

PICTURING SPANISH FILMGOERS: MOTIVES, BARRIERS AND FILM THEATRES

Manuel CUADRADO-GARCÍA

Marketing Department, Universitat de València, Spain
Manuel.Cuadrado@uv.es

Nela FILIMON

Corresponding author
Economics Department, Universitat de Girona, Spain
Nela.Filimon@udg.edu

Juan D. MONTORO-PONS

Applied Economics Department, Universitat de València, Spain
Juan.D.Montoro@uv.es

Abstract

Findings on European countries show non-uniform decreasing trends of film theatres' audiences, the decline being more severe in Spain. This research presents a multifaceted perspective of Spanish filmgoers focused on motives for and barriers to film theatres attendance. Two comprehensive scales (motives, barriers) are proposed. First, motives and barriers are optimally scaled with principal components analysis (PCA); and, second, we identify segments of filmgoers with latent class modelling (LC). PCA recommended a five-factor solution for motives (education, film popularity, film quality, social interaction, and mood) and a seven-factor solution for barriers (film offerings, venue's features, perception, preference and place, substitute activities, financial restrictions, recreation time disposability). LC analysis suggested three segments: mainstream filmgoers who watch films in multiplexes in shopping centers and in the center of the city; art-house filmgoers; and filmgoers who go to film theatres to watch films in original version. The socioeconomic and behavioral covariates complete the profile of the clusters, and the findings are consistent with the existing evidence on film audiences. Increasing cultural participation is the objective of many governments' cultural policies and a more comprehensive understanding of film audiences can contribute to this.

Keywords: filmgoers, motives, barriers, latent-class models, PCA

JEL classification: M310, Z11

1. Introduction

In a report for the EU, Paris (2014) has shown that the decrease in film theatres' audiences has reached its two lowest levels since the beginning of the century, the first in 2005 and the second in 2009, in spite of being a favorite way of spending spare time, especially among young people (De Bruyn and Cillessen, 2008). According to Paris (2014), this decreasing trend was not uniformly distributed, as some countries, such as Spain, have experienced a very severe decline in their cinema audiences (more than 46% in the period 2001-2013), while others have managed this trend more effectively. In Spain, this evolution was observed in the previous century too, with more than half of the film theaters being closed from the '60s to the early '90s (Cuadrado and Frassetto, 1999). This evidence invites the exploration of a deeper understanding of the filmgoers' behavior to help marketers and owners of film theatres design new marketing strategies meant to increase filmgoers' attendance.

From a consumer behavior perspective, motives are taken to be at the origin of the decision process which manifests itself in actions intended to satisfy needs (Crompton and McKay, 1997:425; see also Murray, 1964; Iso-Ahola, 1980). Jackson (1997) developed the 'constraints' paradigm, according to which the desire or need to participate is inherent in human condition, but individual choices are limited by constraints. Thus, "in order to fully understand leisure involvement we need to understand both facilitators and constraints, and how they work together to produce participation and non-participation and their accompanying experiences" (Raymore, 2002:38).

With respect to individuals' engagement with cultural activities, in general, and films, in particular, many studies have sought to explain the motives underlying filmgoers' behavior paying relatively less attention to the barriers. As a matter of fact, even motives have often been determined from a comparative analysis with the audiences of other media, such as television (Austin, 1986:117; Austin, 1983). Some authors have argued that the main reason why fewer studies have paid attention to the motives of cultural audiences (i.e., filmgoers) was that researchers (i.e., film reviewers) were interested in addressing a more general audience (Dyer, 1981). This could explain why "in the motion picture industry, the consumer is the great unknown" (Wierenga, 2006:674). In the case of films, audiences are particularly important because it is "through the existence of an audience that film acquires social and cultural importance" (Gripsrud and Lavik, 2008:455).

This research seeks to analyze the behavior of Spanish filmgoers, with a special focus on motives and barriers of attendance. With this research, we would like to contribute to the literature on cultural participation by providing a multifaceted characterization of filmgoers. The empirical analysis builds on data collected via a self-administered questionnaire to a sample of Spanish population, of 18 years of age and above, selected according to a non-probabilistic method, based on quotas of gender and age (INE, 2011). The methodological approach consists of two steps: first, motives and barriers are optimally scaled with principal components analysis (PCA) and, at a second stage, we employ exploratory latent class (LC) modelling, a method generally recommended for the study of hedonic products' consumption (Botet and Wedel, 1999), with the purpose of identifying specific patterns of film theatres' attendance. Thus, based on preferences for film theatres and their environmental characteristics, we identify three segments of filmgoers: one that prefers multiplexes in shopping centers and in the center of the city, a group for which going to the film theatres means leisure and entertainment; art-house filmgoers; and filmgoers that prefer multiplexes showing films in original version. Moreover, the method allows for considering additional restriction to segment the sample and we do so here by introducing an economic constraint (see also Swanson, Davis and Zhao, 2008). The key findings are intended to add to the literature on experiential goods consumption, such as films, for a better understanding of film audiences' behavior.

The article unfolds as follows: section 2 provides a brief review of the literature on filmgoers' consumption behavior, section 3 is dedicated to the methodology, section 4 presents the main results, and in section 5 we conclude.

2. A Consumer Behavior Perspective of Film Theatres' Audiences

The motives and barriers approach

While a significant bulk of the research on film audiences has focused on the type of films (i.e., 'mainstream' vs. 'art house' films), a particular stream of research has paid special attention to the motives underlying individuals' decisions to participate/not participate in leisure and cultural activities in general, film theatres attendance being one of them. In this line, Chuu, Chang and Zaichkowsky (2009) offer, for example, a comprehensive overview of the motives driving audiences for art versus commercial films. Several features of film consumption, consistent across various studies, were identified by these authors: 1) there is a higher frequency of attendance for art film audiences compared to those of commercial films (see also Faber, O'Guinn and Hardy, 1988); 2) socialization and/or entertainment are not the main motives for art filmgoers but the films per se (see also Vahemetsa, 1970; Austin, 1984); 3) art film audiences seem to be quite 'self-determined' (Chuu, Chang and Zaichkowsky, 2009:216), as their attendance behavior is less dependent on others' opinions or company (see also Faber, O'Guinn and Hardy, 1988); 4), commercial film audiences are more likely to watch films about which they know more, such as popular movies that are extensively advertised, while the audiences of art films go to film theatre to watch a film just because it is an art film (see also Chamberlin, 1960); 5) art film audiences appreciate the 'cultural value' transmitted by films (see also Vahemetsa, 1970,); 6), regarding venues' features, art film audiences were found to be less demanding than commercial film audiences with respect to location or facilities (i.e., sound, seats, parking, etc.), given their main interest in the quality

of the film (Adler, 1959; Austin, 1984); last, art filmgoers who prefer more drama and original version films, are also motivated to watch a director's work, and put more weight on reviewers' critiques than on advertising (see also Adler, 1984; Austin, 1984; Faber, O'Guinn and Hardy, 1988).

As for barriers, research on film theatres' attendance indicates the preference for other ways (digital TV, internet downloads, DVD discounts, etc.) of enjoying films (De Vany and Walls, 2007; Silver and McDonnell, 2007); the preference for film substitutes (videogames) or other viewing environment (mall entertainment) (Silver and McDonnell, 2007), or the existence of domestic constraints, such as lack of time, family obligations, etc. (Collins, Hand and Ryder, 2005). Hart, Kerrigan and Vom Lehn (2016), have analyzed film consumer's hedonic experience with an introspective (diary) research method and identified three dimensions of film consumer behavior that support existing evidence: film characteristics (artistic, commercial), viewing environment (home or film theatre) and situational environment (time, mood, companions, etc.). Their findings also confirm the importance of previous film experience on filmgoers "future sense making and film consumption experiences" (pp. 388).

Types of film theatre audiences

This stream of research distinguishes among various segments of filmgoers. Vahemetsa (1970) found, for example, four segments of art filmgoers: the 'cultural prestige type', for whom film is a specific cultural expression; the 'first cognitive type' (films are important information sources contributing to increasing life experiences); the 'second cognitive type' whose motive for art film attendance is to escape from reality; and the 'aesthetic type' who perceives art films as 'creative products'. Sedgwick and Pokorny (2012:329-330) worked with a historic micro-dataset (early 1940s) on 22 film theatres in Philadelphia, in the US, and identified three types of filmgoers: a non-selective segment, consuming films more as a generic commodity, but who go to the film theatre for various motives –film-viewing habits, the experience of viewing films in a movie theater rather than the film per se, or accompanying friends who want to see a specific film; the selective film consumers, whose preference for recommended films is directly related to their social status; and a small segment of filmgoers who based their choice on personal recommendations.

In Spain, Cuadrado and Frassetto (1999) found three segments of filmgoers –social viewers, apathetic viewers and filmgoers– and, the benefits of going to film theatre to watch films, ranged from having a good time and feeling emotions to having fun. García-Álvarez, Filimon and López-Sintas (2007) focused on filmgoers' choices of films by country of origin –US, Spain and other countries– and identified three typologies of film theatres audiences: a majority of filmgoers with a clear preference for US films, especially families and younger individuals; an audience for Spanish films, integrated mainly by middle-age and middle-class filmgoers; and a social and intellectual elite that preferred European films. The dominant preference for US films was explained by the fact that these were perceived by audiences as synonymous of familiar and reliable entertainment, and in Spanish language; in contrast, these qualities were not all met by Spanish and European film productions. In a research closer to the approach presented here, Fernández-Blanco, Orea and Prieto-Rodríguez (2009) worked with a 1998 Spanish dataset containing self-rated valuations of both US and Spanish films. The authors applied LC models and identified two groups of filmgoers, differentiated by variables such as income, ticket price, education, and age, among others. Overall, their results advocate in favor of introducing socioeconomic indicators and self-rated preferences in the analysis, for a more complete identification of the hidden consumer preferences.

Socioeconomic context and film audiences

From a temporal perspective, the research evidence seems to indicate that there has been a change in the social context surrounding the experience of going to the film theatre to watch a movie (Tudor, 2013), with a significant change in the age profile of the filmgoers over the last twenty years (1993-2012): while young people (11-14 and 15-19 age segments, in particular, and to a lesser extent, the 20-24 year-old segment) go to the film theatre less frequently, those above 50 years of age have increased their consumption of films (Paris, 2014:12-13). Other

demographics, such as gender, point to a rather even trend of film theatre attendance for men and women (Sedgwick and Pokorny, 2012; Tudor, 2013); and, the inverse correlation between film theatre attendance and filmgoers' social status, education level and income, has also weakened over time (Tudor, 2013).

In UK, Chan and Goldthorpe (2007) analyzed visual arts and found evidence for gender effects only in the cases of theater, cinema and dance, with women exhibiting a more omnivorous pattern of consumption than men. Chuu, Chang and Zaichkowsky (2009) found that art filmgoers, compared to commercial filmgoers, were, on average, more educated (high cultural capital), more likely to be single, and men, although gender differences have proven to be an inconsistent feature across the research on film audiences and elitist cultural consumption. From a cross-country perspective, Governo and Teixeira (2014) explored the determinants of the consumer demand for art house films vs. mainstream film theatres offerings and found no significant relationship between social and cultural status indicators, (the relative demand for art films was usually associated with higher income and education levels of film consumers). While these findings are in line with the cultural omnivorousness setting (Peterson and Kern, 1996), other authors (see Katz-Gerro, 1999; López-Sintas and García-Álvarez, 2006, etc.) did find evidence supporting cultural stratification thesis (Bourdieu [36]).

Finally but not lastly, according to Morley (1992:157-158), cited in Meers (2001:140), "picture palaces" and "domestic context" are considered to be different film watching experiences inviting to take into account the 'context' (place) of film consumption (see also Hart, Kerrigan and Vom Lehn, 2016). Richins (1997) also argues that in the case of goods embedding meanings (i.e., experiential goods like films), context is particularly important for emotions. The place was found important also in the case of music consumption: Roose and Vander Stichele (2010), differentiated among music listening and attending behavior in Flanders, through activities or practices that embed a socially visible status marker (i.e., a concert hall) and others that do not (i.e., home), among others.

Overall, existing research indicates that it is necessary to look into the relationship between the film theatre audiences and the role of motives/barriers, and socioeconomic variables to gain a more complete understanding of filmgoers' decision-making behavior.

3. Methodology

Data and variables

The data were gathered with a personal survey based on a structured questionnaire using a quota sampling method that yielded information from 516 individuals of both genders, aged 18 or older in 2013. The questionnaire was divided in three parts: filmgoers' consumption habits, motives/barriers and sociodemographic variables. A comprehensive number of self-rated items registered the motives for (17 items) and the barriers to film theatre attendance (28 items) (see Table 1).

