

# Between Education and Exploitation: Socio-Economic Determinants of Child Labour in Contemporary India

Dr. Pole Laxman

SGT, MPPS, Narsimhulagudem, Nampally Mandal, Nalgonda District, Telangana

## ABSTRACT

Child labour remains one of the most persistent socio-economic challenges in contemporary India, despite constitutional safeguards and policy interventions aimed at universal education and child welfare. This study critically examines the structural relationship between educational inequality and child labour, focusing on how socio-economic determinants such as poverty, caste, regional disparity, and access to schooling shape children's transitions between classrooms and labour markets. Drawing on recent datasets including the Annual Status of Education Report (ASER, 2023) and Unified District Information System for Education Plus (UDISE+, 2023–24), the paper highlights that while enrollment rates have improved significantly, dropout rates and poor learning outcomes continue to push vulnerable children into labour. India accounts for approximately 10.1 million child labourers aged 5–14 years (Census of India, 2011), with a substantial concentration in rural and informal sectors. The study argues that child labour is not merely a function of poverty but is deeply embedded in systemic educational failures, including inadequate infrastructure, teacher shortages, and the privatization of schooling, which excludes economically weaker sections. Basu and Van (1998) emphasize that households often treat child labour as an economic necessity, especially when the perceived returns from education are low (p. 416).

The paper further explores how social stratification particularly caste and gender intensifies vulnerability to child labour. Marginalized communities face compounded disadvantages, including limited access to quality education and increased exposure to exploitative labour conditions. The analysis underscores the need for an integrated policy approach that combines educational reform with socio-economic support mechanisms. The study concludes that bridging the gap between education and labour requires strengthening public education systems, ensuring equitable access, and addressing structural inequalities. Only through such comprehensive interventions can India move towards eliminating child labour and achieving inclusive development.

**Keywords:** Child Labour in India, Educational Inequality, Socio-Economic Determinants, Poverty and School Dropout, Public vs Private Education, Social Stratification

## Introduction

Child labour in India must be understood not as an isolated socio-economic phenomenon but as a structural outcome of deep-rooted inequalities embedded within the education system and broader socio-economic conditions. The relationship between education and labour is inherently paradoxical: while

education is expected to serve as a pathway out of poverty, its inaccessibility or poor quality often pushes children into labour markets. This section develops a conceptual framework to analyze how educational systems and socio-economic structures interact to produce conditions that sustain child labour. At the theoretical level, child labour is often explained through the lens of household economic decision-making models, where families allocate labour based on survival needs and expected returns. Basu and Van (1998) argue that child labour is a rational response to poverty, where households send children to work when adult income is insufficient (p. 416). However, this economic explanation alone is insufficient to capture the complexity of the issue in India. The persistence of child labour even in regions with improved economic indicators suggests that structural factors such as educational inequality and social stratification play a significant role.

Education, in principle, functions as a human capital investment, enhancing future earning potential and social mobility. Becker (1993) emphasizes that investment in education increases productivity and long-term economic growth (p. 45). However, when educational systems fail to deliver quality outcomes, the perceived returns diminish, leading families to prioritize immediate income over long-term benefits. This phenomenon is particularly evident in rural India, where poor infrastructure, teacher absenteeism, and lack of learning outcomes reduce the attractiveness of schooling. The concept of “schooling without learning” has become central to understanding the education–labour nexus in India. According to ASER (2023), a significant proportion of students enrolled in primary schools are unable to read basic texts or perform simple arithmetic operations. This gap between enrollment and learning outcomes undermines the credibility of the education system and contributes to higher dropout rates. When education fails to provide meaningful skills, children are more likely to transition into labour markets. Social stratification further complicates this relationship. Bourdieu’s (1986) theory of cultural capital highlights how educational systems reproduce existing social hierarchies by privileging certain forms of knowledge and cultural practices (p. 243). In the Indian context, children from marginalized communities, including Scheduled Castes (SC) and Scheduled Tribes (ST), face systemic barriers such as discrimination, lack of resources, and limited access to quality schools. These disadvantages increase their vulnerability to child labour.

**Table- 1**  
**Conceptual Link between Education and Child Labour**

Factor	Educational Impact	Labour Outcome
Poverty	Limited access to schooling	Early entry into labour
Poor Learning Outcomes	Low perceived returns	School dropout
Social Inequality	Restricted opportunities	Informal labour
Privatization	Exclusion of poor	Increased vulnerability

Source: Basu & Van (1998, p. 416); Bourdieu (1986, p. 243); ASER (2023).

