



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

**In the slipstream of my Maalkin:
Cascading effect of increasing female
employment in urban India**

Mukherjee, Nandini and Majumder, Rajarshi

Department of Economics, Asutosh College, Kolkata, West Bengal,
India, Department of Economics, The University of Burdwan

2019

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/110080/>
MPRA Paper No. 110080, posted 08 Oct 2021 18:21 UTC

In the slipstream of my *Maalkin*:

Cascading effect of increasing female employment in urban India

Preet Rustagi

Nandini Mukherjee

Rajarshi Majumder

[This paper is the final output of a Major Research Project funded by ICSSR and hosted at Institute for Human Development, New Delhi. Preet Rustagi was the Project Director while the co-authors were co-directors. The paper was initiated while Prof Rustagi was still with us.]

IN THE SLIPSTREAM OF MY MAALKIN: CASCADING EFFECT OF INCREASING FEMALE EMPLOYMENT IN URBAN INDIA

Preet Rustagi¹, Nandini Mukherjee² and Rajarshi Majumder³

Abstract

The world of work is neatly divided into two parts – that of men and women. While men are more into remunerative and recognised work, women shoulder the burden of unpaid and often unrecognised forms of work. Being out of paid formal labour market, they are not paid for their work and hence cannot claim a tangible, monetary contribution to the household. This weakens their bargaining power within the family and in society and prevents their empowerment in true and egalitarian sense. Thus improving Female LFPR and bringing more females into the labour market is a tool for women empowerment, improving GDI & HDI, and reducing GII. This would also raise aggregate work participation and boost the macroeconomic aggregates of the nation along with better health and social indicators. We argue that the impact of increased female employment, especially policy driven formal work, leads to further vacancies in the domestic care-economy space, most often filled up by female domestic worker. Thus a chain effect starts and creates a cascading multiplier impact that improves female work participation much more than the initial and documented rise. In this paper this multiplier impact is sought to be quantified using primary survey data from four cities of India. Results indicate significant cascading effect is present and needs to be tapped to improve gender composition of workforce.

Keywords: Women & Work; Female LFPR; Paid Domestic Work; Work Participation; Employment; Gender Bias

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent times development is perceived as a multidimensional process and revolves around issues related to livelihood and employment, in addition to quality, recognition and remuneration from work. In this aspect, the world of work is neatly divided into two parts – that of men and women. While men are more into remunerative and recognised work, women shoulder the burden of unpaid and often unrecognised forms of work. Even when inside the workforce, women get paid less than men for same work and are routinely subjected to discrimination, sexual assault, and violence at the work place (Mukherjee and Majumder, 2017). As these issues were brought on the table for discussion, policy approaches to women and development in India have changed and there has been a shift from welfare based approach to empowerment based approach. In the former case women acted as the passive

¹ Dr Rustagi was Professor and Joint Director, Institute for Human Development, New Delhi

² Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Asutosh College, Kolkata

³ Corresponding Author; Professor, department of Economics, University of Burdwan, West Bengal; email: meriju@rediffmail.com

beneficiaries of growth where as in the latter one they are viewed as active participants in the process of development. In other words women have come to be recognised as economic agents directly contributing to the development process rather than simply being the recipients of welfare or development. However, it is also a stark reality that strong gender bias exists in the labour market with female labour force participation rates (LFPR) being much lower than men. This results from the fact that women have less control over their time, and as they are not in the labour market, they are not paid for their work and hence cannot claim a tangible, monetary contribution to the household. This weakens their bargaining power within the family and in society and prevents their empowerment in true and egalitarian sense. Thus improving Female LFPR and bringing more females into the labour market is viewed as a tool for women empowerment, improving GDI & HDI, and reducing GII. Needless to say, this would also raise aggregate work participation and boost the macroeconomic aggregates of the nation. With employment and paid work, that is access to income, not only are their potential benefits in terms of women's equality and empowerment but this also enables better child care, nutrition and health care for the family, especially children. The mobility and public participation involved where women are working outside their homes enhances their confidence and gives them a voice. However, this is neither automatic nor substantial in developing societies.

Traditionally, patriarchal nature of developing societies where women's role as a homemaker is not a conscious choice but a compulsory duty, thrust upon her by the society, family, and spouse prevents women from taking up visible *work* in the labour market. Participation in the labour market is not encouraged as it infringes upon the time devotion to the household, including child bearing and rearing. This pressure is not strong among the poor households where dire economic necessity leads to women working irrespective of these requirements. Among the new middle classes, one is witnessing gradual changes with educated women no longer interested in just sitting at home and taking care of the household but are aspiring to join the labour market, as evident from the recently released Census of India Economic Tables (Census of India, 2011). Among the upper classes women generally have care service providers hired and then make a '*choice*' of whether to take up work or not. Given the current gender insecurity in our urban centres and general mistrust on law & order situation, fear for the safety of the women also tends to reinforce patriarchal protection. So in effect it is among the upper and middle classes that patriarchy is reinforced with the primacy given to women's traditional roles and thereby not encouraging their participation in the labour market. Also

there is the lack of public provisioning of services such as Creches, Safe and dependable urban transport services, flexible working hours, gender friendly working conditions etc. that prevents/constrains women from working.

As a result formal contribution of women to economic growth is low. This has significant social connotations as women in such a society are seen as unproductive consumers and therefore discriminated against both within and outside the family, in arenas of nutrition, early-life care, education and health [see Ray, 2003 pp 279-88 for a neat discussion; for empirical evidence see Garg and Morduch, 1997 and Subramanian, 1994]. Only way out of this discrimination is that females must be *seen* to contribute to household income in an equal way. This is possible only when more and more females take up paid work outside the home.

It is however, alarming to notice that Female Labourforce Participation Rate, in the official sense, has been decreasing consistently in India in recent decades, coming down from 37.3 per cent in 1993-94 to 24.2 per cent in 2011-12, for the 15-64 year age group (NSSO 1993, 2011). While absolute numbers of both Labourforce and Workforce have declined in Rural areas, these have shown a healthy rise in urban areas, signalling perhaps that the potential for gender-inclusive employment policies lie more in the urban sphere than rural.

Until very recently issues focusing on urban areas have not been given much emphasis in case of developing countries owing to larger concentration of population in the rural areas stimulating bulk of development initiatives there. However in the last two decades the rural-urban composition of population has changed drastically. Urbanization level in India, which was under 16 percent in 1951, has increased to over 27 percent in 2011, and by 2030 AD 41 percent of its population will be living in cities and towns. This rapid increase in urban population has important implications for the economy as the country's development trajectory will now be significantly determined by the urban processes. Given this, the role and contribution of women in shaping this future will be a key ingredient.

The first issue that merits examination is the type of jobs into which women are entering in recent decades. If women employment is increasing in the stereotypical *female* jobs, which very often fetch lower remunerations and have pathetic work conditions, then the process is inequalitarian rather than empowering. On the other if the disparity between the genders are decreasing across job-types and women are really diversifying into so called better occupations, the process of increased women employment is truly progressive. Hence we

must first identify the sectors/job-types where female employment is increasing in recent times.