Table 1. Motives for and barriers to film theatres attendance

Variable	Range	Mean	Median	SD
<i>Motives for film theatre attendance</i>				
<i>I go to the film theatre ...</i>				
To feel emotions	1-5	3.17	3.0	1.177
To see a director's work	1-5	3.13	3.0	1.181
To achieve self-fulfilment	1-5	2.33	2.0	1.146
To reach educational development	1-5	2.71	3.0	1.130
To learn languages	1-5	2.13	2.0	1.207
To find out about other cultures	1-5	2.57	3.0	1.182
To watch my favourite actors/films	1-5	3.21	3.0	1.158
To see successful box-office films	1-5	3.20	3.0	1.150
To see a film recommended by others	1-5	3.55	4.0	0.970
To watch prized films	1-5	3.01	3.0	1.168
To enjoy a film with good reviews	1-5	3.51	4.0	1.048
To see a film that has been intensively advertised	1-5	3.26	3.0	1.179
To socialize	1-5	3.14	3.0	1.294
To experience better sound and image quality	1-5	3.83	4.0	1.028
To relieve boredom	1-5	2.76	3.0	1.201
To share an experience	1-5	3.09	3.0	1.020
To look for relaxation	1-5	3.32	4.0	1.122
<i>Barriers to film theatre attendance</i>				
<i>I do not go (more often) to film theatre because:</i>				
Too many films to choose	1-5	2.28	2.0	1.014
I do not know what's on	1-5	2.49	2.0	1.116
Films are very similar	1-5	2.35	2.0	1.080
I'm not interested	1-5	2.28	2.0	1.147
It is difficult for me to understand films	1-5	1.75	1.0	0.907
Nobody to go with	1-5	1.77	1.0	0.933
Scarce information on what's on	1-5	2.17	2.0	0.949
Difficult to get tickets	1-5	1.85	2.0	0.941
They sell smelly food	1-5	1.92	2.0	1.080
People disturb by using their mobile phones	1-5	2.28	2.0	1.198
Tables are inconvenient	1-5	2.31	2.0	1.132
Moviemakers make noise by eating food	1-5	2.23	2.0	1.137
I prefer watching movies in diff. media (TV, PC, etc.)	1-5	3.47	4.0	1.204
I prefer doing other act. (shopping, going out, etc.)	1-5	3.52	4.0	1.071
Watching movies at home is more comfortable	1-5	3.69	4.0	1.104
There are cheaper ways of watching films	1-5	3.64	4.0	1.226
I prefer social networking	1-5	2.00	2.0	1.127
I prefer videogames	1-5	1.76	1.0	1.096
It is not as pleasant as years ago	1-5	2.51	2.0	1.187
Current cinemas are not my type	1-5	2.34	2.0	1.186
Lack of time	1-5	3.08	3.0	1.315
I don't like the films that are on	1-5	2.70	3.0	1.093
Films are bad	1-5	2.30	2.0	1.069
I prefer other cultural events (concerts, theatre)	1-5	3.23	3.0	1.203
Cinema tickets are expensive	1-5	3.77	4.0	1.158
Not being able to go out (children, etc.)	1-5	2.49	2.0	1.382
Multiplexes are far away from home	1-5	2.46	2.0	1.164

1. Strongly disagree... 5. Strongly agree

Socioeconomic and behavioral characteristics of cinemagoers

The survey comprised information on several representative indicators of individuals' positions in the social hierarchy: socioeconomic status and education level, all informative with respect to the respondents' social, economic and cultural capital endowments. The occupational status, at the time of the survey, was used as a proxy for the socioeconomic status, as the survey did not elicit information on income level. The categories were as follows: 1) employed, 2) unemployed, 3) retired, 4) student, 5) house work, and 6) others. Educational attainment, recorded with four levels, was used to operationalize the cultural capital: 1) primary school, 2) secondary school, 3) technical college, 4) university studies. A special five-point Likert scale question was meant to measure whether the interviewees had enough disposable income to enjoy leisure pursuits. For calculation purposes, the five levels of responses were reduced to three: disagree, neutral, agree. The profile of the respondents was completed with sociodemographic indicators (see Table 2).

Table 2. Main demographics

Variable	Proportion (%)	Variable	Proportion (%)
<i>Age</i>		<i>Gender</i>	
18-35	35.7	Male	49.6
36-50	32.0	Female	50.4
>50 years	32.4	<i>Occupational status</i>	
<i>Education level</i>		Employed	43.2
Primary school	7.8	Unemployed	10.1
Secondary school	32.7	Retired	11.2
Technical college	18.8	Student	27.9
University	40.6	House works	5.0
<i>Status</i>		Others	2.5
Single no children	26.6	<i>Nationality</i>	
Single with children	6.2	Spanish	84.7
With partner no children	22.9	Other	15.3
With partner and children	44.4	<i>I have enough free time to enjoy leisure activities</i>	
<i>Frequency of going to the film theatre</i>		Disagree	29.6
Less than once per year	8.2	Neutral	25.2
Once a year	26.3	Agree	45.2
Once every 3 months	33.3	<i>I have enough disposable income to enjoy leisure pursuits</i>	
Twice every 3 months	18.6	Disagree	30.2
Twice a month	11.0	Neutral	31.4
Once a week	2.6	Agree	38.4

The frequency of cinema attendance was organized in four levels: 1) once a year or less, 2) once or twice every three months, 3) twice a month, 4) once a week or more. A five-level Likert type question –strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree– asked the respondents to assess whether they had enough time to enjoy leisure activities (see Table 2).

Motives for cinema attendance

A set of 17 items (see Table 1) were dedicated to understanding the motives for cinema attendance. In order to determine the adequate number of components to retain in the analysis, we applied a principal components analysis (PCA). Basic assumptions on the suitability of the data for this type of analysis were checked with the Kaiser-Meyer-Olking (KMO) statistic, which should be greater than 0.600 (KMO=0.744) and the Bartlett's test, which was significant (Chi-squared=1382.486; df=136; p-value=0.000). The PCA procedure recommended a five-factor solution explaining 54.07% of the total variance (TVE). Table 3 shows the final five-factor solution (Varimax Procedure), consisting of 17 items selected based on eigenvalues, TVE, loadings and interpretability. Except for the 'mood' component, integrated by only two items –to relieve boredom and to look for relaxation– which returned high communalities (>0.500), the other components were determined by at least three items (see also Hager and Winkler, 2012, for similar reports of factors with only two items).

Table 3. Rotated factor structure of motives for film theatres attendance

Variable	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV	Factor V	Communality (h^2)
<i>Education (mean=2.57)</i>						
To reach educational development	0.737					0.590
To learn languages	0.730					0.540
To find out about other cultures	0.698					0.553
To see a director's work	0.627					0.417
To achieve self-fulfilment	0.575					0.507
<i>Film's popularity (mean=3.5)</i>						
To see successful box-office films		0.735				0.573
To see a film that has been intensively advertised		0.702				0.639
To watch my favorite actors		0.600				0.442
To watch prized films		0.509				0.529
<i>Film's quality (mean=3.63)</i>						
To experience better sound and image			0.736			0.640
To see a film recommended by others			0.613			0.480
To enjoy a film with good reviews			0.642			0.559
<i>Social interaction (mean=3.13)</i>						
To share an experience				0.720		0.551
To socialize				0.690		0.510
To feel emotions				0.555		0.488
<i>Mood (mean=3.25)</i>						
To relieve boredom					0.711	0.557
To look for relaxation					0.692	0.617
<i>Eigenvalues</i>	3.417	1.488	2.012	1.179	1.097	
<i>Total variance explained (%)</i>	15.823	10.598	10.943	9.167	7.538	54.07
<i>Cronbach-α*</i>	0.730	0.62	0.532	0.441	0.311	

*see Hager and Winkler (2012) for similar levels of Cronbach- α for performing arts attendance

For each factor extracted, the items were summated, and in order to reduce the sparseness of the data, the five-level Likert scale was collapsed into two levels, taking as reference the mean of each subscale (1-disagree/below the average; 2-agree/above the average).

Barriers to cinema attendance

In a similar fashion, the barriers were registered on a five-point Likert scale by a set of 28 items (see Table 1). The PCA procedure converged to a final seven-factor solution (see Table 5 below), explaining 58.2% of the total variance and retaining 26 items out of 28, based on eigenvalues, the items' loadings, TVE and interpretability. The tests of the initial hypotheses (KMO=0.859 and Chi-squared=3091.634; d.f.=190; p-value=0.000) confirmed that a PCA analysis could return significant factor structures. After a first PCA iteration, indicating a suitable seven-factor solution (TVE=56.52%), two items (nobody to go with and multiplexes are far away from home) with very low loadings were eliminated, and the final solution is presented hereafter. A similar procedure, as the one in the previous section, was applied to rescale the items and to reduce the sparseness of the data.

Table 4. Rotated final seven-factors solution for film theatres attendance barriers

Variable	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV	Factor V	Factor VI	Factor VII	Communality (h^2)
Film offerings (mean=2.19)								
Too many films to choose	0.565							0.435
I do not know what's on	0.494							0.475
It is not possible talking in cinemas	0.546							0.478
I'm not interested	0.619							0.540
It is difficult for me to understand films	0.682							0.514
Scarce information on what's on	0.541							0.519
Difficult to get tickets	0.703							0.588
Venue features (mean=2.27)								
They sell smelly food		0.592						0.535
People disturb by using mobile phones		0.757						0.640
Timetables are inconvenient		0.612						0.524
Moviegoers make noise by eating food		0.763						0.646
It is not as pleasant as years ago		0.634						0.683
Current cinemas are not my type		0.533						0.593
Perception (mean=2.45)								
I don't like films that are on			0.748					0.598
Films are very similar			0.651					0.573
Films are bad			0.733					0.598
Preference and place (mean=3.82)								
I prefer watching films in TV, PC, etc.				0.702				0.619
I prefer other cultural events				0.587				0.501
I prefer doing other act. (shopping, etc.)				0.637				0.615
Watching movies at home is more comfortable				0.745				0.664
Substitute act. (mean=2.05)								
I prefer social networking					0.760			0.627
I prefer videogames					0.751			0.627
Financial (mean=3.91)								
Cinema tickets are expensive						0.816		0.725
Cheaper ways of watching films						0.665		0.684
Recreation time (mean=3.01)								
Lack of time							0.789	0.678
Not being able to go out (children care)							0.692	0.613
Eigenvalues	5.763	2.424	1.914	1.479	1.336	1.234	1.143	
Total Variance Explained (%)	22.164	9.325	7.360	5.687	5.138	4.744	4.396	58.82
Cronbach-α*	0.792	0.799	0.682	0.654	0.579	0.588	0.418	

*see Hager and Winkler (2012) for similar levels of Cronbach- α for performing arts attendance

Type of film theaters and audiences

Film theatre attendance was recorded for four types of venues: a) multiplexes in shopping centers, b) multiplexes in city centers, c) film theaters, and d) multiplexes showing films in original version. Each respondent was asked to rank the four types from 1 to 4, according to the frequency of attendance. A paired samples t-test was conducted to evaluate whether the respondents scored differently on these variables. The results indicated that there was not a significant difference in the scores for multiplexes in shopping centers ($M=1.79$; $SD=0.932$) and multiplexes in city centers ($M=1.75$; $SD=0.728$) at the 0.05 level of significance ($t=0.564$; $df=447$; $p=0.573$). In this case, we would not reject the null hypothesis that the scores for these two variables are the same, and a new variable –multiplexes in shopping and city centers– was calculated using the mean scores of these two variables. Finally, in order to

control for the sparseness of the data, the frequency ranks were re-coded in two levels: most preferred and less preferred film theatres, respectively (see Table 5).

Table 5. Descriptive statistics for film theatres ratings

Variable	Range	Mean	Median	SD	1 st -most frequented	2 nd -less frequented
Multiplexes shopping and city centres	1-2	1.274	1.00	0.446	72.5%	27.5%
Art houses	1-2	1.840	2.00	0.366	15.9%	84.1%
Multiplexes original version	1-2	1.838	2.00	0.368	16.1%	83.9%

Data analysis and parameters of the model

We are interested here in exploring the unobserved data heterogeneity associated to filmgoers' patterns of attendance emerging from the type of film theaters usually chosen to watch a film. These patterns are next analyzed in association with filmgoers' motives for and barrier of attendance, and other variables such as, socioeconomic indicators, behavior (frequency of film theatre attendance), generational patterns (age), film preferences, etc., with the purpose of showing that they respond to socioeconomic and generational structures and this applies also to filmgoers' motives/barriers of attendance (for a previous version of this research, without PCA analysis for motives and barriers see Cuadrado et al., 2013). To do this, we employed the latent class (LC) method (Lazarsfeld and Henry, 1968) to test the consumer behavior model according to which, individuals consume patterns of products (Boter and Wedel, 1999). Intuitively, the LC method splits the sample in T clusters or latent classes and estimates, for each one, a set of parameters. In the LC model defined in the equation below (see Vermunt, 2010), Y stands for the whole set of indicators Y1, Y2, and Y3, corresponding to the three types of film theatres defined in Table 5, and Z, for the set of so-called active covariates (e.g., financial constraint) as they will condition the final number of clusters.

$$P(Y = y|Z) = \sum_{t=1}^T P(t|Z) \prod_{k=1}^3 P(Y_k = y_k|t)$$

The model estimates, for each cluster, its size and the probabilities of the indicators (Y), conditioned to cluster membership. Once obtained the clusters and the parameters, each individual (observation) is assigned to a cluster only (Magidson and Vermunt, 2001) based on the calculated membership probabilities (see also Vermunt and Magidson, 2008).

