

Chapter Four:

Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Socio Economic Background of the Respondents:

4.1: Introduction:

Despite the presence of a fat employment in Manipur, the economy is not free from unemployment problem. What is Socio-Economic background?

The social economic background is the relationship between the social activities and economics that study the influence of respondent's behavior to examine potential results. It examines the social and economic factors to better understand the issues facing the community that how they grow up. Socioeconomic describe the total size of the sample through sex, age group, number of families, type of household, education level, income level, marital status, occupation etc. The difference in socioeconomic status is a cause for fear of today as it is increasing throughout the world.

This chapter seeks to discover the socio-economic background of the unemployed youth, the factors responsible for unemployment in the study area. In social sciences, research personnel and social description of respondents have a very important role to play to understand any social problem. Hence the present chapter deals with socio-economic conditions in terms of the family background of the respondents, personal summary, educational, economic and occupational background of the respondents. The aim of the present chapter is to see if the socioeconomic background of the respondents and the patterns of unemployment have any correlation which will help us to understand the core of the crisis. The information for this study was collected through interview schedule and was analyzed.

Table 4.1: Sex of the respondents.

Sex	Block						Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Male	Frequency	85	46	59	47	147	384
	% within sex	22.1%	12.0%	15.4%	12.2%	38.3%	100.0%
	% within block	70.8%	57.5%	73.8%	58.8%	61.3%	64.0%
Female	Frequency	35	34	21	33	93	216
	% within sex	16.2%	15.7%	9.7%	15.3%	43.1%	100.0%
	% within block	29.2%	42.5%	26.3%	41.3%	38.8%	36.0%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% within sex	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data reveals that 64.0% of the educated youth respondents fall under male category while the next 36.0% of the respondents are female.

When we look at the distribution of the respondents on the basis of sex block-wise, Kasom has the maximum respondents from the male side (73.8%) followed by Chengai (70.8%), Ukhrul (61.3%), Phungyar (58.8%) and finally Kamjong (57.5%). When we see the percentage of respondents from the female side, Kamjong has the highest respondents (42%) followed by Phungyar (41.3%), Ukhrul (38.8%), Chengai (29.2%), and finally Kasom (26.3%).

Hence, after looking the table, we can observe that majority of the respondents in all the blocks are male. As the study is conducted using convenient sampling due to the impediment of not finding the unemployed in a particular place always.

Table 4.2: Age group of the respondents.

Age		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
20-25	Frequency	30	25	13	20	71	159
	% within age	18.9%	15.7%	8.2%	12.6%	44.7%	100.0%
	% within block	25.0%	31.3%	16.3%	25.0%	29.6%	26.5%
26-30	Frequency	54	40	43	39	117	293
	% within age	18.4%	13.7%	14.7%	13.3%	39.9%	100.0%
	% within block	45.0%	50.0%	53.8%	48.8%	48.8%	48.8%
31-35	Frequency	21	9	24	16	38	108
	% within age	19.4%	8.3%	22.2%	14.8%	35.2%	100.0%
	% within block	17.5%	11.3%	30.0%	20.0%	15.8%	18.0%
36-38	Frequency	15	6	0	5	14	40
	% within age	37.5%	15.0%	.0%	12.5%	35.0%	100.0%
	% within block	12.5%	7.5%	.0%	6.3%	5.8%	6.7%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% within age	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The above table of the age group of the respondents shows that 48.8% of them are from 26 -30 age group, followed by 20-25 (26.5%), 31-35 (18.0%) and finally 36 – 40 age groups (6.7%).

Looking at the table from the block-wise, the age group of 20-25 with the highest percent falls in the Kamjong block with 31.3% followed by Ukhrul block with 29.6%, and 25.0% each from Chengai and Kamjong and the minimum percent from Kasom block. For the age group of 26-30, the highest age group is found in Kasom block with 53.8%, followed by Kamjong block with 50.0% whereas Phungyar and Ukhrul has a percent of 48.8% each and finally Chengai block has the minimum rate number with 45.0%. For the age group of 31-35, Kasom has the leading percent with 30.0% followed by Phungyar with 20.0%, Chengai 17.5%, Ukhrul 15.8% and Kamjong 11.3%. Finally, for the age group of 36-40, chengai has the highest percent with 12.5 followed by Kamjong 7.5%, Phungyar 6.3, Ukhrul 5.8% and finally Kasom with 0%.

Hence, the rationale for the respondents belonging from diverse age groups in the different block can be associated with again the using of convenient sampling in the study due to the impediment of not finding the unemployed in a particular place always.

Table 4.3: Numbers of family members.

No of family members		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
2-4	Frequency	28	15	24	19	54	140
	% No of members	20.0%	10.7%	17.1%	13.6%	38.6%	100.0%
	% within block	23.3%	18.8%	30.0%	23.8%	22.5%	23.3%
5-7	Frequency	77	58	47	50	146	378
	% No of members	20.4%	15.3%	12.4%	13.2%	38.6%	100.0%
	% within block	64.2%	72.5%	58.8%	62.5%	60.8%	63.0%
8-10	Frequency	15	5	9	10	40	79
	% No of members	19.0%	6.3%	11.4%	12.7%	50.6%	100.0%
	% within block	12.5%	6.3%	11.3%	12.5%	16.7%	13.2%
Above 10	Frequency	0	2	0	1	0	3
	% No of members	.0%	66.7%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%
	% within block	.0%	2.5%	.0%	1.3%	.0%	.5%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% No of members	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The highest number of the respondents (63%) has 5-7 members in their family, followed by 2-4 family members (23.3%), 8-10 members (13.2%) and finally for 10 and above family members (0.5%).

It can be revealed that 2-4 number of family members are mostly found in Kasom block (30.0%), Phungyar (23.8%), Chengai (23.3%), Ukhrul (22.5%) and Kamjong

(18.8%). 5-7 number of family members can be seen mostly in Kamjong block (72.5%) followed by Chengai (64.2%), Phungyar (62.5%), Ukhrul (60.8%) and Kasom (58.8%). 8-10 numbers of family members can be termed as a large family and which leads to Ukhrul (16.7%) comes next with Chengai and Phungyar block with (12.5%), and finally Kamjong (6.3%). Finally, a large number of family members with above 10 can be seen from the data that Kamjong has (2.5%) followed by Phungyar (1.3%), whereas Chengai, Kasom and Kamjong block with (0%).

It can be deduced from the table that that in all the blocks most of the respondents have 5-7, followed by 2-4 and a significant number of them have 8-10 family members. Therefore though nuclear families are coming up in the area but joint families is still the predominant family structure in the study area.

Table 4.4: Type of household.

Type of household		Block					
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	Total
Pucca	Frequency	2	4	1	3	22	32
	% within household	6.3%	12.5%	3.1%	9.4%	68.8%	100.0%
	% within block	1.7%	5.0%	1.3%	3.8%	9.2%	5.3%
Semi Pacca	Frequency	61	38	37	39	141	316
	% within household	19.3%	12.0%	11.7%	12.3%	44.6%	100.0%
	% within block	50.8%	47.5%	46.3%	48.8%	58.8%	52.7%
Katcha	Frequency	57	38	42	38	77	252
	% within household	22.6%	15.1%	16.7%	15.1%	30.6%	100.0%
	% within block	47.5%	47.5%	52.5%	47.5%	32.1%	42.0%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% within household	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The study further reveals that the type of household of the educated unemployed youth is in the standard of not too high neither not too low. It can be seen from the above

table that majority of the respondents (52.7%) have Semi pacca type of household followed by katcha house 42% and finally Pacca houses 5.3%.

When checked from block-wise, the table reveals similar trends as in almost all the blocks maximum number of respondents are living in semi-pucca house, the only exception is the Kasom block where the majority of the respondents are residing in katcha houses. Moreover, though the number of respondents who are staying in pucca houses is negligible but among them, Ukhrul block has the maximum Pacca houses.

Therefore, it can be summed up from the table that Ukhrul block has a comparatively better pattern of living than the other blocks.

Table 4.5: Educational Level of Respondents.

Education		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
PhD	Frequency	1	2	1	1	7	12
	% within edu	8.3%	16.7%	8.3%	8.3%	58.3%	100.0%
	% within block	.8%	2.5%	1.3%	1.3%	2.9%	2.0%
Master (PG)	Frequency	32	20	28	34	66	180
	% within edu	17.8%	11.1%	15.6%	18.9%	36.7%	100.0%
	% within block	26.7%	25.0%	35.0%	42.5%	27.5%	30.0%
Bachelor	Frequency	67	44	43	37	133	324
	% within edu	20.7%	13.6%	13.3%	11.4%	41.0%	100.0%
	% within block	55.8%	55.0%	53.8%	46.3%	55.4%	54.0%
10+2	Frequency	20	14	8	8	34	84
	% within edu	23.8%	16.7%	9.5%	9.5%	40.5%	100.0%
	% within block	16.7%	17.5%	10.0%	10.0%	14.2%	14.0%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% within edu	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

Based on the response from the educated youth, the data shows that the educational level of the respondents is quite high. Majority of the educated youth has complete their bachelor degree (54.0%) followed by master degree (30.0%), Higher Secondary 10+2 with (14%) and Ph.D. with (2%) in the study area.

It is revealed from the data that Ph.D. in Ukhrul block has (2.9%) followed by (2.5%) Kamjong, Kasom, and Phungyar block (1.3%) and Chengai (0.8%).

Educated youth with Master degree can be seen more (42.5%) in Phungyar block followed by Kasom 35.0%, Ukhrul 27.5%, Chengai 26.7% and Kamjong 25.0%. In case of Bachelor degree almost all the blocks have a similar share of the respondents who have the degree i.e. around 55% only with the exception of Phungyar (46.3%). As well as for the higher secondary level, it can be seen from the data that Kamjong has the highest share (17.5%), Chengai 16.7% Ukhrul 14.2%, Kasom and Phungyar 10.0% each.

It can be understood that Phungyar is performing better with a significant share of its respondents are having Masters Degree (42.5%), followed by Kasom block (35%), followed by Ukhrul as the majority of its members are having graduation degree (55.4%).

Table 4.6: Language known by the respondents.

Language Known		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Manipuri+ English	Frequency	6	3	3	2	8	22
	% of language known	27.3%	13.6%	13.6%	9.1%	36.4%	100.0%
	% within Block	5.0%	3.8%	3.8%	2.5%	3.3%	3.7%
Manipuri+ Hindi	Frequency	1	1	0	1	5	8
	% of language known	12.5%	12.5%	.0%	12.5%	62.5%	100.0%
	% within Block	.8%	1.3%	.0%	1.3%	2.1%	1.3%
Manipuri+ Hindi+ English	Frequency	113	76	77	77	227	570
	% of language known	19.8%	13.3%	13.5%	13.5%	39.8%	100.0%
	% within Block	94.2%	95.0%	96.3%	96.3%	94.6%	95.0%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of language known	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within Block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

In response to the question as depicted in the Table, majority of the respondents (95%) are multilingual who knows Manipuri, Hindi, and English. Whereas 3.7% of

respondents know Manipuri and English and lastly, 1.3% of the respondents know only Manipuri and Hindi.

Further exploration of the table reveals that almost in all the blocks we can observe similar trend as the majority of the respondents have command over Manipuri, Hindi, and English. We can summarise from the figure that, the majority of the educated youth which has responded in the schedule have exposure of other community people and places which is reflected in their knowledge of different languages.

Table 4.7: Reasons for discontinuing of studies.

Reasons for discontinued of studies		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhruil	
Finished course	Frequency	15	18	14	14	69	130
	% discontinued	11.5%	13.8%	10.8%	10.8%	53.1%	100.0%
	% within block	12.5%	22.5%	17.5%	17.5%	28.8%	21.7%
Failed examination	Frequency	7	3	5	10	17	42
	% discontinued	16.7%	7.1%	11.9%	23.8%	40.5%	100.0%
	% within block	5.8%	3.8%	6.3%	12.5%	7.1%	7.0%
Did not enjoy schooling	Frequency	4	4	1	2	5	16
	% discontinued	25.0%	25.0%	6.3%	12.5%	31.3%	100.0%
	% within block	3.3%	5.0%	1.3%	2.5%	2.1%	2.7%
Wanted to start working as finished course	Frequency	71	30	51	39	111	302
	% discontinued	23.5%	9.9%	16.9%	12.9%	36.8%	100.0%
	% within block	59.2%	37.5%	63.8%	48.8%	46.3%	50.3%
Parents did not want you to continue schooling	Frequency	7	2	2	3	3	17
	% discontinued	41.2%	11.8%	11.8%	17.6%	17.6%	100.0%
	% within block	5.8%	2.5%	2.5%	3.8%	1.3%	2.8%
Economic reasons	Frequency	1	0	1	2	0	4
	% discontinued	25.0%	.0%	25.0%	50.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within block	.8%	.0%	1.3%	2.5%	.0%	.7%
Education don't guarantees job	Frequency	15	23	6	10	35	89
	% discontinued	16.9%	25.8%	6.7%	11.2%	39.3%	100.0%
	% within block	12.5%	28.8%	7.5%	12.5%	14.6%	14.8%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% discontinued	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

As indicated in the table, the data shows that 50.3% discontinued their education as they finished their course and want to start working after that. Moreover, 21.7% discontinued from studies as they finished their course/studies, there are 14.8% that who opted to discontinue their education as they believe it doesn't guarantee job. There are 7.0% who discontinued their education as they failed their examination, whereas, 2.8% discontinued their education because their parents did not want them to continue schooling and 2.7% discontinued because they do not enjoy schooling and finally, 0.7% discontinued from studies due to economic reason.

The distribution of the data in block-wise reveals that in all the blocks the reason given by the respondents from discontinued of studies is that they wanted to start working as finished course and as they have finished the course. But only in Kamjong block, we can observe that together with wanted to start working as finished course a significant number of the respondents also gives a reason as education doesn't guarantee job.

It is evident from the table that majority of the youth discontinued from studies as they finished their course and want to start working it is understood from the table that 50.3% wanted to start working. Moreover, the data also reveals that there is no motivation in the youths to go for higher education as they are mostly confining themselves to graduation to post-graduation.

Table 4.8: Educational qualification of father.

Qualification of Father		Block					Total
		Cheng ai	Kamjo ng	Kasom	Phungy ar	Ukhrul	
No schooling	Frequency	14	9	2	9	21	55
	% of father qualification	25.5%	16.4%	3.6%	16.4%	38.2%	100.0%
	% within block	11.7%	11.3%	2.5%	11.3%	8.8%	9.2%
Elementary education	Frequency	42	13	21	21	61	158
	% of father qualification	26.6%	8.2%	13.3%	13.3%	38.6%	100.0%
	% within block	35.0%	16.3%	26.3%	26.3%	25.4%	26.3%
Secondary education	Frequency	2	6	1	5	5	19
	% of father qualification	10.5%	31.6%	5.3%	26.3%	26.3%	100.0%
	% within block	1.7%	7.5%	1.3%	6.3%	2.1%	3.2%
Higher Secondary	Frequency	24	30	30	19	68	171
	% of father qualification	14.0%	17.5%	17.5%	11.1%	39.8%	100.0%
	% within block	20.0%	37.5%	37.5%	23.8%	28.3%	28.5%
Graduation	Frequency	29	14	26	20	63	152
	% of father qualification	19.1%	9.2%	17.1%	13.2%	41.4%	100.0%
	% within block	24.2%	17.5%	32.5%	25.0%	26.3%	25.3%
Post-graduate studies	Frequency	9	8	0	6	22	45
	% of father qualification	20.0%	17.8%	.0%	13.3%	48.9%	100.0%
	% within block	7.5%	10.0%	.0%	7.5%	9.2%	7.5%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of father qualification	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

In response to the question of the educational qualification of the respondents father as depicted in table for overall status, maximum number of the respondents' father have secondary school degree (28.5%), followed by graduation (25.35), elementary education (26.3%), no schooling (9.2%), postgraduates (7.5%), and finally, vocational education with 3.2%.

When we reduce the data block-wise we can observe that in Kasom and majority of the respondents' father's education background is good with 70% of the respondents

father in Kasom are having either graduation or higher secondary degree, followed by the Phungyar block where more than half of the respondents father in Kasom are having either graduation or higher secondary degree. The worst two blocks in this category are Ukhrol block with more than one-third of the respondents' father are either illiterate or just have an elementary education. Similarly in Chengai block more than half of the respondents' father are either illiterate or just have an elementary education.

Hence the table reveals diversity in father's educational background rather than the respondents' background.

Table 4.9: Educational qualification of mother.

Qualification of Mother		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
No schooling	Frequency	24	22	13	20	34	113
	% of mother qualification	21.2%	19.5%	11.5%	17.7%	30.1%	100.0%
	% within block	20.0%	27.5%	16.3%	25.0%	14.2%	18.8%
Elementary education	Frequency	46	15	24	20	65	170
	% of mother qualification	27.1%	8.8%	14.1%	11.8%	38.2%	100.0%
	% within block	38.3%	18.8%	30.0%	25.0%	27.1%	28.3%
Vocational education	Frequency	7	1	1	3	12	24
	% of mother qualification	29.2%	4.2%	4.2%	12.5%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within block	5.8%	1.3%	1.3%	3.8%	5.0%	4.0%
Secondary school	Frequency	23	23	29	20	59	154
	% of mother qualification	14.9%	14.9%	18.8%	13.0%	38.3%	100.0%
	% within block	19.2%	28.8%	36.3%	25.0%	24.6%	25.7%
University	Frequency	18	19	9	17	58	121
	% of mother qualification	14.9%	15.7%	7.4%	14.0%	47.9%	100.0%
	% within block	15.0%	23.8%	11.3%	21.3%	24.2%	20.2%
Post-graduate studies	Frequency	2	0	4	0	12	18
	% of mother qualification	11.1%	.0%	22.2%	.0%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within block	1.7%	.0%	5.0%	.0%	5.0%	3.0%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of mother qualification	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

According to the data, the educational qualification of the respondents mother, most of them have Elementary Education (28.3%), followed by higher secondary degree

(25.7%), University 20.2%, as many as 18.8% of them are illiterate, 4.0% of them have vocational education while 2.5% of them have postgraduate degree.

The available data from the educational qualification that is in the category of Higher Secondary Schools has (36.3%) in Kasom, Kamjong (28.8%), Phungyar (25.0%), Ukhurul (24.6%) and Chengai (24.6%). No schooling shows that Kamjong has the maximum of (27.5%) followed by Phungyar (25.0%), Chengai (20.0%), Kasom (16.3%), Ukhurul (14.2%). In the category of elementary education, Chengai heads (38.3%), followed by Kasom (30.0%), Ukhurul (27.1%), Phungyar (25.0%), Kamjong (18.8%).

It can be seen from the data that majority of the respondent's mother qualification falls in the category of elementary education followed and secondary school and university, while a significant share of them are illiterate (18.8%). Hence in the mothers' educational background, the study area is not performing very well.

Table 4.10: Occupation of the father of the respondents.

Occupation		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Professional technical and related worker	Frequency	12	3	4	4	12	35
	% father occupation	34.3%	8.6%	11.4%	11.4%	34.3%	100.0%
	% within block	10.0%	3.8%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.8%
Administrative, Managerial	Frequency	8	7	12	9	20	56
	% father occupation	14.3%	12.5%	21.4%	16.1%	35.7%	100.0%
	% within block	6.7%	8.8%	15.0%	11.3%	8.3%	9.3%
Clerical and related worker	Frequency	9	5	3	6	12	35
	% father occupation	25.7%	14.3%	8.6%	17.1%	34.3%	100.0%
	% within block	7.5%	6.3%	3.8%	7.5%	5.0%	5.8%
Sales	Frequency	8	0	1	0	14	23
	% father occupation	34.8%	.0%	4.3%	.0%	60.9%	100.0%
	% within block	6.7%	.0%	1.3%	.0%	5.8%	3.8%
Agricultural worker	Frequency	58	43	48	44	101	294
	% father occupation	19.7%	14.6%	16.3%	15.0%	34.4%	100.0%
	% within block	48.3%	53.8%	60.0%	55.0%	42.1%	49.0%
Factory/production worker	Frequency	0	1	0	0	0	1
	% father occupation	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within block	.0%	1.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.2%
Government/public sector worker	Frequency	10	6	5	4	55	80
	% father occupation	12.5%	7.5%	6.3%	5.0%	68.8%	100.0%
	% within block	8.3%	7.5%	6.3%	5.0%	22.9%	13.3%
Armed forces	Frequency	12	11	5	9	20	57
	% father occupation	21.1%	19.3%	8.8%	15.8%	35.1%	100.0%
	% within block	10.0%	13.8%	6.3%	11.3%	8.3%	9.5%
Home-based worker/subcontractor	Frequency	1	1	1	1	4	8
	% father occupation	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within block	.8%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	1.7%	1.3%
Unpaid family worker	Frequency	1	1	0	2	1	5
	% father occupation	20.0%	20.0%	.0%	40.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	% within block	.8%	1.3%	.0%	2.5%	.4%	.8%
Housework	Frequency	1	2	1	1	1	6
	% father occupation	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%	16.7%	16.7%	100.0%
	% within block	.8%	2.5%	1.3%	1.3%	.4%	1.0%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% father occupation	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

It is revealed from the data that the highest share in the occupation of respondents father lies in the category of agriculture worker (49.0%), followed by government/public sector worker (13.3%), armed forces (9.5%), administrative (9.3%).

When categorised it block wise, agriculture worker has the maximum percent in Kasom (60.0%) followed by Kamjong (53.8%), Phungyar (55.0%), Chengai (48.3%), Ukhrul (42.1%), whereas on the other occupation of Armed force, Ukhrul block leads with (22.9%) followed by Chengai (8.3%), Kamjong (7.5%), Kasom (6.3%) and finally Phungyar with (5.0%) with a least percent in armed force. For Government/public sector worker, Ukhrul share is the most (22.9%) followed by Chengai (8.3%), Kamjong (7.5%), Kasom (6.3%), and Phungyar (5.0%).

As indicated in the table, majority of the respondents' father are agriculturist worker in the area and as the condition of agriculture in the district is not very optimistic, it tells about the economic status of the respondents' family which also plays a negative role in getting suitable employment opportunity for the respondents in the area.

Table 4.11: Occupations of your mother of the respondents.

Occupation		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Professional technical and related worker	Frequency	6	3	4	2	12	27
	% of mother occupation	22.2%	11.1%	14.8%	7.4%	44.4%	100.0%
	% within block	5.0%	3.8%	5.0%	2.5%	5.0%	4.5%
Administrative, managerial	Frequency	5	4	1	1	6	17
	% of mother occupation	29.4%	23.5%	5.9%	5.9%	35.3%	100.0%
	% within block	4.2%	5.0%	1.3%	1.3%	2.5%	2.8%
Clerical and related worker	Frequency	7	7	6	5	15	40
	% of mother occupation	17.5%	17.5%	15.0%	12.5%	37.5%	100.0%
	% within block	5.8%	8.8%	7.5%	6.3%	6.3%	6.7%
Sales	Frequency	9	3	4	4	15	35
	% of mother occupation	25.7%	8.6%	11.4%	11.4%	42.9%	100.0%
	% within block	7.5%	3.8%	5.0%	5.0%	6.3%	5.8%
Agricultural worker	Frequency	49	31	34	30	73	217
	% of mother occupation	22.6%	14.3%	15.7%	13.8%	33.6%	100.0%
	% within block	40.8%	38.8%	42.5%	37.5%	30.4%	36.2%
Factory/production worker	Frequency	1	1	1	1	3	7
	% of mother occupation	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%	42.9%	100.0%
	% within block	1.8%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	1.2%
Government/public sector worker	Frequency	7	3	6	5	18	39
	% of mother occupation	17.9%	7.7%	15.4%	12.8%	46.2%	100.0%
	% within block	5.8%	3.8%	7.5%	6.3%	7.5%	6.5%
Armed forces	Frequency	0	0	0	1	0	1
	% of mother occupation	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	% within block	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.2%
Housework	Frequency	36	28	24	31	98	217
	% of mother occupation	16.6%	12.9%	11.1%	14.3%	45.2%	100.0%
	% within block	30.0%	35.0%	30.0%	38.8%	40.8%	36.22%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of mother occupation	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

In the overall analysis from the data, the occupation of the respondent's mother can be seen from the data that 36.22% are engaged in housework whereas 36.2% of the respondent's mothers are into agriculture work to which it is totally dependent. On the

other side, clerical and related worker are into 6.7% whereas there are 6.5% who are into the work with the Government/public sector worker. Sales occupation comes with 5.8% in the overall, and on the other hand, there are 4.5% who are in the field of professional or technical. There are 2.8% of the Administrative/managerial that is engaged in the occupation too. Factory production worker is also available with 1.2% too. Finally, there is respondent's mother who works in a defense. The percentage comes with 0.2% that worked in armed force.

The data presented in above Table gives a clear picture of the block too. The housework within the block is lead by Ukhrol 40.8%, followed by Phungyar (38.8%), Kamjong (35.0%), and the two blocks namely Chengai and Kasom (30.0%). Agriculture worker within the block has the highest percentage in Kasom (42.5%) followed by Chengai (40.8%), Kamjong (38.8%), Phungyar (37.5%), Ukhrol (30.4%). Within the block of the Clerical and related worker, it is lead by Kamjong (8.8%) followed by Kasom (7.5%), Phungyar & Ukhrol (6.3%) each and lastly by Chengai (5.8%) within the block. Government or public sector worker within the block of respondents mother comes (7.5%) from two blocks of Kasom & Ukhrol, followed by Phungyar (6.3%), Chengai (5.8%) and Kamjong (3.8%).

It can be analyzed from the overall figure that a maximum number of respondents mother are homemakers and agriculture workers.

Table 4.12: Type of job looked by the respondents.

Sort of looking for job		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Manual job	Frequency	29	17	20	19	60	145
	% of looking for job.	20.0%	11.7%	13.8%	13.1%	41.4%	100.0%
	% within block	24.2%	21.3%	25.0%	23.8%	25.0%	24.2%
Clerical	Frequency	1	3	1	3	8	16
	% of looking for job.	6.3%	18.8%	6.3%	18.8%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within block	.8%	3.8%	1.3%	3.8%	3.3%	2.7%
Technical	Frequency	5	6	1	1	14	27
	% of looking for job.	18.5%	22.2%	3.7%	3.7%	51.9%	100.0%
	% within block	4.2%	7.5%	1.3%	1.3%	5.8%	4.5%
Administrative	Frequency	49	23	38	44	65	219
	% of looking for job.	22.4%	10.5%	17.4%	20.1%	29.7%	100.0%
	% within block	40.8%	28.8%	47.5%	55.0%	27.1%	36.5%
Managerial job	Frequency	4	4	0	4	15	27
	% of looking for job.	14.8%	14.8%	.0%	14.8%	55.6%	100.0%
	% within block	3.3%	5.0%	.0%	5.0%	6.3%	4.5%
Professional job	Frequency	32	27	20	9	78	166
	% of looking for job.	19.3%	16.3%	12.0%	5.4%	47.0%	100.0%
	% within block	26.7%	33.8%	25.0%	11.3%	32.5%	27.7%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of looking for job.	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

It is revealed from the table that the largest percentage of the educated youths who are looking for job wants to be in an administrative positions (36.5%) which is closely to professional job (27.7%), followed by manual job (24.2%) whereas the share of respondents who want to do technical job and managerial job (4.5%) together with clerical job (2.7%) is fewer.

Hence from the table, it can be seen from the table that maximum educated youths preferred on the administrative job within the block are from Phungyar (55.0%) followed by Kasom (47.5%), Chengai (40.8%), Kamjong (28.8%) and lastly by Ukhrul (27.1%). It is also found that professional job is preferred by job seekers with 27.7% within the block and most of them are from Kamjong (33.8%) followed by Ukhrul (32.5%), Chengai (26.7%), Kasom (25.0%) and finally Phungyar (11.3%). It also revealed from the data that there is youth who are looking for a Manual job, (25.0%) are from Ukhrul & Kasom followed by Chengai (24.2%), Phungyar (23.8%) and the remaining percent by Kamjong (21.3%).

Hence, more unemployed educated youth are inclined towards administrative and professional job but these categories of jobs are generated in the state. Moreover, it also speaks about the society there which is still attaching more status with this category of jobs and neglecting entrepreneurship endeavors and private jobs.

Table 4.13: Most important goal of respondents' life.

