POVERTY AS THE PRIMARY DRIVER OF CHILD LABOUR IN RURAL TAMIL NADU: A SOCIO-LEGAL ANALYSIS

R. Gunal, LLB, Vels Institute of Science, Technology & Advanced Studies (VISTAS)

Under the Guidance of G. Uma Maheswari, Assistant Professor, Department of Legal Studies, VISTAS, Chennai

ABSTRACT

Child labour in rural Tamil Nadu is deeply rooted in structural poverty, weak institutional support, and limited access to quality education. This article examines the multidimensional relationship between household poverty and child labour incidence in rural areas of Tamil Nadu, India. Drawing on constitutional provisions, judicial precedents, international conventions, and existing empirical literature, the study analyses the socio-economic mechanisms through which poverty compels families to deploy children in agricultural, domestic, and informal labour markets. The study demonstrates that poverty is not merely a correlate but a fundamental structural driver that sustains intergenerational cycles of educational deprivation and economic marginalisation. The article further evaluates the adequacy of India's legislative framework — including the Child and Adolescent Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act of 1986 as amended in 2016 and the Right to Education Act of 2009 — and assesses judicial interventions that have shaped child protection jurisprudence. The study concludes that lasting elimination of child labour requires a convergent strategy: robust poverty alleviation, universal quality education, effective legal enforcement, community mobilisation, and rehabilitative support for rescued children.

1. INTRODUCTION

Child labour constitutes one of the most acute human rights challenges confronting developing nations. Globally, the International Labour Organization (ILO) estimated that approximately 160 million children were engaged in some form of child labour as of 2020, with rural communities in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa bearing a disproportionate burden. In India, despite considerable legislative progress, millions of children below the age of fourteen continue to participate in agricultural, domestic, and informal sector work — activities that systematically deprive them of education, health, and a dignified childhood.

Tamil Nadu, despite its comparatively higher literacy rates and more developed social infrastructure relative to other Indian states, is not insulated from this phenomenon. Rural districts within the state — particularly those dependent on agriculture, small-scale industries, and seasonal labour — continue to exhibit alarming rates of child labour. The economic fragility of rural households, characterised by low and irregular income, debt bondage, and absent social safety nets, functions as the primary structural catalyst propelling children into the labour force.

This article undertakes a critical socio-legal examination of the causal nexus between poverty and child labour in rural Tamil Nadu. It argues that child labour is not an aberrant individual or family-level phenomenon but rather a systemic outcome of entrenched socio-economic inequalities. The article proceeds in seven parts: following this introduction, Section 2 surveys the theoretical and historical background; Section 3 addresses international normative frameworks; Section 4 analyses judicial roles and legislative architecture; Section 5 traces the evolution of child labour and its causative factors; Section 6 evaluates government interventions and suitable measures; and Section 7 synthesises the findings, recommendations, and actionable conclusions.

2. THEORETICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Historical Development of Child Labour in Tamil Nadu:

Child labour has existed in varying forms throughout human history, shaped by the prevailing economic organisation of each era. In agrarian pre-industrial societies, children's participation in farm work and domestic labour was regarded as a natural extension of family survival

strategies rather than exploitation. This perception was reinforced by the absence of universal schooling systems and formal child protection norms.

In the Tamil Nadu context, one of the earliest and most extensively documented manifestations of organised child labour emerged in the fireworks and match-manufacturing industries centred in Sivakasi during the 1970s and 1980s. Children — many from impoverished rural families — constituted a substantial proportion of the workforce in these hazardous industries. The Rural Institute for Development Education (RIDE) conducted extensive field surveys in rural Tamil Nadu during the 1990s, exposing the prevalence of bonded child labour in silk-weaving clusters and other cottage industries, and identifying poverty and the absence of alternative adult livelihoods as primary root causes.

Academic scholarship in the 1990s and early 2000s began systematically documenting child labour across Tamil Nadu's rural districts. Jayaraj (2002) employed secondary data analysis to chart the structural features of child labour in the state, demonstrating that economic deprivation — rather than cultural disposition — was the principal explanatory variable. These early empirical contributions laid the foundation for subsequent policy reform and judicial activism.

2.2 Theoretical Frameworks:

Several theoretical lenses illuminate the relationship between poverty and child labour. From the perspective of labour supply economics, households facing income constraints — arising from low agricultural productivity, erratic wage employment, and asset-poor circumstances — increase their effective labour supply by deploying children. Children's time is thus allocated between schooling (a long-term human capital investment) and immediate income-generating work. Poor families systematically discount the future returns of education when confronted with immediate survival imperatives (Becker, 1964; Baland and Robinson, 2000).

