



CHILD LABOUR AND HOUSEHOLD POVERTY: DEMAND ISSUES

| **Nsikak-Abasi A. Etim**¹ | and | **Dumka N. Benson**² |

¹ Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension | University of Uyo | P. M. B. 1017 Uyo | Akwa Ibom State | Nigeria |

² Department of Agricultural Education | Federal College of Education (Technical) | Omoku Rivers State | Nigeria |

ABSTRACT

Background: The issue of child labour has become a subject of concern and debate among development stakeholders. Child labour is pervasive particularly in our rural communities. Children in poor households are usually subjected to hazardous work outside their assistance in domestic chores. The aim of this paper is to highlight some factors contributing to demand for child labour. The study identified technological progress, trade and comparative advantage, globalization, non-economic activities of children, urban migration, social norms, cultural and community factors as contributing to the demand for children in labour. Poverty is also found to be a driving force of children into labour. The demand factors for child labour were highlighted. Formulating policies and programs targeted at the poorest of the poor in rural communities and making education less costly to enable poor children access schools are sensible options. Policies aimed at birth control should be encouraged.

Keywords: *Child labour, Poor, Households, Demand.*

1. INTRODUCTION

International Labour Organisation (2013) defined child labour as work that deprives children of their childhood, their potential and their dignity, and that is harmful to physical and mental development [1]. Child labour is a pervasive problem throughout the world, especially in developing countries. Africa and Asia together account for over 90% of total child employment. Child labour is especially prevalent in rural areas where the capacity to enforce minimum age requirements for schooling and work is lacking. Children work for a variety of reasons, the most important being poverty and the induced pressure upon them to escape from this plight. Though children are not well paid, they still serve as major contributors to family income in developing countries. Schooling problems also contribute to child labour, whether it is the inaccessibility to schools or the lack of quality education which spur parents to engage their children in more profitable pursuits. Traditional factors such as rigid cultural and social roles in certain countries further limit educational attainment and increase child labour [2]. According to Osment (2014), for many years now, child labour has been one of the biggest obstacles to social development and as such, it is a challenge and a long term goal in many countries to abolish all forms of child labour, especially in developing countries [3]. Edet and Etim (2013) reported that child labour is one of the impediments to achieving millennium development goals (MDGs) by 2015 for all developing countries including Nigeria [4]. Recently the international labour organization [1] estimated that there are around 215 million children between ages 5- 14 who work worldwide. They are often mistreated and work for prolonged hours, in very bad conditions and this can affect their health physically, mentally and emotionally. According to ILO (2013), the largest number of child labourers are working in hazardous work and the total number of child workers is increasing, even though it is forbidden by law [1]. These children are vulnerable to diseases and they struggle with long-term physical and psychological pain. Though restrictions on child labour exist in most nations, many children do work and this vulnerable state leaves them prone to exploitation. They endure work conditions which include health hazards and potential abuse. Employers capitalize on the docility of the children recognizing that these labourers cannot legally form unions to charge their conditions. These children are deprived of the simple joys of childhood, relegated instead to a life of drudgery. However, there are problems with the obvious solutions of abolishing child labour. First, there is no international agreement defining child labour. Countries not only have different minimum age work restrictions but also have varying regulations based on the type of labour. This makes the limits of child labour very ambiguous. Most would agree that a six year old is too young to work, but whether the same can be said about a twelve year old is debatable. Until there is global agreement which can isolate cases of child labour, it will be very hard to abolish [2]. Studies by [5, 6] argue that not all the work that children do is harmful or brutal. Some work may provide successful learning opportunities, such as baby sitting or newspaper delivery jobs, but not if the work exposes them to psychological stress, like human trafficking, prostitution and pornographic activities. There is also the view that work can help a child in terms of socialization, in building self esteem and for training. The problem is, then not child labour itself but the conditions under which it operates [7]. The international organizations have made great efforts to eliminate child labour across the world. Many countries have adopted legislation to prohibit child labour, nonetheless child labour is widespread throughout the world. It is not an easy task for low income countries to achieve banning child labour. Several studies and international organizations considered that education is the key strategy in addressing child labour, and it can help children to stay away from However, not every family can afford to send their children to school or, even if they enrolled, afford to keep them attending the school is a problem most times. According to Kar and Guha-Khasnobis

(2003), the demand originates from the general equilibrium structure of the small-open economy [8]. They further stated the effect on demand for child labour being propagated primarily through factor price adjustments in the economy and subsequently through the impact of changing factor prices on the production of goods and services. Grootaert and Kanbur (1995), indicated that on the demand side, the two main determinants of child labour are the structure of the labour market and the prevailing production technology [9].

