

Youth Employment and Unemployment during 2011-12 to 2019-20: A Focus on the Skill Gap in Telangana

Danyasi Sivakumar¹

Project Fellow Council for Social Development Hyderabad 5000030.

sivadanyasi@gmail.com

Venkateswarlu Gunna²

Assistant Professor Dept of Arts, KLEF Vaddeswaram, A.P, 522302: Email id:
drgvenkateswarlu@kluniversity.in

I. Introduction

Amidst the era of globalization in India, particularly since the nineteenth century, significant transformations have occurred in human lifestyles, industrialization, and workforce demands. While many global development objectives emphasize the creation of new jobs with a focus on quality, the quality of employment emerges as a critical concern at both national and regional levels as the substantial presence of working poor and informal workers in India, (Morsy 2012). Thus, the youth encounter challenges in securing and maintaining decent employment due to entry barriers in the labor market (Dev and Venkatanarayana, 2011). Examining the context of Telangana, the nation's newest state, becomes pivotal in aligning with global targets like the Millennium Development Goals. Consequently, this research paper aims to offer a comprehensive analysis of employment and unemployment, considering disaggregated levels of social, spatial, and gender dimensions. Additionally, the study investigates the existing skill gap and evaluates the state's capacity to leverage the demographic dividend. Utilizing a comparative perspective, the paper assesses Telangana's performance relative to the contraction observed in the national average.

Against this backdrop, numerous studies have sought to examine the employment and unemployment dynamics in relation to skill gap among the youth in India. Education is often regarded as a supply-side issue, but employability is founded in the job market's demand side. Individually, education improves employment chances greatly, with studies showing a positive association between education level and employability outlook (Krishnakumar and

¹ Project Fellow Council for Social Development Hyderabad 5000030. sivadanyasi@gmail.com

² Assistant Professor Dept of Arts, KLEF Vaddeswaram, A.P, 522302: Email id:
drgvenkateswarlu@kluniversity.in

Research paper

© 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved, UGC CARE Listed (Group -I) Journal Volume 8, Issue 4, 2019

Nogales, 2020; Arrow, 1973). Individuals, particularly youngsters entering the job market without extensive work experience, develop a distinct identity as a result of their educational attainment (Bisht and Pattanaik, 2020).

The 1991 liberalization of the Indian labor market aims to expand employment options for the country's rising youth population. Despite having the biggest population share, Indian young have a high unemployment rate, with skill mismatch described as a structural form of unemployment (Singh, 2003; Mehrotra et al., 2013).

In the early 2000s, the growth of educational institutions encouraged youth enrollment in higher education, but it also generated worries about the impact on youth employability. Due to skill mismatch, highly educated persons are shown to be more vulnerable in terms of labor market employability (Sharma and Sharma, 2017).

Youth in the urban sector have smoother transitions between education and work, although early dropout in the urban sector frequently leads in employment as casual labor (Mitra and Verik, 2013). Rural youth with higher educational levels are more likely to engage in self-employment activities such as horticulture and poultry, but issues remain in determining their employability (Bhanwala and Mani, 2020).

Despite educational expansion, socioeconomic variables such as gender, sector, and educational attainment impede the younger generation's economic production (Sanghi, 2012). Invisible influences within Indian culture, linked to caste, class, gender, and regional characteristics, hinder youth employment possibilities and threaten inclusive higher education (Tilak, 2015).

Despite global expansion of higher education, there remains a continual issue in aligning educational achievements with changing labor market demands. Longer education durations, as well as the lack of a demand-driven education system, are barriers to improving youth employability (Kyndt and Baert, 2013; Fasih, 2008). The expansion of educational institutions and youth enrollment in higher education has not been accompanied by the development of labor-market-driven skills, resulting in a detrimental impact on the employability of educated young (Wheebox, 2020; McQuaid and Lindsay, 2005). Learning alone does not ensure the acquisition of labor-market-required skills, thus leading to an overeducated populace and economic burden (Chevalier and Lindley, 2009; Dunne et al., 2000). The mismatch between educational achievements and labor-market-driven abilities is

a major worry for highly educated individuals' employability (Dev and Venkatanarayana, 2011).

The employability gap between educated and less qualified young remains a continuous concern for the Indian economy, underscoring the ongoing challenges in bridging the gap between education and labor market demands.

II. Objectives

To investigate the trends and changes in labour force participation, workforce participation, employment type, and sectoral employment in Telangana State.

To investigate the demographic dividend and the skill gap among young people.

III. Data and Method

For the purposes of this paper, the NSSO (National Sample Survey Organisation) Employment and Unemployment Survey (EUS) 2011-12 and the most recent NSSO Periodical Labour Force Surveys, PLFS-II (2018-19) and III (2019-20), have been used. Data from the most recent NSSO Periodical Labour Force Surveys were analysed and compared to data from 2011-12 (NSSO 68th round). Despite the fact that district-level data is available from NSSO round 68th and PLFS, the analysis is limited to the state level due to the unequal number of districts in the three time periods. The number of districts has changed from 2011-12 (10 districts) to 2018-19 (30 districts) due to the reorganisation of 10 districts into 30 districts following the formation of Telangana State (TS) on June 2, 2014. STATA was employed to analyse the data. Descriptive statistics were used.

IV. Results

Labour Force Participation Rate (LFPR)

The Labour Force Participation Rate (LFPR), defined as the total of working and unemployed people as a proportion of the total population, is calculated in terms of Usual Status (Principal and Subsidiary Status taken together) for three time points, namely 2011-12, 2018-19, and 2019-20. It demonstrates that Telangana's LFPR was higher than the national average in 2011-12. Similar to the national trend, the LFPR in Telangana fell in 2018-19 before rising in 2019-20. The magnitude decline and raise in respective durations is meagerly higher in Telangana compared to all India (table 1).

Table 1: Labour Force Participation Rate (LFPR) by Location, Sector and Gender in Telangna and India

Location	Year s	Rural			Urban			Total		
		Male	Femal e	Perso n	Male	Femal e	Perso n	Male	Femal e	Perso n
Telangan a	2011	57.8			56.8			57.3		
	-12	2	47.26	52.58	1	15.88	36.85	9	34.41	46.08
	2018	56.0			57.8			56.8		
	-19	9	38.68	47.26	4	19.57	38.97	3	30.79	43.79
	2019	61.1						59.9		
	-20	4	44.33	52.58	58.3	23.28	41.63	5	36.16	48.15
India	2011				56.3			55.6		
	-12	55.3	25.27	40.62	4	15.47	36.74	1	22.48	39.5
	2018	55.1			56.7			55.6		
	-19	3	19.65	37.71	1	16.09	36.94	1	18.58	37.48
	2019	56.3			57.8			56.7		
	-20	2	24.68	40.78	4	18.49	38.59	8	22.8	40.12
% Change (increase/decrease)										
Telangan a	2011									
	-12									
	to									
	2018									
	-19	-1.73	-8.58	-5.32	1.03	3.69	2.12	-0.56	-3.62	-2.29
	2018									
	-19									
	to									
	2019									
	-20	5.05	5.65	5.32	0.46	3.71	2.66	3.12	5.37	4.36
	2011									
	-12	3.32	-2.93	0	1.49	7.4	4.78	2.56	1.75	2.07

	to 2019 -20									
India	2011 -12 to 2018 -19	-0.17	-5.62	-2.91	0.37	0.62	0.2	0	-3.9	-2.02
	2018 -19 to 2019 -20	1.19	5.03	3.07	1.13	2.4	1.65	1.17	4.22	2.64
	2011 -12 to 2019 -20	1.02	-0.59	0.16	1.5	3.02	1.85	1.17	0.32	0.62

Source: Author's calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

Telangana, like the rest of India, has a higher LFPR in rural areas, which has declined over the two time periods, 2011-12 to 2018-19, whereas it has increased in urban areas, which is much higher than the rest of India for the same period. It is worth noting that the rural-urban gap in Telangana was higher than in the rest of India in 2011-12 and decreased between 2011-12 and 2019-20, while urban LFPR increased by 4.78 percentage points during the same period and rural areas are stagnant.

