



UNRISD

UNITED NATIONS RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

**The Political and Social Economy of Care:
India Research Report 2**

**Neetha Pillai
Rajni Palriwala**

March 2008

The **United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD)** is an autonomous agency engaging in multidisciplinary research on the social dimensions of contemporary problems affecting development. Its work is guided by the conviction that, for effective development policies to be formulated, an understanding of the social and political context is crucial. The Institute attempts to provide governments, development agencies, grassroots organizations and scholars with a better understanding of how development policies and processes of economic, social and environmental change affect different social groups. Working through an extensive network of national research centres, UNRISD aims to promote original research and strengthen research capacity in developing countries.

Research programmes include: Civil Society and Social Movements; Democracy, Governance and Well-Being; Gender and Development; Identities, Conflict and Cohesion; Markets, Business and Regulation; and Social Policy and Development.

A list of the Institute's free and priced publications can be obtained by contacting the Reference Centre.

UNRISD, Palais des Nations
1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland

Tel: (41 22) 9173020
Fax: (41 22) 9170650
E-mail: info@unrisd.org
Web: <http://www.unrisd.org>

Copyright © United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD).

This is not a formal UNRISD publication. The responsibility for opinions expressed in signed studies rests solely with their author(s), and availability on the UNRISD Web site (<http://www.unrisd.org>) does not constitute an endorsement by UNRISD of the opinions expressed in them. No publication or distribution of these papers is permitted without the prior authorization of the author(s), except for personal use.

Research Report 2

Analysis of the Time Use Data

The chapter is based on the Indian time use survey conducted during 1998-99. It uses the time use data to explore dimensions of unpaid care work, especially those related to child care. It examines time spent on care work in its relation to the time care givers spent in varied categories of paid and unpaid work, as well as their different demographic, social and economic characteristics. In the process, the chapter suggests an initial analysis of the care-work regime.

The only large-scale time use data available for India are from a survey which was carried out in 1998-99. Taking into account the diversity of the country, six states were covered in the survey from six different regions of the country and three-staged stratified random sampling was followed for the selection of households. The survey instrument used was based on interviews on a one-day recall method. The time spent on different activities was collected for time slots of one hour each from 3.00 A.M in the morning to 4.00 A.M. the next day, on all days of the survey. In the absence of widespread use of watches and clocks, investigators were trained to collect data chronologically, systematically linking it with other time schedules with which the participants could be familiar (school time, office time, etc.). The information was collected through three sets of schedules: one for collecting data on household characteristics, the second on individual characteristics, and the third on the time disposition of selected individuals. The last was collected from all the members of the household aged 6 years in age and above for three types of days – normal day, weekly variant day and abnormal day (if such was found) for a reference period of one week. During the reference week, information was collected for any one of the normal days and also for the abnormal and weekly variant days, if any. The survey was repeated every three months over a period of one year, so as to capture seasonal variation. In case of simultaneous or multiple activities, information was gathered on these activities and the total time was divided across various activities on the basis of their relative importance as reported by the informant. In the case of economic and non-economic activities being performed simultaneously, priority was given to economic activities in deciding their importance.

The reported incidence of weekly variant and abnormal days, other than in the state of Meghalaya, was very low as was the seasonal variation. The normal days constituted 93% of all days covered in the survey and this proportion was marginally higher for women than for men (Report of the time Use Survey, 2000). Weekly average time spent on various activities was calculated based on the presence of various types of days. In the case of individuals with only normal days the time spent on various activities on a normal day was multiplied by 7 to get the weekly average. In the case of individuals with weekly variant and abnormal days the time spent on a normal day was multiplied by 5 and the weekly total was calculated by adding an abnormal and the weekly variant day. The weekly total was divided by 7 to get the daily average time spent.

