Eastern African Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences
Vol. 4 No. 1 (2025): ISSN (Online): 2958-4558
DOI: https://doi.org/10.58721/eajhss.v4i1.850
Parental Attitude and Child Labour: Evidence from Central Region of Ghana

Parental Attitude and Child Labour: Evidence from Central Region of Ghana

Benedicta Leonora Akrono
University of Education, Winneba, Ghana

Article History
Received: 2024.08.18
Revised: 2024.10.21
Accepted: 2024.12.28
Published: 2025.01.01

Keywords
Child labour
Economic activities
Parental attitude
Probit model

How to cite:
Akrono, B. L. (2025). Parental Attitude and Child Labour: Evidence from Central Region of Ghana. *Eastern African Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 1-15.

Abstract
The study focused on parental attitude and its impact on child labour participation in the Central Region of Ghana. The paper empirically examined the incidence of child labour of children between 5-17 years through a cross-sectional survey. A sample size of 788 children and parents was selected for the study. A multi-stage sampling with systematic random and purposive sampling techniques were employed. The questionnaire guide was the instrument for data collection. The study analysis was done using the probit regression model. The findings of the study showed that both father and mother attitudes significantly increase the probability of child labour participation. Mothers' employment status and fathers' education significantly reduce child labour participation. Children from the 3rd, 4th and 5th quintiles have less probability of child labour participation. Others include educational cost, age of the child, and geographical locality of the children significantly affect child labour participation. The study recommends that the District Assemblies must strictly enforce the Children's Act and make it operational for the restrictions regarding the employment of children. It is also recommended that the Ministry of Education and Ghana Education Service through the Inspectorate Board should design a truancy policy that would be enforced on parents to reduce child labour participation in economic activities and promote the free compulsory universal basic education policy.

Introduction

Children engaged in economic activities, generally referred to as child labour, constitute one of the significant socio-economic phenomena in the continents of Asia, Latin America, Europe, Africa and Ghana in particular (ILO, 2013). According to this ILO Report, global estimates show that more than 265 million children are engaged in employment, out of which 168 million aged 5-17 years are into child labour. Out of the estimated number, 115 million of these children are employed in Africa, and over 85 million are employed in hazardous work. Recent global estimates indicate that 160 million children are engaged in child labour, representing 1 out of 10 children in labour activities, and then 79 million children are performing hazardous work (ILO, 2021). Though it shows a reduction within the time lag, the estimate for sub-Saharan Africa stands out, as the region records the highest prevalence and most significant number of children in child labour. Over the years, the survey of the Ghana Statistical Service (GSS, 2014; GSS, 2019) has revealed that a higher proportion of children, often between 5-17 years old, are economically active. For instance, GSS (2014) reports that over 2 million children work in economic activity. In addition, the latest report (GSS, 2019) reiterated that about 7 million children aged between 5 and 14 years participate in economic activities such as forestry,

fishing, services, mining, and quarrying. These indicators show that the prevalence of child labour continues to increase appreciably at the national level. In the Central Region, as GSS (2014) indicated, children working in agriculture or fisheries and schooling account for 83.2% of the total population.

Cognisant of the increase in child labour statistics over the years makes it imperative to examine its determinants. Basu and Van's (1998) altruistic theory has stressed the role of poverty in line with the luxury axiom as a significant factor in the prevalence of child labour, in that the child only works when household income falls to the subsistence level. Empirically, it has been confirmed worldwide (Sasmal & Guillen, 2015; Quattri & Watkins, 2016; Afriyie et al., 2019). However, the issue of poverty being the primary determinant of child labour has been questioned by some scholars, who have illustrated that child labour may be caused by a specific assumption that underpins the economic situation in the household (Fors, 2012). Therefore, this study focuses on non-poverty factors in explaining the prevalence of child labour by paying attention to parents' attitudes. Frempong and Stadelmann (2021), Hamenoo et al. (2018), de Hoop et al. (2017), Ariyanti (2016), Mukherjee and Pal (2016) and Tafere and Pankhurst (2015) have provided evidence on non-monetary factors such as household risk preference, parental expectation, family culture, parental absence and educational level of parents that significantly influence child labour participation. However, the authors ignored parental attitude, which could contribute equally to child labour participation.

The current study contributes to the growing literature on non-poverty determinants of child labour by looking at the role of parental attitude. Past studies have shown that parents' positive attitude towards children in economic activities significantly increases the incidence of child labour (Patrinos & Shafiq, 2010; Tafere & Pankhurst, 2015). The authors noted that some parents view child labour as part of a child's training process and a way of equipping children with their future skills. However, the extent to which such positive attitudes affect child labour participation has not been examined. According to Doss (2013), different parents (such as father or mother) may have divergent attitudes concerning child labour, which may influence their decision to either send their children to work or otherwise. If this is the case, the study considers separately each parent's attitude that may impact child labour participation. Again, given the plausibility of parent attitude affecting child labour participation, previous studies have not treated parental attitude as an exogenous variable. Therefore, this study deviates from the former studies and considers it an endogenous variable, likely to increase the robustness of the findings. This study contributes to the knowledge relevant to researchers and academia regarding parental attitudes and child labour. The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 presents the theory of child labour. Section 3 reviews the related empirical literature. Section 4 considers the methodology. Section 5 interprets the empirical results. Finally, section 6 gives the concluding remarks and policy recommendations.

