



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

**Endangered Freedom to Decent Life
amidst Economic Insecurity: Plight of
Worker Households in Jalandhar's Sports
Good Industry**

Jain, Varinder

Institute of Development Studies, Jaipur

8 September 2020

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/104066/>
MPRA Paper No. 104066, posted 12 Nov 2020 07:09 UTC

ENDANGERED FREEDOM TO DECENT LIFE AMIDST ECONOMIC INSECURITY: PLIGHT OF WORKER HOUSEHOLDS IN JALANDHAR'S SPORTS GOOD INDUSTRY

*Varinder Jain**

Rooted in Senian notions, this study operationalises the concept of freedom by way of examining individual's attainment of various freedoms viz. freedom to be free from hunger, freedom to be free from morbidity and the freedom to be free from illiteracy; necessary for ensuring the enjoyment of a decent life. Besides revealing the incidence of inter- and intra-household differences in the attainment of various freedoms, the study also examines the endangering of various freedoms with respect to the level of economic insecurity suffered by the household. It diagnoses further, through the application of 'Ordered Probit Regression' approach, the relative vulnerability of females in worker households. The domain of the study belongs to the households of workers seeking livelihoods in Jalandhar's sports good industry.

The great Indian poverty debate¹ has contributed significantly to strengthen India's employment policy by revealing that there still exists a sufficiently large proportion of masses experiencing poverty (based on the commonly accepted 'Basic-Needs Based Approach') despite their 'being at work' i.e. they are the 'working poor'. The employments of these working poor are not enabling them to earn adequately for satisfying their basic needs. They are either irregularly employed or inadequately compensated or both. The dependence of a large majority (more than 90 percent) of the Indian workforce on informal sector for livelihoods and the irregular, inadequate and unprotected nature of informal sector employments leaves no doubts to accept that this set of 'working poor' belongs to the informal sector workers. Though the aspect of vulnerability in the informal sector has been a key area of research among the labour economists recently – which contributed to a plethora of research under the topic², there remains a few facets of vulnerability to be explored yet primarily due to their significance in enriching our understanding about the plight of working masses in the informal sector. One such strand is related to the impact of economic insecurity on individual's freedom to live decent life. This aspect is taken up by the present study.

The study is spanned over four key sections besides the fifth concluding one. The first section, by deriving insights from Sen's pioneering work on freedoms, introduces the theoretical and conceptual base of the study. Following this, we discuss briefly the domain of the study along with specific questions addressed by the study in second section. The third and fourth sections are analytical in their nature. First part in the third section provides preliminary evidence on freedom to decent life vis-à-vis household's economic insecurity level. Following this, the second part provides evidence on inter- and intra-household differences in individual's enjoyment of various freedoms contributing towards his attainment of decent life. The fourth section analyses the relative vulnerability of females at times when the enjoyment of various freedoms gets endangered due to household's experience of economic insecurity. Finally, section five discusses the emerging conclusions.

* Institute of Development Studies, Jaipur (Rajasthan)
Email: vjain2007@gmail.com

¹ See, for example, Minhas, et al. (1991); Deaton and Dreze (2002); Deaton (2003); Sundaram and Tendulkar (2004); Sundaram and Tendulkar (2003); Sundaram and Tendulkar (2002); Meenakshi, et al. (2000); Palmer-Jones and Sen (2001); Ranjan and Lancaster (2005).

² See, for example, Banerjee and Knight (1985); Unni (1998); Vijay (2001); Unni (2004); Madheswaran and Attewell (2007); Dewan (2001); Singh (2001); Kantor, et al. (2006); Vijay (2005); Unni and Rani (2005); Unni, et al. (1999).

I. THEORETICAL, CONCEPTUAL AND ANALYTICAL BASE OF THE STUDY

1. *Senian Notion of Freedom*³

Sen's pioneering work has made striking contributions to the discourse on development. The emergence of capability approach led development thinkers believe that development is 'not a matter, ultimately of expanding supplies of commodities, but of enhancing the capacities of people' (Sen, 1984: 511; 1985b). The capacities of people, to Sen, are enhanced by the nature of functionings to which they indulge themselves as the 'capabilities are defined derivatively from functionings' (Sen, 1993: 38). Sen (1990, 1999), in his conception of development as 'expanded capability', has included the notion of freedom in choosing between available alternative functioning combinations. Senian notion of freedom has two valuable aspects viz. the **opportunity aspect** and the **process aspect**. He argues that a comprehensive assessment of freedom must take note of both these aspects (Sen, 1985a). Sen opines that freedom gives the opportunity to achieve objectives – things that we have reason to value. Therefore, the opportunity aspect of freedom "is concerned with our actual capability to achieve. It relates to the real opportunities we have of achieving things that we can and do value (no matter what the process is through which that achievement comes about)" (Sen, 2002: 508). Similarly, significance is attached to the process aspect of freedom as it is related with the process of autonomous choice and thereby "is concerned with the procedure of free decision by oneself" (ibid: 508). The process aspect, as per Sen, "being concerned with the freedom of the person's decisions, must take note of both (i) the scope of autonomy in individual choices, (ii) immunity from interference by others" (ibid: 509-510).

2. *Freedom to Decent Life: A Variant of Senian Concept of Freedom*

An understanding of Senian notion of freedom leaves the impression that the notion of freedom to decent life that we put forward is in fact a variant of Sen's concept of freedom as it encompasses both the opportunity aspect and the process aspect implicit in it. We focus on a few centrally important freedoms viz. freedom to be free from hunger, freedom to be free from morbidity and the freedom to be free from illiteracy. All these three freedoms are mutually exclusive but nevertheless are treated as to contribute to a broader 'Freedom to decent life'. 'Freedom to be free from hunger' is the most basic freedom that makes the survival possible. 'Freedom to be free from morbidity' holds significance due to its ability to reflect one's degree of enjoyment of a disease-free life. 'Freedom to be free from illiteracy' is such freedom that makes one's survival meaningful by enabling him/her to know about.

Having adequate food is the first-most need to sustain human life. In economic literature, the most common approach to gauge one's sufficiency of food intake is to calculate the number of calories taken by that person. Recent literature has gone beyond estimating merely the number of calories by giving due consideration to the nature of calories consumed in terms of proteins and fats (Sen, 2005). Nevertheless, this objective approach of estimating calories consumed by each household member is a bit tedious task and requires strict monitoring mostly through diary method with all sorts of underlying discrepancies. One's food consumption monitored during a certain reference period is also subject to variations. Moreover, the nutritional content of food also depends on various other factors like freshness of vegetables etc. In such situation, the subjective approach offers better alternative by which one may have an assessment of one's nature of food intake.

³ Though employment per se also contributes to the attainment of decent life. We do not consider it here primarily because it has only instrumental value whereas these three freedoms have both intrinsic and instrumental value.

