International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)

E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

# Policy and Challenges: A Sociological Study of Sustainable E-Waste Management

**Abhilasha Dohare[1], Manish K. Verma[2]**

[1]Doctoral Research Scholar, Department of Sociology, Ambedkar School of Social Sciences, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow, India.

[2]Dean, Ambedkar School of Social Sciences; Professor & Head of Department of Sociology, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow, India.

**Abstract**

The unprecedented rise in electrical and electronic equipment (EEE) has led to a significant increase in worldwide electronic trash (e-waste), posing major environmental, health, and regulatory concerns. This study does a sociological analysis of e-waste management to look at how policy frameworks, institutional capacity, informal-sector dynamics, and cultural factors influence sustainability outcomes. The study aims to accomplish three things: first, to examine and evaluate the practical effectiveness of e-waste policy frameworks in India and around the world, particularly Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) and Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE)-type regulations; second, to look at the social, economic, and institutional challenges that arise from the prevalence of informal-sector actors, governance gaps, and consumption and disposal patterns; and third, to study the intersection of e-waste governance with issues of social justice, and environmental health risks. The analysis is largely based on secondary data and literature evaluation, with sources including global e-waste databases (for example, the Global E-waste Monitor), international treaties, and sociological research on informal labour systems. The research indicates that, regardless of the advancement of legislative frameworks such as India's E-Waste Management Rules (2011, 2016, 2022), the practical application of these regulations is prevented by several factors. These include insufficient enforcement capabilities, a lack of cohesive institutional structures, the marginalisation of informal labourers, and enduring disparities in the distribution of environmental and occupational risks. The study suggests that inclusive, sociologically informed policy design is required for sustainable e-waste governance, with an emphasis on institutional strengthening, behavioural interventions, labour and health safeguards. This integrated approach is critical for closing the gap between regulatory purpose and on-the-ground practice, especially in fast-growing economies like India.

**Keywords:** Electrical and Electronic Equipment (EEE), Hazardous waste, Environmental health risks, Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR), Toxic exposure, Sustainability.

## Introduction

Electrical and electronic equipment (EEE) has become ubiquitous in contemporary society. Devices such as Smartphones, laptops, televisions, and appliances have short lifecycles, frequent upgrades, and a trend of increasing global consumption. E-waste has become one of the fastest-growing waste streams. The disparity between e-waste generation and formal management prompts critical enquiries: how do policy

frameworks adapt, which social actors influence the results, and what challenges hinder the attainment of sustainable e-waste management? From a sociological perspective, the complex interplay between regulation, institutions, markets, informal actors and consumption culture must be examined.
In 2025, India produced 2.2 million metric tonnes of e-waste, ranking it as the third-largest e-waste generator worldwide, following China and the United States. A significant portion of this is informally recycled, resulting in the emission of hazardous compounds into the air and water, adversely affecting the health of e-waste workers and surrounding communities.
India's digital transformation has fundamentally altered communication, education, commerce, and governance. From smartphones to intelligent residences, convenience has emerged as the foundation of modern urban existence. However, behind this technical advancement is an escalating environmental and public health crisis: electronic trash (e-waste).
This paper reviews significant literature on e-waste policy and management and discusses key sociological challenges and implications, particularly within the Indian context. Technical solutions, such as recycling technologies and collection logistics, are significant; however, the social and institutional dimensions encompassing actors, power dynamics, informal economies, and cultural factors are frequently less apparent yet crucial to the overall outcomes. This study seeks to clarify the interaction between policy design and social processes, while proposing pathways for enhancing inclusive and effective governance of e-waste.

