CU Global Management Review
Vol. 11,Issue 2, July-December 2022, pp. 3-18

PARENTAL OCCUPATION AND CHILDREN'S LABOUR IN TANZANIA.

Dr. Monica Sebastian Kauky
Lecturer
Department of Geography and Economics,
University of Dar Es Salaam-Dar Es Salaam, University College of Education,
Tanzania

Abstract

This paper examined the effects of parental occupation on child labour in Tanzania. Two latest waves of the Tanzanian National Panel Survey data of 2014/15 and 2019/20 were employed to explore the effects of parental occupation on children's labour. The random effects Tobit regression model was used in estimating the link between parental occupation and children's labour measured by hours. The findings revealed that employed occupation and self-employed occupation of parents are negatively associated with child labour compared to parents in agriculture occupation. In addition, the findings indicated that child labour increases with the age of the child. Moreover, a male child engaged more in child labour compared to their female counterparts. Findings further revealed that attained secondary education by the head of the household was negatively associated with child labour hours. Further, the findings of the current study indicated that residing in urban areas and child school attendance both significantly reduce child labour hours. Therefore, the study recommends that policies that aim to increase child school attendance be laid out to ensure that child schooling is appropriately observed.

Key Words: Parental occupation, Child labour, Panel data, Random effects Tobit model, Tanzania.

1 Introduction

This study examined the effects of parental occupation on child labour in Tanzania. While there has been significant success in eliminating child labour over the past two decades yet, that progress has slowed and even froze between the years 2016 and 2020. Globally, around 160 million children aged 5-17 years are still engaged in child labour as of the year 2020 About 79 million are found to engage themselves in hazardous work (ILO, 2021). The situation is even worse in African countries and particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa (Diallo et al., 2010). This region is the home of the most 160 million working children around the globe. A large number of working children aged 5 to 17 years are found to live in Africa compared to the other regions of the world. As of the year 2020, child labour affected almost 86.6 million children between years 5 to 17 in the region (ILO, UNICEF, 2021).

Child labour prevalence is also seen as a critical issue in Tanzania. Available statistics in the country show that approximately 20.4 million children aged 5-17 years which is equivalent to 33% of the population of the country are engaged in child labour (NBS, 2021). The report also indicated that boys engaged in child labour as compared to their counterparts (girls). These made a total of 10.52 million boys compared to 9.88 million girls. More so, the highest rates of child labour in the country are found in the Geita and Manyara regions with 56% and 53% of the children aged 5-13 years engaging in child labour (NBS,2021). These children are found engaged in work such as domestic work, taking care of the family members, helping the family in business, and helping their family in farming while others are engaged in wage employment (Beegle et al., 2008). Further, about 30% of the children are working in tobacco areas in Tabora region (Eldring et al., 2000).

Child labour is defined as a subset of the job or economic activity that is harmful, unfavorable, or unpleasant to children (ILO-IPEC, 2013). In the United Nations Convention on Children's Rights, a child is defined as any person under the age of 18 years (Reynaert et al., 2009). Moreover, according to UNICEF child labour is defined as work that is hazardous to children physically, psychologically, socially, or morally and that tends to deprive them of opportunities for growth and education. Child labour also includes activities that drain the energy of the children, harm their health, and keep them from attending school to acquire fundamental knowledge and skills for their future development (UNICEF, 2006).

Parental occupation has been evidenced as one of the main sources of the determinants of parental income in many developing countries. In addition, parental occupation is crucial in determining the way children spend their time between school and work (Islam & Hoque, 2022; Amin et al., 2006). These studies suggest that child labour correlates with the level of activity of the labour market and the economy (Duryea & Arends-Kuennings, 2003). When the parents work, they have the opportunity of earning income which helps their families in one way or another. Moreover, each particular kind of work in agriculture, wage employment, and business contributes to the increase in income of the family (Hurst et al., 2005).