When we look at the LFPR in Telangana by gender, we see that it is higher among both males and females than the national average at all three time points. In terms of gender differences in LFPR, it appears that there has been a decline among both males and females from 2011-12 to 2018-19, but the decrease is greater among females than males in Telangana

and across India. This means that the decline in LFPR is primarily due to female labor-force participation during that period. LFPR in Telangana has increased between 2018-19 and 2019-20 (one-time point) and is higher than in the rest of India, particularly among females. As a result, the gender gap in LFPR is smaller in Telangana than in the rest of India. However, gender disparity in 2019-20 is the same as in 2011-12 per 100 males in labour force only 60 females that can be counted considerable disparity.

Table 1a: Female and rural ratio in LFPR by location and sector in Telangana and India

Location	Years	Female ratio-LFPR			R-U Ratio
		Rural	Urban	Person	
Telangana	2011-12	0.82	0.28	0.60	1.43
	2018-19	0.69	0.34	0.54	1.21
	2019-20	0.73	0.40	0.60	1.26
India	2011-12	0.46	0.27	0.40	1.11
	2018-19	0.36	0.28	0.33	1.02
	2019-20	0.44	0.32	0.40	1.06

Source: Author's calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

It is also worth noting that LFPR among urban females is too low, at roughly one-third that of rural females. Rural females experience the greatest decline in LFPR, whereas urban females experience an increase (table 1a). As previously stated, changes in the LFPR may be due to changes in the proportion of workers or changes in unemployment rates, which we will look at next.

When we examine the social group differences in LFPR, it is discovered that there is a caste dimension. The LFPR in Telangana and across India is lowest in the 'Others' category during all three periods (Table 2).

Table 2: Social Group-wise distribution of Labour Force Participation

Years	Telangana				India			
	ST	SC	OBC	Others	ST	SC	OBC	Others
2011-12	58.7	47.5	47.3	36.9	45.9	40.4	38.9	37.8
2018-19	42.57	47.78	45.16	35.98	42.54	37.84	37.02	36.25
2019-20	55.28	51.34	47.9	41.7	47.1	40.28	39.61	38.48
	% Change (increase/decrease)							
2011-12 to 2018-19	-16.13	0.28	-2.14	-0.92	-3.36	-2.56	-1.88	-1.55
2018-19 to 2019-20	12.71	3.56	2.74	5.72	4.56	2.44	2.59	2.23
2011-12 to 2019-20	-3.42	3.84	0.6	4.8	1.2	-0.12	0.71	0.68

Source: Author's calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

LFPR among ST in Telangana was higher than SC and OBC in 2011-12, but it fell to its lowest level in 2018-19. (Table 2). In Telangana, unlike the rest of India, ST is the only social group that has had a fall in LFPR from 2011-12 to 2019-20. Fluctuations in LFPR, on the other hand, have been observed across all social groups, with LFPR declining in 2018-19 from 2011-12 and increasing in 2019-20. The highest LFPR among social groups may either mean a higher proportion of workers or a lower proportion of unemployment, a phenomenon which we will examine later.

Worker Population Ratio (WPR)

In comparison to the rest of India, Telangana had the highest worker population ratio (WPR) in 2011-12. Though its size has fluctuated over time, it is still larger in 2019-20 than the national average. The decline in WPR during 2011-12 and 2018-19, therefore, may be the main reason for the decline in LFPR, and, this in turn indicates relatively higher unemployment in the state, which we examine later (Table 3).

There is a rural-urban dimension to the WPR. Despite the fact that the WPR is higher in rural regions, it has declined significantly over time when compared to the trend in urban WPR between 2011-12 and 2018-19. This is also true at the national level (Table 3). As a result, the drop in rural LFPR we saw before looks to be primarily due to a drop in rural WPR. It's also

worth noting that the rural-urban divide is wider in Telangana at both time periods between 2011-12 and 2018-19 (Table 3). Though it increased in both rural and urban areas at the same time between 2018-19 and 2019-20, the drop in rural areas continued between 2011-12 and 2019-20, while it increased in urban areas.

Table 3 shows some interesting WPR patterns in Telangana, particularly among rural and urban female WPRs, as well as across India. One, Telangana has a substantially higher WPR among rural females than the rest of India. Two, the female-male ratio in rural WPR is higher (almost one) in rural Telangana, but twice as high at the national level. Three, Telangana has a lower female-male ratio in urban WPR, although it is higher than India (almost all similar). Four, as shown by the three time points, the difference between rural and urban WPRs for females is significant and fluctuates. Five, within Telangana, WPRs have decreased for rural females while increasing for urban females between 2011-12 and 2019-20.

Overall, the higher WPR in rural Telangana is not necessarily an indication of development but rather raises a question of quality and security of employment which requires further investigation.

Table 3: Work Participation Rate by Location, Sector and Gender in Telangana and India

State	Year	Rural			Urban			Total		
		Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person
Telangana	2011	56.0						55.0		
	-12	2	46.93	51.51	53.8	14.86	34.81	9	33.8	44.61
	2018	51.4			52.5			51.9		
	-19	9	36.85	44.07	7	16.03	34.55	5	28.26	40.08
India	2019	57.1			52.6			55.2		
	-20	9	42.68	49.8	2	20.42	37.29	7	34.04	44.74
India	2011	54.1			54.5			54.2		
	-12	5	24.74	39.77	2	14.59	35.37	6	21.85	38.5
	2018	51.9	18.91	35.7	52.6	14.47	34.04	52.1	17.57	35.2

	-19							1		
	2019	53.5			54.0			53.7		
	-20	7	23.96	39.03	7	16.8	35.84	2	21.79	38.06
	% Change (increase/decrease)									
Telangan a	2011 -12 to 2018 -19	-4.53	-10.08	-7.44	-1.23	1.17	-0.26	-3.14	-5.54	-4.53
	2018 -19 to 2019 -20	5.7	5.83	5.73	0.05	4.39	2.74	3.32	5.78	4.66
	2011 -12 to 2019 -20	1.17	-4.25	-1.71	-1.18	5.56	2.48	0.18	0.24	0.13
	2011 -12 to 2018 -19	-2.25	-5.83	-4.07	-1.92	-0.12	-1.33	-2.15	-4.28	-3.3
India	2018 -19 to 2019 -20	1.67	5.05	3.33	1.47	2.33	1.8	1.61	4.22	2.86
	2011 -12 to 2019 -20	-0.58	-0.78	-0.74	-0.45	2.21	0.47	-0.54	-0.06	-0.44
	2011 -12 to 2018 -19	-2.25	-5.83	-4.07	-1.92	-0.12	-1.33	-2.15	-4.28	-3.3

to										
2019										
-20										

Source: Author's calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

Table 3a: Female and rural ratio in WPR by Location in Telangana and India

State	Years	Female Ratio-WPR			R-U Ratio
		Rural	Urban	Person	
Telangna	2011-12	0.84	0.28	0.61	1.48
	2018-19	0.72	0.30	0.54	1.28
	2019-20	0.75	0.39	0.62	1.34
India	2011-12	0.46	0.27	0.40	1.12
	2018-19	0.36	0.28	0.34	1.05
	2019-20	0.45	0.31	0.41	1.09

Source: Author's calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

Telangana has a lower gender difference in WPR than the rest of India. WPR, on the other hand, has increased by around 4.66 percentage points from 2011-12 to 2018-19. Though it decreased significantly in the subsequent one-time period from 2018-19 to 2019-20, the gender gap has remained mostly unchanged from 2011-12. However, the minor improvement in WPR could be attributed to increased female participation.

In Telangana, the caste dimension of WPR follows a national pattern (Table 4) that shows a steep fall in WPR among all social groups between 2011-12 and 2018-19, and increasing the following year. The increase is larger among the social groups in Telangana, which is higher than the rest of India. Though it increased significantly among social groups from 2018-19 to 2019-20, it is still lower among STs and BCs in 2019-20 than it was in 2011-12, whereas "Other" categories improved more.

