INTRODUCTION

Child work should be distinguished from child labour. By child work, what is meant is work in which the primary emphasis is on learning, training and socialization. As such, work schedule is flexible, tends to be responsive to developing capacity of the child and encourage his/her participation in appropriate decision-making process (Oloko 2001). It becomes child labour when it is hazardous or otherwise detrimental. The International Labour Organization convention, (ILO 1999) defined child labour as any type of employment or work, which by its nature or circumstances jeopardizes the health, safety, and morals of young persons. It can further be defined as an economic activity that impedes or hinders the full development and education of the child. Child labour is not some teenagers trying to earn additional pocket money but children who are forced by situations and circumstances to work for wages either monetary or otherwise (Fyfe 1993).

One way to look at the causes of child labour is to see them in terms of supply and demand for child labour. On the supply side, most importantly, poverty is a major contributor to child labour. On the demand side, the segmented labour market and the demand for low wage labour or specialized labour explains the presence of child workers (Swaminathan 1998). The work is seldom on individual strategy, rather it occurs within the framework of family and economy and is carried out in a variety of ways. Most of the available jobs in the urban areas are ill-paid with long hours. Families cannot make an adequate living if there is only one wage earner. Two, three or more income generators are needed to earn enough for food, shelter and other necessities. For many poor families, there is no choice but to put their children to work no matter how big and no matter how small the daily pay/wages. Also, large family size has been statistically shown to be associated not only with the higher likelihood that children will work but, also lower school attendance and completion (Fyfe 1993).

The working world of children and adolescents are certainly diverse as are their reasons for working (Salazar 1998). Nevertheless, simplistic notions that these children work as a result of paternal responsibilities exist in some circles. Most working children live with at least one
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parent. There are clearly those who consider child labour to be a socialization process and consequently a means of education. Child work is also influenced by cultural factors. Among the factors is the belief that work instills discipline and a sense of responsibility. This belief has blurred the practice among low-income groups.

The actual number of children involved in exploitative or hazardous work in Nigeria are not known, owing to the widespread dispersion of child workers, their employment in the informal sector and in agriculture, which is not monitored by labour inspectors and the limited research in this field. A recent assessment by Oloko (1999) however puts the lower limit at 8 million.

Our multidimensional social and political structure coupled with the impact of industrialization, unemployment, and urban drift as well as other indices of “modernity” have produced in their wake unique problems with respect to children in Nigeria (Unnna 1988). The labour problems of Nigeria is widespread and persistent and in most cases characterized by exploitation and high risk taking situation which have negative effects on the future of many children in the country (Turbag and Acuna 1998).

The spate of child labour has increased in the last few years with more and more children being withdrawn from school and placed in the labour market. Millions of children work to help their families in ways that are neither harmful nor exploitative, but millions are put to work in ways that drain childhood of all joy. The reason being purely economic.

The prevalence and rapid increase in the number of landless families in rural areas as well as other economic changes, have converged to push the poverty stricken families to urban areas to seek out new ways to eke out a living. Poverty is the greatest single force that creates flow of children into the work place, poor households use children to insure against risks that can be sudden and life threatening, but it is known that premature entry into the labour market contributed to the future and continued poverty of child labours.

The importance of giving young children quality care, nutrition and stimulation needed for their healthy growth and development has increasingly been receiving attention internationally and in Nigeria. Life skills are needed by an individual to operate effectively in society in an active and constructive way (Okebukola 2001). This is generally hindered by child labour, which robs the child of a lot of things and might even give off a feeling of a low self-esteem in years to come. It is against this background that we attempt to:

(i) establish the relationship between the child’s socio-economic characteristics and participation in paid employment.
(ii) establish the relationship between parental/guardian’s socio-economic characteristics and participation of the child in paid employment.
(iii) establish the relationship between earnings and the socio-economic characteristics of the child.
(iv) estimate the determinants of children participation in income-earning activities in the study area.

