

**Role of education in reducing child labour:  
a case from rural Bangladesh**

**Samir R. Nath  
Abdullahel Hadi**

**Research and Evaluation Division, BRAC  
75, Mohakhali C/A, Dhaka-1212**

# **Role of education in reducing child labour: a case from rural Bangladesh**

**Samir R Nath  
Abdullahel Hadi**

## **Abstract**

This article examines the hypothesis that formal education of children and their parents plays a major role in reducing child labour. Data are generated from a representative sample survey of 3,809 children aged 10-14 years in 150 villages of Manikganj and Joypurhat districts in Bangladesh. Findings reveal significant inverse relationship between child labour and years of schooling. Six factors such as age of children, child education, mother's education, father's education, land ownership of household and father's occupation appear to be important determinants of child labour. Probabilities of children to be in the labour force also indicate that years of schooling of the children is the most influential variable to reduce child labour followed by father's and mother's education. It is concluded that child labour may be reduced by enrolling children to school. This should be ensured through motivating the parents for education, making available of schools in rural areas, and creating a joyful environment of learning.

## Introduction

Bangladesh is a country of wide spread illiteracy and economic backwardness. About 40% of the rural households lie under poverty line (Rahman, 1995) and nearly one fourth of the school-aged children are not enrolled or dropped out from schools (Nath, 1994).

Bangladesh is one of the major signatories and adopters of the United Nations Charter on the rights of the children, which ensures proper development of children in the context of family, economy and politics. The constitution of Bangladesh also put much emphasis on ensuring the rights and privilege of the children. In recent years, the government of Bangladesh has committed itself much to education. Compulsory primary education was introduced in 1992. Education for girls has been made free up to grade eight. Apart from these public efforts several non-government organisations (NGOs) have taken up programmes on education for both children and adults. There is no unique rule to protect child labour but different labour laws of Bangladesh suggest different age limit for getting employment to that particular work (Rahman, 1981). According to ILO convention 1973, completion of 14th year is the minimum requirement for admission of children to employment.

Available information at national level suggest that proportion of children active in labour force is increasing in Bangladesh. According to the labour force survey 1990-91, conducted by the Bangladesh Bureau of statistics, about 5.8 million children aged 5-14 years were in the labour force. They were the 18.2% of the same age group and 11.3% of the total labour force of the country (Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics, 1995). On the other hand, the literacy rate in Bangladesh is very low, 24.6% for all ages and 27.8% for those aged 5 years and above (Bangladesh Bureau of Educational Information and Statistics, 1992).

Studies on child labour generally focused on economic contribution of children in total household income. Some studies explored the interrelationship between child work and fertility. Few studies have touched schooling in explaining child labour. Education plays a major role in determining various achievements in the society. It is also supposed to increase social and economic equity provided education is equitably distributed. G Fields (1979, 1980) suggests that primary education is important and very much relevant to control child labour. Cochran (1979) and Dwheeler (1979, 1880) explored that child work with its negative effect on school enrollment aggravates adult literacy and hence leads to high rates of population growth (cited in Ahmad and Quasem, 1991). Another study (Kanbargi and Kulkarni, 1986) carried out in rural Karnataka observed significant negative reciprocal relationship between child labour and child schooling. Barket-E-Khuda (1991)'s study on Bangladesh found that school-going children work about half of the time compared to those of non-school going children. On the other hand, Ahmad and Quasem did not see any direct effect of parental education on child labour, but explored that poverty is the main reason for child labour in poor countries like Bangladesh.

The hypothesis of this study was that educational achievements of the household members might have positive influence to discourage child labour. Along with other socio-economic variables parental as well as child's educational gain have been explored in this paper.

Data from two rural areas of Bangladesh where demographic registration system has been operating for a decade have been used in this study.

## **Methods and materials**

### **Study area and the sample**

In 1986, BRAC launched a demographic registration system (DRS) in three rural unions in its project area in Manikganj in the central area of Bangladesh, which at that time consisted of 87 villages with a total population of 51,739. The system was introduced to document the demographic changes induced as a result of a massive and sustained child survival project (CSP) supported by BRAC's rural development program (RDP). The CSP included oral rehydration therapy, immunisation for both the mother and children, growth monitoring, night blindness prevention programme, and health education. The registration system was expanded in three more rural unions in Joypurhat in the northern Bangladesh covering 63 villages with a population of 35,708 (in 1987) where no such development intervention was underway. Both central and northern areas were similar in the sense that their economy was largely based on subsistence agriculture, and social institutions were predominantly traditional but different in terms of literacy and fertility behaviour. A total of 17,855 households with a population of 96,420 were visited once a month.

