

## CHAPTER 4

### A SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROFILE OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS IN KOKRAJHAR DISTRICT

#### 4.0 Introduction

This chapter deals with the basic features of child labour households. Since it is an empirical survey exploring to analyse the plight of children working in the informal sector, certain slums which were identified for the purpose of improvement under various schemes and spread over 7 Municipal Circles of Kokrajhar district were chosen. The survey was conducted in the selected slums of Kokrajhar district with the assumption that a majority of working children in the urban informal sector live in the slums dwellings. In order to understand the profile of working children, it was thought to approach the households supplying the working children. Generally, the decision to send children to the labour market would be taken by the elders in the households rather than children themselves. The basic characteristics of the households, therefore, are expected to have a greater bearing on the urban labour force, particularly that comprises of child labour.

A total of 300 households were selected from 25 slums in seven municipal circles covering Kokrajhar district. Care was taken to ensure that every household comprised a child worker either boy or girl or both. A majority of the dwelling places of these households were owned while some others were occupied on a rental basis, the monthly rent paid being very nominal at the rate of Rs.80 to Rs.400. All the inhabitants in a particular locality were closely related or acquainted with one another for a long time. Caste-based localities are a common feature in the slums. Therefore, the localities with all the major castes in the downtrodden strata of Indian caste-system were surveyed to draw a representative sample.

An important feature observed in the survey was that all the child workers were living in nuclear families. Houses in slum areas were congested with small rooms occupied by a number of families having been related to one another. They share

common area for living purposes but have separate kitchens. Many of them did not prefer to live in the joint family, which meant sharing a common kitchen, as they desired more independent life. The fact that children chosen for sample study belonged to the nuclear families lends support to the idea that economic necessity of the poor families compels the children to undertake work at an early age.

#### 4.1 Caste-Wise Households

Indian society is caste and community-based. The general assumption is that a majority of the slum-dwellers will be from the disadvantaged sections or lower castes/communities, because many of them live below the poverty line. Hence data were collected on this variable. Data relating to distribution of caste-wise households of the study area are presented in Table 4.1. The households were predominantly inhabited by Muslims in the Municipal Circles of one and two and the rest of the circles were inhabited by a large proportion of people belonging to the Scheduled Castes and Backward Classes. In some other clusters, people belonging to Scheduled Tribes were found living in large numbers. In the category of 'other castes', people of *Vaisyas* and Reddys who were supplying child workers were found living along with the deprived castes of slum dwellers in some areas of the identified slum localities.

**Table 4.1**  
**Caste-Wise Distribution of Sample Households and Population**

Sl. No.	Caste/Community	No. of Households	%	Total Population	%	Household Size
1.	Scheduled Castes	77	25.67	527	25.05	6.84
2.	Scheduled Tribes	58	19.33	411	19.53	7.08
3.	Backward Castes	67	22.33	434	20.63	6.48
4.	Muslim Community	86	28.67	674	32.03	7.84
5.	Other Castes	12	4.00	58	2.76	4.83
<b>Total</b>		<b>300</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2104</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>7.01</b>

As can be noted from Table 4.1, of the total number of 300 households, 28.67% belonged to the Muslim Community, 25.67% to the Scheduled Castes, 22.3% to Backward Classes and 19.33% to the Scheduled Tribes. The average size of households was the highest (i.e., 7.84) in the Muslim Community followed by those of Scheduled Tribes (i.e., 7.08) and the Scheduled Castes (i.e., 6.84). The lowest average size of households was recorded in the category of 'other castes'. Since the number of households and the population were very less in this category, a comparison with other caste community households in respect of various aspects examined in the study did not yield any substantial inferences. Hence data of 'Other Caste' households were ignored. Thus, it can be stated that the study area was predominantly inhabited by Muslims, Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Backward Castes.

## **4.2 Gender-Wise Population**

Gender is another important variable in population analysis. Particularly with reference to child labourers, it is important to know whether there is any gender-based preference in sending children to do work outside home. The data pertaining to the gender-wise distribution of population in the sample households of various caste communities is presented in Table 4.2. As revealed by the table in the caste-community households, male population over numbered the female population. The children above the age of 6 years were considered for the purpose of the study, as the children who were 5 years and below in age were too young to be taken as workers. The population of girls to adult female population (41.4%) is more than that of boys (40.8%) and this feature was common to almost all the caste-group households. That is, the population of female children in these households was slightly higher than that of male children.

## **4.3 Work-Participation Rate**

The proportion of child workers to both total workers and child population is another variable. The particular of data in this respect are presented in Table 4.3. The proportion of children to workers is 34% for boys and 35% for girls. The proportion of girl workers to adult female workers is the highest in the Scheduled Castes (39.3%) followed by Scheduled Tribes (35.8%) and it is lowest in Backward Castes (30.9%). Likewise, the proportion of boy workers to adult male workers is the highest in the

**Table 4.2**  
**Gender-Wise Distribution of Sample Population**

Sl. No.	Caste/ Community	Gender	Children	Adults	Total
1.	Scheduled Caste	Male	112 (41.9)	155 (58.1)	267 (100)
		Female	97 (42.9)	129 (57.9)	226 (100)
		Total	209 (42.9)	284 (57.6)	493 (100)
2.	Scheduled Tribes	Male	84 (40.0)	126 (60.0)	210 (100)
		Female	73 (41.3)	102 (58.3)	175 (100)
		Total	157 (40.8)	228 (59.2)	385 (100)
3.	Backward Castes	Male	87 (39.4)	134 (60.6)	221 (100)
		Female	71 (39.0)	111 (61.0)	182 (100)
		Total	158 (39.2)	245 (60.8)	403 (100)
4.	Muslim Community	Male	142 (42.0)	192 (58.0)	338 (100)
		Female	122 (42.1)	168 (57.9)	290 (100)
		Total	264 (42.0)	364 (58.0)	628 (100)
5.	Other Castes	Male	15 (34.9)	28 (65.1)	43 (100)
		Female	12 (37.4)	20 (62.5)	32 (100)
		Total	27 (36.0)	48 (64.0)	75 (100)
<b>Total</b>	<b>Total</b>	Male	440 (40.8)	639 (59.2)	<b>1079</b> <b>(100)</b>
		Female	375 (41.4)	530 (58.6)	<b>905</b> <b>(100)</b>
		<b>Total</b>	<b>815</b> <b>(41.1)</b>	<b>1169</b> <b>(58.9)</b>	<b>1984</b> <b>(100)</b>

Muslim Community (34.9%) followed by Backward Castes (34.8%) and it is the lowest in the Scheduled Tribes (32.6%). In other words, in total female workers, girls' participation is more from the Scheduled Caste households and similarly in the total male workers, boys participation is more in Muslim and Backward Caste households.

**Table 4.3**  
**Work-Force Participation Rates of Child Labour**

Sl. No.	Caste/ Community	Percentage of Child Workers to Total Workers			Percentage of Child Workers to Child Population (6-14)		
		Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
1.	Scheduled Caste	33.3	39.3	36.3	53.6	66.0	59.8
2.	Scheduled Tribes	32.6	35.8	34.2	53.6	54.3	53.9
3.	Backward Castes	34.8	30.9	32.9	52.9	47.9	50.4
4.	Muslim Community	34.9	34.5	34.7	57.7	58.2	57.9
5.	Other Castes	33.3	40.0	36.7	40.0	50.0	45.0
<b>Total</b>		<b>34.0</b>	<b>35.5</b>	<b>34.8</b>	<b>54.3</b>	<b>56.8</b>	<b>55.6</b>

The percentage of girl workers in children (56.8%) is higher than that of boy workers (54.3%) and tendency is found in almost all caste-community households except Backward Castes. This percentage of girls is highest in the Scheduled Castes (66%) followed by the Muslim Community (58.2%) and it is the lowest in Backward Caste (47.9%) households. Likewise, the percentage of boy workers in total male children is the highest in the Muslim Community (57.7%) followed by the Scheduled Castes and Tribes (53.6% each) and the lowest in Backward Caste (52.9%) households. This means that the proportion of girls in workforce when their percentage is considered in total female workers and in total female children is the highest in the Scheduled Caste households and the lowest in Backward Caste households. In the case of boys, their participation in workforce is highest in Muslim Community households. Though boys outnumbered girls in population, girls outnumbered boys among child workers. As a result, the proportion of girls to female workers and female children stand at 35.5% and 56.8% respectively, whereas for boys the corresponding figures are 34% and 54.3% respectively. Further, the share of child

labour in total workers is more than one third (34.8%) and its share in child population is more than half (55.6%).

