

Exploring the Determinants of Child Labor in District Peshawar

Aneela Ejaz¹
Nadeem Iqbal²
Aisha Rehman³
Khadija Zia⁴

Abstract

The study investigates the relationship between skilled labor, poverty and child labor in district Peshawar. OLS and Multinomial Logistic Regression model is used for empirical findings. 150 boys (5-17 years) are randomly selected for survey. The methodology employed in the present study involves collecting primary data through questionnaires from two distinct populations: physically demanding laborers in Shoba Bazaar's mechanic shops and children engaged in online work. The majority of the little boys had no or little education. Most of their fathers had little education and were in poorly paid jobs, unemployed or deceased. Moreover, the study suggests that educational years of children and head's educational status have strong negative impact on child labor. In addition, the study finds that age of children has positive relationship with child labor while joint family system has negative impact on child labor. Poverty serves as a driving force for child labor.

Keywords: Child Labor, Poverty, OLS, Peshawar

¹ MPhil scholar, Department of Economics, University of Peshawar.

*Corresponding Author's Email: aneelaejaz1997@gmail.com

² Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, University of Peshawar. Email: nadeemiqbal@uop.edu.pk

³ PHD scholar, Department of Economics, University of Peshawar. Email: ayesharehman1995@gmail.com

⁴ MPhil scholar, Department of Economics, University of Peshawar. Email: khadijazia1996@gmail.com

Introduction

Child labor represents a critical socio-economic challenge that violates the rights of children and obstructs their physical, mental, and educational growth. This situation adversely affects economic development by fostering a predominantly uneducated and unskilled workforce, thereby sustaining the cycle of poverty (Ortiz-Ospina & Roser, 2016; Munir et al., 2022). As reported by the International Labor Organization (ILO, 2020), at the onset of 2020, approximately 160 million children between the ages of 5 and 17 were engaged in child labor worldwide, with 79 million involved in hazardous occupations. These statistics encompass 89.3 million children aged 5 to 11, 35.6 million aged 12 to 14, and 35 million aged 15 to 17 (ILO & UNICEF, 2021).

Child labor is particularly prevalent in agriculture, where the majority of child laborers are employed (ILO, 2021). Unemployment and economic hardship due to COVID-19 have

reduced the living standards of many vulnerable families. Temporary school closures during the pandemic are also causing children to drop out of school. Nearly 9 million more children are expected to be in child labor by the end of 2022 due to increased poverty and school closures due to the pandemic (ILO & UNICEF, 2021).

Child labor is a serious issue in Africa and the Asia-Pacific, affecting 72 million and 62 million children, respectively (ILO, 2021). India also grapples with high rates of child labor; 56.4% of children aged 5-14 work in agriculture, and 33.1% in industry, often in hazardous conditions to help pay family debts. They face risks of exploitation and trafficking (Radfar, 2018). In Bangladesh, 5% of children are involved in labor, with 48% working for wages, 42% as unpaid family workers, and 11% self-employed (World Bank, 2021).

In Pakistan, around 3.3 million children are engaged in labor, many facing significant health and developmental risks (UNICEF, 2021). Nearly 10% of workers are aged 10-14, with over 32.5% between 12 and 14, most lacking access to education. High child labor rates stem from poverty, unemployment, and limited educational resources. Punjab has the highest child labor rates, followed by Sindh and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (Azhar et al., 2021; Achakzai, 2011).

In Pakistan, poverty significantly contributes to the prevalence of child labor. According to the World Bank (2021), approximately 39.8% of the global population lives in poverty, and many families in Pakistan depend on the earnings of their children to fulfill basic necessities. A large portion of the population relies on agriculture for their livelihoods, which makes the involvement of children crucial for the family's financial stability. In rural regions, around two-thirds of child laborers are engaged in agricultural work, whereas in urban settings, nearly three-fifths are involved in production-related activities (Azhar et al., 2020). The factors influencing child labor vary between rural and urban contexts, reflecting the distinct socio-economic conditions present in each area.

Child labor in Pakistan is driven by the need to supplement family income, as parents often prioritize income over education due to high costs and low preference for school (Subhadarsani, 2014). An estimated 7.3 million Pakistani children are not enrolled in primary school, and nearly half of Pakistan's population is out of school at various levels of education (Philipp, 2019). The business conditions are spread in various industries, such as brick ovens and carpet production. There, children are facing health problems such as visual, dust, and other dangers (Awaworyi Churchill et al. 2021; Sibte-Ali et al., 2024).

Adolescents between the ages of 15 and 17 are also highly involved in child labor due to limited employment opportunities and the need to provide for their families (Gabriel, 2019). Equipping rural youth with the necessary skills can help them transition to fair, safe, and equitable employment (Magdalena et al., 2021).

