

Determinants of Child Labour among Households in Egbedore Local Government Area of Osun State, Nigeria

J.O. Amao

Department of Agricultural Economics,
Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, P.M.B. 4000, Ogbomoso, Nigeria

Submitted: Aug 2, 2013; **Accepted:** Sep 9, 2013; **Published:** Oct 6, 2013

Abstract: The study analysed the determinants of child labour among households in Egbedore Local Government Area of Osun-State. A multistage sampling technique was used to select 84 respondents in the study area. The data were analysed using descriptive statistics and sequential probit regression model. The study showed that the mean age of the children was 11 years. It was revealed that 52.4% of the respondents were male. Majority of the respondents were literate and Christian in the study area. Majority of the parents were literate and farmers. The significant explanatory variables included household size, educational level of household head, age of child and income of household head respectively were significant at 1% level, while educational level of child, gender and duration of the activity spent on work and the type of their paid job were significant at 5% level.

Key words: Child labour • Determinants • Technical expertise • Wage income • Salary income

INTRODUCTION

Child labour has observed that values and attitudes of poverty and would not be psychologically predisposed to take full advantage of changing but challenging conditions or increased opportunities which may occur in their life time [1]. Child labour is referred to as work that is done by children under the average age of 14 years which restricts or damages a child's physical, emotional, intellectual, social and spiritual growth. Child labour can also be define as works that exceeds a minimum number of hours depending on the age of a child, type of work and nature of the work [2]. House hold income is the major factors in the decision for child labour supply [3]. The consequences of child labour have also been documented in Asia [4]. However, very few studies have reported about the dangers experienced by children at the household level in urban areas as Africa. Furthermore, many of the previous studies on Africa have focuses predominately on the effects of children's activities in rural and agricultural areas [5] Child labour as any type of employment or work, which by its natural or circumstances Jeopardizes the health, safety and morals of young persons. And also define child labour as

economic activities that impede or hinder the full development and education of the child. [6] Child labour is common to see in Nigeria under- ages children involved in economic activities to augment the parents manger incomes [7]. Children are regarded as a source of joy to family and invaluable asset to their parents. Unfortunately, Nigeria has sunk into a Quagmire of poverty and incidentally the culture of poverty is being replicated in all its major institutions, especially the family institution from where child labourers are recruited, incubated and sent to the larger society [8].

The issue of child has been a source of continual concern throughout the world. Depending on the economical structure level and pace of development, it is common for children of all societies to be engaged in some form of occupation or the other [9]. Child labour been generally perceived more as a problem of poor developing nation which are consistently waging war against chronic poverty, increasing land canes, booming populations, rising unemployment and natural disaster [10]. Child work should be distinguished from child labour by work, what is meant is work in which the primary emphasis is on learning, training and socialization [11]. It becomes child labour when it is hazardous in

children education and recreation [12]. The study aimed at analyzing the determinants of child labour participation in the study area.

Theoretical Review: [13] The development of a society in the long run, depends on the quantity and quality of the welfare services delivered to its children from infancy through adolescence. [14] Children are source of old age security, a source of insurance against the risk of income instability and children provide a source of labour to their parent. [15] Children were valuable in well developed labour market for women, particularly in rural areas. [16] When child labour income is included, 22.2 percent of households fall below poverty line, when child labour income is not included in the sample, 77.8 percent of households fall below poverty line. [17] Poverty and child labour are inexorably linked.

