Acta Universitatis Danubius
ŒCONOMICA

# Perception of Arable Crop Farmers on Child Labour in Sagamu Local Government Area, Ogun State, Nigeria

**R. A. Mufutau[1], M.A. Oladoja[2], O.A. Adeokun[3], M. A. Osunmakinde[4], D.P. Nwaorgu [5]**

**Abstract:** The study focused on perception of child labour among arable crop farmers in Sagamu Local Government, Ogun State, Nigeria. Questionnaire was used to collect data from 132 arable crop farmers' socio-economic characteristics, reasons for engaging children in arable crop farming, consequences and perception. Data was analysed using descriptive statistical tools and inferential tools such as Chi-square and Pearson Product Moment Correlation at $p \leq 0.05$ level of significance. Results indicate that arable crop farmers were within age category of 38-47 years, married (88.6%), educated (94.7%) and were traders (72.0%) primarily. Very few (39.4%) had access to credit facilities but operated on an average land-space of 5 acres, majority (99.2%) earned ≤₦200,000 annually. There was unfavourable perception of child labour among majority (65.2%) of arable crop farmers. First among consequences of child labour was general child injuries (2.18). Significant relationship existed between perception of child labour and secondary occupation (9.716), labour used (9.997), contact with extension workers (11.448), transmission of farming skills and knowledge (-0.250), training children among others. In conclusion, arable crop farmers had unfavourable perception of child labour. The study therefore recommends more awareness, seminars, training and financial assistance to child guardians and parents to ameliorate severity of child labour consequences.

[1] Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Sociology, College of Agricultural Sciences, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Nigeria, Address: Yewa Campus, Ayetoro, Ogun State, Nigeria, Tel.:+2348039431998, Corresponding author: mufutau.adeniyi@oouagoiwoye.edu.ng.
[2] Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Sociology, College of Agricultural Sciences, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Nigeria, Address: Yewa Campus, Ayetoro, Ogun State, Nigeria, Tel.:+2348039431998.
[3] Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Sociology, College of Agricultural Sciences, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Nigeria, Address: Yewa Campus, Ayetoro, Ogun State, Nigeria, Tel.:+2348039431998.
[4] Department of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management, College of Agricultural Sciences, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Nigeria, Address: Yewa Campus, Ayetoro, Ogun State, Nigeria, Tel.:+2348039431998.
[5] Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Sociology, College of Agricultural Sciences, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Nigeria, Address: Yewa Campus, Ayetoro, Ogun State, Nigeria, Tel.:+2348039431998.

**Keywords:** children; education; credit facilities; socio-economic

**JEL Classification:** N50

## 1. Introduction

Arable crop farming has continued to play a major role in Nigeria's economy. It is the major source of food crop as well as the dominant agricultural field of practice, especially for the subsistence farmers in Nigeria. Most of the arable crop farmers usually reside in the rural areas of the country and sometimes, especially with the advent of improved technology, engage labourers to work on their farms. The sources of farm labour used on these farms include the farmers themselves, household members, hired labour and labour exchange. Arable crop farmers tend to use the cheapest form of available labour. Coupled with this, the unstable market price as well as high wages of hired farm labour compels arable crop farmers to reduce labour cost on the farm by employing children (Adeoye *et al.,* 2017). Indeed, statistics have shown that around 121 million children aged 5 to 14 (9.9%) are currently working around the world (Diallo *et al*., 2013). Whilst some have argued that the use of children in farms is part of their socio-economic development, others are of the view that child labour cannot be substituted for child work. It has also been noted that children constitute the largest proportion of household labour with about 14% contribution of labour (UNICEF, 2005). As noted by Adeoye (2017), the labour intensive nature of peasant agriculture in the case of little or no use of purchased external inputs, the dominance of small farm area (less than 3ha) holdings and the malleable nature of child labour are also fingered as the causes of child farm labour in rural Africa. Therefore, in an attempt to reduce production costs, this situation has resulted in households substituting child labour for paid or unpaid work by adults (Barneston, 2009).

