

CHILD WELFARE AND POVERTY IN NIGERIA.



**A Paper Presented at Poverty Phase II Dissemination Workshop in Addis Ababa Ethiopia
on 12th to 13th October 2006**

BY

OKPUKPARA, CHIEDOZIE BENJAMIN (PhD)

Center for Rural Development and Cooperatives, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.

benedozie@yahoo.com

PAUL U. CHINE

UNICEF Field Office,

#1b Chime Lane, Off Abakaliki Rd, GRA P.M.B 1644 Enugu–Nigeria

FIDELIS NWELE O. UGURU (PhD)

Department of Agricultural Extension,

University of Nigeria, Nsukka

CHUKWUONE NNAEMEKA

Department of Agricultural Economics,

University of Nigeria, Nsukka.

Abstract¹

This research is motivated as a result of increasing deterioration of child welfare in terms of drop out of children from school, high incidence of child participating in economic activities and incidence of street children in Nigeria. Though many researches have been conducted in areas of child welfare, most of these researches neglected the determining factors of these welfare indices as well as relationship between poverty and child welfare. Or, at best pocket of researches has been done using small unrepresentative sample. Most if not all of these studies in Nigeria have not used national data to make their conclusion because of unavailability of such data. This may have contributed to poor policy response to child welfare in Nigeria as the literature has shown that child welfare continue to deteriorate. This study used FOS/ILO, 2001 Child Labour Survey to examine these issues. The study noted among other things that participation in school or work is dictated by region, sector, child, parent and household characteristics. In addition, the study also noted that poverty has a very weak response to child welfare. The study also noted incidence of street children is a response to poverty, parental interest and regional differences. The study thus suggested in addition to regular survey on child labour and street children to monitor the trends, that policies aiming at improving child welfare in Nigeria should consider sector, region, child, parents, household and community characteristics in their policy.

¹ The authors are grateful to African Economic Research Consortium for Funding and Cornell University for technical assistance

Introduction

Children are regarded as the most vulnerable in society. Therefore, their welfare in a society is an index of social and economic development of that society. The more important reason why child welfare has to be monitored is because child contribution to the society in adulthood is determined to a large extent by their treatment in their childhood (Ray, 1998). Crucial as this matter is, child welfare is included in the Millennium Development Goals (MGD) (UNESCO, 2004). Child is defined internationally as any person aged between 5 and 15 years while Nigeria define a child as any person between the age of 5 and 17 years. Child welfare indices consist of child labour, child schooling, street children and child health. The child labour and child schooling are regarded as two sides of the same coin. This is because the two activities are mutually exclusive activities. Child labourer which different from street children in terms of their activities are therefore refers to any person within these age brackets (5 – 15 years internationally or 5 and 17 years in Nigeria) engaged in work or employment on a regular basis with the aim of earning a livelihood for themselves or for their families. The exploitative child labour occurs when children, especially young ones, are exposed to long hours of work in dangerous environment or are entrusted with too much responsibility without compensating psychosocial reward, or work. In addition, such activities are carried out at the expense of schooling, thereby children are not adequately prepared for the future in a modernizing society (Grootaert and Kanbur, 1995; UNICEF, 2004; FME, 2004). The street child on the other hand is defined as any child who may have parents or guardians in the locality or elsewhere but are living and working in the street. Most often street children are not distinguished in child labour analysis.

It is important to observe that the government in the pre-independence era was not indifferent to child welfare. For instance, the Children and Young Persons Law (CYPL) in several states in Nigeria contained laws regulating street trading and the fact that in the 1960s, at least four ILO conventions prohibiting children's work in various hazardous occupations and conditions were ratified (NBS, 2001). However, the enactment of the Labour Code in 1974 with several provisions to limit the age of admission into employment in various occupations as well as limits of working hours and exposure to hazards was a decisive legal action, which demonstrated the stance of government towards addressing child welfare. The ratification and signing of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) in 1991 represented the climax in government's positive stance to combat child labour in view of the fact that one of its articles targets the elimination of the phenomenon (Oloko, 1999). Article 32 enjoins state parties to recognize the right of the child to be protected from economic exploitation and from performing any work that is likely to be hazardous or to interfere with the

child's education or to be harmful to the child's health or physical, mental, spiritual, moral or social development (UNICEF, 2001). In addition, the effort of government on child welfare precipitated President Olusegun Obasanjo to sign into law the child right bill in June 2006. Other efforts by government and non-government organizations include:

1. Section 31 of Cap 32 of the laws of the Federation of Nigeria, which prohibits Children under 14 years and girls under 16 years from trading in the streets.
2. The Nomadic Education Programme under the National Commission for Nomadic Education promulgated by Decree 41 of 1989 was the major programme that has been established for children who have never attended school. It was established in recognition of the fact that the migratory nature of pastoral nomads and migrant fisher-men made it difficult for their children (who invariably work with their parents) to be enrolled in formal education.
3. Centre for Non-Formal Education and Training (CENFET) provides basic education for out-of-school and working children especially scavengers.
4. The "Hawking by Children Edict Cap.58 Law of Nigeria" prohibits hawking, display of goods for sale, or roaming about in the street, market or any open public place in the state.

It is sad to note that these efforts have made marginal impact on improving child welfare or specifically reducing incidence of child labour and street children (UNICEF, 2001). This is largely because these measures have been uncoordinated, not well implemented and largely un-enforced. For instance, studies conducted by various researchers in Nigeria Oloko (1990; 1992 and 1999); UNICEF (2004); Imam (1998); Onuikwe (1998) and Okpukpara and Odurukwe (2006) shows that the child labour and street children are increasing in both practices and characteristics. It was also reported that gender restrictions in the involvement of children in work in certain crafts were found to have been eroded such that increasingly boys and girls were engaged in most occupations. In other countries, studies attest the same story. UNICEF reported that in the year 2000 there were 233 million children between the ages of 5-18 years in urban areas in developing countries doing one kind of paid work or the other (UNICEF, 2004). This development has grave economic and development consequences. Many studies have condemned child participation in economic activities and worst form of it (street children)

because of its resultant effect on health, schooling, physical, moral and psychological development of the child (UNICEF, 2004; ILO-IPEC, 2002).

Many factors determine the decision concerning sending child(ren) to school or to work as well as being a street child. According to Grootaert (1998) and Dustmann (2003), these factors are cost of schooling, characteristics of the child, parents, households and community. These factors exercise influence over the decision to allocate children's time away from schooling or towards work. Other factors include the location and distance to formal education centre, which can be used as a proxy for demand factor. Specifically, poverty and illiteracy reinforced by traditional customs such as polygyny and preference for large family size were identified as root causes of child labour in Nigeria (Obikeze, 1986 and Oloko, 1992). Moreover, marital instability and family disorganization were also identified as contributory factors. Be that as it may, the first econometric study of National Child Labour Survey data also noted that these factors have an influencing behaviour on child participation in different child activity options (Okpukpara and Odurukwe, 2003). Nevertheless, there are conflicting views of what determines welfare of the child in terms of schooling or employment characteristics in developing countries. Studies like Basu (1998); Bharagwa (2003); Psacharopoulos (1997); Obikeze (1986); Ray (2000); Sasaki and Temesgen (1999) and Oloko, (1999) vary in their child welfare determinants and conclusions. For instance, studies have revealed that households (especially poor households) find it difficult to withdraw their children from labour market because of monetary contribution of those children to household living standards (Blunch and Verner, 2000; Bonnet, 1993; Obikeze, 1986). In Ghana, a study has shown also that children contributed substantially to household incomes, as such, child income cannot be treated as insignificant in household poverty reduction strategy (Psacharopoulos, 1997). Other studies have also found a contrary view to this, by attributing the deteriorating welfare standards to factors other than poverty (Ray, 2000; Sasaki and Temesgen, 1999). Such factors as child, parents and community characteristics are more important variables that influence the decisions to send the child to school or work. In addition, even on the issue of poverty, researchers' views vary. Some argued that child labour income is a clear response to improving household living standards even if it is in a short run. Others argued that child participation in economic activities makes the household deeper below the poverty line by taking the child out of school (which is an important human capital accumulation) thereby making the child to contribute marginally to household income in long run (Psacharopoulos, 1997; Blunch and Verner, 2000; Bonnet, 1993).

