

Working Paper #150

**How Does Socio-Economic Factors Force  
Children into Child Labour?  
A case study of Sahiwal district, Punjab,  
Pakistan**

Syed Mohsin Ali Kazmi<sup>1</sup>



**SDPI**  
Sustainable Development Policy Institute

---

<sup>1</sup> Email: [mohsinali@sdpi.org](mailto:mohsinali@sdpi.org)/[mohsinstats@yahoo.com](mailto:mohsinstats@yahoo.com)

All rights reserved. No part of this paper may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or information storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission of the publisher.

A publication of the Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI).

The opinions expressed in the papers are solely those of the authors, and publishing them does not in any way constitute an endorsement of the opinion by the SDPI.

Sustainable Development Policy Institute is an independent, non-profit research institute on sustainable development.

First edition: April 2015

© 2015 by the Sustainable Development Policy Institute

Mailing Address: PO Box 2342, Islamabad, Pakistan

Telephone: 0092-51-2278134, 2278136, 2277146, 2270674-76

Fax: 0092-51-2278135, URL: [www.sdpi.org](http://www.sdpi.org),

## **Contents**

Abstract .....	1
Keywords .....	1
1. Introduction .....	1
2. Literature Review.....	1
2.1. The World View of Child labour .....	2
2.2. Child Labour in Pakistan.....	2
3. Methodology .....	3
3.1. Sampling Design .....	4
3.2. Analysis Technique .....	4
4. Results and Discussion .....	4
4.1. Univariate Analysis .....	4
4.2. Bivariate Analysis .....	7
4.3. Probit Model.....	10
5. Conclusion .....	11
6. Policy Recommendations.....	12
References.....	14

## **Abstract**

Child labour is a socio-economic issue, which not only wrecks the social growth but also damages the moral fabrics of the society. This study analyzes the socio-economic factors that force children into child labour. In order to find out the key factors of child labour, the techniques of univariate analysis and bivariate analysis have been used in the study. Pearson Chi Square Test and Spearman Rank Correlation have also been employed to check the significant association between the factors. After the identification of significant factors, probit model has been carried out so as to find out the probability and whether the identified factors belong to child labour or not.

The results show that the socio-economic factors like poverty, parents' low level of education, poor livelihood conditions, education being costly and inaccessible, lack of awareness about child labour, hazardous working conditions and parental occupation significantly correlate with child labour.

## **Keywords**

Child Labour, Univariate Analysis, Bivariate Analysis, Pearson Chi Square, Spearman Rank Correlation, Probit Regression Analysis

## **1. Introduction**

The term child labour refers to the child engagement in any work that deprived him of his right to education and childhood, and is mentally, physically, socially or morally harmful and exploitative. It depends on several key factors like poverty, health care, parents' education, lack of awareness about the laws and social status (Awan et al 2011). The study was conducted in Sahiwal district, Punjab, to review the current situation of child labour there. The study has three major objectives.

1. To highlight the current situation of child labour in Sahiwal district.
2. To analyze the existing and influential socio-economic factors, which are directly and indirectly related to child labour.
3. To expose the social, cultural and moral phenomenon behind child labour

## **2. Literature Review**

Amazingly, no precise definition of this 'criminal act' is available in literature. Even the term child has different connotations in different cultures, regions, and literatures. Earlier, there were two categories of child labour. First category comprises children working in factories, and second category consists of those who are involved in the activities that may hamper their education or endanger their physical health (Encarta 2006). According to Britannica (2005), it is the employment of children of less than a pre-specified legal age. Different organizations such as INGOs, NGOs, CBOs, trade unions and other interest groups define child labour in their own

contexts and perspectives. For instance, the International Labour Organization (2002) has identified three categories of child labour, that is: first, the labour performed by a child, who is under minimum age specified by the national legislation; second, the labour that is harmful for the physical and moral well-being of a child; third, the unconditional worst form defined by international laws. Most of the countries, including Pakistan, and a number of development agencies follow this definition of child labour. However, a number of societies/communities do not consider it a harmful or unlawful act except in those conditions when it brings about broader and long-term effects on the education, health and development of children.

