Pakistan Journal of Economic Studies

ISSN (E) 2708-1486 (P) 2708-1478
Volume 7: Issue 2 June 2024
Journal homepage: https://journals.iub.edu.pk/index.php/pjes/index

The Trade-off between Child Labour and Schooling in Pakistan

[a] Farah Gul, [b] Hamid Hasan, [c] Malik Muhammad

[a] School of Economics, International Islamic University Islamabad, Islamabad, Pakistan. Email: farah.phd230@iiu.edu.pk
[b] School of Economics, International Islamic University Islamabad, Islamabad, Pakistan. Email: ekonomiksf@gmail.com
[c] School of Economics, International Islamic University Islamabad, Islamabad, Pakistan. Email: malikmuhammad@iiu.edu.pk

ARTICLE DETAILS

History:
Accepted: 30 April 2024
Available Online: 30 June 2024

Keywords:
Child Labour, Schooling, Region, Pakistan

JEL Codes:
J13, J24 R23,O53

ABSTRACT

Objectives: One of the major issue of developing countries is child labour. A huge number of children, doing the labour work instead of going to schooling under the age of sixteen years. Due to early involvement in work it decrease their work of capacity and a big cause of lower economic growth of a country.
Research Gap: We use Pakistan Social and living Standard Measurement (PSLM) dataset of 2018- 19 for our empirical study on child labour and schooling. This survey covers the all regions of Pakistan that are urban, rural and provinces wise also.
Methodology: we used descriptive and Binominal Logistic Model for the estimations. Our dependent variable is binary it has two categories.
Main Findings: Results showing that gender wise that boys are significantly more involved in child labour as compare to girls. Significant regional differences are also exist in child labour. Income and parental education negatively related with the likelihood that the child is doing work while when the household size is increasing the probability of child labour also increasing.
Theoretical / Practical Implications of the Findings: According to province wise huge number of working children proportion is available in Baluchistan followed by Sindh, Punjab and KPK. According to gender wise data is showing that the proportion of working and non-working female children is lesser than the proportion of male working and non-working male children.
Originality/Value: Employing rigorous analysis, the study offers valuable data and practical insights for policymakers aiming to promote economic stability.

Recommended Citation:

Gul, F., Hasan, H., & Muhammad, M. (2024). The Trade-off between Child Labour and Schooling in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Economic Studies, 7*(2), 188-198. Available at: https://journals.iub.edu.pk/index.php/pjes/article/view/2980

Corresponding Author's email address: farah.phd230@iiu.edu.pk

1. Introduction

Employment of the children in early age is called child labour. Activities of children which deprived them from their respect, dignity, potential and their basic rights and also harmful their physical and mental health are also refers to child labour. It contains the work that (1) is risky for the children morally, physically, socially and mental health; (2) interrupts their schooling schedule; (3)children deprives to take regular classes; (4) at the same time doing both work , to attend school and do heavy work; and (5) supportive to leave the school early.

Like other developing countries, child labour is big issue in Pakistan. According to estimated data of 1994 and 1996 in the labour market, the contribution of child labour was one quarter. In the industry of bangles and bracelets of Hyderabad city children start to doing in very early age of four to five years normally. They get only forty rupees after making the 12 sets of bangles in two or three hours to get ready. This is not

only the condition of one city but the situation is almost same in every city of Pakistan. According to the report of Human Right Commission Report (HRCP) in 2017 that 35 million children are doing child labour in Pakistan. Fifty percent of children are below then the age of 10years. According to International Labour Organization (ILO) the main cause of child labour in Pakistan is poverty. According to statistics 0f 2017-18 per capita income of Pakistan is $1641 approximately. Moreover Pakistani people are also facing very high rate of inflation. In 2017 29.5 percent of the total population of Pakistan is living below the poverty line (Ministry of Planning Development and Reform). Due to high level of poverty in Pakistan they involve their children in to labour work to fulfill the basic needs of life.

Education is basic need and basic right of every child according to the Article 25-A according to the 1973 constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Following Constitutional Provisions are available regarding the child labour in Pakistan.

Article 11(3): No child below the age of 14 years shall be engaged in any factory or mine or any other hazardous employment.