The demand side of the market for child labour has two distinct dimensions. We most commonly think of the demand for child workers arising as a consequence of specific features that children have. It has been argued that the small stature of a child's body or child's hands make them particularly effective at performing certain tasks [10]. However, technological advances can have effects on the demand for child labour. For example, during the 1970s, the availability of credit for Egyptian farmers lowered the cost of technology incentive inputs, the opportunity to mechanize in sectors such as fruits and vegetables reduced production of more labour - intensive production such as cotton. The demand for child labour, therefore declined with mechanization [10]. Mechanization has a particularly strong impact on the work of young children who are normally assigned such menial tasks as pumping water. Indeed, the demand for child labour can be understood, as part and parcel of the demand for unskilled relative to skilled labour. Skill-based technological change will lower the demand for unskilled labour including that provided by children. Concomitantly, the rise in the demand for skilled labour will raise the return to education, providing an additional channel through which technological parameters determine the fraction of time that a child spends working.

Growth, trade liberalization and FDI (Foreign direct investment) penetration increases the demand of child labour and their wages [11]. This increases the cost of opportunity cost for children to go to school. However, some of the most profoundly disturbing and depraved dimensions of child labour do, in fact, involve the special physical features of childhood. For instance, children are valued runners in drug trafficking because they are more difficult to detect by law enforcement officials and, once caught, the punishment is less severe than for an adult runner. Thus, child runners are less costly for drug dealers than adults. Furthermore, some employers believe, rightly or wrongly, that child workers are more compliant, honest and easily disciplined in the workplace. For example, it has been noted by some historians of the British industrial revolution that corporal punishment, while routinely used against child workers, was rarely used as a strategy for controlling adults [10]. Although children from poor households are enrolled in schools, they tend to carry out seasonal or part-time employment in addition to domestic responsibilities and chores [4]. This periodic absence of these children from school due to involvement in work is inimical to their progress. According to ILO (1997), children are most commonly found working on farms, households, and in the informal manufacturing sector, comprising small factories, workshops, foundries etc. Edet and Etim (2013) reported that this usually result in poor performance in school, class repetition, failure and finally drop out from school [4]. Although undertaking a few hours of work per week on a voluntary basis can be beneficial to children, such work is not detrimental to health or education and may indeed help the child to increase its social skills, benefit from informal schooling, learn rewarding trade and earn income. Children worldwide are engaged in different nature of work. However, where a line between 'work' and 'labour', is not clearly defined, there exist a gap. This study attempts to fill this lacuna by presenting some factors contributing to the demand for child labour.

2. FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO DEMAND FOR CHILD LABOUR

2.1 Technological Progress

The impact of technology on child labour has been analysed in diverse ways. Humphries (2003) offers a historical overview of the pattern of child labour in the early industrializers and offers a comparison with the present develop countries [12]. He noted that child labour was more prevalent in the 19th century industrializers than it is in developing countries today. Humphries suggests that this pattern may be a source of optimism signaling the spread of technologies that have little use for child labour and of values that endorse the preservation and protection of children.

He further found that the organization of the labour process generated both direct and indirect implications for the demand for child labour through its influence over technology, employment strategies and labour relations. It is noted that children's work was often the consequence of failed or incomplete mechanization. It was a necessary evil essential to the competitive success of that key industries of the industrial revolution. But with the development of the capitalist labour market, the demand for child labour faded as more advanced industrial technologies replaced the need for the unskilled labour of children [13]. It is assumed that technology has its own in built rationale and that it always acts in favour of adult and in opposition to child labour [12].

Dessy and Pallage (2001) showed that a technology-based co-ordination failure may explain the emergence of child labour [5]. Child labour may arise because of the lack of a co-ordination mechanism between parental decisions to invest in the human capital of their children and firm's decisions to invest in skill-biased technologies. This co-ordination failure and a vicious circle of beliefs may be the source of a poverty trap. This result is established on the basis of three facts; first, is an environment in which children's time has an economic value, educating children presents parents with an opportunity cost; second, the reward from children's education will arise in the long-term provided firms have invested in technology that requires high skill workers in the meantime; and third, investing in an economy with low human capital is a risky venture. Legislative intervention in such a case helps co-ordinate expectations towards a pareto-superior outcome

with investments both in human capital and in skill- biased technologies. Hazan and Berdugo (2002) explored the evolution of child labour, fertility and human capital in the process of development [14]. In the early stages of development, the economy is in a development trap where child labour is abundant, fertility is high and output per capita is low. Technological progress, however, gradually increases the wage differential between parental and child labour, thereby inducing parents to substitute child education for child labour and reduce fertility. The economy takes off to more sustained growth, steady state equilibrium where child labour is effectively abolished and fertility declines. Grootaert and Kanbur (1994) viewed technology of production as a major factor determining the demand for child labour [9]. Many of the cases where this factor plays an extreme role are those that incite reports in the press and by civic societies. Examples are the use of boys in mines, because the tunnels are too small for adults to crawl through; the use of boys as chimney sweeps; the use of girls to weed and pick cotton; the use of children to weave carpets because children have more nimble fingers and can tie smaller knots than adults. They further explained that technological change has also been credited in part with the elimination of child labour in Europe following the industrial revolution. For instance, in the textile industry, the mechanization of spinning and weaving wiped out the family mode of textile production and increased the specialization of work in the factories. This reduced the demand for child labour and increased the demand for skilled labour.