Due to poverty and low income, parents in many developing countries tend to relocate time with their children between school and work (Martey et al., 2022). On the other hand, parents send their children to work when faced with numerous idiosyncratic and covariate shocks (Carter et al., 2006; Beegle et al., 2006). The children are forced to work to compensate for income loss due to household shocks (Beegle et al., 2006). The parental decisions on time allocation to their children and the contribution of the children to household income impose long-run effects on children's growth. This also deters their school development (Blunch & Verner, 2001; Carter et al., 2007; Bacolod & Ranjan, 2008). Furthermore, given that future productivity depends on

investments in human capital, this situation might potentially affect the nation's development as well (Ravalli & Wodon, 1999). Hence, poverty will continue in subsequent generations for the children who opt for child labour and forgo education.

In this study, we examined the effects of parental occupation on children's labour in Tanzania. This study employed the two latest waves of the Tanzanian National Panel Survey data (2014/15 and 2019/20), to analyze the relationship which exists between parental work categories and child labour in Tanzania. The study focused on examining how children's labour is sensitive to the occupation of their parents. These occupation types include employment, business employment, farming employment, and no jobs if they influence child labour. According to Parikh & Sadoulet, (2005), various parental occupation opportunities correlate positively with child labour. Further literature indicated that children whose parents are self-employed tend to be engaged in child labour. The literature also suggests that seasonal variation in agricultural activities forced the adults to engage in non-agricultural work to rise income. This situation creates substitution effects on the children in the household which increase the incidence of child labour (Ahmed & Ray, 2011). For example, the study by Basu and Dimova, (2020) found that child labour increases when a parent is engaging in a farming occupation.

Although various empirical literature exists on the determinants of child labour (Huang and Acheampong, 2018; Bandara et al., 2014; Siddhanta and Nandy, 2003; Beegle et al., 2006; Mealli et al., 2002; Guarcello et al.,2010) few of them (Elgebeleye & Olasupo, 2011; Basu & Dimova, 2020; Mackintosh & Wori, 2021), few of them study on the relationship between parental occupation and child labour. In addition, although empirical literature suggests that parental occupation matters for children's labour, studies in Tanzania are missing. The current study fills the existing gap in the literature by using the most recent dataset of the Tanzanian National Panel Survey 2014/15 and 2019/20.

2. Tanzania Public Education and Child Labour Policy.

In Tanzania, the schooling system is administered by the Ministry of Education and vocational training. Schooling provision is guided by the Tanzanian Education and Training Policy of 2014 (URT, 2014). Schooling has been recognized as among the priority sectors in fighting against poverty as indicated in Tanzanian Poverty Reduction Strategy. The schooling sector in Tanzania, therefore, has the following phases: pre-primary, primary education, secondary schooling, vocational training, adult schooling, and tertiary or higher schooling. Pre-primary education involves all children with age 5 to 6 years which is fee-free. Primary school education in Tanzania is compulsory and basic for all children and it lasts for seven years (URT, 2006). The official entry age in primary school is a minimum of 6 years and it lasts for seven (7) years whereby the complete cycle is marked by writing the standard VII leaving examinations. The results are normally used in

making selections of students who will join public secondary schools. This phase also is free. Secondary education also is free.

To get rid of the worst form of child labour in Tanzania, the government of Tanzania set the minimum age for a child to work to 14 years. Any person below age 14 is regarded as a child and therefore he or she is prohibited to engage in hazardous work. In this case such a child is supposed to be in school. In Tanzania for example, The National Employment Policy of the year 1997 discourages children below 15 years of age to engage in various activities or works which are hazardous to their health, exploitative, or deprive their right to school and their leisure. But it should be understood that this definition of a child for the case of Tanzania includes all persons under 18 years. To ensure this is done, the government of Tanzania developed some implementation policies and among those policies is the National Plan on the Elimination of Child Labour of the year 2009. This is a plan which aims at reducing the child labour incidence in Tanzania at both household and community levels, both in rural and urban areas as well as in all sectors of the economy. Moreover, the Child Development Policy of the year 2008 implements the ILO Convention, which also aims at eliminating all worst forms of child labour. Despite the various laws and policies regarding child labour practices in Tanzania, still, some children are reported to be engaged in child labour. Around 4.85 million which is approximately 24.1% are found to be engaged in economic activities while 24.6% work in dangerous conditions in Tanzania Mainland and 7.3% engaged in dangerous work in Zanzibar. Moreover, 75.3% of the children in Tanzania are found to work in agriculture and fishery occupation (NBS, 2021). Based on working hours, the children in Tanzania are found to spend an average of 23 hours per week, with boys working an average of more hours (25) as compared to girls (21 hours) (NBS, 2021).