Article 25(A): The state shall provide free and compulsory education to all children of the age five to sixteen years in such manner as determined by law.

Article 37(e): The state shall make provision for securing just and humane conditions of work, ensuring that women and children are not employed in vacations unsuited to their age or sex, and for maternity benefits for women in employment.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Child Education and Child labour

Baland and Robison (2000) explains parents spend money on the education of their children to enhance the skills, potential of work when their children become adult. In this way when their parents become old their children also spend money for their wellbeing. So parents can take good decision about the working of their children. This is the case for those children whose parents are altruistic or children are altruistic about their parents. Bommier and Dubois (2002) the unproductivity is higher for those children whose have disutility for their labour work even their parents are altruistic. Rosenzweig and Evanson (1977) explain when the wage rate of mother's increases then the opportunity cost for working children for labour intensive is also increase. Cigno and Rosati (2000) explain the analytical structure of their model about non-altruistic parents when their children become mature they must be pay back the amount of their reward to their parents. The model of overlapping generation also explains that every generation thinks about their children that how much they invest on their education and how much they have to save and how much they can get back from their children when they retired. Ejrnae and poertner (2000) explain that in under developed countries where financial market structure is not strong and the return of education in that countries is also low and that countries return of work is high, so they maximized their wealth by involving their children in to market labour. Canagrajah and Nielsen (2001) explains that parents send their children for labour work in very early age to avoid the risk that their consumption falls below the subsistence level. Wahba (2001) explains that children also work by their own choice for the betterment of their self and for their families. Children who belongs to poor family background are less likely to spend money on education and they are more interested to do work (Basu & Tzannators,2003; Basu & Van, 1998; Bourdillon,2006).

Cockburn & Dosite (2007) explains that in developing countries poor parents can't bear the expenses of so called free education. Parents considered their children like their assets and more interested to involved them in to inheriting profession. Poor parents are more interested to send their children for work as a substitute to send them schools. Basu, Das & Dutta (2010) explains that poor parents can't hire separate worker for the take care of big animals so they require the child worker. Making the food items on daily basis and storing the food by manual methods required the more child worker (Hutton & Haller, 2004).

2.2. Empirical Studies

Lall (2000) explains employment position of the female head of household on child labour has no significant effect in both rural and urban regions. Further, author also shows in urban areas poverty has significant effect on child labour. Wahba (2000) shows that poverty is not only the cause of child labor but the child labour also spread poverty. Wahba (2001) shows that parents who were doing the job as a labour in market are more likely to engaged their children for market work. The chances of children to work were found to be two times greater if their parents were child labourers. Jafarey and Lahiri (2002) showing that negative impact on child labour and when move toward the case of perfect international credit markets negative effect on child labour become stronger. Admassie (2003) poverty is found to be the most important factor responsible for the high occurrence of child labour in sub-Sahara African countries. Strulik (2004) presents a model which explains that necessary or subsidized schooling is better than to completely impose ban on child labour in order to come-out from the problem of stagnation and achieve the economic development successfully. Akabayashi and Psacharopoulos (2007) find out the existence of tradeoff between the working hours and hours of studies exist, and social conditions affecting more hours of work as compare to hours of study. Suliman and El-Kogali (2010) finds that the common reasons for children never attending the schools are poverty, direct and indirect expenditures of education, the opportunity cost of child endowment time, child's lack of interest in school and study, school closeness, traditions and culture in Egypt.

2.3. Child labour in Pakistan

Jafri and Raishad (1997) explains in rural areas gender disparity is higher than in urban areas, and in urban areas dominant role is playing by services sector to employing larger percentage of children. Khan (2002) explains the positive relationship between child labour and household size, the negative relationship between family revenues and child labour, the negative relation between household's property holding and child labour in Bannu city of KPK.

Muhammad and Zubari (2006) explain the absence of parents within families and large size of family; lower earnings of other family members have significant relationship with child labour. Ali and Hamid (2012) show that poverty and lower income of family are major causes of female child labour in the city of Multan. Jamil and Farrukh (2016) show that uncertainty of the job after educational achievements are additional factors that increase supply of child labor.

