.3	IV	13.1	III	82.6	II
2.32 Patiala	1,590	2.9	IV	11.5	III	35.8	I
2.33 Delhi	758	4.2	IV	3.4	IV	92.3	I
1.12 Himachal	530	13.0	II	38.	I	48.9	IV

\* Notes given on p. 160.

SANKHYĀ : THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF STATISTICS: *Series B*

TABLE A.2. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF GENERAL POPULATION BY HOUSEHOLD ECONOMIC STATUS ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1951—(concluded)

census jurisdiction	all females (000)	self-supporting persons		earning dependents		non-earning dependents	
		as % of all females	quar- tile*	as % of all females	quar- tile*	as % of all females	quar- tile*
<i>Rajasthan, Ajmer</i>							
2.34 Jaipur-Alwār	3,137	22.2	I	18.6	II	59.2	IV
2.41 Jodhpur-Bikaner	2,188	22.6	I	11.0	III	66.4	III
3.11 Mewar	1,082	16.8	II	28.6	I	55.8	IV
3.12 Kotah-Bundi	972	16.2	I	25.9	II	57.9	IV
2.36 Ajmer	333	19.2	I	17.4	II	63.4	III
<i>Travancore-Cochin</i>							
4.24 Travancore-Cochin	4,660	13.3	II	9.4	III	77.3	II
<i>Uttar Pradesh</i>							
1.11 Kumaon-Garhwal	1,238	6.9	IV	43.8	I	49.3	IV
2.14 East U.P.	8,860	8.0	III	27.3	I	64.7	III
2.21 Oudh	7,679	7.1	IV	20.7	II	72.2	II
2.22 West U.P.	10,469	3.5	IV	3.2	IV	93.3	I
3.21 South U.P.	1,891	8.2	III	30.1	I	61.7	III
<i>Vindhya Pradesh</i>							
3.22 Vindhya Pradesh	1,742	12.6	II	20.0	II	67.5	III
<i>West Bengal and Sikkim</i>							
1.26 Darjeeling	929	16.5	I	2.0	IV	81.6	II
2.11 Calcutta Industrial Area	1,720	8.6	III	0.5	IV	90.9	I
2.11 West Bengal excluding Calcutta	8,816	8.4	III	2.6	IV	89.0	I
1.36 Sikkim	66	6.0	IV	47.0	I	47.0	IV

Source: Census of India, 1951, Vol. I, Part II-B.

\*The percentages of the total male (or female) population returned in each of the 52 natural divisions have been separately arranged in order of rank for each of the three status categories, and then grouped into four quartiles. Roughly we may say: I. very high percentage; II. fairly high; III. fairly low, and IV. very low.

Thus, for example, we see that as compared with other areas, the percentages of self-supporting males returned in Assam, Manipur and Tripura were low, while the percentages of earning dependents were high. By contrast, in Madhya Bharat and Bhopal, the percentages returned as self-supporting were high, and those of earning dependents low. In Madhya Pradesh both sets of earning percentages were high, in Madras both sets were low.



A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

TABLE A.3. DISTRIBUTION OF GENERAL POPULATION BY ECONOMIC STATUS IN SELECTED STATES: CENSUSES OF 1931, 1941 AND 1951

States	Categorie	1931	earners	working dependents	dependents	all males
		1941	independents	partly dependents	total dependents	
		1951	self-supporting persons	earning dependents	non-earning dependents	
(a) males (000)						
Bihar and Orissa		1931	11,938	305	8,839	21,082
		1941	12,212	1,399	10,617	24,028
		1951	12,682	1,556	13,229	27,467
Bombay*		1931	7,127	609	5,133	12,869
		1941	6,044	967	5,579	12,589
		1951	8,576	1,025	8,413	18,614
Madras		1931	12,884	935	9,462	23,301
		1941	11,741	1,063	11,997	24,800
		1951	12,192	1,267	14,970	28,419
Uttar Pradesh		1931	16,604	571	9,088	26,063
		1941	14,573	1,196	13,551	29,320
		1951	17,411	2,119	13,569	33,099

Percentage Distribution of General Population by Economic Status in Selected States: Censuses of 1931, 1941 and 1951

Bihar and Orissa	1931	56.63	1.45	41.92	100.00
	1941	50.82	5.82	43.35	100.00
	1951	46.17	5.67	48.16	100.00
Bombay	1931	49.79	4.73	45.48	100.00
	1941	48.01	7.68	44.31	100.00
	1951	46.07	8.73	45.20	100.00
Madras	1931	55.29	4.02	40.69	100.00
	1941	47.34	4.29	48.37	100.00
	1951	42.90	4.42	52.68	100.00
Uttar Pradesh	1931	62.94	2.19	34.87	100.00
	1941	49.70	4.08	46.22	100.00
	1951	52.60	6.40	41.00	100.00

\*The figures for Bombay in 1931 cover the areas which were included in Bombay in 1951 except for a few minor princely States transferred to Bombay from Rajputana and Western India Agency. The 1941 Bombay figures exclude as well the Deccan and Gujarat States since Y-sample slips were not available for these States.

Source: Census of 1931, India, Vol. I, Part II, Tables, pp. 2, 3, 218, 222, 386, 394; Madras 1931, Vol. XIV, Part II, pp. 2, 3, 106, 114.

Census of 1941, *Age Tables and Means of Livelihood and Industries Tables—1941 Census on Y-sample*, for Bihar, Orissa, Bombay, Madras and Uttar Pradesh. Census of 1951, Vol. I, Part II-B, pp. 2-3, 4-8, 14-15.

## SANKHYĀ : THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF STATISTICS : SERIES B

TABLE A.3. DISTRIBUTION OF GENERAL POPULATION BY ECONOMIC STATUS IN SELECTED STATES: CENSUSES OF 1931, 1941 AND 1951—(continued)

States	categories	1931	earners	working dependents	dependents	all females
		1941	independent persons	partly dependent	total dependents	
		1951	self-supporting persons	earning dependents	non-earning dependents	
(b) females (000)						
Bihar and Orissa		1931	1,978	394	15,875	21,247
		1941	3,029	2,478	18,768	24,266
		1951	4,207	1,486	21,703	27,406
Bombay*		1931	1,900	1,109	9,028	12,036
		1941	1,340	1,333	9,023	11,697
		1951	1,216	3,974	12,151	17,341
Madras		1931	5,205	7,171**	11,516	23,892
		1941	3,291	1,814	19,934	25,040
		1951	2,771	1,439	24,387	28,697
Uttar Pradesh		1931	4,314	2,871	16,367	23,552
		1941	2,085	1,269	23,222	26,575
		1951	1,848	5,461	22,808	30,117

Percentage Distribution of General Population by Economic Status in Selected States: Censuses of 1931, 1941 and 1951

Bihar and Orissa	1931	23.43	1.85	74.72	100.00
	1941	12.48	10.21	77.30	100.00
	1951	15.35	5.46	79.19	100.00
Bombay	1931	15.78	9.22	75.00	100.00
	1941	11.46	11.40	77.14	100.00
	1951	7.01	22.92	70.07	100.00
Madras	1931	21.79	30.01**	48.20	100.00
	1941	13.15	7.24	79.61	100.00
	1951	9.69	5.03	85.28	100.00
Uttar Pradesh	1931	18.32	12.19	69.49	100.00
	1941	7.85	4.77	87.38	100.00
	1951	6.14	18.13	75.73	100.00

\*See note for Males Only.

\*\*This figure includes 6,086,000 females returned as working dependents in domestic service.

A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA  
**TABLE A.3. DISTRIBUTION OF GENERAL POPULATION BY ECONOMIC STATUS IN  
 SELECTED STATES: CENSUSES OF 1931, 1941 AND 1951—(concluded)**

States	categories	1931	earners	working dependents	dependants	all persons
	1941	independent persons	partly dependents	total dependents		
	1951	self-supporting persons	earning dependents	non-earning dependents		
(c) persons (000)						
Bihar and Orissa	1931	16,917	699	24,714	42,330	
	1941	16,242	3,876	29,174	48,292	
	1951	16,899	3,051	34,932	54,872	
Bombay*	1931	9,027	1,718	14,159	24,904	
	1941	7,384	2,300	14,602	24,286	
	1951	9,792	5,699	20,565	35,956	
Madras	1931	18,090	8,106**	20,998	47,194	
	1941	15,033	2,877	31,931	49,841	
	1951	14,963	2,698	39,357	57,016	
Uttar Pradesh	1931	20,718	3,441	25,456	49,615	
	1941	16,658	2,466	36,772	55,895	
	1951	19,260	7,680	38,378	65,216	
Percentage Distribution of General Population by Economic Status in Selected States: Censuses of 1931, 1941 and 1951						
Bihar and Orissa	1931	39.96	1.65	58.39	100.00	
	1941	31.56	8.03	60.41	100.00	
	1951	30.78	5.56	63.66	100.00	
Bombay	1931	33.36	6.90	59.74	100.00	
	1941	30.40	9.47	60.13	100.00	
	1951	27.23	15.57	57.20	100.00	
Madras	1931	38.33	17.18**	44.40	100.00	
	1941	30.16	5.77	64.07	100.00	
	1951	26.24	7.73	69.03	100.00	
Uttar Pradesh	1931	41.76	6.84	51.30	100.00	
	1941	29.80	4.41	65.79	100.00	
	1951	30.47	11.99	57.54	100.00	

\* See note for Madras Only.

\*\* This figure includes 6,086,000 females returned as working dependents in domestic service.

## SANKHYĀ : THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF STATISTICS: Series B

TABLE A.4. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RURAL POPULATION BY ECONOMIC STATUS ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1961 AND AGRICULTURAL LABOUR ENQUIRY\*

States and divisions	source census ALE	all males	SSP earner	ED helper	NED dependent
(a) males only					
<i>Andhra</i>					
Coastal Andhra	census	6,932,821	43.9	6.9	49.2
	ALE	8,345	53.2	11.5	35.3
Telangana	census	5,080,105	45.5	16.0	38.5
	ALE	6,600	54.3	13.9	31.8
Rayalaseema	census	2,149,413	41.6	5.1	53.2
	ALE	3,720	47.7	16.3	36.0
<i>Assam</i>					
Valley	census	3,978,213	42.2	11.8	46.0
	ALE	4,326	37.1	21.6	41.3
Hills	census	589,717	43.8	10.2	46.0
	ALE	1,447	35.4	30.1	34.5
Manipur	census	283,685	39.6	13.5	46.9
	ALE	1,326	41.8	13.8	44.4
Tripura	census	312,386	45.4	10.3	44.3
	ALE	1,350	40.3	21.3	38.4
<i>Bihar</i>					
North Bihar	census	8,661,341	45.8	4.2	50.0
	ALE	13,917	46.0	17.5	36.5
South Bihar	census	5,029,349	43.9	4.2	52.9
	ALE	5,770	43.5	19.7	36.8
Chhota Nagpur	census	5,070,947	48.2	4.9	46.9
	ALE	7,818	48.8	15.1	36.1
<i>Gujarat</i>					
Gujarat	census	4,330,883	42.8	10.2	47.0
	ALE	8,991	39.6	17.4	43.0
Saurashtra	census	1,397,621	42.3	13.2	44.5
	ALE	3,636	39.9	21.4	38.7
Kutch	census	217,687	47.0	8.9	44.1
	ALE	2,100	41.8	15.8	42.9
Jammu & Kashmir	census		not taken		
	ALE	5,021	32.9	34.6	32.5
<i>Kerala</i>					
Travancore-Cochin	census	3,869,657	43.5	5.9	50.6
	ALE	16,362	47.9	5.8	46.3
Malabar	census	2,901,133	40.6	3.4	56.1
	ALE	7,977	47.5	10.2	43.3

\* See note on p. 169.