Thus investigating the hypothesis that poverty deteriorates child welfare (as this has been dramatized) is essential to determining whether public money committed to reducing child welfare problems should be directed at reducing poverty or at raising the returns to education. Therefore, this paper tried to examine the child welfare as patterned by age, gender, zone, poverty and sector as well as investigate compelling factors of the child welfare indices. This result is likely to better inform the policy debate on how child welfare can be improved especially in traditional African society where there was ineffective machinery to enforce child welfare. Owing to data limitation, econometric analysis was restricted to child labourers while descriptive study included those of street children. In addition, due to the same data problem, caution should be taken to generalize the result of street children.

METHODOLOGY

Data used in this study was taken from the National Survey on Child Labour and Street Children in Nigeria conducted by Federal Office of Statistics (FOS) in conjunction with International Labour Organization (ILO), which ended February 2001. The sampling design for household questionnaire of this survey is facilitated by the provision of estimates at national, regional, and to a reasonable extent, states levels. Sixty enumeration areas (EAs) were selected in each state while thirty enumeration areas were selected at the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja. Ten housing units (HUs) were selected in each EA. Members of households within the selected housing units were interviewed. Therefore, in each State except Federal Capital Territory (FCT) Abuja a sample of 60 enumeration areas (EAS) comprising 30 urban and 30 rural were selected. Ten (10) housing unit was selected in each EAS, thereby providing 600 housing units in each State except FCT where 300 was targeted. This gave a national sample size of 22,200 housing units. However, 20,830 households unit responded, among whom, are 32,354 children aged between 5 and 17 years of age. After data cleaning, the data came to 20,416 household units, which comprises 100,663 individuals, among who are 32,288 children aged between 5 and 17 years. Therefore, the actual data used in this analysis was based on this figure. Purposive sampling design was used to obtain samples of 200 to 400 street children in three selected cities in each of the thirty-six (36) states of the Federation. Valuable information obtained from members of the National Union of Road Transport Workers (NURTW) and others facilitated the selection of street children in these cities. However, 5971 street children responded to the interview.

Results and Discussion

Child Activity Options in Nigeria as Patterned by Gender, Region and Sectors

Children spend their time in different activities in Nigeria. These activities are divided into works, school and leisure. These activities are further divided into those that are in exclusive work category, exclusive schooling category, those combining school with employment and those that neither school nor work.

The age specific differentials in child schooling, work and non-activity is examined in Table 1. The age is grouped into those aged 5 and 11 years (primary school age), those aged 12 and 14 years [Junior Secondary School (JSS)], while those aged 15 and 17 years [Senior Secondary School (SSS)]. This age grouping is important in order to ascertain at what schooling stage does higher participation of various child welfare indices occur among children.

Over all the age classes, boys participation in school only category is lower than girls. Work participation shows a higher and a wider gender disparity for children in senior secondary school than idling children. The table also shows that in all gender, more of the older children combine schooling with economic activities than younger children. However, while there is no gender imbalance among primary school children participating in economic activities, there is gender bias in JSS and SSS children, which favours male children. The table also shows that participation of children in school increases from primary school to junior secondary school stages before a decline in senior secondary school stage. The participation in exclusive economic activity also shows that senior secondary school children are more likely to participate in the activity than any other group of children. Thus, policy should focus more on this group of children for appropriate result.

Table 1: Activity Status of Children across Gender and Age

Age Groups	School Only	Work Only	School/Work	Idle	All School	All Work
Boys						
5 –11	84%	4%	7%	5%	89%	11%
12 –14	81	6	12	1	87	13
15 –17	76	10	13	1	82	18
All Boys	82	5	9	4	86	14
Girls						
5 –11	85	3	7	5	78	22
12 –14	86	4	10	0	85	15
15 –17	79	8	11	1	77	23
All Girls	84	4	8	4	78	22
All Children						
5 –11	84	3	7	6	79	21
12 –14	83	5	11	1	78	22
15 –17	77	9	13	1	81	19
All Children	83	5	8	4	79	13

However, the situation of enrolled children (whether involved in economic activities or not) shows a high incidence of enrolment among children in Nigeria (80%), which favours male children. There is equally relatively higher percentage of male children in economic activities. However, higher incidence of child participation in schooling is an indication that parents are ensuring the participation of their children in school in spite of all odds. The result also shows that older children or senior secondary school children are more likely to withdraw from school and engaged in economic activities than any other group.

These activity options of children are further examined across regions in Nigeria. This is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Percentage Distribution of Child Activities by Gender

Regions	School only			Work only			School/work			Idle		
	M	F	All	M	F	All	M	F	All	M	F	All
NC	76	79	77	7	6	7	13	11	12	4	4	4
NE	59	68	63	18	13	16	14	11	13	9	8	8
NW	81	83	82	6	3	5	8	5	7	6	8	7
All N	74	78	76	9	6	8	11	8	10	6	7	6
SE	97	96	97	1	1	1	2	2	2	0	1	1
SS	93	91	92	2	3	3	3	4	4	1	1	1
SW	79	78	78	2	2	2	19	19	19	1	1	1
All S	91	85	89	2	2	2	8	8	8	1	1	1
All	82	84	83	5	4	5	9	8	8	4	4	4

NC = North Central; NE = North East; NW = North West; SE = South East;

SS = South South; SW = South West; M = Male children F = Female children

Work in this study includes all economic activities engaged by children whether paid or unpaid except domestic chores (example, waged work, work in family enterprise/farm, self-employment, and apprenticeship whether paid or unpaid).

In terms of regional characteristics, it is obvious from the table that over 89% of children in Southern regions are in school only category compared with 74% in Northern regions. This highlights that most of the children in the North are educationally disadvantaged compared to those in the South. The further breakdown of the table shows that children from Southeast region had the highest participation in school only category representing 97% of total sampled children in that region, while children from Northeast region had a relatively low participation rate, which represent 63% of total sample in that region.

In terms of gender – specific activity options across regions, the table shows that female participating in school only category dominates those of male children (with an average of 74% and 78% for male and female respectively). The reason for this is not yet clear; however, nomadic activities of the male may have contributed to these characteristics. The table also shows that not only that children in work only category are more in Northern region than in the South but also more schooling children participate in economic activities in North. The explanation for this may be a reflection of regional poverty differentials, which compel children

to engage in economic activities to augment the household income. More idle children (those that participate in neither school nor work) are also recorded in the Northern than in Southern Nigeria. The explanation of this is not clear, however, there is high incidence of children begging for alms in the north.

Table 3 brings out the activity options of the child in rural and urban areas across the regions in Nigeria. The table shows a wide gap in all the child activity options between the rural and urban sectors in Nigeria. For instance, in all regions child activity options differ significantly between rural and urban sectors. However, there is marginal difference between rural and urban in child participation in schooling especially in southern regions compared to their participation in economic and idling activities in all the regions of Nigeria, especially in northern regions. It is worthy of note that there is little or no sectorial differences among schooling children participating in economic activities and idling children in North and South respectively. However, this difference was reversed when children were divided into school and work categories. While there was a wide sectorial differences in schooling, these differences was marginal in economic activity. The overall analysis of higher incidence of children participating in economic activities reflects two things. First is there is high rate of income poverty, which often compels children to work to enhance household income (similar studies have confirmed this Grootaert, 1998, Nelson, 2000). Secondly, activities that encourages child labour activities are more in rural than in urban area. More idle children are recorded in North to larger extent in rural area than in South. This may be related to delay enrolment, cost of schooling, disability or lack of interest in education, which are important variables that determine child participation in schooling.

