

A Micro Analysis of Urban Child Labour: Some Determinants of Labour and its Conditions

SHAHNAZ HAMID

INTRODUCTION

This paper focuses on (1) The estimation of urban child labour, (2) Analysis of its determinants, (3) Analysis of some of its conditions and their sectoral determinants, and finally puts forward some possible solutions.

This paper is divided into four sections. Section 2 explains the conceptual and analytical framework and describes the data set. Section 3 analyses the empirical evidence and finally Section 4 gives the conclusions and recommendations.

CONCEPTUAL AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

A review of literature on determinants of child labour in Pakistan shows that poverty is the most important causal factor of child labour [Ahmed (1990); Awann and Khan (1990); Hamid (1994); Husain (1986); Irfan and Hamid (1981); Khan (1982) and Mahmood (1994)]. For this paper we go a step further and ask: what are the specific characteristics of poverty at the household level that cause child labour?

For this study we define child labour as all the children in the age cohort of 5-14 years who are not in school. Our argument is that if a child not in school, he or she is either working at home or working at a work place.

Our basic proposition about child labour is that the household's socio-economic status is an important determinant of the supply of child labour. The determinants of socio-economic status include, household income, occupation, education and gender of the head of the household.

Based on these four determinants of socio-economic status our first hypothesis is that child labour depends primarily upon the total income of household. The lower the income of the household, the higher the probability of a child working. To eliminate the effect of household size on total income, we are also analysing the impact of per capita income.

The second hypothesis is that occupational status of the head of the household reflects its social status. The periodicity of earning of the head of the household is also related to job stability and social status of a household. So our second hypothesis is that if we rank in descending order the occupational status and periodicity of earning of the head of the household these will both be negatively related to child labour.

The third hypothesis is that household head's education is important because of its impact on household income and bias towards children's schooling. Therefore our third hypothesis is that the educational level of the head of household will also be negatively related to child labour.

Our fourth hypothesis is that, husbands have a greater potential to earn for the household, so widowed or female-headed household will therefore tend to have a lower income. Therefore our hypothesis is that a higher proportion of children will be working where household is headed by a female. Limiting ourselves to the above conceptual and analytical framework:

- a. We will make a partial estimate of urban child labour;
- b. establish some supply determinants of child labour;
- c. establish some working condition for child labour; and
- d. establish some sectoral determinants of the working conditions of child labour.

The study is based on the data set consisting of 792 households, drawn from the survey data of 1000 low-income urban households distributed over the entire country. The survey was conducted in 1986 under the auspices of the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and the Pakistan Institute of Development Economics, (PIDE).

INCIDENT OF CHILD LABOUR IN URBAN PAKISTAN

We will begin by analysing the incidence of child labour by household, age, education and work activities. Table 1 shows a low incidence of households sending all their school going age children to school. While a high incidence of households are not sending at least one of their (school going age) children to school. Out of 792 households only 41 percent of the household send all their children to school, while the other 59 percent of the total households do not send at least one child to school.

Further out of the 2333 school going age children, around 61 percent of the children are in school, while the other 39 percent are not enrolled.

Table 1
*The Distribution of Children (5-14 Years of Age) Going/Not
 Going to School by Households*

Category	Households		Children	
	No	Percent	No	Percent
All Children in School	322	40.7	1418	60.8
At least One Child not in School	470	59.3	915	39.2
Total	792	100	2333	100

School Enrollment

Table 2 presents school enrollment by age and gender. The disaggregation of the age cohorts reveals the lowest enrollment ratio of 50 percent in the age cohort of 5-6 years, a higher enrollment ratio of 67 percent in age cohort of 7-12 years, while again a lower, enrollment ratio of 51 percent in the age cohort of 13-14 years.

These findings suggest that most of the children start their schooling at a later age. A more or less consistent enrollment ratio between the age cohort of 7-12 years suggest that in this age group the drop out rate is not very high. However, a lower enrollment at the age of 13 and 14 years is probably the result of drop outs.

So the evidence suggest that drop out ratios are not very important in primary education, once children get into school they mostly remain there. This increases the importance of initial enrollment.

The disaggregation of school children by gender shows a significant differential between boys enrollment of 69 percent and girls enrollment at 53 percent.

Disaggregating gender by the age cohorts of 5-6 years, 7-12 years and 13-14 years shows the same trend that we had for genders. Girls enrollment in each age cohort is much lower than for aggregated genders.