Theory of Child Labour

Child labour has existed since the pre-industrialisation era in textile and mining sectors, where large-scale production was a mirage and child labour was the main preoccupation for households. Against this background, Western Europe and the United States involved children intensively in the process of the Industrial Revolution, and the incidence of child labour was relatively high in the 1860s (Horrel & Humphries, 2018). The authors noted that more than a quarter of children below 18 years represented the workforce in Britain. One theory that underlies child labour is the luxury and substitution axioms (Basu & Van, 1998). The luxury axiom emphasises that a household would only send a child to work based on household insolvency when income falls below a subsistence level and the family becomes financially insecure. Thus, the survival of the household depends on child labour

contribution, regardless of the kind of activity the child is exposed. In line with that, schooling and leisure are viewed as luxury goods. Basu and Van (1998) further posit that adults and children were considered substitutes, subject to adult equivalency correction. In other words, children can do what adults do. This substitution axiom emphasises the literature on "nimble fingers", which describes the view that children are better than adults in some tasks where the work of machines replaces children's specific tasks.

The discussion above throws more light in line with Zelizer (1985), who commended that child labour is necessary for character training, discipline and industrial competition. Social norms, particularly on the social cost or stigma of sending a child to work, could be seen in Patrinos and Shafiq (2010). However, Humphries (2012) observed that it is only selfish parents who put children in labour to reap the benefits before their death. It is also noted that the high demand for child labour reduces the future wealth of children (Goldin & Parson, 1989). Also, Goldin and Sokoloff (1982) argued that industrial organisations in the Northeastern United States influenced the demand for female child labour. Therefore, females were the predominant labour force in the various industries. Household size also played a role in the Industrial Revolution. Britain's industrialisation witnessed population growth, thus raising the dependency ratio, which advanced young children into the labour market. In addition, being with no father significantly influenced the start of work at an early age, encouraging children to enter the labour market (Humphries, 2012).

A similar argument raised by Tafere and Pankhurst (2015) asserted that young children benefit from engaging in economic activities as it helps them acquire skills and attempt to explain in line that trade-offs result from persistent work. The author further explained that a moderate amount of work in a supervised environment allows the child to develop skills necessary for being responsible in society. Again, the authors emphasised that work does not necessarily mean a child's education is not valued. However, they have to work to pay the educational costs. Ariyanti (2016) also observed that parents' employment status drives child labour. Edoh-Torgah (2018) further explains that parents perceive child labour as safe. For that matter, it could be combined with schooling with the benefit that the child inculcates valuable skills needed to be responsible in society. Particular emphasis is placed on the informal sector jobs where children learn their parents' craft.

Bourdillon (2017) and Morrow et al. (2018) conclude that child labour fosters self-esteem in otherwise marginalised children; they also develop essential life and social skills that make them responsible in society. The argument follows that though education is important, it forms one aspect of learning but is not necessarily the most effective way of building up skills children need to be productive in the adult stages of life. Frempong and Stadelmann (2021) analysed that risk-averse households are likelier to send their children to the labour market as insurance for future economic shocks and immediate employment. The authors also mentioned that the educational attainment of both father and mother indirectly and significantly affects the probability of child labour incidence (Mukherjee & Pal, 2016). Dasgupta and Mukherjee (2022) explored the demand and supply determinant of child labour and noted that parental education reduces child labour participation significantly; the mother's education is an essential factor since it acts as a bargaining power in household decisions regarding school or work.

Concerning household level of wealth, the empirical evidence of Sasmal and Guillen (2015), Sasongko and Wijayanti (2016) and Kumar and Saqib (2017) attest to the fact that poverty is a significant cause of child labour. Furthermore, children from poor households grow and become unskilled children and have the probability of earning lower wages, thereby likely to generate into a child labour trap. The

literature of de Hoop et al. (2017) supports the view that economic status in terms of women's labour market participation and education has a less negative effect on child labour. Hence, it stands to reason that economic status increases women's decision-making power, likely reducing child labour. As a policy direction, this enables women to acquire more education and decision-making processes and increase assertiveness in household affairs.

Focusing on bio characteristics, Afriyie et al. (2019) studied the determinants of child labour practices in Ghana and noted that gender and age significantly influence child labour participation. These authors found that involvement in child labour decreases as the age of the child also increases. Similar evidence exists in the work of Abou (2014) and ILO (2021) survey report revealed that the probability of child labour engagement is more remarkable when children are younger (between 5-11 years old), whilst it decreases (12-17 years) as they grow older. Regarding gender, the same report makes it clear that boys are roughly twice as likely as girls to be in child labour activities in the 15-17 years (ILO, 2021). It has also been confirmed by Quattri and Watkins (2016) that girls seem to work less than boys. Again, children from a particular geographical locality tend to work fewer hours per week (Nicollela & Kassouf, 2018; Hamenoo et al., 2018; Afriyie et al., 2019).

