

Are lower Labour Market Returns to Education in India responsible for low Female Work Participation? An Analysis of NSSO Data: 2011-12

Sanghamitra Kanjilal-Bhaduri¹ and Francesco Pastore²

Abstract

In this paper data from the Indian National Sample Survey Office (NSSO) for the year 2011-12 is used to examine the relationship between educational attainment and labour market participation. Educational variables are gender disaggregated to see the effect of labour market returns. The analysis in this paper shows that women's education has a U-shaped relationship with paid work participation. Education levels higher than compulsory secondary schooling correlate with an increase in propensity to take part in paid work. This is because the returns to education are insignificant and low for lower levels of education. The returns increase significantly along with the increase in educational levels. However, females have a significant lower rate of return for each year of education as compared to men in rural and urban labour markets. This suggests that women suffer high levels of wage discrimination in the labour market in the year 2011-12. This may be the reason for a decline in work participation of females. The findings suggest that, to increase the numbers of women in the labour force, and wage employment; measures are needed to educate women beyond secondary level.

Keywords: female labour force participation, market returns to education, development, India

JEL Classification: J16, J21, J82, O12, O15

Introduction

This paper adds to the literature on declining female work force participation in India (Ghose 2004, Masood and Ahmad 2009, Srivastava and Srivastava 2010, Majumder 2011, Mehrotra et al 2012, Shaw 2013), by providing empirical evidence on returns to education, using large scale Employment Unemployment Survey (EUS) data of National Sample Survey Office (NSSO) for the most recent period 2011-12. Estimates of the returns to education in wage employment in India by gender and location (rural–urban) are provided in this study. The most recent data

¹ Corresponding Author, Research Scholar, Department of Economics, University of Calcutta, India. Email: bhaduri.sanghamitra@gmail.com.

² Associate Professor of Political Economy at University of Campania Luigi Vanvitelli, Research Fellow of the IZA (Institute of Labor Economics) of Bonn and country lead for Italy of the GLO (Global Labor Organization). Address: Department of Law, Palazzo Melzi, Piazza Matteotti, I-81055, Santa Maria Capua Vetere (Caserta), Italy. Email: francesco.pastore@unicampania.it

collected by the NSSO, on rural and urban work participation for women reveal a decline. In the economics of education literature, an important explanation of the gender gap in education is that the labour market rewards women's education less well than men's, especially in developing countries (Kingdon, 1998). Our paper examines this argument to explain the declining work participation of women in the year 2011-12. Our aim is to study female work participation through the interlinkages between education and employment.

India's economic growth has rapidly increased over the past two decades (Klasen and Pieters, 2012). At the same time, the declining participation of women in work is also a well-known fact in India. Two unusual things were witnessed in the data from rounds of the National Sample Survey Office (NSSO) employment and unemployment survey since 1999–2000 (55th round). First, in 2004–05 (61st round), the work participation of rural and urban women increased by 2–3 percentage points over 1999–2000, which was contrary to the declining trend since 1983 (38th round). Second, there was a massive decrease (12 percentage points) in work participation of rural women between the 2004–05 and 2009–10 surveys. Such a decline was unprecedented in history. From 2009–10 (66th round) to 2011–12 (68th round), the work participation of rural women decreased by 2 percentage points while for urban women it increased by 1 percentage point (Mohammed Zakaria Siddiqui et al., 2017). These stylised facts raise questions about the impact of education in the labour market participation of males and females and about the differential returns to education which may be the reason behind such a decline in female work participation. In this paper, we investigate if lower labour market returns to education in India are responsible for low female work participation in the year 2011–12. An earlier work by Kingdon and Unni (2001) uses NSS data for the 43rd Round, i.e. years 1987–88. They have studied only the urban districts of two states, viz, Madhya Pradesh and Tamil Nadu, whereas our study uses the central sample for nationally representative data, covering the entire span of rural and urban India. The novelty of our study lies in the result, which deviates from established literature regarding the reasons of decline in female labour force participation. Our results show that the lower returns to education in the labour market discourages women workers from participating, whereas literature states that an increase in educational enrolment has caused the decline (Chowdhury 2009, Neff et al. 2012). The decline in women's economic activity is a cause for concern as women are valuable resources and as it implies a decline in their well-being. Women's employment is a critical factor in their progression towards economic independence and is also considered as an indicator of their overall status in society (Mammen and Paxson 2008).

The rest of the paper is structured as follows; section 1 provides a succinct review of literature, section 2 outlines the data, section 3 provides the methodology, section 4 discusses the results and some concluding remarks follow in section 5.

1. Review of Literature

The importance and effects of education on labour force participation for both males and females is a widely recognised and well-known fact by economists (Palaz et al, 2001). Numerous studies (OECD, 1989; Psacharopoulos and Tzannatos, 1991; Tansel, 1996) have found that educational attainment is a consistent and effective determinant of labour force participation rate in both developing and developed countries. It is one of the most important personal variable influencing both male and female labour force participation. The literature on human capital states that women's labour force participation increases with education (Das

and Desai, 2003). However, the strength of this relationship varies between countries; being positive (for example in developed western countries), negative (for example in South Asian countries like India) and approaching insignificance (for example in Latin American countries like Brazil). Higher returns to education for women (compared to men) are shown by several studies for different countries [Psacharopoulos, 1994 (cross-country review); Chase, 1997 (Czech Republic and Slovakia); Malathy and Duraiswamy, 1993 (India) and Duraiswamy, 2000 (India)]. Human Capital theories emphasise the importance of education in employment outcomes. This is especially so for women as higher levels of education (Human Capital) would lead to higher wages, beyond the threshold of reservation wages³, drawing women into the labour force. Hence, female education is a key intervening variable for the achievement of several development goals (Schultz, 1994).

2. Data

The data used for analysis in this paper were collected as part of the all India quinquennial survey on Employment-Unemployment by National Sample Survey Office (NSSO). The NSSO carries out all India household survey programme about Employment and Unemployment every 5 years called the quinquennial rounds of Employment and Unemployment Survey (EUS). A nationwide enquiry is conducted to generate estimates of various characteristics pertaining to employment and unemployment and Labour Force characteristics at the National and State levels. Information on various facets of employment and unemployment are collected through a schedule of enquiry (Schedule 10) adopting established concepts, definitions, and procedures. Based on the data collected during the entire period of survey, estimates pertaining to employment-unemployment in India along with various characteristics associated with them are presented in the reports. These surveys contain particularly rich data on educational attainment at the level of the individual. They also collect a wide array of data on the socio-economic characteristics of individuals including age, religion, caste and land-owned.

NSSO employs three different methods of determining the activity status of the persons. The first method identifies the Usual Principal Activity Status (called 'Usual Principal Status', UPS) of a person by using a reference period of 365 days preceding the date of survey. A person is considered as being in the Work Force if he/she is gainfully employed for a major part of the preceding 365 days. The second method considers a reference period of one week (current weekly status) and the third method considers each day of the week (current daily status). Our study is based on current weekly status. Although ideally long-run longitudinal data are necessary to test the predictions of human capital theory, discussed above, cross-section data can be used if care is taken in interpreting the results.

The main sources of labour force data in India can be obtained from International Labour Organisation (ILO), Census, Indian Household Data Survey (IHDS) and National Sample Survey Office (NSSO). The NSSO sample covers both informal and formal work. This study uses the NSSO data as it provides the most recent information and is widest in coverage.

