CHAPTER - 7

FEMALE WORK FORCE PARTICIPATION UNDER THE OVERLAP OF CLASS, CASTE AND RELIGION

7.1 Introduction

In a culturally diverse country like India, socio-cultural aspects have a say in the participation of women. For example, in some communities, notably upper caste Hindus and Muslims, there may be a stigma attached to women working outside the home - especially if it involves work considered 'menial' - which increases family and societal pressures to drop out if the men in the household are earning enough. At the same time women from lower social groups like Schedule Castes and Schedule Tribes may not be facing such restrictions in entering the labour force. Female work participation – the incidence and the nature of job in which they are employed varies with social groups and religious identities in India.

While employment issues in India centrally focus around the category of gender, by mentioning quantitative levels of female employment, the issues of patriarchy, domestic subordination, biological determinism, reproductive norms etc. are not taken into consideration. These are often informed by the cross-linkages with identities of class and caste. These categories often overlap with gender. Sometimes the low caste women are also from lower class and thus are subjected to the patriarchy (from men of both their own castes and by that of upper castes and upper classes). This causes a denial in vital social services like education, health care, employment opportunities; unlike the middle caste/class and upper caste/class women. However, there are contradictions too at one level which is reflected in some of the lower caste/class women being able to enjoy more freedom of movement and hence the opportunity to work.

The caste system has been widely researched by all of the social sciences except economics; economic analyses of caste inequality have been few. The literature on the overlap between caste and gender is even smaller, and within that literature, economic analyses of this overlap are very few indeed. Such a study can make significant contribution to analyses of intergroup disparities. An analysis of the gender-caste overlap from an economic perspective.

would be a useful contribution to the debate over identity and economic outcomes, especially for women. (Deshpande, 2007).

Female Employment has been considered to be a driver for poverty reduction and empowering. However, it will serve the purpose only if it provides women with an opportunity to improve their well-being through appropriate wages and capability enhancing. If it is low-paying and distress driven then it only increases a woman’s drudgery. The picture that emerges from a study of the work profile of women in rural India in recent years strengthens this conjecture (Srivastava and Srivastava, 2010). A lot has been studied about the different determinants of female labour supply process in the Indian Economy along a single axis, as seen in the previous chapter of the thesis. An in depth study about the inter-relationship of the determinants has been attempted in the thesis, assuming that it will help enrich the research regarding female labour supply. Ownership of land being a historically important indicator of wealth of the households and hence a socio-economic determinant, especially in rural India, warrants a detailed study of its effects on the labour supply decisions of the women workers.

With this background the current chapter has explored the Employment-Unemployment Survey (EUS) data published by NSSO in 2004-05 (61st Round) and 2011-12 (68th Round) to analyse the inter-relationship of socio-economic and socio-religious factors on the decision of women to participate in workforce.

Studies on female employment need to delve more into the overlap (McBride et al. 2014) of the axes of class, caste and religious identities and the cross linkage of the variables in influencing the decision of female labour supply. This chapter has tried to focus on this aspect. Economic class has been proxied by land-ownership, caste and religious identities have been proxied by creating socio-religious groups from NSS data38. Wealth being a stock concept, its availability with the households should affect the decision of the family to send their women folk to work. This would be applicable not only for the current generation but for future as well as the past generations also. So there would be an intergenerational aspect to this particular determinant of female labour supply. The present chapter, however, has focussed only at the effect on the present generation of women workers in the 61st and 68th Round. The marked decline in female labour force participation exhibited in the latest EUS (68th Round, 2011-12) of NSSO (as compared to the 61st Round, 2004-05) is an alarming fact
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which needs to be looked into. Rangarajan et al (2014) mention in their study of the 68th round of NSSO (2011-12), that for the first time in the history of the Indian Labour market, the share of employment in the farm sector fell to below 50%. The thesis has concentrated on rural India as the change in the employment scene of female workers was more prominent in rural than urban areas and given the fact that more than 80% of all female workers are in rural areas, it is important to examine more closely the pattern of changes in the participation rate in the rural sector of the Indian economy.