A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA  
 TABLE A.4. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RURAL POPULATION BY ECONOMIC  
 STATUS ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1951 AND AGRICULTURAL  
 LABOUR ENQUIRY\*—(continued)

States and divisions	source census ALE	all males	88P earner	ED helper	NED dependent
<b>Madhya Pradesh</b>					
Gwalior	census	744,712	50.5	6.4	43.1
	ALE	2,795	33.6	29.4	37.0
Malwa	census	1,866,770	49.8	8.2	42.0
	ALE	1,733	46.2	14.5	39.3
Dhar-Jhabua-Nimar	census	764,886	49.3	7.5	43.2
	ALE	2,165	42.2	22.9	34.9
Bhopal	census	365,702	51.5	5.5	43.0
	ALE	960	61.7	16.3	32.1
Jabalpur-Sagar	census	2,338,361	50.8	12.7	36.5
	ALE	2,801	48.1	12.3	39.8
Chhattisgarh	census	4,757,793	50.6	15.2	34.2
	ALE	6,603	46.4	18.4	35.2
Bundelkhand	census	1,673,635	49.5	9.8	40.7
	ALE	3,393	41.6	21.1	37.3
<b>Madras</b>					
Tamilnad	census	11,712,378	42.5	3.2	54.3
	ALE	16,607	54.5	10.4	35.1
<b>Maharashtra</b>					
Greater Bombay	census		no rural population		
Konkan	ALE				
	census	1,802,483	43.6	9.2	47.2
Deccan	ALE	2,734	42.2	17.7	40.1
	census	4,674,680	42.5	11.2	46.3
Berar-Nagpur	ALE	4,833	39.7	19.8	40.4
	census	2,071,696	50.8	13.6	35.4
Marathwada	ALE	3,432	55.6	10.1	34.2
	census	2,686,751	41.1	18.4	40.5
Mysore	ALE	6,372	48.2	14.8	37.0
	census	5,520,509	43.7	3.5	52.8
Coorg	ALE	5,082	45.0	19.6	35.4
	census	116,040	51.1	3.6	45.3
North Karnatak	ALE	1,198	48.6	9.3	42.1
	census	1,761,688	45.0	11.4	43.6
Orissa	ALE	3,817	39.6	20.7	39.7
	census	3,074,157	47.3	7.0	43.7
Inland	ALE	4,146	48.9	14.4	36.7
	census	3,852,859	48.2	9.9	41.9
Coastal	ALE	3,784	47.2	15.3	37.5
	census				

\* See note on p. 169.

## SANKHYĀ : THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF STATISTICS : SERIES B

TABLE A.4. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RURAL POPULATION BY ECONOMIC STATUS ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1951 AND AGRICULTURAL LABOUR ENQUIRY\*—(continued)

States and divisions	source census ALE	all males	SSP owner	ED helper	NED dependant
<i>Punjab</i>					
Punjab Plain	census	4,895,364	45.6	11.3	43.1
	ALE	15,614	39.4	22.7	37.9
Patiala	census	1,599,539	53.2	7.7	39.1
	ALE	6,807	38.0	20.0	43.0
Punjab Hills	census	454,887	44.9	15.8	39.3
	ALE		separate figure	not available	
Delhi	census	187,106	49.2	8.8	42.2
	ALE	4,902	40.2	14.8	45.0
Himachal	census	553,903	56.0	11.6	32.4
	ALE	2,387	42.5	17.6	39.9
<i>Rajasthan</i>					
Jaipur-Alwar	census	2,806,178	53.9	10.5	35.6
	ALE	3,392	39.4	24.1	38.5
Ajmer	census	202,869	54.1	12.2	33.7
	ALE	2,849	42.4	27.6	39.0
Jodhpur-Bikaner	census	1,943,414	53.9	6.2	39.9
	ALE	2,453	37.0	23.8	39.2
Mewar	census	950,378	49.4	11.6	39.0
	ALE	1,739	41.2	20.6	38.2
Kota-Bundi	census	890,443	53.2	10.1	36.7
	ALE	597	42.1	18.4	39.5
<i>Uttar Pradesh</i>					
Kumaon-Garhwal	census	1,105,287	49.6	8.6	41.8
	ALE	946	42.1	19.1	38.8
East U. P.	census	8,341,307	50.0	8.6	41.4
	ALE	11,250	41.7	21.4	36.9
Oudh	census	7,183,669	51.1	8.8	40.1
	ALE	9,974	44.5	24.1	31.4
West U.P.	census	10,005,692	56.8	3.3	39.9
	ALE	14,614	40.9	21.8	37.3
South U.P.	census	1,724,194	51.2	9.3	39.5
	ALE	2,886	45.5	16.2	38.3
<i>West Bengal</i>					
Darjeeling-Duars	census	978,384	51.3	2.7	46.0
	ALE	3,974	46.0	22.6	31.4
W. Bengal Plain	census	8,653,029	46.8	5.2	48.0
	ALE	16,822	46.8	13.1	40.1
(Chandernagore)	census ALE		no rural population		
Sikkim	census	70,682	41.0	20.8	38.4
	ALE		no villages surveyed		

\* See note on p. 169.

A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA  
 TABLE A.4. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RURAL POPULATION BY ECONOMIC  
 STATUS ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1961 AND AGRICULTURAL  
 LABOUR ENQUIRY\*—(continued)

States and divisions	source census ALE	all females	SSP earner	ED helper	NED dependent
(b) females only					
<i>Andhra</i>					
Coastal Andhra	census	6,038,160	8.7	9.2	82.1
	ALE	7,922	28.2	14.0	57.8
Telangana	census	4,991,606	6.8	27.6	65.6
	ALE	6,055	29.7	18.1	52.2
Rayalaseema	census	2,062,884	12.1	8.2	81.7
	ALE	3,688	29.8	26.1	44.1
<i>Assam</i>					
Valley	census	3,491,728	12.0	17.6	70.4
	ALE	3,784	7.3	30.3	62.4
Hills	census	571,833	21.8	22.6	55.6
	ALE	1,383	12.6	46.2	41.3
Manipur	census	293,050	15.2	35.8	49.0
	ALE	1,350	33.0	18.4	46.6
Tripura	census	284,049	16.7	14.4	68.9
	ALE	1,244	1.0	16.2	82.8
<i>Bihar</i>					
North Bihar	census	8,835,116	15.9	2.6	81.6
	ALE	13,170	13.9	24.7	61.4
South Bihar	census	4,978,820	17.8	4.7	77.5
	ALE	5,308	16.5	17.3	66.2
Ohhota Nagpur	census	4,958,584	21.4	5.3	73.3
	ALE	7,216	23.8	15.4	60.8
<i>Gujarat</i>					
Gujarat	census	4,146,644	5.4	29.6	65.0
	ALE	8,666	9.7	31.8	58.5
Saurashtra	census	1,346,577	4.2	34.6	61.2
	ALE	3,512	13.6	32.2	54.2
Kutch	census	236,165	10.8	23.0	66.2
	ALE	2,300	16.4	21.7	61.9
<i>Jammu &amp; Kashmir</i>	census			not taken	
ALE	4,198	0.8	43.9	55.3	
<i>Kerala</i>					
Travancore-Cochin	census	3,022,476	13.6	10.1	76.3
	ALE	16,888	27.7	6.1	66.2
Malabar	census	3,078,773	12.1	3.6	84.3
	ALE	8,131	21.2	16.0	62.8

\* See note on p. 169.

## SANKHYĀ : THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF STATISTICS : SERIES B

TABLE A.4. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RURAL POPULATION BY ECONOMIC STATUS ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1951 AND AGRICULTURAL LABOUR ENQUIRY\*—(continued)

States and divisions	source census ALE	all females	SP earner	ED halper	NED dependent
<i>Madhya Pradesh</i>					
Owalior	census	636,615	6.7	5.8	87.5
	ALE	2,160	4.1	13.9	82.0
Malwa	census	1,762,335	11.1	16.0	72.9
	ALE	1,663	15.9	26.9	57.2
Dhar-Jhabua-Nimar	census	737,625	23.6	18.0	58.4
	ALE	2,057	11.8	41.3	46.9
Bhopal	census	334,709	20.2	7.8	72.2
	ALE	869	29.1	29.1	41.8
Jabalpur-Sagar	census	2,309,556	8.9	36.9	54.2
	ALE	2,738	20.9	33.2	45.9
Chhattiagarh	census	4,858,723	11.9	43.8	44.3
	ALE	5,762	20.1	37.1	42.8
Bundelkhand	census	1,595,145	12.5	21.2	66.3
	ALE	3,342	8.5	36.0	55.5
<i>Madras</i>					
Tamilnad	census	11,856,917	10.0	4.1	85.0
	ALE	17,695	33.7	19.3	47.0
<i>Maharashtra</i>					
Greater Bombay	census		no rural population		
	ALE				
Konkan	census	1,961,868	9.0	30.4	60.5
	ALE	3,010	14.5	41.6	43.9
Deccan	census	4,512,692	6.0	29.9	64.1
	ALE	4,910	14.1	36.9	49.0
Berar-Nagpur	census	2,034,005	8.2	42.8	49.0
	ALE	3,397	38.0	21.1	40.9
Marathwada	census	2,520,487	4.9	30.7	64.4
	ALE	6,264	23.0	21.1	55.9
<i>Mysore</i>					
Mysore State	census	3,376,736	7.8	2.9	89.3
	ALE	4,811	20.7	25.0	54.3
Coorg	census	97,110	18.1	6.3	77.6
	ALE	1,186	12.7	25.7	61.6
North Karnatak	census	1,704,864	9.9	27.0	63.1
	ALE	3,816	13.1	36.3	51.6
<i>Orissa</i>					
Coastal	census	3,230,761	9.7	4.9	85.4
	ALE	4,066	11.8	11.6	76.6
Inland	census	3,894,099	9.5	14.8	75.9
	ALE	3,683	13.9	12.2	73.9

\* See note on p. 169.



A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

TABLE A.4. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RURAL POPULATION BY ECONOMIC STATUS ACCORDING TO CENSUS OF 1951 AND AGRICULTURAL LABOUR ENQUIRY\*—(concluded)

States and divisions	source census ALE	all females	88P owner	ED helper	NED dependant
<i>Punjab</i>					
Punjab Plain	census	4,255,050	4.6	15.6	70.8
	ALE	13,107	4.6	7.5	87.9
Patiala	census	1,298,636	3.0	13.6	83.4
	ALE	5,560	2.0	2.4	95.6
Punjab Hills	census	428,928	10.8	34.7	54.5
	ALE		figures not available		
Delhi	census	139,832	4.7	12.8	82.5
	ALE	4,419	4.1	33.9	62.0
Himachal	census	519,417	13.2	39.1	47.1
	ALE	2,084	7.8	40.5	51.7
<i>Rajasthan</i>					
Jaipur-Awar	census	2,539,894	24.9	21.0	54.1
	ALE	2,970	7.3	25.4	67.3
Ajmer	census	192,730	26.6	26.9	46.5
	ALE	2,613	9.1	49.1	41.8
Jodhpur-Bikaner	census	1,748,428	26.0	12.5	61.5
	ALE	2,166	4.2	25.0	70.8
Mewar	census	925,752	16.6	30.9	52.5
	ALE	1,692	2.1	44.0	53.9
Kotah Bundi	census	836,943	17.3	29.0	53.7
	ALE	557	8.8	42.2	49.0
<i>Uttar Pradesh</i>					
Kumaon-Garhwal	census	1,122,471	7.1	48.2	44.7
	ALE	885	3.1	47.3	49.6
East U. P.	census	8,253,164	8.0	28.9	63.1
	ALE	9,802	3.5	17.7	78.8
Oudh	census	6,694,802	7.4	23.4	69.2
	ALE	7,747	4.6	26.7	66.7
West U. P.	census	8,527,289	3.4	3.6	93.0
	ALE	12,145	2.1	10.5	87.4
South U.P.	census	1,632,188	8.2	33.8	58.0
	ALE	2,704	3.9	26.3	69.8
<i>West Bengal</i>					
Darjeeling-Duars	census	841,766	17.4	2.0	80.6
	ALE	3,599	13.2	23.9	62.9
W. Bengal Plain	census	8,183,866	8.3	2.7	89.0
	ALE	14,500	6.1	2.0	91.0
(Chandernagore)	census		no rural population		
	ALE				
Sikkim	census	64,399	4.0	48.9	46.2
	ALE		no villages surveyed		

Source : Census—Census of India 1951, Part II-C, *Economic Tables*, pp. 2, 4, 14.

