



CENSUS OF INDIA 1951

VOLUME X

RAJASTHAN AND AJMER

PART II-B

ECONOMIC TABLES

By

Pt. YAMUNA LAL DASHORA B. A., LL. B.,
Superintendent of Census Operations,
Rajasthan and Ajmer.

JODHPUR

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT PRESS,

1953.

[PRICE Rs. 4/12/-]

CONTENTS

	PAGES
Introduction	1—2
Indian Census Economic Classification Scheme	3—5

ANNEXURES.

I.—Census Questions 9, 10 and 11 and related instructions	7—10
II.—Statement showing the divisions and Sub-divisions of Industries and Services (I. C. E. C. Scheme).	11—18
III.—Note on the relationship between the Indian Census Economic Classification (I. C. E. C.) Scheme and the International Standard Industrial Classification (I. S. I. C.) Scheme of the United Nations.	19
IV.—Statement showing the relation of elements in the Indian Census Economic Classification (I. C. E. C.) Scheme to Divisions and Major Groups of the International Standard Industrial Classification (I. S. I. C.) Scheme.	21—24

TABLES.

B.I —Livelihood Classes and Sub-classes	25—49
B.II —Secondary Means of Livelihood	51—113
B.III—Employers, Employees and Independent Workers in Industries and Services by Divisions and Sub-divisions.	115—323

INTRODUCTION.

The tables compiled from the data collected in the Census of 1951 have been published in Pt. II of the Report, Part I being the Report (Narrative) and subsidiary tables. Part II has again been divided into two volumes. The present volume B contains Economic Tables *i.e.* Tables B-I, B-II and B-III. The remaining tables have been published in volume A.

These tables correspond to Table VIII of 1941, Table X of 1931 and Table XVII of 1921 censuses.

Collection of economic data being the salient feature of the present census, detailed instructions were issued and explained to the enumerators on the basis of the instructions laid down in Annexure I.

It has been observed that there was no difficulty in making the enumerator understand what was exactly meant by an Employee or an Independent Worker or a Non-working self-supporting person. The citizens also understood the concept of these technical terms more or less correctly and it can safely be asserted that the statistics collected with regard thereto, on the whole, represent the true picture.

In the case of Employers it was noticed, though in very few cases, that persons who employed domestic servants, were also, by mistake, treated as Employers. Special attention was paid during the inspection stage to detect such mistakes and correct them. There may still be some which have escaped notice, but these are not likely to have affected the results to any appreciable extent.

In a few instances, especially joint families, the householder could not apportion correctly the income among the members and this might have resulted in the wrong classification of persons who should be classified as self-supporting persons, as earning dependants and vice versa.

Some confusion was also noticed regarding the classification of cultivators holding land from Jagirdars. They were treated in most cases, as cultivators of land wholly or mainly unowned although they were really owners of land, what they paid to the Government was revenue. The figures of persons in means of livelihood class I and II are consequently vitiated to some extent.

Replies to questions relating to economic status and occupation were in a few cases vague, indefinite and meaningless *e.g.* 'labour', 'assistance to the head of the family in his occupation', 'assistance in cultivation', 'employee of Mohanlal's firm', 'driver', 'trade', 'service', 'railway employee', etc. They created difficulties in classifying the same into the eight "Means of Livelihood Classes". These returns were classified by referring to the national register of citizens concerned and finding out the occupation of the head of the household concerned or his neighbours. Defects of this nature were satisfactorily removed in the initial stages so far as the classification into the eight means of livelihood classes was concerned.

Sorting operations for the preparation of economic tables revealed further defects of this nature, such as, (a) same occupation was repeated as principal as well as secondary occupation; (b) name of an occupation was mentioned in the slip of a non-earning dependant as secondary means of livelihood; (c) no occupation was entered in the slip of an earning dependant; (d) in the slip of an independent worker, the occupation record showed that he should be classified as an employee and (e) in a slip of self-supporting person, there was no entry to show whether he was an Independent Worker, an Employer or an Employee. Efforts were made to correct such entries by referring to entries against other columns in the same slip, so far as it was practicable. *e.g.* age, caste, education, etc.

Vague, in-sufficiently described or indefinite occupations were a source of trouble in the tabulation stage, particularly for Economic Table III where the occupations have been classified into occupational Divisions, Sub-divisions and Groups. Allocation of such vague returns to Divisions, Sub-divisions or Groups had to be done either under the column of Unspecified and insufficiently described occupations under each class or they were put into such occupational group as was regarded as the most proper by the Tabulation Officer.

In spite of these efforts, it is not unlikely that defects might have escaped notice or had to be allowed as there was no way out. But their magnitude is not such as to vitiate the usefulness of the figures.

The Tables—The replies recorded in the census slips against census questions 9, 10 and 11 have been used for classifying every enumerated person within the frame work of the economic classification explained in detail in the following pages. The results have been exhibited in the three tables.

- (a) Economic Table I Livelihood classes and sub-classes.
 - (b) Economic Table II Secondary means of livelihood.
 - (c) Economic Table III Employers, employees and independent workers in industries and services by Divisions and Sub-divisions.
-