In recent years, especially in the Sub-Saharan Africa (Nigeria inclusive), the problem of child labour in agricultural production has become a topical issue in the economics literature (Okafor and Bode, 2003; Oloko, 2004; Bassey *et al.,* 2012; Owusu & Addo 2008; Amao, 2013). As observed by Olivier (2018), the coercive legislative tools in place, as well as the incentives offered to eradicate or limit child labour, have not so far been able to reduce its prevalence. United Nations Children and Education Fund (UNICEF)'s conventions propose that child work and not child labour can be used in farming as it assists in the social development of children. Over 75% of Nigerians live in rural areas and 25% in urban areas. This implies that most working children are located in rural areas that have agriculture as the major occupation (Muhammed & Adeoye, 2006). UNICEF thus defines child work as "children's participation in economic activity that does not negatively affect their health and development or interfere with their education. The International Labour Organization also contends that, work that does not interfere with children's education (light work) is permitted

from the age of 12 years. In West Africa, children use machetes to clear fields, apply pesticides, harvest crops and even during various processing stages (UNICEF, 2005). There is also strong evidence to suggest that trafficking and bondage have been used to supply children to the workforce (Zdunek *et al.,* 2008; Bassey *et al.,* 2012; Adeoye *et al.*, 2017; Basu, 2017). Although UNICEF's convention allows the use of child work, it discourages the use of child labour of all forms (Adeoye *et al.,* 2017).

Although, poverty, limited access to education, inadequate agricultural technology, traditional attitudes toward children's participation in agriculture and poor access to adult labour are some of the major causes of child labour in agriculture. However, participation of children in agricultural labour is not always hazardous as some farming operations are nonhazardous. Such activities have positive consequences since it enhances inter-generational transfer of technical and social skill and children's food security (ILO, 2005). Much attention has been given to the need to study the level and nature of children's involvement in agricultural work to determine the types of activity that place them at risk (Adeoti *et al*. 2013). Previous child labour studies in agriculture by Nkamleu and Kielland (2006) and Adeoti *et al*. (2013) indicate that long hours of work, dangerous conditions in which children work, meager wages, and poor school attendance are correlates of child labour.

Child labour deprives children of the opportunity to attend school, manifesting either in total exit from school or interrupted participation in school academic activities, poor health condition and safety of these children and putting human capital accumulation in jeopardy. In view of these, the study assessed perception of arable crop farmers on child labour in Sagamu Local Government Area, Ogun State. Specifically, this study seeks to:

i. describe the socio-economic characteristics of farmers in the study area;

ii. identify the reasons for engaging children in arable crop farming activities in the study area:

iii. examine the perception of child labour among arable crop farmers in the study area and;

iv. instigate consequences of child labour in the study area.

## 2. Methodology

### Area of Study

Sagamu Local Government is one of the twenty (20) local government areas in Ogun state, South-West, Nigeria. Founded on 23rd September, 1991, it was carved out of the old Remo Local Government. With a land area of 68.03sq kms and a population

size of about 500,000 residents. The local government is peopled by all tribes in Nigeria. In fact, the Sabo area of Sagamu can be mistaken for any typical northern town in terms of language, culture and setting. Sagamu residents are mainly farmers, producing a vast array of both arable and permanent crops. This makes participation of children in farming activities among rural households a common practice.

**Sample Technique and Sample Size**

A two stage random sampling technique was used in selecting crop farmers in the study area. Stage one involved selection of 30% of the fifteen (15) political wards in Sagamu Local Government. This produced 5 wards in the Sagamu local government. In the second stage, 25% of 529 arable farmers were randomly selected and this produced 132 respondents which constituted sample size for the study.