Incidence of Drop Outs

To estimate the incidence of drop outs among children not going to school, we have analysed their past school attendance. Table 3 supports the fact that drop out rates are not very important. As can be seen from Table 3, out of the total children not going to school, an overwhelming percentage, of 91 percent have never been to school, while 9 percent had initially gone to school and then dropped out. The table further shows that of the 9 percent who initially went to school, the highest

Table 2
The Distribution of Children (15-14 Years) Going/Not Going to School by Age and Gender

Age	Total Children				Males				Females			
	Total	In School	Not in School	Enrol. Ratio	Total	In School	Not in School	Enrol. Ratio	Total	In School	Not in School	Enrol. Ratio
5	242	118	124	48.76	137	73	64	53.28	105	45	60	42.9
6	291	149	142	51.20	146	81	65	55.48	145	68	77	46.9
7	278	188	90	67.62	142	112	30	78.87	136	76	60	55.9
8	278	187	91	67.27	139	108	31	77.69	139	79	60	56.8
9	193	133	60	68.91	88	71	17	80.68	105	62	43	59.0
10	256	173	83	67.58	130	102	28	78.46	126	71	55	56.3
11	161	106	55	65.84	89	64	25	71.91	72	42	30	58.3
12	272	180	92	66.18	148	109	39	73.64	124	71	53	57.3
13	173	89	84	51.44	79	45	34	56.96	94	44	50	46.8
14	188	95	93	50.53	98	57	41	58.16	90	38	52	42.2
Total	2332	1418	914	60.80	1196	822	374	68.72	1136	596	540	52.6

Table 3

The Distribution of Children not Going to School by Age, Gender and Past School Attendance

Attendance	Age 5-14 Years						Age 5-9 Years						Age 10-14 Years					
	Both		Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Never in School	829	90.7	333	89	496	91.9	501	98.8	205	99.0	296	98.7	328	80.6	128	76.7	200	83.3
Primary	62	6.8	31	8.3	31	5.7	6	1.2	2	1.0	4	1.3	56	13.8	29	17.4	27	11.3
Middle	18	2.0	6	1.6	12	2.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	4.4	6	3.4	12	5.0
Secondary	4	0.4	3	0.8	1	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	1.0	3	1.8	1	0.4
Apprentice	1	0.1	1	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.2	1	0.6	0	0
Total	914	100	374	100	540	100	507	100	207	100	300	100	407	100	167	100	240	100

percentage, 7 percent left school at the primary level, and only 2 percent left at the middle or secondary levels.

Gender disaggregation supports this pattern. There is a small differential, of 89 percent boys compared to 92 percent girls who never went to school. The table also shows that among the drop out a higher percentage of both male and female children left school at the primary level.

Pattern of Child Labour

We will now examine child labour. Table 4 presents two sets of variables, the number of children and the number of household.

Table 4
*The Distribution of Children not Going to School by
their Activities and Households*

Activity	Total Children not Going to School		No of Households with Child Labour	
	No	Percent	No	Percent
At Home	821	89.8	454	85.8
Private Employee	43	4.7	33	6.2
Self-employee	13	1.4	12	2.3
Joint HH Activity	18	2.0	13	2.5
Labour	14	1.5	12	2.3
Other	5	0.5	5	0.9
Total	914	100	*529	100

*One HH having Children in more than one activity is counted more than one time, the actual No. of HH is 470.

The table shows that 90 percent of the total 914 children not going to school, are at home. We believe that this is a fault of the data set due to a flawed definition of child activity. Our argument is that a negligible number of children stay home to play, and the overwhelming majority work. This is invisible child labour. Table 4 shows that besides the invisible child labour in the home, there is a high percentage of visible child labour of 10 percent in the labour market. Out of 10 percent visible child labour, 5 percent are private regular workers in the private sector, 1 percent

are self-employed, 2 percent involved in joint household activities, and another 2 percent were employed as labourers.

Child Labour by Age and Gender

Disaggregating child labour by gender in Table 5 in the age cohort of 5–14 years, we get a higher percentage, 97 percent of females in invisible child labour compared to males at 79 percent.

For visible child labour in the market, private employment at 11 percent is the major activity for males and joined household activities at 2 percent for females.