Agricultural Labour Enquiry—Government of India, Ministry of Labour, *Rural Manpower and Occupation Structure 1954*, Table No. 2 for all States.

SANKHYĀ : THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF STATISTICS : SERIES B

TABLE A.5. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RURAL POPULATION BY "ECONOMIC STATUS": CENSUS OF 1951, NATIONAL SAMPLE SURVEY (9th Round 1955) AND AGRICULTURAL LABOUR ENQUIRY (1951) FOR PART A STATES BEFORE 1956 REORGANIZATION

States	source	SSP's owners	ED's helpers	NED's dependents	not recorded	total	all males
							number of sample persons
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
(a) males							
Andhra*	census	43.31	6.40	50.29	—	100.00	8,162,034
	NSS	51.54	15.88	32.11	0.47	100.00	998
	ALE	51.50	12.95	35.55	—	100.00	11,985
Assam	census	42.38	11.82	48.00	—	100.00	4,565,930
	NSS	49.89	10.92	38.88	0.31	100.00	842
	ALE	38.68	23.75	39.57	—	100.00	5,673
Bihar	census	45.86	4.40	49.94	—	100.00	18,761,637
	NSS	46.25	9.68	43.98	0.21	100.00	2,396
	ALE	46.29	17.29	36.42	—	100.00	27,505
Bombay	census	43.14	10.80	46.26	—	100.00	12,469,744
	NSS	47.99	10.17	40.92	0.92	100.00	1,673
	ALE	39.96	18.64	41.40	—	100.00	20,375
Madhya Pradesh	census	50.70	14.24	36.06	—	100.00	9,167,850
	NSS	54.67	7.85	37.10	0.38	100.00	1,088
	ALE	49.48	14.57	35.95	—	100.00	11,838
Madras*	census	42.07	3.39	54.84	—	100.00	14,613,511
	NSS	48.16	13.60	37.12	1.12	100.00	1,561
	ALE	52.27	10.34	37.39	—	100.00	24,784
Orissa	census	47.76	9.48	42.76	—	100.00	6,927,016
	NSS	53.29	8.74	37.97	0.00	100.00	842
	ALE	48.08	14.81	37.11	—	100.00	7,930
Punjab	census	45.55	11.67	42.78	—	100.00	5,350,051
	NSS	52.33	4.26	43.22	0.19	100.00	785
	ALE	39.45	22.68	37.89	—	100.00	16,814
Uttar Pradesh	census	52.75	6.82	40.43	—	100.00	28,380,149
	NSS	50.59	7.88	41.44	0.29	100.00	3,665
	ALE	42.40	21.76	35.84	—	100.00	39,670
West Bengal	census	47.24	4.94	47.82	—	100.00	9,631,413
	NSS	48.85	9.98	40.56	0.61	100.00	1,167
	ALE	46.64	15.04	38.32	—	100.00	19,596
(b) females							
Andhra*	census	9.54	8.44	82.02	—	100.00	8,101,034
	NSS	9.68	30.64	59.23	0.45	100.00	944
	ALE	28.68	17.76	53.55	—	100.00	11,510

\* See notes on p. 172.

A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA  
 TABLE A.5. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RURAL POPULATION BY "ECONOMIC  
 STATUS": CENSUS OF 1961, NATIONAL SAMPLE SURVEY (8th Round 1965)  
 AND AGRICULTURAL LABOUR ENQUIRY (1961) FOR PART A  
 STATES BEFORE 1956 REORGANIZATION—(continued)

States	source	SSP's earners	ED's helpers	NED's dependents	not recorded	total	all females
							number of sample persons
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Assam	census	13.36	18.32	68.32	—	100.00	4,063,369
	NSS	11.51	19.95	68.54	0.00	100.00	570
	ALE	8.72	34.60	56.78	—	100.00	5,127
Bihar	census	17.88	3.82	78.32	—	100.00	18,768,320
	NSS	5.27	16.78	77.88	0.09	100.00	2,433
	ALE	17.20	20.59	62.21	—	100.00	25,694
Bombay	census	6.80	29.47	63.73	—	100.00	12,316,068
	NSS	11.21	32.06	56.04	0.69	100.00	1,524
	ALE	12.10	35.11	52.79	—	100.00	20,402
Madhya Pradesh	census	10.31	41.83	47.86	—	100.00	9,202,344
	NSS	15.31	36.00	47.88	0.21	100.00	1,069
	ALE	25.40	31.61	42.99	—	100.00	11,897
Madras*	census	10.46	3.97	85.67	—	100.00	14,936,689
	NSS	14.72	24.67	59.79	0.82	100.00	1,600
	ALE	29.71	18.27	52.02	—	100.00	26,726
Orissa	census	9.60	10.18	80.22	—	100.00	7,124,860
	NSS	14.12	24.62	61.21	0.05	100.00	819
	ALE	12.81	11.89	75.30	—	100.00	7,749
Punjab	census	5.21	17.32	77.47	—	100.00	4,684,978
	NSS	2.92	6.38	90.27	0.45	100.00	703
	ALE	4.59	7.45	87.96	—	100.00	13,107
Uttar Pradesh	census	6.33	20.42	73.25	—	100.00	28,229,894
	NSS	9.85	12.56	77.40	0.19	100.00	3,461
	ALE	3.29	18.66	78.06	—	100.00	33,283
West Bengal	census	9.17	2.63	88.20	—	100.00	9,025,632
	NSS	8.18	8.37	83.28	0.17	100.00	1,188
	ALE	7.48	7.09	85.43	—	100.00	18,099
			(c) persons				
Andhra*	census	26.50	7.42	66.08	—	100.00	16,283,088
	NSS	31.28	23.02	45.24	0.46	100.00	1,942
	ALE	40.32	15.31	44.37	—	100.00	23,475
Assam	census	28.72	14.77	56.51	—	100.00	8,620,289
	NSS	31.26	15.31	53.27	0.16	100.00	1,212
	ALE	23.41	28.85	47.74	—	100.00	10,900
Bihar	census	31.75	4.11	64.14	—	100.00	37,529,957
	NSS	25.46	13.21	61.19	0.14	100.00	4,929
	ALE	32.24	18.89	48.87	—	100.00	53,199

\* See notes on p. 172.

SANKHYĀ : THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF STATISTICS : SERIES B

TABLE A.5. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RURAL POPULATION BY "ECONOMIC STATUS": CENSUS OF 1951, NATIONAL SAMPLE SURVEY (9th Round 1955) AND AGRICULTURAL LABOUR ENQUIRY (1951) FOR PART A STATES BEFORE 1956 REORGANIZATION—(concluded)

States	source	SSP's owners	ED's helpers	NED's dependents	not recorded	total	all persons number of sample persons
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Bombay	census	25.08	19.96	54.94	—	100.00	24,785,810
	NSS	30.15	20.79	48.26	0.80	100.00	3,097
	ALE	26.03	26.88	47.10	—	100.00	40,777
Madhya Pradesh	census	30.46	28.06	41.48	—	100.00	18,370,194
	NSS	34.99	22.22	42.48	0.30	100.00	2,137
	ALE	37.41	23.11	39.48	—	100.00	23,733
Madras	census	26.09	3.63	70.27	—	100.00	29,548,200
	NSS	31.28	10.18	48.57	0.97	100.00	3,161
	ALE	40.78	14.38	44.84	—	100.00	50,510
Orissa	census	28.41	9.84	61.75	—	100.00	14,051,876
	NSS	34.22	16.47	49.29	0.36	100.00	2,137
	ALE	30.65	13.36	55.99	—	100.00	16,679
Punjab	census	26.71	14.31	58.98	—	100.00	10,035,027
	NSS	29.20	5.25	65.24	0.3	100.00	1,488
	ALE	23.54	15.72	60.74	—	100.00	28,721
Uttar Pradesh	census	30.45	13.85	56.20	—	100.00	34,590,043
	NSS	30.91	10.04	58.81	0.24	100.00	7,126
	ALE	24.55	20.35	55.10	—	100.00	72,953
West Bengal	census	28.82	3.82	67.36	—	100.00	18,657,045
	NSS	28.18	9.15	62.28	0.39	100.00	2,356
	ALE	27.84	11.23	60.93	—	100.00	37,695

Source : Census :—Census of India, 1951, Vol. I, Part II-C, *Economic Tables (Rural and Urban Population)* pp. 2-5, 14-15.

National Sample Survey : No. 16 *Employment and Unemployment (May-November 1955)*, Delhi, 1959, Table 3(2), p. 125.

ALE :—Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Agricultural Labour Enquiry, *Rural Manpower and Occupational Structure—1954* Table No. 2 for all States.

General Note : "Economic Status" (or "Household Economic Status") is used in the Census of 1951 to denote the return of each individual as (a) a self-supporting person (SSP); (b) an earning dependent (ED); (c) a non-earning dependent (NED).

The National Sample Survey used three very similar categories : (a) earning; (b) earning dependents; (c) non-earning dependents.

The Agricultural Labour Enquiry used three somewhat differently defined categories : (a) earners; (b) helpers; (c) dependents.

\*Andhra \*Madras :—The figures taken from the Census for Andhra refer to the "North Madras" and "Madras Decan" divisions of the former Madras State. The latter division includes the entire Bellary district. Chittoor, although a part of Andhra, has been included in the figures for Madras since it was treated in the Census as part of the "South Madras" Division.

The ALE figures taken for Andhra are those for Zones I, III, and VII of the undivided Madras States. Coverage is almost identical with that of the two Census divisions.

A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

TABLE A.6. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF URBAN POPULATION BY "ECONOMIC STATUS": CENSUS OF 1951 AND NATIONAL SAMPLE SURVEY (9th Round 1956) FOR PART A STATES BEFORE 1956 REORGANIZATION

States	source	SRP's	ED's	NED's	not recorded	total	all males
							number of sample persons
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
(a) males							
Andhra*	census	45.02	5.04	49.94	—	100.00	1,602,133
	NSS	51.21	7.61	41.17	0.01	100.00	1,630
Assam	census	50.41	3.52	46.07	—	100.00	246,236
	NSS	44.96	4.69	50.28	0.07	100.00	516
Bihar	census	44.20	3.73	52.07	—	100.00	1,482,028
	NSS	48.68	7.61	43.81	—	100.00	1,727
Bombay	census	52.02	4.95	42.03	—	100.00	6,145,118
	NSS	50.04	4.97	44.81	0.18	100.00	7,296
Madhya Pradesh	census	48.92	6.50	44.38	—	100.00	1,494,962
	NSS	49.04	3.12	47.84	—	100.00	1,617
Madras*	census	44.25	4.27	51.48	—	100.00	4,021,325
	NSS	47.56	5.05	47.30	0.09	100.00	5,422
Orissa	census	51.12	6.05	42.83	—	100.00	315,876
	NSS	52.26	4.18	43.56	—	100.00	314
Punjab	census	45.71	7.86	46.43	—	100.00	1,297,963
	NSS	47.60	2.32	49.95	0.13	100.00	1,580
Uttar Pradesh	census	51.71	3.93	44.26	—	100.00	4,738,717
	NSS	50.65	3.75	45.59	0.01	100.00	5,996
West Bengal	census	59.97	1.52	38.51	—	100.00	3,714,028
	NSS	55.30	4.87	39.75	0.08	100.00	6,239
(b) females							
Andhra*	census	7.58	3.90	88.62	—	100.00	1,585,956
	NSS	10.39	10.26	79.14	0.21	100.00	1,565
Assam	census	5.83	2.71	91.45	—	100.00	168,182
	NSS	2.86	22.73	74.36	0.05	100.00	384
Bihar	census	11.58	3.34	85.08	—	100.00	1,233,952
	NSS	9.18	6.59	84.18	0.05	100.00	1,341
Bombay	census	7.55	6.85	85.60	—	100.00	5,025,222
	NSS	8.10	8.26	83.39	0.25	100.00	6,014
Madhya Pradesh	census	8.05	10.48	81.47	—	100.00	1,382,377
	N.S.S.	8.97	10.15	80.81	0.07	100.00	1,433
Madras*	census	7.96	2.58	89.46	—	100.00	3,974,341
	NSS	8.85	6.75	84.30	0.10	100.00	5,068
Orissa	census	10.24	4.43	85.33	—	100.00	278,194
	NSS	14.30	5.81	79.89	—	100.00	285
Punjab	census	3.49	2.90	93.61	—	100.00	1,057,133
	NSS	6.58	3.28	90.83	0.33	100.00	1,366
Uttar Pradesh	census	4.87	2.67	92.46	—	100.00	3,896,962
	NSS	4.96	3.75	91.19	0.10	100.00	4,827
West Bengal	census	8.71	0.73	90.56	—	100.00	2,439,235
	NSS	6.65	2.74	90.37	0.34	100.00	4,492

\* See notes on p. 174.

