Effect of Households Poverty Level on Child Labour Participation among Households in Nigeria.

Sanusi, W.A and Akinniran T.N
sanusiwa@yahoo.com
Dept of Agricultural Economics,Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Nigeria.

Abstracts

The study was carried out to assess the effect of household poverty level on child labour participation using primary data collected from forty household heads and eighty children in the study area. The data obtained was analyzed using frequency table, FGT poverty index and Tobit Regression model.

The result of the study revealed that, hawking of various items is the is the most important child labour activities in the study area, while the major reasons for participating in child labour work was found to be for supplementing parent income and to take care of children's needs.

The result of FGT poverty analysis also revealed that children from poor households engaged more in child labour activity when compared with children from non-poor Households. Result of Tobit regression model also revealed that, age of the children, age and sex of household heads, poverty head count, urban residency and distance to market are the major determinants of child labour participation in the study area.

Keyword: Child labour, poverty, participation and household.

Introduction

The incidence of child labour is a wide spread and growing phenomenon in developing countries, including Nigeria. International labour Organization (ILO 1997) estimates that there are more than 250million child labourer between the age 7 and 14 in the world of whom at least 120 million are involved in work full time. While UNICEF (1999) estimates suggest that as many as 400 million children are working. Also, in developing economics, child labour is often performed at the expense of education, which makes it an important issue warranting further analysis (Niels-Hugo and Dorte 2001). The ILO minimum Age Convention of 1973 states that the minimum age for entry into employment should not be less than the age of completion of compulsory schooling and not less than 15 years or 14 years in the countries whose economy and educational facilities are insufficiently developed.

According to Chiwanla (2007). The problem of child labour among poor communities have been there but it started receiving more international attention in 1999 when the 174 member states of ILO passed an international conventional, upon ratification of which member states have pledged to eliminate the worst form of child labour immediately and ultimately to end forms of child labour.

Child labour and poverty

Poverty in Nigeria as in most developing countries is a rural phenomenon correlating directly with family size and the number of earners in the household (Okunmadewa, 2001). Poverty is also symmetrical with child labour participation rate in any society.

There are a number of studies that try to establish the relationship between child labour and poverty, but different authors have come up with different conclusions as regard to this relationship. Blunch and Verner (2000), Ray (1999) found a positive relationship between poverty and child labour exists in Ghana and Pakistan respectively, However, Ray (1999) failed to confirm the relationship in Peru. Ray's results in Peru are similar with Nielsen's (1998) result in Zambia.

Niels. Hugo and Dorte (2001) result in Ghana revealed that children from poorer households are almost four times as likely to engage in harmful (human Capacity inflicting) child labour than are children from wealthy households.

Studies on child labour in Nigeria mainly concentrated on the child labour incidence and participation, for instance FOS/ILO/SIMPOC (2001) estimated child labour participation in Nigeria to be 39.4 percent. There is a need to look at relationship between child labour and poverty in Nigeria and this is what this study was aim to achieved.

The main aim of this study is to examine the effect of household poverty on child labour participation among rural Nigeria Households in Nigeria.
The specific objectives are to;
1. Examine various child labour activities engage in by children in the study area.
2. Analysed reasons for child labour participation
3. Asses the poverty profile of the Households base on child labour participation or otherwise.
4. Analysed the determinants of the hours worked by children in child labour work.

Hypotheses of the study

$H0_1$:- there is no significant relationship between Household poverty status and level participation in child labour.

$H0_2$:- There is no significant relationship between child, households and community characteristics and level of participation in child labour.

The concept of child labour

The Oxford Advanced Dictionary of current English defined a child as a young being male or female below the age of puberty. This definition includes all categories of people with ages ranging from birth to 18 years. Such categories include infant (0-8years) and early childhood (6-12years) and adolescent (13-18years).

Many children in almost all societies work in one way or another, although the types of work they do and the forms and conditions of their involvement very among societies and over time. Children's participation in certain types of work, such as helping parents care for home and family for short periods in the days, or teenagers working for few hours before and after school or during holidays to earn pocket money, is considered to be part of growing up for boys and girls and a means of acquiring basic survival and practical skills. This increases their self-confidence and enables them to contribute to the well-being both of themselves and their families. But this is not a child labour. Child labour includes both paid and unpaid work and activities that are mentally, physically and socially or morally dangerous and harmful to children. It is work that deprives them of opportunities for schooling or that requires them to assume the multiple burdens of schooling and work at home and in other work place, and the work that enslave them and separates them from their family. This is what is meant by child labour work carried out to the detriment and endangerment of the child, in violation of international law and national legislation (ILO 2000).