**History of Policy Formulation**

The notion of electronic waste (E-waste) has developed through international conventions, regional regulations, and national policies, embodying increasing concerns regarding environmental contamination, public health, and resource reclamation. At the global level, the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal (1992) offers one of the earliest official definitions of E-waste. It characterises electronic waste as substances or objects that are discarded, designated for disposal, or mandated for disposal under national legislation, and classifies them as hazardous owing to the presence of toxic constituents such as mercury, lead, and brominated flame retardants (Ogunseitan, 2013; Tsydenova et al., 2011). The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and other international entities acknowledge similar attributes of E-waste, highlighting its hazardous properties and the environmental dangers posed by inadequate disposal. The Solving the E-waste Problem (StEP) Initiative (2014) expands the definition to encompass all EEE and their components that are discarded by proprietors without the intention of reuse (StEP Initiative, 2014; Kumar et al., 2017).
The Global E-waste Monitor reports indicate that between 2010 and 2022, e-waste generation increased from 34 billion kg to 62 billion kg, while formally documented recycling rose only from 8 billion kg to 13.8 billion kg, demonstrating that generation growth outpaces formal management by roughly five times. Geographically, Europe reports the highest per-capita generation (17.6 kg) and highest formal collection/recycling rate (42.8 %) in 2022; Africa reported less than 1 % formal documented recycling. These figures emphasise the urgency and scale: e-waste is not only a disposal issue but also a resource loss (precious metals, rare earths) and an environmental or health hazard if mismanaged.
Nations such as India have implemented their own regulatory frameworks. The Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEF&CC), via the E-waste (Management and Handling) Rules, 2008 and subsequent amendments, characterises E-waste as electrical or electronic equipment, wholly or partially

discarded by consumers or bulk users, including rejects produced during manufacturing, refurbishing, or repair processes (MoEF, 2008). Indian researchers also define E-waste more broadly as any electrical appliance that has reached the end of its functional lifespan (Ashfaq & Khatoon, 2014; Suja et al., 2014). Policies presume the presence of collecting facilities, licensed recyclers, transportation or logistics systems, tracking methods, and data-flow transparency. When these are weak, policies fail. The research stresses data gaps (how much e-waste moves through informal channels and where it ends up), making monitoring and accountability challenging. Sociologically, this requires examination of how infrastructure is socially constituted, how data regimes reflect actor power/visibility, and how the invisibility of informal flows affects policymaking. The evolution of e-waste regulation in India demonstrates a slow but considerable acknowledgement of electronic waste as a serious environmental and health issue. The chronological study demonstrates how India's legal and institutional response to e-waste has arisen primarily as a result of industrialisation, globalisation, and the expanding consumer electronics sector.

Initially, the **Environmental Protection Act of 1986** provided a broad framework for environmental regulation but lacked any direct reference to Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE). It was only in the early 2000s that specific attention toward e-waste management emerged. The State of Maharashtra, in collaboration with the International Resource Group Systems of South Asia Private Ltd. (IRGSSA), took the first proactive step toward formulating dedicated WEEE legislation. The study underscores that Maharashtra's efforts were not merely reactive but also strategic, given the state's geopolitical vulnerability to imported e-waste from OECD countries, both legally and illegally. Such imports aggravated the burden on local waste systems and raised serious environmental alarms, ultimately prompting national-level policy deliberations.

At the same time, the review reveals the stark reality of **informal e-waste recycling** practices in India, particularly in areas such as Delhi NCR). These regions have become the centre of environmental degradation and health hazards resulting from unregulated dismantling and burning of e-waste materials. Soil and groundwater contamination due to heavy metals (Pb, Cu, Cd, As, Se, Zn) in Delhi NCR, along with dioxin and furan emissions from open burning in these areas, illustrate the severe ecological and human health consequences of inadequate waste governance.

India is an excellent case for sociological research into e-waste policy and challenges.

- The E-Waste (Management) Rules, 2022 reinforce EPR duties and increase collection/recycling targets (up to 80% by 2025) for registered recyclers.
- Examining interactions between institutional actors (e.g., municipal bodies, state pollution control boards, licensed recyclers) and informal actors, as well as hurdles to local enforcement.
- Examining labour and health aspects: identifying informal workers in e-waste chains, their conditions, social identities (gender, caste, migratory history), and how policy impacts their lives.

Collectively, these findings emphasize that India's legislative journey toward effective e-waste management has been fragmented and reactionary, shaped largely by crisis-driven interventions rather than preventive policy frameworks. The lack of early recognition of e-waste within broader environmental laws delayed the establishment of specialized regulations. However, the growing evidence of environmental contamination and public health risks has progressively pushed policymakers toward more structured mechanisms, laying the groundwork for subsequent e-waste management rules (2011, 2016, and later amendments).

In essence, this assessment demonstrates that while India's e-waste legislation has evolved significantly from its early, fragmented origins, it still faces critical challenges in implementation, particularly concerning informal sector integration, enforcement, and public awareness.