[18] Child labour as any type of employment or work which by its nature or circumstances jeopardizes the health, Safety and morals of young person. [19] Child work is work in which the primary emphasis is on learning, training or socialisation, as such schedule is flexible fends be responsive to the development capacity of the child and encourages his or her participation in appropriate aspects of the decision making process. [20] Child laborers as all children younger than 12 years working in any economic activities, children 7-15 years old engaged in more than light work and all children engaged in the worst forms of child labour in which they are enslaved forcibly recruited, prostituted, trafficked forced into illegal activities or exposed to hazards. [21] The distribution and profile of poverty in Nigeria indicated that the rural areas are worse off and that the propensity of a household falling below the poverty line is higher in rural areas. [22] The elimination/reduction of human capital development impediments are sure way of promoting economic growth and the elimination of child labour in developing countries.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

The study area is Egbedore Local Government Area of Osun State; it is derived from the Savannah Area of Osun State. Egbedore Local Governemten Area occupied a surface area of 270km² with a total population of 74,435 [23]. The study area comprises of many towns and villages such as Awo (Head quarter of the Local Government Area), Ido-Osun, Ikotun, Iragberi, Iwoye, Offatedo, Okinni, MEkuro, Klawe, Ojoo, Egbedi, Abudo and Yemopon. Alsan, Abogunde and Dada Estate

The Local Government Area lies in the latitude 6°N and 8° N with annual maximum temperature 75°C and minimum of 65°C. The annual average rain fallis between 1020-2030 mm, relative humidity is between 80-85% Rainy period is between 240-260 days / year, dry period is 96-125 days / years. The study used primary data. The primary data were collected directly from the respondents with the aid of well structured questionnaires. The population of the study covered the children between the age ranges of 5-14 years. Eight towns were selected and the towns were, Awo, Ido-Osun, Iragberi, Iwoye, Okinni, Offatedo, Ojoo, Egbedi. Out of the 206 household heads that were in the eight towns, 84 household heads were randomly selected.

The data collected were analyzed with the use of descriptive statistics such as the frequency distribution, percentage; means and tabular presentation Sequential probit model was used for the analysis of the determinants of child labour in the study area, These led to the following choices and choice probabilities to be estimated for each child.

Y_1 = Probability to go to school and not to work,
 Y_2 = Probability to go to school and to work,
 Y_3 = Probability not to go to school and to work and
 Y_4 = Probability not to go to school and not to work.
 $Y_1 = F(b_1X)$, $Y_2 = [1-F(b_1X) F(b_2 X)]$, $Y_3 = [1-F(b_1X)] 1-F(b_2 X)]F b_3X]$ and $Y_4 = [1-F(b_1X)] [1-F(b_2X)] [1-F(b_3X)]$. Where: Y_1, Y_2, Y_3 and Y_4 are as earlier explained. F = Standard normal model parameters. b_1, b_2, b_3 = Vectors of the model parameters.

X = Explanatory Variables which are child characteristics, that of the parents and their households. The characteristics of the child include age, gender and income of the child. The parent's characteristics include the education, employment and income of parent while that of the households include the size and their composition. X_1 = Age of child (year), X_2 = Gender of child, X_3 = Educational Level of Child (years), X_4 = Duration of activities by child (hour), X_5 = Household size, X_6 = Religion, X_7 = Age of household head, X_8 = Household head occupation, X_9 = Family Structure (1 for nuclear, 0 otherwise), X_{10} = Income of household head (naira), X_{11} = Educational level of household head (years), X_{12} = Type of paid job.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio Economic Characteristics of the Children: Table 1 revealed that 26.2% of the respondents were between the age ranges of 5-8 years, 39.3% were between the age range of 9-12 years while 34.5% were between the age

Table 1: Distribution of the children according to their Socio-economic Characteristics in the study area.

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative %
Age			
5-8	22	26.2	26.2
9-12	33	39.3	65.5
≤13	29	34.5	100.0
Mean	11		
Total	84	100	
Gender			
Male	44	52.4	52.4
female	40	47.6	100.0
Total	84	100.0	
Native of the town			
Yes	55	65.5	65.5
No	29	34.5	100.0
Total	84	100.0	
Educational Level			
Formal level	0	-	-
Non- formal	11	13.1	13.2
Primary school	37	44.0	56.1
Uncompleted primary school	20	23.8	79.9
Secondary school	12	14.3	94.3
Uncompleted sec.school	4	4.8	
Total	84	100.0	100.0
Religion			
Christianity	42	50.0	50.0
Muslim	41	48.8	98.8
Traditional	1	1.2	100.0
Total	84	100.0	

