**Migration Letters**

Volume: 21, No: S13 (2024), pp. 805-820

ISSN: 1741-8984 (Print) ISSN: 1741-8992 (Online)

www.migrationletters.com

# Supply Side Determinants of Child Labor in Districts Zhob and Sherani of Balochistan, Pakistan

Muhammad Aslam[1], Dr. Umme Ruqiya Saddat[2], Dr. Muhammad Niamat Ullah Khan Babar[3]. Dr.Amjad Khan[4], Muhammad Ehsan Elahi[1], Muhammad Waqar[1], Malik Asfand Yar[1]

## Abstract

*The study investigates supply-side factors that responsible for child labor in Zhob and Sherani districts of Baluchistan. With the use of a structured questionnaire, primary data is gathered in order to achieve the goals. The data is analyzed [1]using the Logit Model. Four categories are used to categorize the primary activities of children: "school only," "combining school and work," "work only," and "no school no work." The study's findings show that child labor in these two regions is mostly caused by low household incomes, or poverty. In addition to that, other factors have also significant impact on household's decision regarding child time allocation. One of the study's key conclusions demonstrates that parents support their sons' education, indicating the existence of gender bias in the educational system. While older children are more likely to participate in work-only and school-only activities, younger children are more likely to engage in school-only and no school work activities. Children of female headed households are more likely to combine school and work. Child labor is negatively impacted by the education and employment status of the head of family and parents, whereas child schooling is positively impacted by education and employment status of parents and head of household. The size of the household has a positive correlation with labor and a negative correlation with child education. When literate adults live in the home, there is a positive correlation between school-only activities and work-only, school-only, and no school-no-work activities.*

*Keywords: Child labor, child time allocation, poverty, Logit Model, household, Balochistan.*

1. Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Economics, Gomal University Dera Ismail Khan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan
2. Lecturer, Institute of Social Sciences Department of Economics, Gomal University Dera Ismail Khan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa,, Pakistan
3. Professor/Director Institute of Social Sciences,Gomal University Dera Ismail Khan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwah, Pakistan
4. University College of Zhob, BUITEMS Balochistan, Pakistan

Corresponding Author (Muhammad Aslam)
Email ID (muhammadaslam_17@pide.edu.pk)
Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Economics, Gomal University Dera Ismail Khan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan

## 1. Introduction

Child labor is exploited both socially and economically, which is wrong for humankind. Although it is widely acknowledged that child labor is a bad thing, the key issue is how to address it. Even though it is illegal for minors to work, child labor is a common phenomenon in poor nations like Pakistan. It necessitates a thorough analysis of the socioeconomic factors that contribute to child labor in emerging nations. The topic is currently receiving attention on a worldwide scale and is the subject of serious discussion in both industrialized and developing nations. Long before industrialization, there existed child labor in many forms, and a child was defined as one who was "aged 18 and under" (United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1973) as a ready labor supply. Following the Industrial Revolution, families that had previously worked in formland moved more and more into cities, where they were used as a cheap labor source by British manufacturers. Child labor has always been a problem in the agricultural sector of the subcontinent. Since there were typically no schools in the villages, working on farms provided training for future employment. The British brought with them the practice of mass child exploitation in the subcontinent.

Child labor in Pakistan started mainly in the 1960s because of the nation's determination to strengthen its industrial base. To end child labor, Pakistan implemented two labor laws. The Employment of Children Act (ECA) of 1991 was the first law to forbid using children younger than the age of 14 for any hazardous work in a mine or factory. The Peshgi system, which was a type of bonded labor in which companies gave cash in advance to a worker or the worker's parents, and the worker was then obligated to the creditor until the loan was paid back, was terminated by the second law, the Bonded Labor Act of 1992. May 2000 saw the National Policy approved by the Federal Cabinet.

The situation of children in Pakistan remained dire even after the country ratified the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. Children are exploited in every aspect of the economy nowadays, since they work in every field. It was believed that child laborers constituted about 25% of the workforce in the nation. Despite the country's laws against it, child labor is still on the rise, with over 10 million child labor working [UNESCO Islamabad, June 2012]. Child labor is a sin that endangers children's participation, safety, growth, and ability to survive. Child labor is a far more serious criminal than other types of crimes since, in contrast to other crimes that only affect specific individuals, Compared to other crimes, child labor is far more serious because it affects the entire generation, as opposed to other crimes that simply harm certain individuals. Since child labor is wrong, identifying its causes would facilitate the introduction of effective policies aimed at ending it. Because Baluchistan’s demographics and other regional features differ greatly from those of the rest of the nation, a district-specific study is necessary to provide a meaningful explanation for the problem. In order to better understand the socioeconomic factors that contribute to child labor in Baluchistan’s Zhob and Sherani districts, this study is being conducted.