## 3. Results and Discussion

Results in Table 1 reveals that majority (41.7%) of the respondents were between 38-47years of age. This is a strong indication that they were still in their active and productive age. The agility and vibrancy characterized by this age group is expected to influence arable crop farming activities for better farming and improved productivity. Results show that majority (60.0%) of the respondents were males. The implication of this result is that the male gender was more involved in farming activities than their female counterparts in the study area. This might be due to the fact that farming involves rigorous activities which are considered too strenuous for the female gender. Similarly, females have been reported to be more involved in the processing and marketing chain of arable other than production. Majority (88.6%) of respondents were married. This implies that marriage is held in high esteem in the study area, probably because farmers need helping hands from their wives and children. Majority of the respondents (94.7%) had formal education. This implies that most of the respondents were educated and this would improve their level of knowledge and adoption of improved agricultural practices towards better yield and awareness of the consequences of child labour. Table 1 shows the main sources of livelihood for farmers in the study area. It reveals that majority (72.0%) of the farmers were traders primarily. By implication, farming was not the only source of income among respondents who had chosen it as primary occupations. It was evident that farmers were involved in farming as an alternative source of livelihood. Result of the farmers' secondary occupation also revealed in Table 1 that they were secondarily farmers as majority (72.7%) were involved in farming. This further establishes the finding of this study as revealed by the primary occupation. Majority (58.3%) of arable crop farmers were members of cooperative societies. This implies that farmers in the study area related well with each other as they were able to form groups either to help themselves in their farming activities or for social reasons. The

study revealed that majority (60.6%) of the respondents did not have access to credit facilities. This could affect the level of their output, food security and hence leading to use of child to source for funds. The study revealed that majority of the farmers (77.3%) started off farming from their personal savings. Loan/gift from friends and family, money lenders, commercial bank, cooperative societies and from microfinance banks all accounted for 24.9% of the total respondents. More than half (51.5%) of the respondents employed family labour. The implication of this is that family labour is dominant among arable farmers in the study area. Eighty-eight farmers (66.7%) disclosed that they have never met with an extension agent. This may suggest that there were few extension agents in the study area. The study revealed that majority (76.5%) of the respondents belonged to the Yoruba ethnic group. The implication of this finding is that farmers in the study area were majorly Yorubas. This is because the study area is a Yoruba speaking location. Majority of the farmers were married. However, the study found that majority of the respondents had a household size 6 members as revealed by the mean score of the analysis. The implication of this is that farmers in the study area had enough household members to help out with farming activities. Majority (67.4%) of the respondents had 1–20 years of experience. This implies that respondents were young workers who engaged in farming as an alternative source of livelihood. Result shows that more than half (66.7%) had farming experience of 1 – 10 years in arable production. The mean years of experience stood at 11 years. This implies that the farmers command significant number of years of experience in the study area which could invariably lead to increase in arable farming outcomes and hence corresponding increase in value chain. This supports the findings of Muhammad and Adeoye (2006), who opined that more year of farming experience will lead to better mastery of season and farming system. Majority (87.8%) of the respondents had farm lands below 4 acres. The implication of this is that arable farming in the study area was still at low level of production. This is because the farmers were not primarily farmers but were involved in farming as a secondary occupation. Annual income from farmers' arable production is as presented in Table 2. Results revealed that majority (73.5%) earned between ₦50,001-₦100,000. Though farmers realized ₦85,091 on average from primary occupation, the study found that only 11.4 percent belonged to a lower earners' group. The implication of this finding is that farmers in the study area did not earn well. This is because they engaged in farming as a secondary occupation, operated on a low area of land and did not have frequent contact with extension agents who would suggest and teach improved farming methods.

**Reasons for Engaging Children in Arable Crop Farming Activities**

Results as presented in Table 3 revealed that economic and political reasons were the major reasons why farmers in the study area engaged children in farming. For economic reasons, 97.0% agreed that they engaged child labour due to high cost of labour, while majority accepted lack of political will to empower farmers and ignorance of policies of child labour among farmers as political reasons.

**Perception of the effect of child labour among arable crop farmers in the study area**

Table 4 shows that majority (57.6%) of the farmers strongly agreed that child labour increases yield because they can control children to work for long hours. Aside the economic factor of high cost of hired labour, farmers feels that they can always control their children to work for as long as it pleased them regardless of the child's physiological and physical state. At least, farmers perceived that children engaged in farming activities will not be malnourished. The implication of this is that farmers in the study area will not reckon with negative effect of child labour.