LITERATURE REVIEW

History of Child Labour

Rizzinin et al. (1998) looked at the history of child labour in Brazil. They stated that in Brazil, the ideology of labour as a supreme principle of social organization is associated with the transition from slavery to free labour which took place during the second half of the nineteenth century. The abolishment of slavery transformed slaves into free workers, who eventually became key assets in the work world was also common in the nineteenth century. They emphasized that because of the argument that it was necessary to mould the children character early in life by acquainting them with enabling sweat, only work many boys and girls loose their childhoods. They revealed that efforts to curtail labour started as early as 1891 on the 17th of January (with Decree No 13123), but this decree was never upheld. Poor children, they found out have always worked in Brazil and rural entrepreneurs and the industrialist often used them. Families in turn, burdened by the difficulties of daily life, were relieved at being able to pass on to employers the responsibility for the support and instruction of their children. Ultimately, children had no choice but to accept their dream of making something of themselves.

Fyfe and Jankanish (1997) came out with the fact that the idea that the place of children is at school and not in the work place developed 150 years ago. Child labour only began to be seriously questioned when industrialization and urbani-
zation fundamentally changed children’s working relationship and multiplied the dangers. This implies that child labour has existed even long before the spotlight was placed on it. In the early nineteenth century, the main jobs carried out by children included factory work and mining. Also a vast majority of children were employed as chimney sweeps due to their size and nimble fingers which enabled them to be able to go to the chimney.

According to David Cody (1987), child labour issues dated as far as the early nineteenth century. Children beneath the age of 12 worked in all sorts of places, an example of which was “blackening factory. He stated that in 1840 perhaps only 20% of children in London had any schooling, a number that had increased in 1860. There were over 120,000 domestic servants in London alone in the mid century, who worked for 80 hours a week and for one half pence an hour. Furthermore, children were put to work at the age of 5 and generally died before they were twenty-five (for children who worked in Iron and coal mines, gas work yards, construction, match factories, nail factories and the business of chimney sweeping).

Pelto (1997), was of the opinion that most of the available jobs in the urban areas are ill paid with longer hours. So families could not survive with only one wage earner but two, three or more income generators are required, so there was need to put their children to work no matter how numerous and how small the daily wage was.

De Ferranti and Koch- weser (1997), corroborated this by stating that wide spread poverty is a major cause of harmful child labour in developing countries. They revealed that in poor households, children might contribute a significant part of the household income. This because such households spend the bulk of their income on food, and income from children may be crucial to survival.

Harsch (2001) stated that, Africa has the biggest incidence of child labour in the world. He went on further to say that, “it is no coincidence that Africa is also the poorest region with the weakest schooling region and among Africa children those from poorer families are likely to seek work”. On asking parents what motivated them to allow their children to work, most often got response include, “to supplement household income” “to help household in enterprise”. He also found out that another contributing factor in Africa was AIDS which by killing so many bread winners has driven most into poverty thus placing an even greater burden on the survivors including children.

Rizzini et al. (1998), suggests that both poverty and cultural factors are responsible for the early entry of children into the labour force. Among the cultural factors is the belief that work instills development and a sense of discipline. But Jatene et al. (1993) warned about the fallacy of his practice stating that children who work prematurely for economic or their reasons will find it difficult to acquire the professional training they need to compete for their jobs.

Tienda (1979), suggested that schooling problems also contribute to child labour, as many a time children seek employment simply because there is access, to schools (either in distance or no school at all) or in cases where there is access, the low quality makes attendance a waste of time for students. Schools in many developing areas suffer from problems such as over-crowding, in adequate sanitation and apathetic teachers and as such some parents find no use in sending their children to school rather sending them to learn a skill order to supplement the family income.

According to Fyfe and Jananish (1997), one way to look at the causes of child labour is to see them in terms of the supply and demand of child labour. In their work, they stated that child labour results both form decisions made by household which affects the supply of child labour and by users of child labour which affect the demand for it. They went on to discuss a number of factors that determines the supply of labour. These include:

- Poverty which is termed to be the greatest single force which create the flow of children into the work place. Poor households will use their children to insure against risk.
- Labour market system where children can substitute for adult workers n the competitive labour market.
- Education system which has encountered a failure in terms of cost availability and equality an can lead may parents to view child labour as the preferred option.
- Family size which influence child labour as poor household tend to have more children and this is associated with higher likelihood of work.

Swaminathan (1998), also based his explanations on the cases of child labour on the demand for and supply of labour. He stated that poverty is a prevailing factor on the supply side. But he
focused on the demand side however, stating that “the segmented labour market and demand for low wage labour or specialized labour is used to explain the presence of child workers”. From the research he carried out, he found out that cross-sectional data from different states in India, showed that a higher incidence of poverty is not uncorrelated with a higher incidence of child labour, but that the structure of demand that determines the use of child labour. His argument? “When there is demand for child labour, poverty ensures that supply is forthcoming”. In essence, poverty is secondary only to the demand for should labour.

