NEW APPROACHES IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
Vol. 5. No. 1. January 2016 pp. 3-10 ISSN: 2254-7399 DOI: 10.7821/naer.2016.1.132

ORIGINAL

Are All Children Equal? Causative Factors of Child Labour in Selected Districts of South Punjab, Pakistan

Syed Zubair Haider[1]*, Ayesha Qureshi[2]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Training, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, R. Y. Khan Campus, Pakistan.{zubairiub@hotmail.com}

[2] Doctoral Research Scholar, Department of Education, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan {qureshiayeshah@yahoo.com}

Received on 5 May 2015; revised on 8 May 2015; accepted on 22 October 2015; published on 15 January 2016.

DOI: 10.7821/naer.2016.1.132

ABSTRACT

The present study investigates the causative factors of child labour in selected districts of South Punjab, Pakistan. As member of the International Labour Organization (ILO) Pakistan has a responsibility to stamp out child labour from its regions. Our sample was selected from seven working environments (workshops, hotels, tea stalls, households, etc.) through purposive sampling. The data were collected via a questionnaire which was completed by a sample of 547 working children. The findings of the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) explored four factors from the research. Multilevel analyses were calculated to pinpoint the causative factors of child labour. The study results revealed that, due to family responsibilities, a lack of educational opportunities for children from low-income families, and increasing poverty, children develop an interest in working to earn their livelihood at the cost of their education. The children are involved in labour because their parents cannot meet their personal and educational requirements.

KEYWORDS: CHILD LABOUR, POVERTY, UNEMPLOYMENT, FAMILY, CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

1 INTRODUCTION

Children are seen as human capital in each family structure because investments in education for children are usually considered the best possible starting point for higher returns. A person below 16 years of age is considered a child, while child labour is work done by a child who is under the minimum age required for that specific work. Child labour is a multifaceted problem in developing countries and forms of child labour vary according to the cultural conditions of the country, family, area of residence, economic background and level of development (Holgado et al, 2014). It is a widespread phenomenon in developing countries, and there is an increasing debate about this important problem (Malik, 2012). Child labour is work that places children under hardships of some sort, whether physically, mentally or morally, or by blocking access to educational opportunities. Asian countries have a sizeable number of children in household workforces; this includes children working at tea stalls, workshops, canteens and factories, or doing common housekeeping. Deprived families are more inclined to use child labour (resulting in educational cut-off) as a method for reducing economic expenses (Vásquez & Bohara, 2010).

The term 'child labour' is commonly used in two ways: to refer to children working in factories for profit to increase household earnings; and to describe a universal social injustice. Child labour impairs children's social, physical, mental, spiritual and emotional development. According to the ILO report (2010), approximately 215 million minors are affected by child labour. Asia and Africa together account for over 90% of global child employment; these children are predominately located in rural areas. They work for many reasons; but the most important of these is poverty. An increase in child labour has been observed worldwide, owing to the growth of rural populations; the participation and fertility of the female workforce; life expectancy; public education expenditures; and involvement of the workforce in agriculture and industry. Child labour decreases as GDP per capita increases (Saad-Lessler, 2010). It is important to note that although these children are not well paid, they serve as a contributor to family earnings in developing countries. The difficulties of education also increase child labour and there is need for quality schooling to encourage parents to send their children to school to learn and fulfil themselves (UNICEF, 2006).

A lack of educational opportunities and job opportunities; family conflicts; an improper distribution of income; unemployment; poverty; and child labour: these are the main issues faced by many underdeveloped and developing countries. Maitra & Ray (2002) analysed data from three countries (Pakistan, Ghana and Peru) which indicated that poverty is a significant rationale for child labour in these countries. The utilization of child labour is mostly observed in the agricultural sector, and a sizable proportion of these children work in their family businesses as non-paid labourers (Kim, 2011). This type of work, which negatively affects the academic and communal development of the child, has been considered less frequently than paid labour done outside the family context (Zabaleta, 2011). Faced with these important issues, it can be seen that child labour is clearly a major issue for all humanity; however,

*To whom correspondence should be addressed:

Department of Educational Training,
The Islamia University of Bahawalpur,
R.Y. Khan Campus
Rahim Yar Khan, Pakistan

this is especially true in developing countries, where the phenomenon is widespread and where an abundance of literature and empirical evidence reveals the magnitude of this growing problem.