Child labor is far more prevalent among children from poor households than among children from non-poor households. According to the study, poverty is closely associated with child labor. Families with poor income send their children to work because they can't afford school fees. Historically, poverty and child labor have been closely linked. The validity of this relationship has been questioned by recent research, which claims that poverty is not the main determinant of child labor (Hoque, 2021). In another study, child labor in the global economy is analyzed extensively, including the distinction between skilled and unskilled labor (Boutin & Jouvin, 2022). Study has shown that unskilled child labor negatively impacts on the growth of the economy. It can lead to lower quality human capital, resulting in lower productivity and innovation (Mehmood& Khan, 2016). Conversely, skilled child labor has been found to increase the availability of skilled labor, reduce production costs, and increase competitiveness in the economy (Ghulam et al., 2021).

This study main contribution is exploring the relationship between skills, poverty, and child labor based on the most recent available data. It differs from previous studies because the previous ones focused primarily on poverty and child labor. These studies largely analyzed the impact of household income and other general determinants on the probability of children to participate in the labor market (Akarro&Mtweve, 2011; Chaudhry& Khan, 2002). Some studies proved that poverty is the main cause of child labor (Shafiq, 2007; Alfa et al., 2016). Brown (2012) argued that for African child labor, poor quality of schooling and irrelevant skills of graduates according to labour market encouraged parents to get their child out from school. (Hafeez & Hussain, 2019) study analyze the relationship between education and child labor based. The main focus of this study will be the association between child labor and skilled or non-formal education. This research is unique because it explores how having certain skills, especially from non-formal education, can lead children to engage in labor. It brings a fresh perspective to the usual thinking that poverty alone is not the main reason for child labor. The objective of the study is assessing the prevalence and characteristics of skilled and unskilled child labor. And to explore the economic impact of skilled and unskilled child labor on wages and to explore the determinants of child labor, especially skilled labor, poverty, and child labor.

Theoretical Background

Gary S. Becker's Human Capital Theory provides a framework for understanding how education and skills development impact economic growth and individual earning potential. In his view, individuals invest in their human capital such as knowledge, skills, and abilities similarly to how they would invest in physical assets, with the expectation of returns through increased wages and better job opportunities (Becker, 2009). Education, training, health, and internal migration are vital for accumulating human capital, which contributes to productivity and innovation (Schultz, 1961; 1971).

The theory suggests that investing in education boosts productivity, leading to higher income and improved living standards. Becker argues that the decision to pursue education involves weighing costs and expected returns, such as potential wage increases and career opportunities. This perspective has implications for policymakers, who can promote economic growth and reduce inequality by investing in accessible education and skill development programs. The relationship between skilled labor, poverty, and child labor can be understood using Becker's human capital theory. Workers with skills are more likely to find higher-paying jobs, which may help lift them and their families out of poverty. Skills people's capabilities can be improved through technical education and other sources. By strengthening human capital and improving employment prospects, but this may also lead to increased levels of child labor. Access to skills development programs could possibly improve children's labor market outcomes. Poverty is reduced, but it is causing an increase in child labor (Becker 2009).

Econometric Model and Methodology

To estimate the impact of skilled labor, poverty, and other factors on child labor the following model is constructed on the basis of objectives, theoretical framework, and literature review (Nasir and Ozturk 2019).

$$\begin{aligned} child\ labor_i = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 Poverty_i + \beta_2 Age_i + \beta_3 Skilled\ labor_i + \beta_4 EDUH_i + \beta_5 INCH_i \\ & + \beta_6 child\ EDU_i + \beta_7 Family\ size_i + \beta_8 Parental\ status_i + \beta_9 Region_i + \varepsilon_i \end{aligned}$$

The econometric model includes child labor as a dependent variable, while independent variables include poverty, age, skilled labor, household head's education, household income, child education, family size (nuclear or join), parental status (alive and deceased) and region (rural and urban) as the dependent variable is in continuous form, so the model will be estimated through ordinary least square technique. The variables included in the model have been carefully selected to specifically investigate the individual and family-level determinants of child labor within the scope of this study.

Description of Variables

Child labor involves employing children in exploitative work that robs them of their childhood and hinders their education, exposing them to harmful conditions (ILO, 2021). Children aged 5 to 17 are particularly at risk. This study will measure child labor based on the number of years spent working.

Poverty is defined as a lack of resources to meet basic needs (Basu & Tzannatos, 2003) and will be assessed using the poverty gap and poverty line indicators, as well as caloric intake to measure economic hardship (Sheikh et al., 2020; Ameer et al., 2024; Shah et al., 2021).