**Policy Governance and Informal Sector Realities**

Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute (MDPI)'s overview (2022) describes India's e-waste regulations (E-waste Management Rules, 2016), which require producers to manage end-of-life disposal. The study highlights measure such as Extended Produce Responsibility (EPR), integration of informal sectors, and Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs). E-waste management in India is governed by a multi-agency system that incorporates policy initiatives, regulatory processes, and collaborations. The Ministry of Environment, Forest, and Climate Change (MoEFCC) is in charge of policy formation, while the Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) and State Pollution Control Boards (SPCBs) regulate and monitor compliance on the ground (CPCB, 2016). The E-waste (Management) Rules of 2016, which include Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR), hold producers of electrical and electronic equipment (EEE) accountable for ensuring e-waste collection and channelisation through approved recyclers (MoEFCC, 2016).

Policy literature identifies the following key instruments:

1. National regulations on Waste Electrical & Electronic Equipment (WEEE), mandating collection, take-back, recycling targets, and the concept of Extended Producer Responsibility.
2. According to the E-waste (Management) Rules of 2016, makers of product, retailers, importers, dismantlers, and recyclers are legally responsible for ensuring environmentally sound e-waste collection, transport, and recycling, which is overseen by the Central Pollution Control Board. Producers are required to establish collection systems, operate **take-back** processes, or deal with authorised Producer Responsibility Organisations (PROs), whereas formal recyclers and dismantlers must adhere to high environmental and worker safety standards. Despite these structured laws, the authors point out that EPR implementation in India is still inadequate, with the formal sector accounting for only a percentage of overall e-waste generation.
3. Literature highlights that policy design alone is inadequate; the implementation aspects, such as financing, monitoring, enforcement, and stakeholder roles, are crucial. Many policies exhibit insufficient incentives for producers, unclear roles for the informal sector, and weak enforcement mechanisms.
4. The E Waste (Management) Rules, 2022 in India enhance Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) obligations and establish elevated collection and recycling targets.

Bhaskar et al. (2017) propose that "Extending Product Resourcefulness" be used to redefine Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR). They propose transforming the informal dismantler ecosystem into a network of part suppliers, thereby benefiting producers, livelihoods, and waste reduction through circular design and reuse. Turaga's study investigates other countries' e-waste management strategies and draws crucial insights from India's current eight-year policy landscape. This article addresses several difficulties, including a lack of awareness and insufficient resources to monitor and enforce regulations.

According to the study, while India produced more than 3.2 million tonnes of e-waste in 2019, formal recyclers around 468 authorised firms with a combined capacity of 1.38 million tonnes per year can only process roughly one-third of that total. In reality, the majority of e-waste is collected and recycled informally by networks of unregistered collectors and small-scale recyclers. Despite having superior technology and safety regulations, formal recyclers face an acute supply constraint, as informal workers dominate the collection process by providing quick door-to-door pickup and minor payment incentives to families.

The informal sector is critical to India's e-waste management ecosystem, accounting for more than 90% of total e-waste generation in the country. Its extensive network allows it to efficiently collect waste from both urban and rural areas. This sector employs thousands of people, primarily from economically disadvantaged families, and contributes significantly to resource recovery. However, its operations constantly face challenges that require attention for a more sustainable and integrated system. Despite its crucial importance, the informal sector usually operates outside of the regulatory framework, making it impossible to acquire precise data on waste volume and worker numbers.

Meanwhile, households frequently avoid formal channels due to a lack of information, concerns about data security, and limited access to licensed institutions. Formal operations are also expensive, with significant capital and compliance costs, making them less competitive than low-cost informal recycling. As a result, a significant amount of e-waste is being handled unregulated, posing substantial health and environmental risks. The unskilled workers in the informal sector, such as trash collectors, smaller scrap dealers, and dismantlers who do not receive official recognition, play a significant part in e-waste, according to sociological literature. the informal sector manages more than 90 % of India's e-waste. The informal sector has low infrastructure cost, uses rudimentary recycling techniques, negligible regulatory oversight. This dominance poses both a challenge and an opportunity: formal systems cannot ignore informal actors, from a sociological perspective, this brings up questions about the safety of the workers' health, the possibility of social exclusion, and the ways in which regulation might either further isolate or include these individuals.

Sengupta et al. (2022) claims that the existing EPR approach is incompatible with India's socio-economic setting since it functions within a limited, bureaucratic framework that excludes the informal sector, which accounts for roughly 90% of total e-waste flow. The article argues that although EPR was introduced to shift the responsibility of safe collection, recycling, and disposal of e-waste onto producers, the mechanism has not been fully effective in practice mainly because it does not adequately account for the dominant role of the informal sector in India’s e-waste landscape. Informal workers kabadiwalas, scrap dealers, buyers collect and process the vast majority of household e-waste due to their extensive networks, door-to-door accessibility, and low-cost recovery methods.