Owing to such considerations, we take somewhat broad approach to conceptualise one's 'freedom to be free from hunger'. Number of square meals taken in a day is the basic step towards this endeavour. We consider taking three meals a day as the ideal situation. Even taking three meals in a day is not enough as for diagnosing one's 'freedom to be free from hunger', another equally significant aspect is that of the sufficiency of food in each meal because sometimes it may happen that the person is taking three square meals during a day but every time he is not able to eat enough quantity of food. Nevertheless, the inquiry remains somewhat inadequate as the concerned individual may be consuming a nutritionally-poor food. So, we further conceptualise the 'freedom to be free from hunger' by incorporating the nutritional dimension of food. Given the pervasiveness of economic insecurity, the household members may avoid their food intake on one occasion or the other. So, a fourth desirable dimension to gauge one's freedom has been to explore one's practice of refraining food intake at times of food insufficiency in the household.

Second domain of freedom to decent life is constituted by one's 'freedom to be free from morbidity'. We conceptualise this freedom by considering not only an individual's current exposure to disease but also a few vital aspects such as nature of immunization received during childhood as this initial childhood precautionary measures have implications in the later life. Moreover, we differentiated an individual's exposure to disease by giving due consideration to the nature of disease experienced. Subsequently, we also accorded significance to the quantum of treatment received and following all these queries, we conceptualise one's 'freedom to be free from morbidity' by giving due significance to the degree of rest enjoyed by the diseased person as the lack of rest during and after sickness, by inducing weakness and thereby increased proneness to experience the sickness spells again, may endanger one's 'freedom to be free from morbidity' quite significantly.

A third domain belonging to the freedom to decent life is constituted by one's 'freedom to be free from illiteracy'. One's current education status lays the first step towards the conceptualisation of this freedom. Depending upon one's age and various other factors, one may be either studying or out of school. So, for a moment, we consider those attending school as the best ones – just like those having the highest level of education, as we found no reason for treating them as inferior to others because their attendance in an educational institution is enabling them to be free from illiteracy. Supplementary to one's education status has been the aspect of one's compulsion to work during the study period. In this case, those who have/had to work always during the study period have been considered worse than their counterparts who never faced such compulsions. Another key aspect bearing significance in this analysis has been the factors leading to disruption of study. We considered this aspect because involuntarily disruption of study has severe implications for an individual's freedom to be free from illiteracy.

To capture an individual's freedom to decent life across these three domains, we collected the information quite carefully by using the subjective approach as the objective approach has been quite deficient in revealing intra-household disparities at the individual level.⁴ By using such an approach, we preferred to be guided by one's own evaluation of his situation rather than drawing inferences on the basis of various assumptions, equivalence scales and various other similar approaches. Moreover, such an approach facilitated us to collect information over a wide range of choices made available to the respondents.

⁴ For example, we found that the households make purchases of food for all the members together. But, from this, it was very difficult to know about the distribution of food in the household.

3. Mapping Freedom to Decent Life: An Index Approach

Nevertheless, such an approach of collecting information on a wide range of choices across various sub-domains has posed challenge for adding precision to such diverse information. Under such situation, indexing is the most common approach used in literature. But, the task of indexing pre-requires the scaling of variables besides agreeing on the possible way to aggregate different aspects under a common head. We were quite careful of the first pre-requisite. So, while designing our questionnaire, we structured our questions under each freedom in such a way that each question in each freedom has been enquired, through the subjective approach, at the scale of five (see Table A.1 in Appendix). Regarding second pre-requisite, we, by deriving insights into the construction of UNDP Human Development Index and ILO's Decent Work Index, have preferred to assign equal importance of each question covered under each freedom domain.

A brief explanation for such endeavour is of relevance here. Each of the four constituents of 'freedom to be free from hunger', for example, holds significance per se. One may say that having adequate food is not at par with having nutritious food, as the latter is more important. But, consider a situation in which an individual is not able to take food (of any type) in adequate quantity. A continuous experience of such vulnerability is bound to cause fragile health, no matter even if that individual takes adequately nourished food during the single meal. Likewise, in case of 'freedom to be free from morbidity', having the freedom to take adequate rest is equally important as having proper medical treatment during sickness as the lack of adequate rest during and after sickness causes frequent exposure to disease. Similarly, one's compulsion to work while studying also bears equal significance as one's level of education because frequent involvement in work hinders effective educational attainment which leaves one with only degrees/certificates, but no/limited knowledge required at that level of education. Many more other arguments can be put forward to uphold the equal significance of various (considered) constituents under each freedom.

Therefore, the best way to aggregate these constituents has been the simple unweighted index, which, in fact, is the average of various constituents underlying that freedom. By this method, we construct the freedom indices. The index value ranges from 1 to 5 – 1 implies lack of freedom and 5 implies enjoyment of full freedom. It is also significant to notice at the outset that we do not aggregate these three freedom indices further into a single index representing an individual's freedom to decent life; rather we maintain the implicit diversity of each domain of freedom as sometimes too much aggregation may take place at the cost of important information collected in that index. Moreover, it also enables us to have a comparative analysis of various freedom domains.

II. OBJECTIVES AND DOMAIN OF THE STUDY

1. Key Researchable Questions

Owing to their being at work, the unorganised sector workers and their families should have the freedom to decent life. But, at the same time, their regular experience of economic insecurity, in one sense or the other, affects this freedom of workers and their household members. The experience of economic insecurity is sometimes so adverse that it puts at stake their current and future well-being. All this, in one sense, is a manifestation of, in Sen's (1999: 88) terminology, their 'coupling of disadvantage'.

In such situation, it becomes desirable to examine:

1. How far do individuals in worker households are able to enjoy their freedom to live decent life – in terms of his/her freedom to be free from hunger, freedom to be free from morbidity and freedom to be free from illiteracy?
2. Is there any variation across worker households differing in terms of various socio-economic characteristics?
3. Are there any intra-household differences, in terms of age and gender, in the enjoyment of various freedoms?
4. How vulnerable are the females, in relative sense, to the enjoyment of various freedoms in the event of household's experience of economic insecurity?

2. Specific Domain of the Study

All these questions are addressed with the primary data collected from 80 worker households (58 households belonging to wageworkers and 22 households belonging to the self-employed workers). This primary survey has been conducted in the urban segment of Punjab's unorganised manufacturing sector. Specifically, the inquiry focuses on those workers who eke out their living by working in Jalandhar's sports good industry. Sixth Economic Census identifies 2,684 enterprises, in 2013-14, in Jalandhar. These enterprises are mainly urban-centred (95 percent). This industry, in fact, makes a significant contribution to national output and export pool of sports equipment (Mukherjee et al. 2010). As per Sports Good Export Promotion Council (SGEPC), Jalandhar's contribution to India's sports good exports lies within the range of 56-64 percent during the post-1990 period and the industrial output in Jalandhar has grown at the CAGR of 7.52 percent during the post-1990 period.

