



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

Child Deprivation: An Extended Approach to Child Labour

Motkuri, Venkatanarayana

Centre for Development Studies, Thiruvananthapuram

October 2003

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/53052/>

MPRA Paper No. 53052, posted 20 Jan 2014 14:05 UTC

Child Deprivation: An Extended Approach to Child Labour

M. VENKATANARAYANA

Doctoral Scholar

Centre for Development Studies

Prasanthnagar, Ulloor

Trivandrum – 695 011

e-mail : venkatanarayan@gmail.com

Abstract

The present paper imparts that it is need of the hour to take a broader view of child labour to include not only the reportedly working children but also those *nowhere children*, namely those neither reported working nor attend school. In line with the perspectives of human capital, human development, and human rights, this paper conceives education as the most basic right of children and re-christens the child labour and *nowhere children* as *deprived children*.

I. Introduction

The problem of child labour has been a policy concern for quite a long period, at least since industrial revolution in developed countries. For developing countries it is in the 20th century especially second half of the century. In 1995, ILO estimated that there were 250 million child labourers all over the world. Out of this, 90 per cent of the incidence of child labour is found in developing countries. Asian countries accounted for significant share, such as India. Whereas the work participation rate is higher in Africa (27.8 per cent) than Asia (15.1 per cent) (Basu, 1999). In India, it is 4.3 per cent in 1991 (Chaudhri, 1997).

However, much of the problem highlighted and focussed on is concerned with reported child workers. It is observed that there are many more children who may be working but not reported as workers referred as 'nowhere' children in the literature. Some of the recent studies pointed out these issues (Weiner, 1994; Chaudhri, 1997; Misra, 2000). In such case, it could be said that a narrow focus on child labour would miss sizeable segment of child population who are neither reported as workers nor attending school (Kannan, 2001). Moreover, when school is the best place and education is the right choice as well as basic right for the children, all out of school children, who are in fact potential workers, are educationally deprived. In perspectives of human capital, human development and human rights, the problem has far reaching implications. Therefore, it deserves the broader view to look into the incidence of child labour. There are only few studies which address this problem in this broader view. And, here arises the research interest of the present paper.

II. Evolution of Child Labour, Childhood and Child Education

The problem of child labour is neither a recent phenomenon nor a specific problem of developing countries (Weiner, 1994). Its origins can be traced back to ancient time and it can be found in modern societies all over the world. In the early societies, in the process of learning by doing, child work was considered as part and parcel of socialisation. In transition, the changing socio-economic conditions changed the nature and extent of the work in general and child work in particular (See Rodgers and Standing, 1989). Especially, in the modern societies, the development of industry and allied activities brought rapid changes in the nature of work, the working environment, employment

relations and the conditions under which work is carried out (Bequele and Boyden, 1988). Socialisation or participatory nature of work is replaced by exploitation. In these circumstances, the nature of work that children used to do is changed and it became unsuitable to children for their age and strength and it is harmful to their growth and development. In the literature, it has been documented these realities in developed countries especially during the industrial revolution and in the contemporary developing countries (See Thompson, 1971; Horrel and Humphries, 1997; Burra, 1995; Misra, 2000).

In fact there was no concept of childhood in the early societies. In the transitional societies, over the past few centuries, a normative perspective for children has been developed. The notion of the childhood is one of the developments in this respect. Where, it, the childhood, is distinguished from the adulthood. In the Western context, Philippe Aries, a demographer historian, observed that was no idea of childhood in the medieval period. He documented that the idea was discovered in 13th century. But it became significant by late 16th century and early 17th century. In 18th century, distinction was made between childhood and adulthood (See Aries, 1962)¹.

Nevertheless, the notion of childhood is not a universal phenomenon. And it is a social construct (Fyfe, 1993). It varies across societies and within the society different cultures (Chaudhri and Gayathri, 2002). In the context of Britain, the idea of childhood gradually spread to working class children from elite class. During the pre-industrial revolution and early industrial revolution the notion is limited to children of elite class. During the industrial revolution, with the emergence of middle class the notion of childhood is perceived for the children of middle class. Later only, it was transformed working class children (Davis, 1988). Over the period, in the developed countries, the notion is almost universally applied to each and every child. But, in developing countries it is not yet. In the light of these changing attitudes towards children, International organisations like United Nations and its subsidiary organs such as ILO and UNICEF has been trying globalise the concept of childhood in the way that it is applicable to each and every child

¹ For a similar kind of brief account on the idea of Childhood in India See Dubey, Leela (1989), the idea is discussed in Jaiswal (1994) Kakar, S (1991).

across nationality, social identity, location and gender. However, within a developing country like India, the notion varies across social group by gender, caste and location.

Further, a normative perspective was developed in such a way that an adequate childhood education and a work free youth are ethical considerations (Lopez-Calva, 2001). As a consequence, the institution of education emerged as an alternative to place the children in schools instead of in work. In the early societies, there was no specific institution for education, if so it was very few. In the primitive societies there was informal education was given to children by the elder family member. The family was the only institution where the child could learn the work and social life (Mendiavich, 1973). In the transition especially in industrial societies, education is more formalised and institutionalised. Moreover, the modern industrialisation process, which is based on technology, knowledge and skills, education became an important factor (See Roderick and Stephens, 1978). Not only that education is necessary for industrialisation process but also it is brought out that education is required for transforming traditional agriculture into modern agriculture where the agricultural productivity in terms of labour as well as land can be increased (Schultz, 1964). In economic sense, in the modern society, the child who does not have minimum level of education will lose future economic opportunities. Again if they are working it may bring down adult wages and reduce employment opportunities of adults (Bequeul and Boyden, 1988; p.90). Consequently, it may create a vicious circle which continue for generations (Lopez-Calva, 2001). Hence, in the modern world child schooling is not only moral or ethical consideration but also it is necessary in the perspectives of human capital and human development.

