

University of Wollongong
Department of Economics
Working Paper Series 2000

**The Challenge of Child Labour in Rural India:
A Multi-Dimensional Problem in Need of
an Orchestrated Policy Response**

D.P. Chaudhri

and

E.J. Wilson

WP 00-02

**Australian Centre for International
Agricultural Research (ACIAR) Funded
Project**

Sub-Project 5

**Challenge of Child Labour in Rural India: A Multi
Dimensional Problem in Need of an Orchestrated Policy
Response**

by

D.P. Chaudhri and E.J. Wilson

PROJECT NO. ANRE1/98/91

EQUITY DRIVEN TRADE AND MARKETING POLICY STRATEGIES
FOR IMPROVED PERFORMANCE OF INDIAN AGRICULTURE – A
SCOPING EXERCISE

**Department of Economics
University of Wollongong
March 2000**

***Challenge of Child Labour in Rural India: A Multi Dimensional Problem
in Need of an Orchestrated Policy Response.****

by

D. P. Chaudhri and E.J. Wilson

Perceptions about facets of child labour in India, and elsewhere, are strongly conditioned by our knowledge of economic history, socio-cultural view of child welfare, respect, or lack of it, for functioning of the market system and attitudes towards duties of the Sovereign with respect to its citizens and to the international community. The spectrum of views generated by such a complex intellectual prism would naturally be rather large. The coloured vision of vested interests reduces the transparency of the spectrum. This is clearly observable in media reporting, legislative processes, national and international posturings on the subject of child labour. The Indian scene has been rendered more complex due to lack of factual knowledge (even among the researchers) on regional, gender and rural dimensions of its incidence. This lacuna has nothing to do with absence of statistical data or hard facts available in public domain. The available statistics are hardly processed, analysed and deceminated. The problem is neither ignorance nor lack of data. But rather *shallow and partial understanding* of the issues involved. Among many articulate and determined interest groups facts are not allowed to come in the way of their opinions and unexamined beliefs.

This paper is an attempt to provide a tentative framework for an objective, factual and systematic look at important dimensions of the child labour problem in rural India. The paper is divided into eight sections. Section I deals with history of the child labour phenomena in industrialised market economies. Section II clarifies the changing meaning and concepts of child labour and ILO's views on the subject. Section III is devoted to the growth of child population and school education. Section IV brings out gender dimensions of child labour and *Nowhere Children* in Rural India. Section V deals with sectoral distribution of child labour and Section VI with

* This is a slightly revised version of a paper prepared and presented at the workshop on *Rural Child Labour* being organised by the National Institute of Rural Development, Hyderabad in January 1998. Thanks are due to Mei Ball, R. N. Chanda, Linda Muñoz, Silvana Noveska and Tauhidur Rahmann for competent research assistance. Usual academic caveat applies.

age composition of child labour. Section VII deals with fragmented and urban oriented policy response to the child labour problem. Last Section brings out limitations of the existing policy responses to the challenge of child labour in rural India and elsewhere and the need for their orchestration.

Section I: Historical Perspective on Child Labour¹

Charles Dickens through *David Copperfield* provided us with a pen portrait of child labour phenomena in the 19th century United Kingdom. Here in India, Raj Kapoor through *Boot Polish* in 1952 and Meera Nair through *Salam Bombay* in 1992 gave us film portraits of child labour in urban slums of Mumbai. These portraits were not only touching but contextually accurate and insightful as well. Recent research re-evaluating the child labour phenomena in the early stages of industrialisation in countries of Europe, North America and Japan provides us with useful information, testable proportions and valuable insights for policy formulation.² Six generalisation culled from vast historical literature are worth serious attention. These are as under:

(1) During early phases of industrialisation each of the industrialised countries experienced a population explosion created by sharply declining death rates but high and rather sluggish total fertility rates. These imbalances affected their population pyramids, increasing the proportion of children (0-14 years) in total population from about 30 per cent to over 40 per cent. It peaked at about 42-45 per cent in all cases when the proportion started declining. Incidence of child labour (variously defined) was at its peak when the proportion of child population was around 42-45 per cent and virtually disappeared when it declined to under 30 per cent. Historically, time taken for this change has differed from country to country. Transition in the UK dragged for almost a century while that in Japan was in less than fifty years. South Korea and China are attempting to do so in one generation. Demographers have studied this phenomena as *Theory of Demographic Transition*.

¹ This section is adapted from Chaudhri, D.P. (1997C), *A Policy Perspective on Child Labour in India with Pervasive Gender and Urban Bias in School Education*, an invited keynote paper prepared for the Indian Society of Labour Economics Conference, Trivandrum, January 2-4, 1998.

² See, UNICEF (1996), Nardinelli (1992, 1994), Trattner (1970), Horn (1994) among many others.

Caldwell (1990) calls it *Soft Under Belly of Development*. This pattern is observable in contemporary Asia, including the Indian states, as well.³

(2) Structural change triggered by the industrialisation process led to migration of workers and their families from agricultural to non-agricultural activities. Degree of urbanisation increased as a by-product, urban facilities, including formal school education facilities, proved inadequate everywhere: grossly inadequate in UK, and USA and moderately inadequate in other countries of Europe. Japan and Germany, as late entrants to the industrialisation process, experienced this inadequacy to a much lower extent mainly due to their insightful educational strategies. Some of the vocal concerns about child labour in UK, USA and Australia at the turn of the century were about the phenomena of *street urchins*: adolescent boys lacking discipline imposed by the family and the village community, having recently migrated to urban centres making a nuisance of themselves. Demand for compulsory schooling particularly in these countries was partly to deal with this phenomena of petty urban crime and indiscipline. The German and Japanese response, built on the foundations of experience of compulsory school education decades before the spread of industrialisation and urbanisation was qualitatively different from that of these three and other European countries.

(3) Rural and agricultural child labour was not an important subject of debate or major concern in any of these countries except in Japan where girls (mostly in the age group 10-14 years) working in silk and textile production activities were targeted for compulsory schooling through a concerted national effort during early decades of this century. In the US, agro-processing industries dealing with fruit and juice canning had widespread use of child labour. Their seasonal work had been a subject of debate and legal sanctions. The agricultural sector, by and large, was left alone. Even the ILO's Charter of 1919 did not include child workers in agriculture as part of its prohibited employment sources. ILO's Convention 138 dealing with minimum age and proposed Convention of 1998 are echoing the experience of present-day industrialised countries.⁴

³ See Chaudhri (1996), Chapter I, UNICEF (1995) for evidence on Indian States.

⁴ See ILO (1996a) for details.

(4) Child labour Prohibitions and Regulation Act of UK (frequently amended in the 19th century) and their counterparts in countries of Europe and North America were mainly focused at urban, industrial activities. The genesis of India's child labour Prohibition and Regulation Act of 1986 can easily be traced back to that of 1938 in India and that of UK of the 19th century with various amendments. ILO's 1919 Charter encompassed the typical features of the Act. Rural agricultural child labour and children working within the household sectors have been exempted from prohibition. The extent of regulations differ from country to country and sector to sector.

(5) Use of trade sanctions as an instrument of public policy to combat child labour occurred only in the United States during 1930's in connection with trade between the states of the USA. Each state had a Child Labour Prohibition and Regulation law of its own and the issue got entangled in constitutional rights of the states to pass their own laws on the subject.⁵ The Federal Government having found itself entangled in a legal quagmire turned to the use of trade sanctions which were under its jurisdiction and above the state laws on child labour. Everywhere else trade as a weapon to deal with the child labour was not considered seriously.