2.3 Trade and Comparative Advantage

Galli (2001) noted that for many developed countries seeking trade sanctions against developing country imports, the worry arises from the fact that exploitation of children in many developing countries can artificially depress the cost of labour, leading to unfair competitive advantage in world markets and to a wider downward pressure on unskilled workers wages and employment in rich countries [15]. Rodrik (1996) explores the relationship between labour standards (including child labour) on one side, and, comparative advantage and foreign investment on the other, and finds evidence validating the expectation of child labour reducing overall costs [16]. The above argument for an economic case of trade sanctions should be seen in light of the fact that just about 5% of the world's child labourers are estimated to work in formal economy export-related jobs [17]. Arat (2002) condemns trade-related bans and other consumer oriented measures intended to combat child labour, and advocates instead a strengthened role for labour unions and consideration for the views of children themselves in espousing their rights [18].

According to Ranjan (2001), trade sanctions against countries using child labour may fail to reduce its incidence, since most countries having a high incidence of child labour are exporters of unskilled labour intensive goods [19]. He discussed the impact of trade sanctions on the economy having a comparative advantage in the unskilled labour good. A trade sanction for this economy will lower the relative price of the unskilled labour intensive good and this will translate into a lower unskilled wage and a higher skilled wage. This would increase the returns to schooling and hence induce the altruistic parents to send their children to school. However, a decline in the unskilled wage would reduce the income of parents who are unskilled. Taking both these effects into account, trade sanctions may fail to reduce the incidence of child labour.

Another trade effect is that eliminating child labour may actually alter the terms of trade between producer and consumer countries in favour of the producer nations, since payments to the labour force will increase, and some of this increase will be transferred to the world market price. Levels of pay may rise for two reasons. First, a direct increase may result from the fact that adult labourers receive higher wages than children, even after adjustments are made for productivity. Second, and probably more important, are the indirect effects of an increase in the demand for adult labourers and of the reduction in the supply of labour due to the absence of child labourers in the work force [20].

Finally, trade reduces the profitability of education, research and development in the poor country as it places local entrepreneurs in competition with a rapidly expanding set of imported, differentiated products. It may drive the country to specialise in production rather than research and within production to shy away from high-tech products, favouring instead traditional, possibly plentiful supply of unskilled workers, thus slowing innovation and growth. Another important effect of trade is that eliminating child labour may actually alter the terms of trade between producing and consuming countries in favour of the producing countries, since payments to the labour force will increase and some of this increase will be transferred to the world market price. Grimsrud (2001) observes that in light of the above arguments, developing country governments should be more eager to legislate against child labour [20]. That such a desire only exists on a limited scale, or has been translated into practical policies to only a small degree, may be due to the fear that an individual nation that unilaterally abolished child labour might easily lose out if other countries failed to follow suit. Thus it is a collective action problem.

2.4 Globalization

Globalization implies socio-political and economic processes of change and interaction among various nations in the worlds. However, the nature of globalization has invariably meant the almost unidirectional flow of influences from the developed to the developing regions of the world. This has often been captured in the notion of unequal globalization. Be that as it may, globalization denoted the fact that the various nations of the world are coming together in a way that makes little of physical boundaries or barriers. In this sense, globalization is hinged on a deconstruction of spatial reality, which has been made possible by the tremendous array of new technologies [21].

Economic globalization implies the widening and intensification of international linkages and interactions in the areas of trade, finance, economic policies and investment across the globe [22]. Thus economic globalization especially in the case of the developing countries, has led to the orthodoxy of particular forms of economic organizations and policies, which are seen as superior to others and having the needed impetus to engender economic growth. It is important to point out that economic globalization was given a boost in Africa by the elusiveness of development in many countries in the region. But far from providing a reliable panacea for ailing African economies, these measures have further worsened the economies and created enormous hardship for the population. Hence, after more than two decades of tinkering with these largely externally driven economic initiatives, a country like Nigeria is still to crawl out of economic doldrums [21].

Globalization is another factor that creates a demand for child labour [3]. Globalization has positive and negative impacts; nevertheless, globalization might give developing countries opportunity to increase their gross domestic production (GDP) per capita via new trade possibilities and ascend their foreign direct investment (FDI) inflows. Globalization also has brought adverse impacts on child labour in developing countries in recent years, many international companies moved their production abroad. These companies often indulge in hiring children as cheap labours as they are enduring, and carry out commands given by their employers even if they are abused and exploited [23]. Mishra (2012) claims that in India, globalization has obliged more children to work in hazardous occupations like brick kiln, motor garage, hotels, shops, transportations, manual loading work etc [24].

Some studies suggest that higher income and higher standard of living can reduce the potential problem which resulted from the increasing child labour of globalization [3]. Other argues that globalization will increase the opportunity of exploring cheap labour especially from low income countries.