Most of the people intermingles child labour with child work though there is a technical difference between the two. There is a general perception that the work done without any financial compensation is child work whereas if children are engaged in mental or physical activity for economic benefits, it is child labour. This is not true. According to ILO (2002), child work means the positive contribution of children in an economic activity, which is not harmful for their health and physical development. On the contrary, child labour refers to all types of work, which violates the international labour laws.

### **2.1. The World View of Child labour**

Child labour affects both the physical and mental health of children ultimately bringing an imbalance in their lives. It is socially and ethically destructive for children and an intrusion between the children and their schooling, and force them to leave the school (ILO 2006). In developing countries, child labour is increasing with an increase in population. Approximately 168 million children in the world are engaged in child labour, which is nearly 11 per cent of the total world child population (ILO 2013). Among them, 85 million are directly engaged in hazardous works, which is a threat to their social and ethical upbringing. 73 million (44 per cent) children aging between 5 to 14 are involved in labour, which is the largest share of total child labourers. Similarly, 218 million children aging between 5-14 are engaged in labour, excluding domestic labour across the world, while 126 million children are engaged in hazardous works (UNICEF 2007).

A careful analysis shows that child labour is a socio-economic issue, which is directly or indirectly related to poverty.

### **2.2. Child Labour in Pakistan**

In Pakistan, it is hardly possible to make specific estimates of child labour due to non-availability of dataset at national and provincial level. The last official survey to identify the characteristics of child labour was undertaken in 1996. Unfortunately, experts are utilizing this two-decade old data in today's researches. According to 1996 survey, there were a total of 40 million children aging between 5-14 years, which was almost 30 per cent of the country's total population. Among them 3.3 million children of the same age group were engaged in child labour. Out of the

3.3 million, 2.4 million (73 per cent) were boys and 0.9 million (27 per cent) were girls. About 2.9 million children (89 per cent) belonged to rural areas whereas 0.3 million (11 per cent) were from urban areas. Likewise, the provincial distribution indicated that child labour in the Punjab was about 1.9 million (about 59 per cent of the total child labour in Pakistan) while 0.3 million (9 per cent) in Sindh, One million (31 per cent) in NWFP (currently KPK), and 14,000 (0.4 per cent) in Balochistan (Federal Bureau of Statistics 1996).

Since 2000, a number of national and international organizations have been conducting surveys to analyze the current situation of child labour in Pakistan. According to ILO (2009), in rural areas, children's engagement in work-related activities is eight times less than urban areas. Children aging between 10-14 are four times more economically active as compared to the children aging between 5- 9. Economically-active children aging between 10-- 17 work more than normal working hours. , which is significantly higher in urban areas as compared to rural areas. Similarly, working conditions in urban areas are worse compared to rural areas. Awan et al. (2011) highlighted the supply side determinants of child labour in the case of the Punjab by utilizing Multiple Indicators Cluster Survey (MICS), 2007-08 dataset. To explore the determinants of child labour, they used Probit model; their results showed that the absence of parents' education and low level of family income were the major factors, which compelled the children to perform some economic activity. They also showed that more boys were engaged in child labour as compared to girls. Most important finding of their research was that poverty was negatively related to school enrolment while school enrolment was negatively related to labour.

Keeping in view the Pakistan's context that schooling and low family income were negatively related to each other while poverty and child labour had positive relationship, Ray (2001) mentions that Islamic laws were the main reason behind low female school enrolment. Maitra and Rajan (2000) employed the logit regression to find the relationship between socio-economic variables and child labour and that poverty and family size were the major reasons behind child labour. Ray (2000) utilized Three Stage Least Square (TSLS) method to explore the determinants of child labour and found out that boys worked longer than girls while adults' education has positive and significant effect on child education. He further highlighted that rural children were poorer than the urban ones whereas inequality has negative relationship with poverty. Khan and Ejaz (2003) explored that 75 per cent of the working children aging between 4-8 were engaged in labour and they got Rs 10-60 on daily basis. This study also explored that poor economic conditions, parents' education and large family size were the key factors behind child labour.

### **3. Methodology**

The data of our baseline survey gives necessary information about the households for the classification of child labour. The aim of the survey was to estimate the prevalence of child labour and identify its cause and significance in terms of socio-economic dynamics. For the

survey, 'child labour' was defined as all persons aged 5-17, who, during a specific time period, fall on any one of following categories.