III. EVIDENCE ON ENDANGERED FREEDOM TO DECENT LIFE

1. Freedom to Decent Life vis-à-vis Household Economic Insecurity

Economic insecurity is conceptualised by considering earning potential, saving potential and borrowing behaviour. Earning potential covers both income adequacy and income variability. Income adequacy involves three questions enquiring about income sufficiency, relative living standards and the ability to lend money. Saving potential involves regular saving's frequency and resourcefulness in old age. Borrowing behaviour is captured through workers' frequency of borrowing and borrowing source. We also asked workers to rate his access to credit in case of need.⁵

Table 1: Correlation Coefficients: Individual Freedom & Household's Economic Insecurity

| | Wageworkers | | | | Self-employed Workers | | | All Workers |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------|--------|-------------|
| | Casual | Contractual | Regular / Permanent | All | Home-based | Non-Home-based | All | |
| Freedom to be Free from Hunger | .035 | -.157** | -.097 | -.340* | -.165 | -.225 | -.158* | -.264* |
| Freedom to be Free from Morbidity | .028 | -.060 | -.148** | -.239* | -.035 | -.186 | -.072 | -.168* |
| Freedom to be Free from Illiteracy | -.079* | -.014 | -.085 | -.278* | -.187** | -.138 | -.165* | -.225* |

Note 1: * and ** imply that the correlation coefficients are significant at 0.01 and 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Based on Primary Survey.

⁵ Evidently, such conceptualisation of economic insecurity covers not only present well-being in absolute and relative sense but also wageworkers' future well-being. This conceptualisation of economic insecurity is relatively more wide-ranging than ILO (2004) which considers a worker as economically insecure if 1) he does not earn adequate incomes 2) he is not able to save 3) if he is not able to save on regular basis. This definition does not consider borrowing behaviour and access to credit. Also, it does not give significance to the variability of earnings – an aspect that is almost a reality in the working lives of the unorganised industry workers.

The very presence of economic insecurity in household is bound to affect adversely individual's enjoyment of freedom to live decent life. Such incidence has been revealed by negative correlation between economic insecurity and various freedoms (Table 1). It is found that the economic insecurity in case of wageworkers' households is relatively more adversely correlated with various freedoms than that in case of self-employed workers' households.

Table 2: (Mean) Freedom in Worker Households Vis-à-vis Economic Insecurity

| Worker Household Type | Freedom to be Free from Hunger | | | Freedom to be Free from Morbidity | | | Freedom to be Free from Illiteracy | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------|------|-----------------------------------|------|------|------------------------------------|------|------|
| | LEI | MEI | SEI | LEI | MEI | SEI | LEI | MEI | SEI |
| Casual | - | 2.61 | 2.75 | - | 3.05 | 3.05 | - | 2.15 | 1.93 |
| Contractual | - | 3.25 | 3.08 | - | 3.43 | 3.26 | - | 2.71 | 2.50 |
| Regular / Permanent | 3.58 | 3.38 | 3.50 | 3.80 | 3.50 | 3.29 | 3.37 | 2.77 | 2.78 |
| <i>Wageworkers</i> | 3.56 | 3.28 | 2.84 | 3.80 | 3.44 | 3.10 | 3.37 | 2.70 | 2.07 |
| Home-based | 2.68 | 3.19 | 2.83 | 2.57 | 3.05 | 2.85 | 1.98 | 2.59 | 1.94 |
| Non-Home-based | 3.60 | 3.28 | - | 3.47 | 3.17 | - | 2.69 | 1.91 | - |
| <i>Self-employed</i> | 2.71 | 3.42 | 2.92 | 2.57 | 3.26 | 2.91 | 1.98 | 2.64 | 1.93 |
| <i>All Workers</i> | 3.04 | 3.32 | 2.87 | 2.97 | 3.39 | 3.03 | 2.42 | 2.68 | 2.02 |

Note: LEI – Least Economic Insecurity; MEI – Moderate Economic Insecurity; SEI – Severe Economic Insecurity.
Source: Based on Primary Survey.

Table 2 presents similar adverse relation between economic insecurity and various freedoms. The (mean) estimates of various freedoms attained by the household members across different levels of exposure to economic insecurity reveal that generally, with every movement towards higher degree of exposure to economic insecurity, there takes place a decline in the average level of freedom enjoyed by the household members of almost all types of workers.

2. Inter- and Intra-Household Differences: Locating Pattern and Nature of Disparities

A. Pattern of Inter-Household Differences

Table 3 provides estimates of three freedoms across worker households by social class and worker type. With respect to 'freedom to be free from hunger', it is found that household members of non-home-based workers enjoy the highest level of this freedom and they are followed by households of regular/permanent wageworkers and contractual wageworkers in this respect. The household members of casual wageworkers enjoy the lowest level of this freedom. A dis-aggregation of these results across social class reveals that households of non-SC workers enjoy relatively better freedom to be free from hunger across all worker categories except contractual wageworkers. Nevertheless, sharp differences across two social groups emerge only in case of regular/permanent wageworkers, home-based workers and non-home-based workers.

Table 3: Freedom Indices Across Households, By Social Class & Worker Type

| | | Casual | Contractual | Regular / Permanent | Home-based | Non-home-based | All |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|-------------|---------------------|------------|----------------|------|
| Freedom to be free from Hunger | SC | 2.65 | 3.28 | 2.98 | 2.55 | 3.37 | 2.86 |
| | Non-SC | 2.72 | 3.21 | 3.53 | 3.28 | 3.76 | 3.36 |
| | All | 2.67 | 3.24 | 3.42 | 2.91 | 3.55 | 3.11 |
| Freedom to be free from Morbidity | SC | 2.98 | 3.46 | 3.10 | 2.56 | 3.25 | 2.99 |
| | Non-SC | 3.05 | 3.35 | 3.62 | 3.12 | 3.59 | 3.38 |
| | All | 2.99 | 3.39 | 3.51 | 2.84 | 3.40 | 3.19 |
| Freedom to be free from Illiteracy | SC | 1.90 | 2.79 | 2.58 | 1.66 | 2.26 | 2.08 |
| | Non-SC | 1.96 | 2.63 | 2.87 | 2.58 | 2.81 | 2.67 |
| | All | 1.91 | 2.69 | 2.81 | 2.12 | 2.51 | 2.37 |

Source: Based on Primary Survey.

With respect to the ‘freedom to be free from morbidity’, it is found that the households of regular/permanent wageworkers enjoy the highest level of freedom followed by non-home-based workers and contractual wageworkers. The households of casual wageworkers are somewhat better in this respect and the lowest level of freedom is enjoyed by the households of the home-based workers. In terms of social class, it is found that the households of non-SC regular/permanent wageworkers, home-based workers and the non-home-based workers enjoy much higher ‘freedom to be free from morbidity’. Similarly, with respect to the ‘freedom to be free from illiteracy’, it is found that the highest level of freedom is enjoyed by the household members of regular/permanent wageworkers followed by contractual wageworkers and non-home-based workers. The household members of casual wageworkers enjoy the lowest level of this freedom. A dis-aggregation of these results across social class reveals that the households of non-SC workers enjoy relatively better ‘freedom to be free from illiteracy’ across all the worker categories except contractual wageworkers. Nevertheless, sharp differences among two social groups emerge only in case of home-based workers, non-home-based workers and the regular/permanent wageworkers.