The age of children involved in labor (Edmonds & Pavcnik, 2005) will be measured by the number of children in each age group.

Skilled labor refers to the prevalence of skilled workers, influenced by technical education, technology, and demand. It will be quantified in terms of expected future income (Beegle, Dehejia & Gatti, 2009; Ishfaq et al., 2024).

The educational background of the household head affects child labor rates (Ray, 2000). Higher educational attainment in household heads correlates with reduced child labor, as educated parents are better able to protect their children from work (Emerson & Souza, 2002; Shah et al., 2021b). This will be measured through direct questions about the household head's education level.

Household income influences child labor, with children often forced into work due to low family income (Dammert et al., 2018). Measurement of this variable is done through income data of the household, which includes various sources of income, such as salaries, wages, self-employment, investments, and government benefits.

Child education relates to school enrollment (Glewwe & Muralidharan, 2016). Higher enrollment rates are associated with decreased child labor, which will be measured by whether children are enrolled in school or not

Family size (nuclear or joint) impacts child labor, as children in joint families often work less due to shared financial responsibilities (Khalid & Shanaz, 2004). This variable will be measured as '1' for joint families and '0' for nuclear families.

Parental status indicates whether parents are alive (Emerson & Souza, 2002) and will be categorized as '1' for both parents alive, '2' for both deceased, and '0' for one parent alive.

Finally, the rural or urban classification will be binary, with '1' for rural areas and '0' for urban areas (Sharif, Mehmood, & Rehman, 2018).

Data Source

This study utilizes primary data collected through questionnaires from a sample of 150 children in the Peshawar district, specifically focusing on areas where child labor occurs. The target population is divided into two categories: First category consists of children engaged in physically demanding work, such as those working in mechanic shops in Shoba Bazaar, the main hub for such activities. The second category consists of children involved in online work. One is because of poverty and second one is because of income. The selection criteria for

participants require that they be aged 5 to 17 years. Only children meeting this age requirement were included in the study.

A structured questionnaire is used to collect the data, and a random sampling technique is used to select the children for the interview. The OLS (ordinary least square) and multinomial logistic regression model technique is used to get the empirical results to solve the problem.

Results and Discussion

Table1 represents the daily working hours of child. The table reveals that 18 children are working less than 5 hours per day. Meanwhile, 41 children are dedicating 5-7 hours to their work. For 46 children, their working hours fall within the range of 7-9 hours. Additionally, 38 children are working 9-12 hours a day, and 7 children are exceeding 12 hours of daily work.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Marginal Percentage
Daily working hours of child		
less than 5 hours	18	12.0%
5-7 hours	41	27.3%
7-9 hours	46	30.7%
9-12 hours	38	25.3%
more than 12 hours	7	4.7%

Table 2:

Daily working hours of child ^a	less than 5 hours (B)	Exp(B)	5-7 hours (B)	Exp(B)	7-9 hours (B)	Exp(B)	9-12 hours (B)	Exp(B)
Intercept	30.322		44.541		42.345		32.551	
Age	-.362	.696	-1.338	.262	-1.205	.300	-.870	.419
[Education=0]	-18.833	6.68E-9	-2.487	.083	-1.133	.322	6.435	623.345
[Education=1]	-9.449	7.87E-5	-4.306	.083	.451	1.570	5.750	314.042
[Education=2]	-9.952	4.76E-5	3.292	26.900	6.162	474.385	13.109	4.932E5
[Education=3]	10.415	3.335E4	8.356	4.254E3	8.186	3.590E3	10.074	2.373E4
[Education=4]	0 ^b		0 ^b		0 ^b		0 ^b	
[Reason=0]	13.748	9.348E5	6.426	617.743	9.744	1.705E4	13.427	6.784E5
[Reason=1]	0 ^b		0 ^b		0 ^b		0 ^b	
[ParentalStatus=0]	2.428	11.336	.827	2.287	1.911	6.758	.570	1.769
[ParentalStatus=1]	0 ^b		0 ^b		0 ^b		0 ^b	

