



IMPACT OF CHILD LABOR ON CHILD EDUCATION IN OGBOMOSO AREA OF OYO STATE, NIGERIA

Ajagbe, F. A.

Department of Management and Accounting
Ladoke Akintola University of Technology
Ogbomoso, Oyo State, Nigeria.

Adegbite, D. O.

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Emmanuel Alayande College of Education
Oyo, Oyo State, Nigeria.

Abstract

This study examined impact of child labor on child education in Ogbomoso area of Oyo state, Nigeria. Both questionnaire and interviewed techniques were used for data collection from 200 respondents chosen through stratified sampling techniques. In analyzing the data the Ordinary Least Square (OLS) estimation techniques was adopted in addition to conventional descriptive statistics such as tables, frequency distribution and percentages. The results showed in this study revealed that impact of child labor on child education can be influenced by mother education, father education, income of the family, family size, awareness of government policy and child education. . The coefficient of family income of -0.256 indicates that a one unit increase in the income of the family will reduce the extent of child labour by 0.256 units. The coefficient of family size of 0.232 indicates that a one unit increase in the family size will increase the extent of child labour by 0.232 units. It is against this background that these recommendations were made that, government should channel resources to people - oriented programmes such as poverty eradication, small and medium enterprises, loan scheme, free qualitative but compulsory education at all levels. There should be binding legislation against the child labor, this will help to checkmate any perpetrator, and such person must be apprehended for effect process.

Keywords: Child Labor, Child Education, Ogbomoso Area, Nigeria.

Introduction

Child labor has long been seen as being detrimental to human capital formation of child. Although, a lot of literature supports the fact that child labor has affected education and human capital negatively, while some empirical studies support the view that child labor has potential to affect human capital formation of child positively(Edmonds, 2007; Udry, 2006). Over 250million children between 5 and 14years of age worked worldwide. This figure represents one - fifth of total population of girls and boys in this age group. About 129million children are found engaging in what has been described "hazardous work" which are likely to have adverse effects on the child's safety, health and moral development. In fact nearly 10million of these children are engaged in some form of slavery labour, armed conflict, prostitution or other illicit activities. However, some observers believe that these figures understate the real magnitude of child labour (ILO, 2010).

The impacts of this situation are significantly complex and cumbersome. The hazardous and worst forms of child labor becomes major concern given the harmful impact on lives of these children and their possibilities for a hopeful future. Nevertheless, child labor has economic impact on future income losses as well as their health and education. Since children are more likely to work and not go school because of the attitude of their parents, the economic losses associated with child labor and their impact on poverty are often transmitted across generations. Based on this, child labor has received considerable attention from many countries as contained in various conventions and recommendation for - example UN convention rights of the child (1989), ILO conventions, the minimum age convention (No. 138, 1973). In promoting children's right, each of these instruments have been motivated to protect children from exploitation through their provision of labor and education as an alternative (ILO, 1999).

The Nigeria NGO's Report attributes that 15million children under the age of 14 are working across Nigeria. More importantly, many of these children are exposed to long hours of work in dangerous and unhealthy environments, carrying too much responsibility for their age. Working in these hazardous conditions with little food, small pay, no education and no medical care establishes a couple of child rights violation. In Oyo state, problems of child labor are many, the nature and incidence varies and are greatly influenced by the geographical and cultural peculiarities of the people. These children are commonly victims of school dropout, sexual abuse, automobile accident, psychological pain, physical damage and stunted growth among others child. It therefore pertinent to look into the difficulties faced by the child in Ogbomoso area as they have been proven to the community that they are here to stay because household costs were found to be complex and costs surrounding schooling, such as uniform, meals, and transport, constitute the largest

burden on household finances, while some of these children have no solid background, no education and no parental care which turns them to become street hawkers. In view of the above stated facts, it is therefore pertinent to examine factors affecting impact of child labor on child education in Ogbomoso area of Oyo state, Nigeria.

The division between work and labour however is difficult to draw. Working and its impact on access to schooling is also complex. There is the positive side that the working child provides funds that go directly towards his or her schooling costs. The negative side to the working child and access to education may be that the work done is of such a heavy load or at times that clash with the school timetable that they may not be able to take full advantage of the schooling offered, by being frequently absent, missing parts of the day or being too tired to participate fully in classes and other work. Quadri (2001) remarked that primary education in Nigeria has among others the following intent to;

- (i) help the child to develop intellectually, physically, morally, socially and emotionally.
- (ii) produce well qualified citizens that are capable of going to secondary and tertiary institutions to be trained as professionals in various services that are essential for the development of the country.

