CHAPTER IV

HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS OF WORKING CHILDREN

Introduction

In Haryana about 2.6% of children in the 10-14 year's age-group work, full-time or part-time. More than half (54%) of the employed children work for wages in the agricultural sector, which is a very disturbing phenomenon. Incidence of child labour, when observed at the social group level, presents a grimmer picture. In the schedule caste group, incidence of child labour is as high as 5%. Further, on a full-time basis 66% of these children are employed as wage labourers and on a part-time basis all working children work as wage labourers. The picture is relatively different in the higher castes. For example in OBC group, 1.9% of the children are employed and 46% of these children work in their own households and another 32% work in regular salaried occupation. Incidence of child labour in 'other' social group is extremely low (1%) when compared to the schedule caste group.

Children who are not counted officially as workers, but work in household chores which indirectly contributes to the welfare of the household, account for almost 5% of the total children in Haryana. Differences exist in the magnitude of children working in household chores at the social group level. Magnitude of children working in household chores is about 10.8% in the SC group compared to 3% in the OBC group and 2.7% in 'others'. Moreover, about 7.5% of the children in rural Haryana neither study nor work. These children are not even found to be working in the household chores and that is why they are not counted by the NSSO in their 'working in domestic duties' categories.

In the present chapter an attempt has been made to examine the economic background of the households in terms of size of landholding and the type of work pursued as well as the educational status of the parents in the households with prevalence of child labour. Many scholars have tried to determine the link between child labour and economic background of the household (i.e. farm size and the nature of work that the household is engaged in i.e. household type). Land ownership by a household in rural areas is a very good indicator of the economic strength of the household. Households that have land as an asset would in turn have higher income level as compared to households with no land and capital. Incidence of child labour would be lower in the former type of household than the latter. Kanbargi and Kulkarni (1991) & Skoufias (1994) found that in households owning less than
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10 acres of land, there was a greater need for productive work by children than in households owning large landholdings. Further, wage labour activities are associated with irregular income and are more or less human capital intensive. Children whose fathers are self-employed are the least exposed to income shocks, while (daily) wage labour yields very uncertain earnings. Participation of children in wage work is generally higher from the agricultural labour households. This statement is supported by the evidence found in studies of Jayraj (1995), Skoufias (1994), Leclercq (2001), Dev and Ravi (2001) which establish positive linkages between proportion of agricultural labourers in total labour and incidence of child labour. Hence, it becomes imperative to understand and examine the economic, social and educational background of the households that these working children belong to. Importantly, this chapter is also devoted to examine the economic background of the girls who work in domestic chores and ‘nowhere’ children. These children who do not go to school like child labourers are a puzzle but this chapter will try to shed some light on these children by identifying their economic background.

Thus, the main objective of this chapter is to examine the strength of relationships between child labour and the following characteristics of the households,

1. Economic position of the households, including size of landholdings and the nature of work that the household is engaged in.
2. Educational background of the head of the household, and
3. Social groups.

This chapter has been organised as follows. Section I has been devoted to examine the economic features of the households in terms of land ownership and type of work pursued. Section II deals with the level of education of the head of the household of working children. Section III considers the economic and educational background of the self-employed, wage labourers and regular salaried working children. Section IV identifies the economic and educational background of the children working in household chores. Section V examines the economic background and educational level of the head of the household of the ‘nowhere’ children.
Section I

**Economic Characteristics of Households of Full-Time Child Labour**

a) **SIZE OF LANDHOLDING**

In Haryana, at the **aggregated level**, the highest incidence of child labour (3%) has been observed in the households that have marginal landholdings (less than one acre), followed by those with medium landholding size (2.5-5.00 acres). At the regional level, Eastern Haryana Plains and Aravalli have the highest incidence of child labour in marginal landholding categories (2.2% and 1.6% respectively). Siwalik region, on the other hand, has the highest incidence of child labour in the medium landholding size class. Hence, we find that the proportion of working children to total child population is the highest in marginal landholding households as compared to larger farm size households.\(^1\) This result is supported by the next observation that 84% of the working children in Haryana belong to the households with marginal landholding size. This holds true at the regional level as well, except in Siwalik where 96.3% of the working children come from medium landholding size category.

It is evident from table 4.6 that in the **schedule caste** social group, incidence of child labour (4.1%) in the state is found only in marginal landholding households. This is true at the regional level too. Western Haryana Plains have the highest incidence of child labour (8.7%) in the households with marginal landholding size followed by Eastern Haryana Plains (3.7%). It is important to point out here that in Western Haryana Plains a very high proportion of SC boys (21%) in marginal landholding households are economically active. In the case of the **other backward caste**, incidence of child labour is the highest (4.2%) in the households owning land between 2.5-5 acres followed by households with marginal landholding sizes (2.5%). At the regional level, incidence of child labour in households with medium landholdings is 9.1% in Aravalli region. Further, in this region 15.5% of the boys in medium landholding size households are child labourer while from the households with marginal landholding size about 5% of the boys work. In Western Haryana Plains, high incidence of child labour (5.4%) is found in household with marginal landholding sizes. Table 4.11 indicates that 76% of the child labourers from the **OBC** social group belong to the

---

\(^1\) Incidence of child labour for boys in marginal landholding categories is as high as 5.8% in Haryana.
households with marginal landholdings. Eastern and Western Haryana Plains, at the regional level, conforms to the State's situation whereas in the Siwalik and the Aravalli region the characteristic of landholding is quite different. In the Siwalik region, about 77% of the child labourers (girls) belong to landless households (although the incidence is quite low-0.4%). In the Aravalli region, half (50.6%) of the child labourers belong to the households with medium landholding size while the rest belong to households with marginal landholding sizes. Incidence of child labour in the 'others' social group is found only in households owning medium sized landholdings (1.7%) in Siwalik.

Thus, it is observed one observes that child labour from the households with marginal landholding size is mostly schedule caste followed by the OBC social group. Half of the child labour from medium landholding size class belongs to 'others' social group while the rest are from the OBC households.

b) **TYPE OF HOUSEHOLD**

The type or nature of work which fetches the maximum proportion of income to the household determines the household type. Incidence of child labour at the aggregated level in Haryana is the highest (3.3%) among agricultural labour households followed by households self-employed in non-farm activities (2.4%). At the regional level, only the Western Haryana Plains conforms to the state pattern where about 10% of the working children belong to agricultural labour households. In the Siwalik and the Aravalli regions, all the working children belong to households self-employed in agriculture and the incidence of child labour is 4.2% and 2.7% respectively. In the Eastern Haryana Plains, incidence of child labour is the highest (2.5%) in households self-employed in non-farm activities followed by agricultural labour households (1.2%). Table 4.4 further indicates that, in Haryana, at the aggregated level 50% of the working children belong to labour households while 48% belong to self-employed households. It may be noted (Table 4.5) that all wage labour households are from near landless households. These wage labour households own less than one acre of land. Similarly, 50% the households self-employed in agriculture own less than one acre of land. Further, 94% of the households self-employed in non-farm activities own less than one acre of land. This holds true at the regional level as well except in Siwalik where households which are self-employed in agriculture own 2.5 to 5 acre of land and yet send their children to labour. Hence we find that all the self-employed households (with child labour) own less than one acre of land which is near landlessness. Therefore higher incidence of child labour
in agricultural labour households and self-employed households (who are near landless) indicates extremely low access to fixed and private capital assets. The average land owned is so small that it is inadequate to provide the minimum income and as a result the self-employed households may be sending their children to labour.

The highest incidence of child labour in the schedule caste social group, is found in households self-employed in non-farm activities (6.3%) followed by agricultural labour households (5%). At the regional level only Eastern Haryana Plains conforms to the state pattern where incidence of child labour in households self-employed in non-farm activities (8.3%) is higher than the agricultural labour households (2.4%). In the Western Haryana Plains, a very high incidence of child labour (11.7%) is found only in agricultural labour households. In fact, incidence of child labour for boys belonging to agricultural labour households is as high as (24%). In the Aravalli region, incidence of child labour is found only in ‘other’ household type.2 Table 4.9 shows that 61% of the child labourers from SC group in Haryana belong to agricultural labour households and another 28% belong to households self-employed in non-farm activities. At the regional level, in Western Haryana Plains, the entire child labourers belong to the agricultural labour households while in Eastern Haryana Plains about 56% of child labourers belong to households self-employed in non-farm activities, 35% belong to agricultural labour households and the rest belong to households dependent on wage labour in non-farm. It is worth mentioning here that all the SC households with incidence of child labour, have marginal landholdings i.e. less than one acre of land. Further, though they own some land yet their main source of income is not from their own farm but from daily wages.