Table 4: Social Group Dimension of Worker Population Ratio in Telangana and India

Years	Telangana				India			
	ST	SC	OBC	Others	ST	SC	OBC	Others
2011-12	58.4	46.2	46	34.6	45.2	39.5	38.2	36.8
2018-19	37.39	43.68	41.51	32.92	40.55	35.32	34.76	30.03
2019-20	49.88	47.94	44.8	37.62	45.4	38.15	37.62	36.28
% Change (increase/decrease)								
2011-12 to 2018-19	-21.01	-2.52	-4.49	-1.68	-4.65	-4.18	-3.44	-6.77
2018-19 to 2019-20	12.49	4.26	3.29	4.7	4.85	2.83	2.86	6.25
2011-12 to 2019-20	-8.52	1.74	-1.2	3.02	0.2	-1.35	-0.58	-0.52

Source: Author's calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

Type of Employment

This section looks at the nature of employment and any changes that have occurred between the three time periods. The NSSO definition of self-employed, regular/salaried, and casual employment is used to categorise employment into several kinds. The study looked at various social groups, genders, and places of living.

Between 2011-12 and 2018-19, the overall picture of employment type in Telangana indicates a decrease in casual and self-employed work and an increase in regular/salaried employment (Table 5). During 2018-19 and 2019-20, however, this pattern is inverted. Though this pattern holds for the entire country, Telangana has a larger share of regular/salaried workers in all three time periods than the rest of India.

Table 5: Type of Employment by Location in Telangana and India

Years	Telangana			India		
	Self-Employed	Regular Salaried	Casual	Self-Employed	Regular Salaried	Casual
2011-12	47.22	22.78	30	52.23	17.88	29.89
2018-19	45.68	26.93	27.39	52.04	23.81	24.15
2019-20	47.32	25.47	27.2	53.48	22.94	23.58
% Change (increase/decrease)						

2011-12 to 2018- 19	-1.54	4.15	-2.61	-0.19	5.93	-5.74
2018-19 to 2019- 20	1.64	-1.46	-0.19	1.44	-0.87	-0.57
2011-12 to 2019- 20	0.1	2.69	-2.8	1.25	5.06	-6.31

Source: Author's calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

Table 6: Type of Employment by Location and Social Group in Telangana and India

Location	Type of Employment	2011-12				2018-19				2019-20			
		ST	SC	OB C	Othe rs	ST	SC	OB C	Othe rs	ST	SC	OB C	Othe rs
Telangana	Self Employed	42.3	26.7	52.0	55.2	41.9	30.7	50.8	45.89	44.1	33.6	53.2	50.50
	Salaried	11.5	25.2	20.2	36.1	19.4	23.6	24.8	41.62	26.2	22.2	24.3	37.46
	Casual	46.2	48.1	27.8	8.7	38.6	45.5	24.3	12.49	29.6	44.1	22.3	12.04
India	Self Employed	53.6	36.7	55.3	57.7	56.5	38.0	55.7	54.74	57.0	40.3	58.0	54.86
	Salaried	8.7	15.3	15.8	26.4	12.9	20.7	22.2	33.05	13.6	20.4	20.5	32.96
	Casual	37.6	47.9	28.9	15.9	30.4	41.1	22.0	12.21	29.3	39.2	21.4	12.18

Source: Author's calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

Table 6a: Type of Employment by Location and Social Groups in Telangana and India

Location	Type of Employment	2011-12 to 2018-19				2018-19 to 2019-20				2011-12 to 2019-20			
		ST	SC	OBC	Others	ST	SC	OBC	Others	ST	SC	OBC	Others
Telangana	Self Employed	-	4.04	-	-9.31	2.16	2.9	2.45	4.61	1.82	6.94	1.28	-4.7
	Salaried	7.92	1.52	4.67	5.52	6.85	1.48	0.52	-4.16	14.77	-3	4.15	1.36
	Casual	-	-	-	3.79	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
India	Self Employed	2.96	1.34	0.46	-2.96	0.5	2.27	2.31	0.12	3.46	3.61	2.77	-2.84
	Salaried	4.29	5.47	6.41	6.65	0.64	-0.3	1.68	-0.09	4.93	5.17	4.73	6.56
	Casual	-	-	-	-3.69	-	-	-	-0.03	-8.28	-	-7.5	-3.72

Source: Author's calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

When compared to the national average, Telangana has a larger percentage of SC, ST, and OBC in casual work. In Telangana, casualization has declined among STs at all three time points. While casualization among SCs remains high, it has decreased from 48.16 percent to 44.16 percent. The 'Self-Employed' category includes over half of the OBC group. Except for SCs, there has been a growth in the salaried category across the board between the two time points, with STs seeing the largest increase from 11.5 percent in 2011-2012 to 26.27 percent in 2019-20. In the regular type of job, the 'Others' category maintain the lead.

Table 7: Type of Employment by Location, Sector and Gender in Telangana and India

Years	Employment category	Telangana				India			
		Rural		Urban		Rural		Urban	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
2011-12	Own Account Employer	44.56	12.71	31.05	28.08	41.77	18.59	34.88	26.11
	Helper	9.32	39.28	2.12	14.06	12.65	40.82	6.84	16.71
	Self-employed	53.88	51.99	33.17	42.14	54.42	59.41	41.73	42.83

	Wages/Salaried	13.29	2.47	55.59	42.96	10.06	5.6	43.44	42.89
	Casual labour	32.83	45.55	11.24	14.9	35.52	35	14.84	14.28
2018-19	Own Account Employer	57.7	19.96	28.04	26.85	48.34	21.82	34.58	24.84
	Helper	3.86	23.93	2.11	6.39	9.02	37.88	4.09	9.59
	Self-employed	61.56	43.88	30.15	33.24	57.37	59.7	38.67	34.43
	Wages/Salaried	14.48	7.08	54.57	54.08	14.27	11.01	47.18	54.83
	Casual labour	23.97	49.04	15.28	12.68	28.36	29.29	14.15	10.74
	2019-20	Own Account Employer	52.68	15.47	30.74	21.42	48.16	20.6	34.63
Helper		6.85	33	2.18	11.03	10.24	42.45	4.06	11.1
Self-employed		59.53	48.47	32.93	32.45	58.41	63.06	38.69	34.64
Wages/Salaried		11.93	8.42	55.29	54.71	13.82	9.48	47.21	54.3
Casual labour		28.54	43.11	11.78	12.84	27.77	27.46	14.1	11.06

Source: Author's calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

As shown in Table 3, the proportion of urban females in WPR in Telangana is low, at 15% in 2011-12. Of these, 43% are employed on a regular/salaried basis (Table 7). In 2011-12, the WPR for rural females was 46% (Table 3), with only 2.5% in the regular/salaried category (Table 7). Among the three time points, the proportion of regular/salaried workers has increased for rural and urban females from 2.5% to 8.42% and from 43% to 55% in 2019-20 compared to 2011-12. (Table 9). The increase in salaried females is greater among urban females than among rural females. However, there has been an increase in the number of rural females. Though there was an increase in the self-employed unpaid family worker category among rural females between 2011-2012 and 2018-19, it decreased in 2019-20.

Sectoral Dimension of Employment

At the national level, rural farm employment is declining while non-farm activities take its place in both rural and urban areas, but it has increased in 2018-19 and 2019-20. On the other hand, rural farm employment fell for two time periods in Telangana, from 2011-12 to 2018-19, and urban non-farm employment fell precipitously (Table 8).

Table 8: Employment by Location and Sector in Telangana and India

Years	Telangana						India					
	Rural		Urban		Total		Rural		Urban		Total	
	Farm	Non-Farm	Farm	Non-Farm	Farm	Non-Farm	Farm	Non-Farm	Farm	Non-Farm	Farm	Non-Farm
2011-12	72.15	27.85	1.69	98.31	49.42	50.58	64.12	35.88	6.66	93.34	48.9	51.1
2018-19	66.62	33.38	2.91	97.09	43.59	56.41	57.75	42.25	5.47	94.53	42.39	57.61
2019-20	70.75	29.25	4.53	95.47	48.44	51.56	61.56	38.44	5.68	94.32	45.53	54.47
	% Change (increase/decrease)											
2011-12 to 2018-19	-5.53	5.53	1.22	-1.22	-5.83	5.83	-6.37	6.37	-1.19	1.19	-6.51	6.51
2018-19 to 2019-20	4.13	-4.13	1.62	-1.62	4.85	-4.85	3.81	-3.81	0.21	-0.21	3.14	-3.14
2011-12 to 2019-20	-1.4	1.4	2.84	-2.84	-0.98	0.98	-2.56	2.56	-0.98	0.98	-3.37	3.37