(6) Expansion of school facilities with or without compulsion occurred everywhere once output per worker and output per capita started growing. Declining total fertility rate, expansion of school enrolment and retention rates in schools occurred virtually simultaneously. Economic historians are still debating the efficacy of the policy instrument like compulsory school education in combating child labour. Nordanellie (1992, 1994) has re-examined the phenomena from the point of view of household's economic rationality. The counter view is also supported by extensive evidence.⁶

Countries of East and South East Asia had been emphasising *quality, universal elementary education* since the Second World War (in some cases even earlier) and have followed the Japanese model of school education.⁷ Myrdal (1968) *Asian Drama* devotes one of the three volumes mainly to the issue of school education and human resource development as a major ingredient of modernisation in Asia. The experience

⁵ See Brown et. al (1992) for details

⁶ See UNICEF (1996) for alternative views.

⁷ See UNESCO (1964) & Myrdal (1968) in this connection.

of South Asia, which is qualitatively different from that of East Asia has been recently summarised by Haq (1997) and can be culled from UNDP (1997). Even within South Asia, Sri Lanka's experience and record is far superior to that of India. Generalising for whole of India would be seriously misleading because the contrast between Kerala and Bihar in school educational effort and outcomes is much sharper than between East Asia and India. Agricultural and rural child labour, as discussed above, has not been an important concern of the policy-makers and pressure groups dealing with the issue of its elimination historically or in the contemporary world.⁸ We argue below that this is short-sighted and ignores the systemic implications of this neglect in terms of current welfare concerns and potential labour productivity losses.

Section II: Conceptual Categories of Child Labour

Societies, from time immemorial, have evolved complex procedures to ensure socialisation of their child population. Preparation for the world of work is also undertaken according to accepted norms for different stratas of society.⁹ Socialisation and preparation for the world of work is done formally as well as informally. Children of the ruling and economically prosperous classes get it in elaborately specified formal methods while those of the lower strata of the society get mostly informal education usually on the job. This has been true till the advent of twentieth century post-industrial market and planned economies.¹⁰ This can also be observed in contemporary India.¹¹ Therefore, defining *Child Labour* as a meaningful conceptual category is a rather complex undertaking, but is important for conceptual clarity.

ILO's original Charter of 1919 deals with child labour in a number of hazardous activities and industries. The list has been expanded substantially. Specification of minimum age for entry into the work force has also been growing. It was 12 years for early nineteenth century U.K.; 13 years for the ILO's original Charter and is 18 years in most industrialised countries. In India, it is upto the age of 14. With rising life expectancy and retirement age, raising acceptable age of entry into the work force is understandable.

⁸ See ILO (1996a), US Department of Labour (1994) & UNICEF (1996).

⁹ See Avinashilingam (1964) for example.

¹⁰ See UNESCO (1964) as an example.

¹¹ See Dreze & Sen (1995), Tilak (1994), Myrdal (1968) among many others.

In Figure I, we present conceptual categories of child labour in three broadly defined sectors of the economy, namely, agricultural sector, manufacturing sector and services sector. Child workers can be classified according to *modes of employment*. Those working as unpaid family workers within the family managed economic enterprises and those employed by others as wage labourers paid according to the quantum of work done or time spent at work. These two categories present vastly different attitudinal, organisational and motivational arrangements of child workers.¹² Governments and communities find it easier to regulate employment conditions, hours of work and the minimum wages for the wage earners but are wary of interfering with the intricate inter-generational reciprocal arrangements within a family.¹³

Intensity of work, hours of work and working conditions have been undergoing major changes since the advent of industrialisation during the last two hundred years. Broadly these three can be either hazardous for the development of a child into a productive and normal adult worker or could be non-hazardous. Conceptual demarcation does not pose serious problems provided science based specialist knowledge is harnessed but empirically it is as hazardous as landmines. Government of India's focus on eliminating so called hazardous forms of child labour and ILO (1996) *Targeting the Intolerable* suffer from both conceptual and informational vagueness. Therefore targeted policy instruments may miss their mark.

From the society's point of view, operational division of child labour should be into three groups. These are:

- a. Problem areas with strong conflict of interest between the State, Community, Family and the Employers of cheap child labour.
- b. Areas where the State, community, family - and employers - do not have major conflict of interest.
- c. Minimal conflict between child development, school education and part-time work.

Most of rural child labour, we believe belongs to group 2 and 3 but the first one is not totally absent. The later two groups need elaborate regulation of child

¹² For details, see Sen (1966, 1975).

¹³ UN Rights of the Child (1989) ratified by India in 1992 in the first comprehensive document dealing with *all* aspects of child development and welfare.

labour with community and family support. Government of India seems to be overly preoccupied with US and European countries agenda which affects a tiny fraction of child labour in India. We consider this issue in the next section.

Section III: Growth of Child Population and Child Labour

One of the major influences on the incidence of child labour is a supply side influence, namely, the rate of growth of child population. We divide child population into three related but conceptually different subsets with rather fuzzy boundaries in India. These are: (i) children in schools; (ii) children in the labour force; and (iii) children who are neither in schools nor in the labour force. We have termed the last category as *Nowhere Children*. These are children who are largely engaged in household activities not considered economically productive work in the universally accepted economist's definitions. The Census of India and the National Sample Survey do not include them as principal workers.

Growth rates of child population, school education, child labour and *nowhere children* in the major states of India for the period 1961-1991 computed separately for each decade are reported in Table 1. These growth rates bring out enormous variations across states of India in each of these three components. Variations observed here are very similar to those observed in different countries of contemporary Asia and in different parts of Europe in the early phases of Industrial Revolution during the 19th century. Growth rates of child population for each of the decades are important indicators of the pace of demographic transition. During 1961-71, Kerala and Tamil Nadu were the only two states where the child population grew at under 20 per cent. Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Orissa had a growth rate of over 3 per cent with an All India average of 2.5 per cent. During the decade 1971-82, it declined to 1.3 per cent for India as a whole with Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh recording a growth rate of 2.5 per cent and 2.3 per cent respectively. The lowest growth rate of child population was in Kerala (0.3 per cent). Growth rates lower than the All India average of 1. Per cent were recorded in Kerala, Punjab, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal. In 1981-91, the growth rate of child population in Kerala became negative at -0.3 per cent and was recorded to be lower than 1 per cent in Himachal Pradesh (0.8

per cent), Orissa (0.8 per cent) and Tamil Nadu (0.1 per cent). Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Haryana and Bihar had growth rates of over 1.5 per cent.

Rate of growth of child labour during 1961-71 was negative. This is partly a statistical illusion due to change in definition of workers. However, against an All India decline of 2.9 per cent, West Bengal had a growth of 1.3 per cent. Census years 1971, 1981 and 1991 are broadly comparable. For the decade 1971-81, incidence of child labour recorded a decline in Kerala, Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, Gujarat, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. It increased in Karnataka (1.8 per cent), Madhya Pradesh (1.8 per cent), Madhya Pradesh (2.5 per cent) and Tamil Nadu (2 per cent). Everywhere else, it declined marginally. During 1981-91, child labour in India declined at an annual rate of -2.0 per cent. Largest decline recorded was in Kerala (-8.3 per cent), Tamil Nadu (-5.0 per cent), Himachal Pradesh (-6.5 per cent), and Madhya Pradesh (-3.1 per cent). Elsewhere, the decline was either equal to or lower than the All India average of -2.0 per cent with the exception of West Bengal where it grew at 3 per cent.