Goal in your life		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Being successful in work	Frequency	38	30	34	49	70	221
	% of goal in life	17.2%	13.6%	15.4%	22.2%	31.7%	100.0%
	% within block	31.7%	37.5%	42.5%	61.3%	29.2%	36.8%
Making contribution to society	Frequency	30	9	13	13	48	113
	% of goal in life	26.5%	8.0%	11.5%	11.5%	42.5%	100.0%
	% within block	25.0%	11.3%	16.3%	16.3%	20.0%	18.8%
Participating in local community affairs	Frequency	6	0	5	1	6	18
	% of goal in life	33.3%	.0%	27.8%	5.6%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within block	5.0%	.0%	6.3%	1.3%	2.5%	3.0%
Upholding religious faith	Frequency	6	1	1	1	6	15
	% of goal in life	40.0%	6.7%	6.7%	6.7%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	5.0%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	2.5%	2.5%
Having lots of money	Frequency	3	11	9	3	15	41
	% of goal in life	7.3%	26.8%	22.0%	7.3%	36.6%	100.0%
	% within block	2.5%	13.8%	11.3%	3.8%	6.3%	6.8%
Having a good family life	Frequency	13	16	9	6	55	99
	% of goal in life	13.1%	16.2%	9.1%	6.1%	55.6%	100.0%
	% within block	10.8%	20.0%	11.3%	7.5%	22.9%	16.5%
Having leisure time	Frequency	3	2	5	0	3	13
	% of goal in life	23.1%	15.4%	38.5%	.0%	23.1%	100.0%
	% within block	2.5%	2.5%	6.3%	.0%	1.3%	2.2%
Having a lot of different experiences	Frequency	6	4	1	2	7	20
	% of goal in life	30.0%	20.0%	5.0%	10.0%	35.0%	100.0%
	% within block	5.0%	5.0%	1.3%	2.5%	2.9%	3.3%
Finding purpose and meaning in life	Frequency	9	6	1	3	26	45
	% of goal in life	20.0%	13.3%	2.2%	6.7%	57.8%	100.0%
	% within block	7.5%	7.5%	1.3%	3.8%	10.8%	7.5%
Building self-esteem and confidence, and finding personal fulfillment	Frequency	6	1	2	2	4	15
	% of goal in life	40.0%	6.7%	13.3%	13.3%	26.7%	100.0%
	% within block	5.0%	1.3%	2.5%	2.5%	1.7%	2.5%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of goal in life	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The study reveals that most important goal of the educated youths in the area that has completed their studies have an emphasis on being successful in work (36.8%) followed by making a contribution to society (18.8%). It is also come up from the study that a significant section of the respondents' goal is having a good family life

(16.5%), followed by finding purpose and meaning in life (7.5%) whereas there are other youths that dreams to have lots of money (6.8%)..

The data from the educated youth within the block whose motto is being successful in work is lead from the block of Phungyar (61.3%) followed by Kasom (42.5%), Kamjong (37.5%), Chengai (31.7%) and finally comes from the Ukhurul block (29.2%). Making a contribution to society, Chengai block heads (25.0%) followed by Ukhurul (20.0%), Kasom & Phungyar (16.3%) each and the remaining percent got it by Kamjong (11.3%). Having a good family life is lead by Ukhurul block (22.9%), followed by Kamjong (20.0%), Kasom (11.3%), Chengai (10.8%) and Phungyar (7.5%). Finding purpose and meaning in life as a goal by few educated youth respondents falls into an Ukhurul (10.8%) followed by Chengai & Kamjong block (7.5%), Phungyar (3.8%) and Kasom with (1.3%).

Hence, it can be established from the above table that being successful in work is one of the main goals from the educated respondents.

Table 4.14: Mismatch of educational qualification and the labor market is the reason for unemployed.

Mismatch of profession and labor market		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhurul	
Yes	Frequency	64	28	46	46	97	281
	% of mismatch	22.8%	10.0%	16.4%	16.4%	34.5%	100.0%
	% within block	53.3%	35.0%	57.5%	57.5%	40.4%	46.8%
No	Frequency	56	52	34	34	143	319
	% of mismatch	17.6%	16.3%	10.7%	10.7%	44.8%	100.0%
	% within block	46.7%	65.0%	42.5%	42.5%	59.6%	53.2%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of mismatch	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

It is observed from the table more than half of the youth (53.2%) don't believe that there is a mismatch in their profession and the demand of the labor market which kept them unemployed whereas a significant proportion (46.8%) agreed with it.

The respondents, who agreed with the mismatch of the profession and the labor market's demand, are mostly from Kasom & Phungyar (57.5%) each followed by Chengai (53.3%) Ukhurul (40.4%) and final touch followed by Kamjong 35.0%. On the other hand, the respondents who do not agree with the existence of the mismatch of the profession and the labor market's demand are mostly from Kamjong (65.0%) followed by Ukhurul (59.6%), Chengai (46.7%) whereas Kasom and Phungyar (42.5%) each.

Therefore, it can conclude here that existence of a belief of the mismatch between the profession and the labor market demand is clearly visible from the data.

Table 4.15: Quality of education as the cause of the educated youths' unemployment.

Quality of education responsible for youth unemployment.		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhurul	
Yes	Frequency	65	43	55	58	121	342
	% quality of education, the caused youth unemployment	19.0%	12.6%	16.1%	17.0%	35.4%	100.0%
	% within block	54.2%	53.8%	68.8%	72.5%	50.4%	57.0%
No	Frequency	55	37	25	22	119	258
	% quality of education, the caused youth unemployment	21.3%	14.3%	9.7%	8.5%	46.1%	100.0%
	% within block	45.8%	46.3%	31.3%	27.5%	49.6%	43.0%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% quality of education, the caused youth unemployment	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

According to the information in the figure that is collected from the respondents, the majority of the educated youth (57.0%) think that quality of education is the caused for them remaining unemployed.

Majority of the respondents who believe that education is the caused for the educated youth's unemployment are mostly from Phungyar (72.5%), followed by Kasom (68.8%), Chengai (54.2%), Kamjong (53.8%) and Ukhurul (50.4%). Whereas on the other side, there is youth who think that education is not the caused for educated youth's unemployment are mostly from Ukhurul (49.6%), followed by Kamjong (46.3%), Chengai (45.8%), Kasom (31.3%) and Phungyar (27.5%).

Hence it can observe here larger share of the sampled educated youths are not satisfied with the present educational system.

Table 4.16: Source of money for the respondents.

Source of Money		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhurul	
My regular job	Frequency	26	12	26	17	44	125
	% source of money	20.8%	9.6%	20.8%	13.6%	35.2%	100.0%
	% within block	21.7%	15.0%	32.5%	21.3%	18.3%	20.8%
Unemployment or social security benefits	Frequency	3	1	1	3	6	14
	% source of money	21.4%	7.1%	7.1%	21.4%	42.9%	100.0%
	% within block	2.5%	1.3%	1.3%	3.8%	2.5%	2.3%
Training allowance or educational grant	Frequency	1	0	1	0	3	5
	% source of money	20.0%	.0%	20.0%	.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	% within block	.8%	.0%	1.3%	.0%	1.3%	.8%
My parents and family	Frequency	88	61	49	57	173	428
	% source of money	20.6%	14.3%	11.4%	13.3%	40.4%	100.0%
	% within block	73.3%	76.3%	61.3%	71.3%	72.1%	71.3%
Drug trafficking	Frequency	2	6	3	3	14	28
	% source of money	7.1%	21.4%	10.7%	10.7%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within block	1.7%	7.5%	3.8%	3.8%	5.8%	4.7%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% source of money	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The available data shows that 71.3% educated unemployed youth get money for their expenditure and any other purpose from their parents and family whereas 20.8% of the educated youth get it from their regular job. The source of money from parents and family comes with a big percent that most of the youth still depends. Kamjong (76.3%), Ukhrul (73.3%), Phungyar (71.3%), Chengai (72.1%), Kasom (61.3%). It can be seen that the youth from regular job Kasom (32.5%), Chengai (21.7%), Phungyar (21.3%), Ukhrul (18.3%) and Kamjong (15.0%). From drug trafficking, Kamjong leads with (7.5%), Ukhrul (5.8%), Kasom & Phungyar (3.8%) and Chengai (1.7%).

It can be understood from the table that majority of the youth though they completed their studies are still depended on their parents and family members for their daily expense.

Table 4.17: Household Consumption Pattern.

Household Consumption Pattern		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Very High	Frequency	0	2	0	0	11	13
	% within HCP	.0%	15.4%	.0%	.0%	84.6%	100.0%
	% within block	.0%	2.5%	.0%	.0%	4.6%	2.2%
High	Frequency	4	3	10	0	14	31
	% within HCP	12.9%	9.7%	32.3%	.0%	45.2%	100.0%
	% within block	3.3%	3.8%	12.5%	.0%	5.8%	5.2%
Average	Frequency	16	12	7	7	32	74
	% within HCP	21.6%	16.2%	9.5%	9.5%	43.2%	100.0%
	% within block	13.3%	15.0%	8.8%	8.8%	13.3%	12.3%
Low	Frequency	15	15	10	19	26	85
	% within HCP	17.6%	17.6%	11.8%	22.4%	30.6%	100.0%
	% within block	12.5%	18.8%	12.5%	23.8%	10.8%	14.2%
Very Low	Frequency	85	48	53	54	157	397
	% within HCP	21.4%	12.1%	13.4%	13.6%	39.5%	100.0%
	% within block	70.8%	60.0%	66.3%	67.5%	65.4%	66.2%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% within HCP	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

It could be seen from the above table that the household consumption pattern is mostly (66.2%) very low in the study, followed by low household consumption pattern (14.2%), average 12.3%, high consumption pattern 5.2% and finally very high with only 2.2%.

The table made it clear that very low household consumption comes from all the blocks with the highest percent in the line of household consumption pattern. In this category, Chengai got with (70.8%), Phungyar (67.5%), Kasom (66.3%), Uchrul (65.4%) Kamjong (12.1%). On the other side of the different field, in the low consumption pattern category of household consumption pattern, it comes with the highest percent in the block of Phungyar (23.8%), Kamjong (18.8%), Chengai & Kasom (12.5%) each and Uchrul (10.8%). In the category with the Average of Household consumption pattern, Kamjong has the highest point (15.0%) followed by Chengai & Uchrul (13.3%) Kasom & Phungyar (8.8%). In the next case of high household consumption pattern, Kasom leads (12.5%) followed by Uchrul (5.8%), Kamjong (3.8%), Chengai (3.3%) and Phungyar (0.0%). It can be analyzed within the block that in the Very High household consumption pattern, Uchrul block has (4.6%), Kamjong (2.5%) whereas the three block have the same percent of (0.0%).

It is clear from the table that the household consumption pattern of the respondents is not very encouraging as most of them have very low come consumption pattern (66.2%) and a very negligible proportion of them have highh (5.2%) and very high (2.2%) consumption pattern, which confirms their economic status.

Table 4.18: Monthly Household Income.

Monthly household income		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
10,000 – 15,000	Frequency	29	19	4	16	33	101
	% of monthly income	28.7%	18.8%	4.0%	15.8%	32.7%	100.0%
	% within block	24.2%	23.8%	5.0%	20.0%	13.8%	16.8%
15001 – 20,000	Frequency	20	19	13	14	37	103
	% of monthly income	19.4%	18.4%	12.6%	13.6%	35.9%	100.0%
	% within block	16.7%	23.8%	16.3%	17.5%	15.4%	17.2%
20001 – 25,000	Frequency	20	7	12	8	26	73
	% of monthly income	27.4%	9.6%	16.4%	11.0%	35.6%	100.0%
	% within block	16.7%	8.8%	15.0%	10.0%	10.8%	12.2%
25,001 – 30,000	Frequency	15	13	21	18	30	97
	% of monthly income	15.5%	13.4%	21.6%	18.6%	30.9%	100.0%
	% within block	12.5%	16.3%	26.3%	22.5%	12.5%	16.2%
30,001 and above	Frequency	36	22	30	24	114	226
	% of monthly income	15.9%	9.7%	13.3%	10.6%	50.4%	100.0%
	% within block	30.0%	27.5%	37.5%	30.0%	47.5%	37.7%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of monthly income	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

Based on the response from the respondents regarding the monthly household income, there are (37.7%) in the range of 30,001 and above, (17.2%) in 15,001- 20,000, (16.8%) in 10,000-15000, (16.2%) in 25,001-3000 and finally (12.2%) 20,001-25,000.

It gives a clear picture that within the range 30,001 and above, Ukhrul has 47.5% followed by Kasom (37.5%), Chengai & Phungyar (30.0%) Kamjong (27.5%). On the other hand, the monthly household income of 15001 – 20,000 Kamjong comes (23.8%), Phungyar (17.5%), Chengai (16.7%), Kasom (16.3%) and finally Ukhrul (15.4%). 10,000 – 15,000 monthly household income, Chengai leads (24.2%) followed by Chengai (23.8%), Phungyar (20.0%), Ukhrul (13.8%) and finally Kasom (5.0%).

On the other category which lies between 25,001 – 30,000, Kasom takes the highest (26.3%), Phungyar (22.5%), Kamjong (16.3%), Chengai & Ukhurul (12.5%) each. In the range of 20001 – 25,000, it is lead by Chengai (16.7%) followed by Kasom (15.0%), Ukhurul (10.8%), Phungyar (10.0%) and Kamjong (8.8%).

Hence, it can be summed up that the highest monthly household income within 30,001 and above is under Ukhurul Block with the rate of 47.5% and the lowest monthly household income 10,000 – 15,000 is in Kasom Block with 5.0% only.

Table 4.19: Getting the required money for fulfilling minimum requirement to life as food.

Get required money for minimum requirement		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhurul	
Most of the time	Frequency	39	32	1	31	88	191
	% of getting required money	20.4%	16.8%	5.0%	16.2%	46.1%	100.0%
	% within block	32.5%	40.0%	1.3%	38.8%	36.7%	31.8%
Frequently	Frequency	32	32	32	18	95	209
	% of getting required money	15.3%	15.3%	15.3%	8.6%	45.5%	100.0%
	% within block	26.7%	40.0%	40.0%	22.5%	39.6%	34.8%
Rarely	Frequency	49	16	47	31	57	200
	% of getting required money	24.5%	8.0%	23.5%	15.5%	28.5%	100.0%
	% within block	40.8%	20.0%	58.8%	38.8%	23.8%	33.3%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of getting required money	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data shows from the respondents that 34.8% get it frequently whereas 33.3% get it rarely while 31.8% of the respondents got it most of the time. This data reveals about the getting of required money for the minimum requirement of life as food, clothing, and shelter.

As indicated in the table within the category of the block, the respondents who get money frequently comes in the block of Kamjong & Kasom (40.0%) each followed by Ukhurul (39.6%), Chengai (26.7%), Phungyar (22.5%). On the other hand, respondents who get rarely for their minimum requirement, Kasom head (58.8%) followed by Chengai (40.8 Phungyar (38.8%), Ukhurul (23.8%), Kamjong (20.0%). Respondents who get money most of the time is lead by Kamjong (40.0%) followed by Phungyar (38.8%), Ukhurul (36.7%), Chengai (32.5%) and finally Kasom (1.3%).

Therefore the data reveals that most of the respondents (34.4%) get money for fulfilling the basic requirements of life only frequently and a significant share of them (33.3%) also reported that they rarely used get the money for the purpose, which also confirms the status of their economic condition.

Table 4.20: Feeling free to ask money from parents.

Feel free to ask money from parents		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhurul	
Yes	Frequency	50	30	12	52	91	235
	% of feeling free	21.3%	12.8%	5.1%	22.1%	38.7%	100.0%
	% within block	41.7%	37.5%	15.0%	65.0%	37.9%	39.2%
No	Frequency	70	50	68	28	149	365
	% of feeling free	19.2%	13.7%	18.6%	7.7%	40.8%	100.0%
	% within block	58.3%	62.5%	85.0%	35.0%	62.1%	60.8%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of feeling free	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The available data shows that 39.2% of the educated youth feel free to ask money from their parents whereas from their guardian. On the other hand, 60.8% of the educated youth do not feel free to ask money from their parents whereas from their guardian.

The youth which doesn't feel free to ask money from their parents comes from the highest percent of Kasom (85.0%), Kamjong (62.5%), Ukhurul (62.1%), Chengai (58.3%) and Phungyar (35.0%). On the other hand, It also indicates that Phungyar (65.0%), followed by Chengai (41.7%), Ukhurul (37.9%), Kamjong (37.5%) and Kasom (15.0%) feel free to ask money from their parent.

Hence we can see that majority of the youth doesn't feel free to ask money from their parents whereas from their guardian though they need it. It also highlights the status of mental stress and anxiety that an educated youth go through when they are unemployed.

Table 4.21: Marital status of the respondents.

Marital Status		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhurul	
Married	Frequency	33	15	30	25	39	142
	% marital status	23.2%	10.6%	21.1%	17.6%	27.5%	100.0%
	% within block	27.5%	18.8%	37.5%	31.3%	16.3%	23.7%
Widowed	Frequency	0	2	0	2	1	5
	% marital status	.0%	40.0%	.0%	40.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	% within block	.0%	2.5%	.0%	2.5%	.4%	.8%
Divorced	Frequency	0	1	1	0	5	7
	% marital status	.0%	14.3%	14.3%	.0%	71.4%	100.0%
	% within block	.0%	1.3%	1.3%	.0%	2.1%	1.2%
Single (never married)	Frequency	87	62	49	53	195	446
	% marital status	19.5%	13.9%	11.0%	11.9%	43.7%	100.0%
	% within block	72.5%	77.5%	61.3%	66.3%	81.3%	74.3%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% marital status	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The study further reveals that majority of the educated youth are still single. Those single, which are never married comes with 74.3%, followed by married 23.7%, divorced 1.2%, widow 0.8%.

It has been found out that majority of the respondents are single who are never married yet from Ukhurul (81.3%), followed by Chengai & Kamjong (77.5%), Phungyar (66.3%) and Kasom (61.3%). According to those youth who are married comes from Ukhurul block with a highest number of Kasom block (37.5%) followed by Phungyar (31.3%), Chengai (27.5%), Kamjong (18.8%), Ukhurul (16.3%). Divorced is the lead in Ukhurul (2.1%) followed by Kamjong & Kasom (1.3%) each Chengai & Phungyar (0%). It is also found that even an educated widow is available from Kamjong & Phungyar with 2.5% followed by Ukhurul 0.4% whereas Chengai & Kasom with nil as a widow is not found within these two block.

Hence it proves that the majority of the youths' within the block marital status is still single. Hence we can establish a positive relation between unemployment and marital status of the youths.

Table 4.22: Perception towards the existence of poverty in Ukhurul district in the next 10 years.

Poverty in Ukhurul district		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhurul	
Increase	Frequency	81	32	68	55	144	380
	% of poverty in Ukhurul dist	21.3%	8.4%	17.9%	14.5%	37.9%	100.0%
	% within block	67.5%	40.0%	85.0%	68.8%	60.0%	63.3%
Decrease	Frequency	12	17	0	9	21	59
	% of poverty in Ukhurul dist	20.3%	28.8%	.0%	15.3%	35.6%	100.0%
	% within block	10.0%	21.3%	.0%	11.3%	8.8%	9.8%
Stay at the same level	Frequency	5	4	1	2	12	24
	% of poverty in Ukhurul dist	20.8%	16.7%	4.2%	8.3%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within block	4.2%	5.0%	1.3%	2.5%	5.0%	4.0%
Don't know	Frequency	19	25	10	14	61	129
	% of poverty in Ukhurul dist	14.7%	19.4%	7.8%	10.9%	47.3%	100.0%
	% within block	15.8%	31.3%	12.5%	17.5%	25.4%	21.5%
Refusal	Frequency	3	2	1	0	2	8
	% of poverty in Ukhurul dist	37.5%	25.0%	12.5%	.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	% within block	2.5%	2.5%	1.3%	.0%	.8%	1.3%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of poverty in Ukhurul dist	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

Based on the response, 63.3% of the youth think that over the next 10 years, poverty in Ukhurul district will Increase, whereas there are respondents with 21.5% which don't know whether it will increase, decrease or stay at the same level too. 9.8% thinks that it will decrease. But on the other hand, 4.0% feels that it will remain at the same without any change.. On the other side, there is 1.3% who doesn't want to a response regarding the poverty as they refused.

According to the table, regarding the increase of poverty within the next 10 years most of them are from Kasom (85.0%), followed by Phungyar (68.8%), Chengai (67.5%),

Ukhrul (60.0%) and Kamjong (40.4%). Respondents who don't know about what will it be and which are in dilemma starts from Kamjong (31.3%), Ukhrul (25.4%), Phungyar (17.5%), Chengai (15.8%), Kasom (12.5%). Those who have reported that it will decrease, they are mostly from Kamjong (21.3%), followed by Phungyar (11.3%), Chengai (10.0%), Ukhrul (8.8%) and Kasom (0.0%). Those who believe that it will stay at the same are mostly from Kamjong & Ukhrul (5.0%), Chengai (4.2%), Phungyar (2.5%) and Kasom (21.3%).

Therefore it can be observed from the above table that majority of the respondents (63.3%) are pessimistic about the future of the district in the coming 10 years as they believe that poverty in Ukhrul district will increase.

Table 4.23: Expectation towards the following to happen in the near future.

Is there anything from the following you expect to happen in the near future		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Improve your standard of living	Frequency	41	27	6	21	97	192
	% expect to happen in the near future	21.4%	14.1%	3.1%	10.9%	50.5%	100.0%
	% within block	34.2%	33.8%	7.5%	26.3%	40.4%	32.0%
Reduce your standard of living	Frequency	2	2	0	0	6	10
	% expect to happen in the near future	20.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	% within block	1.7%	2.5%	.0%	.0%	2.5%	1.7%
Increase your income	Frequency	10	2	0	4	17	33
	% expect to happen in the near future	30.3%	6.1%	.0%	12.1%	51.5%	100.0%
	% within block	8.3%	2.5%	.0%	5.0%	7.1%	5.5%
Reduce your income	Frequency	6	3	2	3	10	24
	% expect to happen in the near future	25.0%	12.5%	8.3%	12.5%	41.7%	100.0%
	% within block	5.0%	3.8%	2.5%	3.8%	4.2%	4.0%
Don't know	Frequency	59	44	72	50	107	332
	% expect to happen in the near future	17.8%	13.3%	21.7%	15.1%	32.2%	100.0%
	% within block	49.2%	55.0%	90.0%	62.5%	44.6%	55.3%
None of these	Frequency	2	2	0	2	3	9
	% expect to happen in the near future	22.2%	22.2%	.0%	22.2%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within block	1.7%	2.5%	.0%	2.5%	1.3%	1.5%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% expect to happen in the near future	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

According to from the information of data regarding what to happen in the near future, 55% of youth don't know whereas 32.0% feels that there will be an improvement in the standard of living.

The table indicates the youth that doesn't have any idea about their future are mostly from Kasom (90.0%), followed by Phungyar (62.5%), Kamjong (55.0%), Chengai

(49.2%), Ukhrul (44.6%). Respondents who believe that there will be an improvement in the standard of living are mostly from Ukhrul (40.4%) followed by Chengai (34.2%), Kamjong (33.8%), Phungyar (26.3%), Kasom (7.5%).

Hence it can be traced from the table that majority of the respondents don't are uncertain whether their life will change in a positive way or in a negative way. It also tells about the policies that are implemented in the grass root which could not even inculcate a sense of hope in the mind of the youth.

Table 4.24: Person living in the household of the respondents.

Who is living in your household		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Alone	Frequency	7	0	7	5	22	41
	% living in your household	17.1%	.0%	17.1%	12.2%	53.7%	100.0%
	% within block	5.8%	.0%	8.8%	6.3%	9.2%	6.8%
Spouse / Partner	Frequency	15	8	25	13	23	84
	% living in your household	17.9%	9.5%	29.8%	15.5%	27.4%	100.0%
	% within block	12.5%	10.0%	31.3%	16.3%	9.6%	14.0%
Children	Frequency	17	3	3	6	17	46
	% living in your household	37.0%	6.5%	6.5%	13.0%	37.0%	100.0%
	% within block	14.2%	3.8%	3.8%	7.5%	7.1%	7.7%
Parents	Frequency	81	69	45	56	178	429
	% living in your household	18.9%	16.1%	10.5%	13.1%	41.5%	100.0%
	% within block	67.5%	86.3%	56.3%	70.0%	74.2%	71.5%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% living in your household	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The table reveals that majority of the respondents (71.5%) stays with their parents followed by their spouse (14.0%) and their children (7.7%).

The data reveals that staying with parents become a majority from all the block starting from Kamjong (86.3%), Ukhrul (74.2%), Phungyar (70.0%), Chengai (67.5%), Kasom (56.3%). In the next phase, the respondents that stay with their spouse is lead by Kasom (31.3%), Phungyar (16.3%), Chengai (12.5%), Kamjong (10.0%) and Ukhrul (9.6%). There are respondents who stay with their children only within the block from Chengai (14.2%), Phungyar (7.5%), Ukhrul (7.1%), Kamjong & Kasom (3.8%) each.

Hence, it can be seen that majority of the youth are dependent on their parents as they don't have any income due to unemployment.

Table 4.25: Number of persons living in the household of the respondents without work and are actively looking for work.

Number of person actively looking for work in your household		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
1.	Frequency	26	7	18	10	25	86
	% actively looking for work	30.2%	8.1%	20.9%	11.6%	29.1%	100.0%
	% within block	21.7%	8.8%	22.5%	12.5%	10.4%	14.3%
2.	Frequency	31	28	19	29	74	181
	% actively looking for work	17.1%	15.5%	10.5%	16.0%	40.9%	100.0%
	% within block	25.8%	35.0%	23.8%	36.3%	30.8%	30.2%
3.	Frequency	38	29	31	31	74	203
	% actively looking for work	18.7%	14.3%	15.3%	15.3%	36.5%	100.0%
	% within block	31.7%	36.3%	38.8%	38.8%	30.8%	33.8%
4.	Frequency	17	14	11	4	52	98
	% actively looking for work	17.3%	14.3%	11.2%	4.1%	53.1%	100.0%
	% within block	14.2%	17.5%	13.8%	5.0%	21.7%	16.3%
More	Frequency	8	2	1	6	15	32
	% actively looking for work	25.0%	6.3%	3.1%	18.8%	46.9%	100.0%
	% within block	6.7%	2.5%	1.3%	7.5%	6.3%	5.3%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% actively looking for work	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

Based on the response of the respondents, most of the respondents (33.8%) have 3 members in their household who are actively looking for work, followed by 2

members (30.2%) who are looking for employment opportunities, and 4 members (16.3%), 1 member 14.3% and finally with 4 and above members 5.3%.

From the table, it can be categorized as block wise. Within 3 person in the family actively looking for work comes in the range within 30 to 40% leads by Phungyar & Kasom (38.8%) each followed by Kamjong (36.3%), Chengai (31.7%), Ukhurul (30.8%). Within 2 person in the family, it is lead by Phungyar (36.3%), Kamjong (35.0%), Ukhurul (30.8%), Chengai (25.8%), Kasom (23.8%). Within 4 members in the family who are looking for work is lead by Ukhurul (21.7%), Kamjong (17.5%), Chengai (14.2%), Kasom (13.8%) and Phungyar (5.0%). Within 1 one person who is actively looking for work from the household comes highest in Kasom (22.5%), Chengai (21.7%), Kamjong (8.8%), Phungyar (12.5%) and Ukhurul (10.4%). Whereas, person above 4 from one household who are looking for work is lead from Phungyar block with a (7.5%) followed by Chengai (6.7%), Ukhurul (6.3%), Kamjong & Kasom (1.3%).

Based on the findings here, the data reveals that there are mostly 3 people in their house who are actively seeking for work which narrated the extent of the problem of unemployment in the area.

4.2: Conclusion:

The study of the socio-economic background of the respondents reveals that male respondents comprise of the major chunk (64.0%) of the sample studied mainly as in the study convenient sampling is used due to the impediment of not finding the unemployed in a particular place always. The rationale for the respondents belonging from diverse age groups in the different block can be associated with again the using of convenient sampling. Moreover, the majority of the youths' marital status is still single. Hence we can establish a positive relation between unemployment and marital status of the youths.

When we look at the size of the family of the respondents, they mostly have 5-7 members, followed by 2-4 and a significant number of them have 8-10 family members. Therefore though nuclear families are coming up in the area but joint

families is still the predominant family structure in the study area. The living condition of the respondents shows that majority of the respondents (52.7%) have Semi pacca type of household followed by katcha house 42% and finally pacca houses 5.3%. The study also reveals that Ukhrul block has comparatively better pattern of living than the other blocks.

The status of education of the respondents though portray an optimistic picture of the area as majority of the educated youth has completed their bachelor degree (54.0%) followed by master degree (30.0%). It can be understood that Phungyar is performing better with significant share of its respondents are having Masters Degree (42.5%), followed by Kasom block (35%), and followed by Ukhrul as majority of its members are having graduation degree (55.4%). The optimistic picture of the status of education in the area is also reflected in their knowledge over languages, as majority of the respondents have command over Manipuri, Hindi and English. We can summarise from the figure that, majority of the educated youth which have responded in the schedule have exposure of other community people and places which is reflected in their knowledge of different languages. The study reveals diversity in fathers educational background unlike the respondents' background, (as maximum number of the respondents' father have secondary school degree (28.5%), followed by graduation (25.35), elementary education (26.3%), no schooling (9.2%), postgraduates (7.5%), and finally, vocational education with 3.2%) and the mothers' educational background is comparatively poor.

The occupation of the respondents' father reveals that they are mostly agriculturist worker in the area and as the condition of agriculture in the district is not very optimistic, it tells about the economic status of the respondents' family which also plays a negative role in getting suitable employment opportunity for the respondents in the area. Whereas a maximum number of respondents mother are homemakers and agriculture workers. The categories of job that the respondents are aspiring in the study area are mostly administrative and professional job but these categories of jobs are generated in the state. Moreover, it also speaks about the society there which is

still attaching more status with this category of jobs and neglecting entrepreneurship endeavors and private jobs.

Moreover, the household consumption pattern of the respondents is not very encouraging as most of them have very low comes consumption pattern (66.2%) and a very negligible proportion of them have high (5.2%) and very high (2.2%) consumption pattern, which confirms their economic status. Hence, it can be summed up that the highest monthly household income within 30,001 and above is under Ukhurul Block with the rate of 47.5% and the lowest monthly household income 10,000 – 15,000 is in Kasom Block with 5.0% only. Therefore the study reveals that most of the respondents (34.4%) get money for fulfilling the basic requirements of life only frequently and a significant share of them (33.3%) also reported that they rarely used get the money for the purpose, which also confirms the status of their economic condition. Hence we can see that majority of the youth doesn't feel free to ask money from their parents whereas from their guardian though they need it. It also highlights the status of mental stress and anxiety that a educated youth go through when they are unemployed. It can be seen from the data that majority of the educated unemployed youth's families are receiving income from employment or self employment, but as the next generation is unemployed the future source of income remained uncertain.