Table 4: Freedom Indices Across Households, By Social & Economic Class

| | | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q5 | All |
|------------------------------------|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Freedom to be free from Hunger | SC | 2.41 | 2.52 | 2.96 | 3.10 | 3.59 | 2.86 |
| | Non-SC | 3.06 | 3.13 | 3.21 | 3.35 | 3.76 | 3.36 |
| | All | 2.68 | 2.75 | 3.07 | 3.25 | 3.68 | 3.11 |
| Freedom to be free from Morbidity | SC | 2.79 | 2.59 | 3.15 | 3.23 | 3.51 | 2.99 |
| | Non-SC | 3.28 | 3.17 | 3.27 | 3.35 | 3.64 | 3.38 |
| | All | 2.94 | 2.80 | 3.20 | 3.30 | 3.59 | 3.19 |
| Freedom to be free from Illiteracy | SC | 1.84 | 1.83 | 2.13 | 2.35 | 2.40 | 2.08 |
| | Non-SC | 2.47 | 2.41 | 2.65 | 2.75 | 2.84 | 2.67 |
| | All | 2.10 | 2.05 | 2.36 | 2.59 | 2.68 | 2.37 |

Note: Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4 and Q5 are the first, second, third, fourth and fifth quintile respectively; these quintiles are based on household per capita (adult equivalent) monthly expenditure.

Source: Based on Primary Survey.

Besides worker type, economic class has been another criterion by which we have examined the magnitude of various freedoms enjoyed by worker households. The results reported in Table 4 reveal that all the three freedoms record an increase in their level as we move towards upper quintiles. A classification by social class also reveals similar broad trend except a few. These freedom levels in the SC households remain at relatively lower levels than those in the non-SC households across all the quintiles. It is also noteworthy that there prevails a relatively high degree of inequality (between first and fifth quintile) among the SC worker households across all the three types of freedoms. The gaps between the initial and the highest quintiles are relatively smaller in case of non-SC worker households across all the freedoms.

B. Nature of Intra-Household Disparities

Following inter-household analysis, we perform a gender analysis of intra-household differences in household members’ enjoyment of various freedoms. Besides gender, we consider the aspect of age across six groups, viz., 5-10 years, 11-18 years, 19-30 years, 31-50 years, 51-60 years and 60+ years.⁶ Table 5 provides results of intra-household disparity across social groups. These results reveal that there prevail gender disparities among household

⁶ For gauging differences among household members across various age-groups, we’ve not considered children below 5 years of age due to two reasons: firstly, WHO’s adult equivalence scale does not reveal the incidence of gender discrimination for this age-group. Secondly, these household members belong to non-school going age and thereby may not have relevance in terms of freedom to be free from illiteracy.

members' experience of various freedoms in SC and non-SC households. With respect to the 'freedom to be free from hunger', it is found that male child receives favoured treatment than female child in access to food, though his degree of this freedom is relatively lower in SC households. Similar is the pattern with other age groups i.e. males are better placed than females across all age-groups in both SC and non-SC households except elderly in SC households where we did not find any gender differences. Moreover, in SC households, females suffer from relatively lower freedom. Such women are concentrated specifically in the age-groups of 11-18 years, 19-30 years and 31-50 years. It can also be noticed that females' freedom level declines after 5-10 age-group in SC households. Afterwards, it remains somewhat stagnant with increasing age and falls sharply for the elderly above 60 years. Such is not the case with females belonging to non-SC households. Their freedom level does not witness decline except in case of elderly but even then, they enjoy relatively better freedom than their counterparts in SC households.

Table 5: Intra-Household Disparity in Various Freedoms, By Social Class

| | | | 5-10 Years | 11-18 Years | 19-30 Years | 31-50 Years | 51-60 Years | 60+ Years | All |
|---|---------------------|---|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|------|
| Freedom to be free from Hunger | SC household | M | 3.48 | 3.14 | 3.27 | 3.33 | 3.16 | 2.25 | 3.27 |
| | | F | 2.88 | 2.49 | 2.52 | 2.53 | 2.50 | 2.25 | 2.54 |
| | | T | 3.22 | 2.74 | 2.88 | 2.97 | 2.86 | 2.25 | 2.89 |
| | Non-SC household | M | 3.72 | 3.87 | 3.67 | 3.66 | 3.50 | 3.37 | 3.69 |
| | | F | 2.90 | 3.07 | 3.09 | 3.10 | 3.20 | 2.58 | 3.07 |
| | | T | 3.45 | 3.32 | 3.40 | 3.38 | 3.37 | 2.90 | 3.36 |
| Freedom to be free from Morbidity | SC household | M | 4.01 | 3.58 | 3.18 | 2.53 | 2.12 | 2.75 | 3.10 |
| | | F | 3.63 | 3.31 | 2.97 | 2.46 | 2.25 | 2.37 | 2.98 |
| | | T | 3.84 | 3.41 | 3.08 | 2.50 | 2.18 | 2.50 | 3.04 |
| | Non-SC household | M | 4.11 | 4.04 | 3.66 | 3.11 | 3.01 | 2.93 | 3.51 |
| | | F | 3.67 | 3.60 | 3.47 | 2.98 | 2.87 | 2.41 | 3.30 |
| | | T | 3.96 | 3.74 | 3.57 | 3.05 | 2.94 | 2.62 | 3.40 |
| Freedom to be free from Illiteracy | SC household | M | 4.07 | 2.68 | 2.22 | 1.91 | 1.22 | 1.00 | 2.38 |
| | | F | 3.02 | 2.08 | 1.78 | 1.51 | 1.13 | 1.00 | 1.89 |
| | | T | 3.60 | 2.30 | 2.01 | 1.73 | 1.18 | 1.00 | 2.13 |
| | Non-SC household | M | 4.20 | 3.39 | 2.98 | 2.70 | 2.11 | 1.25 | 2.98 |
| | | F | 3.36 | 2.80 | 2.55 | 2.05 | 1.13 | 1.00 | 2.39 |
| | | T | 3.92 | 2.99 | 2.78 | 2.37 | 1.67 | 1.10 | 2.67 |

Source: Based on Primary Survey

With respect to the 'freedom to be free from morbidity', it is found that the individuals in non-SC households enjoy relatively more freedom than their counterparts in SC households. Such pattern has been quite general and pervasive across gender and age of the household members. Nevertheless, there have been disparities within each broad group. Females' freedom level in SC households decline continuously with an increase in age till they attain elderly status where it improves marginally. The gender-gap remains the highest in case of children and elderly belonging to SC households whereas in case of non-SC households, the elderly experience the highest gender inequality followed by children and adolescents. In case of working age-group, the incidence of gender disparity, in non-SC households, with respect to this freedom is found to be relatively lower in the age-group of 19-30 years and relatively higher in the age-group of 31-50 and 51-60 years.