Disaggregation of the age cohort of 5–9 years shows 99 percent of the children to be invisible child labour defined as “at home”. In the age cohort of 10–14 years the incidence of invisible child labour is lower at 78 percent children “at home”, with the remaining 22 percent in the visible labour market.

Disaggregating for gender in Table 5 shows the visible labour market for male children much higher 45 percent compared to female children at 5 percent. This suggests that although female children equally participating in child labour, they are mostly confined to invisible home based activities.

DETERMINANTS OF CHILD LABOUR

Our major hypotheses is that household income is the key factor that influences the supply of child labour. So households income will be negatively related to child labour.

Total Income of Household per Month

The first explanatory variable is total income of the household per month. Table 6 suggest that there is a negative relationship between total income of the household per month and child labour. In Table 6, the highest percentage of child labour of 73 percent is found in the lowest income category of less than Rs 2000 per month. Further, the incidence of child labour decreases as the income categories increase, from 73 percent to 16 percent, 5 percent and 6 percent. In almost all categories of child activities the larger proportion of child labour is found where total income of the household is Rs 3000 per month.

Household per Capita Income per Month

A more comprehensive explanation yet is per capita income. Table 7 shows a negative relationship between the household's per capita income per month and

Table 5

The Distribution of Child not Going to School by Age, Gender and their Activity

Attendance	Age 5-14 Years						Age 5-9 Years						Age 10-14 Years					
	Both		Male		Female		Both		Male		Female		Both		Male		Female	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
At Home	821	89.8	296	79.1	525	97.2	502	99.0	204	98.5	298	99.3	319	78.4	92	55.1	227	94.6
Private Employee	43	4.7	42	11.2	1	0.2	3	0.6	3	1.4	-	-	40	9.8	39	23.3	1	0.4
Self-employee	13	1.4	12	3.2	1	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	3.2	12	7.2	1	0.4
Joint HH Activity	18	2.0	8	2.2	10	1.8	1	0.2	-	-	1	0.3	17	4.2	8	4.8	9	3.7
Labour	14	1.5	12	3.2	2	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	3.4	12	7.2	2	0.8
Other	5	0.6	4	1.1	1	0.2	1	0.2	-	-	1	0.3	4	1	4	2.4	-	-
Total	914	100	374	100	540	100	507	100	207	100	300	100	407	100	167	100	240	100

Table 6

*The Distribution of Children not Going to School by their
Activities and Total Income of Household*

Income per Month (Rs)	Total		At Home		Private Employee		Self- employee		Joint HH Activity		Labour		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
< 1000	307	33.6	268	32.6	22	51.2	3	23.1	7	38.9	4	28.6	3	60.0
1000 < 2000	361	39.5	331	40.3	14	32.6	4	30.8	3	16.7	8	57.1	1	20.0
2000 < 3000	142	15.5	127	15.5	7	16.3	2	15.4	3	16.7	2	14.3	1	20.0
3000 < 4000	48	5.3	46	5.6	-	-	1	7.7	1	5.6	-	-	-	-
> 4000	56	6.1	49	6.0	-	-	3	23.1	4	22.2	-	-	-	-
Total	914	100	821	100	43	100	13	100	18	100.	14	100.	5	100

Table 7
*Distribution of Children Going to School by their Activities and
per Capita Income of the Household (Rs)*

Income per Month	Total		At Home		Private Employee		Self- employee		Joint HH Activity		Labour		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
< 100	233	25.5	198	24.1	15	34.9	2	15.4	7	38.9	10	71.4	1	20.0
100 < 200	410	44.9	371	45.2	25	58.1	5	38.5	2	11.1	4	28.6	3	60.0
200 < 300	147	16.1	138	16.8	3	7.0	2	15.4	3	16.7	-	-	1	20.0
300 < 400	65	7.1	61	7.5	-	-	3	23.1	1	5.6	-	-	-	-
> 400	59	6.6	53	6.5	-	-	1	7.7	5	27.8	-	-	-	-
Total	914	100	821	100	43	100	13	100.0	18	100.0	14	100.0	5	100.0

child labour. As per capita income increases from Rs 200 to Rs 300 per month, the incidence of child labour decreases from 45 percent to 16 percent.

Household Head's Occupation and Periodicity of their Earning

To test our hypothesis about occupational status of the head of the household, we will rank occupations in the following way. The highest rank is assigned to the government employees, followed by those who are private employees, self-employed, labour and the lowest rank will be for those at home.