The pertinent reason behind the existence of the extent of the problem unemployment in the area from the perspective of the respondents is the mismatch between the educational training and the labour market's demand. Hence it can be observed here larger share of the sampled educated youths are not satisfied with the present educational system. Therefore the majority of the youth though they completed their studies are still depended on their parents and family members for their daily expense. Therefore it can be observed from the above table that majority of the respondents (63.3%) are pessimistic about the future of the district in the coming 10 years as they believe that poverty in Ukhurul district will increase and they are uncertain whether their life will change in a positive way or in a negative way. It also tells about the policies that are implemented in the grass root which could not even inculcate a sense

of hope in the mind of the youth. Hence, it can be seen that majority of the youth are dependent on their parents as they don't have any income due to unemployment.

Based on the findings here, the data reveals that there are mostly 3 person in their house who are actively seeking for work which narrated the extent of the problem of unemployment in the area.

Pattern of unemployment in Ukhrul District

4.3: Introduction:

The reason of unemployment may differ in different settings, but in order to address the crisis of unemployment in any setting one has to first understand the patterns of the unemployment in the area (Abbott, 2016). One of the major mistakes that are often committed by policy makers is of looking at unemployment as one homogeneous concept and attends to it accordingly. But as unemployment has different types and patterns so its cure is also different. There are diverse types of unemployment as frictional unemployment, chronic unemployment, casual unemployment, underemployment, technological unemployment, educated unemployment, cyclical unemployment, seasonal unemployment, classical unemployment, disguised unemployment, open unemployment, involuntary unemployment, voluntary unemployment etc. Any attempt to actually address the issue of unemployment in any area first demands the proper understanding of the pattern of unemployment that is prevalent in the place. Otherwise the policies will end up not attending to the real issue and will be impotent of bringing much positive change to address the issue.

Table 4.26: Sustaining without regular paid employment by the respondents.

Supporting yourself without regular paid employment		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Yes	Frequency	108	66	77	70	196	517
	% within supporting without paid employment	20.9%	12.8%	14.9%	13.5%	37.9%	100.0%
	% within block	90.0%	82.5%	96.3%	87.5%	81.7%	86.2%
No	Frequency	12	14	3	10	44	83
	% within supporting without paid employment	14.5%	16.9%	3.6%	12.0%	53.0%	100.0%
	% within block	10.0%	17.5%	3.8%	12.5%	18.3%	13.8%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% within supporting without paid employment	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data shows that 86.2% of the respondents are supporting themselves without any regular paid employment whereas 13.2 % have paid employment to do so.

Majority of the educated youth who are supporting themselves without any regular paid employment are from Kasom (96.3%), followed by Chengai (90.0%), Phungyar (87.5%), Kamjong (82.5%) and Ukhrul (81.7%). Whereas, youth who do not depend on supporting their self without paid employment leads from Ukhrul (18.3%), Kamjong (17.5%), Phungyar (12.5%), Chengai (10.0%) and Kasom (3.8%).

It is observed from the table that majority of the respondents are supporting themselves without any regular paid employment which explains the status of unemployment in the area.

Table 4.27: If yes, source of income.

If yes, source of income		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Support from parents	Frequency	76	18	14	34	85	227
	% within Yes	33.5%	7.9%	6.2%	15.0%	37.4%	100.0%
	% within block	63.3%	22.5%	17.5%	42.5%	35.4%	37.8%
Support from other family members	Frequency	9	40	11	21	86	167
	% within Yes	5.4%	24.0%	6.6%	12.6%	51.5%	100.0%
	% within block	7.5%	50.0%	13.8%	26.3%	35.8%	27.8%
Government support	Frequency	0	2	0	1	5	8
	% within Yes	.0%	25.0%	.0%	12.5%	62.5%	100.0%
	% within block	.0%	2.5%	.0%	1.3%	2.1%	1.3%
Church/Charitable support	Frequency	1	0	0	0	2	3
	% within Yes	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within block	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%	.5%
Agriculture	Frequency	24	15	49	14	56	158
	% within Yes	15.2%	9.5%	31.0%	8.9%	35.4%	100.0%
	% within block	20.0%	18.8%	61.3%	17.5%	23.3%	26.3%
Business	Frequency	10	5	6	10	6	37
	% within Yes	27.0%	13.5%	16.2%	27.0%	16.2%	100.0%
	% within block	8.3%	6.3%	7.5%	12.5%	2.5%	6.2%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% within Yes	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The table reveals that majority of the respondents have you been supporting oneself without paid employment but get support from parents (37.8%), support from other family members (27.8%), Agriculture (26.3%) and so on.

When we look at block wise status of the sources of income of the respondents, the data reveals that, the support from parents is lead by Chengai (63.3%), Phungyar (42.5%), Ukhrul (35.4%), Kamjong (22.5%), Kasom (17.5%). The support from other family members is lead from Kamjong (50.0%), Ukhrul (35.8%), Phungyar (26.3%), Kasom (13.8%), Chengai (7.5%). From agriculture, it is lead by Kasom (61.3%), Ukhrul (23.3%), Chengai (20.0%), Kamjong (18.8%), Phungyar (17.5%).

It can be learned from the table that without paid employment, the respondents get main support from their parents, family members hence family as an institution is playing a positive role by supporting the unemployed youth, both financially and psychologically.

Table 4.28: Completed vocational or technical school training.

Ever had vocational or technical school training		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
No	Frequency	67	62	51	64	145	389
	% having vocational or technical school training	17.2%	15.9%	13.1%	16.5%	37.3%	100.0%
	% within block	55.8%	77.5%	63.8%	80.0%	60.4%	64.8%
Yes	Frequency	53	18	29	16	95	211
	% having vocational or technical school training	25.1%	8.5%	13.7%	7.6%	45.0%	100.0%
	% within block	44.2%	22.5%	36.3%	20.0%	39.6%	35.2%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% having vocational or technical school training	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

It is observed from the table that majority of the respondents (64.8%) did not have any vocational or technical school training whereas 35.2% of them received vocational or technical school training.

The present study tries to understand that majority of the respondents did not had any vocational or technical school training and that is lead from the block of Phungyar (80.0%), Kamjong (77.5%), Kasom (63.8%), Uchrul (60.4%) and Chengai (55.8%). On the other hand, 35.2% received vocational or technical school training that is lead from the block of Chengai (44.2%), Uchrul (39.6%), Kasom (36.3%), Kamjong (22.5%) and Phungyar (20.0%).

It is evident from the table that majority of the respondents did not had any vocational or technical school training which also highlight the vacuum that has to be filled to address the issue of employment in the area.

Table 4.29: Type of work experience of the respondents.

Describing the work experience		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Internship in public sector	Frequency	12	6	0	8	24	50
	% within work experience	24.0%	12.0%	.0%	16.0%	48.0%	100.0%
	% within block	10.0%	7.5%	.0%	10.0%	10.0%	8.3%
Internship in non-profit organization	Frequency	17	8	29	9	41	104
	% within work experience	16.3%	7.7%	27.9%	8.7%	39.4%	100.0%
	% within block	14.2%	10.0%	36.3%	11.3%	17.1%	17.3%
Work in family business	Frequency	26	10	12	8	29	85
	% within work experience	30.6%	11.8%	14.1%	9.4%	34.1%	100.0%
	% within block	21.7%	12.5%	15.0%	10.0%	12.1%	14.2%
Work on farm	Frequency	14	13	15	4	34	80
	% within work experience	17.5%	16.3%	18.8%	5.0%	42.5%	100.0%
	% within block	11.7%	16.3%	18.8%	5.0%	14.2%	13.3%
Work in private company	Frequency	13	22	2	28	50	115
	% within work experience	11.3%	19.1%	1.7%	24.3%	43.5%	100.0%
	% within block	10.8%	27.5%	2.5%	35.0%	20.8%	19.2%
Community volunteer work	Frequency	38	21	22	23	62	166
	% within work experience	22.9%	12.7%	13.3%	13.9%	37.3%	100.0%
	% within block	31.7%	26.3%	27.5%	28.8%	25.8%	27.7%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% within work experience	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

As indicated in the table on the overall of district, the work experience of the respondents is in community volunteer work (27.7%), Work in private company

(19.2%) internship in non profit organisation (17.3%), work in family business (14.2%), Work on farm (13.3%).

According to the data, the work experience of the respondents engaged in community volunteer work through block wise is lead from Chengai (31.7%) whereas the rest block is in the range of 25% – 29%. Work in private company leads by Phungyar (35.0%), Kamjong (27.5%), Ukhurul (20.8%), Chengai (10.8%), Kasom (2.5%). The experience of internship in Non profit organisation is lead from the block of Kasom (36.3%), Ukhurul (17.1%), Chengai (14.2%), Phungyar (11.3%), Kamjong (10.0%) whereas work on farm experience is lead by Kasom (18.8%), Kamjong (16.3%), Ukhurul (14.2%), Chengai (11.7%) and finally Phungyar (5.0%).

Hence when we analyse the data here we can observe that apart from private companies (19.2%) there is not much real opportunity for the youths to engage compelling them to be engaged in the field of community volunteer work (27.7%), internships in NGOs (17.3), family business (14.2%) and work in farms (13.3%) where the earnings are very negligible.

Table 4.30: Relation between the type of work experience and monthly household income of the respondents.

Work experience		Monthly Household Income					Total
		10,000 – 15,000	15001 – 20,000	20001 – 25,000	25,001 – 30,000	30,001 & above	
Internship in public sector	Frequency	9	5	7	4	25	50
	% within work experience	18.0%	10.0%	14.0%	8.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	8.9%	4.9%	9.6%	4.1%	11.1%	8.3%
Internship in NGO	Frequency	7	15	14	17	51	104
	% within work experience	6.7%	14.4%	13.5%	16.3%	49.0%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	6.9%	14.6%	19.2%	17.5%	22.6%	17.3%
Work in family business	Frequency	17	21	11	17	19	85
	% within work experience	20.0%	24.7%	12.9%	20.0%	22.4%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	16.8%	20.4%	15.1%	17.5%	8.4%	14.2%
Work on farm	Frequency	15	20	12	11	22	80
	% within work experience	18.8%	25.0%	15.0%	13.8%	27.5%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	14.9%	19.4%	16.4%	11.3%	9.7%	13.3%
Work in private company	Frequency	25	18	6	24	42	115
	% within work experience	21.7%	15.7%	5.2%	20.9%	36.5%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	24.8%	17.5%	8.2%	24.7%	18.6%	19.2%
Community volunteer work	Frequency	28	24	23	24	67	166
	% within work experience	16.9%	14.5%	13.9%	14.5%	40.4%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	27.7%	23.3%	31.5%	24.7%	29.6%	27.7%
Total	Frequency	101	103	73	97	226	600
	% within work experience	16.8%	17.2%	12.2%	16.2%	37.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

According to the data, majority of the respondents have work experience of community volunteer work (27.7%), followed by experience of working in private company (19.2%) and internship in NGO (17.3%)

The relationship with household income of the respondents and their work experience reveals that most of the respondents among all the income groups have work experience as community volunteer work.

Hence the data shows that there is no correlation between household income of the respondents and their work experience.

Table 4.31: Relation between type of work experience and educational qualification of the respondents.

Work experience		Educational Qualification				Total
		PhD	Master	Bachelor	10 + 2	
Internship in public sector	Frequency	0	20	30	0	50
	% of work experience	.0%	40.0%	60.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	11.1%	9.3%	.0%	8.3%
Internship in NGO	Frequency	3	60	35	6	104
	% of work experience	2.9%	57.7%	33.7%	5.8%	100.0%
	% within Education	25.0%	33.3%	10.8%	7.1%	17.3%
Work in family business	Frequency	2	21	42	20	85
	% of work experience	2.4%	24.7%	49.4%	23.5%	100.0%
	% within Education	16.7%	11.7%	13.0%	23.8%	14.2%
Work on farm	Frequency	0	4	48	28	80
	% of work experience	.0%	5.0%	60.0%	35.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	2.2%	14.8%	33.3%	13.3%
Work in private company	Frequency	3	38	65	9	115
	% of work experience	2.6%	33.0%	56.5%	7.8%	100.0%
	% within Education	25.0%	21.1%	20.1%	10.7%	19.2%
Community volunteer work	Frequency	4	37	104	21	166
	% of work experience	2.4%	22.3%	62.7%	12.7%	100.0%
	% within Education	33.3%	20.6%	32.1%	25.0%	27.7%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% of work experience	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The table shows that most of the respondents are having work experience in community volunteer work (27.7%) and when we observe the correlation with educational qualification of the respondents, we can see that among the graduates, most of them have (32.1%) community volunteer work experience. Among the post graduates majority of them have experience of internship in NGO (33.3%), among the higher secondary passed respondents, most of them have experience of working in farm (33.3%).

Hence the data raises serious questions on the status of the unemployment, as well qualified youths with graduation and post graduation degree are forced to have work experience of just community volunteer work, low paid jobs in NGOs and working in farms.

Table 4.32: Type of unemployment of the respondents.

Type of unemployment		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Voluntary unemployment	Frequency	15	16	5	33	37	106
	% type of unemployment	14.2%	15.1%	4.7%	31.1%	34.9%	100.0%
	% within block	12.5%	20.0%	6.3%	41.3%	15.4%	17.7%
Involuntary	Frequency	3	2	3	5	7	20
	% type of unemployment	15.0%	10.0%	15.0%	25.0%	35.0%	100.0%
	% within block	2.5%	2.5%	3.8%	6.3%	2.9%	3.3%
Seasonal unemployment	Frequency	30	19	30	14	45	138
	% type of unemployment	21.7%	13.8%	21.7%	10.1%	32.6%	100.0%
	% within block	25.0%	23.8%	37.5%	17.5%	18.8%	23.0%
Under unemployment	Frequency	58	30	39	25	118	270
	% type of unemployment	21.5%	11.1%	14.4%	9.3%	43.7%	100.0%
	% within block	48.3%	37.5%	48.8%	31.3%	49.2%	45.0%
Casual unemployment	Frequency	14	13	3	3	33	66
	% type of unemployment	21.2%	19.7%	4.5%	4.5%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within block	11.7%	16.3%	3.8%	3.8%	13.8%	11.0%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% type of unemployment	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The study reveals about the type of unemployment where it confirms that under unemployment tops with (45.0%) followed by seasonal unemployment (23.0%), voluntary unemployment (17.7%), casual unemployment (11.0%) and involuntary unemployment (3.3%).

According to block wise, it is observed from the table that Ukhrul leads in under unemployment (49.2%) followed by Kasom (48.8%), Chengai (48.3%), Kamjong (37.5%), Phungyar (31.3%). Seasonal unemployment is followed from Kasom (37.5%), Chengai (25.0%), Kamjong (23.8%), Ukhrul (18.8%), and Phungyar (17.5%). In voluntary unemployment, except Phungyar is in (6.3%) whereas the rest block comes in between (2.5%) – (3.8%).

The above table shows that among all respondents who do not get job are mostly in the category of under unemployment.

Table 4.33: Relation between type of employment and educational qualification of the respondents.

What best describes your type of unemployment?		Educational Qualification				Total
		PhD	Master	Bachelor	Higher Sec 10+2	
Voluntary unemployment	Frequency	3	42	48	13	106
	% within type of unemployment	2.8%	39.6%	45.3%	12.3%	100.0%
	% within Education	25.0%	23.3%	14.8%	15.5%	17.7%
Involuntary unemployment	Frequency	0	7	9	4	20
	% within type of unemployment	.0%	35.0%	45.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	3.9%	2.8%	4.8%	3.3%
Seasonal unemployment	Frequency	3	47	70	18	138
	% within type of unemployment	2.2%	34.1%	50.7%	13.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	25.0%	26.1%	21.6%	21.4%	23.0%
Under Unemployment	Frequency	1	63	165	41	270
	% within type of unemployment	.4%	23.3%	61.1%	15.2%	100.0%
	% within Education	8.3%	35.0%	50.9%	48.8%	45.0%
Casual unemployment	Frequency	5	21	32	8	66
	% within type of unemployment	7.6%	31.8%	48.5%	12.1%	100.0%
	% within Education	41.7%	11.7%	9.9%	9.5%	11.0%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% within type of unemployment	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data reveals that majority of the respondents (45.0%) are experiencing under unemployment. When we look into the educational qualification of respondents in this category, among the graduate respondents (50.9%) we can observe most of the respondents, followed by the higher secondary (48.8%). Among the post graduate,

The data reveals that majority of the respondents (45.0%) are experiencing under unemployment.

The relationship with household income of the respondents and type of unemployment reveals that in almost all the income groups majority of the respondents are facing under unemployment.

Hence the data shows that there is no correlation between household income of the respondents and the type of unemployment.

Table 4.35: Type of unemployment mostly seen in the area of the respondents.

Unemployment mostly seen in the area.		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Voluntary unemployment	Frequency	4	1	2	7	8	22
	% type of unemployment	18.2%	4.5%	9.1%	31.8%	36.4%	100.0%
	% within block	3.3%	1.3%	2.5%	8.8%	3.3%	3.7%
Involuntary	Frequency	5	1	0	1	9	16
	% type of unemployment	31.3%	6.3%	.0%	6.3%	56.3%	100.0%
	% within block	4.2%	1.3%	.0%	1.3%	3.8%	2.7%
Seasonal unemployment	Frequency	32	25	26	27	46	156
	% type of unemployment	20.5%	16.0%	16.7%	17.3%	29.5%	100.0%
	% within block	26.7%	31.3%	32.5%	33.8%	19.2%	26.0%
Under Unemployment	Frequency	64	38	42	39	140	323
	% type of unemployment	19.8%	11.8%	13.0%	12.1%	43.3%	100.0%
	% within block	53.3%	47.5%	52.5%	48.8%	58.3%	53.8%
Casual unemployment	Frequency	15	15	10	6	37	83
	% type of unemployment	18.1%	18.1%	12.0%	7.2%	44.6%	100.0%
	% within block	12.5%	18.8%	12.5%	7.5%	15.4%	13.8%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% type of unemployment	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The type of unemployment mostly seen in the study area is under unemployment (53.8%), followed by seasonal unemployment (26.0%), casual unemployment (13.8%).

When look into the block wise of under unemployment, is lead by Ukhrul (58.3%), Chengai (53.3%), Kasom (52.5%), Phungyar (48.8%), Kamjong 47.5%. On the other hand, in the category of seasonal unemployment, Phungyar (33.8%), Kasom (32.5%), Kamjong (31.3%), Chengai (26.7%), Ukhrul (19.2%). Finally, casual unemployment starts from Kamjong (18.8%), Ukhrul (15.4%), Chengai & Kasom (12.5%) and Phungyar (12.5%).

The above table shows that under unemployment could be seen mostly in the study area by majority of the respondents.

Table 4.36: Relation between type of unemployment visible in the study area and educational qualification of the respondents.

Type of unemployment mostly seen in your area		Educational Qualification				Total
		PhD	Master	Bachelor	Higher Sec 10+2	
Voluntary unemployment	Frequency	0	4	18	0	22
	% unemployment seen	.0%	18.2%	81.8%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	2.2%	5.6%	.0%	3.7%
Involuntary unemployment	Frequency	0	3	10	3	16
	% unemployment seen	.0%	18.8%	62.5%	18.8%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	1.7%	3.1%	3.6%	2.7%
Seasonal unemployment	Frequency	1	40	88	27	156
	% unemployment seen	.6%	25.6%	56.4%	17.3%	100.0%
	% within Education	8.3%	22.2%	27.2%	32.1%	26.0%
Under Unemployment	Frequency	6	101	171	45	323
	% unemployment seen	1.9%	31.3%	52.9%	13.9%	100.0%
	% within Education	50.0%	56.1%	52.8%	53.6%	53.8%
Casual unemployment	Frequency	5	32	37	9	83
	% unemployment seen	6.0%	38.6%	44.6%	10.8%	100.0%
	% within Education	41.7%	17.8%	11.4%	10.7%	13.8%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% unemployment seen	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

Respondents mostly seen in the study area are under unemployed with share of more than half (53.8%). Major share of the post graduate (56.1%), graduate (52.8%), PhD (50%) and higher secondary (53.6) respondents, have reported to be facing the problem of under unemployment.

Hence it can be seen that though varieties of unemployment can be seen among the respondents but majority of the respondents are from under unemployment.

Table 4.37: Relation between type of unemployment visible in the study area and monthly household income of the respondents.

Type of unemployment mostly seen in your area		Monthly household income					Total
		10,000 – 15,000	15001 – 20,000	20001 – 25,000	25,001 – 30,000	30,001 & above	
Voluntary unemployment	Frequency	1	5	4	8	4	22
	% unemployment mostly seen.	4.5%	22.7%	18.2%	36.4%	18.2%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	1.0%	4.9%	5.5%	8.2%	1.8%	3.7%
Involuntary Unemployment	Frequency	5	4	2	2	3	16
	% unemployment mostly seen.	31.3%	25.0%	12.5%	12.5%	18.8%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	5.0%	3.9%	2.7%	2.1%	1.3%	2.7%
Seasonal unemployment	Frequency	25	32	17	24	58	156
	% unemployment mostly seen.	16.0%	20.5%	10.9%	15.4%	37.2%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	24.8%	31.1%	23.3%	24.7%	25.7%	26.0%
Under Unemployment	Frequency	58	50	45	46	124	323
	% unemployment mostly seen.	18.0%	15.5%	13.9%	14.2%	38.4%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	57.4%	48.5%	61.6%	47.4%	54.9%	53.8%
Casual unemployment	Frequency	12	12	5	17	37	83
	% unemployment mostly seen.	14.5%	14.5%	6.0%	20.5%	44.6%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	11.9%	11.7%	6.8%	17.5%	16.4%	13.8%
Total	Frequency	101	103	73	97	226	600
	% unemployment mostly seen.	16.8%	17.2%	12.2%	16.2%	37.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data reveals that majority of the respondents (53.8%) are experiencing under unemployment.

The relationship with household income of the respondents and type of unemployment reveals that in almost all the income group's majority of the respondents are facing under unemployment.

Hence the data present that there is no correlation between household income of the respondents and the type of unemployment in the study area.

Table 4.38: Source of engagement while looking for a job by the respondents.

What looking for a job		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Staying at home and only looking for a job	Frequency	6	8	7	4	14	39
	% while looking for a job	15.4%	20.5%	17.9%	10.3%	35.9%	100.0%
	% within block	5.0%	10.0%	8.8%	5.0%	5.8%	6.5%
Responsible for household chores	Frequency	15	14	9	12	35	85
	% while looking for a job	17.6%	16.5%	10.6%	14.1%	41.2%	100.0%
	% within block	12.5%	17.5%	11.3%	15.0%	14.6%	14.2%
Helping in family business	Frequency	18	12	10	9	43	92
	% while looking for a job	19.6%	13.0%	10.9%	9.8%	46.7%	100.0%
	% within block	15.0%	15.0%	12.5%	11.3%	17.9%	15.3%
Taking additional education/training courses	Frequency	15	6	5	4	46	76
	% while looking for a job	19.7%	7.9%	6.6%	5.3%	60.5%	100.0%
	% within block	12.5%	7.5%	6.3%	5.0%	19.2%	12.7%
Spending time with friends	Frequency	20	19	20	20	27	106
	% while looking for a job	18.9%	17.9%	18.9%	18.9%	25.5%	100.0%
	% within block	16.7%	23.8%	25.0%	25.0%	11.3%	17.7%
Doing volunteer work (without pay)	Frequency	16	4	7	6	23	56
	% while looking for a job	28.6%	7.1%	12.5%	10.7%	41.1%	100.0%
	% within block	13.3%	5.0%	8.8%	7.5%	9.6%	9.3%
Planning to start own business	Frequency	9	8	3	7	10	37
	% while looking for a job	24.3%	21.6%	8.1%	18.9%	27.0%	100.0%
	% within block	7.5%	10.0%	3.8%	8.8%	4.2%	6.2%
Thinking of joining Insurgency	Frequency	21	9	19	18	42	109
	% while looking for a job	19.3%	8.3%	17.4%	16.5%	38.5%	100.0%
	% within block	17.5%	11.3%	23.8%	22.5%	17.5%	18.2%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% while looking for a job	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

As indicated in the table, the data shows that majority of them (18.2%) thinking of joining insurgency, followed by (17.7%) those who are thinking of spending time with friends, (15.3%), helping in family business (14.2%), staying at home and also responsible for household chores, (12.7%) taking additional education courses are some of the percent that the youth have been doing while looking for job.

According to the information from the table, thinking of joining insurgency is lead from Kasom (23.8%), Phungyar (22.5%), Chengai & Ukhurul (17.5%), Kamjong (11.3%). In the category of spending time with friends, it is lead from Kasom & Phungyar (25.0%), Kamjong (23.8%), Chengai (16.7%), Ukhurul (11.3%). In the category of helping in family business, it starts from Ukhurul (17.9%), Chengai & Kamjong (15.0%), Kasom (12.5%), Phungyar (11.3%). Staying at home and also responsible for household chores, it leads by Kamjong (17.5%), Phungyar (15.0%), Ukhurul (14.6%), Chengai (12.5%), Kasom (11.3%). In taking additional education courses, it ranks from Ukhurul (19.2%) followed by Chengai (12.5%) whereas Kamjong, Kasom and Phungyar, it lies in the range between (5.0%) - (7.5%).

There is clear evidence from the table that majority of the educated youth (18.2%) are in a zone that they are thinking of joining into insurgency which is really alarming and it also reveals the real cause of rise in the participation in the insurgent movements in the area.

Table 4.39: Relation between source of engagement while looking for a job and educational qualification of the respondents.

Mainly been doing while looking for job		Educational Qualification				Total
		PhD	Master	Bachelor	Higher Sec 10+2	
Staying at home and only looking for a job	Frequency	2	11	21	5	39
	% while looking for a job	5.1%	28.2%	53.8%	12.8%	100.0%
	% within Education	16.7%	6.1%	6.5%	6.0%	6.5%
Staying at home and also responsible for household chores	Frequency	1	23	47	14	85
	% while looking for a job	1.2%	27.1%	55.3%	16.5%	100.0%
	% within Education	8.3%	12.8%	14.5%	16.7%	14.2%
Helping in family business	Frequency	2	26	49	15	92
	% while looking for a job	2.2%	28.3%	53.3%	16.3%	100.0%
	% within Education	16.7%	14.4%	15.1%	17.9%	15.3%
Taking additional Education/training courses	Frequency	3	18	42	13	76
	% while looking for a job	3.9%	23.7%	55.3%	17.1%	100.0%
	% within Education	25.0%	10.0%	13.0%	15.5%	12.7%
Spending time with friends	Frequency	0	48	48	10	106
	% while looking for a job	.0%	45.3%	45.3%	9.4%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	26.7%	14.8%	11.9%	17.7%
Doing volunteer work (without pay)	Frequency	3	19	29	5	56
	% while looking for a job	5.4%	33.9%	51.8%	8.9%	100.0%
	% within Education	25.0%	10.6%	9.0%	6.0%	9.3%
Planning to start own business	Frequency	1	5	25	6	37
	% while looking for a job	2.7%	13.5%	67.6%	16.2%	100.0%
	% within Education	8.3%	2.8%	7.7%	7.1%	6.2%
Thinking of joining Insurgency	Frequency	0	30	63	16	109
	% while looking for a job	.0%	27.5%	57.8%	14.7%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	16.7%	19.4%	19.0%	18.2%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% while looking for a job	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

It has been found in the study that majority of the respondents (18.2%) are thinking of joining insurgency while looking for job at the same time. When we observe the

correlation with educational qualification of the respondents, we can see that among graduate respondents most of them are thinking about joining insurgency (19.4%), followed by higher secondary respondents (19.0%). Among post graduate respondents (26.7%) most of them prefer to spend time with friends. Finally, among the respondents having Ph.D (25%) most of them prefer to take additional education/training courses and doing volunteer work.

Table 4.40: Relation between source of engagement while looking for a job and monthly household income of the respondents.

Mainly been doing while looking for job		Monthly household income					Total
		10,000 – 15,000	15001 – 20,000	20001 – 25,000	25,001 – 30,000	30,001 & above	
Staying at home & only looking for a job	Frequency	11	4	6	9	9	39
	% of doing while looking for job	28.2%	10.3%	15.4%	23.1%	23.1%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	10.9%	3.9%	8.2%	9.3%	4.0%	6.5%
Staying at home & also responsible for household chores	Frequency	18	21	10	6	30	85
	% of doing while looking for job	21.2%	24.7%	11.8%	7.1%	35.3%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	17.8%	20.4%	13.7%	6.2%	13.3%	14.2%
Helping in family business	Frequency	20	15	9	15	33	92
	% of doing while looking for job	21.7%	16.3%	9.8%	16.3%	35.9%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	19.8%	14.6%	12.3%	15.5%	14.6%	15.3%
Taking additional education/training courses	Frequency	17	8	10	14	27	76
	% of doing while looking for job	22.4%	10.5%	13.2%	18.4%	35.5%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	16.8%	7.8%	13.7%	14.4%	11.9%	12.7%
Spending time with friends	Frequency	10	10	8	20	58	106
	% of doing while looking for job	9.4%	9.4%	7.5%	18.9%	54.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	9.9%	9.7%	11.0%	20.6%	25.7%	17.7%
Doing volunteer work	Frequency	3	12	9	9	23	56
	% of doing while looking for job	5.4%	21.4%	16.1%	16.1%	41.1%	100.0%

	% of monthly household income	3.0%	11.7%	12.3%	9.3%	10.2%	9.3%
Planning to start own business	Frequency	11	8	3	3	12	37
	% of doing while looking for job	29.7%	21.6%	8.1%	8.1%	32.4%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	10.9%	7.8%	4.1%	3.1%	5.3%	6.2%
Thinking of joining Insurgency	Frequency	11	25	18	21	34	109
	% of doing while looking for job	10.1%	22.9%	16.5%	19.3%	31.2%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	10.9%	24.3%	24.7%	21.6%	15.0%	18.2%
Total	Frequency	101	103	73	97	226	600
	% of doing while looking for job	16.8%	17.2%	12.2%	16.2%	37.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The above table shows that majority of the respondents (18.2%) are thinking of joining insurgent groups while looking for job, followed by spending time with friends (17.7%), helping family business (15.3%).