**Level of Perception of the Effect of Child Labour among Arable Crop Farmers in the Study Area**

The overall level of perception of child labour among the respondents as shown in Table 5 revealed that there was unfavourable perception (65.2%) towards child labour among the respondents in the study area. This implies that farmers in the study area did not have good perception about child labour but continued to engage child labour due to economic, social and political reasons and wrongful perceptions of child labour consequences.

**Consequences of Child Labour**

The mean score of the distribution of the consequences of child labour among the respondents in Table 6 revealed that competition with adult workers (60.6%), physical abuse such as corporal punishment (64.4%), and lack or low level of educational attainment (54.5%) were the three most common consequences of child labour in the study area. However, they regarded drug abuse and alcoholism, increased rate of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs), and emotional neglect such as deprivation of family love as the least consequences of child labour.

**Table 1. Socio-economic Characteristics of the Respondents (n = 132)**

| Socio-economic variables | Frequency | Percentage | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Age Group** | | | |
| 28-37 | 9 | 6.8% | 48 years |
| 38-47 | 55 | 41.7% | |
| 48-57 | 53 | 40.2% | |
| 58-67 | 14 | 10.6% | |
| Above 68 | 1 | 0.8% | |
| **Sex** | | | |
| Male | 80 | 60.6% | |
| Female | 52 | 39.4% | |
| **Marital Status** | | | |
| Single | 8 | 6.1% | |
| Married | 117 | 88.6% | |
| Divorces | 4 | 3.0% | |
| Widowed | 3 | 2.3% | |
| **Religion** | | | |
| Christainity | 80 | 60.6% | |
| Islamic | 26 | 19.7% | |
| Traditional | 26 | 19.7% | |
| **Educational Level** | | | |
| No Formal education | 7 | 5.3% | |
| Primary School | 12 | 9.1% | |
| Secondary School | 62 | 47.0% | |
| Tertiary | 51 | 38.6% | |
| **Primary/Major Occupation** | | | |
| Farming | 27 | 20.5% | |
| Trading | 95 | 72.0% | |
| Civil servant | 6 | 4.5% | |
| Artisan | 2 | 1.5% | |
| Others | 2 | 1.5% | |
| **Secondary Occupation** | | | |
| Farming | 96 | 72.7% | |
| Trading | 31 | 23.5% | |
| Civil servant | 4 | 3.0% | |
| Artisan | 1 | 0.8% | |
| **Society Membership** | | | |
| No | 55 | 41.7% | |
| Yes | 77 | 58.3% | |
| **Access to Credit** | | | |
| No | 80 | 60.6% | |
| Yes | 52 | 39.4% | |

*Source: Field Survey, 2021*

**Table 2. Socio-economic Characteristics of the Respondents Cont'd (n = 132)**

| Socio-economic variables | Frequency | Percentage | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Source of Initial Capital** | | | |
| Personal saving | 102 | 77.3% | |
| Loan/gift from friends and family | 9 | 6.8% | |
| Loan from money lender | 2 | 1.5% | |
| Loan from commercial bank | 14 | 10.6% | |
| Loan from cooperative societies | 1 | 0.8% | |
| Loan from microfinance bank | 4 | 3.0% | |
| **Source of Labour Used** | | | |
| Self | 13 | 9.8% | |
| Family labour | 68 | 51.5% | |
| Hired labour | 49 | 37.1% | |
| Joint labour | 2 | 1.5 | |
| **Contact with Extension Workers** | | | |
| Never | 88 | 66.7 | |
| Rarely | 34 | 25.8 | |
| Occasionally | 10 | 7.6 | |
| **Ethnicity** | | | |
| Yoruba | 101 | 76.5 | |
| Igbo | 28 | 21.2 | |
| Hausa | 3 | 2.3 | |
| **Household Size** | | | |
| ≤ 5 | 51 | 38.7 | |
| 5 – 10 | 81 | 61.3 | |
| **Years of Farming** | | | |
| 1-20 | 89 | 67.4% | 11 |
| 21-40 | 42 | 31.8% | |
| above 40 | 1 | 0.8% | |
| **Farm Size** | | | |
| Below 4 | 115 | 87.1% | 2 |
| 4-7 | 16 | 12.1% | |
| 8-11 | 1 | 0.8% | |
| 12-15 | 0 | 0.0% | |
| **Farm Annual Income** | | | |
| ≤₦50,000 and below | 15 | 11.4% | ₦86,371 |
| ₦ 50,001-₦ 100,000 | 97 | 73.5% | |
| ₦100,001-₦150,000 | 12 | 9.1% | |
| ₦150,001-₦200,000 | 7 | 5.3% | |
| > ₦200,000 | 1 | 0.8% | |
| *Total* | *130* | *100.0* | |