The Government of Pakistan's Children Employment Act, 1991 prohibits the work of children below 14 years of age and suggests punishment, detention and fines if someone disobeys the state rules and offers employment to the child. Furthermore, due to the cultural and geographical differences among provinces of Pakistan, not all the determinants of child labour are the same. Part of the vast selection of literature on child labour in Pakistan provides empirical evidence of the causes, nature and determining factors of child labour. Most of the earlier investigations are composed of case studies based on interviews with working children; these mainly discuss qualitative features. Other studies use macro data. However, a small segment of the studies focused on the quantitative features of child labour. On an international level, many comparative studies have also been observed, such as Pushkar & Ray's 2000 study of child labour across three continents; a comparative study between Pakistan and Nepal (Ray, 2001) China, India, Cambodia, Vietnam, etc. As for Pakistan, Khan, Khan, & Sattar (2010) examined the determinants of child labour in urban and rural areas, and Malik (2012) examined two districts: Sukkur in Sindh and Multan in Punjab.

During a literature review, we observed a small number of studies in Pakistan related to South Punjab. The point of change in the present study and its predecessors is the use of primary data and the selection of South Punjab districts to find out the causative factors of child labour. The data, population, sample size and instrument development and validation are discussed in the next section.

2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted to analyse the causative factors of child labour in selected districts of South Punjab, Pakistan. For the problem under investigation, focussing on the current situation and keeping in view the nature of the study, a descriptive research design was found to be appropriate. Descriptive research sets out to describe and interpret a phenomenon (Gay & Airasian, 2000). Among the different descriptive research designs, a survey-based investigation was considered to be the most suitable for extracting reliable results (Haider & Hussain, 2014). As the study was descriptive in nature, information was collected from representative groups in order to draw inferences.

2.1 Population and Sampling

The study population consists of rural and urban, male and female children in the 5-14 age group from South Punjab. Seven places of work (hotels, tea stalls, tuck shops, workshops, petrol stations and domestic environments, etc.) involved in child labour were selected as a sample. A purposive sampling technique was used because the majority of children in South Punjab work in informal economic sectors. Therefore, 547 working children were selected from the districts of Bahawalpur, Rahim Yar Khan, Bahawalnagar, Multan and Lodhran. 346 of these children were taken from urban areas and 201 from rural areas.

2.2 Measurement

The development of a research questionnaire was the result of a literature review and continuous discussions with educational experts and faculty members. The questionnaire was composed of 37 closed-ended questions. A one-page demographic characteristics sheet was used to obtain personal information related to gender, age, location, family structure and qualifications, etc. In the questionnaire, poverty, physical punishment, family disputes and unawareness-related questions were included.

51 items in the original were designed for measuring general characteristics in four areas. The initial 11 items were designed to find out the general characteristics, i.e. age, profession, area, mother tongue, qualifications, father's occupation, father's salary, father's qualifications, mother's qualifications, number of family members, number of educated family members. Family Responsibilities (Items, 01- 11) was developed as the first area in order to find out about the child's responsibilities to the family, i.e. whether the child works willingly in order to fulfil the requirements of family; the age of the child; whether the child has a special responsibility as the eldest son. The second area – Employer Behaviour and Satisfaction (Items, 12-18) – was designed to find out about the employer's treatment of the child: whether the child is given time to rest; whether corporal punishment is used; reasons for punishment inflicted by the employer; and the overall behaviour of the employer. The third area – Work Interest (Items, 19-25) – was designed to find out the reasons and personal motivations behind the child's involvement in labour: i.e. no interest in studying; a desire to learn skills at work; and the chance to purchase enjoyable items or experiences. The fourth area – Educational Opportunities (Items, 26-37) was designed to find out the child's reasons for eschewing education: bad treatment at the hands of teachers; getting an education and technical education; parents' attitude towards education; and the provision of free education or scholarships.