Model selection

The parameters of the LC model are estimated by first fitting the null, or restricted, model (T=1), with one latent class and the unrestricted model (T=2) with two latent classes. A likelihood ratio test (L2) is performed, such that if the null model is rejected, the process continues by incrementing, each time, the number of latent classes by one. This process aims at finding the model that provides an adequate fit for the data and stops once we fail to reject a null model. Table 6 gives the statistics used to assess the goodness of fit of the LC model used in the analysis: the chi-squared likelihood-ratio statistic L2; the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) and the Consistent Akaike's Information Criterion (CAIC) are both based on L2 (see also Raftery, 1986; Fraley and Raftery, 1998). The L2 statistics indicate, for each model, the amount of unexplained association among the variables (hence, lower values are preferred). The data in Table 6 show that the addition of a latent class (from the model with one cluster to the model with two clusters) contributed to reduce the L2 statistic by 75.6%, while the contribution of the additional latent classes (the models with three to four classes) was much lower (22.5%; 1.2%). The p-value (>0.05), indicates that the model with three clusters provides an adequate fit for the data. Additional statistics (Dayton, 1998), such as BIC (which takes parsimony into account) and CAIC, also suggest that the model with three clusters would be a better fit for the data (the lower their values, the better).

Table 6. Goodness of fit statistics for the latent class model

LCA model	LL	Npar	L'	BIC(L')	CAIC(L')	df	p-value	Class. Error
One-cluster	-637.686	3	520.8521	411.6205	393.6205	18	4.30E-99	0.000
Two-cluster	-440.7467	9	126.9735	54.1524	42.1524	12	2.50E-21	0.001
Three-cluster	-382.832	15	9.5443	-26.2663	-32.8663	6	0.15	0.001
Four-cluster	-378.9296	21	3.3398	3.3398	3.3398	0	.	0.024

4. Main Findings and Discussion

The parameters of the model

Table 7A presents the estimates of the parameters for the three-cluster model. The first row presents the proportion of how many individuals have been classified in each cluster, $P(t|Z)$ that is, the cluster's relative size, and the following rows indicate the probability of filmgoers' behavior (preference for a type of film theatre), given their classification in that cluster $P(Y_k|t)$ in percentages. If take, for example, a filmgoer classified in cluster 1, he or she has a probability of 99.97% of going very frequently to watch films in multiplexes in shopping and city centers, a probability of 99.96% of not going to multiplexes showing films in original version (OV) and a 32.78% probability of facing financial constraints on cultural and leisure activities. Thus, based on these conditional probabilities and mean values, we can characterize the probabilistic behavior of the Spanish filmgoers regarding the type of film theater preferred, constrained by the disposable income for cultural pursuits.

The parameters estimated suggest one big cluster (70.53% of the sample) of filmgoers that basically prefer multiplexes in shopping centers and in the center of the city (*mainstream filmgoers*). A second cluster (15.87% of the sample) stands for *art-house filmgoers*; according to Chuu, Chang and Zaichkowsky (2009:214), "[a]rt films are frequently selected to be shown at major film festivals and are often the winners of distinctive film awards. Many of these films are made in non-English speaking countries... In terms of the theatrical release of art films, they are screened primarily in art-house and repertoire theatres only". The third cluster (13.6%) represents filmgoers that prefer to watch films in original version (*OV filmgoers*).

Table 7A: Probabilistic patterns of film theatres attendance (column profiles in %)

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Sample
Cluster Size, $P(t Z)$ (s.e.)	70.53 {0.0217}	15.87 {0.019}	13.6 {0.0179}	100
Indicators of type of film theatre $P(Y_k t)$				
Multiplexes shopping and city centres				
Most frequent (Yes)	99.97 {0.001}	0.35 {0.0071}	3.71 {0.0256}	72.5
Less frequent (No)	0.03 {0.001}	99.65 {0.0071}	96.29 {0.0256}	27.5
Art houses				
Most frequent (Yes)	0.02 {0.0008}	99.52 {0.009}	1.2 {0.0549}	15.9
Less frequent (No)	99.98 {0.0008}	0.48 {0.009}	98.8 {0.0549}	84.1
Multiplexes original version				
Most frequent (Yes)	0.04 {0.0017}	13.75 {0.0575}	99.5 {0.0094}	16.1
Less frequent (No)	99.96 {0.0017}	86.25 {0.0575}	0.5 {0.0094}	83.9
Financial constraint				
I have enough disposable income to enjoy leisure pursuits				
Disagree	32.78	22.92	22.76	30.2
Neutral	35.73	33.42	25.87	31.4
Agree	31.49	43.66	51.37	38.4

An alternative, and easier, interpretation of filmgoers' profiles is based on whether the individuals classified in cluster t , $P(Y_k|t)$, are over- or underrepresented among individuals with that behavior (similar to a row profile table, see bold values in Table 7B). Thus, filmgoers in cluster 1 (70.53%) are overrepresented among those choosing the *very frequent* level (Yes) of attendance for multiplexes in shopping and city centers (*mainstream filmgoers*),

and for whom film theatres mean leisure and entertainment, and the *less frequent* level (No) of attendance for venues showing films in original version (*OV filmgoers*). Cluster 2 (15.87%) is overrepresented among individuals who prefer film theaters, an elitist segment of filmgoers for whom watching films at the movie theatre is an experience (*art-house filmgoers*); cluster 3 (13.6%) is overrepresented among filmgoers who have a clear preference for watching films in multiplexes showing them in original version (*OV filmgoers*).

Table 7B: Probabilistic patterns of film theatres attendance
(row profiles in %)

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Sample
<i>Cluster Size, $P(t Z)$ (s.e.)</i>	70.53 (0.0217)	15.87 (0.0019)	13.6 (0.0179)	100
<i>Indicators of type of film theatre $P(Y_k t)$</i>				
<i>Multiplexes shopping and city centers</i>				
Most frequent (Yes)	99.36	0.00	0.64	72.5
Less frequent (No)	0.00	54.69	45.31	27.5
<i>Art houses</i>				
Most frequent (Yes)	0.00	99.05	0.95	15.9
Less frequent (No)	83.97	0.01	16.01	84.1
<i>Multiplexes original version</i>				
Most frequent (Yes)	0.09	13.81	86.10	16.1
Less frequent (No)	83.74	16.26	0.00	83.9
<i>Financial constraint</i>				
<i>I have enough disposable income to enjoy leisure pursuits</i>				
Disagree	77.44	12.19	10.37	30.2
Neutral	74.07	15.59	10.34	31.4
Agree	61.48	19.18	19.34	38.4

As already mentioned, the LC model estimated here also takes into consideration the income available for cultural pursuits (see i.e., Fernández-Blanco and Baños-Pino, 1997; Fernández-Blanco, Orea and Prieto-Rodríguez, 2009). The estimates show that while filmgoers in cluster 1 (mainstream filmgoers), who prefer multiplexes in shopping and city centers, are subject to financial constraints, those in the other two clusters (art-house and OV filmgoers) ‘agree’ with having enough income for cultural pursuits, as they are overrepresented in these indicators.

Motives for going to film theatres

According to the results presented in Table 8, for cluster 1 (mainstream filmgoers), films’ popularity (i.e., prizes, intensive advertising, favorite actors and successful box-office records) and mood (to relieve boredom and to relax) are the main drivers of cinema attendance. They do not seem to be influenced by films’ quality (good reviews, recommended by others, or better image and quality of the exhibition) or by educational purposes or socialization needs. All in all, on average, they seem to fit well in the profile of filmgoers who prefer commercial and popular films for entertainment. Cluster 2 (art-house filmgoers) exhibits a different motivational pattern: as expected, they are overrepresented in indicators related to motives of personal education achievements and social interaction (share emotions, experiences and socialize with filmgoers sharing common preferences for art films) (see Swanson, Davis and Zhao, 2008; Hager and Winkler, 2012); neither films’ quality nor popularity seem to be strong motives for choosing film theatres, as they seem to be a well-informed and rather specialized film audience and go mainly for the movies alone. Cluster 3 (OV filmgoers) exhibits a pattern similar to cluster 2, except for the fact that these filmgoers do take into account films’ quality (reviews, recommendations, better sound and image). It appears that film theatres allow them to benefit more from the impact of technical innovations on film releases. This result is consistent with the findings of Governo and Teixeira (2014) predicting, on average, a positive relationship between the countries’ level of technological development and the domestic demand for art films.

Table 8. Motives for film theatres attendance (row profiles, %)

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3
<i>Cluster size</i>	70.53	15.87	13.6
<i>I go to the film theatre...</i>			
<i>Education (mean=2.57)</i>			
Agree (≥ 2.57)	66.16	16.53	17.31
Disagree (< 2.57)	75.41	15.14	9.45
<i>Film's quality (mean=3.63)</i>			
Agree	69.5	13.89	16.61
Disagree	72.12	18.96	8.92
<i>Film's popularity (mean=3.5)</i>			
Agree	70.75	15.82	13.42
Disagree	70.26	15.93	13.81
<i>Social interaction (mean=3.13)</i>			
Agree	65.68	18.47	15.85
Disagree	75.8	13.05	11.15
<i>Mood (mean=3.25)</i>			
Agree	76.25	11.70	12.04
Disagree	66.85	18.55	14.60

Barriers for attending film theatres

The results in Table 9 indicate that clusters 1 and 2 (mainstream and art-house filmgoers) are, on average, the most affected by the barriers analyzed. Thus, the mainstream segment is sensitive to factors such as: film offerings (too many films to choose, difficult to get tickets, etc.), perception about the films released (very similar or bad films), their preference for other cultural activities and places; for this audience, the distinction between home and film theatre 'contexts' is important (see Morley, 1992; Sedgwick and Pokorny, 2012); while financial resources act as a constraint (see Fernández-Blanco, Orea and Prieto-Rodríguez, 2009), they face no leisure time restrictions. Overall, these barriers seem to fit well with this profile of filmgoers, looking mainly for entertainment, and that exhibits features similar to the commercial films' audiences (see also Chuu, Chang and Zaichkowsky, 2009). Cluster 2 (art-house filmgoers) shares some of the barriers of cluster 1 (film offerings, perception, preference and place), but in contrast, they are not affected by financial restrictions. They do not face leisure time restrictions either, and as expected, are sensitive to film theatres' features (i.e., smelly food, mobile phone noise, nostalgia for former type of film theatres, etc.). In this respect, Tudor (2013) argues, for example, that an important part of social life in the past century was closely related to 'going to the movies' ritual, and the change in this social context surrounding the experience of going to the film theatre eventually affected attendance. Finally, cluster 3 (OV filmgoers) is affected by two barriers only, that is, leisure time restrictions and the preference for other substitute activities (social networking, videogames).

Table 2. Film theatres attendance barriers (raw profiles, %)

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3
<i>Cluster size</i>	70.53	15.87	13.6
<i>I do not go (more often) to the film theatre because...</i>			
<i>Film offerings (mean=2.19)</i>			
Agree (≥ 2.19)	71.91	16.99	11.1
Disagree (< 2.19)	69.33	14.91	15.76
<i>Venue features (mean=2.27)</i>			
Agree	68.98	19.14	11.88
Disagree	71.83	13.13	15.84
<i>Perception (mean=2.45)</i>			
Agree	72.59	18.52	8.89
Disagree	69.01	13.93	17.86
<i>Preference and place (mean=3.82)</i>			
Agree	71.16	17.13	11.71
Disagree	69.08	13.53	17.39
<i>Scholarship activities (mean=2.85)</i>			
Agree	67.37	16.96	15.67
Disagree	71.87	15.41	12.72
<i>Financial (mean=3.51)</i>			
Agree	72.94	15.65	11.41
Disagree	64.79	16.48	18.81
<i>Recreation time (mean=3.91)</i>			
Agree	65.83	15.81	18.37
Disagree	72.46	15.90	11.64

Socioeconomic and behavioral profile of cinemagoers in clusters

The estimates for the socioeconomic context presented in Table 10 indicate that individuals in cluster 1 (mainstream filmgoers) are, on average, more likely to be men below 50 years of age, some unemployed and with a low education level (primary and secondary school), and single with or without children; they are not affected by leisure time restrictions, as they are either unemployed or students (most of this group being foreigners residents in Spain at the moment of the interview); they are also very frequent filmgoers. Cluster 2 (art-house filmgoers.) is overrepresented among women, who are more likely to be unemployed or retired, but with a higher cultural level (technical and university studies) than the mainstream filmgoers, and some dedicated to housework, with a partner and children; in contrast to cluster 1, they are above fifty years of age and mainly Spanish. They do not go very often to the film theatre, also due to leisure time constraints. Cluster 3 (OV filmgoers) exhibits a different socioeconomic profile: mainly foreign women, above 50 years of age, highly educated (university studies), employed or with another occupational status, and with partner and no children. They are frequent filmgoers and have enough time for leisure pursuits (see also Fernández-Blanco et al., 2009, for the significant impact of socioeconomic indicators on film theatres' audiences). These findings are also in line with the cultural stratification framework (Bourdieu, 1979) confirming previous research evidence on cultural consumption (see López-Sintas and García-Álvarez, 2006).