1. A child under 12, who is economically active for one or more hours per week
2. A child aging between 12-14, who is economically active for at least 14 hours per week
3. A child aging between 15-17, who is economically active for at least 43 hours per week
4. A child aging between 5-17, who participates in activities that are "hazardous by nature or circumstances" for one or more hours per week
5. A child aging between 5-17, who is used in an "unconditional worst form of child labour" such as trafficking, bondage or forced labour, armed conflict, prostitution, pornography, illicit activities, etc.

### **3.1. Sampling Design**

To reduce the heterogeneity prevailing within a target population that may increase variations, Multistage Cluster Sampling technique with equal allocation was used to reduce the sampling error. The updated list of 30 enumeration blocks (i.e. 10 urban and 20 rural) of the district, was provided by Pakistan Bureau of Statistics. In these 30 enumeration blocks, 27 clusters were formed in urban areas and 129 in rural areas. Each of the clusters had 100 household on average. 30 clusters were selected randomly, i.e. 10 for urban areas and 20 for rural areas for screening household. An exclusively devised screening questionnaire was used to identify the working children and their households in the selected clusters. In each cluster, 10 households with working children were randomly selected. From the whole target population, the sample size is

1. Screening questionnaire  $n = 3000$  (100 from each clusters)
2. Household questionnaire  $n = 310$  (from 30 selected clusters)
3. Child Age (5-17) = 876 (Average 29 from each cluster)

### **3.2. Analysis Technique**

For this paper, data has been treated and scrutinize by using SPSS 20 and STATA 10. The univariate classification analysis has been executed to examine the socio-economic factors of child labour. In addition, bivariate classification analysis has also been performed to explore the socio-economic associations of child labour. Finally, Probit Regression Analysis (PRA) technique has been employed in order to find the impact of socio-economic factors on child labour.

## **4. Results and Discussion**

### **4.1. Univariate Analysis**

A brief comparison of the respondents in respect of socio-economic factors (see table 1) shows that 42.5% respondents are engaged in child labour. There is a strong variation in urban and rural areas so the largest percentage (75.5 %) of respondents comes from rural areas while 24.3% from

urban areas. The study reveals that maximum respondents (32.2 %) belong to the age group of 11-14 years. There is a robust variation in cross gender child labour, as 53.2% among child labourers were males, a higher ratio compared to females. Among all the respondents, 23.2% were reported to be illiterate while 12.8% got pre-school education, 44.7% accomplished primary education, 14% finalized their secondary education, and 5.3% left school after finishing their high school education. In the collected sample, 74.3% respondents said that they had their own house while 21.7% lived in rented houses. As most of the respondents were from rural areas, therefore, 52.6% children were involved in agricultural activities whereas 47.4% were engaged in non-agricultural activities. 49.2% respondents worked more than four hours a day, which is obviously a hazardous work. Most of the working children were employed on daily wages and 64.4% had their daily income less than 100 rupees, which is highest as compared to others. Among all the respondents, 74.8% said that poverty is the major reason behind their work. Only 28.8% working children stated that there were superficial injuries during work. Table 1 shows that 82.1% respondent received sufficient food while 17.9% were unable to get it. Among all the respondents, 42.5% children said that they were involved in hazardous work while 57.5% were not. 54.5% said their parents were illiterate while rest of the 45.5% parents were literate.

Table.1 Selected socio-economic factors of the child labour.

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Frequency N=876</b>	<b>Percentage (100)</b>
<b>Engaged in Child labour</b>		
No Child labour	504	57.5
Child Labour	372	42.5
<b>Locality</b>		
Urban	213	24.3
Rural	663	75.7
<b>Age</b>		
5 - 8 years	202	23.1
9 - 10 years	126	14.4
11 - 14 years	282	32.2
15 - 17 years	266	30.4
<b>Sex</b>		
Female	410	46.8
Male	466	53.2