3. Model

Our general model is:

$$CL_i = f(GC_i, PE_i, HY_i, HG_i, HA_i, HS_i, HO_i, GL_i) \quad (1)$$

Where CL= child labour, CG = Gender of ith child, PE = Parental level of education of ith child, HY = Household income of ith child, HG = Household head gender where ith child lives, HA = Household assets where of ith child lives, HS = Household size where of ith child lives, HO = Household head occupation where ith child lives, GL = Geographic location of ith child

We can write in its stochastic form as under:

$$CL_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 CGi + \beta_2 PE_i + \beta_3 HY_i + \beta_4 HG_i + \beta_5 HS_i + \beta_6 HO_i + \beta_7 HA_i + \beta_8 GL_i + \mu_i \quad (2)$$

3.1. Data source and Construction of Variables

For this study we used the data of Pakistan Social and Living Standards Measurement Survey (PSLM) of years 2018-2019. PSLM survey data includes data on all relevant variables, required in our model. It is a representative data which covers almost all regions of the country-rural and urban as well as all four provinces. After adjusting for relevant variables, the total sample size is 63,887 children between ages 10 to 15 years. Out of which 53,232 children are from the rural and others 10,655 are from the urban areas. We reconstruct the variables according to our requirements because the data available in PSLM are not directly fit for our study. The variables are discussed below in detail.

Child Labour (CL)
Child labour is our depended variable which we have divided in to two categories. We use dummy variable where $CL = 1$ if child is involved in labour and $CL = 0$ other wise.

Gender
For gender, we use dummy variable "CG", where CG = 1 if a child is female and CG = 0 otherwise. There are total of 34,652 male children and 29,235 are female children. Male category is a reference category in our model.

Household income
We use household income from all the resources. In this way we get the information of income status of head of house hold i-e mother's income or father's income from the section of (employment) of the questionnaire. Total income of household is the total earning which is received from all resources. First it includes the major source of earning, then it includes the second source if it available. It also includes the others sources like pension, remittances, rent etc.

Wealth
Wealth is a multidimensional variable, so we construct the index of wealth. The index of wealth include twenty consumer durable, access to electricity and water, four type of house characteristics like (material of floor, number of sleeping rooms, facility of toilet, quality of wall material), the source of cooking fuel (electricity, gas, kerosene oil, wood) and source of communication (PTCL, mobiles or both). Moreover it include possession of agriculture and non-agriculture land, property or plot, livestock, chicken and poultry, commercial building, residential building or shop in personal possession are also included.

The information related to the asset of any household can be given a value on wealth index (W). WI which includes the durable of consumer is measured by the variable of two categories. "1" is used for the household owns the durable and "0" for not owns the durable by household. By dividing number of rooms in a house by number of family members we get the information of room per person. Four categories are developed for floor and wall qualities. Different type of six toilets, nine sources of drinking water, seven sources of cooking material, four sources of communication and five sources of light related information is given in questionnaire.

For the construction of variable wealth we use the principle of (PCA) in which we convert all variable i-e (binary, three categories and continuous) in to standardized normal by taking value between "0" and "1".

Household size
We get the information of household size from the roaster of PSLM. The average household size is 8.03 for the child labour data. The smallest household size is 2 and maximum household size is 35 in our data. Household size variable is use as a continuous variable rather than categorical variable.

Occupation of Household head
We collect the data on occupation through PSLM data which contain the information of Pakistan Standard Classification of Occupation (PSCO-1994); PSCO is similar to International Standard Classification of Occupation (ISCO-1988). Occupational categories are defined below:

1. Employer with 1-9 employees: In this category 0.12% head of households working.
2. Employer with 10 or more employees: In this category 0.02% head of households working.
3. Self-employed: In this category 7.61% head of households working.
4. Paid employee: In this category 17.72% head of households working.
5. Unpaid family workers: In this category 57.57% head of households working.
6. Owner cultivator: In this category 0.43% head of households working.
7. Share cropper: In this category 0.08% head of households working.
8. Contract cultivator: In this category 0.06% head of households working.