2.3 Reliability, Validity, Data Collection and Analysis

The instrument was developed after a thorough review of the literature. A panel of three professors established the item and face validity of the research instruments. Questionnaire contents approved by experts were retained, while inappropriate questions were revised on the basis of suggestions and criticism. The research instrument was then piloted on a small sample of 10 children. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated to assess the reliabilities of the questionnaire. Cronbach's alpha values observed: 0.71 for Family Responsibilities, 0.82 for Employer Behaviour, 0.67 for Work Interest and 0.86 for Educational Opportunities. We collected the required data from five districts of South Punjab. Before collecting the data, permission was sought from respondents and their parents or guardians. The data collected were analysed using SPSS version 19, and multiple

Table 1. Cronbach's Alpha and Descriptive measures of the factors

Factors	Number of items	Cronbach's α	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Family Responsabilities	9	0.719	1.11	2.00	1.64	0.21
Owner Behaviour	5	0.823	1.00	2.60	1.91	0.31
Work Interest	4	0.676	1.00	2.50	1.91	0.29
Educational Opportunities	9	0.864	1.00	2.00	1.40	0.31

statistics such as Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) with Principal Component Analysis method (PCA) and Varimax rotation, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), Pearson correlation, paired sample t-test, ANOVA, Standard Deviation, mean, and the percentages were calculated.

3 RESULTS OF STUDY

The study was designed to explore the causative factors of child labour in selected districts of South Punjab, Pakistan. A questionnaire was prepared to collect data, and it was analysed using the 19th version of SPSS. The results deal with the analysis and interpretation of the data in accordance with the aims of the study.

It is evident from (Table 2) that out of 547 working children, children aged 5-7 years make up 2.9% of the total; children in the 8-10 age group make up 34.9%; and 340 working children are between the ages of 11 and 14 (62.2%). This means that the majority of working children belong to the 11-14 age group. As regards the locations or areas where child labour is most prevalent, we can see that 346 working children come from urban areas (63.3%) and 201 working children come from rural areas (36.7%). This means that the majority of working children live in urban areas. The family language of working children breaks down as follows: 121 children belong to Urdu speaking families (22.1%); 217 working children belong to Saraiki speaking families (39.7%); and 208 working children belong to Punjabi speaking families (38.0%). This means that the majority of working children – 217 – belong to Saraiki speaking families. The educational profile of child labour indicated that 265 children are uneducated (48.4%); 194 children have a primary education (35.5%); 83 children are middle-school educated (15.2%); and five children have a high-school education (9%). This means that the majority of working children are uneducated. As regards the number of family members of working children, the study found that 79 children (14.4%) had one to three family members, 316 children (57.8%) had four to six family members, and 152 children (27.8%) had seven to nine family members. This means that the majority of children questioned are involved in child labour due to large family size.

Family Responsibilities

It is evident from Table 3 that 62% of the child labourers surveyed acknowledged that they work for their family of their own volition. More than 71% of child labourers believe that their work is appropriate to their age level, while more than 59% of child labourers want to continue working for their family. More than 84% of child labourers opined that their job is very necessary for their family. It is also noticed that more than 71% of child labourers work because of their large family size, while more than 81% work due to the poor economic conditions of

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of general characteristics

Category		Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Children's Age	5-7 years	16	2.9	2.9	2.9
	8-10 years	191	34.9	34.9	37.8
	11-14 years	340	62.2	62.2	100
Location Nature	Urban	346	63.3	63.3	63.3
	Rural	201	36.7	36.7	100
Family Language	Urdu	121	22.1	22.1	22.1
	Saraiki	217	39.7	39.7	61.8
	Punjabi	208	38	38	99.8
	Others	1	0.2	0.2	100
Education Profile	Not educated/Illiterate.	265	48.4	48.4	48.4
	Primary.	194	35.5	35.5	83.9
	Middle.	83	15.2	15.2	99.1
	Matriculation	5	0.9	0.9	100
	Others.	97	17.7	17.7	100
No. of Family Members	01 - 03	79	14.4	14.4	14.4
	04 - 06	316	57.8	57.8	72.2
	07 and Above	152	27.8	27.8	100

