ISSN2454-5597

Knowledge-Humility-Excellence

ISFIRE WORKING PAPER SERIES

ANALYSING THE FACTORS DETERMINING WAGE-DIFFERENTIALS AMONGST THE CONSTRUCTION WORKERS IN INDIA

Kadambari Chheda
Anuradha Patnaik

Working Paper-22
http://iire.in/ojs/index.php
Issue-April 2016

ABOUT US

ISF Institute of Research and Education (IIRE), a branch of **Inner Search Foundation, a public charitable trust.** It has been established to facilitate education and research in diverse fields. The aim of IIRE is to create integrated educational and research programs which enhance the capability, productivity and employment potential of individuals in their respective fields.

IIRE is a part of a multi-faceted, multi-disciplinary **ISF Group**, which has nearly two decades of experience, providing Consultancy, Business Management, Academic Management, Technical Management and Learning & Development solutions for various organizations. ISF Group believes in creating value for its customers and stakeholders by providing innovative services and solutions that are based on cutting edge research. The R&D activities of the Group are channelized with exclusive focus on leveraging innovation and creativity, of the scientific, technical and management resources across the globe. The group facilitates converting the generated body of knowledge into practical use through development of innovative products, services and solutions. There are three major verticals under the ISF Group:

1. **ISF Maritime Services** – *Provides services spanning the entire eco-system of the shipping industry*
2. **ISF HR Services** – *Provide organizational development and talent management services to organizations across industries*
3. **Inner Search Foundation** – *Guides individuals and helping organizations to expand their horizons and experiencing happy, healthy and fulfilling existence.*

For more information please log on to www.isfgroup.in

This page is intentionally blank

ANALYSING THE FACTORS DETERMINING WAGE-DIFFERENTIALS AMONGST THE CONSTRUCTION WORKERS IN INDIA

Kadambari Chheda[1]
Anuradha Patnaik[2]

Abstract

Wages form a major portion of income for majority of the construction workers in India. Construction industry is specifically chosen for studying wage differentials because, the workers who are engaged in this industry of India are extremely diverse in nature, ranging from large number of unskilled workers to highly skilled engineers and technicians. The present study employs the panel regression technique to test the extended version of Mincerian wage equation for six different groups of construction workers. The results showed that 'work-experience' is the most significant factor influencing the wages of construction workers in India, whereas general education (years of schooling) is insignificant unlike other industries (where general education plays a crucial role in increasing the wage-rates). Also, depending on the nature of work, location, sector *etc*., 'technical education' and 'formal vocation education' play an important role in influencing the wages of the construction workers.

Key Words: Construction Industry, Panel Regression, Wage-differentials, Human capital theory.

JEL Codes: E24, C33, J24, J31, I2

[1] Research Scholar, Department of Economics, University of Mumbai, Mumbai, India.
Email: kadambarichheda@gmail.com (Corresponding author)

[2] Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, University of Mumbai, Mumbai, India.
Email: apatnaik@economics.mu.ac.in

1. INTRODUCTION:

In developing economies, wages are influenced by strict labour market dualism and strong entry barriers amongst different segments of the labour markets (Heckman and Hotz, 1986). In India, dualism in the labour markets has caused major variations in the wages and incomes of the workers (Sen, 1998). Several times, in India, it has been observed that workers performing similar types of work are paid differently (Das, 2012). There are a few studies specific to India (Das, 2012; Krishna and Paul, 2012; Sengupta and Das, 2014) that have attempted to examine the causes for wage differentials amongst various group of workers at aggregate level. However, none of these studies inspected wage differentials distinctively for any particular industry. The present paper attempts to contribute to the existing literature, by examining wage differentials amongst the workers of construction industry in India.

Construction industry was particularly chosen for the study because the workers who are engaged in this industry are extremely diverse in nature, ranging from large number of unskilled workers to highly skilled engineers and technicians. In India, wages form a major portion of income for majority of the construction workers. According to 12th Five Year Plan (2012-2017) construction industry has been reported that amongst the entire construction workforce, 2.5% were skilled engineers, 2.75% were technicians and foreman, 2.26% were clerical staff, 9.1% were skilled workers and 83.3% were unskilled workers in 2012 (Government of India, 2013). This clearly indicates that labour-market of the construction industry is significantly segmented. Hence, there is a probability of existence of high wage differentials in this industry.