#### 4.4 Household Size and Child Labour

The proportion of child labour in relation to the household size is another parameter considered in this study. The details of data on this parameter are presented in Tables 4.4 and 4.5 for boys and girls respectively.

**Table 4.4**  
**Household Size and Boy Workers**

Sl. No.	House hold Size	Number of Boy Workers											
		SC	%	ST	%	BC	%	MS	%	Others	%	Total	%
1.	2	1	1.7	-	-	1	2.2	-	-	-	-	2	0.8
2.	3	1	1.7	-	-	2	4.3	-	-	-	-	3	1.3
3.	4	2	3.3	3	6.7	-	-	3	3.7	3	50.0	11	4.6
4.	5	3	5.0	5	11.1	5	10.9	2	2.4	3	50.0	18	7.5
5.	6	9	15.0	3	6.7	3	6.5	12	14.6	-	-	27	11.3
6.	7	15	25.0	10	22.2	8	17.4	13	15.9	-	-	46	19.2
7.	8	19	31.5	12	26.7	8	17.4	17	20.7	-	-	56	23.4
8.	9	10	16.6	8	17.8	11	23.9	17	20.7	-	-	46	19.2
9.	10	-	-	4	8.9	8	17.4	8	9.8	-	-	20	8.4
10.	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	12.2	-	-	10	4.2
<b>Total</b>		<b>60</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>r</b>		<b>0.84</b>		<b>0.38</b>		<b>0.89</b>		<b>0.50</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>0.49</b>	

r = coefficient of correlation

As can be noted from these two tables, for all the caste community households, the work participation of children is positively correlated with the size of households. In other words, as the size of household increased, the work participation rate of children also increased. For instance, in the Scheduled Castes households, while 6.7% of boy workers were drawn from the households with a size of upto 4, 40% of boy workers came from the household size of 6 and 7. And in Backward Caste households 23.9% of the boy workers belonged to the household size of upto 6 and the rest of 76.1% of boys were drawn from the household size that varied between 7 and 10. In Muslim Community, just 6.1% of boys belonged to the household size of 4 and 5, but more than half the boys (51.2%) were drawn from the household size of 8 and 10. The

coefficient of correlation is the highest in Backward Caste households (0.89) and the lowest in Scheduled Tribe households (0.38). The degree of magnitude is less in the Scheduled Tribes as compared to that of other caste households.

**Table 4.5**  
**Household Size and Girl Workers**

Sl. No.	House hold Size	Number of Girl Workers											
		SC	%	ST	%	BC	%	MS	%	Others	%	Total	%
1.	2	2	3.1	-	-	3	8.8	-	-	-	-	5	2.3
2.	3	2	3.1	3	7.9	4	11.8	-	-	-	-	9	4.2
3.	4	1	1.6	2	5.3	8	23.5	5	7.0	2	33.3	18	8.6
4.	5	3	4.7	-	-	-	-	12	16.9	1	16.7	16	7.5
5.	6	14	21.9	8	21.1	8	23.5	11	15.3	3	50.0	44	20.7
6.	7	21	32.8	5	13.2	5	14.7	3	4.2	-	-	34	15.9
7.	8	11	17.2	12	31.6	6	17.6	14	19.7	-	-	43	20.2
8.	9	10	15.6	8	21.0	-	-	6	8.5	-	-	24	11.3
9.	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	16.9	-	-	12	5.6
10.	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	11.3	-	-	8	3.8
<b>Total</b>		<b>64</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>r</b>		<b>0.69</b>		<b>0.78</b>		<b>0.44</b>		<b>0.09</b>		<b>0.50</b>		<b>0.25</b>	

As per Table 4.5, the coefficient of correlation for girls workers in respect of household size is the highest in Scheduled Tribe households (0.78) and lowest in Muslim households (0.09). In the Scheduled Tribe households, 13.2% of girls have come from the household size of 3 and 4, 34.3% girls from the household size of 6 and 7 while the rest of 52.6% of girls were drawn from the household size of 8 and 9. A consistent correlation is observed in the distribution of girl workers among different sizes of households. Whereas in Muslim households, 23.9% of girls were drawn from the household size of 4 and 5, 39.4% of girls from the household size of 6 to 8 and rest of 36.7% of girls belong to the household size of 9 to 11. That is, a consistent increase in work participation of girls with increase in the size of households is not observed in the Muslim community.

When compared with boy workers, it can be noted that in total households, while 15.1% of girls were drawn from the household size of upto 4 against just 6.7% of boys, the proportion of girl workers in the household size of 9 to 11 was 20.7% as against 31.8% of boys. The coefficient of correlation for boy workers in all the caste-

community households except those of the Scheduled Tribes was higher than that of girl workers. That is, the boys take part more in the work as the size of the households increases, but it is not so with the girls. In other words, when the family size was small girls took up paid work while boys would go to school. Only when it became financially difficult to manage a family of big size, the boys were sent to work.

#### 4.5 Activity Status of the Children

Data pertaining to the activity status of the children between 6-14 years of age in term of workers and non-workers are presented in Tables 4.6 and 4.7 respectively. In table 4.6, those who are involved in full-time activity spending a major part of the day on work, are termed as full-time workers. It can be noted from the table that in the Scheduled Tribe households, all the boys were full-time workers. There were no child workers (boys or girls) in the Scheduled Tribe households where the children were combining school with work. The proportion of such children who are allowed to combine work with schooling (as part time workers) is the highest in Backward Caste households. 32.6% of the boy workers and 26.5% of the girl workers from Backward Caste households were attending school. There were some child workers who were entrusted with household chores and obviously such workers were girls. For instance, 47.0% of girl workers in Backward Castes are obliged to share household activities. In total, while the proportion of girls to combine work with schooling was less (9.4%) as compared to that of boys (12.1%), the percentage of girls who combined work with household chores was 33.3% and no boys were found to have been engaged in that activity.

Further, as can be noted from Table 4.7, among non-workers, the proportion of the boys who attended schools on a full-time basis was much more (i.e., 79.1%) than that of girls (i.e., 40.7%), but when the schooling was combined with household chores (part-time students), it was girls whose percentage was much higher (25.9% than that of boys (3%). Among all the caste/community households, the highest percentage of full-time boy student was found in Muslim Community (i.e., 86.7%) whereas for girls, the corresponding percentage was only 45.9% in Backward Caste

**Table 4.6**  
**Activity Status of Child Workers**

Sl. No.	Caste/Community	Sex	Full-time Workers	Workers/Schooling (part-time workers)	Working/Household Chores (Part-time Workers)	Total
1.	Scheduled Caste	Boys	55 (91.7)	5 (8.3)	-	60 (100)
		Girls	40 (62.5)	6 (9.4)	18 (28.1)	64 (100)
		Total	95 (76.6)	11 (8.9)	18 (18.5)	124 (100)
2.	Scheduled Tribes	Boys	45 (100)	-	-	45 (100)
		Girls	28 (73.7)	-	10 (26.3)	38 (100)
		Total	73 (87.9)	-	10 (12.1)	83 (100)
3.	Backward Castes	Boys	31 (67.4)	15 (32.6)	-	46 (100)
		Girls	9 (26.5)	9 (26.5)	16 (47.0)	34 (100)
		Total	40 (50.0)	24 (30.0)	16 (20.0)	80 (100)
4.	Muslim Community	Boys	73 (89.0)	9 (11.0)	-	82 (100)
		Girls	41 (57.7)	5 (7.0)	25 (37.2)	71 (100)
		Total	114 (74.5)	14 (9.2)	25 (16.3)	153 (100)
5.	Other Castes	Boys	6 (100)	-	-	6 (100)
		Girls	4 (66.7)	-	2 (33.3)	6 (100)
		Total	10 (83.3)	-	2 (16.7)	12 (100)
<b>Total</b>		Boys	210 (87.9)	29 (21.1)	-	<b>239</b> <b>(100)</b>
		Girls	122 (57.3)	20 (9.4)	71 (33.3)	<b>213</b> <b>(100)</b>
		<b>Total</b>	<b>332</b> <b>(73.5)</b>	<b>49</b> <b>(10.8)</b>	<b>71</b> <b>(15.7)</b>	<b>452</b> <b>(100)</b>