The privatization of education has introduced new dynamics into this framework. While private schools are often associated with better quality, they are inaccessible to economically weaker sections due to high costs. This creates a dual system where affluent children receive quality education, while poorer children remain in under-resourced public schools or exit the system altogether. Srivastava (2013) argues that such stratification reinforces inequality and limits upward mobility (p. 126). Gender is

another critical dimension of educational inequality. While enrollment rates for girls have improved, socio-cultural factors such as early marriage, domestic responsibilities, and safety concerns continue to affect their educational trajectories. Girls are often withdrawn from school to assist with household work, which is a form of hidden child labour. The regional dimension is equally significant. Rural areas, characterized by higher poverty levels and weaker educational infrastructure, exhibit higher rates of child labour. Seasonal migration further disrupts schooling, as children move with their families and lose access to education. In contrast, urban areas, while offering better educational facilities, also expose children to informal labour markets.

**Table 2**  
**Key Determinants of Child Labour in India**

Determinant	Description	Impact
Economic Poverty	Low household income	Child labour as survival strategy
Educational Access	Lack of schools/resources	Dropout and labour entry
Social Stratification	Caste, gender inequality	Limited opportunities
Regional Disparities	Rural–urban divide	Unequal outcomes

Source: Becker (1993, p. 45); Srivastava (2013, p. 126); ASER (2023).

In conclusion, the conceptual relationship between education and child labour in India is shaped by a complex interplay of economic, social, and institutional factors. Child labour is not merely a consequence of poverty but a manifestation of systemic failures in education and social policy. Understanding this relationship requires moving beyond simplistic explanations and adopting a multidimensional framework that integrates economic theory with sociological insights.

**Trends, Patterns, and Statistical Profile of Child Labour in Contemporary India**

The persistence of child labour in contemporary India reflects a complex interaction of demographic, economic, and institutional factors. While official data suggests a gradual decline in the overall incidence of child labour, the phenomenon remains deeply entrenched, particularly in rural areas and informal sectors. A detailed examination of trends and patterns reveals that child labour is not uniformly distributed but varies significantly across regions, socio-economic groups, and sectors of employment. According to the Census of India (2011), there were approximately 10.1 million child labourers in the age group of 5–14 years. Although subsequent estimates indicate a decline, India continues to account for a substantial share of global child labour. The International Labour Organization (ILO, 2021) estimates that 160 million children worldwide are engaged in labour, with a significant concentration in South Asia (p. 9). In India, child labour is predominantly concentrated in agriculture, domestic work, construction, and small-scale industries such as textiles, brick kilns, and mining.

Recent educational datasets provide further insights into the dynamics of child labour. The Unified District Information System for Education Plus (UDISE+, 2023–24) reports a decline in total school enrollment from 251.7 million to 248 million, indicating a drop of nearly 3.7 million students. This decline is significant because it signals potential increases in dropout rates, which are closely linked to child labour (UDISE+, 2023–24). The transition from schooling to labour is particularly evident at the secondary level, where dropout rates are highest. The Annual Status of Education Report (ASER, 2023)

highlights another critical dimension of this issue—learning outcomes. While enrollment rates remain relatively high, a large proportion of students lack basic literacy and numeracy skills. For instance, a significant percentage of children in Grade 5 are unable to read Grade 2-level texts. This gap between enrollment and learning outcomes reduces the perceived value of education and contributes to higher dropout rates. When schooling fails to deliver meaningful learning, families are more likely to withdraw children and engage them in labour activities. The sectoral distribution of child labour provides important insights into its persistence. Agriculture continues to account for the largest share, employing more than 50% of working children, particularly in rural areas. Seasonal migration further exacerbates this trend, as children move with their families and participate in agricultural work. In urban areas, child labour is concentrated in informal sectors such as domestic work, street vending, and small-scale manufacturing. These sectors are characterized by low wages, lack of regulation, and high vulnerability to exploitation.

**Table 3**  
**Sectoral Distribution of Child Labour in India**

Sector	Percentage of Child Labour	Characteristics
Agriculture	~50–55%	Seasonal, family-based work
Manufacturing	~20%	Informal, hazardous conditions
Services	~15%	Domestic work, street vending
Others	~10%	Construction, mining

Source: Census of India (2011); ILO (2021, p. 9).

