

LABOR MARKET ANALYSIS: ISSUES AND FACTS

Arup Mitra

Institute of Economic Growth, Delhi University Enclave, Delhi-110007, India

Keywords: agglomeration economies, urbanization, segmentation, non-farm, informal sector, poverty, slums, basic amenities, rural-urban migration, low income households, remittances.

Contents

1. Introduction
 2. Rural Work Market
 3. Urban Work Market
 - 3.1. Perspective
 - 3.2. Urbanization and Industrialization: Agglomeration Economies
 - 3.3. Limited Industrialization, Slums, Informal Sector Employment and Poverty
 - 3.4. Segmentation of the Labor Market
 - 3.5. Political Factors
 4. Recollecting Main Issues
- Glossary
Bibliography
Biographical Sketch

Summary

The chapter reviews issues, models and empirical findings relating to labor economics. First, some of the general research questions are taken up in the context of labor demand and supply, which is followed by detailed discussions on rural and urban labor markets. In the rural context the agriculture and the non-farm sectors are analyzed separately. Four important streams of arguments in the context of urban labor market, namely the agglomeration economies framework, limited-industry based urbanization thesis, contact based migration and labor market segmentation theory and finally, the political vote bank theory are discussed in detail. Debates and differences in findings, if any, are brought out at the appropriate places. At the end, the main issues are listed in order to bring out the policy implications of the study.

1. Introduction

Issues and research questions, which have received extensive attention in the context of labor market analysis are enormous both in the context of developed and developing countries. Some of these themes include family enterprises, missing labor markets, geographical mobility, health/nutrition effects on productivity, labor adjustments to shocks in the presence of imperfect markets and information problems in labor markets (Behrman, 1999). We, however, while addressing some of these issues consider the rural and urban labor market analysis separately. This is because the rural-urban differences in terms of labor market characteristics, research questions and policy directives are quite substantive. However, before focusing on the rural and urban labor

markets we discuss some of the issues relating to the supply of and demand for labor in general.

Among several factors that influence labor force from supply side include age composition of the population, educational status, fertility rate, the ongoing wage rate and the overall business status of the economy (For a detailed review see Mitra, 2000). In fact, one important aspect of labor market analysis is the responsiveness of labor force participation rate to the business cycle. The latter is represented by the unemployment rate of the group, which is a better indicator of the stage of the business cycle as it operates in the labor market than is the overall unemployment rate (Pencavel, 1986). With a rise in the unemployment rate the participation rate is expected to decline due to the phenomenon of discouraged dropouts.

The following equation is fitted to annual U.S. data from 1955 to 1982 for the civilian labor force participation rates of different groups of males in the population (Pencavel, 1986):

$$L_{jt} - L_{j,t-1} = a_j + b(U_t^r - U_{t-1}^r) + e_{jt}$$

where, L_{jt} is the civilian labor force participation rate of group j in year t and U_t^r is the unemployment rate of white males aged 35-44 years in year t .

At the micro level the observed hours of work (h) may be expressed as a function of reported hours of unemployment (UN) and a vector of variables believed to affect the hours an individual would choose to work in the absence of employer's mandates (Pencavel, 1986):

$$h = h_0(p, w, y; A, e) - a(UN)$$

where a is some unknown fraction of reported hours of unemployment that represents to sell labor, A is individual's personal characteristics, e for individual's tastes, p the fixed per unit price of bundle of commodities x , w the hourly wage rate, and y represents independent of the working decision.

The influence of social and cultural variables, particularly on the women participation rate is significant too. Spouse's earnings are also seen as an important determinant of participation as higher wages for males may induce women to allocate their time towards health, education and overall welfare of the children. However, in the context of a developing country like India mother's access to income is seen as an important determinant of children's (particularly that of the girl-children) well-being in terms of nutritional and educational status (see Mitra, 2000). Several studies in the past made an attempt to explain the variations in the work participation rate of males and females across regions, which are diverse in terms of socio-economic, demographic and cultural characteristics. This has been pursued mainly to capture the long-term behavior of the work supply given the paucity of long time series data.

Killigsworth and Heckman (1986) analyze the behavior of female labor supply with special reference to Western economies as the female labor supply has important implications for many other phenomena, including marriage, fertility, divorce, the distribution of family earnings, and male-female wage differentials. Although the inter-relationships, as the authors point out, between women's work and wages have been highlighted in a life-cycle setting, rigorous analysis of such issues using formal life-cycle labor supply models with endogenous wages still needs to be carried out.

Turning to labor demand, its analysis is required to determine the level of wages as long as the supply of labor is not perfectly elastic in the long run. However, if labor supply is perfectly elastic (or there exist instances of unionized employment), work demand allows one to determine the impact of exogenous changes in wages (Hamermesh, 1986). Two important determinants are the overall growth measured in terms of value added and the real wage rate. Also, the choice of technology is crucial in determining the quantum of employment, which in turn is taken to be a function of the relative factor prices. In a two-factor model the Allen elasticity of substitution (s) is defined as the proportionate change in capital (K)/labor (L) due to proportionate change in wage (w) to rental (r) ratio holding output constant:

$$s = F_L F_K / Y F_{LK},$$

where Y is output, and F_L and F_K are marginal productivity of labor and capital respectively. F_{LK} is second order cross derivative representing change in marginal productivity of labor due to unit change in capital

The own-wage elasticity of labor demand at a constant output and constant r is given by

$$n_{LL} = -(1 - wL/Y)s \text{ and the cross-elasticity of demand by } n_{LK} = (1 - wL/Y)s$$

where wL/Y represents the share of labor in total revenue.