Bequele and Boyden (1988), examined the caused of child labour from an entirely different perspective. They stated that children work because their work has a social and economic function. Thus, these social values can inhibit schooling and encourage work. Although there is a general failure to give full social recognition to children’s work and a marked tendency to undervalue child labour economically. They came out with the findings that governmental attitude or employers perception are also important, foreign change earner employed child labourers and as a result the government of countries where these industries adopt an indifferent attitude or even introducing measures facilitating it. They finally concluded their findings by stating that, “children work because they must”. This is as a result of poverty and the non-availability of schools which are compounded by the poor quality of education, rapid rural-urban migration and cultural attitudes.

Finally, Sallah (2002) summarized the causes of child labour by listing the following:
- Poverty “a major and ubiquitous factor”, which greatly limits vocational and economic opportunities in rural areas in particular and pushes families to seek all available avenue to increase their meager income.
- Ignorance among families and children about the risks of trafficking.
- Migration of adults from villages to urban slums which exposes their children to greater risks.
- High demand among employees for cheap and submissive child labour especially in the informal sectors.
- Ease of travel across regional boarders.
- Desire of young people themselves to travel and explore.
- Inadequate political commitment and judicial mechanism to deal with child labour.

Salazar (1998) stated that child workers are heavily concentrated in the rural areas. Some of them carry out traditional activities related to modes of production, other children are involved in commercial export oriented plantation (coffee, fruit, flower and sugar cane). Many of the work they carry out are hazardous and examples of such include weeding spraying, digging, cutting loading in the agricultural sector, constructions work, charcoal production in Brazil, gold and coal mining in Colombia and Peru, hawking goods and rag picking in polluted areas and also the manufacture of fire works.

Swaminathan (1998), described the nature of work into four activities which children were engaged in India that are specific to the region. These occupations are diamond cutting, ship breaking, cleaning plastic cement bags and plaiting plastic ropes.

Fyfe and Jankanish (1997) talked about a special types of child labour which is often neglected but is the most extreme form. This they termed child bonded labour which as defined as form of servitude in which the worker is not free or completely free to enter the labour market and whose labour is used to pay for an often unspecified debt over an unspecified period.

Oloko (2001) stated that child labour can be classified into 3 broad categories throughout the country particularly in the cities. These 3 categories include work in public places, work in cottage industries and mechanic work shops, and domestic service in private households. She went on further to classify these 3 categories into specific work types. Those working in public places included beggars, shoe shine boys, car watchers, scavengers and head loaders (in the 1990s). She said it was common to find any-work children who undertook any form of menial task. Those who work in cottage industries include apprentice mechanics, hairdressers, tailors, weavers, carpenters etc. while those in the domestic service acted as house helps in more prosperous households. She also placed emphasis on child trafficking for the purpose of prostitution across international boarders in debt bondage of victims.

Effect of Child Labour

According to de Ferranti and Koch-weser (1997), child labour is a serious global issue with far reaching effects in the most harmful, forms. They stated that indicators that should be taken
into account to determine whether working has a negative effect on the child’s development. They found out that long working hours is responsible for fatigue that can cause accidents and impair intellectual development. In addition to this, they found out that many children work under exploitative conditions that apart from totally precluding schooling, have harmful effects on their physical conditions and mental health. The working conditions of child garbage pickers in the Philippines clearly increase the risk of diseases and disability due to exposure to lead and mercury, heavy lifting and presence of parasites. Children who work in agriculture are not left out as they are more likely to be affected than adults by climatic exposure, heavy work, toxic chemicals and accidents form sharpened tools and motorized equipment. Defferranti and Koch-weser (1997), also had powerful economic arguments on the adverse effects of child labour. They stated that, premature and extensive engagement in child work prevents children from accumulating human capital and having higher earnings later in life while economic growth is adversely affected by lower rates of productivity and growth.

Rizzini et al. (1998) revealed that children usually work under unfavourable conditions with only a small fraction having employment records, making it easy for exploitation to be carried out. Also the children work for long making it difficult to combine work and schooling especially for younger ones who cannot attend night school. This limited amount of education may help to explain why their remuneration is low, even though the minimum waste is specified by the law and children’s productivity may be equal to that of adults.