3. Simple Model for Parental Child Labour Decisions.

This study adopts the theoretical model from various studies (Parikh & Sadoulet, 2005; Islam & Hoque, 2022; Keshavarz Haddad, 2017). This model is motivated by the notion that the parents force their children to engage in child labour as a result of the poverty which exists among them. Poor households need their children to rise their income in the case when they faced shocks in their daily lives (Beegle et al., 2003; Basu & Tzannatos, 2003). Additionally, when the household has an inadequate income, they may pull children into labour market to rise out income. This situation might force children either to miss school or to use just a little time in schooling. Literature shows that child labour is primarily caused by the poverty which prevails within the families. Additionally, child labour is said to be also influenced by parental social and economic traits or characteristics. These traits or characteristics are such as parental occupation, education access, and employment opportunities, sex, age among others (Siddhanta & Nandy, 2003).

The model is presented by assuming that each household maximizes utility. The utility is maximized subject to financial and time constraints. This utility function is the function of household consumption represented by Z, child education represented by S as well as the leisure of a child which is indicated by K.

This equation is represented below:

$$\text{Max utility } (Z, S, K) \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Subject to } P_z Z + P_s S \leq Y_p + mL \quad (2)$$

$$S + L + l = \bar{T} \quad (3)$$

From the equation above, Y_p represents the parental income from different occupations including income from farming, business, and from employment. In addition, L represents child labour, while T shows the total amount of time. P_z shows the costs of consumers items that have to be consumed by the household, P_s represents the costs for a child's education or schooling m indicates the child's wage.

From this model, the adult uses the time to work or engaged in leisure. The income of the parents is assumed to be exogenous. This implies that when adults at present are unemployed, underemployed, or have no jobs it is mostly due to external market factors rather than their own choices. In solving the model, the following hypothesis has to be produced. In addition, when the labour return in adulthood is low there will be more use of child labour, less child leisure, and less schooling. When education is expensive on the other hand there will be less school, more leisure time, and more child labour. Also, if there are high expected returns from education in the future, there will be more education, less leisure, and less child employment.

The preferences of the children will work if their parents place a high value on them. But if the parents place a low value on child labour, the preferences for child labour will not work. These presences of the children are mostly affected by the socio-economic situation of the parents which in one way or another affects their school attendance and ultimately forced their children to be engaged in child labour.

4. Data

This paper employed two rounds of the National Panel Survey Data of Tanzania (NPS) wave four (2014/15) and wave five (2019/20) datasets to examine the effects of household occupation on child labour and child school attendance. The NPS is normally collected by the National Bureau of Statistics in Tanzania together with the World Bank. The fourth and fifth rounds of the NPS year 2014/15 and 2019/20, gather information on agricultural activities, on-farm income-generating activities, consumption expenditures, the wealth of the household, and other parental

socioeconomic. Further, these two waves (four and five) gather information from the Tanzanian 2012 Demographic and Housing Census unlike the earlier waves one, two, and three, whose information is based on the Master Sample plan from the Tanzanian 2002 Demographic and Housing Census Survey. The NPS waves four and five used a stratified two-stage design with 51 design strata. It covered both Tanzania's rural and urban together with Zanzibar. The sample size for NPS wave four was 989 households, while the sample size for NPS wave five was 1,184 households. A total of 908 households from wave four were followed and re-interviewed in wave five. The attrition rate for this sample was 9.2%. In addition, the NPS provided information such as the occupation of parents, the hours of engaging in various economic activities, and variables on school attendance for the children aged year 5 and above. All this information was employed in this study to the link between parental occupation, child labour, and schooling in Tanzania.