Source: Author's calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

Table 9: Sectoral Share in Employment (PS+SS) by location in Telangana and India

Sectoral Employment	Telangana			India		
	2011-12	2018-19	2019-20	2011-12	2018-19	2019-20
Agriculture	49.42	43.59	48.44	48.90	42.39	45.53
Mining & Quarrying	0.86	0.51	0.61	0.54	0.41	0.28
Manufacturing	11.63	12.87	10.70	12.61	12.08	11.16
Electricity and Water supply	0.54	0.45	0.31	0.52	0.56	0.61
Construction	5.99	8.65	6.62	10.57	12.12	11.63
Trade	9.61	8.79	11.61	9.32	10.78	11.53
Transport	5.34	5.25	4.89	4.07	4.95	4.66
Accommodation & Food	1.20	1.09	0.93	1.64	1.86	1.71
other services	15.41	18.80	15.87	11.82	14.84	12.89
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Author’s calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

Telangana, like the rest of the country, has a high proportion of its workforce employed in agriculture. Despite the fact that it declined between 2011-12 and 2018-19, it increased in the following year 2019-20. Approximately half of all workers are still employed in agriculture. Agriculture and trade activities will largely compensate for the decline in manufacturing, construction, and service employment in 2019-20. Even though trade, hotels and restaurants, and public administration have a larger share of the services sector, changes are rapidly shifting toward financial intermediaries, business, and real estate activities, as seen from 2011-02 to 2019-20. (Table 9).

Unemployment

Unemployment is quantified in two ways: the Unemployment Rate (UR) and the Proportion Unemployed (PU). While the former refers to the total number of unemployed as a percentage of the labour force, the latter refers to the total number of unemployed as a proportion of all people. Telangana ranks higher than the rest of India in terms of both measures and proportion (Table 10). Most importantly, the unemployment rate in Telangana nearly doubled between 2011-12 and 2019-20. Although urban unemployment is higher, rural unemployment has increased significantly from 2011-12 to 2019-20. (Table 10). Male unemployment has risen faster than female unemployment in Telangana and across India (Table 11).

Table 10: Unemployment Rate and Proportion Unemployed (per 100) by Location and Sector in Telangana and India

Years	Telangana						India					
	Rural		Urban		Total		Rural		Urban		Total	
	PU	UR	PU	UR	PU	UR	PU	UR	PU	UR	PU	UR
2011-12	1.07	2.04	2.04	5.53	1.47	3.19	0.85	2.09	1.37	3.72	1	2.53
2018-19	3.19	6.76	4.42	11.33	3.71	8.46	2.01	5.32	2.9	7.84	2.28	6.08
2019-20	2.78	5.29	4.34	10.42	3.41	7.08	1.75	4.29	2.75	7.13	2.06	5.13
	% Change (increase/decrease)											

Research paper

© 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved, UGC CARE Listed (Group -I) Journal Volume 8, Issue 4, 2019

2011-12 to 2018-19	2.12	4.72	2.38	5.8	2.24	5.27	1.16	3.23	1.53	4.12	1.28	3.55
2018-19 to 2019-20	-0.41	-1.47	-0.08	-0.91	-0.3	-1.38	-0.26	-1.03	-0.15	-0.71	-0.22	-0.95
2011-12 to 2019-20	1.71	3.25	2.3	4.89	1.94	3.89	0.9	2.2	1.38	3.41	1.06	2.6

Note: UR: Unemployment Rate; PU: Proportion Unemployed

Source: Author's calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

Table 11: Dimension of Unemployment according to PS+SS by Location, Sector and Gender in Telangana and India

Years	Unemployment Status	Telangana				India			
		Rural		Urban		Rural		Urban	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
2011-12	PU	1.8	0.33	3.01	1.02	1.15	0.53	1.82	0.88
	UR	3.11	0.71	5.29	6.42	2.09	2.09	3.22	5.69
2018-19	PU	4.6	1.83	5.27	3.54	3.23	0.74	4.11	1.62
	UR	8.20	4.72	9.11	18.09	5.86	3.77	7.24	10.07
2019-20	PU	3.95	1.65	5.68	2.86	2.75	0.72	3.77	1.69
	UR	6.47	3.72	9.74	12.30	4.88	2.90	6.52	9.14

Note: UR: Unemployment Rate; PU: Proportion Unemployed

Source: Author's calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

Table 12: Dimension of Unemployment according to PS+SS by Location, and Social Groups in Telangana and India

Years	Unemployment Status	Telangana					India				
		ST	SC	BC	Others	Total	ST	SC	BC	Others	Total
2011-12	PU	0.35	1.37	1.32	2.35	1.47	0.75	1.03	0.9	1.2	1
	UR	0.60	2.89	2.80	6.37	3.19	1.64	2.56	2.32	3.17	2.53

Research paper

© 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved, UGC CARE Listed (Group -I) Journal Volume 8, Issue 4, 2019

2018-19	PU	5.18	4.1	3.65	3.06	3.71	1.99	2.52	2.26	2.22	2.28
	UR	12.18	8.58	8.09	8.50	8.46	4.68	6.67	6.10	6.13	6.08
2019-20	PU	5.4	3.4	3.1	4.08	3.41	1.7	2.13	1.99	2.23	2.06
	UR	9.77	6.62	6.47	9.78	7.08	3.61	5.29	5.02	5.79	5.13

Note: UR: Unemployment Rate; PU: Proportion Unemployed

Source: Author's calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

On the one hand, there is a decline in female labour force and work force participation; on the other hand, female unemployment is lower than male unemployment. This essentially means that women are gradually leaving the labour force and/or not reporting as unemployed. The reasons for women leaving the labour force and the high rate of unemployment in the 'Others' category require further investigation. This is a major concern for policy makers.

Table 13: Skill level among the Unemployed by Education levels, Location, Sector and Gender in Telangana and India

Years	Educational Levels	Telangana				India			
		Rural		Urban		Rural		Urban	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
2011-12	Below	15.0				24.9		16.0	
	Secondary (1-6)	7	0.00	9.72	15.81	0	23.03	2	9.29
	Secondary & Above(7-13)	84.9	100.00	90.2	84.19	75.1	76.97	83.9	90.71
2018-19	Below	15.8				39.8		28.8	
	Secondary (1-6)	8	8.02	9.53	10.11	9	13.09	0	12.53
	Secondary & Above(7-13)	84.1	91.98	90.4	89.89	60.1	86.91	71.2	87.47
2019-20	Below					11.9			
	Secondary (1-6)	0.19	8.79	2.67	1.21	8	7.88	9.72	3.82
	Secondary & Above(7-13)	99.8	91.21	97.3	98.79	88.0	92.12	90.2	96.18

Above(7-13)	1		3		2		8
-------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---

Source: Author’s calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

Table 14: Skill level among the Unemployed by Location, Education levels and Social Group in Telangana and India

State	Educational Levels	2011-12					2018-19					2019-20				
		ST	SC	BC	Others	Total	ST	SC	BC	Others	Total	ST	SC	BC	Others	Total
Telangana	Below Sec	0	0	16.9	10.43	11.86	16.64	0	6.69	2.04	5.39	0	0.69	4.23	0.87	2.5
	Secondary	100	100	83.1	89.57	88.14	83.36	100	93.31	97.96	94.61	100	99.31	95.77	99.13	97.5
India	Below Sec	16.01	32.15	18.9	15.78	20.23	21.4	18.54	12.1	9.05	13.45	11.93	13.86	9.73	6.52	5
	Secondary	83.99	67.85	81.1	84.22	79.77	78.6	81.46	87.9	90.95	86.55	88.07	86.14	90.27	93.48	90.15

Source: Author’s calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

To develop a well-targeted policy, one must first assess the skill levels of the unemployed. For this, we look at the unemployed's skill level, as measured by their level of education above secondary school. As seen from Table 13, more than 80% of the unemployed in Telangana are educated beyond the secondary level, indicating the presence of educated unemployed in the state. It is also worth noting that the proportion of educated unemployed is higher among rural men than among urban women. Across social groups, the Scheduled Tribe and Scheduled Caste populations have a higher proportion of educated unemployed people (table 14). These findings must be taken into account when developing employment policies to ensure that benefits reach rural females, urban males, and, most importantly, the state's socially disadvantaged communities.