It is important to note that the poverty axiom, a monetary determinant, cannot be critiqued. Thus, the level of wealth cannot always assume a cause of child labour, though a growing number of authors have focused their attention on this argument, and it has been found in many research studies to explain the prevalence of child labour. In contrast, what determines child labour is multidimensional assumptions that could also come from social context, a strong bond for traditional virtues, weak legal frameworks that ban child labour, and parental characteristics that mostly move along with parental attitudinal preference and motivation towards child schooling. Parental risk preferences regarding insurance against future economic shocks and time preferences all induce a higher probability of children entering the labour market. This illustrates that no specific factor may contribute to the household's decision to end the child labour phenomenon.

Methodology

Research Design and Sampling

The research study is a cross-sectional survey conducted in the Central Region of Ghana fishing communities. The region was chosen for the analysis because 83.2% of children between 5 and 17 years of age engage in fishing, forestry, or agricultural activity, comparable to the other regions in Ghana (GSS, 2014). Four study areas were selected using a systematic random sampling method. The population included public primary schools in Effutu, Awutu-Senya West, Gomoa West, and Mfantseman, which involved enrolment.

According to Israel's (1992) sample size determination, 394 within a precision of ±5% was obtained from the population. Consequently, 788 pupils were selected to increase accuracy and validity. With the class teacher's support, the pupils were screened based on the condition that at least the child voluntarily engages in fishing activities or at least one parent of the child is involved in fishing activities. Finally, a purposive sampling technique was adopted to select the children for the study. The researcher then traced the child's residence to the household. The questionnaire was developed following GLSS-6 (GSS, 2014) and administered orally, focusing on the parents (not necessarily biological parents) and at least a child. Cronbach alpha coefficients were obtained, which indicated an acceptable level of reliability. Also, the KMO, which measures the proportion of variance in variables, suggests that the factor analysis is helpful (see Appendix A). Table 1 shows detailed information on the determination of the sample size.

Table 1: Population and sample size determination of children

Circuit	Schools	Sampled Circuit	No. of schools	Population	Total sample
Effutu		West	1	1397	48
West	4		2	445	15
Central	8		3	960	33
East	10		4	503	17
Gomoa West					
Adaa-Ngyeresi	9	Apam	1	255	9
Ankamu	9		2	500	17
Apam	6		3	523	18
Odina-Oguaa	9		4	233	8
Mumford	8		5	572	20
Dawurampong	9		6	290	10
Eshiem	9	Mumford	1	309	11
Mprumem	10		2	310	11
Tarkwa	7		3	313	11
			4	119	4
			5	276	9
			6	291	10
			7	455	16
			8	110	4
Awutu-Senya		Awutu	1	432	15
West	7		2	302	10
Awutu	7		3	457	16
Ayensuako	8		4	285	10
Bawjiase A	7		5	512	17
Bawjiase B	8		6	384	13
Jei-Kodua	10		7	260	9
Senya	10	Senya	1	356	12
Obrachire	8		2	274	9
Brontrase			3	597	20
			4	1226	42
			5	406	14
			6	408	14
			7	754	26
			8	337	12
			9	223	8
			10	383	13
Mfantseman		Anomabo A	1	667	23
Anomabo A	10		2	408	14
Anomabo B	7		3	366	12
Dominase	14		4	213	7
Mankessim A	9		5	319	11
Mankessim B	8		6	267	10
Saltpond A	9		7	413	14
Saltpaond B	13		8	190	6
Yamoransa	10		9	154	5
			10	435	15
		Anomabo B	1	96	3
			2	280	10
			3	304	10
			4	143	5
			5	135	5

			6	128	4
			7	121	4
		Saltpond A	1	253	9
			2	377	13
			3	259	9
			4	241	8
			5	418	14
			6	77	3
			7	433	15
			8	513	18
			9	359	12
Total	**243**	**8**	**61**	**23,076**	**788**

Source: Author's Construct

Ethical Considerations

To satisfy all ethical issues in the study, the questionnaire was submitted to the Office of the Institutional Review Board of the University of Cape Coast for clearance. The purpose is to ensure clarity of information, privacy, anonymity and confidentially. Another consent was obtained from the Regional Directorate of the Ministry of Education and Ghana Education Services in the various study areas. Parents of the children were also given letters to inform them about the study.

Measurement of Variables

Table 2 shows the measurement of the variables and their respective specification.