In contrast, the formal sector, consisting of government-authorised recyclers and producer-led systems, remains limited in reach, expensive, and largely dependent on formal channels that households rarely use. The article further argues that a genuinely circular e-waste economy in India requires the strategic integration of formal and informal sectors. Such integration could include capacity-building for informal workers, formal recognition of their role, technological upgrading, and systems of collaboration where formal recyclers process materials collected by informal networks. By bridging the two sectors, India can improve material recovery, reduce environmental harm, and create socially inclusive, resource-efficient e-waste management. Overall, it concludes that EPR in its current form is inadequate, and that inclusion, collaboration, and regulatory reform are essential for strengthening India’s circular economy model of e-waste management.

**Health, Environment and Sustainability**

E-waste contains hazardous substances (lead, mercury, cadmium, flame-retardants) and unsound recycling/disposal (open burning, acid leaching) affects soil, water, air, and human health. Literature emphasises vulnerable populations (children, low-income workers) and the unequal burdens borne by marginalised communities.

Unregulated dismantling, open burning, and acid leaching of electronic components in these informal hubs expose workers and nearby residents to a vast range of toxic substances. As Brune et al. (2013) reported, e-waste contains over 1,000 hazardous chemicals, including heavy metals such as lead (Pb), cadmium (Cd), mercury (Hg), nickel (Ni), and persistent organic pollutants like polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and brominated flame retardants (BFRs). In India, studies conducted in Mandoli revealed alarmingly high concentrations of these substances in soil and groundwater lead levels reaching 2,645.31 mg/kg and copper 115.50 mg/kg, far exceeding acceptable limits. The contamination of the environment through leaching, airborne particulates, and water runoff transforms entire recycling communities into high-risk zones for chronic exposure.

The **health implications** of such exposure are multifaceted and intergenerational. E-waste workers, often from socio-economically marginalized backgrounds, handle discarded electronics without protective gear, leading to direct absorption of toxins through inhalation, dermal contact, and ingestion. Chronic exposure to lead and cadmium affects the nervous, renal, and reproductive systems, while mercury and BFRs disrupt endocrine functions and neurodevelopment. Brune et al. (2013) note that these toxins severely affect pregnant women and children—causing stillbirths, premature births, low birth weight, and developmental delays. In children, early-life exposure leads to cognitive impairments, behavioural abnormalities, and reduced IQ levels, whereas adults face increased risks of lung dysfunction, cardiovascular diseases, and cancers due to prolonged toxic contact.

The persistence of such unsafe practices underscores the critical gap between policy and practice in India's e-waste governance. Although the E-Waste (Management and Handling) Rules of 2011, later revised in 2016 and 2022, sought to institutionalize Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) and promote formal recycling, the informal sector continues to dominate waste processing. This results in sustained exposure to toxic substances, particularly among informal workers who lack occupational health safeguards.

Monika et al. (2010), highlights the growing public-health risks posed by India's unregulated e-waste recycling sector, particularly for informal workers, women, and small children involved in hazardous dismantling activities. Drawing from international studies that document severe health effects of toxic exposure, the authors note that India lacks comparable data, making the scale and health consequences for its workers largely invisible. They argue that this absence of epidemiological research, combined with poor quantification of e-waste volumes and fragmented recycling systems, creates major gaps in policy planning. Emphasizing the need for evidence-based interventions, the authors call for studies to assess e-waste generation, map informal-sector linkages, and evaluate current management practices. They recommend establishing disease-surveillance systems and strengthening collection and recycling mechanisms to ensure safer, more sustainable e-waste governance in India.

Fujimori et al. (2012) provide significant evidence on the health impacts faced by workers engaged in informal e-waste recycling in countries such as Ghana and Nigeria. Their study shows that workers who dismantle or burn electronic components are exposed to a mixture of hazardous substances—including heavy metals, toxic fumes, and chemical residues—that directly affect multiple bodily systems. The researchers documented a range of health problems, including respiratory illnesses caused by inhalation of smoke from burning plastics and circuit boards, skin diseases resulting from constant contact with contaminated materials, and gastrointestinal disorders linked to ingestion or inhalation of toxic particles. Their findings demonstrate that informal e-waste recycling is not just an occupational risk but a multi-system health threat, as chronic exposure over time leads to cumulative damage affecting breathing, skin integrity, digestion, and overall physiological functioning. Fujimori et al. conclude that the lack of protective equipment, unsafe dismantling practices, and unregulated burning processes make informal recycling a high-risk activity with severe, long-term health consequences.