Table 3: Percentage Distribution of Child Activity Options in Urban and Rural Nigeria

Years	School		Work only		School/work		Idle		All School		All Work	
	R	U	R	U	R	U	R	U	R	U	R	U
NC	73	85	8	2	14	11	5	2	79	90	6	4
NE	61	74	18	7	12	15	9	4	55	77	6	6
NW	74	90	7	2	8	5	11	3	63	86	3	2
All N	72	86	10	3	10	9	8	3	67	85	5	4
SE	96	95	1	2	3	2	1	1	96	96	1	1
SS	92	92	3	3	3	5	2	1	95	95	2	2
SW	78	87	2	1	19	11	1	1	94	95	6	4
All S	87	92	2	2	10	5	1	1	95	95	4	3
All	79	89	6	3	10	6	5	2	78	90	5	3

The further analysis shows that 68% and 5% of sampled children in the North are in school and work respectively while 95% and 4% of sampled children in the South are in school and work respectively. Specifically, there is relatively higher incidence of children participating

in economic activities and lower participation of children in school in North East than any other regions in Nigeria. Though there is relatively higher incidence of children in schooling in Southern Nigeria, there is highest incidence of schooling and lowest incidence of child labour in South East region. This has serious programme and policy implications for child labour and schooling in Nigeria.

It seems obvious that household's welfare and child labour should be closely correlated (Okpukpara and Odurukwe, 2003). On a micro-level, this suggests that if a household is too poor to survive, children will be induced to engage in economic activities, which could lead to harmful effects on long-run human capital accumulation and the potential perpetuity of poverty across generations. The analysis of data shows that poverty determines the economic and schooling decision of the child within the household (see Tables 4 and 5). For instance, Table 4 brings out association between activity options of the child and household's poverty status. The table shows that schooling children participating in economic activities increases among families with higher poverty incidence. Non-poor families favour child participation in full-time schooling. These findings are supported in literature (Neilsen, 1998 in Zambia; Patrinos and Psacharopoulos, 1995 in Paraguay). The possible explanation is that as income of household decreases, the need for children to work to augment household income becomes a compelling necessity, thus suggesting poverty as a driving force in child participation in economic activity.

Types of Economic Activities Engaged by Children in Nigeria

Many families have no alternative than to send their children to work because they see their earnings as an important input in family survival. Table 4 shows the type of economic activities engaged by exclusive child workers across gender in Nigeria. The table shows that most popular economic activities engaged by male children are farming, hawking and water fetching, while female popular paid work activities are water fetching, domestic sweeping and Hawking. The table also shows that more female children participate in the hawking than male children, while male children dominated in the other activities to larger extent as brick laying labourers, scavenging, bus conductor and load carrying. This shows that male children are more involved in hard and more risky work than their female counter part. The general picture this result has painted is that there is stereotype of work even at child level in Nigeria. There is no regional difference in children activities except in load carrying which is more of Northern Children activity.

Table 4: Percentage Distribution of Type of Economic Activities by Child Labourers

Types of Economic Activities	Male	Female	North	South
Brick Laying Labourers	6%	1%	2	2
Scavenging	4	2	1	2
Water fetching	51	49	46	35
Domestic sweeping	23	38	32	39
Bus conductor	20	10	1	1
Load carrying	23	10	11	5
Hawking	33	37	18	19
Farming	43	27	49	52

Note: Multiple Responses were recorded

Education and Child Labourers

However, for those that never being to school, the survey shows that lack of interest on the part of parents to send their children, poverty, lack of school in the vicinity and underage are the major reasons for non-participation of children in school (see Table 5).

Table 5: Reasons for never being in school.

Reasons	Male	Female	North	South	All
Parents Poor	10%	9%	6%	14 %	9%
Parents not interested	36	41	39	8	39
Parent's sickness	2	2	1	1	2
No School in vicinity	22	16	17	5	19
Not Interested	8	10	8	7	9
Poor Health	2	3	1	4	3
Under age	20	19	17	46	19

Source: Computed from Child Labour Survey, 2001

However, the poverty, non-existence of school in the vicinity and underage favours more male children in non-school participation than female children, while lack of interest on the part of parent is more responsive in withdrawal of female children from school than their male counterpart. This result is consistent with research that says that poverty and lack of schools drive children into economic activities (Basu, 1998). The fact that interest of parents matters more for female's children in non-school attendant reflects the importance attached by parents in education of their male children. This indicates that there is gender bias in educational attainment of children in Nigeria.

Further analysis of the table shows that there is a wide regional gap for the reasons of never being in school. These reasons include poverty, interest of the parents, access to school and underage. It is important to note that more children in the South attributed their reason for

their non-school attendant to poverty. This reflects probably that schooling expenses in South is relatively high.

The reasons for school drop out among children is examined in Table 6. The table shows that poverty and poor performance. The table also shows that the most popular reasons for drop out among boys are poverty and poor performance; while girls attributed their reasons for dropping from school are poverty, poor performance and marriage. Marriage as factor is not only more important reason for drop out among girl than boys, but also the difference in gender is statistically significant at 5% probability level.

Table 6: Distribution of Child Labourers According to the Reason for Stopping School

Reasons	Male	Female	North	South	All
Failure to pay fee	21.82	22.53	10.05	35.90*	22.16
Poor performance	11.95	9.34	9.03	12.25	10.68
Married	0.26	9.62*	7.79	1.42*	4.81
To assist family enterprise	8.05	9.07	11.31	5.41	8.54
Got pregnant	-	2.20	0.50	1.71	1.07
Poor health	7.01	6.32	7.79	5.41	6.68
Terminated by parents/guardian	5.45	5.49	6.78	3.99	5.47
Don't know	4.42	6.04	6.78	4.56	1.60
Others	40.01	29.00	39.97	29.35	34.84

* = significant at 5%

The regional analysis, the reasons for drop out shows that the more popular reasons for Northern and Southern children are the same - poverty and poor performance. However, higher percentage of children drop out from school because of poverty in South than North. The difference is significant at 5% probability level. It is also important to note that marriage leads to more drop out of children from North than South, which difference is also significant at 5% probability level.

Health of Child Labourers

The result shows that as high as 89% of children reported having no problem in different working environment. The result of the remaining 11% of the sample who reported problem in their work environment shows that children work in an environment characterized by poor sanitation (16%) poor water supply (18%), crowded (11%) and insufficient light (10%) (see Table 7). The result seems almost the same for male and female children. This indicates that children are most likely to be exposed to disease and physical danger during their work activities. Though the overall result shows higher percentage of working children work in a conducive environment (66%), yet as high as 83% of these children are ignorant of health problem associated with work. The result also shows that out of those working in an unhealthy environment 29% of these children suffered injury/illness during work. The analysis further revealed that majority of these children work in agricultural sector.

Table 7: Percentage Distribution of Child Labourers According to their Work Environment Characteristics

Work Environment	Male Children	Female Children	All Children
Crowded	11%	11%	11%
Poor Ventilation	6	6	6
Insufficient Light	10	9	10
Poor Sanitation	17	16	16
Poor Water Supply	19	16	18
Explosive	4	4	4
High Tension Cable	3	4	4

Table 8 shows the type of ailment suffered by child labourers.

Table 8: Distribution of Illness/Injury Suffered by Child Labourers across Gender

Illness/Injury	Male	Female	All
Cold	15	12	14
Eye infection	2	1	1
Ear infection	1	0	1
Skin problem	6	2	4
Breasting problem	1	1	1
Stiff Neck	4	5	4
Body pain	51	47	49
Tiredness	44	40	42
Stomach problem	14	19	15
Headache	35	35	35
Others	29	24	27

The table shows that most child labourers suffer body pain, tiredness, cold, stomach problem and headache. This is an indication that most economic activities engaged by these children are

tedious and painful. However, the less suffered illnesses or injuries are eye infection, ear infection, breathing problem and stiff neck.

Poverty and Child Welfare

It seems obvious that household's welfare and child labour should be closely correlated (Okpukpara and Odurukwe, 2003). On a micro-level, this suggests that if a household is too poor to survive, children will be induced to engage in economic activities, which could lead to harmful effects on long-run human capital accumulation and the potential perpetuity of poverty across generations. The analysis of data shows that poverty determines the economic and schooling decision of the child within the household (see Tables 9 and 10). For instance, Table 9 brings out association between activity options of the child and household's poverty status. The table shows that schooling children participating in economic activities increases among families with higher poverty incidence. Non-poor families favour child participation in full-time schooling. These findings are supported in literature (Nielsen, 1998 in Zambia; Patrinos and Psacharopoulos, 1995 in Paraguay). The possible explanation is that as income of household decreases, the need for children to work to augment household income becomes a compelling necessity, thus suggesting poverty as a driving force in child participation in economic activity.