<b>Educational Status</b>		
Illiterate	203	23.2
Pre-School (i)	112	12.8
Primary School (ii-v)	392	44.7
Secondary School (vi-viii)	123	14.0
High School (ix-x)	46	5.3
<b>Livelihood</b>		
Rented house	190	21.7
Own House	651	74.3
Other	35	4.0
<b>Occupation</b>		
Non-Agriculture labour	415	47.4
Agriculture labour	461	52.6
<b>Working time per day</b>		
1 - 3 hours	125	14.3
4 - 5 hours	320	36.5
5+ hours	431	49.2
<b>Income</b>		
Less than 100 Rupees	564	64.4
100 - 199 Rupees	221	25.2
More than 200 Rupees	91	10.4
<b>Cause behind child labour</b>		
Poverty	655	74.8
Self will	142	16.2
Parent will	79	9.0
<b>Injuries during work</b>		
No	631	72.0
Yes	245	28.0
<b>Food</b>		
No	157	17.9

Yes	719	82.1
<b>Hazardous work</b>		
No	504	57.5
Yes	372	42.5
<b>Parental Education</b>		
Illiterate	399	54.5
Literate	477	45.5

## 4.2. Bivariate Analysis

This section presents association between the different age levels of child labour and some of their socio-economic activities. For bivariate analysis, renowned statistical methods like Pearson Chi-square Test and Spearman Rank Correlation were utilized. The results are given below in Table 2. Most of the results reveal that there is a significant difference in the age levels of respondents and socio-economic factors, i.e. engagement in child labour, level of education, type of livelihood, occupation, working hours, cause behind child labour, injuries during work, food for health situation, hazardous work, and parental education. The study also reveals that most of the socio-economic factors also significantly correlate with the different age levels.

Table.2 Correlation between different age levels and some selected socio-economic factors of child labour

Socio Economic variable	Age Levels of Child Labour				Total
	5 - 8	9 - 10	11 - 14	15 - 17	
<b>Engagement in Work</b>					
No Child Labour	178 (88.1)	96 (76.2)	155 (55.0)	75 (28.2)	504 (57.5)
Child Labour	24 (11.9)	30 (23.8)	127 (45.0)	191 (71.8)	372 (42.5)
Total	202 (100)	126 (100)	282 (100)	266 (100)	876 (100)
$\chi^2 = 189.76$ d.f = 3 P<0.001 Spearman Rank Correlation = 0.46 Sig <0.001					
<b>Locality</b>					
Urban	43 (21.3)	25 (19.8)	76 (27.0)	69 (25.9)	213 (24.3)
Rural	159 (78.7)	101 (80.2)	206 (73.0)	197 (74.1)	663 (75.7)
Total	202 (100)	126 (100)	282 (100)	266 (100)	876 (100)
$\chi^2 = 3.823$ d.f = 3 P= 0.28 Spearman Rank Correlation = -0.05 Sig =0.23					
<b>Sex</b>					
Female	103 (51.0)	58 (46.0)	139 (49.3)	110 (41.4)	410 (46.8)
Male	99 (49.0)	68 (54.0)	143 (50.7)	156 (58.6)	466 (53.2)
Total	202 (100)	126 (100)	282 (100)	266 (100)	876 (100)