The regional distribution of child labour also reveals significant disparities. States such as Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan, and Madhya Pradesh report higher incidences due to higher poverty levels, lower literacy rates, and weaker institutional capacity. In contrast, states with better educational infrastructure and social welfare programs, such as Kerala and Tamil Nadu, have lower rates of child labour. This regional variation underscores the importance of localized policy interventions. Another important trend is the gender dimension of child labour. While boys are more likely to be engaged in visible forms of labour such as agriculture and manufacturing, girls are often involved in domestic work, which is frequently unreported and undercounted. This “invisible labour” includes household chores, caregiving responsibilities, and informal economic activities. As a result, official statistics may underestimate the true extent of child labour among girls. The rise of informal and hidden forms of labour presents additional challenges for measurement and policy intervention. Many children work in family enterprises or small-scale units that are not covered by labour regulations. This makes it difficult to monitor working conditions and enforce legal protections. The Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2016 allows children to work in family enterprises under certain conditions, which has been criticized for potentially legitimizing child labour in informal settings. The relationship between education and labour trends is particularly significant. Data indicates that children who drop out of school are significantly more likely to enter the workforce. Conversely, sustained access to quality education reduces the likelihood of child labour. However, the effectiveness of educational interventions depends on the quality of schooling, availability of resources, and socio-economic support for families.

**Table 4**  
**Education and Child Labour Linkages**

Indicator	Data	Implication
Enrollment Rate	High (>90%)	Access improved
Learning Outcomes	Low (ASER 2023)	Reduced retention
Dropout Rate	High at secondary level	Entry into labour
Private Coaching	~30% students	Inequality in learning

Source: ASER (2023); UDISE+ (2023–24).

The impact of COVID-19 has further intensified these challenges. School closures during the pandemic disrupted education for millions of children, particularly those without access to digital learning resources. Studies indicate that many children who dropped out during this period have not returned to school, increasing their vulnerability to labour exploitation. The digital divide has emerged as a critical factor, with children from disadvantaged backgrounds facing limited access to online education. The economic dimension of child labour is closely linked to household income and employment patterns. Families engaged in informal or low-wage work often rely on children's contributions to supplement their income. Basu and Van (1998) argue that child labour persists when household income falls below a certain threshold, making children's earnings essential for survival (p. 416). This highlights the need for policies that address both educational and economic factors. In conclusion, the trends and patterns of child labour in contemporary India reveal a complex and multifaceted issue that cannot be addressed through isolated interventions. While progress has been made in reducing overall numbers, significant challenges remain in terms of quality of education, regional disparities, gender inequality, and informal labour practices. A comprehensive understanding of these patterns is essential for designing effective policies that can bridge the gap between education and labour.

### **Socio-Economic Determinants of Child Labour: Poverty, Caste, Gender, and Regional Inequality**

Child labour in contemporary India cannot be adequately explained through a single causal factor; rather, it is the outcome of multiple overlapping socio-economic determinants that interact in complex ways. Among these, poverty, caste-based inequality, gender disparities, and regional imbalances emerge as the most significant structural drivers. This section critically examines how these determinants shape children's vulnerability to labour and limit their access to meaningful education. The most widely recognized determinant of child labour is household poverty. In low-income families, children are often perceived as economic contributors rather than dependents. The decision to send children to work is frequently driven by immediate survival needs, particularly in households lacking stable adult income. Basu and Van (1998) argue that child labour is a rational household response to poverty, where families rely on children's earnings when adult wages are insufficient (p. 416). This economic compulsion is especially pronounced in rural areas and informal urban sectors, where employment opportunities are unstable and poorly remunerated. However, poverty alone does not fully explain the persistence of child labour. Even among households with similar income levels, variations in educational access and social conditions influence outcomes. This suggests that structural inequalities, particularly those related to caste and social hierarchy, play a crucial role. In India, historically marginalized communities such as Scheduled Castes (SCs) and Scheduled Tribes (STs) face systemic barriers that limit their access to