[Region=0] [Region=1]	-12.689 0 ^b	3.08E-6	-10.758 0 ^b	2.127E-5	-10.552 0 ^b	2.615E-5	-8.239 0 ^b	.000*
[FamilyType=0] [FamilyType=1]	-10.039 0 ^b	4.36E-5	-9.812 0 ^b	5.477E-5	-10.943 0 ^b	1.769E-5	-10.942 0 ^b	1.770E-5
[HouseholdHeadEducation=0] [HouseholdHeadEducation=1] [HouseholdHeadEducation=2] [HouseholdHeadEducation=3] [HouseholdHeadEducation=4]	-12.000 12.553 5.101 -5.515 0 ^b	6.14E-6 2.830E5 164.114 .004*	8.110 12.858 6.365 -1.885 0 ^b	3.327E3 3.840E5 580.896 .152	9.449 13.077 1.853 .119 0 ^b	1.269E4 4.776E5 6.380 1.126	3.054 6.955 -3.288 .152 0 ^b	21.192 1.048E3 .037* 1.164
[HouseholdMonthlyIncome=0] [HouseholdMonthlyIncome=1] [HouseholdMonthlyIncome=2] [HouseholdMonthlyIncome=3]	-8.691 5.549 15.219 0 ^b	.000* 256.872 4.068E6	-9.578 12.067 13.871 0 ^b	6.924E-5 1.740E5 1.057E6	-12.506 11.987 13.545 0 ^b	3.705E-6 1.607E5 7.633E5	-11.066 12.988 14.402 0 ^b	1.564E-5 4.373E5 1.797E6
[HouseholdPerDayIncome=0] [HouseholdPerDayIncome=1] [HouseholdPerDayIncome=2] [HouseholdPerDayIncome=3]	-4.915 -7.696 -2.256 0 ^b	.007* .000* .105	-7.360 -6.246 -.910 0 ^b	.001* .002* .403	-9.097 -8.320 -1.715 0 ^b	.000* .000* .180	-11.153 -10.026 -.516 0 ^b	1.433E-5 4.424E-5 .597

Rating the skills of child

The table shows rating the skills of child. The table indicates that 15 children are highly skilled. 99 children are moderately skilled. 12 children are undecided about their skills, while 24 children's have low skills.

Table 3:

	N	Marginal Percentage
Rate the skills of child		
highly skilled	15	10.0%
moderately skilled	99	66.0%
Undecided	12	8.0%
low skills	24	16.0%

Table 4:

Highly skilled	B	Exp(B)	Moderately skilled (B)	Exp(B)	Undecided (B)	Exp(B)
----------------	---	--------	------------------------	--------	---------------	--------

Intercept	20.663		32.221		10.256	
Age	1.342	3.827	.739	2.094	.254	1.290
[Education=0]	11.625	1.119E5	30.615	1.976E13	62.355	1.204E27
[Education=1]	12.924	4.099E5	31.258	3.760E13	62.345	1.192E27
[Education=2]	13.161	5.196E5	33.829	4.920E14	62.967	2.219E27
[Education=3]	46.350	1.347E20	46.531	1.614E20	60.783	2.500E26
[Education=4]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[Reason=0]	-3.001	.050	-16.679	5.709E-8	-.267	.765*
[Reason=1]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[ParentalStatus=0]	-35.409	4.189E-16	-.923	.397	.109	1.115
[ParentalStatus=1]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[Region=0]	.366	1.442	1.050	2.858	-1.514	.220
[Region=1]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[FamilyType=0]	1.787	5.971	1.145	3.144	.885	2.422
[FamilyType=1]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[HouseholdHeadEducation=0]	-28.474	4.303E-13	-32.547	7.331E-15	.759	2.136
[HouseholdHeadEducation=1]	-26.302	3.777E-12	-30.773	4.318E-14	.941	2.561
[HouseholdHeadEducation=2]	-28.897	2.820E-13	-30.892	3.836E-14	2.892	18.026
[HouseholdHeadEducation=3]	-15.363	2.128E-7	-14.461	5.246E-7	-.660	.517
[HouseholdHeadEducation=4]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[HouseholdMonthlyIncome=0]	-5.917	.003	-9.369	8.536E-5	-44.561	4.439E-20
[HouseholdMonthlyIncome=1]	-8.184	.000	-12.497	3.738E-6	-45.448	1.829E-20
[HouseholdMonthlyIncome=2]	-11.304	1.232E-5	-12.720	2.992E-6	-61.731	1.551E-27
[HouseholdMonthlyIncome=3]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[HouseholdPerDayIncome=0]	-19.014	5.523E-9	-16.902	4.566E-8	-33.036	4.495E-15
[HouseholdPerDayIncome=1]	-16.410	7.465E-8	-14.608	4.526E-7	-32.696	6.316E-15
[HouseholdPerDayIncome=2]	-17.271	3.159E-8	-17.199	3.391E-8	-31.585	1.918E-14
[HouseholdPerDayIncome=3]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	

Table 5: Per Day Child Income

	N	Marginal Percentage
Per day earning of child less than 200	49	32.7%
200-500	53	35.3%
501-1000	26	17.3%
1100-3000	22	14.7%

This table shows the per day income of child. The table indicates that 49 children earn less than 200 per day, 53 children earn 200-500 per day, 26 children earn 5001-1000 per day while 22 children per day earning are 1100-3000.