³ In a model involving possible labour force participation, the reservation wage rate is the minimum wage rate at which an agent will accept employment. The reservation wage rate is generally greater than zero because the agent's alternatives to paid employment have positive value. The alternatives might be taking care of children (rather than paying for child care services), pursuing education, or simple leisure.

3. Methodology

While mainly economic factors determine a man's participation in paid work, the forces that influence a woman's participation are many and diverse and include demographic, reproductive, social, religious, and cultural factors (Bettio and Villa, 1998; Guiso, Sapienza and Zingales, 2003; Pastore and Tenaglia, 2012). Hence, the decision to participate in the labour force is influenced by women's individual preferences and/or those of her household, family circumstances. The existing literature (e.g. Klasen and Pieters 2012, World Bank 2012) suggest that important determinants of participation in India can be education (human capital endowment), family income, socio-economic and cultural factors, access to resources (skills and capital), labour market regulations, and infrastructure. The probability of participating in paid work is thus modelled in our study as a function of several explanatory variables split into categories: individual characteristics, household characteristics, social characteristics, and regional characteristics.

For the measurement of the returns to education, two variables are of importance; wages and the years of education attained. Wages are recorded in monetary units for both 'cash' and 'in-kind' income, and added together to form a total. In the questionnaires, the recall period for waged earnings is one week. Mincerian earnings functions take years of education as the measure of human capital accumulated. In the NSS samples, however, educational attainment is not recorded by years of education, but rather by level of education completed. Conversion from educational attainment categories to years of education, following Kingdon and Theopold (2008), is detailed in Table A3. In this context, educational attainment only serves as a proxy measure for the years of education completed. It does not consider any repeats. This, however, is not problematic in the context, as, the education level completed captures more accurately the level of human capital accumulated than a direct measure of years spent in schooling. The human capital hypothesis directly supports this view. However, a limitation associated with this method of conversion is the fact that high levels of education, such as postgraduate or doctoral studies, cannot be recorded. This implies a potential over-estimation of the returns of education, as high earnings associated with very high levels of education are effectively attributed to lower educational attainment. Education as a variable has thus been specified in two ways in our analysis, viz, as a continuous variable where years of education have been considered (in the pure mincerian earnings function) and as a categorical variable where we have dummies for different levels of education (in an extended mincerian equation).

Modelling the choice of work force participation is an important exercise as it suggests the way in which education influences people's participation in the labour market. It is also needed for the consistent estimation of earnings functions when selected samples are used, such as a sample of persons for whom earnings are observed (Kingdon, 1998). Following most applied work, we have adopted the standard work force participation model derived from the neo-classical theory of labour supply. The choice between participation in paid work or not is modelled as a binary probit.

The standard Mincerian semi-logarithmic earnings function is used to model earnings, with modifications to take account of the possibility of endogenous sample selection using the familiar two step Heckman procedure.

The wage equation is:

$$\ln(Y_i) = \beta X_i + \varepsilon_i$$

The basic idea of the sample selection model is that the wages are observed only for those individuals for whom $Z_i^* > 0$, where Z_i^* (the employment function), is given by:

$$Z_i^* = H_i' \alpha + \varepsilon_i$$

Where Z_i^* , is a latent variable associated with employment, here defined as paid work, due to the lack of information regarding the hours of work, our analysis will focus on H_i' , which is a vector of determinants of employment, α is the associated parameter vector and ε_i is the error term.

The probabilities of paid work participation estimated from the probit are used to construct the selectivity variable which will then be used as an additional regressor in the earnings function. The analysis uses a sample of persons aged 25-59 years old. Separate sub-group regressions have been performed for married women. Table A1 gives the definition of the dependent and independent variables, while Table A2 gives the descriptive statistics.

4. Results

4.1 Paid work participation

Table 1 and 2 report the specification of the probit model of wage and salaried work participation for women and men, respectively. For each gender, the tables provide estimates of participation equations for urban and rural areas. Co-efficient of a unit change in a variable on the probability of paid work participation (PWP), holding all other variables constant at their mean values are presented in column 2 (Rural) and column 4 (Urban) for females and males aged 25-59 years.

(Tables 1 & 2 about here)

From table 1 and 2, it is seen that age and paid work participation have a U-shaped relation, both for males and females in rural as well as urban areas. This is not a typical finding. As it is the case of most other developed and developing countries, being Married has a negative impact on the propensity to do paid work. For males, it may be that marriage and its consequent responsibilities lowers the reservation wages and compels them to take up any available job, whatsoever. One important point to be mentioned here is that NSS does not provide wage information for self-employment. Hence paid work participation in our data implies only those activities for which wage data is provided. Analysis captures participation in (i)regular salaried/wage employment and (ii)casual wage labour in public works and other types of works. For women, marriage brings domestic and home production responsibilities, thus lowering the probability of taking up paid work⁴. Marital status being a significant determinant of labour supply decisions for women, we have run separate regressions for the sub group 'married women' and results are shown in Table 3.

⁴ Some of the covariates are likely to be endogenous as there might be underlying factors simultaneously affecting the covariates and the dependent variable. This might particularly be the case for marital status and number of children. Such endogeneity will bias the coefficients on marital status and children downwards (as the marriage decision and the decision to have children might be jointly determined with the decision not to work). When interpreting the coefficients, we must keep in mind these potential biases (Klasen and Pieters, 2012).

Further, (continuing with Table 1 and 2) educational level of the individual has a significant impact (U-shaped) whereas the educational achievements of the household head does not impact the participation decision significantly. Comparatively, the wealth of the household (proxied by the amount of land ownership of the household and the monthly per capita expenditure) is a stronger factor determining the participation of married women. U-shape relationship between economic or educational status and women's labour force participation at a given point in time emphasises the fact that among the poorly educated, women are forced to work to survive and can combine farm work with domestic duties (in rural areas) and among the very highly educated, high wages induce women to work and stigmas militating against female employment may be low. Between these two groups, women may face barriers to labour force participation related to both the absence of an urgent need of female employment (the income effect), and the presence of social stigmas associated with female employment (Klasen and Pieters, 2012). An increased propensity to do paid work among the backward castes in urban areas (scheduled castes and scheduled tribes) may be a manifestation of the reservation policy of Government of India⁵, according to which, members of the low and backward castes have a certain proportion of seats reserved for them in wage and salaried public-sector jobs.

For men, the relationship between education and paid work is almost linear and negative, whereas for women it has a distinct U-shape⁶. The co-efficient of the education level dummies first fall and then rise monotonically. In urban areas, the rise starts from graduate level, whereas in rural areas the rise starts from higher secondary schooling level. Women without formal education levels, however show an increased propensity to work. Such a result indicates the fact that returns to education in self-employment may be higher at lower levels of education as compared to participation in paid work in the labour market. So, at low levels the 'income effect' plays a strong role in influencing the labour supply decisions of women. Kingdon and Unni (2001) attribute the downward sloping part of this U to the process of Sanskritization: social restrictions on the lifestyles of women tend to become more rigid as households move up in the caste hierarchy (Chen and Drèze, 1992), The rising part of the U-curve is explained by the fact that highly educated women are pulled towards the labour market with high wages, thus strengthening the 'substitution effect'. High levels of education of the female is also associated with high level of education of the head of household and a positive impact on participation in paid work, thus corroborating the modernising influence that education has on the household's mindset. Women's ambitions and work aspirations also change with educational levels and hence the 'substitution effect' overpowers the 'income effect' at this part of the U-curve. Another plausible explanation is the working of the 'rigidity of social hierarchies'⁷ process. Such a rigidity also causes a significant positive impact on the propensity to do paid work for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. Vocational training has a positive impact towards participation in paid work for males and females in urban areas but not so in rural areas. The difference in nature of jobs in the rural and urban areas in India may be

⁵ Reservation to job placements and enrollment in Education in India is an action designed to improve the well-being of backward and under-represented communities defined primarily by their caste. It's a phenomenon that commenced with the coming into force of the Indian Constitution. This reservation system is also applicable to entry in to Government Service.