However, to explain the biases against labor intensive technology, variables, other than relative factor price, include trade unions strength and strikes, lockouts etc. After controlling for some of these variables estimation of elasticity of employment with respect to growth in value added has been an important feature of the empirical analysis. Another determinant of employment is man-days per worker. With higher magnitude of man days per worker total employment may decline whereas with no scope to increase the man-days per worker, i.e., if labor is utilized to the fullest extent with no possibility of under-utilization, the number of employees goes up in response to rise in demand.

The other issue of interest in this regard is the wage-productivity nexus. How much of productivity growth percolates to benefit workers in terms of wage increase is estimated by computing the wage elasticity with respect to labor productivity:

$$w = f(LP, K/L, M)$$

where, w is real wage rate per worker, LP , labor productivity, K/L , capital-labor ratio, and M , man-days per worker). In an economy-wide model, particularly in a general equilibrium framework wages of different sectors may be inter-related. For example, wages in the large industry can influence the earnings in the small-scale industries, which again may impact on the informal sector enterprises and so on. Further, issues of labor demand not only involve substitution of one factor for another but also possibilities of substitution among groups of workers. The impact on wages of policies such as skills training or population control, which change the demographic and the human-capital composition of the work force can be assessed if the nature and the degree of substitution relations among groups of workers are known (Hamermesh, 1986). So heterogeneity of labor needs to be considered while estimating the aggregate demand for labor in the process of economic growth. On the other hand, from an individual point of view person i 's wage $(Y_i) = g(\mathbf{X}_i, S_i)$,

where, \mathbf{X}_i represents vector of control variables including measures of ability and family background, and S_i , years of educational attainment, (Angrist and Krueger, 1999). This kind of specification is quite popular in analyzing the returns to education or human capital formation as it directly captures the impact of educational attainment on wages and earnings.

Job search and recruiting friction and need to reallocate workers from time to time across alternative productive activities are some of the issues falling into the research frontier. The equilibrium search approach, as Mortensen and Pissarides (1999) mention, emphasizes the role of employers on the demand side of the labor market, and it allows to understand the effects of alternative wage setting institutions and different work market policy regimes. In general, as Angrist and Krueger (1999) point out, broadly two types of empirical research have been pursued in labor economics: descriptive analysis and causal inference. While the former establishes facts that need to be explained by theoretical reasoning the latter seeks to determine the effects of particular interventions or policies or to estimate features of the behavioral relationships emerging from economic theory. Both are, however, important for understanding the reality and they are often complementary to each other.

2. Rural Work Market

Employment in agriculture is often an outcome of excess supplies of work implying gross underemployment. Decomposing the total production into area and yield, the determinants of these two variables have been identified. Acreage response depends on both irrigation and price factors. Yield is a function of irrigation, HYV technology and the improved quality of seeds, and the quality of work, particularly in terms of knowledge on operating higher levels of technology. But the latter component is somewhat a neglected issue though in analytical research this dimension has been brought out very distinctly. In standard production function models work is included as one of the factors of production without emphasizing the heterogeneity of work.

Since agriculture is the primary source of employment in the rural areas, agricultural performance in turn is one of the major determinants of the living standards, which can

be seen from the work on rural poverty (Ahluwalia, 1978). Other than food availability, prices are also important in determining living standards though the correlation between agricultural performance and prices can be very high. Hence, poverty (POV) may be expressed as a function of food availability per capita or per capita agricultural production (F) and prices (P): $POV = f(F, P)$. However, in an attempt to distinguish between the core inflation (that component of measured inflation which is growing due to their own momentum or not having any medium to long run impact on real output) and non-core inflation (prices which are associated with production) and similarly between core output and non-core output, the vector auto-regression (VAR) model seems to be appropriate as suggested by Quah and Vahey (1995). This can be represented as follows (with time being represented by t) though the original work was pursued in relation to real industrial output:

$$F = A_1F_t + A_2F_{t-1} + \dots + B_1P_t + B_2P_{t-1} + \dots + e_t$$

$$P = C_1P_t + C_2P_{t-1} + \dots + D_1F_t + D_2F_{t-1} + \dots + n_t$$

This helps us distinguish between the price incentive, which may be required for production to pick up, and the price rise, which has adverse effect on consumers. However, such kind of a model requires monthly data, which are less likely to be available for the agricultural sector specifically.

Agricultural wage, which directly impacts on the rural living standards, is a complex endogenous variable being influenced by several other variables in turn. Rural-to-urban migration may cause work shortage in the rural areas, particularly during the agricultural peak seasons, and this tends to raise wages. However, work contractors who capture work from backward regions and help them migrate by bearing the initial costs of migration expropriate a part of the work income and thus the actual gains to work due to rise in demand gets substantially suppressed. On the other hand, the rural work market and the credit market are often inter-connected, and thus it is difficult to make a distinction between the wage earned from the work performed and the costs and benefits associated with long term loans received from the employer. Any empirical research is most likely to encounter these problems rendering difficulties to the specification and estimation of agricultural wage function.