## SANKHYĀ : THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF STATISTICS : SERIES B

TABLE A.8. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF URBAN POPULATION BY "ECONOMIC STATUS": CENSUS OF 1951 AND NATIONAL SAMPLE SURVEY (8th Round 1955) FOR PART A STATES BEFORE 1956 REORGANIZATION—(continued)

States	source	SP's	ED's	NED's	not recorded	total	all persons number of sample persons
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
		(a) persons					
Andhra	census	36.39	4.43	69.18	—	100.00	3,188,068
	NSS	30.85	8.93	60.11	0.11	100.00	3,195
Assam	census	32.31	3.19	64.50	—	100.00	414,418
	NSS	25.07	13.21	61.66	0.06	100.00	900
Bihar	census	29.27	3.55	67.18	—	100.00	2,695,990
	NSS	30.61	7.09	62.28	0.02	100.00	3,068
Bombay	census	32.01	5.81	62.18	—	100.00	11,170,340
	NSS	30.32	6.52	62.95	0.21	100.00	13,410
Madhya Pradesh	census	28.29	8.41	62.30	—	100.00	2,877,339
	NSS	29.70	6.61	63.76	0.03	100.00	3,050
Madras	census	26.21	3.43	70.36	—	100.00	7,995,666
	NSS	27.77	5.92	66.21	0.10	100.00	10,490
Orissa	census	31.98	5.29	62.73	—	100.00	594,070
	NSS	31.93	5.05	63.02	—	100.00	599
Punjab	census	26.76	5.64	67.60	—	100.00	2,355,096
	NSS	26.81	2.79	70.17	0.23	100.00	2,946
Uttar Pradesh	census	30.61	3.36	66.03	—	100.00	8,625,699
	NSS	29.88	3.75	66.32	0.06	100.00	10,823
West Bengal	census	39.65	1.21	59.14	—	100.00	6,163,263
	NSS	34.09	3.94	61.78	0.19	100.00	1,072

Source : Census : Census of India 1951, Vol. I, Part II C. Economic Tables (Rural and Urban Population), Table B-I, pp. 26-29, 28-29.

NSS : Indian Statistical Institute, National Sample Survey: No. 16, Report on Employment and Unemployment (May-November 1955), Delhi, 1959, Table 4 (4), p. 185.

General Note : "Economic Status" (or "Household Economic Status") is used in the Census of 1951 to denote the return of each individual as (a) a self-supporting person (SP); (b) an earning dependent (ED); (c) a non-earning dependent (NED).

The National Sample Survey used three very similar categories: (a) earners; (b) earning dependents; (c) non-earning dependents.

\*The figures taken from the Census for Andhra refer to the "North Madras" and "Madras Decon" divisions of the former Madras State. The latter division includes the entire Bellary district. Chittoor, although a part of Andhra has been included in the figures for Madras since it was treated in the Census as part of the "South Madras" division.

A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

TABLE A.7. PERCENTAGE OF RURAL AND URBAN POPULATION IN WORKING AGE GROUP (15-64) COMPARED WITH PERCENTAGES RETURNED AS SELF-SUPPORTING AND EARNING DEPENDENTS IN CENSUS OF 1951 AND NATIONAL SAMPLE SURVEY (9th Round 1955) FOR PART A STATES BEFORE 1956 REORGANIZATION

States	item	source	males		females		persons	
			rural	urban	rural	urban	rural	urban
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Andhra*	Percentages in working ages	census sample	60.55	61.49	60.38	61.37	60.46	61.43
	Percentages of SSP's + ED's	census	49.71	50.06	17.88	11.38	33.92	30.83
	Percentages of Earners + ED's	NSS	67.43	58.83	40.33	20.65	54.30	39.78
Assam	Percentages in working ages	census sample	55.19	66.02	55.53	54.31	54.41	61.33
	Percentages of SSP's + ED's	census	54.00	53.93	31.68	8.54	43.49	35.50
	Percentages of Earners + ED's	NSS	60.81	49.65	31.46	25.59	46.57	38.28
Bihar	Percentages in working ages	census sample	55.94	61.14	56.73	54.54	56.33	58.16
	Percentages of SSP's + ED's	census	50.06	47.93	21.68	14.93	35.86	33.82
	Percentages of Earners + ED's	NSS	55.81	56.19	23.03	15.77	38.67	37.70
Bombay	Percentages in working ages	census sample	55.83	65.05	56.89	59.32	58.36	63.47
	Percentages of SSP's + ED's	census	53.74	56.97	36.27	14.40	45.06	37.83
	Percentages of Earners + ED's	NSS	58.16	55.01	43.27	16.36	50.94	38.84
Madhya Pradesh	Percentages in working ages	census sample	57.96	61.31	58.35	59.25	58.15	60.86
	Percentages of SSP's + ED's	census	64.94	55.43	52.14	18.53	58.53	38.70
	Percentages of Earners + ED's	NSS	63.52	53.18	51.01	19.12	57.21	36.31
Madras*	Percentages in working ages	census sample	59.80	63.97	60.61	61.95	60.21	63.47
	Percentages of SSP's + ED's	census	45.36	48.52	14.43	10.54	29.73	29.64
	Percentages of Earners + ED's	NSS NSS	61.76	52.61	39.39	15.60	50.46	33.69

\* See notes on p. 176.

## SANKHYĀ : THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF STATISTICS : SERIES B

TABLE A.7. PERCENTAGE OF RURAL AND URBAN POPULATION IN WORKING-AGE GROUP (16-64) COMPARED WITH PERCENTAGES RETURNED AS SELF-SUPPORTING AND EARNING DEPENDENTS IN CENSUS OF 1951 AND NATIONAL SAMPLE SURVEY (9th Round 1955) FOR PART A STATES BEFORE 1956 REORGANISATION—(concluded)

States	item	source	males		females		persons	
			rural	urban	rural	urban	rural	urban
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Orissa	Percentages in working age	census sample	58.92	61.04	59.76	57.37	59.34	59.34
	Percentages of SSP's + ED's	census	57.24	57.17	19.78	14.67	38.35	37.27
	Percentages of Earners + ED's	NSS	63.03	56.44	38.74	20.11	50.69	38.98
Punjab	Percentages in working age	census sample	54.23	58.09	53.56	52.52	53.92	55.70
	Percentages of SSP's + ED's	census	57.22	53.57	22.53	8.39	41.02	32.40
	Percentages of Earners + ED's	NSS	56.59	49.92	9.28	8.84	34.45	29.60
Uttar Pradesh	Percentages in working age	census sample	58.28	62.02	57.60	58.22	57.96	60.32
	Percentages of SSP's + ED's	census	59.57	55.64	26.75	7.54	43.80	33.97
	Percentages of Earners + ED's	NSS	58.27	54.40	22.41	8.71	40.95	33.63
West Bengal	Percentages in working age	census sample	60.89	71.93	59.61	60.74	60.28	67.60
	Percentages of SSP's + ED's	census	55.18	61.49	11.80	9.44	32.64	40.86
	Percentages of Earners + ED's	NSS	58.83	60.17	16.55	9.29	37.33	38.03

Source: Census Sample: Census of India, 1951, Vol. I, Part II-A, *Demographic Tables*, Table C-III pp. 186-187, 192-201, 208-209, 214-223; based on 10% Sample.

Census: Census of India 1951, Vol. I, Part II-C, *Economic Tables, (Rural and Urban Population)*, Table B-II, pp. 2-5, 14-15, 26-29, 38-39.

National Sample Survey: No. 16, *Employment and Unemployment (May-November 1955)*, Delhi, 1959, Tables 2(2) and 4(4), pp. 125 and 185.

Andhra\* and Madras\*: The figures taken from the Census for Andhra refer to the "North Madras" and "Madras Decan" divisions of the former Madras State. The latter division includes the entire Bellary district. Chittoor, although a part of Andhra, has been included in the figures for Madras since it was treated in the Census as part of the "South Madras" Division.

Self-supporting persons (SSP's) and Earning dependents (ED's) were the two classifications used in the Census of 1951 to denote persons with occupation or income, as distinguished from those completely dependent on others. The equivalent terms employed in the National Sample Survey are Earners and Earning Dependents.



A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

TABLE A.8. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OCCUPIED POPULATION IN AGRICULTURE AND OTHER OCCUPATIONS, CENSUS OF 1951

States divisions	all males (000)	percen- tage occupied	SSP's +ED's (000)	owner culti- vators	tenant culti- vators	culti- vating labour- ers	all other occu- pations	rent recei- vers
(a) males								
<i>Andhra</i>								
Coastal- Andhra	7,212	50.8	3,663	33.4	7.1	26.1	32.2	1.2
Telangana	6,416	60.2	3,861*	31.6	7.1	23.0	37.5	0.7
Rayalaseema	2,572	46.9	1,207	42.8	4.8	14.8	40.0	1.6
<i>Assam</i>								
Valley	4,179	54.0	2,256	48.0	13.9	3.0	34.7	0.4
Hills	633	54.2	343	71.4	3.8	3.5	20.7	0.6
Manipur	284	53.2	151	76.6	9.9	—	19.9	2.6
Tripura	336	55.4	188	52.1	8.6	8.6	29.6	1.1
<i>Bihar</i>								
North Bihar	9,001	49.9	4,493	45.4	11.0	30.2	11.8	0.7
South Bihar	5,889	46.9	2,669	47.0	7.6	21.5	23.0	0.9
Chhota Nagpur	5,534	52.9	2,930	67.6	26.9	9.2	20.2	0.3
<i>Gujarat</i>								
Gujarat	5,895	53.1	3,125	37.5	8.8	12.6	40.0	1.0
Saurashtra	2,094	53.5	1,120	32.1	7.8	8.1	50.6	1.3
Kutch	273	55.3	151	28.5	8.6	6.6	56.3	2.0
<i>Kerala</i>								
Travancore- Cochin	4,621	49.7	2,298	20.4	6.4	22.3	50.4	0.5
Malabar	3,310	44.5	1,476	6.4	18.3	20.0	54.1	1.2
<i>Madhya Pradesh</i>								
Gwalior	910	56.6	515	48.0	17.5	5.4	28.0	1.1
Malwa	2,385	57.1	1,362	39.9	9.1	16.4	35.2	0.5
Dhar-Jhabua- Nimar	839	58.5	474	54.4	7.8	17.1	20.5	0.2
Bhopal	438	56.8	248	33.5	6.8	20.6	37.1	2.0
Jabalpur-Sagar	2,784	62.1	1,729	37.1	3.9	26.6	31.6	0.8
Ujjain	5,050	65.4	3,305	51.6	2.6	25.7	19.7	0.4
Rundelkhand	1,833	59.1	1,084	58.9	5.8	19.1	15.6	0.6
<i>Madras</i>								
Tamilnad	15,815	46.4	7,104	34.4	7.7	17.0	39.8	1.1
<i>Maharashtra</i>								
Greater Bombay	1,779	67.7	1,204	0.1	0.1	0.1	99.5	0.2
Konkan	2,274	52.6	1,197	25.3	28.7	7.3	38.1	0.7
Deccan	6,284	53.3	3,350	46.8	4.1	14.8	33.4	0.9

\*The percentages for Telangana have been calculated not on the total occupied population of 3,861 males but on a figure of 3,697 males since the returns of own occupation of 164 male earning dependents were missing.