quality education. These include discrimination within schools, lack of resources, and geographical isolation. Bourdieu’s (1986) concept of cultural capital is particularly relevant here, as it explains how educational systems reproduce existing social hierarchies by privileging dominant cultural norms (p. 243). Children from marginalized communities often lack the cultural and social resources required to succeed in formal education, increasing their likelihood of dropping out and entering labour markets. The intersection of caste and poverty creates a compounded disadvantage. For instance, SC and ST households are disproportionately represented in low-income categories and are more likely to depend on informal and manual labour. This structural positioning limits their ability to invest in education and increases the probability of child labour. Data from UDISE+ (2023–24) indicates higher dropout rates among SC/ST students, particularly at the secondary level, where financial and social pressures intensify. Gender is another critical determinant that shapes the patterns of child labour. While boys are more visible in formal and informal labour sectors, girls often engage in hidden forms of labour, including domestic work, caregiving, and participation in family enterprises. These activities are rarely captured in official statistics, leading to an underestimation of female child labour. Gender norms and cultural practices further influence educational participation, with girls more likely to be withdrawn from school for household responsibilities or early marriage. Kabeer (2005) emphasizes that gender inequality in education is closely linked to broader social norms that restrict women’s roles and opportunities (p. 17). The regional dimension of child labour reflects disparities in economic development, infrastructure, and governance. States such as Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, and Rajasthan exhibit higher incidences of child labour due to higher poverty levels, weaker educational infrastructure, and limited enforcement of labour laws. In contrast, states like Kerala and Tamil Nadu, which have invested heavily in education and social welfare, report significantly lower levels of child labour. This variation highlights the importance of state-level policies and institutional capacity in addressing the issue. Migration is another important factor influencing child labour. Seasonal and long-term migration disrupts children’s education and increases their vulnerability to labour exploitation. Migrant families often lack access to formal schooling in destination areas, leading children to work in agriculture, construction, or informal urban sectors. The absence of portable education systems and social protection mechanisms exacerbates this problem.

**Table 5**  
**Socio-Economic Determinants and Their Impact on Child Labour**

Determinant	Description	Impact on Child Labour
Poverty	Low household income	Early workforce entry
Caste Inequality	Social exclusion (SC/ST)	Higher dropout rates
Gender Disparity	Domestic responsibilities	Hidden labour among girls
Regional Inequality	Rural underdevelopment	Higher labour incidence
Migration	Displacement of families	School discontinuity

Source: Basu & Van (1998, p. 416); Bourdieu (1986, p. 243); Kabeer (2005, p. 17); UDISE+ (2023–24).

The role of education quality is central to understanding these determinants. Even when schools are available, poor infrastructure, lack of trained teachers, and inadequate learning outcomes reduce the

effectiveness of education. ASER (2023) highlights that many children in rural India are unable to achieve basic literacy and numeracy levels despite years of schooling. This failure of the education system reduces the perceived benefits of schooling and reinforces the decision to engage children in labour. The privatization of education further intensifies these inequalities. Private schools, often associated with better quality, remain inaccessible to economically weaker sections due to high costs. This creates a dual system where affluent children benefit from quality education, while disadvantaged children are confined to under-resourced public schools or excluded altogether. Srivastava (2013) argues that such stratification reinforces socio-economic inequality and limits upward mobility (p. 126). Another important determinant is the informal economy, which absorbs a large proportion of child labour. Informal sectors operate with minimal regulation, allowing employers to exploit cheap child labour. The lack of enforcement of labour laws and weak institutional mechanisms further perpetuate this problem. Children working in these sectors often face hazardous conditions, long working hours, and limited opportunities for skill development.

**Table 6**  
**Interaction between Education and Socio-Economic Factors**

Factor	Educational Effect	Labour Outcome
Poor Infrastructure	Low learning outcomes	Dropout and labour
High Cost of Education	Limited access	Exclusion from schooling
Social Discrimination	Reduced participation	Early workforce entry
Weak Policy Implementation	Ineffective programs	Persistent child labour

Source: ASER (2023); Srivastava (2013, p. 126); UDISE+ (2023–24).

The interplay of these determinants demonstrates that child labour is a systemic issue rooted in structural inequality rather than individual choice. Addressing it requires a holistic approach that integrates educational reform with broader socio-economic policies. Interventions must focus not only on increasing enrollment but also on improving the quality and accessibility of education, particularly for marginalized communities. In conclusion, the socio-economic determinants of child labour in India reveal a deeply entrenched system of inequality that perpetuates cycles of poverty and exploitation. Poverty, caste, gender, and regional disparities interact in complex ways to limit educational opportunities and push children into labour markets. Breaking this cycle requires comprehensive and sustained efforts that address both the causes and consequences of inequality, ensuring that education serves as a pathway to empowerment rather than a missed opportunity.