A survey on child labour was conducted in all the six rural unions in January-February 1995. Children aged 5-14 years of every fifth households were included in the sample as respondents. This paper uses the data of children aged 10-14 years only. Thus data of 3,809 children were analysed in this paper.

### **Definition of variables**

Though there is a definition of child labour by ILO, but the concept of child labour varies according to culture. Different micro studies used different measures to define child labour. Mead Cain (1977) measured child labour as the proportion of children who have ever participated in all kinds of activities without measuring an average rate. On the other hand, Barkat-E-Khuda (1980) defined labour force in terms of participation in economic activity and time spent is seven hours a week (cited in Ahmad and Quasem, 1991). In this paper, a child aged 10-14 years who participated in any type of work for at least three hours on the previous day of interview was

considered as a child labour. Labour force participation status of the children was the dependent variable for this study. The explanatory variables were area of residence, sex of child, child education, mother's education, father's education, household's land ownership, labour sale status, housing condition and parents religious belief. The measurement of the variables are given in Table 1.

## Data analysis

To know the independent contribution of different educational achievements of the households (i.e., self education, mother's education, and father's education) on child labour, cross tabular bi-variate analysis were done. Appropriate statistical tests were also performed. To know the relative influence of education multivariate logistic analysis was considered with whole set of explanatory variables. The regression model employed in this study was of the following form:

$$\ln [p / (1-p)] = a + \sum b_i x_i$$

Where  $p$  is the probability of a children participated in labour force,  $a$ ,  $b_i$  values are estimated regression coefficients and  $x_i$  values are the socio-economic characteristics of the children. The model was estimated by software SPSS for Windows 6.0. To identify the best model step-wise approach was used and selected the model by a combination of forward selection and backward elimination. Odds ratios of each of the regression coefficients were calculated to predict child labour. The probability that particular education will have the child participated in labour force was also calculated.

## Results

### Socio-economic characteristics of the children

Socio-economic characteristics of the sample children are displayed in Table 2. Mean age of the children was 11.9 years and sex ratio was 113.9. The mothers of these children were less educated than their fathers. Less than one-fourth of the mothers and 38.9% of the fathers attended any school. The mean years of schooling completed by the children and their mothers and fathers were respectively 2.6, 1.2 and 2.7. Proportion of households survive on selling on manual labour was 35.9%. About 42% of the households had no cultivable land and on average mean amount of land was 106.1 decimals per household. Housing condition of 21.7% of the households were reported as good. Father's occupation of 52.3% of the children were reported as agriculture and the others as non-agriculture. In respect to religious belief of parents, 11.6% of the children came from non-Muslim households.

## **Children according to activity status**

It was observed that children of the study area were different according to their activity status. Some of the sampled children were labour, some were student and some were engaged in both labour force and school (Table 3). According to the definition set for this study, 39.7% of the children aged 10-14 years were currently participated in the labour force. Though the current enrollment rate was 83.4% but more than one-third of the currently enrolled children were also in the labour force. Of the children who participated in the labour force, about one-fourth were currently enrolled in any kind of school. On the other hand, 10.5% of the children were professionally labour and 6.1% had no profession. This means 36.6% of the non-enrolled children were doing nothing.

## **Child labour according to education**

According to increase of years of schooling of the children, their mothers and fathers the proportion of children participated in labour force was found linearly decreased (Table 4). About half of the non-educated children were found in the labour force. This rate was 38.5% among those with 1-5 years of schooling and 29.4% among those with 6 or more years of schooling. About 43.5% of the children of the non-educated mothers were found participated in the labour force. This rate reduced to 30.1% and 21.1% when mothers' education increased to 1-5 years and 6 or more years respectively. Among the children of non-educated fathers 45.2% were in the labour force. The rate was 38.4% among those children whose fathers had 1-5 years of schooling and 25.2% among those children whose father had more than 5 years of schooling.