One model that explains rural poverty in a recursive framework capturing the interconnections between rural underemployment and poverty is due to Sundaram and Tendulkar (1992):

$$WDH = f(GINIA, DENHA)$$

$$PDUR = g(WDH, AHH, AGHA)$$

$$AVCE = h(AHH, AGHA, PDUR)$$

$$RPOVT = i(AVCE, GINIC)$$

where, the endogenous variables are WDH (wage work dependant households), $PDUR$ (person day unemployment rate), $AVCE$ (average consumption expenditure per capita)

and *RPOVT* (rural poverty headcount ratio). The exogenous variables in the model include Gini-coefficient of assets (*GINIA*), population per hectare of operated area (*DENHA*), average value of privately owned assets per household (*AHH*) and the value of agricultural output per hectare (*AGHA*), and size distribution of per capita consumer expenditure measured in terms of Gini coefficient (*GINIC*).

The rural non-farm sector has been viewed both in terms of ‘supply push phenomenon’ and ‘demand induced’ growth hypothesis. A number of studies in the past have focused on determinants of the non-farm sector growth. A positive relationship between agricultural productivity and share of non-agricultural employment is taken to substantiate the hypothesis of agriculture led growth (Unni, 1991). In favor of this hypothesis is the positive impact of land concentration, rural incomes, and cropping pattern (inclined towards the non-food crops) on the proportion of male work force engaged in non-agricultural activities. An increase in agricultural productivity can raise non-agricultural employment either by raising the demand for non-agricultural products and services or through a residual absorption of work displaced from agriculture because of mechanization, into non-agricultural activities (Bhalla, 1989). From a simple correlation between the two variables it may not be, therefore, possible to conclude that a demand linkage exists. However, in the context of rural industries in particular, a positive association between their performance and agricultural productivity (or the growth rate of agricultural output), is seen to be a reflection of the positive impact of rising purchasing power and resources for investment generated by the agricultural sector (Papola, 1987). On the other hand, demand and production linkage between agriculture and non-agriculture is said to be weak because large farmers tend to demand goods, which are produced in the urban areas. Rather a strong association between unemployment and non-agricultural employment has been noted by Kumar (1993), which tends to support the residual sector hypothesis.

The aggregate non-farm employment, particularly the manufacturing employment, in the rural sector varies positively with urbanization (Shukla, 1991). Industrial dispersal in the rural areas around the periphery of the big cities – which is quite limited in nature – may be attributed to the diseconomies of the agglomeration, measures adopted for controlling environmental pollution, scarcity and high price of urban lands, problems of work organization in large urban centers and so on. Subsequently, these villages, as Kundu (1992) argues, produce commodities and services quite similar to those produced in the urban localities and tend to get integrated into national market. However, he maintains that only in agriculturally prosperous districts, non-agricultural activities in rural and urban areas are found to be highly inter-related. Since land and work productivity are not strongly related to non-agricultural activities in the rural or urban areas of these districts, such rural-urban linkages in non-agricultural activities are said to derive their strength from the development dynamics in the region and they need not necessarily stem from work or land productivity.

Kundu, Sarangi and Dash (2003) held that non-farm activities located in the rural hinterland of the big cities offered considerably low earnings compared to the urban centers. Also, the other indicators of development such as school enrolment, per capita expenditure on education were much lower in these areas indicating the lack of rural-urban continuum and healthy interdependencies between urban centers and their

hinterlands. Without an increase in productivity mere expansion of non-farm activities can hardly make a dent on living standard of the rural population.

Acharya and Mitra (2000) noted that unorganized manufacturing employment in the rural areas is negatively influenced by both urbanization and agricultural value added per rural population. In other words, with a rise in urbanization, manufacturing tends to shift from their rural location to urban areas, which does not necessarily mean physical transfer rather it could be an outcome of reclassification of areas. Secondly the negative relation between agricultural growth and the relative size of manufacturing employment is again indicative of the lack of demand linkage. In the absence of productive employment in the agriculture sector, unorganized manufacturing is rather a forced alternative source of livelihood. It may also be argued that a rise in agricultural incomes perhaps generates demand for urban-based non-agricultural goods rather than those manufactured in rural settings. Both rural poverty and agricultural work are found to influence employment in rural manufacturing positively, lending support to the ‘residual sector’ hypothesis. However, the literacy coefficient bears a positive sign, favoring the view that education facilitates occupational diversification.

In the case of unorganized trade the coefficients of urbanization and the relative size of agricultural work show negative and positive signs respectively. The latter is indicative of a residual sector growth in trading, which is prompted by the fact that entry barriers in terms of skill etc., do not exist in this sector. The total non-farm sector employment, however, showed a positive association with infrastructure and a negative correlation with rural poverty, revealing the phenomenon of demand induced growth. Since during the nineties poverty has declined in several states, it may, therefore, be inferred that the growth of the non-farm sector in these states have occurred partly in response to the demand side factors.

The study by Lanjouw and Shariff (2002) based on a large nationally representative household survey for rural India in 1994 estimated that non-farm incomes account for nearly one-third of household income. They confirmed that poor earn significant shares of total income from casual non-farm wage employment, and also education determines access to non-farm occupations. The indirect effect of non-farm sector, particularly that of construction, on the agricultural wages and, hence, on rural poverty is quite beneficial. Rise in rural wages, moderate though, and a consequent decline in rural poverty are attributed to agricultural growth, increase in non-farm activities and union interventions too. As Radhakrishna and Sharma (1998) wrote, when rising work productivity is accompanied by an opening up of employment opportunities in the rural non-farm sector the trickle down effect works. Decline in public expenditure can be responsible for sluggish growth. Nevertheless, the pull factors are found to be more important in generating the growth of non-farm sector than the push factors (Sharma, 2001).

