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ABSTRACT

The study had two major objectives; to find out if children's work activities at home had any effect on their performance in school and to establish if the child's socio-economic background and personal characteristics contributed to the children's involvement in child labour. The study hypothesized that children's work activities at home affect their performance in school, that the child's socio-economic background contributes to the child's engagement in child labour and that the child's personal attributes determine his/her involvement in child labour.

It was found that the child's socio-economic background was a major contributing factor to the child's engagement in child labour. The higher the socio-economic status of the child, the fewer hours he/she was engaged in child labour. Children whose parents had secondary education and above were found to work for fewer hours than those whose parents had primary or no formal education at all. Similarly, children whose parents were employed registered fewer hours of work compared to children whose parents had no other source of income apart from tilling the land. Likewise, children whose parents were single worked for more hours than those children who had both parents. Therefore the study's first hypothesis that the child's socio-economic background contributes to the child's engagement in child labour was accepted.

Another important study finding was that the child's personal attributes were less significant in determining their involvement in child labour. Boys and girls were found to perform household duties regardless of their gender. Boys cooked,
cleaned utensils and fetched water; activities that were initially considered to be girls work. Boys were also found to be satisfied in performing such activities.

Similarly, girls were also involved in boy-activities such as milking and taking care of livestock. The study concluded that sex typing not very important in the most of the modern day rural families. In contrast, birth order significantly determined the child's engagement in child labour. First born children were found to work for longer hours than those who were born latter in the family. It was established that parents entrusted a lot of responsibilities to first born children compared to their younger children. Therefore the study's second hypothesis was modified to state that the child's personal attributes may or may not influence the child's engagement in child labour.

A major finding of the study was that child labour impacted negatively on school performance. Children who worked for many hours at home performed poorly in examinations. They were also left with very few hours to study and rarely completed their school homework. These findings verified the study's third hypothesis that children's work activities at home affect their performance in school.

Performance in primary day schools was generally found to be below average. Majority of the children interviewed, 75% (113) had not attained half the total examination marks and only 16% (37) had attained half the total examination
marks. The study found out that child labour was not the only factor contributing to poor performance in primary day schools. Other factors included; lack of text books, parental ignorance on the value of formal education, peer influence, drug abuse among the pupils, lack of teacher commitment, early marriages, and female circumcision, lack of food especially during the dry spells and an overstretched curriculum.

The study recommended sensitization of parents on the value of education vis-a-vis children’s work activities at home. It also recommended that the government put in place mechanisms that will help farmers to be paid well for their produce therefore enabling them to afford wage labour and thus involving their children less in work activities. Finally the study recommend P.N’s further research on issues surrounding children’s work activities and its impact on vital institutions such as education.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Child Labour is a global phenomenon for there is no region in the world, which is completely free of the problem (Fallen and Tzannatos, 1998). However, the incidences of child labour vary with continents. According to statistics, Asia hosts the highest number of working children (61%), Africa 31%, and Latin America 7%. (NJeru and Njoka, 2001 and Grooetart and Kanbur, 1996b). It is also noted that there are relatively very few children working in developed countries, thus rendering child labour a problem for developing countries.

Although Asia has the highest number of children workers, Africa hosts the highest proportion whereby on average one in three children is engaged in some kind of economic activity (Grooetart and Kanbur, 1995). Most of these children work in the agricultural related sectors, streets, mines, households and industrial undertakings (Merkert, 1997).

Overall, the number of working children aged between 5 and 14 years is estimated to be 250 millions worldwide (Grooetart and Kanbur, 1996b). Of these about 120 millions are working full time and 50 – 60 millions work in hazardous circumstances (Muganda, 1999; Grooetart and Kanbur 1996b).

In Kenya it is estimated that about 3.5 million children aged between 6 and 14 years are involved in child labour (Owuor-Oyugi, 1999). The problem seems to be more pronounced in the rural areas where agriculture is the main economic activity. For example, Kagunye (1993) notes that in Central Province of Kenya, it is estimated that about 60% of the workforce in coffee plantations are children. In Eastern
Province where Miraa growing is rampant, children are usually involved in Miraa harvesting and transportation and the payment are done to their parents (Goldsmith, 1995). This is not to say that the urban areas are free of the problem. Child labour has also been observed in Kenyan cities. For example, Zani (1993) notes that children are involved in hawking business on the streets of Mombasa town whereas Machera (2000) observes that most house helps in the middle income estates of Nairobi city are under the age of 16 years.

Studies done on child labour worldwide reveal that millions of children toil for long hours and in very difficult circumstances (Dyorough, 1986). The situation, conditions and the types of work they do seem differ to within countries. For example, in countries such as India and Nigeria children work and go to school simultaneously (Dyorough, 1986). In Jakarta, Indonesia it is noted that a 1/3 of the working children are domestic workers whereas in Haiti, children as young as 8 years old go out to take up employment (Musungu, 1997). In Thailand about 400,000 children were reported to have dropped out of school in order to work in 1998 (Gill, 1999). In particular, India has been cited as a nation plagued by the problem of child labour with 60 to 115 million working children (World Bank Report, 1998). Thus, the problem of child labour is overwhelming not only in Africa but also in other developing countries and it takes many forms.

In their study, Njeru and Njoka (2001) observe that children were engaged in both household and wage labour. The two scholars note that wage labour is done for social and economic exchange relations whereas household labour has been part and parcel of the socialization for children in most African countries.

The causes of child labour seem to be very different. Some scholars have cited the main cause of child labour as being Poverty (Badiwala, 1998, Kayongo-Male and Walji, 1984). Others assert that working children provide for their poor families a source of livelihood. Child labour has also been associated with changing lifestyles in
a capitalistic economy (Nyaoga, 1984). Other causes of child labour include broken families, parental ignorance on the dangers of child labour, rigid traditions and the high cost of formal education (Kagunye, 1999; and Fallen and Tzannatos, 1998; Onyango, 1989; and Kayongo-Male and Walji, 1984).

The increased incidences of child labour phenomenon can also be attributed to an unequally increasing demand for child workers (Ouko, 1998). Children are often offered jobs and can easily be exploited by well-to-do adults. This is because the families of these children have so many unmet basic needs and therefore cannot hesitate to send their children to prospective employers (Muturi, 1994).