*Source: Field Survey, 2021*

**Table 3. Reasons for Engaging Children in Arable Crop Farming Activities (n=132)**

| Reasons | Rating of the Reasons | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Very Reasonable | Reasonable | Undecided | Unreasonable | Very Unreasonable | Mean |
| **Cultural Reasons** | | | | | | |
| Transmission of farming skills and knowledge | 99 (75.0%) | 32 (24.2%) | - | - | 1 (0.8%) | 4.73 |
| Training children to be independent | - | 89 (67.4%) | 3 (2.3%) | 2 (1.5%) | 38 (28.8%) | 4.23 |
| Exposure of children to intricacies of life | - | 64 (48.5%) | 5 (3.8%) | 1 (0.8%) | 62 (47.0%) | 4.42 |
| Transmission of norms and Values | 31 (23.5%) | 94 (71.2%) | 6 (4.5%) | 1 (0.8%) | - | 4.17 |
| **Economic Reasons** | | | | | | |
| High cost of labour | 28 (21.2%) | 100 (75.8%) | 2 (1.5%) | 2 (1.5%) | | 4.15 |
| High cost of living | 25 (18.9%) | 45 (34.1%) | 60 (45.5%) | 1 (0.8%) | 1 (0.8%) | 3.70 |
| Low income | 21 (15.9%) | 41 (31.1%) | 54 (40.9%) | 13 (9.8%) | 3 (2.3%0 | 3.48 |
| **Political Reasons** | | | | | | |
| Lack of political will to empower farmers | 25 (18.9%) | 100 (75.8%) | 6 (4.5%) | 1 (0.8%) | - | 4.13 |
| Ignorance of policies of child labour | 31 (23.5%) | 75 (56.8%) | 19 (14.4%) | 3 (2.3%) | 4 (3.0%) | 3.95 |

**Table 4. Perception of the effect of child labour among arable crop farmers in the study area**

| Perception Statements | Strongly Agree Freq(%) | Agree Freq(%) | Indecisive Freq (%) | Disagree Freq (%) | Strongly Disagree Freq (%) | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Child labour increases yield because farmers can control children to work for long hours | 76(57.6%) | 54 (40.9%) | 2 (1.5%) | - | - | 4.56 |
| Child labour costs less or no money resulting in high profitability | 35(26.5%) | 84 (63.6%) | 9 (6.8%) | 2 (1.5%) | 2 (1.5%) | 4.12 |
| Engaging children in farming hands them early-life farming experience | 35(26.5%) | 84 (63.6%) | 9 (6.8%) | 2 1.5%) | - | 3.98 |
| Children are more interested in agricultural related courses in school | 81(61.4%) | 36 (27.3%) | 6 (4.5%) | 7 5.6%) | 2 (1.5) | 4.42 |
| Children engaged in farming are able to handle farming on their own | 36(27.3%) | 77 (58.3%) | 10 (7.6%) | 3(2.3%) | 6 (4.5%) | 4.02 |
| Farmers are sure that children will uphold their farming legacy and hard work after them | 31(23.5%) | 75 (56.8%) | 16 (12.1%) | 6 (4.5%) | 4 (3.0%) | 3.93 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Children engaged in farming can defend or protect the family's farm land due to prior knowledge of boundary borders | 33(25.0%) | 74 (56.1%) | 15 (11.4%) | 7(5.3%) | 3 (2.3%) | 3.96 |
| When a child is engaged in farming, he/she will be willing to apply the knowledge from western education in farming, hence becoming a better farmer | 50 (37.9%) | 68 (51.5%) | 9 (6.8%) | 4 (3.0%) | 1 (0.8%) | 4.23 |
| If children are employed in farm labour, such children do not perform well in academics | 23 (17.4) | 24 (18.2) | 67 (50.8) | 16(12.1%) | 2 (1.5%) | 3.38 |
| Children can absent themselves from school at will and give teachers the impression that they were taken to the farm by their parents. | 22 (16.7) | 17 (12.9) | 48 (36.4) | 37 (28.0) | 8 (6.1) | 3.06 |
| Income realized by farmers could entice children and make them | 16 (12.1) | 26 (19.7) | 31 (23.5) | 53 (40.2) | 6 (4.5) | 2.95 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| lose interest in schooling | | | | | | |
| Children may feel a sense of independence once they can successfully raise farm crops. Hence, disobey parents and teachers | 19 (14.4) | 20 (15.2) | 22 (16.7) | 61 (46.2) | 10 (7.6) | 2.83 |
| Premature ageing | 8 (6.1) | 29 (22.0) | 22 (16.7) | 68 (51.5) | 5 (3.8) | 2.75 |
| Children may become drug dependence because of the nature of farming | 21 (15.9) | 11 (8.3) | 21 (15.9) | 57 (43.2) | 22 (16.7) | 2.64 |
| Child labour compels children to grow into illiterate adults affecting both academic and social life | 24 (18.2) | 14 (10.6) | 37 (28.0) | 33 (25.0) | 24 (18.2) | 2.86 |
| Children engaged in farming activities may be malnourished | 16 (12.1) | 16 (12.1) | 26 (19.7) | 25 (18.9) | 49 (37.1) | 2.43 |