Table 10: Socioeconomic and behavioral patterns of filmgoers (row profiles, %)

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Sample
<i>Cluster size</i>	70.53	15.87	13.6	100
<i>Education</i>				
Primary School	83.94	12.04	4.02	7.8
Secondary School	75.29	12.58	12.13	32.7
Technical college	69.68	18.66	11.66	18.9
University studies	65.13	17.48	17.39	40.6
<i>Personal status</i>				
Single no children	76.47	11.18	12.35	26.5
Single with children	80.70	7.42	11.88	6.2
Partner no children	64.74	15.50	19.76	22.9
Partner with children	68.76	20.24	11.00	44.4
<i>Occupational Status</i>				
Employed	68.89	13.67	17.45	43.2
Unemployed	73.73	25.47	0.80	10.1
Retired	66.57	20.06	13.37	11.2
Student	75.73	12.04	12.23	27.9
House works	57.79	31.24	10.96	5.0
Others	66.57	16.72	16.71	2.5
<i>Age</i>				
18-35 years	73.67	12.98	13.35	35.7
36-50 years	72.83	14.39	12.78	32.0
>50 years	64.01	21.15	14.83	32.4
<i>Citizenship</i>				
Spanish	70.48	17.04	12.47	84.7
Other	70.77	9.27	19.96	15.3
<i>Gender</i>				
Male	74.00	13.11	12.89	49.6
Female	67.18	18.54	14.29	50.4
<i>I have enough free time to enjoy leisure activities</i>				
D	67.1	18.7	14.21	29.6
N	75.36	14.73	9.91	25.2
A	69.94	14.65	15.41	45.2
<i>Frequency of film theatre attendance</i>				
Once a year or less	70.88	20.86	8.26	34.6
1-2 every 3 months	70.91	15.53	13.57	51.8
Twice a month	67.24	4.01	28.75	11.0
Once a week or more	72.64	8.65	18.71	2.6

5. Conclusions

This research explored the behavior of Spanish filmgoers in order to disentangle their tastes and habits, with a special interest in the motives and barriers of going to film theatres. The empirical results suggest three clusters of filmgoers with the following probabilistic patterns of behavior: a segment of mainstream filmgoers, for whom going to film theatres to watch a film means leisure and entertainment; a segment of art-house filmgoers, and a segment that enjoys watching films in their original version (OV filmgoers). The segmentation of the data set in three clusters was conditioned by filmgoers' financial constraints showing that they may affect filmgoers' behavior.

The PCA findings identify five groups of motives –educational purposes, film popularity, film quality, socialization and mood– and seven groups of barriers: film offerings, venue features, perception, preference and place, substitute activities, financial barriers and recreation time disposability. The socioeconomic and behavioral (frequency) indicators complete the profile of the filmgoers. These findings add to the existing research evidence in favor of using self-rated preferences and socioeconomic variables to determine (film) consumer groups. This paper illustrates the different filmgoers segments, and in doing so, illustrates the specific barriers and motivations for each of these groups. These insights can assist cultural policy makers and film theatres' managers in designing specific actions and market strategies to better meet the needs and preferences of each of these distinct segments. Finally but not lastly, these findings invite to expanding filmgoers' analysis to other national contexts, to allow for further cross-country comparisons.

Acknowledgements

Authors gratefully acknowledge the contribution of Finola Kerrigan and Andrea Rurale on a previous version of this research.

References

- Adler, K.P. (1959), "Art Films and Eggheads", *Studies in Public Communication*, Vol. 2 (Summer), pp.7-15.
- Austin, B.A. (1983), *The Film Audience: An International Bibliography of Research with Annotations and an Essay*, Scarecrow, Metuchen, NJ.
- Austin, B.A. (1984), "Portrait of an Art Film Audience", *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 74-87.
- Austin, B.A. (1986), "Motivations for Movie Attendance", *Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp. 115-126.
- Boter, J. and Wedel, M. (1999), "Segmentation of Hedonic Consumption: An Application of Latent Class Analysis to Consumer Transaction Databases", *Journal of Market-Focused Management*, Vol. 3 No. (3/4), pp. 295-311.
- Bourdieu, P. (1979). *La Distinction. Critique Social du Jugement*, Les éditions de minuit, Paris.
- Chamberlin, P. (1960), "Allies, Not Enemies: Commercial Nontheatrical Experience on the West Coast", *Film Quarterly*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 36-39.
- Chan, T.W. and Goldthorpe, J.H. (2007), "Social Stratification and Cultural Consumption: The Visual Arts in England", *Poetics*, Vol. 35, pp. 168-190.
- Chuu, S.L.H., Chang, J.C. and Zaichkowsky, J.L. (2009), "Exploring Art Film Audiences: A Marketing Analysis", *Journal of Promotion Management*, Vol. 15 No. 1-2, pp. 212-228.
- Collins, A., Hand, C. and Ryder, A. (2005), "The Lure of the Multiplex? The Interplay of Time, Distance, and Cinema Attendance", *Environment and Planning*, Vol. 37 No. 3, pp. 483-501.
- Cuadrado, M. and Frasquet, M. (1999), "Segmentation of Cinema Audiences: An Exploratory Study Applied to Young Consumers", *Journal of Cultural Economics*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 257-267.
- Cuadrado, M., Filimon, N., Kerrigan, F. and Rurale, A. (2013), "Exploring Cinema Attendance Facilitators and Constraints. A Marketing Research Approach", Paper presented at the 5th Workshop on Cultural Economics and Management, 24-25 October 2013, Cadiz, Spain.
- Daenekindt, S. and Roose, H. (2014), "Ways of Preferring: Distinction Through the 'What and the How' of Cultural Consumption", *Journal of Consumer Culture*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 25-45.
- Dayton, M.C. (1998), *Latent Class Scaling Analysis*, Sage University Paper Series on QASS, 07-126, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publishers, CA.
- De Bruyn, E.H. and Cillessen, A.H.N. (2008), "Leisure Activity Preferences and Perceived Popularity in Early Adolescence", *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 442-457.
- De Vany, A.S. and Walls, W.D. (2007), "Estimating the Effects of Movie Piracy on Box-office Revenue", *Review of Industrial Organisation*, Vol. 30, pp. 291-301.
- Dyer, R. (1981), "Entertainment and Utopia", in Altman, R. (Ed.), *Genre: The Musical*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, pp. 175-189.
- Faber, R.J., O'Guinn, T.C. and Hardy, A.P. (1988), "Art Films in the Suburbs: A Comparison of Popular and Art Film Audiences", in Austin, B.A. (Ed.), *Current Research in Film: Audiences, Economics and Law*, Vol. 4, Ablex, Norwood, NJ, pp. 45-53.
- Fernández-Blanco, V. and Baños-Pino, J.F. (1997), "Cinema Demand in Spain: A Cointegration Analysis", *Journal of Cultural Economics*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 57-75.
- Fernández-Blanco, V., Orea, L. and Prieto-Rodríguez, J. (2009), "Analysing Consumers' Heterogeneity and Self-reported Tastes: An Approach Consistent with the Consumer's Decision Making Process", *Journal of Economic Psychology*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 622-633.
- Fraley, C. and Raftery, A. (1998), "How Many Clusters? Which Clustering Methods? Answers via Model-based Cluster Analysis", *Computer Journal*, Vol. 41, pp. 578-588.
- García-Álvarez, M.E., Filimon, N. and López-Sintas, J. (2007), "Reliable Entertainment: Spanish Consumers' Preferences Regarding a Film's Country of Origin", *International Journal of Non Profit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 217-229.
- Governo, F. and Castro Teixeira, A.A. (2014), "Marketing and Technology Sophistication as Key Determinants of the Demand for 'Art House' Cinema Films: A Cross Country Analysis", *Tékhne*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 15-25.
- Gripsrud, J. and Lavik, E. (2008), "Film audiences". In J. Donald and M. Renov (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Film Studies* (pp. 454-470). London: SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781849200400.n29

- Hager, M.A. and Winkler, M.K. (2012), "Motivational and Demographic Factors for Performing Arts Attendance across Place and Form", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 41 No. 3, pp. 474-496.
- Harry, H. (1986), "Motivation Research", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 4 No. 5, pp. i-234.
- Hart, A., Kerrigan, F. and Vom Lehn, D. (2016), "Experiencing Film: Subjective Personal Introspection and Popular Film Consumption", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 375-391.
- Hawkins, B.A., Peng, J Hsieh, C.M. and Eklund, S.J. (1999), "Leisure Constraints: A Replication and Extension of Construct Development", *Leisure Sciences: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 179-192.
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística/National Institute of Statistics (INE). (2011), *Survey on Population Demographics*, available at www.ine.es. (accessed 10 January 2011).
- Iso - Ahola, E. (1980), *Social Psychological Perspectives on Leisure and Recreation*. W. C. Brown Company Publishers.
- Jackson, E.L. (1997), "In the Eye of the Beholder: A Comment on Samdahl and Jekubovich (1997), 'A Critique of Leisure Constraints: Comparative Analyses and Understandings'", *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 458-468.
- Katz-Gerro, T. (1999), "Cultural and social stratification: Leisure activities, musical tastes, and social location", *Social Perspectives*, Vol. 42 No. 4, pp. 627-646.
- Lazarsfeld, P.F. and Henry, N.W. (1968), *Latent Structure Analysis*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston.
- López-Sintas, J. and García-Álvarez, M.E. (2006), "Patterns of Audio-Visual Consumption: The Reflection of Objective Divisions in Class Structure", *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 397-411.
- Magidson, J. and Vermunt, J.K. (2001), "Latent Class Factor and Cluster Models, Bi-plots, and Related Graphical Displays", *Sociological Methodology*, Vol. 31, pp. 223-264.
- Meers, P. (2001), "Is there an Audience in the House? New Perspectives on (European) Film Audiences", *Journal of Popular Film and Television*, Vol. 29 No. 3, pp. 138-144.
- Morley, D. (1992), *Television, Audiences and Cultural Studies*, Routledge, London. Murray, E.J. (1964), *Motivation and Emotion*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Paris, T. (2014), *New Approaches for Greater Diversity of Cinema in Europe? Analyses of Experiments Launched in the Context of the Preparatory Action1 "Circulation of European Films in the Digital Era" (European Parliament & European Commission)*, available at http://ec.europa.eu/culture/library/studies/cinema-diversity-report_en.pdf. (accessed 12 July 2015).
- Peterson, R.A. and Kern, R.M. (1996), "Changing Highbrow Taste: From Snob to Omnivore", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 61, pp. 900-907.
- Raftery, A.E. (1986), "Choosing Models for Cross-Classifications", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 51, pp. 145-146.
- Raymore, L.A. (2002), "Facilitators to Leisure", *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol. 34, pp. 37-51.
- Richins, M.L. (1997), "Measuring Emotion in the Consumption Experience", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 127-146.
- Roose, H. and Vander Stichele, A. (2010), "Living Room vs. Concert Hall: Patterns of Music Consumption in Flanders", *Social Forces*, Vol. 89 No. 1, pp. 185-207.
- Sedgwick, J. and Pokorny, M. (2012), "Film Consumer Decision-Making: The Philadelphia Story, 1935-36", *Journal of Consumer Culture*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 323-346.
- Silver, J. and McDonnell, J. (2007), "Are Movie Theatres Doomed? Do Exhibitors See the Big Picture as Theatres Lose their Competitive Advantage?", *Business Horizons*, Vol. 50 No. 6, pp. 491-501.
- Swanson, S.R., Davis, C.J. and Zhao, Y. (2008), "Art for Art's Sake? An Examination of Motives for Arts Performance Attendance", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 37, pp. 300-323.
- Tudor, A. (2013), *Image and Influence: Studies in the Sociology of Film*, Routledge Library Editions: Cinema, London.
- Vahemetsa, A. (1970), "A Typology of the Recipients of Artistic Film", *Society and Leisure*, Vol. 2, pp. 87-101.
- Vermunt, J.K. (2010), "Latent Class Modelling with Covariates: Two Improved Three-Step Approaches", *Political Analysis*, Vol. 18, pp. 450-469.
- Vermunt Jeroen K., and Jay Magidson. (2008), *LG-Syntax User's Guide: Manual for Latent GOLD 4.5 Syntax Module*. Belmont, MA: Statistical Innovations Inc.
- Wierenga, B. (2006), "Motion Pictures: Consumers, Channels, and Intuition. Invited Commentary", *Marketing Science*, Vol. 25 No. 6, pp. 674-677.