Table 8 shows that as the household head's occupational status improves the incidence of child labour decreases but not continuously. Households with heads who are government employees have a low incidence of child labour of 9 percent. Taking a step down in the occupational status where the household head is a private employee, the incidence of child labour increases to 13 percent. The percentage of child labour increases to 36 percent for the household where the head is self-employed. A further step down in the occupational status of the household head where household head is labourer, about 18 percent of the child labour is found. Where household head's occupational status is defined as "at home" the incidence of child labour is 25 percent.

When we tested our hypothesis about the relationship between the periodicity of earning and child labour, we found no empirical support for it.

Education of Household Head

Our next hypothesis is that the household head's educational level will be negatively related to child labour. Table 9 shows a negative relationship between the household head's educational status and child labour. As the household head's educational level improves from primary to university level, child labour decreases. The highest percent of child labour is, where household head is illiterate. A step up in the educational level, where the household head is literate, the incidence of child labour drops to 15 percent. Incidence of child labour is 16 percent where the household head's educational level is primary. There is a further drop in child labour down to where the household head has completed middle level education. Child labour decreases further when the household head has education upto university level. This supports our hypothesis that child labour is negatively related to the household head's educational level.

Table 8
The Distribution of Children not Going to School by their Activities and Household Head' Occupation

HH Head's Occupation	Total		At Home		Private Employee		Self- employee		Joint HH Activity		Labour		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Govt. Employee	78	8.5	72	8.8	4	9.3	2	15.4	-	-	-	-	1	20.0
Private Employee	117	12.8	106	13.0	7	16.3	2	15.4	-	-	1	7.1	3	60.0
Self-employee	328	35.9	290	35.3	17	39.5	6	46.2	10	55.6	2	14.3	1	20.0
Labour	159	17.4	145	17.7	4	9.3	2	15.4	1	5.6	6	42.9	-	-
Other	10	1.1	9	1.1	1	2.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
At Home	220	24.1	197	24.0	10	23.3	1	7.7	7	38.9	5	35.7	-	-
Student	2	0.2	2	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	914	100	821	100	43	100	13	100	18	100	14	100	5	100

Table 9

The Distribution of Children not Going to School by their Activities and Education Level of HH Head's

Education Level of HH Head's	Total		At Home		Private Employee		Self-employee		Joint HH Activity		Labour		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Illiterate	511	55.9	458	55.8	23	53.5	8	61.5	4	61.1	10	71.4	1	20
Literate	137	15.0	124	15.1	4	9.3	2	15.4	4	22.2	2	14.3	1	20
Primary	142	15.5	125	15.2	11	25.6	3	23.1	-	-	1	7.1	2	40
Middle	69	7.5	64	7.8	1	2.3	-	-	3	16.7	-	-	1	20
Secondary	44	4.8	40	4.9	4	9.3	-	-	-	-	1	7.1	-	-
University	8	0.9	7	0.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Apprentices	2	0.2	2	0.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	1	0.1	1	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	914	100	821	100	43	100	13	100.0	11	100	14	100	5	100

Female-headed Households

Table 10 presents the impact of the gender of the household head, on child labour. The table shows that in the male-headed household, the incidence of invisible children working at home, is higher at 95 percent compared to 85 percent for female-headed households. Therefore female-headed households have a higher proportion of child labour in visible activities.

SECTORAL DETERMINANTS OF ITS CONDITIONS

We aim to establish some relationship between the activities taken up by the children and their working conditions. To do so we will examine the days per week, work hours per day, frequency of payment and earning per month.

Work Days

Table 11 shows that besides the activity "at home" for which we lack data, in all other activities a high percentage of 9 percent of the children work 5–7 days a week. Among these 7 percent work for an average of 6 days a week, 2 percent work for an average of five days a week, and 0.16 percent on an average 7 days a week.

In each activity the highest percentage of children work for 6 days a week. An interesting result is that those working for more than 6 days a week are mostly from either the self-employed category or the "joint household activity". About 23 percent of the total self-employed and 11 percent of the total children "joint household activity" work for an average of 7 days a week.

Working Hours

The Table 12 shows that besides the 821 children for whom we lack data of the remaining, 10 percent work for 6–12 hours a day, 4 percent work for an average of 8-9 hours a day, and the remaining 4 percent of the children work for 10–12 hours a day.