*Source: Field Survey, 2021*

**Table 5. Level of Perception of the Effect of Child Labour among Arable Crop Farmers in the Study Area (n=132)**

| Perception Level | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Unfavourable Perception | 86 | 65.2 |
| Favourable Perception | 46 | 34.8 |
| ***Total*** | ***132*** | ***100.0*** |

*Source: Field Survey, 2021*

**Table 6. Distribution of Farmers by the Consequences of Child Labour**

| Consequences of Child Labour | | Frequency | Percentage | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **General child injuries** | not at all | 10 | 7.6 | 2.18 |
| | to some extent | 88 | 66.7 | |
| | to a great extent | 34 | 25.8 | |
| **Sexual exploitation** | not at all | 73 | 55.3 | 1.55 |
| | to some extent | 45 | 34.1 | |
| | to great extent | 14 | 10.6 | |
| **Physical abuse such as corporal punishment** | not at all | 36 | 27.3 | 1.81 |
| | to some extent | 85 | 64.4 | |
| | to a great extent | 11 | 8.3 | |
| **Emotional neglect such as deprivation of family love** | not at all | 76 | 57.6 | 1.52 |
| | to some extent | 44 | 33.3 | |
| | to great extent | 12 | 9.1 | |
| **lack or low level of educational attainment** | not at all | 46 | 34.8 | 1.76 |
| | to some extent | 72 | 54.5 | |
| | to a great extent | 14 | 10.6 | |
| **Hopelessness** | not at all | 76 | 57.6 | 1.62 |
| | to some extent | 30 | 22.7 | |
| | to a great extent | 26 | 19.7 | |
| **Competition with adult worker** | not at all | 36 | 27.3 | 1.85 |
| | to some extent | 80 | 60.6 | |
| | to a great extent | 16 | 12.1 | |
| **Increased rate of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs)** | not at all | 99 | 75.0 | 1.38 |
| | to some extent | 16 | 12.1 | |
| | to great extent | 17 | 12.9 | |
| **Unwanted pregnancy** | not at all | 59 | 44.7 | 1.68 |
| | to some extent | 56 | 42.4 | |
| | to a great extent | 17 | 12.9 | |
| **Prostitution** | not at all | 89 | 67.4 | 1.44 |
| | to some extent | 28 | 21.2 | |
| | to a great extent | 15 | 11.4 | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Rape** | not at all | 91 | 68.9 | 1.36 |
| | to some extent | 34 | 25.8 | |
| | to a great extent | 7 | 5.3 | |
| **Drug abuse and alcoholism** | not at all | 45 | 34.1 | 1.74 |
| | to some extent | 76 | 57.6 | |
| | to a great extent | 11 | 8.3 | |
| **Humiliation** | not at all | 61 | 46.2 | 1.61 |
| | to some extent | 61 | 46.2 | |
| | to a great extent | 10 | 7.6 | |