Similarly, with respect to the 'freedom to be free from illiteracy', it is found that irrespective of gender and age-group, the individuals in the non-SC households are found to be relatively better placed than their counterparts in the SC households. Females, both children and adolescents, experience relatively large gender disparity in SC households than that in the non-

SC households. The working age population in both SC and non-SC households has also enjoyed relatively little ‘freedom to be free from illiteracy’ with the least in former households. Elderly in both the cases remain most un-free in this respect in both types of households, though a few of the male elderly in non-SC households are relatively better placed in this respect.⁷

Table 6: Intra-Household Disparity in Freedom to be free from Hunger, By Worker Type

| | | 5-10 Years | 11-18 Years | 19-30 Years | 31-50 Years | 51-60 Years | 60+ Years | All |
|------------------------|---|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|------|
| Casual | M | 3.58 | 2.92 | 2.92 | 3.07 | 3.00 | - | 3.06 |
| | F | 2.70 | 2.41 | 2.44 | 2.39 | 2.00 | - | 2.44 |
| | T | 3.18 | 2.61 | 2.70 | 2.75 | 2.66 | - | 2.73 |
| Contractual | M | 3.54 | 3.83 | 3.61 | 3.51 | 3.00 | 3.62 | 3.60 |
| | F | 3.00 | 2.76 | 2.72 | 3.00 | 2.83 | 2.50 | 2.87 |
| | T | 3.30 | 3.18 | 3.28 | 3.27 | 2.87 | 3.06 | 3.23 |
| Regular / Permanent | M | 4.04 | 3.95 | 3.77 | 3.65 | 3.57 | 4.00 | 3.76 |
| | F | 2.68 | 3.10 | 3.23 | 3.19 | 3.00 | 3.25 | 3.12 |
| | T | 3.50 | 3.34 | 3.52 | 3.43 | 3.38 | 3.62 | 3.42 |
| Home- based | M | 3.38 | 3.27 | 3.26 | 3.47 | 3.08 | 2.25 | 3.32 |
| | F | 3.75 | 2.63 | 2.53 | 2.56 | 2.95 | 2.41 | 2.60 |
| | T | 3.45 | 2.86 | 2.86 | 3.00 | 3.02 | 2.37 | 2.95 |
| Non- Home- based | M | 4.00 | 3.91 | 3.94 | 3.94 | 4.12 | 2.25 | 3.90 |
| | F | - | 3.46 | 3.21 | 3.25 | 3.58 | 2.25 | 3.25 |
| | T | 4.00 | 3.59 | 3.55 | 3.62 | 3.80 | 2.25 | 3.55 |
| All | M | 3.60 | 3.46 | 3.48 | 3.50 | 3.40 | 3.15 | 3.49 |
| | F | 2.89 | 2.78 | 2.80 | 2.85 | 3.00 | 2.50 | 2.81 |
| | T | 3.32 | 3.02 | 3.14 | 3.19 | 3.22 | 2.75 | 3.13 |

Source: Based on Primary Survey

Besides social class, a similar analysis of intra-household gender inequalities is performed across various types of workers. The results of intra-household gender disparity in ‘freedom to be free from hunger’ are reported in Table 6. These results reveal that children belonging to the age-group of 5-10 years enjoy the highest ‘freedom to be free from hunger’ in the households belonging to the non-home-based workers and the regular/permanent wageworkers whereas those belonging to the households of casual wageworkers remain the most un-free in this respect. The incidence of gender disparity is found to be the highest in the households of regular/permanent wageworkers. Interestingly, in the households of home-based workers, the female child gets favourable treatment in this respect. Elderly, above 60 years of age, feel most free in this regard in the households of regular/permanent wageworkers but in terms of gender disparity, they are suffering most in the households of contractual wageworkers. Among adolescents (age 11-18 years), females experience the worst of this freedom in the households of casual wageworkers and the incidence of gender disparity is the highest in the households of contractual wageworkers.

⁷ A caveat needs to be noted in this respect. We are considering both the current and past events similarly in evaluating an individual’s ‘freedom to be free from illiteracy’ due to inclusion of two groups – one which is currently in the school-going age and the other which has passed its school-going age. Because latter’s educational experience needs to be considered, we are bound to have such analytical inconsistency.

Table 7: Intra-Household Gender Disparity in Freedom to be free from Morbidity, By Worker Type

| | | 5-10 Years | 11-18 Years | 19-30 Years | 31-50 Years | 51-60 Years | 60+ Years | All |
|---------------------|---|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|------|
| Casual | M | 4.12 | 3.32 | 2.84 | 2.32 | 2.25 | - | 3.03 |
| | F | 3.45 | 3.33 | 2.82 | 2.59 | 2.00 | - | 3.07 |
| | T | 3.81 | 3.33 | 2.83 | 2.45 | 2.16 | - | 3.05 |
| Contractual | M | 4.04 | 3.97 | 3.63 | 3.20 | 2.50 | 2.87 | 3.56 |
| | F | 3.80 | 3.35 | 3.27 | 3.00 | 2.91 | 2.37 | 3.23 |
| | T | 3.93 | 3.59 | 3.50 | 3.11 | 2.81 | 2.62 | 3.39 |
| Regular / Permanent | M | 4.08 | 4.10 | 3.97 | 3.27 | 3.07 | 3.25 | 3.62 |
| | F | 3.56 | 3.52 | 3.68 | 3.14 | 2.90 | 2.50 | 3.40 |
| | T | 3.87 | 3.68 | 3.83 | 3.21 | 3.01 | 2.87 | 3.50 |
| Home-based | M | 3.97 | 3.97 | 3.12 | 2.36 | 2.20 | 2.75 | 3.00 |
| | F | 4.12 | 3.53 | 2.92 | 2.24 | 2.20 | 2.41 | 2.80 |
| | T | 4.00 | 3.70 | 3.01 | 2.30 | 2.20 | 2.50 | 2.89 |
| Non-Home-based | M | 4.25 | 4.16 | 3.77 | 2.83 | 3.37 | 2.75 | 3.42 |
| | F | - | 3.87 | 3.60 | 2.85 | 3.16 | 2.37 | 3.36 |
| | T | 4.25 | 3.95 | 3.68 | 2.84 | 3.25 | 2.50 | 3.39 |
| All | M | 4.06 | 3.78 | 3.43 | 2.83 | 2.75 | 2.90 | 3.31 |
| | F | 3.65 | 3.45 | 3.21 | 2.75 | 2.69 | 2.40 | 3.15 |
| | T | 3.90 | 3.57 | 3.32 | 2.79 | 2.72 | 2.59 | 3.23 |

