## Exclusionary Opportunities? Gendered Perspective of Work in Peri-Urban Areas of Large Metropolitan Cities in India

#### Sucharita Sen

Centre for the Study of Regional Development School of Social Sciences Jawaharlal Nehru University

This presentation is an input to the international policy workshop on rural-urban linkages held in Zhejiang, PRC on 2-4 September 2014. The views expressed in this presentation are those of the author, and do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the organizers (the Asian Development Bank [ADB] and the International Poverty Reduction Center in China [IPRCC]), or ADB's Board of Governors, or the governments they represent. ADB and IPRCC do not guarantee the accuracy of the data and information in this paper.

### Issue

#### Why are Peri-urban areas of Large Metropolitan Cities Important

- Spatial platforms that experience land use changes from agriculture to non-agricultural uses.
- Consequent demands for occupational transitions.
- Fluid population- home to resettled urban poor, urban rich that shifted to avoid urban crowding, migrant population from rural areas in search of jobs.

#### The Gender Issue

- Female work participation rates falling in India for the past quarter century while male WPR is stable- rural declines sharper, urban more fluctuating.
- Impact of transitioning jobs of men and lack of social support for the migrant population on women in Peri-Urban regions (PURs) in terms of responsibility of domestic work and care-giver is expected to impact their interaction with the labour market.

# **Focal Question and Issues**

### Questions

 Given the transient nature of the peri-urban spaces what is the nature of gender differences in terms of participation in labour market in there areas compared to city cores and the areas outside the periurban areas?

### **Issues Dealt with**

- Work Participation Rates
- Composition of work (casual, self employed regular-salaried)
- Barriers to entering labour market
- Wage rates
- Women's response to land dispossession

# Framework of Analysis and Data Base



### Data Base

- Employment-Unemployment rounds of 2004-05 (61<sup>st</sup> round) and 2011-12 (68<sup>th</sup> round) of the National Sample Survey Organization
- Qualitative and quantitative evidences from field surveys carried out in Delhi and Kolkata (reference years 2008 and 2011 respectively)
- Population Census 2001 and 2011

### Peri-Urban Areas: Creating Economic Continuums but Demographic Dis-continuums

	Spatial	Developti	MPCE	Wage/	Work Status			
	Unit	Populati		Daily			workers in	Organize
		on		Earning		Principal	non-Farm	d Sector
		Growth			Workers	Status	Sector	
Location		Rate				Workers		
	Peri-		1584	231	41.20%	<mark>38.80</mark> %	56.70%	10.10%
	Urban	0.35						
	Residual		1481	210	37.70%	46.80%	49.50%	8.50%
Rural	State	0.74						
	Urban		3357	480	47.80%	50.70%		15.80%
	Core	1.51						
	Peri-		2847	438	48.70%	47.40%		15.20%
	Urban	4.86						
	Residual		2101	337	48.40%	48.00%		11.20%
Urban	State	2.98						

# Higher Gender Disparities in WPR in PURs

Spatial Units	Ratio of Female to Male WPR (15-59)					
	Principal and					
	Subsidiary	Principal				
	Status	Status				
	61 <sup>st</sup> Round: 2004-05					
Rural						
Peri-Urban	0.45	0.30				
<b>Residual State</b>	0.70	0.62				
Urban						
Urban Core	0.26	0.24				
Peri-Urban	0.29	0.22				
<b>Residual State</b>	0.38	0.34				
	68 <sup>th</sup> Round: 2011-12					
Rural						
Peri-Urban	0.41	0.22				
<b>Residual State</b>	0.54	0.46				
Urban						
Urban Core	0.29	0.27				
Peri-Urban	0.26	0.22				
<b>Residual State</b>	0.31	0.28				

Peri-urban areas demonstrating higher levels compared to both city cores and residual states.

Disparities deepening in rural areas.

# Barriers to entering the labour market?

City cores improving, peri-urban stable/worsening, residual states unambiguously worsening.

Bridging differences between city cores and residual states in urban areas *City-specific variation:* 

In Delhi, peri-urban areas have lower gender disparities, compared to both city core and residual states (vibrant agriculture and livestock activities in peri-urban areas- higher rural-urban linkages).