In spite of constitutional assurance often-stated rhetoric of equality in educational opportunity, there has been a continuous persistence in educational inequality in developing countries such as India. The notion that education is right of all is not accepted by all. It is viewed that education should be a 'filtering process' to reach good position and improve socio-economic status of some. Here, education becomes a privilege of some groups of population rather than all (PROBE, 1999).

Having said that one can observe that by the second half of 20th century almost all children of school going age in developed countries placed in schools after a long history of the reality of the child labour throughout industrial revolution. But the phenomenon is

still persistence in developing countries. ILO has a concern to the problem of child labour in these countries since its inception. Given the reality of social, economic, political and cultural specificity, the application of working age group to be considered as child labour across countries experienced difficulty. In 1973, it set the age at 15 as the minimum age of employment (Award Digest, 1994; ILO, 1998). Many of the countries ratified these recommendations. Meanwhile, national awareness of the problem proceeded with legislation. Nevertheless, the prevalence of child labour is very much visible in the developing countries. In the light of ILO labour standards and WTO social clause, the problem of child labour is once again highlighted and debated (See Basu 1995 and 1999).

III. Conceptual Problems

There is vast literature with empirical evidence of child labour on its magnitude, consequences and determinants (See Grootaert and Kanbur, 1995; Burra, 1995; Basu, 1999; Misra, 2000; Ray, 2000). The recent development in the area is theoretical models with determinants and policy intervention of child labour (See Basu and Van, 1995; Baus, 1999; Jacob and Skoufias, 1999; Ranjan, 2000; Baland and Robinson, 2001). However, there is no consensus over the extent and nature of child labour. The incidence of child labour varies with source of data and its coverage and the measurement of child labour depends on how it is defined. Moreover, the concept of child itself differs across societies and different cultural settings. Accordingly, both the concept and the measurement of child labour are influenced by ethical and cultural values (Grootaert and Patrinos, 1999; Rodgers and Standing, 1989). Nevertheless, the international organisations like ILO, UNICEF, in their conventions and recommendations especially ILO Convention No. 138, made it uniform that the child is defined as the person below 15 year of age, for all countries irrespective of their socio-cultural setting. Over the period many of the countries adapted this convention. However, the unsettled question is the definition of child labour where conventional definition considers paid child workers as child labourers. In other words, those children who are economically active or gainfully employed are classified as child labourers. When the persons does work as a regular basis for which he or she is remunerated or the output is destined to marketed, then they are referred as economically active or gainfully employed. The missing aspect in this kind estimation of child labour is those who do unpaid work and work that finds no market. In fact they are invisible workers but they are not included in the estimation of

child labour. If they are included, the estimations will shoot up to large extent. Therefore, the conventional definition is questioned by recent studies on the ground that there are many children working in different environments which may not fulfil the criterion that is to be recorded as workers. In this regard Rodgers and Standing (1989) observed that 'most of the children work in one sense or another working. Some of their work involves wage employment. A good deal consists of tasks around the home... (which are) not treated as conventional labour activity but of evident economic and social significance'². In the light of these emerging aspects of child labour, the phenomenon is examined in the context of India.

IV. The Indian Experience

The Article 45 of Indian Constitution says that state is endeavour to provide free and compulsory education for all children till they complete age of 14. Prior to that, the Article 23 refer that children of below 14 age should not to be engaged in any employment (See Misra, 2000). In this context, many of the studies on child labour in India refer child workers as children of age below 15 years and working. It is obvious that children age below 5 is incapable of work. Of course there are occasional citation of these children working. Studies on child schooling refer age group 5-14 as standard reference for basic education. In addition, India ratified many of the international conventions and recommendations, which refers children of this age group. Therefore in Indian context, age group 5-14 is the reference age group of children for the purpose of referring child labour and school going children.

² Referred from Preface to Rodgers and Standing (1989)

Table 1 : Different Estimations of Child Labourers in India

Data Source	Estimated Number of Children Working
Census	
1971	10.7 Million
1981	13.6 Million
1991	11.2 Million
NSSO	
1972-73	17.4 Million
1983	17.4 Million
1987-88	15.8 Million
1993-94	11.6 Million
ORG	
1981	44.0 Million
Ministry of Labour	
1991	17.0 Million
ILO	
1990	15.2 Million
1995	14.8 Million
Campaign Against Child Labor	40-100 Million

Note :

1. Census Data includes both Main and Marginal Workers in the Age Group 5-14 for the years 1981 and 1991.
2. NSSO Estimations includes both Usual Activity and Subsidiary Activity for 5-14 Age Group.
3. ILO Estimation is for 10-14 Age Group only.