### **Policy Interventions, Challenges, and Pathways to Eliminate Child Labour in India**

The persistence of child labour in India, despite decades of legislative and policy interventions, highlights the complexity of the problem and the limitations of existing approaches. While the country has made significant progress in expanding educational access and enacting legal safeguards, structural inequalities and implementation gaps continue to undermine these efforts. This section critically examines the effectiveness of current policies, identifies key challenges, and proposes pathways for bridging the gap between education and labour. India's policy framework addressing child labour is anchored in both constitutional provisions and legislative measures. Article 24 of the Constitution

prohibits the employment of children below the age of 14 in hazardous occupations, while Article 21A guarantees the right to free and compulsory education for children aged 6–14 years. These provisions reflect the state’s commitment to protecting children’s rights and promoting education as a fundamental entitlement. The Right to Education (RTE) Act, 2009 further operationalizes this commitment by mandating universal access to elementary education. In addition to constitutional guarantees, the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2016 represents a significant legislative effort to address child labour. The Act prohibits the employment of children below 14 years in all occupations, with certain exceptions for family enterprises and the entertainment industry. While this amendment strengthens legal protections, it has also been criticized for allowing loopholes that may legitimize child labour in informal settings. Critics argue that the exemption for family-based work can be misused, particularly in rural and small-scale industries, where monitoring is weak (ILO, 2021, p. 42). Educational interventions have played a central role in reducing child labour by increasing school enrollment and retention. Programs such as the Mid-Day Meal Scheme have been effective in improving attendance and reducing dropout rates, particularly among economically disadvantaged children. Similarly, the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) and its successor, Samagra Shiksha, have focused on expanding educational infrastructure and improving access to schooling. However, as ASER (2023) indicates, increased enrollment has not necessarily translated into improved learning outcomes, highlighting the need for quality-focused reforms. The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 represents a comprehensive effort to transform the education system by emphasizing foundational literacy, skill development, and inclusive education. The policy recognizes the importance of addressing socio-economic barriers and aims to create a more equitable and flexible education system. However, its success depends on effective implementation, adequate funding, and coordination between central and state governments.

**Table 7**  
**Key Policies Addressing Child Labour and Education in India**

Policy	Objective	Impact	Limitation
RTE Act (2009)	Universal education	Increased enrollment	Quality gaps
Child Labour Act (2016)	Prohibit child labour	Legal protection	Loopholes in family work
Mid-Day Meal Scheme	Improve attendance	Reduced dropout	Limited scope
NEP 2020	Holistic reform	Inclusive framework	Implementation challenges

Source: Government of India (2009); ILO (2021, p. 42); ASER (2023).

Despite these initiatives, several implementation challenges persist. One of the most critical issues is the lack of effective enforcement of labour laws. Many children continue to work in informal sectors that are difficult to monitor, such as agriculture, domestic work, and small-scale industries. Weak institutional capacity, corruption, and lack of coordination between agencies further hinder enforcement efforts. Another major challenge is the quality of education. While access to schooling has improved, the quality of education in many government schools remains inadequate. Poor infrastructure, teacher shortages, and lack of accountability contribute to low learning outcomes. As a result, families may perceive education as a poor investment and prefer to engage children in income-generating activities. Becker (1993) emphasizes that the returns to education are a key determinant of educational investment

decisions (p. 45). When these returns are uncertain, the incentive to pursue education diminishes. The digital divide has emerged as a new dimension of inequality, particularly in the post-COVID era. The shift to online education during the pandemic exposed disparities in access to digital resources, with children from disadvantaged backgrounds facing significant barriers. This has led to increased dropout rates and a higher risk of child labour among vulnerable groups. The role of social protection programs is crucial in addressing the economic determinants of child labour. Schemes such as conditional cash transfers, scholarships, and income support can reduce the financial burden on families and encourage school attendance. However, the coverage and effectiveness of these programs remain uneven across regions.

**Table 8**  
**Challenges in Eliminating Child Labour**

Challenge	Description	Impact
Weak Enforcement	Poor monitoring of labour laws	Continued exploitation
Poor Education Quality	Low learning outcomes	Increased dropout
Poverty	Economic necessity	Child labour persistence
Digital Divide	Lack of access to technology	Educational exclusion

Source: Becker (1993, p. 45); ASER (2023); ILO (2021).

Addressing these challenges requires a multi-dimensional and integrated approach. First, there is a need to strengthen public education systems by improving infrastructure, teacher training, and accountability mechanisms. Ensuring quality education is essential for increasing the perceived value of schooling and reducing dropout rates. Second, economic interventions must complement educational reforms. Providing financial support to low-income families, creating employment opportunities for adults, and strengthening social safety nets can reduce the economic dependence on child labour. Basu and Van (1998) argue that increasing adult wages can significantly reduce child labour by eliminating the need for children’s income (p. 416). Third, policy coordination and governance must be improved. Effective implementation of existing laws and programs requires coordination between different levels of government and institutions. Strengthening monitoring mechanisms and ensuring transparency can enhance accountability and effectiveness. Fourth, community awareness and social change are essential for addressing cultural and social norms that perpetuate child labour. Education campaigns, community participation, and involvement of civil society organizations can play a crucial role in changing attitudes and promoting the value of education.