Table 2: Measurement of Variables

Variable	**Definition and measurement**
Child labour	1= child labour participation in economic activity; 0 = otherwise
Parental attitude	Indicators: Desire for child to manage fishing business; no desire for education; child labour is a training grounds for future job prospect; parents supervise child labour activities and it is not harmful. Adopted Multiple Correspondence Analysis to create an index
Mother employment status	1 = employed; 0 = unemployed
Mother education	1 = no schooling; 2 = primary education; 3 = junior high school (JHS)/middle school leaving certificate (MLSC)
Father employment status	1 = employed; 0 = unemployed
Father education	1 = no schooling; 2 = primary education; 3 = JHS/MLSC
Household wealth	Indicators: canoe, outboard motor, paddle, net, etc. Adopted Principal component Analysis to create quintiles
Household size	Total number of people in the household
Log of educational cost	total amount of money spent on a child in the area of academic work per academic year
Child relationship to household head	1 = biological/relative child; 0 = foster
Child age	Accumulated birth years
Sex	1 = male; 2 = female
Locality	1 = Effutu; 2 = Awutu-Senya; 3 = Gomoa West; 4 = Mfantseman
School quality	Indicators: Physical resources, standard of academic achievement as broad areas. Likert scale was used.
Household head experience in child labour	1 = experience; 0 = otherwise

Source: Author's construct

Empirical Framework and Estimation

The dependent variable is child labour participation, which is modelled as a function of independent variables of household (HH), child (CHILD), community (COM), and school characteristics (SCH). The parental attitude towards child labour is the key variable, and the control variables are as follows: mothers' employment status (mocc), mothers' education (medu), fathers' employment status (focc), fathers' education (fedu), household wealth index (Hwealth), household size (Hsize), educational expenses (educost), household relation with child (relation), age of the child (age), sex of the child (sex), geographical location (locality) and school quality (schq). Probit regression is considered appropriate (Greene, 2012). However, due to the endogeneity of parental attitude, the estimates from the probit regression model are likely to be biased. Hence, an instrumental variable is employed. This is represented as:

$$\Pr(Y = 1|x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) = \theta(\beta_0 x_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \cdots + \beta_k x_k) \quad (1)$$

Where the dependent variable is binary, θ is the cumulative standard normal distribution function and $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k$ are the regressors. In the context of the problem, (1) is revised as:

$$P_r(Cl\_part = 1|x_1) = \theta(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \varepsilon_i) \quad (2)$$

Where Cl_part is the binary dependent variable, x_i is the vector of exogenous determinants and $\varepsilon_i$is the error term which represents any unpredictability regarding child labour participation. Due to pervasive heterogeneity inherent in household survey data, robust standard errors are invoked in the estimations to cater for the presence of heteroscedasticity and to counteract a possible misspecification of the underlying link function (Long & Freese, 2006). Hence,

$$\Pr(Clpart_i|x) = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 HH + \gamma_2 CHILD + \gamma_3 COM + \gamma_4 SCH + \mu_i \quad (3a)$$

$$\Pr(Clpart_i|x) = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 attitude + \gamma_2 Mocc + \gamma_3 Medu + \gamma_4 Focc + \gamma_5 Fedu + \gamma_6 Hwealth + \gamma_7 Hsize + \gamma_8 logeducost + \gamma_9 Relation + \gamma_{10} age + \gamma_{11} sex + \gamma_{12} locality + \gamma_{13} schq + \mu_i \quad (3b)$$

We generate and interpret the average marginal effects (AME) to facilitate easy interpretation of the coefficient. This is expressed as:

$$\text{AME} = \frac{1}{n}\left[\frac{\partial P(X)}{\partial xi}\right] = \Lambda\, f(\gamma_0 + X_i\gamma)\gamma_j \quad (4)$$

IV Probit Model

To obtain consistent and efficient estimates, the study employs the two-stage least squares to address the potential endogeneity that may bias the results. The estimation requires a valid instrument, and household head experience in child labour was selected. The IV model is specified as:

$$attitude_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 HHDCL^* + \vartheta_i \quad (5)$$

$$Clpart_i = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 attitude' + \gamma_2 Medu + \gamma_3 Mocc + \gamma_4 Fedu + \gamma_5 Focc + \gamma_6 Hwealth + \gamma_7 Hsize + \gamma_8 logeducost + \gamma_9 Relation + \gamma_{10} age + \gamma_{11} sex + \gamma_{12} locality + \gamma_{13} schq + \mu_i \quad (6)$$

Where equation (5) is the first stage regression and equation (6) are the second stage.

Results

Summary Statistics

Given the summary statistics, a large proportion of fathers (89.74%) gave their preference for child labour, and 83.76% of the mothers also agreed to the fact that child labour teaches discipline to the child. The results also revealed that a more significant proportion of women were economically active. The educational attainment of parents from the study shows that women 82.27% had obtained primary schooling compared to the fathers (85.01%). Although the educational level is low, the literacy rate for both parents is high, which is likely to reduce child labour. The general overview of the quintiles shows from the study that households have a fair distribution of economic standing and that very few parents were impoverished. A considerable proportion of households were in the fourth quintile. The summary statistics also revealed that 76.6% of children are biological children, whilst foster children form only 23.4%. The average household size was noted to be approximately 5.7 members in a household. The educational expenses ranged from Ghc 1,205 to Ghc 5100 per academic year, respectively.