Social Reproduction Theory, drawing from the Marxist tradition, offers a complementary structural critique. It argues that capitalism depends on the perpetual reproduction of a labour force, and that in low-income contexts, children are incorporated into this process from an early age. Their contributions — whether in paid labour markets or through unpaid domestic work that frees adult members for wage employment — are rendered invisible and naturalised, thereby obscuring their economic significance. This invisibility perpetuates intergenerational

immobility: children born into poverty reproduce the labour conditions of their parents, rarely acquiring the educational capital necessary to transcend class boundaries (Bhattacharya, 2017).

The intergenerational poverty trap framework synthesises both perspectives, demonstrating that child labour and educational deprivation are mutually reinforcing: poverty induces child labour, which forecloses educational attainment, which in turn perpetuates poverty across generations. This cyclical mechanism explains why interventions targeting only legal prohibition — without addressing the underlying economic insecurity — have demonstrated limited efficacy in practice.

2.3 Review of Empirical Literature:

A growing body of empirical research confirms the poverty-child labour nexus in the Indian context. Rao and Burla (2025) affirm that children from economically weaker households are disproportionately represented in the child labour force, and that household-level income shocks — such as crop failure, illness, or debt — are significant precipitating events. Bhukuth et al. (2022) identify low parental wages and adult unemployment as determinants of child labour incidence in India's informal economy. Subramani and Yoganandham (2024) situate child labour within the broader framework of India's Sustainable Development Goals commitments, arguing that progress towards SDG 8.7 — the elimination of child labour by 2025 — remains constrained by inadequate poverty reduction outcomes.

In a comparative regional study, Das (2022) found that increases in adult earnings among marginal farming households in West Bengal significantly reduced the probability of child labour engagement, lending empirical support to the income-substitution hypothesis. By contrast, Pandey and Gautam (2015) observed that in Uttar Pradesh, deficiencies in school quality exacerbate the pull of labour markets for children, suggesting that the demand side of child labour is not reducible to poverty alone but implicates the relative quality and accessibility of educational provision.

3. INTERNATIONAL NORMATIVE FRAMEWORK

3.1 International Labour Organization Conventions:

The international normative architecture governing child labour is principally constituted by two foundational ILO conventions. Convention No. 138 (Minimum Age, 1973) establishes the

principle that the minimum age for admission to employment shall not be less than the age of completion of compulsory schooling, and in no case less than fifteen years, with a permissible lower threshold of fourteen years for developing countries. Convention No. 182 (Worst Forms of Child Labour, 1999) mandates the immediate prohibition and elimination of slavery, trafficking, debt bondage, serfdom, forced recruitment for armed conflict, prostitution, pornography, and hazardous labour involving children. Notably, Convention No. 182 achieved universal ratification in 2020, binding all 187 ILO member states — a milestone in international child rights law.

The ILO's 2024 Global Estimates indicate encouraging but uneven progress: the total number of children in child labour declined by over 22 million between 2020 and 2024, with those engaged in hazardous work falling by 25 million. This reduction continues a longer trend that has seen child labour fall by over 100 million since 2000, even as the global child population has grown. However, Sub-Saharan Africa remains disproportionately affected, hosting approximately 72 million child labourers, while Asia continues to account for significant numbers in agricultural, manufacturing, and domestic sectors.

3.2 United Nations Human Rights Framework:

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC, 1989), ratified by India in 1992, provides the most comprehensive child-specific human rights instrument. Article 32 obliges state parties to protect children from economic exploitation and any work that is hazardous, interferes with education, or is harmful to health and development. Articles 27 and 28 guarantee children's rights to an adequate standard of living and to education, respectively.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR, 1948), while not itself a binding treaty, furnishes foundational normative standards. Article 25 establishes the right to an adequate standard of living; Article 26 guarantees the right to free and compulsory education; and Article 23 affirms the right to just and favourable conditions of work — conditions that child workers, by definition, cannot meaningfully access or enforce.

The World Health Organization's position on child labour situates it within a public health framework. Rural child labourers in industries such as fireworks manufacturing (Sivakasi), brick kilns, and agricultural work are documented to suffer elevated rates of malnutrition, respiratory illness, musculoskeletal injury, and psychological stress. WHO's analysis

emphasises the bidirectional relationship between poverty and health: poverty increases vulnerability to hazardous work, and hazardous work perpetuates poor health outcomes, trapping children in cycles of physical incapacitation and economic marginalisation.