## SANKHYĀ : THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF STATISTICS : SERIES B

TABLE A.8. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OCCUPIED POPULATION IN AGRICULTURE AND OTHER OCCUPATIONS, CENSUS OF 1951—(continued)

States divisions	all males (000)	percen- tage occupied	SSP's +ED's (000)	owner cul- tivators	tenant cul- tivators	culti- vating labour- ers	all other occu- pations	rent recei- vers
<i>Maharashtra (contd.)</i>								
<i>Berar</i>								
Nagpur	2,822	62.0	1,747	20.6	6.6	41.7	31.1	1.0
Marathwada	3,016	68.4	1,761*	38.4	6.3	28.7	26.0	1.6
<i>Mysore</i>								
Mysore State	4,667	47.7	2,223	50.1	6.1	8.0	35.6	1.2
Coorg	126	55.2	69	21.7	7.2	11.6	56.5	2.9
<i>North Karnatak</i>								
	2,392	55.4	1,228	40.5	11.0	18.8	28.3	1.4
<i>Orissa</i>								
Coastal	3,271	56.3	1,842	46.5	7.9	14.1	30.5	1.1
Inland	3,972	58.0	2,304	55.3	4.0	17.4	22.9	0.4
<i>Punjab</i>								
<i>Punjab</i>								
Plain	6,139	58.1	3,444	33.6	16.5	10.0	39.0	1.9
Patiala	1,895	69.7	1,131	47.9	11.4	10.2	28.5	2.0
Punjab Hills	509	61.3	212	63.8	8.0	1.9	25.3	1.0
Delhi	987	58.9	581	6.8	0.7	1.4	92.1	—
Himachal	580	67.2	390	79.0	7.7	1.8	11.0	0.5
<i>Rajasthan</i>								
Jaispur-Ajwar	3,448	62.1	2,140	43.1	20.6	4.4	31.0	0.9
Ajmer	380	60.8	219	32.9	3.6	8.2	52.9	1.4
<i>Jodhpur</i>								
Bikaner	2,416	58.2	1,406	24.0	41.3	3.8	30.1	0.7
Mewar	1,062	60.2	639	65.4	6.1	3.8	24.4	0.3
Kolab-Bundi	1,036	62.4	648	58.5	2.9	9.1	29.9	1.5
<i>Uttar Pradesh</i>								
<i>Kumaon</i>								
Garhwal	1,284	53.5	751	65.8	4.7	1.7	27.7	0.1
East U.P.	9,037	58.3	5,268	67.3	6.4	7.4	18.6	0.3
Oudh	8,451	59.5	5,030	61.2	5.6	5.4	28.9	0.8
West U.P.	12,312	59.1	7,274	66.6	3.8	6.9	33.1	0.8
South U.P.	2,015	59.9	1,207	64.2	6.8	11.8	28.7	0.7
<i>West Bengal</i>								
<i>Darjeeling-</i>								
Duars	1,102	54.2	597	23.3	20.6	4.2	51.4	0.5
West Bengal	12,243	54.8	6,712	23.5	9.3	15.5	51.3	0.4
<i>Plain</i>								
Chandernagore	28	55.0	16	—	—	—	93.8	6.4
Sikkim	72	61.1	44	52.3	4.5	27.3	15.9	—

\*The percentages for Marathwada have been calculated not on the total occupied population of 1,761 males but on a figure of 1,528 males since the returns of own occupation of 233 male earning dependents were missing.

Source: Census of India 1951, Vol. I, Part II-B, *Economic Tables*, pp. 2-14, 25-40, 90-100.

A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

TABLE A.8. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OCCUPIED POPULATION IN AGRICULTURE AND OTHER OCCUPATIONS, CENSUS OF 1961—(continued)

States divisions	all females (000)	percen- tage occupied	SSP's +ED's (000)	owner culti- vators	tenant culti- vators	culti- vating labour- ers	all other occu- pations	rent recei- vers
(b) females								
<i>Andhra</i>								
Coastal Andhra	7,221	16.7	1,909	19.2	3.1	48.2	26.1	3.4
Telangana	6,294	30.9	1,042*	12.4	1.9	42.8	21.6	1.3
Rajyalasoma	2,466	17.4	428	27.6	3.0	32.2	34.1	3.0
<i>Assam</i>								
Valley	3,626	28.8	1,043	37.1	9.8	3.2	49.1	0.8
Hills	605	42.8	259	78.8	3.9	6.4	10.9	1.1
Manipur	994	51.0	150	39.3	5.3	—	54.0	1.3
Tripura	303	29.7	90	53.3	7.7	10.0	26.7	2.2
<i>Bihar</i>								
North Bihar	9,117	18.3	1,665	42.0	11.3	35.5	10.4	0.8
South Bihar	5,562	21.6	1,200	44.3	7.7	27.8	18.2	2.0
Chhota Nagpur	6,333	26.0	1,385	68.0	3.5	14.7	13.2	0.6
<i>Gujarat</i>								
Gujarat	5,612	29.4	1,619	37.7	7.3	30.8	22.3	1.9
Saurashtra	2,043	29.7	607	30.0	6.8	29.8	32.1	1.0
Kutch	296	30.8	91	19.8	5.5	23.1	51.6	—
<i>Kerala</i>								
Travancore- Cochin	4,660	22.7	1,057	13.8	2.5	27.1	54.5	2.1
Malabar	3,500	16.3	534	5.4	11.6	35.2	44.0	4.1
<i>Madhya Pradesh</i>								
Gwalior	782	11.4	89	30.7	15.9	21.6	28.4	3.4
Malwa	2,231	23.5	524	22.1	8.8	47.9	19.8	1.3
Dhar-Jhabus- Nimar	808	39.6	319	45.5	8.1	33.0	11.3	1.3
Bhopal	399	24.8	99	28.3	8.1	38.4	23.2	2.0
Jabalpur-Sagar	2,706	41.2	1,114	17.1	1.0	65.0	15.8	1.2
Chhatisgarh	5,143	54.0	2,777	22.7	1.3	69.1	16.2	0.7
Bundelkhand	1,742	32.5	566	45.8	6.9	31.4	15.2	0.7
<i>Madras</i>								
Tamilnad	15,410	13.2	2,039	23.1	4.0	37.1	32.3	3.5

\*The percentages for Telangana have been calculated not on the total occupied population of 1942 females but on a figure of 1,739 females since the returns of own occupation of 203 female earning dependents were missing.

SANKHYĀ : THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF STATISTICS : SERIES B

TABLE A.8. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OCCUPIED POPULATION IN AGRICULTURE AND OTHER OCCUPATIONS, CENSUS OF 1951—(continued)

States divisions	all females (000)	percen- tage occupied	88P's + ED's (000)	ownr culti- vators	tenant culti- vators	multi- vating labour- ers	all other occu- pations	rent recei- vers
<b>Maharashtra</b>								
Greater Bombay	1,060	11.3	120	—	—	—	97.5	2.5
Konkan	2,382	34.9	832	28.5	31.7	16.3	22.5	1.0
Deccan	4,081	30.8	1,870	47.9	4.0	30.6	15.9	1.6
Berar-Nagpur	2,735	42.6	1,164	4.9	0.8	83.2	10.0	1.1
Marathwada	2,930	35.7	957*	14.3	2.9	63.9	18.9	2.0
<b>Mysore</b>								
Mysore State	4,418	10.0	444	30.9	4.1	20.0	37.4	7.7
Coorg	104	22.1	23	8.7	4.3	13.0	56.5	17.4
North Karnatak	2,306	32.5	749	35.9	10.0	35.6	16.3	2.3
<b>Orissa</b>								
Coastal	3,402	14.5	494	26.9	4.1	16.6	49.4	3.0
Inland	4,001	23.9	956	31.0	2.5	27.8	37.8	1.0
<b>Punjab</b>								
Punjab Plain	5,278	17.4	920	35.5	12.4	19.6	28.8	3.7
Patiala	1,599	14.4	230	53.0	71.3	12.6	20.4	2.6
Punjab Hills	464	43.7	203	46.8	24.6	8.4	17.7	2.5
Delhi	758	7.7	58	13.8	—	10.3	70.7	5.2
Himachal	530	51.1	271	81.2	5.2	3.7	9.6	0.3
<b>Rajasthan</b>								
Jaipur-Alwar	3,137	40.7	1,279	48.0	24.8	12.9	25.7	1.5
Ajmer	333	36.0	122	32.0	2.4	34.4	28.7	2.5
Jodhpur-Bikaner	2,188	33.5	734	24.1	48.8	6.8	19.5	0.8
Mewar	1,032	44.4	458	68.1	4.4	8.1	17.9	1.5
Kotah-Bundi	972	42.2	410	57.3	2.2	19.0	19.3	2.2
<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>								
Kumaon-								
Garhwal	1,238	50.7	628	88.2	5.1	1.0	5.7	—
East U.P.	8,850	35.3	3,125	65.4	6.5	12.1	15.3	0.7
Oudh	7,679	27.8	3,132	64.8	6.1	10.2	18.0	1.1
West U.P.	10,459	6.7	699	37.5	2.0	4.4	49.6	6.4
South U.P.	1,891	38.3	724	53.9	5.8	19.1	18.8	1.5
<b>West Bengal</b>								
Darjeeling-Duars	929	18.5	172	9.3	6.4	2.9	79.7	1.7
West Bengal								
Plain	10,536	10.7	1,123	18.3	6.3	19.9	54.4	1.0
Chandernagore	22	9.0	2	—	—	—	100.0	—
Sikkim	66	53.0	35	11.4	8.6	74.3	2.9	2.8

\*The percentages for Marathwada have been calculated not on the total occupied population of 957 females but on a figure of 575 females since the returns of own occupation of 382 female earning dependents were missing.

Source: Census of India 1951, Vol. I, Part II-B, Economic Tables, pp. 2-14, 26-40, 90-120.

A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

TABLE A.8. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OCCUPIED POPULATION IN AGRICULTURE AND OTHER OCCUPATIONS, CENSUS OF 1951—(continued)

States divisions	all persons (000)	percen- tage occupied	SSI's + EID's (000)	owner ulti- vators	tenant ulti- vators	ulti- vating labour- ers	all other occu- pations	rent recei- vers
(c) persons								
<b>Andhra</b>								
Coastal Andhra	14,433	33.8	4,872	29.9	6.1	31.5	30.7	1.8
Telangana	12,709	45.7	5,803*	25.5	5.4	36.7	32.4	0.9
Rayalaseema	5,038	32.4	1,634	38.8	4.3	19.4	35.5	2.0
<b>Assam</b>								
Valley	7,805	42.3	3,299	44.5	12.6	3.1	39.3	0.5
Hills	1,238	48.6	602	74.8	3.8	4.3	16.5	0.8
Manipur	578	52.1	301	53.5	7.6	—	38.9	2.0
Tripura	639	43.2	276	52.5	6.3	9.1	28.6	1.5
<b>Bihar</b>								
North Bihar	18,118	34.0	6,158	44.5	11.8	31.6	11.4	0.7
South Bihar	11,241	34.4	3,869	46.2	7.6	23.4	21.5	1.3
Chhota Nagpur	10,866	30.7	4,315	67.8	3.0	10.9	17.9	0.4
<b>Gujarat</b>								
Gujarat	11,397	41.6	4,744	37.6	8.3	18.8	34.0	1.3
Saurashtra	4,137	41.7	1,727	31.5	7.4	15.9	44.0	1.2
Kutch	668	42.6	242	24.0	7.4	12.8	54.5	1.2
<b>Kerala</b>								
<b>Travancore-</b>								
Cochin	9,280	36.2	3,353	18.3	5.1	23.9	51.7	1.0
Malabar	6,819	29.5	2,009	5.9	16.6	24.1	51.4	2.0
<b>Madhya Pradesh</b>								
Gwalior	1,692	35.6	603	45.5	17.2	7.8	28.0	1.5
Malwa	4,616	40.9	1,886	34.2	9.0	26.1	30.9	0.8
<b>Dhar-Jhabua-</b>								
Nimar	1,647	48.1	793	50.8	7.9	23.8	16.8	0.6
Bhopal	836	41.4	347	32.0	7.2	25.5	33.1	2.0
Jabalpur Sagar	5,490	51.8	2,843	29.3	2.7	41.7	25.5	0.9
Ohhatisparh	10,169	56.6	6,082	38.4	2.0	41.0	18.1	0.5
Bundelkhand	3,575	46.2	1,650	54.5	6.1	23.3	15.5	0.6
<b>Madras</b>								
<b>Tamilnad</b>								
Tamilnad	30,726	29.8	9,143	31.9	6.9	21.5	38.1	1.7
<b>Maharashtra</b>								
Greater Bombay	2,839	46.6	1,324	0.1	0.1	0.1	99.4	0.4
Kenkan	4,657	43.5	2,028	26.6	30.0	11.0	31.7	0.8
Deccan	12,366	42.2	5,221	47.2	4.1	20.5	27.1	1.1

\*The percentages for Telangana have been calculated not on the total occupied population of 5,803 persons but on a figure of 5,436 persons since the returns of own occupation of 367 earning dependents were missing.