Child labour seems to be justified by the people who practice it. For example, Nyaoga (1984) in his study found out that employers prefer child workers because of their efficiency, fastness on the job and obedience unlike adults who can be rude and slow. At the same time the problem of child labour is a controversial issue among many nations and especially those in Africa, Kenya included (Kagunye, 1999). This is because child labour as a social phenomenon hinges between two crucial perspectives. At one end, child labour is beneficial as it serves a socialization function. For example, Kayongo-Male and Walji (1984) in their study of children at work in Kenya found out that those children who worked in their childhood became responsible citizens in their adult life. On the other end, child labour is destructive and exploitative as it directly interferes with the development of the child (Grooetart and Kanbur, 1998 and ILO, 1996b). This is the case especially where child labour is not effectively regulated.

Child labour brings about developmental problems to growing children. Children who engage in child labour often suffer from mental and physical retardation. Zani (1993) cites that mental repercussions come about because the ages at which children go out to work coincide with a period of profound change in their mental faculties. According to Muturi (1989), child labour may endanger the child’s physical
health especially when there is poor dieting causing retardation. Consequently children who work in agricultural related activities are likely to be affected by climatic exposure, toxic chemicals and can be hurt from sharpened tools as their young skin is very delicate (Grooetart and Kanbour, 1996b). In addition, children are likely to suffer from extreme fatigue as a result of heavy work. Child domestic workers are likely to be affected psychologically when they work away from home. They are likely to be subjected to physical and sexual abuse by their employers (Onyango, 1989). Children working in factories are engaged in heavy-duty work equivalent to those done by adults and this may retard their physical development.

Inspite of the negative consequences of child labour, it is noted that employers view children as cooperative, efficient and fast workers. Hence, children are more likely to be exploited as cheap labour. It is therefore assumed in this study that if not well monitored, can bring about various repercussions on children.

1.2 Problem Statement

Child labour hinders the physical, mental and psychological development of the child (Owour-Oyugi, 1999, Groertart and Kanbur, 1996Zani, 1993, and Kayongo-Male and Walji, 1984). Children engaged in child labour are known to exhibit stunted growth, dull faces, fragile skins and general fatigue (Grooetart and Kanbur, 1995). Scholars have also argued that child workers are denied the joy of childhood by being sent to work instead of e.g playing (Kagunye, 1999; Muturi, 1994 Zani, 1993; Nyaoga, 1984 and Mendel eivich, 1979).

On the other hand, formal education is viewed as a key factor not only to National development but also to individual socio-economic mobility (Gakuru, 1992; Kinyanjui 1990 and Nkinyangi 1980). Education in itself has been cited as a deterrent to child labour (Merkert, 1997 and Izoura and Bequelle, 1988). However very little has been investigated about the impact of child labour on education.
Therefore this study seeks to find out the impact of child labour on school performance. It also seeks to identify the factors contribute to child labour. The study is guided by the following research questions

1. What factors contribute to child labour?

2. What is the impact of child labour on education?

3. What policy measures can be taken to curb the ever-increasing problem of child labour?

1.3 Goals and Objectives

The broad objectives for the study were to investigate the factors that contribute to child labour as well as to find out the impact of child labour on the education.

The specific objectives of the study were:

1. To identify the socio-economic /demographic factors that contribute to child labour.

2. To find out the impact of child labour on school performance.

3. To recommend some policy measures that can help curb the ever increasing problem of child labour
1.4 Rationale for the Study

Education as a basic right plays a key role in the development of any country. Despite this crucial role played by education, enrolment rates especially in primary and secondary schools have been declining (Gill, 1999). It is noted that for every 100 boys enrolled in standard one, only 43 complete standard eight and even fewer (Less than half) join secondary schools. This ratio is even less for girls whereby only 36 out of 100 complete primary education (Gill, 1999).

Elsewhere, it is noted that only 23% of teenage children aged 14 and 17 years were in school in 1998 (Owuor-Oyugi, 1999). Therefore there is likelihood that child labour is a contributing factor to the observed trend. In addition, informal observation shows that boarding primary schools in the study area perform better than their day counterparts in national examinations. Children who attend day schools are called upon to help in household chores when they are not in school and child labour could explain this disparity.

Lastly, both National and International child labour laws often exempt family labour and generally enforce wage labour (Children's Act, 2001). This has resulted into very few children working in the formal sector whereas it has been noted that the family set up can be a fertile ground for child labour (Kayongo-Male and Walji, 1984).

1.5 Scope and limitations of the study

The study confined itself to Primary School going children in Kyeni division of Embu district, Kenya. Embu district was selected because of the following two reasons. Firstly, Kyeni is a rich agricultural area and hence has potentiality for child labour just like Kiambu and Murang’a (Muturi, 1994 and Kagunye, 1999) and secondly; very few studies have been done in the area concerning child labour and school performance.
The study was also confined to school going children in primary day schools. It was argued that children in boarding schools were unlikely to experience domestic child labour in the same scale as non-boarding pupils.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1.1 A Historical overview of the Child Labour Phenomenon

Most of the literature reviewed indicates that child labour is a product of social change and development. In the Western countries child labour was as a result of labour shortage in the factories upon an increased demand of manufactured goods (Clayton and Savage, 1974). The wind of industrialization in the 19th century in the west led to shift from the agrarian agriculture to manufacturing. In Africa, the child labour phenomenon was a consequence of the cash economy introduced by European colonizers in the continent.

In Kenya child labour intensified with the onset of the First World War (1914-1918). During this period, most able-bodied men were recruited to fight leaving women and children behind. Without the young and energetic men there was a shortage of labour in the White firms. A favourable alternative was to engage children in the farms. According to the Barth Native Labour Commission of 1913, it is reported that children were favoured to work because they were cheap and fast (Buel, 1965).

Child labour in Kenya has since increased. It is estimated that Kenya has 3.5 million children between the ages of 6 and 14 working of which the majority are househelps (Ouko, 1998). This is just but a fractional representation because many more are likely to be working informally at home. Some scholars also note children are an important source of labour in most Kenyan households (Onyango, 1989)
2.1.2 Child Labour: Towards a Definition.

The concept of child labour covers a wide range of situations in which the ethical, economic and legal respond could be different (Muturi, 1994). A child by definition is one who has not attained the majority age (18 years) and thus is vulnerable to exploitation and thus needs protection by the law (Zani 1993). However, this definition is sometimes not true, for example, in some African traditional societies, by the time a child reaches puberty (12-14 years), he or she is socially and culturally an adult capable of various responsibilities (Rodgers and Standing, 1981). In contrast, in areas where schooling is the norm at age of 15, most youngsters are still in school and very much dependent on their parents economically to provide for their needs. Since they are below the majority age children do not have legal documents (e.g. Identification card) to formalize their employment.

According to International Labour Laws, child labour includes all non-education and non-leisure activities of individuals below a certain age (Grooetart & Kanbur, 1996 b). Individual countries are supposed to come up with their minimum age for work as it applies to their social situation. In addition, the term non-education seems problematic as education with its full definition encompasses all learning experiences both in and out of school (Zani, 1993).