A specially designed classification schedule was used for the survey which took into account adequate coverage of likely activities, as well as compatibility and comparability with other national and international data. The Indian classification did not follow the United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD) (1997) classification which distinguishes between economic categories in terms of whether the work was done in establishments or not. The major classification groups that were used in the time use survey are: Primary production activities, secondary production activities; tertiary production activities (trade, business and services); household maintenance, management and shopping for own households; care for children, elderly, and disabled of own household; community services; learning; social and cultural activities; personal care and self maintenance. The

first three come under System of National Accounts (SNA) activities which fall within the production boundary, the next three are extended SNA activities which fall within the general production boundary, while the last three are Non SNA activities taken as being personal in nature. These activities are further divided at 2-digit and 3-digit levels, which enable further classification of activities. The 2-digit and 3 digit classification is given in the Appendix. In this survey unlike the employment and unemployment surveys, engagement of persons in economic activities for less than one hour has also been recorded. Further, travel time as well as time spent on activities such as fetching water which are not counted in the normal workforce calculations, are included under SNA in the TUS survey.

The survey covered 18,591 households spread over 6 states. 77,593 individuals were covered of whom 40,187 were males and 37,406 were females. The number of households drawn from each state and the rural –urban distribution were as follows:

Table 1: Number of selected households and participants by state and place of residence

| States | No. of Households | | | No. of participants | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|-------|-------|---------------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
| | Rural | Urban | Total | Rural | | Urban | | Total | | |
| | | | | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | |
| Haryana | 984 | 360 | 1344 | 1919 | 1603 | 687 | 588 | 2606 | 2191 | 4797 |
| Madhya Pradesh | 3801 | 1260 | 5061 | 6832 | 6186 | 2275 | 1963 | 9107 | 8149 | 17256 |
| Gujarat | 1676 | 1485 | 3161 | 3244 | 2988 | 2913 | 2652 | 6157 | 5640 | 11797 |
| Orissa | 2244 | 552 | 2796 | 4131 | 4157 | 957 | 877 | 5088 | 5034 | 10122 |
| Tamil Nadu | 3637 | 2016 | 5653 | 5507 | 5541 | 3204 | 3186 | 8711 | 8727 | 17438 |
| Meghalaya | 408 | 168 | 576 | 652 | 655 | 269 | 283 | 921 | 938 | 1859 |
| Combined States | 12750 | 5841 | 18591 | 22285 | 21130 | 10305 | 9549 | 32590 | 30679 | 63269 |

Throughout this report, though not mentioned in the titles of individual tables, all tables are presented with data disaggregated by location - Haryana, Tamil Nadu and combined states. In the report, the data for combined states are given as All India since the sample states and sample population were selected statistically to represent the country. It is important to note that the small sample size in Haryana can make some of the results in the disaggregated analysis unreliable. All individual data are presented disaggregated by sex. As has been discussed earlier, time use data are gathered for individuals from the selected household with age 6 years and above. Since the data is collected from the respondents directly (though some help was given by parents or care takers in the case of children), data reported by children are bound to have misreporting problems, especially for those in the lower age categories. To circumvent this problem, all the disaggregate analysis is limited to individuals aged 10 and above.¹

The rest of the chapter is divided into four broad sections. Section 2 outlines the household and individual characteristics of the surveyed population. Time spent on SNA and extended SNA activities is analysed and compared across broad population characteristics in Section 3. Since rural-urban and inter state differences are sharp, the analysis in this section is disaggregated across rural/urban locations and across Tamil Nadu and Haryana, the states used for detailed study. Unpaid care work is analysed in Section 4 across various subcategories such as household maintenance, person care and community services. A detailed analysis of household maintenance work that

¹ Because of misreporting issues the age category followed in time use survey by many other countries is age 10 and above.

accounts for the largest share of total unpaid care work is also done in this section. Since the sample size does not allow for disaggregated analysis, in these sections rural/urban distinctions are not used. Further in Section 5, person care, especially child care and its various dimensions are examined across various population characteristics outlining the major determinants of child care work. Here again the analyses is not disaggregated across rural and urban areas. Section 6 analyses the major determinants of unpaid care work and person care statistically using tobit regression analysis. Section 7 deals with valuation of unpaid care work and compare the value of unpaid care work with other macro economic variables. Finally Section 8 summarizes the chapter.