The second question that arises is that due to increased female work participation, a second round of vacancies are being generated in the family space. Also, in urban India, more than elsewhere, assortive mating are at play in the marriage market and couples, especially young couples, are similar in educational achievements, career options and occupational choices. As a result relatively more professionally qualified women would be earning members and in the formal labour market. Therefore demand for care workers would be higher in the urban centres. These second order vacancies in the care economy are mostly being filled by females, e.g. as ayahs, baby-sitters, maids, cooks etc. Thus one additional female worker brings in its trail several other female employment opportunities and there is a multiplier effect in work. This is supposed to be more pronounced in the urban areas. This process has already started in Metros and Tier-I cities, but how they are playing out in the Tier-2 cities will determine the trends in 3 different but related dimensions – female employment, urbanisation, and tertiarisation. Hence we must try to assess the magnitude of such multiplier effects.

We argue that the impact of female employment, especially policy driven improvement in female labourforce participation, leads to further chain effects and creates a cascading multiplier impact that improves female work participation much more than the initial and documented rise. This paper attempts to quantify such cascading effects so that the impact is better perceived by researchers and policy makers.

II. OBJECTIVES

This study aims to estimate the impact of such increased women employment in urban India with special focus on the multiplier effect of such increase. The objectives can be outlined as:

1. Estimating the trends in Female Employment in urban India over the 1993-2013 period (using secondary data);
2. Assessing impact of increasing female employment on second round employment creation (using primary survey data);
3. Quantifying the cascading effect of rising female employment in urban areas.

III. BRIEF REVIEW OF EXISTING LITERATURE

It is evident from various studies that global labour market is highly gender biased with female LFPR being much lower than men; persistence of more unemployed women than men; a large proportion of working women working as unpaid labour in family enterprises with no access to an income of their own and prevalence of gender disparities in earnings are common and persistent. According to some economists, there exist a male bias in data collection and analysis resulting into gross under estimation of women's work in the process of development. They believe that women's work is best shown by micro-level studies and data which reveal their role more conspicuously (**Mathur, 1994**). Women's participation in the labour force can be viewed as a signal of declining discrimination and increasing empowerment of women (**Mammen & Paxson, 2000**). Among the different indicators like work, education, health, survival, participation in private/ public decision making and safety/security that measure women's status across India, women's work is being considered as the most vital indicators serving as an empowerment tool (**Rustagi, 2004**). It is in this context that the role of women in the work sphere of urban areas needs to be studied. Women work both for the labour market and for the household of which some are recognized as economic work and some are as unpaid work and do not enter into the sphere of the market. The role played by women in the care sector (bearing, rearing, nurturing children and household maintenance) is enormous and deserve special attention. It is really a difficult task to assign numerical value to the tasks performed by them. **Kabeer (2005)** while talking about gender equality and women's empowerment highlighted the role of education, employment and political participation as important indicators in attaining the Millennium Development Goals. While analysing the pattern of female employment in urban India during 1983 to 1999-2000 **Mitra (2006)** showed that increased rate of output growth has not resulted in increased employment opportunities for urban women workers. Further there occurred a rise in open unemployment rates and deteriorating work conditions in terms of reduced wages and paucity of non-wage remuneration. **Olsen and Mehta (2006)** argues that labour force participation in India responds to economic, social, cultural and demographic mechanisms and provide a number of reasons which explains work patterns of housewives. **Mukherjee (2014)** contends that status of a sub-section of population of a society (read *women*) is closely related with their economic position which in turn depends on rights, roles and participation in economic activities. **Ferrant et al (2014)** argues that unpaid care work is an important aspect of economic activity as well as indispensable factor contributing to the well-being of individuals, their families and societies. **Bardhan (1985)** stated that differences in work participation affect women's status and welfare, the quality of female life. **Budlender**

(2008) while comparing findings from time-use studies from Argentina, Nicaragua, India, the Republic of Korea, South Africa and Tanzania showed that the time spent by men on unpaid care work cluster at the lower end of distribution while there are substantial numbers of women devoting long hours in the care economy. **Rustagi (2010)** anticipated a continuous rise in the number of women workers in the years to come, and remarked that efforts must be made to provide them with basic amenities and strong support service system for a smooth functioning of their responsibilities. The effect of globalisation and higher economic growth rate in India resulted in increase in female work participation between 1999-2000 and 2004-05 with more employment in services and shift from unpaid household work to paid jobs (**Ghosh, 2009**). There is however an other side of the story which reveals a decline in female labour force participation rate from 29.4 per cent in 2004-05 to 23 per cent in 2009-10 (**Mahapatro, 2013**) and an absolute fall in female employment at an annual rate of 1.72 per cent (**Chandrasekhar and Ghosh, 2011**). There are some recent studies explaining the causes of declining entry of females into labour forces in recent years either through the education channel (increased stay at educational institutions) or through changes in employment pattern (**Rangrajan et al, 2011; Mazumdar and Neetha, 2011**). **Rustagi, Sarkar and Joddar (2009)** highlighted that women in urban areas are affected by widespread discrimination and high inequalities. They observed that a positive shift in the employment status among the urban women in the form of increase in regular workers during the last decade. The paper also mentioned how household responsibilities and services of the working women in urban areas are being transferred to hired service providers /external care givers. However inadequacy of child care provisions/crèche facilities remained a major constraint for many qualified urban women who frequently are compelled to remain out of employment during early child rearing years. **Kabeer (2012)** reflects how women's economic empowerment directly lead them into the domain of labour markets and livelihoods through majority of the women having access to economic resources.

There are some recent works that brings to the fore the growing importance of the care economy, especially care economy jobs within the household. For example, **ILO (2012)** examines how gender stereotyping affect the provision of care and why women are over represented in specified *care* jobs. It argues that inadequate supply of affordable non-parental childcare is a major constraint for parent's full time participation .particularly for mothers. **Antonopoulos and Kim (2011)** show the employment effects of investment in care economy of two countries like South Africa and United States. The study aims to show how investment

in social care provisioning through public job creation lead to promote gender equality .The study reveal that investment in care service for the elderly, chronically ill and children under school age is an effective employment generation policy. Home based care is found to be more cost effective and most of the workers in home based health care services happen to be women in United States. The social care expansion also leads to reduction of poverty directly through employment. It has been observed that the number of jobs for the low income households has exceeded 540,000 under the care expansion program. **Liangshu Qi Tsinghua (2013)** provides the estimates of the effects of housework burdens on the earnings of men and women in China through time use survey. Results show that both housework time and its interference with market work have negative effects on the earnings of men and women. **Folbre (2014)** tries to outline a theoretical framework for analysing the care economy, including both the paid and unpaid work of caring for dependents and the flow of financial resources through the family, the community, the state and the market in Africa. **Sharma et al (2013)** examines how the infant children of domestic workers who are left with other members of the households are taken care of and how the role of the relatives increases in child care depending on the occupation of the mother and also the family structure.

It is thus clear that not much work has been done in the Indian context on the impact of female work participation either on the economy or on the household, especially the scenario in the urban areas has remained under-studied. Similarly, studies linking female work participation and care economy have been fairly sparse too. Many of the issues related to increased female work participation, especially the urban areas, are yet to be addressed in the Indian context. However, in the next decade or so India's social, economic, and demographic scenario will be shaped by the trends in female workforce participation and related impacts on the society, the household and the intra-household service delivery mechanism. In this context, this study becomes relevant and significant as it seeks to address some of the key issues related to female work participation. In particular it tries to explore the vital link between increased female employment and monetisation of the care economy so that both can be synergised together to improve gender composition of workforce, bring the *better half* into the labour market, and boost both macroeconomic performance and social & human development indicators.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The study is based on both secondary and primary data to seek answer to the research questions mentioned earlier. It uses secondary data from NSSO rounds on Employment and Unemployment for 1993-94 and 2011-12 to understand the broad trends in women's work participation, and associated characteristics, structure, and occupational profile of women workers in India, focussing on urban sector specially. Thereafter, primary survey was undertaken to answer several questions mentioned in the preceding sections.