To get the sample size used in this study, we focused on primary school-aged children. These are the children between the ages of 6 to 14 going through Tanzanian primary education. The study focused on children in the age group of 6-14 years. Though the compulsory age for a primary school in Tanzania was 7 years previously, at the present majority of the children found themselves enrolled at age of 6 years. So, we chose this age since the minimum years' school age for children in Tanzania is 6 years, and the completion age is 12 if a child is enrolled on time or 14 if delayed in enrollment. On the other hand, the minimum age of legal employment in Tanzania is 14 years according to the International Labour Organization. It follows that if these groups of children are engaged in activities that stunt their growth, we regard them as having engaged in child labour as long as they were supposed to be in school at that age and at that particular time.

This paper uses a balanced panel of 1,384 observations. The wave four datasets had a total sample of 1,028 observations within the age range of 6 to 14 years, while the wave five dataset has a sample of 1,155 within the same age range, making a total of 2,183 observations. On appending, we got 1,384 observations in total, which is 692 observations per wave. The reason for ending up with 1,384 observations is the five-year gap between the two waves, whereby most of the children 9 years and above in wave four (2014/15) will be above the age of 14 years in wave five (2019/20). Also, children with 10 years and below in wave five (2019/20) were less than six years in wave four (2014/15) and could not meet the criteria.

4.1 Outcome Variable

4.1.1 Child Labour

The outcome variable for this paper is child labour. The definition of child labour has been derived from the National Panel Survey Data Questionnaire in two waves (2014/15 and 2019/20). Section E of the NPS involved questions on labour hours for households aged five years and above.

The questions were asked whether the household member has five years and above and they were supposed to respond with a Yes or No. The other questions were on the hours in which the household aged five years engaged in various economic activities including wage employment, business, unpaid family worker non-farm activities, or agricultural activities. The questions were used to construct the child labour variable for children between 6 to 14 years. Child labour, in this case, was defined as the total hours in the previous week spent by a child between 6-14 years working in economic activities for wage, household-run business, farming, and unpaid household activities. This also is in line with the definition of child labour according to the International Labour Organization.

4.1.2 Explanatory variable

Parental Occupation is the main explanatory variable in this study. Given the availability of the data, the study makes a distinction between five categories of work including, work for pay which is termed as employed, agriculture activities, self-employed, family work, and no jobs. The other control variables for this study include child age which was measured in years. Child sex was measured as a dummy variable with a value of 1 if the child is male and 0 if otherwise. Child schooling status was measured as a dummy variable with a value of 1 if the child is currently schooling and 0 otherwise. Household head age is a numeric variable measured in years. Household head sex was measured as a dummy variable with a value of 1 if the head is male and 0 if otherwise. Household size is a numeric variable that captures the number of people in a household. The marital status of the head of the household is a categorical variable with five categories married, separated, divorced, widow/widower, and never married. The education level of the head of household is a categorical variable categorized into four categories namely; no formal education, primary, secondary and tertiary. The residence is a dummy variable with a value of 1 if the child resides in urban areas and 0 if otherwise.

4.3 Econometric Strategy

To examine the effect of parental occupation on child labour, the following empirical model is adopted; $[\![CL]\!]_it=\beta_0+\beta_1\,[\![ParOcc]\!]_it+\beta_3\,X_it+\mu_it$

(4)

Where; $[\![CL]\!]_it$ is the dependent variable that stands for child labour measured in the number of hours a child has worked per week. $[\![ParOcc]\!]_it$ is the parental occupation which is the main explanatory variable, X_it is the control variable that includes child age, child sex, household size, household head age, sex of the head of the household, the marital status of the household head, education level of the household, and residence and μ_it representing is an error term.