Source: Based on Primary Survey

Table 8: Intra-Household Gender Disparity in Freedom to be free from Illiteracy, By Worker Type

| | | 5-10 Years | 11-18 Years | 19-30 Years | 31-50 Years | 51-60 Years | 60+ Years | All |
|---------------------|---|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|------|
| Casual | M | 4.11 | 2.11 | 1.70 | 1.57 | 1.16 | - | 2.15 |
| | F | 2.56 | 2.00 | 1.45 | 1.22 | 1.00 | - | 1.78 |
| | T | 3.40 | 2.04 | 1.58 | 1.40 | 1.11 | - | 1.95 |
| Contractual | M | 4.24 | 3.09 | 2.66 | 2.72 | 2.00 | 1.33 | 2.96 |
| | F | 3.66 | 2.67 | 2.07 | 2.02 | 1.11 | 1.00 | 2.38 |
| | T | 3.98 | 2.84 | 2.44 | 2.38 | 1.33 | 1.16 | 2.67 |
| Regular / Permanent | M | 4.61 | 3.54 | 3.15 | 2.77 | 1.93 | 1.33 | 3.03 |
| | F | 3.41 | 2.78 | 2.97 | 2.29 | 1.20 | 1.00 | 2.60 |
| | T | 4.13 | 3.00 | 3.07 | 2.55 | 1.68 | 1.16 | 2.80 |
| Home-based | M | 3.62 | 3.81 | 2.35 | 1.91 | 2.16 | 1.00 | 2.51 |
| | F | 3.33 | 2.40 | 1.97 | 1.57 | 1.06 | 1.00 | 1.88 |
| | T | 3.57 | 2.92 | 2.15 | 1.74 | 1.66 | 1.00 | 2.18 |
| Non-Home-based | M | 5.00 | 3.88 | 3.33 | 2.47 | 1.16 | 1.00 | 2.92 |
| | F | - | 2.20 | 2.36 | 1.94 | 1.22 | 1.00 | 2.08 |
| | T | 5.00 | 2.66 | 2.82 | 2.23 | 1.20 | 1.00 | 2.47 |
| All | M | 4.13 | 2.99 | 2.62 | 2.32 | 1.85 | 1.20 | 2.69 |
| | F | 3.16 | 2.44 | 2.15 | 1.81 | 1.13 | 1.00 | 2.15 |
| | T | 3.75 | 2.63 | 2.39 | 2.07 | 1.53 | 1.07 | 2.41 |

Source: Based on Primary Survey

Table 7 reports evidence on intra-household gender disparity in ‘freedom to be free from morbidity’ by worker type. It is found that the children belonging to the casual households remain the most un-free to enjoy this freedom. Similarly, elderly belonging to the home-based and non-home-based workers remain the most vulnerable in this respect. Adolescents remain the most un-free in casual households and most free in non-home-based worker households whereas the family members in the working age-group remain the freest in the households of regular/permanent waged workers. Nevertheless, there prevail gender disparities. Casual waged worker households reveal the highest incidence of gender disparity in children’s

experience of this freedom. The female child receives relatively favorable treatment in the households of home-based workers. Elderly experience the highest gender disparity in the households of regular/permanent wagedworkers. Adolescents experience such disparity in contractual wagedworker households. Nevertheless, the working age-group experiences relatively lower degree of this freedom irrespective of gender across all the worker types. Such pattern emerges due to their experience of functional insecurity at their workplaces. Their occupations are making them vulnerable to various diseases. Moreover, they are un-free to seek proper medical care and take adequate rest due to their nature of work.

Similarly, Table 8 reveals the incidence of intra-household gender disparity in ‘freedom to be free from illiteracy’ across different types of workers. It is found that the male child is enjoying this freedom at the highest level in the households of non-home-based workers followed by regular/permanent wagedworkers, contractual wagedworkers and casual wagedworkers whereas the girl child receives the worst treatment in this respect in the households of casual wagedworkers. Elderly belonging to almost all types of workers are at the lowest levels of this freedom. Similar has been the observations in case of workers belonging to the age-group of 51-60 years but in this age-group, we found the family members of regular/permanent wagedworkers relatively better than their counterparts in the households of other workers.

IV. ECONOMIC INSECURITY AND ENDANGERED FREEDOM TO DECENT LIFE: ANALYSING RELATIVE VULNERABILITY OF FEMALES WITH ORDERED PROBIT REGRESSION APPROACH

A. Methodology

Nevertheless, from above analysis, it remains unclear: how severely affected are the freedoms enjoyed by females, across worker households, with every increase in the level of economic insecurity? Such query can be answered only by locating the marginal effect of change in economic insecurity on the enjoyed freedom by the respective gender. As the estimation of marginal effects urges for controlling for various other characteristics influencing that freedom, so regression analysis is the most widely used econometric tool in such situation.

The dependent variable measuring individual’s freedom is inherently ordered with options 1 (negligible freedom), 2 (moderate freedom) and 3 (significant freedom). In such a situation, an appropriate econometric technique is the ‘Ordered Probit Regression’ as it estimates the underlying score as a linear function of the independent variables and a set of cut-points.

The probability of observing outcome i corresponds to the probability that the estimated linear function, plus random error, is within the range of cut-points estimated for the outcome:

$$\Pr(\text{outcome}_j = i) = \Pr(k_{i-1} < \beta_1 x_{1j} + \beta_2 x_{2j} + \dots + \beta_k x_{kj} + \mu_j \leq k_i)$$

μ_j is assumed to be normally distributed. The coefficients $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_k$ together with the cutpoints k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{I-1} , where i is the number of possible outcomes. k_0 is taken as $-\infty$ and k_I is taken as $+\infty$.

If $X_i \beta < k_1$ then predict $\text{Outcome}_i = \text{Negligible Freedom}$

If $k_1 < X_i \beta < k_2$ then predict $\text{Outcome}_i = \text{Moderate Freedom}$

If $X_i \beta > k_2$ then predict $\text{Outcome}_i = \text{Significant Freedom}$

Formally, the specification used is:

$$Freedom_{ij} = \alpha_1 Gender + \alpha_2 Age + \alpha_3 Age^2 + \beta_1 Y$$

where Y is the household economic insecurity index and subscripts i and j indicate respectively various freedoms and the type of worker household.

B. Evidence

The ‘Ordered Probit Regression’ results are reported in Table A.2 (in appendix). Most of the estimated coefficients are statistically significant. This analysis enables us to estimate the marginal effects of a change in independent variable on the dependent variable. Here, we estimate the marginal effect of economic insecurity on individual’s freedom to be free from hunger, morbidity and illiteracy in terms of its negligible, moderate and significant experience. These marginal effects are presented in Table 9. A significant inference derived from these marginal effects is that a marginal increase in the level of economic insecurity is causing adverse impact on individual’s enjoyment of various freedoms – a major adverse impact is experienced by females vis-à-vis males in the household.