Empirical evidences demonstrate that in poor countries, where child labor is widespread, children of moderately wealthy people are not found to be labouring. Children work for a variety of reasons, the most important being poverty and the induced pressure upon them to escape from this plight. It was observed that increase in household income and rising living standard bring about significant decline in child labor trends (Edmonds, 2001). In spite of dearth of data from recent empirical studies on street children in Nigeria, there is consensus in literature that various issues such as poverty, hunger, insecurity child abuse, domestic violence, displacement caused by communal clashes, inadequate care of parents, inability to continue schooling, unemployment of one or both parents, illiteracy, housing challenges, and drug use by children are the factors pushing children on to the street (Ashagrie, 1998).

Han (2007) suggested a contemporaneous inverse U - shaped relationship between child labor and child health in rural Cambodia. Edmonds (2005) remarked that in the impoverished societies, child labor might contribute to increasing household income and child education attainment. Roseti and Strab (2007) conducted studies in India, Brazil, and Guatemala, respectively; they found that child labor has negative effects on child labourers when they grow through adulthood, due to injury or illness.

Materials and Methods

This study was carried out in Ogbomoso areas of Oyo state, Nigeria. The areas include the five local government areas and they are; Ogbomoso - North, Ogbomoso - south, Ogo oluwa, Orire and Surulere. The study area was chosen because there were five local governments in the area servicing diverse interest of the people in the study area. Both questionnaire and interviewed techniques were used for data collection from 200 respondents chosen through stratified sampling techniques. In analyzing this data, Ordinary Least Square (OLS) method was employed in addition to conventional descriptive statistics such as tables, frequency distribution and percentages. The software used is E - View 7.0.

The regression model specified in this study to analyze impact of child labor on child education can be expressed as follows:

$$CL_i = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 FED + \beta_2 MED + \beta_3 FNC + \beta_4 FMZ + \beta_5 AWR + \beta_6 CED + \mu_1$$

Where:

CL = Child labor in individual household

FED = Father education in individual household

MED = Mother education in individual household

FNC = Family income of individual household

FMZ = Family size of individual household

AWR = Public awareness on child labor / child education

CED = Child education in individual household

μ_1 = error term

Results and Discussion

A summary of the distribution of these variables that are expected to have important implications on child labor and child education is presented in Table 1. About 23.5% of the respondents agreed that child labor is occasionally, 24.5% agreed that child labor is frequently, 27.5% agreed that child labor is often and 24.5% that child labor is very often. The distribution clearly reveals that, all the respondents (100%) agreed on child labor in the study area.

Table 1, also shows that 42.5% of the mothers had no education, 30% of the mothers had primary education, 20% of the mothers had secondary education, while the remaining 7.5% of the mother had tertiary education. This implies that mothers with no education constitute the majority of the respondents and this has affected the mothers to develop intellectually, physically, morally, socially and emotionally (Quadri, 2001).

In respect of fathers' education, about 35% of the father had no education, 37.5% of the father had primary education, 22.5% of the father had secondary education and 5% of the father had tertiary education. This shows high level of illiteracy among the fathers and this has affected the fathers to produce well qualified citizens that are capable of going to secondary and tertiary institutions to be trained as professionals in various services that are essential for the development of the country (Quadri, 2001).

The result of the family size of the respondents is in Table 1. 37.5% of the respondents had less than family size of 5, 52.5% were within 5 - 10 family size and just about 10% had more than family size of 10. This coincides with the findings of Edmonds (2001) that children work for a variety of reasons, the most important being poverty and the induced pressure upon them to escape from this plight. It was also observed that increase in household size might increase income and rising living standard of the family.

Awareness is another factor that can affect the activities of child labor on child education. The higher the level of government policy awareness by the respondents, the lower the rate of child labor activities in the study area. The level of awareness stood at 25%, while the remaining 75% were unaware about government policy on child labor.

The analysis of child academic performance as shown in Table 1, indicates that 50% of the children had poor academic performance, 30% of the children had fair academic performance, 15% of the children had good academic performance and 5% of the children had very good academic performance. This shows the negative side to the working child and access to education may be that the work done is of such a heavy load or at times that clash with the school timetable that they may not be able to take full advantage of the schooling offered, by being frequently absent, missing parts of the day or being too tired to participate fully in classes and other work.