The Kenya development plan 1997-2001, defines child labourers as the economically active population under the age of 15 years. By economically active, it means that these children are in regular employment. This may not be necessarily the case because some scholars (e.g. Kayongo Male and Walji, 1984) feel that the family is a favourable ground for child labour. The two scholars defined child labour as the contribution that children make as part of the family’s division of labour. Their definition seems over-exaggerated as children’s work if well regulated plays a key role in the socialization process (Muturi 1994). Nevertheless, family labour without
some regulation mechanisms in place is likely to result to physical, emotional, mental and social retardation and hence incapacitating the child's development (Zani 1993). Therefore, child labour should not only be viewed in the concept of wage labour where it is most recognized but also as a problem within the family setting.

As factors encompassing the child labour phenomenon become complex, the emerging question is at what point children's work and in particular their activities within the household are considered to be child labour? There seems to be little consensus among scholars sharing within the two extremes. Some maintain that child labour is inclusive of all the children's work activities in and outside home (Kayongo – Male and Walji 1984, Muturi, 1994) whereas others view child labour as a problem in so long as it interferes with the child's total development (physical, social, mental and psychological (Grooetart & Kanbur, 1996 b). Some are of the view that only the worst forms of children's work especially those oriented towards economic gain should be considered as child labour (Grooetart and Kanbur, 1996). For the purposes of this research child labour is defined in terms of hours of work that a child puts in household/agricultural wok activities. According to the word Development Report, a child who works for 20 or more hours in a week is engaged in child labour(Fallen and Tzannatos, 1998). Thus according to the study, children who worked for 20 hours and more were engaged in child labour.

2.1.3 An Analysis of the Child Labour Phenomenon

The notion of child labour as a social problem; a phenomenon hindering harmonious physical, psychological and mental development of child goes back to the 19th Century (Mendeleivich, 1979). This era in history is associated with the industrialization of the Europeans continent and their conquest of the African continent and other parts of the world.
Industrialization in Europe necessitated a shift from indigenous trade and agriculture to urban settings of industries and other commercial related activities. (Goldthorpe, 1965). Most of the men shifted to the urban centers to work in the factories. As a result only women and children were left as labourers in the farm. The fact that these workers had left their rural dwellings to work in town meant that they had no other source of income apart from wage labour. Their meagre salaries were not enough to sustain their families. As a result, their children were also forced to join the labour force and hence supplement the family income. (Nyaoga, 1984; Kershaw, 1972 and Clayton and Savage, 1974). As time went by children were increasingly exploited until children’s work became synonymous to child abuse (Onyango, 1989).

In Africa, most societies viewed children’s participation in work as playing a socialization function (Onyango, 1988). According to Ekwe (1986), work taught children specific skills for adulthood and virtues such as responsibility, perseverance and hardwork. However, the colonization of the African communities by the Europeans changed the role of the family and especially the concept of work ethics. Information about family labour patterns suggests a shift in the family division of labour and children for the first time worked outside the family’s own economic system (Kayongo – Male and Walji, 1984). In 1901, the institution of the hut tax in Kenya drew men into migrant labour, which left women and children to work at home (Kershaw, 1972). Sometimes women and children were drawn into forced labour due to labour shortage (Clayton and Savage 1974). This became more pronounced during the two world wars (1914-18 and 1939 –45) because men had been recruited to fight.

Children were therefore left to work for the white settlers. The Barth or Native labour Commission of 1913 reports that children were favoured to work since they were faster and cheaper. They were usually employed in coffee/sisal plantations as well as in railway and ballast construction sites (Buell, 1965).
It was not until 1933 when employment of children faced some resistance. A law prohibiting employment of young persons under the age of 12 years was enacted (Clayton and Savage, 1974). In 1939, an estimated number of 36,000 children were employed in the white settlement. However, this number reduced to 11,000 at independence because the church missionaries were at the forefront in condemning child labour (Mwashimba, 1983). To date it is estimated that about 3.5 million children aged between 6 and 14 years are engaged in the worst forms of child labour in the country (Muthoga, 1999). It is also noted that these statistics may be higher as there is much secrecy involved in the employment of children especially in the informal sector (Grooetart and Kanbur, 1996).

2.1.4 Nature and Extent of Child Labour.

In many parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America, millions of children toil long hours for no pay or very low wages (Grooetart and Kanbour, 1996). However, the situation and conditions under which these children work as well as the types of work done are also different. For example, in countries such as India and Nigeria, children combine school and work (Dyorough, 1986). In Jakarta, Indonesia, 1/3 of the working children are said to be domestic workers while in Haiti children as young as 8 years go out to take employment (Musungu, 1997). In Thailand, about 400,000 children are reported to drop out of school every year in order to work (Gill, 1999).

In Kenya, the middle and high class mainly do employment of children. Child labour also thrives in the rural areas where agriculture is the major economic activity. Children out of school are employed as casuals in tea, Miraa (Khat) coffee, tobacco or sisal farms (Njeru and Njoka, 2001; Muturi, 1994, Zani 1993 and Onyango, 1989). Child labour is also becoming a problem in tobacco growing areas. In their study Njeru and Njoka (2001), found out that children dropped out of school at certain times of the year to work on tobacco farms in Mbeere district. Similarly, Goldsmith
(1995) observes that child labour is rampant in Meru and especially in Miraa growing areas of Nyambene district. In these areas, children work but the payment is done to their parents. In Thika district, children as young as 7 years old are collected from their homes by use of lorries in the morning to go and work in coffee plantations and are brought back in the evenings. (Kagunye, 1999).

Child labour is also a growing problem in the Western regions of the country. In Kisii district children work in the stone carving industries to supplement the family income. According to Muthoga (1999), the carving industry in the region has contributed to high primary school drop out. In Kisumu, children are found hawking fish along the shores of Lake Victoria (Muthoga, 1999).

Child labour has not only been a problem in the rural areas but also in the urban areas. In her study, Zani (1993), found that children were involved in the hawking barafu(ice) among other foodstuffs to earn a living in the coastal region. A study conducted in Nairobi, the capital city showed that most househelps in middle and lower class estates were children aged 7 and 16 years (Machera, 2001). Children are also a familiar cite in the Jua kali (informal sector) where they do all kinds of work. These include collecting scrap metal, rolling it into sheets and transporting the final products (Muthoga, 1998).