Table 5 to 7 presents proportion of children active in the labour force by different socio-economic characteristics and education. These tables show, for the children of different socio-economic groups (except the Muslim children), proportion of child labour significantly varies by years of schooling of the children, their mothers and their fathers. Findings of these tables also show that proportion of child labour significantly varies by their age, father's occupation, and ownership of land, labour sale status and housing condition of the household.

## **Multivariate analysis**

Multivariate logistic regression analysis were employed to understand the relative influence of the socio-economic variables considered for this study. The regression coefficients of the best model are displayed in Table 8. Standard errors of the coefficients and their respective odds ratios are also shown in the table. From eleven socio-economic and behavioural characteristics which are described earlier, the model included only six. The explanatory variables included by the model are age, child

education, mother's education, father's education, land ownership of the household and father's occupation. The effects of the explanatory characteristics can best be summarised through the odds ratios.

Older aged (13-14 years) children were found 116% more likely to be included in the labour force than the younger aged (10-12 years) children if other variables remain constant. Education of the child, the mother and the father were found negatively associated with child's participation in the labour force. Children with 1-5 years of education were 22% and the children with more than 5 years of schooling were 46% less likely to sell labour than the non-schooling children. The children of the mother's with 1-5 years of schooling were 21% and the mother's with 6 or more years of schooling were 34% less likely to be participated in the labour force than the children of the mother's who had no education. The children of the father's with 1-5 years of schooling were 16% and the father's with 6 or more years of schooling were 42% less likely to sell labour than the children of the father's who had no education.

Land ownership of the household were also found negatively associated with child labour. Children of the households with less than 200 decimals of land were 9% and the children of the households with more than 199 decimals of land were 36% less likely to be participated in labour force than the children of landless households. Children of fathers with non-agricultural profession were 23% less likely to sell labour than the children of fathers having agriculture as profession.

The probability that a children with particular characteristics will have participated in the labour force have been calculated. A selection of such probabilities are presented in Table 9.

For different socio-economic groups the probability of a child being participated in the labour force ranges from 0.09 to 0.67. The highest probability that a child would be participated in labour force is not so big. This findings indicates that there are other socio-economic characteristics of children that would need to be explored and included in the analysis in order to determine increased probability of being participated. The probabilities estimated for a group of children-- who were 10-12 years old, fathers of whom had agriculture as profession and household had no land, clearly show negative linear relationship between education and child labour. If the children and their parents have more than primary level of education then the probability of being labour stood at 0.16, which being doubled when education of each reduced to 1-5 years of schooling. On the other hand, when each of them were illiterate then the chance of being labour rose to 0.49. When one of them had more than primary level of education and the rest two had no education then the probability ranged from 0.34 to 0.38. Again, if two of them had more than primary level of education and the other had no education then the probability became 0.23 to 0.27. In both cases, the probability of being labour was found less if the children was educated.

The above results implies that formal education has a direct impact to reduce child labour. The analysis reveals that, of these three types of education schooling of the children was the most influential variable to eradicate child labour followed by father's and mother's education respectively.

## **Discussion and conclusion**

This paper examines the relationship between child labour and education (both children and parents) in the rural areas of Bangladesh. Among the interviewed children 83.4% were currently enrolled and 37.9% were participating in the labour force, indicating many children were engaged in both education and labour market. The relationship between labour force participation and education was found inverse. Findings of this study clearly show that as years of schooling of the children and their parents increased the tendency to participate in the labour force decreased. This indicates that education played a major role in reducing child labour. The children of better-off households were less likely to participate in the labour force than those of poor households. Both bivariate and multivariate analyses indicate the same.