2. Household and Individual Characteristics of Sample Respondents

The characteristics of the sample population are discussed in the first section so as to provide a broad overview of the population that is being analysed. As discussed, apart from the all India picture, the state-specific data for two states, namely Haryana and Tamil Nadu, are also discussed. As discussed in the earlier chapter these two states provide very different scenarios in terms of women's participation in paid work and in terms of norms of extra-household movement for women. Women in Tamil Nadu have long worked in the non-domestic, non-family sphere and have been relatively mobile compared to women in Haryana who are largely confined to family agriculture. There are also differences in terms of household size and household organisation. These two states not only provide some contrasts but raise paradoxes as well. Thus, while sex ratio, juvenile sex ratio, female literacy, and female 'work' participation is higher in Tamil Nadu, reported spousal violence is also higher in the state.

Table 2: Percentage distribution of sample households by religion

| States | | Religion | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------|----------|--------|-----------|------|-------|-----|
| | | Hindu | Muslim | Christian | Sikh | Other | |
| Haryana | Rural | 79.3 | 11.3 | - | 9.2 | 0.3 | 100 |
| | Urban | 92.2 | - | - | 6.4 | 1.5 | |
| | Total | 81.7 | 9.2 | - | 8.7 | 0.5 | |
| Tamil Nadu | Rural | 92.0 | 4.3 | 3.0 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 100 |
| | Urban | 83.1 | 8.5 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 1.3 | |
| | Total | 88.9 | 5.7 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.9 | |
| Combined States | Rural | 92.5 | 3.9 | 2.1 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 100 |
| | Urban | 84.3 | 10.4 | 3.4 | 0.4 | 1.6 | |
| | Total | 90.2 | 5.7 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 0.8 | |

The surveyed population was largely composed of Hindus who accounted for about 92 per cent of the rural population and 84 per cent of the urban population. Muslims constituted the second largest category in all the areas. In rural Haryana, the proportion of individuals from religious categories other than Hinduism was much higher than for all states combined. The proportional distribution of religious communities within the sample, whether for all-states combined, Haryana or Tamil Nadu, was not in accordance with the proportions recorded in the census. While there has been an overestimation of Hindus, the proportion of Muslim households is much lower than the Census estimates. This discrepancy is probably a reflection of the particular locations in the states in which the time utilization survey was conducted. If religious community makes a difference in the time spent on care work, this aspect of the sample will have to be kept in mind.

Table 3: Percentage distribution of sample households by caste

| | Caste | Rural | Urban | Total |
|-----------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| Haryana | SC | 33.7 | 19.3 | 29.8 |
| | Others | 66.3 | 80.8 | 70.2 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| TN | ST | 3.6 | 1.1 | 2.7 |
| | SC | 23.6 | 9.2 | 18.4 |
| | Others | 72.9 | 89.7 | 78.9 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| All India | ST | 18.8 | 5.7 | 14.7 |
| | SC | 18.7 | 10.5 | 16.1 |
| | Others | 62.6 | 83.9 | 69.2 |
| | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Scheduled Castes (SC) and Scheduled Tribes constitute 37 per cent of the surveyed households in rural areas. The proportion was less in urban areas - about 16 percent. In Haryana, no individual belonging to a scheduled tribe was covered while Tamil Nadu has a small proportion drawn from this category. The proportion of SCs and STs was again different from that recorded in the census - lower for SCs in Tamil Nadu and higher for STs as well as for SCs in Haryana in the sample.