Table 9: Child Activity Option and Household Poverty Status

Poverty status	Child Activity Options			
	School only	Work Only	School/work	Idle
Core- Poor	79%	6%	9%	6%
Moderate-Poor	82	5	9	3
Non – Poor	86	4	8	2

Note: core-poor constitute households whose mean per capita income is 1/3 or less, Moderate poor constitute households whose mean per capita income is >1/3 but less than 2/3 of mean per capita income and non-poor constitute households whose mean per capita income is 2/3 and above

In terms of expenditure quintiles, the table shows a marked difference in participation in work activity by children whose households are within the second quintile and third quintile (as presented in Table 10). This seems to suggest that poverty status of the household started having effect on child participation in economic activities after third quintile. In addition, this study is able to establish a positive relationship between child participation in economic activities and expenditure quintiles of the household. For example, seven percent of sampled children from lowest quintile engaged in full-time work compared with only three percent of sampled children belonging to highest quintile. For the lowest expenditure quintile, 77% and 8% of children participate in full-time schooling and idling respectively compared to 87% and 2% of children belonging to highest expenditure quintile participating in full-time schooling

and idling activities respectively. In other words, probability of children being economically active rises if the child belongs to the household with the lowest expenditure quintile. However, it should be noted that in the third and fourth quintiles, the participation of children in part-time economic and idling activities remain constant. Therefore, for poverty to increase the enrolment of the child one will consider raising the household income quintile to fourth position, which is above N5000 per month.

Table 11: Distribution of child Economic Activities across Different Expenditure Quintiles.

Quintiles	School Only	Work	School/work	Idle
1 st Quintiles	77	7	9	8
2 nd Quintiles	80	6	10	4
3 rd Quintiles	83	5	9	3
4 th Quintiles	85	4	9	2
5 th Quintiles	87	3	9	2

The Econometric Framework for the Determinants of Child Welfare Indices

Our model tries to understand the factors that influence the probability of child's school attendance (and not delay enrolment) and participation in economic activities in a reduced form model, focusing on a mixture of demand and supply side variables. Our understanding of the household's decision-making process and available data has influenced the particular choice of this estimation method. We do not want to assume that schooling and work decisions of children are independent. We also do not want to assume any sequential process in the decision making process as we believe it is not necessarily a sequential choice. Hence, we treat schooling and working possibilities as two interdependent choices. We also do not want to assume any sequential process in the decision making process as we believe it is not necessarily a sequential choice. Hence, we treat schooling and working possibilities as two interdependent choices. We therefore, use a univariate probit model to estimate the household and individual determinants of children working or going to school.

Assume there are two potential binary schooling outcomes (S_1 and S_0) for the working ($W=1$) and non-working ($W=0$) states, respectively, where $S_k=1$ if the child is attending school and $S_k=0$ if s/he is not ($k = 0, 1$). The observed schooling outcome is given by $S = W S_1 + (1 - W)S_0$. However, the observed binary outcomes are generated according to underlying latent index structure as follows:

$$W = 1(W^* \geq 0) = 1(Z\beta_w + \varepsilon_w \geq 0)$$

$$S_1 = 1(S_1^* \geq 0) = 1(X\beta_1 + \varepsilon_1 \geq 0) \text{ iff } W = 1$$

$$S_0 = 1(S_0^* \geq 0) = 1(X\beta_0 + \varepsilon_0 \geq 0) \text{ iff } W = 0$$

We therefore, use a univariate probit model to estimate the household, parents, community and individual determinants of children working or going to school.

Econometric Result

Introduction

First, it should be noted that the econometric analysis consists of girls and boys that are aged between 8 and 17 years with at least one parent. The reason for doing this is that the focus of the econometric study is on determinant of schooling and involvement of child in economic activities rather than delayed enrolment. It is assumed that any willing child would have been in school at the age of 8 years. Secondly, the data has problem of identifying the child's mother's or father's education. In other to manage this defect, the researcher used the most educated adult male as a proxy for father's education in the households and most educated adult female in the households as a proxy for mother's education. The general school model does neither exclude those participating in economic activities nor does child participation in economic activities exclude those participating in schooling. In other words, school model consist of children in school only category and those combining school with some economic activities, while work model consist of children in work only category as well as those that combine work with schooling. The econometric result is presented in Appendix 2. The detailed discussion is subdivided into child characteristics, parent characteristics, household characteristics and regional characteristics for each case of child.

Determinants of Child Schooling in Nigeria

General univariate probit result shows that participation of child in schooling is determined by many variables. These variables not only vary from location to location but also differ in magnitude as measured by marginal effects. Generally, child participation in school is determined by gender and age of the child as well as the relationship of the child to household head, gender and age of household head, education of the household head, household composition, access to schools, regional and sectorial differences.

Child Characteristics

The regression result shows that female children are more disadvantaged in attending school compared with their male counterpart. This disadvantage is probably occasioned by the perception of parents in a male child in African tradition as their only representative identity that will ensure the family continuity when the parent dies. Similar interest on the male child has been reported (Okpukpara, 2003). This may also be the problem associated with opportunity cost of training of female child in school to that of male child. The age of the child

also determines the probability of child schooling. The effect of child participation in school is positive until at 13 years of age, which is point of inflection after which age of the child becomes negatively related to child participation in school. Though the marginal impact of age on probability of child schooling is marginal ($< 5\%$) in most ages, there is strong negative statistically significant impact of age on probability of child schooling at the age of 16 and 17 years which marginal effect is 7% and 13.9% respectively. This indicates that children aged 16 and above are more likely to drop from school than children in any other age category. Thus, confirming the result of our descriptive statistics. The result also shows that being a household head child increases the probability of child schooling compared with non-household head child. This indicates that though extended family system is practiced in Nigeria; there tend to be some sort of discrimination of child of the household head from other children in the extended family system concerning their welfare. The simple message is that child welfare is improved when the child stays with his or her biological parents.

Parent's characteristics

Some characteristics of parents are important in determining child welfare. The univariate school regression model shows that though gender and age of the household head are important factors in child schooling, their impact are less than 10% in any case. The result also shows that a child living with other relations reduces the probability of child participation in school compared with when a child is living with both parents. The educational status of parents is not only significant but also positive to child schooling compared with illiterate parents. However, father's education has more impact on child schooling than mother's education as explained by its marginal effects. This finding contradicts report by Eswaran (2001) and other authors who suggest that mother's education has strong positive effect on child schooling because mothers care more for children than fathers. However, this result may have been influenced by high level of mother illiteracy, which is identified in the descriptive statistics.

Household Characteristics

Although, household composition significantly influences the probability of child schooling, its impact is less than 1% as evidenced by marginal effects analysis. It must be noted that the presence of children from 6 to 17 years in the household influences the participation of children in school. This contradicts most findings in developing countries on dependency ratio (Nelson, 2000). However, one can argue that the presence of these kids increases the household earnings through their participation in economic activities, which enable them to participate in schooling activities. The absence of adult male encourages participation of child in school. This is surprise and inconsistency with a priori expectation and

hard to explain. However, the variable may be capturing the interest of the parents in education of the child. This result may explain the fact that the child takes better decision for his or her welfare when there is no adult person in the household. Most children will probably want to go to school to improve their future but the interest of the parents may force them to choose work. In descriptive statistics where 37% of the children that dropped out of school attributed their dropout from school to lack of parental interest perhaps because, more than half of the respondents had no formal education. Therefore, when such parents have much control over their children, which is expected in Nigerian society, their perception of the value of school is important in diverting children time away from school.

Household welfare status (asset index) has a positive significant effect on probability of child schooling. The result also shows that a unit increase in household wealth marginally increases the probability of schooling by 2%. This confirms Basu, 1998 report that poverty has a weak impact on the probability of a child schooling. Even though, the weakness of this variable in compelling a child to school is confirmed, it could be reasoned that, when children drop from school, it is not necessarily because of irresponsible parenting, it may be due to the family's financial situation.