Source :

Over the period, the magnitude of the child labour in India is revealed by various data sources differently. It raises the confusion about the scale of the problem in India. It can be observed from the table (Table 1) that NSSO estimations of working children are always higher than the Census estimations. And other than Census and NSSO, the estimation of a Baroda-based Organisation of Research Group and Campaign Against Child Labour, their estimations are far above for comparable years. Even Ministry of Labour estimation, in 1991, is above Census figures for the same year and 1993-94 NSSO figures.

It is obvious that these differences in estimations are due to differences in definition of worker and its coverage in enumeration. The Census defined child labourer as those children who are engaged in economically productive work while NSSO takes into account the gainfully employment. The ORG has a broader definition which includes all the children between the ages of 5 and 15 who are engaged in productive work whether paid or unpaid at any time of the day within or outside the family (cited in Burra, 1989).

At this point, first let us categorise children according to their activities. While providing topography of children, Rodgers and Standing (1989) classified children activities into 9 categories. It is too detailed classification where different types of work which children do taken into account. In brief, we can categorise children activity into four: full time schooling, full time working, working and attending school, neither working nor schooling. They are referred as respectively students, child workers, part-time workers and students and neither students nor workers. The set diagram (See Appendix I) can clearly shows the subset of children according to their activities. It depicts the children engaged in different activities. Out of total child population, A, B, C, and D are sub sets of children who are referred as students, workers, worker students and neither students nor workers respectively.

In the Indian context, those who work part-time and go to school are very insignificant. Census figures shows that less than 0.5 per cent while NSSO clubbed them either as workers, or students depend upon their main activity. Therefore, we have three category of children i.e. students, workers and neither students nor workers.

Apart from the differences of incidence of child labour among the different estimates, there are large number of children who actually working are excluded from all these estimates. It is because neither they report as workers nor their work is considered to be as child labour. When we observe the Census data (See Table 1), it shows that less than 12.6 per cent children of 5-14 age group were working in 1961 and it reduced to less than 4.3 per cent in 1991. Then the question is what rest of the children is doing. As the education is best alternative to work or the Indian constitution assures compulsory education of this age group, whether all those children other than workers are in schools.

Table 1: Share of Child Population and Distribution of Children by their Activity Status in India - Census and NSSO

Year	Share of Child Population	Working Children	Students	Others	Out of School Children (3+5)
1	2	3	4	5	6
Census					
1961	24.5	12.7	30.4	57.0	69.7
1971	27.5	7.1	33.6	59.3	66.4
1981	27.0	7.6	43.9	48.4	56.0
1991	23.4	5.4	50.7	43.9	49.3
NSSO					
1983	-	11.2	49.2	39.5	50.4
1987-88	-	8.6	45.4	46.0	54.6
1993-94	-	5.0	68.8	26.2	31.2
1999-2000	-	4.2	72.4	23.4	27.6

Notes : 1. Share of Child Population is to total population.

2. Given data is children of 5-14 age group only.

3. Data is presented in percentages.

4. Total Out of School Children includes both Child Workers and Other Children.

5. NSSO data is based on Usual Principal and subsidiary Status Activity.

Source : 1. Census of India (1961, 1971, 1981, 1991)

2. Chaudhari, D P (1996).

3. Sarvekshana April 1988 for NSSO and NSSO reports for 1993-94 and 1999-2000.

From the above table it shows that only 30 per cent the children in the age group 5-14 are in schools in the year 1961 and it is increased to 50.4 per cent in 1991. The rest of the, large margin, children are recorded as neither attending schools nor working. These residual children accounted for 57.5 per cent in 1961, which reduced to 44.2 per cent 1991. NSSO data also illustrates similar kind of distribution of children at four different points of time. It is in consistent with Census data where a large chunk of the children are neither workers nor students. These residual children are missing out of sight in the research and policy.

Although many of the Child labour studies by-passed this phenomenon of residual category of children, some recent studies which recognised its importance (See Weiner, 1991; Chandrasekher, 1995; Cigno and Rosati, 2001). These residual children are referred as nowhere children (Chaudhri, 1995) or missing children (Cigno and Rosati, 2001), or invisible children (Jayaraj and Subramanian, 2002). These studies observed that many of these children are also working. But, they are not reporting as workers on the one hand, nor their work is recognised on the other. The reason for differential estimation can be located here in the inclusion and exclusion of these 'residual' children according to difference in definitions gave the difference in estimates. Conventional definition is

followed by many of the child labour studies. It excludes child workers other than those who work outside the home and for paid work or wage, in the child labour.

Recent studies are pointing out the conservative definition of child labour in the view that many children working are not recorded as workers. While examining the problem of child labour in dry regions of India, Jodha and Singh (1991) observed that because of children primarily engaged in informal activities which are seldom recorded, the extent of child labour is to be underreported. Chaudhri (1995) observed that 'this residual category is neither at school nor reported to be economically active as main or marginal workers. They are either doing nothing or performing household work not classified as economic activity or on the fringe areas (beggars, prostitutes etc.,) and have not been recorded in either of main or marginal economically active category. Weiner (1994) observed in his study that:

...one difficulty in estimating how many children work is that many work without wage *are* unreported by the Census. Large numbers of children work often wages but some times without wages alongside their parents... Children [who work for their family] are not classified as working children, although they are classified as workers if they do the same work for pay for others. Even those who are paid wages are not easily counted. The number of children employed in cottages industries is not reflected in census data. Nor are many children employed as domestic servants for the middle class... And there are the street children, especially beggars and prostitutes who are unreported. Given the uncertainties of definition and the complexities of enumeration, it is no wonder that estimate of child labour vary so greatly in India (p.20).