3.3 Global Case Studies Illustrating Poverty-Driven Child Labour:

The international experience offers instructive comparative examples. Brazil's conditional cash transfer programme, Bolsa Familia, demonstrated that targeted income support to poor households significantly reduced child labour rates by enabling families to sustain consumption without depending on children's earnings. The ILO-led intervention in Sialkot, Pakistan, which addressed widespread child stitching of footballs for export markets, demonstrated that industry-wide agreements combined with alternative income generation for affected families could achieve measurable reductions in child labour incidence.

In the Democratic Republic of Congo, child labour in artisanal cobalt mining — a sector supplying global electronics supply chains — attracted international legal scrutiny in 2020, when major technology corporations faced lawsuits for allegedly benefiting from child labour. This case underscores the intersection of global economic structures and local poverty in perpetuating child labour, and the need for due diligence obligations throughout international supply chains.

4. LEGAL AND JUDICIAL FRAMEWORK IN INDIA

4.1 Constitutional Provisions:

The Constitution of India contains multiple provisions that collectively establish a framework for child protection. Article 21A (inserted by the 86th Constitutional Amendment, 2002) guarantees the fundamental right to free and compulsory education for all children between the ages of six and fourteen. Article 24 expressly prohibits the employment of children below fourteen years in any factory, mine, or other hazardous occupation. Articles 39(e) and 39(f), forming part of the Directive Principles of State Policy, direct the State to protect children from being forced by economic necessity into activities unsuited to their age, and to ensure that children are given opportunities and facilities to develop in a healthy manner with freedom and dignity. Article 23 prohibits traffic in human beings and forced labour. Article 47 places an obligation on the State to raise the level of nutrition and public health, which is directly relevant

to the condition of child labourers.

4.2 Legislative Framework:

The principal statutory instrument governing child labour in India is the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act of 1986, as substantially amended by the Child and Adolescent Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act of 2016. The 2016 amendment introduced several transformative provisions. First, it imposed a comprehensive prohibition on the employment of children below fourteen years of age across all occupations and processes, with limited exceptions for family enterprises (excluding hazardous activities) and the entertainment industry subject to prescribed conditions. Second, it created a new regulatory category of 'adolescents' (persons aged fourteen to eighteen years) and prohibited their employment in hazardous occupations, including mines, inflammable industries, and dangerous manufacturing processes. Third, the amendment significantly enhanced penal provisions: first-time employer offenders face imprisonment of six months to two years and fines of twenty thousand to fifty thousand rupees, or both; repeat offenders face imprisonment of one to three years. Fourth, the amendment expressly linked enforcement with the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act of 2009, creating a structural connection between child labour prohibition and school enrolment.

The Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act of 1976, the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act of 2015, and the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act of 2012 collectively supplement the child protection architecture, particularly in relation to children in conditions of servitude, debt bondage, or trafficking.

4.3 Judicial Contributions to Child Labour Jurisprudence:

Indian courts have played a pivotal role in expanding the substantive content of child labour law and in directing affirmative state action. Several landmark decisions merit examination.

In M.C. Mehta v. State of Tamil Nadu (1996) 6 SCC 756, the Supreme Court addressed the widespread employment of children in Sivakasi's fireworks and match manufacturing industries. The Court unequivocally held that child labour in hazardous industries violated Article 24 of the Constitution, and directed the establishment of welfare funds financed by employer contributions to support the education and rehabilitation of affected children.

Significantly, the Court recognised that legal prohibition alone, absent alternative income support for the families of child labourers, would be insufficient to achieve lasting reform — a judicial acknowledgement of the structural poverty dimension of the problem.

In People's Union for Democratic Rights v. Union of India (1982) 3 SCC 235, the Supreme Court established a broad interpretation of the constitutional prohibition on forced labour under Article 23, holding that any form of compelled labour — whether or not arising from physical coercion — falls within the scope of the prohibition. This decision has been foundational in subsequent bonded and child labour jurisprudence.

In Bandhula Mukti Morcha v. Union of India (1984) 3 SCC 161, the Supreme Court took a proactive role in directing the identification, release, and rehabilitation of bonded labourers, including children. The Court treated the petition as a public interest litigation and imposed positive obligations on state governments to take measures consistent with the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act.