Table 3. Child labour responses for Family Responsibilities

Response	Percentage (%)	
	Yes	**No**
You are working of your own volition to help your family	62	38
You are satisfied that your work is appropriate to your age	71.8	28.2
Do you want to continue working for your family?	59.2	40.8
Your job is essential to your family	84.3	15.7
You work due to the large size of your family	71	28.2
You work due to the poor economic condition of your family	71.8	18.6
You work because of the low income of your father	72.9	27.1
You work due to family responsibilities	42.4	57.6
You are educated, but you work due to parents' unemployment	32.5	67.5
Overall Responses (Mean & SD)	63.10 (16.32)	35.74 (17.34)
Paired Sample t-test	t (08) = 2.44	Sig = .04

their family. More than 72% of child labourers responded that they work due to the low income of their fathers, whilst more than 57% of working children suggest there may be other reasons why they work. More than 67% also stated that even though they are educated, they work because of their parents' lack of employment. The overall mean and standard deviation for (yes) responses were (M = 63.10, SD = 16.32), and a statistically significant difference was observed between 'yes' and 'no' sets of responses in favour of the 'yes' side, t = 2.44, df = 08, p = .04).

Owner Behaviour

It is clear from Table 4 that more than 86% of child labourers believe that their employer is satisfied with their work. More than 72% of child labourers agreed with the statement 'Your employer gives you time to rest'. It can be observed that 67% of child labourers admitted that their owners used corporal punishment on them, while more than 66% also accepted that their employer used punishment for no reason. These might be cheap tactics used by employers to pressurize the children into working for them. More than 82% of the children also argued that although their employers punished them for no reason, or in an effort to retain control over them, these employers were helpful towards their child workers and supported them in their difficult situation. The overall mean and standard deviation for 'yes' responses were (M = 74.98, SD = 8.84), and a statistically significant difference was observed between 'yes' and 'no' sets of responses in favour of 'yes': t = 6.31, df = 04, p = .003).

Work Interest

It can be seen from Table 5 that more than 50% of child labourers admitted that they work because they have no interest in studying. More than 82% of child labourers stated that they receive a decent salary and are satisfied that it is appropriate to the amount of work they put in. Over 92% of child labourers stated that they were learning new skills in their work. It is also important to point out that more than 67% of child labourers argued that they have access to enjoyable things (like television, mobiles, computers and CD / DVD players, etc.) due to their child labour. The overall mean and standard deviation for 'yes'

Table 4. Child labour responses for Employer Behaviour

Response	Percentage (%)	
	Yes	No
Do you think that your employer is satisfied with your work?	86.1	13.9
Your employer gives you time to rest	72.4	27.6
Your employer has used physical punishment on you	67.1	32.9
Your employer has used punishment for no reason	66.9	33.1
Your employer is helpful towards you	82.4	17.6
Overall Responses (Mean & SD)	74.98 (8.84)	25.02 (8.84)
Paired Sample t-test	t (04) = 6.31	Sig = .003

Table 5. Child labour responses of work interest

Response	Percentage (%)	
	Yes	No
You work because you are not interested in studying	50.1	49.9
Do you get a salary appropriate to your work efforts?	82.1	17.9
Do you learn any skills from this work?	92.1	7.9
Do you have access to enjoyable things thanks to this work?	67.2	32.8
Overall Responses (Mean & SD)	72.82 (18.32)	27.17 (18.32)
Paired Sample t-test	t (03) = 2.49	Sig = .088

Table 6. Child labour responses regarding Educational Opportunities

Response	Percentage (%)	
	Yes	No
You left your studies due to the harsh behaviour of teachers at school	80.3	19.7
Would you agree to get an education if someone provided you with free schooling or a scholarship?	52.5	47.5
Would you agree to get a technical education if it was provided free of charge?	67.5	32.5
Would you agree to get an education if the duration of the school day were reduced?	51	49
Would you agree to get an education if separate girls' and boys' schools were opened in your area?	36.6	63.4
Do you agree with a new school being opened near your house?	49	51
Do you have an interest in education?	75	25
Do your parents motivate you to get an education?	29.6	70.4
Do you get any help from educational institutions?	12.4	87.6
Do you feel inferior when you see other children going to school?	70.5	29.5
Overall Responses (Mean & SD)	52.44 (21.67)	47.56 (21.67)
Paired Sample t-test	t (09) = .356	Sig = .730

responses were (M = 72.84, SD = 18.32), and a statistically significant difference was observed between 'yes' and 'no' sets of responses at .10 level of significance, in favour of 'yes', t = 2.49, df = 03, p = .088).