## 2. Literature Review

Basic research on modeling approaches for child labor includes unitary models of household decision-making based on Becker's (1981) work. Current empirical data suggests that unitary household models might not offer a significant insight into household behavior, while a growing body of empirical research indicates that collective models do offer a significant

understanding. This strategy has been updated by Moehling, who portrays the transaction as taking place between a parent and their child within the family. An overview of the development of theories on the modeling of child labor is given by Basu (1999). It is argued that research on collective models of household decision-making overlooked the opposite effect and discovered that considering the reciprocal relationship between issues of power and choices within the household leads to intriguing new understandings of both household equilibrium and child labor (Basu, 2006). Work to raise awareness of the problem of child labor in Pakistan and around the world is proliferating. The body of research indicates that poverty, parental education, earnings for both adults and children, parent age, family size, and other factors are key contributors to child labor.

There are different opinions regarding the relationship between poverty and child work, despite the fact that empirical research indicates that poverty is a significant supply-side element of child labor at both the micro and macro levels. The majority of research papers (Hussain, 1985, 1997; Khan, 1982, 2001, 2003; Delap, 2001; Ray, 2000; Chaudhry and Khan, 2002; Maitra and Ray, 2002; Kulsoom, 2009; Shaikh et al., 2015) concludes that poverty is the primary cause of child labor. According to some research, there are other factors that have a greater impact on child work than poverty, including low-quality education, a lack of employment opportunities, and development (Emerson and Souza, 2008; Siddiqi, 2009; Hai et al., 2010; fors, 2007, 2010). These other factors appear to be the main cause of child labor.

Research has shown that a child's and parents educational background has a detrimental impact on the way the child works (Rosenzweig and Evenson, 1977; Tienda, 1979; Khan, 2001; Kurosaki et al., 2006; Hai et al., 2010). Regarding the influence of parents' educational attainment on child labor, opinions are unanimous. There is disagreement on the relative effects of mother and father education on child labor, despite the fact that nearly all research support the idea that parental education has a negative impact on child labor. The majority of studies concludes that a mother's education has a greater detrimental effect on child labor than a father's (Addison et al., 1997; Khan, 2003; Kurosaki et al., 2006). According to some research, fathers' education has a greater impact on reducing their children's labor market engagement than mothers' does (Tienda, 1979; Nath and Hadi, 2000). Demographic and cultural variables also influence households' choices about how much time to spend with their children. The factors influencing child labor may range from place to place because of cultural and demographic variations. Khan (1982) provides proof that one of the causes of child labor in Punjab, Pakistan's districts of Lahore, Gujranwala, and Sialkot is family custom. Burki and Faseeh (1998) draw the conclusion that the factors influencing child labor vary throughout provinces because of the cultural and demographic distinctions between Punjab and Sindh. According to Chaudhary and Khan (2002), the social structure of Dera Ismail Khan City prevents female children from leaving the house, which explains why female schooling and child work are uncommon there. The association between parental employment and wages and child labor is not well established in the empirical literature. While Skoufias (1994) concludes that adult wages have no significant impact on the likelihood of children working in India, Rosenzweig and Evenson (1977) conclude that adult male and female wages have a significant negative effect on working children in rural districts of India and conclude that an increase in the mother's wage reduces child labor. Burki and Faseeh (1998) draw the conclusion that a mother's

employment has a detrimental impact on her child's likelihood of attending school and favorably influences choices to work in Pakistan. There is a gender disparity in schooling in developing nations, as multiple empirical investigations have shown.

The majority of empirical research on developing nations confirms the gender gap that favors boys who work. According to Cartwright (1999) for Bolivia and Ray (1999) for Pakistan and Peru, boys are more likely than girls to work. Blunch and Verner (2000) do discover, however, that in Ghana, girls are somewhat more likely than boys to be employed. According to Jensen and Neilson (1997), there is no discernible difference between boys' and girls' labor in Zambia. Several studies have examined the impact of household size on the prevalence of child labor. In India's rural districts, Rosenzweig and Evenson (1977) found an inverse link between child labor and family size. According to Chaudhary and Khan (2002), child labor is caused by big families with low levels of education in Dera Ismail Khan, which prevents children from attending school. According to Khan (2003), child labor has a positive correlation with household size in the Punjab districts of Pakpatan and Faisalabad, but school attendance has a negative correlation.

Numerous studies have demonstrated the association between a kids age and both child work and schooling. Research by Valassoff (1979) for India, Nath and Hadi (2000) for Bangladesh, Khan (2003), and Kulsoom (2009) for Pakistan shows a positive correlation between child labor and age. The empirical data reveals conflicting findings about parents' altruistic actions toward their kids. Parents devote more money to their first child's education, according to a subset of the empirical research (Zajonc and Markus, 1975; Blake, 1981; Horton, 1988; Hanushek, 1992; Downey, 2001). The other body of studies emphasizes the bias in favor of later-born infants over early-born children (Emerson and Souza, 2008; Edmonds, 2005).