On the whole, it would be useful to specify the structural model of rural non-farm sector employment ($RNONF$) from supply side as well as demand side:

$$RNONF = S(.)$$

$$RNONF = D(.)$$

where, S and D represent supply and demand equations. Presuming that the observed employment is based on the equality of supply and demand, the reduced form equation of non-farm sector employment would include both supply side and demand side factors. The other aspect is to treat each major activity within the rural non-farm sector separately instead of clubbing them together. In other words, the demand and supply equation of each of the activities need to be considered specifically (Shukla, 1991). We may further note that the inter-connections among different activities within the rural non-farm sector also need to be highlighted, which then can be tackled better in a general equilibrium framework.

-
-
-

TO ACCESS ALL THE 39 PAGES OF THIS CHAPTER,
Visit: <http://www.eolss.net/Eolss-sampleAllChapter.aspx>

Bibliography

Acharya, Sarathi and Arup Mitra (2000), “The Potential of Rural Industries and Trade to Provide Decent Work Conditions: A Data Reconnaissance in India,” SAAT Working Papers, SAAT-ILO, New Delhi. [The paper analyses the non-farm sector growth and its determinants.]

Ahluwalia, M.S. (1978), “Rural Poverty and Agricultural Performance in India”, *Journal of Development Studies*, 14(3). [The paper examines the effect of agricultural performance on rural poverty.]

Aldrich, Brian C. and Ranvinder S. Sandhu (1995) ‘The Global Context of Housing Poverty’, Chapter 1, pp. 17-33 in Brian C. Aldrich and Ranvinder S. Sandhu (eds.) *Housing the Urban Poor: Policy and practice in developing countries*, New Delhi: Vistaar Publications. [It deals with the issue of housing for the urban poor.]

Angrist J.D. and A.B. Krueger (1999), “Empirical Strategies in Work Economics”, *Handbook of Work Economics*, Volume 3, ed. by O. Ashenfelter and D. Card, Elsevier Science, BV.[The study deals with methodological and practical issues in estimating causal relationships in work economics.]

Banerjee, Biswajit, (1986), *Rural to Urban Migration and the Urban Labour Market*, Himalaya Publishing House, Delhi.[Urban work market issues and the impact of rural to urban migration on urban work market are discussed].

Banerjee, Biswajit and Gabriella A. Bucci, (1994), “On the Job Search after Entering Urban Employment: An Analysis Based on Indian Migrants,” *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 56(1). [The survey data from Delhi is analyzed to throw light on work market issues.]

Bhalla, S. (1998), “Trends in Poverty, Wages and Employment in Rural India, in,” in R. Radha Krishna and Alakh N. Sharma (eds) *Empowering Rural Work in India*, Institute for Human Development, New Delhi.[It details the movements in certain key variables reflecting on living standards.]

Becker, C.M., J. G. Williamson, and E.S. Mills. (1992), *Indian Urbanization and Economic Growth since 1960*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.[In a general equilibrium framework it deals with issues relating to Indian urbanization.]

Behrman, J.R. (1999), “Work Markets in Developing Countries”, *Handbook of Work Economics*, Volume 3, ed. by O. Ashenfelter and D. Card, Elsevier Science Publishers, BV. [Several issues relating to the functioning of the work market are discussed in this paper.]

Carlino, G.A. (1979), “Increasing Returns to Scale in Metropolitan Manufacturing,” *Journal of Regional Science*, 19. [It focuses on the issue of agglomeration economies.]

Chopra, Kanchan (2002), “Social Capital and Development Processes: Role of Formal and Informal Institutions”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, July 13. [It brings out the importance of informal networks in the light of Putnam’s work.]

Connell J., B. Dasgupta, L. Roy and M. Lipton (1976), *Migration from Rural Areas: The Evidence from Village Studies*, Oxford University Press, Delhi. [Based on data from rural areas it focuses on various aspects of migration and work market functioning.]

Cornwell, C. et al. (1990) “Production Frontiers with Cross-Sectional and Time Series Variation in Efficiency Levels”, *Journal of Econometrics*, 46. [This suggests a methodology to estimate technical efficiency based on panel data.]

Datta –Chaudhary, Mrinal (1980). “Infrastructure and Location” in John Cody, H. Hughes and D. Wall (eds.) *Policies for Industrial Progress in Developing Countries*, Oxford University Press, New York. [The paper deals with the issue of agglomeration economies highlighting the indivisibility of infrastructure.]

Davis, K. and H. H. Golden, (1954), “Urbanization and the Development of Pre-Industrial Areas”, *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 3(1). [The level of urbanization and industrialization index are compared to deal with the issue of industry-urban nexus.]

Drèze, Jean and Amartya Sen (2002) *India: Development and Participation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. [It talks about interconnections between economic development, public action and social progress.]

Dupont, V. and Arup Mitra (1995), “Population Distribution, Growth and Socio-Economic Spatial Patterns in Delhi: Findings from the 1991 Census Data”, *Demography India*, 24(1). [Based on the data at a highly disaggregated level, i.e., census charges, the paper identifies clusters of different socio-economic attributes, which correspond to geographical location also.]