Education in Bangladesh is compulsory up to grade eight and primary education is free for all. Moreover, for girls, education is free up to grade eight. The non-government organisations (NGOs) are also contributing in raising enrollment and literacy through their non-formal primary education (NFPE) programmes. Obviously these public and private efforts increased enrollment in recent years, but probably these efforts are not enough to reduce child labour. National level estimates show that the enrollment and labour force participation rate of the children of age 10-14 years were respectively 27.6% and 42% in 1990-91 (Bangladesh Bureau of statistics, 1995b; 1995a). But this study shows a huge increment in enrollment rate and slight reduction in labour force participation rate. Here the question of dropout comes. Probably, to enroll all the children into schools is not enough to reduce child labour. How much time in a day they are engage in education may be a factor in child labour. Increase of school contact hours may be considered in this regard. Another factor may be the age of first enrollment in school. Enrollment of the children should be ensured at the beginning of their schooling age and dropout should be strictly reduced up to a certain level of age. Programmes such as parents' motivation towards education can also be taken. Schools should be made available within the reach of the children and joyful environment of learning should be ensured to reduce dropout.



## References

- Ahmad A and Quasem M A (1991): Child Labor in Bangladesh. Dhaka. p.1-20.
- Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (1995a): Report on Labour Force Survey 1990-91, Dhaka: BBS, Ministry of Planning, Government of Bangladesh. p. xvii, p.72.
- Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics (1995b) : Statistical Yearbook of Bangladesh 1994. Fifteenth edition. Dhaka: BBS, Ministry of Planning, Government of Bangladesh. p.467.
- Bangladesh Bureau of Educational Information and Statistics (1992): Bangladesh Educational Statistics. Dhaka: BANBEIS, Ministry of Education, Government of Bangladesh. p.185
- Khuda B (1991): Child Labour in Rural Bangladesh: Some Findings from a Relatively Developed Villages; *In Child Labour in Indian Subcontinent, Dimensions and Implications* (edited by Ramesh Kanbargi), New Delhi: Sage Publications India Pvt. Ltd, p. 49-62.
- Kanbargi R, Kulkarni PM (1991): Child work, Schooling and Fertility in Rural Karnataka, India; *In Child Labour in Indian Subcontinent, Dimensions and Implications* (edited by Ramesh Kanbargi), New Delhi: Sage Publications India Pvt. Ltd, p. 125-63.
- Nath S R (1994) : Gender Variation in School Enrollment in Rural Bangladesh. Watch Report No. 12. Dhaka: BRAC. p.1.
- Rahman H Z (1995): Rural Poverty Update 1994 (Summary). Dhaka: The Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies. p. 2.
- Rahman G S (1981) : Laws Relating to children in Bangladesh. Dhaka: Bangladesh Shishu Academy. 146p.

Table 1: Measurement of the variables used in this study.

| Variables           | Measurement  |
|---------------------|--|
| Child labour        | Whether the child worked at least three hours at the reference day ( 0= No, 1= Yes)      |
| Area                | Area of residence (0= Central, 1= North)   |
| Age                 | Age of children (0= 10-12 years, 1= 13-14 years)   |
| Sex                 | Sex of children (0= Boy, 1= Girl)  |
| Child education     | Years of schooling completed by children<br>(0= No schooling, 1= 1-5 years, 2= 6+ years) |
| Mother's education  | Years of schooling completed by mother<br>(0= No schooling, 1= 1-5 years, 2= 6+ years)   |
| Father's education  | Years of schooling completed by father<br>(0= No schooling, 1= 1-5 years, 2= 6+ years)   |
| Father's occupation | Occupation of father<br>(0= Agricultural, 1= Non-agricultural)                           |
| Land                | Households ownership of land<br>(0= Landless, 1= 1-199 decimals, 2= 200+ decimals)       |
| Labour              | Labour sale status of the household<br>(0= Sale, 1= Don't sale)                          |
| Housing             | Housing condition of the household<br>(0= Bad, 1= Good)                                  |
| Religion            | Religious belief of the parents<br>(0= Muslim, 1= Non-Muslim)                            |

Table 2. Socio-economic characteristics of the sample children.