⁶ Kingdon and Unni (2001), Kingdon (1998) also find a U-shaped relationship between education and paid work participation in two separate studies involving urban areas of Uttar Pradesh and Tamil Nadu.

⁷ In India, women from low educated, low income and low caste households can work (even in menial jobs) without facing disapproval from the society. Caste and Class diktats, however, forbid women from highly educated, high income class and high caste households from doing such work. This is the 'Sanskritisation' process.

responsible for such an outcome. Availability and access to vocational training for women is now being prioritised in the rural areas through many self-help groups.

Being head of household significantly increases the possibility of women participating in paid work. It impacts men's participation negatively but not significantly, thus implying that for men, if paid work opportunities are not available then it compels them to take up self-employment. Share of female headed households is very insignificant as compared to male headed households. For women, being the head of household brings in added responsibility which increases their propensity of doing paid work. Availability of jobs in the area and region maybe a possible instrument of inclusion in the participation equation. The regional dummies have tried to capture this effect to a certain extent (data limitations have not enabled us to include more specific variables showing the job opportunities).

Education levels of the head of household, which is a proxy for family background has a positive impact on male paid work participation. For females, only when the education level of the household head is very high, corresponding to their own high level of education, is there a positive impact on paid work participation.

Presence of dependents in the household (children under the age of 5 years and adults over the age of 65 years) has a very significant negative impact on paid work participation for females in urban and rural areas, thus emphasising the burden of care work on women. For males, the negative impact is significant in rural areas only. This is puzzling, as the gender division of work dictates that care for the young and aged dependents of the household is the responsibility of the females and hence might inhibit their work participation. However, such a result has been obtained previously by three other studies of the Indian labour market, using different datasets (Divakaran, 1996; Kingdon, 1998; Kingdon and Unni, 2001). In urban areas, there is a positive impact. This emphasises the role of joint family in rural areas and nuclear families in the urban areas.

Ownership of land (proxy for the wealth availability of the household) very significantly reduces the propensity of paid work participation for males and females in rural areas⁸. In Urban areas, it has a very significant positive impact. In urban areas, wealth index of the household may not be correctly measured by the ownership of land, as it is quite possible that some households own ancestral land in the rural areas from where no income is generated. The income level of the household (proxied by the monthly per capita expenditure⁹) can be a better indicator of the economic class. Results depict that males belonging to the highest quartile of monthly per capita expenditure (mpce) have a very significant positive propensity to do paid work.

4.2 Labour market Earnings

In this section, we have investigated if the returns to education differ for the two sexes, i.e if the labour market discriminates against female workers. The mean and standard deviations of the variables included in the earnings function are reported in Table A5. The dependent variable is the log of weekly wages. The reference category is thus, persons not having wage work

⁸In a previous study by Kanjilal, 2016, it has been established that an increase in land ownership causes an increased participation in self-employment for males and females in rural areas (especially unpaid work in household farms, for women).

⁹ NSSO does not provide data on income levels

during last week (At the time of the survey). Two specifications of the earnings function are presented, one a pure Mincerian specification, i.e with just education, experience and experience-squared (Tables 4 & 5) as the independent variables and the second an extended earnings function which also includes the household characteristics, social groups and religion as added regressors (Table 8 & 9). Education as a variable has been specified in two ways, viz, as a continuous variable where years of education have been considered (in the pure mincerian earnings function) and as a categorical variable where we have dummies for different levels of education.

The measure of 'potential work experience (pwe)' is calculated as follows: $pwe = [age - education - 6(\text{age at which primary schooling starts in India})]$, (Pastore and Verashchagina, 2004). Data relating to actual work experience is not provided by NSSO, therefore we prefer potential work experience. This specification does not allow us to consider the voluntary breaks which may have been taken. Thus, it may overstate the potential work experience of females as compared to males.

(Tables 4 & 5 about here)

Table 4 & 5 present the results of the pure Mincerian specification of the earnings function for male and females in rural and urban areas. The selectivity term lambda is well defined and highly significant in all the four earnings equations. Education years has a highly significant effect on earnings for both male and female workers in the labour market. The mincerian rate of return to education is 18.2% and 22.3% for females in rural and urban India respectively, whereas for males it is 20% and 24.2%. So, we see that the rate of return is less for females than for males. There is a gender gap in returns to educational attainment which, in turn, is reflected in the lower participation of females in paid work participation.

To further explore the relationship between education and earning we have relaxed the restriction of linearity implicit in Tables 4 & 5 and have considered the educational level dummies in the earnings equation.

(Table 6 & 7 about here)

Table 6 & 7 show that, with respect to no-education, non-formal education has insignificant returns. Formal education in schools, colleges and university have significant returns. The rate of return increases with the level of education attained. Thus, returns are very significantly highest for Post Graduate and above level of education. The turning point in returns occurs at Higher Secondary Level for both males and females. Such a pattern of results on returns to education is also shown in studies on India by Kingdon and Unni (2001), Kingdon (1998) and Unni (1996).

(Table 8 & 9 about here)

Tables 8 & 9 present the extended earnings function for each gender by location. Some of the variables used in the participation equation have been used here as regressors. We explore the effect on earnings, of caste, household characteristics and religion in addition to the usual regressors experience, experience-squared and education. It is noticed that Hindu males and females face significant wage discrimination in rural areas but in urban areas it is not significant. Muslims do not face significant wage discrimination in rural or urban labour markets. Being head of household has significant negative effect on wages for females but not

so males. Presence of elderly adults has a statistically negative effect on wages in urban labour market only. This is explained by the existence of nuclear family setup in urban areas whereby the onus of care work falls more on the women. Scheduled Caste males and female workers face significant discrimination in the rural and urban labour market. Scheduled Tribe females do not face wage discrimination but males do face very insignificant discrimination. In this earnings equation where we have included the first step (probit) variables, lambda is still well defined and highly significant.

5. Conclusion

The analysis in this paper shows that women's education has a U-shaped relationship with paid work participation. Education levels higher than compulsory Secondary Schooling cause an increase in propensity to take part in paid work. This is because the returns to education are insignificant and low for lower levels of education. The returns increase significantly along with the increase in educational levels. Thus, education has a strongly significant relationship with wages of both males and females in rural and urban labour market. However, females have a significant lower rate of return for each year of education as compared to men in rural and urban labour markets. This suggests that women suffer high levels of wage discrimination in the labour market in the year 2011-12. This may be the reason for a decline in work participation of females. Our results are divergent from the established literature about the reason for declining female labour force participation in rural and urban India for the year 2011-12.