Edelman, Brent and Arup Mitra (2006), “Slum Dwellers’ Access to Basic Amenities: The Role of Political Contact, Its Determinants and Adverse Effects”, *Review of Urban and Regional Development Studies*, 18(1). [The paper identifies the determinants of accessing political contact.]

Ferro, Manuel, David Rosenblatt and Nicholas Stern (2002) *Policies for Pro-Poor Growth in India*, Ithica, NY: Cornell University. [The authors highlight empowerment as one of the twin pillars of policies for pro-poor growth.]

Gattoni, G. (1998) *Providing Services to the Urban Poor: Urban Infrastructure Projects*, Washington DC:World Bank UPTG. [It deals with the issue of providing basic amenities to the urban poor.]

Government of India (2002) *National Human Development Report 2001*, New Delhi: Planning Commission. [Information relating to socio-economic, education and health indicators across states are compiled in this volume.]

Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi, Planning Department (2004) ‘Economic Survey of Delhi, 2003-2004’, URL: <http://delhiplanning.nic.in/Economic%20Survey/Ecosur2003-04/Ecosur2003-04.htm>. [It compiles administrative and geographical information on Delhi.]

Gugler, J. (1988). “Over-Urbanization Reconsidered” in J. Gugler (ed.) *The Urbanization of Third World*. Oxford University Press, Oxford. (It focuses on the magnitude and issues of rural to urban migration).

Gupta, Indrani and Arup Mitra (2002) ‘Rural Migrants and Labour Segmentation: Micro-Level Evidence from Delhi Slums’, *Economic and Political Weekly*, January 12. [It talks about the work market fragmentation.]

Hamermesh, D.S. (1986), “The Demand for Labor in the Long Run”, *Handbook of Work Economics*, Volume I, ed. by O. Ashenfelter and R. Layard, Elsevier Science Publishers, BV. [The focus is on the relations between exogenous wage changes and the determination of employment, and between exogenous changes in inelastic ally supplied work and the structure of relative wages.]

Harris, J.R. and M.P. Todaro (1970) ‘Migration, Unemployment and Development: A Two-Sector Analysis’, *American Economic Review* 60(1). [Rural-urban expected income differentials are said to be the main determinants of rural-urban migration.]

Hayami, Yujiro, A. K. Dikshit and S. N. Mishra (2006), “Waste Pickers and Collectors in Delhi: Poverty and Environment in an Urban Informal Sector”, *Journal of Development Studies*, 42(1). [The paper estimates the value addition that the waste pickers are making and compares it with the cost that the government had to incur for disposing of the waste.]

Helsley, R.W. and W. C. Strange (1990), “Matching and Agglomeration Economies in a System of Cities,” *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 20. [The paper analyses the issue of agglomeration economies.]

Henderson, J.V. (1982), “The Impact of Government Policies on Urban Concentration,” *Journal of Urban Economics*, 2(3). [It examines the effectiveness of policy in curbing concentration of activities.]

Henderson, J. V. (1986), “Efficiency of Resource Usage and City Size,” *Journal of Urban Economics*, 19. [The paper focuses on the optimal city size highlighting the role of localization economies.]

Henderson, J.V. (1988), *Urban Development: Theory, Fact and Illusion*, Oxford University Press, New York. [The book deals with the issue of localization economies and favors concentration in reaping the benefits.]

Hermansen, T. (1972), “Development Poles and Related Theories: A Synoptic Review,” in N. M. Hansen (ed.) *Growth Centers in Regional Economic Development*, The Free Press, New York. [The concept of development pole theory, indivisibilities and positive effects of concentration are discussed in this paper.]

Hoff, Karla and Arijit Sen (2000) “Home-ownership, Local Interactions, and Segregation”, URL: <http://www.econometricsociety.org/meetings/wc00/pdf/0952.pdf>. [It demonstrates how residential stability or tenure security acts as an incentive to further invest in one’s community.]

Hoselitz, B. (1953) “The Role of Cities in the Economic Growth of Underdeveloped Countries”, *Journal of Political Economy*, 61(3). [It highlights the economic role of cities in the context of growth.]

Hoselitz, B. (1955) “Generative and Parasitic Cities”, *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 3(3). [What helps us draw a line between two types of cities is the focus of the paper. When it contributes to growth and welfare and when it does not are two important aspects that are dealt with.]

Hoselitz, B. (1957), “Urbanization and Economic Growth in Asia,” *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 6(1). [Whether and how urbanization and economic growth are inter-linked is brought out by the paper.]

Jha, Saumitra, Vijayendra Rao and Michael Woolcock (2004) ‘Governance in the Gullies: Democratic responsiveness and community leadership in Delhi’s Slums’, URL:<http://www.cultureandpublicaction.org/bijupdf/GovernanceintheGullies.pdf>. [The paper talks about the social costs in interacting with political figures, emerging from differences in education, caste and religious identity.]

Johnson, G.E. and W.E. Whitelaw (1974), Urban-Rural Income Transfers in Kenya: An Estimated Remittances Function, *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 22(3), [The paper deals with the issue of remittances in Kenya.]

Killingsworth, Mark. R. and James J. Heckman, (1986), “Female Labour Supply: A Survey”, *Handbook of Labor Economics*, Vol. I, O. Ashenfelter and R. Layard (ed.). Elsevier Science Publishers BV. [Issues related to female labor supply are compiled in this paper.]