Further examination of activities and average working hours per day shows that the children, working as "private employees" have the longest working hours. Out of total private employees, about 58 percent children work on an average of 10–12 hours a day. In all other categories of activities a higher proportion of children work an average of less than 10 hours a day.

Frequency of Payment

Table 13 presents the relationship between the frequency of payment and

Table 10

*The Distribution of Children not Going to School by their
Activities and Gender of the Household Head*

Gender of the HH Head	Total		At Home		Private Employee		Self- employee		Joint HH Activity		Labour		Other	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Male	866	100	780	95.0	40	4.6	12	1.4	18	2.1	11	1.3	5	
Female	48	100	41	85.4	3	6.3	1	2.1	–	–	3	6.3	–	
Total	914	100	821	89.8	43	4.7	13	1.42	18	1.97	14	1.5	–	

Table 11

*The Distribution of Children not Going to School by their
Activities and Average Work Days per Week*

Activity	Total		0		1		2		3		4		5		6		7		
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	
At Home	821	100	821	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private Employee	43	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2.3	1	2.3	6	13.9	34	79.1	1	2	
Self-employee	13	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	7.7	1	7.7	1	7.7	7	53.8	3	21	
Joint HH	18	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	5.5	3	16.7	12	66.7	2	11	
Activity												5							
Labour	14	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28.6	10	71.4	-	-	
Other	5	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	100.	-	-	
																0			
Total	914	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	0.2	3	0.3	14	1.53	68	7.4	6	0.6	

Table 12

*The Distribution of Children not Going to School by their
Activities and by Average Work Hours per Day*

Activity	Total Children		0		3-4		5-6		8-9		10-12	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
At Home	821	100	821	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private Employe	43	100	-	-	1	2.3	2	4.7	15	34.9	25	58.2
Self-employee	13	100	-	-	3	23.0	3	23.1	4	30.8	3	23.1
Joint HH Activity	18	100	-	-	-	-	2	11.1	10	55.5	6	63.4
Labour	14	100	-	-	1	7.1	2	14.3	9	64.3	2	14.3
Other	5	100	-	-	-	-	1	20.0	2	40.0	2	40.0
Total	914	100	821	89.8	5	0.5	10	1.1	40	4.4	38	4.2

Table 13

*The Distribution of Children not Going to School by
their Activities and Frequency of Payment*

Activity	Total Children		Nothing		Daily		Weekly		Monthly		Irregular	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
At Home	821	100	821	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private Employee	43	100	-	-	5	11.7	9	21.	26	60.3	3	7.0
Self-employee	13	100	-	-	9	69.2	1	7.7	2	15.4	1	7.7
Joint HH Activity	18	100	14	77.8	2	11.1	-	-	-	-	2	11.1
Labour	14	100	-	-	3	21.4	2	14.3	-	-	9	64.3
Other	5	100	-	-	1	20.0	-	-	-	-	4	80.0
Total	914	100	835	91.4	20	2.2	12	1.3	31	3.4	19	2.1

child activity. The table shows that besides 91 percent of the children who get nothing. The remaining 8 percent have different periodicity for their earnings. Of these 3 percent of children are monthly earners, 2 percent are daily earners, 1 percent earn weekly and 2 percent have an irregular pattern of earning.

Out of the total private employees 60 percent work on regular basis and get monthly earning. Among the self-employed, 69 percent are daily earners, while 78 percent of the children who work with their parents or other members as joint household activity get nothing.

Among the labourers 64 percent, and 80 percent of those in the category "other" are irregular earners. The table suggest that the nature of employment in relation to the frequency of payment.

Earnings per Month

Table 14 presents the relationship between the child's activity and his/her earning. The table shows while 91 percent of the children get nothing the remaining get fairly low wages.

The highest proportion of earning children of 37 percent fall in the lowest income category of less than Rs 200.

The nature of employment of the child is seem to affects their earnings. Out of the total private employees only 16 percent have an income of more than Rs 400 per month. Of self-employees a much higher 69 percent get more than Rs 400 per month. However among the children who work with their parents, only a lower 22 percent get Rs 200 to less than Rs 400 a month. Child labourers also have high percentage of earnings 57 percent earn more than Rs 400 per month. Children who are engaged in odd activities get less than Rs 200 per month.

All the above evidence suggests that the nature of employment of children affect their term and conditions, and among all the categories of employment private employees are the most exploited. They work more in terms of hours and days, but get far less in return.