Singh et al. (2018) examined the health impacts of informal e-waste recycling in Delhi and found widespread toxic exposure among workers. The study reported significantly elevated levels of lead and cadmium in the blood of adults and children involved in dismantling activities. Workers commonly experienced respiratory issues, eye irritation, and skin rashes, indicating direct exposure to hazardous dust, fumes, and chemicals. The authors also highlighted gender- and age-specific vulnerabilities: women workers faced reproductive health problems, while children showed delayed physical growth and learning difficulties due to chronic exposure to toxic metals. Overall, the study demonstrates that informal e-waste recycling poses serious, multi-system health risks, disproportionately harming women and children who work in unsafe, unregulated conditions.

**Sociological Challenges in Sustainable E-Waste Management**

The global rise in electronic waste has emerged as one of the most pressing sustainability challenges of the 21st century. According to *The Global E-Waste Monitor 2020*, the world generated 53.6 million tonnes of e-waste in 2019, of which only 17.4% was processed through formal, environmentally sound systems. This widening gap between generation and formal recovery has intensified concerns regarding environmental pollution, human-health risks, and socio-economic inequalities, especially in developing countries where e-waste tends to flow through informal channels (Forti et al., 2020).

A major sociological dilemma is the role of the informal sector as both an economic lifeline and a site of marginalisation. Ethnographic and policy studies emphasise that informal collectors, dismantlers, and recyclers provide essential door-to-door collection and material recovery, yet operate outside formal labour protections (Chikarmane et al., 2009; Chatterjee & Kumar, 2009). These studies also highlight global environmental-justice dimensions: technological flows often redistribute risks to poorer communities along lines of class and geography. Evidence from India and other countries shows that integration efforts must contend with livelihood insecurities, caste- and gender-based labour divisions, and the informal economy's deep embeddedness within urban socio-economic networks (Chikarmane et al., 2009; Bhagat-Ganguly, 2022).

The sociological analysis of Policy and Challenges in Sustainable E-Waste Management can be grounded in three theoretical lenses: Environmental Justice Theory, World-Systems Theory, and Bourdieu's Social Practice Theory. Environmental justice research indicates that marginalised and low-income communities disproportionately bear environmental burdens. This pattern is evident in informal e-waste processing sites like Seelampur and Moradabad in India, Guiyu in China, and Agbogbloshie in Ghana. Here, unsafe recycling practices expose vulnerable populations to toxic substances and dangerous working conditions (Bullard, 1990). This disproportionate cost is further elucidated by Immanuel Wallerstein's World-Systems Theory, which asserts that global disparities are perpetuated by structural interactions between "core" and "peripheral" nations. In the realm of electronic waste, central economies in Europe and North America export hazardous e-waste both legally and illegally to peripheral nations, where it is disassembled by low-cost, high-risk informal labour, thus externalising environmental damage and perpetuating global dependency (Wallerstein, 2004). Pierre Bourdieu's Social Practice Theory elucidates home disposal behaviour and the social organisation of the informal recycling sector at the micro-sociological level. Habitus influences daily activities, including the accumulation of obsolete gadgets or their sale to local scrap dealers, while informal workers depend on extensive social capital networks for collection and trade that are overlooked by official regulatory frameworks. The domain of waste governance is predominantly controlled by state agencies and formal recyclers, frequently sidelining informal actors that manage over 90% of e-waste in nations such as India (Bourdieu, 1990). Collectively, these theories elucidate how structural inequities, global political-economic dynamics, and socially ingrained habits constrain present e-waste laws, underscoring the necessity for inclusive, justice-oriented, and context-sensitive governance strategies.

The article by Fawole et al. (2023) highlights that sustainable e-waste management is essential not only for mitigating environmental pollution but also for addressing the growing climate impacts associated with improper disposal. The authors explain that rapidly increasing volumes of discarded electronics, driven by short product life cycles and high global consumption, are contributing to greenhouse gas emissions through open burning, unregulated landfilling, and the release of refrigerants from discarded appliances. At the same time, low recycling rates lead to continued extraction of virgin metals—an energy-intensive process that further increases emissions. The paper argues that sustainable management must be grounded in circular economy principles that treat e-waste as a valuable resource, advocating for strong regulatory frameworks such as Extended Producer Responsibility, eco-design to reduce hazardous substances, technological advancements in recycling, and the formalisation of informal recycling networks. Consumer education and international cooperation are emphasised as vital components for preventing illegal trade and ensuring responsible disposal.