2.1.5 The Relationship between Child Labour and Education

Work and education play a key role in socializing children. Socialization can be viewed as the process through which new members are integrated into the society so that they can assume their rightful place in terms of role performance in that particular society. In other words, socialization is a process by which young people are prepared for adult roles in a society (Murenga, 1998).
Socialization involves learning both values (ideologies) and skills of the day of a given society to enable the individual to fit in the social system. It is a continuous process during which the individuals are socially developed so that they internalize values and ideas relevant for action performance in a given society (Elkin, 1972). Socialization functions to ensure survival and continuity of a community. During the socialization process individuals acquire knowledge, skills and dispositions to enable them participate as members of a group.

During the socialization process the learner consciously makes choices, seeks out new roles and decides as well as being unconsciously induced to acquire new skills and other existing behaviour (Verkerisser, 1973). People's behaviour in a society thus adjusts as they meet more influential sources and agents of socialization. Today, the institution of education is the key agent of socializing children as opposed to the family in the past. Formal education is seen as a cultural prerequisite to many avenues especially social mobility, economic empowerment and communication network (Gakuru, 1992).

Despite this undisputable role played by education, it can be curtailed by many factors. According to Murenga (1999), the way different communities receive and accept formal education depends on the options available. In communities where the traditional modes of production is still dominant, the role of education is underestimated and parents are not likely to take their children to school as the immediate benefit of schooling is not visible (Zani, 1993). They would prefer their children to attend to home duties instead. In situations where the families are poor children may be sent away to work instead (Gakuru, 1992).

Linkages between child labour and education have been implicitly documented though. Nkinyangi (1980), studying factors that influence school dropout attributes high rates of school drop out to child labour.
"Some pupils opt to work outside home to supplement family income under the influence of peers who had previously left school to be employed as house helps in the city". (Nkinyangi 1980:19).

In her study, Zani (1993) observed that most of the children who hawked on the streets of Mombasa town were mainly primary school dropouts with little aspirations in life. In addition, Muturi (1989) argued that child labour hindered children from attaining complete and satisfactory educational standards. However, little has been said on child labour and its impact on children who are already in school.

The available literature clearly shows that much emphasizes have been laid on paid child away from home (e.g. children employed as house helps or farm labourers away from home or children who work as casuals in the nearby well to do families once in a while) ignoring the domestic child labour (Kagunye, 1999; Zani, 1993 and Kayongo-Male, 1984). It is noted that many school going children are required to help with household chores when out of school. Such domestic works if not well-regulated may eventually affect their schooling as it leaves less time for study (Muturi, 1994 and Zani, 1993). Children who are engaged in child labour may also have very little or no time to play, an essential component of growing up.

2.1.6 Child Labour and Relevant Laws.

One of the main objectives of the International Labour Organization (ILO) is the alleviation of child labour. The ILO set this in the year of its creation (1919) by adopting the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which has been amended over-time.

The National Convention on the Rights of the Child 1989, Article 32.1 states that;
State parties recognize the rights of the child to be protected from economic exploitation and from performing any work that is likely to be hazardous or harmful to the child's education or harmful to the child's health or physical, spiritual, moral and social development.

Thus, the convention recognizes the right of the child to be protected from all work activities that may hinder the child's development. Nevertheless, Child labour laws are in themselves inadequate. They are only concerned with formal employment. The situations and circumstances surrounding the child labour phenomenon are also very complex. First, there is the secrecy involved in the employment of children (Oyugi-Owour, 1999). Employers are either ignorant of the child labour laws or the governments are lax in enforcing these laws. Moreover, the children and their parents are most often not in a position to negotiate the terms of employment. Furthermore, children in employment come from such poor backgrounds that what they need most is food and shelter (Muturi, 1994). Consequently, the employers take advantage of their situations and pay them very little or they don't pay them at all. (Kagunye, 1999). Besides, it has also been noted that children are preferred in places of work because they are fast and cheap (Nyaoga, 1984). Therefore most often children fall prey of cruel employers.

The Convention on the Rights of Children also requires the governments of various countries to provide a minimum age or ages for admission into employment, provide appropriate regulation of the hours and conditions for employment as well as the penalties or other sanctions to ensure the effectiveness of child labour laws (Ouko, 1998).

There are no clear-cut distinctions between what can be referred to as child labour and work with a socialization objective in the first place. There are also no agreed limits of what types of children work activities are hazardous and how many hours of such work. The World Development Report (1998) stipulates that 20 hours of work
per week is more than adequate but this is not adhered to. In Kenya for example, some children especially those on employment are found to work between 40 and 60 hours per week, far beyond the expectation (Melkert, 1997). Countries such as Togo and Morocco are noted to allow children to work under difficult circumstance although they have ratified the convection or the Rights of the Child (Musungu, 1997)

In 1998, ILO set new standards on the most intolerable or extreme forms of child labour. The ILO’s first convention on child labour of 1919, outlawed the employment of children below the age of 14 years in industrial establishment but during the Geneva Conference the International Convention of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) called for new standards that would improve the existing child labour laws other than echoing the ILO standards. While keeping the age benchmarks, ICFTU suggested that the conventions complement and reinforce the existing standards taking into consideration the fundamental human rights. ICFTU demanded for immediate action to suppress the worst forms of child labour while placing priority on education (Ouko, 1998). In addition, part II of the children’s Act safeguards the rights and the welfare of the child.

Section 9(1) stipulates that:
“Every child shall be protected from economic exploitation and 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” (Children’s Act, 2001).
Section 9(5) states that:

"In this Act child labour refers to any situation where a child provides labour in exchange for payment and include;

- Any situation where a child provides labour as an assistant to another person and his/her labour is deemed to be the labour of the other person for the purposes of payment.
- Any situation where a child's labour is used for gain by any individual or institution whether or not the child benefits directly or indirectly and
- Any situation where there is inexistence a contract for services where the party provides services is a child whether the person using the service does so directly or by an agent."

(Children's Act, 2001)

Kenya ratified the ILO convention and in 1990, and consequently set the minimum age for employment to be 16 years (Muthoga, 1999). Nevertheless, this is rarely adhered to and informal observation show that children as young as 7 years are employed as house help in may parts of the country. According to Machera (2001), about 75% of the children employed in Nairobi's middle and low class estates as house helps are aged between 7 and 13 years.

At the global level, a number of countries have addressed the problem of child labour as members of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC). In 1996, ILO and IPEC examined the effects of concrete measures in economic, political, social, legal and cultural spheres in selected countries with substantiative experience in tackling the problems of child labour of which Kenya was included (Musungu, 1997). Child labour problem was found to be difficult because it was imbedded in the social economic and cultural structure of many societies and thus required integrated strategies. It is noted that IPEC'S experience demonstrated that child labour can only be phased out through a comprehensive
and holistic approach involving both the government and the civil society (Musungu, 1997).