Incidence of child labour amongst the other backward castes in Haryana is the highest in self-employed household (4.5%) followed by households self-employed in non-farm activities (2.2%). In the Eastern Haryana Plains and the Aravalli region incidence of child labour is the highest in households self-employed in agriculture. In the Western Haryana Plains, in contrast, incidence of child labour is observed only in households self-employed in non-farm activities. Incidence of child labour among the ‘others’ social group is observed in households self-employed in agriculture.

---

2 In the Aravalli region the dominant household type is ‘other’ which is non self-employed/non-labour household's, i.e. regular salaried households.
It is evident from the above analysis that in the OBC social group, incidence of child labour is observed in self-employed households who own marginal landholdings. It is possible that these children work in their own household enterprise (agriculture and non-agriculture) compared to the SC children who belong to agricultural labour households and work as wage labourers as well. These are a few questions that would be addressed in Section III of this chapter. A look at the distribution of child labour by household type across social group (table 4.18) shows that 72.7% of child labour in households self-employed in agriculture belong to the OBC group and the rest are from the ‘others’ social group. 60% of child labour from households self-employed in non-farm activities belong to the SC social group while the rest are OBCs. All the child labourers from agricultural labour households are from the SC social group. Children who belong to labour households in non-agriculture sector, 75% of them are OBC while the rest are from the SC segment.

Summary

To sum up the highest incidence of child labour in Haryana at the aggregated level is observed in households with less than one acre of land. This is true across regions except in Siwalik, where child labourers come from households with medium landholding size. Not surprisingly, wage-earning households have the highest incidence of child labour in Haryana, followed by cultivating households. A look at the distribution of child labour across household types shows that about half of the child labour comes from the wage labour households (with the proportion of child labour in agricultural labour households higher than the non-agricultural labour households); the other half comes from households self-employed in agriculture or non-farm activities. Further, it was observed that most of the self-employed households own less than one acre of land. This could indicate that although these households are self-employed cultivators, the average land owned is so small that it is inadequate to provide enough income; as a result they have to send their children to work. At the social group level, SC child labourers belong to households that own less than one acre of land. These households are either self-employed in non-farm activities or are agricultural labourers. Child labourers from the OBC and ‘others’ social group belong to households self-employed in agriculture who own 2.5 to 5 acres of land, these households are found in the agriculturally less developed regions of Siwalik and the Aravalli regions in Haryana.

3 This hypothesis has been tested in Chap VII in which the linkage between child labour and poverty has been analysed.
Section II

Educational Characteristics of the Head of the Households of Child Labour (UPS)

It is reasonable to assume that the incidence of child labour within families would be a function of the educational level of the head of the household. Specifically, the more educated the head of a household, the lower is the probability of the presence of child labour in that household – this argument rests on the assumption that educated parents are more likely to escape poverty, have access to credit, use developed agricultural techniques which alter the relative gains from child labour and schooling. Educated parents’ thus are able to help their children through the schooling process as they would value the experience more and encourage their own children to attend school, thereby decreasing the probability of their being involved in child labour activities.

It is observed that at the aggregated level that 53.4% of the child labour in Haryana comes from households where the heads are illiterate while 38% belong to the households where the heads are literate below primary or primary level and 8.9% of the child labour comes from the households where the head has up to secondary level of education. This analysis brings out two main things, firstly child labour belongs to the households where heads are illiterate or have low level of education (below primary or primary) and, secondly, households with higher level of education (graduate and above) do not send their children to labour. This is observed at the regional level in Haryana as well except in Siwalik where 66.3% of the child labour belongs to the households where the head has secondary or higher secondary level of education.

If the standard of education of the head of the household and the ownership landholding size of the household from which the child labour comes are examined, it is found that the educational characteristics of the parents’ of the child labourers determine their economic activities and their ability to invest in children’s human capital. It is revealed that across all land size classes (except medium landholding); in Haryana, the head of the households to which the child labour belongs, are mostly illiterates. The head of the landless households sending their child to work are illiterate. Of the households with marginal landholding size with child labour, 77.5% of the child labour belongs to the households where the heads are illiterate 15.1% belong to the households where the head is literate but below primary and 7.4% belong to the households where the head is educated up to primary
level. Child labour from households with small landholding size come from the households where heads are illiterate. Parents' of the child labour that come from medium landholding size class are all literate. More than half of them have secondary or higher secondary level of education, the other half are literate through non-formal educational channels. This picture holds true at the regional level as well.

The type of work that the household is engaged in and the standard of the education of the head should be logically related. In Haryana, at the aggregated level. 48.5% of the child labour households self-employed in agriculture belong to the households where the head is illiterate, 24.2% belong to household where the head is literate through NFEC and 27.3% belong to households where the head has obtained secondary and higher secondary level of education. Across regions, in the Eastern Haryana Plains, parents' of the entire child labourers from households self-employed in agriculture are illiterate. In the Aravalli region, almost all child labourers from households self-employed in agriculture show that their heads are educated only through non-formal educational channel. The exception is Siwalik region where parents' of 99% of the child labour in households self-employed in agriculture have attained educational level up to secondary and high secondary levels. Head of the households self-employed in non-farm activities with child labour are either illiterate or have very low level of education (literate below primary). This picture holds true for both the State as well as regional level. Head of the agricultural labour households with child labour are all illiterate.

From the above it is evident that:

a) More than half of the child labour belongs to the households where the heads are illiterate while the other half are literate but have attained very low level of education (below primary). The low educational level of the parents is uniform at the state as well as the regional level.

b) Working children who belong to households with marginal or small landholding sizes are mostly headed by illiterate individuals. Working children who belong to households with medium landholding sizes are headed by literates with secondary or higher secondary education.

c) Further, head of the households self-employed in non-farm activities with child labour are illiterates or literate with very low educational level. All the heads of the
agricultural labour households with child labour are illiterate individuals. While in case of households self-employed in agriculture with child labour, 48% of the child labour belong to households who are headed by illiterate individuals, 24% of child labour households are headed by individuals with very low level of education and 27.3% of the heads of child labour households have attained education up to secondary and higher secondary level.

Thus, the households of child labour are not only economically vulnerable (in terms of lack of land as an asset and dependence of the household on daily wages which are unstable in nature) but these households lack human capital i.e. education which makes them even more susceptible to falling into poverty trap.

With respect to the educational characteristics of the head of the household with child labour across social groups it is observed that the level of education of the parents, is the lowest amongst the schedule caste. Two-third of the child labourers from the schedule caste social group belong to households which are headed by illiterate individuals while the rest are educated but below primary level. At the regional level as well this pattern holds true (Table 4.23). The low educational level of the parents’ of the SC child labourers seems to determine the type of work pursued by the parents. It is observed that the illiterate parents’ are agricultural labourers dependent on daily wages while those who are literate (educated below primary level) are self-employed in non-farm activities. This pattern holds true at the state as well as at the regional level (Table 4.25). As mentioned earlier more than 60% of the child labour from the SC social group belongs to agricultural labour households while the rest belong to households self-employed in non-farm activities.

Similar to the SC child labour, 63.2% of the other backward castes child labourers belongs to the households that are headed by illiterate individuals, 19.1% belong to the households whose heads are literate through NFEC while 17.8% belong to the households whose heads have attained primary level education. At the regional level, in Siwalik, Eastern Haryana and Western Haryana Plains, all OBC working children belong to households whose heads are illiterate. In Aravalli region most of the OBC working children come from households whose heads are literate, though the level of education is low (are literate through NFEC or have attained primary level education). In the earlier section (economic characteristics) it was observed that the incidence of child labour was the highest in households with medium landholding size followed by marginal landholding size class for
the OBC social group. The educational level of the head of the households with medium landholding size is pretty low. The OBC working children belonging to medium landholding size are headed by individuals who have attained literacy through non-formal education channels. This holds true at regional level as well. Table 4.27 further indicates, that 76.5% of OBC working children from households with marginal landholding size are headed by illiterate individuals while the rest of the child labour (23.5%) belong to households whose heads have attained primary level education. At the regional level in Eastern and Western Haryana Plains, all OBC child labourers who belong to households with marginal landholding size are headed by illiterate individuals. In Aravalli region, OBC child labourers in marginal landholding categories are headed by individual who have attained primary level education. Further, it has been observed that 66.7% of the OBC child labour from households self-employed in agriculture are headed by illiterates while the rest of the child labour from these households are headed by literates (through NFEC). At the regional level in Siwalik and Eastern Haryana Plains the entire OBC child labourers’ households self-employed in agriculture are headed by illiterate individuals. In the Aravalli region the head of the households self-employed in agriculture have attained literacy through NFEC. All the child labourers’ households self-employed in non-farm activities are headed by illiterate individuals. This is true at the regional level as well. With regards to the educational level of the head of the household of child labour from the ‘others’ social group, it is observed that all of them belong to households whose heads have attained secondary and higher level of education, they are medium landowners and their main source of income is cultivation of land (self-employed in agriculture). Thus, it has been observed that among the social groups, child labourers belonging to marginal landholding size class are mostly from SC social group followed by the OBC. The head of the SC households are mostly illiterate or are literate below primary level while the head of the OBC households are literate with at least primary level of education. Child labourers from ‘others’ social group belong to medium landholding size class whose heads have attained secondary or higher secondary level of education.