7.2 Research Objective

To make an attempt to fill in the existent gaps in the literature this chapter has the following objectives:

i) To present a disaggregated analysis of female employment across class, caste and religious identities in rural India

ii) Investigate the causal relationship between socio-economic and socio-religious determinants of female work force participation.

iii) Establish the effectiveness of intersectionality in determining female work force participation.

The causal relation between land-ownership classes and female work-force participation has been studied in this chapter. The social stratification of class has been done by considering ‘economic class’ which in rural areas is well delineated by the land ownership of the respective households. Greater amounts of land imply higher social positioning and hence a privileged position. Amount of land owned is a strong class stratifier in rural India. Hence the idea of taking up land as one of the causal variable. As female labour is not decided by any single factor but rather by an interplay of various factors so the concept of intersectionality has been utilised. Introduction of the interaction terms brings in the concept of ‘Intersectionality’ (Crenshaw, 1989). It enables the present study to consider three dimensional axes at one point of time.

The axes of observation are;

1. landownership class

2. socio-religious group (interaction terms of social groups and religions), and

3. interaction terms (of land ownership and socio-religious groups)
The extent of female participation in the labour market is determined in India by a nexus of class/caste hierarchy and norms of patriarchal ideology. In an hierarchical society based on patrilineal-patrilocal families, the location of the family in the caste/class hierarchy would determine the level and forms of female work participation (Bardhan, 1985). This observation encouraged a look into the behaviour of female work-participation of the different socio-religious groups in India. These groups have been constructed from NSS data, which gives the position of the household in the socio-religious ladder. Interaction of these socio-religious groups and land ownership has given the position of the household in the class or socio-economic ladder. Econometric estimation and analysis of the impact of these interaction terms on the work participation of female workers has enabled the study to make certain conclusions about the behaviour of female labour supply. It has provided an insight into the employment aspects of women workers belonging to various land ownership classes of the different socio-religious groups. The need for such a study was felt as there are differences in inheritance and asset ownership legislations among the various social and religious groups in India.

7.3 Econometric Specification

7.3.1 Model and Variables

Data at the unit level has been extracted from the 61st (2004-05) and 68th Round (2011-12) of NSSO. Household Level and Person Level data has been used.

**Total no. of observations in the 61st Round=6,02,833 individuals.**

This includes both males and females in rural as well as urban areas. Only females have been considered for this part of the study and then the data set reduces to 2,94,205 individuals. As the chapter is attempting to analyse the employment behaviour of female workers so the data set consists of working age females in the age group 15-59 years. Now the data set consists of 1,78,786 persons. After making adjustments for work-force participation of female workers in rural areas and dropping missing observations the final data-set is 1,13,010 persons.

**Total no. of observations in the 68th Round= 4,56,999 individuals.**

This includes both males and females in rural as well as urban areas. For the purpose of this specific study only females have been considered and then the data set reduces to 2,23,195
persons. An attempt is made to analyse the employment behaviour of female workers, so the data set consists of working age females in the age group 15-59 years. Now the data set consists of 1,42,776 persons. After making adjustments for work-force participation of female workers in rural areas the final data-set is 90,230 persons.

7.3.1.1 Dependent Variable : \{P(1,0)\} is a categorical one, with binary outcome, where participation is either in workforce or not.

For considering Work-Participation of Female Workers (in the age group of 15-59 years) in the Usual Principal Activity Status the data has been arranged in the following manner :

i. Usual Principal Activity Status code 81\(^{39}\) (as per NSSO schedule) has not been taken into consideration as that will give us the Labour Force estimate but we are considering Work-Force participation only.

ii. Usual Principal Activity Status code 91\(^{40}\)(attending educational institutions) has been considered ‘out of labour force’ (as per NSSO directive),

iii. Usual Principal Activity Status codes [(92\(^{41}\),93\(^{42}\), (94,95,97\(^{43}\))] have not been taken into consideration as they do not enable us to define work-participation as gainful employment. (These codes describe activities which are not remunerable or done for gainful purposes)

iv. An observation needs to be made here: Although Upa21\(^{44}\) defines unpaid family worker yet we have considered it in Work Participation because of the fact that as landownership increases there is a greater representation of working age women in the family who work as unpaid family labour. Most of the unpaid agricultural (on owned farms) or non-agricultural (in own household enterprise) work is done by female workers of the household. Taking Upa21 into consideration or leaving it out of the definition of Work Participation changes the econometric results for the different socio-religious groups.