The foregoing literature analysis demonstrates that, depending on the social and economic circumstances of the household and the location, a variety of factors contribute to the phenomenon of child work. As a result, the majority of researchers focus on studies of child labor that are district- or region-specific. The literature review also makes it evident that no district-specific research on child labor participation has been done in Balochistan (Shaik et al., 2015 conducted a study solely on Quetta District, taking into account 90 children employed in various district enterprises). Thus, utilizing primary data, an attempt is made to conduct a study on the fundamental supply-side determinants of child labor in the districts of Zhob and Shereni.

## 3. Materials and Methods

### 3.1 Methodology, model and variables

Secondary data on desired variables is not available therefore primary data is collected at household level with the help of a structured questionnaire in July-August 2024. The questionnaire comprises a wide range of questions on the social and economic conditions of the household. It consists of four sections regarding information about the characteristics of children, head of household, parents and household. The rural and urban areas of district Zhob and Sherani are selected as a sample of population. Both districts have urban and rural areas. Sherani District is not much urbanized as compared to Zhob district, so these two districts

more suitably (Sherani Integrated District Development Vision (2013) by IUCN) portray the average conditions of the Balochistan. The 200 households are surveyed from urban and rural areas of Zhob and Sherani districts with 100 households surveyed from each district using stratified random sampling method. Overall 10 union councils are surveyed. The 5 union councils are selected from each district and 20 households are surveyed from each union council. The household having at least one child in the age group 5-15 years qualifies for the survey.

In district Zhob, there are two tehsil Kakar Khurasan ,Zhob and 24 union councils, respectively. Total five union councils are selected from 24 union councils for survey. Five union councils Babu Muhalla , Islamyar Zhob, Meena Bazar, Garda Babar, Wala Akram and Apozai UCs are selected from 24 union Councils of Zhob . District Sherani is the most backword area has 1 Tehsil and 13 union councils, Five union councils are surveyed from district Sherani. The surveyed union councils are selected namely Dhanasir, , Mani Khwah, Kapip, Shinghar Harifal South , Shinghar Harifal North.

The time allocation of child depends upon his/her main activity. The main activity may be school only, combining school and work, work only and no school no work. The month preceding survey is considered as a reference period for child main activity. The reference period of 1 month is chosen keeping in view the informal nature of child labor if child combines schooling with homecare, the child main activity is considered as schooling. On the other hand if child combines schooling with paid work then main activity is considered as combining school and work. If child is involved only in paid work then child main activity is taken as work only. If child is doing nothing, i.e., neither going to school nor involved in paid work, then main activity is considered as No School No Work.

### 3.2 Model

There exist multiple approaches to simulate the supply side factors that contribute to child labor, based on the household's decision-making process. The children's activities, which are dummy variables, represent the study's dependent variable. Thus, when examining the effects of the head of the household, the parents, and other household variables on the activities of the children as measured by school only, school and work combined, work only, and no school no work, the logit model is comparatively a better model. We take the following steps to look into the relationship between children's activities and its determinants:

$$P(B_i = 1) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 X_i)}}$$

Where $X_i$ is the vector of independent variables and $\alpha$'s is the vector of coefficients. If we suppose that $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 X_i = H$, then for simplicity, we can write Eq. 1 as:

$$P_i = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-H}} = \frac{e^H}{1 + e^H} \qquad (2)$$

Equation 2 is known as logistic distribution function**.** It represents the probability that child involves in any one of the activities mentioned above. The probability that child does not involve in any of these activities can be represented as follows:

$$P(B_i = 0) = \frac{1}{1+e^{H}} \qquad (3)$$

$$1 - P(B_i = 1) = \frac{1}{1+e^{-H}} \qquad (4)$$

Dividing Eq. 3 by Eq. 4 we get:

$$\frac{P_i}{1-P_i} = \frac{1+e^{H}}{1+e^{-H}} = e^{H} \qquad (5)$$

$P_i/(1-P_i)$ are the ratio of the probability that a child involves in any activity to the probability that he does not. By taking natural log of the Eq. 4, the following equation is obtained:

$$B_i = \ln\left(\frac{P_i}{1-P_i}\right) = H \qquad (6)$$

As we know that

$$H = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 X_i$$

Therefore, we can write Eq. 6 as:

$$B_i = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 X_i + \varepsilon \qquad (7)$$

Where:

$B_i$ = The log of odd ratio

$\varepsilon$ = Stochastic error term

$X_i$ = The vector of independent variables

$\alpha_i$ = The vector of coefficients

The estimate able form of Eq. 7 is represented as:

$$B_i = \alpha + \beta_i(\text{child characteristics})$$
where 'i' varies from 1-4 +
$\delta_j$(Head of household characteristics),
where 'j' varies from 1-4 +
$\theta_k$(Parents' characteristics),
where 'k' varies from 1-6 +
$\gamma_l$(household characteristics),
where 'l' varies from 1-7

Where, $B_i$ represents children's activities and 'i' varies from 1-4. The above equation is estimated to explore the determinants of child labor in two districts of Balochistan.