A flexible method to check wage differentials amid different groups of workers is through the human capital theory (Becker, 1964; Mincer 1958, 1974). According to the human capital theory, rise in accumulation of human capital (*i.e.* education, skills and work-experience), leads to rise in the productivity and earnings of the workers. The present study employs the panel regression technique to test the extended version of Mincer (1974) wage equation or popularly known as “human capital earnings function” for the construction workers in India. The primary data source for the study is National Sample Surveys (NSS) quinquennial unit-level data, which is one of the most exhaustive and extensive employment data of India. Most of the labour studies in India use this data as it consists extensive data on different set of workers employed. It covers vast details of household characteristics, personal details, working details and wages of the workers in India. The study uses the two quinquennial rounds of NSS, *i.e.* 61^{st} quinquennial round (2004-05) and 68^{th} quinquennial round (2011-12).

We use panel-data set to empirically investigate the relationship between wages and 'human capital' variables (work-experience, education, technical education and vocation training), for six different groups of construction workers in India, separately (formal construction workers, informal construction workers, rural construction workers, urban construction workers, male construction workers, and female workers). The motive for separating workers into different clusters, is to observe the fluctuations in each group individually, caused due to 'human capital' variables. This will contribute in understanding precisely the influence of 'skill' variables (technical education and vocation training), in addition to 'education' and 'work-experience', on the wages of the construction workers in India.

The remainder of paper is structured as follows: Section 2 reviews literature on human capital theory; followed by literature review on construction industry and importance of human capital in the industry. Section 3 presents a brief idea about the database and methodology used in the study, Section 4 presents the step-wise empirical results of the panel regression models and the explanation of the results, Finally, Section 5 discusses, conclusions and policy implications.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

2.1 Human Capital Theory and Importance:

A persistent debate amongst various scholars, policy-makers and academia is "what determines wages" (Groshen, 1990). A relevant question in this debate inquiries about why there is diversity in wages payment to various workers (Mortensen, 2003). According to M. Krishna and Paul, B. (2012), wage disparities in the labour market of India can be chiefly attributed to two reasons: first, workers receive dissimilar wages as they are employed in different economic activities; second, due to different skill-sets and education-levels (workers are heterogeneous in nature) and acquire different wages. Therefore, skills and education play a crucial role in the labour market for not only entering the labour market but also for explaining variations in wages. A study by Sengupta and Das (2014) showed that wage differences amongst workers could be explained by dividing the wage determining factors into two parts: (i) "observed" part (defined by variations in education, skill, work experience and social factors) and (ii) "unobserved" part (explained by the unknown factors). One of the significant methods to examine for the "observed" part is human capital theory.

Human capital theory is an important theory of labour economics that studies impact of different "human-capital" variables (such as work-experience, education and training variables) on the wage-rates. Within the wide scope of demand and supply, several prominent economists like Schultz (1961), Becker (1962) and Mincer (1974) have stressed that market wage as a function of education, skills and experience acquired through years of schooling and training. They referred these variables as "human capital" variables which assist in explaining significant part of the variation in wages of the workers.

The foundation of human capital is from the time of classical economics (1776), and eventually developing into a scientific theory (Fitzsimons, 1999). Human capital generates positive spillovers in the economy (Acemoglu and Angrist, 2000). According to Romer (1990), it is 'a fundamental source of economic productivity'. Rosen (1999) denotes human capital as 'an investment that people make in themselves to increase their productivity'. Schultz (1961) was of view that accumulation of a person's human capital will largely affect his/her wage, firm's productivity and eventually national economy.

The early studies of Mincer (1958, 1974) and Becker (1964) were significant contributions in the human capital theory. The work by J. Mincer (1958) showed that training and skills positively influenced the incomes of workers. According to him, the variable 'training' could be divided into two sections: (a) formal training (years of schooling) and (b) informal training– work experience. In this model, he substituted worker's age for his/her work experience. According to Polacheck (2007), Mincer treated schooling and training as a part of investment for a worker, where a worker likes to invest up to a limit where investment cost equals the present value of gains from it. The equation also directed that worker's wages increases consistently over a period at a decreasing rate yielding a concave earnings outline for most of the workers. The study by Lemieux (2003) has pointed out two reasons for Mincerian equation to be popular and a significant contribution to labour economics. They are, first it was an initial formal model which discussed investment in human capital; second, it provided with the foundation for estimating causal effect of education on earnings, which was a crucial contribution.