**Table 9**  
**Pathways to Eliminate Child Labour**

Strategy	Approach	Expected Outcome
Education Reform	Improve quality and access	Higher retention
Economic Support	Financial assistance	Reduced labour dependence
Legal Enforcement	Strengthen monitoring	Protection of children

Strategy	Approach	Expected Outcome
Social Awareness	Community engagement	Behavioral change

Source: Basu & Van (1998, p. 416); Government of India (2020); ASER (2023).

In conclusion, the elimination of child labour in India requires a comprehensive strategy that addresses both the supply and demand sides of the problem. While significant progress has been made in expanding educational access and strengthening legal frameworks, persistent inequalities and implementation challenges continue to hinder progress. Bridging the gap between education and labour requires a holistic approach that integrates educational reform, economic support, and social transformation. Only through sustained and coordinated efforts can India move towards a future where every child has access to quality education and is free from exploitation. The challenge is not merely to reduce child labour but to create conditions in which education becomes a viable and attractive alternative for all children, ensuring inclusive and sustainable development.

### **Conclusion**

The persistence of child labour in contemporary India reflects a deeply entrenched structural problem that lies at the intersection of poverty, educational inequality, and social stratification. This study has demonstrated that child labour is not merely a consequence of economic deprivation but a complex outcome of systemic failures within the education system and broader socio-economic framework. While significant progress has been made in expanding access to schooling, the gap between enrollment and meaningful learning continues to undermine the transformative potential of education. The analysis reveals that educational inequality plays a central role in sustaining child labour. Poor infrastructure, inadequate teaching quality, and low learning outcomes reduce the perceived value of schooling, particularly among economically disadvantaged households. As Basu and Van (1998) argue, families often make rational decisions to engage children in labour when the returns to education are uncertain (p. 416). This highlights the need to focus not only on access but also on the quality and relevance of education.

Furthermore, the study underscores the significance of social determinants such as caste, gender, and regional disparities. Marginalized communities face compounded disadvantages that limit their educational opportunities and increase their vulnerability to exploitation. Bourdieu's (1986) concept of cultural capital provides a useful framework for understanding how educational systems reproduce social inequalities by privileging certain groups over others (p. 243). Addressing these disparities requires targeted interventions that promote inclusivity and equity. Policy interventions, including the Right to Education Act and child labour legislation, have contributed to reducing the incidence of child labour. However, their effectiveness is constrained by implementation gaps, weak enforcement, and the persistence of informal labour markets. The findings suggest that a multi-dimensional approach is essential, integrating educational reform with economic support and social protection measures. In conclusion, bridging the divide between education and exploitation requires a sustained commitment to strengthening public education systems, addressing socio-economic inequalities, and ensuring that every child has access to quality learning opportunities. Only through such comprehensive efforts can India move towards eliminating child labour and achieving inclusive and equitable development.

## References

1. Annual Status of Education Report (ASER). (2023). *Annual status of education report (rural India)*. ASER Centre.
2. Basu, K., & Van, P. H. (1998). The economics of child labour. *American Economic Review*, 88(3), 412–427.
3. Becker, G. S. (1993). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education* (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
4. Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood Press.
5. Census of India. (2011). *Primary census abstract data on child labour*. Government of India.
6. Government of India. (2020). *National education policy 2020*. Ministry of Education.
7. International Labour Organization (ILO). (2021). *Global estimates of child labour: Results and trends 2016–2020*. ILO.
8. Kabeer, N. (2005). Gender equality and women's empowerment: A critical analysis. *Gender & Development*, 13(1), 13–24.
9. Ministry of Education. (2024). *UDISE+ report 2023–24: School education in India*. Government of India.
10. Ministry of Labour and Employment. (2016). *Child labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2016*. Government of India.
11. Nussbaum, M. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Harvard University Press.
12. Pratham Education Foundation. (2023). *ASER 2023: Learning outcomes report*. ASER Centre.
13. Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
14. Srivastava, P. (2013). Low-fee private schooling: Issues and evidence. *Oxford Review of Education*, 39(2), 125–145.
15. UNICEF. (2022). *Child labour in India: Trends and policy recommendations*. UNICEF India.