DETERMINANTS OF EMPLOYMENT SITUATION IN LARGE AGGLOMERATIONS IN INDIA: A CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY

Sabyasachi TRIPATHI

Department of Economics, Adamas University, Kolkata, India

Abstract

The present paper analyzes the employment situation in different class of cities in urban India. By focussing on 52 large urban agglomerations in India and using latest unit level National Sample Survey data for the year of 2011-12 on employment and unemployment, it investigates the relevant city specific determinants of city-wise work-force participation rate (WPR). Finally, it reviews the current and past employment policies in India. The analyses show that though urban India has been witnessing an increase in the number of total job opportunities, WPR in the large cities have declined over the years. The regression results show that indicators like city-wise average land owned by a person, city-wise percentage of persons receiving any vocational training, percentage of persons currently registered with any placement agency, city size population and city output growth have a positive effect on city-wise WPR. Finally, the paper suggests that education of the worker, vocational training, and placement agencies are needed for successful job creation in the large agglomerations in India.

Keywords: Urban Agglomeration, employment, urban India

JEL classification: R1, J21

1. Introduction

India is on the threshold of becoming one of the world's fastest growing economies due to the policy reforms adopted in the recent decades. Among the various policy reforms, promotion of urban agglomeration is one of the most important and acclaimed ones. It is also considered unavoidable for the country's future development by the government presently in power. Recently, government of India has embarked on the mission of "Make in India" to encourage multinational and domestic companies to manufacture their products in India which is meant to attract a huge amount of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI). The main objective behind this mission is to increase job opportunities and skill development in the economy by adopting industry friendly policies. In fact, one of his lectures, Hon'ble Prime Minister Mr. Narendra Modi has said that "Young Indian are not seeking high paying jobs, they prefer becoming entrepreneurs".

Concurrently, Government is promoting urban agglomeration in a big way by making 100 smart cities in India, which is under implementation on priority basis. The proposed investment in the smart city project is about Rs. 48 thousand crore in the coming years. The main features of the smart city development include promotion of mixed land use in area based developments; urban housing and inclusiveness; creation of walk-able localities; making governance citizen-friendly and cost effective; preserving and developing open spaces; promoting variety of transport options; and applying smart solutions to infrastructure and services in area-based development.

On the whole, it is clear that India is currently undergoing a transformation and promotion of urban agglomeration and industrialization is an inevitable part of this process. This transformation will make India as one of the fastest growing countries in the world in the days to come. In this backdrop, the present paper tries to see what factors actually contribute to higher employment generation in large agglomerations in India. In addition, the paper evaluates the past and current policies of government of India intended to enhance job opportunities and also impart the necessary skills to make the population employable in the emerging high-tech industries.

Now let us discuss in more detail about economic growth and employment situation in urban India, in the context of the present emphasis on urban agglomerations. Urban development in India is characterised by higher urbanization rate and higher economic growth. Annual exponential growth rate of urban population increased from 2.75 percent

during 1991-2001 to 2.76 percent during 2001- 2011. Consequently, the share of urban population in the total increased from 27.86 percent in 2001 to 31.16 percent in 2011. As per 2011 Census, the absolute increase in population was more in urban areas than in rural areas. A McKinsey Global Institute study “India’s Urban Awakening: Building inclusive cities, Sustaining Economic Growth” (MGI, 2010) projected that nearly 590 million Indians will be living in cities by 2030. This clearly points to the increasing trend in India’s urbanization in the recent decades as also the decades to come. The draft report of “Regional Plan 2021: National Capital Region” (GOI, 2013) estimated that about 42.6% of India’s urban population is concentrated in 53 metropolitan cities (cities with a million plus population as per the Census definition). The four major metropolitan cities in India, namely, Mumbai, Kolkata, Chennai and Delhi together account for 15.4% of the total urban population of India. As per the Census data, 42.6 (or 70.24) percent of urban population lived in 53 metropolitan cities (or 468 Class I cities) in India in the census decade 2001-2011. Most importantly, the 2014 revision of the World Urbanization Prospects found that Delhi with a population about 25 million has become the world’s second most populous city in 2014 after Tokyo which has an agglomeration of 38 million inhabitants (UN, 2014). These facts and figures clearly show that India’s increasing urban population is mainly getting concentrated in and around large or class I cities.

Urban India contributes over 50% of the national Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The share of urban economy in the total increased from 37.65% in 1970–1971 to 52.02% in 2004–2005. The growth rate of urban NDP at constant prices (1999–2000) was about 6.2 % in the period from 1970–1971 to 2004–2005, which is much higher than the growth rate of India’s national NDP which was about 4.87 % during the same period. Mid-Term Appraisal of the Eleventh Five Year Plan shows the urban share of GDP was about 63 per cent for 2009-10, and this share is projected to increase to 75 percent by 2030. A study by Indian Institute for Human Settlement (IIHS), “Urban India 2011: Evidence” (IIHS, 2012) estimated that India’s top 100 largest cities are currently producing about 43% of the GDP, with 16 % of the population and just 0.24% of the land area .

Urban India also has experienced an increase in total employment in different periods of time. As per the latest rounds of the National Sample Survey (NSS), The total workforce (as per Current Daily Status basis) in urban India increased from 82 million in 1993-94 to 136.5 million in 2011-12, an increase of about 66 % (See Table 1 for details). Among the different periods of time, percentage increase in total employment was the highest (i.e., 22 %) from 1999-00 to 2004-05 and it was the lowest (i.e., 7 %) from 2004-05 to 2009-10.

The Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) of total urban employment was about 2.87% in the period of 1993-94 to 2011-12. Most importantly, CAGR of total urban employment was the highest (i.e., 5.52 %) in the period from 2009-10 to 2011-12 and the lowest (i.e., 1.29 %) in the period from 2004-05 to 2009-10. Growth rate of male (or female) employment was about 2.92 % (or 2.67 %) in the period of 1993-94 to 2011-12. Within this entire time period, the annual growth rate of male employment was the highest (or i.e., 4.6 %) during the period 2009-10 to 2011-12 and the lowest (i.e., 2 %) in the period 2004-05 to 2009-10. On the other hand, the growth rate for female employment was the highest (or 9.42 %) in the period 2009-10 to 2011-12 and the lowest (i.e., -1.51 %) in the period 2004-05 to 2009-10.

Table 1: Employment situation in urban India

NSS Survey Year	Total urban employment (million)			CAGR of total urban employment (%)		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
1993-94	65	17	82	-	-	-
1999-00	76	18	94	2.64	0.96	2.30
2004-05	90.4	24.6	115	3.53	6.45	4.12
2009-10	99.8	22.8	122.6	2.00	-1.51	1.29
2011-12	109.2	27.3	136.5	4.60	9.42	5.52

Source: Author' calculation based on Employment and Unemployment Surveys by National Sample Survey Office, various rounds.

On the whole, the statistical data indicate an increasing trend in India's urbanization process (measured by the demographic approach), higher urban economic growth and also employment situation. However, detailed analysis by Bhalla and Kaur (2011) found that percentage of labour-population in the age group 15-19 in urban areas declined from 61.8 % in 1983 to 52.2 % in 2007-08. Most importantly, male (or female) labour population in age group 15-19 in urban areas declined from 88.6 % (or 23 %) in 1983 to 82.5 % (or 19.7 %) in 2007-08. According to International Labour Organisation (ILO) data, the worker (15 years and above) to population ratio was 53.6% in India in 2011, while it was 64.8% in Brazil and 70.9% in China. This indicates that labour participation rate in the Indian economy is nowhere near that in other developing countries [Shaw, 2013]. The report on Global Employment Patterns 2012 published by the International Labour Organisation (ILO) states that robust growth in India has been mostly associated with a rapid rise in labour productivity, rather than an expansion in employment.

World Urbanization prospects 2014 projected that India will add 404 million urban dwellers, between 2014 and 2050. In fact, it is estimated that between 2010 and 2030, an additional 250 million persons – many migrants from rural areas – will join the urban population in India (McKinsey Global Institute, 2010). It is also projected that an increasing number of large agglomerations in India will provide higher employment opportunities to absorb the new additions to the labour force in this period. This would happen only if urban planners and local governments implement job friendly environment in urban India.

Now the question arises about how India can improve actual employment prospects for its fast-expanding urban population. In this perspective, the present paper tries to analyse the recent employment situation in urban India by focusing on large cities in the different periods of time. In addition, using the latest (i.e., 68th Round) unit level data of the National Sample Survey in 2011-12 on Employment and Unemployment, it tries to find the relevant economic determinants of WPR by considering 52 large cities in India. Finally, it discusses the major policies which need to be considered by urban planners for increasing work participation rate in urban India. To the best of our knowledge, this paper is the first study that evaluates the determinants of city level employment in India by considering availability of limited unit or individual level urban employment data.

Rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the review of literature. Employment situation in different size/class of cities in urban India is discussed in section 3. Section 4 explains the empirical framework and results for estimation of determinants of city-wise work-force participation rate. Evaluation of past and current policies is summarized in section 5. Finally, conclusions and discussions are highlighted in sections 6 and 7 respectively.

2. Select review of literature

There are several studies (e.g., Mehrotra et al. 2014; Maiti, 2015; IHD, 2014; Bhalla and Kaur, 2011; Papola and Sahu, 2012) that have tried to understand the trends and patterns of employment and unemployment in India. Mehrotra et al (2014) make a detailed review of these studies, in the context of the situation in India. The study found that India experienced an absolute fall in agricultural employment and a rise in non-agricultural employment for the period of 1993-94 to 2011-12. On the other hand, a fall in demand for manufacturing exports and increasing capital intensity resulted in a decline in manufacturing employment in the years 2004-05 to 2009-10. Bhalla and Kaur (2011) found that India has been witnessing one of the lowest labour force participation rates for women in the world, especially, urban women. Maiti (2015), using Behavior over Time Graph (BOT) variables such as economic growth, education and labour force, finds that unemployment is decreasing over time, and employment in India is challenged by major factors like economic crisis, gap between curriculum and industry demand, and jobless growth. Most importantly, India Labour and Employment Report (IHD, 2014), states that while India is counted as one of the most important emerging economies of the world, its employment scenario is abysmal. Overall, labour-force to population ratio (age group 15 years and above) at 56 per cent is low in India compared to nearly 64 per cent for the rest of the world. In India, a large proportion of workers (i.e., 49 %) are engaged in agriculture; in contrast, employment share in service

sector (or industry) is just 27 % (or 13 %). About 92 % of workers are engaged in informal employment with low earning with limited or no social protection. Papola and Sahu (2012), using NSS data for the period of 1993-94 to 2009-10, have provided a detailed explanation of the trends and patterns of employment across different sectors in India. The study argues that there is need for creation of new jobs and improvement of quality of the existing jobs in order to achieve faster economic growth.

However, there are few studies that statistically measure urban employment in the specific context of India. Chen and Raveendran (2012) explore the trends in urban employment in India, with special focus on urban informal employment, by considering three rounds of National Sample Survey data for the year of 1999-00, 2004-2005 and 2009-10, respectively. The descriptive analysis shows that though the proportion of urban self-employment increased between 1999-00 and 2004-05, it decreased between 2004-05 and 2011-12. However, between 2004-05 and 2009-10, the combined share of urban employment of different informal groups grew from 12 per cent to 41 per cent. A study by Shaw (2013) using NSS Employment and Unemployment Survey data for the year of 1999-00, 2004-05, 2009-10, and 2011-12 pertaining to both urban and rural employment scenario found that the proportion of workforce moving towards to non-farm activities has increased over the years along with a fall in the proportion of workforce engaged in casual wage-employment. Chowdhury's (2011) analysis reveals the grim employment situation in India. Author cites the drastic reduction seen in total employment in India during the years 2004-05 to 2009-10 due both to the widespread withdrawal of population from the labour force (especially women) and the slow growth of employment in the non-agricultural sector in support of his argument. The paper also finds that the spread of education among the youth is a positive development but does not by itself explain the decline of labour force participation rate. Ramaswamy and Agrawal (2012) found that manufacturing employment in urban India grew at a faster rate (2.8 per cent) relative to all-India (1.8 per cent) over the period 1999-2000 and 2009-10. Its growth rate was higher relative to the earlier period of 1993-99. A little less than 50 per cent of the employment created in India was accounted for by the urban sector in the 2000s. More than 85 per cent of the jobs created in business services and more than 80 per cent of the jobs in total manufacturing were in the urban sector. Most importantly, IHS (2012) using data from Economic Census, found that workforce participation rates are highest in the "major metros" (population 4 million plus), and employment in "high-tech" sector (ICT, high technology manufacturing, and fast growing exports) is also highly concentrated in the large cities. Further, the pattern of employment growth around the India's largest cities shows that manufacturing activity is shifting outwards from the city core. Manufacturing activities in general are spreading outward within 10-100 km radius from the city centre, with high-tech manufacturing spreading to 10-50 km radius from the city centre, and medium high tech manufacturing and fast growing export manufacturing moving to a 50-100 km radius from the city centre. Finally, the report suggests that the spread of manufacturing and other employments away from the city core raises the issue of sprawl and links between land use and transportation.