For example countries like Vietnam, Mexico and Thailand have provided evidence that child labour declines due to globalization, but countries like Bolivia and Zambia have showed a decline in schooling and an increase in child labour [24]. In most studies, evidence about increases in child labour participation rates with economic growth have been identified. Economic growth increase the demand for the child labour; especially during lack of government intervention, labour market becomes open to child labour. Globalization might be affecting the sources of the economic growth which create child labour demand. The effect of growth duration on the demand for the child labour that is started by the developing countries along with global dynamics are hidden in those countries comparative advantage. Globalization may not only create comparative advantages in unskilled labour intensive sectors, especially in the rural sector, for the developing countries but also lead to competitive erosion of labour standards at the end [25]. But as far as the long-term capital movements from developed countries to developing countries are concerned, the labour standard of developing countries plays an important role in comparative advantage. It is known that the developing countries with lax labour standards, low wages and abundant supply of unskilled labour, especially with child workers, are regarded as a heaven for foreign investors.

Edmonds (2002) suggests that when globalization improves the income of impoverished households, this additional income helps parents reduce the workload of their children and provide an opportunity to send more of them to school [26]. These are often called income effect and it is known that income effects of trade are most likely expected to reduce the need for child labour incidence [27].

The impact of globalization on child labour has been through the impact it has had on the economic status of families. In this sense, economic globalization has created the objective condition for the proliferation of child labour in Nigeria. Most studies have found that globalization further worsens class and national inequalities as well as mirrors the contradiction between labour and capital [21]. It is on this note that one sees globalization as having adverse implications for general inequality and poverty in developing world. Child labour is an index of poverty, neediness or general deprivations. In this sense, child labour may be expected to increase as the general deprivation of the population expands. Therefore, the era of globalization, which has wrought unsavoury socio-economic conditions on most families can be seen as increasing the incidence of child labour.

2.5 Non-economic Activities of Children and Gender issues

Non-economic activities of children constitute an important demand on the child's time. Grimsrud (2001) noted that majority of the world's child labourers are girls and most economically active children are boys [20]. This difference in number and gender composition is as a result of children's work in the household and activities defined as non-economic. Galli (2001) noted that unpaid family workers contribute to their household's income and survival by helping their parents in both paid and self-employment activities [15]. It is common for families to engage in sub-contracting where the family is paid at piece rates so that the help of children is crucial to increase household productivity and daily income. Children (especially girls) are often engaged in unpaid family activities in order to free their parents (especially mothers) from household and allow them to undertake paid work.

Largest number of children are in fact found working in agriculture and allied activities. Moreover, a large number of children are involved in the informal economy, which in itself is very expensive. Informal enterprises run by adults depend hugely on family labour, particularly the labour of children [2]. And, if children are not directly working on production-related work, they are engaged in supporting the care economy so that their mothers can be freed up for wage employment. It is being increasingly realized that a large number of children are out of school largely because they are involved in some kind of work within the household. In the light of this, the distinction between child labour and child work can be abolished and all children should be targeted for compulsory primary education.

2.6 Composition of Household Assets Portfolios

The composition of household asset portfolios is usually an important factor on the demand side of child labour. Cockburn (2000) shows that an explicit integration of the role of household asset profiles provides a fuller and more nuanced explanation of child labour and schooling decision [28]. It is also shown that both work and school conflict substantially but not entirely. These increase assets, is usually characterized by increased child labour and a dominant wage (income) effect. Bhalotia and Heady (2003) however, criticized the fact that poverty lead to child labour [29]. They showed and explained the fact that households that own (or operate) larger amounts of land tend to make their children work more. This is because larger land holding would typically mean greater wealth, and this seems to suggest that greater poverty does not lead to greater child labour. In this case, children of the poorest household will not appear in global child labour estimates because larger land holdings are generally owned by the rich [30].

2.7 The Structure of the Labour Market (Efficiency Wages)

The economic value of children and the implications for reproductive behaviour cannot be properly assessed without references to the structure of the labour market. The latter determines the level of wages, which in turn determines the contribution of children to household income. A key factor is the flexibility of wages. In competitive markets, where wages are flexible, children can substitute for adults in the market place. But where wages are at a floor, whether due to legislation, collective action or because they have reached an (adult) subsistence minimum, the employer will prefer adult works (assuming their productivity is higher than that of children). Effective minimum wages can thus in principle determine child labour, although in practice one must ask whether minimum wage legislation is more likely to be effectively enforced than legislation banning child labour.

An efficiency wage is a wage paid that exceeds the market wage. It stimulates worker productivity and can result in higher employer revenues that offset the higher wage cost. In Nigeria, example of an efficiency wage is the recent minimum wage now being paid to every government worker. Genicot (2001) argues that if some part of adult wages is used to purchase child nutrition and if efficiency wages are being paid, child labour may tend to increase [31]. This is because of parental altruism, as evidenced by higher incomes for parents and better nutrition for children; implies a leakage of the efficiency wage paid to adults, which can create an incentive for the employer to employ the adult along with his or her children. He concludes that his analysis consistent with the fact that entire families are often employed together on farms and in factories and workshops. Thus, increasing adult employment also leads to an increase in demand for child labour [8].