## SANKHYĀ : THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF STATISTICS : SERIES B

TABLE A.8. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OCCUPIED POPULATION IN AGRICULTURE AND OTHER OCCUPATIONS, CENSUS OF 1951—(concluded)

States divisions	all persons (000)	percen- tage occupied	SSP's + E1's (000)	owner culti- vators	tenant culti- vators	culti- vating labour- ers	all other occu- pations	rent recei- vers
<b>Maharashtra (contd.)</b>								
Berar-Nagpur	5,568	53.4	2,911	14.4	3.7	58.3	22.8	1.0
Marathwada	5,946	46.7	2,718*	31.7	4.6	38.5	23.5	1.7
<b>Myore</b>								
Myore State	9,075	29.4	2,857	46.9	4.9	10.0	35.9	2.2
Coorg	229	40.2	92	18.5	6.5	12.0	56.5	6.5
North Karnatak	4,698	44.2	2,075	38.8	10.7	24.9	23.9	1.7
<b>Orissa</b>								
Coastal	6,873	35.0	2,336	42.3	7.0	14.6	34.5	1.6
Inland	7,973	40.9	3,260	48.2	3.5	20.5	27.2	0.6
<b>Punjab</b>								
Punjab Plain	11,417	38.2	4,364	34.1	14.8	12.0	36.8	2.3
Patiala	3,494	39.0	1,361	48.4	11.4	10.6	27.1	2.1
Punjab Hills	873	52.9	515	57.1	14.6	4.5	22.3	1.5
Delhi	1,745	26.5	839	6.6	0.6	2.2	90.1	0.5
Himachal	1,110	59.5	661	79.9	6.6	2.6	10.4	0.5
<b>Rajasthan</b>								
Jaipur-Awar	6,585	51.9	3,411	42.0	21.1	7.0	27.9	1.1
Ajmer	603	49.2	341	32.5	3.2	17.6	44.9	1.8
Jodhpur-								
Bikaner	4,604	46.5	2,139	24.1	43.9	4.9	28.4	0.7
Mewar	2,093	52.4	1,097	66.5	5.4	5.6	21.7	0.8
Kotah-Bundi	2,008	52.6	1,056	66.6	2.6	13.0	26.8	1.8
<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>								
Kumaon-								
Garhwal	2,522	54.7	1,379	76.0	4.8	1.4	17.7	0.1
East U.P.	17,887	46.9	8,393	66.5	6.5	9.2	17.3	0.5
Oudh	16,130	44.4	7,182	62.2	5.8	9.9	24.3	0.9
West U.P.	22,771	35.0	7,973	44.9	3.5	5.8	34.6	1.3
South U.P.	3,906	49.4	1,931	54.1	6.8	14.4	23.7	1.0
<b>West Bengal</b>								
Darjeeling-								
Duars	2,031	37.9	769	20.2	17.4	3.9	57.7	0.8
West Bengal								
Plain	22,779	34.4	7,835	22.8	8.9	16.2	51.7	0.4
Chandernagore	50	35.0	17	—	—	—	94.4	5.6
Sikkim	138	57.2	75	34.2	6.3	48.1	10.1	1.3

\*The percentages for Marathwada have been calculated not on the total occupied population of 2,718 persons but on a figure of 2,115 persons since the returns of own occupation of 603 earning dependents were missing.

Source: Census of India, 1951, Vol. I, Part II-B, Economic Tables, pp. 2-14, 26-40, 90-120.

**Definitions:** Percentage occupied: Number of self-supporting persons and earning dependents. Owner cultivators: Self-supporting persons in Class I, plus earning dependents with own occupation in Class I, plus rent receivers with subsidiary occupation in Class I. Tenant cultivators: Self-supporting persons in Class II, plus earning dependents with own occupation in Class II, plus rent receivers with subsidiary occupation in Class II. Cultivating labourers: Self-supporting persons in Class III, plus earning dependents with own occupation in Class III, plus rent receivers with subsidiary occupation in Class III. All other occupations: Self-supporting persons in Classes V, VI, VII, and VIII; plus earning dependents with own occupation in these classes plus rent receivers with subsidiary occupations in these classes. Rent receivers: Self-supporting persons in Class IV with no subsidiary occupation plus earning dependents with own occupation in Class IV.

TABLE A.9. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELF-SUPPORTING PERSONS (CENSUS OF 1931) AND EARNERS (AGRICULTURAL LABOUR ENQUIRY) BY PRINCIPAL OCCUPATION FOR 17 STATES (RURAL POPULATION)

States*	source	all number	all percentage	self-supporting persons (census) and earners (agricultural labour enquiry)						
				agricultural			non-agricultural			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Assam	census	2,478,398	100.0	65.3	62.9	50.9	11.1	0.9	2.4	34.7
	ALE	2,528	100.0	73.2	60.8	43.5	17.3	—	12.4	26.8
Bihar	census	11,917,649	100.0	91.0	67.6	58.9	8.1	0.8	23.4	9.0
	ALE	17,151	100.0	74.9	25.6	1.7	24.9	—	48.3	25.1
Bombay	census	6,216,910	100.0	80.6	65.1	51.1	12.5	2.5	14.5	19.4
	ALE	10,811	100.0	84.6	53.2	57.7	15.5	—	31.4	15.4
Hyderabad	census	3,836,099	100.0	78.1	54.1	43.2	7.9	3.0	24.0	21.9
	ALE	9,841	100.0	77.9	25.9	22.3	3.6	—	52.0	22.1
Madhya Bharat	census	2,630,478	100.0	68.1	55.3	45.8	8.6	0.9	12.8	31.9
	ALE	3,242	100.0	80.7	49.2	30.4	18.8	—	31.6	19.3
Madhya Pradesh	census	5,590,182	100.0	84.5	56.1	48.0	4.6	2.0	29.4	15.6
	ALE	8,878	100.0	82.2	31.0	4.5	26.5	—	51.2	17.8
Madras	census	12,025,850	100.0	75.6	50.8	32.7	0.7	2.4	24.8	24.4
	ALE	30,061	100.0	70.9	10.0	14.1	4.5	—	60.9	50.1

\* As of 1951.

TABLE A.9. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELF SUPPORTING PERSONS (CENSUS OF 1951) AND EARNERS (AGRICULTURAL LABOUR ENQUIRY) BY PRINCIPAL OCCUPATION FOR 17 STATES—(continued)

(1)	States*	all			agricultural			non-agricultural			
		source	number	per-centage	all agri-cultural	all	owners and tenants	labourers	rent receivers	non-agricultural	
		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Mysore	census		1,803,161	100.0	65.3	73.8	64.6	5.6	3.6	11.6	14.7
	ALE		3,279	100.0	86.9	36.4	31.5	4.9	—	60.5	13.1
Orissa	census		3,992,481	100.0	80.2	65.6	58.2	5.7	1.6	14.7	19.8
	ALE		4,608	100.0	79.6	30.6	27.6	3.0	—	49.0	20.4
PEPSU	census		862,317	100.0	84.9	72.6	56.7	13.0	9.9	18.3	15.1
	ALE		2,698	100.0	69.7	53.6	39.6	14.0	—	16.1	36.3
Punjab	census		2,680,629	100.0	77.7	67.6	46.4	18.5	2.7	10.1	22.3
	ALE		6,760	100.0	56.3	38.3	33.5	13.4	—	11.4	41.7
Rajasthan	census		4,887,904	100.0	84.0	80.1	50.1	28.5	1.5	3.9	20.0
	ALE		3,802	100.0	79.2	66.6	32.6	33.1	—	13.6	20.8
Saurashtra	census		647,624	100.0	63.4	56.4	42.9	11.1	3.4	7.0	36.6
	ALE		1,925	100.0	66.6	31.4	19.9	11.6	—	34.1	34.6
Travancore-Cochin	census		2,215,948	100.0	57.0	31.0	23.3	6.8	1.1	26.0	43.0
	ALE		12,462	100.0	57.6	14.7	10.2	4.6	—	42.9	42.4
Uttar Pradesh	census		16,819,690	100.0	82.0	74.2	67.1	5.7	1.4	7.8	18.0
	ALE		17,910	100.0	71.3	54.2	6.6	47.7	—	17.1	28.7
Vindhya Pradesh	census		1,027,707	100.0	91.7	73.8	62.7	7.5	0.6	20.9	8.3
	ALE		1,779	100.0	80.2	49.6	45.1	6.4	—	30.7	19.4
West Bengal	census		6,377,010	100.0	67.4	48.5	34.3	13.7	0.5	18.9	32.6
	ALE		10,493	100.0	64.2	37.9	7.1	30.8	—	28.3	35.8

Source : Census—Census of India 1951, Vol. I, Part II, C, Economic Tables, pp. 4-14, Agricultural Labour Enquiry—Government of India—Ministry of Labour, Rural Manpower and Occupational Structure, (Delhi) 1954, Table No. 6 for all States.

\* As of 1951.



A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

TABLE A.10. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELF-SUPPORTING PERSONS (CENSUS OF 1961) AND EARNERS (AGRICULTURAL LABOUR ENQUIRY) BY SINGLE AND COMBINED OCCUPATIONS IN CULTIVATION, AGRICULTURAL LABOUR, AND NON-AGRICULTURE FOR SEVENTEEN STATES

States	source	census ALE				self-supporting persons				solely or partly engaged in cultivation				solely or partly engaged in agricultural labour				solely or partly engaged in non-agriculture									
		total number		percentage		with single occupation		with combined occupation		total		as sole occupation		with other occupation		total		as sole occupation		with other occupation		total		as sole occupation		with other occupation	
		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)	(24)	(25)	(26)	
Assam	census	2,612,286	100.0	87.6*	11.6*	62.3	52.1	20.2	2.7	2.0	0.7	44.5	33.4	11.1													
	ALE	2,538	100.0	75.8	24.2	70.4	40.4	11.0	14.7	7.3	7.4	38.2	19.1	19.1													
Bihar	census	12,706,059	100.0	88.4	11.0	65.4	56.3	9.1	25.5	20.7	4.8	18.9	11.4	7.5													
	ALE	17,191	100.0	35.6	47.4	42.1	17.2	24.9	53.5	38.4	18.1	34.7	—	34.7													
Bombay	census	9,792,261	100.0	87.1	10.9	45.2	38.7	8.5	12.5	9.4	3.1	49.7	41.0	8.7													
	ALE	10,611	100.0	77.4	22.6	60.1	43.4	16.7	37.4	24.5	12.9	22.7	9.5	13.2													
Hyderabad	census	2,811,189	100.0	82.9	14.4	46.2	34.1	11.1	23.4	19.0	4.4	41.7	29.8	11.9													
	ALE	9,841	100.0	81.4	18.6	32.5	21.6	10.9	56.0	44.6	11.4	28.5	16.2	13.4													
Madhya Pradesh	census	2,518,318	100.0	86.6	12.4	59.2	49.9	0.4	16.2	12.8	3.4	34.5	24.0	10.5													
	ALE	3,242	100.0	77.2	22.8	55.8	41.1	14.7	37.0	24.5	12.5	29.4	11.6	17.8													
Madhya Pradesh	census	6,438,698	100.0	80.3	17.8	50.3	38.3	14.0	31.5	23.5	8.0	32.8	20.5	12.3													
	ALE	9,878	100.0	77.6	22.4	37.0	21.7	17.3	58.7	42.1	16.9	28.7	10.8	17.9													
Madras	census	14,962,541	100.0	80.4	6.2	41.8	35.8	6.0	22.7	19.9	2.8	40.2	33.7	6.5													
	ALE	30,061	100.0	74.7	25.2	32.2	14.8	17.4	85.0	47.5	17.5	27.4	12.4	15.0													
Mysore	census	2,300,578	100.0	98.4	10.3	56.1	47.6	8.5	10.1	8.7	1.4	30.6	30.1	9.5													
	ALE	3,270	100.0	81.2	18.8	43.9	28.8	15.1	53.0	43.5	9.5	21.1	8.9	12.9													
Orissa	census	4,182,456	100.0	76.8	22.6	44.4	45.8	18.6	17.9	12.2	5.7	38.7	17.8	18.9													
	ALE	4,806	100.0	64.8	35.2	46.4	18.0	28.6	55.5	36.2	20.3	32.1	11.6	20.6													
PEPSU	census	1,044,929	100.0	93.0	4.3	60.3	57.3	3.0	11.0	10.2	0.8	20.4	25.5	3.9													
	ALE	2,608	100.0	90.7	9.3	56.9	50.2	6.7	16.0	15.2	1.7	34.0	25.3	8.7													