Source:Field Survey,2012

range of =13years and the mean age was 11 years. The result of the finding showed that mean age of the respondents was 11years which implies that most of the children were within the age range that they can easily be involved in child labour. This corroborated with the work of [24] who studied Child Labour and Labour Market Fluctuation in Urban Brazil which showed that the mean age was 11years. Table 1 showed the distribution of child respondents by their gender.52.4% was male and 47.6% were female. This implied that number of male who engaged in child labour were more than female. This contradicted with the work done by [11] whostudied Protection Rights on Children and Women Right in Nigeria. His work revealed that the number of the male that participated in child labour was 45.0%. Table 1a showed that (65.5%) of the respondents were native of the town while (34.5%) were non-native of the town. This clearly showed that child labour existed mostly in the rural household of the study area. This corroborated with the work of [25] where he studied Issues and

Table 2: Distribution of respondents by the socio-economic characteristics of parents in the study area.

Age	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative %
≤ 30	0	0	0
31-40	26	30.9	30.9
41-50	32	38.1	69.0
51-60	15	17.9	86.9
61-70	7	8.3	95.2
≥80	4	4.8	100
Mean	55		
Total	84	100.00	
Educational level			
Formal	10	11.9	11.9
Non formal	13	15.5	27.4
Primary	14	16.7	44.1
Uncompleted primary	12	14.3	58.4
Secondary	20	23.8	88.2
Uncompleted secondary	15	17.9	
Total	84	100.0	
Household Head Occupation			
Farming	55	65.5	65.5
Trading	1	1.2	66.7
Artisan	20	23.8	90.5
Civil servant	5	5.9	95.2
Others	4	4.8	
Total	84	100.0	100.0

Source::FieldSurvey,2012

Problems of Girls Child Labour in India and Bangladesh and his study revealed that 62.5% were native of the town. Table 1 showed that (13.1%) of the respondents were non- former education, (44.0%) were in primary school, (23.8%) did not completed their primary school, (14.3%) were in second school and (4.8%) did not complete their secondary school. This showed that the primary school children engaged mostly in child labour. This agreed with the work of [26] who studied Child Labour in Cameroon and his study showed that (20.0%) respondents were in primary school. Table 1 revealed that (50.0%) of the respondents were Christian while (48.8%) were Muslim and (1.2%) were traditional worshipers. This implied that all the religions that we have were also participated in child labour but the majority (50.0%) of the respondents were Christian. This confirms with the work of [27] in his work titled Determinants of Child Labour participation in Ibadan, Oyo State.they revealed that (61.9%) were Christian.

Distribution of Socio-Economic Characteristics of the Parents in the Study Area: Table 2 revealed that there is no parent that is between the age range that is less than 30 years of age, 30.9% of the parents were between

the age range of 31-40, 38.1% of the parents were between the age range of 41-50, 79% of the parents were between the age range 51-60, 8.3% of the parents were between the age range 61-70 and 485% of the parents had their age greater than 80 and their mean age was (55years). This corroborated with the work of [25] where he studied Issue sand Problems of Girls Child Labour in India and Bangladesh his study showed that the mean age of parent's was 60 years. Table 2 showed that (11.9%) were former in their educational level, (15.5%) were non-formal, (16.7%) graduated from primary school, (14.3%) did not completed their primary school, (23.8%) of the respondents also graduated from secondary school and (17.9%) of the respondents did not completed their secondary school. This implied that most of the parent that their children engaged in child labour, were illiterate and also engaged in poverty. This corroborated with the work of [19] in their work titled Determinants of Child Labour in Crop Prduction in Abia State, Nigeria. They reported that (15.70%) of the respondents never receiveformaleducation. Table 2 showed that (65.5%) of household head that their child participated in child labour engaged in farming, (1.2%) were Trading, (23.8%) were artisans, (4.8%) of them were civil servant and (4.8%) of the respondents participated in other job. This showed that most parent that their children participated in child labour were farmers. This corroborated with the work of [28] in his work titled Determinants of Child Labour Supply among Farming Households in Coted'Ivoire. It was revealed that 56.20% of the respondents were fully involved in farming.

Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Their Level of Dependency on Household Economy and Benefit Derived from Child Labour in the Study Area:

Table 3 revealed that (20.2%) of the respondents depend on the household income for feeding (11.9%) for shelter, (16.7%) for clothing and 51.2% depend on the household income for schooling. This implied that majority of the respondent are involved in child labour depend on the house hold in come for schooling This corroborated with the work of [29] who studied Determinants of Child Labour Participation Among Yam Farmers in Abia State, Nigeria. his work revealed that (20.0%) depend on household consumption needs. Table 3 showed that (35.7%) of the respondents gained technical expertise from their involvement in child labour, (11.9%) were able to tolerate different conditions due to their involvement in different activities, (9.5%) were of the social states, (34.5%) of the respondents are prepared for their future

Table 3: Distribution of Respondents by their contribution of children to household economy and benefits derived from child labour.

Depending	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative
Feeding	17	20.2	20.2
Shelter	10	11.9	32.1
Clothing	14	16.7	48.8
Schooling	40	51.2	100
Total	83	100	
Benefit Derived			
Technical expertise	30	35.7	35.7
Tolerance	10	11.9	47.6
Social state	8	9.5	57.1
Generate income	7	8.3	65.4
Prepares for future	29	34.5	100
Total	83	100	

Source: Field Survey, 2012.

Table 4: Distribution of respondents by the type of their paid job, Duration of Activities (Hrs) and payment in the study area.

Work done by children	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative
Hawking	52	61.9	61.9
Farming	11	13.1	75.0
Vocational training	4	4.78	79.78
Cottage industry	7	8.3	88.08
Household chore	10	11.9	100
Duration of Activities (HR)			
2-5	70	83.3	83.3
6-10	14	16.7	100
Total	83	100	
Payment of activity			
Yes	23	27.4	27.40
No	61	72.6	
Total	83	100	

Source: Field Survey, 2012

due to child labour while (8.3%) of the respondents sampled during survey benefited income generation This implied that the reexist some benefits from the participation of children in child labour despite all odds were against the children This work disagreed with the work of [30] in his work titled Child Labour Rooted in African Recovery. He reported that (35.7%) gained technical expertise in child laboring.

Distribution of Respondents by the Type of Their Paid Job, Duration of Activities (Hrs) and Payment in the Study Area:

Table 4 showed that (61.9%) of the respondents engaged in hawking of one commodity ortheother (13.1%) of the respondents went farm, (4.78%)

engaged in vocational training (8.3%) work in a cottage industry and (11.9) perform household chores at home. This implied that majority of this participate in one activity or the other after school, and most of them engaged in hawking. This contradicted with the findings of [31] in their work titled Children Participation in Vegetable Production and Associated Hazards in Oyo-State, Nigeria. Who posited that 77% of children who ventured into vegetable production did so to generate income for family sustenance? Table 4 showed that the higher parentage of the respondents (83.3%) attempted an average of 2-5hrs of work daily and (16.7%) worked within the range of 6-10hrs. This showed that most of the respondents were exposed to child labour. This agreed with the work of [28] in his work titled Determinants of Child Labour Supply Among Farming Households in Coted'Ivoire his work showed that (91.4%) spent not more than 2-5 hours on the activity per day. Table 4 showed that (27.4%) of the respondents were being paid for any of the activity they engaged in, while (72.6%) were not given any payment. It showed these exploitative forms of employment based on the socio vulnerability of children and work in the form o long hours or intense in physical `effort which is totally unsuited to children this work corroborated with the work of [32] in their work titled Determinants of Child Labour Participation in Crop Production in Nigeria. They reported that (68.83%) were not being paid for the activity.