Size, composition and the presence of old and young in the household have important bearings on the care burden and care work. The distribution of the sample households across place of residence and household size is given in the following table. The average household size for all the states combined was 4.2, with considerable variation between selected states and rural and urban areas. For Haryana it was 4.5, considerably higher than for Tamil Nadu where it was 3.6. As expected, the average household size was higher in rural areas than in urban areas, for all the states combined and for Haryana. However, in Tamil Nadu, the urban average household size (3.7) was marginally higher than the rural figure (3.5). The percentage of single member households was also much higher in rural Tamil Nadu (9.0) than it was for all-India or Haryana. This could to some extent be explained by the relatively high mobility of men and women for work in the state compared to Haryana and other states of the country.

Table 4: Percentage distribution of households by household size

| States | | Household size (No. of Persons) | | | | | | | Average Household size |
|-----------------|-------|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-----------|------------------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 & above | |
| Haryana | Rural | 2.1 | 7.0 | 15.2 | 24.7 | 24.0 | 16.5 | 10.5 | 4.6 |
| | Urban | 3.7 | 6.7 | 16.4 | 32.3 | 22.4 | 13.1 | 5.3 | 4.3 |
| | Total | 2.4 | 7.0 | 15.4 | 26.1 | 23.7 | 15.9 | 9.6 | 4.5 |
| Tamil Nadu | Rural | 9.0 | 19.0 | 23.2 | 25.7 | 13.6 | 6.2 | 3.3 | 3.5 |
| | Urban | 5.1 | 14.7 | 23.2 | 30.5 | 17.8 | 6.7 | 2.0 | 3.7 |
| | Total | 7.7 | 17.5 | 23.2 | 27.4 | 15.1 | 6.4 | 2.9 | 3.6 |
| Combined States | Rural | 6.0 | 13.3 | 17.0 | 23.2 | 18.7 | 11.8 | 10.1 | 4.2 |
| | Urban | 6.7 | 11.5 | 18.3 | 26.8 | 20.3 | 9.9 | 6.5 | 4.0 |
| | Total | 6.2 | 12.8 | 17.4 | 24.2 | 19.2 | 11.2 | 9.1 | 4.2 |

The table reveals that the largest proportion of households had 4 members, irrespective of rural-urban location and state differences. While for all states combined and Haryana the proportion of households with 5 members constituted the second largest category of households, for Tamil Nadu the second largest category was households with 3 members.

Household composition can be analysed in terms of the generations living together. As age is a central element in any generational classification, using a threefold division of generations by age (0-17, 18-49, and 50+ years), the sample households have been mapped over seven categories depending on the presence of various age groups in the households. These categories are described beneath the table that follows which presents the distribution of the categories.. There was a negligible proportion of households which consisted of only children (0-17) and the category was completely absent in Haryana.

Table 5: Household composition of sample households (age-generational classification)

| Rural | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|--------|-------|
| State | G1 | G2 | G3 | G1_2 | G1_3 | G2_3 | G1_2_3 | Total |
| Haryana | 0.0 | 6.1 | 3.4 | 60.9 | 1.8 | 7.4 | 20.4 | 100.0 |
| TN | 0.3 | 12.7 | 11.4 | 39.9 | 1.3 | 17.0 | 17.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 0.2 | 9.7 | 7.7 | 47.6 | 1.6 | 11.2 | 22.0 | 100.0 |
| Urban | | | | | | | | |
| Haryana | 0.0 | 8.1 | 5.3 | 54.7 | 0.6 | 10.0 | 21.4 | 100.0 |
| TN | 0.3 | 13.0 | 6.9 | 45.3 | 0.6 | 17.8 | 16.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 0.3 | 12.8 | 6.5 | 47.7 | 0.8 | 13.5 | 18.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | | | | | | | | |
| Haryana | 0.0 | 6.6 | 3.9 | 59.2 | 1.5 | 8.1 | 20.7 | 100.0 |
| TN | 0.3 | 12.8 | 9.8 | 41.9 | 1.1 | 17.3 | 17.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 0.2 | 10.7 | 7.3 | 47.7 | 1.4 | 11.9 | 20.9 | 100.0 |

Note: G1: households with only individuals in the age group less than 18 years; G2: households with only individuals between 18-49 years; G3: households with only individuals 50 years and above; G1_2: households with individuals in the age group less than 18 years and between 18-49 years; G1_3: households with individuals in the age group less than 18 years and 50+ years; G2_3: households with individuals in the age group 18-49 years and 50+ years; G1_2_3: households with individuals in all age groups.