Growth of *Nowhere children* during 1961-71 was slightly higher than the observed decline in child labour. During 1971-81, the number of *Nowhere children* grew in 4 states and declined in 11 of the states we have considered. For India as a whole, there was a small decline. During 1981-91, in the 6 of the 15 states, the size of *Nowhere children* grew while in the remaining 9, it declined. Fastest decline having been observed in Kerala and Tamil Nadu. This is directly related to deceleration in the growth of child population discussed above.

Kerala, followed by Tamil Nadu and Himachal Pradesh, has demonstrated the demographic and substantially reduced child labour benefits of sustained school education efforts. The experience echoes the observed historical patterns discussed above. Punjab, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Karnataka and Orissa are on the same trajectory but probably a decade behind from Tamil Nadu and Himachal Pradesh. Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Madhya Pradesh continue to suffer from sluggish demographic transition. Incidence of child labour and/or of *Nowhere children* in these states will continue to be high unless concerted policy effort is mounted in these states.

The estimates of child labour, according to 1991 Census and those based on National Sample Survey 50th Round 1993-94, provide very similar results. According

to NSS estimates of 1993-94, there were approximately 9 million children who were working as full-time workers according to NSS usual activities, principal worker status definition. ILO (1996), after experimenting in four countries, has recommended a methodology of estimating child labour which is very similar to that of NSS of India. Visaria and Jacob (1995) was one of the four methodological studies done for the ILO dealing with two districts of Gujarat. As such, NSS estimates not only reasonably accurate but also provide sub-grouping of child population (0-14 years) into five years age intervals. We discuss below the magnitudes of rural and total child labour according to NSS 50th Round data for the year 1993-94. Possible problems of small sample in specific stratas of some states should be kept in mind while interpreting NSS based state level results. National level estimates do not suffer from these problems.

In Figure 2, we present the absolute number and proportions of rural-urban dimensions of child population (5-14 years), child labour and its gender components. Out of a total estimated child population of 175.9 million in India 85.8 per cent are in rural areas and 14.4 per cent in urban areas. When seen in the light of degree of urbanisation in India, we find that proportionately the number of children in rural India is much larger than that in urban India. In Figure 2(b) we show that out of a total estimated full-time child labour (usual activities status definition) of 8.9 million, 90.9 per cent were in rural areas and only 9.1 per cent were in urban areas. Numerical magnitudes are also reported in Figure 2.

Section IV: Gender Bias in Child Labour and Nowhere Children

Incidence of male child labour in rural India for the Census years 1961 to 1991 is presented in Map 1. In 1961, 14.6 per cent of children below the age of 14 according to Census of India were found working in rural India with a range of only 2.2 per cent in Kerala and 15.6 per cent in Rajasthan. States with low incidence of rural male child labour were Kerala, West Bengal, Gujarat, Uttar Pradesh, Punjab, and Haryana. In 1971, it declined everywhere except in Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh with the largest drop having occurred in Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Haryana. In 1981, Andhra Pradesh is the only state where more than 10 per cent of rural male children were working. The pattern

observed in 1991 suggested lowest incidence of rural male child labour in Kerala, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, and Uttar Pradesh while the highest was in Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Madhya Pradesh.

Incidence of rural female child labour in 1961 had a marked regional bias as can be observed from Map II. Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh and Himachal Pradesh had extremely high incidence of rural female child labour while Kerala, Uttar Pradesh, Punjab, Haryana and West Bengal had low incidence. The change in definition of workers in 1971 affected rural female workers much more than others. Therefore, 1961 and 1971 Census data are not strictly compared. A proper comparison would be between 1971, 1981 and 1991 Census. Examining the map it can be clearly seen that the incidence of rural female child labour has worsed in the states of Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh between 1971 and 1991. The highest incidence being 12 per cent in Andhra Pradesh against an All India average of 4.4 per cent.

Incidence of male children in rural India who are neither in schools nor in labour force, as such defined as *nowhere children* in rural India as can be seen from Map III had a marked regional patterns. In 1961, Rajasthan, Punjab, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and West Bengal had the highest incidence, over 50 per cent. In the rest of India, the proportion of nowhere rural male children ranged between 25 and 50 per cent. The situation in 1971 got worsed with Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh also joining states reporting the incidence of over 50 per cent *nowhere* rural male children. The proportion in Himachal Pradesh was found to be more than 75 per cent. Between 1971 and 1981, the proportion of nowhere rural boys declined to under 50 per cent everywhere except in Bihar. Highest decline having occurred in Kerala where it was 17.9 per cent. According to 1991 Census, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal had more than 50 per cent of rural boys who were neither in schools nor in labour force while proportion in Maharashtra was also more than 75 per cent. Lowest incidence was in Kerala at 14.9 per cent and in Himachal Pradesh at 23.5 per cent.

In Map IV we present incidence of rural female nowhere children in different states of India. In view of non-comparability of 1961 and 1971 Census data, we concentrate on the remaining three Censuses. In 1971 the states of Rajasthan, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Bihar and West Bengal had over 75

per cent of rural girls who were neither in schools nor in labour force (*nowhere*) while in the rest of India, the percentage was between 50 and 75 per cent. The only exception was Kerala, where 35.5 per cent of girls were neither in schools nor in labour force. The situation between 1971 and 1981 hardly changed. Between 1981 and 1991 states with over 75 per cent of nowhere rural girls were Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, and Bihar. In Madhya Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh, the proportion of nowhere rural girls ranged between 50 and 75 per cent. Everywhere else it was between 25 and 50 per cent with the only exception of Kerala where it was reported to be 14.1 per cent.

Section V: Sectoral Distribution of Child Labour

The sectoral distribution of total full-time child labour of 8.9 million is reported in Figure 2(c). 74.4 per cent were employed in the rural agricultural sector and 16.6 per cent in the rural non-agricultural sector (village industries, service sectors etc.). In the urban areas, 2.0 per cent of total child labour was working in the agricultural sector which represents vegetable production, milk production and similar agricultural activities on the fringes of the urban areas. Only 7.1 per cent of the 8.9 million full-time child workers numbering 6,28,913 were in urban non-agricultural activities. Child Labour Regulation and Prohibition Act of 1956, the ILO's forthcoming Convention of Child Labour and most of the NGOs activities as well as media reporting is concentrating on these 6.3 lakh urban child workers in India against a total of 89 lakhs.¹⁴ International trade sanction lobby which has gained considerably ground in the recent years is targeting only a small fraction of these 6 lakh children. Partly due to ignorance about the factual situation but mainly because media is able to project it as an emotive human rights and Rights of the Child issue, the Indian society, its opinion leaders and the policy-makers would be doing a serious disservice to the cause of child welfare and India's potential for successful integration into the global economy if we accept the motivated western blinkers under pressure from abroad. Our concern should be the welfare of the entire 175.9 million children.

¹⁴ Child Labour as well as Bonded Labour in hazardous activities and Immoral Traffic involving children are already banned in India. As such, these are illegal activities and subject to serious prosecutions as has been made clear in Supreme Court decision of December 1996. IPEC-

In dealing with child labour, the welfare of 89 million should be our concern and not 6 lakh urban child workers only.

The gender components of 8.9 million child workers is presented in Figure 2(b). 79.3 per cent of total child labour consists of rural male child workers and 13.6 per cent consists of urban male child workers. Rural female child workers as a percentage of total child workers was 6.4 per cent while its proportion in urban areas was only 0.7 per cent. From this figure, it is clear that full-time child labour is overwhelmingly biased towards male child workers. This might create an impression that girls largely escape the need to work in gainful employment. The impression is not only inaccurate but totally misleading. The issue has been examined in details in Chaudhri (1997). A vast majority of girls are found working in household activities which do not qualify as child labour in the ILO's or Government of India's definition. We have termed this group *Nowhere Children*.