Underlying all these agreements is the requirement that the best interest of the child shall always be of primary consideration in all decisions. This is hardly the case. In Kenya, for example children’s rights of which the children’s protection against child labour is part and parcel have been implicated as human rights in the constitution. (Muthoga, 1999). Every child is entitled to his/her right as an individual but in the exercise of these rights the child is greatly disadvantaged. For example, every individual is entitled to basic needs (food, clothing, shelter, health and education). Adults are assumed to have powers to address these basic needs whereas children depend on them for provisions of these needs.

Although measures have been put in place to curb the problem of child labour they seem inadequate due to various reasons. First, the problem of children is a multifaceted one, which needs a comprehensive and integrated approach. Causes of child labour cuts across the continents and needs to be addressed separately. Secondly, clear and well-defined laws need to be put in place. In addition these laws not only need to address the worst forms of child labour (such as, prostitution and serfdom) but also the commonly practiced forms such as domestic and agricultural work.

Altogether, child labour is a global problem cutting across diverse cultures. The problem is much more pronounced in developing countries whose incomes are very low. Child labour laws are also very inadequate as much emphasize is laid on the worst forms of child labour like slavery and child prostitution. Child labour laws leave out agricultural and other domestic works that are the common types of child labour in developing countries. Consequently the impact of child labour on minors touches both on the mental and physical development of the child. Children involved in child labour exhibit stunted growth, have poor mental capabilities and are denied the time
to play. Therefore child labour being a multifaceted problem need an integrated approach to alleviate.
2.2 Theoretical Framework

Two major theories; the Social Class theory and the Division of Labour theory guided this particular study. The Division of Labour theory postulates that the family as a social system has many functioning parts and each has a role to play. Children are part and parcel of the family system and need to contribute to the family division of labour.

On the other hand, the Social Class Theory views the society as divided into social classes. According to Karl Marx (1966), there are two classes of people in society. Those people who have the means of production and those who do not have the means of production and mainly rely on their labour for their livelihood. The owners of production exploit the later. The child labour phenomenon at a global level is viewed in this aspect.

2.2.1 The Social Class Theory

The concept of social class has a long history and a phenomenon of the industrial world. According to Maszrou 1971, industriaization was a consequence of transition of societies from traditional to modern (advanced) ones. Modernization is brought about by industrialization or a shift from traditional mode of production (agriculture) to manufacturing or large-scale production of and services (Goldthorpe, 1965).

Industrialization is not only brought about by several interrelated factors but has diverse and sometimes harmful consequences (Maszrous, 1971). The shift from agriculture to formal employment implies a transformation of societies from reliance in subsistence farming to wage labour. Along with these changes comes new lifestyles, change in value systems and also emphasize on capital investment.
According to historical materialism theorists the world has experienced four forms/modes of production (Mwachofi, 1991). The first was the simple community production. Mwachofi 1991 asserts that in this mode of production, necessary labour was expended to produce only necessary products. Communities produced only what they could consume. There was no exploitation of some members of the community as can be seen in other mode of production. Every member worked and benefited equally in this mode of production is a product of the capitalistic mode of production. The child labour phenomenon at the global level can be viewed in this aspect.

The second mode of production was the slave modes of production. Here we had the lords and the slaves. The lords were the owners of the land, machine and the labour (means of production). The slaves hence were the property of the lords and were asked to provide labour without any pay. 'The next mode of production was the feudal system, which was more or less like the slave mode of production. The later mode was the capitalistic mode of production, which is still in existence in the world today. In this mode of production goods are exchanged with money. According to Marx, (1966) the capitalistic mode of production has brought great inequalities in the world and untold suffering for the masses who are the majority of the population.

In the above modes of production (slave, feudal and capitalists), society is divided into “non labouring owners and the labouring non owners” (Mwachofi 1991: 21). These are class societies and each of the group (non labouring owners and labouring non owners relate differently to the means of production i.e. tools and implements of work (means of labour), land and other raw material (objects of labour). One class owns the means of production while the other toils.

Thus the production process generates the likelihood of the producer that of the non-producers or owners and some surplus for further development of the forces of
production. This is only possible because the producer receives only what is necessary for his bare reproduction while the owner appropriates the rest. Hence, there is exploitation of labour or appropriation of surplus. The system is sustained by the social relations of production, which in turn is sustained by the myth created by the ruling class to justify and rationalize the status quo called the dominant ideology (Lefebre, 1968).

Kenya's mode of production is dependent capitalism because it is tied to the international monopoly capitalistic system in unequal relationships. Prior to the establishment of this mode of production, communities had patriarchal or simple commodity mode of production, which had neither the primitive communal mode nor the slave or the feudal one. Under the patriarchal mode of production ownership was by household unit or the family. The social relations of production were marked by gender and age so that who performed which task, who wielded which power and how surplus was accumulated/disposed off, all depended on the ideology of provision of the likelihood for all members. The ideal was service and commitment whereas inequality was rationalized by age and gender.

Upon colonization the capitalistic mode of production was introduced. It imposed commodity exchange and international division of labour most suited to its own needs. It also aimed at getting overseas products at prices obtained through extra economic means and at prices neither determined by demand or supply nor by costs of production (Hoogvelt, 1982). This led to dependent capitalism, which has persisted to the present as characterized by inefficient production forces. In this case, producers have no say in the production forces and merely survive in the global economy. This economic situation explains the phenomenon of child labour in the country. The farmers are not sufficiently rewarded and therefore they cannot afford wage labor. Children are most disadvantaged because they have to combine work and schooling. Alternatively, the available labour is sometimes inadequate
especially in areas of large-scale production (coffee, tea, miraa, zones) thus use of children becomes handy.

These inequalities created by capitalistic mode of production demands children to go out and provide for themselves by engaging themselves in paid child labour. Since children find it extremely difficult to cope with the two demanding activities (work and education), the easiest option is to neglect or abandon the later. Unfortunately education is one of the sub processes in the production forces. In its role of skill-development, it promotes change by improving the productive forces and failure to acknowledge this role means total collapse of the production forces.

2.2.2 The Social Division of Labour Theory

To understand the phenomenon of child labour as part of the families’ obligations the study adopted the social division of labour theory. Adam Smith founded the social division of labour theory in the 18th century.

Social division of labour is a characteristic of both the traditional and the modern societies. According to Durkheim (1966), the division of labour denotes the role each member plays in the family. Children are part and parcel of the family and hence have the obligation to participate in the family chores.

In the traditional Kenyan societies children in preparation for adults roles were allocated duties by their gender (Kayongo – Male and Walji, 1984). This imparted societal values and responsibility in adult life. There were clear-cut roles for both male and female and this was accepted without questioning.