**Table 4.7**  
**Activity Status of Non-Workers**

Sl. No.	Caste/Community	Sex	Schooling/ (full-time students)	Schooling/ Household Chores	Look after Household Chores	Idle/Not Doing any Thing	Unable to Work	Total
1.	Scheduled Caste	Boys	41 (78.8)	3 (5.8)	-	8 (15.4)	-	52 (100)
		Girls	10 (30.3)	9 (27.3)	12 (36.4)	-	2 (6.1)	33 (100)
		Total	51 (60.0)	12 (14.1)	12 (14.1)	8 (9.4)	2 (2.4)	85 (100)
2.	Scheduled Tribes	Boys	30 (76.9)	-	3 (7.7)	4 (10.3)	2 (5.1)	39 (100)
		Girls	13 (37.1)	8 (22.9)	12 (34.3)	-	2 (5.7)	35 (100)
		Total	43 (58.1)	8 (10.8)	15 (20.3)	4 (5.4)	4 (5.4)	74 (100)
3.	Backward Castes	Boys	27 (65.9)	3 (7.3)	5 (12.2)	6 14.6	-	41 (100)
		Girls	17 (45.9)	10 (27.0)	10 (27.0)	-	-	37 (100)
		Total	44 (56.4)	13 (16.7)	15 (19.2)	6 (7.7)	-	78 (100)
4.	Muslim Community	Boys	52 (86.7)	-	-	8 (13.3)	-	60 (100)
		Girls	23 (45.1)	12 (23.5)	14 (27.5)	-	2 (4.0)	51 (100)
		Total	75 (67.6)	12 (10.8)	14 (12.6)	8 (7.2)	2 (1.8)	111 (100)
5.	Other Castes	Boys	9 (100)	-	-	-	-	9 (100)
		Girls	3 (50.0)	3 (50.0)	-	-	-	6 (100)
		Total	12 (80.0)	3 (20.0)	-	-	-	15 (100)
<b>Total</b>		Boys	159 (79.1)	6 (3.0)	8 (4.0)	26 (12.9)	2 (1.0)	<b>201</b> <b>(100)</b>
		Girls	66 (40.7)	42 (25.9)	48 (29.6)	-	6 (3.7)	<b>162</b> <b>(100)</b>
		<b>Total</b>	<b>225</b> <b>(62.0)</b>	<b>48</b> <b>(13.2)</b>	<b>56</b> <b>(15.4)</b>	<b>26</b> <b>(7.2)</b>	<b>8</b> <b>(2.2)</b>	<b>363</b> <b>(100)</b>

households. Out of the 162 non-working girls, nearly 30% of them were asked to be at home looking after siblings and other household chores including assisting the main workers to carry on their work in the household industry. A Girl is expected to contribute to the maintenance of the family by assisting her parents. Because the girls did more work at home, the family would lose more if they sent a daughter to school than if they sent a son. According to a 1995 World Bank paper on child labour, when mothers go to work in the market, girls stay at home looking after siblings and other household chores and in this way the opportunity cost of school is not the wages forgone by girls but by their mothers'.

In the total of 201 non-working boys, 26 (12.9%) boys were found doing nothing. While some parents admitted that boys were not inclined either to go to school or to go work, some others told that they could not afford to admit their sons in private schools as they did not like nearby government schools, and in the process, children had to remain idle at home. In some families of the poor, boys were idle where parents would not force them to work against their liking, but this situation was hardly found in the case of girls. As a result, no girls were found idle or not doing anything in the total sample households.

#### **4.6 Educational Status of Child Labour**

Education is an effective instrument for change. So it was considered necessary to examine the educational achievement levels of the children in the study area. The assumption was that parental interest in their children's education would act as an antidote against child labour. In view of this, the data pertaining to the child workers as per their age and educational background are presented in Table 4.8. It can be noted from the table that among the child workers below the age of 10 years, the number of girls was 26 out of 37 i.e., 70.3%. The percentage of girls within the age group varied but younger the age group, larger was the percentage of girls. This only suggests that the girls started working at any early age than the boys, but were withdrawn from employment as their age increased. When the age in terms of education was considered, it was found that the percentage of illiterate working

**Table 4.8**  
**Age-wise Educational Background of Child Workers**

Sl. No.	Age Group	Sex	Illiterate	Attending School	Dropouts		Total
					Primary	Middle	
1.	6-10	Boys	4 (36.3)	7 (63.7)	-	-	11 (100)
		Girls	14 (53.8)	12 (46.2)	-	-	26 (100)
		Total	18 (48.6)	19 (51.4)	-	-	37 (100)
2.	10-12	Boys	6 (8.9)	10 (14.9)	51 (76.1)	-	60 (100)
		Girls	12 (20.3)	4 (6.8)	43 (72.9)	-	59 (100)
		Total	18 (14.3)	14 (11.1)	94 (74.6)	-	126 (100)
3.	12-14	Boys	8 (4.9)	12 (7.5)	74 (46.0)	67 (41.6)	161 (100)
		Girls	14 (10.9)	4 (3.1)	71 (55.5)	39 (30.5)	128 (100)
		Total	22 (7.6)	16 (5.5)	145 (50.2)	106 (36.7)	289 (100)
<b>Total</b>		Boys	18 (7.5)	29 (12.1)	125 (52.3)	67 (28.0)	239 (100)
		Girls	40 (18.8)	20 (9.4)	114 (53.5)	39 (18.3)	213 (100)
		<b>Total</b>	<b>58</b> <b>(12.8)</b>	<b>49</b> <b>(10.8)</b>	<b>239</b> <b>(52.9)</b>	<b>106</b> <b>(23.5)</b>	<b>452</b> <b>(100)</b>

Average age of Boys: 12.3

Average age of Girls: 11.9

children consistently decreased with the increasing age of the children which means in general that, when children were employed at an early age, they remained illiterate. As can be expected, the girls had relatively poor educational background as compared to that of boys. The survey revealed that the percentage of illiterate girls (i.e., 18.8%) was more than two times that of illiterate boys (7.5%). The dropout rate of girl workers shows that the percentage of girls who dropped out at the primary level (53.5%) was about three times the percentage of dropouts at middle level (18.3%). Only 28% of the boy workers and 18.3% of girl workers had a relatively better education. This group of working children was able to reach the middle level of schooling. The percentage of girl and boy workers who were able to attend schools was 9.4% and 12.1% respectively. Since the majority of girls were engaged in

household industries like tailoring, *Beedi* rolling etc, when can be performed on a part-time basis, some girls found it convenient to combine work with school.

The reasons for not attending school as stated by the respondents are given in Table 4.9. Of the total child workers in the sample, 58 respondents were illiterate and 345 were dropouts. These child workers (i.e.,  $58 + 345 = 403$ ) were considered for Table 4.9. The parents of 24.8% of child workers stated that their families were too poor to afford education and another 31.5% stated that the child workers were required to supplement their inadequate family income. A significant fact to be noted in this context is that the child workers who were not able to go school due to heavy domestic work were exclusively girls. Their percentage in the total girl workers was 36.8%. The percentage of such girl workers was the highest in the Backward Castes (i.e., 64%) followed by that of Muslim households (i.e., 37.9%). The impact of poverty on gender reflects itself in the sharing by girls of heavy domestic work, which deprived them of education.