$\chi^2 = 5.326$ d.f = 3 P= 0.149 Spearman Rank Correlation = 0.065 Sig <0.01					
<b>Educational Status</b>					
Illiterate	49 (24.3)	17 (13.5)	63 (22.3)	74 (27.8)	203 (23.2)
Pre-School (i)	86 (42.6)	15 (11.9)	6 (2.1)	5 (1.9)	112 (12.8)
Primary (ii-v)	67 (33.2)	94 (74.6)	140 (49.6)	100 (37.6)	401 (45.8)
Secondary (vi-viii)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	66 (23.4)	49 (18.4)	115 (13.10)
High School (ix-x)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	7 (2.5)	38 (14.3)	45 (5.1)
Total	202 (100)	126 (100)	282 (100)	266 (100)	876 (100)
$\chi^2 = 368.0$ d.f = 12 P<.001 Spearman Rank Correlation = 0.275 Sig <0.001					
<b>Livelihood</b>					
Rented house	36 (17.8)	28 (22.2)	52 (18.4)	74 (27.8)	190 (21.7)
Own House	161 (79.7)	97 (77.0)	212 (75.2)	181 (68.0)	651 (74.3)
Other	5 (2.5)	1 (0.8)	18 (6.4)	11 (4.1)	35 (4.0)
Total	202 (100)	126 (100)	282 (100)	266 (100)	876 (100)
$\chi^2 = 18.174$ d.f = 6 P<.01 Spearman Rank Correlation = -0.057 Sig =0.093					
<b>Occupation</b>					
Non-Agriculture labour	79 (39.1)	49 (38.9)	137 (48.6)	150 (56.4)	415 (47.4)
Agriculture labour	123 (60.9)	77 (61.1)	145 (51.4)	116 (43.6)	461 (52.6)
Total	202 (100)	126 (100)	282 (100)	266 (100)	876 (100)
$\chi^2 =$ Chi Square 18.013 d.f = 3 P<.001 Spearman Rank Correlation = -0.140 Sig <0.001					
<b>Working time per day</b>					
1 - 3 hours	47 (23.3)	14 (11.1)	39 (13.8)	25 (9.4)	125 (14.3)
4 - 5 hours	99 (49.0)	60 (47.6)	94 (33.3)	67 (25.2)	320 (36.5)
5+ hours	56 (27.7)	52 (41.3)	149 (52.8)	174 (65.4)	431 (49.2)
Total	202 (100)	126 (100)	282 (100)	266 (100)	876 (100)
$\chi^2 =$ Chi Square 75.33 d.f = 6 P<.001 Spearman Rank Correlation = 0.261 Sig <0.001					
<b>Income</b>					
Less than 100 Rupees	142 (70.3)	88 (69.8)	178 (63.1)	156 (58.6)	564 (64.4)
100 - 199 Rupees	38 (18.8)	28 (22.2)	75 (26.6)	80 (30.1)	221(25.2)
More than 200 Rupees	22 (10.9)	10 (7.9)	29 (10.3)	30 (11.3)	91 (10.4)

Total	202 (100)	126 (100)	282 (100)	266 (100)	876 (100)
$\chi^2 = 10.58$ d.f = 6 P=0.104 Spearman Rank Correlation = 0.089 Sig <0.01					
<b>Cause behind child labour</b>					
Poverty	136 (67.3)	102 (81.0)	219 (77.7)	198 (74.4)	655 (74.8)
Self will	55 (27.2)	14 (11.1)	37 (13.1)	36 (13.5)	142 (16.2)
Parent will	11 (5.4)	10 (7.9)	26 (9.2)	32 (12.0)	79 (9.0)
Total	202 (100)	126 (100)	282 (100)	266 (100)	876 (100)
$\chi^2 = 28.154$ d.f = 6 P<.001 Spearman Rank Correlation = -0.022 Sig =0.512					
<b>Injuries during work</b>					
No	183 (90.6)	109 (86.5)	196 (69.5)	143 (53.5)	631 (72.0)
Yes	19 (9.4)	17 (13.5)	86 (30.5)	123 (46.2)	245 (28.0)
Total	202 (100)	126 (100)	282 (100)	266 (100)	876 (100)
Chi Square 92.634 d.f = 3 P<.001 Spearman Rank Correlation = 0.323 Sig <.001					
<b>Food</b>					
No	8 (4.0)	13 (10.3)	61 (21.6)	75 (28.2)	157 (17.9)
Yes	194 (96.0)	113 (89.7)	221 (78.4)	191 (71.8)	719 (82.1)
Total	202 (100)	126 (100)	282 (100)	266 (100)	876 (100)
$\chi^2 = 53.443$ d.f = 3 P<.001 Spearman Rank Correlation = -0.243 Sig <.001					
<b>Hazardous work</b>					
No	178 (88.1)	96 (76.2)	155 (55.0)	75 (28.2)	504 (57.5)
Yes	24 (11.9)	30 (23.8)	127 (45.0)	191 (71.8)	372 (42.5)
Total	202 (100)	126 (100)	282 (100)	266 (100)	876 (100)
$\chi^2 = 189.762$ d.f = 3 P<.001 Spearman Rank Correlation = 0.46 Sig <.001					
<b>Parental Education</b>					
Illiterate	45 (22.3)	74 (58.7)	186 (66.0)	172 (64.7)	477 (54.5)
Literate	157 (77.7)	52 (41.3)	96 (34.0)	94 (35.3)	399 (45.5)
Total	202 (100)	126 (100)	282 (100)	266 (100)	876 (100)
$\chi^2 = 111.47$ d.f = 3 P<.001 Spearman Rank Correlation = 0.283 Sig <.001					