Table 1, also justifies parents occupation. 2.5% of the respondents were students, 15% were civil servants, 40% were private workers, 10% were unemployed and 32.5% were farmers. This implies that parents occupation have adverse effect on child labor activities in the study area.

About 70% of the children were females and 30% were males . This reveals that female children were found in child labor activities than their male counterpart. The parents were therefore encouraged to put an end to child labor activities in the study area.

The Table 1, also shows that 32.5% of the children had age less than 10years. 50% were within 10 - 15 age group, while 17.5% were more than 15 years old. This revealed that the population sampled was predominantly children. More so, the children are young and probably active to provide for their family and to smooth family consumption pattern.

The result of the money realised from child labor activities can be seen in Table 1. 80% of the money realised went to the parents while the remaining 20% went to the children. This may probably be as a result of poverty in the household of the respondents in the study area which encompasses such issues as inadequate income, health, nutrition, education, choice and voice, opportunities etc. Poverty is further characterized by vulnerability and exposure to risks, low life expectancy, low purchasing power, insufficient access to social and economic services (World bank, 2001).

Regression Result

From the regression result presented in the Table 2, it was shown that mother education has an inverse relationship with the extent to which a child is subjected to labour. This implies that as mother education increases, the extent of her child being subjected to labour decreases and vice versa. The coefficient of variable mother education of -0.783 indicates that a one unit increase in the level of mother education will decrease the extent of child labour by 0.783 units.

Also, the regression result shows that there is an inverse relationship between father's educational level and child labour. This shows that an increase in the level of father's education reduces the extent of child labor. The coefficients of father's education of -0.199 implies that a unit increase in the level of father's education will decrease the extent of child labour by 0.199 units.

Similarly, the regression result indicates that there is an inverse relationship between child labour and income of the family. By implication, an increase in the family income will reduce the extent of child labour in such family. The coefficient of family income of -0.256 indicates that a one unit increase in the income of the family will reduce the extent of child labour by 0.256 units.

It could also be seen from Table 2, that the regression result reveals that there is a positive relationship between family size and the extent of child labour in the family. This implies that children from large family size are more likely to be subjected to child labour than their counterpart from relatively small family size.. The coefficient of family size of 0.232 indicates that a one unit increase in the family size will increase the extent of child labour by 0.232 units.

Awareness of government policy is negatively correlated with the extent of child labour. This implies that people with more awareness of the detriment of child labour are less likely to involve in child labour. The coefficient of the variable of -0.809 indicates that a one unit increase in the level of awareness will reduce the extent of child labour by 0.809 and vice-versa .

From the regression result, it was discovered that there is an inverse relationship between child education and child labour. This implies that an increase in the educational level of the children the lesser their involvement in child labor activities. The coefficient of the variable of -0.699 indicates that a one unit increase in child education will reduce the extent of child labour by 0.699 and vice-versa.

Conclusions

The results showed in this study revealed that impact of child labor on child education can be influenced by mother education, father education, income of the family, family size, awareness of government policy and child education. It also has serious implication on human capital accumulation and has negative impact on academic performance of children involved in the activities. It is against this background that these recommendations were made that, government should channel resources to people - oriented programmes such as poverty eradication, small and medium enterprises, loan scheme, free qualitative but compulsory education at all levels. There should be binding legislation against the child labor, this will help to checkmate any perpetrator, and such person must be apprehended for effect process.

References

- Ashagrie, K., (1999): "Statistics on Child Labor and Hazardous Child Labor in brief", mimeo. *Bureau of Labor Statistics, ILO, Geneva.*
- Edmonds, E. V., (2001): "Will Child Labor Decline with Improvement in Living Standards?" *Dartmouth College Mimeo.*
- Edmonds, E. V., (2005): Does Child Labor decline with improving economic status? *Journal of Human Resources* 40 (1) (in press).
- Edmonds, E. V., (2007): *Child Labor in The Handbook of Development Economics* (TP Schultz & J. Strauss (eds.), Vol. 4 www.nber.org. papers' w12926.

Han, P., (2007): Child Labor, Poverty and Human Capital. A study of Cambodia. PhD. *Desertations, Graduate School of International Cooperation Studies, Kobe University.*

International Labor Organization, (1999): National Program on the Elimination of child labor in Nigeria.

International Labor Organization, (2001): "Focusing on the worst Forms of Child Labor. *Dares Salam.*

International Labor Organization, (2010)): Facts on Child Labor. www.ilo.org/126685.pdf.

Quadri, C. K., (2001): *Introduction to primary education studies*, Ibadan: Glory land publishing company, pp. 8 - 11.