The Youth and Skill Gap

There is a lack of an internationally accepted age cohort for defining youth because the definition of youth in a given country can vary depending on a variety of factors, including political and cultural factors. The United Nations defines "youth" as people aged 15 to 24,

and "young people" as those aged 10 to 19. (UNESCO, 2004). In India, the age group of 13 to 35 is defined by the National Youth Policy (NYP) of 2003. The NYP 2012, on the other hand, covers the age range of 16 to 30. Here, we adhere to the definition provided by the Government of India's most recent National Youth Policy (NYP 2014), which considers youth to be between the ages of 15 and 29.

Accordingly, the proportion of youth in Telangana is around 30 per cent, which is higher compared to the national average. Data from the Census of India 2011 confirms the NSSO figures that the proportion of youth in the total population is around 29% (around 28 per cent in rural and about 30 per cent in urban).

Table 15: Youth Usual Principal Status by Location, Sector and Gender in Telangana and India

Years	Activity Status	Telangana				India			
		Rural		Urban		Rural		Urban	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
2011-12	own account worker	9.89	7.37	5.66	3.83	10.76	3.72	9.26	3.34
	employer	0.81	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.17	0.02	0.67	0.00
	unpaid family worker	13.29	17.86	2.16	2.27	18.51	11.08	8.43	2.69
	regular salaried/wage employee	8.93	1.30	33.96	6.72	6.78	1.72	26.62	7.83
	casual wage labour : in public works	3.98	5.88	0.23	0.01	2.38	1.92	0.33	0.01
	casual wage labour :in other types of work	16.06	15.54	8.61	2.09	23.02	7.38	10.51	1.86
	seeking and/or available for	5.45	0.92	8.43	2.87	3.24	1.29	4.93	2.37

	work								
	attended educational institutions	40.60	23.53	40.42	28.11	32.88	22.64	37.46	31.88
	attended domestic duties only	0.39	22.15	0.12	52.24	0.26	23.91	0.20	36.98
	attended domestic duties and free collection of goods	0.00	4.37	0.00	1.63	0.35	25.35	0.10	12.26
	rentiers, pensioners, remittance recipients, etc.	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.09	0.12	0.07
	not able to work due to disability	0.14	0.67	0.30	0.14	0.67	0.40	0.49	0.33
	begging, prostitution, etc.	0.43	0.39	0.04	0.09	0.95	0.48	0.89	0.38
	Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
2018-19	own account worker	14.09	4.56	4.68	2.43	10.82	2.35	7.39	2.46
	employer	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.31	0.05	0.63	0.01
	unpaid family worker	3.83	4.29	2.28	0.57	11.76	5.30	4.57	1.18
	regular salaried/wage employee	7.49	1.43	28.77	8.81	8.94	1.95	27.23	8.13

casual wage labour : in public works	3.53	1.49	0.00	0.00	0.51	0.51	0.09	0.04
casual wage labour :in other types of work	9.68	10.71	7.75	1.13	16.70	3.43	7.70	0.90
seeking and/or available for work	15.61	5.83	15.55	8.03	9.78	2.19	10.94	4.40
attended educational institutions	44.99	31.40	39.37	33.15	38.73	28.77	38.79	36.27
attended domestic duties only	0.00	36.68	0.47	42.67	0.48	38.32	0.51	40.76
attended domestic duties and free collection of goods	0.00	2.76	0.00	2.22	0.20	15.94	0.07	4.46
rentiers, pensioners, remittance recipients, etc.	0.23	0.13	0.15	0.26	0.22	0.49	0.13	0.27
not able to work due to disability	0.12	0.51	0.34	0.41	0.85	0.34	0.65	0.26
begging, prostitution, etc.	0.44	0.21	0.55	0.31	0.71	0.37	1.32	0.84
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

2019-20	own account worker	12.49	6.50	5.32	2.23	10.91	2.80	7.69	2.56
	employer	0.68	0.00	0.86	0.00	0.25	0.02	0.55	0.07
	unpaid family worker	7.97	6.24	2.03	1.65	14.35	8.41	4.67	1.56
	regular salaried/wage employee	9.51	1.94	30.48	12.62	9.44	2.22	26.95	10.02
	casual wage labour : in public works	5.22	5.44	0.00	0.18	0.65	0.69	0.09	0.02
	casual wage labour :in other types of work	7.55	6.41	5.74	1.79	16.83	4.43	7.72	1.00
	seeking and/or available for work	14.06	6.19	16.06	6.69	8.37	2.13	10.63	5.04
	attended educational institutions	41.49	40.63	37.71	32.16	36.06	28.87	39.48	35.20
	attended domestic duties only	0.29	24.21	0.39	38.47	0.93	32.41	0.82	38.44
	attended domestic duties and free collection of goods	0.00	2.10	0.00	2.52	0.38	16.81	0.09	5.27
	rentiers, pensioners, remittance	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.36	0.15	0.56	0.03	0.22

recipients, etc.									
not able to work due to disability	0.09	0.34	0.87	1.07	1.02	0.34	0.58	0.33	
begging, prostitution, etc.	0.24	0.00	0.54	0.27	0.67	0.33	0.72	0.27	
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Author's calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

The alarming situation is that approximately one-fifth of the state's youth are neither in the labour force nor in educational institutions during 2018-19, whereas the percentage was only 14.5 in 2011-12³. We can draw an important conclusion if we disaggregate this picture based on gender and place of residence. It is clear that those who do not fit into either the labour force or the educational categories are most prevalent among urban females, followed by rural females in 2011-12. While the former increases from 27 percent in 2011-12 to around 39 percent in 2018-19, the latter decreases from 54 to 45 percent (Table 15). In the following year, 2019-20, it fell further among both urban and rural females, to 41 and 26.31, respectively. This is significant evidence that allows us to pinpoint the participation of females in the labour force as well as their absence from domestic and household duties. These belong to the 'SC' category (9%) and the ST category (4.3%) that have been returned as labour force (Table 16).

Table 16: Youth: Usual Principal Status by Location and Social Group in Telangana and India

³Those who are not seen either in employment, education or training are often referred as NEET category (the missing youth).

Years	Activity Status	Telangana					India				
		ST	SC	BC	Others	Total	ST	SC	BC	Others	Total
2011-12	own account worker	11.1	4.59	7.99	3.89	6.91	7.46	6.38	7.03	7.41	7.05
	employer	0	0	0.39	0.08	0.23	0.04	0.03	0.12	0.39	0.17
	unpaid family worker	14.2	5.98	11.63	5.2	9.69	17.64	8.63	13.33	10.69	12.04
	regular salaried/wage employee	13.06	13.05	11.27	12.47	11.95	4.12	7.45	7.91	11.31	8.46
	casual wage labour : in public works	7.25	3.55	2.66	0.65	2.81	4.3	1.92	1.57	0.41	1.54
	casual wage labour :in other types of work	13.08	22.08	10.21	3.91	11.21	20.79	20.33	11.47	6.58	12.6
	seeking and/or available for work	0.97	2.82	4.1	7.59	4.29	2.14	2.61	2.51	3.31	2.73
	attended educational institutions	24.12	22.87	34.94	40.25	33.04	22.6	26.01	29.86	35.27	30.02
	attended domestic duties only	15.44	23.04	14.46	23.49	17.68	8.22	13.28	14.7	13.84	13.62
	attended domestic duties and free collection of goods	0.64	1.04	1.69	2.18	1.59	11.59	11.68	10.29	9.66	10.49

Research paper

© 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved, UGC CARE Listed (Group -I) Journal Volume 8, Issue 4, 2019

	rentiers, pensioners, remittance recipients, etc.	0	0	0.01	0	0.01	0.03	0.09	0.07	0.07	0.07
	not able to work due to disability	0.13	0.31	0.42	0.14	0.33	0.25	0.65	0.53	0.42	0.5
	begging, prostitution, etc.	0	0.67	0.21	0.15	0.26	0.82	0.95	0.6	0.64	0.7
	Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
2018-19	own account worker	5.07	7.19	7.57	3.82	6.66	6.56	5.59	6.37	6.1	6.16
	employer	0	0	0.03	0	0.02	0.19	0.16	0.23	0.31	0.23
	unpaid family worker	3.53	2.12	3.55	1.38	2.88	12.09	4.38	7.36	6.01	6.82
	regular salaried/wage employee	5.76	10.52	10.54	14.3	10.95	5.19	8.21	9.02	12.72	9.46
	casual wage labour : in public works	3.17	3.38	0.8	0.51	1.36	1.02	0.4	0.33	0.19	0.37
	casual wage labour :in other types of work	4.51	12.76	7.36	4.4	7.65	15.24	13.67	6.91	4.24	8.39
	seeking and/or available for work	16.19	12.08	11.01	9.03	11.15	5.96	7.24	6.6	6.35	6.61
	attended educational	47.09	27.55	37	44.53	37.23	29.19	31.4	35.6	39.01	35.02