We present the rural-urban and gender composition of *Nowhere Children* in Figure 3. Out of a total child population of 1759 lakhs, 89 lakhs, we have already pointed out, were found to be full-time child workers. Of the remaining, 464 lakhs were neither in schools nor in labour force (*Nowhere Children*). Figure 3(a) shows that 93.6 per cent of all *Nowhere Children* were in rural areas accounting for 425 lakhs children. The remaining 29 lakhs or 6.4 per cent of *Nowhere Children* were in urban areas. Examined along with child labour it can be clearly seen that *child labour and Nowhere Children are largely a rural phenomena amounting to 515 lakhs children* out of a total child population of 1759 lakhs. In Figure 3(d), we report the gender composition of rural *Nowhere Children*, 59.9 per cent i.e. 255 lakhs were females and remaining 170 lakhs (40.1 per cent) were males. The situation in terms of incidence of *Nowhere Children* in urban India is opposite to that of rural India. In urban India, out of a total of 29 lakhs *Nowhere Children* 25 lakhs (87.2 per cent) were males and 3.7 lakhs (12.8 per cent) were females. Numerically, the largest group of *Nowhere Children* consist of rural females numbering 255 lakhs. Rural-urban groups taken together we can see that 56.1 per cent of all *Nowhere Children* are rural girls

India, 1997-99 Programme does have a major area focused thrust involving all forms of child labour in selected districts of India which are reported to have high incidence of child labour.

and 0.8 per cent urban girls are in the category. The proportion of *Nowhere* boys is 37.5 per cent in rural areas and 5.6 per cent in urban areas.

Any child labour elimination strategy in India which does not take into account its pre-dominantly rural dimension and chooses to ignore the presence of 425 lakhs rural *Nowhere Children* cannot succeed. Similarly, any attempt at universalising school education that ignores the rural dimension of *Nowhere Children* cannot yield noticeable results. *Nowhere Children* are hardly covered by any regulation or act other than the Compulsory Primary Education Act in some states which covers the age group 6-11 years. We turn to the issue of the incidence of child labour and *Nowhere Children* in different age groups in the next section.

Section VI: Age Composition of Rural Child Labour

That child labour is a pre-dominantly rural phenomena in India, has been demonstrated beyond doubt in our presentation above, we now turn to the regional dimensions of child labour. For this purpose, we have analysed the NSS data for 38th, 43rd and 50th Rounds pertaining to the years 1982-82, 1987-88 and 1993-94 for each of the major states of India. The results are reported in Table 2 for rural India and Table 2* for urban India. In this table we present age specific work participation rates of children in the age groups 5-9 and 10-14 on the basis of principal status only. Children working as marginal workers and on a part-time basis are excluded from this analysis. These are analysed in Chaudhri (1997c). The work participation rates of children, males as well as females, in the age group 5-9 are substantially lower than those of the age group 10-14 years for India as a whole and for all the major states. Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh had rural male child participation rates in the age-group 5-9 years three to four times higher than that of all India average. Between 1982-83 and 1993-94, there was a decline in the labour force participation rates every where except in Uttar Pradesh where it increased from 0.8 per cent to 2.2 per cent in the age group 5-9. The sampling problem of a sub strata may affect results for some smaller states but would be unlikely in a large state like Uttar Pradesh. For educational policy-makers concerned with universalising primary education, it would be important to focus mainly on these states. In terms of incidence of child labour this age group is numerically small. For female child labour, the work

participation rates have been highest in Rajasthan followed by Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Karnataka. Everywhere else they are small and declining.

Work participation rates for rural male child workers in the age group 10-14 years have declined everywhere between 1982-83 and 1993-94 as can be seen from columns 5-7 of Table 2. The highest incidence is in Andhra Pradesh at 29.6 per cent followed by Karnataka at 20.3 per cent and lowest incidence is in Kerala at 0.7 per cent of rural male children in 10-14 years age group. This age group represents highest number of rural male child workers. Unless schooling upto the middle school level is made compulsory and the state governments concerned are willing to commit vast amount of financial resources to provide education in rural areas for these children, making education as a fundamental right or making education compulsory by legislation only are unlikely to achieve any substantive results.

The work participation rates of rural female child workers in the age group 10-14 years declined everywhere except in Bihar during 1987-88 and 1993-94, Punjab between 1982-83 and 1987-88, West Bengal between 1983-84 and 1987-88 and for India as a whole in 1980s. Compared with 1980s, there has been a decline in work participation rates everywhere except in Bihar where it has increased. Highest incidence of female child labour in this age group is found in Andhra Pradesh at almost 33 per cent followed by Rajasthan at 29 per cent with Kerala having the lowest rate of 1 per cent female child workers in this age group.

Orchestration of policy-focus by a number of national and state bodies and implementing agencies on the age group 10-14 in rural areas, attempting to reduce the incidence of child labour and *nowhere children* would be required as the first major step towards the elimination of child labour in India. With rural-urban migration on the rise and accelerating labour mobility between sectors due to structural change, concentrating energies at hazardous or intolerable forms of child labour alone with a huge urban bias would be an exercise in futility. It may make the policy-makers look good internationally, but they are unlikely to do much good through such a limited narrow focus. What is being attempted is useful but very limited because the real sources of the problem lies elsewhere.

We have computed the incidence of rural-urban child labour by age, sex and modes of employment in agricultural and non-agricultural activities for the 43rd and

50th Rounds of the NSS corresponding to the years 1987-88 and 1993-94. These are reported in Tables 3 and 4. Of all child workers in rural India during 1987-88 only, 2.9 per cent were boys and 2.2 per cent were girls in the age group 5-9 years. Concentration of rural child labour was in the age group of 10-14 years. Boys in this age group 10-14 years, constituted 54.8 per cent and girls consisting of 40.1 per cent of total rural child labour. The absolute numbers are reported in columns 2-5 for respective age-groups by sex. We divide the child workers into two major sub-sectors namely agriculture and non-agriculture. In the age-group 5-9, 85.7 per cent of rural male child workers were in the agricultural sector and the remaining 14.3 per cent were in the non-agricultural sector. All the boys in this age-group in the non-agricultural sector were working as unpaid household workers. In the agricultural sector, one-third were wage labourers while two-third were working within the family economic enterprises as unpaid child workers. The sectoral proportions for girls in this age group was similar to that for boys except that only 20 per cent of girls in the age group 5-9 were working as wage labourers in the agricultural sector and the remaining 80 per cent were unpaid family workers. In the non-agricultural sector, virtually all of them were wage earning workers.

Rural male child workers in the age group 10-14 were mainly in agriculture; 82 per cent were working in agriculture and only 18 per cent were in non-agriculture. Almost two-third of the boys were employed in the family enterprises as non-wage workers and only one-third were in the wage based employment in the rural agricultural sector. In the rural non-agricultural sector, the ratios were almost reversed. Rural girls in the age group 10-14 also had agriculture as their pre-dominant activity as 75.8 per cent of girls were working in rural agricultural sector and 28.5 per cent in the rural non-agricultural sector. Family operated farms were the source of employment for 60.8 per cent of girls in the rural agricultural sector. The proportion of wage earning girls in the agricultural sector 10-14 years was 39.2 per cent. The proportion were almost reversed in the non-agricultural sector.