Note: All statistical results are based on normal approximation

### 4.3. Probit Model

In order to manipulate the socio-economic factors of child labour, binary experimental variable is employed in probit model. Binary experimental variable signifies the child labour and non-child labour of the respondent. Predictor variables comprises locality, age, sex, educational status, livelihood, occupation, working hours, per day income, factor (cause) involved in child labour and parental education. The design of model with dummy variables is as follow:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Child labour} = \phi (\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \text{Locality} + \alpha_2 \text{Age} + \alpha_3 \text{Sex} + \alpha_4 \text{EduStatus} + \alpha_5 \text{Livelihood} \\ + \alpha_6 \text{Occupation} + \alpha_7 \text{WorkHours} + \alpha_8 \text{IncomeStatus} + \alpha_9 \text{Cause}_{labor} \\ + \alpha_{10} \text{Parental education}) \end{aligned}$$

Where

$\phi$  = Cumulative distribution function of standard normal

Child labour = Dummy variable equal to 1 for the child who is engaged in work and otherwise.

Age = Discrete variable.

Locality = dummy variable 1 for rural and 0 for urban

Sex= dummy variable 1 for Male child and 0 for Female

Educational Status= Educational status of working children during last week or last year

Livelihood= Dummy variable 1 for own house, otherwise it is 0

Occupation= Dummy variable 1 for Agriculture and 0 for non-agriculture

Working Hours= Discrete variable.

Per day income = Discrete variable.

Factor for labour = Categorical Variable 1 for Poverty, otherwise it is 0

Parental Education = Dummy variable 1 for Literate, and 0 for literate

Table 3 presents the results of probit model, which shows that most of the socio-economic indicators are related to child labour except locality, livelihood, occupation and income. Coefficient of the locality (region) is positively related to child labour, which means the probability of child labour increases if it belongs to rural areas. Coefficient of age is significantly and positively correlated with child labour, which shows that with the increase in age, the probability of engagement in child labour rises. Positive coefficient of sex is significantly allied

with child labour, which reveals that the probability of child labour increases if working children are male. Education of working children is very important indicator because it is directly correlated with child labour. In our analysis, the coefficient of educational status of working children is significant and negatively related to child labour, which shows that probability of child labour decreases if educational status of working children increases. Livelihood is positively linked with the child labour, which depicts that the probability of child labour increases if the working children do not live in their own homes. Negative coefficient of occupation illustrates that occupation is inversely proportional to child labour, which means that probability of child labour increases if more working children are affiliated with the non-agricultural activities. Working hours of the respondents are significantly and positively connected with child labour, which implies that if working hours of children increase, the probability of their engagement in child labour also increases. Income status is negatively associated with child labour, which shows that the probability of child labour increases if income status decreases. This study also explores that poverty is significantly and negatively correlated with child labour, which means that the probability of child labour increases if more and more households are affected with poverty. Here parental education is statistically significant and negatively correlated with child labour, which exerts that the probability of child labour decreases if parents are educated.

Table.3 Results of the Probit Regression Analysis with the child labour

Probit regression	Number of obs	=	876
	LR chi2(10)	=	390.60
	Prob > chi2	=	0.0000
Log likelihood = -401.91555	Pseudo R2	=	0.3270

Child_Labour	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Locality	.0599295	.1544596	0.39	0.698	-.2428057	.3626648
Age	.7623786	.0554735	13.74	0.000	.6536526	.8711047
Sex	.5917783	.1032128	5.73	0.000	.389485	.7940716
Edu_Status	-.2383089	.0678913	-3.51	0.000	-.3713733	-.1052444
Livelihood	.1781213	.1108622	1.61	0.108	-.0391646	.3954071
Occupation	-.021526	.1295756	-0.17	0.868	-.2754895	.2324374
Work_Hours	.3782288	.0776525	4.87	0.000	.2260327	.530425
Income_Sta~s	-.0036496	.0778898	-0.05	0.963	-.1563108	.1490116
Cause_labour	-.6977566	.1042256	-6.69	0.000	-.902035	-.4934783
Parental_Edu	-.5991531	.1575336	-3.80	0.000	-.9079133	-.2903929
_cons	-2.010573	.4377564	-4.59	0.000	-2.86856	-1.152586