Kim, S. (1991), Heterogeneity of Labor Markets and City Size in an Open Spatial Economy, *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 21. [How city size and the nature of labor market are in relationship is the main focus of the paper.]

Kim, S. (1989), Labor Specialization and the Extent of the Market, *Journal of Political Economy*, 97 [The relationship between labor specialization and the extent of the market is brought about by the paper.]

Kumar, Alok (1993), Rural Non-Farm Employment: A Static and Dynamic Study of Inter-State Variations,” *Indian Journal of Labor Economics*, 36(3). [The paper talks about the factors that explain inter-state variations in rural non-farm employment.]

Kundu, Amitabh (1992), *Urban Development and Urban Research in India*, Khama Publishers, New Delhi. [The volume records issues relating to urban development in India and the research issues that have been pursued in the Indian context.]

Kuznets, S. (1966), *Modern Economic Growth: Rate, Structure and Spread*, New Haven, Yale University Press. [The volume delineates the patterns of changes in terms of value added and work force composition in the process of modern economic growth.]

Lall, Somik V., Uwe Deichmann, Matthias K.A. Lundberg and Nazmul Chaudhury (2004) 'Tenure, Diversity and Commitment: Community Participation for Urban Service Provision', *The Journal of Development Studies* 40 (3). [The paper notes that residents in the lower to middle parts of the welfare distribution are most willing to participate in group-efforts to improve living standards.]

Lanjouw, Jean O. and Phillip I. Levy (2002) "Untitled: A Study of Formal and Informal Property Rights in Urban Ecuador", *The Economic Journal* 112 (October). [Not only tenure security significantly increases the likelihood of participation in community improvement projects, it also yields a sizeable financial benefit.]

Lanjouw, Peter and A. Shariff (2002), "Rural Non-Farm Employment in India: Access, Income and Poverty Impact," Working Paper Series No. 81, National Council of Applied Economic Research. [Based on survey data issues relating to rural non-farm sector employment are discussed in this paper.]

Lipton, Michael (1980), *Why Poor People Stay Poor?* Temple Smith, London. [The book deals with questions on poverty including the policy aspect.]

Mills, E.S. (1967), "An Aggregate Model of Resource Allocation in A Metropolitan Area," *American Economic Review*, 57. [The paper highlights the concept of urbanization economies arising in the process of concentration.]

Mills, E.S. (2006), "Industrialization, Urbanization and Poverty", in Tendulkar Suresh et.al. (eds.) *India: Industrialization in a Reforming Economy, Essays for K. L. Krishna*, Academic Foundation, New Delhi. [The relationship between industrialization and urbanization and the effect of industrialization on poverty are discussed in this paper.]

Mills, E. S. and C. Becker (1986), *Studies in Indian Urban Development*, A World Bank Research Publication, Oxford. [Issues relating to urban development in India are extensively discussed in this book.]

Mills, E. S. and B. W. Hamilton (1994), *Urban Economics*, 5th Ed. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresmen. (This a basic text book in the field of urban economics.)

Mills, E. S. and Arup Mitra, (1997), *Urban Development and Urban Ills*, Commonwealth Publishers, New Delhi. [It deals with the pattern of urbanization in developing countries, in particular India, estimates the population pressure index across cities and examines the links between rural and urban poverty.]

Mitra, Arup (1990) 'Duality, Employment Structure and Poverty Incidence: The Slum Perspective', *Indian Economic Review* 25 (1). [The paper examines the dualistic economic structure in cities and its association with the incidence of slums and poverty.]

Mitra, Arup (1992) 'Growth and Poverty: The Urban Legend', *Economic and Political Weekly* 37 (13). [The paper examines the effect of industrial growth and tertiary sector growth on urban poverty in India.]

Mitra, Arup (1992), "Urban Poverty: A Rural Spill-over?," *Indian Economic Review*, Special Number in Memory of Sukhamoy Chakravarty. [The paper assesses if urban poverty is a transformation of rural poverty.]

Mitra, Arup (1993), "An Econometric Model of Unemployment, Informal Sector Employment and Poverty in Slums", *Journal of Quantitative Economics*, 9(2). [Inter-connections among informal sector employment, income, consumption per capita and poverty in slums are examined in this paper.]

Mitra, Arup (1994) *Urbanization, Slums, Informal Sector Employment and Poverty: An Exploratory Study*, Delhi: B.R. Publishing Corporation. [The book focuses on issues relating to pattern of urbanization, informal sector employment, slums and urban poverty.]

Mitra, Arup (1999) "Agglomeration Economies as Manifested in Technical Efficiency at the Firm Level", *Journal of Urban Economics* 45. [It examines the effect of city size on technical efficiency of firms.]

Mitra, Arup (2000a) “Changing Labor Market and Women Employment: India, in *Changing Labor Market and Women Employment*, edited by Asian Productivity Organization, Tokyo, 2000.[The paper examines the nature of women employment in the context of economic reforms.]

Mitra, Arup (2000b) ‘Total Factor Productivity Growth and Urbanization Economies: A Case of Indian Industries’, *Review of Urban and Regional Development Studies* 12 (2). [It assesses the impact of urbanization economies on TFPG.]

Mitra, Arup (2003) *Occupational Choices, Networks, and Transfers: An Exegesis Based on Micro Data from Delhi Slums*, New Delhi: Manohar. [The book deals with the physical segmentation of the labor market, poverty and inter-household transfer of resources.]