A sample of 4 wards from each city were selected based on socioeconomic characteristics like female LFPR, social composition and economic dynamics. For houselisting, from each sample ward, 2 census enumeration blocks (CEB) consisting of 100-150 households each were selected. Though our focus shall be on households with working women, households without working women shall also be taken into account for control purpose. The listed households were therefore divided into two stratum in the second stage - households with working women (SSS-I) and households without working women (SSS-II). Sample allocation were 20 households to SS-I and 5 households to SS-II. In the third stage households were divided again into two stratum – households with hired female domestic worker (TSS-I) and those without female domestic worker (TSS-II). The predesignated sample size for each SSS shall be allocated to each TSS using the probability proportional to the size (PPS) method. The sample distribution in each sample ward were as follows:

Household Type	SSS No.	Sample Size	TSS No.	Sample Size
<i>Households with working women and hiring female domestic worker:</i>	I	20	I	Proportionate to population within SSS-I
<i>Households with working women and not hiring female domestic worker:</i>	I		II	Proportionate to population within SSS-I
<i>Households without working women and hiring female domestic worker:</i>	II	5	III	Proportionate to population within SSS-II
<i>Households without working women and not hiring female domestic worker:</i>	II		IV	Proportionate to population within SSS-II

After scrutiny and data cleaning, we had 3116 households in the houselisting. From each sample ward 25 households were selected comprising of 20 households with working women and 5 households without working women. A buffer of 10 per cent were also kept to allow

for post-scrutiny sample demise. In all, our final main survey sample consists of 4 cities, 16 wards, 32 CEBs and 424 households.

The details about field operation are as follows:

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Sample unit</i>	<i>Delhi</i>	<i>Kolkata</i>	<i>Asansol</i>	<i>Noida</i>	<i>Total</i>
1	Wards	4	4	4	4	16
2	CEBs	8	8	8	8	32
3	Houselisting	800	800	800	800	3200
3	<i>Households</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>400</i>
5	<i>Total Sample units</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>400</i>

The secondary data and primary data collected were analysed with statistical data analysis softwares R and SPSS — using a variety of statistical instruments.

V. RESULTS & DISCUSSION AT MACRO LEVEL

a) Labourforce Participation

We have concentrated on females between 15 to 65 years of age in this paper. Numbers of females in this age group has increased from 232 million in 1993 to 357 million in 2011, the increase being more pronounced in urban areas (Table 1). Surprisingly, both aggregate labourforce and workforce has remained unchanged during this period – a result of substantial increase in urban figures accompanied by a drop in rural figures. As a result, official LFPR has dropped sharply from 37.3 to 24.2 during this period, the drop being sharper in rural areas compared to urban areas. WPR has remained almost unchanged over this time. Looking at social groups, LFPR has decreased across the board, but most sharply for SCs & STs in rural areas.

During this period, females engaged in domestic duties and also engaged in extra-domestic jobs that add to the family's consumption basket have shown the highest increase – from 60 million to more than 104 million.⁴ As mentioned by Majumder (2012), this has been caused mainly by stagnant & distressed labour market conditions which discourages female work participation but forces them to take up a host of activities to supplement household income/consumption. At the regional level, female LFPR has declined in all major states except in Delhi and urban areas of Himachal Pradesh (Table 2). Proportion of women

⁴ This subset, in the Indian context, includes those who, in addition to domestic duties, are engaged in – free collection of goods (vegetables, roots, fire-wood, cattle feed, etc.); sewing, tailoring, weaving, making baskets & mats, preparation of cow-dung cake, etc. for household use; husking of paddy, grinding of foodgrains, preparation of gur, preservation of meat and fish for household consumption; and, tutoring of children.

engaged in wage employment has also declined except in Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Delhi, urban Karnataka, and urban Punjab (Table 3).

b) Occupational Distribution

Traditionally, women in India, as in any large, predominantly rural, developing country, have been engaged in farming. Over time, that share is declining but still more than half of all wage employed females between 15-65 years of age are engaged in farming occupations (Table 4). This is followed by production jobs and unclassified labourers in rural areas, and sales workers, technicians and professionals in urban areas. Looking at the temporal dynamics, growth rate of wage workers have been highest for urban sales jobs, clocking a stupendous 22 per cent per annum growth over 1993-2011 period – fuelled no doubt by the shopping mall revolution of the last two decades. This has been followed by growth of urban administrative and technical jobs. It is thus clear that the growth spurt to female jobs will come from urban areas.

What is also evident is the changing composition of female wage workers. Rather than stereotyped *feminine* occupations like farming, services and administration, females are increasingly moving into White collar occupations like Technical and Professional jobs, and Sales. As a result gender-composition of workforce is becoming more spread out across occupations and the increase in (absolute number of) female workforce has been empowering and egalitarian in its purport.

c) Paid Domestic Work

Our special focus is on the paid domestic work – an area where there is enough scope for the chain/multiplier action to operate – as mentioned earlier. Just about 1.2 per cent of females aged between 15-65 years are engaged as Paid Domestic Workers in India, up from 0.8 per cent two decades earlier. The proportion, as expected is higher in urban areas (at 2.7 per cent) compared to rural areas where it is just 0.6 per cent. Thus in 2011-12, there were 4.4 million PDWs in India, two-third of them in urban areas. Proportions of female PDWs are relatively higher in Kerala, Himachal Pradesh, Punjab, and urban areas of Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Maharashtra and West Bengal. Growth in female PDWs has also been a respectable 5.3 per cent per annum in the aggregate. At the regional level, growth of PDWs has been faster in Himachal Pradesh, Haryana, Arunachal Pradesh, Punjab, and Andhra Pradesh.

d) Linking trends in PDW with other Labour Market Markers

We proposed at the outset that PDW is basically monetisation of domestic work space and has a link with increased participation of women in the labour market. In particular, our contention is that as women move out of the home, especially into the formal job market, it creates a vacancy at the household for the care-jobs. These spaces are filled up by paid employees as with increased income the household can now afford to employ domestic helps. Is this process/linkage supported by macro data? To examine that, we compute the correlations between proportion of female PDW with several other labour market indicators across the states. To avoid circular association and endogeneity, we compute the labour market indicators after excluding the PDWs.

It is observed that share of PDW is higher in states where LFPR and WPR are higher. Growth of PDWs has also been higher in regions where growth of labourforce and wage workers have been relatively higher. This association is particularly stronger for the urban areas, confirming our expectations that the linkage would be stronger in the urban set-up. If we differentiate between types of occupations, we find that the association is stronger with White and Pink collar occupations and insignificant but negative for Blue Collar occupations.⁵

The macro results thus support our notion that greater labourforce and workforce participation by females in general is accompanied by an increased number of females being engaged as paid domestic workers, bringing into play a chain of more and more females being inducted into the labour market. This process is also seemingly stronger in urban areas than rural.