Poverty is widely considered the top reason why children work at inappropriate jobs for their age, but there are other reasons as well. Among other reasons are lack of good schools in nearby, family expectation and traditions, abuse of child, public opinion that downplays the risk of early work for children, uncaring attitudes of employers and limited choice of jobs for women among others.

Research Methodology

  Study Area

The study was carried out in Ogbomoso North Local Government of Oyo-State Nigeria. Ogbomoso is situated in the northern part of Oyo-State with a geographical location of latitude 8.1^0N and longitude 2.29^0E.

The area is characterized by a fairly high temperature (as high as 28.70) while the mean annual rainfall is about 1200mm.

Due to the influence of the prevailing climate condition of the area, they are involved in both arable and livestock farming. The commonest form of arable farming in the area is maize, cassava, yam, and vegetable production. Among the tree crop grown include cocoa, kola, oil palm and cashew. Ogbomoso North comprises of ten wards.

. **The population of the study, sample size and sampling procedure**

The population of the study is all households in Ogbomoso North Local Government Area. Sampling procedure adopted was multistage sampling technique. In the first stage, the whole local government area was stratified into tem wards. The next stage involved random selection of four wards from the whole local government. The third and the final stage involved systematic selection of Ten households from each selected ward. In the end a sample size of 40 households and 80 children was obtained.

  Type of Data and Instrument of data collection

The major type of data that was used for this study was primary data, which was collected from selected households. Instrument for data collection was a well structured questionnaire for literate respondents and interview schedules for illiterate respondents..

  Method of Data Analysis

The major analytical tools used are, Descriptive statistics like frequency counts, percentage, mean and standard deviation. While inferential statistics like FGT model and Tobit regression model was also used.

  Model Specification

1. In order to assess the poverty profile of households, FGT poverty index was applied as given by

$$Px = {}^q/_n \sum \left(\frac{z-y}{z}\right) \propto$$

$$\propto = 0,1,2$$

Where, z = poverty line

q = number of individual below poverty line

n = number of individuals in the reference Households

yi = per capital expenditure of household in which an individual lives

α = FGT index which take value 0,1,2
(2)   Tobit Model

This was used to analyse the determinants of participation in child labour. The model was stated as

$$y* = \beta' x + e$$
$$y = y * (\beta' x + e) \, if \, y* > 0$$
$$y = 0 \, if \, y* \le 0$$

Y= proportion of time spent weekly on child labour work
X = a vector of explanatory variables
β = vector of unknown parameter to be estimate
e = independently and normally distribution random error terms
The included variables are individual characteristic, Household characteristics and community characteristics.
   (1)   Child characteristics:- Age, Age squared, child sex, child years of schooling, Relation to Household
           head and disabled dummy.
   (2)   Household characteristic:- Age of Head, Sex of head, family size, Total income of Head, poverty
           head count.
   (3)   Community characteristics:- urban residence, Distance to school and Distance to market.

Result and Discussion
(a)   Various child labour Activities:- The result in table 1 shows that larger percentage (43.3%) of the
children are involved in hawking of various items like pure water and food stuffs, 25 percent of them are
engaged in farm labour activities, while others were involved in phone cell business, (7.8%), sale boy or sale girl
(6.3%) respectively, house help (3.7%) and other activities (7.8%) respectively. It can be deduced from these
result that the most important child labour activities in the study area was hawking and farm labour.
(b) Reasons for participating in child labour activities:- The Result in table 2 shows that the major reasons why
children engaged in child labour activities was to supplement parent income (41.3%) and to take care of their
needs (25%), while other reasons as given by the children was for economic gain (10%), alternative means of
schooling (7.3%) and as a means of livelihood (6.3%), while the least important of the reasons given was for
leisure's purposes.
(c)   The FGT model was used to examine the poverty profile of the Households in the study area. In order
to achieve this, a poverty line was established using two-third of per capital expenditure (a relative poverty line),
and this was estimated to be N 9, 529.04.
       Table 3 shows that households whose children engaged in child labour activities were poorer when
compared with other households whose children did not engaged in child labour activities, this is by all three
variants of FGT poverty measure. Wthin the group of household whose children engaged in child labour
activities, less than 28% are living below poverty line compared to about 18% and 22% for Households whose
children does non engaged in child labour and all households respectively. The poverty gap was also bigger for
households engaging in child labour activities, the average poor household's expenditure fall by 20% compared
to 9% and 13% respectively for household with child labour activity and all household. Finally poverty is more
severe for households whose children engaged in child labour as revealed in table 3.
(d)   Determinants of child labour participation:-. This was achieved using Tobit models, as specified in the
methodology. The result shows that the sigma б is 0.0813 with a t-value of 17.859, hence sigma is statistically
significant (p<0.01). This indicate that the model had a good fit to the data. In the analysis, seven of the fifteen
(15) variables estimated in the model were statistically significant at different level of significant.
       The study finds that child characteristics of age significantly affect the number of hour worked by
children. Age of the child and it square are found to have significant positive and negative signs respectively,
that is, older children work for more hours than younger children but the increase in age increases the number of
hour work at a decreasing rate.
       On household level variables:- the study also finds that age and sex of the household heads are
significant determinants of child labour hour worked, from the result in table 4, as the age of household head
increase, the tendency for their children to work more hours also increases. The dummy variables of sex of the
household head shows a significant negative sign implying that children from female headed households work
for more hours than their male counterpart.
       Poverty head count dummy was negative and significant, and this shows that children for poor
households are more likely to work more hour in child labour than children from non poor households and this
emphasized the fact that poverty promote child labour participation.