---

39 Did not work but was seeking and/or available for work-Upa81
40 Attended educational institution-Upa91
41 Attended domestic duties only-Upa92
42 Attended domestic duties and was also engaged in free collection of goods(vegetables, roots, firewood, cattle-feed, etc.), sewing, tailoring, weaving, etc. for household use-Upa93
43 Rentiers, Pensioners, Remittance recipients etc.-Upa94, Not able to work due to disability-Upa95, Others(including begging, prostitution, etc.)-Upa97
44 Worked as helper in h.h enterprise (unpaid family worker)-Upa-21
Work-Participation= \text{Usual Principal Activity Status } [(11^{45}+12^{46})+21]+31^{47}+(41^{48}+51^{49})

Final size of the dataset= 90230(observations). Over this data set describing and testing of the hypotheses is done using the Binary Logit framework.

7.3.1.2 Independent Variables:

1) Land Ownership:

Is a categorical variable where the classes considered are:

- Land1 = Landless Households (landownership 0.000 hectares), (yes=1; no=0)
- Land2 = Marginal Landowners (ownership 0.001-0.40 hectares), (yes=1; no=0)
- Land3 = Small Landowners (ownership 0.41-2.00 hectares), (yes=1; no=0)
- Land4 = Large Landowners (ownership >2.00 hectares), (yes=1; no=0)

This concept of creating land-ownership categories has also been used by the following researchers in their papers:

(a) P.K. Bardhan (1979); where he has considered three main classes viz, Landless labourers, Small farmers (holdings<2.5 acres) and Large farmers (holding>2.5 acres)

(b) Supriya Garikipati (2006); where she has classified men and women labourers using ‘labour class ranks’ developed by Bardhan (1984) and DaCorta & Venkateshwarlu (1999). It is based on Roemer’s (1982) system and gives three labour classes: Pure Labourers, Labour Plus and Small Farmers.

2) Socio-Religious Groups:

NSSO disaggregates data on the basis of social groups and religions. The following socio-religious groups have been created to get a detailed picture of the behaviour of workforce participation.

- Hindu-Others(H-O), (yes=1; no=0)
- Hindu-SC(H-SC), (yes=1; no=0)
- Hindu-ST(H-ST), (yes=1; no=0)
- Muslims(M), (yes=1; no=0)
- Other-Religions(Othr-Relgns), (yes=1; no=0) [Includes Christianity-3, Sikhism-4, Jainism-5, Buddhism-6, Zoroastrianism-7, Others-9]

---

45 Worked in h.h. enterprise (self-employed): own account worker - Upa11
46 Employer - Upa12
47 Worked as regular salaried/ wage employee - Upa31
48 Worked as casual wage labour: in public works - Upa41
49 Worked as a casual wage labour In other types of work - Upa51
50 Refer Appendix 7A
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(3) Interaction Terms:\(^{52}\):

To get a further disaggregated picture of the work-force participation behaviour of the socio-religious groups in particular, interaction terms of landownership and the socio-religious groups have been created in the following manner:

Lasrg11= Hindu-Others who are landless, (yes=1; no=0)
Lasrg12= Hindu-SCs who are landless, (yes=1; no=0)
Lasrg13= Hindu-STs who are landless, (yes=1; no=0)
Lasrg14= Muslims who are landless, (yes=1; no=0)
Lasrg15= Other-Religions who are landless, (yes=1; no=0)
Lasrg21= Hindu-Others who are marginal landowners, (yes=1; no=0)
Lasrg22= Hindu-SCs who are marginal landowners, (yes=1; no=0)
Lasrg23= Hindu-STs who are marginal landowners, (yes=1; no=0)
Lasrg24= Muslims who are marginal landowners, (yes=1; no=0)
Lasrg25= Other-Religions who are marginal landowners, (yes=1; no=0)
Lasrg31= Hindu-Others who are small landowners, (yes=1; no=0)
Lasrg32= Hindu-SCs who are small landowners, (yes=1; no=0)
Lasrg33= Hindu-STs who are small landowners, (yes=1; no=0)
Lasrg34= Muslims who are small landowners, (yes=1; no=0)
Lasrg35= Other-religions who are small landowners, (yes=1; no=0)
Lasrg41= Hindu-Others who are large landowners, (yes=1; no=0)
Lasrg42= Hindu-SCs who are large landowners, (yes=1; no=0)
Lasrg43= Hindu-STs who are large landowners, (yes=1; no=0)
Lasrg44= Muslims who are large landowners, (yes=1; no=0)
Lasrg45= Other-Religions who are large landowners, (yes=1; no=0)

Landownership as a wealth indicator has a very important role in rural areas but not so in urban areas. Hence, regressions have been run with rural/urban dummy.

The Model can be expressed as follows:

\[
\text{Logit } x = \alpha_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_i Y_i
\]

Where \(x\) is the probability that an individual participates in workforce;

\[
\text{Logit } x = \ln \left( \frac{x}{1-x} \right)
\]

\(\{Y_i\}(i=1,2,\ldots,k)\) are the predictor variables, \(\alpha_0\) is the intercept and \(\alpha_i\)'s are the regression coefficients.

---

\(^{51}\) The steps involved in creating the socio-religious groups have been detailed out in Appendix 7A.

\(^{52}\) See appendix 7B for creation of interaction terms.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners</th>
<th>Wfpr (with UPA21)</th>
<th>Wfpr (without UPA21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Landowners</td>
<td>0.91(0.03)***</td>
<td>0.95(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Landowners</td>
<td>0.91(0.03)**</td>
<td>0.79(0.03)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Landowners</td>
<td>0.97(0.03)</td>
<td>0.83(0.03)***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Model 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-religious groups</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindu-Others</td>
<td>0.78(0.02)***</td>
<td>0.79(0.02)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu-SCs</td>
<td>0.85(0.02)***</td>
<td>0.97(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>0.63(0.01)***</td>
<td>0.66(0.02)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Religions</td>
<td>0.70(0.02)***</td>
<td>0.70(0.02)***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Model 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction Terms</th>
<th>Hindu-Others</th>
<th>Hindu-SCs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landless</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>0.92(0.03)**</td>
<td>0.95(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0.89(0.03)***</td>
<td>0.78(0.03)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>0.99(0.03)</td>
<td>0.83(0.03)***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1&2 are reference categories because they have lowest representation in sample
Ref. implies reference category; *** implies significance at 1%, ** implies significance at 5%, * implies significance at 10% level. The figures given in the parenthesis are the robust standard errors. Source: NSSO 61st Round, 2004-05.
Table 7.2: Odds ratios explaining female participation (68th Round)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model1</th>
<th>Land-Classes</th>
<th>Wfp (with UPA21)</th>
<th>Wfp (without UPA21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landless</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal LandOwner</td>
<td>0.99(0.08)</td>
<td>0.99(0.08)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small LandOwner</td>
<td>1.04(0.08)</td>
<td>0.88(0.07)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large LandOwner</td>
<td>1.07(0.01)</td>
<td>0.94(0.07)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model2</th>
<th>Socio-religious grps</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindu-STs²</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu-Others</td>
<td>0.82(0.02)***</td>
<td>0.85(0.02)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu-SCs</td>
<td>0.82(0.03)***</td>
<td>0.93(0.03)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>0.64(0.03)***</td>
<td>0.70(0.02)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Religions</td>
<td>0.72(0.03)***</td>
<td>0.75(0.02)***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model3</th>
<th>Interaction Terms</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindu-Others</td>
<td>Landless</td>
<td>Ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>1.02(0.08)</td>
<td>1.01(0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1.08(0.08)</td>
<td>0.93(0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>1.12(0.08)</td>
<td>0.96(0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu-SCs</td>
<td>Landless</td>
<td>Ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>1.07(0.09)</td>
<td>1.11(0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1.11(0.09)</td>
<td>1.02(0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>1.04(0.09)</td>
<td>0.95(0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu-STs</td>
<td>Landless</td>
<td>Ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>1.30(0.12)***</td>
<td>1.32(0.12)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1.2(0.09)</td>
<td>1.01(0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>1.30(0.10)</td>
<td>1.00(0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>Landless</td>
<td>Ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>0.85(0.07)**</td>
<td>0.82(0.07)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0.77(0.06)***</td>
<td>0.69(0.06)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>0.95(0.08)</td>
<td>0.89(0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-Religions</td>
<td>Landless</td>
<td>Ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>0.93(0.07)</td>
<td>0.90(0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>0.96(0.07)***</td>
<td>0.88(0.07)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>0.93(0.08)</td>
<td>0.87(0.08)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1&2 are reference categories because they have lowest representation in sample. Ref. implies reference category; *** implies significance at 1%, ** implies significance at 5%, * implies significance at 10% level. The figures given in the parenthesis are the robust standard errors. Source: NSSO 68th Round, 2011-12.
7.4 Observations