**3.3 Description of variables / Dependent variables**:

- C $B_1$ = 1 if child goes to school only, 0 otherwise
- C $B_2$ = 1 if child combines school and work, 0 otherwise
- C $B_3$ = 1 if child goes to work only, 0 otherwise.
- C $B_4$ = 1 if child neither goes to school nor to work, 0 otherwise

**3.4 Independent variables / Child characteristics**

- C Children [Child gender]: 1 if the child is male, 0 otherwise
- C Chldage [Child age]: Age of child in completed years
- C Chldbirthord [Child birth order]: Birth order of child in brothers and sisters
- C Chldedu [Child education level]: Years of child education

**3.5 Head of household characteristics:**

- C Hhdgen [Household head's gender]: 1 if head of Household is male, 0 otherwise
- C Hhdage [Household head's age]: Age of household's head in completed years
- C Hhdedu [Household head's education level]: Education level of head of household in years
- C Hhdemp [Household head's employment status]: 1 if head is employed, 0 otherwise.

**3.5.1 Parent's characteristics:**

Fthredu [Education level of father]: Education level of father

- C Fthremp [Employment status of father]: 1 if father is employed, 0 otherwise
- C Mthrage [Age of mother]: Age mother in completed years
- C Mthredu [Education level of mother]: Education level of mother
- C Mthremp [Employment status of mother]: 1 if mother is employed, 0 otherwise

### 3.5.2 Household characteristics:

- C HhA [Asset of household]: 1 if household own assets, 0 otherwise
- C Hhinco [Income of household]: Income of household in Rs./month
- C Hhdebt [Debt of household]: 1 if household is in debt, 0 otherwise
- C Hhsize [Size of household]: Total number of members in the household
- C Nmbrofchild: Total number of children in household
- C Child 5-15 years: No. of children aged 5-15 years in household
- C Adultlitrate: Number of adult literates in household
- C Hhlocatin [location of household]: 1 if household belongs to rural area, o otherwise

## Results and Discussion

### 4.1 Estimates of Logit Model

The Logit Model is used to investigate socio-economic factors that could influence a parent's choice about how best to use their child's time. Table 1 presents the marginal impacts of socio-economic variables on parents' choices on how to allocate their children time between four types of activities: work only, school only, school and work combined, and no school and no work activities.

### 4.2 Child characteristics

#### 4.2.1 Gender of child

Logit Model estimation suggests that boys are more likely to participate in school exclusively or to combine work and education. If the child is male, the likelihood that he will attend school, combine work and school, or work alone is 7.6, 1.16, and 5.49%, respectively. Additionally, the results show that girls are more likely to participate in No School No Work initiatives. The social and cultural customs of the community, which forbid girls from leaving the house to attend school or work, could be the cause. For Zambia, Canagarajah and Coulombe (1998), Burki and Faseeh (1998), Ray (2000), and Khan (2003) are in agreement with our results, as are Jensen and Neilson (1997) and Neilson (1998) for Ghana.

#### 4.2.2 Age of child

The age of the child is a significant factor in deciding what the youngster must do for work and school. Our study's findings show that a child's age is inversely correlated with their attendance at school and their lack of employment. An extra year of childhood reduces the likelihood of attending school and not working by 5.2 and 6.3%, respectively. One possible explanation is that older kids are more likely to be put to work rather than school since they are expected to earn more money in the labor market than younger kids do. Our results are consistent with those of Burki and Faseeh (1998), Illahi (2001), Ray (2000), Patrinos and Psacharopoulos (1997), and Peru. Estimates indicate that a child's age has a good impact on balancing job and education.

**Table 1:** Estimates of marginal effects of socio-economic variables on $B_1$, $B_2$, $B_3$ and $B_4$ Marginal effects of socio-economic variables on four types of choice probabilities