Work Participation Rates: WPR

WPR= workers in 15-59 age group/ population in 15-59 age group



### Age-specific WPRs

- Education related withdrawals do not tell us the full story.
- Hypothesis of prosperityinduced withdrawal is not consistent with the spatio-temporal pattern.
- Urbanization effect appears to have had positive impact in reducing gender disparities over time, the peri-urban vulnerabilities in terms of WPR levels notwithstanding.

### Nature of jobs acceptable to women in PURs

#### **Composition of work**

- Most favourable for women in PURs compared to both urban core and residual states.
  - Higher (and increased)share in regular salaried and lower (and reduced) in unpaid family work.
  - Lower shares of casual wage work compared to RS.
- Not willing to accept jobs with less stability? Not in a position to do so?

#### Jobs acceptable

If regular home-based work ulletwas offered, of a regular (vis-à-vis occasional) and part-time (vis-à-vis full time), a greater share of non-working women in PURs would have been in the labour force compared to the other two spatial units.

### Barriers to Entry to the Labour Market\*

Barriers	Men	Women				
Dissimilarities						
Spatial Units	Residual States	Peri-urban Regions				
Education		Middle School and secondary education compared to higher secondary and above				
Social Group	Scheduled caste backgrounds	Upper caste backgrounds				
Marital Status	Divorced and separated status	Never married status				
Similarities						
Age	Younger age					
Household size	Larger household size					
Locations	Urban locations					

\* Based on logit regression for two points of time carried out for men and women separately and probabilities of working with respect to different explanatory variables for entry to labour market  Wage rate differentials reducing in rural areas in low-wage sectors, more favorably for PURs; increasing in high-wage sector
Wage rate differentials increasing in urban areas, more sharply for PURs, particularly in the higher paid sectors