The results (Table 7.1 & 7.2) of the micro decision making process as evident from the binary choice model are explored. The model uses land (categorised as marginal, small and large), socio-religious groups (categorised as Hindu-Others, Hindu-SC, Hindu-ST, Muslims and Other Religions), interaction terms of land and socio-religious groups and sector (categorised as rural and urban) as the causal variables. Regressions are run with a rural/urban dummy.

7.4.1 Model 1

61st Round results show that economic class plays a significant role in the decision regarding female labour supply. This result corroborates the ‘income effect’ whereby an increase in the income and wealth of the household causes withdrawal of the female labour. This is not in accordance with the established literature which states that there has been an exponential increase in female labour force participation in the year 2004-05, the 61st round.

1. There is a lower probability of women workers from higher land owning classes taking part in work force participation. This is irrespective of the presence of non-remunerative work done on own farm or household enterprise (Upa 21). The social stratification in terms of economic class causes women to withdraw from the labour force. One of the axis of the intersection creates a negating effect for the supply of female labour.

68th Round results, on the other hand, show that economic class is not a significant variable in determining whether the women worker will take part in work-force or not.

1. Women workers belonging to marginal landowning households have a lower probability of working.

2. Those from small and large landowning have a greater probability of taking part in work force.

3. There is no inverse relationship between land-ownership classes and female work-force participation implying that the ‘income effect’ is not at work in the year 2011-12.

4. This is mainly due to the presence of Unpaid home based work (Upa21) because when binary logit without including this kind of work in the definition of work
participation is performed then results show that there is an inverse relation between the two variables. The tables showing both the regression results have been presented.

5. As the ownership of land increases there is a lower probability of women workers working when the ‘unpaid work’ (Upa21) done by women workers is not considered, but once this work is taken into consideration the work force participation increases with increase in land ownership size.

6. This is a representation of the fact that for female workers the decision to participate in work force is not a simple function of economic or social or demographic or cultural factors. There are elements beyond these determinants which must be factored in to get the actual scenario.

7. The forces at play in determining whether a women worker will provide labour supply are varying in both the rounds. This proves the fact that unlike for male, female labour force participation is an interplay of a myriad factors. The interconnectedness of female labour is clearly brought out from the results.

The results can be summed up as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>61st Round</th>
<th>68th Round</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class is significant</td>
<td>Class is not significant. Presence of unpaid work is significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asset ownership laws are varied among the different socio-religious groups in our country. To study the impact of such differences we have studied female work-participation behaviour among the various socio-religious groups.

7.4.2 Model 2

Hindu-STs (Schedule tribes who are Hindus) as the reference category for the next section of study involving socio-religious groups as they are least represented in the sample.

1. Women workers from Hindu-Others, Hindu-SCs, Muslims (considering Mus-STs, Mus-SCs, Mus-Others and Mus-OBCs) and Other-Religions have a significantly lower probability of taking part in work-force participation, irrespective of the presence or absence of non-remunerative work done on own farm or household enterprise (Upa21) in both the rounds [61st (2004-05) and 68th (2011-12)].
2. This proves the importance of caste as a variable in determining the trend of female labour supply. Similar results are noted for both the rounds.