9. Livestock only: In this category 16.38% head of households working.

Parental education

There are 21 different categories of level of education, including never attend school. We drop the "others" category which contain information about mixed level of education like certificate courses, diploma courses, religious courses etc. Remaining 20 categories combine in to seven categories. For both mother and father seven categories are. (1) Never Attend School (2) less than primary (3) primary (4) middle (5) matric (6) intermediate (7) Graduate and above.

Region

We use the dummy variable for rural-urban area as "1" is used for rural and "0" is used for urban region. We also use three dummy variables for Punjab, Sindh, and Balochistan. KPK is used as a reference category.

4. Results

For results we use two types of methods; descriptive analysis and binomial logistic model

4.1. Descriptive analysis

In descriptive analysis we use the percentage and frequencies to present our results and to check the relationship of independent variables with dependent variable

Table 1: Categories of Dependent Variable

Categories of Dependent Variable	Pakistan	Punjab	KPK	Sindh	Balochistan
Non-Working Children	(57,112)	(22,939)	(10,628)	(14,354)	(9,191)
	89.40%	88.58%	97.15%	87.62%	86.15%
Working Children	(6,775)	(2,958)	(312)	(2,028)	(1,477)
	10.60%	11.42%	2.85%	12.38%	13.85%
Total	(63,887)	(25,897)	(10,940)	(16,382)	(10,668)
	100%	100%	100%	100 %	100%

Source: Author's Estimations

Table 1 shows the two categories of dependent variable, children involve in child labour and children who's not involve in child labour. Between the ages of 10 to 15 years old children 10.60 percent children are doing child labour while 89.40 percent of children are not doing child labour, out of 63,887 total children. The percentage of child labour in Punjab is 11.42%, in KPK is 2.85%, in Sindh is 12.38% and in Balochistan is 13.85%. The percentage of child labour is high in Balochistan.

Table 2: Gender of children and dependent variable

Categories of Dependent Variables	Male	Female	Total
Non-Working Children	29903	27,209	57,112
	(52.36%)	(47.64%)	(100%)
Working Children	4,749	2,026	6,775
	(70.10%)	(20.90%)	(100%)
Total	34,652	29,235	63,887
	(54.24%)	(45.76%)	(100%)

Source: Author's Estimations

Table 2 is shows percentage of male and female children involves in child labour. Out of total children 63,887, female children are 29235 in which 47.64% are not doing child labour while 29,235 are doing child

labour. While male children are 34652 in which 52.36% are not doing child labour while 70.10% are doing child labour.

Table 3: Regional effects and dependent variable

Region	Rural Region	Urban Region	Total
Non-working Children	46,942 (88.18%)	10,170 (95.45)%	57,112 (100%)
Working Children	6,290 (11.82%)	485 (4.55%)	6,775 (100%)
Total	53,232 (100%)	10,655 (100%)	63,887 (100%)

Source: Author's Estimations

This table is showing the percentage of working and non-working children in rural and urban regions of Pakistan. Results of this table show that in rural areas 88.18% while in urban areas 95.45% children are not doing child labour. While the percentage of working children in rural region is 11.82% and 4.55% in urban region.

Table 4: Employment Status of Head of Household and Dependent Variable

Employment Status (Head)	Working Children (%)	Non-working Children (%)
Employer with 1-9 Employees	17.62	82.38
Employer with 10 or more Employees	22.43	77.57
Self Employed	28.76	71.24
Paid Employee	33.39	66.61
Unpaid Family Workers	66.12	33.88
Owner Cultivator	40.98	59.02
Share Cropper	64.47	35.53
Contract Cultivator	40.04	59.96
Livestock only	59.86	40.14

Source: Author's Estimations

Table 4 shows the head of household status of their occupations and the status of their children as working or non-working children. The percentage of working children is high for those head of household who are working as unpaid workers. Families related to the occupations like agriculture or livestock's child labour percentage is also high there. While the families whose heads are paid employees or self-employees their children are less involved in child labour.