Children were also allocated duties by their age and sex (Kayongo-Male and Walji, 1984). Children were not overworked, had time to play and seek guidance from their elders (Onyango, 1989). Today the notion of the family division of labour is conflict
laden. There are no clear distinctions between children's work, which has a socialization function, and work that can be termed as child labour. Most often children are overworked and abused in places of work. This is especially the case when children are engaged in wage labour (Zani, 1993).

At home children may be forced to perform all the household chores by themselves while their mothers are engaged in some income generating activities (Zani, 1993). Today new lifestyles and the demands of living forces children to do all sorts of works in order to take care of themselves or so that they can contribute to the family income. Whereas the social division of labour theory underscores the fact that children need to contribute to family labour, it at the same time helps us to understand the situations and circumstances that force children to contribute to family income by working for wages.
STUDY HYPOTHESES

The study sought to test the following three Hypotheses

1. The child's socio-economic background contributes to the child's engagement in child labour.
2. The child's personal characteristics determine the child's involvement in child labour.
3. The children's work activities at home adversely affect their performance in school
DEFINITION OF THE STUDY VARIABLES

Dependent Variables

Agricultural Activities – Refers to farm work (Activities performed in the field).

Child labour – Refers to children work activities at home. Domestic and agricultural. In this particular study child Labour was measured in terms of 20 or more hours of work per week.

Examination Score- Was calculated by adding the two district examination marks that the respondent scored in the last two district examinations prior to the study.

Hours of Study – This refers to number of reading hours per week while outside school.

Household Activities – Domestic Chores, which include washing clothes, cleaning the house and fetching firewood.

Rate of Completion of School Home work – Measured as always, often and rarely. Denotes the frequency in which school homework in a week.

School Absenteeism – This refers to the number of times that the respondent was absent from school in order to perform household activities.

School Performance – Refers to the Child’s examination score, hours of study and rate of completion of school – homework.
**Independent Variables**

**Big Families** - Families that had 4 or more children at the time of the study.

**Birth Order** – Position of Birth of child – (1\(^{st}\) 2\(^{nd}\) or 3\(^{rd}\) born). Synonymous to position of birth.

**Child** – A young person between the ages of 10 and 16 and who by virtue of age is disadvantaged and needs protection by the law.

**Child’s Socio-Economic Background** – refers to the marital, educational and Occupation statuses of the parents (Male & Female) of the child.

**Child’s Personal Attributes** – Refers to gender (male or female) and Birth order of the child.

**Educational Status** – Refers to the educational level of the child’s parent that is Secondary and above, Primary or none.

**Marital Status** – Single or Married.

**Married Couple** – Parents who were in a marriage relationship at the time of the study.

**Occupational Status** – Refers to the type of Employment of the Child’s Parent (Formal, Informal, Self Employed and Not Employed)

**Position of Birth** – 1\(^{st}\), 2\(^{nd}\), 3\(^{rd}\), ------ e.t.c. borns.
School-Homework – Work given by teachers to pupils to be done at home or during their free time.

Sex - Male or female attribute of a child.

Single Parent– The marital status of a parent who at the time of the study had no spouse.

Small Families – Families that had 1-3 children at the time of the study.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the research site in terms of geographical location, topography, land use and climatic conditions. A justification for the study area is given. In addition, the researcher highlights the processes of selecting the sample size for the interview schedule and the reasons to supplement this type of data with qualitative data. Methods of data collection and analysis as well as the justification of their usage are also explained.

3.1 Description of the Research Site

Embu district is one of the 12 districts that form the Eastern Province of Kenya. The district has 5 divisions namely; Manyatta, Runyenjes, Nembure, Kyeni and Central divisions. Kyeni division has three locations, which are Kyeni North, Kyeni South and Karurumo.

Embu district lies approximately latitude 0°8" and 0°35" South and longitude 37°9" and 37°42" East. It is bordered by Mbeere district to the East and South East; Kirinyaga district to the West; and Meru South district to the North and occupies an area of 708 sq km. It has a population of 55,926 thousands (1999 National Census). Embu district lies between altitude 1200M and 4500M.

The district form part of Kenya’s Eastern Highlands. The landscape is characterized by high and mid lands, hills and valleys. The district is drained by four major rivers: Thuci, Kiu, Rupingazi and Ena, all which flow in a southward direction. The district
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experiences two rainy seasons. Long rains fall between March and June and short rains fall between October and December. Temperatures are cool and range between 12° and 27° centigrade. It has an agro-ecological profile that is typical of the windward side, most of the land (70%) being arable land. Soils range from humid nitrosols with an acid and humid topsoils to ferrosols (Embu Development Plan 1997-2001).

These physical features along with climatic conditions create a favorable environment for various agricultural activities inform of small scale farming. Typical cash crops include tea, coffee and tobacco, sweet and Irish potatoes as well as horticultural crops such as exotic mangoes, pawpaws and avocados. The later are increasingly becoming an important cash crop in the area. Food crops include maize, beans, bananas, peas and millet.

3.2 Justification of the Research Site

Embu is predominantly a high agricultural potential area (Embu District Development Plan, 1997-2001). The district’s bimodal type of rainfall pattern means that agricultural activities are carried out throughout the year. Unfortunately, Kenya being among the poorest of the developing country agriculture is not commercialized. Most of the farmers are small scale surviving on subsistence and depending on family labour. Such are the characteristics of the Embu people. Children are not only required to help in household chores (e.g., cooking, collecting water and firewood) but also provide farm labour. Embu therefore was found to be a good site to study family labour among children.

Moreover, studies carried out on child labour in Kenya tend to concentrate on coffee and miraa Estates (i.e. Meru and Kiambu districts) as evidenced in literature review. This does not rule out possibilities of child labour in other districts such as Embu.
Hence, a prime concern of the study was to find out whether there is child labour in the area and if it exists whether it affects the child's performance in school.

Lastly due to financial constraints the researcher found it cost effective to carry the study in her home district.

3.3 Target Population and Units of Analysis

The target populations were mainly primary school going children in Embu district, which were also viewed as the units of analysis. However, standard seven pupils were the main observational units.

The choice of standard seven pupils was because of the following two main reasons: Firstly the availability of a common district examination enabled the researcher to measure the child's performance in school in terms of examination score. Secondly, the standard seven pupils were conversant with the English language (the interview schedule was written in English) easier for the researcher to administer the questions to the respondents.