To understand the process and to quantify the linkage, primary surveys were conducted in four cities as mentioned earlier – Delhi and Noida in Northern India, and Kolkata and Asansol in Eastern India. The results are discussed below.

VI. RESULTS FROM THE FIELD: THE CASCADING EFFECT

a) Listing Survey

The Listing Survey covered 3116 households across the 4 cities. Though randomly chosen, there was a predominance of General caste households in our listing sample, followed by SCs, OBCs and STs (Table 8). Most of the households had 3-5 members in the households, though large households with 9 or more members were also encountered (Table 9).

⁵ These occupations groups are as follows:

LFPR among women in the listing sample was 32.3 per cent (Table 10). LFPR was close to 20 per cent in Asansol and Kolkata (two eastern cities) and more than 45 per cent in Delhi and Noida (two northern cities). Maximum numbers of women were engaged in regular salaried jobs in the private sector, followed by regular jobs in the government sector. Only in Delhi more women were in government jobs rather than in private sector. These were followed by self-employment. Casual outdoor jobs were more common in Asansol and Kolkata compared to Delhi and Noida. Kolkata also had a sizeable number of retirees in the listing sample. Majority of the female domestic help were engaged to assist the female member of the household, while a sizeable proportion also goes to fill in for the female member when she goes out to work (Table 11).

For the households who have not engaged female domestic help, the predominant reason is that such help is not required, especially in Delhi and Noida (Table 12). However, in Asansol the predominant reason is un-affordability of such help. This reason is also sizeable in Kolkata.

b) Main Survey

i) Difference in Proportions

The Main Survey covered 424 households from the four cities (Table 13). In aggregate, 63.7 per cent surveyed households employ paid Female Domestic Worker (FDW). There are several social and household characteristics that affect these results. Engagement of FDW is higher among General Caste compared to SCs and STs (Table 14). Larger families engage fewer FDW, may be because they have other family members to do the household chores even when the main female member of the household is working. At the same time, households with elderly and children are engaging FDW more frequently than others (Table 15). Affordability emerges to be another factor as larger proportions of relatively better-off families are seen to be employing FDWs (Table 16). Engagement of FDW is also more common when the main female member of the household is a regular worker in organised sector.

However, our main query is to examine whether proportion of engagement of FDW is higher for households with working females compared to households without working females. We find that in all the four cities, this is indeed so (Table 17). Independent samples *t-test* suggests that the differences in proportions are significant in all the cities except Kolkata.

ANOVA tests suggest that variation in Number of FDWs hired can be suitably explained by whether the woman of the household is currently working or not, with the across the group (Working/Not Working) variation significantly larger than between group variation (Table 18).

ii) Regression based approach

Since we have already noted that hiring of FDW is linked with several variables in addition to the working status of the female member of the employer household, we have used the multiple regression technique to examine the impact of the explanatory variables.

The first regression uses a dichotomous categorical variable (Whether FDW hired or not) as the dependent variable while the explanatory variables are: Family Size, Proportion of Elderly members in the household, Proportion of Children below 5 years of age in the household, Monthly Household Income, and, Working status of the female member of the employer household. In the second model we include the marital status of the female member also. Results indicate that all the explanatory variables except Marital status are significant (Table 19). Whether FDW is hired or not depends significantly on whether the female member of the household is working or not and probability of hiring FDW increases one-and-half times if the female is working relatively to if the female is not working. Among other variables, number of children in the family is most significant and one additional child in the family more than doubles the probability of hiring FDW. Increase in family size decreases the probability of hiring FDW by two-fifth.

The third and fourth regression uses the same set of explanatory variables as before but now uses a continuous variable (Number of FDW hired) as the dependent variable. Results indicate that all the explanatory variables except Marital status are significant. Increase in number of children, elderly, household income increases number of FDWs hired while increase in family size decreases it. If the female of the household is working, number of FDWs hired increases by 0.1, indicating that for every 10 females brought into formal workforce, another female will be inducted as FDW.

iii) Simulation exercise

We have also used a Simulation exercise to understand the situation better. Working females were asked which of the female domestic workers they would have still retained if they were not working. Difference between actual number of females hired and this simulated number can be taken as additional FDW hired due to working of the female member of the

household. On an average 31 per cent of working females report that the FDW hired by them would have been dismissed had they been not working (Table 20). This proportion was highest in Kolkata and lowest in New Delhi.

Conversely, we had asked the non-working females whether they would hire any additional FDW if they were working. Close to one-fourth of such households reported that they would require FDW if they were working (Table 20). This proportion was highest in Noida and least in New Delhi.

c) The multiplier at work

We have so far found strong and significant evidence that a rise in female work participation creates a vacancy for the care work at the household level and triggers second round job creation for females. This cascading chain therefore is like a multiplier effect where first round increase in female LFPR would be followed by subsequent automatic increase in female LFPR so that the final increase would be more than the initial one. The magnitude of this *multiplier* varies across cities and depending on the methodology adopted, it ranges from 0.09 to 0.29, indicating that any policy inducement that directly increases female employment by 100 would bring in its wake another 10-30 females into the workforce. Since hiring of FDW is more in higher income families, an interaction effect would also operate and increase this multiplier effect further since as the female goes out to work, family income would also increase. Encouraging female employment in the formal/organised sector through several affirmative actions thus assumes greater significance because of the extra jobs created in the slipstream.

VII. CONCLUSION

The study aimed at exploring the trends in female labour market markers over the last two decades in India. It is observed that over the 1993-2011 period, quantum of female employment have increased significantly, especially in urban areas. However, this has fallen short of population increase and thus there has been a drastic fall in female LFPR. Female WPR has remained stagnant over these two decades. This has serious consequence not only on the gender front but also on hard economic performance of the country. As **UNDP (2010)** talked of '*pervasive gender inequality as a barrier to progress, justice and social stability*', and '*persistent gender discrimination and under-representation of women in the economy*'. It has been estimated that increase in female workforce participation rate to the level of developed countries would add about 60 per cent to its GDP by 2025 and 4 percentage points

to its growth rate. A successful example is East Asia where more women in the workplace is a major reason for its superior economic performance. Thus increasing female employment, creating more jobs for females and inducing women to take up paid work are important strategies that needs to be pursued vigorously. Some churning in the labour market is also visible as occupational composition is shifting and female employment is moving away from traditional stereotyped *feminine* jobs to newer occupations, especially in urban areas. We had also put forward a notion that this urban growth spurts in terms of increasing and diversifying female employment can be tapped to create a sustained improvement in female WPR and argued that there are second round impacts of increased female employment through the link of increased female work participation with (monetisation of) the care economy. If females can be brought into workplace through policy incentives and creating a conducive workplace environment, there will be a cascading effect as vacancy arises at the household for care jobs. Our results support this cascading effect and quantification indicates that a multiplier effect is at work – policy driven female employment generation will have greater impact than initially pushed for.

The results have important policy implications as well. We find that monetisation of the care economy is already at work and the process will gain momentum as more and more women starts getting into the labour market. Thus a large part of the unpaid work will become *paid* work, increasing our GDP. While this leads to higher macroeconomic capacity to usher in human development at large, several micro benefits also follow such increase in number of females in the labour market. For example, this leads to greater bargaining power of women within the household, increasing scope and coverage of maternal and child care, reducing domestic injustice, oppressiveness and dissent (UNDP, 2010). The cascading effect that we observe brings more jobs to women mostly from the lower rungs of socioeconomic hierarchy, who otherwise would have remained unemployed, at the mercy of the men folk of their households, often being subject to domestic oppression and violence. Being able to work and getting to earn improves not only the economic condition of these relatively poor households, but also empowers the females. Thus findings of this study thus give a fillip for the policy of encouraging women's participation in the labour market, improving women's access to paid jobs, and creating a flexible, gender-sensitive and safe workspace for the *other half* of our shared planet.