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| Mean age (in year)                                    | 11.9  |
| Sex ratio   | 113.9 |
| Percent of mother ever attended school                | 23.3  |
| Percent of father ever attended school                | 38.9  |
| Mean years of schooling of children                   | 2.6   |
| Mean years of schooling of mother                     | 1.2   |
| Mean years of schooling of father                     | 2.7   |
| Percent of household survive on selling manual labour | 35.9  |
| Percent of landless households                        | 41.8  |
| Percent of household with good housing facility       | 21.7  |
| Percent non-Muslim                                    | 11.6  |
| Percent of father with agriculture as profession      | 52.3  |
| Mean amount of land (in decimal) per household        | 106.1 |

Table 3: Proportion of children by activity status.

| Activity status         | Proportion of children |
|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Currently enrolled      |                        |
| Only student            | 54.2                   |
| Both student and labour | 29.2                   |
| Only labour             | 10.5                   |
| None                    | 6.1                    |

Table 4: Proportion of children participated in labour force by education.

| Characteristics    | Years of schooling |      |      | Remarks |
|--------------------|--------------------|------|------|---------|
|                    | 0                  | 1-5  | 6+   |         |
| Child education    | 48.9               | 38.5 | 29.4 | p<0.01  |
| Mother's education | 43.5               | 30.1 | 21.2 | p<0.01  |
| Father's education | 45.2               | 38.4 | 25.2 | p<0.01  |

Table 5: Proportion of children participated in labour force by different socio-economic characteristics and their years of schooling.

| socio-economic characteristics | Years of schooling |                   |                  | All              |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                                | 0                  | 1-5               | 6+               |                  |
| <b>Area</b>                    |                    |                   |                  |                  |
| Central***                     | 43.0               | 40.1              | 28.2             | 39.7             |
| North***                       | 57.4               | 36.3              | 30.6             | 39.8             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>p&lt;0.001</i>  | <i>p&lt;0.05</i>  | <i>NS</i>        | <i>NS</i>        |
| <b>Age</b>                     |                    |                   |                  |                  |
| 10-12 years***                 | 41.3               | 32.4              | 19.4             | 33.8             |
| 13-14 years***                 | 63.6               | 50.7              | 32.8             | 49.7             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>p&lt;0.001</i>  | <i>p&lt;0.001</i> | <i>p&lt;0.01</i> | <i>p&lt;0.01</i> |
| <b>Sex</b>                     |                    |                   |                  |                  |
| Boy***                         | 50.9               | 36.8              | 29.2             | 39.2             |
| Girl***                        | 46.2               | 40.4              | 29.7             | 40.4             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>NS</i>          | <i>p&lt;0.05</i>  | <i>NS</i>        | <i>NS</i>        |
| <b>Father's occupation</b>     |                    |                   |                  |                  |
| Agriculture***                 | 50.9               | 41.1              | 32.3             | 42.4             |
| Non-agriculture***             | 46.7               | 35.6              | 27.1             | 36.9             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>NS</i>          | <i>p&lt;0.01</i>  | <i>NS</i>        | <i>p&lt;0.01</i> |
| <b>Land size</b>               |                    |                   |                  |                  |
| Landless***                    | 52.3               | 40.6              | 33.7             | 43.6             |
| 1-199 decimals***              | 43.9               | 40.8              | 29.8             | 40.3             |
| 200+ decimals**                | 44.9               | 27.8              | 26.0             | 28.8             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>p&lt;0.10</i>   | <i>p&lt;0.001</i> | <i>NS</i>        | <i>p&lt;0.01</i> |
| <b>Labour sale status</b>      |                    |                   |                  |                  |
| sell**                         | 51.9               | 45.0              | 39.3             | 47.1             |
| Don't sell***                  | 44.9               | 35.2              | 28.6             | 35.6             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>p&lt;0.05</i>   | <i>p&lt;0.001</i> | <i>NS</i>        | <i>p&lt;0.01</i> |
| <b>Housing condition</b>       |                    |                   |                  |                  |
| Bad***                         | 47.7               | 39.7              | 32.8             | 41.0             |
| Good***                        | 56.7               | 34.0              | 25.0             | 35.1             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>p&lt;0.10</i>   | <i>p&lt;0.05</i>  | <i>p&lt;0.10</i> | <i>p&lt;0.01</i> |
| <b>Religion</b>                |                    |                   |                  |                  |
| Muslim***                      | 49.7               | 38.5              | 30.0             | 40.0             |
| Non-Muslim                     | 43.2               | 38.4              | 24.4             | 38.1             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>NS</i>          | <i>NS</i>         | <i>NS</i>        | <i>NS</i>        |

\*p<0.10

\*\*p<0.05

\*\*\*p<0.01

NS= not significant at 10%

Table 6: Proportion of children participated in labour force by different socio-economic characteristics and mother's years of schooling.