Educational Opportunities

Table 6 indicated that more than 80% of child labourers leave their studies due to the harsh behaviour of teachers at school. A small majority of child labourers would agree to get an education if an organization or individual were to provide it free of charge. More than 67% of child labourers expressed their wish to get a technical education if it were provided free of charge, while a small majority of 51% agreed that they would get an education if the school day was reduced, allowing them to work after school. It is also worth remarking that more than 63% of child labourers would not agree to be educated even if separate boys' and girls' schools were opened in their area, while 51% of child labourers did not agree that new schools should open near their houses. It is important to point out that 75% of child labourers did express an interest in studying; however, due to the non-availability of educational opportunities, these children seldom go to school. More than 70% of child labourers explained that their parents do not motivate them to get an education, whilst more than 87% also argued that they do not receive any help or financial resources from educational institutions. It should also be noted that more than 70% of child labourers feel a sense of inferiority when they see other children going to school. The overall mean and standard deviation for 'yes' responses were (M = 52.44, SD = 21.67) and, statistically, no significant difference was observed between 'yes' and 'no' sets of responses, t = .356, df = 09, p = .730).

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted to explore the factors structure in the research instrument (see table 7). Principal component analysis with varimax rotation extracted the uncorrelated items of the research instrument. The EFA results identified four factors, with each of their Eigenvalues greater than 1.0, and with 64% of the total variance explained. 27 items were finally retained after the analysis. The four factors are: Family Responsibilities (09 items), Employer Behaviour (05 items), Work Interest (04 items) and Educational Opportunities (09 items). Cronbach's alpha coefficients of the reliabilities for the four factors ranged from 0.67 to 0.86, indicating good internal consistencies of the items within each factor. Factor scores of the rotated factors extracted from the analysis were computed and used in the following analysis.

Moreover, the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) of the instrument indicates that there exist significantly high correlations among the error variances of item 10 ('Your employer is helpful towards you'), item 11 ('You work due to

Table 7. Component factor loading of child labour factors

Items	Component Factor Loading			
	FR	EB	WI	EO
You are working of your own volition to help your family	.743			
You are satisfied that your work is appropriate to your age	.591			
Do you want to continue working for your family?	.755			
Your job is essential to your family	.494			
You work due to the large size of your family	.498			
You work due to the poor economic condition of your family	.595			
You work because of the low income of your father	.733			
You work due to family responsibilities	.413			
You are educated, but you work due to parents' unemployment	.612			
Do you think that your employer is satisfied with your work?		.458		
Your employer gives you time to rest		.477		
Your employer has used physical punishment on you		.755		
Your employer has used punishment for no reason		.801		
Your employer is helpful towards you		.491		
You work because you are not interested in studying.			.620	
Do you get a salary appropriate to your work efforts?			.580	
Do you learn any skills from this work?			.458	
Do you have access to enjoyable things thanks to this work?			.470	
You left your studies due to the harsh behaviour of teachers at school.				.447
Would you agree to get an education if someone provided you with free schooling or a scholarship?				.870
Would you agree to get a technical education if it were provided free of charge?				.761
Would you agree to get an education if the school day was reduced?				.899
Would you agree to get an education if separate girls' and boys' schools were opened in your area?				.720
Do you agree with a new school being opened near your house?				.906
Do you have an interest in education?				.843
Do your parents motivate you to get an education?				.459
Do you get any help from educational institutions?				.412
Do you feel inferior when you see other children going to school?				.428

FR= Family Responsibilities, EB= Employer Behaviour, WI= Work Interest, EO= Educational Opportunities

Note: Only those values greater than 0.40 are provided in the table

your large family size'), item 17 ('You work because you are not interested in studying'), item 18 ('You are educated, but work due to your parents' unemployment'), items 23, 24, 25, 27 and item 35 ('Are you in contact with any NGOs?'). Modification indices indicated that the removal of these items could improve the goodness of fit. The results of CFA for the remaining items demonstrated that the CFA model for the remaining factors fitted the data very well (Chi-square goodness of fit = 6.51, df = 27, p = 0.15; CFI = 0.92; NNFI = 0.80; RMSEA = 0.04; IFI = 0.88; RFI = 0.84; NFI = 0.81) while Cronbach's alpha coefficient of reliability for the overall scale was .791.