These judicial decisions collectively demonstrate a shift from purely punitive approaches toward a welfare-oriented jurisprudence that situates child labour within the broader framework of socio-economic rights. Courts have increasingly directed governments to implement surveilling, rescue, rehabilitation, and educational integration measures — a multi-dimensional judicial response that parallels the academic consensus on the structural causes of child labour.

5. EVOLUTION OF CHILD LABOUR AND ITS CAUSATIVE FACTORS

5.1 Historical Evolution:

The nature and organisation of child labour have undergone significant transformation across historical epochs. In pre-industrial agrarian societies, children's participation in household farming and livestock care was regarded as an unremarkable extension of family economic activity. The Industrial Revolution in eighteenth and nineteenth century Europe radically altered this landscape: factory and mine owners recruited children — who were inexpensive, physically manageable in confined spaces, and easily disciplined — creating conditions of systematic and often brutal exploitation. Legislative responses in Europe and North America during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries gradually displaced formal industrial child labour, though this shift was accomplished largely by restricting visible, formal-sector

employment rather than addressing the underlying poverty that had generated the demand for child labour.

In India, formal-sector child labour has similarly declined following legislative prohibition, but child labour has migrated to the informal economy — agriculture, domestic service, street vending, construction, and family-based enterprises — where regulatory oversight is limited and enforcement capacity remains inadequate. This shift from visible to invisible and dispersed forms of child labour complicates detection, measurement, and intervention.

5.2 Contemporary Causative Factors:

Empirical research consistently identifies poverty as the primary causative factor of child labour. When household income is insufficient to meet basic consumption needs, parents' calculus shifts toward deploying children as supplementary income sources. Several secondary factors compound and mediate this primary relationship.

Parental unemployment and precarious adult employment generate income volatility that increases the risk of child labour engagement, particularly during adverse income shocks such as crop failure, illness, or natural disasters. Indebtedness — a pervasive feature of rural Tamil Nadu's household economy — can create debt-bondage situations in which children are pledged to creditors as a form of collateral or debt repayment.

The direct and opportunity costs of schooling constitute a significant barrier for poor families. Even where tuition is nominally free under the Right to Education Act, indirect costs — uniforms, textbooks, transport, and foregone income — represent a substantial burden relative to household resources. The comparative returns to immediate wage income often outweigh the discounted present value of future educational returns, particularly where school quality is poor, teacher attendance is irregular, or the local labour market offers limited premium for educational credentials.

Social and structural factors further modulate child labour incidence. Caste-based social hierarchies can limit the occupational mobility of lower-caste families, reinforcing dependence on traditional occupations that involve children. Gender discrimination operates to make girls' participation in domestic and invisible forms of labour particularly resistant to intervention, as such labour is naturalised within patriarchal household norms and falls outside the purview of

most labour inspections. Migration for seasonal agricultural labour exposes children to heightened risks of exploitation, as families traversing district and state boundaries move beyond the reach of local child welfare institutions.

6. GOVERNMENT INTERVENTIONS AND SUITABLE MEASURES

6.1 Existing Policy Architecture:

The Government of India and the Government of Tamil Nadu have deployed a range of schemes addressing both the symptoms and structural causes of poverty-driven child labour. At the national level, the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) provides a legal guarantee of one hundred days of wage employment per year to rural households, directly addressing income insecurity among the most vulnerable. The National Child Labour Project (NCLP), implemented since 1988, establishes bridge schools in high-incidence districts to provide rescued child labourers with transitional education, nutrition, health care, and stipends prior to mainstreaming into formal schooling.

Tamil Nadu has implemented several state-specific programs with demonstrated impact on the determinants of child labour. The Chief Minister's Noon Meal Scheme reduces the direct costs of school attendance and improves nutritional status, thereby reducing one dimension of the economic calculus that draws children away from school. The Anbu Karangal Scheme provides monthly financial assistance to eligible vulnerable children until age eighteen, reducing the income pressure that leads to school discontinuation. The Chief Minister's Child Labour Eradication Project coordinates district-level raids, rescue operations, and legal awareness campaigns.

6.2 Recommendations and Actionable Solutions:

Not with standing these initiatives, persistent child labour in rural Tamil Nadu indicates the need for a more comprehensive and effectively implemented response. The following measures, grounded in evidence and comparative policy experience, are recommended.