Regarding children's economic activity, the data showed that 77.5% participate in fishing activity, and 22.5% do not participate in fishing activity. The survey also recorded 15.7 average working hours per week for all children working. The study also presents data on the nature of work and found that 73.43% of children were engaged in hazardous work, whilst 25.82% were also involved in non-hazardous work. Gender dynamics was also noted, and it is an important policy variable in national planning. The data show that 51.09% were female, slightly higher than male children (48.01%).

Furthermore, many of the child labourers were found in Gomoa West (73.58%) and Awutu-Senya West (63.31%) Districts, whilst Mfantseman District recorded the highest number of children (51.45%) who are not child labourers. School quality was also noted, including the presence of qualified and experienced teachers and the adequacy of infrastructure. It came to light that most schools have adequate infrastructure and competent teachers.

Econometric Analysis

Before discussing the estimations in Table 3, it is worthwhile also to confirm the robustness of the model. The hatsq was found insignificant, demonstrating that the model is correctly specified. In addition, a multicollinearity test of 2.97 shows that there is no dependency among the predictors. The F-test also indicates that the validity of the instrumental variable is satisfied, which lies within an acceptable range. Generally, the model could be considered entirely satisfactory (Tabachnick et al., 1996). Greene (2012) mentions that if the model fits perfectly, it signifies a flaw in the model that is considered not a good fit.

Table 3: Average Marginal Effect of Probit Regression: Parental Attitude and Child Labour Participation

Explanatory Variables	**AME**	**IV AME**
Parental attitude towards child labour	0.136***	0.435***
	(0.039)	(0.117)
Mother Employment (u*nemployed*)		
Employed	-0.096**	-0.064***
	(0.033)	(0.036)
Mother Education *(no education)*		
Primary Education	-0.078	-0.074
	(0.095)	(0.086)
JHS/MLSC	-0.209	-0.152
	(0.142)	(0.142)
Father Employment *(unemployed)*		

Employed	0.138	-0.108
	(0.107)	(0.102)
Father Educational *(no education)*		
Primary Education	-0.255***	-0.257***
	(0.072)	(0.061)
JHS/MLSC	-0.482	-0.439
	(0.096)	(0.097)
Household wealth *(1st Quintile)*		
2nd Quintile	0.011	0.054
	(0.046)	(0.044)
3rd Quintile	-0.089*	-0.049*
	(0.047)	(0.048)
4th Quintile	-0.128**	-0.056*
	(0.047)	(0.057)
5th Quintile	-0.227***	-0.159
	(0.049)	(0.063)
Household Size	0.175	-0.159
	(0.029)	(0.063)
Log of education cost	0.199**	0.117**
	(0.088)	(0.044)
Relationship to child ***(Biological)***		
Non-biological	-0.016	-0.021
	(0.036)	(-0.032)
Age of child	0.002*	0.049*
	(0.0002)	(0.0001)
Gender *(Male)*	-0.356***	-0.271***
Female	(0.046)	(0.062)
Locality *(Effutu)*		
Awutu-Senya West	0.0128***	0.005**
	(0.003)	(0.002)
Gomoa East	0.150***	0.068
	(0.039)	(0.028)
Mfantseman	-0.070*	-0.074*
	(0.041)	(0.041)
Adequate infrastructure	-0.004	-0.124
	(0.047)	(0.078)
Post Estimations		
_hatsq	(-0.039)0.580	
F-test of excluded instrument		17.580(0.000)
VIF	2.97	
Wald test(prob>chi2)		3.97(0.046)
Observations		778

*Source: Field survey, 2023. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. ***p<0.01; **p<0.05; *p<0.1*

Discussions

Table 3 contains the results of both the probit and IV probit models of the effect of parental attitude on child labour participation. The analysis shows that the coefficient is positive and significant at 1%. The results also indicate that increased parental attitude towards child labour increases the likelihood of child labour participation. The average marginal effect of 0.136 explains that, on average, child labour participation is likely to increase by a 13.6% margin if the parental attitude is positive towards child labour. Similarly, the coefficient of the IV shows an increasing effect on child labour participation by 0.435 points.

Theoretically, accumulated knowledge in the historical view of child labour commends child labour activity as necessary for skill training and discipline. Indeed, households attached importance to children in labour and were made very useful by working intensively in critical sectors such as textiles in the Industrial Revolution (Doepke et al., 2002).

Empirical literature of Tafere and Pankhurst (2015), Morrow et al. (2018) and Edoh-Torgah (2018) have noted the positive stigma towards child labour, which teaches the children valuable skills and could be combined with schooling. The result also sheds light on the theory of child labour in line with Zelizer (1985), who commended that child labour is essential for character training and discipline. Social norms and positive stigma towards child labour are viewed to yield more benefits to the household (Partinos & Shafiq, 2010).