G. Becker (1964) further worked on human capital model and showed the importance and effects of "on-the-job training." He described the distinction between: "firm specific" training and "general" training (Chiswick, 2003). "Firm specific" training refers to the skills developed by specific education, whereas "general" training refers to knowledge acquired through education and which can be useful in any work (*i.e.* reading writing). According to Fugar *et.al* (2013), Becker's opinion on human capital was comparable to "physical means of production". That is, if one invests in human capital then their output would depend partially on the human capital's rate of return. This concludes, that additional investment in the human capital would lead to addition in the total output.

Several studies have used human capital model which have shown positive relationship between human capital variables and increase in wage-rates. Lynch (1992) showed that provision of training by private sector played crucial role in positively influencing the wages of the workers. Newell and Socha (2007) displayed that there was an increase in wages of the professional and managerial workers in comparison to the less-educated workers. Mishel and Bernstein (2003) were of view that increase in wage inequality amongst workers was majorly due to returns in the education and work-experience.

A study by Michelacci and Pijoan-Mas (2007) pointed that in addition to differences in education and job-experience, differences in the working hours of workers also caused wage differences amongst the workers. A comprehensive study by P. Das (2012), used Mincerian human capital model to check wage inequality in India. The results displayed that education had more effect on the expected wage in the Indian labour market. His study also showed the presence of diminishing returns to human capital in determining wages.

2.2 Construction Industry and Importance of Human Capital in the Industry:

Construction industry is labour-intensive, and its economic prosperity is closely linked to its human capital (Fugar *et.al.*, 2013). It differs from other industries in case of human capital theory as there is absence of strong relationship between education attainment and occupational choice amongst construction workers (Joll *et.al.*, 1983). According to study by Anwar C. (2004), while employing the construction workers for the work, the contractors and subcontractors usually asked for their job-experience in the sector rather than their educational qualification. Therefore, work-experience or duration of time spent in the construction sector was the strongest variable influencing the construction jobs and its wages. Generally, it is believed that, in the construction sector providing training is less preferred. This is because, employers or contactors of other firms are willing to pay more for pre-trained construction workers and the workers readily leave their original jobs for better pay in other firms (Fugar, *et.al.* 2013).

Fugar *et.al.* (2013) studied importance of human capital on the Ghanaian construction industry. They pointed out that, the people working in the construction industry believed that the activities involved in construction were majorly physical in nature and therefore could not be efficiently learnt in a classroom. This resulted into less attention given to formal training or education by the construction managers. The study also showed that, most of the employers of construction firms were not inclined in investing in the training of construction workers as these workers worked on a temporary basis. They weren't willing to invest in expensive training of the workers as the benefits of such training would be in the long-term; whereas temporary nature of the construction workers would not provide with any benefits. Loosemore. *et.al.* (2003) have stated that investments in the human capital variables were relatively at a low level in the construction sector when compared with the other industries.

'Technical education' and 'formal vocation education' forms the part of 'specific industry training' variable, which is relevant for labour-intensive construction industry. Technical education refers to the courses provided after the secondary education and practical training to prepare technicians for work as supervisory staff. Vocational education refers to the training and skill building for workers with lower education levels in specific areas, and does not develop through general education (Goel, 2010). Technical and vocational education has traditionally been considered an option for those students who fail to make through the straight path (primary, secondary, preparatory to university) (Haimanot, 2014). Majority of construction workers are illiterate or less literate, for them such 'firm specific' training gives opportunity for increase their productivity levels for that particular industry.

Given the above backdrop, we attempt to test extended Mincerian wage equation for the six different groups of construction workers in India using panel regression technique.

3. DATA-SOURCE AND METHDOLOGY:

For the present study, the primary data source used is the unit-level data of National Sample Survey (NSS) quinquennial rounds, which is collected by the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation (MOSPI) - Government of India (GoI). It provides the most comprehensive and extensive employment-unemployment data of India at national, state and unit level. NSS primary surveys employ a common theoretical method of estimating number of workers in all its surveys. Although NSS quinquennial round's unit-level data is available in the gaps of 5 years, it is considered the most superior employment data source because of it definitional lucidity in concepts and enhanced sampling methodology (Lall, 1976). Furthermore, it estimates large number of workers which comprises of workers who contribute in the production of goods and services in India (Bhaumik, 2012).

For the present study, unit-level data of 61st quinquennial round (2004-05) and 68th quinquennial round (2011-12) have been used. 61st NSS quinquennial round was conducted from July 2004 to June 2005 and 68th NSS quinquennial round was conducted from July 2011 to June 2012. The unit-level data of NSS provides with profound details of workers in India. This detail consists of personal and household characteristics of workers; along with work and wages related information. For the present analysis, workers between the ages of 15-59 were considered. The complexity of the data extraction is high due to large number of workers and their comprehensive details.