5.0 Findings.

The study first tested the presence of multicollinearity in the data using the VIF Test. The findings reveal that the mean VIF is 4.18 which is less than the threshold of 10 statistics. A multicollinearity problem exists when the mean VIF is greater than 10 statistics (Senaviratna and Cooray, 2019). Therefore, this study does not suffer from the multicollinearity problem. Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics of the variables used in this study.

Waves	**Combined waves**			**Wave four**		**Wave five**	
Variable	**N**	**Mean**	**Std. Dev.**	**Mean**	**Std. Dev.**	**Mean**	**Std. Dev.**
Child labour (Hours weekly)	1384	3.11	9.66	3.98	11.45	2.25	7.35
Household head occupation							
Agriculture	1384	0.64	0.48	0.66	0.47	0.62	0.49
Employed	1384	0.15	0.36	0.16	0.36	0.14	0.35
Self employed	1384	0.15	0.36	0.13	0.34	0.16	0.37
Family work	1384	0.01	0.07	0	0	0.01	0.1
No jobs	1384	0.06	0.24	0.05	0.23	0.07	0.25
Child age (years)	1384	9.89	2.58	9.49	2.53	10.28	2.56
Child sex (Male=1)	1384	0.48	0.5	0.49	0.5	0.48	0.5
Currently schooling	1384	0.82	0.39	0.76	0.43	0.88	0.33
Household head age (years)	1384	50.36	13.67	49.46	13.71	51.26	13.59
Household head sex (Male=1)	1384	0.78	0.41	0.79	0.41	0.78	0.42
Household head marital status							
Married	1384	0.79	0.41	0.8	0.4	0.79	0.41
Separated	1384	0.05	0.21	0.05	0.23	0.04	0.19
Divorced	1384	0.03	0.16	0.03	0.16	0.03	0.17
Never married	1384	0.03	0.16	0.02	0.15	0.03	0.17
Widow/widower	1384	0.1	0.31	0.1	0.3	0.11	0.32
Household head education level							
No formal education	1384	0.2	0.4	0.21	0.41	0.19	0.39
Primary	1384	0.68	0.47	0.67	0.47	0.69	0.46
Secondary	1384	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.3
Tertiary	1384	0.02	0.13	0.02	0.13	0.02	0.13
Household size	1384	4.98	3.08	4.44	3.31	5.51	5
Residence (Urban=1)	1384	0.33	0.47	0.32	0.47	0.33	0.47

Table 1 above shows that the average child labour is around 3 hours per week, while the minimum value obtained is 0 hours and the maximum value is 83 hours per week. These hours were calculated in economic activities such as wage employment, family business, and agricultural activities. The implication provided is that there are children who did not experience any child labour, while others experienced intensive labour of up to more than 80 hours per week. Findings also show that around 64% of the parents are in farming occupation, followed by 15% who are employed either in the public or private sector, 15% who are self-employed, 0% who are in family work, and 6% who do not have jobs. This indicates that agricultural activities form the main occupation for the majority as it is also the backbone of the Tanzania economy with a significant share of the employment and GDP contribution. According to the National Sample Census of Agriculture of 2019/20, agriculture is the main source of employment and it contributes to around 26.7% of the national GDP.

Findings also show that the average child age is around 10 years, with a minimum of 6 years and a maximum of 14 years. This implies that these children are superposed to be receiving primary education. Furthermore, males account for 47% of the children, while females account for 53%. It is further observed that around 82% of the children are currently schooling. Around 78% of the households are headed by males and 33% of the households are located in urban areas. Findings also show that the average age for the head of households is around 50 years, indicating that most of the heads are old enough. In addition, around 79% of the household head are married, 5% are separated, 3% are divorced, 3% are never married and 10% are widows/widowers.

Findings show that 68% of the head of households have primary education, followed by around 20% with no formal education, 10% with secondary education, and 2% with tertiary education. This implies that the majority of the heads of households have primary education. It is further observed that the average household size is 5 members which are consistent with the national average household size.