2.8 Urban Migration

Many rural families migrate to urban areas because of rural push and urban pull factors. As a consequence of that, they are often forced to live and work in the street as they lack access to basic requirements such as food, shelter etc and these children become street workers as vendors, and mostly street workers are vulnerable to violence and become more susceptible to illegal works, such as stealing, trafficking drugs and prostitution [32]. These children live in urban poverty, many child labourers live in unhealthy poor condition slum areas and work in poor environment such as domestic work, or work in hotels and restaurants etc [3]. Many cities in developing countries have experienced rapid urbanization. Etim and Edet (2013) reported that rapid urbanization is being accompanied by a phenomenon known as the urbanization of poverty [33]. This means that the population is increasing in cities due to immigration and natural growth. Urban poverty is a multidimensional phenomenon and in developing countries, urban poor faces many challenges in their daily lives, resulting to great hardship due to unemployment, housing shortages, violence and unhealthy environments and this forces many children into labouring to make ends meet [3].

Migration is associated by financial crisis, with many migrants expected to return to their country and/or area of origin. Such return migration might directly involve children and adolescents, as many migrants, especially internal ones, are likely to move with their families. Migrants returning from abroad or urban areas to rural areas are more likely to be involved in family based enterprises; especially in agriculture activities where child labour is often more prevalent [34].

There are, hence, good reasons to believe that the return migration to mostly rural areas of origin may create an increase in children's participation in economic by country and areas and is likely to be heavily influenced by the ability of the governments to support risk management interventions.

2.9 Social Norms, Cultural and Community Factors

Social norms, cultural and community factors play an important role in influencing not only the demand, but also the supply of child labour. They influence the institutional context in which child labour occurs, by making child labour either acceptable or non-acceptable. Leiten (2002) suggest that the cultural and poverty contexts of the existence of child labour are not necessarily distinct [35]. At a subjective level, the relationship between poverty and the breakdown of social systems finds particular mention in the context of the worst forms of child labour. For instance, a rapid assessment ILO conducted in Tanzania identified poverty, the laxity of families and of community members at large (in the sense of loose moral ethics, lack of hope, marital separation and domestic violence) as being responsible for driving children out of their homes and into the streets, leading to child exploitation by local and international private social entertainers and for

child prostitution as a means for survival. Invernizzi (2000) in an analysis of the daily life of child street workers, found that cultural elements and gender are important in explaining daily survival practices [3]. Siddiqi (1996) argued that non-schooling and work by children reflect not only parental income constraints but also, more importantly, the paucity of publicly provided educational opportunities [2]. Edet and Etim (2013) reported that the absence of formal education, lack of government presence costs of schooling and low levels of parental education are predisposing factors to child labour [4]. Thus child labour is the product of not just a parental utilization calculus but of deficiencies in public policy and social institutions. Norms, values and cultural practices to favouring boys over girls, especially regarding access to education, are changing and progress has been made in providing equal access to girls and boys to basic education. Still, some hurdles remain. Girls continue to have less access to education and training, especially at the secondary and tertiary levels. Often educating a girl is seen as a poor investment because the girl will marry and leave home, bringing the benefits of education to the husband's family rather than her own [37]. And thus the girls are sent to work due to these cultural and traditional reasons.

2.10 Economic Crisis

Economic decline and/or austerity programs result in squeezed livelihoods for poor families and reduced public investment in education and its quality thus reducing its attractiveness to children and increasing its cost. Economic decline also means stagnation or decline in average incomes. The impact is even more adverse when sectors that employ the poor are affected, in particular, agriculture and labour intensive industries [37]. Economic crisis such as reduction in living standards, limited credit flows/access to credit, migration, unfavourable policies can all lead to a high demand for child labour.

2.11 Informalization of the Economy

The analysis of labour markets in low and some middle-income countries indicates that informal activities are likely to increase as a result of economic turmoil. Informal employment can act as buffer when people are laid off in the formal sector and need to find job opportunities. Furthermore, an economy entering a phase of recession might experience a shift from the tradable to expansion of the informal sector [38]. For instance in Argentina, the level of informality tended to increase during economic downturns. This tends to lead to a dramatic increase in the number of people joining the ranks of those in vulnerable employment [39].

Child labour is also prevalent mainly in the informal sector of economies, where it is easier to find employment. In this sector, the technology level is often such that children can be easily utilized as unskilled labours. The threat posed by an expansion of the informal sector to children's welfare should therefore not be underestimated. According to Koselleck and Rosati, (2009) greater opportunity to find employment in the informal sector in times of economic hardship might push many children out of school and in the labour market [33].

2.12 Changes in Public Budgets and International Aid Flows

A macro-economic downturn leads to falling tax revenues and usually put pressure on governments to cut (or reduce the growth of) public spending.