To investigate the background variables of child labour (see Table 9), a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. This demonstrated a significant difference between child labour and the children's age: 5-7 years (M 1.60, SD .13), 8-10 years (M 1.60, SD .13) and 11-14 years (M 1.69, SD .14) with F (2, 544) = 24.82, P = .000. Whereas, in the case of mother tongue, no significant difference was noted between mother tongue and child labour: F (3, 543) = 1.08, P = .357. However, a significant difference was identified with academic qualification: F (3, 543) = 59.69, P = .000; father's occupation: F (4, 542) = 9.89, P = .000; and father's salary: F (3, 543) = 6.63, P = .000.

To investigate the child labour background variables, the one way (ANOVA) technique was used. A significant difference was observed between father's qualification: F (4, 542) = 8.29, P = .000; mother's qualification: F (4, 542) = 4.76, P = .001; and number of educated family members: F (3, 543) = 25.66, P = .000 and child labour. However, in the case of total family members: 1-3 (M 1.66, SD .16), 4-6 (M 1.65, SD .14) and 7-9 (M 1.65, SD .14) with F (2, 544) = .10, P = .906, no significant difference was observed among the variables of the study (see Table 10).

To investigate the child labour background variables, One Way (ANOVA) was used which demonstrate that a significant difference was observed between father's qualification F (4, 542) = 8.29, P = .000, mother's qualification F (4, 542) = 4.76, P = .001, number of educated family members F (3, 543) = 25.66, P = .000 and child labour. However, in case of total family members, 1-3 (M 1.66, SD .16), 4-6 (M 1.65, SD .14) and 7-9 (M 1.65, SD .14) with F (2, 544) = .10, P = .906 no significant difference was observed among the variables of the study (see Table 10).

4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

68 years after coming into existence as an independent nation, Pakistan is still in a critical condition. It has demonstrated a failure in the labour market and has been unable to develop itself successfully. The country's unstable economy has a big influence on this area, as it does on many others, particularly

Table 8. Correlation coefficients among the factors behind child labour

	1	2	3	4
1. Family Responsibilities	-			
2. Employer Behaviour	-.087*	-		
3. Work Interest	-.274**	.093*	-	
4. Educational Opportunities	.136**	.022	-.155**	-

*Correlation is significant at 0.05; **correlation is significant at 0.01

Table 9. Children's age, mother tongue, academic qualification, father's occupation and father's salary: difference on child labour

Factor		N	M	SD	df	F	Sig
Children's Age	5-7 Years	16	1.60	0.13	2	24.82	.000
	8-10 Years	191	1.60	0.13			
	11-14 Years	340	1.69	0.14			
Mother Tongue	Urdu	121	1.66	0.14	3	1.08	0.357
	Punjabi	217	1.66	0.14			
	Saraiki	208	1.64	0.14			
	Others	1	1.56	.			
Academic Qualification	Illiterate	265	1.59	0.13	3	59.69	.000
	Primary	194	1.69	0.13			
	Middle	83	1.77	0.11			
	Matric	5	1.83	0.08			
Father's Occupation	Labourer	249	1.62	0.14	4	9.89	.000
	Agriculture	124	1.65	0.14			
	Employee	137	1.71	0.14			
	Business	34	1.71	0.14			
	Others	3	1.56	0.04			
Father's Salary	1000-2000	155	1.61	0.13	3	6.63	.000
	2000-3000	176	1.68	0.15			
	3000-5000	119	1.67	0.15			
	Others	97	1.66	0.14			

child labour and its mismanagement. The impoverishment of society has forced children from their studies into unsafe working environments which are physically, emotionally and mentally damaging to children's long-term health. Child labour is a widespread trend that exists primarily in developing countries in both urban and rural areas. Children perform jobs at hotels, tea stalls, tuck shops, workshops and petrol stations, and they also work as domestic workers and in the service sector.

Many research studies have identified a great number of factors that contribute to child labour all over the world. Efforts have been made to explore the different dimensions of this problem, and our research proposal has identified a few of the main causative factors of child labour in South Punjab. Four main factors of child labour are examined as a result of our exploratory factor analysis. These are: Family Responsibilities, Employer Behaviour, Work Interest, and Educational Opportunities. Additionally, children in the 11-14 age group were identified as the main victims of the child labour problem. The results demonstrate that a large number of child labourers are from urban areas. This is because expenditures in urban areas are high in comparison with rural areas, and so children work because of their parents' desire for additional earnings.