Table 5: Reasons of Children not going to Schools (%)

Reasons	Pakistan	Punjab	KPK	Sindh	Balochistan
Expensive Education	6.28	9.99	7.87	3.29	4.14
Too Far	11.49	12.29	22.98	7.99	9.76
Poor Quality Education	2.65	0.92	0.62	4.84	3.16
Had to Work at Home	5.85	5.58	7.66	3.78	8.28
Had to Help with Work	2.47	1.45	2.48	2.73	3.65
Parents do not Allow	28.48	33.05	13.87	23.2	36.0
Limited Female Teachers	4.95	0.53	4.35	8.55	6.80
Child not Willing	13.92	15.51	13.46	15.35	9.76
Education not Useful	4.88	5.26	6.63	2.87	6.31

Due to Job or Work	3.31	4.14	1.04	4.34	1.68
Shortage of Male Teachers	0.36	0.07	0.00	0.91	0.20
Lack of Documents	0.31	0.00	0.00	0.21	1.08
Too Young	0.36	0.79	0.00	0.14	0.20
Marriage	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.00
Handicapped	0.18	0.39	0.00	0.14	0.00
Education Complete	0.16	0.13	0,00	0.35	0.00
Others	14.33	9.92	19.05	21.23	8.97
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Author's Estimations

This table shows the important reasons of not going school children in Pakistan. The main and the biggest reason of non-going school children is poor financial conditions of their parents and they not allowed them to go school and get good education. By this reason 28.48% non-going school children through overall Pakistan lies in this category. Second biggest reason of non-going school children is lack of their interest in studies. The third biggest reason for non-going school children are "school so far" from their location.

4.2. Binomial Logistic Model

Table 6: LR chi2 (23) = 6762

Child labour	Log Odd Ratio	Std. Err.	P values	Odd Ratio	Marginal Effects (%)
Female	-0.808*	0.029	0.00	0.45	-0.065
Less than Primary (Father)	-0.315*	0.066	0.00	0.73	-0.030
Primary (Father)	-0.562*	0.042	0.00	0.57	-0.049
Middle (Father)	-0.909*	0.069	0.00	0.40	-0.071
Matric (Father)	-1.116*	0.065	0.00	0.33	-0.081
Intermediated (Father)	-1.313*	0.109	0.00	0.27	-0.090
Graduate and Above(Father)	-1.920*	0.162	0.00	0.15	-0.108
Less than Primary (Mother)	-0.432*	0.131	0.00	0.65	-0.033
Primary (Mother)	-0.741*	0.088	0.00	0.48	-0.051
Middle (Mother))	-1.135*	0.189	0.00	0.32	-0.069
Matric (Mother)	-1.469*	0.224	0.00	0.23	-0.080
Intermediated (Mother)	-2.028*	0.507	0.00	0.13	-0.093
Graduate and Above (Mother)	-2.427*	0.720	0.00	0.09	-0.099
Wealth	-0.001	0.002	0.60	0.99	0.000
Fathers Income	-0.01***	0.007	0.07	0.99	-0.001
Mothers Income	-0.08***	0.052	0.09	0.92	-0.007
Household Size	0.014**	0.005	0.01	1.01	0.001
Mother Working	0.820*	0.152	0.00	2.27	0.068
Father Working	-0.493*	0.082	0.00	0.61	-0.041
Both Mother and Father Working	0.473*	0.154	0.00	1.60	0.039
Urban	-0.360*	0.053	0.00	0.70	-0.028
Punjab	1.392*	0.063	0.00	4.02	0.076
Sindh	1.479*	0.065	0.00	4.39	0.084
Balochistan	1.813*	0.066	0.00	6.13	0.118
Constant	-0.373	0.293	0.20	0.69	0.105

Standard errors in parentheses* p<0.01, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.1
Source: Author's Estimations

Overall the above model is statistically significant at 1% level of significance showing the high value (6762) of likelihood ratio (LR) and probability of chi-square is 0.0000. This is presenting that the variables which are used in this model are very essential and cannot be omitted. Practically R2 (measure of goodness of fit) is not important in the case of that a model in where dependent variable is binary (Gujarati 2004). Therefore, there are some further measures of goodness of fit which are available also like McFadden and Pseudo R2. Pseudo R2 shows the value of 0.115. Through goodness of fit in probabilities model is not important, well the important thing is the level of significance and expected signs of coefficient (Gujarati, 2004). And the marginal effect of all variables are showing their effects in percentage point.