| | $B_1$ | | $B_2$ | | $B_3$ | | $B_4$ | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Variables | dy/dx | Z | dy/dx | Z | dy/dx | Z | dy/dx | Z |
| **Child characteristi cs** | | | | | | | | |
| Chldgen | 0.076055* | 1.973396 | 0.01164** | 1.93704 | .05496* | 1.96561 | -0.0094* | -1.78053 |
| Chldage | -0.05244*** | -7.481428 | 0.08209*** | 4.91239 | 0.037874*** | 6.8476 | -0.0632*** | -4.45215 |
| Chldbirthord | 0.017338*** | 7.045144 | -0.00271*** | -6.95821 | -0.01252*** | -7.04224 | 0.0021*** | 7.03445 |
| Chldedu | 0.135675*** | 13.59467 | 0.02124*** | 6.08473 | -0.09798*** | -11.8477 | -0.01646*** | -4.43633 |
| **Head of household characteristics** | | | | | | | | |
| Hhdgen | 0.001686 | 0.11116 | -0.00026*** | -2.84554 | -0.0122*** | -13.3662 | -0.00205** | -2.234 |
| Hhdage | 0.00441*** | 2.81128 | 0.0069*** | 2.817959 | 0.00318*** | 2.811474 | -0.0053*** | -2.8015 |
| Hhdedu | 0.05889*** | 7.66741 | -0.00921*** | -7.66143 | -0.04252*** | -7.66501 | -0.07144*** | -7.5036 |
| Hhdemp | 0.19956** | 2.163 | -0.043943*** | -4.74081 | -.13865** | -2.26341 | -0.01695*** | -2.7221 |
| **Parents' characteristics** | | | | | | | | |
| Fthrage | -0.00698*** | -7.49689 | 0.001092* | 7.431293 | 0.005041* | 7.489599 | 0.000847*** | 7.4271 |
| Fthredu | 0.079498*** | 10.28166 | -0.01244*** | -10.2664 | -0.05741*** | -10.2721 | -0.00964*** | -9.9319 |
| Fthremp | 0.226503* | 1.95548 | -0.02077*** | -3.47965 | -0.16464*** | -1.96441 | -0.04109*** | -13.711 |
| Mthrage | -0.00284*** | -9.91608 | 0.000444*** | 9.444681 | .002048*** | 9.942233 | 0.000344*** | 10.1176 |
| Mthredu | 0.235217*** | 3.112979 | -0.03682*** | -2.42051 | -0.16987*** | -30.9354 | -0.02853*** | -3.2987 |
| Mthremp | 0.33996*** | 3.67462 | -0.00839*** | -2.61681 | -0.23975*** | -15.7524 | -0.09186*** | -6.9587 |
| **Household's characteristics** | | | | | | | | |
| HhA | 0.05745*** | 11.1338 | 0.00899*** | 10.88632 | -0.04148*** | -11.1052 | -0.00696*** | -11.0625 |
| Hhinco | 0.11700*** | 10.645 | 0.0165* | 1.65098 | -0.6300*** | -8.04004 | -0.0876** | -2.56 |
| Hhsize | -0.05192** | -2.06034 | 0.008127* | 1.939499 | 0.037495** | 2.054542 | 0.006299* | 1.92027 |
| Nmbrofchild | 0.055764* | 1.777068 | -0.00873* | -1.70806 | -0.04027*** | -4.36456 | -0.00676*** | -7.1912 |
| Child 5-15 years | -0.07491** | -2.48869 | 0.011725** | 2.308031 | 0.054097*** | 5.867906 | 0.009087** | 2.26052 |
| Adultslitratss | 0.08314*** | 2.798371 | -0.01301** | -2.43232 | -0.06004*** | -2.77582 | -0.01009** | -2.6196 |
| Hhdlocatin | -0.1076*** | -3.9538 | 0.029405* | 1.9909 | .0767089*** | 4.56439 | 0.09818** | 2.26341 |

*, ** and *** show significant at 10, 5 and 1% significance level, respectively

Only activities, since older kids are more likely to mix work and school or just work. The probability of combining employment and education increases by 8.2 and 7.3%, respectively, for every year that a youngster is older. One explanation might be that older kids are more likely than younger kids to earn more money in the workforce are. These results support those of Ray (2000), Durant and Arif (1998), Blunch and Verner (2000), and Ray (2000) for Pakistan and Ghana, respectively.

### 4.2.3 Birth order of child

When making decisions within a household on how best to allocate their children's time, birth order is a significant factor. The findings of our research indicate a positive correlation between birth order and the practices of "School Only" and "No School No Work." Due to parents' reluctance to send all of their children into the workforce, younger children who are born later in life are more likely to participate in school and NO SCHOOL NO WORK activities. Additionally, the results imply that older kids are more likely than younger kids to combine job and school or just work. One possible explanation could be that parents are sending their

earlier-born children into the job market and mixing work and school, which loosens the household financial restriction and sends later-born children to school.

### 4.2.4 Educational level of child

The child's educational attainment is a significant factor in determining their schooling. The study's logit results indicate a positive correlation between children's educational attainment and their ability to combine employment and school-related activities. The child's current educational attainment and work-only or no-school activities are negatively correlated. It suggests that the likelihood of attending school and combining work and school grows with a child's years of education, whereas the likelihood of attending work alone or not attending school at all decreases. Child labor and education are mutually exclusive. Wiener (1991), Khan (2003), Chaudhry (1998), Peter and Zafiris (1998), and Chaudhary and Khan (2002) all obtained results that are similar.