The NSS unit-level data is divided into eleven different levels for 61st NSS quinquennial round; and nine different levels for 68th NSS quinquennial round. Each level includes explicit category of details of every worker. The levels used for present paper were levels 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 for both NSS quinquennial rounds. Level 2 consists of the details of household characteristics of workers; Level 3 consists of personal and demographic particulars of the workers; Level 4 and 5 consists of details about economic activities of the workers; and finally level 7 gives the details on wages of the workers. Initially, entire data was extracted using the R software to the excel spreadsheets. For the different levels, the sample size of workers varied; therefore, we merged the required levels (mentioned above) with common household and personal identification number of each worker. This was followed by data extraction of the workers employed in construction industry, from the entire data-set by referring to their National Industrial Codes (NIC) *i.e.* NIC-2004 and NIC 2008.The details of the construction workers employed in the 61st quinquennial round data was extracted using NIC 2004; and for the 68th quinquennial round, NIC 2008 was used. The five-digit NIC 2004 code for construction industry were: 45101, 45102, 45201, 45202, 45203, 45203, 45204, 45205, 45206, 45207, 45208, 45209, 45301, 45302, 45303, 45309, 45401, 45402, 45403, and 4550. The five-digit NIC 2008 code for construction worker were: 41001, 41002, 41003, 42101, 42102, 42102, 42103, 42201, 42202, 42203, 42204, 42205, 42206, 42209, 42901, 42902, 42903, 42904, 42909, 43110, 43121, 43122 and 43123.

Mincerian wage function or popularly known as "human capital earnings function", is the log earnings modeled as the sum of linear function of years of education and quadratic function of work experience (Lemieux, 2003). For the present study we extend this equation by adding the variables- technical education and formal vocational education to the original equation. We use panel-data set to empirically investigate the relationship between wages and 'human capital' variables (work-experience, education, technical education and vocation training), for six different clusters of construction workers in India, distinctively. The six clusters are – (1) formal construction workers, (2) informal construction workers, (3) rural construction workers,

(4) urban construction workers, (5) male construction workers, and (6) female workers. The motive for separating workers into different clusters, is to observe the fluctuations in each cluster caused due to 'human capital' variables mentioned above. This will contribute in understanding precisely the influence of 'skill' variables (technical education and vocation training), in addition to the variables of 'education' and 'work-experience', on the wages of workers.

Panel regression technique studies the influence of different independent variables on a dependent variable across the year (spatial effects) as well as repeatedly over a period of time (temporal effects) (Frees, 2004). According to Paul (2011), panel data provides with more informative data and higher efficiency because of greater degrees of freedom and less collinearity amongst variables. Therefore, to understand the impact of human capital variables on the wages of different clusters of construction workers across the space and time period from 2004-05 and 2011-12, we use the panel regression. The number of observations for 61st round and 68th round NSS round are unequal, however, to fit it in the panel-data, we take the weighted average of all the above mentioned variable figures. Therefore, before constructing the panel-data frame, we initially calculated the weighted average of each variable, for every state, individually; and then set it in the panel-data frame.

The basic 'Mincerian' wage function (1974) is expressed as:

$$\log w_i = \alpha + \beta_1 s_i + \beta_2 exp_i + \beta_3 exp_i^2 + \varepsilon_i \quad \text{----------------------} \quad (1)$$

Where,

w_i= wage rate,

s_i= number of years of schooling completed,

exp_i = years of labour market experience,

exp_i^2 =experience squared,

ε_i = random disturbance term capturing unobserved features.

β_1 = coefficient on years of schooling can be interpreted as the average rate of return (or the percentage change in wages) to an additional year of schooling. The above function (equation 1) assumes the rate of return is similar for all levels of schooling.

β_2 *and* β_3 = The 'labour market experience' variable is incorporated in the equation because a worker with higher experience in a job is probable to receive more wages. The experience squared term captures the possibility of a non-linear relationship between earnings and work-experience.