IIDRAN

DIIDAI

RURAL				URBAN					
	Female/Male Wage rate		Mean			Female/Male		Mean	
			1	Trues Of	Creatial	<b>U</b>	1	1	
Spatial	2004-		(2011-12)*	1	•			Differenc	
Unit	05	2011-12		Work	Units	05	-12	2011-12*	
Peri-Urban	0.69	0.76							
Residual			42*		Urban Core	0.84	0.81		
State	0.62	0.7	(121)	Manufactu.	Peri-Urban	0.44	0.41	193*	
Peri-Urban	0.41	0.73		Regular	Residual	0.00	0.40	(393)	
Residual			118*		State	0.33	0.40	-	
State	0.32	0.51	(249)		Urban Core	0.78	0.90		
Peri-Urban	0.54	0.74		Education	Peri-Urban	0.93	0.74	169*	
Residual			67*					(525)	
State	0.55	0.56	(144)			0.68	0.70	(0-0)	
Peri-Urban	0.7	0.68				0.78	0.70		
Residual			84*	Hoalth				230*	
State	0.64	0.57	(179)			0.95	0.55		
Peri-Urban	0.74	0.43		Regular		0.70	0.66	(575)	
Residual			295*		State				
State	0.57	0.48	(456)						
	Spatial Unit Peri-Urban Residual State Peri-Urban Residual State Peri-Urban Residual State Peri-Urban Residual State Peri-Urban Residual State	FemaSpatial2004-Unit05Peri-Urban0.69Residual0.62Peri-Urban0.41Residual0.41Residual0.32Peri-Urban0.54Residual0.55Peri-Urban0.71Residual0.71State0.64Peri-Urban0.74Residual0.74Residual0.74Residual0.74	Femal/Male Wage rateSpatial2004-Spatial2004-Unit0.52011-12Peri-Urban0.690.76Residual0.620.70Peri-Urban0.410.73Residual0.320.51Peri-Urban0.540.74Residual0.540.74Residual0.540.56Peri-Urban0.70.68Residual0.70.68Residual0.740.57Peri-Urban0.740.43Residual0.740.43Residual0.740.43Residual0.740.43Residual0.740.43	Female/Male Wage rateMean DifferenceSpatial2004-(2011-12)*Unit052011-12Peri-Urban0.690.76Residual0.620.7State0.620.7Peri-Urban0.410.73Residual0.410.73Residual0.320.51State0.320.51Peri-Urban0.540.74Residual0.550.56State0.550.56Peri-Urban0.70.68Residual0.640.57State0.640.57Peri-Urban0.740.43Residual0.740.43Residual0.740.43Residual0.740.43State0.740.43	Female/Male Wage rateMean Difference (2011-12)*Type Of WorkSpatial Unit2004- 0.5(2011-12)*Type Of WorkPeri-Urban0.690.7642*Residual State0.620.7(121)Peri-Urban0.410.7342*Residual State0.620.7(121)Peri-Urban0.410.7384*Residual State0.540.7467*Residual State0.550.5667*Residual State0.70.6884*Peri-Urban0.70.6884*Residual State0.640.57(179)Peri-Urban0.740.43295*	Female/Male Wage rateMean Difference (2011-12)*Type Of 	Female/Male Wage rateMean Difference (2011-12)*Mean Difference (2011-12)*Female WageSpatial Unit2004- 2011-12(2011-12)*Type Of WorkSpatial Units2004- 2004- 0.5Peri-Urban0.690.76 $Urban Core$ 0.84Residual State0.620.7(121) $Manufactu$ RegularPeri-Urban0.44Peri-Urban0.410.73 $Regular$ Residual State0.51(249)Peri-Urban0.540.74 $Cree$ (144) $Regular$ Residual Regular $Residual$ State $0.68$ Peri-Urban0.770.68 $Regular$ Residual Regular $Residual$ Regular $0.68$ Peri-Urban0.70.68 $Regular$ Residual State $0.68$ Peri-Urban0.740.57 $(144)$ $Peri-Urban$ $0.93$ Peri-Urban0.640.57 $(179)$ $Regular$ $Regular$ $Residual$ RegularResidual State0.640.57 $(179)$ $Regular$ $Residual$ Regular $0.70$ Peri-Urban0.740.43 $Residual$ Regular $0.70$ $0.70$	Fermi-Freme Wage rateMean Difference DifferenceMean DifferenceRean DifferenceFermale/HaltHean Wage rateSpatial Unit2004- 052011-12)*(2011-12)*Type Of WorkSpatial Units2004- 052011Peri-Urban0.690.76Mean (2011)Units2004- 05-12Peri-Urban0.690.76ManufactuPeri-Urban0.840.81State0.620.77(121)ManufactuResidual State0.410.440.41Peri-Urban0.410.73ManufactuResidual State0.320.510.400.41Peri-Urban0.540.5167* (144)Urban Core0.780.90Peri-Urban0.700.6680.70Residual State0.630.70Peri-Urban0.770.668Max (144)Mean Peri-Urban0.690.70Peri-Urban0.740.550.56Max (144)Mean Peri-Urban0.680.70Peri-Urban0.740.680.70Mean (179)Mean (189)0.700.70Peri-Urban0.740.530.550.550.550.55Peri-Urban0.740.73Mean (179)Mean (189)0.70Peri-Urban0.740.75Mean (189)0.700.70Peri-Urban0.740.75Mean (179)Mean (180)0.70Peri-Urban0	

\*Average wage rates/earnings per day in INR in parenthesis

# Responses to Land Dispossession: Observation from the Field

- Household responses stronger than gendered responses.
- Upward mobility observed for large land-owners (men).
- Downward mobility for tenant cultivators, irrespective of their gender.
- Women transitioning from subsidiary work status (livestock and milk) to non-workers. Loss of money from sale of milk, which they used to spend on their own.
- Loss of social networks: men joining business syndicate groups (formal networks), women more isolated than before.
- Women married earlier with compensation money.

### **Concluding Observations**

### Findings

- PURs represents economic continuums between the urban cores and the residual states but gendered dis-continuums with respect to participation in labour market, wages and nature of work.
- Home-based work of regular but parttime nature favoured, particularly by women of PURs.
- Effects of urbanization appears to be having a positive effect over time in terms of WPR, visible more in city cores, followed by peri-urban areas.
- Wage-rate differentials growing the fastest in the urban locations of PURs, particularly in the well-paid sectors, relative to urban cores and residual states.
- Women from poor and tenant households vulnerable in the nature of work they are forced to take up.

### **Policy Directions**

- Government encouragement of homebased work (direct or through NGOs), ensuring payment of statutory wage rates.
- MGNREGS with gender sensitive provisions like providing place of work near home and providing crèche facilities should be strengthened in rural PUR (currently poor performance).
- Extending urban governance to the PURs to improve education and safe transport facilities might contribute in increasing flexibility (from regular jobs to part-time jobs in diversified sector) of the women to join the job market that they require, as per this study.

# **THANK YOU**