## 5. Conclusion

Child labour is a burning issue across the world because future of every nation is based on the new generation. Only an enthusiastic and strong generation can lead the nation toward success and stability, therefore, ignoring children means the destruction of society at all. In Pakistan, the year 2015 saw no major developments to overcome child labour. Owing to lack of availability of updated information about child labour, researchers and policy makers have failed to create any

policy on this multicultural issue. The current figures on child labour are based on the projected estimates, which do not provide break up of data so as to highlight the prevalence of underage employment in different sectors. Furthermore, the non-availability of provincially disaggregated data is especially problematic as after the 18th amendment, provinces are responsible for framing legislation and policies on child labour.

None of the provincial assemblies passed any resolution in 2015 against child labour. The Federal Employment of Child Act (ECA) 1991 needs to be revisited and redefined in the backdrop of current situation of the country. The government has yet to develop monitoring tools to check whether the ECA is being implemented in the provinces or not.

This study also highlights some socio-economic factors responsible for damaging social and mental growth of children. According to the Probit regression analysis, poverty and parental education are the two major factors behind child labour.

## **6. Policy Recommendations**

The government needs to comprehensively define child labour so that this multifaceted phenomenon could be tackled at country as well as regional level. This may be done at federal level keeping in view the child labour definitions opted by the international agencies especially the International Labour Organization.

- In order to mitigate the limitation of lack of updated dataset, the government also needs to launch a yearly survey, which should be representative of the whole population to find out the exact number of working children and root cause of this socio-economic problem.
- The provincial governments in line with Article 25A of the Constitution should prepare a comprehensive strategy to implement laws banning child labour in their respective provinces. Child labour should be totally banned and rigorous punishments should be made for the employers and the head of household. In case of absence of the household head, the family should be managed through Benazir Income Support Program (BISP). Charity organizations and philanthropists can play a vital role in this connection.
- A proper strategy should be devised to find out the root cause of child labour so that it could be controlled.
- Small local level soft loan schemes should be introduced for the poor especially for those head of household who have no other option but to engage their children in work. Under these schemes, consultancies should be provided to the loanees to opt for small businesses. In this regard, incentives of tax exemption may also be introduced at initial level.
- Primary, Secondary and vocational training institutes should be established at Tehsil and union council level where education should be free and accessible for all. The children from vulnerable families should also be given books, uniforms and one-time meal free of cost. 10-20 such institutes should be established in each Tehsil. District chambers of commerce and

industry should be engaged in this task especially for resources allocation. Zakat funds can also be used for this purpose.

- Awareness campaigns should be launched in urban and rural areas about hazardous impact of child labour, which creates social, physical and moral discrepancies among children.
- Strong monitoring system is an important tool for achieving the targets of any continuous process. So, after banning the child labour, there should a plan to monitor the health of child workers so that they could recover out of an environment of suppression.
- The provincial governments/and district and tehsil managements should ensure the implementation of labour laws in their respective areas. A grass roots level mechanism, under the supervision of local governments, need to be devised in this connection. 10.
- After declaring a complete ban on child labour, the government should commemorate 2016‘The Year of Elimination of Child Labour from Pakistan’. In this regard, a large-scale forum, comprising trade union leaders, civil society representatives, political parties’ youth wings, private and public school students and teachers, prayer leaders, religious leaders, social activists, community workers, show biz personalities and representatives of media from local press clubs, should be set up to launch awareness campaigns at Tehsil and district level to sensitize the general public, especially the poor mothers, about the hazards of child labour. Further to the campaign, walks, children’s rallies and grand meetings can be arranged, documentaries and special talk shows should be aired on TV channels, billboards and banners should be displayed in the middle of cities’ busy squares and business centres with slogans against child labour.