Overall, e-waste management as a critical sustainability challenge that, if effectively addressed, can support climate mitigation, resource conservation, safer livelihoods, and long-term environmental protection. the article situates e-waste within a global governance context and insists on international cooperation as essential for meaningful progress. Instruments such as the Basel Convention and regional directives like the EU's WEEE and RoHS frameworks provide partial models, but the authors argue that greater coordination, knowledge sharing, technical assistance and monitoring of cross-border flows are needed to prevent environmental dumping and to spread best practices. They conclude that e-waste management should be seen not as a narrow waste problem but as a critical dimension of climate policy, sustainable consumption and production, and broader sustainability transitions. By treating discarded electronics as a resource reservoir rather than merely a disposal challenge, and by aligning legislation, technology, market incentives and social behaviour, e-waste governance can contribute simultaneously to climate change mitigation, resource conservation, public health protection and more equitable development.

**Disposal Behaviour, Culture and Consumption Patterns**

Households and small consumers make disposal decisions based on convenience, awareness, economic benefit (cash from scrap dealers), and cultural attitudes to repair vs replace. Low awareness of formal collection schemes, and the dominance of informal channels, create structural lock-ins. In sociological terms, understanding how individuals and households behave within broader social systems (consumption cultures, status of electronics, social networks of scrap dealers) is crucial for designing effective interventions.

Sivathanu's (2016) work provides a significant behavioural viewpoint within the discussion of sustainable e-waste management, namely by investigating consumer comprehension, perceptions, and involvement in responsible disposal behaviours. The research identifies five key factors that shape how consumers choose to dispose of electronic waste. These factors are: (1) understanding the environmental risks of throwing away electronics, (2) knowing how e-waste can harm human health, (3) being aware of proper and safe disposal methods, (4) recognising the roles of different groups involved, like manufacturers, recyclers, and government agencies, and (5) being familiar with recycling options and how easy they are to use. These findings follow broader patterns seen in global research, which reveals that consumer knowledge and the perception of convenience strongly influence how households handle waste (Kveselis et al., 2017).

The article by Pathak, Srivastava, and Ojasvi (2017), highlighting a thorough assessment of India's legal and organisational structures concerning the management of WEEE, emphasising both advancements achieved and ongoing difficulties. The authors argue that India's existing regulations, such as the E-Waste (Management and Handling) Rules and their later revisions, have not been very effective. This is mainly due to weak enforcement, insufficient infrastructure, a lack of formal recycling facilities, and the large role of the informal sector. The review indicates that, despite the introduction of concepts such as Extended Producer Responsibility and the mandate for environmentally sound recycling within the legislation, the practical application at the local level is impeded by fragmented governance structures, insufficient monitoring systems, and a lack of awareness among both consumers and small businesses. The article further argues that good e-waste regulation is vital for environmental sustainability, using resources wisely, and protecting public health in a world that is becoming more digital.

## Conclusion

From a sociological standpoint, sustainable e-waste management is not merely a matter of technical recycling solutions or legal rules, it is fundamentally about how social actors (producers, consumers, informal workers, regulators), institutions, and cultural behaviours interact within structural contexts of inequality, market incentives, and state capacity. While policy frameworks such as EPR, WEEE regulations, and circular-economy rhetoric provide important scaffolding, the real challenge lies in translating these into inclusive, equitable, and effective practice.

In India, recognising the informal sector’s centrality, strengthening institutional capacity, engaging consumers, and embedding social justice and labour considerations are essential. The research agenda for sociologists and policy practitioners must focus not just on macro-policy design but on micro-level processes: how informal workers engage with formal systems; how households decide disposal behaviour; how local regulators enforce rules amid resource constraints.

The majority of research shows that changing the systems that handle the consumption, disposal, and recycling of electronic is necessary for sustainable e-waste management, rather than relying just on technology solutions or legislative reform. More than 80% of the world's e-waste still goes through informal or unregulated routes, according to global evaluations like the Global E-Waste Monitor 2020 (Forti et al., 2020). This means that workers, including children and women, are exposed to dangerous chemicals without any protection. There is an immediate need to incorporate public-health protections and decent-work principles into policy frameworks because studies conducted in India, Ghana, China, and Nigeria have shown that informal dismantling and open-burning practices have serious impacts on multiple systems of health (Awasthi et al., 2016; Grant et al., 2013; Huo et al., 2007; Fujimori et al., 2012). While official systems have more reach and efficiency, informal collectors and recyclers are still crucial to e-waste recovery due to their dense, embedded networks (Chikarmane et al., 2009; Chatterjee & Kumar, 2009).