The relationship with household income of the respondents and the work done by the respondents while looking for job reveals that the respondents with least household income group i.e. Rs 10,000 – 15,000 prefer to help in family business (19.8%), and the respondents with highest income group 30001 and above prefer to spend time with their friends (25.7%). While the middle household income group from 15,000-30,000 are thinking of joining insurgent groups in the category of 20001 – 25,000 (24.7%), 15001 – 20,000 (24.3%), 25,001 – 30,000 (21.6%).

Hence the data shows that the least income groups who are struggling to fulfil the basic amenities of life are forced to help their family business whatever they are doing, whereas the respondents belonging to the highest income groups who need not have to worry about money can afford to spend time with their friends. The rest of the middle income group respondents find joining insurgent group as logical from both financial perspective and social status.

Table 4.41: Reason for not working or looking for work by the respondents.

Reason for not working or looking for work		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Personal family responsibilities	Frequency	18	12	9	10	41	90
	% of not working	20.0%	13.3%	10.0%	11.1%	45.6%	100.0%
	% within block	15.0%	15.0%	11.3%	12.5%	17.1%	15.0%
Already found work to start later	Frequency	7	6	0	6	25	44
	% of not working	15.9%	13.6%	.0%	13.6%	56.8%	100.0%
	% within block	5.8%	7.5%	.0%	7.5%	10.4%	7.3%
Already made arrangements for self-employment to start later	Frequency	8	7	1	1	13	30
	% of not working	26.7%	23.3%	3.3%	3.3%	43.3%	100.0%
	% within block	6.7%	8.8%	1.3%	1.3%	5.4%	5.0%
Awaiting busy season	Frequency	4	8	1	1	6	20
	% of not working	20.0%	40.0%	5.0%	5.0%	30.0%	100.0%
	% within block	3.3%	10.0%	1.3%	1.3%	2.5%	3.3%
Believe no suitable work available	Frequency	14	21	14	10	43	102
	% of not working	13.7%	20.6%	13.7%	9.8%	42.2%	100.0%
	% within block	11.7%	26.3%	17.5%	12.5%	17.9%	17.0%
Lack employers' requirements	Frequency	28	9	43	22	37	139
	% of not working	20.1%	6.5%	30.9%	15.8%	26.6%	100.0%
	% within block	23.3%	11.3%	53.8%	27.5%	15.4%	23.2%
Could not find suitable work	Frequency	25	9	8	21	45	108
	% of not working	23.1%	8.3%	7.4%	19.4%	41.7%	100.0%
	% within block	20.8%	11.3%	10.0%	26.3%	18.8%	18.0%
Do not know how or where to seek work	Frequency	10	4	4	6	24	48
	% of not working	20.8%	8.3%	8.3%	12.5%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within block	8.3%	5.0%	5.0%	7.5%	10.0%	8.0%
Not yet started to seek work	Frequency	6	4	0	3	6	19
	% of not working	31.6%	21.1%	.0%	15.8%	31.6%	100.0%
	% within block	5.0%	5.0%	.0%	3.8%	2.5%	3.2%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of not working	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

According to the response of the educated youth from the study area, the main reason for not working or looking for work lies on lack employer's requirement (23.2%),

could not find suitable job (18.0%), believe no suitable work available (17.0%), personal family responsibilities (15.0%).

The table shows that lack of employer's requirement is the reason for not getting job mostly in Kasom (53.8%) followed by Phungyar (27.5%), Chengai (23.3%), Ukhrul (15.4%), Kamjong (11.3%). Those who responded that they remained unemployed as they could not find suitable job are mostly from Phungyar (26.3%), Chengai (20.8%), Ukhrul (18.8%), Kamjong (11.3%), Kasom (11.3%). Whereas those who held waiting busy season for the cause are mostly from Kamjong (26.3%), Ukhrul (17.9%), Kasom (17.5%), Phungyar (12.5%), Chengai (11.7%). Whereas on the fourth phase of personal family responsibilities is lead by Ukhrul (17.1%), Chengai & Kamjong (15.0%), Phungyar (12.5%), Kasom (11.3%).

From the respondents' perspective, it can be conclude that the main reason for not working or looking for work is because of lack employer's requirement according to the maximum number of the respondents.

Table 4.42: Relation between the main reason for not working or looking for work and educational qualification of the respondents.

Main reason for not working or looking for work		Educational Qualification				Total
		PhD	Master	Bachelor	Higher Sec 10+2	
Personal family responsibilities	Frequency	4	16	45	25	90
	% main reason for not working	4.4%	17.8%	50.0%	27.8%	100.0%
	% within Education	33.3%	8.9%	13.9%	29.8%	15.0%
Already found work to start later	Frequency	0	20	16	8	44
	% main reason for not working	.0%	45.5%	36.4%	18.2%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	11.1%	4.9%	9.5%	7.3%
Already made arrangements for self-employment to start later	Frequency	3	8	16	3	30
	% main reason for not working	10.0%	26.7%	53.3%	10.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	25.0%	4.4%	4.9%	3.6%	5.0%
Awaiting busy season	Frequency	0	8	9	3	20
	% main reason for not working	.0%	40.0%	45.0%	15.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	4.4%	2.8%	3.6%	3.3%

Believe no suitable work available	Frequency	2	42	51	7	102
	% main reason for not working	2.0%	41.2%	50.0%	6.9%	100.0%
	% within Education	16.7%	23.3%	15.7%	8.3%	17.0%
Lack employers' requirements	Frequency	3	50	72	14	139
	% main reason for not working	2.2%	36.0%	51.8%	10.1%	100.0%
	% within Education	25.0%	27.8%	22.2%	16.7%	23.2%
Could not find suitable	Frequency	0	31	67	10	108
	% main reason for not working	.0%	28.7%	62.0%	9.3%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	17.2%	20.7%	11.9%	18.0%
Do not know how or where to seek work	Frequency	0	5	32	11	48
	% main reason for not working	.0%	10.4%	66.7%	22.9%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	2.8%	9.9%	13.1%	8.0%
Not yet started to seek work	Frequency	0	0	16	3	19
	% main reason for not working	.0%	.0%	84.2%	15.8%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	.0%	4.9%	3.6%	3.2%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% main reason for not working	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The table shows that the main reason for not working or looking for work by the respondents in the study area is because they did not fulfilled employers requirements by (23.2%). Among the graduates (22.2%) and post graduates (27.8%) most of them are unemployed as they did not fulfilled employers requirements. Among the PhD (33.3%) and higher secondary (29.8%) respondents most of them are unemployed because of personal issues.

Hence most of the educated respondents remained unemployed as they were unemployable or they preferred to be so because of their personal issues.

Table 4.43: Relation between main reason for not working or looking for work and Monthly household income of the respondents.

Reason for not working or looking for work		Monthly household income					Total
		10,000 – 15,000	15001 – 20,000	20001 – 25,000	25,001 – 30,000	30,001 & above	
Personal family responsibilities	Frequency	21	17	15	15	22	90
	% of not working	23.3%	18.9%	16.7%	16.7%	24.4%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	20.8%	16.5%	20.5%	15.5%	9.7%	15.0%
Already found work to start later	Frequency	6	8	6	5	19	44
	% of not working	13.6%	18.2%	13.6%	11.4%	43.2%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	5.9%	7.8%	8.2%	5.2%	8.4%	7.3%
Already made arrangements for self-employment to start later	Frequency	1	12	1	2	14	30
	% of not working	3.3%	40.0%	3.3%	6.7%	46.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	1.0%	11.7%	1.4%	2.1%	6.2%	5.0%
Awaiting busy season	Frequency	4	1	0	3	12	20
	% of not working	20.0%	5.0%	.0%	15.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	4.0%	1.0%	.0%	3.1%	5.3%	3.3%
Believe no suitable work available	Frequency	14	12	12	19	45	102
	% of not working	13.7%	11.8%	11.8%	18.6%	44.1%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	13.9%	11.7%	16.4%	19.6%	19.9%	17.0%
Lack employers' requirements	Frequency	22	15	18	28	56	139
	% of not working	15.8%	10.8%	12.9%	20.1%	40.3%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	21.8%	14.6%	24.7%	28.9%	24.8%	23.2%
Could not find suitable	Frequency	16	23	13	15	41	108
	% of not working	14.8%	21.3%	12.0%	13.9%	38.0%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	15.8%	22.3%	17.8%	15.5%	18.1%	18.0%
Do not know how or where to seek work	Frequency	12	11	4	6	15	48
	% of not working	25.0%	22.9%	8.3%	12.5%	31.3%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	11.9%	10.7%	5.5%	6.2%	6.6%	8.0%
Not yet started to seek work	Frequency	5	4	4	4	2	19
	% of not working	26.3%	21.1%	21.1%	21.1%	10.5%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	5.0%	3.9%	5.5%	4.1%	.9%	3.2%

Total	Frequency	101	103	73	97	226	600
	% of not working	16.8%	17.2%	12.2%	16.2%	37.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data reveals that majority of the respondents (23.2%) lack employers' requirements followed by (18.0%) believe no suitable work is available and (15.0%) personal family responsibilities.

The majority of the respondents from households of all income groups apart from 15001 – 20,000 is not doing anything as they believe that they lack employers' requirements.

Hence here too we cannot establish any correlation between household income of the respondents and the type of unemployment in the study

Table 4.44: Consideration of moving out of district to find work.

Consider moving out of district to find work?		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
No	Frequency	77	44	57	46	134	358
	% moving to find work	21.5%	12.3%	15.9%	12.8%	37.4%	100.0%
	% within block	64.2%	55.0%	71.3%	57.5%	55.8%	59.7%
Moving to capital city	Frequency	17	17	7	10	31	82
	% moving to find work	20.7%	20.7%	8.5%	12.2%	37.8%	100.0%
	% within block	14.2%	21.3%	8.8%	12.5%	12.9%	13.7%
Moving to a city outside Imphal)	Frequency	14	9	11	17	38	89
	% moving to find work	15.7%	10.1%	12.4%	19.1%	42.7%	100.0%
	% within block	11.7%	11.3%	13.8%	21.3%	15.8%	14.8%
Moving to a rural area	Frequency	2	4	0	1	8	15
	% moving to find work	13.3%	26.7%	.0%	6.7%	53.3%	100.0%
	% within block	1.7%	5.0%	.0%	1.3%	3.3%	2.5%

Moving to another country	Frequency	4	2	4	1	16	27
	% moving to find work	14.8%	7.4%	14.8%	3.7%	59.3%	100.0%
	% within block	3.3%	2.5%	5.0%	1.3%	6.7%	4.5%
No preference	Frequency	6	4	1	5	13	29
	% moving to find work	20.7%	13.8%	3.4%	17.2%	44.8%	100.0%
	% within block	5.0%	5.0%	1.3%	6.3%	5.4%	4.8%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% moving to find work	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

In response to the question, it reveals that half of the respondents (59.7%) responded that they are not considering moving out of the district for seeking job, followed by those who will prefer moving to city, other than the capital city (14.8%), moving to capital city (13.7%).

In the response of respondents who are not considering moving out of the district for seeking job, the block wise distribution reveals that they are mostly from Kasom (71.3%), Chengai (64.2%) whereas the remaining three blocks, it lies between (55.0%) - (57.5%). Those who are considering to move to a city other than the capital city, are mostly from Phungyar (21.3%) followed by Ukhrul (15.8%) whereas the rest block, it lies between (11.3%) – (13.8%). Those who are considering to move to capital city are mostly from Kamjong (21.3%), followed by Chengai (14.2%), Ukhrul (12.9%), Phungyar (12.5%), Kasom (8.8%).

Therefore the data indicates that majority of the respondents which is half of the unemployed are not considering moving out of the district for seeking job. Hence, it reveals that they might be interested to work within the district or they are not very optimistic about getting job outside the district too or they are not confident about their chances of surviving in the competitive world outside the district.

Table 4.45: Relation between considering moving outside the district to find work and monthly household income of the respondents.

Would you consider moving to find work?		Monthly household income					Total
		10,000 – 15,000	15001 – 20,000	20001 – 25,000	25,001 – 30,000	30,001 & above	
No	Frequency	50	60	40	65	143	358
	% consider moving to find work	14.0%	16.8%	11.2%	18.2%	39.9%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	49.5%	58.3%	54.8%	67.0%	63.3%	59.7%
Moving to capital city	Frequency	20	18	15	9	20	82
	% consider moving to find work	24.4%	22.0%	18.3%	11.0%	24.4%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	19.8%	17.5%	20.5%	9.3%	8.8%	13.7%
Moving to a town/city (other than capital city)	Frequency	20	14	10	14	31	89
	% consider moving to find work	22.5%	15.7%	11.2%	15.7%	34.8%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	19.8%	13.6%	13.7%	14.4%	13.7%	14.8%
Moving to a rural area	Frequency	2	2	1	4	6	15
	% consider moving to find work	13.3%	13.3%	6.7%	26.7%	40.0%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	2.0%	1.9%	1.4%	4.1%	2.7%	2.5%
Moving to another country	Frequency	3	2	4	3	15	27
	% consider moving to find work	11.1%	7.4%	14.8%	11.1%	55.6%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	3.0%	1.9%	5.5%	3.1%	6.6%	4.5%
No preference	Frequency	6	7	3	2	11	29
	% consider moving to find work	20.7%	24.1%	10.3%	6.9%	37.9%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	5.9%	6.8%	4.1%	2.1%	4.9%	4.8%
Total	Frequency	101	103	73	97	226	600
	% consider moving to find work	16.8%	17.2%	12.2%	16.2%	37.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data reveals that majority of the respondents (59.7%) would not consider moving outside the district to find work.

The relationship with household income of the respondents reveals that the respondents from lower income group (10,000- 25000) are considering more for moving out mostly to capital city to find work in comparison to the higher income groups 25000- above 30,000.

Table 4.46: Reason for not availing opportunities outside Ukhrul

Stopping from opportunities outside Ukhrul		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Family problem	Frequency	25	12	23	25	56	141
	% of stopping from opportunities	17.7%	8.5%	16.3%	17.7%	39.7%	100.0%
	% within block	20.8%	15.0%	28.8%	31.3%	23.3%	23.5%
Financial problem	Frequency	57	43	30	41	115	286
	% of stopping from opportunities	19.9%	15.0%	10.5%	14.3%	40.2%	100.0%
	% within block	47.5%	53.8%	37.5%	51.3%	47.9%	47.7%
Health problem	Frequency	8	2	1	2	7	20
	% of stopping from opportunities	40.0%	10.0%	5.0%	10.0%	35.0%	100.0%
	% within block	6.7%	2.5%	1.3%	2.5%	2.9%	3.3%
Personal Issues	Frequency	25	21	26	12	51	135
	% of stopping from opportunities	18.5%	15.6%	19.3%	8.9%	37.8%	100.0%
	% within block	20.8%	26.3%	32.5%	15.0%	21.3%	22.5%
Educational qualification	Frequency	4	0	0	0	11	15
	% of stopping from opportunities	26.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	73.3%	100.0%
	% within block	3.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.6%	2.5%
Language problem	Frequency	1	2	0	0	0	3
	% of stopping from opportunities	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within block	.8%	2.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of stopping from opportunities	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

From the view of the above table, it shows that the prime reason for not availing opportunities outside Ukhurul district starts with the issue of financial problem (47.7%), family problem (23.5%), personal issues (22.5%).

The respondents who opined financial problem as the reason for not availing opportunities outside Ukhurul district, are mostly from Kamjong (53.8%), Phungyar (51.3%), Ukhurul (47.9%), Chengai (47.5%), Kasom (37.5%). Those who responded that it is because of family problem are mostly from Phungyar (31.3%) followed by Kasom (28.8%), Ukhurul (23.3%), Chengai (20.8%), Kamjong (15.0%). In the third group of personal issues, it heads by Kasom (32.5%), Kamjong (26.3%), Ukhurul (21.3%), Kasom (20.8%), Phungyar (15.0%).

Hence, majority of the respondents fail to avail opportunities outside Ukhurul district because of financial problem, family problem and personal issues of the respondents.

Table 4.47: Relation between suspending from availing opportunities outside Ukhurul and educational qualification of the respondents.

What is stopping you from availing opportunities outside Ukhurul?		Educational Qualification				Total
		PhD	Master	Bachelor	Higher Sec 10+2	
Family problem	Frequency	4	40	78	19	141
	% availing opportunities	2.8%	28.4%	55.3%	13.5%	100.0%
	% within Education	33.3%	22.2%	24.1%	22.6%	23.5%
Financial problem	Frequency	1	71	171	43	286
	% availing opportunities	.3%	24.8%	59.8%	15.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	8.3%	39.4%	52.8%	51.2%	47.7%
Health problem	Frequency	0	7	13	0	20
	% availing opportunities	.0%	35.0%	65.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	3.9%	4.0%	.0%	3.3%
Personal Issues	Frequency	7	59	56	13	135
	% availing opportunities	5.2%	43.7%	41.5%	9.6%	100.0%
	% within Education	58.3%	32.8%	17.3%	15.5%	22.5%
Educational qualification	Frequency	0	2	6	7	15
	% availing opportunities	.0%	13.3%	40.0%	46.7%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	1.1%	1.9%	8.3%	2.5%
Language problem	Frequency	0	1	0	2	3
	% availing opportunities	.0%	33.3%	.0%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	.6%	.0%	2.4%	.5%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% availing opportunities	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The table reveals that majority of the respondents are not availing opportunities outside Ukhurul mainly because of financial problems (47.7%), followed by family problem (23.5%) and personal issues (22.5%). When we see the relation with

educational qualification of the respondents, the data shows that among the higher secondary qualified respondents (51.2%) and graduates (52.8%) and post graduates (33.3%) most of them could not go out of Ukhurul because of financial crisis. Among the PhD qualified respondents personal issues is the reason for not going out of Ukhurul to avail employment opportunities.

Hence, the table shows that respondents have not availed opportunities outside Ukhurul basically due to financial problem, family problem and personal issues.

Table 4.48: Relation between suspending from availing opportunities outside Ukhrul and monthly household income of the respondents.

Lack of availing opportunities outside Ukhrul district.		Monthly household income					Total
		10,000 – 15,000	15001 – 20,000	20001 – 25,000	25,001 – 30,000	30,001 & above	
Family problem	Frequency	19	24	13	21	64	141
	% of not availing opportunities	13.5%	17.0%	9.2%	14.9%	45.4%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	18.8%	23.3%	17.8%	21.6%	28.3%	23.5%
Financial problem	Frequency	65	55	46	57	63	286
	% of not availing opportunities	22.7%	19.2%	16.1%	19.9%	22.0%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	64.4%	53.4%	63.0%	58.8%	27.9%	47.7%
Health problem	Frequency	1	5	2	2	10	20
	% of not availing opportunities	5.0%	25.0%	10.0%	10.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	1.0%	4.9%	2.7%	2.1%	4.4%	3.3%
Personal Issues	Frequency	14	16	9	17	79	135
	% of not availing opportunities	10.4%	11.9%	6.7%	12.6%	58.5%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	13.9%	15.5%	12.3%	17.5%	35.0%	22.5%
Educational qualification	Frequency	2	2	2	0	9	15
	% of not availing opportunities	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	2.0%	1.9%	2.7%	.0%	4.0%	2.5%
Language problem	Frequency	0	1	1	0	1	3
	% of not availing opportunities	.0%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	33.3%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	.0%	1.0%	1.4%	.0%	.4%	.5%
Total	Frequency	101	103	73	97	226	600
	% of not availing opportunities	16.8%	17.2%	12.2%	16.2%	37.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

According to the data, it reveals the lack of availing opportunities outside Ukhru district is financial problem (47.7%) followed by family problem (23.5%) and personal issues (22.5%).

The majority of the respondents from household's income of 10,000 – 30,000 is facing financial problems, respondents with income of 30,001 & above cannot avail the opportunity mostly (35.0%) because of personal issues

Hence it can clearly be seen that lack of opportunities outside Ukhru district is mainly based on the income of the respondents households. It shows that the respondents with a low household income up to Rs 30,000 lack opportunities due to financial problem. For the higher income group i.e. above Rs 30,000 family problem is the issue.

Table 4.49: Source for searching job.

Source for searching job		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Through education/training institution	Frequency	19	17	2	11	53	102
	% looking for a job	18.6%	16.7%	2.0%	10.8%	52.0%	100.0%
	% within block	15.8%	21.3%	2.5%	13.8%	22.1%	17.0%
Attending job fairs	Frequency	3	0	0	1	6	10
	% looking for a job	30.0%	.0%	.0%	10.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	% within block	2.5%	.0%	.0%	1.3%	2.5%	1.7%
Public employment office	Frequency	13	17	15	30	60	135
	% looking for a job	9.6%	12.6%	11.1%	22.2%	44.4%	100.0%
	% within block	10.8%	21.3%	18.8%	37.5%	25.0%	22.5%
Private employment office	Frequency	0	0	0	0	1	1
	% looking for a job	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within block	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%	.2%
Direct application for employers,	Frequency	27	17	16	12	39	111
	% looking for a job	24.3%	15.3%	14.4%	10.8%	35.1%	100.0%
	% within block	22.5%	21.3%	20.0%	15.0%	16.3%	18.5%
Placing newspaper advertisements	Frequency	10	6	11	5	14	46
	% looking for a job	21.7%	13.0%	23.9%	10.9%	30.4%	100.0%
	% within block	8.3%	7.5%	13.8%	6.3%	5.8%	7.7%
Seeking assistance of friends, relatives, colleagues,	Frequency	42	19	35	18	60	174
	% looking for a job	24.1%	10.9%	20.1%	10.3%	34.5%	100.0%
	% within block	35.0%	23.8%	43.8%	22.5%	25.0%	29.0%
Looking for equipment to establish own enterprise	Frequency	5	3	1	3	7	19
	% looking for a job	26.3%	15.8%	5.3%	15.8%	36.8%	100.0%
	% within block	4.2%	3.8%	1.3%	3.8%	2.9%	3.2%
Other	Frequency	1	1	0	0	0	2
	% looking for a job	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within block	.8%	1.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% looking for a job	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

In response to the question as depicted, the respondents are mostly looking for jobs through seeking assistance of friends, relatives, colleagues, unions, etc (29.0%),

followed by public employment office (22.5%) and direct application for employers, participation in a competition (18.5%).

The study further reveals that the respondents looking for job is lead by seeking assistance of friends, relatives, colleagues, unions, etc from Kasom (43.8%), Chengai (35.0%), Ukhrul (25.0%), Kamjong (23.8%), and Phungyar (22.5%). Registration at a public employment office is lead by Phungyar (37.5%), Ukhrul 25.0%, Kamjong (21.3%), Kasom (18.8%), Chengai (10.8%). Looking for own enterprise is lead by Chengai (4.2%), Kamjong & Phungyar (3.8%), Ukhrul (2.9%) and finally Kasom (1.3%).

Hence it is observed here that maximum numbers of the respondents are depended on their friends, relatives, colleagues, unions, etc for seeking job.

Table 4.50: Receipt of advice from the employment service.

Advice from employment services		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
None	Frequency	96	72	79	79	166	492
	% received from the employment services	19.5%	14.6%	16.1%	16.1%	33.7%	100.0%
	% within block	80.0%	90.0%	98.8%	98.8%	69.2%	82.0%
Advice on how to search for job	Frequency	12	5	0	1	25	43
	% received from the employment services	27.9%	11.6%	.0%	2.3%	58.1%	100.0%
	% within block	10.0%	6.3%	.0%	1.3%	10.4%	7.2%
Information on vacancies	Frequency	8	0	0	0	13	21
	% received from the employment services	38.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%	61.9%	100.0%
	% within block	6.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	5.4%	3.5%
Guidance on education & training opportunities	Frequency	2	1	1	0	26	30
	% received from the employment services	6.7%	3.3%	3.3%	.0%	86.7%	100.0%
	% within block	1.7%	1.3%	1.3%	.0%	10.8%	5.0%
Placement at education/training programmes	Frequency	2	2	0	0	10	14
	% received from the employment services	14.3%	14.3%	.0%	.0%	71.4%	100.0%
	% within block	1.7%	2.5%	.0%	.0%	4.2%	2.3%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% received from the employment services	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The table reveals that (82.9%) of the respondents did not get any help or assistance from the employment office but (7.2%) received an advice on how to search for job whereas (5.0%) received a guidance on education and training opportunities, regarding

information on vacancies (3.5%) and (3.2%) received placement at education or training programmes.

The present study tries to understand that in the none category, it is lead by Kasom & Phungyar (98.8%), Kamjong (90.0%), Chengai (80.0%), Ukhrul (69.2%). Advice on how to search for job from employment office, it is lead by the respondents of Ukhrul (10.4%), Chengai (10.0%), Kamjong (6.3%), Phungyar (1.3%), Kasom (0%).

Therefore the data reveals the role played by the employment exchange in the area which is just doing its job on paper as a ritual with having negligible impact on the status of employment in the area.

Table 4.51: The level of education required for getting a decent employment.

Needs in level of education to get a decent job		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Elementary education	Frequency	0	0	0	0	4	4
	% within the needs of edu.	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within block	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.7%	.7%
Secondary education	Frequency	3	1	1	1	5	11
	% within the needs of edu.	27.3%	9.1%	9.1%	9.1%	45.5%	100.0%
	% within block	2.5%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	2.1%	1.8%
Higher Secondary	Frequency	11	8	0	10	9	38
	% within the needs of edu.	28.9%	21.1%	.0%	26.3%	23.7%	100.0%
	% within block	9.2%	10.0%	.0%	12.5%	3.8%	6.3%
Graduation	Frequency	11	4	2	9	18	44
	% within the needs of edu.	25.0%	9.1%	4.5%	20.5%	40.9%	100.0%
	% within block	9.2%	5.0%	2.5%	11.3%	7.5%	7.3%
Post-graduate studies	Frequency	61	27	55	39	112	294
	% within the needs of edu.	20.7%	9.2%	18.7%	13.3%	38.1%	100.0%
	% within block	50.8%	33.8%	68.8%	48.8%	46.7%	49.0%
Ph.D	Frequency	34	40	22	21	92	209
	% within the needs of edu.	16.3%	19.1%	10.5%	10.0%	44.0%	100.0%
	% within block	28.3%	50.0%	27.5%	26.3%	38.3%	34.8%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600

	% within the needs of edu.	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

It could be seen from the table that to get a decent job from the perspective of the most of the respondents a person need a minimum qualification of post graduate (49.0%) and Ph.D (34.8%).

According to block level the respondents who believe that a minimum of post graduate qualification is required to get a decent job, is lead by the respondents from Kasom block (68.8%), followed by Chengai (50.8%), Phungyar (48.8%), Ukhrul (46.7%), Kamjong (33.8%). On the other hand, those who thinks that atleast Ph.D qualification is required for the purpose, it is lead by the respondents from Kamjong block (50.0%), followed by Ukhrul (38.3%), Chengai (28.3%), Kasom (27.5%) and finally Phungyar (26.3%).

It is also evident from the table that majority of the respondents opined that a person needs a level of education which is at least postgraduate or Ph.D level to get a decent job these days. This tells the value of educational qualification and also highlights the problem of unemployability that is produced by the outdated educational qualification our society.

Table 4.52: Refusal of any job that was offered to the respondents.

Ever refused any job that was offered to you		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Yes	Frequency	19	6	6	7	32	70
	% refused any job that was offered	27.1%	8.6%	8.6%	10.0%	45.7%	100.0%
	% within block	15.8%	7.5%	7.5%	8.8%	13.3%	11.7%
No	Frequency	101	74	74	73	208	530
	% refused any job that was offered	19.1%	14.0%	14.0%	13.8%	39.2%	100.0%
	% within block	84.2%	92.5%	92.5%	91.3%	86.7%	88.3%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% refused any job that was offered	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

According to the information, it is revealed that 88.3% of respondents have not got any chance to refuse any job as it is yet to be offered to them. On the other hand a mere 11.7% of the respondents had refused a job that was offered.

When checked from block wise in the category of respondents who have not got any chance to refuse is mostly lead from Kamjong & Kasom (92.5%) followed by Phungyar (91.3%), Ukhrul (86.7%), Chengai (84.2%).

Based on the response, it can be understood that majority of the educated youth have not refused any job as the respondents did not get any chance to refuse as employment opportunities did not reached the study area.

Table 4.53: Relation between refusal to any job and educational qualification of the respondents.

Refused any job that was offered to you		Educational Qualification				Total
		Ph.D	Master	Bachelor	Higher Sec 10+2	
Yes	Frequency	3	23	41	3	70
	% refused any job that was offered to you	4.3%	32.9%	58.6%	4.3%	100.0%
	% within Education	25.0%	12.8%	12.7%	3.6%	11.7%
No	Frequency	9	157	283	81	530
	% refused any job that was offered to you	1.7%	29.6%	53.4%	15.3%	100.0%
	% within Education	75.0%	87.2%	87.3%	96.4%	88.3%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% refused any job that was offered to you	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The table shows that majority of the respondents (88.3%) did not get an opportunity to refused a job as a job was not available and when we observe the correlation with educational qualification of the respondents, we can see that among Higher secondary (96.4%), followed by bachelor degree (87.3%), Master (87.2%) and finally PhD (75.0%) majority of the respondents did not ever refused any job.