5.1 Child labour and other socio-economic variables relationships.

Table 2 presents the relationship between child labour and other variables. It shows how child labour correlates with other explanatory variables.

Table 2: Child labour and other socio-economic variables

Variable		**Mean**	**Std. dev.**	**Freq.**
Occupation of the head of household	Agriculture	4.25	10.96	884
	Employed	1.28	6.92	205
	Self-employed	0.22	1.17	205
	Family work	0	0	7
	No jobs	2.89	10.66	83
Residence	Rural	3.86	10.14	933
	Urban	1.57	8.39	451
Household head sex	Female	2.37	8.93	299
	Male	3.32	9.84	1,085
Education level of head	No formal	4.32	11.71	277
	Primary	3.19	9.66	942
	Secondary	0.74	3.71	141
	Tertiary	0	0	24

Findings revealed that among the parental occupations, agriculture occupation leads to having the highest child labour of 4.25 hours per week followed by a parent who has no jobs with 2.89 hours per week. On the other hand, employed and self-employed occupations of parents have the least child labour with 1.28 and 0.22 hours per week respectively. Findings further show that children who reside in rural areas experience child labour of 3.86 hours per week while those who reside in urban areas experience child labour of 1.57 per week. This indicates that parents in rural areas use their children in different economic activities to help them rise household incomes in efforts of withstanding different shocks. It is further observed that child labour is higher among male-headed households with an average of 3.32 hours per week while female-headed households have child labour of 2.37 hours per week. With regards to the education level of the head of household, findings reveal that child labour is high among those with no formal education as it records an average of 4.32 hours per week, followed by those with secondary education as it records 3.19 hours per week. It further reveals that those with secondary education with 0.74 hours per week while there is no child labour among those with tertiary education. This indicates that education is critical in reducing child labour.

5.2 Effect of Parental occupation on the child labour

Random effects Tobit regression was employed to examine the effect of parental occupation on child labour in Tanzania. The dependent variable child labour was captured as working hours per week while the main explanatory variable is the parental occupation which is a categorical variable with five categories. The use of the Tobit model is influenced by the fact that the dependent variable child labour is censored from below. Table 3 presents the marginal effects from the Random effects Tobit regression.

VARIABLES	Child labour
Reference Household head occupation = Agriculture	
Employed	-16.26***
	-3.784
Self-employed	-17.16***
	-4.149
Family work	-131.9
	-99,282
No job	-6.556
	-4.193
Household size	0.0422
	-0.18
Child age (years)	4.327***
	-0.407
Child sex (Male=1)	6.974***
	-1.907
Household head sex (Male=1)	-0.855
	-4.812
Household head age (years)	0.0941
	-0.08
Reference Household head marital status = Married	
Separated	-5.92
	-6.231
Divorced	-8.231
	-8.628
Never married	-13.4
	-8.804
Widow/widower	-9.446*
	-5.468

Residence (Urban=1)	-9.167***
	-2.592
Currently schooling (Yes=1)	-12.68***
	-2.248
Reference Household head education level = No formal education	
Primary education	-3.293
	-2.318
Secondary education	-13.41***
	-4.741
Tertiary education	-140.1
	-58,107
Observations	1,383

Standard errors in parentheses
**** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1*

Findings show that when the parent is employed, child labour declines by 16 hours per week in comparison to the parent who is in agriculture. It is further observed that when the parent is self-employed, the child labour declines by around 17 hours per week in comparison to the parent in agriculture occupation. This means that whether the parent is employed in the public or private sector, or self-employed, child labour declines while it increases among the children whose parents are in the agriculture sector. Evidence from the existing literature shows that parents in agriculture occupation tend to use their children for farming activities to help raise family income and withstand shocks. The finding is consistent with the findings from previous studies (Ofuoku et al.,2020). However, family work and no job occupation for parents have been found not to have a significant effect on child labour.