Mitra, Arup (2004a) ‘Informal Sector, Networks and Intra-City Variations in Activities: Findings from Delhi Slums’, *Review of Urban and Regional Development Studies* 16 (2). [The paper estimates the occupational choice model, highlighting the impact of informal networks, and the heterogeneity of the existing economic structure in the city.]

Mitra, Arup (2004b) “What Motivates Transfer of Resources: Altruism or Principle of Exchange, *Journal of Developing Areas*, 37(2). [The paper examines the motive of transfer of resources across households.]

Mitra, Arup (2005), “Labor Market Outcomes: Rural Non-farm Sector, Urban Informal Sector and Organized Industry in India,” Paper submitted to ILO-Delhi. [The study deals with employment in different sectors.]

Mitra, Arup (2006a), “Urban Informal Sector and Networks: A Case Study of Delhi Slum Dwellers”, in Ravi Kanbur and B. Guha-Khasnobis (eds.) *Informal Labor Markets and Development*, WIDER-Palgrave-Macmillan. [The informal coping mechanisms of the low income households are discussed in the context of livelihood.]

Mitra, Arup (2006b), Labor Market Mobility of Low Income Households, *Economic and Political Weekly*, May 27. [Upward mobility hypothesis is examined for the low income households.]

Mitra, Arup and Prasad, S. Bhattacharya Arup (2006), “Industry-Urban Nexus, Employment and Poverty: Quantitative Assessment”, in Tendulkar Suresh et.al. (eds.) *India: Industrialization in a Reforming Economy, Essays for K. L. Krishna*, Academic Foundation, New Delhi. [The relationship between industry and urban is examined to assess the role of industry in reducing poverty.]

Mitra, Arup and Y. Tsujita (2006), Migration and Well-being at the Lower Echelons of the Economy: A Study of Delhi Slums, Institute of Developing Economies, Discussion Paper No. 51, Japan, March. [The well-being index is estimated based on several characteristics and the nature of relationship between the duration of migration and the well-being index is examined.]

Mitra, Arup, Aristomene Varoudakis and Marie-Ange Veganzones (2002), “Productivity and Technical Efficiency in Indian States’ Manufacturing: The Role Infrastructure,” *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 50. [The role of infrastructure in enhancing TFPG and technical efficiency is the focus of the paper.]

Mohan, Rakesh, (1993), Industrial Location Policies and Their Implications for India, Paper No. 9, Ministry of Industry, Office of the Economic Adviser, Government of India. [The paper argues that industrial location policy which aims at dispersing industrial- spread has not been successful because firms locate in regions where they can reap economies of scale.]

Mortensen, Dale (1986), “Job Search and Labor Market Analysis”, in O. Ashenfelter and R. Layard (eds.) *Handbook of Labor Economics*, Volume II, North-Holland. [This work reviews the search theory and its applications in labor market analysis.]

Mortensen, Dale, and C.A. Pissarides (1986), “New Developments in Models of Search in the Labour Market”, in *Handbook of Labor Economics*, Volume 3, ed. By O.Ashenfelter and D. Card, Elsevier Science, BV. [The paper argues that framework and provides a useful setting in which the effects of alternative wage setting institutions different labor market policy regimes can be studied.]

Mujtaba, Syed Ali (2004) ‘Commentary: ‘Monolith India’ and the vote bank’, *Himal South Asian*, May, URL: http://www.himalmag.com/2004/may/commentary_4.htm. [The paper points out how politicians use the slum dwellers as vote banks.]

Mullen, J.K., M. Williams and R.L. Moomaw (1996), “Public Capital and Interstate Variations in Manufacturing Efficiency,” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 15. [The papers refers to the distribution of public capital and relates efficiency to external economies of scale.]

Oberoi, A.S. and H.K. Manmohan Singh (1980), “Migration, Remittances and Rural Development,” *International Labor Review*, 119(2). [Issues relating to migration and remittances are discussed in the paper.]

Papola, T.S., (1981), “Urban Informal Sector in a developing Economy”, Vikas Publishing House Delhi. [Estimation of the relative size of the informal sector, its relationship with industrialization and migration are some of the issues that are discussed in this volume.]

Papola, T.S. (1987), “Rural Non-Farm Employment: An Assessment of Recent Trends,” in R. Islam (ed.) *Rural Industrialization and Employment in Asia*, ILO/ARTEP, New Delhi. [The issue of rural non-farm employment and its changing pattern is discussed in this paper.]

Pencavel, John, (1986), “Labor Supply of Men: A Survey,” *Handbook of Labor Economics*, Volume I, ed. By O. Ashenfelter and R. Layard, Elsevier Science Publishers, BV. [The survey covers the determinants of whether men work for pay in the labor market and the determinants of their hours of work.]

Preston, S. H. (1988). “Urban Growth in Developing Countries: A Demographic Reappraisal”, in J. Gugler (ed.) *The Urbanization of Third World*, Oxford University Press, Oxford. [From demographic point of view this paper analyses the pattern of urban growth in developing countries.]

Putnam, Robert D. (1993), *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. [The volume develops the concept of social capital which can be used as an analytical framework in various contexts.]

Quah, D, and P.S. Vahey (1995), “Measuring Core Inflation”, *The Economic Journal*, Vol.105, September. [The paper distinguishes between core and non-core inflation and estimates both the components.]