After observing above excerpt, what we can say is, as Chandrasekhar (1997) mentioned, that 'it is possible that there are a host of other children who have not been recorded as child workers, but engaged in work as well as are deprived the benefits of an education'. Certainly, it is because of the uncertainty of definition and complexity of enumeration the estimates of child labour varies.

In the light of this evidence, we can further probe into details of composition of nowhere children provided by NSSO figures for India. What we can observe from the following table is that among the residual category, children reporting as performing domestic duties both inside and outside the family are almost equal to reporting as gainfully employed children. Nevertheless, they are never considered as economically gainfully employed.

Table 2 : Percentage Distribution of Children by their Activities Status in India : NSSO

Activity Status	1999-2000	1993-94	1983
1	2	3	4
Students	72.4	68.8	49.2
Child Workers	4.2	5.0	11.2
Others	23.4	26.2	39.5
a). <i>Domestic Duties</i>	2.8	4.4	8.3
b). <i>Others</i>	20.6	21.8	31.2

Note : 1). It is based on Usual Principal and subsidiary Activity.

2). It is for the children of 5-14 age group

Source: Sarvekshana, April, 1988 and April-June, 1999

NSSO Report 455 : Employment and Unemployment in India 1999-200 : Key Results.

Having observed the phenomenon in table above, we can say that the reported workers are not the only workers. Though it still keeps significant proportion as residual category, it reveals that there are other working children who are in fact working but not reported as workers. This is mainly because of definitional restrictions and the problem of enumeration coverage.

At this point let us look into debate on how one should treat these children. There are two streams of thought that whether to consider all those out of school children as child labourers or not. One stream of thought is that so long as work which children do is participatory, skills development and part of socialisation, it is acceptable. In this line of argument, the distinction had been made between child work and child labour (See George, 1993; Fyfe, 1993; Lieten, 2002a and 2002b). Therefore, the conventional wisdom justifies the child work which is distinguished from child labour as part of the process of socialisation. Moreover, it is argued that the child labour estimations that are brought out in developing countries as well as in India are, in fact, exaggerated (See Lieten, 2000, 2002a and 2002b) when the estimations includes children who are neither reported as working nor attending schools, without discrimination.

However, one can say that given the importance of education, whether child work/labour is exploitative or participatory nature, if it is at the cost of education, it is definitely deprives the children and their future. Another point is that child work is no longer has skill improvement character in contrast to conventional wisdom expectation (See Swaminathan, 1997; Ankar, 2001). Moreover, in a human capital and human rights

perspective one has to consider educational deprivation of these children whether working or not.

In contrast, another stream of thought argues that since keeping children idle is unrealistic especially in Indian context, they argue that, all the children of school going age who are out of school should be presumed to be doing some form of work or other³ (Sinha, 2000). Weiner (1994 and 1996) argues that most of the children those who are not attending schools are, in fact, working. Jayaraj and Subraminian (2001) estimated child labour in Tamil Nadu in this direction while recognising the problem of over estimation which is justified. This estimations shows while the conventionally defined child labourers in the age group of 5-14 are only 13 per cent, with the liberal definition taking into account all out of school children into account, the figures did shoot-up to 33 per cent. Moreover, it is distributed, though unevenly, across the state unlike conservative estimations of the incidence of child labour which concentrated in specific regions or industries (Jayaraj and Subramanian, 2002). Therefore, it can be argued that a narrow focus on child labour would leave sizeable segment of child population who are neither in school nor reporting as workers, out of concern (Kannan, 2001).

Moreover, most of the conventional wisdom on child labour shows that children are working so that they are not attending schools. It reveals that educational deprivation of children along with health and other problems is as a consequence of child labour. It restricts the space for those who are reported as worker. Alternatively, when we see children are not attending schools, one reason could be because they are working out of economic necessity⁴. Others could be that since they are not attending school so that they involved in some kind of work. More clearly, if one goes by an argument that all out of school children has to be considered as child labour. It seems to consider three points.

³ For instance, the M V Foundation an NGO working in Andhra Pradesh has this objective in its workings to rehabilitate the child (See, Wazir, 2000). The non-negotiable for children of school going age as formulated by **M.V. Foundation** is all children must attend full-time formal day schools: *any child out of school is child labour*. The definition of child labour encompasses every non-school going child irrespective of whether engaged in wage work or non-wage work, self employed or working for others, employed in hazardous or non-hazardous occupations, employed on daily wage or on contract basis as bonded labour. Source: <http://hdrc.undp.org.in/childrenandpoverty/>

⁴ It is observed that one reason could be that household demand for child labour is a barrier to child education. On the other hand, in many cases, children are working at home as a consequence of being out of school, whether because their parents cannot afford the direct costs of education, because school is too far away or because the quality of education offered is perceive as inadequate (Oxfarm Education Report, 2000: p. 191). For similar observations See Mahendra Dev (2000).