The results also indicate that mothers' labour market participation decreases the incidence of child labour. Specifically, compared to mothers not working, mothers' employment status is likely to reduce child labour participation by 9.6% and 6.4% in both models. Literature asserts that mothers' labour market participation determines the mothers' power within the household decisions, which may account for the decreasing effect on child labour participation (Doss, 2013). The finding also aligns with de Hoop et al. (2017) empirical contributions, who underscored that women's economic capacity is likely to reduce child labour participation.

Furthermore, the father's educational attainment was also significant at 1% and had a reducing effect on child labour participation. The result revealed that, on average, a child whose father has attained primary education is less likely to engage in child labour activities by 0.255 points. In the IV model, the coefficient increases, justifying that parents' education has the probability of reducing child labour by 0.257 points. In a study in Bangladesh, Kumar and Saqib (2017) found that a father's education significantly and adversely affects the supply of child labour. Again, the result confirms Mukherjee and Pal (2016), who sought to prove that parental educational level reduces child labour participation.

It is also evidenced from Table 3 that the household wealth index was found to be essential to child labour participation. Indeed, low assets have been the primary cause of child labour prevalence, in which children work purposely to complement household income for living (Sasmal & Guillen, 2015). The study revealed that children from households whose poverty level was low (3rd, 4th and 5th quintile), have less probability of child labour participation. The effect is negative, and the level of significance established was 10%, 5% and 1%, respectively. For example, the average marginal effect of 0.128 suggests that, on average, a child from the 4th quintile household is 12.8% less likely to participate in child labour than a household that has a high poverty level (1st quintile). Many alternative empirical literature have shown that most children work because of household poverty. It is worth emphasising that the theory of Basu and Van (1998) still stands as it corroborates with the empirical literature of Sasongko and Wijayanti (2016), Kumar and Saqib (2017) and Ayifah (2018). Hence, the empirical literature on child labour gives evidence that poverty drives child labour participation.

Regarding school factors, the estimates reveal that educational cost is statistically significant and positive to child labour participation. The coefficient of the average marginal effect of 19.9% indicates more likelihood that a child would participate in the labour market. Using the country data of Ghana, the study substantiates Ayifah (2018), who found a negative relationship between educational expenditures and child labour participation. The results also highlight the geographical location of the children, and it was revealed that children in the Awutu-Senya and Gomoa West Districts are

more likely to participate in child labour. The findings also indicate that children in the Mfantsiman Municipal are less likely to participate in child labour. Looking at Hamenoo et al. (2018) view, the geographical location of children affirms the likelihood of child labour participation. It is also consistent with the findings of Nicollela and Kassouf (2018) and Afriyie et al. (2019). Therefore, the study concludes that children in child labour are influenced by their locality of residence.

Differences in Attitude of Parents and Child Labour Participation

Table 4 presents mothers' and fathers' attitudes and their relative effects on child labour participation.

Table 4: Probit and IV Probit Regression Models: Differences in Parental Attitude

Variable	Probit	IV Probit	Probit	IV Probit
Father's attitude index			0.003	0.032***
			(0.003)	(0.011)
Mother's attitude index	0.005***	0.023***		
	(0.002)	(0.007)		
Mother employment *(unemployed)*				
Employed	-0.096***	-0.080**	-0.097**	-0.079**
	(0.034)	(0.033)	(0.030)	(0.034)
Mother education *(no education)*				
Primary education	-0.249***	-0.207**	-0.198**	-0.111
	(0.080)	(0.090)	(0.086)	(0.103)
JHS/MLSC	-0.488***	-0.425**	-0.441**	-0.343***
	(0.106)	(0.117)	(0.109)	(0.130)
Father employment *(unemployed)*				
Employed	0.113	0.067	0.121	0.077
	(0.110)	(0.104)	(0.110)	(0.101)
Father education *(no education)*				
Primary education	-0.069	-0.048	-0.087	-0.069
	(0.099)	(0.094)	(0.097)	(0.089)
JHS/MLSC	-0.190	-0.058	-0.204	-0.142
	(0.153)	(0.153)	(0.152)	(0.142)
Wealth Quintile *(1st Quintile)*				
2nd Quintile	-0.007	0.012	-0.012	0.020
	(0.046)	(0.145)	(0.146)	(0.045)
3rd Quintile	-0.094***	-0.042	-0.098**	-0.025
	(0.047)	(0.151)	(0.047)	(0.056)
4th Quintile	-0.136***	-0.132**	-0.240***	-0.116
	(0.048)	(0.067)	(0.052)	(0.080)
5th Quintile	-0.222***	-0.132***	-0.240***	-0.116
	(0.052)	(0.067)	(0.052)	(0.080)
Household size	0.043	0.040	0.036	0.038
	(0.047)	(0.044)	(0.750)	(0.043)
Log of educational cost	-0.443**	-0.488***	-0.326***	-0.365***
	(0.082)	(0.092)	(0.046)	(0.032)
Relation to child *(biological)*				
Non-biological	-0.009	0.012	-0.005	0.030
	(0.031)	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.034)
Age of the child	0.020	0.104	0.054	0.020
	(0.500)	(0.068)	(0.059)	(0.050)
Sex of child *(Male)*	-0.355***	0.287***	-0.363***	-0.266***
Female	(0.031)	(0.052)	(0.031)	(0.069)
Locality *(Effutu)*				
Awutu-Senya West	0.124***	0.174***	0.061***	0.277***