Extending the Mincerian wage equation (1974), for the present study we added two more variables 'technical education' and 'formal vocation education' to the original equation (*i.e.* general education (schooling years) and work-experience). This has been done keeping in mind the nature of work in the construction industry which requires specialized skill sets. Therefore, the extended Mincerian wage equation for the present study is expressed as:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 X_{1t} + \beta_2 X_{2t} + \beta_3 X_{3t} + \beta_4 X_{4t} + \beta_5 X_{4t}^2 + w_{it} \quad \text{----------} \quad (2)$$

Where,

i=1,….,N;

t=1,….,T;

Y= wages of construction

X_1 = general education of construction workers

X_2 = technical education of construction workers

X_3 = formal vocational training of construction workers

X_4 and $X^2{}_4$ = age (proxy for work-experience) of the construction workers. The quadratic term in work-experience allows for the probable drop in post-schooling human capital acquisition.

β_1 = co-efficient for general education of construction workers.

β_2 = co-efficient for technical education of construction workers

β_3 = co-efficient for formal vocational training of construction workers

β_4 = co-efficient for age (proxy for job-experience) of the construction workers.

β_5 = co-efficient for age squared (proxy for job-experience) of the construction workers. Note that, 'β_4' and 'β_5' co-efficient that corresponds to work-experience, reflects concavity in the age earnings when 'β_5' is negative.

α = intercept of fix-effect model. Fixed effect model is used as it controls for the unobservable confounding variables that fluctuate across units, but are constant over time.

$\boldsymbol{\omega_{it}}$= is the normally distributed error term of the panel regression, with mean 0 and variance
σ^2 measuring the effects of unobservable factors.

We regress six fixed effect panel regression models as per the above mentioned equation No.1: The six panel data models are as follows:

Model 1: Estimating the wage equation for formal construction workers employed in India.

Model 2: Estimating the wage equation for informal construction workers employed India.

Model 3: Estimating the wage equation for construction workers employed in rural areas.

Model 4: Estimating the wage equation for construction workers employed in urban areas.

Model 5: Estimating the wage equation for male construction workers employed India.

Model 6: Estimating the wage equation for female construction workers employed India.

4. EMPIRICAL RESULTS AND ITS EXPLANATIONS:

Table No.1: shows the empirical results of the above models:

Models and its Equations	Co-efficient	P-value
Model 1 (formal construction workers) *(formal)* $Y_{it}(formal) = \alpha + \beta_1 X_{1t}(formal) + \beta_2 X_{2t}(formal) + \beta_3 X_{3t}(formal) + \beta_4 X_{4t}(formal) + \beta_5 X_{4t}^2(formal) + w_{it}(formal)$	β_1: (+) 0.07 β_2: (+) 0.89* β_3: (+) 0.65 β_4: (+) 0.01* β_5:(+) 0.008*	0.59 0.004 0.34 0.08 0.07
Model 2 (informal construction workers) *(informal)* $Y_{it}(informal) = \alpha + \beta_1 X_{1t}(informal) + \beta_2 X_{2t}(informal) + \beta_3 X_{3t}(informal) + \beta_4 X_{4t}(informal) + \beta_5 X_{4t}^2(informal) + w_{it}(informal)$	β_1: (-) 0.11 β_2: (-) 1.52 β_3: (-) 0.70 β_4: (+) 0.45*** β_5: (-) 0.006***	0.59 0.39 0.72 4.85e-05 0.0003
Model 3 (rural construction workers) *(rural)* $Y_{it}(rural) = \alpha + \beta_1 X_{1t}(rural) + \beta_2 X_{2t}(rural) + \beta_3 X_{3t}(rural) + \beta_4 X_{4t}(rural) + \beta_5 X_{4t}^2(rural) + w_{it}(rural)$	β_1: (-) 0.13 β_2: (-)1.07 β_3: (+) 1. 79* β_4: (+)0.29** β_5: (-) 0.003*	0.05 0.36 0.01 0.009 0.05
Model 4 (urban construction workers) *(urban)* $Y_{it}(urban) = \alpha + \beta_1 X_{1t}(urban) + \beta_2 X_{2t}(urban) + \beta_3 X_{3t}(urban) + \beta_4 X_{4t}(urban) + \beta_5 X_{4t}^2(urban) + w_{it}(urban)$	β_1: (+) 0.08 β_2: (+) 0.76 β_3: (+) 0.79 β_4: (+) 0.22* β_5: (-) 0.002*	0.18 0.89 0.36 0.02 0.18
Model 5 (male construction workers) *(male)* $Y_{it}(male) = \alpha + \beta_1 X_{1t}(male) + \beta_2 X_{2t}(male) + \beta_3 X_{3t}(male) + \beta_4 X_{4t}(male) + \beta_5 X_{4t}^2(male) + w_{it}(male)$	β_1: (-) 0.29 β_2: (+) 0.08* β_3: (+) 0.074 β_4: (+) 0.29** β_5: (-) 0.00036*	0.72 0.039 0.89 0.009 0.058
Model 6 (female construction workers) *(female)* $Y_{it}(female) = \alpha + \beta_1 X_{1t}(female) + \beta_2 X_{2t}(female) + \beta_3 X_{3t}(female) + \beta_4 X_{4t}(female) + \beta_5 X_{4t}^2(female) + w_{it}(female)$	β_1: (+) 0.04 β_2: (+) 1.13 β_3: (+) 0.85 β_4: (0.25)*** β_5: (-) 0.003***	0.76 0.45 0.72 0.0003 0.005