Although it was designed with progress in mind, India's Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) regime continues to encounter issues with data dependability, enforcement, and the incorporation of informal actors (Bhaskar & Turaga, 2018; Sharma & Pandey, 2022). Inclusionary governance, strong monitoring, and consumer engagement are essential for releasing EPR from its structural constraints. Furthermore, according to behavioural studies, public involvement is crucial in order to redirect e-waste from harmful routes. This is because household disposal behaviours are influenced by factors such as awareness, cultural norms, and convenience (Kveselis et al., 2017).

The long-term solution is generally agreed upon as shifting to a circular economy that prioritises repair, reuse, and resource recovery (Agamuthu & Awasthi, 2020; Awasthi et al., 2024). Stakeholder governance that includes informal workers, improved regulatory capacities, consumer behavioural and cultural interventions, producers, recyclers, and collectors with appropriately aligned economic incentives, and labour and health protections for vulnerable populations are all necessary for this. Policy designs that encourage repairability and product lifespan are equally vital as transparent data systems and accessible gathering infrastructure. Finally, because e-waste practices vary greatly among cities and socioeconomic contexts, context-specific local research is crucial.

The time is ripe for turning the global e-waste challenge into a circular economy opportunity but this requires integrated governance, inclusive social policy, and culturally informed interventions. As the volumes grow and resource-recovery stakes increase, policy must evolve beyond mere regulation into socially embedded, multi-actor governance systems. This study provides a roadmap for such an orientation and invites further empirical investigation into the lived realities of e-waste flows, labour markets, and disposal cultures.

**References:**

1. Agamuthu, P., & Awasthi, A. K. (2020). *Zero waste: Circular economy and benefits*. Waste Management & Research, 38(8), 781–782. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734242X20954331
2. Ashfaq, A., & Khatoon, S. (2014). *E-waste management: A step towards ensuring environmental sustainability*. Journal of Environmental Research & Development, 9(1), 371–376.
3. Awasthi, A. K., Li, J., & Koh, L. (2024). *Sustainable e-waste management: Global status and future perspectives*. Waste Management & Research, 42(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734242X231225693
4. Awasthi, A. K., Zeng, X., & Li, J. (2016a). *Relationship between electronic waste recycling and human health risk in India: A critical review*. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 23, 11509–11532.
5. Awasthi, A. K., Zeng, X., & Li, J. (2016b). *Environmental pollution of electronic waste recycling in India: A critical review*. Environmental Pollution, 211, 259–270.
6. Bhagat-Ganguly, Varsha, (2022). “E-Waste management challenges and opportunities in India”, by Routledge India Taylor Francis.