[This paper is the outcome of a Major Research Project funded by Indian Council of Social Science Research and hosted at Institute for Human Development, New Delhi. Preet Rustagi was the Project Director while the co-authors were co-directors. Authors are thankful to Piyali Majumdar at University of Burdwan, Balwant Singh Mehta, Sudheer Shukla, and Deeksha Tayal at IHD for research assistance. A part of the study also funded by SAP-DRS program of University Grants Commission of India at Department of Economics, Burdwan University. The paper was presented at the annual DRS Seminar at Department of Economics, University of Burdwan and at the 60th Annual Conference of the Indian Society of Labour Economics held at IGIDR, Mumbai. Comments received from participants has been most helpful, especially those from Indrani Mazumdar, Arup Chattopadhyay, Ratna Sudarshan, Praveena Kodoth, and Jhilam Ray. Usual disclaimers apply.]

References

- Bardhan (1985) “women’s work welfare and status-forces of tradition and change in India” *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 20 Issues No. 50, 14 Dec 1985
- Budlender, D. (2008). “The Statistical Evidence on Care and Non-care Work Across Six Countries,” Program on Gender and Development, Paper No. 4,
- Census of India (2011) – Economic tables, Census of India, 2011, Registrar General of India, Government of India
- Chandrasekhar, CP and Jayati Ghosh (2013) “Where have All the Women Workers Gone?” *The Business Line* on November 11, 2013.
- Ferrant et al (2014) Ferrant, Gaëlle, Luca Maria Pesando and Keiko Nowacka (2014) - Unpaid Care Work: The missing link in the analysis of gender gaps in labour outcomes, OECD Development Centre, December 2014
- Folbre 2006; “Measuring Care: Gender, Empowerment, and the Care Economy” *Journal of Human Development* Vol. 7, No. 2, July 2006
- Ghosh Jayati (2009). *Never Done and Poorly Paid: Women’s Work in Globalising India*, Women Unlimited, New Delhi.
- International Labor Organization (2012). “Global Employment Trends for Women 2012,” Geneva: ILO.
- Kabeer. Naila (2012); “Women’s economic empowerment and inclusive growth: labour markets and enterprise development”; School of Oriental and African Studies, UK SIG WORKING PAPER 2012/1. Supported by Department for International Development (DFID) and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC).
- Liangshu Qi Tsinghua (2013) “Housework Burdens, Quality of Market Work Time, and Men’s and Women’s Earnings in China”.
- Mahapatro, Sandhya Rani (2013) “Declining Trends in Female Labour Force Participation in India: Evidence from NSSO” MPRA Paper No. 44373, posted 14. February 2013 09:43 UTC
- Majumder, R. (2012) “Female Labour Supply in India: Proximate Determinants”, *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol. 55, No. 3
- Mammen, Kristin, and Christina Paxson (2000) “Women’s Work and Economic Development”, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 14 (4), pp141-164, DOI: 10.1257/jep.14.4.141
- Mathur. O.P (1994); “ Women, Urban Poverty and Economic Development”, in Noleen Heyzer and Gita Sen (eds) ‘*Gender, Economic Growth and Poverty : Market Growth and State Planning in Asia and Pacific*’;
- Mazumdar, Indrani and N Neetha (2011) “Gender Dimensions: Employment Trends in India, 1993-94 to 2009-10”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 46, Issue No. 43, 22 Oct, 2011, pp118-126
- Mitra, Sona (2006) “Patterns of female employment in urban India: Analysis of NSS Data”, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 41, Issue No. 48, 02 Dec, 2006, pp5000-5008.
- Mukherjee, Sujata. (2014). “The ‘Invisible’ Worker: Women and Work in the Informal Economy”. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, Vol. 4(9). Pp. 24-43.
- Mukherjee, Nandini and R. Majumder (2015), Unpaid Work and Missing Women in the Indian Labour Market, *Indian Journal of Human Development*, Vol. 9, No. 2, July-December, 2015
- NSSO (1993) Unit level records of survey on Employment and Unemployment in India, 50th round, 1993-94, National Sample Survey Office, Ministry of Statistics and Program Implementation, Government of India
- NSSO (2011) Unit level records of survey on Employment and Unemployment in India, 68th round, 2011-12, National Sample Survey Office, Ministry of Statistics and Program Implementation, Government of India
- Olsen and Mehta (2006) Olsen, W. and Mehta, S. (2006): “A Pluralist Account of Labour Participation in India” GPRG-WPS-042 Global Poverty Research Group downloaded from <http://www.gprg.org/pubs/workingpapers/pdfs/gprg-wps-042.pdf>

- Rangrajan et al, (2011) Rangarajan, C, P I Kaul and Seema (2011): “Where Is the Missing Labour Force?”, *Economic & Political Weekly*, 46(39).
- Rustagi, Preet, S. Sarkar and P. Joddar (2009) *Gender Dimensions of Urban Poverty in India: Urban Poverty Report*, OUP, New Delhi
- Rustagi. Preet (2004); “Significance of gender –related development indicators: An analysis of Indian states; *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*,2004;Sage Publications
- Rustagi. Preet (2010); “Employment trends for women in India”, ILO Asia –Pacific Working Paper Series, June 2010.
- Sharma. K, Raman.V and Dhawan.P (2013); “Need Assessment for Creches and Child Care Services: Report”; Ministry for Women and Child Development, Government of India; Conducted by Forum for Creches and Child Care Services(FORCES) and Centre for Women's Development Studies (CWDS).
- UNDP (2010) *Power, Voices and Rights: Asia Pacific Human Development Report 2010*, Macmillan, New Delhi

Table 1
Labour Force Participation of Women in India – 1993 – 2011

<i>Status</i>	<i>1993</i>			<i>2011</i>		
	<i>Rural</i>	<i>Urban</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Rural</i>	<i>Urban</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>(Numbers – in millions) – 15-64 years age</i>						
<i>Number of Females</i>	173.4	58.8	232.2	249.9	106.8	356.8
<i>Labourforce</i>	73.3	13.3	86.5	66.6	19.9	86.5
<i>Workers</i>	71.0	12.1	83.1	64.7	18.6	83.2
<i>Extra-domestic^a</i>	51.1	8.8	59.8	87.1	17.2	104.3
<i>Domestic Work</i>	48.3	30.5	78.8	66.1	52.4	118.5
<i>Paid Domestic Work^b</i>	0.5	1.3	1.8	1.5	2.9	4.4
<i>Labour Force Participation Rates (15-64 years age)</i>						
<i>Official LFPR (%)</i>	42.3	22.5	37.3	26.6	18.6	24.2
<i>Modified LFPR1 (%)^c</i>	71.7	37.5	63.0	61.5	34.7	53.5
<i>WPR</i>	96.9	91.3	96.1	97.1	93.4	96.3
<i>Official Labour Force Participation Rates (15-64 years age) – by Social Class</i>						
<i>Scheduled Tribe</i>	60.6	31.2	58.0	43.9	25.7	41.8
<i>Scheduled Caste</i>	45.3	30.3	42.7	27.4	22.2	26.2
<i>Others (OBC+General)</i>	38.7	21.1	33.6	23.7	17.7	21.7

Source: Author’s calculations based on NSSO (1993) and NSSO (2011).