Table 9: Marginal Effect of Economic Insecurity on Individual’s Freedom Experience

| | | Casual | | Contractual | | Regular / Permanent | | Home-based | | Non-Home-based | |
|------------------------------------|---|--------|--------|-------------|--------|---------------------|--------|------------|--------|----------------|--------|
| | | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M |
| Freedom to be free from Hunger | N | -.2079 | -.1607 | .1556 | .0365 | .0945 | .0200 | .1410 | .0825 | .2236 | .0529 |
| | M | -.1847 | -.0429 | -.7910 | -.1340 | -.1611 | -.1202 | -.0944 | -.0479 | -.5407 | -.2575 |
| | S | -.2325 | -.1178 | -.6646 | -.1705 | -.5945 | -.1402 | -.4466 | -.1305 | -.3644 | -.3104 |
| Freedom to be free from Morbidity | N | .0329 | .0315 | -.0071 | -.0021 | .1209 | .0619 | .0802 | .0708 | .0788 | .0434 |
| | M | -.0026 | -.0002 | -.0817 | -.0097 | -.3287 | -.1983 | -.0210 | -.0004 | -.8845 | -.5785 |
| | S | -.3302 | -.0317 | -.2588 | -.0118 | -.6496 | -.2602 | -.3591 | -.0712 | -.6633 | -.2220 |
| Freedom to be free from Illiteracy | N | .3115 | .2979 | .0115 | .0054 | .1963 | .0795 | .2731 | .1880 | .6644 | .1603 |
| | M | -.1532 | -.0427 | -.1741 | .0099 | -.1371 | .0044 | -.6404 | .0741 | -.1599 | .3650 |
| | S | -.3583 | -.1551 | -.2156 | -.0154 | -.3334 | -.2639 | -.6327 | -.2621 | -.7044 | -.2254 |

Note: N – Negligible; M – Moderate; S – Significant;

Source: Based on Table A.2 in Appendix

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this study, we have considered the three freedoms viz. freedom to be free from hunger, freedom to be free from morbidity and the freedom to be free from illiteracy; necessary for ensuring the enjoyment of a decent life. One may argue that we have not considered the aspect of employment as it has significant impact on one’s enjoyment of decent life. In fact, we have not considered the aspect of employment here primarily because it has only instrumental value whereas these three freedoms have both intrinsic and instrumental value. The study finds that individuals in worker households lack significantly the freedom to enjoy decent life. A major contributory factor is that of the prevalence of economic insecurity in the household as reflected by the adverse correlation between household’s economic insecurity level and the enjoyment of various freedoms by the household members. The study further points out that the SC households are more deprived in the enjoyment of various freedoms vis-à-vis their counterparts. Similar has been the situation with the casual wageworker households and the

households at the lower quantiles. Moreover, the study finds that the females and the elderly remain the most vulnerable group. These inferences are further strengthened by locating the marginal effects of change in economic insecurity on individual's enjoyment of various freedoms across gender. It has been found that a marginal increase in economic insecurity leaves relatively more adverse impact on females' enjoyment of various freedoms.

APPENDIX

Table A.1: Choice of Indicators under Various Freedoms

| | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| Freedom to be Free from Hunger | Square meals taken in a day | Three square meals with snacks in afternoon | Three square meals only | Two square meals with snacks in afternoon | Two square meals only | One square meal, with/without snacks |
| | Food Sufficiency in Each Meal | More than Adequate | Adequate | Neither Adequate nor Deficient | Deficient | Too Deficient |
| | Nutritional Richness of Daily Food | Quite Rich | Rich | Moderate | Poor | Too Poor |
| | Reduced Food Intake Practice (Enforced) | Never | Rarely | Not Much Frequently | Most often | Always |
| Freedom to be free from Morbidity | Immunization Status | Immunization against all known diseases | Vaccination for Measles, Hepatitis besides basic one | All the basic vaccinations (Polio / DPT / BCG) | Some among basic vaccinations (Polio / DPT / BCG) | No immunization of any sort |
| | Nature of Experienced Sickness | Minor sickness (like cough, common cold, fever etc.) | Major non-fatal sickness (like typhoid, jaundice etc.) | Chronic disease (like hypertension, diabetes etc.) | Major fatal sickness (like accident causing limb loss) | Deadly disease (like cancer, tuberculosis etc.) |
| | Quantum of Treatment Received | Full treatment | Some treatment & still feel pain & weakness | Could not take treatment due to lack of time | Could not take treatment due to lack of money | No treatment due to lack of time & money |
| | Rest Status during Sickness | Could take adequate rest with homely care | Could take rest | Could take little rest but had to work as well | No rest due to fear of income loss | No rest due to fear of job loss |
| Freedom to be free from Illiteracy | Current Education Status | Studying or got education above secondary standard | Studied up to secondary standard | Studied up to middle standard | Studied up to primary standard | Illiterate / Can Read and Write |
| | Work Status during Study ⁸ | Never | Rarely | Not Much Frequently | Most often | Always |
| | Reason for Disruption of Study ⁹ | Not interested in further study | Wanted to earn for self-expense/marriage | Lack of guidance / Unclear on career | Needed help by parents | Household inability to finance studies |

Source: Constructed by author himself.

⁸ In case of illiterate/those who can read and write, code 5 is considered.

⁹ In case of illiterate/those who can read and write, code 5 is considered.

Table A.2: Ordered Probit Results: Locating Determinants of Various Freedoms

| | <i>Casual Worker Household</i> | | | <i>Contractual Worker Household</i> | | | <i>Regular Worker Household</i> | | | <i>Home-based Worker Household</i> | | | <i>Non-Home-based Worker Household</i> | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|--|------------------|------------------|
| | <i>F-I</i> | <i>F-II</i> | <i>F-III</i> | <i>F-I</i> | <i>F-II</i> | <i>F-III</i> | <i>F-I</i> | <i>F-II</i> | <i>F-III</i> | <i>F-I</i> | <i>F-II</i> | <i>F-III</i> | <i>F-I</i> | <i>F-II</i> | <i>F-III</i> |
| Gender | .9897* (.191) | .1339 (.181) | .6207* (.193) | 1.292* (.205) | .898* (.199) | .689* (.197) | 1.078* (.190) | .649* (.188) | .946* (.215) | 1.092* (.178) | .219 (.181) | .845* (.198) | .9923* (.278) | .480 (.296) | 1.535* (.345) |
| Age | -.057 (.031) | -.129* (.034) | -.104* (.037) | .0189 (.023) | -.074* (.026) | -.0312 (.027) | -.022 (.027) | -.0215 (.028) | .035 (.032) | -.016 (.018) | -.140* (.022) | -.084* (.026) | -.007 (.029) | -.188* (.046) | -.003 (.052) |
| Age-squared | .001 (.000) | .013** (.006) | .0012 (.000) | -.003 (.001) | .0004 (.001) | -.0002 (.004) | .0001 (.004) | -.0002 (.005) | -.001* (.004) | .001 (.010) | .0013* (.001) | .004 (.002) | -.002 (.001) | .001* (.010) | -.001 (.001) |
| Economic Insecurity | .53*** (.444) | -1.005 (.415) | -.79** (.429) | -.428 (.290) | .0298 (.297) | -.0410 (.298) | -.356 (.265) | -.65** (.278) | -.83** (.326) | .354** (.169) | -.214 (.176) | .684* (.190) | -.958* (.367) | -1.59* (.426) | -1.70* (.445) |
| / k ₁ | 1.035 (1.24) | -2.900 (1.18) | -3.73 (1.22) | -1.193 (.737) | -2.453 (.789) | -1.943 (.784) | -1.939 (.688) | -3.378 (.739) | -2.994 (.835) | -1.207 (.511) | -3.49 (.590) | -3.525 (.630) | -3.701 (1.02) | -9.57 (1.63) | -5.531 (1.26) |
| / k ₂ | 2.89 (1.25) | -1.523 (1.16) | -2.73 (1.21) | .6356 (.738) | -.672 (.776) | -.805 (.770) | -.129 (.675) | -1.814 (.717) | -1.985 (.820) | .226 (.504) | -2.269 (.561) | -2.948 (.619) | -2.358 (.984) | -7.03 (1.41) | -4.54 (1.21) |
| LR chi ² (4) | 33.61 | 62.19 | 63.19 | 47.86 | 59.73 | 50.25 | 36.96 | 42.61 | 67.76 | 46.68 | 97.00 | 84.01 | 24.31 | 59.89 | 64.06 |
| Prob > chi ² | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| Pseudo R ² | 0.109 | 0.169 | 0.1774 | 0.149 | 0.190 | 0.157 | 0.1092 | 0.1249 | 0.2065 | 0.1204 | 0.2417 | 0.223 | 0.1482 | 0.3626 | 0.3602 |
| Log Likelihood | -136.5 | -152.4 | -146.5 | -135.8 | -127.1 | -134.3 | -150.7 | -149.2 | -130.1 | -170.4 | -152.1 | -146.2 | -69.88 | -52.64 | -56.90 |
| No. of Observations | 125 | | | 137 | | | 114 | | | 104 | | | 48 | | |