Child labourers in Haryana belong to households with the following features:

1. SC child labourers belong to marginal landholding size class while child labourers from the ‘other’ social group belong to the medium landholding size class. With

4 These are the households that own 2.5-5.00 acres of land i.e. belong to medium landholding size class.
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respect to the OBC child labourers, 75% belong to marginal landholding size class while the rest belong to medium landholding households.

2. SC child labour belongs to wage labour households while majority of the OBC child labour belongs to self-employed households. Child labour from the ‘other’ social group, all belongs to self-employed households.

3. All wage labour households with the incidence of child labour own less than one acre of land while self-employed households in agriculture own 2.5 to 5 acre of land (medium land owners).

4. All wage labour households with marginal landholdings are headed by illiterate individuals. In these households poverty as well as lack of education which are inter-related might be the cause of incidence of child labour. Most of the child labour (70%) in households owning land between 2.5 to 5 acres is headed by individuals who are illiterates or literate but with a very low educational level. But 30% of child labourers belong to households which are headed by individuals who have attained secondary or higher secondary level of education. Despite a strong asset base (land) and a reasonable level of education, children from these households join the labour force.

Section III

Employment Pattern of Child Labour (UPS) and Their Household Characteristics

In the earlier section of this chapter, it was observed that among the land size categories, the highest incidence of child labour is observed in households that own less than one acre of land (marginal landowners). Further, 80% of the total child labour is also found in these marginal landowning households. Incidence of child labour in landless, small and medium landholding households is low and child labour is not found in households with more than 5 acre of land. The share of child labour is also low in these households (20%). Moreover it was observed that large and very large landowning households don’t have children working as labourers. It was further observed that households with agricultural wages as the major source of income had the highest incidence of child labour followed by households which were self-employed in non-farm activities (self-employed in trade /manufacturing). The lowest incidence of child labour is found in households who are self-employed in agriculture (cultivation).
The aim of this section is to examine if the employment pattern of the children changes with the size of their landholdings and the type of activity the households are engaged in. This analysis is done at the aggregated as well as at the social group level.

a) Size of Landholding and Employment Pattern of Children – Aggregated Level (UPS)

In Haryana, all the working children of landless households\(^5\) work as casual labourers. This holds true at the regional level as well. In Haryana, of the total employed children from the households with marginal landholding size in Haryana, 42.4% work as casual labourers for daily wages, 29.6% work as helpers in their own enterprises while 28% work in regular salaried jobs. At the regional level as well the proportion of children working as wage labourers is higher than those working as unpaid family worker. In fact in Aravalli, 70% of the child labourers work for daily wages while 30% work as unpaid family workers. In Eastern Haryana Plains, 66.1% of the child labourers are wage employees while the rest are wage labourers. Only in Western Haryana Plains, proportion of child labourers in household enterprise is slightly higher (51%) than that of wage labourers. Child labourers from households of medium landholding size work in a slightly higher proportion (53%) as casual labourers than as helpers in household enterprise.

Hence, it has been observed that the proportion of children working for wages (either as labourer or employee) from landless and near landless households is higher (70%) than the proportion of children working in household enterprises. In households that own 2.5 to 5 acres of land (medium land owners) half of the working children are employed in household enterprise while the rest are casual labourers. By this analysis we find that although the lower landholding size class (where the asset base is small) do have a higher proportion of children working as wage labourers, but even in the larger land size class half of their children work for wages.\(^6\)

Thus, the analysis indicates that it is not necessary that child labour from a higher asset base household (where income is expected to be higher than lower asset base households) would only work as a helper in family business. Working as helper at home is

---

\(^5\) Incidence of child labour in landless households is marginal (0.41%). Even share of child labour is low in landless households (1.4%). But, nevertheless, in absolute number there are 489 children who all work for wages.

\(^6\) About 80% of children working as casual labourers belong to marginal landholding categories while 16.7% belong to medium landowning households. Rest of the casual child labourers are from landless households ([Table 4.32(i)]).
still better type of activity (since he/she is not in direct contact with the market) than going out and earning daily wages. Wage labour for children is the worst form of activity as these children are exploited, have to work for long hours and are paid less. Evidence in literature suggests (Burra 1995, p.199) that child’s wage in any industry is a third to a half of that of an adult for the same output and children are capable of much greater efficiency.

b) Household Type and Employment Pattern of the Child Labour (UPS)- Aggregated Level

The occupational status of the household, i.e., whether a farmer, agricultural/non-agricultural labourer or salaried employee have an impact on the employment pattern of child labourers. Working children from self-employed in agriculture or self-employed in non-agriculture households work as helpers in the family run business while children from labour households themselves also work for wages. This hypothesis is examined in this sub-section.

(i) Employment Pattern in Households Self-Employed in Agriculture:

In Haryana, in the households that are self-employed in agriculture, children work in a higher proportion for regular salary (40.7%) than in household enterprises (32%) or as casual labourers (27.3%). At the regional level, only Eastern Haryana Plains conform to the state pattern where, in households self-employed in agriculture, proportion of children working as regular salaried labour is the highest in proportion (84.1%) followed by those working in household enterprises (15.9%). Children employed as regular salaried workers are all motor vehicle mechanics, while those children who work in household enterprises take care of the livestock.

In Siwalik, 99.1% of the working children from households self-employed in agriculture work for wages (in non-farm activities i.e. as helpers to motor vehicle drivers). These households self-employed in agriculture are medium land size owners (2.5 to 5 acres) whose children work as casual labourers. The Aravalli region, on the other hand, is the only region that proves our hypothesis that, children from households self-employed in agriculture work in that same activity that the household is engaged in. In this region majority of the working children from households self-employed in agriculture are engaged in household enterprises, specifically, they work as helper in their own farms.
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(ii) Employment Pattern of Children in Households Self-Employed in Non-Farm Activities:

About 60.1% of the working children in households self-employed in non-farm activities are employed in regular salaried jobs, 34.2% work in their own enterprises while 5.8% work as casual labourers. At the state level these households are again mostly marginal landowners (94%) or without land (6%). At the regional level, in Eastern Haryana Plains, majority of the working children who belonging to households self-employed in non-farm activities, majority of them are employed in regular salaried jobs, more specifically as carpenters. Further these households self-employed in non-farm activities are marginal landowners who need the income that their children bring into the household. In Western Haryana Plains, all the working children work in household enterprises as helpers in household enterprises who manufacture plywood.

(iii) Employment Pattern of Children in Wage Labour Households:

In both agricultural labour and non-agricultural labour households, majority of the working children work as wage labourers while some work in household enterprise (especially from agricultural labour household). It is important to add here that these labour households are also marginal landowners and yet the main source of income of these households is wages. This could mean that these landowning household are not able to derive adequate income from farming and therefore, have to resort to wage employment. This in turn determines the pattern of employment of the children with majority of them engaged in wage employment as well. Interestingly, 30% of the working children in agricultural labour households (who are also marginal landowner) work as helpers in the household business. In this case, children are engaged in animal husbandry and look after the livestock at home, while the parents go out and earn wages. At the regional level, the Western Haryana Plains, conform to State’s employment pattern for children. In the Eastern Haryana Plains all the working children belonging to wage labour households, work for wages. These labour households are marginal landowners.

To recapitulate the characteristics of the employment pattern of working children at the aggregated level, child labourers belonging to landless and near landless households, work in a higher proportion as wage labourers or employees than as helpers in household enterprises. This pattern is similar at the regional level as well, except in Western Haryana.
Plains where child labourers work in a higher proportion in household enterprises than as wage labourers. Majority of such child labour belong to households owning less than one acre of land. In Haryana and its regions (except Aravalli), child labourers belonging to households self-employed (whether in agriculture or non-agriculture), work in a higher proportion as helpers in the family business than for daily wages. Households self-employed in agriculture are marginal farmers and own landholdings which are economically unviable. The self-employed in non-agriculture own no land and have petty business of plywood manufacturing. In Aravalli, child labourers work as helpers on their own farms. Finally, child labourers belonging to rural labour households preponderantly work as wage labourers.