3. Employment situation in different class of cities in urban India

Table 2 shows the percentage increase in employment situation in urban India in terms of difference in size/class of cities/towns from 1993-94 to 2011-12. As can be seen from Table 1, there exists in urban India, a stark difference in the pattern of employment between male and female. In this regards, Table 2 presents the disparities in employment scenario in urban India by considering usually employed (principal activity status -ps+ subsidiary activity status -ss-) male and female workers in different categories separately, rather than at aggregate level.

As can be seen from Table 2, the percentage of WPR declined during the years 1993-94 to 2011-12 for both male and female worker in all the all size/class of cities/towns in India, except for female workers in class 1 cities whose share increased by 9.94 %. ¹ In contrast,

¹ It is important to note here that in this paper we have used Census data and National Sample Survey (NSS) data for the analysis. Census defines class 1 cities which have *population 100,000 or*

the percentage of WPR increased during the years 1999-00 to 2004-05 for both male and female worker in all the size/class of cities/towns of India. During this period, the percentage increase (i.e., 21.79%) was higher for female workers in class 2 cities/towns than others. In addition, the percentage of WPR marginally increased in the period from 2009-10 to 2011-12, except for male workers in class 2 cities. However, it is seen that the percentage of WPR for all categories of urban workers registered decline during the years from 1993-94 to 1999-00 and 2004-05 to 2009-10.

Table 2: % increase of per 1000 distribution of usually employed (ps+ss) persons aged 15 years and above by status of employment for different size/class of cities/towns in different periods of time.

Different Category	Time span	all class 1 cities	size class 2	size class 3	Urban India	all class 1 cities	size class 2	size class 3	Urban India
		Male				Female			
WPR	1993-94 to 1999-00	-2.87	-1.97	-1.92	-2.08	-2.76	-11.82	-13.17	-11.66
	1999-00 to 2004-05	2.28	1.34	1.44	1.46	12.50	21.79	13.11	15.23
	2004-05 to 2009-10	-3.81	-2.65	-2.83	-3.01	-15.66	-18.35	-25.36	-19.38
	2009-10 to 2011-12	1.77	-1.09	0.40	0.14	19.16	0.56	5.34	6.56
	1993-94 to 2011-12	-2.74	-4.34	-2.94	-3.52	9.94	-11.82	-22.78	-12.56
Self-employed	1993-94 to 1999-00	4.25	-2.63	2.83	0.00	24.82	-3.46	4.58	1.35
	1999-00 to 2004-05	7.34	12.75	3.17	8.19	8.52	5.59	4.19	4.20
	2004-05 to 2009-10	-2.03	-12.83	-7.79	-8.69	-13.35	-13.14	-14.81	-13.38
	2009-10 to 2011-12	-2.07	6.48	-0.22	1.95	7.85	3.66	8.37	4.41
	1993-94 to 2011-12	7.37	1.91	-2.39	0.72	26.60	-8.21	0.60	-4.48
Regular wage/salaried	1993-94 to 1999-00	-5.56	0.00	-3.65	-1.65	-8.08	11.30	33.13	14.33
	1999-00 to 2004-05	0.39	-8.45	-0.32	-2.63	0.96	8.06	3.76	7.76
	2004-05 to 2009-10	0.78	10.00	-1.90	3.19	9.47	14.92	5.43	9.97
	2009-10 to 2011-12	5.81	-3.73	9.35	3.57	0.00	3.37	17.17	8.56
	1993-94 to 2011-12	1.11	-3.05	3.04	2.35	1.58	42.86	70.63	47.10
Casual labour	1993-94 to 1999-00	14.02	7.10	-0.47	3.75	-16.11	-7.63	-22.49	-18.39
	1999-00 to 2004-05	-23.77	-10.24	-6.67	-13.25	-28.00	-24.31	-11.45	-21.60
	2004-05 to 2009-10	4.30	14.09	22.45	18.06	0.00	5.45	29.74	17.37
	2009-10 to 2011-12	-22.68	-6.47	-11.67	-13.53	-27.78	-16.67	-26.25	-26.53
	1993-94 to 2011-12	-29.91	2.58	0.47	-8.13	-56.38	-38.56	-34.32	-44.83

Note: Class 1 cities (with a population of one million or more), class 2 towns (with a population 50,000 to less than one million) and class 3 towns (with population less than 50,000) as per the National Sample Survey definition.

Source: Author's calculation based on Employment and Unemployment Surveys by National Sample Survey Office, various rounds.

Analyses also show that while the period 1993-94 to 2011-12 witnessed a marginal increase in the percentage of self employed male but it has decreased in the percentage of self employed female in all India urban area. During same period of time, the proportion of female self-employed workers of class 1 cities in India registered a higher increase (i.e., 26.6 %) than other groups in different size/class of cities and towns in India. Most importantly, the percentage of self-employed increased during the period 1999-00 to 2004-05 but decreased during the period 2004-05 to 2009-10 in all categories of size/class of cities in India irrespective of any gender differences. In the period of 2009-10 to 2011-12, the percentage of self employment rate increased for all categories of cities and towns except for the male working in class 1 and 3 cities/towns in India.

In the case of regular wage/salaried workers, except female working in class 2 cities, other all categories of both male and female in different size/class of cities/towns in India experienced a positive percentage change in the period 1993-94 to 2011-12. Most importantly, the percentage of female wage/salaried workers registered a higher percentage

more. At the Census 2011, there are 468 such cities. On the other hand, NSS defines class 1 cities which have population of one million or more. We have mentioned it clearly whenever we have used these two different definitions throughout this paper.

increase than the male wage/salaried workers during the same period of time. In overall, there was an increase in the percentage of female wage/salaried workers in different periods of time in different size/class of cities/towns excepting the percentage of female wage/salaried workers in class 1 cities during the period of 1993-94 to 1999-00. In contrast, the percentage of male wage/salaried workers decreased or remained constant during the years 1993-94 to 1999-00 for all class/size cities/towns in India. In addition, the results also show that the percentage of male wage/salaried workers in class 3 cities declined in different periods of time except 2009-10 to 2011-12. On the other hand, the percentage of male wage/salaried workers in class 1 cities increased in different periods of time except the period of 1993-94 to 1999-00 in different size/class cities in India.

Finally, the figures show that the percentage of casual labour declined for both male and female in different size/class of cities/towns in India except for male casual labourer working in class 2 and 3 cities and towns in India during the years 1993-94 to 2011-12. Overall, there was a decline in the percentage of casual labour in different class/size of cities/towns in India except during the period of 2004-05 to 2009-10 for both male and female categories.

In general, Table 2 clearly shows that the decline in the percentage of WPR from 1993-94 to 2011-12 for both urban male and female in India is associated with the percentage increase in male self employed persons and regular wage earners among both male and female workers and the percentage decline in casual labourer among both male and female workers along with percentage decline in the percentage of self employed female workers.

4. Empirical framework for the Estimation of Determinants of WPR in large cities in India

The basic econometrics model for the estimation of the determinants of WPR is stated as follows:

$$WPR_t = \alpha_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{11} \alpha_i x_i + e_t \quad \dots\dots\dots (1)$$

WPR_t refers to city-wise work-force participation rate, X_1 refers to city-wise average land owned by a person, X_2 refers to percentage of persons currently registered with any placement agency, X_3 refers to city-wise percentage of persons receiving/received any vocational training, X_4 refers to city population, X_5 refers to city-wise percentage of people literate without formal schooling, X_6 refers to city output growth rate, X_7 refers to city inequality level, X_8 refers to city-wise percentage of not literate persons, X_9 refers to city-wise percentage of city slum population, X_{10} refers to city-wise percentage of persons literate up to middle, X_{11} refers to CAGR of city population from 2001 to 2011. Equation (1) has been estimated by the technique of OLS.

For the analysis, we have selected 52 large cities (or agglomerations) in India.² There are several reasons behind the selection of these large agglomerations as units of analysis. First, because of non-availability of city-specific data for a large number of variables used in this study (e.g. city level income and employment data), city district (where the sample city is located) is used as a proxy of a city. Larger cities are good proxies for city districts as they cover large portions of the respective districts compared to smaller cities. Second, as India's urbanization (i.e. share of urban population) is mainly based on Class I cities (with a population of more than 100,000 as per Census definition), these cities are also taken as Class I cities.

² A total of 58 cities are listed in the World Urbanization Prospects 2011. We also consider Bhiwandi city, which is not listed in the World Urbanization Prospects 2011 but was listed in World Urbanization Prospects 2009. Due to unavailability of district domestic product (DDP), we consider only 52 cities (with population 750,000 or more) out of these 59 cities for our analysis. It is important to note here is that, as per the 2011 Census, there were 53 metropolitan cities (cities with a million plus population as per the Census definition) in India and 42 cities among these 53 metropolitan cities are included in our analysis.

Measurement of variables, data sources, and description of data

Appendix Table A.1 lists the cities used in the analysis. Appendix Table 2 summarizes the descriptions, measurements, and data sources of all the variables used in the estimation Equation 1. Table 3 elucidates the means, standard deviations, minimum, and maximum values for the variables used for the regression estimation. Dispersion about the mean is higher for city population size, percent of persons currently registered with any placement agency of the age 15 to 45 years, percent of persons literate without formal schooling, CAGR of city population from 2001 to 2011, and city-wise average land owned by a person. On the other hand, dispersion about the mean is lower for city-wise percent of persons literate up to middle school, workforce participation rate, city level inequality, and city output growth rate from 2001 to 2005. Table 4 shows the raw correlation of the variables. The values of the correlation coefficient (r^2) shows that workforce participation rate is positively associated with the city-wise percent of persons receiving/received any vocational training (i.e. r^2 is 0.52) and % of persons currently registered with any placement agency (i.e. r^2 is 0.46). On the other hand, workforce participation rate is negatively associated with persons literate without formal schooling (i.e. r^2 is -0.33) and city-wise percent of persons not literate (i.e. r^2 is -0.22).

Table 3: Description of data

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max	Coefficient of Variation
Workforce Participation Rate (WPR) in 2011-12 (in %)	37.43	6.12	22.91	50.69	16.3
City-wise average land owned by a person in 2011-12 (in hector)	194.88	204.55	8.44	975.88	105
% of persons currently registered with any placement agency of the age 15 to 45 years in 2011-12	10.52	10.70	0.00	42.48	101.7
City-wise % of persons receiving/received any vocational training in 2011-12	15.80	11.13	0.98	47.58	70.5
Literate without formal schooling in 2011-12 (%)	0.70	0.70	0.00	2.74	101.2
City population in 2011 (in lakh)	27.63	38.35	7.11	184.00	138.8
City output growth rate from 2001 to 2005	5.08	2.75	0.01	13.29	54.2
City level inequality in 2011-12	0.32	0.06	0.18	0.51	18.9
City-wise % of not literate persons in 2011-12	20.49	7.79	7.08	42.49	38
% of city slum population in 2011	18.75	11.98	0.20	48.56	63.9
City-wise % of persons literate up to middle in 2011-12	40.03	5.29	26.17	54.49	13.2
CAGR of city population from 2001 to 2011 (in %)	4.83	3.98	0.87	19.62	82.5

Source: Author

Table 4: Correlation Coefficient of determinants WPR in large cities

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)
Workforce												
Participation Rate (a)	1.00											
City-wise average land owned by a person (b)	0.12	1.00										
% of persons currently registered with any placement agency of the age 15 to 45 years (c)	0.46	-0.19	1.00									
City-wise % of persons receiving/received any vocational training (d)	0.52	0.06	0.15	1.00								
Literate without formal schooling (e)	-0.33	0.02	-0.21	-0.11	1.00							
City population (f)	0.18	-0.21	0.06	-0.02	0.01	1.00						
City output growth rate (g)	0.11	-0.05	0.09	-0.10	0.06	0.14	1.00					
City inequality level (h)	0.16	-0.13	0.29	0.18	-0.11	0.21	-0.12	1.00				
City-wise % of not literate persons (i)	-0.22	0.13	-0.45	-0.18	0.26	-0.22	-0.21	-0.33	1.00			
City-wise % of city slum population (j)	0.04	0.03	-0.10	0.19	-0.10	-0.07	-0.22	-0.04	0.13	1.00		
City-wise % of persons literate up to middle (k)	0.10	0.14	0.03	0.27	-0.01	-0.18	0.09	-0.26	-0.18	0.08	1.00	
CAGR of city population (l)	-0.03	-0.32	0.22	-0.10	0.01	0.20	0.37	0.09	-0.16	-0.46	0.11	1.00

Note: The correlation coefficients are based on 52 observations.