First, whether children work out of economic necessity to supplement family income (by income earning) or to supplant family labour (either in income generating activities or income saving activities like household chores) so that they are not attending schools, leaving social and cultural aspects aside. Second, if not the earlier case, when they are supposed to be in school but they are actually not turned up to schools. Whether their parents cannot afford to send them to school due to certain direct costs they have to incur⁵. Third, when the parents willing to send their children to school and afford pay minimum direct cost of education of their children, children are not turned up⁶. Whether the school is available and access to those children. And whether quality of education in terms infrastructure and its maintenance and quality of teaching which is not satisfactory to the parent. As a result of non-availability and no access to school and unsatisfactory quality of schooling, children are kept away from the school. Consequently, it can be said, instead of keeping children idle, parents can engage them one or other form of work. In a survey of studies based on field investigation, Bhatta (1998) observed that 'children are often put to work as a deterrent to idling rather than as an economic necessity' (p.1734). Therefore, one can presume that most of the children who are out of school seems to be working either out of economic necessity or not having an alternative. Here first two reasons can be seen as economic and last one as problem of education system. Hence, to examine this phenomenon of children one has to adopt more liberal view that consider all those children out of schools as a part of deprived children.

V. Child and Education : Human Capital, Development and Rights Perspective

As it is mentioned earlier, the child work is no longer be a participatory or socialisation or skill improvement in nature. During the industrial revolution, it was evident that the working conditions and health conditions of children who were working. In the contemporary developing countries, similar kind of evidences are well documented. In a modern society, the work which is assigned to children, is not at all suitable to them for

⁵ In the literature it is well observed that although elementary education is said to be free, in reality it is not that much free. Various studies estimated the cost of primary education incurred by parents in spite of the given subsidies. For instance, NSSO for the year 1986-87 estimates Rs. 212 and PROBE Team for the year 1996 estimates Rs. 318 is the average cost of education at the primary level of education and at the elementary level of education NCAER for the year 1994 estimates Rs. 478 (figures are Rs. Per year at the constant prices of 1996-97: See PROBE, 1999).

⁶ PROBE survey says that 90 per cent of the parents are willing to send their children to school but could not afford to do so (See PROBE, 1999).

their overall development. Instead, it is the education which is the best alternative for the work in childhood. And it equips the children for improving future opportunity as an adult.

Education has been a concern for human resources enhancement over the past few centuries. From classical to neo-classical economics theoreticians, education has been concern for the economic development. Adam Smith said that 'education is one of the principle cause of differences in talent in men' (p.120). While J S Mill wrote that 'the need of education is greatest'. One of the developments in the field of economics in the 20th century is 'human capital' approach to economic development where education plays important role. Human capital theories identified the role of education in explaining economic growth of a country (See Schultz, 1993; Denison, 1978; Colclough, 1995). It is stated that knowledge improvement through education increases labour productivity which in turn increases production in the economy. As a result education viewed as investment rather than consumption. Subsequently, studies on education estimated the rate of return to education where it was found that primary education followed by secondary education has higher rate of return, both private and social return (See Pascharpolous, 1988 and 1995). In 1990's human development approach to economic development, education has been given due importance (HDR, 1990). Moreover, it is observed that education enlarges peoples income earning opportunity on the one hand and enable to achieve a better quality of life at a given level of income (Dreze and Saran, 2000). In Sen's view education improves the capability of human beings (Dreze and Sen, 1995).

It has been established that childhood is the ideal stage for giving basic education. And literature on demand for education views schooling as most important means of drawing children away from the labour market (See Siddiqi and Patrinos, 1995). Hence, the proper activity for children is the schooling rather than work. Knowledge that learned in school through educational process helps them for their future development. Apart, education became basic human right for children as UN Convention on Children's Rights emphasised (UNCRC, 1989). While Weiner (1994) says that 'education does not ensure occupational mobility, but without educational occupational mobility in modern societies is exceedingly difficult.' In that case the lives of children, as Burra (1995) observed, 'as they grew up to adulthood the absence of schooling closes route to upward mobility and

once again perpetuated the disadvantages in the next generation'. Therefore, we can say that those children who are out of school, whether working or potential workers, first of all, they are deprived of education. And those who are not going school and working, the deprivation is more sever. This child deprivation would carry forward further deprivation in adulthood. It is virtually a vicious circle of deprivation for generations.

VI. Child Deprivation : The Concept

Berthoud defined the term deprivation means a lack of something which other people have (See Holman, 1977). The term emerged into the economics literature out of the poverty debate related to absolute and relative poverty. Deprivations are considered to be those aspects of inequality that are avoidable. There are multiple deprivations where educational deprivation is one among them. The aspect of educational deprivation considers the educational attainment of children where there are wide variations among population sub-groups. For instance, many of the children are amongst those who leave school without any qualification or without reaching minimum standards. On other hand there are children who never enrolled in schools at all. All these children are deprived of education, absolutely and relatively. In Absolute terms, given the standard minimum educational norm that all children below 15 years of age should get, those children who are not reached such level are absolutely deprived. In the relative sense, while every child has right to education it is realised to only some children, those children who could not avail their right to education are relatively deprived.

VII. Child Deprivation in India

Article 45 of the Constitution of India assured the compulsory primary education for the children of age group 5-14. In spite of constitutional and often stated government commitment in ensuring the basic education, the figures for out of school children referred here as deprived children shows alarming situation. Out of 220 million estimated children of 6-14 age group, children going to formal schools (112 Million) and non-formal schools (7 Million) together 119 million and the rest of 100 million children are out of school in 1991 (Misra, 2000).