In this sub-section, the pattern of employment of children and their household characteristics in terms of land size and household type disaggregated by social groups has been analysed. It is observed from the data that all the schedule caste child labourers in Haryana belong to households owning less than one acre of land. Majority (65.7%) of the child labourers from these households, work for daily wages while 28% work for regular wages and the rest work as helpers in family business. In the Eastern and the Western Haryana Plains, majority of the SC child labourers work for wages while in the Aravalli region, all of them work as helpers in their family business. In terms of nature of work which fetches the maximum proportion of income to the household, it is observed that all SC working children belonging to households self-employed in non-farm activities work as wage employee (at regular wages) and are employed as carpenters. These children come from the Eastern Haryana Plains. Further, all SC working children from labour households work for daily wages in agriculture. These children come from the Eastern and the Western Haryana Plains.

Among the other backward castes social group all child labour in landless households work as casual labour (Table 4.36). Child labour from households with less than one acre of land work in a higher proportion as regular wage employees (41.18%) than in household enterprises (35.35) and as casual labourers (23.5%). At the regional level, in Eastern Haryana Plains, 84.1% of the child labourers from households with less than one acre of landholding size work as regular wage employees while the rest work as helper in the family business. In Western Haryana, all OBC child labourers work as helpers in family business while in the Aravalli region all child labourers from households with marginal landholding size household's work as casual labourers. In the households with small
landholding size, 80% of child labourers are regular wage employees while the rest work as helper in household enterprises. At the regional level, in the Siwalik region all child labourers from households with small landholding size work as helpers in family business, while in the Aravalli region all child labourers' work on daily wages. Further, in the Aravalli region all OBC child labourers belonging to households with medium landholding size worked as helpers in household enterprises. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the highest incidence of child labour for OBC social group is also found in households with medium landholding size. The child labourers in the Aravalli region are all girls who help on the farm.

In terms of the nature of work pursued by the household it is observed that among the OBC social group, the highest incidence of child labour has been observed in households of non-agricultural labour. Table 4.37 indicates that all these child labourers work for daily wages and are casual labourers in Haryana. These children work in the rural non-farm sector of the Aravalli region and are either well diggers or construction workers. The next highest incidence of child labour is found in households self-employed in agriculture followed by those self-employed in non-farm activities. Table 4.37 shows that half of the child labourers in households self-employed in agriculture work for regular wages and the rest work as helper on their farm. At the regional level, in Eastern Haryana Plains, majority of the child labourers (84.1%) from households self-employed in agriculture work as motor vehicle mechanics for regular wages while the rest of the working children take care of the livestock. In the Aravalli region, on the other hand, all child labourers from households self-employed in agriculture work as helpers in their farms. All child labourers from households self-employed in non-farm activities work as helpers in the household enterprises. These types of households are found in the Western Haryana Plains, where child labourers work as helpers in manufacturing plywood business owned by their own family.

Child labourers from the ‘others’ social group belong to households who own medium landholding size and are self-employed in agriculture. Working children of this social group are casual labourers, who work for wages as helpers to the drivers and are found in the Siwalik region.

Summing Up

Analysis of the household characteristics of full-time child labourers indicates a strong association between incidence of child labour and the socio-economic status of the
household. In Haryana, the incidence of child labour is the highest among the households with marginal landholding size. The incidence of child labour declines as the land size increases, and the data indicates that households with land size above 5 acres have no child labourers. Households with marginal landholding also have the largest share of child labourers. Further, the households with marginal landholding size are labour households where the major source of income is through daily wages.7 Majority of the households with marginal landholding size (engaged in labour work) with incidence of child labour are schedule caste followed by other backward caste.

It is also observed that majority of the child labourers from SC labour households work as casual labour on daily wages while those from SC households with self-employed status work for regular wages as carpenters. In case of the OBC social group, majority of the child labour work as helpers in their own family run business (farming or plywood manufacturing). Girl child labourers from OBC social group work as helpers in the farm while boys assist in the plywood manufacturing business that the household owns. A small proportion of OBC boys also work for regular wages as motor vehicle mechanics and for daily wages as well diggers. Surprisingly, child labour in ‘other’ social group is observed in households with medium landholding size (2.5 to 5 acres) where the main source of income is through cultivation (self-employed in agriculture). In these households, child labourers work as helpers to motor vehicle drivers for daily wages.

Section IV.

Economic Characteristics of Households of Part-Time Child Labour

In this section the economic characteristics of households (land size and household type) of the part-time child labourers have been presented. Table 4.40 presents incidence of child labour among the land size classes. Incidence of part-time child labourers, at the aggregated level in Haryana, is found in households with marginal and large landholding sizes. It is observed that the incidence is higher in households with marginal landholding size than large landholding households. Further in marginal landowning households both boys and girls work while in large landowning households only girls work as part-time labourers (although this incidence is extremely low: 0.25%). In fact, 98% of part-time child labourers
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7 Rural labour households are usually marginalized in terms of economic existence and the resultant weak bargaining power denies them stable and durable opportunities. (Planning Commission Reports on Labour and Employment, p.314).
belong to households with less than one acre of land. Hence we see that the majority of the part time child labourers belong to households that own less than one acre of land. This holds true at the regional level as well.

In terms of the household type it is seen from table 4.42 that the highest incidence of child labour (1.3%) at the aggregated level is found in households which generate major portion of their income from regular wages and salaries. Households of non-agricultural labour have the second highest incidence of child labourers who are all girls (2.1%). At the regional level, in Eastern Haryana Plains, high incidence of child labour (6.3%) is observed among boys who belong to households with regular salaries and wages. Further in this region incidence of child labour among girls (2.99) is also observed in agricultural labour households. In the Western Haryana Plains, very high incidence of child labour among girls (12.6%) is observed in non-agricultural labour households. This region also has incidence of child labour among girls (4.7%) who belong to households dependent on regular wages. It is further observed that the households with regular wages have the highest share of part-time child labour (45.6%) followed by labour households (43.2%) and the rest (11.7%) of the child labour is found in households who are self-employed. The incidence of child labour in households self-employed in agriculture household, though, is extremely low (0.2%). It is also observed that all part-time child labourers come from households whose heads are illiterate. Thus, the educational level of the members of the households affects the induction of child into the workforce.

Across social groups, the economic characteristics of households of part-time child labourers are as following. Incidence of child labour among the schedule caste social group is found only in the households that own less than one acre of land. Further, all-SC child labourers are girls. Majority of the part-time child labourers (98%) from ‘others’ social group also belong to households who own less than one acre of land. The incidence of child labour in these households is higher especially among boys (5.3%) than girls (1%). Part-time child labourers are found only in Eastern Haryana Plains, in fact, 10.1% of the boys work as part-time labourers and belong to households owning less than one acre of land. Further, in case of the ‘others’ social group, 83% of the child labour come from households with regular salaries who also own less than one acre of land and are found in Eastern Haryana Plains. The rest of the child labour (all girls) belong to households self-employed in agriculture who have large landholdings.
Thus, it has been observed that a majority of part-time child labour comes from households with marginal landholding size, either agricultural labour or are dependent on regular wages. The rest of the child labour belong to self-employed households with large landholding size. Incidence of child labour, though, is higher in households with marginal landholding size than in households with large landholding size. At the regional level as well (i.e., in Eastern and Western Haryana Plains) economic characteristics of households of part-time child labour are similar to those observed at the state level.

Child labour from both the SC and the 'others' social group belong to households with less than one acre of land. Surprisingly, incidence of child labour in 'others' social group is higher than in the SC group, and, among the households with marginal landholding size, a higher proportion (57%) of the child labour belong to the 'others' as compared to the SC social group. Further, in the SC households with less than one acre of land self-employed in agriculture, incidence of child labour is observed among girls. While in the 'other' social group, incidence of child labour is observed among boys who belong to households that have marginal landholding size and are dependent on regular wages.

*Employment Pattern and Household Characteristics of Part-Time Child Labour*

At the *aggregated level*, 56.5% of the part-time child labourers from households with marginal landholding size work in household enterprise while the rest work as wage labourers. At the regional level, Eastern Haryana Plains has a similar employment pattern as the states where 65% of the child labour from marginal landholdings work as helpers and tend livestock while the rest are agricultural labourers. In Western Haryana Plains, all part-time child labourers from households with marginal landholding size work as wage labourers. As mentioned earlier incidence of child labour is extremely low in households with large landholding size. Nevertheless, all part-time child labourers in these households work in their own enterprises. It is observed that all part-time child labourers from rural labour households work for daily wages (Table 4.54). This is true at both State and regional levels. Part-time child labourers from households dependent on regular wages, on the other hand, work as helpers in the family business.