3.4 Sample Selection

Probability sampling design was used to select the sample size for the interview schedule. Probability sampling has advantage of the "possibilities" of not introducing bias on the part of the researcher in selection of cases (Singleton et al, 1988). Chance only determines cases which are to be included in the sample by virtue of random selection. This is unlike non-sampling design, which has no control over 'investigator bias.' The two designs were utilized to complement each other.

The researcher first compiled a list of all the 29 primary day schools in Kyeni division by location. Kyeni North location had the following nine (9) schools Kithare,
Kiangungi, Iriari, Rukuriri, Gatumbi, Njeruri, Mufu, Muganjuki and Kiaragana. Kyeni south had ten (10) schools:- Gwakwegori, Kaarago, SA Kyeni, Kathanjuri, Karungu, Ciamanda, Magaca, Makuria, Kivuria and Kathare while Karurumo location had also ten schools:- Kiamboa, Kathunguri, Kaveti, Kariru, Nyagari, Karurumo, Kinthithe, Kaandete, Gasagori and kasafari. New schools, which had up to class six or less were not included in the sampling. Only schools with class seven were included in the sample selection.

Two schools were selected out of the nine schools in Kyeni North, three Schools out of ten schools for Kyeni south and three out of ten (10) schools in Karurumo location by use of simple random technique

The following numbers of pupils were selected for interviewing in each of the schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Location</th>
<th>Name of the School</th>
<th>No. of Pupils selected</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyeni</td>
<td>Kiangungi</td>
<td>(17) 10</td>
<td>(42) 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mufu</td>
<td>(18) 10</td>
<td>(42) 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyeni South</td>
<td>Ciamanda</td>
<td>(30) 10</td>
<td>(40) 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magaca</td>
<td>(25) 10</td>
<td>(44) 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mukuria</td>
<td>(24) 13</td>
<td>(22) 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karurumo</td>
<td>Kariru</td>
<td>(12) 10</td>
<td>(28) 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaveti</td>
<td>(15) 4</td>
<td>(16) 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kathanguri</td>
<td>(8) 3</td>
<td>(12) 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>149 (70)</td>
<td>246 (80)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures in brackets indicate the total number of pupils in each of the schools by gender.
In all, out of a total number of 395 pupils, 246 girls and 149 boys in class seven, 150 pupils, 80 girls and 70 boys were selected. All the schools selected had more girls than boys except for Mukuria. Selection of individual respondents was done by use of simple random sampling technique.

The total number of standard seven pupils in Kyeni division (i.e. including the none selected schools were 1069, 566 girls and 483 boys.

The researcher used non-probability sampling design to select participants for both the in-depth interviews and focus group discussions. Non probability sampling refers to the process of case selection other than random selection (Singleton, 1988). However, without random selection the investigator has no control over his/her personal biases and there is a high likelihood of being subjective (Singleton, 1988). This type of sampling was found to be more appropriate and practical for selecting participants for both focus group discussions and indepth interviews.

In purposive sampling technique, the researcher relies on ‘expert judgment’ to select units that are representative or typical of the population (Babbie, 1995). Thus, the researcher selected the head teachers of Kiangungi and Mukuria Primary Schools for in-depth interviews. Kiangungi and Mukuria were selected because of their distinctive geographical locations. Kiangungi is found on the upper areas of Embu district near the Mount Kenya forest whereas Mukuria is found on the lower part neighbouring Mbeere district which has a semi-desert climatic conditions. Two schools were selected for focus group discussions. These were Mukuria and Kariru primary schools on the basis of their performance in national examinations. Mukuria was the best school in performance of the 1999 (The year prior to this study) Kenya Certificate of Primary Education whereas Kariru was the last in Kyeni division (Kyeni division Education Office Records, 2000). Finally, a women group,
Ikura Women Group’ was also selected by use of convenience sampling technique for focus group discussions with the parents.

The above categories of groups had the following number of participants for focus group discussions;

- Mukuria Primary School – 12 boys
- Kariru Primary School – 8 girls
- Ikura Women Group – 12 women.

3.5 Methods of Data Collection

According to Nachimias and Nachimias (1992), “the choice of a particular method of empirical research depends on the nature of the research problems and the type of data needed for analysis.” However, the qualitative versus quantitative debate over methodological superiority has challenged the social scientists to critically review their methodological particularism and incorporate the two views to come up with a more comprehensive data (Mbatia, 1996). Data was therefore gathered using the following three methods of data collection: - self assisted questionnaire (interview schedule), indepth interviews and focus group discussions.

The interview schedule is a key instrument for collecting quantitative data. Face to face interview between the interviewer and the respondent is the ideal format. An interview schedule has the advantage of obtaining information from a cross section of individuals with heterogeneous characteristics. It is particularly efficient because several variables can be measured and their relationships sought in a single study. Interview schedules have also the advantage of collecting data from many respondents within short time and at low costs. In addition, they provide quantitative data, which can be generalized for the whole population.
However, the interview schedule has its own limitations. Among these limitations is that it is inefficient in studies that seek to understand a particular case or phenomenon. To gain a deeper understanding of child labour phenomenon and its relation to education, a second and a third method of data collection, that is, indepth interview and focus group discussions were employed.

Indepth interviewing is largely a method of data collection for qualitative researchers but can be used to supplement survey data. It has a major advantage of flexibility, which the questionnaire lacks (Babbie, 1995). Indepth interviews can probe for more specific answers from the respondent. In addition, if the answer given by the respondent is misconceived, the researcher is in a position to alter the wording of the question (but not the meaning) to a more simplified format in order to get the correct response. A major set back of the in depth interviews is that they are time consuming and only a few respondents can be handled in a single study (Mbatia, 1996). This makes generalizations of findings difficult, as the sample may not be “representative” of the population.

Focus group discussions are also used to collect data for this study. FGDs unlike other methods of data collection have the advantage of gathering a collective view from a cross section of respondents about a phenomenon under investigation. They can also be used to discuss diverse issues within a very short time provided the researcher carefully guides the discussion so that the group does not divert from the theme (Babbie, 1995). Issues relating to child labour and school performance were collectively discussed using this method.
3.6 Data Collection Exercise

Fieldwork was done in three phases.

The first phase constituted administering the interview-assisted questionnaires to standard seven pupils already selected by use of random sampling. It was not possible to administer questionnaires during lunch and tea break as had been suggested at the proposal stage. This was because the pupils needed their break time in order to prepare for the coming lessons. For example, administering questionnaires during lunch hours would mean the respondent had to forego lunch or eat in a hurry. Some of the schools encouraged pupils to go for lunch at home and therefore they would not be available at the time.