During periods of fiscal contraction, social and/or education expenditure typically suffer the most. For example, education budgets were cut in most of the East Asian countries after the 1999 financial crisis; in the Philippines, in 1998, allocations for key educational inputs (like textbooks, desks, school buildings and teachers training) were also cut. Developing countries are heavily dependent on aid flows and sub-Saharan Africa is most at risk since aid averages around 9% of GDP, while South Asia has reduced its dependency on aid flows to only 1% [40]. The point here is that education as well as social expenditure is substantially supported by international development aid in poor countries. For example, in Nepal, external sources account for about 15% of the total public expenditure on education as such, donor countries confronting economic recession and rising fiscal strain are expected to face difficulties to maintain their foreign aid commitments.

According to Koselleck and Rosati (2009), this resulting strain put on recipient countries education and social expenditures may indirectly lead to a decrease in households incentives to send children to school and an increase in children's labour force participation [33].

3. STRATEGIES FOR ELIMINATING CHILD LABOUR

According to Grootaert and Patrinos (2002), the five elements for the elimination of child labour are as follow [41]:

1. Apply a gradual or nuanced policy approach to the elimination of child labour: No matter how strong the ethical objections of child labour, it cannot be instantly eradicated. A zero tolerance approach to child labour in the short term, such as legislative bans and international boycotts of products manufactured with child labour can actually harm working children, because such policies fail to address the root causes of child labour. Bachman (2000) cited the case of garment manufactures in Bangladesh who fired tens of thousands of children after the United States started banning imports of goods made by children [17]. Since no provision has been made for an alternative activity of source of income for these children, some were found later in worse jobs, including prostitution. Child labours exist because education system and labour markets do not function properly, because poor households cannot insure themselves adequately against income fluctuations, and because perverse incentives exists, that create a demand for child labour. Over the longer term, however, concern for the welfare of children demands nothing less than a zero-tolerance position toward any

form of child labour that interferes with the personal and social development of the child. The policy question then becomes how to identify the most efficient and feasible path toward the elimination of child labour. The evidence presented in most literature on child labour, calls for a gradual or nuanced, four step approach that begins with protecting working children and avoiding any measures that could harm working children: The recommended gradual approach is in line with the ILO's current favoured three step solution to child labour: Adopt policies and programs to raise family incomes and remove children from dangerous work, provide education for children and , monitor the work place to ensure that underage employees are not rehired [17, 41].

According to Grootaert and Patrinos (2002) the four step' approach that begins with protecting working children avoiding measures that could harm working children include first, the enforcement of legislation against child labour needs to be consistent and prioritized [41]. Legislation should initially be used to combat the most ethically intolerable forms of child labour, such as prostitution, bonded labour etc. Enforcement should be the responsibility of the police and armed forces, not of inspectors of ministries of labour and social affairs Second, measures are needed to protect working children. This includes the prohibition of hazardous work by children and limitation on hours in all jobs. Again for measures effectiveness, there is a need to strengthen enforcement capacity, which in this case should fall to ministries of labour and social affairs. The measure should not prohibit child labour but rather should protect working children (an acknowledgement that over the short-term, until conditions change, neither employers nor parents will be able to forego the benefits of child labour). Parents tend to pull their children out of the labour market only when alternative sources of income are available and creating these sources takes time and depends on many different factors, including the overall conditions of the national economy. Employers will be able to afford to replace low-cost child workers with adult workers only after making investments in new technology. The investment should be encouraged but the will not take place overnight.

Thirdly, it must be made easier for working children to combine work and school. Poor households need the income their children generate. Part of this income is often needed to meet schooling expenses. A combination of restrictions on hours worked and the creation of flexible school hours, so that children can attend school in the evenings and during nonpeak seasons, can create a transition situation between full-time work and no work that may be easier for parents to accept than the no-work alternative and Fourthly, measures are needed to alleviate the income constraints of households with working children through cash or in-kind transfer. Such measures will allow children who work and do not attend school to combine work and school and should eventually prepare the way for children to go to school and not work. Often it will be possible to target the transfer directly on working children. Providing free health care services in place in which children work is one way to improve the health of working children. Education subsidies are other ways to transfer resources to working children and their households. This is possible, but evidence suggests that this is likely to be outweighed by the income effect for the household, which will tend to reduce child labour. The essential question to consider in every case is whether the children will be better off. Providing free health and education services to working children will improve their lives in virtually all situations. Also, because girls are pulled out of school earlier and with greater frequency than boys, it is especially important to target health and education interventions of girls. Ultimately, the most efficient way to transfer resources to households with working children is to make alternative income sources available to households. This will eliminate the need for child labour over the long run. On the way to that outcome, measures are needed to protect the child, encourage the work-school combination, and focus enforcement of child labour bans on morally unacceptable forms of child labour. The work-school combination represents a flexible form of schooling that may be most attractive and beneficial to many working children developing world in the short-term.