An increase in the child's age by 1 year is observed to increase child labour by 4 hours per week. This means that as the child keeps on growing, they are engaged in different activities to help increase household incomes. It has been observed that families tend to use their children to supplement household incomes especially to stand different shocks that may shake the household wealth. Similar findings have been obtained in previous studies (Okpukpara & Odurukwe, 2006; Mwebaze, 2007; Abou, 2014; Basu & Dimova, 2020).

When the child is male, child labour is observed to increase by around 7 hours per week in comparison to their female counterpart. This means that households rely more on using male

children in performing different activities to raise family incomes in comparison to female children. On the other hand, while male children are undergoing child labour, parents tend to use their female children for household chores and as they grow older, they are engaged in early marriages. Thus, male children are put into more disadvantageous positions concerning their education and future. This finding concurs with the findings from the previous studies (Okpukpara & Odurukwe, 2006; Abou, 2014).

Findings revealed that when the household resides in urban areas child labour declines by 9 hours per week in comparison to their counterparts who reside in rural areas. This means that children in rural areas are more exposed to child labour as rural households experience high poverty levels than their urban counterparts. Thus, households in rural areas tend to direct their children to child labour to raise family income and cope with the shocks. Similar findings have been found in previous studies (Abou, 2014; Afriyie et al., 2018).

When the child is attending school, it is observed that child labour declines by around 13 hours in comparison to those who are not attending school. This means that school attendance for the children reduces possible child labour as most of the time children are in school. A similar finding was also indicated by Siddhanta & Nandy, 2003.

Also, when the household head has a secondary education level, child labour declines by around 13 hours per week in comparison to the heads with no formal education. This indicates that having education increases the awareness of not depriving children of rights such as the right to leisure and education, thus, reducing child labour. The finding obtained is consistent with the finding from the previous studies (Siddhanta & Nandy, 2003; Zapata et al., 2011). Nevertheless, primary education and tertiary education did not have a significant effect on child labour, though they provide a negative relationship.

6. Conclusion and Policy Implication

This study used panel data with two waves to examine the effect of parental occupation on child labour in Tanzania. random effects Tobit regression was employed for analysis. The findings revealed that when the parent is self-employed, or employed, the child labour declines significantly in comparison to those parents in the agriculture occupation. Tailored approaches need to be developed to assist parents to have off-farm work/employments that may increase their resilience to shocks and help them reduce their dependence on using children as labour and supplement their incomes and help to reduce child labour.

Child labour is observed to decline with child schooling. Furthermore, household education level reduces child labour. Therefore, the study recommends enhancing policies and programs to increase child school attendance be laid out to ensure that child schooling is appropriately

observed. Additionally, the study highlights the need for government agencies and other stakeholders such as NGOs to engage in tailored interventions geared towards providing education to the public to stop child labour practices. This will significantly reduce child labour.

Child labour is observed to decline significantly in urban areas in comparison to rural areas. This indicates that rural areas are known to have higher child labour, and it is linked to high poverty levels. Therefore, the study recommends for special intervention programs for rural areas to help them supplement their incomes and lift them out of poverty.

References

1) Abou, P. E., (2014). A reexamination of determinants of child labour in Côte d'Ivoire, Nairobi: African Economic Research Consortium, Research paper no.284.

(2) Amin, S., Quayes, S., & Rives, J. M. (2006). Are children and parents' substitutes or complements in the family labour supply decision in Bangladesh. The Journal of developing areas, 15-37.

(3) Basu, A. K., & Dimova, R. (2020). Household Behavioral Preferences and the Child Labor-Education Trade-off: Framed Field Experimental Evidence from Ethiopia (No. 13011). IZA Discussion Papers.

(4) 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.

(5) Beegle, K., Dehejia, R. H., & Gatti, R. (2003). Child labor, income shocks, and access to credit. Income Shocks, and Access to Credit (June 2003).