3. Thus in the social stratification of class and caste, both play an important role in the 61\textsuperscript{st} round but not so in the 68\textsuperscript{th} round (as class loses its significance) and the composition of work done by the women worker gains more importance.

### 7.4.3 Model 3

The overlap of economic class, caste, religion and gender is studied with the concept of intersectionality by looking at the impact of the interaction of land and socio-religious groups on female work participation. Results are as follows:

#### 61\textsuperscript{st} round depicts that

1. For the Hindu-Others, probability of participation in work-force declines as the landownership of the household increases. The type of work done by the female worker is not of much consequence because this lower probability is prevalent both in the presence and absence of Upa21.

2. For Hindu-SCs when Upa21 is considered in the regressions then there is a higher probability of work-force participation with an increasing landownership.

3. For Hindu-STs there is a higher probability of participating in work-force as landownership increases. When Upa21 is not included the probability of participation is less only for the households who own more than 2.00 hectares of land.

4. For Muslims and Other-Religions the probability of participation is significantly determined by the overlap of class, caste and religion. There is a significantly lower probability of work force participation by women workers as the land ownership class increases.

#### 68\textsuperscript{th} round depicts that,

1. The logistic regression results for Hindu-Others show that women workers belonging to marginal, small and large landownership households have a greater probability of working. Presence of land as a productive asset, which is a form of wealth, is not affecting work participation favourably, i.e there is no inverse relationship between landownership and female work force participation rate (FWFPR) among this socio-
religious group. This is again due to the presence of ‘unpaid work (Upa21)’ in the
definition of work participation. Although we are not clear as yet, about the
ownership rights of the available land with the households so we have assumed that
the women workers have the same right to ownership as their male counterparts.

2. For Hindu-SCs and Hindu-STs, the results show that women workers from marginal,
small and large landowning households have a greater probability of working. This is
irrespective of whether we are considering Upa21 or not. So the overlap of class, caste
and religion determine the employment relations for women workers. An increase in
wealth is not affecting the work participation decision favourably.

3. For Muslims and Other-Religions too the lower probability of work force
participation by women workers, both in case of the presence or absence of Upa21
again reiterates the fact that the Overlap plays an important role in decision making.

4. As a robustness check similar exercises have been performed for male workers (15-59
years). It has been found that class plays an important role in the decision making
process of male labour supply. Caste and composition of work do not have a
significance. Overlap does not bring about any changes in the decision making
process.

5. Thus, economic variables are stronger in determining male work force participation,
whereas the interconnectedness of economic and social variables a stronger role in
determining female work force participation.

7.5 Conclusion

The importance and relevance of the Overlap of several characteristic features in
determining female labour supply is highlighted in this chapter. But one interesting aspect
which gets noticed is that the category or type of work done by the women worker also plays
an important role in the female labour supply process. So the working of myriad factors in
determining whether a woman works or not is brought out. The general picture which arose
from research was one of significant change in rates of employment for women in the 61st
round (2004-05), but it is noticed in this chapter that for the majority it is actually a continuity
of their disadvantaged position within the labour market. The question which comes to be
answered at this juncture is, “has the increased participation by women contributed to their

53 Not published in the thesis to economise on space
integration into paid employment or has it confirmed their marginalisation (Humphries and Rubery, 1992)?” An answer to this question would be provided by a study of the categories of employment for women workers and then ascertain, in what kind of work are women workers participating more. In the next chapter employment status for women workers have been studied (self-employment, regular work and casual work) and in the chapter thereafter a detailed study of the kind of work done by women workers (Paid or Unpaid work) has been presented. Both the analyses are carried out under the overlap of the socio-economic variables using intersectionality, to assess the impact on the relations being created in the process of employment.
Appendix 7A

Creation of the Variable ‘Socio-religious group’

National Sample Survey (NSS) provides data for

1. Social Groups, Codes for which are as follows: ST=1, SC=2, OBC=3, Others=9
2. Religion, Codes for which are as follows: Hindu=1, Muslims=2, Others=3

Socio-religious groups created in the thesis:

**Hindu-Others (including OBC):** This group consists of individuals who are Hindus and belong to Others (non SC, ST and OBCs i.e the upper castes) and OBC social category. This group may be classified as elite because the representation of Others outweighs that of OBCs in this sample. The very small sample size of OBCs among Hindus has encouraged this step of considering them with the Others group, to avoid the problem of micro-numerosity.