The figures in the table 1 illustrate the high shortfall of our constitutional goal of achieving cent per cent of school attendance among children after four decades of its

resolution. Only 51 per cent of children of 5-14 age group are in schools. Among the rest around 5 per cent of the children are reported as working and 44 per cent neither going to school nor reporting as workers. Both together, workers and nowhere children, around 49 per cent of the children are out of school. It means there is a high incidence of educationally deprived children in India. As table 2 has shown that by the end of 20th century, there are more than ¼ of the children who are educationally deprived. And it is a bitter pillow to swallow that in the field of elementary education India stands behind even the average of the poorest countries of the World (Dreze and Sen, 1995).

Table 3 : Child Deprivation in Major States in India : 1961-91

Sn	State	Child Workers				Total Deprived Children				Change 1961-91
		1961	1971	1981	1991	1961	1971	1981	1991	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	Andhra Pradesh	20.8	14.1	13.8	10.0	72.3	72.7	59.5	51.5	20.8
2	Bihar	11.9	6.5	5.5	4.8	77.7	79.5	67.3	58.3	19.4
3	Gujarat	11.0	6.8	6.9	5.2	63.0	59.5	47.8	37.9	25.1
4	Haryana	9.4	4.5	5.2	2.0	67.3	64.9	53.2	44.0	23.3
5	Himachal Pradesh	11.5	7.7	8.7	4.6	57.1	53.7	40.5	28.0	29.1
6	Karnataka	15.5	9.9	11.4	8.8	66.3	64.7	54.3	42.7	23.6
7	Kerala	3.2	2.0	1.5	0.6	37.9	30.2	19.2	13.5	24.4
8	Madhya Pradesh	18.8	10.0	11.6	8.0	77.2	76.6	65.2	53.2	24.0
9	Maharashtra	13.8	7.3	9.4	5.7	61.2	55.3	42.8	34.1	27.1
10	Orissa	14.8	8.0	9.6	5.9	68.4	71.0	57.8	47.3	21.1
11	Punjab	11.1	6.1	5.2	2.6	62.9	56.9	42.2	37.5	25.4
12	Rajasthan	20.7	7.9	8.4	6.5	79.9	77.9	67.5	59.6	20.3
13	Tamil Nadu	12.6	7.2	8.4	4.8	58.3	48.7	42.5	29.3	29.0
14	Uttar Pradesh	10.2	5.6	4.6	3.8	80.9	73.1	66.5	62.2	18.7
15	West Bengal	5.0	4.1	4.0	4.2	66.6	67.3	55.4	53.0	13.6
	India	12.7	7.1	7.6	5.4	69.6	66.4	56.1	49.3	20.3
	Mean (15 States)	12.7	7.2	7.6	5.2	66.5	63.5	52.1	43.5	23.0
	CV	39.7	39.5	43.6	48.5	16.5	20.8	25.5	31.3	18.0
	SD	5.0	2.8	3.3	2.5	11.0	13.2	13.3	13.6	4.1
	Range	17.6	12.1	12.3	9.4	43.0	49.3	48.3	48.7	15.5
	Minimum	3.2	2.0	1.5	0.6	37.9	30.2	19.2	13.5	13.6
	Maximum	20.8	14.1	13.8	10.0	80.9	79.5	67.5	62.2	29.1

Note : 1. Data Presented in Percentages.

2. Children of 5-14 Age Group Only.

Source : Census of India, 1961, 1971, 1981, 1991.

Registrar General of India (1991) Working Children.

Chaudhri, D. P (1997).

And, table 3 above shows the incidence of child labour and total deprived children which includes both child labour and others referred as nowhere children, in major Indian states over the period 1961-91. It is observed that there is a wide variation (shown by CV i.e.

Coefficient of Variation) across states in both child labour and total deprived children (See Table 3). Also, in both cases the variation is increasing over the period. It indicates the increasing spatial inequality across the states in terms of child deprivation as well as child labour. And, the variation is high in terms of child labour when compared with total deprived children.

The incidence of child labour is highest in Andhra Pradesh (10 per cent) followed by Karnataka and Rajasthan states respectively and lowest in Kerala (0.6 per cent) followed by Haryana and Punjab respectively in 1991. When put together all out of school children - both child workers and neither working nor attending schools referred as deprived children - the incidence is highest in Uttar Pradesh followed by its fellow BIMARU (Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, and Rajasthan) states, West Bengal and Andhra Pradesh respectively. As one would expect, least incidence of deprived children is located in Kerala followed by Himachal Pradesh and Tamil Nadu. It is observed that, except Kerala, the states which are harbouring high or low incidence of child deprivation are not the same states which hosts high or low incidence of child labour respectively. Over the period, significant change in terms of decline in the incidence of child deprivation was observed in each the state. The highest change in terms of decline in child deprivation was observed for Himachal Pradesh (29.1 per cent) followed by Tamil Nadu (29 per cent), Maharashtra (27.1 per cent) and Punjab (25.4 per cent) and the lowest was for West Bengal (13.6 per cent) followed by Uttar Pradesh (18.7 per cent), Bihar (19.4 per cent) and Rajasthan (20.3 per cent).