Community Characteristics

Nigeria, which is most populated country in Africa, is divided into six regions or regions. Study that does not capture this regional influence may arrive at a misleading conclusion or recommendation. The general model shows that regional dummies have strong effect on the probability of child schooling. Specifically, though location of children in different regions has a weak influence on child schooling in the Northern Nigeria, there is evidence that child located in North West is less likely to be in school compared to those in North East Nigeria. However, there is strong impact of regional influence on probability of child schooling in South especially children in South East (marginal effect of .103) compared with those in South West Nigeria. This specifically tells us that the probability of child schooling increases by 10.3% if the child is located in South East compared to South West. There are a number of reasons for differences in school enrolment between North and South but most importantly, religion differences may be a contributory factor. The result also shows that the probability of child schooling increases when the school is close to the child. In quantitative terms, the result shows that the probability of child schooling increases by 8% when school is close to the child's vicinity. This result probably may suggests that going to school in distant location outside the child's environment could involve further cost to the household, especially transportation cost, which some poor households may not be able to afford. Children located in rural areas are less likely to be in school compared to their urban counterpart. Specifically,

probability of schooling by rural children reduces by less than 1% compared to their urban counterpart showing a very weak effect on schooling.

Determinant of Child Work in Nigeria

General univariate probit result shows that participation of child in economic activities is determined by child, parent, household and community characteristics. These variables have different impacting magnitude as revealed by marginal effects.

Child Characteristics

The result shows that not only that girls are less likely to work but also as the age of the child increases, his or her participation in economic activities also increases in older children compared with younger children. The contribution of marginal effects to economic activities of the child also increases along the age of the child. For instance, at the age of 17 years, the likelihood of a child participating in economic activities increases by 19%.

Parent's Characteristics

The result of the study shows that a child is likely to withdraw from economic activities if the father holds secondary and postsecondary education as well as all if the mother holds any form of formal education compared to if the mother or father is illiterate. This result is not surprise because educated parents are more knowledgeable on the importance of human capital formation. Consequently, educated parents may not want the welfare of their children to deteriorate by their participation in economic activities.

Household Characteristics

The result shows that household composition also has a marginal impact on the probability of a child working. Specifically, the number of children aged below 11 years in the household increases the probability of children withdrawing from economic activities. The table also shows that though household welfare (as measured by asset index) increases the probability of a child not working, the marginal effect of this variable shows a very weak effect (1%).

Community Characteristics

The table also shows that regional influence is very strong in determining the likelihood of a child participating in economic activities. Specifically, children in North Central, South East and South South compared with their respective based variables are less likely to work by 3%, 13%, and 10% respectively. In addition, children access to school in terms of distance

increases their probability to participate in economic activities. The result also shows that it is more likely that children from rural areas will work compared to their urban counterpart.

Street Children

Street children live in various places. It is important to examine where they live across region and gender in order to direct appropriate targeting policies. This is examined in Table 12. The table shows that most street children live in the market stall and motor parks and least found under the bridges. Further analysis shows that almost the same number of male street children resides in market stall and motor parks, while most female street children live in market stall and uncompleted building. In regional analysis, the result shows that there is no difference where street children live between North and South Nigeria. However, it must be emphasized that more street children live under the bridge in the South than in the North.

Table 12: Distribution of Street Children According to their Residence

	Male	Female	North	South	All
Under the bridge	2.33	1.88	0.37	4.26	2.32
In the market stall	27.64	35.48	28.99	27.26	28.12
Vehicle parked outside	6.09	1.88	4.57	7.08	5.83
Motor park	27.46	10.75	29.26	23.56	26.41
Uncompleted building	15.17	16.67	14.95	15.58	15.26
Others	13.72	8.60	12.63	14.17	13.40

Source: Child Labour Survey, 2001

Incidence of Street Children in Nigeria

Table 13 examines the incidence of street children in different regions in Nigeria. The table shows that most children in full-time work or part-time schooling are from Southern Nigeria and indeed from Southwest. This is understood because Lagos one of the state that makes up the Southwest has the highest incidence of street children (7.22% of the total street children in the sample). In addition, numerous activities exist in Lagos being the former capital of Nigeria with almost the highest population in Nigeria. However, the number of idling street children is relatively high in South South Nigeria.

Table 13: Percentage Distribution of Street children Activities According to their Categories in Different Regions in Nigeria

Regions	Work Only	School/work	Idle	All
North central	93.24%	5.85%	0.90%	12.87%
North East	94.95	4.33	0.72	7.21
North West	95.75	3.25	1.00	17.92
South East	83.44	15.52	1.05	6.89
South South	96.38	2.08	1.54	18.20
South West	95.12	4.36	0.52	36.91
All	94.97	4.24	0.79	100.00

Source: Child labour Survey, 2001

In view of the negligible number of children in idling and schooling, our discussions will centre on those street children either combining schooling with some economic activities or those in full time economic activities.

4.4.3: Education and Street Children in Nigeria.

In view of the fact that education is one of the most important welfare indicators of children, analysis of street children data is centred on children combining schooling with some economic activities as well as those in exclusive work category. Therefore, the categories of street children are divided into schooling/working, working only and non-schooling. Table 14 presents the distribution of street children according to different categories in Nigeria. These categories are based on the schooling programmes in Nigeria. For instance, the first category is primary school age, second category is junior secondary school age and the third is senior secondary school age.

Table 14: Percentage Distribution of Street Children across the Age and Activity Option of the Child.

Age Group	Schooling/Working	Working	Non – Schooling
5 – 11 Years	3.02	91.81	96.13
12 – 14 Years	2.11	92.99	95.32
15 – 17 Years	0.65	95.44	96.62
All	1.57	93.96	96.12

Note: “Schooling/working” here includes children combining schooling with economic activities. “Working” includes children in full – timework, while “Non – schooling” include those children in full – time work and idling children.

Source: Child Labour Survey, 2001

Table shows that basically, almost more of the street children participate in economic activities. This non-school attendant increases as the age of the child increases. More specifically, children of secondary school age (15 to 17 years) are the worst hit. Further, the result shows that though there is no clear association between participation in non – schooling activities and age of the street children, there is a clear association between those combining schooling with economic activities as well as those in exclusive economic activities. However, it must be noted that higher incidence of street children were found among non – schooling and working categories.

Table shows that there is higher concentration of schooling children in Southern Nigeria, to a large extent Southeast. The table also shows that NC, SE and SW have the highest concentration of working street children. The non-schooling children are highest in NW and SS. This is an indication that children in these regions need re-orientation and value system.

Worse still, one of the major constraints in Nigerian’s growth challenge has been the lack of human capital development, which is as a result of high rate of non-schooling among street children. The reasons for this are examined in Table 15. This is a more serious negative welfare indicator of the street children

Table 15: Distribution of Non-Schooling Children According to Reason for Never Attended School

Reasons	Male	Female	North	South	All
Parents Poor	25.99	33.33	23.60	34.37	26.41
Parents not Interested	34.16	23.26	38.72	18.97	33.58
Parents sick	2.99	6.20	2.03	6.38	3.16
No School in the Vicinity	3.85	0.75	3.43	4.35	3.69
Not Interested	20.01	24.81	19.55	22.24	20.25
Poor Health	1.54	2.33	1.35	2.18	1.58
Do not know	8.51	6.98	9.04	6.69	8.42
Others	2.95	2.33	2.25	4.82	2.92

Source: Child Labour Survey, 2001

The table shows that major reason for never being in school by street children are poverty, parent’s interest and personal interest. However poverty and personal interest contribute more to non-school attendance by female children than male while parents interest contribute more to non-school attendance of male children than female children. When the data is disaggregated across regions, the result shows that there is marginal differences in factors that encourage incidence of non-school attitude among the street children in Nigeria. In the North, the major factors responsible for non-schooling attitude of street children are poverty, parents and personal interest while in the South; the situation is attributed to poverty and personal interest. The regional analysis seems to tell us one interesting thing. First, parental factor is the

major difference in the determinants of non-school attendant by region. This influence is stronger in North than South. Therefore, programmes that target parents in the North on child education is necessary. Again since personal interest is also a factor in both region, there is need for re-orientation of value system of children towards interest in education. The analysis shows that 59.36% and 10% of street children in North and South respectively indicated their unwillingness to go to school because of low return to education when they were asked if they would like to participate in school if they had every opportunity. The remaining 40.64% and 90% of North and South indicated their willingness to go to school if they had the opportunity.

One of the major constraints in Nigerian's growth challenge has been the lack of human capital development, which is as a result of high rate of drop out. The reasons for drop out among the street children are examined in Table 16.