Hence the data shows that the educated youths with minimum higher secondary qualification in the area have not refused any job mainly because they were not offered any job.

Table 4.54: Relation between refusal to any job and monthly household income of the respondents.

Ever refused any job that was offered to you		Monthly household income					Total
		10,000 – 15,000	15001 – 20,000	20001 – 25,000	25,001 – 30,000	30,001 & above	
Yes	Frequency	11	10	7	15	27	70
	% within refused any job	15.7%	14.3%	10.0%	21.4%	38.6%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	10.9%	9.7%	9.6%	15.5%	11.9%	11.7%
No	Frequency	90	93	66	82	199	530
	% within refused any job	17.0%	17.5%	12.5%	15.5%	37.5%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	89.1%	90.3%	90.4%	84.5%	88.1%	88.3%
Total	Frequency	101	103	73	97	226	600
	% within refused any job	16.8%	17.2%	12.2%	16.2%	37.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data shows that majority of the respondents (88.3%) never refused any job that was offered to them.

The relationship with household income of the respondents and the refusal of any job that was offered to them reveals that most of the respondents among all the income groups have never refused any job that was offered to them.

Hence the data shows that there is no correlation between household income of the respondents and the refusal of any job that was offered to them.

Table 4.55: Reason for leaving job by most of the people in your area.

Why most people leave job in your area		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Low wage	Frequency	80	44	41	69	160	394
	% of the people leave job in your	20.3%	11.2%	10.4%	17.5%	40.6%	100.0%
	% within block	66.7%	55.0%	51.3%	83.3%	66.7%	65.7%
Qualification	Frequency	9	8	6	1	25	49
	% of the people leave job in your	18.4%	16.3%	12.2%	2.0%	51.0%	100.0%
	% within block	7.5%	10.0%	7.5%	1.3%	10.4%	8.2%
Performance	Frequency	4	6	19	1	19	49
	% of the people leave job in your	8.2%	12.2%	38.8%	2.0%	38.8%	100.0%
	% within block	3.3%	7.5%	23.8%	1.3%	7.9%	8.2%
Distance for work	Frequency	5	3	2	2	8	20
	% of the people leave job in your	25.0%	15.0%	10.0%	10.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	4.2%	3.8%	2.5%	2.5%	3.3%	3.3%
Communication problem	Frequency	6	12	3	2	4	27
	% of the people leave job in your	22.2%	44.4%	11.1%	7.4%	14.8%	100.0%
	% within block	5.0%	15.0%	3.8%	2.5%	1.7%	4.5%
Working condition	Frequency	16	7	9	5	24	61
	% of the people leave job in your	26.2%	11.5%	14.8%	8.2%	39.3%	100.0%
	% within block	13.3%	8.8%	11.3%	6.3%	10.0%	10.2%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of the people leave job in your	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

Most of the people leaved the job in the study area because of low wages (65.7%) followed by working condition (8.2%).

The data reveals in the category of low wage lead from Phungyar (83.3%), Chengai & Ukhrul (66.7%), Kamjong (55.0%) and Kasom (51.3%). On the other hand, in the line

of working condition, it is lead by Chengai (13.3%), Kasom (11.3%), Ukhrul (10.0%), Kamjong (8.8%), Phungyar (6.3%).

Hence the study reveals about the problem of low wages and poor working condition which is motivating youths to leave their jobs.

4.4: Conclusion:

In the study area it is observed that majority of the respondents are supporting themselves without any regular paid employment (86.2%) which explains the status of unemployment in the area and they are fulfilling their basic needs (food, cloth, shelter and their minimum luxury as mobile phone, internet etc.) as they get main support from their parents (37.8%), other family members (27.8%), agriculture (26.3%) and so on. Hence family as an institution is playing a positive role by supporting the unemployed youth, both financially and psychologically and also for seeking job. Moreover the lack of vocational or technical school training (only 35.2% got these trainings) in the study area is also established from the study which is also has highlighted the vacuum that has to be filled to address the issue of employment in the area. As far as their work experience is concerned, apart from private companies (19.2%) there is not much real opportunity for the youths to engage compelling them to be engaged in the field of community volunteer work (27.7%), internships in NGOs (17.3), family business (14.2%) (which is mainly selling of fire woods, agricultural products, charcoal, grocery shops, local cabs etc.) and work in farms (13.3%) where the earnings are very negligible. Hence the study confirms the prevalence of mostly under unemployment (45.0%) among the respondents, followed by seasonal unemployment (23.0%), voluntary unemployment (17.7%), casual unemployment (11.0%) and involuntary unemployment (3.3%). Consequently a significant number of the educated youth (18.2%) are in a zone that they are thinking of joining into insurgency while looking for job at the same time and it also reveals the real cause of rise in the participation in the insurgent movements in the area. The prevalence of underemployment can also be traced by the reason for leaving the jobs by the respondents which is mainly due to low wages and poor working condition. And according to the maximum number of the respondents the main reason for not working

or not looking for work is because of lack of fulfilling employer's requirement (23.2%), followed by those who could not find suitable job (18.0%), who believe no suitable work is available (17.0%), and who have personal family responsibilities (15.0%). Surprisingly even though there is less employment opportunities in the district according to most of the respondents but still majority of the respondent fail to avail opportunities outside Ukhru district (59.7%) because of financial problems (47.7%), followed by family problem (23.5%) and personal issues (22.5%).

Problems of unemployment in Ukhrul District

4.5: Introduction:

The crisis of unemployment is serious as it is not an end in itself; it is giving birth to many other social problems as crime, drug addiction, alcoholism, gambling, insurgency, suicide etc. When these unemployed youths are educated, the problem is even graver, as they can easily fall into the prey of violent protest movements against political system which proved to be incapable of addressing their problem.

Hence to bring quality human resource one has to focus on many factors as quality of education, vocational skills, the demand of the market etc, but the motivation for youth to pursue ambitious, expensive and challenging educational training is a good secure job at the end of the course. But the impediments of unemployment often de motivate youth to pursue educational training and remain unskilled.

Table 4.56: Respondents level of seeking for work.

Are you actively seeking work?		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Actively	Frequency	70	46	70	56	175	417
	% of actively seeking work	16.8%	11.0%	16.8%	13.4%	42.0%	100.0%
	% within block	58.3%	57.5%	87.5%	70.0%	72.9%	69.5%
Inactively	Frequency	50	34	10	24	65	183
	% of actively seeking work	27.3%	18.6%	5.5%	13.1%	35.5%	100.0%
	% within block	41.7%	42.5%	12.5%	30.0%	27.1%	30.5%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of actively seeking work	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

It is also evident from the table that 69.5% of the respondents is actively seeking work whereas 30.5% of the respondents are not according to their response.

The study further reveals in a block wise data of respondents actively seeking work, Kasom leads with (87.5%), Ukhrul (72.9%), Phungyar (70.0%), Chengai (58.3%), Kamjong (57.5%). On the other hand, the respondents which falls in the category of educated youth and which is not seeking for work is lead by Chengai (41.7%), Kamjong (42.5%), Phungyar (30.0%), Ukhrul (27.1%), and Kasom (12.5%).

As observed from the Table, it can be seen that majority of the respondents are actively seeking for work whereas a significant number of them (30.5%) may have lost hope and hence are no longer seeking employment opportunities.

Table 4.57: Relation between the respondents who are actively seeking work and their educational qualification.

Are you actively seeking work?		Educational Qualification				Total
		PhD	Master	Bachelor	Higher Sec 10+2	
Yes	Frequency	8	145	226	38	417
	% actively seeking work	1.9%	34.8%	54.2%	9.1%	100.0%
	% within Education	66.7%	80.6%	69.8%	45.2%	69.5%
No	Frequency	4	35	98	46	183
	% actively seeking work	2.2%	19.1%	53.6%	25.1%	100.0%
	% within Education	33.3%	19.4%	30.2%	54.8%	30.5%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% actively seeking work	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The table indicates that majority of the respondents (69.5%) are actively seeking work. Among the post graduates most of them (80.6%) followed by graduate respondents (69.8%), Ph.D (66.7%), and higher secondary (45.2%) are from this category.

Hence, the above data shows that (30.5%) are not actively looking for work but (69.5%) are actively looking for work among the entire respondents from the study area. Hence a significant number of the respondents who have Ph.D (33.3%), followed

by higher secondary (54.8%) graduation (30.2%) seem to leave any hope from the system hence they are no longer seeking for employment any more.

Table 4.58: Relation between the respondents who are actively seeking work and their monthly household income.

Are you actively seeking work?		Monthly household income					Total
		10,000 – 15,000	15001 – 20,000	20001 – 25,000	25,001 – 30,000	30,001 & above	
Yes	Frequency	61	58	51	75	172	417
	% of actively seeking work	14.6%	13.9%	12.2%	18.0%	41.2%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	60.4%	56.3%	69.9%	77.3%	76.1%	69.5%
No	Frequency	40	45	22	22	54	183
	% of actively seeking work	21.9%	24.6%	12.0%	12.0%	29.5%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	39.6%	43.7%	30.1%	22.7%	23.9%	30.5%
Total	Frequency	101	103	73	97	226	600
	% of actively seeking work	16.8%	17.2%	12.2%	16.2%	37.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data shows that majority of the respondents (69.5%) are actively seeking work.

The relationship with household income of the respondents and actively seeking of work reveals that lower income group up to Rs 25,000 are comparatively more who are not seeking any job in comparison to the higher income group above Rs 25,000.

Hence the data shows that the lower income group respondents seems to have lost hope in getting employment opportunity hence they are mostly not even seeking for any job in comparison to their higher income group counterparts.

Table 4.59: Discontinuation of education to work fulltime.

Did you ever stop your education to work fulltime		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Yes	Frequency	14	14	10	12	50	100
	% stopping edn to work full time	14.0%	14.0%	10.0%	12.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within block	11.7%	17.5%	12.5%	15.0%	20.8%	16.7%
No	Frequency	106	66	70	68	190	500
	% stopping edn to work full time	21.2%	13.2%	14.0%	13.6%	38.0%	100.0%
	% within block	88.3%	82.5%	87.5%	85.0%	79.2%	83.3%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% stopping edn to work full time	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

In response to the question, 83.3% of the respondents did not ever stop their education whereas 16.7% of the respondents stops their education to work or look for work and then re-enter school at a later date.

When we look at the share of the respondents who discontinued their education for getting job are mostly from the block of Ukhrul (20.8%), followed by Kamjong (17.5%), Phungyar (15.0%), Kasom (12.5%), Chengai (11.7%).

It is revealed that majority of the respondents did not ever discontinued their education to work or look for work and then re-enter school at a later date.

Table 4.60: Obstacle in finding a good job.

Main obstacle in finding a good job		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Community Biasness	Frequency	44	24	35	30	97	230
	% of obstacles in finding job	19.1%	10.4%	15.2%	13.0%	42.2%	100.0%
	% within block	36.7%	30.0%	43.8%	37.5%	40.4%	38.3%
No enough job created	Frequency	62	40	38	39	87	266
	% of obstacles in finding job	23.3%	15.0%	14.3%	14.7%	32.7%	100.0%
	% within block	51.7%	50.0%	47.5%	48.8%	36.3%	44.3%
No work experience	Frequency	14	16	7	11	56	104
	% of obstacles in finding job	13.5%	15.4%	6.7%	10.6%	53.8%	100.0%
	% within block	11.7%	20.0%	8.8%	13.8%	23.3%	17.3%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of obstacles in finding job	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

As indicated in the table, the main obstacle in finding a good job according to the respondents is lack of enough job creation (44.3%), community biasness (38.3%), and lack of work experience (17.3%).

The study further reveals from the respondents from the category of Community Biasness, it leads from the block of Kasom (43.8%), Ukhrul (40.4%), Phungyar (37.5%), Chengai (36.7%), and Kamjong (30.0%). Those who reported that lack of enough job created is the problem are mostly from Chengai (51.7%), followed by Kamjong (50.0%), Phungyar (48.8%), Kasom (47.5%), Ukhrul (36.3%). Whereas those who reported that lack of work experience is the reason, it leads from the respondents of Ukhrul (23.3%), Kamjong (20.0%), Phungyar (13.8%), Chengai (11.7%), Kasom (8.8%).

As indicated in the table from the response of the educated youth, it can be seen that lack of creation of enough job is one of the main obstacle in finding a good job in the study area.

Table 4.61: Effects of unemployment.

Effect that of unemployment		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Economic Effect	Frequency	59	30	11	50	80	230
	% of effect	25.7%	13.0%	4.8%	21.7%	34.8%	100.0%
	% within block	49.2%	37.5%	13.8%	62.5%	33.3%	38.3%
Addicted to different drugs	Frequency	3	6	17	3	21	50
	% of effect	6.0%	12.0%	34.0%	6.0%	42.0%	100.0%
	% within block	2.5%	7.5%	21.3%	3.8%	8.8%	8.3%
Psychological effect	Frequency	13	11	26	5	25	80
	% of effect	16.3%	13.8%	32.5%	6.3%	31.3%	100.0%
	% within block	10.8%	13.8%	32.5%	6.3%	10.4%	13.3%
Family problems	Frequency	45	33	26	22	114	240
	% of effect	18.8%	13.8%	10.8%	9.2%	47.5%	100.0%
	% within block	37.5%	41.3%	32.5%	27.5%	47.5%	40.0%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of effect	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

It is revealed from the above table in the study area that the educated youths believed that the most predominant effect of unemployment is family problems that arises out of it (40.0%), followed by economic impediments (38.3%), psychological stress (13.3), addiction to different drugs (8.3).

The further segregation of the data block wise reveals that those respondents who finds family problem as the predominant effect of unemployment are mostly from Ukhrul (47.5%), followed by Kamjong (41.3%), Chengai 37.5%, Kasom (32.5%), Phungyar (27.5). Those who held economic problems as the effect are mostly from Phungyar (62.5%), followed by Chengai (49.2%), Kamjong (37.5%), Ukhrul (33.3%),

Kasom (13.8%). The respondents who viewed psychological stress as the major effect of unemployment are mostly from Kasom (32.5%), Kamjong (13.8%), Chengai (10.8%), Ukhrul (10.4%), Phungyar (6.3%). Again, in the group of addicted to different drugs, Kasom leads all by (21.3%) and the rest block lies below (9%).

It is clear from the data given by the respondents that they believed that the most predominant effect of unemployment is family problems which take them far from the family and alienate them therefore significant number of them also reported that psychological stress is the major effect of unemployment.

Table 4.62: Unemployment as a male problem or a female problem.

Unemployment is more a male problem than a female problem		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Male	Frequency	46	27	41	15	58	187
	% of unemployment is more a male problem	24.6%	14.4%	21.9%	8.0%	31.0%	100.0%
	% within block	38.3%	33.8%	51.3%	18.8%	24.2%	31.2%
Female	Frequency	13	8	2	8	29	60
	% of unemployment is more a male problem	21.7%	13.3%	3.3%	13.3%	48.3%	100.0%
	% within block	10.8%	10.0%	2.5%	10.0%	12.1%	10.0%
Same/Equal	Frequency	45	33	34	39	131	282
	% of unemployment is more a male problem	16.0%	11.7%	12.1%	13.8%	46.5%	100.0%
	% within block	37.5%	41.3%	42.5%	48.8%	54.6%	47.0%
Can't say	Frequency	16	12	3	18	22	71
	% of unemployment is more a male problem	22.5%	16.9%	4.2%	25.4%	31.0%	100.0%
	% within block	13.3%	15.0%	3.8%	22.5%	9.2%	11.8%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of unemployment is more a male problem	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

In response to the question of Unemployment is more a male problem than a female problem, the respondents opined that it is an equal problem for both the sex (47.0%)

followed by respondents who reported that it is more a male problem than female (31.2%), those who are not sure (11.8%), and finally those who don't think that it is more a male problem than female (10.0%).

The study further reveals in the category of respondents who opined that it is an equal problem for both the sex, Ukhurul leads (54.6%) followed by Phungyar (48.8%), Kasom (42.5%), Kasom (41.3%), Chengai (37.5%). Among the respondents who reported that it is more a male problem than female, it leads from Phungyar (51.3%), followed by Chengai (38.3%), Kamjong (33.8%), Ukhurul (24.2%), Phungyar (18.8%). Those who can't say, Phungyar leads (22.5%) followed by Kamjong (15.0%), Chengai (13.3%), Ukhurul (9.2%), Kasom (3.8%).

It could be seen from the table that majority of the respondents feels and think that male and female are facing the problem of unemployment similarly, hence unemployment is not more a male problem according to most of the respondents which also tells about the position of women in the society, who are looked upon there as contributing beyond household responsibilities. But a significant number of them also believe that it is a male problem, may be as most of the respondents are male and their sex biasness can be traced in the response.

Table 4.63: Consultation by the family in family matters.

How often do your family consult you in family matters		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Always	Frequency	61	35	23	39	111	269
	% of consult in family matters	22.7%	13.0%	8.6%	14.5%	41.3%	100.0%
	% within block	50.8%	43.8%	28.8%	48.8%	46.3%	44.8%
Sometimes	Frequency	51	36	52	31	110	280
	% of consult in family matters	18.2%	12.9%	18.6%	11.1%	39.3%	100.0%
	% within block	42.5%	45.0%	65.0%	38.8%	45.8%	46.7%
Rarely	Frequency	8	9	5	10	19	51
	% of consult in family matters	15.7%	17.6%	9.8%	19.6%	37.3%	100.0%
	% within block	6.7%	11.3%	6.3%	12.5%	7.9%	8.5%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of consult in family matters	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The present data indicates that most of the respondents are consulted by their family members regarding family affairs only occasionally (46.7%), followed by always (44.8%) rarely (8.5%).

It could be seen from block wise distribution that those respondents who are consulted by their family are mostly from Kasom (65.0%), followed by Ukhrul (45.8%), Kamjong (45.0%), Chengai (42.5%), Phungyar (38.8%). Whereas in the category of those respondents who are always consulted, are mostly from Chengai (50.8%) followed by (48.8%), Ukhrul (46.3%), Kamjong (43.8%), Kasom (28.8%).

The study further reveals that majority of the family members consult the respondents in term of family matters only occasionally, hence it tells about the status of those youths who are unemployed in their own house.

Table 4.64: Similarity of the opinion of the respondents with head of the family in family matters.

How similar is your opinion with your family head in family matters		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Very similar	Frequency	32	23	13	14	55	137
	% of similarity with family head in family matter	23.4%	16.8%	9.5%	10.2%	40.1%	100.0%
	% within block	26.7%	28.8%	16.3%	17.5%	22.9%	22.8%
Somewhat similar	Frequency	72	49	62	54	169	406
	% of similarity with family head in family matter	17.7%	12.1%	15.3%	13.3%	41.6%	100.0%
	% within block	60.0%	61.3%	77.5%	67.5%	70.4%	67.7%
Somewhat dissimilar	Frequency	15	5	3	8	14	45
	% of similarity with family head in family matter	33.3%	11.1%	6.7%	17.8%	31.1%	100.0%
	% within block	12.5%	6.3%	3.8%	10.0%	5.8%	7.5%
Very different	Frequency	1	3	2	4	2	12
	% of similarity with family head in family matter	8.3%	25.0%	16.7%	33.3%	16.7%	100.0%
	% within block	.8%	3.8%	2.5%	5.0%	.8%	2.0%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of similarity with family head in family matter	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The table reveals the extent of similarity of opinion of the respondents with the family head in family matters. Most of the respondents perspective are somewhat similar with the family head (67.7%), followed by very similar opinion (22.8%), somewhat dissimilar opinion (7.5%), and very different opinion (2.0%).

The data when subdivided block wise reveals that those respondents who have similarity of opinion with the family head are mostly from Kasom (77.5%) followed by Ukhurul (70.4%) whereas the rest of the block lies between (60.0%) – (67.5%). On the other hand those respondents who have very similar opinion with the family head are mostly from Kamjong (28.8%) followed by Chengai (26.7%), Ukhurul (22.9%), Phungyar (17.5%), Kasom (16.3%).

It can be observed here that majority of the respondents perspective with the family is somewhat similar and majority of the respondents comes from Kasom block, so the family head is cooperating with the unemployed member of the family.

Table 4.65: Feeling of isolation and cut off from society because of unemployment.

Felt isolated and cut off from society, or depressed, because of unemployment		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhurul	
Yes	Frequency	58	48	62	45	97	310
	% cut off from society	18.7%	15.5%	20.0%	14.5%	31.3%	100.0%
	% within block	48.3%	60.0%	77.5%	56.3%	40.4%	51.7%
No	Frequency	62	32	18	35	143	290
	% of isolated and cut off from society	21.4%	11.0%	6.2%	12.1%	49.3%	100.0%
	% within block	51.7%	40.0%	22.5%	43.8%	59.6%	48.3%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of isolated and cut off from society	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data reveals that more than half (51.7%) of the respondents in the past have felt isolated or depressed because of unemployment whereas (48.3%) have not been cut off from society or depressed.

It reveals in the category of isolated and cut off from society are mainly from Kasom (77.5%) followed by Kamjong (60.0%), Phungyar (56.3%), Chengai (48.3%), Ukhurul

(40.4%). On the other hand, the respondents who have not cut off from society or depressed are mostly from the block of Ukhrul (59.6%), followed by Chengai (51.7%), Phungyar (43.8%), Kamjong (40.0%), Kasom (22.5%).

Hence the study reveals that majority of the respondents feels that they are cut off from the society and also felt isolated or depressed in the past because of lack of money and unemployment. This is one of the major impacts of unemployment, depression which is leading to other social problems in the area as drug abuse and insurgency in the area.

Table 4.66: Most important impact of unemployment in the area of the respondents out of the following.

Most important impact of unemployment in your		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Addiction to alcoholic drinks	Frequency	65	15	25	22	84	211
	% of impact on unemployment	30.8%	7.1%	11.8%	10.4%	39.8%	100.0%
	% within block	54.2%	18.8%	31.3%	27.5%	35.0%	35.2%
Gambling	Frequency	17	20	30	25	56	148
	% of impact on unemployment	11.5%	13.5%	20.3%	16.9%	37.8%	100.0%
	% within block	14.2%	25.0%	37.5%	31.3%	23.3%	24.7%
Addiction to drugs	Frequency	17	7	9	4	46	83
	% of impact on unemployment	20.5%	8.4%	10.8%	4.8%	55.4%	100.0%
	% within block	14.2%	8.8%	11.3%	5.0%	19.2%	13.8%
Crime	Frequency	5	14	14	6	31	70
	% of impact on unemployment	7.1%	20.0%	20.0%	8.6%	44.3%	100.0%
	% within block	4.2%	17.5%	17.5%	7.5%	12.9%	11.7%
Insurgency	Frequency	16	24	2	23	23	88
	% of impact on unemployment	18.2%	27.3%	2.3%	26.1%	26.1%	100.0%
	% within block	13.3%	30.0%	2.5%	28.8%	9.6%	14.7%
Totals	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of impact on unemployment	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

From the response of the respondents, it is shown that the most imperative impact of unemployment in the study area is addiction to alcoholic drinks (35.2%) followed by gambling (24.7%), insurgency (14.7%), addiction to drugs (13.8%), crime (11.7%).

The study further reveals that those respondents who are addicted to alcoholic drinks are mostly from Chengai (54.2%) followed by Ukhurul (35.0%), Kasom (31.3%), Phungyar (27.5%), Kamjong (18.8%). Those who are engaged in gambling are mostly from Kasom lead by (37.5%) followed by Phungyar (31.3%), Kamjong (25.0%), Ukhurul (23.3%), Chengai (14.2%). The respondents who believe that insurgency is the impact of unemployment are mostly from Kamjong (30.0%), Phungyar (28.8%), Chengai (13.3%), Ukhurul (9.6%), Kasom (2.5%).

It is revealed here that there how even the youth of the place is confirming that unemployment is giving birth to other major socials problems as alcoholism, gambling, insurgency and addiction to drugs. Hence all these problems can be to a great extent addressed by addressing the problem of unemployment.

Table 4.67: Relation between most important impact of unemployment in the area and educational qualification of the respondents.

Most important impact of unemployment in the area		Educational Qualification				Total
		PhD	Master	Bachelor	10+2	
Addiction to alcoholic drinks	Frequency	1	61	119	30	211
	% of impact on unemployment	.5%	28.9%	56.4%	14.2%	100.0%
	% within Education	8.3%	33.9%	36.7%	35.7%	35.2%
Gambling	Frequency	1	49	81	17	148
	% of impact on unemployment	.7%	33.1%	54.7%	11.5%	100.0%
	% within Education	8.3%	27.2%	25.0%	20.2%	24.7%
Addiction to drugs	Frequency	7	28	38	10	83
	% of impact on unemployment	8.4%	33.7%	45.8%	12.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	58.3%	15.6%	11.7%	11.9%	13.8%
Crime	Frequency	0	22	37	11	70
	% of impact on unemployment	.0%	31.4%	52.9%	15.7%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	12.2%	11.4%	13.1%	11.7%
Insurgency	Frequency	3	20	49	16	88
	% of impact on unemployment	3.4%	22.7%	55.7%	18.2%	100.0%
	% within Education	25.0%	11.1%	15.1%	19.0%	14.7%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% of impact on unemployment	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

According to the table, it denotes that (35.2%) of the respondents believe that addiction to alcoholic drinks is the most important impact of unemployment in the study area. Majority of the respondents who believed alcohol drinks as an impact of unemployment are from the respondents of graduates (36.7%) followed by higher secondary (35.7%). Respondents who believed gambling as an impact are from post graduate (27.2%) followed by graduate (25.0%). On the other hand, respondents who

believed addiction to drugs as an impact are mostly among the respondents with Ph.D (58.3%).

The table shows that the impact of unemployment is mostly addiction to alcoholic drinks, gambling, insurgency, addiction to drugs, crime. Above all the impact, addiction to alcoholic drinks is the most important impact that majority of the responds.

Table 4.68: Things done by the respondents in the last two/three years in the following list.

Which of the things on this list have you done in the last two/three years		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Presented views to a local MLA	Frequency	23	10	13	11	26	83
	% done in the last few years	27.7%	12.0%	15.7%	13.3%	31.3%	100.0%
	% within block	19.2%	12.5%	16.3%	13.8%	10.8%	13.8%
Written a letter to an editor	Frequency	2	1	0	0	2	5
	% done in the last few years	40.0%	20.0%	.0%	.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	1.7%	1.3%	.0%	.0%	.8%	.8%
Made speech before an organised group	Frequency	6	5	1	1	33	46
	% done in the last few years	13.0%	10.9%	2.2%	2.2%	71.7%	100.0%
	% within block	5.0%	6.3%	1.3%	1.3%	13.8%	7.7%
Stood for public office	Frequency	3	0	1	2	5	11
	% done in the last few years	27.3%	.0%	9.1%	18.2%	45.5%	100.0%
	% within block	2.5%	.0%	1.3%	2.5%	2.1%	1.8%
Taken an active part in a political campaign	Frequency	6	3	5	1	10	25
	% done in the last few years	24.0%	12.0%	20.0%	4.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	5.0%	3.8%	6.3%	1.3%	4.2%	4.2%
Helped on fund raising drives	Frequency	16	14	1	9	40	80
	% done in the last few years	20.0%	17.5%	1.3%	11.3%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within block	13.3%	17.5%	1.3%	11.3%	16.7%	13.3%
Voted in the last General election	Frequency	38	38	19	18	92	205
	% done in the last few years	18.5%	18.5%	9.3%	8.8%	44.9%	100.0%
	% within block	31.7%	47.5%	23.8%	22.5%	38.3%	34.2%
None of these	Frequency	26	9	40	38	32	145
	% done in the last few years	17.9%	6.2%	27.6%	26.2%	22.1%	100.0%
	% within block	21.7%	11.3%	50.0%	47.5%	13.3%	24.2%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% done in the last few years	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

From the response, it indicates that only (34.2%) of the respondents have voted in the last general election, a mere 13.8% of them presented views to their local MLA, (13.3%) helped on fund raising.

The present study shows in the category of voted in the last general election, are mostly from Kamjong (47.5%) followed by Ukhrol (38.3%), Chengai (31.7%), Kasom (23.8%), Phungyar (22.5%). Regarding the presenting of views to their local MLA is lead from the respondents of Chengai (19.2%), Kasom (16.3%), Phungyar (13.8%), Kamjong (12.5%), and Ukhrol (10.8%). On the other hand of helped on fund raising is lead from the block of Kamjong (17.5%) followed by Ukhrol (16.7%), Chengai (13.3%), Phungyar (11.3%), Kasom (1.3%).

The data reveals a very gloomy picture related to the educated unemployed youth as a mere 34.2% of them have voted in the last election which reveals their trust in the political system. The share of respondents who have written to communicate their problem to the local MLA is also very negligible (13.3%), which also an indicator of the trust of the unemployed youths on political leadership.

Table 4.69: Relation between purpose of engagement in last two – three years and educational qualification of the respondents.