CONCLUSIONS

The evidence suggests that poverty is the most pervasive factor affecting child labour and child schooling. Household income, gender, occupational status and educational level of the household head, are all linked to child labour and school enrollment.

To curb child labour we need a comprehensive policy package that can simultaneously increase employment and earning opportunities for adult household

Table 14

*The Distribution of Children not Going to School by
their Activities and Average Monthly Earning*

Activity	Total Children		0		< 200		200 < 400		400 < 600		600 & Above	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
At Home	821	100	821	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private Employee	43	100	-	-	16	37.2	20	46.5	4	9.3	3	7.0
Self-employee	13	100	-	-	3	23.1	1	7.7	8	61.5	1	7.7
Joint HH Activity	18	100	14	77.8	1	5.6	3	16.7	-	-	-	-
Labour	14	100	-	-	6	42.9	5	35.7	3	21.4	-	-
Other	5	100	-	-	5	100	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	914	100	835	91.4	31	3.4	29	3.2	15	1.6	4	0.4

members, encourage child schooling, specially at the primary level, because drop out rates are not so important. It is more important to get children to school.

Educational opportunities can play a role in reducing child labour only if adults are offered economic incentives to compensate for the loss of that income which results from school attendance. Labour laws concerning child labour should be enforced forcefully.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, Manzooruddin (1990) Child Labour a Time to Reflect UNICEF. Government of Balochistan.
- Awann, Saeed, and Ali Adid Khan (1990) Child Labour in Carpet Weaving Industry in Punjab. Report of a Survey.
- Hamid, Shahnaz (1994) A Micro Analysis of Urban Child Labour, some Determinants of Labour and its Conditions. Paper presented at the Tenth Annual General Meeting of Pakistan Society of Development Economists, Islamabad.
- Husain, Akmal (1986) Economic Growth Poverty and Plight of Children. In *Children Issue* 1.
- Irfan, M., and Shahnaz Hamid (1981) Child Labour in Pakistan. Unpublished.
- Khan, Shaheen (1982) Labour Force Participation of Children. A Case Study. *Pakistan Economics and Social Review*.
- Mahmood Moazam (1994) Why do Children not Going to School in Pakistan. Some Estimates and Theoretical Framework. Paper presented at the Tenth Annual General Meeting of the Pakistan Society of Development Economists, April 2-5, Islamabad.

Comments on
“A Micro Analysis of Urban Child Labour:
Some Determinants of Labour and its Conditions”

To further enrich the review of the literature and discussion you may like to include the following comments on the above study.

According to Mr Moazam Mahmood in 1994, there are 18.8 million children are involved in economic activities. This is a shocking figure for many agencies. However, simple estimates and calculations indicate that out of 52 million children in Pakistan, only 31 million children get admission in schools and later 15 million children leave school before completing primary education. Therefore 21 million children are out of school. This is a large number which needs attention from the legislators, planners and policy-makers.

To mobilise positive action on this research from the concerned agencies, it will be a powerful argument to include the convention on the Rights of the Child, in the review of literature. “The convention on the Rights of the Child” (CRC) was ratified by the Government of Pakistan in November 1990. The Government is obliged to provide education to all children “not as a charity but as a right”. Children must not be available for work. The Government must provide protection to children from economic exploitation. These commitments are reaffirmed in the First Report on the Implementation of the Convention on the Rights from Pakistan to the Committee on the Rights of the Child (1993-1994) in Geneva.

For details please see the attached documents. The Convention will also enrich the discussion part.

Poverty is of course the basic cause of child labour. The results of the study very clearly indicate that the majority of the working children are from the lowest socio-economic group moreover, these children belong to large families. This argument may be included with emphases on the parental attitudes towards child rearing practices.

The most unethical part of child labour is the employers exploitative attitude towards the child worker. The employment of young children in the formal or informal sectors is total violations of the existing laws and CRC commitments. A child is working for 6–12 hours a day and receives Rs 4.00 to 6.00 per day while, an

adult receives Rs 80–100 per day for the same work. An employer prefers a child because he/she is an obedient servant and ready to work for long hours for low or no wages.

The child workers is illegally employed in the various sectors and secondly exploited. Child labour punishes Pakistan three times over: it deprives adults of job opportunities; it steals the country's childhood; it prevents education of its youth. This may be included in the discussion and conclusion.

Khalida Ahmed

UNICEF,
Islamabad.