Table 16: Distribution of Street Children According to the Reason for Drop Out

Reasons	Male	Female	North	South	All
Failure to pay fee	46.10	35.77	33.42	50.21	45.63
Poor performance	23.97	34.15	18.36	26.72	24.44
Married	0.12	3.25	0.27	0.26	0.26
To assist family enterprise	3.25	2.44	4.25	2.83	3.21
Got pregnant	0	8.13	0.96	0.51	0.64
Poor health	2.04	4.07	2.47	2.00	2.13
Terminated parents/guardian	by 13.24	8.94	23.56	9.10	13.04
Don't know	4.86	2.44	7.12	3.85	4.75
Others	6.15	0.81	9.59	4.52	5.90

Source: Child Labour Survey, 2001

The table shows that though there are varying reasons why children drop out from school across gender and regions, the chief reasons for drop out from school by street children are failure to pay school fees, poor performance and interest of the parents. The table shows that major reasons that contribute to drop out of female and male street children are almost the same; however, the magnitude is not the same. The drop out is more among male than female. It must

be noted that 8.13% of female street children stopped schooling due to pregnancy. Furthermore, more male than female drop out due to poverty, while more female than male drop out due to poor performance.

In regional analysis, the result also showed varied reasons for drop out from schools. The major reasons for drop out in the North are poverty, interest of the parents or guardian and poor performance, while in the South; the major reasons are poverty and poor performance. The overall analysis of drop out of street children shows that the major reasons for the high incidence of drop out is poverty. This is supported in literature. It is pertinent to note that poverty contributed more than 50% of drop out in the South. There are number of reasons for these. However, the most important of these reasons is that schooling expenses may be higher in the Southern than in the Northern Nigeria. Secondly, formal education is more subsidized or less recognized in the Northern than in the Southern Nigeria.

Health of Street Children

Work Environment

Place where children work determines their health status. The result of responses from children when they were asked the kind of injury/illnesses suffered during their work activities is examined in Table 17. First, the work environment for street children in Nigeria is characterized by poor sanitation (38%), poor water supply (21%) and crowded (48%). The trend of the result seems similar to both genders. However, there is large gender variation among those working in crowded environment, explosives and high-tension cable, which is skewed towards male children. This result shows that male children are more likely to be exposed to disease during their work activities than female children. However, it should be noted that about 64% of respondents reported that they had no injury or illness in their work environment.

Table 17: Distribution of Street Children According to the Characteristics of their Work Environment.

Working Environment	All	Male	Female
Crowded*	47.95	49.32	23.23
Poor Ventilation	17.58	18.58	11.72
Insufficient light	11.27	11.48	7.48
Poor sanitation*	37.58	38.44	21.65
Poor water supply	20.96	20.95	21.25
Explosives	4.41	4.58	1.00
High tension cable	3.18	3.31	1.00

Multiple responses were recorded; "*" means significant @5% probability level.

Source: Child labour Survey, 2001

Further illness or Injury Street children suffered in their work place in Nigeria varies across gender (see Table 18)

Table 18: Distribution of Street Children According to Type of Injury/Illness in their Work Environment

Illness/Injury	Male Children	Female Children	All Children
Cold	11	13	11
Eye Infection	2	1	2
Ear Infection	0	0	0
Skin Problem	5	6	5
Breathing Problem	1	0	1
Stiff Neck	8	5	7
Body Pain	27	24	27
Tiredness	23	23	23
Stomach Trouble	5	12	5
Headache	18	16	19

Source: Child labour Survey, 2001

The table shows that the most frequently suffered illness/injury by street children in Nigeria are body pains (27%), tiredness (23%), headache (19%) and cold (11%). The less suffered illnesses are eye (2%) and ear infection (0%) as well as breathing problem (1%). The nature of frequently suffered illness shows that children are mostly engaged in work that required much more energy and time. With respect to gender, the result shows that male suffer more of the listed sicknesses during the course of their work except cold, skin problems, and stomach trouble, which is suffered more by female street children.

The data also shows that though majority of children encountered minor health injury, which requires little or no medical treatment. However, 1%, 2% and 21% of street children are permanently prevented from working, hospitalized for an average period of 3 days and stopped work temporarily respectively. Worse still the analysis revealed also that most street children not only lack access to protective wares (96%), but were treated at home and pharmacy/chemist shops when injures/sick. Thus, indicating inadequate treatment of the ailment. The analysis also shows that most injured street children paid for the treatment of this ailment. Place of treatment and payment for the treatment is an indication of poor access to medical facilities and/or poverty as well as undue exploitation of children in Nigeria.

Comparing Child Labourer and Street Children in Nigeria.

Certain characteristics of children in child labour survey and street children survey need to be compared for policy recommendations. Such characteristics as gender, age, zone, work characteristics, schooling characteristics and health characteristics are the basis of this comparism. However, the comparism in terms of activity opinions will be based only on work and those that combine school with economic activity because the number of street children in full-time schooling (school only) and idling (school/work) are very negligible (< 0.5% of the sample).

In terms of gender, though more male than female participate in full-time economic activities both survey, the gender differential is stronger in the street children than child labourers. There is no difference in relationship between age and participation in economic activities in both surveys as both categories of children increase their participation in economic activities as they get older. However, there is a basic difference in the two survey concerning schooling children participating in economic activities (school/work). In street children survey, the result shows that the school age is inversely related to schooling children participation in economic activities. It is almost near zero for street children aged between 15 and 17 years. However, a different characteristic is observed among the children living with their parents. The explanation of this is difficult. However, street children may be probably interested in primary education where the cost of schooling is almost affordable (especially now the government is introducing free and compulsory primary education), which fortunately coincided with early age of the child. Beyond this school level, education becomes more expensive. Hence, they can foot the school bills. Therefore, it may be more difficult for street children to contain the costs of self-maintenance and schooling expenses at the same time. The kid may as a matter of survival decide to opt for self-maintenance and leave participation in schooling. On other hand, the children living with their parents still have some support from that family. In our focus group discussion, we found that it is difficult to find a parent that does not encourage their child to participate in schooling activities even when such parent is very poor.

In terms of zone, the basic difference is that participation of children in full-time economic activities (work only) and participation of schooling children in economic activities (school/work) is significant at 5% probability level in all the zones among the street children. However, this difference is not statistically significant at 5% probability level among the child labourers except in Northwest zone. Not only that regional differences between street children and child labourers, the characteristic of those in full-time economic activities (work only), and those that combine schooling with some economic activities (school and work) is also different

across zones in Nigeria. For instance, children from South South and South West had the higher and lowest participation of schooling children in economic activities in child labour survey respectively in the southern zones. The reason for this trend is not clear, however; Nigerian poverty profile coincides with the trends in schooling children participation in economic activities. The reverse in case with street children. For instance, in the street child survey, more street children combine schooling with economic activities in South than Northern Nigeria. The reason for different trend in street children survey is not yet understood. However, poverty may not be an important factor responsible for street children activities.

In terms of factors that contribute to non-schooling of children, the result shows that poverty, parental and personal interests are factors responsible for non-schooling of street children. In almost contrast to this, child labourers (children living with their parents) attributed their non-schooling to parental interest, access to school, and underage age. It is worth of noting that poverty is not a major reason for non-school participation of children living with their parents. This is an indication that child labourers attain a relatively higher welfare than street children. More so, the parents of child labourers usually insist on education of their children no matter their level of poverty, even if it means sending the person to economic activities. In terms of region, the result shows that poverty and underage are major factor responsible for non-schooling of children living with their parents, in South while parental interest, access to school and underage were factor responsible for non-schooling of same category of children in North. However, poverty, parental and personal interests are the major factors contributing to non-schooling of street children North and South. Though this trend exists, parental influence is more influential in the North than South. Part of Nigeria, while poverty and personal interest are more influential is South than North. One thing is clear from this result. Household poverty does not increase the non-schooling attendance of child labourers. In terms of gender, parental interest, access to school and underage are factors responsible for non-schooling of male children living with their parents, while major factor increasing the non-participation of non – schooling are parental interest and access to school. However, parental interest, poverty and personal interest are factors responsible for non-schooling attendant of street children irrespective of zone where they are found. In addition, parental interest is a major factor contributing to non-schooling of street children while it is not a factor in children living with their parents.