Three inferences follow from an examination of this table. First, family based agriculture is the dominant source of employment for boys as well as girls in the age group 5-9 years. This is also true of boys and girls in the age group 10-14. Policy implications of these concentrations in rural agriculture with family mode of

employment are enormous. *Agricultural development strategy affecting small and marginal farmers would require a re-examination. Rural development programmes also need to be refocused.*

Second, concentration of wage-based rural child labour is in the non-agricultural sector and mainly in the age group 10-14 years. Implementation of Minimum Wage Laws, already on the statute books of every state, insistence on non-discriminatory wage payment for children, women and men and as one of the possible policy instruments that can be used to deal with high incidence of male and female child labour in rural India in the age group 10-14 years. Reducing the opportunity cost of middle school education would, probably, shift these workers from being main workers to marginal workers. The issue needs further research.

Third, the age composition of *nowhere children* is very heavily skewed in favour of the age group 5-9 years for male as well as female children in rural India. This is an unambiguously clear evidence of a glaring failure of the primary school system in major states of rural India. The evidence can be easily analysed for each of the states and is currently being attempted by a number of researchers.¹⁵

The patterns observed in urban India have two major differences from those of rural India. Firstly, urban agricultural activities are a minor sub-sector of the urban economy. Secondly, the predominance of *nowhere children* in the age group 5-9 observed in rural India is less glaring in urban India.

Section VII: Child Labour Policies and Rural India

National Authority on the Elimination of Child Labour (NAECL) established by the Government of India in September 1994 with Minister of State for Labour as Chairman and nine Secretaries to the Government of India as members with the Secretary, Ministry of Labour working as the Member-Secretary of NAECL was a major initiative of the Government of India to orchestrate its policies dealing with the elimination of child labour. In view of its paramount concern for the elimination of child labour from hazardous industries and activities culminating in the then Prime Minister of India, Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao, promising to have this component

¹⁵ Indian Society of Labour Economics at its forthcoming Annual Conference is discussing *Child Labour* issues based on a large number of papers received on the subject. Chaudhri (1997c) is an invited keynote paper on the subject.

eliminated within a grossly unrealistic time-frame of only five years. This restricted the focus of NAECL to a small subset of child labour in India. ILO (1996) *Targeting the Intolerable* and its proposed Convention to be adopted in 1998 has again restricted itself to the so-called hazardous and intolerable forms of child labour. That child labour phenomena cannot be separated into water-tight compartments and dealt with component by component, according to our view of priorities is neither appreciated nor fully understood in the national and international policy making circles. Child Labour Prohibition and Regulation Act of 1986 exempts from prohibition over 90 per cent of child labour in India as has been argued above. In view of rural-urban migration and mobility of labour between sectors created by uneven pace and pattern of structural change, the incidence of child labour in the prohibited and hazardous activities does not occur from children born and brought up in the vicinity of these activities. *A large number of these children are migrants, individually or with families, from rural areas of backward states needs to be kept in mind.*

UNICEF's views on child development and child labour, as can be inferred from UNICEF (1994, 1995, 1996 and 1997) is somewhat broader than that of the narrowly targeted child labour policies of the Government of India. It ought to deal with child labour as part of broader concerns of child development with major emphasis on primary and middle school education and poverty reduction.

US Department of Labour (1994) and ILO's recent interest in child workers in plantation agriculture do deal with agricultural child labour but still are caught in the wage-based employment mode and largely within the capitalistic modes of production. Employment of child labour in subsistence agriculture, semi-capitalistic mode of employment and production where vast majority of children work in India are not subjected to serious analysis and policy targets. Cost of cultivation studies conducted in all part of India by the Ministry of Agriculture for use in its policy formulation on agricultural costs and prices has never examined the age structure of workers (wage based and non-wage Head Count Poverty) in agricultural production activities. This information is regularly collected but never analysed. Computing cost of cultivation from these surveys without combining three categories of workers mainly children, women and adult males is impossible. Similarly, annual survey of industries for unorganised sector does collect information on male, female and child

workers but the children's part is never analysed. These are examples of lack of sensitivity and awareness on the part of different sections of the Government about child labour concerns of the Government of India in NAECL.

As part of poverty focused rural development programmes, a number of initiatives to target rural youth (15-24 years)¹⁶ The Government of India through its PRMY – Prime Minister Rojgar Yojna since 1995 has been targeting rural youth. The children are excluded from this scheme. Another scheme, called TRYSEM initiated in 1979 was *to provide basic technical and managerial skills to rural youth from families below the poverty line*. Ministry of Rural Development evaluated TRYSEM in 1993. In all these attempts the implementing agencies have neither been concerned with nor been sensitive about the incidence of child labour in the families whose youth were getting targeted. Number and frequency of introduction of schemes operating in rural areas, under different names, has been increasing with rising frequency of the change of Government and/or Prime Minister at the national level.

Indian bureaucracy at the national and the state level is much more mobile than its counterparts in other parts of the world. Our upwardly mobile emerging politician class is the only sub-group with comparable mobility. The unfortunate consequence of their footloose nature is that no senior decision-making position is held by any public servant for a period of 3 to 5 years. Typical tenure is under two years. This sets in a trend of chain reactions in which the gap between policies (that get modified frequently) and implementation not only has remained high but has been widening during the last two decades. Development strategy and people friendly delivery system of services, particularly in the social sector, has suffered as a consequence.

To deal with the problem of child labour, we need to deal with both the subsets of deprived children, namely child labour and *nowhere children*. Co-ordination of policies and programmes of the Department of Family Planning and Welfare, Department of Education, Department of Labour, various Rojgar Yojnas and Child Labour Elimination Programmes need to be orchestrated to ensure that *capability and entitlement of rural and youth, irrespective of modes of employment*

¹⁶ Originally, Government of India's definition of rural youth was 15-34 years. It was later modified to ILO specified definition of youth, 15-24 years.

are improved. The need to orchestrate strategies can hardly be over-emphasised. Village communities, opinion leaders and non-government voluntary organisations (religious as well as secular) would need to come together to generate a moral pressure on the local politicians and bureaucrats for dealing with the issue of child development in an integrated way. Examples of success abound in vibrant parts of India. Kerala state's literary campaign can be cited as a recent example of successful orchestration.

Section VIII: Conclusion

From the evidence presented above, it is unambiguously clear that incidence of full-time child labour in India has been declining for the last decade but continues to be an overwhelmingly rural phenomena. There is preponderance of rural boys still working within the family modes of employment. Numerically, a large segment of rural girls are in *nowhere* category. Those employed as child workers are also mainly in the family modes of employment. Concentration of child labour in some states and in the age group 10-14 years is a pointer for an urgent need of a focused policy. State to state variations and also inter-district variations within states (not discussed here) are large and increasing due to uneven rates of demographic transition and major differences in attitudes to or success in rural school education programmes.

Efforts of the Government of India in establishing a National Authority for the Elimination of Child Labour created a machinery for co-ordination among nine major Ministries of the federal government are important steps in the right direction. However, the fragmentary nature of our approach to different facets of child welfare, rural education, rural development and child labour policies at the local level needs to be recognised and machinery for a co-ordinated effort at the village level has to be put in place. Without such a co-ordinated effort, we cannot successfully deal with the issues of child development of which child labour is a part. On the broader developmental front, successful rural development strategy demands ensuring that the foundational building blocks of human resource development are created effectively. It is a challenge for the policy-makers and leaders at the village, regional, state and the national level as well as an opportunity to redeem themselves and confidently correct the errors of neglect of many decades.