7. Bhaskar, K., & Turaga, R. M. R. (2017). *India's e-waste rules and their impact on e-waste management practices: A case study*. Journal of Cleaner Production, 177, 362–370. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.12.210
8. Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Stanford University Press.
9. Brune, M. N., Hellweg, S., & Stahel, W. A. (2013). *Assessment of human health risks in informal e-waste recycling sites*. Environmental Science & Technology, 47(5), 2345–2353.
10. Bullard, R. D. (1990). *Dumping in Dixie: Race, class, and environmental quality*. Westview Press.
11. Chatterjee, S., & Kumar, K. (2009). *Effective electronic waste management and recycling process involving formal and non-formal sectors*. International Journal of Physical Sciences, 4(13), 893–905.
12. Chikarmane, P., Narayan, L., & Chaturvedi, B. (2009). *Recycling livelihoods: Integration of the informal recycling sector in solid waste management in India*. SNDT Women's University & Chintan Environmental Research and Action Group.
13. Fawole, A. A., Orikpete, O. F., Ehiobu, N. N., & Ewim, D. R. E. (2023). Climate change implications of electronic waste: Strategies for sustainable management. *Bulletin of the National Research Centre, 47*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s42269-023-01101-3
14. Forti, V., Baldé, C. P., Kuehr, R., & Bel, G. (2020). *The Global E-waste Monitor 2020: Quantities, flows and the circular economy potential*. United Nations University (UNU), United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), International Telecommunication Union (ITU), & International Solid Waste Association (ISWA).
15. Fujimori, T., Itai, T., Goto, A., Asante, K. A., Otsuka, M., & Takahashi, S. (2012). Health risks of workers engaged in the informal recycling of electronic waste in Ghana and Nigeria. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 19(3), 335–345. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-011-0562-9
16. Grant, K., Goldizen, F. C., Sly, P. D., Brune, M.-N., Neira, M., van den Berg, M., & Norman, R. E. (2013). *Health consequences of exposure to e-waste: A systematic review*. The Lancet Global Health, 1(6), e350–e361. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(13)70101-3
17. Huo, X., Peng, L., Xu, X., Zheng, L., Qiu, B., Qi, Z., ... & Piao, Z. (2007). *Elevated blood lead levels of children in Guiyu, an electronic waste recycling town in China*. Environmental Health Perspectives, 115, 1113–1117.
18. Kumar, A., Holuszko, M., & Espinosa, D. C. R. (2017). E-waste: An overview on generation, collection, legislation and recycling practices. *Resources, Conservation & Recycling, 122*, 32–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2017.01.018
19. Kveselis, V., Dvarioniene, J., Staniškis, J. K., & Slavinskiene, G. (2017). *Sustainable electronic waste management: Public participation and preferences*. Journal of Environmental Engineering and Landscape Management, 25(3), 299–309. https://doi.org/10.3846/16486897.2016.1276417
20. Manufacturers' Association for Information Technology (MAIT). (2025, March 25). *Strengthening e-waste management in India: The role of the informal sector.* https://www.mait.com/site/blog-details/eyJpdiI6IjFOUENtc1Z4NmFvcnE1V05STnpJT3c9PSIsInRhZyI6IiJ
21. Ministry of Environment and Forests. (2008). *E-waste (Management and Handling) Rules, 2008*. Government of India.
22. Monika, & Kishore, J. (2010). E-waste management: As a challenge to public health in India. *Indian Journal of Community Medicine*, 35(3), 382–385. https://doi.org/10.4103/0970-0218.69251
23. Ogunseitan, O. A. (2013). The Basel Convention and e-waste: Translation of scientific uncertainty into protective policy. *The Lancet Global Health, 1*(6), e313–e314.

24. Pathak, P., Srivastava, R. R., & Ojasvi. (2017). Assessment of legislation and practices for the sustainable management of waste electrical and electronic equipment in India. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 78*, 220–232. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.04.062
25. Sengupta, S., Roy, A., & Bhattacharya, S. (2022). Circular economy and household e-waste management in India: Integration of the formal and informal sectors. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 356*, 131845. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.131845
26. Sharma, S., & Pandey, S. (2022). *Electronic waste management: Legislative framework and stakeholder participation in India*. Waste Management, 150, 234–243.
27. Shukla, S. K. (2023, November 14). *The cost of convenience: Health hazards as a side-effect of using digital tools*. The Hindu. https://www.thehindu.com/sci-tech/health/the-cost-of-convenience-health-hazards-as-a-side-effect-of-using-digital-tools/article70116984.ece
*(Note: If the exact date is different, please adjust accordingly.)*
28. Sivathanu, B. (2016). User's Perspective: Knowledge and Attitude towards E-Waste. *International Journal of Applied Environmental Sciences.* ISSN 0973-6077 Volume 11, Number 2 (2016), pp. 413-423 © Research India Publications http://www.ripublication.com
29. Singh, R., Kumar, A., & Sharma, P. (2018). Health impacts of informal e-waste recycling in Delhi: Toxic exposures and vulnerable populations. Journal of Environmental Health Research, 20(3), 145–159.
30. Solving the E-waste Problem (StEP) Initiative. (2014). *One global definition of e-waste*. United Nations University.
31. Suja, S., Siwar, C., & Agamuthu, P. (2014). E-waste management: From a global perspective to a Malaysian scenario. *Waste Management & Research, 32*(4), 331–339.
32. Tsydenova, O., & Bengtsson, M. (2011). Chemical hazards associated with treatment of waste electrical and electronic equipment. *Waste Management, 31*(1), 45–58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2010.08.014
33. United Nations University. (2022). *The global e-waste monitor 2022*. United Nations Institute for Training and Research.
34. Wallerstein, I. (2004). *World-systems analysis: An introduction*. Duke University Press.
35. World Health Organization. (2021). *Children and digital dumpsites: E-waste exposure and child health*. WHO Press.