In terms of work environment, child labourers work in environment that is crowded, poorly ventilated, insufficient light, poor sanitation and poor water supply. Though street children work in similar work environment, the incidence of street children working in these environments is relatively high compared with those children living with their parents.

Specifically, street children working in crowded and filthy environment are 48% and 38% respectively. In terms of gender, there is marginal difference in work environment among children living with their parents. However, the difference between male and female working in crowded and filthy environment is statistically significant at 5% probability level. This also means that male children work in more crowded and filthy environment than female children. The result is able to inform us that the kids living with their parents are less prone to work hazards, thereby ensuring a more work friendly environment than street children. This is probably because child labourers are protected by their parents unlike street children. Parent or guardian could withdraw their child from any economic activities if working condition and work environment is not favourable to his child if the child must work

In terms of injury/illness, most street children suffered body pain, tiredness and cold while kids living with their parents suffered in addition to the already mentioned factors headache and stomach trouble. These indicate two things. First is could be that children living with their parents are not tough enough to resist most ailment.

In term of gender, there is no gender bias in types of ailment suffered during their involvement in economic activities. This is because though there is numerical difference, all the sickness/injury suffered were test non - statistically significant at 5% level of significant, except stomach trouble in street children.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The regional analysis seems to inform us that parental factor is the major difference in the determinants of non-school attendant by region. This also was identified in econometric analysis in form of the effect of educated parents and illiterate parents in child school enrolment and work activity. This influence is stronger in North than South. Literacy programme (be it formal or non-formal) for parents should be organized to educate parents on the importance of child education and bad effects of child labour and more importantly girl child education and parents in Northern Nigeria. This should be supported by a follow-up programmes or workshop on re-orientating the value system of children. This is because most children left school because of long gestation periods of benefits of education especially in Southern Nigeria. There is also a greater sectorial difference in school enrolment in North East and North West. This calls for a concerted effort of child education campaign in these rural zones. This can be done using grassroots approach in form of first, organizing workshop and training the respected leader in the communities on the ills of not being educated. Generally, there is an indispensable need to improve general awareness of the problem of child labour, promoting participatory research aimed at action; informing, heightening awareness and mobilising the population through training and awareness campaigns on current legislation and the nature, causes and consequences of child labour in Nigeria.

However, for those children combining schooling with some economic activities, (which is a response to poverty) with higher incidence in South than North, there is need to structure school programme to accommodate them in form of school hours etc especially in the Southern Nigeria. This is because most families especially poor families may not afford the cost of schooling without engaging their children in economic activities. Alternatively, government should provide some assistantship in form of grant, free education or scholarship for children of poor. This can be done through well articulated and target programme devoid of politics to these families. In addition, any effective policy for eradicating child labour must be linked to an ambitious poverty eradication effort over the long term, since both phenomena are linked in a vicious circle. The Poverty Reduction Strategy offers an opportunity to include the fight against child labour within the global plan to combat poverty throughout the country, and further efforts must be made to prioritize protection of children within that Strategy. Of particular interest is the creation of new sources of jobs, increased income from wages and salaries or of some other type, and improvement of working conditions and qualifications of adult labourers, which would be its cardinal points. These actions must include adequate measures for social compensation, favouring the lowest income sectors, granting special priority to support families whose under-aged members are working.

However, these campaigns efforts by government and non-government organizations to motivate the children to school are important, inadequate facilities in schools or number of schools available may discourage children from schooling. Therefore, improving these facilities and establishing more schools in the North may also rekindle their interest in schooling. All these mount to expansion of government spending on education and formulating a well-targeted policy especially in rural areas and Northern Nigeria. Generally, it is of fundamental importance to make a radical and qualitative transformation in school-based education. This means establishing schools even out in the most remote sites, with programmes and curricular contents in tune with local and regional needs, obtaining texts, equipping schools with libraries, spaces and adequate furnishings and with adequately paid and trained teaching staff. In particular the proposal for the gradual and progressive eradication of child labour must be articulated with the demand for a universal, efficient and useful primary education. In the Northern Nigeria, where people live far apart, it is necessary to resettle them into a settlement village in order to ensure that schools and other infrastructure are making important impact. This is because of access problem which is more prominent in the North than South.

The child participation in school or economic activities is influenced by regional dummies. In addition, there are noted factors that have disproportionately contributed to drop out of children across gender and region. It is likely that religion and/or tribal (in form of culture) may have influenced the result. Therefore, community heads in any form should be educated on the need for playing down some of the cultural and religious variables hindering education of their children.

The environment where children work is worthy of comment. All stakeholders should provide necessary work environment and working condition for children comparable to those of adult if they must work. In addition, parents should not use their children as means of improving household welfare rather they should see their work as a supplement to household income towards their education expenses. In this vein, parents (especially fathers) should be advised and encouraged to channel whatever income accrued from child labour to their school expenses. However, this policy will only be implemented where children could not help working.

The factors that encourage existence of street children should be discouraged. Street children are compelled to do anything possible to meet their basic survival needs in the street. They are mostly engaged in the worst forms of child labours. Therefore government, non-government and international non-government organization should first establish a rehabilitation centers, run-in homes for correction. In this centers and homes, a lot of counseling and other non-formal education should be the highest priority. There should also be a regular

networking meetings not only GOs, NGOs, and community based organizations (CBOs), but also street children should be able to share experiences, ideas, resources, and information that will uplift their welfare. These centres should be more in cities where there is higher incidence.

It is also important to educate both parents and children on the recently signed child right bill in whatever language and mode that could ensure effective understanding. This is important because some parents and indeed children lack complete knowledge of their right in the society. In addition, to this government should develop effective and efficient strategies in enforcing the contents of the bill.

Regular survey on child labour and street children are important for monitoring the trends of the incidence. However, the obvious lapses in terms of inclusion of omitted variables especially in street children survey should be corrected

In conclusion, given resource constraints and the likely need for trade off between values, blanket prohibitions on child labour face one important challenge. This is because children are better off attending part-time school than not at all. Therefore, while the overall goal of policies must be to move the child from exclusive labouring situation to “school only” status, such can only be a long-term one. In the short run, any policy that moves a child from, exclusive labourer or “neither work nor school” status to one where the child combines schooling with work must be considered a significant success. The country already has several economic and social programmes. Given that child labour is not independent of socio-economic conditions of the households, but rather is one of their most severe consequences, it is extremely important to link these programmes with the different programmes for eradicating child labour.

References

- Basu, kaushik (1998) “ Child labour: Cause, Consequence, and cure, with Remarks on International labour standards”. Policy Research Working Paper 2027 Washington, D.C., The World Bank.
- Bhargava, P. H. (2003) *The Elimination of Child Labour: Whose Responsibility?* Sage Publications, New Delhi, India
- Blunch N. H. and D. Verner (2000). “Revisiting the Link between Poverty and Child Labour: The Ghanaian Experience” *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper* No. 2488 Washington, D.C. World Bank.
- Bonnet, M. (1993) “Child Labour in Africa” *International Labour Review* 132(3) 371 – 389.
- Dustmann, C., 2003. Children and return migration, *Journal of Population Economics* 16 (4), 815-830
- Federal Ministry of Education (FME) (2004) Primary School Statistical Indicators
- Grootaert, Christiaan (1998) “Child labour in Cote d’Ivoire: Incidence and Determinants” *Policy Research Working Paper* 1905. Washington, D.C., The World
- Grootaert, Christiaan and Kanbur, Ravi (1995) “Child labour: An Economic Perspective” *International labour Review* Vol 134
- ILO – IPEC (2000), Combating Trafficking in Children for Labour Exploitation in West and Central Africa, Report On Sub-Regional Workshop, Cotonou, Benin 18-20 July.
- Imam, Y. O. (1998; A Situation Analysis of Almajiris in North East zone of Nigeria. A report submitted to UNICEF, Nigeria.
- Nelson, H. S. (2000) Child Labour and Schooling in Zambia: *World Bank Working Paper*. Washington, D.C., The World Bank.
- Obikeze, D. S.(1986); Agricultural Child Labour in Nigeria; A Case Study of Anambra State in Child Labour in Africa. Proceeding of the First International Workshop on Child Abuse in Africa, Enugu –27th April-2nd May.
- Okpukpara, B.C. (2006) Determinants and Strategies for Rural Financial Savings Mobilization by Female-Headed Households in Anambra State, Nigeria *Journal of Rural Development* in Press
- Okpukpara, B.C. and N. Odurukwe (2003) Incidence and Determinants of Child Labour in Nigeria: Implication for Poverty Alleviation. *Journal of Economic Policy* Vol 10(2) 2003
- Oloko, S. B. A (1999) National Study on Child Labour in Nigeria, Report for International Labour Organisation, Lagos.
- Onuikwe, A. C (1998); Child Labour in Nigeria Transport Industry, Paper Presented at the Eight World Conference in Transport Research, Antwerp, Belgium 12th-17th July.