Bibliography


- Avinashilingam, T.S. (1978), *Education: Compiled from the Speeches and Writings of Swami Vivekananda*, Sri Ramakrishna Mission Vidyalaya, Madras.
- Brown, M., Christiansen, J. and Philips, P., 'The Decline of Child Labour in the U.S. Fruit and Vegetable Canning Industry: Law or Economics?' in *Business History Review*, Vol. 66, Winter 1992.
- Chaudhri, D.P. (1996), *Dynamic Profile of Child Labour in India 1951-91*, ILO, New Delhi.
- Chaudhri, D.P. (1997a), 'Female Child Labour and Gender Bias in School Education in Indian States, 1961-1991'. *Indian Journal of Labour Economics* (September-December, 1997 issue).
- Chaudhri, D.P. (1997b), "Child Labour in India in the Asian Perspective - 1951-1996", *Social Change* (Special Issue on Child Labour), Vol. 27, No. 3-4, September-December, 1997.
- Chaudhri, D.P. (1997c), *Policy Perspective on Child Labour in India with Pervasive Gender and Urban Bias in School Education*, invited keynote paper for the Indian Society of Labour Economics conference, Trivandrum, January 1998, *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol.40, No.4, October-December, 1997.
- Chaudhri, D.P. and D.M. Lea (eds) (1983), *Rural Development and the State*, Methuen, London.
- Dreze, J. and A. Sen (1995), *India: Economic Development and Social Opportunity*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
- Goonesekere, Savitri (1998), *Children, Law and Justice: A South Asian Perspective*, Sage Publications, New Delhi.
- ILO (1996), *Child Labour: Targeting the intolerable*, ILO, Geneva.
- ILO (1996a), *Lists of Ratifications by Convention and by country*, Report 3 (Part 5), ILO, Geneva.
- Haq, Mahbub-ul, (1997), *Human Development in South Asia*, Oxford University Press, Karachi.
- Horn, Pamela (1994), *Children's work and welfare, 1780-1890*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Myrdal, G. (1968), *Asian Drama*, Vol. 1-3, Oxford University Press, London.

- Nardinelli, C (1990), *Child Labour and the Industrial Revolution*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Nardinelli, C. (1992), 'Child Labour and the Industrial Revolution', reviewed by Hudson, P. In *The Economic History Review*, Vol. XLV, No. 2, May 1992.
- Nardinelli, C., 'Child Labour and the industrial revolution', reviewed by Boyer, G.R. in *Business History Review*, Vol. 65, No. 4, Winter 1991.
- Nardinelli, C., 'Child Labour and the industrial revolution', reviewed by Crafts, N.F.R. in *History of Education Quarterly*, June 1994.
- Sen, Amartya (1966), 'Peasants and Dualism with or without Surplus Labour', *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 74, pp. 425-50.
- Sen, Amartya (1975), *Employment, Institutions and Development*, Oxford University Press (Prepared for ILO's World Employment Programme).
- Sen, Amartya (1975), 'Unit of Analysis' an invited address, Econometric Society, South and South East Asia Chapter Meeting at Delhi, 28-30 December, to be published in *Econometrica*, 1997 (forthcoming).
- Tilak, J.B.G. (1994), *Education for Development in Asia*, Sage Publications, New Delhi.
- Trattner, W.I. (1970), *Crusade for the Children: A History of the National Child Labour Committee and Child Labour in America*, Quadrangle Books, Chicago.
- UNICEF (1994), *The Child and the Law*, Papers from the International Conference on Shaping the Future of Law: Children, Environment and Human Health, UNICEF, New Delhi.
- UNICEF (1995), *The Progress of Indian States*, UNICEF, New Delhi.
- UNICEF (1996), *Child Labour in Historical Perspective 1800-1985*, UNICEF, International Child Development Centre, Florence.
- UNICEF (1997), *The State of the World's Children 1997*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- UNICEF (1997), *The State of the World's Children 1997: Focus on Child Labour*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- UNESCO (1964), *Education and Economic Development of Japan*, UNESCO and Ministry of Education, Tokyo.

U.S. Department of Labour (1994), *By the Sweat and Toil of Children Volume II: The Use of Child Labour in U.S. Agricultural Imports and Forced and Bonded Child Labour*, a report to the Committee on Appropriation U.S. Congress, U.S. Department of Labour, Bureau of International Labour Affairs, Washington D.C.

Visaria, P. And Jacob, P. (1995), *Child Labour in India: Results of a Methodological Survey in Surendranagar & Surat Districts of Gujarat State*, Gujarat Institute of Development Research, Ahmedabad.

FIGURE 1: CLASSIFICATION OF CHILD WORK AND CHILD LABOR



CLASSIFICATION

POTENTIAL MEASURES



Problem areas with strong conflict of interest between the State-Community, Family and the Employers of cheap child labor



Areas where the State-Community, Family and the Employers do not have major conflict of interest




Areas where there is minimal conflict between the State-Community, Family and the Users of child work, particularly between school education and part-time work

- * Strengthening the legal basis (national and international) and its enforcement
- * Improving monitoring and awareness raising


- * Institutional reforms
- * Making school education cheaper, more flexible and accessible combining with awareness raising and provision of technical supports

- * Institutional strengthening
- * Decriminalization of child labor of non-hazardous, part-time non-conflicting with schooling


**Figure 2: Rural, Agricultural & Gender Components of Child Population and Child labour in India
(NSS 50th Round, 1993-94 data)**



Rural child population	150979000	85.8 per cent
Urban child population	24925000	14.2 per cent



Rural child labour	8098329	90.9 per cent
Urban child labour	810465	9.1 per cent




Rural Non-agriculture	1474462	16.6 per cent
Rural Agriculture	6623867	74.4 per cent
Urban Agriculture	181552	2.0 per cent
Urban Non-Agriculture	628913	7.1 per cent

Rural female	362018	40.8 per cent
Rural male	4478211	50.3 per cent
Urban male	768619	8.6 per cent
Urban female	41846	0.5 per cent


Source: Compiled from Employment and Unemployment in India, 1993-94, NSS 50th Round, Report No. 409.

For details see text of Chaudhri, D.P. (1997) Challenges of Child Labour in Rural India: A Multi Dimensional Problem in Need of an Orchestrated Policy Response.


Figure 3: Rural, Urban and Gender Components of Child Population (5-14 years) and Nowhere Children in India (NSS 50th Round, 1993-94 Data)



Rural	42512717	93.6 per cent
Urban	2909543	6.4 per cent



Rural male	17028132	40.1 per cent
Rural female	25484585	59.9 per cent




Urban male	2536424	87.2 per cent
urban female	373119	12.8 per cent

Rural male	17028132	37.5 per cent
Urban male	2536424	5.6 per cent
Rural female	25484585	56.1 per cent
urban female	373119	0.8 per cent

Source: Compiled from Employment and Unemployment in India, 1993-94, NSS 50th Round, Report No. 409.

For details see text of Chaudhri, D.P. (1997) Challenges of Child Labour in Rural India: A Multi Dimensional Problem in Need of an Orchestrated Policy Response.

Figure 4: Gender Bias in School Education and Nowhere Children in Major States of India 1987-88
(Number of Girls per 100 Boys)



Source: Compiled from National Sample Survey 43rd Round (1987-88), various tables.
 Chaudhri, D.P. (1997), Policy Perspectives on Child Labour in India with Pervasive Gender and Urban Bias in School Education.
 (An invited paper for the Indian Labour Economics Conference, January 1998)
 Note 1: Bias is measured as number of girls for every one hundred boys.
 2. Bias is too high in states where rural bar is missing.