Source: Author

Results of the estimated OLS model

Table 5 summarizes the regression results of size models of the determinants of city WPR based on Equation 1 by employing the OLS method. City Workforce Participation Rate (per1000) for persons of age 15 years and above, according to usual status (ps+ss) in 2011-2012 is considered as dependent variable in the estimation. Regression analysis includes the set of controls of the best fit model for 52 large cities in India.³ The regression explains 58% of the total variation in the dependent variable. A non-graphical test has been done by considering the Shapiro–Wilk test for normality. The statistically insignificant Z values do not reject the null hypothesis that the distribution of the residuals is normal.

The results show that city-wise average land owned by a person has positive and significant (at 10 % level) effect on city WPR. In particular, a 100% increase in city-wise average land owned by a person is associated with 0.5% increase in city WPR. This may be the case that average land holding increasing WPR by increasing self employment rate. City-wise percent of persons currently registered with any placement agency and receiving/received any vocational training has statistically strong significant effect (at 1 % level) on city WPR. The results show that a 10 % increase in the number of persons registered in any placement agency (or persons received vocational training) leads to 2.6 % increase in city WPR. This indicates that these two variables are very important factors for increasing city WPR in India. Size of city population has a robust statistically significant (at 1 % level) effect on city WPR. The results indicate that a 100% increase in city size population leads to 3.8% increase in city WPR. This is quite obvious as large urban agglomerations have a strong positive effect on employment opportunities, higher productivity per worker, and wages

³ Other variables which did not show any impact on city WPR are city population density 2001, city-wise % of persons having diploma or certificate (below graduate level), city-wise % of persons having diploma or certificate (graduate and above level), City-wise % of persons literate and upper middle, poverty head count ratio, poverty gap ratio, squared poverty gap ratio, and mean per capita consumption measured by Modified Mixed Reference Period (MMRP).

through realization of higher economies of scale. However, city-wise percent of people literate without formal schooling has a statistically significant (at 1 % level) negative effect on city WPR. An increase of 10% in the percentage of people literate without formal schooling leads to 21.4 % reduction in city WPR. This indicates that lower level of education is one of the negative factors which decrease WPR in urban India. Finally, city output growth rate also has a very strong positive effect on city WPR. The coefficient 0.376 indicates that a 10% increase in city output growth rate increases city WPR by 3.8%. This indicates that higher economic growth is required for increasing city WPR in India. However, other variables that have statistically insignificant effect on city WPR are city inequality level, city-wise percent of not literate persons, city-wise percent of city slum population, city-wise percent of persons literate up to middle school, and CAGR of city population during years 2001 to 2011.

Table 5: Determinants of Workforce Participation Rate for large agglomerations in India

	<i>Dependent variable:</i> City-wise Workforce Participation Rate (per1000) for persons of age 15 years and above according to usual status (ps+ss) in 2011-2012
City-wise average land owned by a person in 2011-2012	0.005* (0.003)
City-wise % of persons currently registered with any placement agency of the age of 15 to 45 years in 2011-2012	0.26*** (0.061)
City-wise % of persons receiving/received any vocational training in 2011-2012	0.26*** (0.051)
City population in 2011	0.038*** (0.012)
City-wise % of people literate without formal schooling in 2011-2012	-2.14*** (0.694)
City output growth rate from 2001 to 2005	0.376** (0.172)
City inequality level in 2011-2012	-3.093 (12.33)
City-wise % of not literate persons in 2011-2012	0.136 (0.128)
City-wise % of city slum population 2011	-0.034 (0.063)
City-wise % of persons literate up to middle (up to class VIII) in 2011-12	0.002 (0.152)
CAGR of city population from 2001 to 2011	-0.210 (0.179)
Intercept	27.9*** (8.3)
R ²	0.58
Adjusted R ²	0.46
F statistics	9.36***
Mean VIF	1.39
Shapiro-Wilk test for normality (Prob>z)	0.76
No. of Observation	52

Source: Estimated using equation (1).

5. Evaluation of past and current policies on employment generation in India with focusing on urban employment

Table 6: Evaluation of past and current policies on employment generation taken in different Planning Period in India by focusing on urban areas

	Major employment challenges	Policy consideration
First Five Year Plan (1951-56)	Statistical measurement of employment and un-employment situation. Insufficient employment opportunities	Provision of better employment opportunities in rural sector. Reduction of unemployment or underemployment in urban sector.
Second Five Year Plan (1956-61)	Creation of employment opportunities Measurement of employment situation by considering the urban and rural sectors in different regions of the country Need of adequate data on the extent and nature of unemployment	1. Creation of labour opportunities by considering labour intensive policy (such as, construction work, railways, industries and Minerals, etc) in urban area.
Third Five Year Plan (1961-66)	Incorporation of urban employment with business, transport and industry. Inadequacy of data for building up a sufficiently detailed picture of the state of employment in the country as a whole and in its regional, urban and rural aspects.	Promote industrial development and enhancement of employment opportunities in urban area by considering different sectors. Establishment of skill and vocational or technical training centres to enhance the skill of the labourer for specific jobs of work.
Fourth Five Year Plan (1969-74)	Refinement of data for measuring employment and unemployment situation in rural and urban areas. Increase of employment opportunities.	Considerable emphasis on labour-intensive schemes such as roads, minor irrigation, soil conservation, rural electrification, village and small scale industries, housing and urban development. The industrial safety for the workers was considered by considering insurance scheme. Expansion of the intake capacity of the industrial training institutes
Fifth Five Year Plan (1974-79)	Enhancement of employment opportunities.	Reduction of urban unemployment by increasing employment situation in rural areas through improving agricultural productivity.
Sixth Five Year Plan (1980-85)	Progressive reduction of unemployment in the country Examination in some detail the main aspects of employment and unemployment in rural and urban areas based on the latest available data of N.S.S. surveys on employment and unemployment during 1972-73 (27th Round) and 1977-78 (32nd Round)	1. Increase scope for urban self-employment by providing work sheds within industrial estates, providing capital or institutional marketing support and by providing industrial home work.
Seventh Five Year Plan (1985-90)	Increase of productivity of the labour intensive informal urban sector through better urbanisation and introduction of modern technology.	Provision of housing is a highly employment intensive activity. The step-up of investment in housing envisaged during Plan Periods provided employment on a large scale, especially in urban and semi-urban areas. Provisioning for the welfare and working and living conditions of unorganised labour not only in the rural sector, but also in the urban areas. Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Services, Act, 1979, greatly improved matters for the unorganised urban workers.
Eight Five Year Plan (1992-97)	The higher incidence of urban unemployment which is much higher in urban than in rural areas. The improvement of quality of existing services which were lacking of inputs like credit and raw materials, facilities for skill development and space for carrying on such activities	Consideration of the importance of absorption of extra rural workers in urban area for increasing productivity and higher income opportunities. Creation of a favourable policy environment for the growth of entrepreneur-ship and self-employment in medium and large towns and cities were created.

Ninth Five Year Plan (1997-02)	To provide employment not only for the additions to the labour force during the Plan period, but also to reduce the back-log of unemployment accumulated from the past. Examination of both the consistency of the work opportunities with the skill attributes of the labour force and the quality of employment in terms of providing an adequate level of income for the workers.	Diversification of rural economy into non-farm activities to provide productive employment to the growing rural labour force in arresting migration from rural areas to urban areas. Promotion of infrastructural development in rural towns for expansion of activities with a high employment potential for rural workers. Reduction of the mismatch between the skill requirements of employment opportunities and the skill base of the unemployed.
Tenth Five Year Plan (2002-07)	Requirement of employment opportunities for the backlog of unemployment for the provision of gainful employment in excess of the addition to the labour force.	Promotion of urban sector development by converting rural land for urban use, reduction of stamp duty on transfer of property and laws facilitating private development of township – to increase the real estate growth, and thereby generate increased demand for construction and employment opportunities.
Eleventh Five Year Plan (2007-12)	Need to increase the volume of good quality employment along with higher rate of growth. Generation of productive and gainful employment, with decent working conditions, on a sufficient scale to absorb the growing labour force for achieving inclusive growth. Increase of female urban employment rate.	Increase of employment rate in manufacturing, construction and transport and communication sector. Taken up programmes for skill development and ensure of wider provision of social security for welfare of unorganized workers, particularly in sectors such as construction and transport. Encouragement of the corporate sector to move into more labour-intensive sectors. Encouragement of higher employment of women workers by providing various incentives. The creation of a formal relationship between the worker and the hiring establishment. To increase the volume of formal or regular employment
Twelfth Five Year Plan (2012-17)	Concern of the negative employment elasticities in manufacturing sector. Problem of re-skilling the unskilled informal labour force.	Expansion of employment Opportunities. Simplification of regulatory framework for higher level of quality of employment. Skill development of the laborer including unorganized informal sector for achieving faster, sustainable and inclusive growth and for providing decent employment opportunities to the growing young population. Increase of female employment Improvement of educational qualification and vocational training of workers.

Source: Author's compilation from various Planning Period documents, GoI.

Table 6 shows that past and current government policies and programmes have tried the following: First, generation of substantial data on employment and unemployment in India by considering different categories; second, creation of employment opportunities in rural and urban sectors; third, enhancement of skill of the labourer by establishing skill, vocational and technical training centres; fourth, consideration of industrial safety for the workers by considering insurance scheme; fifth, increase of productivity of the labour intensive informal urban sector through organized urban development and introduction of modern technology; sixth, improvement of the welfare, working and living conditions of unorganised labour; seventh, absorption of extra rural workers in urban areas; eighth, increase the volume of formal or regular employment; ninth, encouragement of employment for women worker by providing various incentives; and tenth, promotion of a formal relationship between the worker and the hiring establishment.

6. Conclusions

The paper has tried to explore the following three important issues. First, it presents the employment situation in different size/class of cities in urban India; second, using NSS 68th Round unit level data for the year of 2011-12 on employment and unemployment and by employing OLS regression model, it has tried to find out the most relevant economic determinants of workforce participation rate in large agglomerations in India; and third, it proposes major policies which need to be considered by urban planners in order to improve the employment situation in urban India through reviewing current and past government policies in this regard.

The paper finds that though urban India has experienced an increase in the number of total employment slots, work-force participation rate (WPR) in the large cities has shown decline

over the different periods of time. The decline in the percentage of WPR from 1993-94 to 2011-12 for both male and female for all India urban level is associated with the percentage decline in the number of both male and female casual labourers as also female self employed workers in all urban areas in India. The regression results show that city-wise average land owned by a person, city-wise percentage of persons receiving any vocational training, percentage of persons currently registered with any placement agency of the age of 15 to 45 years, city size population and city output growth have positive and statistically significant effect on city-wise work participation rate. On the other hand, city wise percentage of literate people without formal schooling has a negative and statistically significant effect on city-wise work-force participation rate. In addition, we did not find any impact of city inequality level, city-wise slum population and growth rate of slum population on city-wise work participation rate. Review of current and past policies on employment show that government of India has tried to produce substantial amounts of data on employment and unemployment situation in India. Policies are also being formulated to improve employment situation in India along with improving productivity through providing skills, safety, and welfare of the labourer. Finally, higher women employment generation is one of the main issues which are under consideration by the government of India.

7. **Discussion**

The study finds that city-wise percentage of persons receiving any vocational training has a significant impact on city-wise work participation rate. In this perspective, India Labour and Employment Report 2014 (IHD, 2014) reports that the levels of education and professional and vocational skills of the Indian workers are extremely low. Less than 30 per cent of the workforce has completed secondary education or higher, and less than one-tenth have had vocational training, either formal or informal. Therefore, in context of India, skill development and vocational education are critical areas of concern. In vocational training courses, India's net enrollment is about 3.5 million persons per year whereas the relevant figure for China is about 90 million and for the U.S. about 11 million. Therefore, India needs to ensure much higher enrollment rate in vocational training programmes of its labour force in order to increase the work participation rate in urban areas. In addition, city-wise average land owned by a person has a positive impact on city-wise work participation rate. This indicates that land ownership by a person increases chance of self employment. The NSS survey estimates that half of all urban households are landless.⁴ Our results suggest that landless people have less chance to participate in the workforce. Therefore, appropriate urban land reform policy is needed to increase urban work-force participation rate in India.