Note: a – those engaged in domestic duties plus other activities as explained in text; b – Paid domestic job includes those engaged in Housekeeping, Personal Care and Services, Domestic and Related Helpers, Domestic Cleaners and Launderers, Domestic Caretakers, Messengers, Porters, Door Keepers and Related Workers, ; c – includes those engaged in *Work* and *Extra-domestic Duties*; Modified LFPR1 is derived from this;

Table 2
Female Labour Force Participation Rate in India by States

<i>States / UTs</i>	<i>% of 15-64 years females in labourforce</i>					
	<i>1993</i>			<i>2011</i>		
	<i>Rural</i>	<i>Urban</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Rural</i>	<i>Urban</i>	<i>Total</i>
Andhra Pradesh	64.4	26.0	54.5	56.3	23.4	45.5
Arunachal Pradesh	64.2	17.4	58.8	42.0	20.1	38.1
Assam	22.8	16.5	22.0	12.9	12.3	12.8
Bihar	22.5	11.2	21.2	5.6	5.7	5.6
Jharkhand	-	-	-	15.5	8.3	13.8
Goa	31.7	29.6	30.9	27.6	23.8	25.8
Gujarat	51.9	20.4	41.6	29.6	16.3	24.2
Haryana	36.1	21.4	32.2	9.1	12.6	10.2
Himachal Pradesh	68.6	25.4	65.2	62.7	28.3	59.1
Jammu & Kashmir	41.7	17.7	35.8	7.3	15.2	9.2
Karnataka	54.1	26.0	45.9	37.7	23.3	32.5
Kerala	31.9	30.2	31.5	28.8	27.4	28.4
Madhya Pradesh	51.6	21.1	44.5	28.9	14.9	25.1
Chhattisgarh	-	-	-	54.6	31.9	49.6
Maharashtra	62.6	23.5	47.8	42.8	20.9	32.6
Manipur	46.1	31.2	41.8	23.6	25.3	24.1
Meghalaya	73.2	30.4	67.5	59.9	29.1	52.9
Mizoram	52.9	42.2	49.3	53.6	38.7	46.0
Nagaland	29.0	16.3	25.8	33.1	22.9	29.7
Orissa	33.7	19.9	32.0	20.6	18.5	20.3
Punjab	31.1	14.7	26.3	7.3	13.5	9.6
Rajasthan	58.3	22.0	49.8	35.6	13.9	30.2
Sikkim	39.1	21.1	37.6	69.7	38.2	64.1
Tamil Nadu	59.1	32.9	49.9	42.4	26.9	35.5
Tripura	18.7	20.5	18.9	24.8	34.1	26.4
Uttar Pradesh	29.2	15.7	26.6	14.2	11.0	13.4
Uttaranchal	-	-	-	32.2	12.8	27.2
West Bengal	24.1	22.5	23.7	15.9	18.0	16.5
Andaman & Nicobar	40.0	24.2	35.5	32.5	33.4	32.8
Chandigarh	21.6	37.7	35.8	-0.6	17.2	16.1
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	59.0	37.5	57.6	23.5	17.3	20.9
Daman & Diu	33.4	23.9	29.7	5.2	21.1	11.1
Delhi	-	14.9	14.9	-	15.0	15.0
Lakshadweep	23.8	19.5	21.7	20.4	18.0	19.2
Pondichery	38.0	21.7	27.3	25.7	19.1	21.7
All India	42.3	22.5	37.3	26.6	18.6	24.2

Source: Same as Table 1.

Table 3
Female Wage Employment in India by States

<i>States / UTs</i>	<i>% of (15-64 years) females engaged in Wage Employment</i>					
	<i>1993</i>			<i>2011</i>		
	<i>Rural</i>	<i>Urban</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Rural</i>	<i>Urban</i>	<i>Total</i>
Andhra Pradesh	31.4	12.6	26.5	29.6	12.3	23.9
Arunachal Pradesh	4.4	10.7	5.1	4.3	9.4	5.2
Assam	11.7	8.4	11.3	5.9	6.5	6.0
Bihar	12.9	6.1	12.1	3.5	2.5	3.4
Jharkhand	-	-	-	4.0	5.7	4.4
Goa	17.7	17.0	17.5	21.9	18.9	20.5
Gujarat	21.5	11.3	18.2	14.1	9.3	12.2
Haryana	6.8	9.6	7.5	3.9	9.6	5.7
Himachal Pradesh	2.5	12.1	3.3	7.4	18.3	8.6
Jammu & Kashmir	2.0	9.0	3.7	3.3	9.3	4.8
Karnataka	25.4	13.5	21.9	19.5	15.8	18.2
Kerala	13.6	14.5	13.9	16.0	16.0	16.0
Madhya Pradesh	17.5	11.4	16.1	12.5	7.6	11.2
Chhattisgarh	-	-	-	25.3	20.9	24.4
Maharashtra	29.4	14.3	23.7	22.0	14.3	18.4
Orissa	12.3	11.5	12.2	8.6	8.2	8.5
Punjab	4.7	7.3	5.4	3.9	10.2	6.2
Rajasthan	6.2	8.9	6.8	7.9	7.3	7.7
Tamil Nadu	32.0	18.4	27.2	27.7	16.1	22.5
Uttar Pradesh	4.9	5.3	5.0	3.8	4.3	3.9
Uttaranchal	-	-	-	2.5	5.6	3.3
West Bengal	9.7	11.9	10.2	8.7	10.6	9.2
Delhi	-	10.2	10.2	-	10.6	10.6
All India	16.1	11.7	15.0	12.1	11.0	11.8

Source: Same as Table 1.

Table 4
Occupational Distribution of Female Wage Workers in India – 1993 – 2011

	<i>(Numbers – in millions) – 15-64 years age</i>						<i>Growth Rate per annum</i>		
	<i>1993-94</i>			<i>2011-12</i>			<i>1993-2011</i>		
	<i>Rural</i>	<i>Urban</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Rural</i>	<i>Urban</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Rural</i>	<i>Urban</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Technical</i>	0.80	0.39	1.19	1.51	1.85	3.36	3.6	9.0	5.9
<i>Professionals</i>	0.60	1.14	1.74	0.66	1.78	2.45	0.5	2.5	1.9
<i>Administrative</i>	0.03	0.06	0.09	0.04	0.31	0.35	1.6	9.6	7.8
<i>Clerical</i>	0.25	0.80	1.05	0.22	1.05	1.27	-0.7	1.5	1.1
<i>Sales</i>	0.03	0.07	0.10	0.99	2.44	3.43	21.4	21.8	21.7
<i>Service</i>	0.73	1.49	2.22	0.90	1.04	1.94	1.2	-2.0	-0.7
<i>Farming</i>	22.59	1.07	23.66	20.76	0.89	21.64	-0.5	-1.0	-0.5
<i>Production, etc.</i>	1.29	0.73	2.02	2.41	1.56	3.97	3.5	4.3	3.8
<i>Transport</i>	0.18	0.11	0.28	0.01	0.02	0.03	-14.8	-9.0	-11.7
<i>Labourers, nec</i>	1.38	1.06	2.44	2.71	0.83	3.53	3.8	-1.3	2.1
<i>Aggregate Paid Work</i>	27.88	6.91	34.79	30.21	11.77	41.97	0.4	3.0	1.0
<i>Paid Domestic Work^a</i>	0.54	1.22	1.75	1.49	2.93	4.42	5.8	5.0	5.3

Source: Author's calculations based on NSSO (1996) and NSSO (2011).