2. Provide both home business support and enrolment incentives: The probability of working rises when there is a home enterprise. In many developing countries, households rely on home enterprises for the bulk of their income. Policy measures to support the development of such enterprises (such as the provision of credit, technical and marketing assistance) are frequently part of poverty alleviation programs. There is a danger that promoting households enterprises will increase parents demand for their children to work in these enterprises. Although in the long-run, the income effect will reduce the need for child labour. Any negative effects in the short-run can be counteracted by also providing school enrolment incentives to households and such incentives are clearly most critical at the primary education level, but they should not be limited to that level. It has been noted that child labour increases with age, especially at the secondary school age so children of poor households may therefore need subsidies for school fees, books, uniforms and meals at the primary and secondary levels.

School incentive programs have worked extremely well. A number of new initiatives have been put in place to address the needs of working children and families with children at risk of not attending school. One of the most influential in recent years is Mexico's progress program, which involves government cash payments to low-income families of children who regularly attend school. The benefit levels are intended to offset the opportunity cost of not sending children to school and vary by grade and gender of the child. Increasing schooling levels through cash transfers not only help reduce child labour, increase schooling levels and reduce poverty, they are also cost-effective.

There is an important gender dimension to child labour in household enterprises. Employment of the mother is a critical determinant of child work, especially for girls. When women work as entrepreneurs, their daughters are often recruited to work in the home enterprise. This is one factor behind the lower school enrolment rates for girls. Girls need to be an explicit target of school incentive programs that are provided jointly with measures to support household enterprises.

3. Target the children of parents with low education: Grootaert and Patrinos (2002), presented evidence from four countries indicating that low education levels of the parents increase the probability of child labour [41]. This is primarily an income effect, since low education leads to low earnings, but parents who themselves received little education may be less able to perceive the benefits of education for their children. Parental schooling can therefore be used in targeting interventions, especially subsidized education and health services. The gradual approach of first promoting the school-work combination is especially important for households in which parent's educational attainment is low.

4. Target locations where child labour is concentrated: since child labour is concentrated in specific disadvantaged regions, it makes sense to concentrate policy interventions in those areas. Because those areas also tend to suffer from supply constraints in education and health services, part of the policy package needs to be the build up of the education and health infrastructure. For instance, in Cote d'Ivoire, Savannah is the poorest and most disadvantaged area. Apart from cotton production, agriculture is subsistence oriented. And as such educational infrastructure in the area has been lacking for generations, and the adult literacy rate is well below the national average, as is the school enrolment rate. Therefore low incomes and lack of schools combine to make child labour prevalent there.

5. Poverty reduction programs should target characteristics of poverty that contribute to higher rates of child labour: Reducing poverty will contribute more to the elimination of child labour. Identifying the characteristics of poverty that contribute to child labour outcomes, underlines the importance of household's size, human capital and asset base. And these contribute to increase poverty level. The presence of many children in the household increases the probability that some children will work; low levels of human and physical capital in the household result in low level of income and little ability to protect against income fluctuations. Specifically, programs are needed to provide credit to poor households without collateral so that they no longer need to rely on their children working as insurance against failing income. These programs can play a key role in the reduction of child labour.

4. CONCLUSION

The engagement of children in hazardous jobs APART from those of rendering help within the immediate families is abnormal. Children are usually objects of extreme exploitation in terms of toiling for long hours for meager pay. This study outlined several factors contributing to the demand for children in labour to include globalization, technological progress, non-economic activities, urban migration among others. Programs aimed at reducing poverty should target the felt needs of the poor. Policy decisions that promote birth control should be formulated. The cost of education should also be reduced to enable children from the poorest of the poor households attend schools.