Radhakrishna R. and A.N. Sharma (eds.) (1998), *Empowering Rural Labor in India: Market, State and Mobilization*, Institute for Human Development, New Delhi. [The volume deals with livelihood issues and means and ways of empowering the rural poor.]

Ravallion, Martin (2001) “On the Urbanization of Poverty”, Washington, DC: Development Research Group, World Bank. [It talks about the migration of poor to cities and in the process urban poverty emerging as a spill-over of rural poverty.]

Sachs, Jeffrey D., Nirupam Bajpai and Ananthi Ramiah (2002), “Understanding Regional Economic Growth in India,” CID Working Paper No. 88, Center for International Development at Harvard University, March 2002. [The paper shows that divergence has taken place in terms of economic growth in the recent years, and urbanization is one of the important factors of urbanization.]

Segal, D. (1976), “Are There Returns to Scale in City Size?”, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 58. [It examines if large cities are more productive compared to small and medium sized towns.]

Sethuraman, S. V. (1976), “The Urban Informal Sector: Concept, Measurement and Policy”, *International Labor Review*, 114(1). [The definition of informal sector and the measurement issues are dealt with in this paper.]

Sharma, A.N. (2001), “Rural Non-Farm Sector in India: Emerging Perspectives and Policy,” IHD, New Delhi (Mimeo). [The pattern of growth in the non-farm sector is discussed here.]

Shukla, V. (1984), “The Productivity of Indian Cities and Some Implications for development Policy,” Ph.D. Dissertation, Princeton University, Department of Economics. [The author examines the effect of population concentration on productivity.]

Sridharan, N. (1995) ‘Indian Slums: Problems, Policies, and Issues’, Chapter 18, pp. 385-400 in Brian C. Aldrich and Ranvinder S. Sandhu (eds.) *Housing the Urban Poor: Policy and practice in developing countries*, New Delhi: Vistaar Publications. [The paper covers issues relating to slums and they being used as vote banks.]

Stark, Oded (1978), *Economic Demographic Interactions in Agricultural Development: The Case of Rural-to-Urban Migration*, Bar Ilan University, Israel. [Issues related to rural-urban migration are discussed in this work.]

Stark, Oded (1995), *Altruism and Beyond: An Economic Analysis of Transfers and Exchanges within Families and Groups*, Cambridge University Press. [The author examines the reasons of transfer of resources across households.]

Sundaram, K. and Suresh D. Tendulkar (1988), "Towards an Explanation of Integrated Variations in Poverty and Unemployment in Rural India", in T.N.Srinivasan and P.K.Bardhan (eds.) *Rural Poverty in South Asia*, Oxford University Press, Delhi. [The paper brings out overlaps between unemployment and poverty across regions.]

Tendulkar, Suresh D. (2004), "Organized Labour Market in India: Pre and Post Reform", Paper Presented at the Conference on Anti Poverty and Social Policy in India, Alwar, January 2-4. [Issues and situations relating to labor market regulation and deregulation are discussed here.]

Todaro, M. P. (1969), "A Model of Labor Migration and Urban Unemployment in Less Developed Countries," *The American Economic Review*, LIX(1). [The process of migration from rural to urban informal sector and then finally to urban formal sector is discussed in this paper.]

Unni, J. (1991), "Regional Variations in Rural Non-Agricultural Employment: An Exploratory Analysis," *Economic and Political Weekly*, 26(3). (Different factors that explain rural non-farm employment are highlighted in this paper.)

Werlin, Herbert (1999) 'The Slum Upgrading Myth', *Urban Studies* 36 (9). [The paper argues that land tenure is essential for the poor to become central to the productive work force.]

Willimason, J. G. (1988). "Migration and Urbanisation", in H Chenery and T.N. Srinivasan (eds.) *Handbook of Development Economics*, Vol.1, Elsevier Science Publishers. B.V. [Issues relating to migration and urbanization are discussed in detail in this work.]

Biographical Sketch

Arup Mitra is Professor of Economics, Institute of Economic Growth, Delhi. He completed Ph D in Economics from Delhi School of Economics, Delhi University. He worked as a Ford Foundation post-doctoral fellow with Professor Edwin S. Mills at Kellogg, Northwestern University, USA. Recently he received the visiting research fellowship to pursue research at Institute of Developing Economies, Japan. Earlier he received the fellowship from the French Ministry of External Affairs under the Indo-French Exchange Programme to work in Paris. He has worked as a consultant to APO, ADB, ILO, OECD, UNDP, WIDER and World Bank. His research area encompasses issues related to labour and welfare, urban development, industrial growth and productivity, infrastructure development and gender inequalities. He has published three books on urbanization, informal sector employment, slums and poverty. Besides, he has to his credit more than seventy research papers, which appeared in various journals and edited volumes. Some of his publications include *Journal of Urban Economics* (1999), *Review of Urban and Regional Development Studies* (2000, 2004, 2006), *Economic Development and Cultural Change* (2002), *Development and Change* (2005), *Development Policy Review* (2004), *Journal of Developing Areas* (2004), *Asian Development Review* (2005), *International Journal of Employment Studies* (2001), *Journal of Health and Population in Developing Countries* (1999) and *Journal of Quantitative Economics* (1993), *Service Industries Journal* (2008), *Habitat International* (2008) and *Journal of Policy Modeling* (forthcoming). He has received the Mahalanobis Memorial Gold Medal for his contribution in the field of quantitative economics.