Table 6:

Per day earning of child ^a	less than 200 (B)	Exp(B)	200-500 (B)	Exp(B)	501-1000 (B)	Exp(B)
Intercept	-13.814		-8.043		-10.598	
Age	.062	1.064	.503	1.653	.754	2.125
Education=0]	33.004	2.156E14	18.029	6.761E7	10.518	3.699E4
[Education=1]	34.162	6.864E14	21.001	1.320E9	24.132	3.022E10

[Education=2]	34.457	9.213E14	21.008	1.330E9	11.681	1.183E5
[Education=3]	2.718	15.157	3.693	40.145	4.137	62.641
[Education=4]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[Reason=0]	-21.573	4.275E-10	5.971	391.827	-9.299	9.150E-5
[Reason=1]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[ParentalStatus=0]	2.000	7.392	1.579	4.848	.975	2.650
[ParentalStatus=1]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[Region=0]	-2.152	.116	.073	1.076	-.514	.598
[Region=1]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[FamilyType=0]	-1.325	.266	-1.579	.206	-1.886	.152
[FamilyType=1]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[HouseholdHeadEducation=0]	2.983	19.742	-13.087	2.072E-6	-1.448	.235
[HouseholdHeadEducation=1]	15.207	4.022E6	.801	2.228	11.026	6.143E4
[HouseholdHeadEducation=2]	2.932	18.773	-12.577	3.450E-6	-.424	.654
[HouseholdHeadEducation=3]	2.687	14.689	.640	1.897	.507	1.660
[HouseholdHeadEducation=4]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[HouseholdMonthlyIncome=0]	6.814	910.310	11.035	6.201E4	8.796	6.610E3
[HouseholdMonthlyIncome=1]	-3.542	.029*	.067	1.070	-1.585	.205
[HouseholdMonthlyIncome=2]	-.071	.931	3.067	21.485	.190	1.210
[HouseholdMonthlyIncome=3]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[HouseholdPerDayIncome=0]	25.586	1.294E11	10.023	2.253E4	-.760	.468
[HouseholdPerDayIncome=1]	13.848	1.033E6	-1.296	.274	-.952	.386
[HouseholdPerDayIncome=2]	11.011	6.053E4	-3.984	.019*	-2.424	.089
[HouseholdPerDayIncome=3]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	

Table 7: Accruing Skills

		N	Marginal Percentage
Acquire these skills	informal training from family members	15	10.0%
	apprenticeship with a skilled worker	55	36.7%
	vocational training institute	24	16.0%
	self-learning	56	37.3%

This table shows that how children acquire the skills. The table indicates that 15 children acquire skills from informal training from family members. 55 children acquire skills under the apprenticeship of a skilled worker. 24 children acquire skills from vocational training institute while 56 children acquire the skills by self-learning.

Table 8:

Acquire these skills ^a	Informal training from family members (B)	Exp(B)	Apprenticeship with a skilled worker (B)	Exp(B)	Vocational training institute (B)	Exp(B)
Intercept	5.000		2.621		9.179	
Age	-.424	.655	-.175	.839	-.649	.522
Education=0]	26.208	2.411E11	.503	1.654	-19.017	5.506E-9

[Education=1]	26.541	3.363E11	.683	1.981	-19.340	3.989E-9
[Education=2]	26.324	2.706E11	-.104	.901	-17.861	1.750E-8
[Education=3]	-.018	.983	-15.501	1.853E-7	-2.441	.087
[Education=4]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[Reason=0]	-18.111	1.362E-8	43.99	1.275E19	-13.32	1.629E-6
[Reason=1]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[ParentalStatus=0]	-.378	.685	-.977	.376	-15.11	2.729E-7
[ParentalStatus=1]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[Region=0]	.522	1.685	.998	2.712	.835	2.306
[Region=1]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[FamilyType=0]	1.154	3.171	-.283	.753	1.01	2.746
[FamilyType=1]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[HouseholdHeadEducation=0]	2.676	14.522	-29.001	2.542E-13	1.548	4.704
[HouseholdHeadEducation=1]	3.145	23.219	-29.023	2.486E-13	2.39	10.911
[HouseholdHeadEducation=2]	1.331	3.785	-31.344	2.442E-14	2.12	8.333
[HouseholdHeadEducation=3]	-15.277	2.319E-7	-14.114	7.423E-7	.329	1.390
[HouseholdHeadEducation=4]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[HouseholdMonthlyIncome=0]	-10.925	1.801E-5	-11.960	6.396E-6	16.34	1.254E7
[HouseholdMonthlyIncome=1]	-11.617	9.014E-6	-12.991	2.281E-6	3.92	50.718
[HouseholdMonthlyIncome=2]	-26.618	2.753E-12	-13.837	9.789E-7	2.56	13.031
[HouseholdMonthlyIncome=3]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	
[HouseholdPerDayIncome=0]	-1.434	.238	-2.316	.099	-2.46	.085
[HouseholdPerDayIncome=1]	-.670	.512	-2.437	.087	-2.13	.119
[HouseholdPerDayIncome=2]	-2.703	.067	-2.076	.125	-.159	.853
[HouseholdPerDayIncome=3]	0 ^c		0 ^c		0 ^c	