With respect to employment pattern and economic characteristics of households of part-time child labour across the social groups, it is seen that all part-time child labourers from the *schedule castes* social groups are girls and they belong to households with marginal
landholding size. All these part-time girl child labourers work for daily wages in agriculture. Further, all girl wage labourers belong to agricultural labour households who own less than one acre of land. All part-time child labourers from the 'others' social group belong to households with marginal landholding size who work as helpers in household enterprises. Similarly, child labour from households with large landholding size work as helpers on their own farms. Further, child labour in 'others' social group is found only from households self-employed in agriculture or from households which are dependent on regular wages. All working children (child labourers) from these households work as helpers in their own farms.

To sum up, data on the household's economic characteristics of part-time child labour show that majority of the child labour belong to households with marginal landholding which are also agricultural labourer households. Incidence of child labour is also high in these agricultural labour households. A small proportion of part-time child labour belongs to households with large landholding size which are self-employed in agriculture. Incidence of child labour in these households is extremely low. High incidence and concentration of child labour in lower land size classes as compared to large land size classes indicates better economic conditions of the latter households. Households with larger landholding size have a better access to sources of income such as agricultural land, as compared, to the marginal landowners. Further, most of the marginal land owners are rural labourers whose income is determined together by level of employment and the wage rate. Rural labour households, thus, are one of the most vulnerable rural groups in terms of high poverty and low income levels. Further, we observe that all these households with marginal landholding size with part-time child labour belong to the SC social group, whereas, the large landholding households are the 'other' social group households.

Not only is the incidence of child labour high among the rural labour households with marginal landholding, their children also resort to wage employment. While in households self-employed in agriculture with large landholdings, children work on part-time basis as helpers in their family managed farms. It could be the case here that wage employment undertaken by children from rural labour households is poverty induced, while child labour in non-paid household activities is not. And since here child labour who work for wages belong to lower caste (SC) households who themselves work for wages in agriculture and are near landless, it can be that here child labour is poverty induced. Hence these households might need their children's income to survive. The households with large landholding size who do
not need their children’s income to survive, may still use child farm labour if labour market
imperfections prevent them from hiring extra adult labour, notably during seasonal peaks of
activity. Thus, we find existence of strong association between the incidence and type of
activity of child labour and the socio-economic status of the households.

Section V

1. Economic Characteristics of Households of Children Working in Household Chores

In Haryana, 10.7% of the children are engaged in chores at home and all are girls. These children although are not labourers in the strict sense of the term but the chores that they perform do interfere with their normal development and their ability to reach their true potential. And as it has been observed in chapter 3, 94% of the children who work in household chores do not attend school. Such being the case, these children like child labourers will enter their adult hood without any human capital i.e. education. Hence, in this sense, like child labourers these children are deprived and call for a closer analysis. Incidence of child work assumes alarming proportion in Haryana when seen in the lower caste. Close to 20% of SC girls work at home and do not attend school as against 6% from OBC and ‘other’ social group. In the literature these households chores are termed as ‘work’ as against ‘labour’. Thus, the following section is devoted to analyse the economic household characteristics in terms of land size and household type of households with child ‘work’ at the aggregated level of population and at disaggregated level by social groups.

Economic Characteristics of Household of Children Working in Household Chores - Aggregated Level

In term of landholding size of the households, it is observed that the incidence of girls working in household chores is the highest among the landless households. 9.5% of the girls in these households work in the household chores. The Eastern Haryana Plains is the only region where the incidence of girls working in household chores is observed among landless households. The households with marginal landholdings have the highest incidence of girls working in household chores (6.61%). The Eastern Haryana Plains and the Aravalli region, at the regional level, have a lower incidence than the state’s average while in the Western Haryana Plains, about 12.6% of the girls from households of marginal landholding
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8 The evidence to this is found in the works of Bhalotra and Heady (2000), Child Farm Labour: Theory and Evidence, DERP, No.24, STICERD, LSE.
size are engaged in household chores. Second highest incidence of child work in Haryana, is observed in households that own 5 to 10 acres of land. At the regional level, in the Eastern Haryana Plains, 8.8% of the girls are engaged in household chores.

It is observed that 67% of the girls working in household chores belong to households with marginal landholding size followed by the landless households in Haryana. Further, 8.8% of girls working in household chores come from households with large landholding size. At the regional level, the Eastern Haryana Plains conforms to the State’s picture where the highest proportion of child work is from marginal landholding then from landless and large landholding size. In the Aravalli region and the Western Haryana Plains, 98% of the child work is found to be from households with marginal landholding size.

In terms of household type, it is seen from table 4.61 that the highest incidence of child work is found in agricultural labour households where 11.7% of the girls work in household chores. In all the three regions of Haryana, agricultural labour households have a higher incidence of child work. In fact, in the Aravalli region, in agriculture labour household, close to 15% of the girls work in household chores. Interestingly incidence of child work is similar (4%) in non agricultural labour households as well in households self-employed in agriculture. Generally, wage labour activities are associated with an irregular source of income while self-employed are the least exposed to income shocks. Despite having relatively assured earnings, self-employed households have a similar proportion of girls working in household chores (at the expense of schooling) as the labour households. In the Eastern Haryana Plains, incidence of child work is higher in non-agricultural labour household while in the Western Haryana Plains it is similar in both types of households. Table 4.62 further indicates that 50.1% of the girls working in household chores belong to agricultural labour households and another 28.6% belong to households self-employed in agriculture.

Hence, it has been observed that incidence of child work is the highest in landless households who also happens to be households engaged in agricultural labour. While the incidence is the highest among the landless households, of the total child workers, majority are from households with marginal landholding size. Half of these households are either agricultural labour households (51.3%) or farmers (20.6%). Rest of the marginal landowning households with child work are self-employed in non-farm activities or are non-agricultural
labourers (Table 4.63). Households with large landholding households where girls work in household chores and do not go to school are all self-employed in agriculture.

Economic Characteristics of Households of Children Working in Household Chores—Schedule caste

Table 4.64 presents incidence of child work by land size classes for SC social group. It is alarming to see that 41.8% of girls in landless households are engaged in household chores in Haryana. Incidence of child work in landless SC households is found only in the Eastern Haryana Plains where 74% of the girls work in household chores. Among the households owning land, incidence of child work is the highest in households with small landholding size (10.8%). In the Eastern Haryana Plains, 21.2% of the girls from households with small landholding size work in household chores while in households with marginal landholding size, 9.2% of the girls work in household chores. The Western Haryana Plains, on the other hand, have 13.5% of the girls from households with marginal landholding size engaged in household chores. Further, in Haryana 74.4% of the SC child work belong to households with marginal landholding size while 17% belong to landless households. In the Aravalli and the Western Haryana Plains SC child work belongs to households with marginal landholding size. While in the Eastern Haryana Plains child work come from different land size categories i.e. 60% belong to marginal landholding size, 26.7% belong to landless household and the rest belong to households with small landholding size.

In terms of household type, the highest incidence of child work (18.7%) has been observed in agricultural labour households of the schedule caste. At the regional level, the Western Haryana Plains have a lower incidence of child work in agricultural labour households than the State's average. The Eastern Haryana Plains, on the other hand, have a higher incidence of child work. Here 23% of SC girls in agricultural labour households work in domestic duties. In households self-employed in non-farm activities have the second highest incidence of child work (8.38%). In the Aravalli region, 37% of SC girls from households self-employed in non-farm activities work in household chores. Further, it has been found that the majority of SC child work is in agricultural labour households i.e. 76.1% of the girls engaged in household chores belong to agricultural labour households, while 12.5% belong to households self-employed in non-farm activities. This pattern is observed at the regional level as well.
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To sum up in Haryana, incidence of child work in SC social group is the highest in landless households whose primary source of income is through agricultural wages. Among the landowning households, incidence of child work in household chores is the highest in households with small landholding size who own land between 1 to 2.5 acres and are also agricultural labour households. Further, majority of the girls working in household chores belong to households with marginal landholding size classes and these households are either agricultural labour or self-employed in non-farm activities. Likewise, in case of small landholding size class with high incidence of child work, all are agricultural labour households and not cultivators. A similar pattern of household characteristics of child work has been observed at the regional level as well. Hence, girls who do not go to school and only work in household chores among SC segment belongs to marginal or small landholding size classes, whose parents’ are engaged in either wage labour agricultural activities or self-employed in non-agricultural activities.