	(0.048)	(0.052)	(0.133)	(0.103)
Gomoa East	0.385**	0.346***	0.441**	0.584***
	(0.142)	(0.130)	(0.154)	(0.165)
Mfantseman	-0.578**	-0.467**	0.441**	0.584***
	(0.221)	(0.223)	(0.154)	(0.165)
School quality	-0.021	-0.014	-0.144	-0.008
	(0.101)	(0.170)	(0.121)	(0.014)
Post estimations				
_hatsq	-0.123		-0.137	
	(0.101)		(0.165)	
OV Test			0.167	
Multicollinearity	2.13		2.15	
F-test of excluded instrument		35.170		17.580
		(0.000)		(0.000)
Wald Chi (Prob>chi2)		4.47		4.19
		(0.035)		(0.041)
Observation	778	778	778	778

*Source: Field survey, 2023. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. ***p<0.01; **p<0.05; *p<0.1*

Table 4 shows that the coefficient of fathers' attitudes towards child labour remains positive at a 1% significance level in the IV probit model. The 0.032 further indicates that the father's positive stigma for child labour participation, on average, increases by 3.2%. The result differs from the mother's attitude towards child labour participation. The estimates for probit and IV probit models are all positively signed and significant at 1%. Indeed, on average, the coefficients show that mother's attitude increases the supply of child labour by 2.3%. The margins differ, which shows that the father's attitude is stronger than that of the mother. Specifically, when the father has a positive attitude, the incidence of child labour participation increases. Bourdillon (2017) and Morrow and Boyden (2018) refer to the above discussions as social norms and acceptance where parents may have worked as child labourers at a young age and are likely to encourage their children to work. The control variables have already been discussed.

Conclusions

The study's primary purpose was to investigate the effect of parental attitude on the incidence of child labour participation in fishing and its related activities in the Central Region of Ghana. The findings showed that father's and mother's attitudes were found to have significant and positive effects on the incidence of child labour. However, the impact of the father's attitude is more important than that of the mother's. This implies that parental attitudes are more likely to increase the incidence of child labour. Mother's employment was substantial and had a decreasing effect on child labour participation. Thus, the ability of the mother to contribute to the household decisions is likely to reduce child labour participation. Fathers' educational attainment also reduced the probability of child labour participation. Children from households whose wealth quintile level is at (3rd, 4th and 5th quintiles) had less likelihood of participating. Other variables such as educational cost, age of the child and locality are more likely to induce child labour participation, whilst a child being female is less likely to increase child labour.

On the strength of the significant findings, it is worth mentioning that positive parental attitude increases the incidence of child labour. This implies that parents' lack of concern toward schooling (e.g., no desire for education) would pave the way for increasing child labour in fishing activities, also

viewed as human capital development for nurturing the child for future self-employment prospects. Hence, the likelihood that parents' attitude affects child labour plays a role in the prevalence rate of child labour. The study recommended that the Ministry of Fisheries and Aquaculture Development and the Ministry of Women and Children's Affairs must educate women on employment avenues concerning fishing that can create more wealth for the household. Again, the Ministry of Gender and Children's Affairs should inform the public on gender issues that empower women to help in household decisions. District Assemblies must strictly enforce the Children's Act and make it operational to curb child labour. It is also recommended that future research studies should consider the cultural factors and child labour in the Central Region.

Acknowledgements
The author acknowledges the Office of the Institutional Review Board of the University of Cape Coast, Regional Directorate of Ministry of Education and Ghana Education Services in the various study areas for ethical clearance.

References

Abou, E. P. (2014). A re-examination of the determinants of child labour. *African Economic Research Consortium (AERC) Research Paper,* 289.

Afriyie, L. T., Saeed, B. I. I., & Alhassan, A. (2019). Determinants of child labour practices in Ghana. *Journal of Public Health from Theory to Practice, 27,* 211-217.

Ariyanti, I. (2016). Socio economic factors affecting the child labour in Palembang city Indonesia. *Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce, 21*(2), 1-36.

Ayifah, R. N. Y. (2018). *Essays on child labour and schooling in Ghana.* (Doctoral thesis, University of Cape Town). http://hdl.handle.net/11427/28435

Basu, K., & Van, P. H. (1998). The economics of child labour. *The American Economic review, 58*(3), 412-427.