Harsh (2002) discovered that trafficking tears children away form the protection of their home and communities and is especially perilous to their well-being. Trafficked children were often found to work between 10 and 20 hours a day carrying heavy loads and operating dangerous tools. They often lacked food and drink. Many died of illness and/or accidents other contacted sexually transmitted diseases including HIV/AIDS.

According to Swaminathan (1998), one simple yet powerful effect of child labour is the drudgery which they face in the course of their work. The number of hours worked per day is one way to look at this drudgery. He stated that the most startling characteristic is the high proportion of children who work for more than the standard 8 hours per day. Another important aspect of this drudgery of work is the physical and mental harm caused to the children through their work and through their work and through their work environments. Children by their very definition have growing minds and bodies and are therefore subjected to physical and verbal abuse at the work site, lacking drinking water and toilets at the work site. He also concluded that the detrimental conditions of work are not likely to affect only the immediate well being of children but also leads to long term effects of morality. Hence, when a young child is exposed to stress and injuries the physical growth of the child may be permanently damaged.

**METHODOLOGY**

The study was carried out in Ibadan North Local Government Area of Oyo State, Nigeria. Ibadan North Local Government area is approximately on 3°59’ East longitude and 7°20’ North Latitude. Bodija is the headquarters of the local government area. The local government covers the following areas; Beere, Oke-Are, Mokola, Oke-Itunu, Ijokodo, Idi-Ape, Bashorun, Bodija, Secretariat and Agbowo. The entire area is essentially Yoruba speaking with people from the Northern and Eastern parts of the country.

The Local Government Area has a population of 300,939 people. The male population is made up of 150,839 people while the female population made up of 149,000 people (1991 census). The local government area shares boundaries on the north with Akinyele local government area, on the east with Ido Ibadan, Ibadan south-west and Ibadan south-east local government areas, on the west with Ibadan north-east and Lagelu local government areas, on the west with Ibadan north-east and Lagelu local government areas and on the south with Ona- Ara local government area. It is a metropolitan community and it is the most populated in the state making it a commercial centre.

The respondents used were in the ages 8-16 years. Primary data were collected through administration of structured questionnaires. A two stage sampling technique was employed in data collection. The first stage involved the choosing of clusters. The study area was divided into 13 clusters. Four clusters were chosen. The second stage was the selection of children from each cluster randomly. Thirty children were selected from each cluster randomly. In all 120 children were chosen for the study.

The data were analysed using descriptive
statistics and regression analysis. The analytical framework is briefly discussed below:

Descriptive statistics involves the use of mean, frequency, tabular presentation and percentages.

Regression analysis was used to estimate the determinants of child’s participation in income-earning activities. Based on the nature of the study, probit model was used in carrying out the study.

The implicit form of the model is given as:

\[ P = f(A, B, C) \]

Where:

- \( P \) = 1 if the child participates in income-earning and 0 if otherwise.
- \( A \) = socio-economic characteristics of the child workers.
- \( B \) = socio-economic characteristics of the parents.
- \( C \) = household characteristics

The explicit form of the model is presented below.

\[
P = a_0 + a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + a_3 x_3 + a_4 x_4 + a_5 x_5 + a_6 x_6 + a_7 x_7 + a_8 x_8 + a_9 x_9 + a_{10} x_{10} + a_{11} x_{11} + a_{12} x_{12} + a_{13} x_{13} + a_{14} x_{14} + a_{15} x_{15} + a_{16} x_{16} + a_{17} x_{17} + a_{18} x_{18} + a_{19} x_{19} + U_i
\]

Where:

- \( x_1 \) = Age of the child (years)
- \( x_2 \) = Sex of the child; 0 = 1 for male and 0 otherwise.
- \( x_3 \) = Number of years spent in the workforce (years).
- \( x_4 \) = Average hours worked per day.
- \( x_5 \) = Earnings of the child (₦).
- \( x_6 \) = Educational level of the child (years).
- \( x_7 \) = Age of father (years).
- \( x_8 \) = Age of mother (years).
- \( x_9 \) = Employment status of father; D = 1 if unemployed and 0 if otherwise.
- \( x_{10} \) = Employment status of mother, D = 1 if unemployed and 0 if otherwise.
- \( x_{11} \) = Occupation of father; D = 1 if unsalaried and 0 if otherwise.
- \( x_{12} \) = Occupation of mother; D = 1 if unsalaried and 0 if otherwise.
- \( x_{13} \) = Fathers with non-formal education; D = 1 if non-formal education and 0 if otherwise.
- \( x_{14} \) = Mothers with non-formal education; D = 1 if non-formal education and 0 if otherwise.
- \( x_{15} \) = Income level of father (₦)
- \( x_{16} \) = Income level of mother (₦)
- \( X_{17} \) = Sex of household head; D = 1 if household headed by male and 0 if otherwise.
- \( X_{18} \) = Household size.
- \( X_{19} \) = Marital status of household head; D = 1 if married and 0 if otherwise.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 reveals that the average age of children who participated in paid employment is about 13 years of which 57.7 percent were boys and 42.3 percent were girls. Out of the children who participated in paid employment, 14.1 percent partake in alternative training and 7.1 percent of those who did not participate in paid employment partake in alternative training. This implies that emphasis is not laid on alternative training for children whether they participated or not in paid employment.

Children who participated in paid employment had an average of 3.1 years working experience and worked an average of 7.9 hours per day. For this, they were paid an average of ₦9,859.62 per month. On the other hand, those who do not participate in paid employment had an average age of 12.3 years, 38.1 percent of which were boys and 61.9 percent were girls thus implying that more girls than boys went to school in the study area. Since the children did not participate in income-earning activities, they did not work at all to earn income.

Table 2 reveals the relationship between parent’s socio-economic characteristics and participation of the child in paid employment. It was revealed that, on the average, children who participated in income-earning activities had younger parents than those who did not participate in income-earning activities. Parents who earned less income were liable to put their children in paid employment as is observed in table 2, where fathers who earned ₦7,000 on the average per month sent their children into the labour market as against fathers who earned an average of ₦30,000 per month who did not send their children to labour market. The same holds true for mothers as those who earned an average of ₦15,000 per month did not send their children into the labour market while those who sent their children earned an average of ₦4,000 per month which is an indication of poverty.

Table 3 revealed that about 18 percent of the children who participated in paid employment earned more than ₦15,000 per month. This is the
case for most older children and 50 percent of them did not have interest in going to school. Out of the remaining 50 percent who had interest in school and had gone to school, an average of 3.2 years of school had been completed. A large percentage (69.2%) of the children who participated in paid employment earn less than N10,000 per month. This shows that children who participated were not paid large amounts of money for the services they rendered. Though the amount earned per month is relatively low, still majority (90.7%) of these children did not have interest in schooling.

Table 4 revealed that, about 23 percent of the boys earned more than N15,000 as against 11.4 percent of the girls. These boys were said to earn more than girls in paid employment. Also about 65 percent of the boys and 74 percent of the girls earned less than N10,000 per month. Table 5 revealed that, children who earned more than N15,000 per month came from large households working an average of 9.5 hours per day. They were found to have work experience of 4.5 years and through the children who earned between N10,000 and N14,000 worked an average of 9.6 hours per day. Still they did not earned as much as N15,000. This could be attributed to their work experience as they worked an average of 3.1 years. This shows that, the higher the experience more the pay.

Table 1: Relationship between the child's socio-economic characteristics and participation in paid employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paid employment</th>
<th>Average age</th>
<th>Sex (%)</th>
<th>Alternative training (%)</th>
<th>Average years of work</th>
<th>Average hours of work</th>
<th>Average income (₦)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-participation</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.859.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey 2002.

Table 2: Relationship between parent/guardian's socio-economic characteristics and participation of the child in paid employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paid employment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent-</th>
<th>Average age of father</th>
<th>Average age of mother</th>
<th>Average income of father (₦)</th>
<th>Average income of mother (₦)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-participation</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey 2002.

Table 3: Relationship between income earned and age of the children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income (per month ₦)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Average age</th>
<th>Average years of schooling</th>
<th>Attitude to school (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 14,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10,000</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey 2002.

Table 4: Relationship between income earned and the gender of the children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income (Per month ₦)</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 14,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey 2002.
Table 6 revealed the result of the determinants of participation of the child in paid employment. It was revealed that, the age of the child, numbers of years spent in the work force, average hours worked per day, earnings of the child, educational level of the child, age of mother, employment status of father, employment status of mother, occupation of mother and mother with non-formal education were significant determinant of participation at one percent. The income level of mother, occupation of father, and household size were significant at ten percent while only the marital status of household head was significant at five percent level of significance. The sex of the household head, educational level of father and sex of the child were not significant.