*Source: Field Survey, 2021*

## Hypotheses Testing

**$H0_1$: There is no significant relationship between perception of child labour among arable crop farmers and socio-economic characteristics.**

As presented in Table 7, secondary/other occupation, labour used and contact with extension workers were statistically related with perception of child labour among arable crop farmers ($p \leq 0.05$). This finding implies that having other occupation, the type of labour used and contacting an extension worker influences farmers' degree of favourableness about consequences of child labour.

**$H0_2$: There is no significant difference between perception of child labour and reasons for engaging child in arable crop farming.**

Table 8 reveals that transmission of farming skills and knowledge" was statistically significant at 5% level of significance but negatively signed. This implies that the farmers in the study area perceived child labour as transmitting farming skills and knowledge but this factor was 95% less of their reasons for engaging in child labour. Also, "training children to be independent" was significant at 10% and positively signed. The implication of this is that farmers were of the view that using children for farming activities will make them independent and self-reliant.

In addition, high cost of labour, high cost of living, low income, lack of political will to empower farmers, and ignorance of policies of child labour were all statistically significant at 5% level of significance and positively signed. The implication of this is that these reasons are the major reasons why farmers employ child labour in the study area.

**Table 7. Chi-square Analyses of Relationship between Perception of Child Labour among Arable Crop Farmers and Their Socio-economic Characteristics**

| | $\chi^2$ Value | DF | p-value | Remark | Decision |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Farmer's Sex | .629 | 1 | .428 | NS | Accept$H_0$ |
| Marital Status | 4.972 | 3 | .174[a] | NS | Accept $H_0$ |
| Highest Level of Education | 2.086 | 3 | .555[a] | NS | Accept $H_0$ |
| Religion | 1.357 | 2 | .507 | NS | Accept $H_0$ |
| Primary/Major Occupation | 4.843 | 4 | .304[a,b] | NS | Accept $H_0$ |
| Secondary/Other Occupation | 9.716 | 3 | .021[a,b,*] | S | Reject $H_0$ |
| Are you a member of cooperative society? | 1.102 | 1 | .294 | NS | Accept $H_0$ |
| Do you have access to credit facility? | 3.327 | 1 | .068 | NS | Accept $H_0$ |
| What was your source of initial capital? | 4.594 | 5 | .467[a,b] | NS | Accept $H_0$ |
| Labour used | 9.997 | 3 | .019[a,b,*] | S | Reject $H_0$ |
| Contact with extension workers | 11.448 | 2 | .003[*] | S | Reject $H_0$ |
| Ethnicity | 2.574 | 2 | .276[a] | NS | Accept $H_0$ |

**, * denote 5% and 10% level of significance

*Source: Field Survey, 2021*

**Table 8. Pearson Product Moment Correlation of Relationship between Perception of Child Labour and Reasons for Engaging Child in Arable Crop Farming**

| | Correlation coefficient | P-value |
|---|---|---|
| Transmission of farming skills and knowledge | -.250** | .004 |
| Training children to be independent | .204* | .019 |
| Exposure of children to intricacies of life | .127 | .146 |
| Transmission of norms and value | -.030 | .729 |
| High cost of labour | .409** | .000 |
| High cost of living | .531** | .000 |
| Low income | .363** | .000 |
| Lack of political will to empower farmers | .258** | .003 |
| Ignorance of policies of child labour | .408** | .000 |

***, * respectively denote 5% and 10% level of significance*
*Source: Field Survey, 2021*

## 4. Conclusion

The study concludes that the practice of child labour was high among the farmers in Sagamu Local Government Area. Perception of arable crop farmers on child labour depend on other occupation, the type of labour used, extension service, high cost of labour, high cost of living, low income, lack of political will to empower farmers, and ignorance of government policies regarding child labour.