VIII. Conclusion

We should not leave the residual children out of research and policy. Rather we have to find out a way to explain these children. In this respect, the problem of child deprivation is to be studied comprehensively where child labour is a sub set of deprived children. While looking into determinant factors of child deprivation one has see in a broader perspective. For instance, while observing relationship of child deprivation with poverty, instead of uni-dimensional income poverty, the multi-dimensional aspects of poverty can present more reality. In addition, though poverty is the potential factor determining child deprivation, it is not the only factors. One has to consider other factors also. For instance,

supply side factors like, access and availability of schools, quality of schooling and community participation in functioning of schools.

* * *

Reference

- Ahmed, Iftakar (1999) Get Rid of Child Labour, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. (),
- Aries, Phillippe (1962) Centuries of Childhood,
- Baland and Robinson (1999) Is Child Labour Inefficient?, *Journal of Political Economy*,
- Basu, K (1999) Child Labour : Cause, Consequence, and Cure with Remarks on International Labour Standards, *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. XXXVII, September.
- Basu, K and Van, P H (1995) The Economics of Child Labour, *American Economic Review*, Vol. 88 (3).
- Becker, Gary (1981) A Treatise on the Family, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Bequele and Boyaden (1988)
- Bhatty, Kiran (1996) Child Labour : Breaking the Vicious Cycle, *Economic and Political Weekly*, February 17.
- Bhatty, Kiran (1998) Educational Deprivation in India : A Survey of Field Investigation, *Economic and Political Weekly*, July 4-10 and 11-17 (No. 27 and 28).
- Burra, N (1989) Out of Sight, Out of Mind : Working Girls in India, *International Labour Review*, Vol. 128 (5).
- Burra, N (1995) Born to Work, OUP, New Delhi.
- Census of India (1999) Working Children, Registrar General of India, New Delhi.
- Chandrasekhar, C P (1995) The Economic Consequences of the Abolition of Child Labour : An Indian Case Study, *Journal Peasant Studies*, Vol 24 (3).
- Chatrath, KJS (2001) Some Lessons from the French School Education System, COMPASS, Monsoon Issue, 2000-2001.
- Chaudhri, D P (1996) A Dynamic Profile of Child Labour in India : 1951-91, ILO-CLASP, New Delhi.
- Chaudhri, D P (1997b) Female Child Labour and Gender Bias in School Education in Indian States : 1961-991, *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol. 40 (4).
- Chaudhri, D. P (1997a) A Policy Perspective of Child Labour in India with Pervasive Gender and Urban Bias in School Education, *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol. 40 (4).
- Colclough, Christopher (1982) The Impact of Primary Schooling on Economic Development : A Review of the Evidence, *World Development*, Vol. 10 (3), pp. 167-195.
- Dasgupta, Partha (1993) An Inquiry in to The Well-being and Destitution, Clardondon, Oxford.
- De Gregoria, Jose (2002) Education and Income Inequality : New Evidence from Cross-Country Data, *Review of Income and Wealth*, Series 48 (3), September.

- Deaton, A and Dreze J (2002) Poverty and Inequality in India : A Re-examination, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Sept. 7-13.
- Dennison, (1967) Why Growth Rates Differs?, The Brookings University Press,
- Dreze and Sen (1995) Basic Education and Political Issue, *The Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*, Vol. IX (1).
- Dreze and Sen (1995) India : Social Opportunity and Economic Development, OUP, Oxford.
- Dreze and Sen (1997) India Development : Regional Perspective, OUP, New Delhi.
- Dubey, Leela (1981) Child Labour in India : Some Methodological Overview, in Rodgers and Standing (eds.) (1981)
- Fan, Shenggan, Peter Hazell and S K Thorat (2000) Impact of Public Expenditure on Poverty in India, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Sept. 30.
- Grooteart, C and Kanbur, R (1995) Child Labour : An Economics Perspective, *International Labour Review*,
- Grooteart, C and Patrinos (1999) A Policy Analysis of Child Labour, ILO, Geneva.
- I L O (1998) U N System in India : Position Paper on Child Labour, ILO, New Delhi.
- Jacoby and Skoufias (1997) Risk, Financial Markets, and Human Capital in a Developing Countries, *Review of Economic Studies*, Vol. 64.
- Jayaraj, D and Subramanian, S (2002) Child Labour in Tamil Nadu in the 1980's : A Preliminary Account of its Nature, Extent and Distribution, *Economic and Political Weekly*, March 9.
- Jaychandran (1997) Children Work and Education, *Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*,
- Jodha, N S and Singh, R P (1991) Child Labour in Dry land Agriculture in India, in Ramesh Kanbargi (ed.) *Child Labour in the Indian Subcontinent : Dimensions and Implications*, New Delhi : Sage
- Kannan, K. P (2001) Food Security for Reducing Child Deprivation : Kerala's Remarkable Record, IDPAD International Conference on Child Labour in South Asia, October 15-17, 2001.
- Karlekar, Malavika (1989) Education and Inequality, in Beteille, Andre (ed.) *Equality and Inequality*, OUP, New Delhi.
- Krishnaji (2000) Poverty and Child Schooling in Andhra Pradesh in Vaidynathan and Nair (eds.) *Elementary Education in India*, Sage, New Delhi.
- Lieten, G K (2000) Children, Work and Education : General Parameters, *Economic and Political Weekly*, June 10 and June 17 (No. 24 and 25).
- Lieten, G K (2002) Child Labour and Poverty : The Poverty of Analysis, *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol. ().
- Lopez-Calva, (2001) Child Labour : Myths, Theories and Facts, *Journal of International Affairs*, Fall 2001.
- Mahendra Dev, S (2000) Child Labour in India : Dimensions, Determinants and Policies, Keynote address paper presented in 83rd Annual Conference of the Indian Economic Association. Also in Kannan, K. P (ed.) (2000) *Economics of Child Labour*, Deep and Deep, New Delhi.
- Malthus, T R (1993) (org. 1798) *An Essay on the Principles of Population*, Oxford World's Classics, O U P, London.