Note: (+) denotes positive co-relation, (-) denotes negative co-relations. '***' denotes 1% level of significance. '**' denotes 5% level of significance '*' denotes 10% level of significance. 'Y'= wages, 'X_1'= general education, 'X_2'= technical education, 'X_3' = formal vocation education, 'X_4' = work-experience (proxied by age).

Table No.2: Implications of the above results are as follows:

Model	Significant Co-efficient(s)	Implications
Model 1 Formal construction workers	Technical Education Work- experience	Technical education co-efficient is positive and significant for formal construction workers. The coefficient of 'work-experience' and 'squared work experience' are both positive for formal construction workers unlike the other models (where 'squared work experience' is negative). It indicates that wages of formal construction workers in India rises with the accumulation on of work-experience, at an increasing rate.
Model 2 Informal construction workers	Work- experience	Only work-experience is significant for the informal construction workers. The model shows significant and positive co-efficient for 'work-experience' and significant negative co-efficient for 'squared work-experience'. It indicates that wages of the construction workers in India rises with the accumulation of work-experience, at a decreasing rate. These results are consistent with the Mincer's theory.
Model 3 Rural construction workers	Formal Vocation Education Work- experience	Vocation training co-efficient is positive and significant. Also, work-experience is significant for the rural construction workers.
Model 4 Urban construction workers	Work- experience	Only work-experience is significant for the urban construction workers.
Model 5 Male construction workers	Technical education Work- experience	Technical education is positive and significant for male construction workers. Also, work-experience is significant for the male construction workers.
Model 6 Female construction workers	Work- experience	Only work-experience is significant for the female construction workers.

The results of the above Table No.2 can be summed up in the following manner.

- ‘Work-experience’ is the most significant factor influencing the wages of construction workers in India (significant for all the above models). It is the pre-dominant and pre-requisite factor influencing the wages of the construction workers in India. The results show significant positive co-efficient for ‘work-experience’ and significant negative co-efficient for ‘squared work-experience’ (except model 1). It indicates that wages of the construction workers in India rises with the accumulation of work experience, at a decreasing rate. Construction is one of the few industries where people can work their way to the top from the bottom level (Fisher, 2007), with increase in work-experience.

- The variable ‘general education’ is insignificant for all the six tested models. This implies that the years of schooling (general education) does not have any significant impact on the wages of construction workers in India, unlike other industries in the economy (where increase in general education leads to increase in the worker’s wages). This empirical result supports the theoretical argument of Anwar C. (2004) that while recruiting construction workers, the employers (contractors and subcontractors) usually ask workers for their past work-experience rather than educational qualifications.

- ‘Technical education’ variable is positive and significant only for the wages of formal construction workers. Needless to mention that, high skill-based construction work (usually performed in the formal construction sector) require workers with good technical education background. Furthermore, wages of the informal construction workers are distinctly based on ‘work-experience’ (p-value 0.0003) only. Informal construction workers are mainly illiterate or less educated migrant workers, who find work in construction industry as a last resort (with no skill-based education).

- For the wages of rural construction workers, formal vocation education plays a significant role in addition to work-experience; whereas for wages of the urban construction workers only work-experience has been significant. One of the reason for such results might be that, in rural areas, construction industry is considered a potential sector as a source of income, unlike in urban areas where most of the workers are highly literate and consider this industry only for the illiterate and migrant workers (ILO, 2000). Workers in rural areas consciously take up vocation education as a substitute for technical education (as vocation education does not require secondary-level schooling). It helps them to improve their existing earnings in the industry. In urban areas, workers enter in the construction industry only with the two extreme views: (1) of either earning high returns (with sound technical education background) or (2) as industry of 'last resort' to get work (for illiterate and unskilled workers).