The coefficient of gender dummy shows that being a female child the probability of doing work reduces by 0.065 percentage points. However, it should also be noted that in Pakistan girls are mostly involved in household chores which are not reported as a work and boys are mostly doing work outside the home which are reported. So in this case our estimates might be biased in favor of boys to involve largely in child labour. Coefficients of father's levels of education are negative and are highly significant showing that children of educated fathers are less likely to involve in child labour as compared to the children whose fathers never attend school. Further, the coefficients of education are increasing in magnitude with the increase in level of education indicating that with the increase in level of education of fathers the probability in favor of working by children are decreasing. For example the probability of doing work reduce by 0.049 percentage points if the father education is less than primary relative to never attend school while the probability of doing work decrease 0.108 percentage points if the fathers level of education is graduate or above relative to never attend school.

The results also show that level of education of mother has negative impact on child labour. As the level of education of mother increases they become more conscious about their children education. In this way children of more educated mothers are less likely to involve in child labour as compare to less educated mothers. Coefficients of mother's levels of education are negative and significant. This indicates that children of educated mothers are less likely to do work as compared to the children whose mothers never attend school. For example the probability of doing work reduce by 0.033 percentage points if the mothers education is less than primary relative to never attend school while the probability of doing work decrease 0.093 percentage points if the mothers level of education is graduate or above relative to never attend school.

In general with the increase in level of income of the fathers decreases the chances of their children to involve in child labour. They are more intending to educate their children. Our findings show that when level of income of father increases by one unit (100000 per annum) probability of children to do work decreases by 0.001. However, our results show that mother's income and child labour are also negative related, that is as the level of mother's income increases child labour decreasing. If the level of income of a mother increases by 100000 per annum, the probability of child labour decreases by 0.007 percentage points.

Results are also showing that if the fathers of children are working in market and earning some income decrease the chance of their children to work in labour market. Findings showing that if the father of child are working father the probability of doing work by children decrease by 0.041. While the coefficient of working mothers is positive significantly relate with child labour, this is showing that if the mother of child is a working woman the probability of doing work increase by 0.068 percentage points. Results are also showing that if the mothers and fathers both are doing work in labour market it has significant positive effect on child labour. If both the fathers and mothers are doing labour the probability increase by 0.039 percentage points. Pakistan is an agriculture country. Most of the working mothers and fathers work in agriculture sector and they belong to poor financial background. They try to involve their children in same labour work because they want to more increase their family income to make their financial situation better. Basu and Van (1998) found that the demand for schooling by land holder heads is less than child labour. They considered that professional skills related to their agriculture land or farm houses are more important

than schooling that's why they involve their children in work from the very young age. Results also reveal that wealth of the family have no significant impact on child labour.

Our estimates also show that household size have positive impact on child labour. Normally households live in rural areas are poor and have large family sizes. Coefficient of household size indicates that if a household size increase by one person probability of child labour will increase by 0.001 percentage points. It is due to the fact that a large family size has to meet a larger expense of household to fulfill the basic requirements of life. Therefore, the poor people involve their children in labour market.

Our results also show that the coefficient of urban region is negative which shows that living in urban areas reduces the probability in favor of child labour decreases by 0.028 percentage points. The condition of child labour is also different across the four provinces of Pakistan. Results show that children belongs to Balochistan have greater tendency to participate in child labour followed by Sindh, Punjab and KPK.

4.3. Why we do the marginal effects?

We can write the binomial logistic model as $\log(x = \frac{p}{1-p}) = \beta 0 + \beta 1 age + \beta 2 male$. The estimated parameters are in the log-odds scale, which, other than the sign, don't have any useful interpretation In the above equation, β1 is the effect of age on the log-odds of the outcome, not on the probability, which is often what were care about As an alternative, economists prefer to estimate Probit models for binary outcomes But still similar problem.