Economic Characteristics of Households of Children Working in Household Chores - OBC

Among the OBC social group, incidence of child work (about 4%) is similar in landless and marginal households. Across regions, the Eastern Haryana Plains is the only region where incidence of child work is observed in the landless households as well as in households with marginal landholding size. On the other hand, in the Aravalli region and the Western Haryana Plains, it is observed among households with marginal landholding size only. Further, in the marginal households' incidence of child work in the Eastern Haryana Plains is lower than the State's average while in the Aravalli region and the Western Haryana Plains it is higher than the State’s average. In fact in the Western Haryana Plains, about 10% of the OBC girls work in household chores in households with marginal landholding size. Table 4.70 indicates that 80.5% of the girls working in household chores belong to households with marginal landholding size while the rest belong to landless households. The same situation is observed in the three regions of Haryana as well.

With respect to the household type it is interesting to note that, among the OBC social group, incidence of child work is the highest in non-agricultural labour households (9%) followed by agricultural labour households (6.9%). Across regions, in the Eastern Haryana Plains, this incidence is higher in the non-agricultural labour household as compared to agricultural labour households. In the Aravalli region and the Western Haryana Plains the incidence of child work has been observed only in agricultural labour households. Table 4.72
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indicates further that of the total girls working in household chores, 60% belong to agricultural labour households while 27% belong to non-agricultural labour households and 11.7% of the child work belongs to households dependent on regular wages/salaries. The Aravalli is the only region where girls working in households chores belonging to such type of households are found.

Hence, from the above analysis it is observed that among OBC social group, incidence of child work is the highest among households who own less than one acre of land and are dependent on daily wages for their income. Further, majority of the OBC girls working in household chores belong to labour households who have marginal landholdings or are landless. At the regional level as well this pattern is constant.

Economic Household Characteristics of Children Working in Household Chores - 'Others'

Among the social group designated as 'others', interesting results have been observed with respect to the landholding size of the households with incidence of child work. At the state level the incidence of child work is the highest among the large landowners (5.6%), in fact, in the Eastern Haryana Plains, about 11.3% of girls from households with large landholding size are engaged in household chores. Incidence of child work is 3.3% in households of medium landowning and marginal landholding size classes. Table 4.74 further indicates that across regions the landholding characteristic of the household is slightly different. In the Eastern Haryana Plains, a higher incidence of child work has been observed in households of medium landholding (5.6%) as compared to marginal landholding size class (3.8%). On the other hand, in the Western Haryana Plains, it is higher (4.7%) in the marginal households as compared to medium households (0.6%). In fact, at the State level, a higher proportion (37.4%) of total girls engaged in household chores belong to households of large landholding size followed by households with marginal landholdings (29.4%) followed by medium landholding households (20.5%). A similar pattern has been observed at the regional level as well where large landholding household’s account for a higher proportion of child work as compared to households of smaller landholding size.

The types of households with the incidence of child work have been presented in Table 4.76. It has been observed that at the state level incidence of child work is the highest among the agricultural labour households (5.2%) followed by households self-employed in agriculture (3.8%) and then in households self-employed in non-farm activities (2.4%). In the
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Eastern Haryana Plains incidence of child work is higher in households self-employed in agriculture (5.7%) than in households self-employed in non-farm activities (3.4%). In the Western Haryana Plains it is found only in agricultural labour households (10.2%). Interestingly, majority (80%) of the girls engaged in household chores from the 'others' social group belong to households which are self-employed in agriculture while 10.3% of the child work comes from households self-employed in non-farm activities and the rest belong to agricultural labour households (Table 4.77).

Hence, it has been observed that among the 'others' social group, incidence of child work is the highest among the households with large landholding size. The households with 5 to 10 acres of land are all cultivating households. Moreover, large size cultivating households account for the majority of the total child work. Further, about one-third of the child work also comes from households with marginal landholdings. Majority of these households are cultivators while one-third are agricultural labourers.

Summary

The analysis gives the following broad features. It shows that the incidence of child work is the highest in landless households and is dependent on wage labour for their income. From cultivating households, marginal households account for the highest proportion of the girl child population engaged in household chores. Majority of these households are, again, wage labour households. Wage labourers work for wages because they are landless and even if they do own land, it is not enough to be sufficient to provide livelihood. Surprisingly, incidence of child work is substantial in households of large landholding size (5 to 10 acre of land), which are all cultivators. These cultivating households have a large asset base (land) and hence their income level would also be better than the households with less or no land, yet a large proportion of girls from these households work on household chores and are not sent to school. It can be assumed from the analysis that girls in households with marginal landholding work at home and do not attend school because of the low economic status of the households. Since the girls look after the chores at home, it frees the mother to go out and work for wages. In this sense, work performed at home by girl children indirectly contributes to the economic welfare of the household.

At the social group level, the incidence of child work is the highest in SC group as compared to OBC and 'others' social groups across all land size categories. Incidence of
child work has been observed in landless and marginal households for SC and OBC social group, with proportion of SC child work being higher than the OBC. In case of 'others' social group, children engaged in household chores is, in majority, found in medium and large landholding households.

**Educational level of the Head of the Household with Child Work**

It is reasonable to assume that the incidence of child work within families would be a function of the educational level of the head of the household. Specifically, the more educated the head of a household, the lower is the probability of child work in that household – this argument rests on the assumption that adults with higher level of education would value the experience more and encourage their own children to attend school, thereby decreasing the probability of their being involved in child work activities.

Educational level attained by the head of the household has been taken as representing the level of education of the household. Table 4.79 indicates that of all child workers, the largest segment i.e. 80.1% come from illiterate households and another 10.2% come from where the head of the household has not completed even primary schooling. Proportion of child work progressively declines with the educational attainment of the head which is evident from the fact that only 3.4% of the child workers come from families where the heads are graduate and above. Having said this, proportion of child workers in families with higher educational level is still not negligible (3% of the total child workers who belong to these families do not go to school).

The regional level scenario conforms to the state level. In all four regions of Haryana, majority of child workers come from families where the head of the household is either illiterate or has a very low educational attainment. As the educational attainment of the head of the household increases, the proportion of child workers decreases. The exception here is Aravalli region where we do not find this inverse relationship between educational level of the head of the household and child work. In this region a large segment of the child workers (19.7%) come from households where the person heading the family is graduate and above. The next table provides the explanation in which it shows that these households own less than one acre of land and have regular salaried jobs. A deeper analysis of these households indicates that all of the households with a substantial proportion of child work belong to schedule caste social group. It has been further found (table 4.80) that across all land sizes,
proportion of child work is the highest in illiterate households than in households with literate head. This holds true for all the three social groups.

As observed earlier, incidence of child work in ‘others’ social group is substantial in large households. From table (4.90) it is further evident that all the head of the households are illiterate. This serves to highlight the importance of education of the family or the person heading the family. To elucidate further, the upper caste households with large landholdings do not send their girls to school because they themselves are illiterate.

Section VI

Economic Characteristics of Household of ‘Nowhere’ Children

Aggregated Level

Incidence of ‘nowhere’ children is observed across all landholding size categories in Haryana. The highest incidence of ‘nowhere’ children (10.7%), has been recorded in households of small landholdings (1 to 2.5 acres), followed by landless households and then those with marginal landholding. It has also been observed from table 4.91 that about 3% of the children who are neither studying nor working are from households that have landholding size of 10 acre or above. Incidence of ‘nowhere’ children across various land size categories does not follow any uniform pattern at the regional level. In the Siwalik region, incidence of ‘nowhere’ children is the highest among the households of medium landholding followed by households of small landholding size. In the Eastern Haryana Plains, incidence of ‘nowhere’ children is the highest in the landless households (21%) followed by households of small landholding size (12.8%). In the Aravalli region, a similar level of incidence (9%) is observed in households with marginal and small landholdings. The Western Haryana Plains is the only region in Haryana where households with ‘very large’ landholdings have about 7% of the children neither working nor studying. A similar proportion of ‘nowhere’ children has been recorded in the landless households as well. Hence, we find that children who are neither in school nor at work out of total child population come from all land size categories.

Distribution of ‘nowhere’ children across land size categories indicates that majority (51%) of the ‘nowhere’ children in Haryana belong to households of marginal landholding category followed by households with small landholding size. Across regions a similar pattern of distribution of ‘nowhere’ children across land size classes has been observed,
except in the Siwalik region where 71% of the 'nowhere' children belong to households with small landholdings.