Bourdillon, M. (2017). *Ignoring the benefits of children's work: Beyond trafficking and slavery.* Open Democracy. https://www.opendemocracy.net/beyond slavery/michael-bourdillon

Dasgupta, S., & Mukherjee, A. (2022). Determinants of child labour in India: A cross-sectional analysis. *Economic and Political Weekly, 57*(42), 54-60.

de Hoop, J., Premand, P., Rosati, F., & Vakis, R. (2017). Women's economic capacity and children's human capital accumulation. *Discussion Paper Series, No. 10501.* Bonn; Germany: IZA DP.

Doepke, M., & Zilibotti, F. (2002). *Voting with your children: A positive analysis of child labour laws.* Working Paper. Los Angeles: University of California, Department of Economics.

Doss, C. (2013). Intrahousehold bargaining and resource allocation in developing countries. *The World Bank Research Observer, 28*(1), 52-78. https://wbro.oxfordjournals.org/

Endo-Torgah, N. A. (2018). Metaphor of child labour: Is it always Negative? A narrative Analysis. *Journal of Educational, Health and Community Psychology, 7*(2), 247-264. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.12928/jehcp.v7i3.12015

Fors, H. C. (2012). Child labour: A review of recent theory and evidence with policy and implications. *Journal of Economic Series, 26*(4), 570-593.

Frempong, R. B., & Stadelmann, D. (2021). Risk preference and child labour: Econometric Evidence. *Review of Development Economics, 25*(2), 878-894.

Ghana Statistical Service (2014). *Ghana living standards survey round 6, 2013. Child labour report.* Accra, Ghana: Ghana Statistical Service.

Ghana Statistical Service (2019). *Ghana Living Standard Survey round 7. Main report.* Accra, Ghana: Ghana Statistical Service.

Goldin, C., & Parson, D. O. (1989). Parental altruism and self-interest: Child labour among American families. *Economic Inquiry*, *27*(4), 637-659.

Goldin, C., & Sokoloff, K. (1982). Women, children and industrialisation in the early Republic: Evidence from the manufacturing censuses. *Journal of Economic History, 42*(4), 741-774.

Greene, W. H. (2012). *Econometric analysis* (7ed). Prentice Hall: Pearson Education, Inc.

Hamenoo, E. S., Dwomoh, E. A., & Dako-Gyeke, M. (2018). Child labour in Ghana: Implications for children's education and health. *Children and Youth Services Review,* 93, 248-254.

Horrel, S., & Humphries, J. (2018). *Children's work and wages, 1270-1860*. University of Oxford. Humphries, J. (2012). Childhood and child labour in the British industrial revolution. *Economic History Review, 66*(2), 395-418.

ILO (2013). *Making progress against child labour: Global estimates and trends*. ILO.

ILO (2021). *Child labour: Global estimates 2020, trends and the road forward.* ILO/UNICEF.

Isreal, G. D. (1992). *Determining sample size. Programme evaluation and organisational development IFAS extension.* Gainesville, USA: University of Florida.

Kumar, A., & Saqib, N. (2017). School absenteeism and child labour in rural Bangladesh. *The Journal of Developing Areas, 51*(3), 299-316.

Long, J. S., & J. Freese (2006). Review of regression models for categorical dependent variables using stata. *The Stata Journal, 6*(2), 273-278.

Morrow, V. & Boyden, J. (2018). *Responding to children's work: Evidence from the Young Lives Study in Ethiopia, India, Peru and Vietnam, Summative Report.* Oxford: Young Lives.

Mukherjee, C., & Pal, R. (2016). *Role of parental expectations in determining child labour and schooling.* Sweden: Lund University.

Patrinos, H. A., & Shafiq, N. (2010). An empirical illustration of positive stigma towards child labour. *Economics Bulletin, 30*(1), 43-63.

Quatrri, M., & Watkins, K. (2016). *Child labour and education: A Survey of Slum Settlements in Dhaka, Bangladesh.* London: Overseas Development Institute.

Sasmal, J., & Guillen, J. (2015). Poverty, educational failure and the child-labour trap: The Indian experience. *Global Business Review, 16*(2), 270-280.

Sasongko, M., & Wijayanti, F. (2016). Poverty and child labour: Are children as the economic resource of the household? *Immunity*. DOI:10.2991/imm-16.2016.3

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics.* Harper Collins College Publishers.

Tafere, Y., & Pankhurst, A. (2015). *Can children in Ethiopia communities combine schooling with work?* Working Paper 141. Young Lives.

Zelizer, V. A. (1985). *Pricing the priceless child: The changing social value of children*. Basic books.

Appendix A: Reliability Analysis: Cronbach alpha and Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (KMO)

Variable	**Cronbach Alpha**	**KMO**
Child labour participation	0.872	0.790
Parents' attitude	0.766	0.699
Fathers' attitude	0.832	0.806
Mothers' attitude	0.902	0.740
Fathers' education	0.650	0.590
Mothers' education	0.756	0.890
Household size	0.637	0.789
Educational cost	0.600	0.850
Age of the child	0.774	0.700
Geographical location	0.890	0.841
School quality	0.720	0.753

Source: Author's construct