The data relating to the reasons for child workers not attending school also revealed that there are some cases where, despite the availability of schools and affordability on the part of the parents, they were not interested in their childrens' education (13.4%) for the reasons that there was no immediate returns, no guarantee for better employment and this sending children to school was a waste of time. The percentage of the boys belonging to such families was highest in Backward Castes (25.8%) followed by those from the Scheduled Tribes (17.8%) households. In the case of girl workers, the corresponding percentages were 13.8 (for SCs), 13.2 (for STs) and 12.1 (for Muslims). Even some children (i.e., 6.9%) were not inclined towards schooling saying that education served no purpose as educated children were also working along with them. The percentage of such boys was the highest in Muslim households (20.5%) followed by those from the Scheduled Castes (9.1%). In the Muslim Community, some girls (i.e., 6.1%) also expressed indifference towards education and thus joined the piece-rate wage work like *Bangle* making, *Agarbatti* making and *Zari* embroidery industries. Some respondents were not satisfied with the quality of education (i.e., 4.2%) and therefore they preferred work to school.

**Table 4.9**  
**Child Labour and Reasons for Not Attending School**

Sl. No.	Caste/Community	Sex	Family too poor	Child had to supplement family Income	Heavy domestic work	Family not interested	Child not interested	School not good	No school in the vicinity	Total
1.	Scheduled Caste	Boys	16 (29.1)	22 (40.0)	-	7 (12.7)	5 (9.1)	5 (9.1)	-	55 (100)
		Girls	12 (20.7)	15 (25.9)	18 (31.0)	8 (13.8)	-	5 (8.6)	-	58 (100)
		Total	28 (24.8)	37 (32.7)	18 (15.9)	15 (13.3)	5 (4.4)	10 (8.8)	-	113 (100)
2.	Scheduled Tribes	Boys	10 (22.2)	18 (40.0)	-	8 (17.8)	4 (8.9)	5 (11.1)	-	45 (100)
		Girls	10 (26.3)	8 (21.1)	10 (26.3)	5 (13.2)	-	2 (5.3)	3 (7.9)	38 (100)
		Total	20 (24.1)	26 (31.3)	10 (12.0)	13 (15.7)	4 (4.8)	7 (8.4)	3 (3.6)	83 (100)
3.	Backward Castes	Boys	9 (29.0)	14 (45.2)	-	8 (25.8)	-	-	-	31 (100)
		Girls	5 (20.0)	4 (16.0)	16 (64.0)	-	-	-	-	25 (100)
		Total	14 (25.0)	18 (32.1)	16 (28.6)	8 (14.3)	-	-	-	56 (100)
4.	Muslim Community	Boys	20 (27.4)	28 (38.4)	-	10 (13.7)	15 (20.5)	-	-	73 (100)
		Girls	14 (21.2)	12 (18.2)	25 (37.9)	8 (12.1)	4 (6.1)	-	3 (4.5)	66 (100)
		Total	34 (24.5)	40 (28.8)	25 (18.0)	18 (12.9)	19 (13.7)	-	3 (2.2)	139 (100)
5.	Other Castes	Boys	2 (33.3)	4 (66.7)	-	-	-	-	-	6 (100)
		Girls	2 (33.3)	2 (33.3)	2 (33.3)	-	-	-	-	6 (100)
		Total	4 (33.3)	6 (50.0)	2 (16.7)	-	-	-	-	12 (100)
<b>Total</b>		Boys	57 (27.1)	86 (45.0)	-	33 (15.7)	24 (11.4)	10 (4.8)	-	<b>210</b> <b>(100)</b>
		Girls	43 (22.3)	41 (21.2)	71 (36.8)	21 (10.9)	4 (2.1)	7 (3.6)	6 (3.1)	<b>193</b> <b>(100)</b>
		<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b> <b>(24.8)</b>	<b>127</b> <b>(31.5)</b>	<b>71</b> <b>(17.6)</b>	<b>54</b> <b>(13.4)</b>	<b>28</b> <b>(6.9)</b>	<b>17</b> <b>(4.2)</b>	<b>6</b> <b>(1.5)</b>	<b>403</b> <b>(100)</b>

According to some parents, the teachers were not serious, failed to inculcate interest in children towards education. Therefore, some of the Scheduled Caste parents (of 8.8% children) and Scheduled Tribes parents (of 8.4% children) stated that they were not convinced with the performance of Government Schools and if at all they had to get their children educated, they would prefer private schools. The parents of some girls in Muslims (4.5%) and Scheduled Tribes (7.9%) households stated that there were no schools in the vicinity. Very poor status of the households, need of the children to supplement the family income, heavy domestic work, absence of interest on the part of family as well as children, in some cases, were the main reasons for child workers not attending schools.

#### **4.7 Parental Status**

The social and living status of parents can also some times influence the child's life. It was a difficult task to solicit information regarding the marital status of the parents. In the slums, where houses were very congested with number of smaller rooms occupied by nuclear families, it was difficult to get detailed information separately for each household. The respondents were not ready to part with information particularly about the status of living parents. The child workers who were living with stepmothers were not allowed to speak whether their mothers had died or been divorced. It was only after friendly talks were held repeatedly with the respondents that some information was obtained and it is presented in Table 4.10.

As revealed in Table 4.10, a majority of the households i.e., 195 (65%) had both the parents living together. The children from 55 households (18.3%) were living with fathers and stepmothers. In this category, the percentage of households was the highest in the Scheduled Tribes (32.7%) followed by that of Muslims (19.8%) and Scheduled Castes (19.5%), where children were found living with step mother. The households, which had living mothers but no fathers were 46 (15.3%) in which the highest number of 17 households were found in the Scheduled Tribes (29.3%) followed by 14 (16.3%) Muslim households. These were the households where mothers were heading the families and thus the children were living in the women

**Table 4.10**  
**Households and living Status of Parents**

Sl. No.	Caste/Community	Both alive (living together)	Father alive (divorced / separated) living with step mother	Father alive (widower) living with step mother	Mother alive (divorced/ separated)	Mother alive (widow)	Neither alive	Total Households
1.	Scheduled Caste	52 (67.5)	9 (11.7)	6 (7.8)	4 (5.2)	6 (7.8)	-	77 (100)
2.	Scheduled Tribes	20 (34.5)	9 (15.5)	10 (17.2)	9 (15.5)	8 (13.8)	2 (3.4)	58 (100)
3.	Backward Castes	58 (86.6)	-	4 (5.9)	5 (7.5)	-	-	67 (100)
4.	Muslim Community	53 (61.6)	12 (14.0)	5 (5.8)	8 (9.3)	6 (7.0)	2 (2.2)	86 (100)
5.	Other Castes	12 (100)	-	-	-	-	-	12 (100)
<b>Total</b>		<b>195</b> <b>(65.0)</b>	<b>30</b> <b>(10.0)</b>	<b>25</b> <b>(8.3)</b>	<b>26</b> <b>(8.7)</b>	<b>20</b> <b>(6.7)</b>	<b>4</b> <b>(1.3)</b>	<b>300</b> <b>(100)</b>

headed households. These mothers were either widowed or divorced and did not marry again and were living with their children heading the family. There were few child labour households (i.e., 4) where neither of the parents was alive. Children in these households were living with guardians, mostly relatives, and working to contribute to the family income perhaps to reward their guardians for being their wardens. In most cases, these children were forced to seek employment, basically for their survival.

#### **4.8 Women Headed Households**

As mentioned above, the women heading a household were either divorced or widows. They would not head households where there were men folks even though they were the main bread earners of the family. In some households of *Padmashali* caste (i.e., BCs), the main earners were women as their men folk were rendered unemployed with the closure of spinning mills in and around the city. Nevertheless, the households were headed by their men. That is, heading a household was not

always by the main earners of the household concerned. Therefore, women head a household only in the absence of their male counterparts. The details in this respect are presented in Table 4.11

As can be noted from Table 4.11, the number of households headed by women was 46. While the proportion of women headed households was highest in the case of Scheduled Tribes (i.e., 37%) followed by Muslim households (30.4%), the proportion of men headed households was higher in Muslims (28.3%) followed by Scheduled Caste households (26.4%). In all the caste-communities, it was found that the proportion of girl workers in women headed households were more than that of boys. From the abstract given below Table 4.11, it can be found that the share of girls in the total girl workers, and share of boys in the total boy workers in the women headed households were 24.4% and 12.6% respectively. Similarly, from the total child workers of the women headed households, the proportion of girls and boys was 63.4% and 36.6% respectively. It means that the percentage of girl workers was more than that of boys in the households headed by women. The girls usually actively involved themselves in the work force where households were headed by women, because the women, working hard for the upliftment of the family, made girls work in the same way, leaving their boys to school.