Note: a – Paid domestic job includes those engaged in Housekeeping, Personal Care and Services, Domestic and Related Helpers, Domestic Cleaners and Launderers, Domestic Caretakers, Messengers, Porters, Door Keepers and Related Workers.

Table 5
Magnitude & Growth of Female Paid Domestic Work in India by States

States/UTs	Numbers - 1993			Numbers - 2011			Growth Rate (% pa)		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Andhra Pradesh	37417	107113	144530	114267	403980	518247	6.4	7.7	7.4
Arunachal Pradesh	0	468	468	2726	1770	4496	-	7.7	13.4
Assam	2448	16827	19274	28096	8973	37069	14.5	-3.4	3.7
Bihar	5328	30716	36044	17511	31950	49461	6.8	0.2	1.8
Goa	2128	7589	9717	11741	8962	20703	10.0	0.9	4.3
Gujarat	11759	72204	83963	59933	102221	162154	9.5	2.0	3.7
Haryana	0	5277	5277	28444	40530	68974	-	12.0	15.4
Himachal Pradesh	0	1119	1119	31011	2036	33047	-	3.4	20.7
Jammu & Kashmir	0	2321	2321	12555	9414	21969	-	8.1	13.3
Karnataka	42292	62628	104919	110615	235141	345756	5.5	7.6	6.8
Kerala	63886	36079	99965	194035	110872	304907	6.4	6.4	6.4
Madhya Pradesh	15314	63622	78936	90204	154690	244894	10.4	5.1	6.5
Maharashtra	45216	258536	303752	88633	750916	839549	3.8	6.1	5.8
Orissa	17343	17900	35243	32956	24728	57684	3.6	1.8	2.8
Punjab	18143	15976	34119	77059	62176	139235	8.4	7.8	8.1
Rajasthan	0	26233	26233	14122	63012	77134	-	5.0	6.2
Tamil Nadu	115786	236108	351894	130430	317887	448317	0.7	1.7	1.4
Uttar Pradesh	15570	58226	73795	192073	164172	356245	15.0	5.9	9.1
West Bengal	134702	137488	272190	239696	335923	575619	3.3	5.1	4.2
Delhi	-	44080	44080	-	73493	73493	-	2.9	2.9
All India	535875	1215994	1751870	1491917	2931208	4423125	5.9	5.0	5.3

Source: Same as Table 1.

Table 6
Proportion of Female Paid Domestic Work in India by States

States / UTs	% of (15-64 years) females engaged in Paid Domestic Work					
	1993			2011		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Andhra Pradesh	0.3	2.1	0.7	0.6	4.3	1.8
Arunachal Pradesh	0.0	2.0	0.2	1.0	3.0	1.4
Assam	0.0	2.5	0.3	0.4	0.9	0.4
Bihar	0.0	1.3	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0
Jharkhand	-	-	-	0.1	1.5	0.4
Goa	1.0	5.8	2.9	4.6	3.8	4.2
Gujarat	0.1	1.9	0.7	0.6	1.4	0.9
Haryana	0.0	0.4	0.1	0.5	1.7	0.9
Himachal Pradesh	0.0	0.9	0.1	1.5	0.8	1.5
Jammu & Kashmir	0.0	1.3	0.3	0.5	1.2	0.7
Karnataka	0.5	1.7	0.8	0.9	3.4	1.8
Kerala	1.0	1.7	1.2	2.3	3.5	2.6
Madhya Pradesh	0.1	1.5	0.4	0.4	1.6	0.7
Chhattisgarh	-	-	-	0.5	4.2	1.3
Maharashtra	0.3	3.1	1.4	0.5	4.6	2.4
Orissa	0.2	1.4	0.3	0.3	1.3	0.4
Punjab	0.5	1.0	0.6	1.4	2.0	1.6
Rajasthan	0.0	1.0	0.2	0.1	1.4	0.4
Tamil Nadu	1.0	3.6	1.9	1.0	2.9	1.8
Uttar Pradesh	0.1	0.8	0.2	0.5	1.2	0.6
West Bengal	0.9	2.9	1.4	1.2	4.2	2.0
Delhi	0.0	2.1	1.9	0.0	1.9	1.8
All India	0.3	2.1	0.8	0.6	2.7	1.2

Source: Same as Table 1.

Table 7

Association between Paid Domestic Work and Other Labour Market Indicators in India

Indicators	Level-1993		Level-2011		Growth Rate	
	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
Labourforce	0.208 (0.394)	0.518* (0.023)	0.113 (0.646)	0.569* (0.011)	0.263 (0.277)	0.295 (0.22)
Wage Employment	0.401 (0.089)	0.701** (0.001)	0.296 (0.219)	0.574* (0.01)	0.415 (0.077)	0.611** (0.005)
White Collar Jobs	0.179 (0.462)	0.693** (0.001)	0.565* (0.012)	0.515* (0.024)	0.138 (0.573)	0.145 (0.554)
Pink Collar Jobs	0.533* (0.019)	0.735** (0.001)	0.662** (0.002)	0.725** (0.001)	0.321 (0.181)	0.542* (0.016)
Blue Collar Jobs	-0.089 (0.717)	-0.105 (0.669)	-0.669** (0.002)	-0.212 (0.384)	-0.172 (0.496)	-0.284 (0.239)

Source: Same as Table 1.

Table 8

Social Background of Listing Population

	General	SC	ST	OBC	Size
Asansol	85.1	8.5	2.7	3.8	829
New Delhi	80.5	12.8	2.8	3.9	671
Noida	96.7	1.8	0.0	1.5	722
Kolkata	88.3	9.9	0.7	1.1	894
All	87.7	8.4	1.6	2.6	3116

Source: Field Survey, 2016-17

Table 9

Family Size of Listing Population

	1-2	3-5	6-8	9+	Size
Asansol	11.2	65.0	18.1	5.7	829
New Delhi	6.1	68.3	20.3	5.4	671
Noida	12.7	71.3	12.9	3.0	722
Kolkata	21.3	67.6	9.1	2.1	894
All	13.4	67.9	14.8	4.0	3116

Source: Field Survey, 2016-17

Table 10

Employment Type of Earning Women Members

	LFPR	Self Employed	Casual Indoor	Casual Outdoor	Regular in Pvt	Regular in Govt	Retired	Size
Asansol	20.8	13.3	2.3	14.8	29.7	31.3	7.8	128
New Delhi	45.0	8.9	0.0	0.9	40.4	48.4	1.3	225
Noida	47.8	17.1	1.0	4.5	60.8	15.0	1.4	286
Kolkata	20.4	16.8	2.1	11.6	28.4	21.1	18.9	95
All	32.3	13.9	1.1	6.1	45.0	28.9	4.8	734