The results suggest that policies to encourage education beyond secondary levels for females will enhance their paid work participation. Removal of discrimination against females in the labour market may increase the returns to education. This will provide a fillip in work participation for females.

References

- Beneria, L. (1982), (ed) *Women and Development: The Sexual Division of Labor in Rural Societies*, New York, Praeger.
- Bettio F. and Villa P. (1998), 'A Mediterranean Perspective on the Break-Down of the Relationship between Participation and Fertility', *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 22 (2): 137-171.
- Chakraborty, S and S. Mukherjee. (2014), "Gender Wage Gap In The Indian Labour Market: Evidence From The NSS 66th Round Data", *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol. 57, No. 2, 2014.
- Chase, Robert, S. (1997), "Markets for Communist Human Capital: Returns to Education and Experience in the Czech Republic and Slovakia", Center Discussion Paper No. 770, Economic Growth Center, Yale University.

Chen, M. and J. Drèze (1992). Widows and Health in Rural North India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 27(43-44), 24-31.

Chowdhury, S. (2011), "Employment in India: What Does the Latest Data Show?", *Economic and Political Weekly* Vol. XLVI, No. 32, August 6, 2011.

Das, Maitreyee. B. (2006), "Do traditional axes of exclusion affect labour market outcomes in India?", *Social Development Papers, South Asia Series, No. 97*, Washington DC, World Bank.

Das, Maitreyee. B. and S. Desai, (2003), "Why are Educated Women Less Likely to be Employed in India? Testing Competing Hypotheses", *Social Protection Discussion Papers Series, No. 0313*, Social Protection Unit, Human Development Network, The World Bank.

Desai, S. and D. Jain, (1994), "Maternal employment and changes in family dynamics: The social context of women's work in rural South India", *Population and Development Review*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 115–136.

Divakaran, S. (1996), "Gender based wage and job discrimination in urban India", *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp 327-340.

Duraiswamy, P. (2000), "Changes in Returns to Education in India, 1983-94: By Gender, Age-Cohort and Location", *Center Discussion Paper No. 815*, Economic Growth Center, Yale University.

Gaeta, Giuseppe L; L, Giuseppe L; Pastore, Francesco (2017), "Much ado about nothing? The wage penalty of holding a Ph.D. degree but not a Ph.D. job position", *GLO Discussion Paper, No. 12*

Ghose, Ajit. K. (2004), "The Employment Challenge in India", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 39, No.48, (Nov 27-Dec 3, 2004), pp 5106-5116.

Ghosh, J. (2009), "Never Done and Poorly Paid: Women's Work in Globalising India", *Signs*, Vol. 37, No. 1 (September 2011), pp. 247-251, The University of Chicago Press Journals.

Guiso Luigi, Paola Sapienza and Luigi, Zingales, (2003), "People's opium? Religion and economic attitudes", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 50(1): 225-282.

Kanjilal, S. (2016), "Gender Relations in Employment under overlapping Class, Caste and Community Identity", Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Science) in Economics, Department of Economics, University of Calcutta, 7th December.

Kingdon, G. (1998), "Does the Labour Market Explain Lower Female Schooling in India?", *The Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 1, October 1998, pp. 39-65.

Kingdon, G. (2002), "The gender gap in educational attainment in India: How much can be explained?", *The Journal of Development Studies*, Volume 39, No. 2, pp. 25-53.

Kingdon, G. and N. Theopold, (2008), "Do returns to education matter to schooling participation? Evidence from India", *Global Poverty Research Group, Working Papers, No.052*.

Kingdon, Geeta. G. and J. Unni, (2001), "Education and Women's Labour Market Outcome in India", *Education Economics*, Vol.9, No. 2, pp 173-195

Klasen, S. and J. Pieters, (2012), "Push or Pull? Drivers of Female Labor Force Participation during India's Economic Boom", IZA Discussion Paper No. 6395, February 2012.

Malathy, D. and P. Duraiswamy, (1993), "Returns to Scientific and Technical Education in India", Margin, July-September.

Masood, T. and Ahmad. Mohd. Izhar. (2009), "An Econometric analysis of Inter-State Variations in Women's Labour Force Participation in India", mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de.

Mehrotra, S. et al. (2012), "Creating Employment in the Twelfth Five-Year Plan", Economic and Political Weekly, May 12, 2012, VOL XLVII No. 19.

Mohammed Z. S. et al., (2017), "Reconsidering Women's Work in Rural India Analysis of NSSO Data, 2004-05 and 2011-12", Economic & Political Weekly, January 7, 2017 vol. L II no. 1.

NSSO. 2011-12. Employment and Unemployment Situation in India, 68th Round, Report No.554. Ministry of Statistics and Program Implementation, Government of India

OECD Employment Outlook, (1989), "Educational Attainment of The Labour Force", Chapter-2.

Palaz, S.; Karagal, E.; Masatci, K. (2001) "The Effect of Education on Labour Force Participation Rate: The Case of TURKEY", [www.academia.edu/.../The Effect of Education on Labour Force Participation Ra...](http://www.academia.edu/.../The_Effect_of_Education_on_Labour_Force_Participation_Ra...)

Pastore, F. and S. Tenaglia (2013), "Ora et non Labora? A Test of the Impact of Religion on Female Labor Supply", IZA discussion paper, N° 7356.

Pastore, F and A. Verashchagina, (2004), "Private Returns to Human Capital over Transition: A Case Study of Belarus", IZA, Discussion Paper No. 1409.

Psacharopoulos, G. (1994), "Returns to Investment in Education: A Global Update", World Development, Vol.22 No. (9), pp 1325-1343.

Psacharopoulos, G. and Tzannatos, P. (1992) "Women's Employment and Pay in Latin America", Washington, DC, World Bank.

Schultz, T. P, (1994), " Human Capital Investment in Women and Men: Micro and Macro evidence of Economic Returns", Occasional Papers, No. 44, International Center for Economic Growth

Sethuraman, S.V. (1998), "Gender, informality and poverty: A global review", ILO Working Paper, (Geneva, ILO).

Srivastava, N and Srivastava, R (2010), "Women, Work and Employment Outcomes in Rural India", Economic and Political Weekly July 10, 2010, Vol XLV No. 28.

Shaw, A. (2013), "Employment Trends in India", Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 48, No. 42, 19 Oct, 2013.

Tansel, A. (2004), "Education and Labor Market Outcomes in Turkey", World Bank report, Turkey: Education Sector Study, June.

Thomas, J.J. (2012), “India’s labour market during the 2000s: Surveying the changes”, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 47, No. 51, pp. 39-51.

Unni, J. (1996), “Returns to education by gender among wage employees in urban India: a cross-national study”, Journal of Educational Planning and Administration, July.

World Bank, (1995a), “Jobs, Poverty and Working Conditions in South Asia”, Regional Perspectives on World Development Report 1995, Washington D.C.: The World Bank.

World Development Report, (2012), “Gender Equality and Development”

Table1: Binary Probit estimates of paid work participation for females aged 25-59 years, by location.