5. REFERENCES

- ILO (International Labour Organisation) 2007. International Labour Office and U.N.C Fund. Strategies for Eliminating Child Labour: prevention, removal and rehabilitation. In International Conference on Child Labour, 1997,Oslo
- Siddiqi, F. and Patrinos, HC. *Child Labour. Issues, causes and interventions* Human capital development and operations policy working papers (HCOWp56). 1996.
- Osment, L. *Child labour; the effect on child, causes and remedies to the revolving menace*. Department of Human Geography, University of Lund, Sweden, 2014.
- Edet, GE and Etim NA. Child Labour in Agricultural among poor rural households: some issues and facts European Journal of Physical and Agricultural Sciences 2013;1(1):1-7.
- Dessy, SE. and Pallage, S. (2001). *Child labour and co-ordination failures*. *Journal of Development Economic*, pp. 469-79, Elsevier.
- Collins, L. Fertility determinants in a high andes community: population and development review 1983. 9(1)61-75.
- Boyden, J. (1991). *Working children in Lima*, Peru. In W. E. Myers (Ed) protecting working children. London: Zed books Ltd. In association with Unicef.
- Kar, S. and Guha-Khasnabis. *Wage determination of child labour and effect of trade reform*, 2003. <http://www.cgdev.org/.../Guha-khasnabis%20...>
- Grootaert, C. and Kanbur, R. Child Labour: An Economic Perspective, International Labour Review, 1995, 134(2):187-203. World Bank Development Report on Labour.
- Brown, KD., Deardorff, AV. and Stern, RM. *The determinants of child labour: Theory and evidence*. Research seminar in international economics. Discussion paper No. 46. 2002.
- Edmonds, E. and Pavenik, N. *International trade and child labour, cross-country evidence*. *Journal of International Economic*, 2006; 65, (1); 15- 40.
- Humphries, J. (2003). *Cliometrics, child labour and the industrial revolution*. *Critical Review*, 13, (3-4): 269-83. Critical review foundation, Texas. <http://www.history.ox.ac.uk/.../Jhumphriespublications.html>.
- Nardinelli, C. *Child labour and the industrial revolution*. Indiana University press, Bloomington,1990.
- Hazan, M. and Berdugo, B. (2002). *Child labour fertility and economic growth*. *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 112, (482): 810-828.
- Galli, R. *The economic impacts of child labour*, decent work research programmed discussion paper -DP/128/2001, International Institute for Labour Studies (ILO, Geneva). 2001
- Rodrik, D. Labour Standards in International Trade. Washington, D. C.: Overseas Development Council, 1996.
- Bachman, SL. (*New economics of child labour*: searching for answers behind the headlines, *Journal of International Affairs* 2000, 53(2): 545 -572. Columbia University, New York.
- Arat, ZF. Analysing Child Labour as a Human Rights Issue: Its Causes, Aggravating Policies, and Alternative Proposals. *Human Rights Quarterly* 2002 24, 177-204.
- Ranjan, P. Credit constraints and the phenomenon of child labour, *Journal of Development Economics*, 2001; 64, 81-102, Elsevier.
- Grimrud, B. *What can be done about child labour?* An overview of recent research and its implications for designing programs to reduce child labour, social protection discussion paper series No. 0124 (World Bank, Washington DC), 2001.
- Anugwom, E. (2003). *Child labour in the context of globalization in Nigeria*. *The African Anthropologist*, 10(2) 107-115.
- World Bank. *Global Economic Prospects and Developing Countries*, Washington, D.C: World Bank,1996.
- Mapaure, C. *Child Labour: A Universal Problem from a Namibian Perspective*, 2009.
- Mishra, L. *History of labour rights. Social change*. 2012; 3 (42):335-357.
- Dagdemi, O. and Acaroglu, H. *The Effects of globalization on child labour in developing countries*. BEH, July, 2010. 37-47. vol. 2.
- Edmonds, E. *Will child labour decline with improvements in living standards?* Department of Economics; Dartmouth College, 2002.
- Kis-katos, K. *Does globalization reduce child labour?* *The Journal of International Trade and Economic Development*, 2007;16(1):71- 92.
- Cockburn, J. *Child labour versus education: poverty constraints or income opportunities?* 22 March. Centre for the study of African Economic, Oxford 2000.
- Bhalotra, S. and Heady C. *Child farm labour: the wealth paradox*. *The World Bank Economic Review* 2003;17(2) 197-227. Washington DC.
- ILO (International Labour Organisation) 2007. Explaining the Demand and Supply of Child Labour: A Review of the Underlying Theories. ILO/IPEC-SIMPOC, Geneva.
- Genicot, G. *Malnutrition and child labour*. Department of Economic, University of California, Irvine, 2001.
- Yadav, S. and Sengupta, G. *Environmental and occupational health problems of child labour: some Issues and challenges for future*; 2009.
- Etim, NA. and Edet GE. Comparison of Poverty among Peri-Urban Farming Households in Uyo, Nigeria. *American Journal of Advanced Agricultural Research*, 2013,1(1): 1-9.
- Koselleck, N. and Rosati, F. *Child labour and the global financia crisis: an issues paper*. Working paper September 2009. pp.1 1-16. http://www.ucw-project.org/Jfinancial_crisis_and_c15dec20110517-141701.
- Lieten, OK. *Child labour and poverty, the poverty of analysis*. *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*,2002. Vol. 45, No. 3, July-September 2002.
- Invernizzi, A. *Child Workers on the Streets of Lima: Strategies for Survival and Socialization*. Faculty of Economic and Social Sciences, University of Fribourg, Fribourg. 2000.
- Chaubey, J., Perisic, M., Perrault, M., Perrault, N., Laiyea-Adjei, G. and Khan, N. *Child labour, educational and policy options*. UNICEF working paper, 2007.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. *Informal Employment and the Economic Crisis*, 2009.
- ILO (International Labour Organization). *Global Employment Trends*, January 2009, Geneva ILO 2009.
- Glennie, G. *The trouble with aid: why less could mean more for Africa*, zed books, 2008.
- Grootaert, C. and Patrinos, HA. *A four-country comparative study of child labour*. Paper presented at the international seminar, "The Economics of child labour", OSLO, Norway, May 2002. pp.15-25.
- ILO (1999). *IPEC Action Against Child labour: Achievements, lessons learr2 and indications for the future*. Geneva: ILO.

Cite this article: Nsikak-Abasi A. Etim and Dumka N. Benson. CHILD LABOUR AND HOUSEHOLD POVERTY: DEMAND ISSUES. *The American Journal of Innovative Research and Applied Sciences*. 2015; 1(2): 67-74.

This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>