Source: Field Survey, 2016-17

Table 11
Reasons for Hiring Female Domestic Workers

	<i>To Assist FM</i>	<i>To Fill in for FM</i>	<i>Both assist & fill in</i>	<i>Others</i>	<i>Size</i>
Asansol	78.0	3.3	13.8	4.9	427
New Delhi	66.9	18.5	13.8	0.8	390
Noida	75.5	7.2	15.5	1.9	587
Kolkata	74.2	7.4	10.9	7.4	376
All	73.9	8.8	13.8	3.5	1780

Source: Field Survey, 2016-17

Table 12
Reasons for Not Hiring Female Domestic Workers

	<i>Cannot Afford</i>	<i>Not Required</i>	<i>Not Allowed</i>	<i>Others</i>	<i>Size</i>
Asansol	47.9	38.7	4.6	8.9	402
New Delhi	6.8	90.2	0.0	3.0	281
Noida	6.2	88.7	1.0	4.1	135
Kolkata	30.6	62.3	2.8	4.3	518
All	27.7	64.6	2.5	5.2	1336

Source: Field Survey, 2016-17

Table 13
Sample Stratum

	<i>TSS1</i>	<i>TSS2</i>	<i>TSS3</i>	<i>TSS4</i>	<i>Size</i>
Asansol	43.1	31.2	11.9	13.8	109
Kolkata	43.5	34.8	13.0	8.7	115
New Delhi	51.5	22.2	10.1	16.2	99
Noida	57.4	9.9	25.7	6.9	101
All	48.6	25.0	15.1	11.3	424

Source: Field Survey, 2016-17

Table 14
Proportion of Households Hiring Female Domestic Workers by City & Employer Household Characteristics

	<i>Asansol</i>	<i>Kolkata</i>	<i>New Delhi</i>	<i>Noida</i>	<i>All</i>
Family Size					
1	53.3	46.4	83.3	33.3	49.0
2 - 4	57.0	43.6	71.5	77.4	60.9
5 - 7	53.0	34.4	70.1	63.2	55.3
8 & above	54.8	43.8	66.7	52.5	54.6
Social Group of Employer					
Scheduled Caste	37.1	9.0	51.5	24.2	26.0
Scheduled Tribe	9.1	16.7	69.2	50.0	31.9
OBC	28.1	30.0	50.0	42.1	36.7
Others	60.3	45.9	73.0	75.7	62.7
All	55.7	41.9	70.6	71.1	58.6

Source: Field Survey, 2016-17

Table 15

Proportion of Households Hiring Female Domestic Workers by Employer Household Characteristics

<i>No. of Elderly Members</i>		<i>No. of Children</i>		<i>Education status of Female member</i>	
0	63.2	0	62.5	Illiterate	25.0
1	62.7	1	75.0	Primary	43.2
2	68.3	2	100.0	High School	46.4
3	100.0			Graduate+	79.7
All	63.7	All	63.7	All	63.7

Source: Field Survey, 2016-17

Table 16

Proportion of Households Hiring Female Domestic Workers by City & Employer Household Income

	<i>Asansol</i>	<i>Kolkata</i>	<i>New Delhi</i>	<i>Noida</i>	<i>All</i>
<i>Income Group of Employer (₹ pm)</i>					
< 2000	7.7	0.0	0.1	0.1	6.7
2001-5000	21.6	4.2	0.1	0.1	16.4
5001-10000	28.2	15.9	0.1	0.0	23.5
10001-15000	62.2	31.9	0.1	0.1	44.7
15001-25000	65.3	51.9	20.0	20.0	58.2
25001-50000	81.5	56.0	35.3	66.7	65.1
50001-100000	85.9	62.3	47.1	77.9	70.8
> 1 lakh	81.8	76.5	73.3	71.1	72.1
All	55.7	41.9	70.6	71.1	58.6

Source: Field Survey, 2016-17

Table 17

Proportion of Households Hiring Female Domestic Workers

	<i>Aggregate</i>	<i>HH with Working Females (A)</i>	<i>HH with No Working Female (B)</i>	<i>t-test[@]</i>		<i>Implicit Multiplier (A – B)</i>
				<i>t-ratio</i>	<i>Sig</i>	
Asansol	55.0	58.0	46.4	-1.66*	0.09	11.6
Kolkata	56.5	60.6	55.0	0.39	0.39	5.6
New Delhi	61.6	69.9	38.5	-2.91**	0.01	31.4
Noida	83.2	85.3	78.8	-1.78*	0.07	6.5
All	63.7	66.0	57.1	-1.65*	0.10	8.9

Source: Authors' calculation based on Field Survey, 2016-17

Note: @ - t-test is Independent Sample t-test to test difference between A and B;

Table 18

ANOVA Test – Number of FDW hired across Working Status of Household Female

City	Sources of Variance	Sum of Square	Mean Square	F-value	p-value
Asansol	Between Groups	1.451	1.451	2.824*	.096
	Within Groups	54.989	0.514		
Kolkata	Between Groups	2.894	2.894	3.295**	.045
	Within Groups	99.289	0.879		
New Delhi	Between Groups	2.126	2.126	5.373**	.023
	Within Groups	38.379	0.396		
Kolkata	Between Groups	.086	0.086	0.314	.577
	Within Groups	27.280	0.276		
All	Between Groups	4.242	4.242	7.928**	0.01
	Within Groups	225.796	0.535		

Source: Authors' calculation based on Field Survey, 2016-17

Table 19

Proximate Determinants of Hiring of Female Domestic Worker

<i>Causal Variables</i>	<i>Dependent Variable: Whether Female DW Hired</i>				<i>Dependent Variable: No. of Female DW Hired</i>	
	<i>Model 1 - Logit</i>		<i>Model 2 – Logit</i>		<i>Model 3 OLS</i>	<i>Model 4 OLS</i>
	<i>Coeff</i>	<i>Exp(B)</i>	<i>Coeff</i>	<i>Exp(B)</i>		
(Constant)	1.182 (0.02)		1.762 (0.02)		0.939 (0.01)	0.890 (0.01)
Marital status	-0.131 (0.74)	0.876			-0.024 (0.77)	
Family Size	-0.456 (0.01)	0.634	-0.455 (0.01)	0.635	-0.100 (0.01)	-0.100 (0.01)
No. of Elderly	0.331 (0.04)	1.393	0.334 (0.04)	1.397	0.076 (0.04)	0.077 (0.03)
No. of Child below 5	0.826 (0.03)	2.283	0.829 (0.03)	2.292	0.177 (0.02)	0.178 (0.02)
Monthly HH Income	0.161 (0.02)	1.175	0.162 (0.02)	1.175	0.034 (0.02)	0.035 (0.02)
Whether Currently Working	0.416 (0.07)	1.516	0.417 (0.07)	1.516	0.096 (0.06)	0.097 (0.06)
Adj R sq [@]	0.61		0.70		0.50	0.50
F-stat [#]	63.9		64.9		5.43 (0.01)	6.78 (0.01)

Source: Authors' calculation based on Field Survey, 2016-17

Note: @ - For Logit Models Cox-Snell R-squares are reported; # - For Logit Models Correct Classification percentage are reported;

Table 20

Simulation Exercise - Proportion of Households reporting need of Female Domestic Workers

	<i>FDW hired BECAUSE female is working</i>	<i>FDW needed IF female would work</i>
Asansol	24.8	28.4
Kolkata	40.0	18.3
New Delhi	24.2	18.2
Noida	36.6	29.7
All	31.6	23.6

Source: Field Survey, 2016-17