Sequential Probit Model Result for the Determinants of Child Labour Participation among Households. Y₁ = Probability to Go to School and Not to Work: Table 5 revealed that educational level of the child X₃, Household size of household head and educational level of household head were positive and significant at 5%, 1% and 1% levels respectively which indicated a direct relationship. The implication is that the more a child advances in schooling and their household size, the more the probability that they will participate in child labour activities. This corroborated with the report of [26] in their work titled determinants of Child Labour Participation in Uganda, his work revealed that the higher the levels and quality of education and the likelihood of continuing in school would reduce the profitability of a child joining the labour market. It also corroborated with the report of [32] in their work titled incidence and determinants of Child Labour in Nigeria in which people in a household would need more mouths to feed and more bodies to clothe and care for. This also corroborated with [33] work

Table 5: Sequential Probit Model Result for Determinants of child labour participation among households. Y₁= (Probability to go to school and not to work).

Variable	Co-efficient	Standard error	T.ratio
Constant	8.3557	3.4290	2.437
X1 Age of the child (year)	0.1355	-0.1067	-1.270
X2 Gender	-0.5461	-0.5357	1.020
X3 Educational level of the child	0.2740	-0.1447	-1.893**
X4 Duration of activity	-0.5001	-0.1495	0.334
X5 Household size	0.7278	-0.3131	-2.325***
X6 Religion	-0.8860	-0.2450	-0.362
X7 Age of household head (year)	0.8762	-0.2873	-0.305
X8 Household head occupation	-0.2063	-0.1533	1.345
X9 Family structure	0.4408	-0.3444	-1.280
X10 Income of household head (Naira)	0.5334	-0.3438	-1.551
X11 Educational level of household head	0.5172	-0.1383	-3.740***
X12 type of paid job	0.5376	-0.1656	-0.325

Source: Field Survey, 2012.

*** Significant at 1% level, ** significant at 5% level,

which reported that there is empirical evidence that education of parents' affects child labour reduction decisions positively. This suggests that educated farmers had a better knowledge of the negative effect of their children working without schooling, in particular, level of education of father is found to have a stronger impact on the male participation while that of the mothers is found to have more impacts on the female participation in the labour market.

Sequential Probit Model Result for Determinants of Child Labour Participation among Households. Y₂= (Probability to Go to School and to Work): Age of the child X₁ was significant at 10% level with positive coefficient of 0.1606 and indicated a direct relationship with determinants of child labour participation among households. This corroborated with the findings of [32] in their work titled determinants of Child Labour in Crop Production in Nigeria which say that the older the child, the more it is likely that he/she will be involved in farm or streets activities. The implication is that older children had higher probability of being engaged in agricultural activities. A reason that can be adduced is that older children are more muscular and have greater capacity to muster brutal force, which is highly needed in farm work.

Table 6: Sequential Probit Model Result for Determinants of child labour participation among households. Y2= (Probability to go to school and to work).

Variable	Co-efficient	Standard error	T.ratio
Constant	0.5501	2.4238	0.227
X1 Age (year)	0.1606	-0.9554	-1.681*
X2 Gender	-0.9271	-0.4545	2.040**
X3 Educational level of the child	-0.9184	-0.89911	-0.245
X4 Duration of activity	0.2786	-0.1498	-1.860**
X5 Household size	0.379	-0.2695	-1.409
X6 Religion	0.25285	-0.2142	-1.180
X7 Age of household head	-0.3178	-0.2518	0.126
X8 Household head occupation	-0.1007	-0.5178	-0.194
X9 Family structure	-0.5470	-0.2471	2.213***
X10 Income of household head (Naira)	-0.1952	-0.2232	0.875
X11 Educational level of household head	0.1634	-0.1081	-1.511
X12 type of paid job	-0.1398	-0.1774	0.788

Source: Field Survey, 2012.