- Gender wage-discrimination exists at a large scale in the construction industry of India (Jhabvala and Kanbur, 2002; Devi and Kiran, 2013). Women in India are usually involved only in the unskilled construction work (Barnabas *et.al,* 2009). Therefore, the skilled based variables (technical education) is only significant for wages of the male construction workers and not for the female construction workers, who are often involved in the unskilled type of construction work. Majority of workers in the construction sector have a view that women lack skills to perform certain tasks in the construction sector. Such mindset has led to discrimination of women in this sector and is preventing them from being trained and employed as masons in construction sector (Lingam, 1998)

5. CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY-IMPLICATIONS:

5.1 Conclusions:

It can be concluded that, 'work-experience' is the most significant factor that influences the wages of the construction workers in India. Extending the Mincerian wage equation (1974) (by adding technical education and formal vocation education to the original equation) has been justified by the above panel regression results. Depending on the nature of work, location and gender, other variables like 'technical education' and 'formal vocation education' also play an important role in influencing the wages of the construction workers in India. The variable 'general education' is insignificant for all the six tested models, which implies that the years of schooling (general education) does not have any significant impact on the wages of construction workers in India, unlike other industries in the economy (where increase in general education leads to increase in the worker's wages). Additionally, results also suggest that, technical education is significant only for the formal construction workers; and the skilled based variables are significant only for the wages of male construction workers and not for the female construction workers.

5.2 Policy Implications:

For formalising the construction work-force and improving their wage-rates, more attention has to be given to the accessibility of technical education and formal skill-based (vocation) training for the construction workers in India. Secondly, considering the importance of 'work experience' for construction workers in improving their wages, 'experience certificates' (as issued in the formal sector) would prove beneficial for them in further improving their earnings.

References:

Acemoglu, D. and Angrist, J. (2000). How large are Human-Capital Externalities? Evidence from Compulsory Schooling laws. *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, Vol.15, pp.9-59.

Anwar, C. (2004). *Labour Mobility and Dynamics of the Construction Industry Labour Market: The Case of Makksar, Indonesia*, Cuvillier Verlag, Indonesia.

Barnabas, A.; Anbarasu, J. and Clifford, P. (2009). A Study on the Empowerment of Women Construction Workers as Masons in Tamil Nadu, India. *Journal of International Women's Studies,* 11(2), 121-141.

Becker G (1964). *Human Capital*. Columbia University Press, New York.

Bhaumik, S. (2012). Youth Employment and Unemployment in India: Trends and Dimensions. *Journal of Indian School of Political Economy*, 24(4), 77-108.

Chiswick, B. (2003). Jacob Mincer, Experience and the Distribution of Earnings. *IZA Discussion Paper Series*, IZA Discussion Paper No.847, Institute for the Study of Labour, Germany.

Das, P. (2012). Wage Inequality in India: Decomposition by Sector, Gender and Activity Status. Economic and Political Weekly, 47(50), 58-64.

Devi, K. and Kiran, U. (2013). Status of Female Workers in Construction Industry in India: A Review. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 14(4), 27-30.

Fisher, C. (2007). *Women: Construction's Untapped Resource*, Associated Construction Publications.

Fitzsimons, P (1999). *Human capital theory and education*, The Encyclopedia of Education, London: Macmillian.

Frees, E. (2004). *Longitudinal and Panel Data: Analysis and Applications for the Social Sciences*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Fugar, F.; Ashiboe-Mensha, N. and Adinuira, E. (2013). Human Capital Theory: Implications for the Ghanian Construction Industry Development", *Journal of Construction Project Management and Innovation*, 3(1), 464-79.

Goel, V. P. (2010). Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) System in India for Sustainable Development, Retrieved from (http://www.unesco.org/up/) on 5th December, 2015.

Government of India (2013). *Twelfth Five Year Plan (2012-2017)*, Economic Sectors, Vol. 2. Planning Commission, Government of India. New Delhi.

Groshen L Erica (1990). *How are wages determined?* Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, Economics Commentary.

Haimanot, E (2014). *Participation of Female Students in Technical and Vocational Education and Training in Entoto Technical and Vocational Education and Training Ploy-Technic College: Implications for Gender Equity*. Thesis Submitted to Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.

Heckman J and Hotz J. (1986). An Investigation of the Labour Market Earnings of Panamanian Males: Evaluating the Sources of Inequality. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 21(4), 507-42.