## 4.3 Head of household characteristics

### 4.3.1 Age of the head of household

The study's results enable us to draw the conclusion that a child's age and the age of the head of the family are positively correlated with their education, their combination of work and school, and their job-only activities. One plausible explanation could be that as the head of home ages, they become sufficiently mature to see the value of education. As the head of the household ages, physical weakness sets in, and children are bring to the job market or family business to provide financial support for the household.

### 4.3.2 Gender and literacy status of head of household

A female-headed home is typically indicative of a low-income household (Sakellario and Lal, 1999). Therefore, children from homes headed by women are more likely to work. This perspective is supported by the study's findings. One plausible explanation could be that children are compelled to work due to poor income levels in households headed by women. Based on available empirical data, the likelihood of attending school rises as the head of household's years of education increase (Khan and Ali, 2003). The study's logit estimates also imply that the likelihood of a youngster attending school rises as the head of the household's years of education do. A household head's additional year of education raises the likelihood that a child will attend school by 5.88%. The study's results also show that the likelihood that a household head will mix employment and school, work alone, or neither work nor school lowers as their years of education increase. This is because educated household heads understand the need of providing their kids with a good education.

### 4.3.3 Employment status of head of household

The leader of the household's employment situation positively affects the academic activities of their children. According to Burki and Shahnaz, a child's decision to attend school is unaffected by the work status of the head of the household. According to the results of the current study, children from households with a working parent and a high income are more likely to attend school. The likelihood that a youngster from a household headed by an

employed person will attend school rises by 19.95%. The study's conclusions also demonstrate that children of working parents are less likely to participate in activities that mix work and school, work alone, or neither work nor school. When the head of the home works, the children's likelihood of working decreases by 13.86%.

### 4.4 Parental characteristics

#### 4.4.1 Parents' age and their education level

The mother's and father's ages are also important factors in deciding what the child does. The study's findings indicate that there is a positive correlation between a parent's age and combining job and school or work-only activities, but a negative correlation between a parent's age and schooling. The father's age influences the child's activities more than the mother's does. Additionally, the data shows that parents with higher levels of education are more likely to send their kids to school and are less likely to have them work, combine job and school, or not do any work at all. One plausible explanation is that well-educated parents are well-off and understand the value of education for their kids, so they send them to school rather than to work. The findings also show that a mother's education has a greater influence on her child's education than a father's.

#### 4.4.2 Employment status of parents

According to the study's demonstration, working parents significantly improve their children's educational outcomes. Children of working mothers are 33.96% more likely to attend school than children of working fathers, who have 22.65% more opportunities to do so. The study's conclusions also show that parents' working position has a detrimental effect on their children's ability to combine work and school, work alone, and no school at all. A parent and mother's employment status reduces the likelihood that their child will work by 16.46 and 23.97%, respectively. It implies that working mothers care more about their kids' education than working fathers do.

### 4.5 Household characteristics

#### 4.5.1 Assets and income of household

The study's conclusions demonstrate that children from wealthy families are more likely to attend school and balance their education with employment. One plausible explanation could be that wealthy families are reluctant to use outside labor. The possession of assets by households has a negative correlation with a child's ability to work and attend school. Because the marginal gains of higher income groups are greater, higher income households are more likely to favor high-quality education. The study's findings also show that a household's money significantly influences a child's decision to work and attend school. It allows us to confidently draw the conclusion that, in these two areas of the Balochistan. According to our research, there is a significant positive correlation between children's attendance at school and their work activities and household income. Higher income households are more likely to send their kids to school and balance employment and education.

#### 4.5.2 Household size and composition

Regarding the effect of home size on children's education, there are two theories. According to the first hypothesis, there is less possibility of education and more work for those in larger households because of the lower per capita income (Lloyed, 1994). The second theory states that since larger households employ more people, they send their kids to school rather than the workforce (Durant and Arif, 1998). The first hypothesis—that household size affects children's schooling and employment in different ways is supported by the study's findings. The low per capita income in larger families forces parents to put their children to work. This is the explanation. According to our calculations, home size has a beneficial effect on both the combination of work and school and the absence of work and school activities. Youngsters from larger homes are more likely to mix employment and education, or the other way around.

### 4.5.3 Number of adult literates in the household

The study's findings indicate that the likelihood of a child attending school rises by 8.31% for every increase in the number of literate people living in the home. Our results also show that a child's ability to combine school and work, work only, or no school and no work activities is negatively impacted by the amount of literate adults in the home. The explanation for this is that literate individuals are more aware of how education affects their children's future.

### 4.5.4 Location of household

Family dynamics have a major impact on children's exercise regimens (Beam, 2000). According to our assessments, children residing in urban areas are more likely to attend school and are less likely to skip school altogether than children from rural areas. The low adult education rate and lack of tutoring centers in rural areas could be the causes of this. The other reason is that rural areas have greater levels of poverty than do urban areas.