## 5. Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the researcher recommends that;

i. Farmers should be empowered, encouraged to diversify into secondary income sources so that all necessary farm equipments could be procured. This will lessen arable crop farmers' over-dependence on household labour for arable crop production and reduces excessive use of child as source of farm labour.

ii. Government agencies should grant loans at affordable collaterals and minimal interest rates to farmer to enable them practice farming as a major occupation and on a larger scale.

iii. Extension agents should be deployed so as to orientate arable crop farmers on the consequences of child labour.

## Reference

Adeoti, A. I.; Coster A. S. & Gbolagun. A. O. (2013). Child Farm Labour in Rural Households of South-West, Nigeria. *International Journal of African and Asian Studies*, 1, pp. 47–56.

Adeoye, S. O.; Agbonlahor, M. U.; Ashaolu, O. F. & Ugalahi, U. B. (2017). Analysis of child labour dimensions and causes in rural farm households of ogun state, nigeria. *Afr. J. Food Agric. Nutr. Dev.;* 17(3), pp. 12198 – 12214.

Amao, J. O. (2013). Determinants of Child Labour among Households in Egbedore Local Government Area of Osun State, Nigeria. *World Applied Sciences Journal,* 25, pp. 607-614.

Barneston, B. (2009). Children Working alone in Alberta: How Child Labour and Working alone Regulations Interact. *Just Labour: A Canadian Journal of Work and Society*, 17, pp. 34-48.

Bassey E.N.; Baghedo M. & Otu C.A. (2012). Child Labour in Nigeria and its Economic Implications: A case Study of Calabar Municipality. *Journal of Research on Humanities and Social Sciences, 2*: pp. 19-159.

Basu K. (2017). Child Labour: Causes, Consequences and Cure with Remarks on International Labour Standards. *Journal of Economic Literature, 37*, pp. 1083-1119.

Diallo, Y.; Étienne, A. & Mehran, F. (2013). *Tendances mondiales du travail des enfants de 2008 à 2012*, Genève, BIT.

International Labour Organization and Cornell University ILR School.2005. Childn Labour in Latin America. Ithaca, New York*: Cornell University.*

Muhammed, A.Y & Adeoye, M. N. (2006). Socio-Economic Implications of Child Labour in Agricultural Development of Oro Community in Kwara State, as Expressed by Parents. *Paper Presented at 15th Annual Congress of the Nigeria Rural Sociological Association (NRSA)*.

Nkamleu, G. B. & Kielland, A. (2006). Modelling Farmers' Decisions on Child Labour and Schooling in the Cocoa Sector:A Multinomial LogitAnalysisin Cote d'Ivoire. *Agricultural Economi*, 35, pp. 319–333.

Okafor, E.E. & Bode–Okunade A.S. (2003). Institutional Collapse and Child Labour: The Pervasive Problem of Street Hawking in Nigeria. In: Jike VT (Ed). The Scourge of Child Labour in Nigeria. *A book of Reading Lagos: NIS Publication*, pp. 90-102.

Olivier E. M. (2018). Determinants of child labour in Cameroon: The role of area of residence and gender In *Revue d'économie du développement*, 26:1, pp. 5-52. Translated by Cadenza Academic Translations.

Oloko SBA (2004): Child Labour in Nigeria: Continuities and Transformation. Inaugural Lecture Delivered at the University of Lagos, Lagos: *University of Lagos Press.*

Owusu Victor & Addo Gema Kwarteye (2008). An Empirical Analysis on the Determinants of Child Labour in Cocoa Production in Ghana. *Paper presentation at PEGNet Conference 2008 Assessing Development Impact – Learning from Experience Accra (Ghana)*, pp. 11 – 12.

UNICEF Report (2005). *United Nation's Children and Education Fund report*, United Nations.

Zdunek G.; Dinkelaker D.; Kalla B.; Mathias G.; Szrama R. & Wenz K (2008). Child Labour and Children's Economic Activities in Agriculture in Ghana. *SLE Publication, Series S233*.