PWP	URBAN		RURAL	
	Coef.	R S.E.	Coef.	R S.E
age	-0.010	0.007	-0.006	0.006
agesq	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Married	-0.169	0.033***	-0.035	0.038
LiterateWithoutFormalSchooling	0.024	0.122	-0.056	0.085
LiterateBelowPrimary	-0.082	0.031***	-0.097	0.021***
Primary	-0.086	0.027***	-0.119	0.020***
MiddleSchool	-0.149	0.025***	-0.120	0.020***
SecondarySchool	-0.166	0.026***	-0.099	0.024***
HigherSecondarySchool	-0.061	0.029**	0.062	0.029
GraduateandDiploma	0.057	0.028**	0.150	0.033***
PostGraduateandAbove	0.275	0.036***	0.252	0.056***
Training	0.075	0.023***	-0.060	0.022***
headofhh	0.166	0.041***	0.121	0.030***
HHLitwithoutFS	-0.018	0.299	0.175	0.248
HHLitBP	0.041	0.084	-0.110	0.074
HHPrimary	-0.073	0.079	-0.085	0.069
HHMS	-0.178	0.076***	-0.090	0.067
HHSS	-0.163	0.083**	-0.041	0.087
HHHS	-0.213	0.103**	-0.121	0.115
HHGrDip	0.174	0.077**	0.382	0.114***
HHPG	0.283	0.123**	0.824	0.226***
hhschildren	-0.119	0.009***	-0.104	0.007***
hhselderly	-0.162	0.016***	-0.167	0.013***
Landowned	0.075	0.007***	-0.225	0.008***
North	0.140	0.030***	0.008	0.024
South	0.331	0.028***	0.263	0.023***
East	0.231	0.033***	0.040	0.026
West	0.300	0.030***	0.188	0.025***
Central	0.031	0.030	-0.168	0.023***
Hindu	-0.011	0.026	0.058	0.022***

Muslims	-0.152	0.031***	-0.051	0.028*
ST	0.240	0.030***	0.132	0.019***
SC	0.203	0.021***	0.209	0.016***
mpce2	0.025	0.026	-0.033	0.016**
mpce3	0.001	0.025	-0.046	0.017***
mpce4	0.084	0.025***	0.018	0.021
Constant	-0.929	0.144***	-0.349	0.125***
Number of obs =46875			No. of Obs=74799	
Wald chi2(36)=1570.26			Wald chi2(36)=2557.72	
Prob > chi2=0			Prob > chi2=0	
Log pseudolikelihood= -21736			Log pseudolikelihood= -29048.2	
Pseudo R2=0.037			Pseudo R2=0.0465	

Note: *, **, *** represent significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively. The base or reference category is non-participation in paid work. Reference Categories: 'Notliterate' for education level; 'mpce1' for monthly expenditure level; 'North-East' for regions; 'Other-Religions' for religion dummies; 'OBCs' for Caste; 'HHNotLit' for the education level of household head.

Table 2: Binary Probit estimates of paid work participation by males aged 25-59 years, by location.

PWP	RURAL		URBAN	
	Coef.	R S.E	Coef.	R S.E
age	-0.052	0.006***	-0.062	0.007***
agesq	0.001	0.000***	0.001	0.000***
Married	-0.205	0.024***	-0.229	0.024***
LiterateWithoutFormalSchooling	-0.394	0.264	0.048	0.371
LiterateBelowPrimary	-0.037	0.056	-0.230	0.075***
Primary	-0.217	0.048***	-0.193	0.064***
MiddleSchool	-0.220	0.041***	-0.232	0.055***
SecondarySchool	-0.283	0.043***	-0.334	0.056***
HigherSecondarySchool	-0.271	0.046***	-0.446	0.058***
GraduateandDiploma	-0.200	0.045***	-0.364	0.054***
PostGraduateandAbove	0.027	0.064	-0.266	0.066***
Training	-0.043	0.016***	0.029	0.016*
headofhh	-0.013	0.038	-0.109	0.053**
HHLitwithoutFS	0.188	0.281	0.169	0.389
HHLitBP	-0.037	0.061	0.176	0.084**
HHPrimary	0.117	0.052**	0.153	0.071**
HHMS	0.056	0.046	0.082	0.062
HHSS	0.113	0.049**	0.131	0.063**
HHHS	0.225	0.054***	0.291	0.066***
HHGrDip	0.382	0.052***	0.362	0.060***
HHPG	0.301	0.078***	0.420	0.074***
mpce2	-0.010	0.016	-0.145	0.009***
mpce3	-0.004	0.017	-0.137	0.016***

mpce4	0.104	0.020***	0.113	0.007***
hhschildren	-0.095	0.007***	0.227	0.029***
hhselderly	-0.105	0.013***	0.296	0.027***
Landowned	-0.225	0.008***	0.236	0.032***
North	0.033	0.023	0.301	0.029***
South	0.250	0.022***	0.070	0.028***
East	0.014	0.025	0.106	0.026***
West	0.162	0.025***	-0.073	0.031***
Central	-0.148	0.022***	0.184	0.028***
Hindu	0.053	0.022***	0.166	0.020***
Muslims	-0.023	0.027	-0.034	0.025
ST	0.108	0.018***	-0.005	0.024
SC	0.201	0.016***	0.167	0.024***
Constant	0.868	0.124***	0.328	0.145**
Number of obs =74599			Number of obs=47793	
Wald chi2(36)=2765.85			Wald chi2(36)=2145.8	
Prob > chi2=0.000			Prob > chi2=0.000	
Log pseudolikelihood= -30116.6			Log pseudolikelihood= -23741.8	
Pseudo R2=0.0468			Pseudo R2=0.048	

Note: *, **,*** represent significance at the 10%,5% and 1% levels respectively. The base or reference category is non-participation in paid work. Reference categories are the same as for table 1.

Table 3: Binary Probit Estimates of Paid Work Participation For Married Women

PWP	RURAL		URBAN	
	Coeff.	R S.E.	Coeff.	R S.E.
age	-0.010	0.005	-0.010	0.005**
agesq	0.000	0.000***	0.000	0.000**
LiterateWithoutFormalSchooling	-0.030	0.069	-0.039	0.072
LiterateBelowPrimary	-0.100	0.017***	-0.099	0.018***
Primary	-0.111	0.016***	-0.112	0.017***
MiddleSchool	-0.138	0.015***	-0.136	0.016***
SecondarySchool	-0.142	0.017***	-0.145	0.018***
HigherSecondarySchool	-0.019	0.021	-0.022	0.021
GraduateandDiploma	0.107	0.020***	0.109	0.021***
PostGraduateandAbove	0.326	0.031***	0.334	0.031***
Training	-0.016	0.017	-0.015	0.017
headofhh	0.142	0.024***	-0.389	0.059***
HHLitwithoutFS	0.115	0.190	0.255	0.550
HHLitBP	-0.022	0.055	0.226	0.119*
HHPrimary	-0.054	0.052	-0.065	0.118
HHMS	-0.123	0.050	0.081	0.098
HHSS	-0.119	0.061	0.090	0.111
HHHS	-0.190	0.079	-0.035	0.135

HHGrDip	0.112	0.067	0.595	0.100***
HHPG	0.288	0.121	0.766	0.161***
mpce2	-0.017	0.014	-0.023	0.014
mpce3	-0.036	0.014	-0.043	0.015***
mpce4	0.033	0.016	0.036	0.016**
hhschildren	-0.114	0.006***	-0.108	0.006***
hhselderly	-0.191	0.011***	-0.190	0.011***
Landowned	-0.075	0.006***	-0.079	0.006***
North	0.050	0.019***	0.059	0.020***
South	0.304	0.018***	0.305	0.019***
East	0.124	0.021***	0.119	0.022***
West	0.218	0.020***	0.215	0.021***
Central	-0.094	0.019***	-0.084	0.019***
Hindu	0.024	0.017	0.016	0.017
Muslims	-0.087	0.021***	-0.083	0.022***
ST	0.161	0.016***	0.167	0.017***
SC	0.233	0.013***	0.234	0.013***
Rural	-0.127	0.009***	0.122	0.010***
Constant	-0.586	0.099	-0.692	0.104
N=117471			N=108105	
Wald chi2(36)=3593.09			Wald chi2(36)=3175.98	
Prob>chi2=0.000			Prob>chi2=0.0000	
PseudoR2=0.0374			PseudoR2=0.0374	
Log Pseudolikelihood= -49150.949			Log Pseudolikelihood= -44182.456	

Note: ***, **, * Significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels respectively. Reference categories are the same as for Table 1.