The findings from the analysis of daily working hours among children in District Peshawar reveal several significant determinants of child labor. Firstly, age exhibits a negative correlation with child labor, indicating that as children grow older, and the likelihood of engaging in exploitative work decreases. Education emerges as a powerful factor, with increasing levels of education correlating with a decrease in daily working hours. Notably, illiterate children tend to work longer hours compared to those who have completed higher secondary education. However, for children with secondary education, the chances of working fewer than 5 hours increase. Poverty emerges as a driving force for child labor, with children working due to poverty being more likely to engage in labor for various durations. Parental status also plays a crucial role, as children with both parents deceased are more likely to working across different time. Urban residence is associated with longer working hours, and joint family systems exhibit a negative impact on child labor. Additionally, the educational status of the household head is influential, with higher education correlating with a lower likelihood of child labor. The household head's income, both monthly and per day, is positively related to child labor, suggesting that lower income levels are associated with increased child labor incidents.

The analysis of skill ratings among children in District Peshawar, as presented in Table-3 and Table-4, reveals several significant determinants. Age exhibits a positive correlation with the likelihood of children being categorized as highly skilled, suggesting that as children grow older, they are more likely to engage in skilled labor. Education plays a crucial role, with higher levels of education contributing to a shift towards highly skilled or moderately skilled

categories. Poverty, when identified as the reason for child labor, significantly reduces the chances of a child being highly skilled, moderately skilled, or undecided about their skills. Urban residence, nuclear family structure, and lower educational attainment and income of the household head 53 are associated with a higher likelihood of children being highly skilled. Conversely, factors such as illiteracy, living in poverty, and the unfortunate circumstance of both parents being deceased decrease the likelihood of a child being moderately skilled. The undecided category is influenced by age, lower education levels, urban residence, and nuclear family structure; lower household head education, and income. Child are being unsure about their skills is more likely if they are older, didn't go to school much, live in cities, are from smaller families, have a household leader with less education, and if the family doesn't have a lot of money. All these factors make it a bit harder for a child to figure out what they're good at.

The results from Table-5 and Table-6 shed light on the factors influencing the per day income of children in District Peshawar. In Table-7, it's evident that a considerable number of children fall into the lower income categories, with 32.7% earning less than 200 per day and 35.3% earning between 200 and 500 per day. Table-8 examines the influencing factors. Older children are more likely to earn less than 200 per day, suggesting a correlation between age and lower income. Working due to poverty, rather than skill, significantly increases the likelihood of earning less than 200 per day. Education plays a pivotal role, with lower levels associated with a higher probability of falling into lower income categories. This pattern holds for both the child's education level and the household head's education level. Similarly, lower household head monthly and per day incomes correlate with an increased likelihood of the child earning less than 200 per day.

The table 7 and 8 on acquiring skills reveals key findings about the factors influencing how children acquire their skills. In comparison to self-learning, younger children, those with lower education levels, urban residents, members of nuclear families, and those with household heads lacking formal education are more likely to acquire skills through informal training from family members. Conversely, older age, higher education levels, rural residence, joint family structure, and a household head with graduation education decrease the likelihood of depending on family members for skill acquisition rather than self-learning. For apprenticeship with skilled workers, age, education, poverty, parental status, urban or rural residence, family structure, household head education, and income play significant roles. Younger individuals with lower education levels, working due to poverty, and living in urban areas are more likely to decide for apprenticeship with skilled workers. On the contrary, higher 54 education levels, rural residence, joint family structures, and a household head with formal education or higher income decrease the likelihood of depending on skilled workers for skill acquisition. Regarding vocational training institutes, the likelihood of choosing this method over self-learning increases with the child's age decrease. Lower educational attainment, particularly illiteracy or completion of only primary and middle education, decreases the probability of acquiring skills

from vocational institutes. Working due to poverty, parental death, urban residence, and nuclear family structure all decrease the chances of acquiring skills from vocational institutes. The household head's lower education levels, both monthly and daily income, are associated with an increased likelihood of choosing vocational institutes for skill acquisition over self-learning.