#### **4.9 Parental Occupations**

It has been a general observation that the parents of working children engage themselves in economic activities such as petty business, self-employment, construction work, casual labour etc. Hence, data were collected on this variable. Details of the various occupations of parents of the working children in the sample households are presented in Table 4.12. The table reveals that the main occupation of fathers of children in a majority of households was petty business (23.3%) followed by salaried jobs (20.%) and self-employment (16%). In Scheduled Tribes, fathers of 17.2% of households were petty businessmen, and 15.5% of households each were engaged in wage employment and self-employment. In this community, the fathers of about 30% of households were not living with the children and another 10.3 percent of households were non-workers. In Muslim community, the main occupation of fathers

**Table 4.11**  
**Women Headed Households and Child Labour**

Caste Community	Women Headed Households	Workers in Women Headed Households						Men Headed Households	Workers in the Men Headed Households					
		Boys	%	Girls	%	Total	%		Boys	%	Girls	%	Total	%
Scheduled Caste	10 (21.7)	4 (28.6)	13.3	10 (71.4)	19.2	14 (100)	17.1	67 (26.4)	56 (50.9)	26.8	54 (49.1)	33.5	110 (100)	29.7
Scheduled Tribes	17 (37.0)	14 (41.2)	46.7	20 (58.8)	38.5	34 (100)	41.5	41 (16.1)	31 (63.3)	14.8	18 (36.7)	11.2	49 (100)	13.2
Backward Castes	5 (10.9)	2 (28.6)	6.7	5 (71.4)	9.6	7 (100)	8.5	62 (24.4)	44 (60.3)	21.1	29 (39.7)	18	73 (100)	19.7
Muslims	14 (30.4)	10 (37.0)	33.3	17 (63.0)	32.7	27 (100)	32.9	72 (28.3)	72 (57.1)	34.4	54 (42.9)	33.5	126 (100)	34.1
Other Castes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12 (4.7)	6 (50.0)	2.9	6 (50.0)	3.7	12 (100)	3.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>46 (100)</b>	<b>30 (36.6)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>52 (63.4)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>82 (100)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>254 (100)</b>	<b>209 (56.5)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>161 (43.5)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>370 (100)</b>	<b>100</b>

**ABSTRACT**

Category	No. of Households	Boys	%	Girls	%	Total	%
Women Headed Households	46 (15.3)	30 (36.6)	12.6	52 (63.4)	24.4	82 (100)	18.1
Men Headed Households	254 (84.7)	209 (56.5)	87.4	161 (43.5)	75.6	370 (100)	81.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>300 (100)</b>	<b>239 (52.9)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>213 (47.1)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>452 (100)</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 4.12**  
**Caste and Parental Occupational Status**

Caste/ Community	Sex	Salaried Jobs	Petty Business	Wage Empl- Oyment	Self Empl- oyment	Un- Empl- oyment	Una- ble to Work	Non- Work- ers	Not Living with Children	Not Alive	Total
Scheduled Castes	Father	17 (22.1)	20 (26.0)	8 (10.4)	12 (15.6)	4 (5.2)	2 (2.6)	4 (5.2)	10 (13.0)	-	77 (100)
	Mother	21 (27.3)	17 (22.1)	14 (18.2)	11 (14.3)	10 (13.0)	4 (5.2)	-	-	-	77 (100)
Scheduled Tribes	Father	5 (8.6)	10 (17.2)	9 (15.5)	9 (15.5)	-	-	6 (10.3)	17 (29.3)	2 (3.5)	58 (100)
	Mother	5 (8.6)	10 (17.2)	9 (15.5)	14 (24.1)	14 (24.1)	4 (6.9)	-	-	2 (3.5)	58 (100)
Backward Castes	Father	17 (25.4)	17 (25.4)	6 (9.0)	11 (16.4)	8 (11.9)	3 (4.5)	-	5 (7.5)	-	67 (100)
	Mother	15 (22.4)	17 (25.4)	11 (16.4)	10 (14.9)	12 (17.9)	2 (3.0)	-	-	-	67 (100)
Muslims	Father	16 (18.6)	19 (22.1)	10 (11.6)	16 (18.6)	4 (4.7)	-	5 (5.8)	14 (16.3)	2 (2.3)	86 (100)
	Mother	7 (8.1)	20 (23.3)	35 (40.7)	6 (7.0)	12 (14.0)	4 (4.7)	-	-	2 (2.3)	86 (100)
Others	Father	5 (41.7)	4 (33.3)	3 (25.0)	-	-	-	-	-	-	12 (100)
	Mother	-	5 (41.7)	7 (58.3)	-	-	-	-	-	-	12 (100)
<b>Total</b>	Father	60 (20.0)	70 (23.3)	36 (12.0)	48 (16.0)	16 (5.3)	5 (1.7)	15 (5.0)	46 (15.3)	4 (1.3)	<b>300</b> <b>(100)</b>
	Mother	48 (16.0)	69 (23.0)	76 (25.3)	41 (13.7)	48 (16.0)	14 (4.7)	-	-	4 (1.3)	<b>300</b> <b>(100)</b>
Salaried job	F	watchmen, truck drivers, those in furniture making industries, welding & automobile servicing industries etc.									
	M	Sweeper, domestic servants, employment in manufacturing industries, attenders in institutions etc.									
Petty Business	F	pan shops, leather work, cobblers, vending variety of wares, pottery wares making, eatable stalls etc.									
	M	knitting, mirror work, weaving broom sticks, mats, baskets, kirana stores, eatable stalls, vending fruit, vegetables etc.									
Wage Labourers	F	construction work, stone breaking, daily wage labourers etc.									
	M	construction work, stone breaking, bangle making, agarbatti making, beedi rolling etc.									
Self employment	F	rickshah pulling, auto drivers, dhobhi work, hair cutting, rag picking etc.									
	M	tailoring, dobhi work, rag picking etc.									

of majority households (22.1%) was petty business and the second major occupation was salaried jobs (18.6%) and self-employment (18.6%).

The main occupation of mother in a majority of Scheduled Caste households was salaried jobs (i.e., 27.3%), in Scheduled Tribes households it was petty business (i.e., 17.2%) and in Muslim households, it was wage employment (i.e., 40.7%). In the total number of 300 households it was found that, the fathers' occupation in a largest number of households was petty business and the mothers' occupation was wage employment. This reveals an interesting fact that mothers in general, readily would take up the available wage work to offer immediate succor to the family, whereas fathers would take time and prefer to run petty business units.

The fathers of the children in 16 households (5.3%) were unemployed, majority of whom were rendered unemployed. Another 15 households (5%) had father who were non-workers, and many of them were drunkards, vagabonds and some were wanderers. They were voluntary un-employed persons. There were altogether 46 households (15.3%) where children did not have fathers and therefore these households were headed by women.

The mothers of 48 households (16%) were unemployed persons. Unemployed mothers were the highest in Scheduled Tribes households (24.1%) followed by the Backward Castes (17.9%) and Muslim households (14%). Since these mothers were unpaid for the work they performed for the family and not doing paid work outside the family they were termed as un-employed. However, they worked round the clock attending a variety of household activities. In this way, the status of an unemployed women was completely different from that of an unemployed man.