Research paper

© 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved, UGC CARE Listed (Group -I) Journal Volume 8, Issue 4, 2019

	institutions										
	attended domestic duties only	14.68	20.63	20.21	19.98	19.92	14.71	20.27	20.02	18.75	19.26
	attended domestic duties and free collection of goods	0	2.73	1.08	0.83	1.27	8.7	7.08	5.92	4.74	6.11
	rentiers, pensioners, remittance recipients, etc.	0	0.11	0.24	0.19	0.19	0.11	0.34	0.32	0.32	0.3
	not able to work due to disability	0	0.55	0.21	0.68	0.35	0.44	0.6	0.55	0.56	0.55
	begging, prostitution, etc.	0	0.39	0.41	0.34	0.37	0.61	0.65	0.77	0.71	0.71
	Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
2019-20	own account worker	6.75	4.61	8.92	3.98	7.07	6.57	5.79	6.74	6.35	6.42
	employer	1.26	0	0.17	1.7	0.39	0.12	0.07	0.18	0.34	0.19
	unpaid family worker	4.77	5.04	5.33	2.54	4.85	15.24	6.93	9.63	7.06	8.9
	regular salaried/wage employee	18.99	7.87	14.29	13.31	12.81	6.5	8.59	9.38	13.05	9.89
	casual wage labour : in public works	2.12	4.11	3.14	1.38	3.09	1.08	0.63	0.49	0.13	0.48

casual wage labour :in other types of work	7.98	6.34	5.72	3.49	5.67	17.52	13.68	7.47	4.09	8.85
seeking and/or available for work	15.39	11.2	9.98	11.82	10.8	5.13	6.08	6.06	6.68	6.14
attended educational institutions	29.66	44.69	36.43	39.49	38.54	27.86	31.01	34.35	38.29	34.06
attended domestic duties only	11.71	13.31	14.12	20.61	14.7	12.09	17.01	17.84	17.61	17.08
attended domestic duties and free collection of goods	0	1.75	1.04	0.6	1.1	6.4	8.24	6.63	5.24	6.6
rentiers, pensioners, remittance recipients, etc.	0	0	0.2	0.5	0.18	0.18	0.32	0.26	0.3	0.28
not able to work due to disability	1.37	0.82	0.34	0.54	0.54	0.61	1.15	0.43	0.5	0.62
begging, prostitution, etc.	0	0.27	0.31	0.04	0.25	0.7	0.5	0.55	0.37	0.51
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Author's calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

Of the total working youth, 33% work in agriculture, where wages are the lowest. Manufacturing (15%) and Trade, Hotels, and Restaurants (15%) are two other major sources of employment for young people (Table 17). Manufacturing and trade sectors have seen an increase in working youth, while agriculture has seen a decrease.

Table 17: Youth: Sectoral Employment by Location in Telangana and India

Sectoral Employment	Telangana			India		
	2011-12	2018-19	2019-20	2011-12	2018-19	2019-20
Agriculture	44.07	34.9	33.31	43.95	33.98	37.29
Mining & Quarrying	0.32	0.81	0.64	0.6	0.49	0.27
Manufacturing	13.82	12.36	15.19	16.1	15.36	14.15
Electricity and Water supply	0.79	0.35	0.28	0.5	0.58	0.66
Construction	7.43	9.88	9.11	12.94	14.83	14.78
Trade	9.29	11.57	14.22	9.16	11.82	11.94
Transport	6.04	8.15	6.84	4.07	5.5	5.39
Accommodation & Food	1.25	0.47	1.03	1.73	2.17	2.09
other services	16.97	21.5	19.37	10.95	15.27	13.43
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Author’s calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

Skill Gap among Youth

We consider both general and technical education among youth when assessing skill levels (Tables 18 & 19). This has been investigated across all social groups and genders. The unemployed youth's educational status has also been determined. The government must pay close attention to the fact that, according to 2019-20 data, 3% of the state's youth are illiterate (compared to 11% in 2011-12). (Table 18). Programs for skill development must take into account the fact that 79% of youth have educational attainments above the secondary school level (up from 62% in 2011-12). (Table 18).

Table 18: Youth Educational Attainments (general) by Location in Telangana and India

Educational Levels	Telangana	India
--------------------	-----------	-------

	2011-12	2018-19	2019-20	2011-12	2018-19	2019-20
Illiterates	11.33	4.89	3.1	13.17	6.93	6.8
literate without formal schooling	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.07	0.06	0.05
TLC		0.01		0.01	0.03	0.02
others		0.15	0.02	0.14	0.11	0.06
below primary	5.03	0.78	1.23	7.02	2.54	2.91
primary	6.94	4.12	2.44	12.1	9.68	8.57
middle	14.3	15.33	13.85	22.77	24.85	24.4
secondary	27	26.35	26.9	20.11	20.41	19.99
higher secondary	20.39	23.96	26.57	14.41	20.02	20.85
diploma/certificate course	1.41	1.5	1.17	1.78	1.76	1.75
graduate	10.49	18.04	19.64	6.77	11.14	11.9
postgraduate and above	3.09	4.86	5.07	1.65	2.5	2.69
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Author's calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

Table 19: Youth Educational Attainments (Technical) by Location in Telangana and India

Levels of education	Telangana			India		
	2019-20	2011-12	2018-19	2011-12	2018-19	2019-20
no technical education	95.64	95.98	95.61	96.79	96.12	95.74
technical degree in agriculture/ engineering/ technology/ medicine, etc.	2.83	1.47	3.28	0.48	1.6	1.83
diploma or certificate (below graduate level) in: agriculture	0.04			0.04	0.03	0.04

diploma or certificate (below graduate level) in: engineering/technology	0.35	1.01	0.29	1.11	0.87	1.03
diploma or certificate (below graduate level) in: medicine	0.05	0.11	0.06	0.13	0.15	0.13
diploma or certificate (below graduate level) in: crafts			0.01	0.06	0.02	0.05
diploma or certificate (below graduate level) in: other subjects	0.29	0.72	0.38	0.69	0.62	0.54
diploma or certificate (graduate and above level) in: agriculture				0	0	0.03
diploma or certificate (graduate and above level) in: engineering/ technology	0.65	0.48	0.28	0.31	0.28	0.26
diploma or certificate (graduate and above level) in: medicin		0	0.02	0.06	0.04	0.06
diploma or certificate (graduate and above level) in: crafts		0.01		0.02	0.01	0
diploma or certificate (graduate and above level) in: other subjects	0.15	0.22	0.07	0.31	0.27	0.28
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Author's calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

The Scheduled Tribe and Scheduled Caste categories have the highest rate of illiteracy among youth. However, there is a marked improvement in attainment of literacy among these two social groups between 2011-12 and 2018-19. More than 53% of the youth in these two social groups have completed secondary school (Table 20).