***Significant at 1% level, **significant at 5% level, *significant at 10% level

Table 7: Sequential Probit Model Result for Determinants of child labour participation among households. Y3= (probability not to go to school and to work)

Variable	Co-efficient	Standard error	T.ratio
Constant	3.6945	1.6674	2.216
X1 Age (year)	0.2693	-0.7084	-3.801***
X2 Gender	-0.2656	-0.3511	0.757
X3 Educational level of the child	-0.2036	-0.7310	2.786***
X4 Duration of activity	-0.1109	-0.1317	0.084
X5 Household size	0.4874	-0.2167	-0.225
X6 Religion	0.1844	-0.1582	-1.165
X7 Age of household head	0.2455	-0.2075	-11.183
X8 Household head occupation	0.1533	-0.7651	-0.200
X9 Family structure	0.2505	-0.1771	-0.136
X10 Income of household head (Naira)	0.3223	-0.1650	-1.953**
X11 Educational level of household head	-0.8028	-0.7336	1.094
X12 type of paid job	0.2240	-0.1217	-1.841**

Source: Field Survey, 2012

*** Significant at 1% level, ** significant at 5% level, * significant at 10% level

Gender X₂ was significant at 5% level with negative coefficient of -0.9271 and indicated an inverse relationship with the determinants of child labour participation among households. The implication of this finding is that as the gender of the child changes from male to female in the study area, the probability of going to school and also work reduces.

Duration of hours spent on work X₄ was significant at 5% level with positive coefficient of 0.2786 and indicated a direct relationship with determinants of child labour participation among households. This implied that children participated in child labour spent over time in the activity so that there is no time for such child to study his or her book at home when return from school. Family structure X₉ was significant at 10% level with negative coefficient of -0.5470 indicating an inverse relationship. This corroborated with the findings of [33] in his work titled determinants of child labour in Rural economy. That family structure had an inverse effect on child labour, he stated that when the child is from polygamous family and they were more than 5 children in the house such child will participate in child labour.

Sequential Probit Model Result for Determinants of Child Labour Participation among Households..

Y3= (Probability Not to Go to School and to Work):

Age of the child X₁ had a positive coefficient of 0.2693 and was significant at 1% level which is an indication of direct relationship with child labour participation in the study area. The findings agrees with the findings of [32] that children aged between 5 and 11 years participated most in child labour than those aged between 12 and 14 years in both rural and urban sector. Household head income X₁₀ had direct relationships with level of participation in child labour and was significant at 5% level. This showed that the higher the income of the household head the higher the probability of the child not to go to school and to work which is a contradiction to the economic criteria that the higher the income of the household heads the lower the probability of the child participation in paid job. For their will be enough money to cater for them in the household. This corroborated with the findings of [34] in his work titled issue of child labor in Africa, that farm incomes or household head income had a positive significant effect on the child schooling. The implication is that as household incomes increases, the odds of the child participating in farm activities reduce. This confirms that child labour participation correlates positively with income poverty. Countries in which large numbers of children are working are on the average poor countries.

Types of Paid Job X₁₂ was significant at 5% level of significant and had a positive coefficient of 0.2240 which implied that type of the paid job that the child participated had direct relationship with the child's probability of not to go to school and to work.

Table 8: Sequential Probit Model Result for Determinants of child labour participation among households. Y4= (probability not to go to school and not to work)

Variable	Co-efficient	Standard error	T.ratio
Constant	2.1495	1.9436	1.106
X1 Age (year)	-0.2132	-0.7118	0.300
X2 Gender	0.5058	-0.4391	-1.152
X3 Educational level of the child	-0.8429	-0.1168	0.721
X4 Duration of activity	-0.1219	-0.1559	0.782
X5 Household size	0.1169	-0.2774	-0.421
X6 Religion	0.9603	-0.1831	-0.524
X7 Age of household head	-0.1269	-0.2268	0.056
X8 Household head occupation	0.1171	-0.1138	-0.1029
X9 Family structure	0.3773	-0.2362	-1.597
X10 Income of household head (Naira)	0.2711	-0.1614	-1.680*
X11 Educational level of household head	-0.3518	-0.9922	3.546***
X12 type of paid job	-0.1219	-0.1051	1.160

Source: Field Survey, 2012

***significant at 1% level, ** significant at 5% level, *significant at 10% level

Educational level of the child X_3 had a negative coefficient of -0.2035 and was significant at 1% level. This implicated that the more a child advanced in schooling, the less they participated in child labour. This corroborated with the findings of [26] in their work titled determinants of child labour participation among rural people, he stated that the higher the level and quality of education and the likelihood of continuing in school would reduce the profitability of a child joining the labour market.