Table 4: Mincerian Earnings Functions with education years for females

Variable	Rural		Urban			
	Coef.	t	Coef.	t		
logwg						
Intercept	5.295	(62.4)***	6.025	(67.55)***		
pwe	0.036	(8.85)***	0.029	(6.94)***		
pwesq	0.000	(-5.97)***	0.000	(-3.51)***		
education	0.182	(43.23)***	0.223	(52.23)***		
lambda	0.268	(7.76)***	-0.145	(-3.24)***		
N=74794			N=8755			
Adjusted R-squared=0.9683			Adjusted R-squared=0.2698			
Mean of Dependent Variable=1.6335			Mean of Dependent Variable=1.4697			

Note: ***, **, * Significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels respectively.

Table 5: Mincerian Earnings Functions with education years for males

Variable	Rural		Urban		
	Coef.	t	Coef.	t	
Intercept	5.868	(85.06)***	6.088	(97.78)***	
pwe	0.027	(7.08)***	0.040	(10.22)***	
pwesq	0.000	(-3.08)***	0.000	(-6.01)***	
education	0.200	(55.05)***	0.242	(66.1)***	
lambda	-0.216	(-6.44)***	-0.521	(-15.38)***	
N=11225			N=10322		
AdjustedR-squared=0.2167			Adjusted R-squared=0.3173		
Mean of Dependent Variable=1.6002			Mean of Dependent Variable=1.3946		

Note: ***, **, * Significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels respectively.

Table 6: Mincerian Earnings Function with Education Level Dummies (Females)

Variable	Rural Females		Urban Females		
	Coef.	t	Coef.	t	
Intercept	5.130	(60.31)***	5.926	(64.09)***	
pwe	0.051	(12.54)***	0.042	(9.99)***	
pwesq	-0.001	(-9.87)***	0.000	(-6.6)***	
LiterateWithoutFormalSchooling	0.110	(-0.98)	-0.052	(-0.34)	
LiterateBelowPrimary	0.183	(6.29)***	0.187	(4.68)***	
Primary	0.260	(9.36)***	0.289	(8.04)***	
MiddleSchool	0.481	(17.65)***	0.539	(16.13)***	
SecondarySchool	0.788	(24.45)***	0.919	(26.33)***	
HigherSecondarySchool	1.244	(31.77)***	1.230	(31.96)***	
GraduateandDiploma	1.470	(34.86)***	1.537	(43.81)***	
PostGraduateandAbove	1.769	(25.54)***	1.839	(40.57)***	
lambda	0.415	(11.74)***	0.078	(-1.6)	
N=10568			N=8755		
Adjusted R-squared=0.1903			Adj R-squared=0.2876		
Mean of Dependent Variable=1.6335			Mean of D.V.=1.4697		

Note: ***, **, * Significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels respectively. NotLiterate is the base category for education.

Table 7: Mincerian Earnings Function with Education Level Dummies (Males)

Variable	Rural Males		Urban Males	
	Coef.	t	Coef.	t
logwg				
Intercept	5.897	(88.08)***	6.410	(105.64)***
pwe	0.039	(10.27)***	0.048	(12.51)***
pwesq	0.000	(-6.82)***	-0.001	(-8.71)***
LiterateWithoutFormalSchooling	0.102	(-0.81)	0.000	(-0.000)
LiterateBelowPrimary	0.118	(4.05)***	0.137	(3.46)***
Primary	0.180	(6.54)***	0.243	(7.03)***
MiddleSchool	0.330	(12.55)***	0.454	(14.27)***
SecondarySchool	0.685	(-23.87)***	0.741	(22.69)***
HigherSecondarySchool	1.014	(30.53)***	1.080	(30.55)***
GraduateandDiploma	1.410	(47.12)***	1.510	(49.15)***
PostGraduateandAbove	1.716	(38.01)***	1.765	(47.18)***
lambda	-0.025	(-0.74)	-0.392	(-11.38)***
N=11225			N=10322	
Adj R-squared=0.2566			Adj R-squared=0.3455	
Mean of D.V.=1.6002			Mean of D.V.=1.3946	

Note: ***, **, * Significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels respectively. NotLiterate is the base category for education.

Table 8: Extended Mincerian Earnings Function (Females)

Variable	Rural Females		Urban Females	
	Coef.	t	Coef.	t
logwg				
Intercept	5.615	(56.4)***	6.344	(59.3)***
pwe	0.035	(8.43)***	0.033	(7.69)***
pwesq	0.000	(-5.17)***	0.000	(-3.9)***
education	0.184	(41.79)***	0.219	(48.57)***
headofhh	-0.385	(-13.49)***	-0.387	(-12.21)***
hhschildren	0.004	(-0.36)	0.059	(3.78)***
hhselderly	-0.029	(-1.4)	-0.053	(-2.24)***
SC	-0.040	(-1.78)*	-0.134	(-4.77)***
ST	0.068	(2.79)***	0.171	(4.92)***
Hindu	-0.098	(-3.54)***	0.002	(0.07)
Muslims	0.073	(1.92)*	-0.031	(-0.75)
lambda	0.100	(2.32)***	-0.404	(-6.65)***
N=10568			N=8755	

Adj R-squared=0.1863		Adj R-squared=0.2873
Mean of D.V.=1.6335		Mean of D.V.=1.4697

Note: ***,**, * Significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels respectively.

Table 9: Extended Mincerian Earnings Function (Males)

Variable	Rural Males		Urban Males	
	Coef.	t	Coef.	t
logwg				
Intercept	6.252	(78.92)***	6.474	(86.08)***
pwe	0.032	(7.84)***	0.050	(11.9)***
pwesq	0.000	(-4.02)***	-0.001	(-7.56)***
education	0.197	(52.65)***	0.243	(63.3)***
headofhh	-0.042	(-1.91)*	-0.026	(-1.21)
hhschildren	0.032	(2.98)***	0.122	(9.25)***
hhselderly	-0.011	(-0.54)	0.052	(2.35)***
SC	-0.112	(-5.29)***	-0.113	(-4.88)***
ST	-0.037	(-1.58)	0.031	(-0.98)
Hindu	-0.240	(-9.19)***	-0.186	(-6.13)
Muslims	-0.031	(-0.87)	-0.092	(-2.44)
lambda	-0.366	(-9.18)***	-0.844	(-18.3)
N=11225			N=10322	
Adj R-squared=0.2294			Adj R-squared=0.3268	
Mean of D.V.=1.6002			Mean D.V.=1.3946	

Note: ***,**, * Significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels respectively.