Table 20: Youth Educational (General) Attainments by Location and Social Group in Telangana and India

Years	Educational level	Telangana					India				
		ST	SC	BC	Others	Total	ST	SC	BC	Others	Total
2011-12	Illiterates	21.4	21.08	9.7	3.19	11.33	22.53	17.43	13.71	6.59	13.17
	literate without formal schooling	0	0.07	0	0	0.01	0.28	0.03	0.07	0.04	0.07
	TLC						0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01
	others						0.17	0.14	0.12	0.16	0.14
	below primary	12.01	3.02	5.33	2.75	5.03	11.12	8.12	6.86	5.27	7.02
	primary	11.11	9.33	6.07	5.57	6.94	14.99	15.57	11.7	9.45	12.1
	middle	15.89	17.19	14.1	11.71	14.3	23.64	25.06	23.04	20.52	22.77
	secondary	19.3	23.79	29.81	24.99	27	14.13	17.16	21.21	22.25	20.11
	higher secondary	10.74	13.23	20.97	29.21	20.39	9.05	10.74	14.04	19.13	14.41
	diploma/certificate course	1.75	0.34	1.09	3.13	1.41	0.58	1.14	1.89	2.42	1.78
	graduate	7.53	5.33	9.69	18.64	10.49	2.86	3.73	5.93	11.32	6.77
	postgraduate and above	0.27	6.62	3.25	0.81	3.09	0.62	0.86	1.43	2.84	1.65
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
2018-19	Illiterates	7.44	6.77	4.5	3.38	4.89	11.92	9.1	6.77	3.69	6.93
	literate without formal schooling	0	0	0	0.13	0.03	0.27	0.03	0.05	0.02	0.06
	TLC	0	0	0	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.03
	others	0	0	0.14	0.35	0.15	0.04	0.06	0.1	0.18	0.11

Research paper

© 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved, UGC CARE Listed (Group -I) Journal Volume 8, Issue 4, 2019

	below primary	0	2	0.67	0.14	0.78	4.59	3.18	2.25	1.78	2.54
	primary	6.03	5.99	3.66	3.02	4.12	14.39	12.18	8.97	7.2	9.68
	middle	25.43	14.69	14.36	15.72	15.33	29.96	27.93	24.51	21.14	24.85
	secondary	22.68	24.19	29	21.5	26.35	16.64	18.95	21.19	21.57	20.41
	higher secondary	24.66	22.47	24.43	23.8	23.96	14.81	17.22	20.86	22.68	20.02
	diploma/certificate course	3.29	0.38	1.52	1.97	1.5	0.73	1.64	1.92	1.93	1.76
	graduate	8.91	18.49	17.1	23.43	18.04	5.62	8.2	11	15.69	11.14
	postgraduate and above	1.57	5.01	4.62	6.51	4.86	1.01	1.48	2.33	4.11	2.5
	Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
2019-20	Illiterates	5.25	3.84	2.81	2.22	3.1	12.23	9.03	6.46	3.59	6.8
	literate without formal schooling	0	0	0.02	0	0.01	0.14	0.02	0.06	0.02	0.05
	TLC						0.08	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.02
	others	0	0	0.04	0	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.07	0.08	0.06
	below primary	1.98	0.77	1.26	1.63	1.23	5.86	3.24	2.75	1.88	2.91
	primary	2.42	2.51	2.68	1.29	2.44	11.9	10.46	8.31	6.27	8.57
	middle	15.07	17.71	13.36	8.58	13.85	30.47	27.74	23.72	20.61	24.4
	secondary	21.72	20.51	30.24	26.42	26.9	16.91	18.75	20.77	20.8	19.99
	higher secondary	19.93	21.08	28.78	29.64	26.57	14.64	18.2	21.54	24.09	20.85
	diploma/certificate course	3.14	0.74	1.44	0.11	1.17	0.86	1.8	1.89	1.77	1.75
	graduate	26.89	24.62	15.56	24.95	19.64	5.88	8.85	12.04	16.32	11.9
	postgraduate and above	3.61	8.22	3.81	5.15	5.07	1.01	1.85	2.37	4.54	2.69
	Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Author's calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

Table 21: Youth Educational (technical) Attainments by Location and Social Group in Telangana and India

Years	Educational level	Telangana					India				
		ST	SC	BC	Others	Total	ST	SC	BC	Others	Total
2011-12	no technical education	97.87	98.83	96.14	92.22	95.98	99.29	98.21	96.79	95.05	96.79
	technical degree in agriculture/ engineering/ technology/ medicine, etc.	0.06	0.69	1.24	3.48	1.47	0.02	0.23	0.47	0.78	0.48
	diploma or certificate (below graduate level) in: agriculture						0.01	0.02	0.02	0.08	0.04
	diploma or certificate (below graduate level) in: engineering/technology	1.75	0.1	1.04	1.39	1.01	0.35	0.7	1.11	1.61	1.11
	diploma or certificate (below graduate level) in: medicine	0	0	0.2	0	0.11	0.04	0.06	0.17	0.15	0.13
	diploma or certificate (below graduate level) in: crafts						0.02	0.03	0.03	0.15	0.06
	diploma or certificate (below graduate level) in: other subjects	0	0.24	0.66	1.61	0.72	0.15	0.49	0.76	0.88	0.69
	diploma or certificate (graduate and above level) in: agriculture						0	0	0	0.01	0
	diploma or certificate (graduate and above level) in: engineering/ technology	0.21	0.12	0.44	1.03	0.48	0.07	0.09	0.3	0.56	0.31
	diploma or certificate (graduate and above level) in: medicine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.02	0.03	0.13	0.06
	diploma or certificate (graduate and above level) in: crafts	0.08	0	0	0	0.01	0	0	0.04	0.02	0.02
	diploma or certificate (graduate and above level) in: other	0.03	0.03	0.28	0.28	0.22	0.04	0.14	0.27	0.57	0.31

Research paper

© 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved, UGC CARE Listed (Group -I) Journal Volume 8, Issue 4, 2019

	subjects										
	Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
2018-19	no technical education	97.6 3	96. 07	96.4 2	91.9 6	95. 61	98. 54	97. 08	95. 94	94.8	96.1 2
	technical degree in agriculture/ engineering/ technology/ medicine, etc.	1.4	2.0 1	2.73	6.92	3.2 8	0.4 5	1	1.6 9	2.32	1.6
	7-diploma or certificate (below graduate level) in: agriculture						0.0 1	0.1 1	0.0 1	0.01	0.03
	8-diploma or certificate (below graduate level) in: engineering/technology	0.89	0.2 4	0.23	0.3	0.2 9	0.2 7	0.7 5	0.9 6	1.01	0.87
	9-diploma or certificate (below graduate level) in: medicine	0	0.1 1	0.06	0	0.0 6	0.0 8	0.1 7	0.1 3	0.19	0.15
	10-diploma or certificate (below graduate level) in: crafts	0	0	0.02	0	0.0 1	0	0.0 1	0.0 3	0.01	0.02
	11-diploma or certificate (below graduate level) in: other subjects	0	0.2	0.36	0.76	0.3 8	0.2 7	0.5 2	0.6 4	0.8	0.62
	12-diploma or certificate (graduate and above level) in: agriculture						0.0 1	0	0	0.01	0
	13-diploma or certificate (graduate and above level) in: engineering/ technology	0.07	1.2 2	0.07	0.06	0.2 8	0.0 8	0.1 6	0.3 5	0.34	0.28
	14-diploma or certificate (graduate and above level) in: medicin	0	0	0.03	0	0.0 2	0.0 1	0.0 2	0.0 3	0.09	0.04
	15-diploma or certificate (graduate and above level) in:						0	0	0.0 1	0.01	0.01

	crafts										
	16-diploma or certificate (graduate and above level) in: other subjects	0	0.14	0.07	0	0.07	0.29	0.18	0.23	0.4	0.27
	Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
2019-20	no technical education	98.49	98.73	94.65	93.19	95.64	98.45	96.98	95.44	94.28	95.74
	technical degree in agriculture/ engineering/ technology/ medicine, etc.	1.17	0.85	3.47	4.29	2.83	0.57	1	2.11	2.47	1.83
	7-diploma or certificate (below graduate level) in: agriculture	0	0	0.08	0	0.04	0.03	0.07	0.03	0.04	0.04
	8-diploma or certificate (below graduate level) in: engineering/technology	0	0	0.62	0.03	0.35	0.37	0.85	1.16	1.21	1.03
	9-diploma or certificate (below graduate level) in: medicine	0	0	0.05	0.17	0.05	0.05	0.18	0.08	0.21	0.13
	10-diploma or certificate (below graduate level) in: crafts						0.02	0.03	0.06	0.05	0.05
	11-diploma or certificate (below graduate level) in: other subjects	0	0.11	0.47	0	0.29	0.18	0.52	0.53	0.7	0.54
	12-diploma or certificate (graduate and above level) in: agriculture						0.01	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.03
	13-diploma or certificate (graduate and above level) in: engineering/ technology	0.34	0	0.54	2.33	0.65	0.15	0.11	0.26	0.44	0.26
	14-diploma or certificate (graduate and above level) in:						0.06	0.03	0.05	0.08	0.06

medicin										
15-diploma or certificate (graduate and above level) in: crafts						0	0	0	0.01	0
16-diploma or certificate (graduate and above level) in: other subjects	0	0.3 1	0.12	0	0.1 5	0.1 2	0.2 3	0.2 3	0.47	0.28
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Author’s calculations from NSSO 68th round (2011-12), PLFS-II (2018-19) and PLFS-III (2019-20)

Addressing the issue of technical education is the most important point for policymakers to focus on. Across social groups, slightly more than 93% of Telangana's youth lack technical education. Technical illiteracy among youth from Scheduled Tribes and Scheduled Castes is as high as 98 percent (Table 21). The youth's lack of technical education raises serious concerns about their employability in modern and high-paying activities.