The following sub-section has been devoted to discuss the type of work that the households of the 'nowhere' children are engaged in. Table 4.92 indicates that at the aggregated level, non-agriculture labour households have the highest proportion of 'nowhere' children to child population (18.4%). The second highest incidence of 'nowhere' children (9%) has been observed among the agricultural labour households, followed by households self-employed in non-farm activities (8.7%). Similar to the state level pattern, across regions, highest incidence of 'nowhere' children has been observed in non-agriculture labour households followed by agricultural labour households. In fact, majority (about 60%) of the 'nowhere' children in Haryana belong to the households that are dependent on daily wages. About 25% of the 'nowhere' children belong to households self-employed in non-farm activities while 16.5% belong to households self-employed in agriculture. Across regions as well, a majority of the 'nowhere' children belong to labour households followed by households self-employed in agriculture and non-agricultural activities.

Thus, prevalence of 'nowhere' children at the aggregated level in Haryana has been observed in landless or marginal landholdings classes and households with small landholdings (one to 2.5 acres of land). Further, majority of the 'nowhere' children belong to households that are dependent on daily wages. This provides evidence that economic vulnerability of a household is associated with higher levels of children who are neither in school nor working. However, prevalence of 'nowhere' children is also observed in the higher land size categories i.e. in households owning 2.5 to 5 acres of land and 10 acres or above. Moreover, occurrence of 'nowhere' children is also observed in households who are self-employed which have more or less stable income unlike daily wage labour households. Children in these households are neither studying nor working not because of economic reasons but these might be children who are waiting to get married or have no specific aim in life because of lack of opportunities. They do not work because the household is well-off enough to support itself.

Another very important determinant of schooling is parents education and especially among the economically better-off households where non-attendance in school is not poverty
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9 It is observed in the earlier chapter which deals with the incidence of 'nowhere' children that, 5% of 'nowhere' children are girls and 6.6% are boys.
driven. In such households which are economically well-off, whether a child goes to school or not will be greatly determined by the value given to education. The following sub section analyses the educational level of the head of the households of the ‘nowhere’ children. Parents education is also analysed by land size owned to gather evidence on the hypothesis that incidence of ‘nowhere’ children from higher land size owning households is associated with education of the head of the household.

**Educational Level of the Head of the Household of ‘Nowhere’ Children**

61% of the ‘nowhere’ children in Haryana belong to households whose head are illiterate and another 23% belong to households in which parents have completed primary schooling. Across regions, the Eastern and the Western Haryana Plains conform to the State level pattern of parents’ educational level of the ‘nowhere’ children. In the Aravalli region, one-third of the ‘nowhere’ children belong to households where parents have completed primary schooling and another third belong to households where parents are illiterate. Further, 11.5% and 15.5% of the ‘nowhere’ children belong to households where parents have completed secondary schooling or are graduates and above respectively. Table 4.95(a) indicates that such households (where heads have a relatively higher level of education) have less than one acre of land. Consequently in these households a child might not be going to school because of the poor economic condition. On the other hand, parents of almost all the ‘nowhere’ children from households of large landholding size class are illiterate. Though, these households are economically well-off their children do not attend school probably because the illiterate parents are not aware of the value of education. Illiteracy of the parents, thus, affects the attendance status of the child even if the child belongs to economically well-off households.

**Economic Characteristics of Households of ‘Nowhere’ Children – Schedule caste**

Among the schedule caste group, incidence of ‘nowhere’ children (8.5%) has been observed only in households with less than one acre of land. Across regions as well almost all children who neither go to school nor work belong to marginal land owning households. Incidence of ‘nowhere’ children among these households range from 7.9% in the Eastern Haryana Plains to about 11% in the Western Haryana plains (Table 4.96).

With respect to the **household type** it has been observed that the households engaged in non-agricultural labour activities have the highest proportion of ‘nowhere’ children in their
total child population (21.2%). The second highest incidence of ‘nowhere’ children (7.7%) has been observed in agriculture labour households. Across regions as well, incidence of ‘nowhere’ children is higher in non-agricultural labour households as compared to agriculture labour households. Further, half of the ‘nowhere’ children in Haryana belong to agricultural labour households while the other half belong to non-agriculture labour households (Table 4.99). Thus, prevalence of ‘nowhere’ children among the schedule caste segment is observed in economically vulnerable households which have a very small asset base and are dependent on daily wages for their income.

Coupled with the low economic base in terms of land and capital, majority of the ‘nowhere’ children also belong to households that are low in educational level. About 70% of the ‘nowhere’ children belong to households that are headed by illiterate persons, followed by 15.3% of these children belong to headed by parents educated only up to primary level. An interesting observation (that is seen from Table 4.100) is that parents of about 15% of ‘nowhere’ children are graduates and above, yet these children do not go to school. An explanation to this can be attempted if their economic background is observed. All such households own less than one acre of land thus, indicating that due to low economic base, parents are unable to send their children to school. Hence, it has been observed that among the schedule caste segment, children are neither studying nor working because of distress as all these children belong to households which are economically weak in terms of land, financial as well as human capital.

Economic Characteristics of Households of ‘Nowhere’ Children – Other Backward Caste

The landholding size of the households with the incidence of ‘nowhere’ children is presented in Table 4.102. It has been observed that the proportion of ‘nowhere’ children to total child population is similar (13%) in both landless and small landholding households. Further, about 9.7% of the children in the households with medium landholding (2.5 to 5 acres) are neither studying nor working. Hence, it is observed that at the state level, incidence of ‘nowhere’ children is higher in landless households as well as in households with small and medium landholding sizes. Across regions, in Siwalik and Aravalli, incidence of ‘nowhere’ children is the highest among the households with small landholding size (1 to 2.5 acres) followed by households with marginal landholding size (less than one acre). The Aravalli region also has about 5% of the children from households with large landholding size who neither study nor work. In the Eastern Haryana Plains, 38.4% of the children from
the landless households do not go to school nor do they work. A high level of incidence (36.7%) is also observed among the households with 2.5 to 5.00 acres of landholding size in this region. Furthermore, about 50% of the ‘nowhere’ children in Haryana belong to households with less than one acre of land, about 22% belong to landless households and a similar proportion (20%) belong to households with 1 to 2.5 acres of land. Hence, among the OBC segment majority of the ‘nowhere’ children in Haryana and its regions belong to households with small size of landholding or landless households. The only exception is the Eastern Haryana Plains where about 19% of the ‘nowhere’ children belong to households with relatively larger landholding size (2.5 to 5 acres).

With regards to the household type, the incidence of ‘nowhere’ children, it has been observed that the proportion of children who are neither study nor work to total child population is very high among the non-agricultural labour households (26.5%) followed by agricultural labour households (10.6%). High level of incidence of ‘nowhere’ children (8.3%) has also been observed among the households self-employed in non-farm activities. Across regions, the proportion of ‘nowhere’ children to total children is the highest among the households dependent on daily wages. In the Eastern Haryana Plains and the Aravalli region a high level of incidence has also been observed in self-employed households where relative stability in income is higher than the daily wage labour households.

A look at the distribution of the ‘nowhere’ children across household type presents the following pattern (Table 4.1). Firstly, children who neither study nor work are distributed more or less evenly across households of all livelihood categories. But if we club the agriculture labour households and non-agriculture labour households, we find that about 66% of the ‘nowhere’ children belong to households that are dependent on daily wages for their income. Secondly, 34% of the ‘nowhere’ children also belong to self-employed households where income is more or less stable. Thirdly, Eastern Haryana Plains is the only region where about two-fifth of the ‘nowhere’ children belong to self-employed households. In the other regions majority of the ‘nowhere’ children belong to labour households.

The educational level of the parents’ of the ‘nowhere’ children, from the OBC social group, seems to be related with the attendance status of these children. Parents of 56% of the ‘nowhere’ children in Haryana are illiterate. Among the literate parents about 26% have primary schooling while parents of 11.3% are literate but below primary. About 6.9% of the ‘nowhere’ children also belong to households whose heads have secondary and higher
secondary education. Across regions, parents of the majority of the ‘nowhere’ children are illiterate or have a very low level of education. Further, we find that OBC ‘nowhere’ children from economically vulnerable households (landless, marginal and small farmers, wage labour) are headed by illiterate parent or parents with very low level of education. On the other hand, incidence of ‘nowhere’ children has also been observed among economically stable households i.e. those households who own larger size of land and have regular income (self-employed). Children from these households do not go to school not because of economic disability but possibly because their parents are illiterate or have very low level of education [Table 4.106(a)]. Such types of households are present in the Eastern Haryana Plains.