| socio-economic characteristics | Mother's years of schooling |                   |           | All              |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------------|
|                                | 0                           | 1-5               | 6+        |                  |
| <b>Area</b>                    |                             |                   |           |                  |
| Central***                     | 43.0                        | 28.4              | 21.7      | 39.7             |
| North***                       | 44.2                        | 31.7              | 20.5      | 39.8             |
| <i>Significant level NS</i>    | <i>NS</i>                   | <i>NS</i>         | <i>NS</i> |                  |
| <b>Age</b>                     |                             |                   |           |                  |
| 10-12 years***                 | 37.1                        | 24.4              | 19.5      | 33.8             |
| 13-14 years***                 | 54.2                        | 39.7              | 24.0      | 49.7             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>p&lt;0.001</i>           | <i>p&lt;0.001</i> | <i>NS</i> | <i>p&lt;0.01</i> |
| <b>Sex</b>                     |                             |                   |           |                  |
| Boy***                         | 43.9                        | 25.1              | 19.0      | 39.2             |
| Girl***                        | 42.9                        | 35.8              | 23.6      | 40.4             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>NS</i>                   | <i>p&lt;0.01</i>  | <i>NS</i> | <i>NS</i>        |
| <b>Father's occupation</b>     |                             |                   |           |                  |
| Agriculture***                 | 45.5                        | 32.5              | 24.0      | 42.4             |
| Non-agriculture***             | 41.1                        | 27.6              | 19.5      | 36.9             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>p&lt;0.05</i>            | <i>NS</i>         | <i>NS</i> | <i>p&lt;0.01</i> |
| <b>Land size</b>               |                             |                   |           |                  |
| Landless***                    | 46.1                        | 30.5              | 24.6      | 43.6             |
| 1-199 decimals***              | 43.5                        | 33.1              | 21.6      | 40.3             |
| 200+ decimals***               | 33.2                        | 25.7              | 18.3      | 28.8             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>p&lt;0.001</i>           | <i>NS</i>         | <i>NS</i> | <i>p&lt;0.01</i> |
| <b>Labour sale status</b>      |                             |                   |           |                  |
| sell**                         | 47.9                        | 40.4              | 26.7      | 47.1             |
| Don't sell***                  | 40.1                        | 28.2              | 20.8      | 35.6             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>p&lt;0.001</i>           | <i>p&lt;0.05</i>  | <i>NS</i> | <i>p&lt;0.01</i> |
| <b>Housing condition</b>       |                             |                   |           |                  |
| Bad***                         | 44.1                        | 30.2              | 21.2      | 41.0             |
| Good***                        | 40.5                        | 30.0              | 21.1      | 35.1             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>NS</i>                   | <i>NS</i>         | <i>NS</i> | <i>p&lt;0.01</i> |
| <b>Religion</b>                |                             |                   |           |                  |
| Muslim***                      | 43.6                        | 31.2              | 21.1      | 40.0             |
| Non-Muslim***                  | 42.7                        | 20.0              | 21.9      | 38.1             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>NS</i>                   | <i>p&lt;0.10</i>  | <i>NS</i> | <i>NS</i>        |

\*p<0.10

\*\*p<0.05

\*\*\*p<0.01

NS= not significant at 10%

Table 7: Proportion of children participated in labour force by different socio-economic characteristics and father's years of schooling.