Odds-ratios are often misinterpreted as if they were relative risks/probabilities A simple example with no covariates Say that the probability of death in a control group is 0.40. The probability of death in the treatment group is 0.20 the odds-ratio is $\frac{\frac{0.2}{1-0.2}}{\frac{0.4}{1-0.4}} = 0.375$. The treatment reduces the odds of death by a factor of 0.375. Or in reverse, the odds of death are 2.67 higher in the control group (1/ 0.375) but that's not the relative risk, even though most people would interpret the odds ratio as a relative risk. The relative risk is 0.2/0.4 = 0.5. The probability of death is reduced by half in the treatment group. With odds ratios and relative risks, we don't have a sense of the magnitude. Same example but now the probability of death in the control group is 0.0004 and 0.0002 in the treatment group. The odds ratio is still 0.375 and the relative risk is still 0.5. The magnitudes are of course quite different. As we will see, marginal effects is a way of presenting results as differences in probabilities, which is more informative than odds ratios and relative risks.

5 Conclusion and Recommandations

In our empirical analysis we used PSLM 2018-19 for our descriptive analysis as well as regression analysis. Our results are showing that 10.60 percent children out of total children 63887 are doing child labour. The percentage of child labour is high in Balochistan (13.85%) as compared to other provinces like Sindh (12.38%), Punjab (11.42%) and KPK (2.85%). Child labour proportion is also high in rural areas of Pakistan (11.82%) as compared to urban regions (4.55%). The difference of childlabour also exist among genders like child labour is high for male children (13.7%) as compare to female children (6.07%) in Pakistan. However another side is showing that percentage for female non-going school children is also high as compare to male non-going school children in Pakistan. The basic reason behind this large proportion of non-going school female children is that they are mostly involved in household chores or remain idle at their homes.

The results of logit model regression are also showing that female children are less involve in child labour in Pakistan. Results also show that when the level of parent's education increases the probability of child labour decreases as compared to uneducated parents. Because educated parents know about the important of education for their children. Parental income shows the negative impact on child labour as the income of parents increase they become financially strong to afford the expenses of their children education. Only in

urban region in the case of mother income increases child labour also increases because due to their poor economic condition increase in mothers income encourage to involve their children to get more money.

Household size has positive impact on child labour because with large family size it is difficult to bear their educational expenses by poor families. In Pakistan child labour is high in rural areas as compare to urban areas, because Pakistan in an agriculture country and this sector is not much developed and majority of people living in rural areas and earn through this sector. To enhance the skill of their children in this sector that started to involve them in this sector from their early ages instead to send them to schools.

References

Admassie, A. (2003). Child labour and schooling in the context of a subsistence rural economy: can they be compatible? *International Journal of Educational Development, 23*(2), 167-185.

Ahmed, I. (1999). Getting rid of child labour. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 1815-1822.

Akabayashi, H., & Psacharopoulos, G. (1999). The trade-off between child labour and human capital formation: A Tanzanian case study. *The Journal of Development Studies, 35*(5), 120-140.

Ali, K., & Hamid, A. (1999). Major determinants of female child labour in urban Multan (Punjab-Pakistan).

Arshad, M., Razzaq, Z., & Mahmood, K. (2015). Anxiety and Depression Level Among Child Labour. *European Journal of Psychological Research Vol, 2*(1).

Arunatilake, N. (2006). Education participation in Sri Lanka—Why all are not in school. *International Journal of Educational Research, 45*(3), 137-152.

Beegle, K., Dehejia, R., & Gatti, R. (2003). Child labor, crop shocks, and credit constraints: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Beegle, K., Dehejia, R., Gatti, R., & Krutikova, S. (2008). *The consequences of child labor: evidence from longitudinal data in rural Tanzania*: World Bank Washington, DC.

Bhalotra, S. (2007). Is child work necessary? *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics, 69*(1), 29-55.

Brown, D. K., Deardorff, A. V., & Stern, R. M. (2002). *The determinants of child labor: theory and evidence*: School of Public Policy, University of Michigan.

Cardoso, A. R., & Verner, D. (2007). School drop-out and push-out factors in Brazil: The role of early parenthood, child labor, and poverty.

Chakrabarty, S., Grote, U., & Lüchters, G. (2006). The trade-off between child labor and schooling: influence of social labeling NGOs in Nepal: ZEF discussion papers on development policy.

Chaudhary, M. A., & Khan, F. N. (2002). Economic and Social Determinants of Child Labour: A Case Study of Dera Ismail Khan, Pakistan.