Sequential Probit Model Result for Determinants of Child Labour Participation among Households. Y4= (Probability Not to Go to School and Not to Work):

Table 8 revealed that income of household head X_{10} had positive coefficient of 0.2711 and was significant at 1% level and indicated direct relationship with the child labour participation among the households. This corroborated with the findings of [34] which reported that children from the poor households engaged frequently in child labour because of the low income of the father. Educational level of household head was significant at 1% level and the coefficient was negatively related to child labour. This indicated that as the educational level of the household head increased the probability that the child will not to go to school and will not work decreased. This result agrees with the apriori expectation of the study.

CONCLUSION

The study revealed that child labour participation among the households is very high in the study area, both sexes participated in child labour and the result showed that the educational level of the child as well as the parents provided more significant results as compared to other factors in determining child labour participation. The result of the sequential probit model showed that child labour was primarily a phenomenon of poverty. This was attributed to gender distribution of child, age of child, age of household head, household size, educational level and income of the household heads in the study area.

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are drawn to eradicate the involvement of children in child labour in the study area. The study revealed that poverty is the major cause of child labour participation. It is thereby recommended that government should provide enough jobs with good payment so that poverty will be eradicated in order to reduce child labour in the study area. Strict implementation of child labour laws should be enacted and monitored effectively for efficient eradication of child labour in the study. It is also recommended that the parents should engage themselves in family planning most especially in rural areas in order to reduce child labour. It is thereby recommended that provision of sound education for household head at affordable fees will go a long way in reducing the incidence of child labour participation among the respondents in the study area.

REFERENCES

1. Muhammed N.A., 2004. "The Socio Economics Impact of Child Labour in Cameroon" *Labour Capital and Society*, 27(2) 34-48.
2. ILO, 2003. "A Future without Child Labour Global Report under the follow-up to ILO Declaration of Fundamental Principles and Right at Work" pp: 15-17.
3. Southron, R., M. Hassan and O. Debnath, 2002. "Issues and Problems of Girls Child Labour in Indian and Bangladesh" *Journal of Indian Anthropology*, 35(2): 55-70.
4. Makhoul, J., R. Shayboub and J. Jamal, 2004. "Violence: the silent determinants of labour in Kwara State. *Journal of Children and Poverty*, 10(2): 131-47.
5. ILO, 2000. *Child Labour: Report IV (2A)*. International Labour Organization conference. 87th session, pp: 46.