- Mendelovich (1973)
- Mill, J S (1991) *On Liberty and Other Essays*, O U P, Oxford (ed. By Jon Cray)
- Mill, J S (1994) *Principles of Political Economy and Chapters on Socialism*, O U P, Oxford (ed. By Jonathan Riley).
- Misra, L (2000) *Child Labour in India*, OUP, New Delhi.
- Mythili, N (2002) Community Pressure for Higher Quality of Education : Rural Primary Schools, *Economic and Political Weekly*, June 15-21.
- NCAER (1999) *India Human Development Report*, OUP, New Delhi.
- NCAER (2001) *South Indian Human Development Report*, OUP, New Delhi.
- Pal, S P and Pant, D K (1995) Strategies to Improve School Enrolment Rate in India, *Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*, Vol. IX (2).
- Planning Commission (2001) *Child Labour in India : Nature, Strategies and Policy Option*, IDPAD International Conference on Child Labour in South Asia, October 15-17, 2001.
- PROBE (1999) *Public Report of Basic Education*, Probe Team, O U P, New Delhi.
- Ramachandran, H (1990) Responsiveness to Educational Inputs : A Study of Rural Households, in Moonis Raza (ed.) (1990).
- Ranjan, P (2000) , *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. ().
- Ray, Ranjan (2000) Poverty, Household Size, and Child Welfare in India, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXXV (39) September 23.
- Ray, Ranjan (2001) *Child Labour and Child Schooling in South Asia : A Cross Country Study of their Determinants*, A Paper Presented in IDPAD International Conference on Child Labour in South Asia, October 15-17, New Delhi, India.
- Raza, Moonis (1990) *Educational Development and Society*, Vikas, New Delhi.
- Roderick and Stephens (1978)
- Rodgers and Standing, G (1981) *Child Work, Poverty and Underdevelopment*, ILO, Geneva.
- Rosati, Furio C and Cignetto, Alessandro (2001) *Child Labour, Education, Fertility and Survival in Rural India*, A Paper Presented in IDPAD International Conference on Child Labour in South Asia, October 15-17, New Delhi, India.
- Rosenzweig and Evenson (1977) Fertility, Schooling and the Economic Contributions of Children in Rural India : An Econometric Analysis, *Econometrica*, Vol 45 (5).
- Schultz, T W (1961) Investment in Human Capital, *American Economic Review*, Vol. 51(1). Also in Blaug, M (1981) *Economics of Education*,
- Schultz, T W (1964) *Transforming Traditional Agriculture*, Yale University Press, London.
- Schultz, T W (1994) *Economics of Being Poor*, O U P, Oxford.
- Sen, A K (2002) *Commodities and Capabilities*, O U P, Oxford.
- Siddiqi, F and Patrinos, H A (1995) *Child Labour : Issues, Causes and Interventions*, HCO, Working Paper No. 56.

- Sinha, S (2000) Child Labour and Education, in Rekha Wazir (ed.) (2000) *The Gender Gap in Basic Education*, Sage, New Delhi.
- Smith, A (1986) (Org. 1776) *The Wealth of Nations (Book I – III)*, Penguin Classics, London.
- Streeten, Paul (1994) Human Development : Means and End, *American Economic Review*, Vol. 84 (2).
- Swinnerton, K A and Rogers, C A (1995) The Economics of Child Labour : A Comment, *American Economic Review*, Vol. 89 (5).
- Taakei, Atsushi (1999) Child Work and Schooling : A Case Study of Andhra Pradesh Village, A paper Presented in South Asian Conference on Education, University of Delhi, November 14-18.
- Thompson, E P (1973) *The Making of English Working Class*,
- Tilak, J B G (2002) Education Poverty in India, *Review of Development and Change*, January-June.
- UNESCO (1995) *World Education Report*, UNESCO, Paris.
- UNESCO (2000) *World Education Report*, UNESCO, Paris.
- Weiner, M (1994) *Child and State in India*, OUP, New Delhi.
- Weiner, M (1996) Child Labour in India, *Economic and Political Weekly*, November 9-16.
- Witkinson, Kevin (2000) *Oxfam Report on Education*, Oxfam.
- World Bank (2000) *India : Reducing Poverty, Accelerating Development*, OUP, New Delhi.

Appendix I

Diagram 1 : Main Activities of Children

Read above set diagram as A: Children Attending Schools; B: Working Children; C: Children those who are attending school and working; and D: Children those who are neither attending school nor working. All sub sets together (A,B,C,D) are total child population.