TABLE 1: GROWTH RATE OF CHILD POPULATION, LABOUR AND NOWHERE CHILDREN IN THE MAJOR STATES OF INDIA: 1961-1991

States	Compound Annual Growth Rate								
	Child Population			Child Labour			Nowhere Children		
	0-14 yrs			0-14 yrs			5-14yrs		
	1961-71	1971-81	1981-91	1961-71	1971-81	1981-91	1961-71	1971-81	1981-91
Andhra Pradesh	2.1	1.6	0.5	-1.6	0.8	0.3	3.6	-0.2	0.5
Bihar	2.2	1.8	1.4	-3.7	-1.7	1.8	3.7	0.5	1.3
Gujarat	2.7	1.4	0.1	-1.7	-1.1	0.0	3.3	-0.5	0.3
Haryana	2.8	1.5	1.9	-4.2	0.3	1.4	3.6	-0.2	1.9
Himachal Pradesh	3.0	1.7	0.0	-0.8	-1.7	0.7	3.7	-0.6	-0.4
Karnataka	2.3	1.7	0.5	-2.1	1.8	0.7	3.2	0.2	0.0
Kerala	1.8	0.3	-0.9	-2.8	-4.8	-0.2	0.1	-3.7	-0.5
Madhya Pradesh	3.3	1.7	1.1	-2.9	2.1	1.3	5.3	0.4	0.8
Maharashtra	2.6	1.5	1.1	-3.4	2.5	0.4	3.1	-1.1	0.3
Orissa	3.1	1.2	-0.3	-2.7	0.5	0.1	5.2	-0.4	-0.4
Punjab	2.6	1.0	1.3	-3.0	-2.6	0.7	2.8	-2.0	0.5
Rajasthan	2.9	2.5	1.2	-6.1	0.0	2.3	5.0	1.5	1.4
Tamil Nadu	1.9	1.0	-0.3	-3.5	2.0	-0.7	1.1	-0.2	-0.1
Uttar Pradesh	2.2	2.3	1.6	-3.7	-0.5	7.5	2.0	1.9	0.5
West Bengal	2.9	1.1	0.7	1.3	0.3	0.8	3.6	-0.3	0.2
All India	2.5	1.3	1.2	-2.9	0.4	1.2	3.2	0.0	0.9

Sources: Census of India 1961, 1971 & 1981 and Chaudhri (1996).

Table 2: Trends in Age-Specific Usual (Principal Status) Child Participation Rates in Rural India

States	'Male Child Workers 5-9 years			'Male Child Workers 10-14 years			Female Child Workers 5-9 years			Female Child Workers 10-14 years		
	1982-83	1987-88	1993-94	1982-83	1987-88	1993-94	1982-83	1987-88	1993-94	1982-83	1987-88	1993-94
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Andhra Pradesh	5.66	4.80	3.50	42.45	32.80	29.60	3.43	3.90	3.00	36.16	34.90	32.90
Bihar	1.79	0.20	0.50	14.29	10.70	8.30	1.55	-	0.30	8.93	3.90	4.30
Gujarat	1.19	0.20	-	16.35	8.80	6.70	1.02	0.50	-	16.74	10.60	5.10
Haryana	0.44	-	-	11.39	10.00	3.50	0.40	-	-	9.59	2.50	1.70
Himachal Pradesh	0.67	-	0.30	9.58	3.20	3.70	2.13	-	0.70	17.11	7.50	7.70
Karnataka	4.24	2.30	2.70	35.41	23.40	20.30	3.37	1.60	2.80	27.64	20.70	18.40
Kerala	-	-	0.20	3.35	1.90	0.70	0.08	0.10	-	2.25	1.20	1.00
Madhya Pradesh	2.36	0.10	1.20	28.17	16.50	15.40	1.34	-	0.40	25.95	15.90	10.40
Maharashtra	2.22	0.60	0.70	22.30	11.60	8.40	2.12	0.70	0.80	25.31	17.20	12.10
Orissa	1.71	-	0.90	29.95	19.00	13.80	1.39	0.10	0.70	20.04	11.20	7.60
Punjab	2.80	-	-	26.84	17.90	7.20	0.33	-	-	2.42	2.70	0.90
Rajasthan	3.33	0.20	2.40	24.91	18.00	11.80	7.21	0.40	6.30	34.45	31.10	29.20
Tamil Nadu	2.30	0.90	1.20	26.17	17.60	13.10	2.40	1.40	3.00	27.17	24.10	19.40
Uttar Pradesh	0.80	0.10	0.20	17.27	12.00	9.00	0.98	0.10	0.40	8.81	5.20	4.50
West Bengal	0.97	0.40	0.60	16.25	12.60	10.50	0.19	0.10	0.20	4.14	4.70	4.00
All India	1.97	2.30	0.90	21.28	19.30	11.20	1.78	2.40	1.10	16.97	18.30	10.40

Table 2*: Trends in Age-Specific Usual (Principal Status) Child Participation Rates in Urban India

States	'Male Child Workers 5-9 years			'Male Child Workers 10-14 years			Female Child Workers 5-9 years			Female Child Workers 10-14 years		
	1982-83	1987-88	1993-94	1982-83	1987-88	1993-94	1982-83	1987-88	1993-94	1982-83	1987-88	1993-94
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Andhra Pradesh	2.07	0.70	1.00	18.22	12.60	12.50	0.83	0.30	0.70	8.90	10.20	9.80
Bihar	1.25	0.70	0.20	9.48	6.30	2.80	0.32	0.10	0.20	4.86	0.50	1.70
Gujarat	0.15	0.20	0.30	6.61	4.30	3.20	0.25	-	0.20	2.23	1.30	1.70
Haryana	0.33	-	1.00	10.25	6.40	5.40	-	-	-	4.47	1.60	0.40
Himachal Pradesh	-	-	-	5.10	0.80	3.50	-	-	-	-	0.70	1.10
Karnataka	0.98	0.70	0.90	11.29	11.00	10.40	0.73	0.50	0.10	9.05	7.60	3.30
Kerala	0.25	-	-	3.06	1.70	1.40	-	-	-	0.64	1.30	0.40
Madhya Pradesh	0.04	0.50	0.20	7.21	4.30	1.80	0.27	-	0.50	4.27	3.80	2.00
Maharashtra	0.24	0.20	-	6.17	3.30	5.00	-	0.10	0.30	2.01	1.90	1.40
Orissa	0.44	-	0.60	10.05	6.50	5.60	0.71	0.80	-	5.49	5.30	2.80
Punjab	0.60	0.40	-	8.13	9.80	5.00	-	0.10	-	2.49	0.20	0.40
Rajasthan	0.31	0.10	0.20	7.76	7.10	4.30	1.95	1.30	1.10	9.30	9.70	5.40
Tamil Nadu	0.64	1.20	0.60	13.08	11.70	9.10	0.86	1.10	0.40	8.91	9.80	6.60
Uttar Pradesh	0.25	0.50	0.40	11.34	9.10	7.80	0.49	-	0.30	3.44	1.70	1.60
West Bengal	0.26	0.30	0.20	6.31	5.90	4.30	0.11	0.60	0.20	8.31	4.20	6.30
All India	0.54	0.50	0.40	9.31	9.20	5.90	0.50	0.30	0.30	5.41	6.60	3.50

Source: Compiled from Employment and Unemployment in India, 1982-83, 1987-88, 1993-94, NSS 38th, 43rd and 50th Rounds.

For details see text of Chaudhri, D.P. (1997) Challenges of Child Labour in Rural India: A Multi Dimensional Problem in Need of an Orchestrated Policy Response.