Table 9: Age of child * Reason behind working

		Reason behind working		Total
		Poverty	Skill	
Age of child	10	6	0	6
	11	4	0	4
	12	10	0	10
	13	9	1	10
	14	12	2	14
	15	14	12	26
	16	15	25	40
	17	14	26	40
Total		84	66	150

The table shows the relationship between the age of the child and the reason behind working. The table contains a total of 150 observations. The table indicates that the majority of children (84) are working due to poverty and (66) are working due to skills. However, a closer look at the table reveals that before the age of 16, children are unskilled and do not know about any skills because they have limited or no education. As a result, many children are forced to work due to poverty. In contrast, the age range between 16 and 17 shows a different trend. In this age group, the majority of children are skilled. This is likely because these children have received education and are aware of skill-related opportunities. In summary, the table indicates that most children start working due to poverty and lack of skills at a young age. However, as education improves, children become more skilled and gain knowledge about opportunities, leading to a shift in the reasons behind working.

Conclusion

In conclusion, poverty remains the main driver of child labor, as families often rely on children's income for survival. However, as education access improves, children gain skills and awareness, which shifts their work motivations away from financial necessity. With better educational opportunities, children are empowered to seek better employment options, making

informed decisions about their futures and reducing reliance on early labor. Our study has highlighted that technical education plays a significant role because it offers higher future returns. This is why more children are inclined towards child labor, anticipating greater rewards in the future. This information can assist policy-makers in formulating an education policy aligned with the current market trends.

References

1. Achakzai, J. K. (2011). Causes and effects of runaway children crisis: evidence from Balochistan. *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*, 49(2), 211-230.
2. Akarro, R. R., & Mtweve, N. A. (2011). Poverty and its association with child labour in Njombe District in Tanzania: The case of Igima Ward. *Current Research Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(3), 199-206.
3. Alfa, A. B., & Abd Karim, M. Z. (2016). Effect of child labor and performance on child relationship with head in rural areas of Niger State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 6(3), 892-900.
4. Ameer, N., Bhutta, M. A., Nawaz, D., Asghar, M. M., & Jawad, F. (2024). Navigating the Role of Remittances in Attaining Sustainable Development Goals in Developing Countries: New Insights from Panel ARDL Model. *The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies*, 2(2), 384-396.
5. Azhar, T., Khan, M. S., Zareen, A., Ali, S., & Ali, S. (2020). Determinants of child labor in Pakistan: A multivariate analysis. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 25(1), 51-58.
6. Basu, K., & Tzannatos, Z. (2003). The global child labor problem: What do we know and what can we do? *The World Bank Economic Review*, 17(2), 147-173.
7. Becker, G. S. (2009). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education*. University of Chicago press.
8. Beegle, K., Dehejia, R., & Gatti, R. (2009). Why should we care about child labor?: The education, labor market, and health consequences of child labor. *Journal of Human Resources*, 44(4), 871-889.
9. Boutin, D., & Jouvin, M. (2022). *Child Labour Consequences on Education and Health: A Review of Evidence and Knowledge Gaps*. <https://hal.science/hal-03896700>
10. Brown, D. K. (2012). Labor standards: where do they belong on the international trade agenda? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 15(3), 89-112.
11. Chaudhry, M. A., & Khan, F. N. (2002). Economic and social determinants of child labor: A case study of Dera Ismail Khan, Pakistan. *Lahore Journal of Economics*, 7(2), 15-40.
12. Churchill, S. A., Iqbal, N., Nawaz, S., & Yew, S. L. (2021). Unconditional cash transfers, child labour and education: theory and evidence. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 186, 437-457.