Moreover, insufferable economic pressures on parents force them to push their children into work. These children have no option but to obey their parents and they also feel duty-bound to share the financial burden of their families. These findings revealed that poverty is the chief reason for child labour, especially in cities. However, many other factors also contribute, such as father's income, family size, type of work, parents' qualifications, number of family members and so on. It has been observed that at certain levels of poverty, child labour becomes indispensable for the economic existence of the families. Considering the low economic value of child labour at present, parents are struggling to capitalize on their value for the fulfilment of their basic needs. Many studies also revealed that household income is a very important factor in child labour. Sakellariou and Lall (2000) argued that poverty is the primary reason for child labour in the Philippines. They further suggested that the probabilities of child labour increase when family income is not sufficient.

Meltem (2006) has demonstrated that children from low-income families, or families in which the father earns little, are always at risk of child labour. A study conducted by Malik, et al (2012) collected data from two districts (Multan & Sukkur) in Pakistan, revealing that poverty is one of the main motivations behind sending children into the labour market. The household income significantly influences parents' decision to send their children to work. In both urban and rural areas, higher earnings and a higher income level of the head of a family reduce the probabilities of child labour. This effect is particularly striking when comparing urban and rural areas (Khan, Khan, & Sattar, 2010).

It is usually believed that the education of the head of a family plays a significant part in the child's likelihood of going to school. Khan (2003) noticed that, in rural areas of Pakistan, the likelihood of a child receiving schooling increases by an average of 9.7% with each unit increase of one year's schooling completed by the head of family. This explores very significant complementarities between the head of a family's education and their child's schooling. Emerson & Portela (2001) indicated a strong relationship between the education level of parents and the probability of their children going to school. In this study the majority of working children's heads of family were found to be illiterate and therefore unable to perform any other kind of work. The same was observed of mothers, who were not only uneducated, but also unaware of the importance of education, meaning that they did not wish to send their children to school.

The results demonstrate that most child labourers are in families of four to six. This large family structure forces them to be engaged in child labour and reduces their likelihood of going to school. This study is also in line with Malik et al (2012), who shows that a high dependency ratio was observed in Multan, where children are pushed into working in the market because their families are large and their heads of families earn a low income. The more uneducated family members that children have, the fewer opportunities they have to enhance their

Table 10. Qualification of father, qualification of mother, total number of family members, and number of educated family members: difference on child labour

Factor		N	M	SD	df	F	Sig
Fathers' Qualification	Illiterate	332	1.63	0.14	4	8.29	.000
	Primary	92	1.67	0.14			
	Middle	74	1.71	0.15			
	High-school	39	1.72	0.13			
	More	10	1.64	0.08			
Mothers' Qualification	Illiterate	462	1.64	0.14	4	4.76	.001
	Primary	48	1.72	0.12			
	Middle	29	1.69	0.13			
	High-school	4	1.79	0.08			
	More	4	1.67	0.17			
Total Family Members	1-3	79	1.66	0.16	2	0.10	.906
	4-6	316	1.65	0.14			
	7-9	152	1.65	0.14			
No. of Educated Family Members	1	124	1.68	0.14	3	25.66	.000
	2	165	1.69	0.14			
	3	87	1.70	0.13			
	More	171	1.58	0.12			

resources, education and income.

In conclusion, it is difficult to identify all the factors influencing child labour in a single study because a huge amount of resources are needed to pinpoint all the components. The overall results and findings of this study have generated much hearsay evidence. The results of this investigation are also in line with most other studies conducted in the same area (in developing and developed countries), except a few that did not yield the same findings and conclusions. If we wanted to generalize about other geographical regions based on our results, more studies would be required to look into the differing conditions in those other regions and districts. Considering our results, and the small sample size, a generalization might not be appropriate. It is strongly recommended that more research be conducted at the national level, and in a similar pattern, to ensure proper decision making in the formulation of policies and their execution in the field. Moreover, legislative amendments, such as prohibiting child labour, cannot be long-lasting solutions; only implementable and well-organized action plans and policies can eradicate child labour in Pakistan.