TABLE A.10. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELF SUPPORTING PERSONS (CENSUS OF 1961) AND EARNERS (AGRICULTURAL LABOUR ENQUIRY), BY SINGLE AND COMBINED OCCUPATIONS IN CULTIVATION, AGRICULTURAL LABOUR, AND NON-AGRICULTURE FOR SEVENTEEN STATES—(continued)

States	source	total		self-supporting persons		solely or partly engaged in cultivation		solely or partly engaged in agricultural labour		solely or partly engaged in non-agriculture				
		number	per cent	with single occupa- tion	with combined occupa- tion	as sole total	with other occupa- tion	as sole total	with other occupa- tion	total	with single occupa- tion			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
Punjab	census	3,310,828	100.0	91.6	6.1	64.8	50.7	4.1	9.1	8.1	1.0	38.4	33.8	5.6
	A.L.E.	6,780	100.0	83.0	18.0	51.3	40.1	11.2	13.3	8.4	4.9	60.4	33.5	26.9
Rajasthan	census	5,965,469	100.0	84.5	13.1	72.5	61.7	10.9	5.2	3.2	2.0	33.3	26.6	11.7
	A.L.E.	3,502	100.0	79.1	20.9	73.2	55.1	18.1	19.8	12.1	7.7	37.0	11.9	15.1
Saurashtra	census	974,035	100.0	92.1	6.1	39.8	37.2	2.8	5.8	4.8	1.0	53.7	50.1	3.6
	A.L.E.	1,923	100.0	63.6	36.4	33.3	27.7	5.6	47.8	18.3	29.5	53.4	17.6	35.8
Tamil Nadu	census	2,648,254	100.0	83.7	15.0	33.4	21.6	10.8	25.0	20.8	4.2	54.3	41.3	13.0
	A.L.E.	12,452	100.0	81.4	18.6	30.4	13.7	16.7	43.5	35.0	8.5	44.4	33.7	11.7
Uttar Pradesh	census	19,259,310	100.0	85.7	12.9	65.2	54.9	11.2	8.7	6.1	2.6	35.5	24.7	10.9
	A.L.E.	17,910	100.0	82.7	17.3	64.0	49.4	14.2	19.3	10.5	8.8	33.2	22.8	10.4
Vindhya Pradesh	census	1,126,116	100.0	80.5	12.9	67.1	56.0	11.1	31.3	18.3	3.0	32.4	13.2	11.2
	A.L.E.	1,779	100.0	86.6	11.4	54.8	44.0	10.8	31.2	26.2	3.0	25.3	16.4	8.9
West Bengal	census	7,618,756	100.0	87.0	11.6	36.6	27.3	9.3	16.5	11.5	2.0	57.9	49.1	8.8
	A.L.E.	10,493	100.0	82.0	18.0	40.5	32.1	14.1	28.2	22.9	5.3	42.6	27.0	15.6

Source: Census-Census of India 1961, Vol. I, Part II-B, *Monographic Tables*, pp. 4-10, 1415, 46-47, 60-62, 62-63, 66-74, 82-89, 106-111, 114-121.  
 A.L.E.—Government of India—Ministry of Labour, *Rural Manpower and Occupational Structure—1954*, Table No. 6, for all States.

Note: The Census percentages in columns (5) and (6) add up to slightly less than 100% since a small number of self-supporting persons in each State were returned as having no occupation as such but subsisting solely on receipts of rent. Thus the figures for Assam, 87.5 and 11.6, come to a total of 99.1. We used in Appendix Table B that the percentage of rent receivers returned for this State, was 0.3.

A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

TABLE A.11. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RURAL POPULATION BY PRINCIPAL OCCUPATION OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD—  
CENSUS OF 1951 AND AGRICULTURAL LABOUR ENQUIRY

States and divisions	source	occupations										total population
		owners	tenants	non-cultivating holders	agricul. labour with land	all householders	agricul. labour without land	agricul. labourers	all rural occupations	other occupations		
Andhra	census	43.4	8.7	2.2	—	54.3	—	95.7	80.0	20.0	100.0	
	ALE	26.5	6.2	—	23.8	35.5	26.5	50.3	82.0	18.0	100.0	
	census	46.5	9.9	2.2	—	58.6	—	17.6	76.2	23.8	100.0	
Telangana	census	32.6	3.5	—	24.6	60.7	18.0	42.6	78.7	21.3	100.0	
	ALE	53.5	5.5	2.7	—	61.7	—	15.3	77.1	22.9	100.0	
Rayalaseema	census	30.0	3.9	—	30.7	64.3	22.2	52.9	86.5	13.5	100.0	
	ALE	57.1	14.7	0.9	—	72.0	—	1.6	74.4	25.6	100.0	
Assam Valley	census	57.9	19.3	—	7.0	84.2	2.2	9.2	86.4	13.6	100.0	
	census	82.2	4.6	0.6	—	87.3	—	2.0	90.2	9.8	100.0	
	ALE	50.5	24.7	—	4.1	79.3	4.2	8.3	83.5	16.5	100.0	
Manipur	census	71.2	10.0	2.0	—	83.2	—	0.2	83.4	16.6	100.0	
	ALE	54.7	26.3	—	0.4	81.4	0.1	0.4	81.5	18.5	100.0	
Tripura	census	63.6	9.3	1.6	—	74.5	—	6.2	79.7	20.3	100.0	
	ALE	68.3	13.2	—	1.4	82.9	12.5	13.9	95.4	4.6	100.0	
Bihar	census	40.5	12.0	0.5	—	62.0	—	30.5	92.5	7.5	100.0	
	ALE	4.6	42.0	—	22.8	60.4	12.4	35.2	81.8	18.2	100.0	
North Bihar	census	63.0	9.1	0.8	—	62.9	—	24.3	87.2	12.8	100.0	
	ALE	3.1	61.4	—	50.3	64.8	7.4	27.8	82.3	17.7	100.0	
Chhota Nagpur	census	79.3	2.8	0.4	—	82.5	—	8.2	80.7	9.3	100.0	
	ALE	2.0	37.4	—	31.3	70.7	11.7	43.0	82.4	17.6	100.0	

TABLE A.11. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RURAL POPULATION BY PRINCIPAL OCCUPATION OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD—  
CENSUS OF 1951 AND AGRICULTURAL LABOUR ENQUIRY—(continued)

States and divisions	source	ownote	tonants	non- cultivating holders	occupations				all landholders	agricul- tural labour with land	agricul- tural labour without land	all agricul- tural labourers occupations	all agricul- tural labour occupations	other occupa- tions	total population
					ownote	tonants	non- cultivating holders	agricul- tural labour with land							
Gujarat	ownote	54.2	12.3	2.2	—	—	—	68.7	11.9	—	10.4	79.1	20.9	100.0	
	ALE	46.7	24.7	—	—	1.9	—	72.3	—	—	13.9	84.9	16.8	100.0	
Saurashtra	ownote	44.9	12.0	2.3	—	—	59.2	5.2	—	—	5.2	64.4	35.6	100.0	
	ALE	32.2	20.7	—	—	2.3	—	55.2	16.2	—	17.5	70.4	29.6	100.0	
Kutch	ownote	33.5	11.4	1.9	—	—	46.8	—	—	—	3.4	50.2	49.8	100.0	
	ALE	32.4	8.0	—	—	3.5	—	43.9	13.0	—	16.5	56.9	43.1	100.0	
Jammu-Kashmir	ownote	69.4	14.7	—	—	not taken	87.1	0.5	—	—	3.5	87.6	12.4	100.0	
	ALE	—	—	—	—	3.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Kerala	ownote	29.6	8.0	1.0	—	—	38.6	—	—	—	22.0	60.6	39.4	100.0	
	ALE	21.4	10.0	—	—	20.5	—	51.9	16.8	—	35.4	87.7	32.2	100.0	
Travancore-Cochin	ownote	8.8	25.5	2.4	—	—	36.7	—	—	—	22.6	50.3	40.7	100.0	
	ALE	15.3	16.5	—	—	22.7	—	53.5	14.6	—	37.3	68.1	31.9	100.0	
Madhya Pradesh	ownote	64.0	20.2	0.7	—	—	84.9	—	—	—	4.5	80.4	10.6	100.0	
	ALE	27.5	52.7	—	—	4.4	—	84.8	5.7	—	10.0	90.3	9.7	100.0	
Malwa	ownote	56.6	10.7	1.1	—	—	68.4	—	—	—	15.5	53.9	16.1	100.0	
	ALE	40.9	13.4	—	—	12.2	—	66.5	14.3	—	26.5	80.8	19.2	100.0	
Dhar-Dhabus-Nimar	ownote	87.2	7.4	0.9	—	—	75.5	—	—	—	13.2	88.7	11.3	100.0	
	ALE	59.9	6.5	—	—	6.6	—	73.0	12.5	—	19.2	85.6	14.4	100.0	
Bhopal	ownote	44.0	8.3	1.4	—	—	53.7	—	—	—	23.7	77.4	22.6	100.0	
	ALE	41.2	4.7	—	—	9.2	—	66.1	36.3	—	44.5	100.4	9.6	100.0	
Jabalpur-Sagar	ownote	64.1	5.1	2.1	—	—	61.3	—	—	—	20.2	81.5	18.5	100.0	
	ALE	5.3	48.0	—	—	7.6	—	58.9	16.7	—	24.3	75.6	24.4	100.0	
Chhattisgarh	ownote	65.9	3.2	1.1	—	—	70.3	—	—	—	17.3	87.6	12.4	100.0	
	ALE	5.0	54.6	—	—	17.9	—	77.4	12.9	—	30.8	90.3	9.7	100.0	
Bundelkhand	ownote	60.7	6.7	0.5	—	—	73.0	—	—	—	18.7	92.6	7.4	100.0	
	ALE	68.3	13.2	—	—	1.4	—	82.0	12.5	—	13.0	95.4	4.5	100.0	

A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

TABLE A.11. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RURAL POPULATION BY PRINCIPAL OCCUPATION OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD—  
CENSUS OF 1961 AND AGRICULTURAL LABOUR ENQUIRY—(continued)