Purpose of engagement in last two – three years back		Educational Qualification				Total
		PhD	Master	Bachelor	Higher Sec 10+2	
Presented my views to a local councillor/MLA	Frequency	3	35	42	3	83
	% done in last 2/3 years	3.6%	42.2%	50.6%	3.6%	100.0%
	% within Education	25.0%	19.4%	13.0%	3.6%	13.8%
Written a letter to an editor	Frequency	0	2	2	1	5
	% done in last 2/3 years	.0%	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	1.1%	.6%	1.2%	.8%
Made a speech before an organised group	Frequency	1	20	22	3	46
	% done in last 2/3 years	2.2%	43.5%	47.8%	6.5%	100.0%
	% within Education	8.3%	11.1%	6.8%	3.6%	7.7%
Stood for public office	Frequency	1	4	6	0	11
	% done in last 2/3 years	9.1%	36.4%	54.5%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	8.3%	2.2%	1.9%	.0%	1.8%
Taken an active part in a political campaign	Frequency	0	9	12	4	25
	% done in last 2/3 years	.0%	36.0%	48.0%	16.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	5.0%	3.7%	4.8%	4.2%
Helped on fund raising drives	Frequency	3	10	49	18	80
	% done in last 2/3 years	3.8%	12.5%	61.3%	22.5%	100.0%
	% within Education	25.0%	5.6%	15.1%	21.4%	13.3%
Voted in the last General election	Frequency	1	51	114	39	205
	% done in last 2/3 years	.5%	24.9%	55.6%	19.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	8.3%	28.3%	35.2%	46.4%	34.2%
None of these	Frequency	3	49	77	16	145
	% done in last 2/3 years	2.1%	33.8%	53.1%	11.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	25.0%	27.2%	23.8%	19.0%	24.2%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% done in last 2/3 years	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data reveals that majority of the respondents (34.2%) have voted in the last general election in the last two-three years leading from the respondents qualification

of higher secondary followed by graduate (35.2%). Presenting the views to local MLA/councillor is lead from the respondents who have a degree of Ph.D (25.0%) followed by postgraduate (19.4%). Whereas helping on fund raising is lead from the respondents of Ph.D degree holders (25.0%) followed by higher secondary (21.4%)

The data here reveals very pertinent fact about the unemployed youth in the area, as only 34.2% of them have voted in the last election which means 65.8% of them did not even voted, which is mostly because they have lost hope in political authorities to change their status. Their poor participation in all the activities mentioned in the above table shows that the youth have lost hope not only in the system but slowly in themselves which will be a alarming situation for the society as a whole.

Table 4.70: Relation between purpose of engagement in last two – three years and monthly household income of the respondents.

Purpose of engagement in the last two years?		Monthly household income					Total
		10,000 – 15,000	15001 – 20,000	20001 – 25,000	25,001 – 30,000	30,001 & above	
Presented my views to a local councillor/MLA	Frequency	8	17	15	16	27	83
	% done in last two – three years	9.6%	20.5%	18.1%	19.3%	32.5%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	7.9%	16.5%	20.5%	16.5%	11.9%	13.8%
Written a letter to an editor	Frequency	3	0	0	0	2	5
	% done in last two – three years	60.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	3.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.9%	.8%
Made a speech before an organised group	Frequency	7	12	3	3	21	46
	% done in last two – three years	15.2%	26.1%	6.5%	6.5%	45.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	6.9%	11.7%	4.1%	3.1%	9.3%	7.7%
Stood for public office	Frequency	3	2	1	0	5	11
	% done in last two – three years	27.3%	18.2%	9.1%	.0%	45.5%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	3.0%	1.9%	1.4%	.0%	2.2%	1.8%
Taken an active part in a political campaign	Frequency	7	4	1	3	10	25
	% done in last two – three years	28.0%	16.0%	4.0%	12.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	6.9%	3.9%	1.4%	3.1%	4.4%	4.2%
Helped on fund raising drives	Frequency	17	10	6	15	32	80
	% done in last two – three years	21.3%	12.5%	7.5%	18.8%	40.0%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	16.8%	9.7%	8.2%	15.5%	14.2%	13.3%
Voted in the last General election	Frequency	44	44	23	22	72	205
	% done in last two – three years	21.5%	21.5%	11.2%	10.7%	35.1%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	43.6%	42.7%	31.5%	22.7%	31.9%	34.2%
None of these	Frequency	12	14	24	38	57	145
	% done in last two – three years	8.3%	9.7%	16.6%	26.2%	39.3%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	11.9%	13.6%	32.9%	39.2%	25.2%	24.2%
Total	Frequency	101	103	73	97	226	600
	% done in last two – three years	16.8%	17.2%	12.2%	16.2%	37.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data reveals that majority of the respondents (34.2%) have voted in the last general election.

The relationship with household income of the respondents is mostly seen in the category of 10,000 – 15,000 (43.6%), followed by 15001 - 20,000 (42.7%).

The data clearly indicates that the respondents having the lowest income go for more in voting the last general election.

Table 4.71: Likeliness to accept any job by the respondents.

More likely to accept any job		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Whatever the conditions	Count	42	24	31	25	51	173
	% likely to	24.3%	13.9%	17.9%	14.5%	29.5%	100.0%
	% within Block	35.0%	30.0%	38.8%	31.3%	21.3%	28.8%
Provided it was stable	Count	53	43	38	49	124	307
	% likely to	17.3%	14.0%	12.4%	16.0%	40.4%	100.0%
	% within Block	44.2%	53.8%	47.5%	61.3%	51.7%	51.2%
Accept any job, provided well paid	Count	13	6	10	2	39	70
	% likely to	18.6%	8.6%	14.3%	2.9%	55.7%	100.0%
	% within Block	10.8%	7.5%	12.5%	2.5%	16.3%	11.7%
If stable, well paid & appropriate to level of qualification	Count	12	7	1	4	26	50
	% likely to	24.0%	14.0%	2.0%	8.0%	52.0%	100.0%
	% within Block	10.0%	8.8%	1.3%	5.0%	10.8%	8.3%
Total	Count	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% likely to	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within Block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

According to the data, the respondents are more likely to accept any job provided it is stable (51.2%), followed by those who will accept any job in whatever the condition (28.8%).

As indicated on the table, it reveals that from the block wise distribution of the respondents who have reported that they will accept any job provided it was stable are mostly from Phungyar (61.3%) followed by Kamjong (53.8%), Ukhrul (51.7%), Kasom (47.5%), Chengai (44.2%). On the other hand of those respondents who reported that they will accepting any job in whatever condition, their share block wise is between (30.0%) - (38.8%) but except Ukhrul it has (21.3%)

As observed from the table, it can be observed that majority of the respondents are into the looking for stability in jobs followed by those who have no criteria. The dearth of employment opportunities is forcing them to take any job they get without being choosy.

Table 4.72: Relation between probability of the respondents to accept any job and their educational qualification.

Likely to accept any job		Educational Qualification				Total
		PhD	Master	Bachelor	Higher Sec 10+2	
Whatever the conditions	Frequency	2	21	107	43	173
	% more likely to	1.2%	12.1%	61.8%	24.9%	100.0%
	% within Education	16.7%	11.7%	33.0%	51.2%	28.8%
Provided it was stable	Frequency	5	119	162	21	307
	% more likely to	1.6%	38.8%	52.8%	6.8%	100.0%
	% within Education	41.7%	66.1%	50.0%	25.0%	51.2%
Provided it was well paid	Frequency	4	24	33	9	70
	% more likely to	5.7%	34.3%	47.1%	12.9%	100.0%
	% within Education	33.3%	13.3%	10.2%	10.7%	11.7%
If it was stable, well paid and if it was appropriate to my level of qualification	Frequency	1	16	22	11	50
	% more likely to	2.0%	32.0%	44.0%	22.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	8.3%	8.9%	6.8%	13.1%	8.3%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% more likely to	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The table indicates that majority of the respondents (51.2%) are ready to accept any job provided it was stable. Majority of the respondents in this category among the post graduate (66.1%) followed by graduates (50.0%) are from this category. Respondents who are ready to accept any job, whatever the conditions is 28.8%, among that are mostly from higher secondary (51.2%) followed by (33.0%) graduate respondents. Respondents who are more likely to accept any job, provided it was well paid, (33.3%) are Ph.D followed by (13.3%) postgraduate.

The data reveals that majority of the respondents are ready to accept any job whatever the condition is because unemployment has come up as a big issue for the respondents as well as for the family and society.

Table 4.73: Presence of affect of unemployment on the status of the respondents at home and the status of the family in the community.

Affect of status by Unemployment		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Yes	Frequency	107	69	79	69	201	525
	% that affect status	20.4%	13.1%	15.0%	13.1%	38.3%	100.0%
	% within block	89.2%	86.3%	98.8%	86.3%	83.8%	87.5%
No	Frequency	13	11	1	11	39	75
	% that affect status	17.3%	14.7%	1.3%	14.7%	52.0%	100.0%
	% within block	10.8%	13.8%	1.3%	13.8%	16.3%	12.5%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% that affect status	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

Here, it is established from the above table that a significant majority (87.5%) of the respondents believed that unemployment undermines their status at home as well the status of their family in the community.

It is revealed from the data that unemployed respondents who feels that status at home as well the status of their family in the community is affected because of their unemployment

are mostly from the block of Kasom (98.8%) and the rest block comes between (83.8% – 89.2%).

Hence the study shows that unemployment is a problem for the individual, family and society as it hampers their and their social image.

Table 4.74: Relation between the likelihood of affecting the status at home as well as the status of family/community due to unemployment and educational qualification of the respondents.

Affect of status by Unemployment		Educational Qualification				Total
		PhD	Master	Bachelor	Higher Sec 10+2	
Yes	Frequency	10	166	280	69	525
	% affect of status	1.9%	31.6%	53.3%	13.1%	100.0%
	% within Education	83.3%	92.2%	86.4%	82.1%	87.5%
No	Frequency	2	14	44	15	75
	% affect of status	2.7%	18.7%	58.7%	20.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	16.7%	7.8%	13.6%	17.9%	12.5%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% affect of status	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data reveals that majority of the respondents (87.5%) agreed that unemployment affect their status at home as well as the status of family in the community. The relation with the educational background of the respondents and their perspective on this reveals that majority of the respondents among the post graduates (92.2%) followed by graduate respondents (86.4%) , Ph.D (83.3%) and finally higher secondary (82.1%) believe that unemployment affect their status at home as well as the status of family in the community. .

Hence, it can be seen from the data that maximum share of the respondents are affected by unemployment and they recognise it as their personal and family's social status is negatively affected by this.

Table 4.75: Relation between the likelihood of affecting the status at home as well as the status of family/community due to unemployment and monthly household income of the respondents.

Unemployment affect your status		Monthly household income					Total
		10,000 – 15,000	15001 – 20,000	20001 – 25,000	25,001 – 30,000	30,001 & above	
Yes	Frequency	83	92	62	90	198	525
	% of unemployment affect in status at home etc	15.8%	17.5%	11.8%	17.1%	37.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	82.2%	89.3%	84.9%	92.8%	87.6%	87.5%
No	Frequency	18	11	11	7	28	75
	% of unemployment affect in status at home etc	24.0%	14.7%	14.7%	9.3%	37.3%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	17.8%	10.7%	15.1%	7.2%	12.4%	12.5%
Total	Frequency	101	103	73	97	226	600
	% of unemployment affect in status at home etc	16.8%	17.2%	12.2%	16.2%	37.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

According to the data, majority of the respondents (87.5%) are being affected by unemployment in their status at home as well as the status of their family in the community.

The relationship with household income of the respondents reveals that most of the respondents among all the income groups are affected by unemployment in the status of their family and in the community.

Hence the data shows that there is no correlation between household incomes of the respondents and if unemployment affects their/family status at home/community.

Table 4.76: Likelihood of fulfilling the expectations of the parents.

Do you think that you can fulfil the expectations of your parents		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Very likely	Frequency	37	36	5	13	116	207
	% that can fulfil the expectations of parents	17.9%	17.4%	2.4%	6.3%	56.0%	100.0%
	% within block	30.8%	45.0%	6.3%	16.3%	48.3%	34.5%
Not Likely	Frequency	7	7	4	8	12	38
	% that can fulfil the expectations of parents	18.4%	18.4%	10.5%	21.1%	31.6%	100.0%
	% within block	5.8%	8.8%	5.0%	10.0%	5.0%	6.3%
Can't say	Frequency	76	37	71	59	112	355
	% that can fulfil the expectations of parents	21.4%	10.4%	20.0%	16.6%	31.5%	100.0%
	% within block	63.3%	46.3%	88.8%	73.8%	46.7%	59.2%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% that can fulfil the expectations of parents	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The available data shows that majority of the respondents are not sure if they can fulfil the expectations of their parents (59%). Followed by those who are confident (34.5%) of fulfilling the expectations of their parents or guardians in the near future whereas (6.3%) of the respondents have no hope of fulfilling the parental expectations.

The study reveals in the category of unsure respondents most of them are from Kasom (88.8%), followed by Phungyar (73.8%), Chengai (63.3%), Ukhrul (46.7%), Kamjong (46.3%). Whereas the respondents who are confident of fulfilling the expectation are mostly from Ukhrul (48.3%) followed by Kamjong (45.0%), Chengai (30.8%), Phungyar (16.3%), Kasom (6.3%). The respondents who do not have any hope in fulfilling the parental expectations are mostly from the block of Ukhrul (31.6%), followed by Phungyar (21.1%), Chengai & Kamjong (18.4%), Kasom (10.5%).

Therefore, it is clear that majority of the respondents are doubting their chances of fulfilling their parents or guardians' expectations in the near future.

Table 4.77: Relation between likelihood of fulfilling the expectations of the parents and educational qualification of the respondents.

Fulfilling parents expectation		Educational Qualification				Total
		PhD	Master	Bachelor	Higher Sec 10+2	
Yes	Frequency	7	69	108	23	207
	% fulfil parents expectation	3.4%	33.3%	52.2%	11.1%	100.0%
	% within Education	58.3%	38.3%	33.3%	27.4%	34.5%
No	Frequency	0	9	14	15	38
	% fulfil parents expectation	.0%	23.7%	36.8%	39.5%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	5.0%	4.3%	17.9%	6.3%
Can't say	Frequency	5	102	202	46	355
	% fulfil parents expectation	1.4%	28.7%	56.9%	13.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	41.7%	56.7%	62.3%	54.8%	59.2%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% fulfil parents expectation	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data describe that (59.2%) respondents are not sure whether they can fulfil the expectations of their parents or not followed by respondents (34.5%) who still have hope. In the correlation with education qualification, among the graduate respondents (62.3%) followed by (56.7%) postgraduate and higher secondary qualified respondents (54.8%) are mostly uncertain about their future. Whereas, (34.5%) of the respondents feels that they can fulfil the expectations of their parents where majority of the respondents among the Ph.D qualified (58.3%) followed by (38.3%) postgraduates who still have hope to get employment.

The data reveals that more than half of the respondents are not sure whether they will fulfil the expectation of their parents in their near future and they are mostly post

graduates, graduates and higher secondary degree holders, which explains the extent of the crisis in the area.

Table 4.78: Relation between likelihood of fulfilling the expectations of the parents and Monthly household income of the respondents.

Fulfilling parents expectations in the future		Monthly household income					Total
		10,000 – 15,000	15001 – 20,000	20001 – 25,000	25,001 – 30,000	30,001 & above	
Yes	Frequency	38	40	24	24	81	207
	% of fulfilling expectation	18.4%	19.3%	11.6%	11.6%	39.1%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	37.6%	38.8%	32.9%	24.7%	35.8%	34.5%
No	Frequency	9	8	4	6	11	38
	% of fulfilling expectation	23.7%	21.1%	10.5%	15.8%	28.9%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	8.9%	7.8%	5.5%	6.2%	4.9%	6.3%
Can't say	Frequency	54	55	45	67	134	355
	% of fulfilling expectation	15.2%	15.5%	12.7%	18.9%	37.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	53.5%	53.4%	61.6%	69.1%	59.3%	59.2%
Total	Frequency	101	103	73	97	226	600
	% of fulfilling expectation	16.8%	17.2%	12.2%	16.2%	37.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data reveals that majority of the respondents (59.2%) can't say whether they will be fulfilling their parents' expectation or not followed by (34.5%) responding that they will fulfil.

It indicates the relationship with household income of the respondents and the expectation of fulfilment of the expectations of the parents reveals that most of the respondents among all the income groups are not sure about the fulfilment of expectation of the expectations of the parents.

Hence there is no correlation between income and fulfilment of the expectations of the parents is established here.

Table 4.79: Person to have interaction most.

Interacted most		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Employed friends	Count	45	35	22	23	59	184
	% of interact most	24.5%	19.0%	12.0%	12.5%	32.1%	100.0%
	% within Block	37.5%	43.8%	27.5%	28.8%	24.6%	30.7%
Unemployed friends	Count	75	45	58	57	181	416
	% of interact most	18.0%	10.8%	13.9%	13.7%	43.5%	100.0%
	% within Block	62.5%	56.3%	72.5%	71.3%	75.4%	69.3%
Total	Count	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of interact most	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within Block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The present study reveals from the data that most of the respondents (69.3%) interact with unemployed friends.

As indicated on the table the share of the respondents who are interacting with unemployed friends are mostly from Ukhrul (75.4%) followed by Kasom (72.5%), Phungyar (71.3%), Chengai (62.5%), Kamjong (56.3%) whereas respondents who are also interacting with employed friends are mostly from Kasom (43.8%), followed by Chengai (37.5%) and the rest block falls under (24.6%) - (28.8%).

It is observed from the table that majority of the unemployed respondents interact with friends who are unemployed like them, it tells the level of inferiority complex of the respondents who are not comfortable in regularly spending time and interacting with employed friends of theirs.

Table 4.80: Hope to get a suitable job of choice by the respondents.

Getting a suitable job of choice		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Yes	Frequency	46	37	14	28	113	238
	% of hoping for a suitable job of choice	19.3%	15.5%	5.9%	11.8%	47.5%	100.0%
	% within block	38.3%	46.3%	17.5%	35.0%	47.1%	39.7%
No	Frequency	18	11	7	12	24	72
	% of hoping for a suitable job of choice	25.0%	15.3%	9.7%	16.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within block	15.0%	13.8%	8.8%	15.0%	10.0%	12.0%
Can't say	Frequency	56	32	59	40	103	290
	% of hoping for a suitable job of choice	19.3%	11.0%	20.3%	13.8%	35.5%	100.0%
	% within block	46.7%	40.0%	73.8%	50.0%	42.9%	48.3%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of hoping for a suitable job of choice	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The table shows that majority of the respondents (48.3%) are not sure whether they will get a job of their choice or not whereas (39.7%) of the respondents still hope of getting a suitable job of choice. On the other hand, (12.0%) of the respondents have no hope at all for getting a suitable job of their choice.

It is evident from the table in the category of uncertain respondents about their chances of getting a job are mainly from Kasom (73.8%), followed by Kasom (50.0%) whereas the rest block falls between (40.0%) - (46.7%). The respondents who still hopes of getting a suitable job of their choice are mostly from Ukhrul (47.1%) followed by

Kamjong (46.3%), Chengai (38.3%), Phungyar (35.0%), Kasom (17.5%). The category of respondents who have no hope of getting a suitable job mostly from Chengai & Phungyar (15.0%) followed by Kamjong (13.8%), Ukhrol (10.0%), Kasom (8.8%).

From the findings of the table, it can be seen that majority of the respondents are uncertain about their chances of getting a suitable job of their choice. It tells about the status of the problem of unemployment in the area.

Table 4.81: Relation between hoping to get a suitable job of choice and educational qualification of the respondents.

Do you still hope to get a suitable job of your choice?		Educational Qualification				Total
		PhD	Master	Bachelor	Higher Sec 10+2	
Yes	Frequency	8	86	121	23	238
	% hoping to get suitable job	3.4%	36.1%	50.8%	9.7%	100.0%
	% within Education	66.7%	47.8%	37.3%	27.4%	39.7%
No	Frequency	0	16	33	23	72
	% hoping to get suitable job	.0%	22.2%	45.8%	31.9%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	8.9%	10.2%	27.4%	12.0%
Can't say	Frequency	4	78	170	38	290
	% hoping to get suitable job	1.4%	26.9%	58.6%	13.1%	100.0%
	% within Education	33.3%	43.3%	52.5%	45.2%	48.3%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% hoping to get suitable job	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data explains that (48.3%) of the respondents can't say whether they will get a suitable job of their choice or not and those respondents belongs mostly from (52.5%) graduate followed by (45.2%) higher secondary. 39.7% of the respondents still hope to

get a suitable job of their choice and the respondents belong from the qualification of Ph.D. (66.7%) followed by postgraduate (47.8%).

Almost half of the respondents who are mostly having graduation, higher secondary, post graduate degree are not sure if they will get a suitable job of their choice or not, narrates the coverage of the problem of unemployment in the area.

Table 4.82: Relation between hoping to get a suitable job of choice and monthly household income of the respondents.

Hoping of getting a suitable job of your choice		Monthly household income					Total
		10,000 – 15,000	15001 – 20,000	20001 – 25,000	25,001 – 30,000	30,001 & above	
Yes	Frequency	43	42	26	29	98	238
	% of getting a suitable job	18.1%	17.6%	10.9%	12.2%	41.2%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	42.6%	40.8%	35.6%	29.9%	43.4%	39.7%
No	Frequency	22	11	9	6	24	72
	% of getting a suitable job	30.6%	15.3%	12.5%	8.3%	33.3%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	21.8%	10.7%	12.3%	6.2%	10.6%	12.0%
Can't say	Frequency	36	50	38	62	104	290
	% of getting a suitable job	12.4%	17.2%	13.1%	21.4%	35.9%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	35.6%	48.5%	52.1%	63.9%	46.0%	48.3%
Total	Frequency	101	103	73	97	226	600
	% of getting a suitable job	16.8%	17.2%	12.2%	16.2%	37.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

According to the data, it reveals that (48.3%) of the respondents can't say of whether they will get a suitable job of their choice followed by (39.7%) that they will get a suitable job of their choice.

The relationship with household income of the respondents and hope to get a suitable job of one's choice reveals that, most of the respondents among all the income groups are not sure about that.

Hence the data shows that there is no correlation between household income of the respondents and hope to get a suitable job of one's choice.

Table 4.83: Existence of minimum level of income per month for accepting a work.

Minimum level of income per month below which you would not accept a job		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Yes	Frequency	68	33	43	38	162	344
	% of minimum level of income per month	19.8%	9.6%	12.5%	11.0%	47.1%	100.0%
	% within block	56.7%	41.3%	53.8%	47.5%	67.5%	57.3%
No	Frequency	52	47	37	42	78	256
	% of minimum level of income per month	20.3%	18.4%	14.5%	16.4%	30.5%	100.0%
	% within block	43.3%	58.8%	46.3%	52.5%	32.5%	42.7%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of minimum level of income per month	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

It can be seen from the data that majority of the respondents (57.3%) needs a minimum level of income per month below which they are not going to accept a job whereas (42.7%) do not need a minimum level of income per month to accept a job.

In the category of minimum income which would not accept a job is lead by Ukhrul (67.5%) followed by Chengai (56.7%), Kasom (53.8%), Phungyar (47.5%), Kamjong (41.3%). Whereas the respondents who want to work with a minimum income per month are mostly from Kamjong (58.8%), Phungyar (52.5%), Kasom (46.3%), Chengai (43.3%), Ukhrul (32.5%).

It is clear from the table that majority of the respondents which are also the educated youth of the study area needs a minimum level of income per month to accept a job as

the respondents are well qualified. But we cannot ignore a significant share of respondents (42.7%) who are desperate to get any job that they do not even have any minimum income requirement in the job they are seeking.

Table 4.84: Relation between the choice of having minimum level of income per month to accept any job and educational qualification of the respondents.

Minimum level of income per month to accept job		Educational Qualification				Total
		PhD	Master	Bachelor	Higher Sec 10+2	
Yes	Frequency	9	131	172	32	344
	% of working with minimum income	2.6%	38.1%	50.0%	9.3%	100.0%
	% within Education	75.0%	72.8%	53.1%	38.1%	57.3%
No	Frequency	3	49	152	52	256
	% of working with minimum income	1.2%	19.1%	59.4%	20.3%	100.0%
	% within Education	25.0%	27.2%	46.9%	61.9%	42.7%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% of working with minimum income	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

When looked in the table above, it reveals that (57.3%) of the respondents have a minimum level of income per month below which would not accept. Half of the respondents who have bachelors degree (50.0%) have a minimum level of income per month that would not accept followed by (38.1%) post graduate, higher secondary (9.3%) and finally (2.6%) PhD.

The data indicates that more than half of the respondents need a minimum income but not with a significant number (42.7) no longer expecting any minimum income.

Table 4.85: Relation between the choice of having minimum level of income per month to accept any job and monthly household income of the respondents.

Is there a minimum level of income per month to accept a job		Monthly household income					Total
		10,000 – 15,000	15001 – 20,000	20001 – 25,000	25,001 – 30,000	30,001 & above	
Yes	Frequency	56	55	30	47	156	344
	% of minimum wages to be accepted.	16.3%	16.0%	8.7%	13.7%	45.3%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	55.4%	53.4%	41.1%	48.5%	69.0%	57.3%
No	Frequency	45	48	43	50	70	256
	% of minimum wages to be accepted.	17.6%	18.8%	16.8%	19.5%	27.3%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	44.6%	46.6%	58.9%	51.5%	31.0%	42.7%
Total	Frequency	101	103	73	97	226	600
	% of minimum wages to be accepted.	16.8%	17.2%	12.2%	16.2%	37.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data shows that majority of the respondents (57.3%) needs a minimum level of income per month below which they would not accept a job.

The relationship with household income of the respondents reveals that most of the respondents among higher income group i.e. above 30,000 are mostly expecting a minimum income below which they won't work.

Hence the data shows that there is a correlation between household income of the respondents and the need of a minimum level of income per month below which the respondents would not accept.

Table 4.86: Perception towards having a life doing something different from the training received by the respondents.

Life will end up doing something different		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Yes	Frequency	85	60	48	51	181	425
	% of life end from doing something.	20.0%	14.1%	11.3%	12.0%	42.6%	100.0%
	% within block	70.8%	75.0%	60.0%	63.8%	75.4%	70.8%
No	Frequency	35	20	32	29	59	175
	% of life end from doing something.	20.0%	11.4%	18.3%	16.6%	33.7%	100.0%
	% within block	29.2%	25.0%	40.0%	36.3%	24.6%	29.2%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of life end from doing something.	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

It is observed from the table that majority of the respondents (70.8%) think that their life will end up doing something different from what they have been trained for whereas (29.2%) think that their life will not end up doing something different but get the opportunity of good job.

As indicate in the table in the category of respondents that think their life will end up doing something different are mainly from Ukhrul (75.4%) followed by Kamjong (75.0%), Chengai (70.8%), Phungyar (63.8%), Kasom (60.0%). Whereas respondents who optimistic and don't think that their life will end up doing something different are mostly from the block of Kasom (40.0%) followed by Phungyar (36.3%) and the rest block lies between (24.6%) - (29.2%).

Hence according to the information from the respondents, it is revealed that the poor status of the problem of unemployment is forcing the youths to be pessimistic about their chances of getting a job which suits their training.

Table 4.87: Poor political leadership as one of the major reasons for unemployment in the locality.

Poor political leadership is one of the major reason for unemployment		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Yes	Frequency	106	75	79	66	212	538
	% of poor political leadership as a reason	19.7%	13.9%	14.7%	12.3%	39.4%	100.0%
	% within block	88.3%	93.8%	98.8%	82.5%	88.3%	89.7%
No	Frequency	14	5	1	14	28	62
	% of poor political leadership as a reason	22.6%	8.1%	1.6%	22.6%	45.2%	100.0%
	% within block	11.7%	6.3%	1.3%	17.5%	11.7%	10.3%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of poor political leadership as a reason	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

It revealed from the table that majority of the respondents (89.7%) held poor political leadership as the reason for unemployment in the area

From those who held poor political leadership as the reason for unemployment in the area, most of them are from Kasom (98.8%) followed by Kamjong (93.8%) Chengai & Ukhrul (88.3%), Phungyar (82.5%). On the other hand, respondents who do not think that it's because of poor political leadership, are mostly from Phungyar (17.5%) followed by Chengai & Ukhrul (11.7%), Kamjong (6.3%), Kasom (1.3%).

Hence it is revealed here that majority of the respondents have very poor perception towards the functioning of the political leadership in the area which according to them have clearly failed to address the problem of unemployment in the study area.

Table 4.88: Relation between thinking that poor political leadership is one of the major reasons for unemployment in the locality and educational qualification of the respondents.

Is poor political leadership one of the major reasons for unemployment		Educational Qualification				Total
		PhD	Master	Bachelor	Higher Sec 10+2	
Yes	Frequency	11	166	289	72	538
	% in lack of poor political leadership	2.0%	30.9%	53.7%	13.4%	100.0%
	% within Education	91.7%	92.2%	89.2%	85.7%	89.7%
No	Frequency	1	14	35	12	62
	% in lack of poor political leadership	1.6%	22.6%	56.5%	19.4%	100.0%
	% within Education	8.3%	7.8%	10.8%	14.3%	10.3%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% in lack of poor political leadership	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data indicates that majority of the respondents (89.7%) think that poor political leadership is one of the major reasons for unemployment. Respondents from qualification wise that blames the poor political leadership as the major reason are mostly among the post graduate respondents (92.2%) followed by Ph.D respondents (91.7%), graduate (89.2%), higher secondary (85.7%).

Hence the table shows that respondents from different educational background seem to conform to the fact that that poor political leadership is one of the major reasons for unemployment in the area.