#### **4.10 Parental Responsibility**

A general notion was that very poor conditions of the households contribute to the high incidence of child labour. However, the extent of responsibility shouldered by the parents towards the family well being also has a role in the incidence of child labour. The responsibility of the parents was measured in terms of the way they spend

their earnings, their punctuality at the work place, sensitiveness to the family requirements, commitment and hard work etc. Keeping this in view, data on the extent of responsibility of both the parents were tabulated and presented in Table 4.13. From the table it can be noted that, children from 135 households (45%) were forced to get into employment as their fathers were not the main earners of the family due to ill health, unemployment, irregular nature of employment and their irresponsible attitude towards family. Some of the casual wage labourers, rickshaw pullers, vendors and construction workers were reportedly spending their earnings for themselves, on gambling, alcohol and other unhygienic beverages. The number of households having such fathers was 17.2% in Scheduled Tribes and 15.1% in Muslim Communities. Around one-fifth of the households in the Scheduled Castes (i.e., 19.5%) and more than one-fourth households in Muslims (i.e., 26.7%) had fathers who do not work regularly. They were mostly daily wage labourers, rag pickers, hawkers and vendors and also construction workers. The fathers of more than 10% of households in all the caste-communities (10.4% in SCs, 10.3% in STs, 11.9% in BCs and 10.5% in Muslims) were totally dependent on their families as they were un-employed persons. In the total 300 households, only 115 (38.3%) had fathers who were totally responsible and sensitive to the requirements of their families.

The mothers in general would shoulder more responsibility and this can be observed from the table which shows that 43.3% of households (as against 38.3% in the case of fathers) had mothers who shouldered the total responsibility of the families and contributed their total earnings to the household income. There were no irresponsible mothers who would spend their earnings for themselves. The mothers of 48 households (16%) were totally dependent on the family, as they were able to earn nothing in the form of cash. However, their contribution to the household activities which enabled the other members to join the labour force was very important and therefore were they also equally responsible mothers as the mothers who contributed in cash to their household income. The mothers of 90 households (30%) have no regular income, as they did not get into work regularly due to several reasons that kept them away from work. Such mothers were the highest in proportion in the Backward

**Table 4.13**  
**Households and Parental Responsibility**

<b>Caste/ Community</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<b>Totally Responsible</b>	<b>Not work Regularity</b>	<b>Ill health/ unable to work</b>	<b>Spends for self (irresponsible)</b>	<b>Total dependent on the family</b>	<b>Not living with children</b>	<b>Not alive</b>	<b>Ill treat- ment</b>	<b>Total</b>
Scheduled Caste	Father	35 (45.5)	15 (19.5)	2 (2.6)	7 (9.1)	8 (10.4)	10 (13.0)	-	-	77 (100)
	Mother	40 (51.9)	20 (26.0)	4 (5.2)	-	10 (13.0)	-	-	3 (3.9)	77 (100)
Scheduled Tribes	Father	15 (25.0)	8 (13.8)	-	10 (17.2)	6 (10.3)	17 (29.3)	2 (3.4)	-	58 (100)
	Mother	20 (34.5)	13 (22.4)	4 (6.9)	-	14 (24.1)	-	2 (3.4)	5 (8.6)	58 (100)
Backward Castes	Father	30 (44.8)	16 (23.9)	3 (4.5)	5 (7.5)	8 (11.9)	5 (7.5)	-	-	67 (100)
	Mother	25 (37.3)	28 (41.8)	2 (3.0)	-	12 (17.9)	-	-	-	67 (100)
Muslims	Father	25 (29.1)	23 (26.7)	-	13 (15.1)	9 (10.5)	14 (16.3)	2 (2.3)	-	86 (100)
	Mother	38 (44.2)	24 (27.9)	4 (4.7)	-	12 (14.0)	-	2 (2.3)	6 (7.0)	86 (100)
Other Castes	Father	10 (83.3)	2 (16.7)	-	-	-	-	-	-	12 (100)
	Mother	7 (58.3)	5 (41.7)	-	-	-	-	-	-	12 (100)
<b>Total</b>	Father	115 (38.3)	64 (21.3)	5 (1.7)	35 (11.7)	31 (10.3)	46 (15.3)	4 (1.3)	-	<b>300</b> <b>(100)</b>
	Mother	130 (43.3)	90 (30.0)	14 (4.7)	-	48 (16.0)	-	4 (1.3)	14 (4.7)	<b>300</b> <b>(100)</b>

Caste households (41.8%), followed by Muslims (27.9%) and the Scheduled Caste households (26%). Finally, the mothers of 14 households (4.7%), mostly step mothers and guardians were reported to be guilty of ill-treating the children. Owing to all these reasons, children in these households were forced to work and earn for the family.

#### 4.11 Household Per Capita Income

Details of the capita income of the households including and excluding the childrens contribution are presented in Tables 4.14 and 4.15 respectively.

**Table 4.14**  
**Caste/Community and Per-Capita Income of Households with Child Labour Contribution**

Per Capita Income of Households (Rs.)	Scheduled Caste Hhds.		Scheduled Tribe Hhds.		Backward Caste Hhds.		Muslim Community Hhds.		Other Caste Hhds.		Total Hhds	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
150-200	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	4.7	-	-	4	1.3
200-250	2	2.6	-	-	-	-	2	2.3	-	-	4	1.3
250-300	1	1.3	4	6.9	6	8.9	1	1.2	-	-	12	4.0
300-350	3	3.9	6	10.3	7	10.4	5	5.8	2	16.7	23	7.7
350-400	11	14.3	12	20.7	10	15.0	15	17.4	2	16.7	50	16.7
400-450	14	18.2	8	13.8	18	26.9	19	22.1	2	16.7	61	20.3
450-500	4	5.2	7	12.1	12	17.9	12	14.0	3	25.0	38	12.7
500-550	10	12.9	4	6.9	6	8.9	14	16.3	3	25.0	37	12.3
550-600	10	12.9	6	10.3	4	6.0	9	10.5	-	-	29	9.7
600-650	3	3.9	2	3.4	1	1.5	5	5.8	-	-	11	3.7
650-700	2	2.6	6	10.3	1	1.5	-	-	-	-	9	3.0
700-750	8	10.4	3	5.2	2	3.0	-	-	-	-	13	4.3
750-800	6	7.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	2.0
800-850	3	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Avg. Income (Rs.)</b>	<b>530.10</b>		<b>471.00</b>		<b>437.20</b>		<b>443.00</b>		<b>438.20</b>		<b>469.00</b>	
<b>SD</b>	<b>136.50</b>		<b>130.00</b>		<b>101.00</b>		<b>107.00</b>		<b>71.00</b>		<b>128.50</b>	
<b>CV</b>	<b>25.75</b>		<b>27.60</b>		<b>23.10</b>		<b>24.15</b>		<b>16.20</b>		<b>27.40</b>	

SD=Standard Deviation.

CV=Coefficient of Variation

As per Table 4.14, the proportion of households belonging to higher per capita income of Rs.700 and above is the highest in the Scheduled Castes (22.2%) followed by the Scheduled Tribes (5.2%) and the Backward Classes (3%). There were no households with per capita income above Rs.650 in Muslim Community. Therefore

the proportion of households belonging to low per capita income group of Rs.300 and below was the highest in Backward Classes (8.9%) followed by the Muslims (8.2%) and the Scheduled Tribes (6.9%). In all the caste-communities, a majority of households belonged to the per capita income between Rs. 350 and Rs.450. Their proportion was 32.5% in SCs, 34.5% in STs, 41.9% in BCs and 39.5% in Muslims.