(6) Beegle, K., Dehejia, R. H., & Gatti, R. (2006). Child labor and agricultural shocks. Journal of Development economics, 81(1), 80-96.

(7) Blunch, N. H., & Verner, D. (2001). Revisiting the link between poverty and child labor: the Ghanaian experience.

(8) Carter, M. R., Little, P. D., Mogues, T., & Negatu, W. (2006). Shocks, sensitivity and resilience: Tracking the economic impacts of environmental disaster on assets in Ethiopia and Honduras (No. 580-2016-39326).

(9) Diallo, Y., Hagemann, F., Etienne, A., Gurbuzer, Y., & Mehran, F. (2010). Global child labour developments: Measuring trends from 2004 to 2008. International Labour Office, International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC). ILO, Geneva. 44pp.

(10) Duryea, S., & Arends-Kuenning, M. (2003). School attendance, child labor and local labor market fluctuations in urban Brazil. World Development, 31(7), 1165-1178.

(11) Hurst, P., Termine, P., & Karl, M. (2005). Agricultural workers and their contribution to sustainable agriculture and rural development.

(12) ILO, and UNICEF. 2021. "Child Labour: Global Estimates 2020, Trends and the Road Forward." New York: International Labour Office and United Nations Children's Fund. https:// www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---ipec/documents/publication/ wcms_797515.pdf.

(13) Islam, R., & Hoque, M. M. (2022). Trade-off between schooling and labor for children: understanding the determinative factors among rural households in Bangladesh. Frontiers in Sociology, 7.

(14) Keshavarz Haddad, G. (2017). Parents' decision on child labour and school attendance: evidence from Iranian households. Journal of Education and Work, 30(6), 612-631.

(15) Martey, E., Etwire, P. M., & Koomson, I. (2022). Parental time poverty, child work and school attendance in Ghana. Child indicators research, 1-27.

(16) Mwebaze, T. (2007). Extent and Determinant of Child Labour in Uganda. AERC Research Paper 167, June 2007.

(17) National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) (Tanzania). 2021. Intergrated Labour Force Survey, 2019/20 Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: NBS.

(18) Ofuoku, A. U., Ovharhe, O. J., & Agbamu, J. U. (2020). Child labor in farming households in the Niger delta region of Nigeria. Journal of Developing Societies, 36(1), 41-55.

(19) Okpukpara, B. C., & Odurukwe, N. (2006). Incidence and determinants of child labour in Nigeria: Implications for poverty alleviation.

(20) Parikh, A., & Sadoulet, E. (2005). The effect of parents' occupation on child labor and school attendance in Brazil.

(21) Reynaert, D., Bouverne-de-Bie, M., & Vandevelde, S. (2009). A review of children's rights literature since the adoption of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. Childhood, 16(4), 518-534.

(22) Senaviratna, N. A. M. R., & Cooray, T. M. J. A. (2019). Diagnosing multicollinearity of logistic regression model. Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics, 5(2), 1-9.

(23) Siddhanta, S., & Nandy, D. (2003). Socio-Economic Determinants of Child Labour. Problems of Child Labour in India, 205-218.

(24) Wang, H. (2018). The Impact of Parental Entrepreneurship on Children's Health. Open Journal of Business and Management, 6(03), 585.

Variable	VIF	1/VIF
Household head occupation		
Employed	1.54	0.65
Self employed	1.6	0.62
Family work	1.05	0.95
No jobs	1.22	0.82
Child age (years)	3.48	0.29
Child sex (Male=1)	13.03	0.08
Currently schooling	1.96	0.51
Household head age (years)	12.87	0.08
Household head sex (Male=1)	16.15	0.06
Household head marital status		
Separated	1.59	0.63
Divorced	1.38	0.73
Never married	1.26	0.79
Widow/widower	2.8	0.36
Urban	2.03	0.49
Currently schooling	5.7	0.18
Household head education level		
No formal education	4.66	0.21
Primary education	1.72	0.58
Secondary education	1.15	0.87
Mean VIF	4.18	