Appendix

TableA1: Definitions of variables used in the paid-work participation and earnings functions

Variable	Definition
PWP	Paid Work Participation in past week, yes=1 no=0
logwg	Log of weekly total wages
Personal Variables	
age	Age in years
agesq	Square of age
Education	Number of years of education (as defined in tableA3)
Female	Gender dummy; male=0, female=1
Male	Gender dummy; male=1, female=0
Married	Marital Status dummy; never married=0, married, divorced, widowed, separated=1
Training	Gained vocational training; yes=1, no=0
Not Literate	Years of education gained=0; yes=1, no=0
Literate without formal schooling	Years of education gained=1; yes=1, no=0
Literate Below Primary	Years of education gained=3; yes=1, no=0
Primary	Years of education gained=5; yes=1, no=0

Middle School			Years of education gained=8; yes=1, no=0
Secondary School			Years of education gained=10; yes=1, no=0
Higher Secondary School			Years of education gained=12; yes=1, no=0
Graduate and Diploma			Years of education gained=15; yes=1, no=0
Post Graduate and Above			Years of education gained=17; yes=1, no=0
Demographic Variables			
headofhh			Head of household; yes=1, no=0
hhschildren			Number of children <=5 years of age
hhselderly			Number of adults >=65 years of age
mpce1			Household's monthly per capita expenditure lowest quartile; yes=1, no=0
mpce2			Household's monthly per capita expenditure second quartile; yes=1, no=0
mpce3			Household's monthly per capita expenditure third quartile; yes=1, no=0
mpce4			Household's monthly per capita expenditure uppermost quartile; yes=1, no=0
Landowned			Household owns land; yes=1, no=0
North			Region dummy (according to Table A4)
South			Region dummy (according to Table A4)
East			Region dummy (according to Table A4)
West			Region dummy (according to Table A4)
Central			Region dummy (according to Table A4)
North East			Region dummy (according to Table A4)
Hindu			Religion dummy; yes=1, no=0
Muslims			Religion dummy; yes=1, no=0
Other-Religions			Religion dummy; yes=1, no=0
Scheduled Tribe			Social Group dummy; yes=1, no=0
Scheduled Caste			Social Group dummy; yes=1, no=0
Other Backward Castes(OBC)			Social Group dummy; yes=1, no=0
Rural			Location dummy; yes=1, no=0
Urban			Location dummy; yes=1, no=0
HHNotLit			Interaction headofhh*NotLiterate
HHLitwithoutFS			Interaction headofhh*LiterateWithoutFormalSchooling
HHLitBP			Interaction headofhh*LiterateBelowPrimary
HHPrimary			Interaction headofhh*Primary
HHMS			Interaction headofhh*MiddleSchool
HHSS			Interaction headofhh*SecondarySchool
HHHS			Interaction headofhh*HigherSecondarySchool
HHGrDip			Interaction headofhh*GraduateandDiploma
HHPG			Interaction headofhh*PostGraduateandAbove
pwe			Years of potential work experience=age-education-6
pwesq			Square of pwe
lambda			Selectivity term, Inverse of Mill's Ratio

TableA2: Descriptive Statistics of the variables used in paid-work participation function

Variable	Females age 25-59			Males age 25-59		
	All	Non-Participants	Participants	All	Non-Participants	Participants
	Mean			Mean		
age	38.420	38.295	39.077	38.867	38.887	38.773
	(9.579)	(9.569)	(9.605)	(9.498)	(9.419)	(9.858)
agesq	1567.816	1558.089	1,619.342	1600.880	1600.953	1600.541
	(775.760)	(775.590)	(774.650)	(773.460)	(767.420)	(801.160)
Married	0.965	0.968	0.955	0.900	0.909	0.858
	(0.183)	(0.177)	(0.208)	(0.300)	(0.288)	(0.349)
Training	0.082	0.081	0.090	0.183	0.181	0.192
	(0.275)	(0.273)	(0.286)	(0.387)	(0.385)	(0.394)
NotLiterate	0.335	0.332	0.346	0.155	0.153	0.166
	(0.472)	(0.471)	(0.476)	(0.362)	(0.360)	(0.372)
LiterateWi~g	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.004	0.004	0.004
	(0.070)	(0.070)	(0.067)	(0.064)	(0.065)	(0.063)
LiterateBe~y	0.094	0.095	0.087	0.084	0.084	0.084
	(0.291)	(0.293)	(0.282)	(0.278)	(0.278)	(0.278)
Primary	0.123	0.125	0.110	0.124	0.124	0.119
	(0.329)	(0.331)	(0.314)	(0.329)	(0.330)	(0.324)
MiddleSchool	0.156	0.160	0.135	0.190	0.194	0.168
	(0.363)	(0.367)	(0.342)	(0.392)	(0.396)	(0.374)
SecondaryS~l	0.116	0.119	0.102	0.157	0.162	0.135
	(0.321)	(0.324)	(0.303)	(0.364)	(0.369)	(0.341)
HigherSeco~l	0.072	0.071	0.073	0.106	0.109	0.094
	(0.258)	(0.258)	(0.260)	(0.308)	(0.312)	(0.292)
Graduatean~a	0.074	0.069	0.099	0.139	0.132	0.169
	(0.262)	(0.254)	(0.299)	(0.345)	(0.338)	(0.375)
PostGradua~e	0.025	0.022	0.042	0.040	0.036	0.060
	(0.157)	(0.146)	(0.201)	(0.197)	(0.186)	(0.238)
mpce1	0.226	0.231	0.197	0.224	0.233	0.185
	(0.418)	(0.421)	(0.398)	(0.417)	(0.423)	(0.389)
mpce2	0.244	0.248	0.227	0.246	0.253	0.213
	(0.430)	(0.432)	(0.419)	(0.431)	(0.435)	(0.410)
mpce3	0.258	0.261	0.243	0.258	0.261	0.239
	(0.438)	(0.439)	(0.429)	(0.437)	(0.439)	(0.427)
mpce4	0.272	0.261	0.333	0.272	0.253	0.362
	(0.445)	(0.439)	(0.471)	(0.445)	(0.435)	(0.481)
hhschildren	0.648	0.681	0.475	0.675	0.713	0.497
	(0.929)	(0.951)	(0.781)	(0.933)	(0.955)	(0.799)
hhselderly	0.214	0.226	0.150	0.213	0.226	0.149