Among the community characteristics, distance to market and urban residency dummy were negative and positive significant respectively. The interpretation for this is that children living far away from market area are less likely to work more hours in child labour, when compared with children living near the market and those living in urban area are likely to work more in child labour when compared with children living in rural area.

Conclusion

The following conclusion can therefore be drawn from the study,

(1)   The most important child labour work in the area is hawking of items like pure water and food stuffs.

(2)   The major reasons why children participate in child labour was to supplement parent income and to take care of their needs.

(3)   Households whose children engaged in child labour activities were generally poorer than other households whose children do not engaged in child labour activities.

(4)   The major determinants of child labour work were the Age of the children, Age and Sex of the households head, households poverty head count, Urban Residency and distance to market.

References

Blunch, N.H and D. Verner (2000). Revisiting the link between poverty and child labour:- The Ghanian Experience. Policy Research Working Paper No 2488. The World Bank Washington D.C

Chiwanla I.S, (2001). Child labour in urban Area in Malawi. A case study from the municipality of zombia. Unpublished B.Sc Research Project, Bunda College of Agriculture, University of Malawi, Lilongwe, Malawi.

FOS/ILO/SIMPOC (2001) National Modular child labour Survey Report

International labour organization (ILO) (2002), Every child counts: New Global Estiamtes on child labour Geneva.

International labour organization (ILO) (1997) IPEC at a Glance, ILO: Geneva

Nielsen, H, S (1998), "Child labour and School Attendance" Two Joint Decision', CLS-WP98-15. Centre for labour market and social Research, Aarhus, Demark.

Niels – Hugo.

Okunmedewa F.Y, (2001), "Poverty Reduction in Nigeria: A four point Demand' The House Annual Guiest lectures, University of Ibadan.

Ray, R. (1999) How child labour and child schooling interact with Adult labour University of Tasmania Working Paper.

UNICEF (1997) child labour and poverty Transmission No room for Dreams Memo University of Southampton U.K.

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents by various child labour activities

Activities	Frequency	Percentage
Hawking	35	43.7
Hawking delivery	1	1.3
Bricklayer	4	5
Phone cell business	6	7.5
Sales boys or girl	5	6.3
House help	3	3.7
Farm labour	20	25
Others	6	7.6
Total	80	100

Source:- Field Survey 2009.

Table 2: Distribution of Respondents by Reasons for participating

Reasons	Frequency	Percentage
To take care of my needs	20	25
Economic gain	8	10
For personal interest	5	6.3
As a means of livelihood	5	6.3
Alternative for schooling	6	7.5
For leisure	3	3.7
To supplement parent income	33	41.7
Total	80	100

Source:- Field survey 2009.

Table 3: Poverty Profile of Households

	P0	P1	P2
All Households	0.2230	0.1431	0.0867
Households whose children engaged in child labour activities	0.2743	0.1992	0.1238
Households whose children do not engaged in child labour	0.1750	0.0875	0.0436

Source:- calculated from field survey 2009.

Table 4: Determinants of child labour work ration participation using Tobit Regression

Variable	Coefficient	t-value	p-value
Constant	46.1661	1.749**	.0302
Child Age	-8.3336	-2.446**	.0144
Child Age square	0.433316	3.173***	0.0015
Child Sex	-4177	-.127	.8990
Child yrs Sch.	-7363	-1.386	.1657
Relation to Head	-6.4345	-1.423	.1547
Urban (residence)	9.3981	1.658*	.0974
Disabled	-1368	0.21	.833
Age of head	.5366	1.887*	0.0592
Sex of head	-0.0312	-2.062**	0.0392
Family size	-1.7906	-1.149	.2504
Total income	0.0001	0.482	0.6297
Poverty head			
Count dummy	-1.9045	-3.377***	.0064
Home	-2.3190	-240	.8099
Distance of school	-0.0673	-.440	.6599
Distance of market	.3483	4.823***	.0083

Sigma   0.0813***

Number of observation 80

Log likelihood function -319.6447

Note: *** denotes significance at 1% and ** denotes significance at 5%.