4.6: Conclusion

The crisis of unemployment is serious as it is not an end in itself; it is giving birth to many other social problems. In the present study the most predominant effect of unemployment is family problems which take them far from the family and alienate them therefore significant number of them also reported that psychological stress is the

major effect of unemployment (13.3%). The status of the respondents in their family and community shows that majority of the family members consult only occasionally (46.7%) in term of family matters with the respondents, though majority of the respondents' perspective with the family is somewhat similar (67.7%) and the family head is cooperating with the unemployed member of the family, hence it tells about the status of those youths who are unemployed in their own house. But their unemployment is forcing them to doubt about their chances of fulfilling their parents or guardians' expectations in the near future (59%). Moreover the restricted interaction only with friends who are unemployed like them, also tells the level of inferiority complex of the respondents who are not comfortable in regularly spending time and interacting with theirs employed friends (69.3%). Hence the study shows that unemployment is a problem for the individual, family and society as it hampers their and their social image. Furthermore, majority of the respondent feels that they are cut off from the society (51.7%) and also felt isolated or depressed in the past because of lack of money and unemployment. This is one of the major impacts of unemployment, depression which is leading to other social problems in the area according to the respondents as drug abuse (13.8%), alcoholism (35.2%), gambling (24.7%) and insurgency (14.7%). The data reveals a very gloomy picture related to the educated unemployed youth as a mere 34.2% of them have voted in the last election which reveals their trust in the political system. The share of respondents who have written to communicate their problem to the local MLA is also very negligible (13.3%), which also an indicator of the trust of the unemployed youths on political leadership. Hence all these problems can be addressed by attending the crisis of unemployment in the area.

Causes of unemployment

4.7: Introduction:

Unemployment is one of the most pertinent crisis encountered by almost all the societies of the world today, even the developed countries are no longer devoid of it, though its extent varies from societies to societies. Diverse causes have come up from different studies conducted in different parts of the world, contributing to unemployment among the educated youth. The major causes contributing to the unemployment is the imbalance of supply and demand of the educated human resource. The growth of the educated number of youth does not match the number of employment that comes in the state. The major causes which have been responsible for the wide spread unemployment are rapid population growth, limited land, seasonal agriculture, decline of cottage industries, defective education, educated unemployment, slow growth of industrialisation, defective planning, immobility of labour, corruption (Osemengbe, 2013). The present chapter aims to unearth the causes responsible for the issue of unemployment in the study area and relate it with the different socio economic variables of the respondents.

Table 4.89: Level of satisfaction towards the present educational system by the respondents.

Level of satisfaction towards the present educational system		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Satisfied	Frequency	11	4	7	7	30	59
	% towards the educational system	18.6%	6.8%	11.9%	11.9%	50.8%	100.0%
	% within Block	9.2%	5.0%	8.8%	8.8%	12.5%	9.8%
Partially satisfied	Frequency	81	49	59	45	164	398
	% towards the educational system	20.4%	12.3%	14.8%	11.3%	41.2%	100.0%
	% within Block	67.5%	61.3%	73.8%	56.3%	68.3%	66.3%
Not satisfied	Frequency	28	27	14	28	46	143
	% towards the educational system	19.6%	18.9%	9.8%	19.6%	32.2%	100.0%
	% within Block	23.3%	33.8%	17.5%	35.0%	19.2%	23.8%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% towards the educational system	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within Block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data exhibits the perspective of respondents towards the present educational system, where majority (63.3%) are partially satisfied whereas (23.8%) of the respondents are not satisfied and a mere 9.8% of them are satisfied with the present educational system.

The respondents, who are partially satisfied, are mostly from the block of Kasom (73.8%), Ukhrul (68.3%), Chengai (67.5%), Kamjong (61.3%), and Phungyar (56.3%). In the category of not satisfied with the education system, majority are from the block of Phungyar (35.0%) followed by Kamjong (33.8%), Chengai (23.3%), Ukhrul (19.2%), Kasom (17.5%). The category who are satisfied with the present

educational system are mainly from the block of Ukhrlul (12.5%) followed by Chengai (9.2%), Kasom & Phungyar (8.8%), Kamjong (5.0%).

Hence the table clearly indicates the lack of trust of the respondents in the present educational system.

Table 4.90: Completion of vocational or technical training.

Completion of vocational or technical school training		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrlul	
No	Frequency	67	62	51	64	145	389
	% having vocational or technical school training	17.2%	15.9%	13.1%	16.5%	37.3%	100.0%
	% within block	55.8%	77.5%	63.8%	80.0%	60.4%	64.8%
Yes	Frequency	53	18	29	16	95	211
	% having vocational or technical school training	25.1%	8.5%	13.7%	7.6%	45.0%	100.0%
	% within block	44.2%	22.5%	36.3%	20.0%	39.6%	35.2%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% having vocational or technical school training	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

It is observed from the table that majority of the respondents (64.8%) did not have any vocational or technical school training whereas 35.2% of them received vocational or technical school training.

The present study tries to understand that majority of the respondents did not had any vocational or technical school training and that is lead from the block of Phungyar (80.0%), Kamjong (77.5%), Kasom (63.8%), Ukhrlul (60.4%) and Chengai (55.8%). On the other hand, 35.2% received vocational or technical school training that is lead from the block of Chengai (44.2%), Ukhrlul (39.6%), Kasom (36.3%), Kamjong (22.5%) and Phungyar (20.0%).

It is evident from the table that majority of the respondents did not had any vocational or technical school training which also highlight the vacuum that has to be filled to address the issue of employment in the area.

Table 4.91: Usefulness of the education/training received in the past in getting a job by the respondents.

Education/training you received in the past is useful in getting a job		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Very useful	Frequency	23	7	2	11	62	105
	% education / training received	21.9%	6.7%	1.9%	10.5%	59.0%	100.0%
	% within block	41.8%	38.9%	6.5%	57.9%	62.0%	47.1%
Somewhat useful	Frequency	24	9	23	6	34	96
	% education / training received	25.0%	9.4%	24.0%	6.3%	35.4%	100.0%
	% within block	43.6%	50.0%	74.2%	31.6%	34.0%	43.0%
Not useful	Frequency	6	0	2	0	1	9
	% education / training received	66.7%	.0%	22.2%	.0%	11.1%	100.0%
	% within block	10.9%	.0%	6.5%	.0%	1.0%	4.0%
Don't know	Frequency	2	2	4	2	3	13
	% education / training received	15.4%	15.4%	30.8%	15.4%	23.1%	100.0%
	% within block	3.6%	11.1%	12.9%	10.5%	3.0%	5.8%
Total	Frequency	55	18	31	19	100	223
	% education / training received	24.7%	8.1%	13.9%	8.5%	44.8%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

In response to the question as depicted in table, shows that 47.1% of the respondents feel that education / training received in the past is very useful. On the other hand, 43.0% feels that it is somewhat useful.

Out of the youths who have taken the education or training in the past and which is very useful is lead from the respondents of Ukhurul (62.0%) followed by Phungyar (57.9%), Chengai (41.8%) Kamjong (38.9%), Kasom (6.5%). On the other hand, respondents for somewhat useful of training in the past is lead by Kasom (74.2%) followed by Kamjong (50.0%) Chengai (43.6%), Ukhurul (34.0%), and Phungyar (31.6%).

It can be understood that majority of the respondents training received in the past is either very useful or somewhat useful. Therefore it reveals that those who got these training are getting its benefits hence are positive about it. Therefore the data is also an attestation of the usefulness of vocational training courses for unemployed youths.

Table 4.92: Reasons for youth not availing the self employment avenues.

Lack of youth employment avenues		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Education problem	Frequency	14	5	2	3	12	36
	% Lack of youth employment avenues	38.9%	13.9%	5.6%	8.3%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within Block	11.7%	6.3%	2.5%	3.8%	5.0%	6.0%
Lack of avenues	Frequency	37	24	43	39	78	221
	% Lack of youth employment avenues	16.7%	10.9%	19.5%	17.6%	35.3%	100.0%
	% within Block	30.8%	30.0%	53.8%	48.8%	32.5%	36.8%
No support from family	Frequency	3	7	4	2	25	41
	% Lack of youth employment avenues	7.3%	17.1%	9.8%	4.9%	61.0%	100.0%
	% within Block	2.5%	8.8%	5.0%	2.5%	10.4%	6.8%
Financial problem	Frequency	64	42	31	32	117	286
	% Lack of youth employment avenues	22.4%	14.7%	10.8%	11.2%	40.9%	100.0%
	% within Block	53.3%	52.5%	38.8%	40.0%	48.8%	47.7%
Preferring easy income	Frequency	2	2	0	4	8	16
	% Lack of youth employment avenues	12.5%	12.5%	.0%	25.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within Block	1.7%	2.5%	.0%	5.0%	3.3%	2.7%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% Lack of youth employment avenues	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within Block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

According to the table, it indicates that youth are not availing the self employment avenues due to financial problem (47.7%) and lack of avenues (36.8%).

It is evident from the same table that the block wise segregation reveals the respondents who finds financial problem as the reason for not availing the self

employment avenues are mainly from Chengai (53.3%), Kamjong (52.5%), Ukhrul (48.8%), Phungyar (40.0%), Kasom (38.8%). Lack of avenues is cited by respondents who are mostly from Kasom (53.8%) followed by Phungyar (48.8%) and the rest block lies between (30.0%) - (32.5%).

The study again reveals the status of financial impotency which is why they are mostly not availing the self employment avenues in the area. It clearly exposed the inefficiency of the government machinery to implement the projects meant for encouraging self employment opportunities in the area for financial inclusion of this population.

Table 4.93: Perception towards the types of problems in development of self employment infrastructure.

Problems of self employment in local area		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Lack of raw materials	Frequency	41	13	4	12	67	137
	Problems of self employment	29.9%	9.5%	2.9%	8.8%	48.9%	100.0%
	% within Block	34.2%	16.3%	5.0%	15.0%	27.9%	22.8%
Shortage of capital for investment	Frequency	59	40	72	45	105	321
	Problems of self employment	18.4%	12.5%	22.4%	14.0%	32.7%	100.0%
	% within Block	49.2%	50.0%	90.0%	56.3%	43.8%	53.5%
Geographical location	Frequency	7	11	2	2	28	50
	Problems of self employment	14.0%	22.0%	4.0%	4.0%	56.0%	100.0%
	% within Block	5.8%	13.8%	2.5%	2.5%	11.7%	8.3%
Communication problem	Frequency	8	11	2	16	22	59
	Problems of self employment	13.6%	18.6%	3.4%	27.1%	37.3%	100.0%
	% within Block	6.7%	13.8%	2.5%	20.0%	9.2%	9.8%
Technology problem	Frequency	5	4	0	5	11	25
	Problems of self employment	20.0%	16.0%	.0%	20.0%	44.0%	100.0%
	% within Block	4.2%	5.0%	.0%	6.3%	4.6%	4.2%
Electricity problem	Frequency	0	1	0	0	7	8
	Problems of self employment	.0%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	87.5%	100.0%
	% within Block	.0%	1.3%	.0%	.0%	2.9%	1.3%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	Problems of self employment	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within Block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The study further reveals that there are lots of problems according to the respondents in the development of self employment infrastructure in the area but mainly it is shortage of capital for investment (53.5%) and lack of raw materials (22.8%).

Based on the information from block wise, shortage of capital for investment is the major cause for the lack of entrepreneurship development for respondents who are mostly from Kasom (90.0%), Phungyar (56.3%), Kamjong (50.0%), Chengai (49.2%), Ukhurul (43.8%). Those who find lack of raw materials as the problem are mostly from Chengai (34.2%), Ukhurul (27.9%), Phungyar (15.0%), Kamjong (16.3%), and Kasom (5.0%).

Hence it is observed that majority of the respondents faced financial difficulties to even think of starting an entrepreneurship project.

Table 4.94: Contribution of population growth in raising the problem of unemployment.

Population growth is a contribution for rising problem of unemployment.		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhurul	
Yes	Frequency	93	56	77	66	206	498
	% of contribution for rising problem	18.7%	11.2%	15.5%	13.3%	41.4%	100.0%
	% within block	77.5%	70.0%	96.3%	82.5%	85.8%	83.0%
No	Frequency	27	24	3	14	34	102
	% of contribution for rising problem	26.5%	23.5%	2.9%	13.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within block	22.5%	30.0%	3.8%	17.5%	14.2%	17.0%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of contribution for rising problem	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

Based on the response from the table reveals that majority of the respondents (83.0%) reported that population growth has a contribution for rising problem of unemployment.

It is observed from the table according to block wise in the favour of population growth that have a contribution for educated youth, that Kasom block leads 96.3% followed by Ukhrul (85.8%), Phungyar (82.5%), Chengai (77.5%), Kamjong (70.0%).

It could be seen from the table that majority of the respondents feels and think that population growth have a contribution for rising problem of unemployment.

Table 4.95: Type of income received by the respondents and their household.

Kind of household Income		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Your Household	Frequency	23	28	14	37	57	159
	% kind of Income	14.5%	17.6%	8.8%	23.3%	35.8%	100.0%
	% within Block	19.2%	35.0%	17.5%	46.3%	23.8%	26.5%
Earnings from agriculture	Frequency	71	37	33	27	133	301
	% kind of Income	23.6%	12.3%	11.0%	9.0%	44.2%	100.0%
	% within Block	59.2%	46.3%	41.3%	33.8%	55.4%	50.2%
Maintenance/Child Support	Frequency	0	0	0	2	0	2
	% kind of Income	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Block	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.5%	.0%	.3%
Regular allowance from outside the household	Frequency	2	2	3	0	5	12
	% kind of Income	16.7%	16.7%	25.0%	.0%	41.7%	100.0%
	% within Block	1.7%	2.5%	3.8%	.0%	2.1%	2.0%
Other benefits or pensions	Frequency	13	11	25	12	23	84
	% kind of Income	15.5%	13.1%	29.8%	14.3%	27.4%	100.0%
	% within Block	10.8%	13.8%	31.3%	15.0%	9.6%	14.0%
Other sources of income e.g. rent	Frequency	11	2	5	2	22	42
	% kind of Income	26.2%	4.8%	11.9%	4.8%	52.4%	100.0%
	% within Block	9.2%	2.5%	6.3%	2.5%	9.2%	7.0%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% kind of Income	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within Block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

According to the data, the income that the household received is mainly from earning from agriculture 50.2%, followed by household income by selling home made products (26.5%), pension (14.0%), other source of income like rent 7.0%. Moreover according to the Baseline Survey of Minority Concentrated Districts, Ukhurul District Report, by OKD Institute of Social Change and Development: Guwahati, more than 70 per cent of the total population of the district is directly or indirectly depended on agricultural activities.

It can be traced from the data of block wise that according to the earning from employment or self employment, Chengai leads (59.2%) followed by Ukhurul (55.4%), Kamjong (46.3%), Kasom (41.3%), and Phungyar (33.8%). On the other hand, the Household income, Phungyar leads by 46.3% followed by Kamjong (35.0%), Ukhurul (23.8%), Chengai (19.2%) and Kasom (17.5%). There are families living with the benefit of pension who had got retired or retirement within the block of all that leads from Kasom with (31.3%), Phungyar (15.0%), Kamjong (13.8%), Chengai (10.8%), and Ukhurul (9.6%). There are families which get the sources of income for their household through rent or other in Chengai & Ukhurul (9.2%), Kasom (6.3%), Kamjong & Phungyar (2.5%). Other kind of regular allowance from outside the household, Kasom leads with (3.8%) followed by Kamjong (2.5%), Ukhurul (2.1%), Chengai (1.7%), Phungyar (0%). There are few families who get income from Maintenance child support from Phungyar with (2.5%) whereas the rest of the block besides Phungyar has (0%).

It can be seen from the data that majority of the educated unemployed youth's families are receiving income from employment or self employment, but as the next generation is unemployed the future source of income remained uncertain.

District-Wise number of Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises

Sl.No	District	Micro	Small	Medium	Total
1	Senapati	11	0	0	11
2	Tamenglong	10	01	0	11
3	Churachanpur	18	0	0	18
4	Bishnupur	79	0	0	79
5	Thoubal	07	02	0	09
6	Imphal West	20	06	01	27
7	Imphal East	31	10	0	41
8	Ukhrul	0	0	0	0
9	Chandel	02	0	0	02
	Total	178	19	01	198

*District Industrial Potential Survey Report Of Imphal West District 2014-15
Nucleus Cell / Comm. & Industry .Manipur*

No existence of micro, small scale and cottage industries and medium industries (0% small scale industries were there up to 2014-15, according to *District Industrial Potential Survey Report Of Imphal West District 2014-15*), is also one of the major causes of unemployment in the area.

Table 4.96: Level of satisfaction regarding the role and functioning of Bureaucracy in Manipur.

Role & function of bureaucracy in Manipur		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Highly satisfactory	Frequency	0	0	0	0	1	1
	% bureaucracy in Manipur	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within block	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.4%	.2%
Satisfactory	Frequency	7	7	2	6	37	59
	% bureaucracy in Manipur	11.9%	11.9%	3.4%	10.2%	62.7%	100.0%
	% within block	5.8%	8.8%	2.5%	7.5%	15.4%	9.8%
Unsatisfactory	Frequency	93	62	57	60	156	428
	% bureaucracy in Manipur	21.7%	14.5%	13.3%	14.0%	36.4%	100.0%
	% within block	77.5%	77.5%	71.3%	75.0%	65.0%	71.3%
Highly unsatisfactory	Frequency	20	11	21	14	46	112
	% bureaucracy in Manipur	17.9%	9.8%	18.8%	12.5%	41.1%	100.0%
	% within block	16.7%	13.8%	26.3%	17.5%	19.2%	18.7%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% bureaucracy in Manipur	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data reveals the perspective of respondents towards the level of satisfaction in the functioning of bureaucracy, it shows that the majority of the respondents are not satisfied (71.3%) by the functioning of bureaucracy in the area, followed by those (18.7%) who are highly unsatisfied, and a very small share of the respondents (9.8%) who finds it satisfactory.

According to the table, as in case of those respondents who find the functioning of bureaucracy unsatisfactory are mainly from the block of Chengai & Kamjong (77.5%) Phungyar (75.0%), Kasom (71.3%), Ukhrul (65.0%). The highly unsatisfied

respondents are mostly from, Kasom (26.3%), Ukhrul (19.2%), Phungyar (17.5%), Chengai (16.7%), Kamjong (13.8%).

Therefore it reveals that the bureaucracy clearly fails to reach to the youths of the area and fails to cater to their expectations, this is why most of them are not satisfied with the role and functioning it in the area.

Table 4.97: Relation between perspective towards bureaucracy in Manipur and educational qualification of the respondents.

Bureaucracy in Manipur		Educational Qualification				Total
		PhD	Master	Bachelor	Higher Sec 10+2	
Satisfactory	Frequency	2	23	28	7	60
	% of bureaucracy in Manipur	3.3%	38.3%	46.7%	11.7%	100.0%
	% within Education	16.7%	12.8%	8.6%	8.3%	10.0%
Unsatisfactory	Frequency	10	157	296	77	540
	% of bureaucracy in Manipur	1.9%	29.1%	54.8%	14.3%	100.0%
	% within Education	83.3%	87.2%	91.4%	91.7%	90.0%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% of bureaucracy in Manipur	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data clearly indicates the perspective of the unemployed youths towards the level of performance of bureaucracy in Manipur as huge majority of them (90.0%) who is from all educational background finds it unsatisfactory.

Hence the clearly establish the fact that bureaucracy in Manipur totally failed to get the acceptance of the unemployed youths of the area.

Table 4.98: Functioning of political parties and politicians in Manipur.

Political parties and politicians		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Highly satisfactory	Frequency	1	0	0	0	0	1
	% of parties & politicians	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within block	.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.2%
Satisfactory	Frequency	2	0	2	3	11	18
	% of parties & politicians	11.1%	.0%	11.1%	16.7%	61.1%	100.0%
	% within block	1.7%	.0%	2.5%	3.8%	4.6%	3.0%
Unsatisfactory	Frequency	89	66	51	48	154	408
	% of parties & politicians	21.8%	16.2%	12.5%	11.8%	37.7%	100.0%
	% within block	74.2%	82.5%	63.8%	60.0%	64.2%	68.0%
Highly unsatisfactory	Frequency	28	14	27	29	75	173
	% of parties & politicians	16.2%	8.1%	15.6%	16.8%	43.4%	100.0%
	% within block	23.3%	17.5%	33.8%	36.3%	31.3%	28.8%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of parties & politicians	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

According to the response from the respondents in the level of functioning of political parties and politicians, (68.0%) of the respondents are unsatisfactory whereas (28.8%) of the respondents are highly unsatisfactory.

In response to the question from block wise in the category of respondents who find the functioning of the political parties unsatisfactory are mostly from Kamjong (82.5%), Chengai (74.2%) and the remaining block lies between (60.0%) – (64.2%). In the category of highly unsatisfied respondents are mainly from Phungyar (36.3%) followed by Kasom (33.8%), Ukhrul (31.3%), Chengai (23.3%), Kamjong (17.5%).

The study also established the distrust of the youth in the functioning of the local political parties where they seem to have lost hope.

Table 4.99: Relation between perspective towards functioning of political parties and politicians in Manipur and educational qualification of the respondents.

Functioning of political parties and politicians		Educational Qualification				Total
		PhD	Master	Bachelor	Higher Sec 10+2	
Satisfactory	Frequency	1	7	9	2	19
	% of functioning political parties	5.3%	36.8%	47.4%	10.5%	100.0%
	% within Education	8.3%	3.9%	2.8%	2.4%	3.2%
Unsatisfactory	Frequency	11	173	315	82	581
	% of functioning political parties	1.9%	29.8%	54.2%	14.1%	100.0%
	% within Education	91.7%	96.1%	97.2%	97.6%	96.8%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% of functioning political parties	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The table clearly shows the perspective of the unemployed youths towards the levels of performance of political parties in Manipur as huge majority of them (96.8%) who are from all educational background finds it unsatisfactory.

Hence the data shows the negative attitude of the respondents towards the functioning of political parties in the area.

Table 4.100: Functioning of judiciary in Manipur.

Functioning of judiciary		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Satisfactory	Frequency	2	1	2	4	7	16
	% functioning of judiciary	12.5%	6.3%	12.5%	25.0%	43.8%	100.0%
	% within block	1.7%	1.3%	2.5%	5.0%	2.9%	2.7%
Unsatisfactory	Frequency	85	65	59	45	157	411
	% functioning of judiciary	20.7%	15.8%	14.4%	10.9%	38.2%	100.0%
	% within block	70.8%	81.3%	73.8%	56.3%	65.4%	68.5%
Highly unsatisfactory	Frequency	33	14	19	31	76	173
	% functioning of judiciary	19.1%	8.1%	11.0%	17.9%	43.9%	100.0%
	% within block	27.5%	17.5%	23.8%	38.8%	31.7%	28.8%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% functioning of judiciary	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

According to the table, it reveals that majority of the respondents are not satisfied with the functioning of judiciary in the study area. From the response, we can observe that most of the respondents (68.5%) are not satisfied with the functioning of judiciary, followed by those (28.8%) who are highly unsatisfied, and a negligible share of those who are satisfactory (2.7%).

As observed from block wise segregation of the data reveals that in the category of unsatisfactory respondents most of them are from Kamjong (81.3%), Kasom (73.8%), Chengai (70.8%), Ukhrul (65.4%), Phungyar (56.3%). The respondents who are highly unsatisfied with the political parties and politician, are mostly from the block of Phungyar (38.8%), Ukhrul (31.7%), Chengai (27.5%), Kasom (23.8%), Kamjong (17.5%).

Therefore it indicates that the judiciary in the area failed to convince the youth about its transparent functioning, as majority (68.5%) of them are unsatisfied with the functioning of judiciary. It also reveals the corruption practices attached with even judiciary in the area that acts as a major reason for this distrust of the youth towards the institution.

Table 4.101: Relation between perspective towards functioning of judiciary in Manipur and educational qualification of the respondents.

Functioning of judiciary		Educational Qualification				Total
		PhD	Master	Bachelor	Higher Sec 10+2	
Satisfactory	Frequency	0	8	6	2	16
	% of functioning judiciary	.0%	50.0%	37.5%	12.5%	100.0%
	% within Education	.0%	4.4%	1.9%	2.4%	2.7%
Unsatisfactory	Frequency	12	172	318	82	584
	% of functioning judiciary	2.1%	29.5%	54.5%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	95.6%	98.1%	97.6%	97.3%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% of functioning judiciary	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

According to the data, it reveals the perspective of the unemployed youths towards the levels of functioning of the judiciary in Manipur as huge majority of them (97.3%) who are from all educational background finds it unsatisfactory.

Therefore judiciary in the area has also clearly failed to function according to the expectation of the unemployed youths of the study area.

Table 4.102: Role of family towards the educated unemployed youth.

Role of family towards the educated unemployed youth		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Highly-satisfactory	Frequency	3	2	2	0	16	23
	% towards educated unemployed youth	13.0%	8.7%	8.7%	.0%	69.6%	100.0%
	% within block	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	.0%	6.7%	3.8%
Satisfactory	Frequency	77	51	52	56	163	399
	% towards educated unemployed youth	19.3%	12.8%	13.0%	14.0%	40.9%	100.0%
	% within block	64.2%	63.8%	65.0%	70.0%	67.9%	66.5%
Unsatisfactory	Frequency	38	26	19	23	57	163
	% towards educated unemployed youth	23.3%	16.0%	11.7%	14.1%	35.0%	100.0%
	% within block	31.7%	32.5%	23.8%	28.8%	23.8%	27.2%
Highly-unsatisfactory	Frequency	2	1	7	1	4	15
	% towards educated unemployed youth	13.3%	6.7%	46.7%	6.7%	26.7%	100.0%
	% within block	1.7%	1.3%	8.8%	1.3%	1.7%	2.5%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% towards educated unemployed youth	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The available data shows that role of family towards the educated unemployed youth is mostly satisfactory by (66.5%) followed by unsatisfactory by (22.7%).

The data present in the category of satisfactory on the table indicates according to block wise as Phungyar (70.0%) and the rest lies between (63.8%) – (67.9%). In the category of unsatisfactory most of them are from Kamjong (32.5%) followed by Chengai (31.7%), Phungyar (28.8%), Kasom & Ukhrul (23.8%).

Hence the data here shows that the positive support that this youth are getting is from the family, this is why most of the respondents are satisfied with its role performed in the area.

Table 4.103: Relation between perspective towards roles of family towards the educated unemployed youth and educational qualification of the respondents.

Role of family towards the educated under unemployed youth		Educational Qualification				Total
		PhD	Master	Bachelor	Higher Sec 10+2	
Satisfactory	Frequency	11	140	224	47	422
	% role of family	2.6%	33.2%	53.1%	11.1%	100.0%
	% within Education	91.7%	77.8%	69.1%	56.0%	70.3%
Unsatisfactory	Frequency	1	40	100	37	178
	% role of family	.6%	22.5%	56.2%	20.8%	100.0%
	% within Education	8.3%	22.2%	30.9%	44.0%	29.7%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% role of family	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

According to the table, (70.3%) of the respondents are satisfied with the role of family towards the educated unemployed youth, but when we see the relationship with the educational qualification of the respondents the establish the fact that as the qualification of the respondents go down their perspective towards the role played by family towards educated under unemployed youths steadily goes down.

Hence the data indicates that the more the respondents are educated they look at the role played by family as an institution as positive for the educated unemployed.

Table 4.104: Community attitudes towards educated unemployed youth.

Community attitudes towards educated unemployed youth		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Highly satisfactory	Frequency	2	1	1	0	2	6
	% community towards unemployed youth	33.3%	16.7%	16.7%	.0%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within block	1.7%	1.3%	1.3%	.0%	.8%	1.0%
Satisfactory	Frequency	63	34	25	34	106	262
	% community towards unemployed youth	24.0%	13.0%	9.5%	13.0%	40.5%	100.0%
	% within block	52.5%	42.5%	31.3%	42.5%	44.2%	43.7%
Unsatisfactory	Frequency	48	41	42	44	127	302
	% community towards unemployed youth	15.9%	13.6%	13.9%	14.6%	42.1%	100.0%
	% within block	40.0%	51.3%	52.5%	55.0%	52.9%	50.3%
Highly unsatisfactory	Frequency	7	4	12	2	5	30
	% community towards unemployed youth	23.3%	13.3%	40.0%	6.7%	16.7%	100.0%
	% within block	5.8%	5.0%	15.0%	2.5%	2.1%	5.0%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% community towards unemployed youth	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The table reveals the satisfaction level of unemployed youth towards community attitudes, where most of the respondents are (50.3%) unsatisfied, followed by those who are satisfied (43.7%).

In the category of unsatisfied respondents with the community attitudes, are mostly from Phungyar (55.0%), Ukhrul (52.9%), Kasom (52.5%), Kamjong (51.3%), Chengai (40.0%). On the other hand most of the satisfied respondents are from Chengai (52.5%), Ukhrul (44.2%), Kamjong & Phungyar (42.5%), Kasom (31.3%).

Therefore the data visibly shows that even the community many a times failed to connect and act as an agent to address their feeling of alienation of the educated

unemployed youth from the society. Though it is performing much better than other institutions, as little less than half of the respondents are still satisfied with its role that is performed in the area.

Table 4.105: Relation between community's attitudes towards educated unemployed youth and educational qualification of the respondents.