Table 3: Rural and Urban Child Labour in All India by Age, Sex and Modes of Employment in Agriculture and Non-Agriculture Sectors - 1987-88

Categories of children	Numbers (RURAL)				As per cent of child population (Row-wise)				As per cent of age-group (Column-wise)			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
Age Group	5 - 9 years	10-14 years	5-9 years	10 - 14 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	5-9 years	10-14 years
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1 Number of Children	41120300	36460200	36616800	30803100	28.4	25.1	25.3	21.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2 Child Workers	287842	5469030	219701	4004403	2.9	54.8	2.2	40.1	0.7	15.0	0.6	13.0
3 Child Workers in Agriculture	246722	4484605	183084	3141916	3.1	55.7	2.3	39.0	85.7	82.0	83.3	78.5
(a) Non-wage HH workers and self-employed	164481	2916816	146467	1909792	3.2	56.8	2.9	37.2	66.7	65.0	80.0	60.8
(b) Wage earning children	82241	1567789	36617	1232124	2.8	53.7	1.3	42.2	33.3	35.0	20.0	39.2
4 Child workers in non-agriculture	41120	984425	36617	862487	2.1	51.1	1.9	44.8	14.3	18.0	16.7	21.5
(a) Non-wage HH workers and self-employed	41120	364602	0	308031	5.8	51.1	0.0	43.2	100.0	37.0	0.0	35.7
(b) Wage earning children	0	619823	36617	554456	0.0	51.2	3.0	45.8	0.0	63.0	100.0	64.3
5 Full time students	11349203	24428334	8604948	13029711	19.8	42.5	15.0	22.7	27.6	67.0	23.5	42.3
6 Nowhere children	29483255	6599296	27792151	13768986	38.0	8.5	35.8	17.7	71.7	18.1	75.9	44.7

Categories of children	Numbers (URBAN)				As per cent of child population on (Row-wise)				As per cent of age-group (Column-wise)			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
Age Group	5 - 9 years	10-14 years	5-9 years	10 - 14 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	5-9 years	10-14 years
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1 Number of Children	10193500	9906400	9390400	9009800	26.5	25.7	24.4	23.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2 Child Workers	50968	802418	28171	414451	3.9	61.9	2.2	32.0	0.5	8.1	0.3	4.6
3 Child Workers in Agriculture	10194	128783	9390	117127	3.8	48.5	3.5	44.1	20.0	16.0	33.3	28.3
(a) Non-wage HH workers and self-employed	10194	89158	9390	63069	5.9	51.9	5.5	36.7	100.0	69.2	100.0	53.8
(b) Wage earning children	0	39626	0	54059	0.0	42.3	0.0	57.7	0.0	30.8	0.0	46.2
4 Child workers in non-agriculture	40774	673635	18781	297323	4.0	65.4	1.8	28.9	80.0	84.0	66.7	71.7
(a) Non-wage HH workers and self-employed	20387	217941	9390	108118	5.7	61.2	2.6	30.4	50.0	32.4	50.0	36.4
(b) Wage earning children	20387	455694	9390	189206	3.0	67.5	1.4	28.0	50.0	67.6	50.0	63.6
5 Full time students	7400481	8053903	6357301	6523095	26.1	28.4	22.4	23.0	72.6	81.3	67.7	72.4
6 Nowhere children	2742052	1050078	3004928	2072254	30.9	11.8	33.9	23.4	26.9	10.6	32.0	23.0

Sources: Computed from NSS 1972-73 round reports for each of the states and Statistical Appendix of

Chaudhri, D.P. (1996) A Dynamic Profile of Child Labour in India 1951-1991, ILO, New Delhi.

Notes: 1. Worker categories are based on 'usual activity' status and are computed by combining sub-groups according to NSS two digit occupation codes (99 categories)

2. Nowhere Children consist of those children who are neither workers nor students

3. Categories 1-4 are subsets of child population, while (a) and (b), are subsets of child labour in agriculture and non-agriculture respectively.

Table 4: Rural and Urban Child Labour in All India by Age, Sex and Modes of Employment in Agriculture and Non-Agriculture Sectors - 1993-94

Categories of children	Numbers (RURAL)				As per cent of child population (Row-wise)				As per cent of age-group (Column-wise)			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
Age Group	5 - 9 years	10-14 years	5-9 years	10 - 14 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	5-9 years	10-14 years
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1 Number of Children	39784100	36141700	35705400	30396700	28.0	25.4	25.1	21.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2 Child Workers	358057	4120154	428465	3191654	4.4	50.9	5.3	39.4	0.9	11.4	1.2	10.5
3 Child Workers in Agriculture	358057	3325036	357054	2583720	5.4	50.2	5.4	39.0	100.0	80.7	83.3	81.0
(a) Non-wage HH workers and self-employed	238705	2060077	285643	1519835	5.8	50.2	7.0	37.0	66.7	62.0	80.0	58.8
(b) Wage earning children	119352	1264960	71411	1063885	4.7	50.2	2.8	42.2	33.3	38.0	20.0	41.2
4 Child workers in non-agriculture	0	795117	71411	607934	0.0	53.9	4.8	41.2	0.0	19.3	16.7	19.0
(a) Non-wage HH workers and self-employed	0	325275	35705	273570	0.0	51.3	5.6	43.1	0.0	40.9	50.0	45.0
(b) Wage earning children	0	469842	35705	334364	0.0	55.9	4.3	39.8	0.0	59.1	50.0	55.0
5 Full time students	26734915	27684542	20066435	16930962	29.2	30.3	22.0	18.5	67.2	76.6	56.2	55.7
6 Nowhere children	12691128	4337004	15210500	10274085	29.9	10.2	35.8	24.2	31.9	12.0	42.6	33.8

Categories of children	Numbers (URBAN)				As per cent of child population on (Row-wise)				As per cent of age-group (Column-wise)			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
Age Group	5 - 9 years	10-14 years	5-9 years	10 - 14 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	5-9 years	10-14 years
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
1 Number of Children	11398400	11661700	1064100	1104400	45.2	46.2	4.2	4.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2 Child Workers	45594	723025	3192	38654	5.6	89.2	0.4	4.8	0.4	6.2	0.3	3.5
3 Child Workers in Agriculture	0	174926	0	6626	0.0	96.4	0.0	3.6	0.0	24.2	0.0	17.1
(a) Non-wage HH workers and self-employed	0	69970	0	2209	0.0	96.9	0.0	3.1	0.0	40.0	0.0	33.3
(b) Wage earning children	0	104955	0	4418	0.0	96.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	66.7
4 Child workers in non-agriculture	45594	548100	3192	32028	7.2	87.2	0.5	5.1	100.0	75.8	100.0	82.9
(a) Non-wage HH workers and self-employed	22797	221572	2128	12148	8.8	85.7	0.8	4.7	50.0	40.4	66.7	37.9
(b) Wage earning children	22797	326528	1064	19879	6.2	88.2	0.3	5.4	50.0	59.6	33.3	62.1
5 Full time students	9586054	10169002	852344	901190	44.6	47.3	4.0	4.2	84.1	87.2	80.1	81.6
6 Nowhere children	1766752	769672	208564	164556	60.7	26.5	7.2	5.7	15.5	6.6	19.6	14.9

Sources: Computed from NSS 1972-73 round reports for each of the states and Statistical Appendix of Chaudhri, D.P. (1996) A Dynamic Profile of Child Labour in India 1951-1991, ILO, New Delhi.

Notes: 1. Worker categories are based on 'usual activity' status and are computed by combining sub-groups according to NSS two digit occupation codes (99 categories)

2. Nowhere Children consist of those children who are neither workers nor students

3. Categories 1-4 are subsets of child population, while (a) and (b), are subsets of child labour in agriculture and non-agriculture respectively.