6. Fyde, A., 2000. Child labour: A Guide to project Designs Geneva: International Labour Organization. pp: 203-205.
7. Ayoade, J.A., 2010. Nigeria: Positive Pessimism and Negative Optimism. A valedictory Lecture delivered at the Faculty of the Social Sciences, University of Ibadan, Nigeria. on September, pp: 17.
8. Okafor, E.E., 2010. "Child Labour Dynamics and Implications for Sustainable Development in Nigeria: Implications for Poverty Alleviation" Children Consortium. *Journal of Sociology of the Family*, 32(2): 87-111.
9. Omonona, B.T., J.O. Amao and R.I. Onoja, 2010. Determinants of Participation of Children in Income- Earning Activities among Households in Ibadan North Local Government Area of Oyo State. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 32(3): 197-205.
10. Nawani, A., 2012. "Causes and earning of child labour in Beedi and Agarbathi Industries in India." *Journal of Labour Economics*, 23(2): 2.
11. Oloko, S., 2001. Protection Rights. Children and Women Rights in Nigeria: A wake up call Lagos. *Journal of Educational Development*, 15(7): 47-60.
12. Ray, R., 2000. Child Labour, Child Schooling and their Interaction with Adult Labour: Empirical evidence for Peru and Pakistan. *The World Bank Review*, 14(2): 347-368.
13. ILO, 2011. Action Against Child Labour, International Labour Organization, Geneva, pp: 17.
14. Ayanwale, B.A., 2002. Family investment in the Education of children Adolescents in Rural Osun, State, Nigeria. In: *Issues in Africa Rural Development Monograph Series*. No.21 Winrock International, pp: 9.
15. Larsen, M., 2012. "Family poverty and the exploitation of child labour" Law and policy. In Oyo-State, Nigeria. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 23(2): 102.
16. CBN, 2008. "Child Labour and African Scholarship: A Critical Overview" *African Studies Review*, 47(2): 1-25.
17. ILO, 2005. Eliminating worst form of child labour. A practical guide to ILO convention, 182: 155-157.
18. ILO, 2012. "Economic growth and the persistence of child labour; Evidence from an India City" *World Development*, 26: 513-528.
19. UNICEF, 2010. Revisiting the Link between Poverty and Child Labour. The Ghanaian Experience. Centre for Labour Market and Social Research Working Paper 01-03, Aarhus Denmark, pp: 6.
20. Williams, D., H.G. Lewis and R.M. Stern, 2010. On the Interaction between the quantity and quality of Children in Nigeria. *Journal of Political Economics*. 8(1): 279-288.
21. CBN, 2004. Central Bank of Nigeria Annual Report and Statistical Bulletin. CBN Report Abuja, Nigeria: pp: 14.
22. Glick, P. and D. Sahn, 2008. "Schooling of girls and boys in a West African country. The effects of parental education, income and household structure. *Economics of Education Review*, 19(1): 63-87.
23. National Population Census, 2006.
24. Duryea, S., 2003. "School Attendance, Child Labour and local labour market fluctuations in urban Brazil ". *World Development*, 31(7): 78-165.
25. Lumpkin, M., 2002. "Issues and Problems of girl child labour in India and Bangladesh". *Journal of Indian Anthropology*, 8: 28-32.
26. Okafor, E.E. and O.E. Amayo, 2010. Parents and their Coping Strategies in Nigeria: A study of selected working Mothers. *International Journal of Sociology of the Family*, 32(1): 87-111.
27. Adekola, O.O., A.O. Falusi and B.T. Omonona, 2010. Determinants of child labour participation in Ibadan, Oyo State. " *Journal of Economics and Rural Development* ", 14(2): 18.
28. Nkamalarb, C., 2009. Child Survival, Poverty and Labour in Africa. *Journal of Children and Poverty* 1(1): 19-42.
29. Nwaru, O., 2012. "Child Labour Myths, Theories and Facts". *Journal of International Affairs*, 55(1): 59-73.
30. Harsch, E., 2002. Child labour Rooted in Africa's poverty: Campaign Launched against Traffickers in Abusive Work. *African Recovery: A Troubled Decade for African Children United Nations Department of Public Information*, pp: 12.
31. Tade, O., 2010. Household demand and child Trafficking for Domestic use in Ibadan, Nigeria. PhD post field Seminar Presented at the Department of Sociology, University of Ibadan, Nigeria, pp: 172-180.
32. Okpukpara, B.C. and N. Odurukwe, 2003. "Incidence and Determinants of Child Labour in Nigeria: Implication for Poverty Alleviation. "Children Activities in Nigeria", 10(138): 143-148.
33. UNICEF, 2012. "Determinants of Child Labour in Crop Production:" A case studies in Abia State, Nigeria. *Pakistan Journal of social science*", 4(3): 89-105.
34. Petro, O.E., 2005. "Rural Credit Markets and Resource Use in Arable Crops Production in Imo State of Nigeria". Ph.D. Dissertation, Michael Okpara University of Agriculture Department of Agricultural Economics Umudike, Abia State, Nigeria.