Community's attitudes towards educated unemployed youth		Educational Qualification				Total
		PhD	Master	Bachelor	Higher Sec 10+2	
Satisfactory	Frequency	11	83	144	30	268
	% Community attitudes	4.1%	31.0%	53.7%	11.2%	100.0%
	% within Education	91.7%	46.1%	44.4%	35.7%	44.7%
Unsatisfactory	Frequency	1	97	180	54	332
	% Community attitudes	.3%	29.2%	54.2%	16.3%	100.0%
	% within Education	8.3%	53.9%	55.6%	64.3%	55.3%
Total	Frequency	12	180	324	84	600
	% Community attitudes	2.0%	30.0%	54.0%	14.0%	100.0%
	% within Education	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

According to the table, it reveals that little more than half of the respondents (55.3%) are not satisfied with the community's attitudes towards educated unemployed youth; they are mostly from the (55.6%) graduates followed by (53.9%) post graduate holders. On the other hand, out of those who are satisfied with the community's attitude are mostly (91.7%) Ph.D. holders.

Hence though little more than half of the respondents are not satisfied with the community's attitudes towards educated unemployed youth, but the highly educated respondents who have PhD believe in the opposite as a huge majority of them thinks otherwise.

Table 4.106: Perception of the respondents towards bringing any change for youth in Ukhrul district by the state government.

The state government is bringing a change		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Yes	Frequency	5	5	1	2	19	32
	% bringing change for youth	15.6%	15.6%	3.1%	6.3%	59.4%	100.0%
	% within block	4.2%	6.3%	1.3%	2.5%	7.9%	5.3%
No	Frequency	73	68	67	26	196	430
	% bringing change for youth	17.0%	15.8%	15.6%	6.0%	45.6%	100.0%
	% within block	60.8%	85.0%	83.8%	32.5%	81.7%	71.7%
Can't say	Frequency	42	7	12	52	25	138
	% bringing change for youth	30.4%	5.1%	8.7%	37.7%	18.1%	100.0%
	% within block	35.0%	8.8%	15.0%	65.0%	10.4%	23.0%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% bringing change for youth	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The study further reveals that the state government is not bringing the change for the unemployed youths according to the respondents as majority of them (71.7%) believe in that, followed (23.0%) of the respondents who are not sure about its role in bringing change.

The respondents, who think that the state government is not bringing any change for youth, are mostly from Kamjong (85.0%), Kasom (83.8%), Ukhrul (81.7%), Chengai (60.8%), and Phungyar (32.5%). And those who are not sure about its role in bringing change are mainly from Phungyar (65.0%), Chengai (35.0%), Kasom (15.0%), Ukhrul (10.4%), and Kamjong (8.8%).

Therefore the available data shows that majority of the respondents lost its hope in the state government as an agent of change in the future of the unemployed youth's career. It reveals the existence of corruption and marginalisation that is practiced by the main stream politics towards the hill population that is reflected in the disbelieve shown by the youth towards the role played by the government.

4.8: Conclusion:

The findings clearly establish lack of trust of the respondents in the present educational system. Furthermore, the findings of the study also ascertain that the bureaucracy clearly fails to reach out to the youths of the area and fails to cater to their expectations; this is why most of them are not satisfied with the role and functioning it in the area. Similar dissatisfaction can also be traced in the functioning of the local political parties, judiciary, police where they seem to have lost hope. Hence the study clearly reveals the tarnished image of the bureaucracy, police, local political parties and judiciary in the eyes of the youths of the area, mainly for their engagement in corrupt practices, misuse of power and human rights violations and their impotency to address the issues they are supposed to deal with. But on the contrary the study also shows that the positive support that this youth are getting is from the family, this is why most of the respondents are satisfied with its role performed in the area. Therefore the data visibly shows that even the community many a times failed to connect and act as an agent to address their feeling of alienation of the educated unemployed youth from the society. Though it is performing much better than other institutions, as little less than half of the respondents are still satisfied with its role that is performed in the area.

Therefore the available data shows that majority of the respondents lost its hope in the state government as an agent of change in the future of the unemployed youth's career. It reveals the existence of corruption and marginalisation that is practiced by the main stream politics towards the hill population that is reflected in the disbelief shown by the youth towards the role played by the government.

Alternatives means of livelihood for employment in Ukhru District

4.9: Introduction:

This chapter deals with the prospects of alternative livelihood and employment. The chapter deals with identifying the resources and scopes that is available or can be made available to act as an alternative of livelihood for employment in the study area and also evaluate the status of the different schemes introduced by government and NGOs to generate alternative employment opportunities. For the large majority of unemployed youth in the study area, the most important livelihood asset is primarily their own labour, followed by other household assets such as land. Looking at the overall changes that is taking place in global society mainly because of globalisation, industrialisation, and urbanisation, the economy is coming through a changeover, hence it is expected that the increase in output and income from agriculture may not be enough to the growing demand of unemployment.

Micro enterprises and small scale industry is the solution to create employment opportunities as well as income for unemployed youth in Ukhru district. Micro enterprises and small scale industry should be taken as an option to mainstream for employment opportunities and not the perfect way of providing employment to youth.

The study area needs to build up an employment centre for micro enterprise and small scale industry so that employment centres provide counselling on job search and self-employment. Employment centres also needs to make an arrangement to offer appropriate skill training for the job seekers to develop skills for future work. Micro enterprises and small scale industry in the study area can make advance job creation and growth. The unemployed youth must engage not just only in voluntary work or in NGOs as a mirror but as a social enterprise. The unemployed educated youth must further think than credit and utilize the enterprise by developing a business plan and financial statement to calculate success for income. Moreover one of the most pertinent impediment in creation of micro enterprises and small scale industry in the study area is the lack of infrastructure in guise of roads and loans that is available for the educated youths in the area.

Since from the beginning of five year plans, it has introduced several employment generating schemes and programmes over the year but due to the absence of proper implementation and monitoring have failed to achieve the required targets. Considering the situation of unemployment problem, the state government started to implement various schemes to reduce unemployment in Manipur but it did not reached to all the needy people.

This chapter deals with the prospects of alternative livelihood and employment. The chapter deals with identifying the resources and scopes that is available or can be made available to act as an alternative of livelihood for employment in the study area and also evaluate the status of the different schemes introduced by government and NGOs to generate alternative employment opportunities. For the large majority of unemployed youth in the study area, the most important livelihood asset is primarily their own labour, followed by other household assets such as land. Looking at the overall changes that is taking place in global society mainly because of globalisation, industrialisation, and urbanisation, the economy is coming through a changeover, hence it is expected that the increase in output and income from agriculture may not be enough to the growing demand of unemployment.

Table 4.107: Awareness of the programmes and policies launched by the government.

Aware of the programmes and policies launched by the government		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Yes	Frequency	83	50	59	55	152	399
	% aware of programmes and policies	20.8%	12.5%	14.8%	13.8%	38.1%	100.0%
	% within block	69.2%	62.5%	73.8%	68.8%	63.3%	66.5%
No	Frequency	37	30	21	25	88	201
	% aware of programmes and policies	18.4%	14.9%	10.4%	12.4%	43.8%	100.0%
	% within block	30.8%	37.5%	26.3%	31.3%	36.7%	33.5%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% aware of programmes and policies	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

Available data shows that a majority of the respondents (66.5%) are aware of the government programmes and policies and the remaining (33.5%) are not aware of such programmes.

As indicated in the table of the respondents who are aware are mainly from Kasom (73.8%) and the rest block lies between (62.5%) – (69.2%). Whereas in the category respondents who are not aware of the programmes their share in the entire block lies between (37.5%) - (30.8%) accept Kasom has the minimum percent of (26.3%).

The table shows that a maximum respondent are aware of the government policies that is meant to tackle unemployment, their educational status can be the major reason for the awareness. Though, maximum numbers of unemployed are aware, none of them are availing the facilities from the government, which reveals the problems of implementation of this programs in the grassroots which is almost not there.

Table 4.108: Perception towards self employment or entrepreneurship as the demand of the hour.

Self employment is the demand of the hour		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Yes	Frequency	103	74	75	70	213	535
	% of entrepreneurship, the demand of hour	19.3%	13.8%	14.0%	13.1%	39.8%	100.0%
	% within block	85.8%	92.5%	93.8%	87.5%	88.8%	89.2%
No	Frequency	17	6	5	10	27	65
	% of entrepreneurship, the demand of hour	26.2%	9.2%	7.7%	15.4%	41.5%	100.0%
	% within block	14.2%	7.5%	6.3%	12.5%	11.3%	10.8%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% of entrepreneurship, the demand of hour	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

According to the table, majority of the respondents (89.2%) feels that self employment or entrepreneurship is the demand of the hour whereas only (10.8%) of the respondents do not believe in that.

The block wise segregation of the data shows that the respondents who feels that self employment or entrepreneurship is the demand of the hour are mainly from Kasom (93.8%) followed by Kamjong (92.5%) and the rest lies between (85.8%) – (88.8%). On the other hand, do not believe in that are mostly from Chengai (14.2%) followed by Phungyar (12.5%), Ukhrul (11.3%), Kamjong (7.5%), Kasom (6.3%).

Based on the findings from the table, it can be seen that maximum number of the respondents confirms the role that should be performed by self employment or entrepreneurship to address the crisis of unemployment in the area, but the lack of capital, training, infrastructure and opportunities given by state government is acting as an impediment in realising it.

Table 4.109: Areas where a youth of the village can start a new employment.

Area that can start a new employment		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Technological avenue	Frequency	23	9	10	9	46	97
	% on areas of employment	23.7%	9.3%	10.3%	9.3%	47.4%	100.0%
	% within block	19.2%	11.3%	12.5%	11.3%	19.2%	16.2%
Patty business	Frequency	35	21	46	47	58	207
	% on areas of employment	16.9%	10.1%	22.2%	22.7%	28.0%	100.0%
	% within block	29.2%	26.3%	57.5%	58.8%	24.2%	34.5%
Public contract	Frequency	18	23	9	4	39	93
	% on areas of employment	19.4%	24.7%	9.7%	4.3%	41.9%	100.0%
	% within block	15.0%	28.8%	11.3%	5.0%	16.3%	15.5%
Business agencies	Frequency	27	21	13	15	75	151
	% on areas of employment	17.9%	13.9%	8.6%	9.9%	49.7%	100.0%
	% within block	22.5%	26.3%	16.3%	18.8%	31.3%	25.2%
Courier agencies	Frequency	17	6	2	5	22	52
	% on areas of employment	32.7%	11.5%	3.8%	9.6%	42.3%	100.0%
	% within block	14.2%	7.5%	2.5%	6.3%	9.2%	8.7%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% on areas of employment	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The available data from the respondents shows that patty business (34.5%), business agencies (25.2%), technological avenues (16.2%), public contract (15.5%) are the areas where youth can work to get employment.

It is observed that in the category of the respondents who finds patty business as an option for employment are mostly from Phungyar (58.8%), Kasom (57.5%) and the rest lies between (24.2%) – (29.2%). Those who find business agencies as an source of

employment opportunity are mostly from Ukhurul (31.3%), Kamjong (26.3%), Chengai (22.5%), Phungyar (18.8%), Kasom (16.3%). Those who find technological avenues are mainly from Chengai & Ukhurul (19.2%) follow by Kasom (12.5%), Kamjong & Phungyar (11.3%).

Hence the study clearly reveals that opportunity are less for the respondents to start a new employment in the area but there is scope for patty business in the area according to majority of the respondents, provided a minimum facilities like loan by banks can be given to start these endeavours.

Table 4.110: Existence of link with political association by the respondents.

Link with political association		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhurul	
Yes	Frequency	30	16	23	13	40	122
	% in political association	24.6%	13.1%	18.9%	10.7%	32.8%	100.0%
	% within block	25.0%	20.0%	28.8%	16.3%	16.7%	20.3%
No	Frequency	90	64	57	67	200	478
	% in political association	18.8%	13.4%	11.9%	14.0%	41.8%	100.0%
	% within block	75.0%	80.0%	71.3%	83.8%	83.3%	79.7%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% in political association	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The table above shows that the respondent's majority of the respondents (79.7%) don't have any link with the political association and 20.3% have a link.

As observed in the category of who do not have link with political association, Phungyar (83.8%), Ukhurul (83.3%), Kamjong (80.0%), Chengai (75.0%), Kasom (71.3%). The respondents who have link start from Kasom (28.8%), Chengai (25.0%), Kamjong (20.0%), Ukhurul (16.7%), Phungyar (16.3%).

It reveals that majority of the respondents do not have any link with the political association which again reveals their hope and trust in political associations.

Table 4.111: Relation between any link of the respondents with political association and their monthly household income.

Link with political association		Monthly household income					Total
		10,000 – 15,000	15001 – 20,000	20001 – 25,000	25,001 – 30,000	30,001 & above	
Yes	Frequency	14	26	18	20	44	122
	% link with political association	11.5%	21.3%	14.8%	16.4%	36.1%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	13.9%	25.2%	24.7%	20.6%	19.5%	20.3%
No	Frequency	87	77	55	77	182	478
	% link with political association	18.2%	16.1%	11.5%	16.1%	38.1%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	86.1%	74.8%	75.3%	79.4%	80.5%	79.7%
Total	Frequency	101	103	73	97	226	600
	% link with political association	16.8%	17.2%	12.2%	16.2%	37.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data shows that majority of the respondents (79.7%) have no link with the political association.

The relationship with household income of the respondents and the link with the political association reveal that most of the respondents among all the income groups have no link with political association.

Hence the data shows that there is no correlation between household income of the respondents and the link with political association.

Table 4.112: Existence of link with cultural association by the respondents.

Link with cultural association		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Yes	Frequency	19	15	3	23	61	121
	% in cultural association	15.7%	12.4%	2.5%	19.0%	50.4%	100.0%
	% within block	15.8%	18.8%	3.8%	28.8%	25.4%	20.2%
No	Frequency	101	65	77	57	179	479
	% in cultural association	21.1%	13.6%	16.1%	11.9%	37.4%	100.0%
	% within block	84.2%	81.3%	96.3%	71.3%	74.6%	79.8%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% in cultural association	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

In response to the question, majority of the respondents (79.8%) does not have any link with the cultural association and (20.2%) respondents have link.

As indicated in the table from block wise segregation of the data shows that majority of the respondents who does not have any link with the cultural association are mostly from Kasom (96.3%), followed by Chengai (84.2%), Kamjong (81.3%), Ukhrul (74.6%), Phungyar (71.3%). The respondents who have links with such association are mostly from the block of Phungyar (28.8%), Ukhrul (25.4%), Kamjong (18.8%), Chengai (15.8%), and Kasom (3.8%).

Hence the data confirms the fact that most of the respondents no longer have hope and interest in cultural association.

Table 4.113: Relation between any link of the respondents with cultural association and their monthly household income.

Link with cultural association		Monthly household income					Total
		10,000 – 15,000	15001 – 20,000	20001 – 25,000	25,001 – 30,000	30,001 & above	
Yes	Frequency	19	12	13	12	65	121
	% link with cultural association	15.7%	9.9%	10.7%	9.9%	53.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	18.8%	11.7%	17.8%	12.4%	28.8%	20.2%
No	Frequency	82	91	60	85	161	479
	% link with cultural association	17.1%	19.0%	12.5%	17.7%	33.6%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	81.2%	88.3%	82.2%	87.6%	71.2%	79.8%
Total	Frequency	101	103	73	97	226	600
	% link with cultural association	16.8%	17.2%	12.2%	16.2%	37.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data reveals that majority of the respondents (79.8%) have no link with the cultural association.

The relationship with household income of the respondents and the link with the cultural association specify that most of the respondents among all the income groups have no link with cultural association except the above Rs 30,000 income group who are having more association in comparison to other income groups with the cultural association.

Table 4.114: Existence of link with welfare association by the respondents.

Link with welfare association		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Yes	Frequency	21	21	2	30	68	142
	% in welfare association	14.8%	14.8%	1.4%	21.1%	47.9%	100.0%
	% within block	17.5%	26.3%	2.5%	37.5%	28.3%	23.7%
No	Frequency	99	59	78	50	172	458
	% in welfare association	21.6%	12.9%	17.0%	10.9%	37.6%	100.0%
	% within block	82.5%	73.8%	97.5%	62.5%	71.7%	76.3%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% in welfare association	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

It reveals that (76.3%) do not have link with welfare association in the study area.

As indicated in the table the respondents who do not have any link with welfare association are mainly from Kasom (97.5%) followed by Chengai (82.5%), Kamjong (73.8%), Ukhrul (71.7%), Phungyar (62.5%). The respondents which have link leads from Phungyar (37.5%), Ukhrul (28.3%), Kamjong (26.3%), Chengai (17.5%), Kasom (2.5%).

Therefore the data also reveals the distrust and lack of hope that the respondents attach with the welfare association in the area.

Table 4.115: Relation between any link of the respondents with welfare associations and their monthly household income.

Any Link with welfare association		Monthly household income					Total
		10,000 – 15,000	15001 – 20,000	20001 – 25,000	25,001 – 30,000	30,001 & above	
Yes	Frequency	19	21	13	16	73	142
	% with welfare association	13.4%	14.8%	9.2%	11.3%	51.4%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	18.8%	20.4%	17.8%	16.5%	32.3%	23.7%
No	Frequency	82	82	60	81	153	458
	% with welfare association	17.9%	17.9%	13.1%	17.7%	33.4%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	81.2%	79.6%	82.2%	83.5%	67.7%	76.3%
Total	Frequency	101	103	73	97	226	600
	% with welfare association	16.8%	17.2%	12.2%	16.2%	37.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data illustrate that mainstream of the respondents (76.3%) have no link with the welfare association.

The relationship with household income of the respondents and the link with the welfare association specify that most of the respondents among all the income groups have no link with cultural association except the above Rs 30,000 income group who are having more association in comparison to other income groups with the cultural association.

Table 4.116: Existence of link with sports association by the respondents.

Link with sports association		Block					Total
		Chengai	Kamjong	Kasom	Phungyar	Ukhrul	
Yes	Frequency	24	7	2	20	46	99
	% in sport association	24.2%	7.1%	2.0%	20.2%	46.5%	100.0%
	% within block	20.0%	8.8%	2.5%	25.0%	19.2%	16.5%
No	Frequency	96	73	78	60	194	501
	% in sport association	19.2%	14.6%	15.6%	12.0%	38.7%	100.0%
	% within block	80.0%	91.3%	97.5%	75.0%	80.8%	83.5%
Total	Frequency	120	80	80	80	240	600
	% in sport association	20.0%	13.3%	13.3%	13.3%	40.0%	100.0%
	% within block	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

It could be seen that majority of the respondents (83.5%) do not have any link with the sports association whereas (16.5%) has link.

As the study reveals the respondents that do not have link with sports association are predominantly from the block Kasom (97.5%), followed by Kamjong (91.3%), Ukhrul (80.8%), Chengai (80.0%), Phungyar (75.0%). The respondents that have link with such associations are from Phungyar (25.0%), Chengai (20.0%), Ukhrul (19.2%), Kamjong (8.8%), Kasom (2.5%).

North eastern state in general and Manipur in particular is known for its participation and excellence in sports, but the data of the study shows that this unemployed youths do not even have hope in these associations which is also not spared from corruption and biasness.

Table 4.117: Relation between any link of the respondents with sports association and their monthly household income.

Link with sports association		Monthly household income					Total
		10,000 – 15,000	15001 – 20,000	20001 – 25,000	25,001 – 30,000	30,001 & above	
Yes	Frequency	18	13	13	11	44	99
	% with sports association	18.2%	13.1%	13.1%	11.1%	44.4%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	17.8%	12.6%	17.8%	11.3%	19.5%	16.5%
No	Frequency	83	90	60	86	182	501
	% with sports association	16.6%	18.0%	12.0%	17.2%	36.3%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	82.2%	87.4%	82.2%	88.7%	80.5%	83.5%
Total	Frequency	101	103	73	97	226	600
	% with sports association	16.8%	17.2%	12.2%	16.2%	37.7%	100.0%
	% of monthly household income	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Field work

The data shows that majority of the respondents (83.5%) have no link with the sports association.

The relationship with household income of the respondents and link with the sports association reveals that most of the respondents among all the income groups have no link with the sports association.

Hence the data demonstrate that there is no correlation between household income of the respondents and the link with sports association.

4.10: Conclusion

Though, maximum numbers of unemployed respondents are aware of the government policies that are meant to tackle unemployment in the study area but none of them are availing the facilities from the government, which reveals the problems of implementation of this programs in the grassroots level which is almost not there. Based on the findings from the study, it can be seen that maximum number of the

respondents confirms the role that should be performed by self employment or entrepreneurship to address the crisis of unemployment in the area, but the lack of capital, training, infrastructure and opportunities given by state government is acting as an impediment in realising it.

Hence the study clearly reveals that though the opportunities are less for the respondents to start a new employment in the area but there is scope for petty business in the area according to majority of the respondents, provided a minimum facilities like loan by banks can be given to start these endeavours. Therefore the study reveals the status of financial impotency which is mainly responsible for not availing the self employment avenues in the area. It clearly exposed the inefficiency of the government machinery to implement the projects meant for encouraging self employment opportunities in the area for financial inclusion of this population. Hence the study already established in the last chapter about the preference that is shown by the respondents on government jobs which are lucrative and secure, but they are also too rare to avail. Starting a new business has its own problems particularly the challenge of arranging capital. Moreover the study also reveals that majority of the respondents do not have any link with the political association which again reveals their lack of hope and trust in political associations. The data also reveals the distrust and lack of hope that the respondents attach with the welfare association in the area. North eastern state in general and Manipur in particular is known for its participation and excellence in sports, but the data of the study shows that this unemployed youths do not even have hope in these associations which is also not spared from corruption and biasness.

Hence in the study area we can observe following alternative employment opportunities for the youth to avail.

1. Micro enterprises and small scale industry is the solution to create employment opportunities as well as income for unemployed youth in Ukhrul district. Micro enterprises and small scale industry should be taken as an option to mainstream for employment opportunities and not the perfect way of providing employment to youth. Moreover these industries should also be linked with external markets where effective marketing of these products are required to expand its market.

For speedy growth of small-scale industries, according to the Economic survey of Manipur 2015-16, Government had brought about simplifications in the SSI registration procedures in the state. By the end of March 2006, the number of registered permanent SSI stood at 10,264. During the year, 2014-15, the number of registered establishments in MSME (Part II) is 198 with an investment of Rs. 2643.32 crores in plants and machineries and providing employment to at least 2245 persons where annual production was estimated to be Rs.183.72 crores. Moreover policies as The Pradhan Mantri Mudra Yojana (PMMY) can also address the vacuum of financial assistance in the guise of loans at low rates to micro-finance institutions and non-banking financial institutions which then provide credit to MSMEs. It provides its services to small entrepreneurs outside the service area of regular banks. The bank will classify its clients into three categories and the maximum allowed loan sums will be based on the category: Shishu : covering loans upto 50,000/-, Kishor : covering loans above 50,000/- and upto 5 lakh, Tarun : covering loans above 5 lakh and upto 10 lakh. The products being offered by MUDRA are so designed, to meet requirements of different sectors / business activities as well as business / entrepreneur segments.

The study area needs to build up an employment centre for micro enterprise and small scale industry so that employment centres provide counselling on job search and self-employment. Employment centres also needs to make an arrangement to offer appropriate skill training for the job seekers to develop skills for future work. Micro enterprises and small scale industry in the study area can make advance job creation and growth. The unemployed youth must engage in NGOs as a social enterprise and look at it as a major source of employment and generation of employment. The data also establish the emergence of NGOs a major sector for employment generation (10.7%) of the respondents are engaged in NGOs. According to the Office of the District Co-operative Officer, Ukhrul there were 627 NGOs with working capital in Ukhrul District. The unemployed educated youth must further think than credit and utilize the enterprise by developing a business plan and financial statement to calculate success for income. Moreover one of the most pertinent impediment in creation of

micro enterprises and small scale industry in the study area is the lack of infrastructure in guise of roads and loans that is available for the educated youths in the area.

2. The state has immense scope for promotion of tourism. It has a salubrious climate, exotic greenery and rich flora besides the rich culture. Shirui Kashung, Khangkhui Cave, Khayang Peak, Ango Ching, Hundung, Mangva Cave are popular tourist spots in the district. During the year 2014-15, 2,900 foreign tourist and 1,34,584 domestic tourist came to the state. Tourism can bring many scopes to the field of handloom, handicraft, hotel and food, cab services, petty business etc.

3. Though the state has no marine fishery, it has vast inland fishery resources like ponds, tanks, natural lakes, marshy areas, swampy areas, rivers, reservoirs, submerged cropped land, low lying paddy fields etc. The target source of fish is the Loktak Lake. The production of fish in Manipur for the year 2014-15 was estimated to be 32.00 thousand tonnes as against the 28.00 thousand tonnes in 2013-14, the demand for fish is mostly addressed by fishes coming from outside the state. Hence there is a huge scope for the development of fishery in the state in general and Ukhrul in particular to generate employment opportunities for youths.

4. There is also wide scope in the field of sericulture in the state of Manipur and Ukhrul district too, particularly for women. Manipur has 4 (four) varieties of Silk viz., Mulberry, Eri, Muga and Oak Tasar. To provide employment particularly to womenfolk, Manipur Sericulture Project was initiated with the assistance of the Government of Japan through Government of India, 94.71% plantation was achieved. With the help of Central Silk Board, the Catalytic Development Programme (CDP) has been implemented since 2003-04. The production of cocoon during the year 2013-14 is Mulberry – 1056.00, Eri-440.90 MT, Tasar-119.85 lakh nos. and Muga-32.00 lakh nos.

5. The Indo Myanmar Border Trade was operationalised from 12th April, 1995. The Central Government is making an effort to frame a policy for development of trade with South East Asia under India's Look East Policy. In connection with the border trade, the then Union Minister of State visited Imphal and Moreh on 29th September, 2006 and announced for development of Moreh Town by creating an

integrated Check Post (ICP) adjacent to international boundary within Land Customs Station, Moreh. The State Government was entrusted the task of acquiring land measuring 45.50 acres at the cost of about Rs. 125 crores. The Indo Myanmar market at Moreh can act as an idle market for selling the local handloom and handicrafts, minerals, silk and also encourage tourism in the state, which is and if properly planned can promote much more employment opportunities.

6. Manipur is also house of diverse forest resources as Teak, Charcoal, Bamboo and Cane, Broom, Cinnamon (*Dalchini*), Incense which can be used to produce finished products and they can be linked to bigger market as in Indo Myanmar market at Moreh, Interstate markets at Jeribum (Assam), Kohima (Nagaland) etc, which can encourage entrepreneurship endeavours and generate many employment opportunities. Though, maximum numbers of unemployed respondents are aware of the government policies that are meant to tackle unemployment in the study area but none of them are availing the facilities from the government, which reveals the problems of implementation of this programs in the grassroots level which is almost not there. Based on the findings from the study, it can be seen that maximum number of the respondents confirms the role that should be performed by self employment or entrepreneurship to address the crisis of unemployment in the area, but the lack of capital, training, infrastructure and opportunities given by state government is acting as an impediment in realising it.

4.11: Entrepreneurial Opportunities in Ukhrul district

There are always plenty of opportunities in many sectors if the youth get into the idea as it depends on the particular interests, location, skill set and knowledge base. It has to be something that the individual youth love to do. One should understand that entrepreneur is not a degree.

It is quite understandable that every youth needs a constant source of income, but most people over the Ukhrul district do not have enough amount of capital to start a business. Therefore one must choose the area to start an entrepreneurship in Ukhrul district. According to Peter F. Drucker, "Entrepreneur is an innovator". Douglas

MacArthur gave as opening quotation saying that “There is no security on this earth-only opportunity.” The various business opportunities available in the environment of Ukhrul district are the following only:

7. School and Office Supplies: Entrepreneurs do not need to worry about making sales. With a large number of businesses and schools situated in Ukhrul district, pencils, pens, the paper of different varieties, notebooks, and others will always be in constant demand.

8. Customised Jewellery: Youth, especially women love to accessorize themselves and since Ukhrul is a religious, cultural yet fashionable hill area, customized jewellery businesses in Ukhrul are sure to grow. One can invest in buying a small jewellery-making kit and create necklaces, earrings, and bracelets that are uniquely designed for each of the customers.

9. Fast food: Menu in a restaurant or street food counter does not necessarily have to be top-of-the-line, but begin with simple recipes. One must remember that food is a basic need of man and humans must eat regardless of the economic or whatever situation. Fast food is another area where youths can start up as it is very popular in the area. Mobile food carts have the potentiality to generate employment in the area.

10. Digital photography: Almost every youth owns a digital camera or smart phone, so one can also use this gadget to generate a steady source of income. Photocopy, scanning and printing has also got potentiality to generate employment in the area as there are no such facility in the area yet.

11. Furniture Making: Many youths are good in furniture making, then one can surely create and design wooden furniture and decoration products at an affordable price for the residents of the community just the way they want it to be. Again these products can be sold in Ukhrul market place and they can also create market in Imphal by producing attractive and affordable products, these area can also generate employment as there are no such endeavours availed by the youths yet in the area.

Hence the study clearly reveals that though the opportunities are less for the respondent to start a new employment in the area but there is scope for petty business in the area according to majority of the respondent, provided a minimum facilities like loan by banks can be given to start these endeavours. Therefore the study reveals the status of financial impotency which is mainly responsible for not availing the self employment avenues in the area. It clearly exposed the inefficiency of the government machinery to implement the projects meant for encouraging self employment opportunities in the area for financial inclusion of this population. Hence the study already established in the last chapter about the preference that is shown by the respondents on government jobs which are lucrative and secure, but they are also too rare to avail. Starting a new business has its own problems particularly the challenge of arranging capital. Moreover the study also reveals that majority of the respondent do not have any link with the political association which again reveals their lack of hope and trust in political associations. The data also reveals the distrust and lack of hope that the respondents attach with the welfare association in the area.

North eastern state in general and Manipur in particular is known for its participation and excellence in sports, but the data of the study shows that this unemployed youths do not even have hope in these associations which is also not spared from corruption and biasness.