## References

- Awan, MS, Waqas, M & Aslam, MA 2011, 'Why do Parents Make their Children Work? Evidence from Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey', International Journal of Academic Research, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 545-549, viewed 09 March 2015  
[http://information.hanyang.ac.kr/eds/brief/discoveryResult?st=KWRD&service\\_type=brief&si=SO&q=%22International+Journal+of+Academic+Research%22](http://information.hanyang.ac.kr/eds/brief/discoveryResult?st=KWRD&service_type=brief&si=SO&q=%22International+Journal+of+Academic+Research%22)
- Britannica 2005, DVD, 'Child labor', Encyclopedia Britannica, viewed 15 January 2015
- Encarta 2006, DVD, 'Child labor', Microsoft Encarta, Technical report, Microsoft Corporation, viewed 23 February 2015
- International Labour Organization 1999, Eliminating the worst forms of child labour, A report of the ILO Caribbean tripartite meeting on the worst forms of child labour, viewed 10 December 2014.  
[http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---americas/---ro-lima/---sro\\_port\\_of\\_spain/documents/projectdocumentation/wcms\\_308204.pdf](http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---americas/---ro-lima/---sro_port_of_spain/documents/projectdocumentation/wcms_308204.pdf)
- International Labour Organization 2002, A future without child labour: global report under the follow-up to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, International Labour Conference (90th : 2002 : Geneva, Switzerland) International Labour Conference, 90th Session, 2002, ISBN 92-2-112416-9, viewed 17 January 2015.  
[http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@dgreports/@dcomm/@publ/documents/publication/wcms\\_publ\\_9221124169\\_en.pdf](http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@dgreports/@dcomm/@publ/documents/publication/wcms_publ_9221124169_en.pdf)
- International Labour Organization 2006, The end of child labour within reach: global report under the follow-up to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, International Labour Conference, 95th session, 2006, ISBN 92-2-116603-1, viewed 10 Feb 2015,  
<http://www.ilo.org/public/english/standards/relm/ilc/ilc95/pdf/rep-i-b.pdf>
- International Labour Organization 2009, Action against child labour IPEC highlights: 2008, ISBN: 978-92-2-122054-1 (Print); 978-92-2-122055-8 (Web PDF), viewed 02 March 2015.  
<http://www.ilo.org/ipecinfo/product/viewProduct.do?productId=9471>
- International Labour Organization 2013, Marking progress against child labour - Global estimates and trends 2000-2012 / International Labour Office, International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) – Geneva, ISBN: 978-92-2-127182-6 (Web PDF), viewed 09 March 2015.  
[http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/ed\\_norm/ipec/documents/publication/wcms\\_21894.pdf](http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/ed_norm/ipec/documents/publication/wcms_21894.pdf)
- Khan, A, & Ejaz, R 2003, The determinants of child labor a case study of Pakpattan and Faisalabad (Pakistan), PhD thesis, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, viewed 09 March 2015

- <http://pr.hec.gov.pk/Thesis/1192.pdf>
- Maitra, P, & Ray, R 2000, The Joint Estimation of Child Participation in Schooling and Employment: Comparative Evidence from Three Continents: Papers 2000-08, Tasmania - Department of Economics, viewed 12 January 2015.  
[http://crawford.anu.edu.au/acde/asarc/pdf/papers/2000/WP2000\\_04.pdf](http://crawford.anu.edu.au/acde/asarc/pdf/papers/2000/WP2000_04.pdf)
- Ray, R 2000, 'Child Labour, Child Schooling, and Their Interaction with Adult Labour: Empirical Evidence for Peru and Pakistan', The World Bank Economic Review, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 347–367 viewed 25 January 2015  
<http://wber.oxfordjournals.org/content/14/2/347.abstract>
- Ray, R 2001, 'Simultaneous analysis of Child Labour and Child Schooling: Comparative Evidence from Nepal and Pakistan', School of Economics, University of Tasmania, Australia. (Processed), viewed 08 February 2015
- <http://www.lahoreschoolofeconomics.edu.pk/JOURNAL/vol9-NoI/06%20Karamat%20Ali%20and%20Rana%20Ejaz%20Ali%20Khan.pdf>
- United Nations Children's Fund 2007, The State of the World's Children: 2007. ISBN-13: 978-92-806-3998-8, UNICEF, viewed December 2014  
[http://www.unicef.org/publications/files/The\\_State\\_of\\_the\\_Worlds\\_Children\\_2007\\_e.pdf](http://www.unicef.org/publications/files/The_State_of_the_Worlds_Children_2007_e.pdf)