Chaudhuri, S., & Dwibedi, J. K. (2007). Foreign capital inflow, fiscal policies and incidence of child labour in a developing economy. *The Manchester School, 75*(1), 17-46.

Dalal, K. (2008). *Causes and consequences of violence against child labour and women in developing countries*: Institutionen för folkhälsovetenskap/Department of Public Health Sciences.

Dessy, S., & Pallage, S. (2003). Taxes, inequality and the size of the informal sector. *Journal of Development Economics, 70*(1), 225-233.

Dillon, A. (2008). *Access to irrigation and the escape from poverty: Evidence from northern Mali* (Vol. 782): Intl Food Policy Res Inst.

Edmonds, E. V., & Pavcnik, N. (2005). Child labor in the global economy. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 19*(1), 199-220.

Emerson, P. M., & Knabb, S. D. (2006). Opportunity, inequality and the intergenerational transmission of child labour. *Economica, 73*(291), 413-434.

GATTI, R. (2005). Child Labor: The Role of Financial Development and Income Variability across Countries.

Hussain, M., & Kashif, M. (2013). Help to helpers: A Quantitative Study on Child Labor in Pakistan and Dynamic Solutions. *Pakistaniaat: A Journal of Pakistan Studies, 5*(3).

Jafarey, S., & Lahiri, S. (2002). Will trade sanctions reduce child labour?: The role of credit markets. *Journal of Development Economics, 68*(1), 137-156.

Jafri, S. Y., & Raishad, S. Y. (1997). Some dimensions of child labour in Pakistan. *The Pakistan Development Review*, 69-86.

JAMIL, H., FARRUKH, K., & JAVED, M. A. Some facts about Child Labour: A study for protecting Lahore from teenage greed.

Khan, R. E. A. (2003). Children in different activities: child schooling and child labour. *The Pakistan Development Review*, 137-160.

McFadden, D. (1973) Conditional Logit Analysis of Qualitative Choice Behaviour. In Paul Zarembka (ed.) *Frontiers in Econometrics.* New York: Academic Press.

Menon, M., Perali, F., & Rosati, F. (2005). The shadow wage of child labour: An application to Nepal. *Understanding Children's Work: An Inter-Agency Research Cooperation Project*.

Muhammad, R., & Zubairi, N. A. A Sociological Study of Socio-Economic Dimensions of Child Labour In New Vegetable And Fruit Market Karachi. *Research Journal Social Sciences*, 51.

Pouliot, W. (2006). Introducing uncertainty into Baland and Robinson's model of child labour. *Journal of Development Economics, 79*(1), 264-272.

Ray, R. (2002). Simultaneous Analysis of Child Labour and Child Schooling: Comparative Evidence from Nepal and Pakistan. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 5215-5224.

Soares, J. (2010). Welfare impact of a ban on child labor. *Economic Inquiry, 48*(4), 1048-1064.

Strulik, H. (2004). Economic growth and stagnation with endogenous health and fertility. *Journal of Population Economics, 17*(3), 433-453.

Thabet, A., Matar, S., Carpintero, A., Bankart, J., & Vostanis, P. (2011). Mental health problems among labour children in the Gaza Strip. *Child: care, health and development, 37*(1), 89-95.

Wahba, J. (2000). *Child labor and poverty transmission: no room for dreams*.

Zaidi, N., Javed, N., & Khan, M. S. (2013). Child Labour in Pakistan-A tip of an iceberg. *Journal of Postgraduate Medical Institute (Peshawar-Pakistan), 27*(3).

Zainab, S., & Kadir, M. M. (2016). Nutritional status and physical abuse among the children involved in domestic labour in Karachi Pakistan: a cross-sectional survey. *JPMA. The Journal of the Pakistan Medical Association, 66*(10), 1243.

Acknowledgments

We sincerely thank the reviewers for their invaluable feedback and insightful suggestions, which have significantly enhanced the quality of this work.

Disclosure statement

There is no conflict between authors to produce this research and every author(s) took effort to contribute his part.

Disclaimer

The views and opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author alone and do not necessarily reflect the views of any institution.