## Conclusion

The goal of this study is to identify the primary supply-side factors that contribute to child labor in Pakistan's Balochistan, namely in the districts of Zhob and Sherani. Families are presumed to choose between the following four options for allocating their children's time: school only, work and school together, work exclusively, and no school, no work. It has been observed that girls are more likely to participate in no school, no work activities, whereas boys are more likely to participate in school only, school and work, and work alone activities. Older kids are less likely to participate in no school, no work activities and more likely to attend school, combine work and school, and work exclusively. It is more common for younger children to participate in school-only and no school-no work activities. The current educational level of a child is positively correlated with school-only and school-plus activities; however, work-only and school-no-work activities are negatively correlated. Male-headed families are more likely to have a child who attends school exclusively, whereas female-headed households are more likely to have a child who works only, combines school and employment, or attends neither. The age of the head of the home has a negative influence on no school, no work activity, and a favorable impact on school only, combining work and school, and work only activities. The age of the parents has an adverse effect on the education of their children and a beneficial effect on their ability to combine employment and school, work alone, and no school at all.

The head of the household's and parents' employment and educational status have a favorable influence on school-only activities and a negative influence on work-only, school-only, and no school-no-work activities. Household assets have a negative impact on work alone and no school, no work activities, and a favorable impact on education and integrating work and school. The size of a household affects a child's education both negatively and favorably, depending on whether school and work are combined or not. The likelihood of attending school exclusively increases with the number of literate individuals living in the home, while the likelihood of combining work and school, working exclusively, and not attending school at all decreases.

**Policy Implications**

The findings of study have several policy implications for government and Non-Government Organizations (NGOs) and institutions working for the welfare of children in Balochistan.

Education is the best solution for child labor. Both parents and children must be convinced that education can solve their problems. Hence, effective actions should be taken to offer free education and reduce the cost of schooling to the working children. The facilities of non-formal education should be extended to provide access to such working children who are vulnerable to become full time child laborers. Non-formal education programs can also be planned to facilitate working children to improve their skills.

The policy makers should develop policies with which the uneducated parents should not feel left out. A more encouraging and supportive approach is proposed towards the children whose parents are uneducated. Parents with children aged 5-7 years should be given special support to send their children to schools. A campaign should be launched at grass root level to make people aware of moral as well as financial aspects of education in one’s life.

**References**


1. Addison, T., S. Bhalotra, F. Coulter and C. Heady, 1997. Child Labour in Pakistan and Ghana: A Comparative Study. Centre for Development Studies, University of Bath, UK Processed.
2. Basu, K., 1999. Child labor: Cause, Consequence and Ccure, with Remarks on International Labor Standards. J. Econ. Lit., 37: 1083-1119.
3. Basu, K., 2006. Gender and Say: A Model of Household Behaviour with Endogenously Determined Balance of Power. The Econ. J., 116: 558-580.
4. Becker, G.S., 1981. A Treatise on the Family. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
5. Blake, J., 1981. Family size and the quality of children.
6. Blunch, N.H. and D. Verner, 2000. Revisiting the Link between Poverty and Child Labor: The Ghanaian Experience. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper, No. 2488, Washington, D.C., World Bank.
7. Burki, A. and T. Faseeh, 1998. Non-leisure time allocation for children and determination of child labor in Punjab, Pakistan. The Pak. Dev. Rev. 7: 889-914.Canagarajah, S. and
8. Chaudhary, M. A. and F.N. Khan, 2002. Economic and Social Determinants of Child Labour: A Case Study of Dera Ismail Khan, Pakistan. Lahore J. Econ., 7: 15-40.
9. Chaudhry, M.A.K., 1998. Child labor facts and fictions.The Lahore J. Econ. 7: 15-40.
10. Delap, E., 2001. Economic and Cultural Forces in the Child Labour Debate: Evidence from Urban Bangladesh. J. Dev. Stud., 37: 1-22.Demography, 18: 421-442.
11. Downey, D.B., 2001. Number of Siblings and Intellectual Development: The Resource Dilution