Results also suggest that there is a significant correlation between the percentage of people registered with any placement agency and the rate of workforce participation in urban India. As per the available information, here we consider potential laborers as those registered 'only in government employment agencies', 'only in private placement agencies', and in both government employment exchanges and private placement agencies. This indicates that those registering with placement agencies as seeking work or available for work (or unemployed) have better information regarding their job opportunities not only in different places but also their preferred places. Therefore, government needs to motivate workers to register themselves with placement agency for reducing the mismatch between labour demand (employer) and labour supply (employee).

Our results suggest that level of education of the worker is an important factor in increasing work-force participation rate. Recent census data on workers and their educational levels clearly indicate that a large share of the total Indian workforce is either illiterate or educated only up to the secondary level, which is indicative of the poor level of their competence. Most importantly, data reveals that out of about 55.5 million marginal workers seeking work in India, 21.9 million are illiterates and 20.9 million have studied below secondary level. In fact, recently Prof. Amartya Sen has argued that "India is the only

⁴<http://www.livemint.com/Opinion/PUzqHSs3xejXk4hm2djTPM/How-many-Indians-are-landless.html>, accessed on 3rd December, 2015.

country trying to become a global economic power with an uneducated and unhealthy labour force".⁵ In line with Prof. Sen's views, this paper highlights the influence of education of the labourer on work-force participation rate.

Both population size of large cities and output growth rate in large cities have significant effect on work-force participation rate in India. In searching for reasons behind the formation of large cities we need to take note of the New Economic Geographic models (NEG) pioneered by Krugman (1991). NEG models explain that the agglomeration forces mainly come from pecuniary externalities by interacting among increasing returns, transportation costs, and movement of production factors. These factors not only increase employment opportunities in large cities but also allow selling the produced commodities at cheaper prices in cities than in rural areas, which in turn increases the real wage of the worker. But the main assumption behind this phenomenon is that the production process of the commodities should have taken place in the city as well so that we can have advantage of lower transport costs. Most importantly, Duranton and Puga (2004) argue that sharing the local infrastructure, matching between employers and employees, and learning new technologies are the major factors behind increasing returns to investment which mainly happens in the large cities. Recent empirical studies clearly show that large agglomerations have a positive impact on economic growth (e.g., Tripathi (2013) – in the Indian context) by creating better opportunities to workers. Therefore, promotion of large agglomeration will not only lead to higher economic growth but also creation of higher opportunities for workers. Finally, this paper supports the current government policies such as 'Make in India' and 'creation of 100 smart cities project' for its emphasis on better organized and industrialized urban agglomerations as also its potential to achieve higher and sustainable economic growth through providing best workable environment to workforce in India.⁶

Appendix

Table A1. Names of Cities Used in Regression Analysis

Agra (Agra), Aligarh (Aligarh), Allahabad (Allahabad), Amritsar (Amritsar), Asansol (Bardhaman), Aurangabad (Aurangabad), Bangalore (Bangalore Urban), Bareilly (Bareilly), Bhiwandi (Thane), Bhopal (Bhopal), Bhubaneswar (Khordha), Chandigarh@, Chennai (Chennai), Coimbatore (Coimbatore), Delhi@, Dhanbad (Dhanbad), Durg-Bhilainagar (Durg), Guwahati (Kamrup), Gwalior (Gwalior), Hubli-Dharwad (Dharwad), Hyderabad (Hyderabad), Indore (Indore), Jabalpur (Jabalpur), Jaipur (Jaipur), Jalandhar (Jalandhar), Jamshedpur (Purbi- Singhbhum), Jodhpur (Jodhpur), Kanpur (Kanpur Nagar), Kochi (Eranakulam), Kolkata (Kolkata), Kota (Kota), Kozhikode (Kozhikode), Lucknow (Lucknow), Ludhiana (Ludhiana), Madurai (Madurai), Meerut (Meerut), Moradabad (Moradabad), Mumbai (Mumbai), Mysore (Mysore), Nagpur (Nagpur), Nashik (Nashik),

Patna (Patna), Pune (Pune), Raipur (Raipur), Ranchi (Ranchi), Salem (Salem), Solapur (Solapur), Thiruvananthapuram (Thiruvananthapuram), Tiruchirappalli (Tiruchirappalli), Varanasi (Varanasi), Vijayawada (Krishna), Visakhapatnam (Visakhapatnam).

Note: City district (where the sample city is located) is used as a proxy of a city to measure all the variables (except population data) used in estimation of OLS regression of Equation

⁵ <http://www.indiandefensenews.in/2015/11/india-is-only-country-trying-to-become.html>, accessed on 2nd December, 2015.

⁶ Though there are many other government policies (e.g., Prime Ministers Employment Generation Programme (PMEGP), Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, Swarnajayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY), and Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rojgar Yojana (SJSRY)) which were formulated in past Planning periods, we mainly emphasize on 'Make in India' and 'creation of 100 smart cities project' as these policies are new and very much important for promotion of urbanization which will lead to higher economic growth and higher employment in urban India.

1 by considering urban sample persons (if data available for rural and urban separately) of that district. Name in parentheses indicates the name of the district in which the city is located. @Delhi and Chandigarh were considered as a whole proxy of a city district.

Appendix A2: Variable sources and definitions

Work-force participation rate (WPR)(As given in NSSO): The number of persons employed in *usual status* (ps+ss) per 1000 persons is referred to as work force participation rate (WFPR) or worker population ratio (WPR) in *usual status* (ps+ss). **Usual principal activity status**: The usual activity status relates to the activity status of a person during the reference period of 365 days preceding the date of survey. **Usual subsidiary economic activity status**: A person whose usual principal status was determined on the basis of the major time criterion could have pursued some economic activity for a shorter time throughout the reference year of 365 days preceding the date of survey or for a minor period, which is not less than 30 days, during the reference year. **Usual activity status considering principal and subsidiary status taken together**: The usual status, determined on the basis of the usual principal activity and usual subsidiary economic activity of a person taken together, is considered as the usual activity status of the person and is written as usual status (ps+ss). According to the usual status (ps+ss), workers are those who perform some work activity either in the principal status or in the subsidiary status. Thus, a person who is not a worker in the usual principal status is considered as worker according to the usual status (ps+ss), if the person pursues some subsidiary economic activity for 30 days or more during 365 days preceding the date of survey.

Source: Unit level data of NSS 68th Round on Employment and Unemployment in 2011-12.

City-wise average land owned by a person: This includes the following:

First, land owned by the household i.e., land on which the household has the right of permanent heritable possession with or without the right to transfer the title e.g., Pattadars, Bhumidars, Jenmons, Bhumiswamis, Rayat, Sithibans etc.

Second, land held under special conditions such as the holder does not possess the title of ownership but the right for long-term possession of the land (for example, land possessed under perpetual lease, hereditary tenure and long-term lease for 30 years or more).

Third, sometimes a plot may be possessed by a tribal in accordance with traditional tribal rights from local chieftains or village/district council. Again a plot may be occupied by a tenant for which the right of ownership vests in the community. In both the cases the tribal or other individual (tenant) will be taken as owner; for in all such cases, the holder has owner-like possession of the land in question.

Fourth, frequently, the land possessed by the household is *owned by the head of the family, who stays in a different town or village and therefore is not a member of the household*. In such cases the land should be regarded as not owned but *leased in* by the household.

Source: Unit level data of NSS 68th Round on Employment and Unemployment in 2011-12.

Persons currently registered with any placement agency: This includes persons registered only in government employment exchanges, only in private placement agencies, in both government employment exchanges and private placement agencies. Source: Unit level data of NSS 68th Round on Employment and Unemployment in 2011-12.

Persons receiving/received any vocational training : This includes persons who were receiving formal vocational training, received formal vocational training, and received non-formal vocational training through hereditary, self-learning, learning on the job, and others. Source: Unit level data of NSS 68th Round on Employment and Unemployment in 2011-12.

Literate without formal schooling: Persons who has got lower level education without formal schooling. Source: Unit level data of NSS 68th Round on Employment and Unemployment in 2011-12.

Large city population and its growth rate: 52 urban agglomerations 750,000 or more inhabitants in 2011 and growth rate of urban agglomerations over the period 2001 to 2011. Source: Census of India 2011, GoI.

City output growth rate: Growth rate of per capita non-primary District Domestic Product (DDP) over the period 2000-01 to 2004-05 at 1999-2000; constant prices are taken as

a measure of urban economic growth. Source: Directorate of Economics and Statistics (DES), various State Governments, GoI.

City inequality level: Gini coefficient of the large city districts by considering urban sample persons of that district. Source: Unit level data of NSS 2011-12 on consumer expenditure.

City-wise percentage of not literate persons: Percentage of people those are not literate. Source: Unit level data of NSS 68th Round on Employment and Unemployment in 2011-12.

City-wise percentage of persons literate up to middle: Percentage of people those have education up to class VIII. Source: Unit level data of NSS 68th Round on Employment and Unemployment in 2011-12.

Percentage of city slum population: Ratio of city slum population to total city population in 2011. Source: Census of India 2011, GOI.

References

- Bhalla, S S and R Kaur (2011): "Labour Force Participation of Women in India: Some facts, some queries", Asia Research Centre Working Paper 40, London School of Economics & Political Science, London. Available at <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/38367/1/ARCWP40-BhallaKaur.pdf>, accessed on 12th December 2014.
- Chen, M A and G Raveendran (2012): "Urban Employment in India: Recent Trends and Patterns", Margin: The Journal of Applied Economic Research, 6(2): 159-179.
- Chowdhury, S (2011): "Employment in India: What Does the Latest Data Show?", Economic and Political Weekly, 46 (32): 23-26.
- Duranton, G and D Puga (2004): Micro- Foundation of Urban Agglomeration Economies. In Henderson, J V and J F Thisse (eds). Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics, Vol. 4: Cities and Geography. Amsterdam, Elsevier: 2063-2117.
- Government of India (GoI) (2013): Draft Revised Regional Plan 2021 National Capital Region, National Capital Region Planning Board, Ministry of Urban Development, New Delhi, accessed on 10 June 2014 from http://ncrpb.nic.in/pdf_files/Draft%20Revised%20Regional%20Plan%202021/06%20Chapter%204%20Demographic%20Profile%20and%20Settlement%20Pattern-26%20july%202013.pdf.
- Institute for Human Development (IHD) (2014): "India Labour and Employment Report 2014: Workers in the Era of Globalization", Academic Foundation & Institute for Human Development, New Delhi. Available from <http://www.ihdindia.org/ILER.html>, accessed on 3rd March, 2015.
- Indian Institute for Human Settlements (IIHS) (2012): "Urban India 2011: Evidence", Bangalore, India, accessed on 5 June 2013 from ihs.co.in/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/IUC-Book.pdf.
- Krugman, P (1991): "Increasing Returns and Economic Geography", Journal of Political Economy, 99(3): 483-499.
- Maiti, M (2015): "Understanding the Employment challenges in India", International Research Journal of Social Sciences, 4(1): 1-8.
- McKinsey Global Institute (MGI) (2010): India's Urban Awakening: Building Inclusive Cities, Sustaining Economic Growth (San Francisco, CA: McKinsey Global Institute, April), accessed on 5 November 2012 from www.mckinsey.com/mgi/publications/india_urbanization/index.asp.
- Mehrotra S, J Parida, S Sinha and A Gandhi (2014): "Explaining employment trends in the Indian economy: 1993-94 to 2011-12", Economic and Political Weekly, 49 (32): 49-57.
- Papola, T S and P P Sahu (2012): "Growth and structure of employment in India long-term and post-reform performance and the emerging challenge", Institute for Studies in Industrial Development, New Delhi, available at http://isidev.nic.in/pdf/ICSSR_TSP_PPS.pdf, accessed on 5th may 2014.
- Ramaswamy, K V and T Agrawal (2012): Services-led Growth, Employment, Skill, and Job Quality: A Study of Manufacturing and Service Sectors in Urban India. In M. Dev (eds). India Development Report 2012-13, New Delhi, Oxford University Press: 116-131.
- Shaw, A (2013): "Employment Trends in India: An Overview of NSSO's 68th Round", Economic and Political Weekly, 48 (42): 23-25.
- Tripathi, S (2013): "Do large agglomerations lead to economic growth? Evidence from urban India", Review of Urban and Regional Development Studies, 25 (3): 176-200.
- United Nations (UN) (2014): World Urbanization Prospects: The 2014 Revision, Highlights, New York, United Nations, Population Database, Population Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, accessed on 15 June 2014 from <http://esa.un.org/unpd/wup/Highlights/WUP2014-Highlights.pdf>.