The largest number of households belonged to the category G1_2, which could be taken as a rough indication of households consisting of parents and young children - i.e. of nuclear households. However, other persons belonging to these 2 generations, such as siblings or nieces/nephews, could also be present. The persistence of 3 generation households was also marked with category G1_2_3 constituting a significant proportion of households, being the second largest category for all-India as well as Haryana. In Tamil Nadu, households with individuals in the age category 18-49 years plus the 50 and above age group (G2_3) constituted a significant proportion, close to that of the three generation household. Haryana had a relatively low proportion of single generation households compared to Tamil Nadu or the all-India picture.

In looking at these figures we may keep in mind that very roughly, the generation 18-49 are likely to be net care-givers, the generation 0-17 net care receivers and the generation 50+ both receivers and givers. Thus, depending on the mix of generations in a household we would have an idea of the volume of care likely to be required within the household, whether care-giving is likely to take place within it - between or within generations - or whether a need of non-household care labour is likely to rise. Thus in Haryana, an exchange of care labour across generations within a household could be a common pattern, less so in Tamil Nadu.

Since the focus of the study is unpaid care work, especially child care, households were classified on the basis of the presence of children belonging to various age categories. The three classifications namely households with children (0-6), (0-14) and (0-17) are not mutually exclusive

categories. For example, a household with one four-year old child will be part of all three categories.

Table 6: Distribution of households by presence of children of different age categories in the household

| | | 0-6 | 0-14 | 0-17 | No of hhs with no children | Total Households |
|-------|---------|------|------|------|----------------------------|------------------|
| Rural | Haryana | 550 | 742 | 818 | 166 (16.9) | 984 |
| | TN | 1218 | 1838 | 2141 | 1496 (41.1) | 3637 |
| | Total | 6071 | 8290 | 9100 | 3650 (28.6) | 12750 |
| Urban | Haryana | 161 | 246 | 276 | 84 (23.3) | 360 |
| | TN | 711 | 1091 | 1254 | 762 (37.8) | 2016 |
| | Total | 2383 | 3507 | 3930 | 1911 (32.7) | 5841 |

Of the sample households, 71 percent in rural areas and 67 percent in urban areas reported the presence of children in some age category. The number of childless households was higher in Tamil Nadu where they accounted for 41 percent and 38 percent of the surveyed households in rural and urban areas respectively.

Table 7: Percentage distribution of sample households by size of agricultural landholding possessed

| States | | Landless | Landed |
|-----------------|-------|----------|--------|
| Haryana | Rural | 59.2 | 40.8 |
| | Urban | 88.1 | 12.0 |
| | Total | 64.5 | 35.5 |
| Tamil Nadu | Rural | 64.2 | 35.9 |
| | Urban | 89.7 | 10.3 |
| | Total | 73 | 27 |
| Combined States | Rural | 47.3 | 52.7 |
| | Urban | 88.2 | 11.8 |
| | Total | 58.9 | 41.1 |

In urban areas, most households are landless - about 88 per cent, but even in rural areas where agriculture remains a critical source of livelihood, the proportion was very high - about 47 per cent.

Table 8: Percentage distribution of sample households by monthly per capita expenditure

预览已结束，完整报告链接和二维码如下：

https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/云报告?reportId=5_21185



云报告
https://www.yunbaogao.cn

云报告
https://www.yunbaogao.cn

云报告
https://www.yunbaogao.cn