**Table 4.15**  
**Caste/Community and Per-Capita Income of Households without Child Labour Contribution**

Per Capita Income of households (Rs.)	Scheduled Caste Hhds.		Scheduled Tribe Hhds.		Backward Caste Hhds.		Muslim Community Hhds.		Other Caste Hhds.		Total Hhds	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
100-150	3	3.9	4	6.9	2	3.0	6	7.0	-	-	15	5.0
150-200	5	6.5	5	8.6	3	4.5	3	3.5	-	-	16	5.3
200-250	15	19.5	6	10.3	2	3.0	4	4.7	4	33.3	31	10.3
250-300	10	12.9	9	15.5	10	14.9	19	22.1	1	8.3	49	16.3
300-350	6	7.8	12	20.7	11	16.4	23	26.7	2	16.7	54	18.0
350-400	5	6.5	10	19.0	22	34.3	9	10.5	2	16.7	48	16.0
400-450	9	11.7	8	13.8	12	17.9	9	10.5	3	25.0	41	13.7
450-500	8	10.4	2	3.4	5	7.5	4	4.6	-	-	19	6.3
500-550	4	5.2	2	3.4	-	-	9	10.5	-	-	15	5.0
550-600	4	5.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	1.3
600-650	5	6.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	1.7
650-700	3	3.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Avg. Income (Rs.)</b>	<b>368.60</b>		<b>315.45</b>		<b>347.50</b>		<b>333.80</b>		<b>320.70</b>		<b>341.80</b>	
<b>SD</b>	<b>151.50</b>		<b>100.00</b>		<b>81.50</b>		<b>105.00</b>		<b>80.50</b>		<b>114.50</b>	
<b>CV</b>	<b>41.10</b>		<b>31.70</b>		<b>23.45</b>		<b>31.45</b>		<b>25.10</b>		<b>33.50</b>	

When childrens' contribution from household income was withdrawn (Table 4.15) a significant variation noted was that the majority of households from all caste communities did not belong to the same range of per capita income group. For instance, 32.4% of the Scheduled Caste households belonged to per capita income group of Rs.200-300, 39.7% of Scheduled Tribes belonged to Rs.300-400, 52.2% of Backward Caste households belonged to Rs.350-450 and 48.8% of Muslim household belonged to Rs.250-350. The proportion of households that had highest per capita income of Rs.550 and above was 15.6% in Scheduled Castes. There were no

households in any other caste-community, which belonged to this per capita income group i.e., Rs.550 and above. The proportion of households with low per capita income of Rs.200 and below was highest in the Scheduled Tribes (15.5%) followed by Muslim (10.5%).

A comparison of household per capita income between Tables 4.14 and 4.15 revealed that, in the total of 300 households, the proportion of households with low per capita income of Rs.300 and below would increase from 6.6% to 36.9% if childrens' contribution were withdrawn. The decline in average per capita household income due to the withdrawal of childrens' contribution was the highest in the Scheduled Castes being Rs.161.50 (i.e., from Rs.530.10 to 368.60) followed by the Scheduled Tribes being Rs.155.55 (i.e., from Rs.471.00 to 315.45) and the lowest being in the Backward Classes, Rs.89.70 (i.e., from Rs.437.20 to 347.50). A substantial increase in coefficient variation was also observed in the case of the Scheduled Caste households. Barring Backward Caste households, for all other caste groups, there was an increase in the coefficient of variation which shows that income from child labour reduced the inconsistency, instability and variability in the distribution of per capita household income, thus emphasizing the contribution from childrens' earnings.

#### **4.12 Household Per Capita Income With Childrens' Contribution and Child Labour**

It is important to analyse the per capita household income with and without child labour contribution and participation of children (girls and boys) in workforce. Tables 4.16 and 4.17 present the caste-wise per capita household income with childrens' contribution and children in workforce. As can be noted from Table 4.16 that proportion of girls belonging to high per capita household income of Rs.600 and above was the highest in the Scheduled Castes (15.6%), followed by Scheduled Tribes (10.6%). There were no girls from Backward Castes and Muslims belonging to this income group of households. On the other hand, the proportion of girls from low per capita income of Rs.300 and below, was the highest in the Muslims (18.3%) followed

**Table 4.16**  
**Household Per Capita Income With Child Labour Contribution and Girl Child Workers**

Per Capita Income of households (Rs.)	Scheduled Caste		Scheduled Tribe		Backward Castes		Muslim Community		Other Castes		Total	
	No. of Girls	%	No. of Girls	%	No. of Girls	%	No. of Girls	%	No. of Girls	%	No. of Girls	%
150-200	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	9.9	-	-	7	3.3
200-250	2	3.1	-	-	-	-	3	4.2	-	-	5	2.3
250-300	3	4.7	-	-	6	17.6	3	4.2	-	-	12	5.6
300-350	3	4.7	4	10.5	8	23.5	7	9.9	1	16.7	23	10.8
350-400	10	15.6	10	26.3	5	14.7	15	21.1	-	-	40	18.8
400-450	14	21.9	8	21.1	9	26.5	19	26.8	2	33.3	52	24.4
450-500	3	4.7	5	13.2	4	11.8	9	12.7	1	16.7	22	10.3
500-550	10	15.6	2	5.3	1	2.9	6	8.5	2	33.3	21	9.9
550-600	9	14.1	5	13.2	1	2.9	2	2.8	-	-	17	7.9
600-650	3	4.7	2	5.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	2.3
650-700	2	3.1	2	5.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	1.9
700-750	3	4.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1.4
750-800	2	3.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>SD</b>	<b>128.00</b>		<b>105.00</b>		<b>81.00</b>		<b>102.50</b>		<b>69.50</b>		<b>98.00</b>	
<b>CV</b>	<b>26.65</b>		<b>22.90</b>		<b>21.20</b>		<b>26.60</b>		<b>15.40</b>		<b>22.90</b>	
<b>r</b>	<b>-0.15</b>		<b>-0.27</b>		<b>-0.18</b>		<b>+0.10</b>		<b>+0.51</b>		<b>-0.28</b>	

by Backward Castes (17.6%) households. A majority of girls were drawn from the households with per capita income of Rs.350-450. The proportion of girls belonging to this income group of households was 47.9% in Muslims, 47.4% in STs, 41.2% in BCs, and 37.5% in SCs.

It can be noted from Table 4.17, that the proportion of boys belonging to the households with high per capita income of Rs.600 and above was the highest in the Scheduled Castes (36.6%), followed by the Scheduled Tribes (28.8%) and it was the lowest in the Muslim Community (6.1%). The percentage of boys belonging to low per capita income of Rs.300 and below was 8.9% in the Scheduled Tribes households. There were no boys from any other community in this low-income group. The proportion of boy workers belonging to per capita household income of Rs.350-450 was 36.7% in the Scheduled Castes and 41.5% in the Muslim community. While in the Scheduled Tribes 24.3% of boy workers came from the per capita household income group of Rs.300-400. In the Backward Castes, 47.8% of boys belonged to the

**Table 4.17**  
**Household Per Capita Income With Child Labour Contribution and Boy Child Workers**

Per Capita Income of households (Rs.)	Scheduled Castes		Scheduled Tribes		Backward Castes		Muslim Community		Other Castes		Total	
	No. of Boys	%	No. of Boys	%	No. of Boys	%	No. of Boys	%	No. of Boys	%	No. of Boys	%
250-300	-	-	4	8.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	1.7
300-350	2	3.3	6	13.3	-	-	3	3.7	1	16.7	12	5.0
350-400	12	20.0	5	11.0	8	17.4	15	18.3	2	33.3	42	17.5
400-450	10	16.7	3	6.7	10	21.7	19	23.2	-	-	42	17.5
450-500	2	3.3	2	4.4	12	26.1	15	18.3	2	33.3	33	13.8
500-550	7	12.0	4	8.9	6	13.0	13	15.9	1	16.7	31	13.0
550-600	5	8.3	8	17.8	4	8.7	12	14.6	-	-	29	12.1
600-650	3	5.0	2	4.4	2	4.3	5	6.1	-	-	12	5.0
650-700	2	3.3	7	15.5	2	4.3	-	-	-	-	11	4.6
700-750	8	13.3	4	8.9	2	4.3	-	-	-	-	14	5.9
750-800	6	10.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	2.5
800-850	3	5.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>SD</b>	<b>156.50</b>		<b>147.50</b>		<b>91.00</b>		<b>80.50</b>		<b>53.39</b>		<b>124.00</b>	
<b>CV</b>	<b>28.40</b>		<b>29.20</b>		<b>18.65</b>		<b>17.08</b>		<b>12.80</b>		<b>24.80</b>	
<b>r</b>	<b>-0.15</b>		<b>+0.08</b>		<b>-0.86</b>		<b>-0.08</b>		<b>0</b>		<b>-0.42</b>	

households with per capita income of Rs.400-500. A comparison with the girl workers reveals that while 11.2% of girls were drawn from the per capita household income of Rs.300 and below against just 1.7% of boys, only 6.5% of the girls belonged to the high per capita income of Rs.600 and above against 19.3% of boys. In many of the households of various caste communities, it was found that the coefficient of correlation between participation of children in workforce and household per capita income is negative, where it is positive, the degree of magnitude is very negligible. This type of correlation reveals that childrens' participation in the labour market has an inverse relationship with the level of per capita income of households.