Note 1: the freedom index value from 1 to 2.50 is considered as 1; from 2.51 to 3.50 as 2 and above 3.51 as 3 in case of freedom to be free from hunger and freedom to be free from morbidity but in case of freedom to be free from illiteracy, the index value from 1 to 1.50 is considered as 1; from 1.51 to 2.50 as 2 and above 2.51 as 3; 1, 2 and 3 imply negligible freedom, moderate freedom and significant freedom respectively; gender is categorised as 0 for females and 1 for males;

Note 2: *, **, *** imply that the estimated coefficients are significant at 1, 5 and 10 % level of significance

Source: Based on Primary Survey

REFERENCES:

- Banerjee, B. and J. B. Knight (1985) Caste Discrimination in the Indian Labour Market, *Journal of Development Economics*, 17(April): 277-307.
- Deaton, A. (2003) Adjusted Indian Poverty Estimates for 1999-2000, *Economic and Political Weekly*, January 25, pp. 322-326.
- Deaton, A. and J. Dreze (2002) Poverty and Inequality in India: A Re-Examination, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 37(36): 3729-3748.
- Dewan, R. (2001) Health Safety and Occupational Safety for Informal Migrant Workers: The Case of Bakery Industry, *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 44(4): 585-599.
- ILO (2004) *Economic Security for a Better World*, International Labour Organisation, Geneva.
- Jain, V. (2008a) An Inquiry into the Growth Dynamics of Punjab's Urban Unorganised Establishments in an Era of Globalisation: A Labour Perspective, *International Journal of Business and Emerging Markets*, 1(2): 171-188.
- Jain, V. (2008b) Relative Advantage of Skill and Wages Workers' Exposure to Insecurity: How Debilitating Is the Impact of Migration Status and Social Class? *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 51(4): 927-938.
- Kantor, P., U. Rani and J. Unni (2006) Decent Work Deficits in Informal Economy: Case of Surat, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 41(21): 2089-2097.
- Madheswaran, S. and P. Attewell (2007) Caste Discrimination in the Indian Urban Labour Market: Evidence from the National Sample Survey, *Economic and Political Weekly*, October 13, pp. 4146-4153.
- Meenakshi, J. V., R. Ray and S. Gupta (2000) Estimates of Poverty for SC, ST and Female-Headed Households, *Economic and Political Weekly*, July 29, pp. 2748-2754.
- Minhas, B. S., L. R. Jain and S. D. Tendulkar (1991) Declining Incidence of Poverty in the 1980s: Evidence Versus Artefacts, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 26, pp. 1673-1682.
- Mukherjee, Arpita et al. (2010): *Sport Retailing in India: Opportunities, Constraints and Way Forward*, Working Paper No. 250, ICRIER, New Delhi.
- Palmer-Jones, R. and K. Sen (2001) On India's Poverty Puzzles and Statistics of Poverty, *Economic and Political Weekly*, January 20, pp. 211-217.
- Ranjan, R. and G. Lancaster (2005) On Setting the Poverty Line Based on Estimated Nutrient Prices: Condition of Socially Disadvantaged Groups During the Reform Period, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 40(1): 46-56.
- Sen, A. (1985a) Well-Being, Agency and Freedom: The Dewey Lectures 1984, *Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 82, pp. 169-221.
- Sen, A. (1990) Development as Capability Expansion, pp. 41-58, in *Human Development and the International Development Strategy for the 1990s*, edited by K. Griffen and J. Knight, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Sen, A. (1993) Capability and Well-Being, pp. 30-53, in *The Quality of Life*, edited by M. Nussbaum and A. Sen, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sen, A. (1999) *Development as Freedom*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sen, A. (2002) *Rationality and Freedom*, Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Sen, A. K. (1984) *Resources, Values and Development*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Sen, A. K. (1985b) *Commodities and Capabilities*, Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Sen, P. (2005) Of Calories and Things: Reflections on Nutritional Norms, Poverty Lines and Consumption Behaviour in India, *Economic and Political Weekly*, October 22, pp. 4611-4618.
- Singh, M. (2001) Political Economy of Labour: A Case Study of Surgical Instruments Manufacturing Industry at Jalandhar, Punjab, pp. 215-228, in *Informal Sector in India:*

- Perspectives and Policies*, edited by A. Kundu and A. N. Sharma, Delhi: Institute of Human Development.
- Sundaram, K. and S. D. Tendulkar (2002) *The Working Poor in India: Employment Poverty Linkages and Employment Policy Options*, Issues in Employment and Poverty Discussion Paper 4, ILO, Geneva.
- Sundaram, K. and S. D. Tendulkar (2003) Poverty in India in the 1990s: An Analysis of Changes in 15 Major States, *Economic and Political Weekly*, April 5, pp. 1385-1393.
- Sundaram, K. and S. D. Tendulkar (2004) The Poor in the Indian Labour Force: Scenario in the 1990s, *Economic and Political Weekly*, November 27, pp. 5125-5132.
- Unni, J. (1998) Employment and Wages in the Unorganised Sector: Issues in Wage Policy, *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 41(4): 875-892.
- Unni, J. (2004) Globalization and Securing Rights for Women Informal Workers in Asia, *Journal of Human Development*, 5(3): 335-354.
- Unni, J., N. Balu and J. Vyas (1999) *Subcontracted Women Workers in the Global Economy: Case Study of Garment Industry in India*, Ahmedabad: SEWA Academy.
- Unni, J. and U. Rani (2005) *Impact of Recent Policies on Home-Based Work in India*, HDRC, Discussion Paper Series-10, UNDP, New Delhi.
- Vijay, G. (2001) Impact of Flexibilisation on Quality of Life and Social Security of Labour in New-Industrial Towns, pp. in *Social and Economic Security in India*, edited by S. M. Dev, V. Gayathri and R. P. Mamgain, New Delhi: Institute for Human Development.
- Vijay, G. (2005) Migration, Vulnerability and Insecurity in New Industrial Labour Markets, *Economic and Political Weekly*, May 28-June 4, pp. 2304-2312.