**Hindu-SC:** This group of individuals are Hindu Scheduled Castes

**Hindu-ST:** They are Hindu Scheduled Tribes. Their representation is the least in the sample and hence this group has been considered as the reference categories in econometric estimations.

**Muslims (including Muslim-ST, Muslim-SC, Muslim others and Muslim-OBC):** The entire Muslim sample with respect to the different social groups (SC, ST, OBC and Others) is included in this group.

**Other-Religion (including Christianity, Sikhism, Jainism, Buddhism, Zoroastrianism, Others):** We have clubbed the Other-Religions and considered them as a single group to avoid problems of micro-numerosity.

Proceeding through trial and error final coding in the thesis is;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Hindu (H)</th>
<th>Muslim (M)</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social-Groups</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>Others+OBC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Author’s Calculation*
**Socio-Religious Groups = religion*social-group**

=> Hindu-Others (including OBC) = (5*3), (5*9) = 15, 45

=> Hindu-SC = 10

=> Hindu-ST = 5

=> Muslims (Mus-ST, Mus-SC, Mus-Others, Mus-OBCs) = 8, 16, 24, 72

=> Other-Religions (Others-ST, Others-SC, Others-Others, Others-OBC) = 9, 18, 27, 81
APPENDIX 7B

Interaction term=land-ownership class*socio-religious group

Dummy variables for land classes:

Land1 = Landless Households (landownership 0.000 hectares), (yes=1; no=0)
Land2 = Marginal Landowners (ownership 0.001-0.40 hectares), (yes=1; no=0)
Land3 = Small Landowners (ownership 0.41-2.00 hectares), (yes=1; no=0)
Land4 = Large Landowners (ownership >2.00 hectares), (yes=1; no=0)

Dummy variables for socio religious groups:

Socrg1= Hindu-Others (H-O), (yes=1; no=0)
Socrg2= Hindu-SC (H-SC), (yes=1; no=0)
Socrg3= Hindu-ST (H-ST), (yes=1; no=0)
Socrg4= Muslims (M), (yes=1; no=0)
Socrg5= Other-Religions (Othr-Relgns), (yes=1; no=0)

Creation of the interaction terms

Lasrg11=land1*socrg1= Hindu-Others who are landless
Lasrg12=land1*socrg2= Hindu-SCs who are landless
Lasrg13= land1*socrg3= Hindu-STs who are landless
Lasrg14=land1*socrg4= Muslims who are landless
Lasrg15=land1*socrg5= Other-Religions who are landless
Lasrg21=land2*socrg1= Hindu-Others who are marginal landowners
Lasrg22= land2*socrg2= Hindu-SCs who are marginal landowners
Lasrg23= land2*socrg3= Hindu-STs who are marginal landowners
Lasrg24= land2*socrg4= Muslims who are marginal landowners
Lasrg25 = land2 * socrg5 = Other Religions who are marginal landowners
Lasrg31 = land3 * socrg1 = Hindu Others who are small landowners
Lasrg32 = land3 * socrg2 = Hindu SCs who are small landowners
Lasrg33 = land3 * socrg3 = Hindu STs who are small landowners
Lasrg34 = land3 * socrg4 = Muslims who are small landowners
Lasrg35 = land3 * socrg5 = Other-religions who are small landowners
Lasrg41 = land4 * socrg1 = Hindu Others who are large landowners
Lasrg42 = land4 * socrg2 = Hindu SCs who are large landowners
Lasrg43 = land4 * socrg4 = Hindu STs who are large landowners
Lasrg44 = land4 * socrg4 = land4 * socrg4 = Muslims who are large landowners
Lasrg45 = land4 * socrg5 = Other Religions who are large landowners.