Thus, it has been observed that among the OBC’s segment, about 90% of the ‘nowhere’ children belong to economically vulnerable households (i.e. wage labour households who are landless, own marginal or small landholdings). Further, 10% of the ‘nowhere’ children belong to households that have medium landholdings (2.5 to 5 acres). Level of incidence of ‘nowhere’ children is observed to be high in larger land size categories and self-employed households. It is important to add here that households that are engaged in self employment in non-agricultural activities in majority are also marginal and small farmers. Hence, we cannot rule out distress element for non-attendance in school in these self-employed households. The households self-employed in agriculture, on the other hand, are households with medium landholding size (2.5 to 5 acres) which are relatively better-off in terms of asset base. Chances are that children in these households do not go to school not because of distress but other non-economic factors.

**Economic Characteristics of Household of ‘Nowhere’ Children – ‘Others’**

In reference to landholding size, it is evident from the available data (table 4.107) that the proportion of ‘nowhere’ children to total child population is the highest (12%) in the households with small size of landholding. Interestingly, among the very large landholding households about 3% of the children neither studies nor work. Across regions, in Siwalik and the Eastern Haryana Plains, high incidence of ‘nowhere’ children is observed in households with small landholdings. On the other hand, in Western Haryana Plains, proportion of ‘nowhere’ children to total child population is high among households with medium landholdings (9.4%) and very large landholdings (6.9%).
Further we observe that at the state level, 72% of the ‘nowhere’ children belong to households that own 1 to 2.5 acres of land, 12% belong to households with 2.5 to 5.00 acres of land while 16% belong to households with 10 and above acres of land. Across regions, in the Siwalik and the Eastern Haryana Plains, majority of the ‘nowhere’ children belong to households with small size of landholding while in the Western Haryana Plains, half of the ‘nowhere’ children belong to households that are medium and very large landowners.

All the children who are neither studying nor working from the ‘others’ segment belong to self-employed households. Proportion of ‘nowhere’ children to total child population in Haryana is relatively high in households self-employed in non-farm activities (15.3%) as compared to households self-employed in agriculture (2.6%). A similar pattern of higher level of incidence of ‘nowhere’ children in households self-employed in non-agricultural activities as compared to those self-employed in agriculture is observed across regions as well (Table 4.109). Further, half of the ‘nowhere’ children in rural Haryana belong to households self-employed in agriculture while the other half belong to households self-employed in non-agricultural activities. Across regions, in the Siwalik and the Western Haryana Plains all the sample children who neither study nor work belong to households that are self-employed in agriculture while in the Eastern Haryana Plains majority of ‘nowhere’ children belong to households self-employed in non-agricultural activities. Moreover, three-fifth of the households with incidence of ‘nowhere’ children are headed by illiterate individuals while the rest (39%) have a very low level of education.

Thus, we find that majority of the children who are study nor work in the ‘others’ segment belong to households of small landholding size who are self-employed. Further, it is also observed that one-third of the ‘nowhere’ children also belong to households of medium (2.5 to 5 acres) and very large landholding size (10 acre and above) i.e. the size of land cultivated is relatively high. These households are headed by illiterate individuals at the state as well as at the regional level.

To conclude it can be said that at the aggregated level, majority of the ‘nowhere’ children in rural Haryana and its regions belong to economically poor households. The economic vulnerability of these households is reflected in their landlessness, very small size of land owned and dependence on daily wages. This provides evidence that economic vulnerability is associated with higher level of ‘nowhere’ children. Across social groups, among the SC segment all the ‘nowhere’ children belong to economically susceptible
households where distress element for non-attendance in school and lack of opportunity to work is evident. In the OBC and 'others' segment as well, majority of the 'nowhere' children belong to economically vulnerable households.

It is important to add here that the above analysis may indicate that economic vulnerability is the reason for the children not going to school but it does not mean that this vulnerability is the only or single major cause of non-attendance in school. Children who are neither studying nor working/doing nothing also come from households that are not economically weak (i.e. households with landholding size of 10 acres and above and self-employed households where income is generally stable). Interestingly, majority of these well-off households belong to the 'others' social group and persons heading these household are all illiterates. Children from such households do not work because the household is well-off enough and the social status will not even allow them to help at home. These children do not go to school possibly because their parents are illiterate and thus do not realise the value of education. Another plausible reason could also be that there is no school in the village beyond a certain level of education. It is evident that non attendance in school of 'nowhere' children from economically well-off households is definitely not distress induced but due to other non-economic factors.

Conclusion

The preceding analysis of the economic characteristics of households of working children and 'nowhere' children presents us with the following observations. Firstly, the group which contributes a majority of child labour is schedule caste households that own less than one acre of land and work for daily wages. Children in these households predominantly work for daily wages as agricultural labourers and are located in the Eastern and the Western Haryana Plains. Secondly, the child labour from the OBC group is almost exclusively drawn from households that own less than one acre of land. However, unlike schedule caste households, most of these children help out on their own farms which affect the employment pattern of the OBC child labourers. OBC child labourers predominantly are found in the Aravalli region of Haryana. Thirdly, the lowest proportion of child labour comes from the 'others' social group. Majority of the child labourers from this group come from those households who own 2.5 to 5 acres of land and are cultivators. Children from these households work as casual labourers in non-farm sector of the Siwalik region. Fourthly,
significantly it is observed that a majority of the child labourers (from all three social groups) belong to families where the head is illiterate or has a very low educational attainment.

With respect to the economic characteristics of households of children engaged in household chores it is observed that the incidence of child work is the highest in landless households which are dependent on wage labour for their income. From cultivating households, marginal households account for the highest proportion of the girl child population engaged in household chores. Majority of these households are, again, wage labour households. These households belong to the schedule caste social group and are found in the Eastern Haryana Plains. In all the regions, except Siwalik, child work mainly comes from SC social group with the above economic characteristics. Similarly, in the OBC social group, which has a lower proportion of child work than the SC social group, it is observed that child work comes from households that are landless or own one acre of land and are predominantly agricultural labourers. In contrast, among the ‘others’ social group majority of child work comes from households that own 5 to 10 acres of land and are cultivating households. This is true at state level but at the regional level only the Eastern Haryana Plains conform to the state picture. In the Western Haryana Plains, a majority of child work comes from households that own less than one acre of land and are agricultural labourer households. It is further observed that across all three social groups, child work comes from households that are headed by illiterate persons or persons with very low educational attainment. Hence, low level of education of the individuals who are head of the households might explain the incidence of child work households where economic base (i.e. land) is large.

Prevalence of ‘nowhere’ children at the aggregated level in Haryana is observed in landless or households with marginal landholdings size and with small landholdings (one to 2.5 acres). Further, majority of the ‘nowhere’ children belong to households that are dependent on daily wages. Thus, this provides evidence that economic vulnerability of a household is associated with higher levels of children who are ‘nowhere’. Within the social group, the incidence of ‘nowhere’ children is higher than the average in the SC and the OBC social groups. The ‘Others’ segment has the lowest incidence of ‘nowhere’ children of all social groups. Among the SC segment all the ‘nowhere’ children belong to economically susceptible households where distress element for non-attendance in school and lack of opportunity to work is evident. In the OBC and ‘others’ segment as well, majority of the ‘nowhere’ children belong to economically vulnerable households.
The analysis may indicate that economic and social vulnerability of the household is the key reason for the children working as labourers, in household chores and for children who are doing apparently nothing, i.e. they neither go to school nor work, but it does not mean that this vulnerability is the only or single major cause of non-attendance in school. 'Nowhere' children and children who are engaged in household chores sometimes also come from households that are not socially and economically weak\(^{10}\). Interestingly, majority of these households belong to the 'others' social group and headed by illiterate individuals. Children from such households do not work for wages (in case of 'nowhere' children) because the household is well-off enough and the social status will not even allow them to help at home. These children do not go to school possibly because their parents are illiterate and thus do not value the experience of education. It is evident that non-attendance in school of children engaged in domestic duties and 'nowhere' children from the higher social groups who are economically well-off households is definitely not distress induced but non-attendance is due to other non-economic factors.

Thus, we have some evidence for the link between economic characteristics of households and child labour. It has been observed that majority of child labour and child work belongs to socially and economically backward households i.e. SC, who own less than one acre of land, are agricultural labourers and are mostly illiterate. These are households who own insufficient land and have high level of poverty\(^{11}\) which induces their children (mainly boys) into the labour force and their girl children into household chores; both form of work negatively affect their education.

\(^{10}\) Households of the social group designated as 'others' with landholding size of 10 acres and above and are self-employed households where income is generally stable.

\(^{11}\) Poverty level of the households with child labour across social group is discussed in the next chapter.