For the significant variables, a unit increase in the age of the child will reduce the probability of participation by 0.13 and for every additional year spent in the labour market, the probability is increased by 0.18. If an additional hour is spent doing work the probability that the child will participate is increased by 0.19. For every naira added to the earnings of the child, the probability increases by 0.00004. The probability that the child will participate in paid employment will increase by 0.92 for every additional year spent in the work force and reduce by 0.074 for every year added to the age of the mother.

For every child whose father is unemployed, the likelihood of participation is higher than for those fathers who are employed. Also, for every child whose mother is unemployed, the likelihood of participation is lower than for those whose mothers are employed. For every household headed by a male, the likelihood of participation is higher than for every household headed by a female. For every household where the mother had non-formal education, the likelihood of participation is higher than mothers with any formal education. For every child whose parents are married, the likelihood of participation is lower than for those whose parents are not married. The probability of participation in paid employment reduces by 0.03 for person added to the household.

The pearson goodness of fit chi-square is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression coefficient</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant term</td>
<td>0.24334</td>
<td>0.82799</td>
<td>0.29389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of child</td>
<td>-0.1342</td>
<td>0.4464</td>
<td>-3.00594***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of child</td>
<td>-0.03837</td>
<td>0.14502</td>
<td>-0.26459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years spent in the workforce</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.05537</td>
<td>3.34141***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average hours of worked per day</td>
<td>0.19387</td>
<td>0.02676</td>
<td>7.24531***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings of child (per month)</td>
<td>0.00004</td>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>5.45912***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level of the child</td>
<td>0.09294</td>
<td>0.02565</td>
<td>3.62292***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of father</td>
<td>-0.0035</td>
<td>0.0114</td>
<td>-0.3059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of mother</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>0.01586</td>
<td>-4.72517***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status of father</td>
<td>0.81535</td>
<td>0.27217</td>
<td>2.99576***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status of mother</td>
<td>-1.5128</td>
<td>0.24217</td>
<td>-6.14543***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation of father</td>
<td>0.26934</td>
<td>0.15737</td>
<td>1.71149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation of mother</td>
<td>0.62367</td>
<td>0.2284</td>
<td>2.73058***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father with non-formal education</td>
<td>-0.1408</td>
<td>0.18577</td>
<td>-0.7594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother with non-formal education</td>
<td>0.8297</td>
<td>0.1854</td>
<td>4.47528***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income level of father</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.1518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income level of mother</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.93779*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of household head</td>
<td>-1.0578</td>
<td>0.24782</td>
<td>-4.2685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>0.02135</td>
<td>1.73393*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status of household head</td>
<td>0.6952</td>
<td>0.27337</td>
<td>2.52457***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson goodness of fit chi-square</td>
<td>378929.838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey 2002

*** = significant at 1%,  ** = significant at 5%,  * = significant at 10%
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378929.838 and it is significant at one percent level. This shows that, the model has a good fit to the data.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the study, various determinants of child participation in paid employment was examined in Ibadan North Local Government Area of Oyo State. The major determinant is poverty thus even though children earned less than adults, whatever income generated is beneficial to the family as a whole.

The children work for long hours and were seldom provided with adequate health care and education and were often paid low wages. Long hours of work while attending school can have negative consequences on the health, attendance and performance of school children.

Rapid rural urban migration, urbanization and a shortages of employment opportunities have made the streets an increasingly important arena of socialization and a central element in the work experience of many urban children. The child is indeed an important part of the development of nation. As it often said “today’s children are leaders of tomorrow”. It is important to include them in all development efforts.

In the policy arena, there is much debate and disagreement on what needs to be done for about child labour. The policy implications then, of the foregoing analysis can be summarized as follows:
(i) The provision of schemes that generate and enhance employment and income among adult workers is a necessary condition for the reduction of child labour.
(ii) An important measure is the promotion of schooling. The need to expand educational facilities and improve the quality of the curricula and the teaching method is all too obvious.
(iii) The household size is an important factor as household that were large tend to have children participating in paid employment, so birth control should be encouraged.
(iv) Emphasis should be laid on giving children alternatives to formal education especially for children who participated in paid employment but can not attend school. This will give them a feeling of self-worth.
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