- Patrinos, H and G. Psacharopoulos (1997) "Family size, schooling and child labour in Peru: An Empirical Analysis." *Journal of Population Economics*
- Psacharopoulos, G. (1997) "Child labour versus Educational Attainment – Some Evidence from Latin America" *Journal of Population Economics* Vol 10 No 4
- Ray, Ranjan (1998) "Analysis of child labour in Peru and Pakistan: A comparative study" *Mimes* Australia, Hobert.
- Ray, R. (2000), "Child labor, child schooling and their interaction with adult labor: empirical evidence from Peru and Pakistan", *The World Bank Economic Review*, 14, n. 2 pp. 347-367
- Sasaki, Masaru and Tilahun Temesgen (1999), "Children in different activities: Child labour and schooling in Peru" Draft, World Bank, Washington, D C.
- UNESCO. 2004. *Education For All. The Quality Imperative*. France: UNESCO Publishing.
- UNICEF (2001); *Children's and Women's Rights in Nigeria: A Wake-up Call. Situation Assessment and Analysis 2001*.
- UNICEF (2004) *The State of the World's Children 2004*. The United Nations Children's Fund, UNICEF House, 3 UN Plaza, New York, NY 10017, USA.

Appendix 1: Definition of Variables Used for Econometric Model

ag8 = 1 if age of the child is 8 years old, 0 otherwise

ag9 = 1 if age of the child is 9 years old, 0 otherwise

ag10 = 1 if age of the child is 10 years old, 0 otherwise

ag11 = 1 if age of the child is 11 years old, 0 otherwise

ag12 = 1 if age of the child is 12 years old, 0 otherwise

ag13 = 1 if age of the child is 13 years old, 0 otherwise

ag14 = 1 if age of the child is 14 years old, 0 otherwise

ag15 = 1 if age of the child is 15 years old, 0 otherwise

ag16 = 1 if age of the child is 16 years old, 0 otherwise

ag17 = 1 if age of the child is 17 years old, 0 otherwise

Household Head Child = 1 if the child is household head child, 0 otherwise

Male head = 1 the gender of the household head is male, 0 otherwise

Household Head Age = Household head age in years

Living with the father = 1 if the child is living with the father only, 0 otherwise

Living with the mother = 1 if the child is living with the mother only, 0 otherwise

Living with other relations = 1 if the child is living with other people other than the father or the mother, 0 otherwise

No adult male = 1 if there is no male aged >25 years in the household

Father holds primary school Education = 1 if the most educated adult male holds primary school education, 0 otherwise

Father holds secondary school Education = 1 if the most educated adult male holds secondary school education, 0 otherwise

Father holds post-secondary school Education = 1 if the most educated adult male holds postsecondary school education, 0 otherwise

No adult female = 1 if there is no female aged >25 years in the household

Mother holds primary school Education = 1 if the most educated adult female holds primary school education, 0 otherwise

Mother hold secondary school Education = 1 if the most educated adult female holds secondary school education, 0 otherwise

Mother hold post-secondary school Education = 1 if the most educated adult male holds postsecondary school education, 0 otherwise

Number of Kids aged below 6 years = Households with number of kids aged below 5 years

Number of boys kids aged between 6 and 11 years = Households with number of male kids aged between 6 and 11 years

Number of girls kids aged between 6 and 11 years = Households with number of female kids aged between 6 and 11 years

Number of girls kids aged between 12 and 17 years = Households with number of female kids aged between 12 and 17 years

Number of boys kids aged between 12 and 17 years = Households with number of male kids aged between 12 and 17 years

Number of male aged between 18 and 59 years = Households with number of males aged between 18 and 59 years

Number of female aged between 18 and 59 years = Households with number of females aged between 18 and 59 years

Number of people aged above 59 years = Households with number of people aged above 59 years

Asset Index = number

North Central = 1 if a child is located in North Central region of Nigeria

North West = 1 if a child is located in North West region of Nigeria

South East = 1 if a child is located in South East region of Nigeria

South South = 1 if a child is located in South South region of Nigeria

Access to School = 1 if there is no school in a place where the child is living.

Rural = 1 if a child is located in rural Nigeria

Note: Living with both parents, no formal education for father or for mother, North East and South West are based variables used for the probit regression model.

Appendix 1: Marginal Effects of Determinants of Child Work and Child Schooling in Nigeria

Variables	Work	Schooling
Female	- 0.025 [-5.34]***	- 0.04 [- 8.64]***
ag8	0 [0.00]	0.006 [0.77]
ag9	0.037 [3.56]***	0.01 [1.17]
ag10	0.051 [5.41]***	0.013 [1.64]
ag11	0.097 [7.53]***	0.023 [2.24]**
ag12	0.083 [7.62]***	0.016 [1.80]*
ag13	0.109 [8.95]***	-0.004 [0.43]
ag14	0.114 [9.34]***	-0.019 [1.87]*
ag15	0.15 [12.46]***	-0.044 [4.49]***
ag16	0.169 [12.69]***	-0.068 [5.98]***
ag17	0.19 [13.20]***	-0.139 [10.74]***
Household Head Child	-0.007 [0.61]	0.07 [5.22]***
Male head	0.004 [0.31]	-0.048 [3.66]***
Household head age	0.000 [1.91]*	0.002 [7.46]***
Living with the father	-0.011 [1.02]	-0.011 [0.91]
Living with the mother	-0.003 [0.28]	-0.017 [1.44]
Living with other relations	0.015 [1.10]	-0.027 [1.97]**
No adult male	0.01 [0.67]	0.067 [5.11]***
Father holds primary school Education	-0.009 [1.60]	0.093 [18.00]***
Father holds secondary school Education	-0.014 [2.01]**	0.092 [14.63]***
Father holds post-secondary school Education	-0.028 [2.98]***	0.095 [11.15]***
No adult _female	-0.036	0.029

	[4.09]***	[3.31]***
Mother holds primary school Education	-0.013	0.063
	[2.35]**	[10.69]***
Mother holds secondary school Education	-0.033	0.071
	[4.46]***	[8.59]***
Mother holds post-secondary school Education	-0.029	0.035
	[2.33]***	[2.44]**
Number of Kids aged below 6 years	0.005	-0.005
	[2.99]***	[3.08]***
Number of boys kids aged between 6 and 11 years	-0.006	0.01
	[2.69]***	[3.67]***
Number of girls kids aged between 6 and 11 years	-0.004	0.007
	[1.57]	[2.86]***
Number of girls kids aged between 12 and 17 years	-0.001	0.009
	[0.41]	[3.04]***
Number of boys kids aged between 12 and 17 years	-0.001	0.008
	[0.43]	[2.82]***
Number of male aged between 18 and 59 years	-0.005	0.003
	[2.21]**	[1.36]
Number of female aged between 18 and 59 years	-0.002	-0.001
	[0.90]	[0.56]
Number of people aged above 59 years	-0.004	0.012
	[0.78]	[2.44]**
Asset Index	-0.011	0.024
	[3.55]***	[6.43]***
North Central	-0.027	0.033
	[5.38]***	[5.89]***
North West	0.087	-0.021
	[19.30]***	[3.88]***
South East	-0.129	0.103
	[25.22]***	[16.75]***
South South	-0.099	0.077
	[19.92]***	[12.79]***
Access to School	0.028	-0.083
	[4.38]***	[12.16]***
Rural	0.012	-0.005
	[2.03]***	[0.84]
Observations	26031	26031

Absolute value of Z statistics in brackets, * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%.