According to the analysis, approximately 52.45 percent of the state's unemployed youth are educated beyond the secondary level. Approximately 95% of unemployed youth have no technical education. As a result, the state must pay special attention to ensuring technical education and vocational training for youth in order for them to take advantage of available and emerging opportunities. This is especially important for youth from the SC and ST categories, who have 50% and 40% education above secondary level, respectively, indicating their suitability for skill enhancement in preparation for entry into the labour market.

V. Conclusions and policy suggestions

This research paper using NSSO major rounds of 2011-12 (EUS), 2018-19 (PLFS-II), and 2019-20 (PLFS-III) attempted to assess Telangana State's employment and unemployment status. A special focus has been placed on mapping the comparative status of different social groups, residence, and gender. Five important policy-related conclusions can be drawn: a) the significantly lower proportion of urban female employment is a serious concern; and b) the major concern for rural females should be the declining proportion and quality of employment; this necessitates a quality-cum-quantity emphasis in employment policy for

rural and urban women, respectively.c) On closer inspection, the higher percentage of workforce in rural areas among marginalised social groups is discouraging in terms of employment type. The majority of rural and marginalised social groups are employed on a casual or self-employed basis.d). Since the declining labour force is mainly due to the decline in workforce among the rural female in the state of Telangana over the period from 2011-12.e). According to the data for the three time periods, general education above the secondary level is improving, which is a positive sign. However, the level of unemployment among educated youth is high in the state which is closely related to the absence of technical education among the youth across all social groups.

Based on the findings from the analysis of the NSSO rounds and PLFS on Telangana State's employment and unemployment status, a number of critical areas requiring immediate government attention. Specifically:

Empowerment of Urban Women: Address the significantly lower proportion of urban female employment by implementing targeted policies and programs that promote skill development, entrepreneurship, and job creation specifically for urban women. Establish and expand vocational training centers in urban areas to enhance the employability of women in non-traditional sectors.

Rural Female Employment Strategy: Develop a comprehensive employment strategy for rural females, focusing on both quantity and quality of employment opportunities. This could involve investments in rural infrastructure, agriculture-related industries, and skill development programs tailored to rural women. Implement policies to promote sustainable and decent work in rural areas, ensuring that rural women have access to secure and well-paying jobs.

Diversification of Rural Employment: Address the concentration of marginalized social groups in casual or self-employed positions by promoting diversification of rural employment. This could involve supporting initiatives that create formal employment opportunities in various sectors.

Reversing the Decline in Rural Female Workforce: Investigate and address the factors leading to the decline in the rural female workforce. This may include targeted interventions such as awareness campaigns, family support programs, and policies that facilitate work-life balance for rural women.

Promoting Technical Education: Recognize the link between the high unemployment rate among educated youth and the lack of technical education. Develop and implement policies to enhance the availability and accessibility of technical education across all social groups. Collaborate with educational institutions and the private sector to create more opportunities for technical skill development, aligning education with the needs of the job market.

Youth Employment Programs: Design and implement youth employment programs that address the mismatch between general education levels and the skills required by the job market. This could include internships, apprenticeships, and on-the-job training programs.

Monitoring and Evaluation: Establish a robust monitoring and evaluation system to track the impact of these policies over time. Regularly assess the employment and unemployment trends, with a specific focus on the targeted social groups, gender, and residence categories.

Public-Private Partnerships: Foster collaboration between the government, private sector, and civil society organizations to create a holistic approach towards employment generation. Public-private partnerships can contribute to the design and implementation of effective programs.

Awareness Campaigns: Launch awareness campaigns to promote the importance of education, especially technical education, and to inform the population about available employment opportunities. This can help in addressing the issue of unemployment among educated youth.

Inclusive Policy Design: Ensure that all policies are designed with inclusivity in mind, considering the specific needs and challenges faced by different social groups, genders, and regions within the state.

By addressing these key points, the government can work towards creating a more inclusive, diversified, and sustainable employment landscape in Telangana, fostering economic growth and social development.

References

Research paper

© 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved, UGC CARE Listed (Group -I) Journal Volume 8, Issue 4, 2019

- [1] Abraham, V. 2007. Growth and inequality of wages in India: Recent trends and patterns. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 50 (4): 927–941
- [2] Arrow, K.J. (1973), “Higher education as a filter”, *Journal of Public Economics*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 193-216.
- [3] Bhanwala, K.H. and Mani, G. (2000), “Engaging rural youth gainfully”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 55 No. 11, pp. 16-18.
- [4] Bisht, N. and Pattanaik, F. (2000), “Youth labour market in India: education, employment, and sustainable development goals”, in Amine, S. (Ed.), *International Perspectives on the Youth Labor Market: Emerging Research and Opportunities*, IGI Global, pp. 172-196.
- [5] Chevalier, A. and Lindley, J. (2009), “Overeducation and the skills of UK graduates”, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A*, Vol. 172 No. 2, pp. 307-337.
- [6] Dev, S.M. and Venkatanarayana, M. (2011), *Youth Employment and Unemployment in India*, Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research, Mumbai.
- [7] Directorate of Economics and Statistics (2016) *Statistical Year Book 2016*, Government of Telangana, Hyderabad
- [8] Dunne, E., Bennett, N. and Carre, C. (2000), “Skill development in higher education and employment”, *Differing Visions of a Learning Society: Research Findings*, Vol. 1, pp. 105-137.
- [9] Fasih, T. (2008), “Linking education policy to labor market outcomes”, *The World Bank*, pp. 1-108.
- [10] Government of India (2014) *Report on District Level Estimates for the State of Telangana- 2013-14*, Ministry of Labour and Employment, Labour Bureau, Chandigarh
- [11] Krishnakumar, J. and Nogales, R. (2000), “Education, skills and a good job: a multidimensional econometric analysis”, *World Development*, Vol. 28, p. 1048-1062.
- [12] Kumar, VA. 2009. ‘Federalism and Decentralisation in India: Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu’. Working Paper 208, ISEC, Bangalore

Research paper

© 2012 IJFANS. All Rights Reserved, **UGC CARE Listed (Group -I) Journal Volume 8, Issue 4, 2019**

- [14] Kyndt, E. and Baert, H. (2013), “Antecedents of employees’ involvement in work-related learning: asystematic review”, *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 83 No. 2, pp. 273-313.
- [15] McQuaid, R.W. and Lindsay, C. (2005), “The concept of employability”, *Urban Studies*, Vol. 42 No. 2, pp. 197-219.
- [16] Mehrotra, S., Gandhi, A. and Sahoo, B.K. (2013), “Estimating India’s skill gap: on a realistic basis for 2022”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 48 No. 13, pp. 102-111.
- [17] Mitra, A. and Verick, S. (2013), *Youth Employment and Unemployment: An Indian Perspective*, International Labour Organization, Geneva.
- [18] Morsy, Hanan (2012): “Scarred Generation,” *Finance and Development*, Vol 49, No 1, <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2012/03/morsy.htm>.
- [19] Sanghi, S. (2012), “Skill development for employability”, *Vikalpa*, Vol. 37 No. 3, pp. 89-94.
- [20] Sharma, S. and Sharma, P. (2017), “Educational mismatch and its impact on earnings: evidence from Indian labour market”, *International Journal of Social Economics*, Vol. 44 No. 11, pp. 1778-1795.
- [21] Shyjan, D. 2014. ‘Services Sector Growth in Kerala: Character, Composition and Implications’, (Unpublished) PhD Dissertation submitted to Jawaharlal Nehru University, Centre for Development Studies, Trivandrum