	(0.495)	(0.508)	(0.411)	(0.500)	(0.515)	(0.418)
Landowned	2.614	2.629	2.534	2.642	2.650	2.607
	(0.804)	(0.802)	(0.813)	(0.820)	(0.812)	(0.855)
North	0.165	0.167	0.150	0.165	0.165	0.165
	(0.371)	(0.373)	(0.357)	(0.371)	(0.371)	(0.371)
South	0.221	0.207	0.297	0.209	0.196	0.273
	(0.415)	(0.405)	(0.457)	(0.407)	(0.397)	(0.445)
East	0.104	0.103	0.110	0.105	0.104	0.110
	(0.305)	(0.304)	(0.110)	(0.307)	(0.306)	(0.313)
West	0.120	0.116	0.141	0.124	0.120	0.143
	(0.325)	(0.320)	(0.348)	(0.330)	(0.325)	(0.350)
Central	0.246	0.260	0.177	0.249	0.263	0.184
	(0.431)	(0.438)	(0.381)	(0.432)	(0.440)	(0.387)
NorthEast	0.144	0.148	0.124	0.147	0.152	0.125
	(0.351)	(0.355)	(0.330)	(0.354)	(0.359)	(0.331)
Hindu	0.745	0.739	0.774	0.749	0.742	0.781
	(0.436)	(0.439)	(0.418)	(0.433)	(0.437)	(0.414)
Muslims	0.136	0.141	0.106	0.134	0.139	0.110
	(0.342)	(0.348)	(0.308)	(0.134)	(0.346)	(0.312)
OtherRelig~s	0.120	0.120	0.120	0.117	0.119	0.110
	(0.325)	(0.325)	(0.325)	(0.321)	(0.323)	(0.312)
ST	0.136	0.136	0.138	0.139	0.140	0.133
	(0.343)	(0.343)	(0.345)	(0.346)	(0.347)	(0.339)
SC	0.149	0.140	0.195	0.151	0.143	0.190
	(0.356)	(0.347)	(0.396)	(0.358)	(0.350)	(0.393)
OBC	0.393	0.397	0.369	0.389	0.392	0.373
	(0.488)	(0.489)	(0.483)	(0.488)	(0.488)	(0.484)
headofhh	0.076	0.071	0.105	0.700	0.693	0.734
	(0.265)	(0.257)	(0.306)	(0.458)	(0.461)	(0.442)
HHNotLit	0.031	0.029	0.045	0.131	0.130	0.139
	(0.175)	(0.167)	(0.208)	(0.338)	(0.336)	(0.346)
HHLitwitho~S	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.004	0.004	0.004
	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.027)	(0.061)	(0.061)	(0.060)
HHLitBP	0.008	0.007	0.010	0.069	0.069	0.069
	(0.088)	(0.086)	(0.099)	(0.254)	(0.254)	(0.254)
HHPrimary	0.009	0.009	0.011	0.095	0.095	0.094
	(0.095)	(0.094)	(0.104)	(0.293)	(0.293)	(0.291)
HHMS	0.011	0.011	0.011	0.129	0.132	0.115
	(0.103)	(0.103)	(0.105)	(0.335)	(0.338)	(0.319)
HHSS	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.102	0.105	0.092
	(0.082)	(0.081)	(0.085)	(0.303)	(0.306)	(0.290)
HHHS	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.063	0.063	0.063
	(0.060)	(0.060)	(0.065)	(0.242)	(0.242)	(0.242)
HHGrDip	0.005	0.004	0.011	0.082	0.075	0.116
	(0.069)	(0.059)	(0.105)	(0.275)	(0.264)	(0.116)
HHPG	0.001	0.001	0.004	0.025	0.021	0.042
	(0.036)	(0.028)	(0.064)	(0.155)	(0.143)	(0.201)

N	121674	102351	19323	122392	100842	21550
----------	--------	--------	-------	--------	--------	-------

Note: The figures in parentheses are standard deviations.

TableA3: Transformation of education coding to years of education

Educational Attainment Code	NSS Code	Imputed Years Of education
Not Literate	1	0
Literate through attending NFEC/AEC, TLC or others	2,3,4	1
Literate, but below primary	5	3
Primary	6	5
Middle	7	8
Secondary	8	10
Higher Secondary	10	12
Graduate and Diploma	11,12	15
Post Graduate and above	13	17

Source: Kingdon and Leopold, 2008; Table 1.

Note: NFEC = Non-Formal Education Centre, TLC = Total Literacy Campaign, AEC = Alternative Education Centre

Table A4: Regions and States

Region	States
North	Haryana, Himachal-Pradesh, Jammu-Kashmir, Punjab Rajasthan, Chandigarh, and Delhi.
South	Andhra-Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Tamil-Nadu, Lakshadweep and Puducherry
East	Orissa, West-Bengal, Andaman&Nicobar Islands.
West	Goa, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Dadra&Nagar Haveli, Daman& Diu
Central	Bihar, Madhya-Pradesh, Uttar-Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand and Uttarakhand
North-East	Arunachal-Pradesh, Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Sikkim, and Tripura

Source: Own computation from Unit Level Data, 68th Round, 2011-12.

Table A5: Descriptive Statistics of Variables used in Earnings Function

Variable	Rural Males		Urban Males		Rural Females		Urban Females	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean	Std. Dev

logwg	7.005	0.931	7.464	0.976	6.952	0.916	7.450	1.026
pwe	26.325	10.713	24.771	10.224	27.712	11.178	25.641	10.989
pwesq	807.796	610.177	718.121	552.383	892.908	664.241	778.230	615.684
education	4.632	2.294	5.625	2.274	3.384	2.305	4.772	2.536
Married	0.915	0.280	0.877	0.329	0.974	0.160	0.952	0.213
LiterateWi~g	0.005	0.069	0.003	0.056	0.006	0.075	0.004	0.060
LiterateBe~y	0.098	0.297	0.063	0.243	0.105	0.307	0.075	0.264
Primary	0.139	0.346	0.099	0.298	0.132	0.339	0.109	0.312
MiddleSchool	0.199	0.399	0.176	0.380	0.151	0.359	0.164	0.370
SecondaryS~l	0.153	0.360	0.165	0.371	0.097	0.296	0.148	0.355
HigherSeco~l	0.096	0.294	0.123	0.329	0.053	0.225	0.101	0.301
Graduatean~a	0.097	0.296	0.203	0.402	0.039	0.194	0.130	0.336
PostGradua~e	0.025	0.156	0.064	0.245	0.011	0.104	0.048	0.213
Training	0.168	0.374	0.207	0.405	0.077	0.266	0.092	0.289
headofhh	0.702	0.458	0.698	0.459	0.071	0.256	0.085	0.279
HHLitwitho~S	0.004	0.064	0.003	0.054	0.000	0.022	0.001	0.023
HHLitBP	0.082	0.274	0.050	0.218	0.007	0.086	0.009	0.092
HHPrimary	0.108	0.310	0.075	0.263	0.009	0.092	0.010	0.100
HHMS	0.134	0.340	0.121	0.326	0.010	0.097	0.013	0.112
HHSS	0.095	0.293	0.114	0.318	0.005	0.069	0.010	0.098
HHHS	0.052	0.222	0.079	0.269	0.003	0.051	0.005	0.073
HHGrDip	0.053	0.224	0.129	0.335	0.002	0.047	0.009	0.093
HHPG	0.013	0.115	0.042	0.201	0.000	0.022	0.003	0.051
hhschildren	0.726	0.966	0.595	0.874	0.693	0.967	0.576	0.860
hhselderly	0.221	0.509	0.199	0.486	0.219	0.499	0.206	0.486
Hindu	0.758	0.428	0.736	0.441	0.755	0.430	0.728	0.445
Muslims	0.118	0.323	0.158	0.365	0.121	0.326	0.160	0.367
ST	0.172	0.377	0.088	0.283	0.167	0.373	0.088	0.283
SC	0.164	0.370	0.132	0.339	0.162	0.369	0.128	0.334
lambda	1.600	0.260	1.395	0.254	1.634	0.259	1.470	0.223