Rosati, F. and Straub, R. (2007): "Does work during childhood affect the health of Gustemalan adults?" *Review economics of the Household, springer*, Vol. 5 (1), pages 83 - 94, march.

Udary, C., (2006): *Child Labor* in Banejee, A. V. Benabous, R., and Mookherjee, D. (Eds.). Understanding poverty. New York, Oxford University press, 243 - 257.

World Bank (2001): Tanzania at the Turn of the Country: From Reforms to Sustained Growth and Poverty Reduction, *The World Bank*: Washington DC.

Appendix:

Table 1: Socio-Economic Characteristics of the Respondents

| Characteristics | Frequency | Percentage (%) | Cumulative |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------------|------------|
| Extent of child labour | | | |
| Occasionally | 47 | 23.5 | 23.5 |
| Frequently | 49 | 24.5 | 48.0 |
| Often | 55 | 27.5 | 75.5 |
| Very often | 49 | 24.5 | 100.0 |
| Mother's education | | | |
| No education | 85 | 42.5 | 42.5 |
| Primary education | 60 | 30.0 | 72.5 |
| Secondary education | 40 | 20.0 | 92.5 |
| Tertiary education | 15 | 7.5 | 100.0 |
| Father's education | | | |
| No education | 70 | 35.0 | 35.0 |
| Primary education | 75 | 37.5 | 72.5 |
| Secondary education | 45 | 22.5 | 95.0 |
| Tertiary education | 10 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| Family size | | | |
| Less than 5 | 75 | 37.5 | 37.5 |
| 5-10 | 105 | 52.5 | 90.0 |
| Above 10 | 20 | 10.0 | 100.0 |
| Awareness | | | |
| No | 150 | 75.0 | 75.0 |
| Yes | 50 | 25.0 | 100.0 |
| Child academic performance | | | |
| Poor | 100 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| Fair | 60 | 30.0 | 50.0 |
| Good | 30 | 15.0 | 95.0 |
| Very good | 10 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| Parent occupation | | | |
| Student | 5 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| Civil servant | 30 | 15.0 | 17.5 |
| Private worker | 80 | 40.0 | 57.5 |
| Unemployed | 20 | 10.0 | 67.5 |
| Farming | 65 | 32.5 | 100.0 |
| Child sex | | | |
| Female | 140 | 70.0 | 70.0 |
| Male | 62 | 30.0 | 100.0 |
| Child age | | | |
| Less than 10 years | 65 | 32.5 | 32.5 |
| 10-15 years | 100 | 50.0 | 82.5 |
| Above 15 years | 35 | 17.5 | 100.0 |
| Money realized | | | |
| Parent | 160 | 80.0 | 80.0 |
| Self | 40 | 20.0 | 100.0 |
| Force to engage in labour | | | |
| No | 45 | 22.5 | 22.5 |
| Yes | 155 | 77.5 | 100.0 |

| Effect on academic performance | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----|------|-------|
| No | 50 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| Yes | 150 | 75.0 | 100.0 |

Source: Field survey, 2013

Table 2: Regression Result for Child Labour on Child Education

Dependent Variable: CHILD

Method: Least Square

Sample: 200

Include observations: 196

| Variable | coefficient | Std. Error | t-Statistic | Prob. |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------|--------|
| MED | -0.782516 | 0.233792 | -3.347058 | 0.0012 |
| FED | -0.198652 | 0.063897 | -3.108958 | 0.0025 |
| FNC | -0.256080 | 0.078985 | -3.242140 | 0.0017 |
| FMZ | 0.232354 | 0.095811 | 2.425127 | 0.0173 |
| AWR | -0.808500 | 0.142650 | -5.667719 | 0.0000 |
| CED | -0.699409 | 0.219461 | -3.186931 | 0.0020 |
| C | 2.460270 | 0.218792 | 11.24479 | 0.0000 |
| R-squared | 0.894006 | Mean dependent var | 1.541667 | |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.886860 | S.D dependent var | 1.104218 | |
| S.E. of regression | 0.371418 | Akaike info criterion | 0.927146 | |
| Sum squared resid | 12.27769 | Schwarz criterion | 1.114130 | |
| Log likelihood | -37.50301 | Hannan-Quinn criter | 1.002728 | |
| F-statistic | 125.1111 | Durbin-Watson stat | 2.046137 | |
| Prob(F-statistic) | 0.000000 | | | |

Source: Data Analysis, 2013