Explanation. Am. Psychologist, 56: 497-504.
12. Durrant, V.L. and G.M. Arif, 1998. Community influences on schooling and work activity of youth in Pakistan [with Comments]. The Pak. Dev. Rev., 37: 915-937.
13. Edmond, E.V., 2005. Does Child Labor Decline With Improvement in Living Standard: A Case Study of Vietnam. J. Hum. Resour., 40: 77-99.
14. Emerson, P.M. and A.P. Souza, 2008. Birth order, child labor and school attendance in Brazil. World Dev., 36: 1647-1664.
15. Fors, H.C., 2012. Child Labour: A Review of Recent Theory and Evidence with Policy Implications. J. Econ. Surv., 26: 570-593.
16. H. Coulombe, 1998. Child labor and schooling in Ghana. Policy Research Working Paper No.1844, The World Bank, Washington. Pages: 1-37. Cartwright, K., 1999. Child Labor in Colombia. St.Martin Press, New York.
17. Hai, A.A., A. Fatima and M. Sadaqat, 2010. Socio- economic Conditions of Child Labor: A Case Study for the Fishing Sector on Balochistan Coast. Int. J. Social Econ., 37: 316-338. https://doi.org/ 10.1108/03068291011025273
18. Hanushek, E.A., 1992. The trade-off between child quantity and quality. J. Political Economy, 100: 84-117.
19. Horton, S., 1988. Birth Order and Child Nutritional Status: Evidence from the Philippines. Econ. Dev. Cult. Change, 36: 341-354.
20. Hussain, A., 1985. Child labour in Lahore. A Survey Sponsored by Syed Engineers, Lahore, 96: 54-56.
21. Hussain, A., 1997. Child workers in hazardous industries in Pakistan. The Lahore J. Econ., 2: 59-79. http://hdl.handle.net/123456789/3486
22. Ilahi, N., 2001. Children's Work and Schooling: Does Gender Matter? Evidence from the Peru LSMS. Washington DC, World Bank.
23. Jenson, P. and H.S. Nielsen, 1997. Child Labour or Schooling Attendance: Evidences from Zambia. J. Popul. Econ., 10: 407-424.
24. Khan, R.E.A. and K. Ali, 2003. Determinants of schooling in rural areas of Pakistan. The Lahore J. Econ., 8: 99-122.
25. Khan, R.E.A., 2001. Socio-economic Aspects of Child Labour: A Case Study of Children in Auto Workshops. The Lahore J. Econ., 6: 93-112.
26. Khan, R.E.A., 2003. The Determinants of Child Labour: A Case Study of District Faisalabad and Pakpattan, PhD Thesis, Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan, Multan, Pakistan.
27. Khan, S., 1982. Labour Force Participation of Children: A Case Study. Pak. Econ. Social Rev., 20: 52-70.
28. Kulsoom, R., 2009. Child Labor at District Level: Evidence from Rawalpindi. Retrieved on 24 December 2009 from http://mpra.ub.uni- muenchen.de/19161/
29. Kurosaki, T., S. Ito, N. Fuwa, K. Kubo and Y. Sawada, 2006. Child Labor and School Enrollment in Rural India: Whose Education Matters? The Developing Economies, 44: 440-464.
30. Lloyd, C.B., 1994. Investing in the Next Generation: The Implications of High Fertility at the Level of the Family. New York Population Council, Research Division Working Paper No. 63.
31. Maitra, P. and R. Ray, 2002. The joint estimation of child participation in schooling and employment: comparative evidence from three continents. Oxford Dev. Stud., 30: 41-62.
32. Nath, S.R. and A. Hadi, 2000. Role of Education in Reducing Child Labour: Evidence from Rural Bangladesh. J. Biosocial Sci., 32: 301-313.
33. Nielsen, H., 1998. Child labor and school attendance: Two joint decisions. Retrieved from DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.176068·
34. Patrinos, H.A. and G. Psacharopoulos, 1997. Family size, schooling and child labor in Peru an empirical analysis. J. Popul. Econ., 10: 387-405.

35. Peter, F. and T. Zafiris, 1998. Child Labor: Issues and Directions for the World Bank. Washington DC, World Bank.
36. Ray, R., 2000. Analysis of Child Labour in Peru and Pakistan: A Comparative Study. J. Popul. Econ., 13: 3-19.
37. Rosenzweig, M.R. and R. Evenson, 1977. Fertility, Schooling and the Economic Contribution of Children of Rural India: An Econometric Analysis. Econometrica: J. Econometric Soc., 45: 1065-1079. Sakellario, C. and A. Lal, 1999. Child Labour in Philippines. In C. Grootaert and H. Patrinos (Eds.).
38. Shaikh, M.A., T. Mangan, M. Ahmed, M. Buriro, M. Nangraj and S. Ahmed, 2015. Economic and Social Causes of Child Labor in District Quetta, Balochistan. J. Eur. Academic Res., 3: 4539-4554.
39. Siddiqi, A.F.I., 2009. Child Labour: A Statistical Study Using Multistage Probability Proportional Stratified Systematic Sampling (Doctoral dissertation, GC University Lahore, Pakistan).
40. Skoufias, E., 1994. Using shadow wages to estimate labor supply of agricultural households. Am. J. Agric. Econ., 76: 215-227.
41. The Policy Analysis of Child Labour: A Comparative Study. New York, St. Martin's Press.
42. Tienda, M., 1979. Economic Activity of Children in Peru: Labor Force Behavior in Rural and Urban Contexts. Rural Sociology, 44: 370-391.
43. Vlassoff, M., 1979. Labour Demand and Economic Utility of Children: A Case Study in Rural India. Popul. Stud., 33: 415-428.
44. Weiner, M., 1991. The Child and State in India. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
45. Zajonc, R.B. and G.B. Markus, 1975. Birth order and intellectual development. Psychological Rev., 82: 74-88.