(i) Strengthening Household Income Security:

Poverty reduction must be positioned as the foundational pillar of any anti-child labour strategy. Expansion of MGNREGA coverage, enhanced minimum wage enforcement, access

to micro-credit, and promotion of women-led self-help groups and cooperative enterprises can stabilise household incomes and reduce dependence on children's earnings. Evidence from comparable interventions internationally — including Brazil's Bolsa Familia — confirms that targeted income transfers to poor households produce significant reductions in child labour incidence.

(ii) Ensuring Quality and Accessible Education:

The availability of schooling is a necessary but insufficient condition for reducing child labour; the quality of educational provision is equally determinative. Improvements in teacher recruitment and attendance, digital learning infrastructure, transport facilities for remote communities, and mid-day meal programmes in rural Tamil Nadu schools are essential to make the opportunity cost calculus favour education over labour. Bridge schools and evening learning centres should be expanded to reintegrate working and dropout children into formal schooling.

(iii) Robust Legal Enforcement:

Effective deterrence requires consistent enforcement of the Child and Adolescent Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act in the informal and agricultural sectors, where the majority of child labour now occurs. District-level inter-agency task forces comprising labour officers, police, district administration, and child welfare committees should conduct regular, unannounced inspections and rescue operations. Penalties for repeat offenders should be applied rigorously, and employers found in violation should face business license revocation in addition to criminal sanction.

(iv) Community Mobilisation and Awareness:

Village-level awareness campaigns addressing the long-term economic costs of child labour and the benefits of education can shift social norms in communities where child work is culturally normalised. Engagement of panchayat leaders, schoolteachers, and respected community figures as advocates for child education is likely to be more effective than top-down enforcement in changing household decision-making.

(v) Rehabilitation and Reintegration:

Rescued child labourers require comprehensive rehabilitation support, including psychological counselling, health assessment, remedial education, and vocational guidance appropriate to their age. Families whose children are removed from work must receive alternative income support to prevent re-entry into the labour force. District authorities should maintain monitoring systems to track the educational progress and welfare of rescued children.

7. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Principal Findings:

This study yields several substantive findings. First, poverty functions as the primary structural driver of child labour in rural Tamil Nadu, operating through multiple interrelated mechanisms: income insufficiency, household debt, parental unemployment, and the direct and opportunity costs of education. The relationship is not unidirectional; child labour, by foreclosing educational attainment, perpetuates poverty across generations, creating an intergenerational trap from which escape requires external intervention.

Second, international normative frameworks — including ILO Conventions 138 and 182, the UNCRC, and the UDHR — provide a robust normative foundation for state action, but their translation into effective domestic policy remains incomplete. India's legislative framework, while comparatively well-developed, suffers from enforcement deficits, particularly in the informal and agricultural sectors that now host the majority of child labourers.

Third, judicial interventions in India have progressively expanded the substantive content of child protection norms, moving beyond punitive enforcement toward welfare-oriented directives that combine legal accountability with rehabilitation, education, and family support. The Sivakasi jurisprudence — culminating in M.C. Mehta v. State of Tamil Nadu — represents a high-water mark of this approach and offers a template for comprehensive judicial oversight of child labour.

Fourth, comparative state-level analysis within India confirms that poverty is a stronger driver of child labour in states with weak social infrastructure than in Tamil Nadu, which benefits from relatively higher literacy rates, stronger welfare programmes, and better school enrolment. Nevertheless, rural child labour persists in informal and hidden forms in Tamil Nadu, underscoring the need for continued vigilance and targeted intervention.

Fifth, the evolution of child labour from visible industrial employment to diffuse informal sector engagement necessitates a corresponding evolution in detection, monitoring, and intervention strategies. Data systems capable of tracking child labour in agricultural and domestic settings — which are notoriously under-reported in official statistics — are essential prerequisites for evidence-based policymaking.

7.2 Policy Recommendations:

On the basis of these findings, the following policy recommendations are advanced. Policymakers should treat poverty alleviation as the primary anti-child labour strategy, ensuring that income support programmes reach the most economically vulnerable rural households. Universal, quality primary education must be guaranteed through sustained investment in school infrastructure, qualified teaching staff, and financial incentives for poor families. Legal enforcement should be extended comprehensively into the informal economy, with dedicated inspection capacity for agricultural and domestic labour settings. Community-based monitoring systems, involving local bodies, teachers, and civil society organisations, should complement state enforcement machinery. Comprehensive rehabilitation programmes — encompassing psychological, educational, and economic dimensions — should be established for rescued child labourers and their families. Finally, inter-departmental convergence between labour, education, social welfare, and law enforcement agencies is essential to achieve a coherent and effective response to poverty-driven child labour.