| socio-economic characteristics | Father's years of schooling |                   |                   | All              |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|
|                                | 0                           | 1-5               | 6+                |                  |
| <b>Area</b>                    |                             |                   |                   |                  |
| Central***                     | 45.9                        | 35.5              | 21.2              | 39.7             |
| North***                       | 44.6                        | 41.4              | 28.9              | 39.8             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>NS</i>                   | <i>NS</i>         | <i>p&lt;0.01</i>  | <i>NS</i>        |
| <b>Age</b>                     |                             |                   |                   |                  |
| 10-12 years***                 | 38.7                        | 31.3              | 21.2              | 33.8             |
| 13-14 years***                 | 56.3                        | 49.6              | 31.5              | 49.7             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>p&lt;0.001</i>           | <i>p&lt;0.001</i> | <i>p&lt;0.001</i> | <i>p&lt;0.01</i> |
| <b>Sex</b>                     |                             |                   |                   |                  |
| Boy***                         | 45.6                        | 36.8              | 21.8              | 39.2             |
| Girl***                        | 44.7                        | 40.3              | 28.7              | 40.4             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>NS</i>                   | <i>NS</i>         | <i>p&lt;0.05</i>  | <i>NS</i>        |
| <b>Father's occupation</b>     |                             |                   |                   |                  |
| Agriculture***                 | 47.5                        | 39.1              | 29.5              | 42.4             |
| Non-agriculture***             | 42.7                        | 37.4              | 21.1              | 36.9             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>p&lt;0.05</i>            | <i>NS</i>         | <i>p&lt;0.01</i>  | <i>p&lt;0.01</i> |
| <b>Land size</b>               |                             |                   |                   |                  |
| Landless***                    | 47.3                        | 38.5              | 27.1              | 43.6             |
| 1-199 decimals***              | 45.7                        | 39.4              | 26.0              | 40.3             |
| 200+ decimals***               | 31.8                        | 36.0              | 22.6              | 28.8             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>p&lt;0.001</i>           | <i>NS</i>         | <i>NS</i>         | <i>p&lt;0.01</i> |
| <b>Labour sale status</b>      |                             |                   |                   |                  |
| sell**                         | 48.5                        | 42.5              | 35.9              | 47.1             |
| Don't sell***                  | 42.0                        | 37.2              | 24.0              | 35.6             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>p&lt;0.01</i>            | <i>NS</i>         | <i>p&lt;0.05</i>  | <i>p&lt;0.01</i> |
| <b>Housing condition</b>       |                             |                   |                   |                  |
| Bad***                         | 45.6                        | 39.8              | 24.2              | 41.0             |
| Good***                        | 42.7                        | 35.1              | 26.8              | 35.1             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>NS</i>                   | <i>NS</i>         | <i>NS</i>         | <i>p&lt;0.01</i> |
| <b>Religion</b>                |                             |                   |                   |                  |
| Muslim***                      | 45.7                        | 38.2              | 24.2              | 40.0             |
| Non-Muslim                     | 40.4                        | 39.6              | 31.4              | 38.1             |
| <i>Significant level</i>       | <i>NS</i>                   | <i>NS</i>         | <i>NS</i>         | <i>NS</i>        |

\*p<0.10

\*\*p<0.05

\*\*\*p<0.01

NS= not significant at 10%

Table 8: Regression coefficients and odds ratios of best model to predict the probability of child labour.

| Variable                   | Beta coefficient | Standard error | Odds ratio |
|----------------------------|------------------|----------------|------------|
| <b>Age</b>                 |                  |                |            |
| 10-12 years                | 0.00             | -              | 1.00       |
| 13-14 years                | 0.77***          | 0.07           | 2.16       |
| <b>Child education</b>     |                  |                |            |
| No schooling               | 0.00             | -              | 1.00       |
| 1-5 years                  | -0.25***         | 0.09           | 0.78       |
| 6+ years                   | -0.62***         | 0.15           | 0.54       |
| <b>Mother's education</b>  |                  |                |            |
| No schooling               | 0.00             | -              | 1.00       |
| 1-5 years                  | -0.24**          | 0.10           | 0.79       |
| 6+ years                   | -0.42**          | 0.18           | 0.66       |
| <b>Father's education</b>  |                  |                |            |
| No schooling               | 0.00             | -              | 1.00       |
| 1-5 years                  | -0.17*           | 0.09           | 0.84       |
| 6+ years                   | -0.54***         | 0.11           | 0.58       |
| <b>Land size</b>           |                  |                |            |
| Landless                   | 0.00             | -              | 1.00       |
| 1-199 decimals             | -0.09            | 0.08           | 0.91       |
| 200+ decimals              | -0.44***         | 0.11           | 0.64       |
| <b>Father's occupation</b> |                  |                |            |
| Agricultural               | 0.00             | -              | 1.00       |
| Non-agricultural           | -0.26***         | 0.07           | 0.77       |
| Constant                   | -0.05            | 0.09           |            |
| *p<0.10                    | **p<0.05         | ***p<0.01      |            |