13. Dammert, A. C., De Hoop, J., Mvukiyeye, E., & Rosati, F. C. (2018). Effects of public policy on child labor: Current knowledge, gaps, and implications for program design. *World development*, 110, 104-123.
14. Edmonds, E. V., & Pavcnik, N. (2005). Child labor in the global economy. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 19(1), 199-220.
15. Emerson, P. M., & Souza, A. P. (2002). Is there a child labor trap? Intergenerational persistence of child labor in Brazil. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 51(2), 375-398.
16. Gabriel, D. (2019). Child Labor and Society: A Detrimental Situation. *Supremo Amicus*, 11, 431.
17. Ghulam, M., Mahmood, S., & Saeed, T. (2021). *Impact of Skilled Child Labor on Economic Growth: Evidence from Pakistan*. *South Asian Journal of Management Sciences*, 15(1), 12-22.
18. Glewwe, P., & Muralidharan, K. (2016). Improving education outcomes in developing countries: Evidence, knowledge gaps, and policy implications. In *Handbook of the Economics of Education* (Vol. 5, pp. 653-743). Elsevier.
19. Hafeez, A., & Hussain, S. (2019). An empirical analysis of child labor: evidence from Pakistan. *Pakistan Economic Review*, 2(1), 48-64.
20. Hoque, M. M. (2021). *Reviewing child labour and its worst forms: Contemporary theoretical and policy agenda*. <https://philpapers.org/rec/HOQRCL>
21. ILO/UNICEF: (2021, May 18) *Social protection contributes to reducing child labour*. [News]. http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/news/WCMS_845351/lang--en/index.htm
22. International Labor Organization (ILO). (2020). Child labor in Pakistan. Retrieved from <https://www.ilo.org/pakistan/areas/child-labor/lang--en/index.htm>
23. Ishfaq, M., Rasool, A., Asghar, M. M., Karim, S., & Ahmad, R. (2024). Impact of Natural, Physical and Human Capital Formation on Economic Growth in Pakistan: An ARDL Analysis. *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, 13(3), 222-233.
24. Khalid, U., & Shahnaz, L. (2004). Socio economic conditions of child labourers in Pakistan: Evidence from the Labour Force Survey. *Lahore Journal of Economics*, 9(1), 85-105.
25. Magdalena, F., Sukamdi, S., & Rofi, A. (2021). The Determinants of Child Labor Participation in Indonesia: A Multilevel Approach. *SOUTHEAST ASIAN JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS*, 9(3), Article 3.
26. Mehmood, K., & Khan, S. (2016). *Child Labor and Economic Growth: A Comparative Study of Pakistan and India*. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 4(7), 17-26.

27. Munir, F., Khan, I. H., Javed, M., Sibt-e-Ali, M., & Zaib, L. (2022). Understanding Social Inequalities in Pakistan: An Intersectionality Perspective on Ethnicity, Income, and Education. *International journal of special education*, 37(3).
28. Nasir, M., & Ozturk, I. (2019). The impact of child labor on economic growth in Pakistan: An empirical analysis. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 13(1), 205-223.
29. Ortiz-Ospina, E., & Roser, M. (2016). Child Labor. *Our World in Data*. <https://ourworldindata.org/child-labor>
30. Philipp, J. (2019, October 27). *10 Facts About Child Labor in Pakistan*. The Borgen Project. <https://borgenproject.org/child-labor-in-pakistan-2/>
31. Radfar, A., Asgharzadeh, S. A. A., Quesada, F., & Filip, I. (2018). Challenges and perspectives of child labor. *Industrial Psychiatry Journal*, 27(1), 17. https://doi.org/10.4103/ipj.ipj_105_14
32. Ray, R. (2000). Child labor, child schooling, and their interaction with adult labor: Empirical evidence for Peru and Pakistan. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 14(2), 347-367.
33. Schultz, T. W. (1961). Investment in human capital. *The American economic review*, 51(1), 1-17.
34. Schultz, T. W. (1971). Investment in human capital. The role of education and of research.
35. Shafiq, M. N. (2007). Household schooling and child labor decisions in rural Bangladesh. *Journal of Asian Economics*, 18(6), 946-966.
36. Shah, S. Z. A., & Riaz, M. M. A. U. (2021b). Role of education and labor force participation in influencing women empowerment in Pakistan: A case study of District Khanewal. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, 5(4), 601-614.
37. Shah, S. Z. A., Farooq, F., Chaudhry, I. S., & Asghar, M. M. (2021a). The role of internal and external migration on rural poverty alleviation in Pakistan: a case study of Multan district. *Review of Education, Administration & Law*, 4(2), 495-502.
38. Sharif, A., Mehmood, S., & ur Rehman, M. (2018). Exploring the Socio-Economic Causes of Child Labor in Automobile Workshops in District Multan Punjab. *Academy of Social Science Journal*, 3(3), 1149-1154.
39. Sheikh, M. R., Akhtar, M. H., Asghar, M. M., & Abbas, A. (2020). Demographic and economic aspects of poverty. *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*, 58(1), 131-160.
40. Sibt-e-Ali, M. S., Faridi, M. Z., Sheikh, M. R., Javed, K., & Javaid, M. Q. (2024). Nexus Between Technology, Education, Income, and Social Capital in Top 10 Terrorism Affected Countries: The Leading Role of Corruption. *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, 13(1), 599-613.
41. Subhadarsani, S. (2014). An Economic Perspective of Child Labour in Odisha: A Case Study of Rourkela, National Institute of Technology, Rourkela, Odisha. UNICEF. Child labour in India statistics.

42. Unicef. ILO(2021). Child labour rises to 160 million—first increase in two decades. *Truy cập ngày, 8(03), 2023.*
43. World Bank (2021). World development indicators.
<https://datatopics.worldbank.org/world-developmentindicators/>