7.3 Conclusion:

This article has argued that child labour in rural Tamil Nadu is fundamentally a structural phenomenon rooted in persistent household poverty, inadequate social protection, and unequal access to quality education. Its elimination cannot be achieved through legal prohibition alone. A convergent, multi-dimensional strategy — one that simultaneously addresses income insecurity, educational quality, legal enforcement, social norms, and rehabilitative support — is essential. Tamil Nadu's relatively more developed welfare architecture offers a comparative advantage, but sustained political will, institutional capacity, and community engagement are indispensable complements.

Every child deprived of education and condemned to labour is a profound moral failure and a long-term economic loss for society. Recognising child labour as a structural rather than

individual pathology is the essential first step toward policies capable of breaking the intergenerational cycle that links poverty to exploitation. Only through sustained, coordinated, and evidence-based action can Tamil Nadu — and India more broadly — honour its constitutional commitments and its obligations under international human rights law to ensure every child a safe, educated, and dignified childhood.

REFERENCES

A. Legislation and Constitutional Provisions

Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986 (India).

Child and Adolescent Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2016 (India).

Child Labour Amendment Rules, 2017 (India).

Constitution of India, 1950, Articles 21A, 23, 24, 39(e), 39(f), 45, 47.

Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (India).

Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 (India).

Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act, 1976 (India).

B. International Instruments

ILO Convention No. 138 on Minimum Age, 1973.

ILO Convention No. 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour, 1999.

UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989, Articles 27, 28, 32.

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948, Articles 23, 25, 26.

C. Case Laws

Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India (1984) 3 SCC 161 (India).

M.C. Mehta v. State of Tamil Nadu (1996) 6 SCC 756 (India).

People's Union for Democratic Rights v. Union of India (1982) 3 SCC 235 (India).

Asha Nivas Social Service Centre v. The State of Tamil Nadu (2016) (Madras HC).

D. Books and Book Chapters

Baland, J.-M., & Robinson, J. A. (2000). Is child labour inefficient? Journal of Political Economy, 108(4), 663–679.

Becker, G. S. (1964). Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education. University of Chicago Press.

Bhattacharya, T. (Ed.). (2017). Social reproduction theory: Remapping class, recentring

oppression. Pluto Press.

Burra, N. (2005). Crusading for children in India's informal economy. Economic and Political Weekly, 40(49), 5199–5208.

Kannan, K. P. (2007). Labouring children: Child labour in India. Centre for Development Studies.

Lieten, G. K. (2004). Child labour in South Asia. Aksant Academic Publishers.

Neelavathi, S. (2010). Child labour in Tamil Nadu. Department of Labour, Government of Tamil Nadu.

Pande, B. B. (2011). Child labour and human rights. Universal Law Publishing.

Sharma, R. N. (2006). Problems of child labour in India. Anmol Publications.

Weiner, M. (1991). The child and the state in India. Princeton University Press.

E. Journal Articles and Reports

Bhukuth, A., Ballet, J., & Gupta, M. R. (2022). Child labour and its determinants in India: New perspectives. Journal of International Development, 34(3), 512–531.

Chakrabarty, D. (2021). Child labour in India: A legal perspective. International Journal of Law Management & Humanities, 4(2), 1412–1428.

Das, S. (2022). Adult earnings and child labour in rural West Bengal. Indian Journal of Labour Economics, 65(1), 201–218.

ILO & UNICEF. (2024). Global estimates on child labour 2024. ILO Publications.

Jayaraj, D. (2002). Child labour in Tamil Nadu in the 1980s: Evidence and issues. Economic and Political Weekly, 37(4), 333–344.

Pandey, A. K., & Gautam, A. (2015). Child labour and schooling in Uttar Pradesh. Journal of Rural Development, 34(1), 87–108.

Rao, R. J., & Burla, V. (2025). Poverty and child labour in India: An empirical examination. South Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Economics, 12(1), 45–62.

Subramani, T., & Yoganandham, G. (2024). Child labour in India and sustainable development goals: An assessment. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 6(5), 1–14.

Tejaswini, G. (2023). A study on the causes and impact of child labour on children in India. International Journal of Law and Legal Jurisprudence Studies, 10(2), 44–59.