5 ACTION IMPLICATIONS

This situation demands serious consideration by parents, teachers, policy & planning departments and the government of Pakistan. Educational awareness should be generated amongst the population, and the attention of parents should be directed towards the education of their children. Child Labour Laws should be implemented in their truest sense, with effective monitoring to ensure that the causative factors of child labour are eliminated. The education system of Pakistan should be modified and redesigned. Afternoon schools, providing healthcare, should be established for working children. Financial help should be provided for the education of deprived child labourers over longer periods, until the children are self-independent. Adult education programmes should be introduced quickly: these will also help reduce child labour. Education may be linked to credit provision and skill training in order to attract the attention of children and parents. Moreover, family planning must be introduced through programmes of education.

REFERENCES

Emerson, P, M., & Portela, A. (2001). *Bargaining Over Sons and Daughters: Child Labour, School Attendance and Intra-Household Gender Bias in Brazil*. Ithaca: Department of Economics, Cornell University.

Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. W. (2002). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*. Lahore: National Book Foundation.

Haider, S. Z., & Hussain, A. (2014). Relationship between Teacher Factors and Student Achievement: A Correlational Study of Secondary Schools. *US-China Education Review A*, *4*(7), 465-480.

Holgado, D., Maya-Jariego, I., Ramos, I., Palacio, J., Oviedo-Trespalacios, O., Romero-Mendoza, V., & Amar, J. (2014). Impact of child labor on academic performance: Evidence from the program "Edúcame Primero Colombia". *International Journal of Educational Development, 34*, 58-66. doi:10.1016/j.ijedudev.2012.08.004

ILO (2010*). Accelerating Actions against Child Labour*. Report of the Director-General. International Labour Office: Geneva.

Khan, R. E. A. (2003). Children in different activities: child schooling and child labour. *The Pakistan Development Review*, *42*(2), 137-160.

Khan, R. E. A., Khan, T., & Sattar, R. (2010). A comparative analysis of rural and urban child labor in Pakistan. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, *27*, 139-157. doi:10.2139/ssrn.2567431

Kim, C.-Y. (2011). Child labour, education policy and governance in Cambodia. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *31*(5), 496-504. doi:10.1016/j.ijedudev.2011.03.002

Maitra, P., & Ray, R. (2002). The joint estimation of child participation in schooling and employment: comparative evidence from three continents. *Oxford Development Studies*, *30*(1), 41-62. doi:10.1080/136008101200114895

Malik, A. K., Bhutto, N. A., Shaikh, D., Akhter, E., & Butt, F. (2012). *Another Real Fact about Child Labor: A Comparative Study between Districts of Two Provinces of Pakistan*. In *Proceedings of 2nd International Conference on Business Management Lahore*. Retrieved from: http://umt.edu.pk/icobm2012/pdf/2C-81P.pdf

Meltem, D. (2006). The impact of household income on child labour in urban Turkey. *Journal of Development Studies*, *42*(6), 939-956. doi:10.1080/00220380600774723

Pushkar, M. & Ray, R. (2000). *The Joint Estimation of Child Participation in Schooling and Employment: Comparative Evidence from Three Continents*. Victoria/Hobart: University of Monash/University of Tasmania.

Ray, R. (2001). *Simultaneous Analysis of Child Labour and Child Schooling: Comparative Evidence from Nepal and Pakistan. Schools of Economics*. Hobart, Australia: University of Tasmania.

Saad-Lessler, J. (2010). A cross-national study of child labor and its determinants. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, *44*(1), 325-344. doi:10.1353/jda.0.0074

Sakellariou, C., & Lall, A. (2000). Child Labour in the Philippines: Determinants and Effects. *Asian Economic Journal*, *14*(3), 233-253. doi:10.1111/1467-8381.00110

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) (2006). *The State of the World's Children 2006*. Retrieved from UNICEF Webpage: http://www.unicef.org/sowc06/pdfs/sowc06_fullreport.pdf

Vásquez, W. F., & Bohara, A. K. (2010). Household shocks, child labor, and child schooling: evidence from Guatemala. *Latin American research review*, *45*(3), 165-186.

Zabaleta, M. B. (2011). The impact of child labor on schooling outcomes in Nicaragua. *Economics of Education Review*, *30*(6), 1527-1539. doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2011.08.008

How to cite this article:
Haider, S.Z. & Qureshi, A. (2016). Are All Children Equal? Causative Factors of Child Labour in Selected Districts of South Punjab, Pakistan. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*, *5*(1), 3-10. doi: 10.7821/naer.2016.1.132