States and divisions	source	occupations					agricul- tural labour holders with land	all agricul- tural labourers	all agricul- tural occupations	other occupa- tions	total population
		owners	tenants	non- cultivating holders	agricul- tural labour with land	all landholders					
Madhya Pradesh	census	47.1	10.0	1.8	—	58.8	—	20.3	79.1	20.9	100.0
	ALE	22.6	3.8	—	—	36.8	20.7	56.5	82.0	17.1	100.0
Maharashtra	census	33.7	35.3	1.5	—	70.5	—	5.0	16.3	23.7	100.0
	ALE	43.2	32.1	—	—	89.5	3.8	18.0	93.3	6.7	100.0
Deccan	census	66.6	4.7	2.1	—	72.3	—	13.2	86.6	14.5	100.0
	ALE	50.1	7.9	—	—	63.4	8.1	23.5	91.6	8.5	100.0
Berar-Nagpur	census	34.9	8.8	2.7	—	46.4	—	38.4	84.8	15.2	100.0
	ALE	14.1	19.9	—	—	63.3	38.3	57.5	91.6	8.4	100.0
Marathwada	census	53.0	6.8	3.6	—	62.3	—	24.6	85.9	13.1	100.0
	ALE	42.2	5.3	—	—	53.9	21.2	37.0	85.1	14.9	100.0
Mysore	census	70.7	6.7	3.0	—	79.4	—	6.4	87.8	12.2	100.0
	ALE	47.3	6.1	—	—	61.0	10.6	38.1	91.5	8.5	100.0
Coorg	census	36.3	10.7	3.0	—	50.0	—	11.4	61.4	38.6	100.0
	ALE	50.4	23.0	—	—	80.8	4.4	11.9	85.3	14.7	100.0
North Karnataka	census	54.3	12.6	3.2	—	70.1	—	17.4	87.5	12.5	100.0
	ALE	49.7	16.1	—	—	61.8	7.4	23.4	80.2	10.8	100.0
Orissa	census	58.2	8.5	2.3	—	67.1	—	11.9	79.0	21.0	100.0
	ALE	41.8	5.7	—	—	52.7	8.4	36.1	83.6	16.4	100.0
Inland	census	96.2	4.2	0.7	—	11.1	—	13.1	84.5	16.6	100.0
	ALE	42.8	2.4	—	—	20.1	23.2	43.2	88.5	11.5	100.0
Punjab Plain	census	44.0	20.0	2.4	—	66.3	7.4	10.0	76.3	23.7	100.0
	ALE	40.1	19.2	—	—	55.0	—	0.0	74.3	25.7	100.0

TABLE A.11. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RURAL POPULATION BY PRINCIPAL OCCUPATION OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD—CENSUS OF 1961 AND AGRICULTURAL LABOUR ENQUIRY—(continued)

States and divisions	source	owners	tenants	non-cultivating holders	occupations					all agricultural labourers	all agricultural labourers occupations	other occupations	total population
					agricul. labour with land	all landholders	agricul. labour without land	agricul. labour with land	all agricultural labourers				
Punjab (Contd.)	census	57.2	13.1	2.6	—	72.9	—	12.1	85.0	15.0	100.0		
	ALE	47.6	18.3	—	0.8	66.7	11.7	12.5	78.4	21.6	100.0		
Punjab Hills	census	75.9	9.9	1.7	—	87.5	—	1.8	89.3	10.7	100.0		
	ALE	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Delhi	census	37.2	4.4	1.1	—	42.7	—	9.2	51.9	48.1	100.0		
	ALE	38.0	9.9	—	0.4	48.3	3.7	4.1	52.0	48.0	100.0		
Himachal	census	86.4	7.3	0.7	—	94.6	—	1.0	95.5	4.5	100.0		
	ALE	48.2	26.9	—	5.1	80.2	2.7	7.7	82.9	17.1	100.0		
Bihar	census	52.6	25.1	1.7	—	79.4	—	2.4	81.8	18.2	100.0		
	ALE	24.2	48.0	—	5.2	77.4	6.8	11.0	83.2	16.8	100.0		
Ajmer	census	64.2	5.1	3.2	—	72.6	—	4.8	77.4	22.6	100.0		
	ALE	28.4	45.0	—	6.0	73.4	2.6	8.7	82.1	17.9	100.0		
Jodhpur-Bikaner	census	28.8	48.2	1.2	—	78.2	—	3.6	81.8	18.2	100.0		
	ALE	33.3	44.5	—	4.9	82.7	2.8	7.7	85.5	14.5	100.0		
Mewar	census	74.4	6.7	1.8	—	82.0	—	2.0	84.9	15.1	100.0		
	ALE	58.6	22.3	—	0.4	81.3	1.1	1.6	82.4	17.6	100.0		
Kashmir	census	67.5	3.3	2.9	—	73.7	—	8.6	82.3	17.7	100.0		
	ALE	69.6	3.6	—	6.7	79.8	11.2	17.9	91.0	9.0	100.0		

A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

TABLE A.11. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RURAL POPULATION BY PRINCIPAL OCCUPATION OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD—CENSUS OF 1951 AND AGRICULTURAL LABOUR ENQUIRY—(concluded)

States and divisions	source	occupations							total population			
		ownor	tenants	non-cultivating holders	agricultural labourers with land	all landholders	agricultural labour without land	all agricultural labourers		other occupations		
<i>Uttar Pradesh</i>												
Kannoo-Garhwal	census	81.9	5.3	0.2	—	—	87.4	—	1.2	88.6	11.4	100.0
	ALE	46.4	43.8	—	—	—	89.2	—	—	89.2	10.8	100.0
<i>East U.P.</i>												
	census	73.4	6.0	0.5	—	—	81.1	—	6.8	87.9	12.1	100.0
	ALE	5.4	61.4	—	10.2	77.0	6.9	6.9	16.1	82.9	17.1	100.0
<i>Oudh</i>												
	census	72.7	6.4	1.3	—	—	80.4	—	6.7	86.1	13.9	100.0
	ALE	5.1	62.9	—	6.9	74.9	6.5	13.4	—	81.4	18.6	100.0
<i>West U.P.</i>												
	census	86.9	3.7	1.2	—	—	71.8	—	6.2	78.0	22.0	100.0
	ALE	12.6	52.8	—	3.3	68.7	9.8	13.1	13.1	78.5	21.5	100.0
<i>South U.P.</i>												
	census	62.7	8.0	1.3	—	—	72.0	—	12.9	84.9	15.1	100.0
	ALE	7.0	48.2	—	3.1	68.3	10.4	13.5	—	68.7	31.3	100.0
<i>West Bengal</i>												
Darjeeling-Duars	census	34.0	24.7	0.4	—	—	59.1	—	3.6	62.7	37.3	100.0
	ALE	29.8	36.7	—	22.6	81.1	9.2	31.8	—	98.2	1.7	100.0
<i>W. Bengal Plain</i>												
	census	43.3	14.8	0.6	—	—	58.7	—	17.3	76.0	24.0	100.0
	ALE	1.0	44.3	—	7.0	54.0	10.5	18.4	—	64.5	35.5	100.0
<i>Sikkim</i>												
	census	86.4	7.7	0.1	—	—	93.2	—	0.1	93.3	6.7	100.0
	ALE	—	—	—	—	—	no villages surveyed	—	—	—	—	—

Sources : Census—Census of India, 1951, Vol. I, Part II-C, Economic Tables, pp. 2, 6, 2, 10, 12, and 14.  
Agricultural Labour Enquiry—Government of India—Ministry of Labour, Rural Manpower and Occupational Structures 1954, Table No. 3 for all States.

## SANKHYĀ : THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF STATISTICS : SERIES B

TABLE A.12. PROPORTION OF CULTIVATING CLASSES (FAMILIES) TO ALL CLASSES (FAMILIES), RURAL POPULATION, 75 DISTRICTS, CENSUS OF 1951, AND RURAL CREDIT SURVEY 1951-1952

State and divisions	districts	census	rural credit survey
		cultivating owners and tenants, and their dependents	cultivating families
<b>Andhra</b>			
Conatal Andhra	West Godavari	46.4	48.2
Telangana	Mahabubnagar	54.0	55.6
	Nizamabad	59.8	81.1
Rayalaseema	Cuddapah	55.3	78.3
	Kurnool	51.0	70.3
<b>Assam</b>			
Assam Valley	Cachar	59.3	72.5
	Kamrup	81.4	71.4
	Lakhimpur	56.7	66.2
Tripura	Tripura	72.8	72.9
<b>Bihar</b>			
North Bihar	Monghyr North	53.8	52.7
South Bihar	Bhagalpur	59.6	73.4
Chhota Nagpur	Hazaribagh	82.5	81.3
	Palamau	74.0	79.8
<b>Gujarat</b>			
Gujarat	Ahmedabad	52.0	54.1
	Broach	58.2	56.7
Saurashtra	Sorath	62.5	67.6
<b>Kerala</b>			
Travancore-Cochin	Quilon	41.7	69.7
Malabar	Malabar	29.2	83.3
<b>Madhya Pradesh</b>			
Malwa	Shivpur	73.6	83.6
	Shajapur	64.0	66.5
	Bhilsa	57.0	58.3
Dhar-Jhabua-Nimar	Jhabua	87.7	95.7
Bhopal	Raisen	50.2	57.5
Jabalpur-Sagar	Segar	56.2	71.7
	Bilaspur	76.2	86.9
Chhattisgarh	Durg	65.4	82.1
	Rewa	68.1	85.3
	Seeta	67.0	75.4
<b>Madras</b>			
Tamilnad	Coimbatore	41.4	43.8
	Chingleput	49.5	63.9
	Ramnad	64.1	82.8
<b>Maharashtra</b>			
Konkan	Ratnagiri	70.1	75.9
Deccan	West Khandesh	65.7	60.5
	Poona	72.7	66.3
	Kolhapur	79.7	85.9



A REGIONAL ANALYSIS OF CENSUS AND SAMPLE SURVEY DATA

TABLE A.12. PROPORTION OF CULTIVATING CLASSES (FAMILIES) TO ALL CLASSES (FAMILIES), RURAL POPULATION, 75 DISTRICTS, CENSUS OF 1951, AND RURAL CREDIT SURVEY 1951-1962—(continued)

States and divisions	districts	census	rural credit survey	
		cultivating owners and tenants, and their dependents	cultivating families	
Bihar-Nagpur	Akola	43.3	46.3	
	Nagpur	45.8	51.3	
Chhattisgarh	Chanda	59.3	55.9	
Marathwada	Parbhani	55.2	50.0	
	Omanabad	57.8	55.5	
Mysore	Bangalore	70.0	78.7	
	Hassan	82.8	76.7	
North Karnataka	Bijapur	57.4	68.9	
Orissa	Coastal Orissa	66.6	62.0	
	Inland Orissa	Sambalpur	67.3	
	Koraput	69.0	41.0	
Punjab	Punjab Plain	Hoshiarpur	63.8	56.5
		Jullunder	48.2	21.0
		Hissar	81.9	72.8
	Patials	Bhatinda	70.8	64.3
		Mohindorgarh	82.9	68.7
Himachal	Sirmoor	91.7	83.5	
Rajasthan	Jaipur-Alwar	Jaipur	68.4	73.9
		Sawai madhopur	77.6	85.1
	Jodhpur-Bikaner	Churu	95.8	89.4
		Barnor	80.9	92.4
	Mewar	Sirohi	50.0	69.2
Kotah-Bundi	Chittorgarh	81.3	69.7	
Uttar Pradesh	Kumaon-Gerhwal	Nainital	76.6	47.3
		Deoria	89.6	92.7
	East U.P.	Jaunpur	78.1	75.8
		Ballia	67.1	77.7
		Kanpur	74.7	75.1
	Oudh	Sitapur	85.0	83.5
		Sultanpur	78.5	91.0
		Meerut	52.6	60.7
	West U.P.	Aligarh	60.8	48.8
		Agra	69.2	74.4
		Shahjahanpur	84.5	86.3
South U.P.	Hamirpur	67.7	62.0	
	Mirzapur	65.6	64.4	

## SANKHYĀ : THE INDIAN JOURNAL OF STATISTICS : SERIES B

TABLE A.12. PROPORTION OF CULTIVATING CLASSES (FAMILIES) TO ALL CLASSES (FAMILIES). RURAL POPULATION, 75 DISTRICTS, CENSUS OF 1951, AND RURAL CREDIT SURVEY 1951-1952—(concluded)

States and divisions	districts	census	rural credit survey
		cultivating owners and tenants, and their dependents	cultivating families
<i>West Bengal</i>			
Derjeeling-Duars	Jalpaiguri	50.5	85.3
West Bengal Plain	Burdwan	53.8	58.2
	Midnapur	72.3	83.2
	Malda	60.8	60.3

Sources : Census of India, 1951, Vol. I, Part II-A, *Demographic Tables*, pp. 385-388.

All-India Rural Credit Survey : Vol. II, *The Technical Report*, 1956, pp. 240-241.

Note : The Rural Credit Survey figures for the percentages of cultivating families to all village families are derived from entries in the General Schedule, which was filled up for every family in eight sample villages for each of 75 selected districts.

*Paper received : September, 1959.*

*Revised : April, 1960.*