#### **4.13 Household Per Capita Income without Childrens' Contribution and Child Labour**

When childrens' income is withdrawn, the distribution of child workers moved down to low per capita income group of households. As per Table 4.18, the distribution of girl workers moved to Rs.100-500. The proportion of girls belonging to

high per capita household income of Rs.400 and above was the highest in the Scheduled Castes (21.9%) followed by that of the Backward Classes (5.9%). In the low per capita income group of Rs.200 and below, the percentage of girls was the highest in Muslim households (15.5%) followed by that of Backward Castes (14%). While the largest proportion of girls in Scheduled Tribe households (i.e., 47.4%) belo-

**Table 4.18**  
**Household Per Capita Income Without Child Labour Contribution and Girl Child Workers**

Per Capita Income of households (Rs.)	Scheduled Castes		Scheduled Tribes		Backward Castes		Muslim Community		Other Castes		Total	
	No. of Girls	%	No. of Girls	%	No. of Girls	%	No. of Girls	%	No. of Girls	%	No. of Girls	%
100-150	3	4.7	2	5.2	3	8.8	8	11.3	-	-	16	7.5
150-200	5	7.8	3	7.9	2	5.9	3	4.2	-	-	13	6.1
200-250	15	23.4	8	21.1	2	5.9	6	8.4	3	50.0	34	15.9
250-300	12	18.8	10	26.3	11	32.4	19	26.8	1	16.7	53	24.8
300-350	8	12.5	10	26.3	8	23.5	23	32.4	1	16.7	50	23.5
350-400	7	10.9	5	13.2	6	17.6	7	9.9	1	16.7	26	12.2
400-450	9	14.1	-	-	2	5.9	5	7.0	-	-	16	7.5
450-500	5	7.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	2.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>SD</b>	<b>97.60</b>		<b>67.00</b>		<b>78.50</b>		<b>93.00</b>		<b>57.50</b>		<b>83.20</b>	
<b>CV</b>	<b>32.45</b>		<b>24.30</b>		<b>27.00</b>		<b>31.50</b>		<b>21.00</b>		<b>28.70</b>	
<b>r</b>	<b>+0.016</b>		<b>+0.58</b>		<b>+0.23</b>		<b>+0.16</b>		<b>-0.78</b>		<b>-0.15</b>	

nged to the per capita income of Rs.200-300, in the remaining caste communities, the largest proportion of girls (i.e., 59.2% in Muslims; 55.5% in BCs and 52.6% in STs) belonged to the per capita income of Rs.250-350. There were no girls in the entire sample who hailed from households with per capita income of above Rs.500. It means that when childrens' income is withdrawn from the per capita income of households, child workers were pushed down from relatively more per capita income group of households to lower per capita income group of households. For instance, when the childrens' income was withdrawn, nearly 45.3% of girls in the Scheduled Castes were pushed down from households with per capita income of above Rs.500 (Table 4.16) to those having per capita income of Rs.500 and below. Similarly, in the Scheduled Tribes, about 63.4% of girls from households with a per capita income of above Rs.400 were pushed down to those of Rs.400 and below.

As per Table 4.19, the distribution of boy workers in different groups of per capita household incomes was relatively wider ranging from Rs. 100 to Rs.700. The proportion of boys belonging to high per capita income of Rs.500 and above was the highest in the Scheduled Castes (26.7%) followed by Muslim (13.4%) households. There were no boys in the Backward Castes with a per capita household income of

**Table 4.19**  
**Household Per Capita Income Without Child Labour Contribution and Boy Child Workers**

Per Capita Income of households (Rs.)	Scheduled Castes		Scheduled Tribes		Backward Castes		Muslim Community		Other Castes		Total	
	No. of Boys	%	No. of Boys	%	No. of Boys	%	No. of Boys	%	No. of Boys	%	No. of Boys	%
100-150	-	-	3	6.7	-	-	2	2.4	-	-	5	2.1
150-200	4	6.7	2	4.4	-	-	3	3.7	-	-	9	3.8
200-250	9	15.0	3	6.7	2	4.3	2	2.4	1	16.7	17	7.1
250-300	7	11.7	7	15.6	5	10.9	17	20.7	-	-	36	15.1
300-350	5	8.3	8	17.8	8	17.4	20	24.4	1	16.7	42	17.6
350-400	3	5.0	6	13.3	16	34.8	10	12.2	1	16.7	36	15.1
400-450	5	8.3	8	17.8	10	21.7	9	11.0	3	50.0	35	14.6
450-500	11	18.3	4	8.9	5	10.9	8	9.8	-	-	28	11.7
500-550	4	6.7	4	8.9	-	-	11	13.4	-	-	19	7.9
550-600	4	6.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	1.7
600-650	5	8.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	2.1
650-700	3	5.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>SD</b>	<b>149.50</b>		<b>109.50</b>		<b>64.00</b>		<b>94.80</b>		<b>73.00</b>		<b>113.00</b>	
<b>CV</b>	<b>36.90</b>		<b>31.60</b>		<b>17.20</b>		<b>26.30</b>		<b>19.90</b>		<b>30.40</b>	
<b>r</b>	<b>-0.28</b>		<b>+0.15</b>		<b>+0.41</b>		<b>+0.41</b>		<b>+0.68</b>		<b>-0.24</b>	

above Rs.500. The proportion of boys in the low per capita income of Rs.200 and below, was the highest in Scheduled Tribes (11.1%) followed by the Scheduled Caste households (6.7%). A majority of the boys i.e., 33.4% in the Scheduled Tribes, 45.1% in the Muslim Community belonged to the per capita household income of Rs.250-350, while 56.5% boys in the Backward Castes belonged to Rs.350-450 and 26.7% in Scheduled Castes belonged to the per capita income of Rs.200-300. A comparison between girls and boys workers reveals that the proportion of girls belonging to poor households with a per capita income of Rs.200 and below was 13.6% against 5.9% of boys. There were no girls in the households with a per capita income of Rs.500 and above, and there were 13% of boys in this per capita income group. Even in the per

capita household income group of Rs.400-500, the proportion of girls was 9.8% against 26.3% of boys. This indicates that in low per capita income of households, more girls were in workforce than boys and on the other hand, in high per capita income of households, the proportion of boys in workforce was relatively more than that of girls. This is probably so because relatively more girls were drawn from small size of households, and more boys from big size of households.

Another finding was that the value of coefficient of correlation between many of the child workers hailing from different caste communities and various levels of per capita income of households is not uniform, i.e., for some households it is positive and for some other households it is negative. However, when considered the child workers as well as households in total, the coefficient is negative i.e., -0.28 for girl workers and -0.42 for boy workers in the households with child labour contribution, and -0.15 for girl workers and -0.24 for boy workers in the households without child labour contribution. It means that, even in the absence of child labour contribution to household income, the negative correlation continued to exist revealing that childrens' participation in work force was more from the households with low per capita income and vice versa.

It can be concluded that the children in Kokrajhar slums were forced to enter the labour market due to irresponsible attitude of the parents in some cases and desire of the parents to supplement the family income in many other cases and in a few cases, it was due to the stagnation of schooling of the children. The poor status of the households of child labour was reflected, besides meager earnings, in the type of houses they lived, their standard of living and household environment. The households had no other source of income like land and any side business. However, the respondents were not inclined to disclose the actual ownership status of their dwelling places. Nevertheless, it was observed that while a majority of households lived in the encroached slum dwellings, others lived in the rented single room tenements at a very low rent. Since there was no other source of income except earnings through the daily work, the contribution of children toward the family income was a crucial and deciding factor in the management of households.