International Labour Organisation (2001). Report on "The Construction Industry in the Twenty First Century: Its Image, Employment Prospects and Skill Requirements", Geneva.

Joll, C.; McKenna, C.; McNabb, R. and Shorey, J. (1983). *Developments in Labour Market Analysis.* Boston: G. Allen and Unwin, 1983, London.

Jhabvala R. and Kanbur, R. (2002). *Globalisation and Economic Reform as seen from the ground: Sewa's Experience in India*. Paper presented in the Indian economy conference, Cornell University, April, 2002.

Krishna, M. and Paul B. (2012). What Explains Wages in India? Labour Market Research Facility, *LMRF Discussion Paper No.15,* Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai.

Lall, D. (1976). Agricultural Growth: Real Wages and the Rural Poor in India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 11(26), 47-61.

Lemieux, T. (2003), "The "Mincer Equation" Thirty Years after Schooling, Experience, and Earnings*", Center for Labour Economics,* Working Paper No.62, University of California, Berkley.

Lingam, L. (1998). Migrant Women, Work Participation and Urban Experience. *The Indian Journal of Social Work*, 59(3), 806-822.

Liu, Y. (2013). *Mincer's wage Determination, Job Changing and Social Capital in China.* Proceedings 59th ISI World Statistics Congress, Hong Kong.

Loosemore, M., Dainty, A. and Lingard, H. (2003). *Human Resource Management in Construction Projects: Strategic and Operational Approaches.* Spoon Press, New York.

Lynch, L. (1992). Private Sector Training and the Earnings of Young Workers. *American Economic Review*, 82(1), 299-312.

Mincer, J (1974), *Schooling, Experience and Earnings*. Columbia University Press, New York. (1958). Investment in Human Capital and Personal Income Distribution. *Journal of Political Economy*, 66(4), 281-302.

Mortensen, D. (2003). *Why are Similar People Paid Differently*? Cambridge: MIT Press. Hardback edition.

Michelacci, C. and Pijoan-Mass, J. (2007). The Effects of Labour Market Conditions on Working Time: The US-EU Experience. *Center for Monetary and Financial Studies*, CEMFI Working Paper No.0705, Spain.

Mishel L. and Bernstein, J. (2003). Wage Inequality and the New Economy in the US: Does IT-Led Growth Generate Wage Inequality. *Canadian Public Policy/Analyse de Politiques*, 29(supplement), 203-221.

National Sample Survey Organisation (1999-00), *Employment and Unemployment Situation in India, 1999-00,* NSS 55th Round, Report No.458. NSSO, New Delhi.

National Sample Survey Organisation (2004-05*), Employment and Unemployment Situation in India, 2004-05,* NSS 61st Round, Report No.515. NSSO, New Delhi.

National Sample Survey Organisation (2011-12*), Employment and Unemployment Situation in India, 2011-12,* NSS 68th Round, Report No.554.NSSO, New Delhi.

Newell, Andrew, and Mieczyslaw W. Socha. (2007). The Polish Wage Inequality Explosion. *Economics of Transition*, 15(4), 733-58.

Paul, R (2011). *Econometric Analysis Using Panel Data*, Indian Agricultural Statistics Research, I.A.S.R.I. Library Avenue, New Delhi.

Polacheck, S. (2007). Earnings over the Lifecycle: The Mincer Earnings Function and its Applications. *IZA Discussion Paper Series,* IZA Discussion Paper Series No.3181, Institute for the Study of Labor. Germany.

Romer, P. M. (1990). Endogenous Technological Change. *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5), 71–102.

Rosen, H. S. (1999). *Public Finance,* McGraw-Hill, New York.

Schultz, T. W. (1961). *Investment in Human Capital. The American Economic Review,* 51(1), 1-17.

Sen, A. (1998). Rural Labour Market and Poverty. In Radhakrishna; S. (eds.): "Empowering Rural Labour in India: Market, State and Mobilisation", Institute for Human Development, New Delhi.

Sengupta, A. and Das, P. (2014). Gender Wage Discrimination across Social and Religious Groups in India: Estimates with Unit Level. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 49(21), 71-6.

Smith, D. M. (2002). Pay and Productivity Difference between Male and Female Veterinarians. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 55(3), 493-511.

Published by:

ISF INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH AND EDUCATION
410, Gemstar Commercial Complex, Ramchandra Lane Ext, Kachpada,
Off Link Road, Malad (W), Mumbai 400 064, India