Therefore the researcher resulted in calling one respondent at a time while the others continued with the lessons. The respondent who had been interviewed would call the next respondent. This way each respondent lost some time out of class but each a different time. In addition, where need arose, probing was allowed to come up with the correct response. For pupils who could not fully understand English, the native language was used to translate the questions being asked. In return the respondents were free to answer questions by use of Kiembu dialect.

The second phase involved holding indepth interviews with head teachers of Kiangungi and Mukuria Primary schools. The third phase entailed holding focus group discussions with various categories of participants.
3.7 Methods of Data Analysis

Data from the study were analyzed mainly by use of descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics are indices that tell us about the sample or the population. Where possible measures of central tendencies, that is, the mean, medium and the mode were given. A chi square test was done to find out the statistical significance of the findings.

Qualitative data from in depth interviews and focus group discussions were analyzed into the major themes of the study and were used to complement quantitative data. Documented research works backed Field data.

3.8 Problems Encountered in the Field

A major problem encountered in the study was transport. Some schools were very far from the researcher's residential home and means of communication was very poor. The researcher had to walk most of the time.

Another problem was the misplaced community expectation due to members' lack of knowledge in the value of research. Many of the parents thought that the study entailed giving handouts. Some parents would confront the researcher asking why their children were excluded from the interview, yet they were more needy than those interviewed. The researcher had to explain that the study was an academic one and the children who were interviewed were a representative of the others. Therefore any policy issues made on the basis of the research would be beneficial to the community at large.

A third problem emerged from the focus group discussion with the women. Some few members of the group refused to participate even when the leader asked...
questions specifically for them. The researcher had no alternative but bear with passive members.
The chapter has two main objectives. First is to present the background characteristics of the respondents in terms of personal attributes and socio-economic background. The second objective is to present and interpret the relationships between child labour and independent and other dependent variables. Data are presented in form of percentages and a chi square test is given to test the significance of the relationships.

Qualitative data were grouped into various themes and interpreted in order to complement quantitative data. Both qualitative and quantitative data were comprehensively analyzed to test the study's three hypotheses. The findings are backed by relevant data from documented works.

4.1 Background information about the Respondents

Sex

Most of the schools were found to have more female than male pupils in class seven. Of the 150 respondents interviewed, 53% (80) were girls and 47% (70) were boys.
Age

In terms of age, the youngest respondent was 10 years and the oldest was 16 years. Both the mean and modal ages for the respondents were 14 years.

Position of Birth

Majority (almost two thirds) 64% (96) of the respondents were 1st, 2nd or 3rd borns in the family. 19% (28) were 4th, 5th or 6th borns and the rest 17% (26) were 7th and above borns. This is an indication of the preference of small families especially among young parents whose first-born children are in primary school. The findings also reveal that large families were still prevalent in the study area since a quarter 27% (41) of the respondents were 7th and above borns.

Cross tabulating birth order and family size, it was found that those families with fewer children were the families whose children were born early in the family. Thus, younger parents were found to prefer smaller families as opposed to older parents who had larger families. Younger parents were probably more educated and hence had knowledge of family planning or understood the cost of having many children.

Table 1 Distribution of Respondents by Birth Order and Family Size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Size</th>
<th>Birth 1-3</th>
<th>Order 4-6</th>
<th>7 and above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>100.0 (48)</td>
<td>71.0 (43)</td>
<td>12.0 (5)</td>
<td>64.0 (96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30.0 (18)</td>
<td>24.0 (10)</td>
<td>19.0 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 and above</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63.0 (26)</td>
<td>17.0 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32.0 (48)</td>
<td>41.0 (61)</td>
<td>27.0 (41)</td>
<td>100.0 (150)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All, 100% (48) of the children who were born early in the family (1-3 borns) came from small families (1-3 children) compared to 71% (43) of the 4-6 borns category and 12% (5) of the 7 and above borns category. Majority 63% (26) of the respondents born later in the family (7 and above borns) came from big families.

**Marital Status**

Majority 83% (124) of the respondents reported that both of the parents were in a marriage relationship, 5% (7) reported that their parents were separated or divorced and 4% (6) were of parents who were single. Approximately, and 8% (12) of the respondents had lost one parent and .7% (1) was an orphan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>149</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One respondent was an orphan*

The study found out that parents who were in a marriage relationship had more children than those who were single. As table 3 shows approximately 27% (33) of the children from married parents came from small families compared to 48% (12) of the single parents. Approximately, 73% (91) of respondents whose parents were married came from big families compared to 52% (13) of the respondents whose parents were single.
Table 3: Distribution of Respondents by Family Size and their Parents' Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Size</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Children</td>
<td>27.0 (33)</td>
<td>48.0 (12)</td>
<td>30.0 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 and above children</td>
<td>73.0 (91)</td>
<td>52.0 (13)</td>
<td>70.0 (104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83.0 (124)</td>
<td>17.0 (25)</td>
<td>100.0 (149)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One respondent was an orphan

An explanation for this was that probably married parents had more resources and hence could afford to have more children. Alternatively single parents are not regularly exposed to sex as married couples and are therefore less likely to become pregnant. They may also be using contraceptives more than the married mothers, as their partners when making such decisions may not oblige them.

**Education Level**

The study found out that more fathers 53% (63) compared to mothers 43% (51) had attained secondary education and above. As was expected more mothers 53% (63) than fathers 45% (53) had primary education only. Likewise, more mothers 4% (5) compared to fathers 2% (2) had no formal education. In all 48% (114) of the parents had secondary education and above, 49% (116) had primary education only and 3% (7) had no formal education.
Table 4: Distribution of Respondents by the Parents’ Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and above</td>
<td>53.0 (63)</td>
<td>43.0 (51)</td>
<td>48.0 (114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>45.0 (53)</td>
<td>53.0 (63)</td>
<td>49.0 (116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.0 (2)</td>
<td>4.0 (5)</td>
<td>3.0 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49.0 (118)</td>
<td>51.0 (119)</td>
<td>100.0 (237)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=237

* Some of the respondents did not know their parents educational statuses

**Occupational Status**

As was expected more fathers than mothers were in some kind of employment either formal, informal or self employment. Over half 52% (75) of the fathers were employed compared to less than a quarter 24% (35) of the mothers. Majority of the mothers 76% (112) were unemployed compared to 48% (69) of the fathers.

Table 5: Distribution of Respondents by Employment Statuses of The Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>52.0 (75)</td>
<td>24.0 (35)</td>
<td>38.0 (110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Employed</td>
<td>48.0 (69)</td>
<td>76.0 (112)</td>
<td>62.0 (181)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49.0 (144)</td>
<td>51.0 (147)</td>
<td>100.0 (291)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=291

- 5 respondents did not have a father
- 2 respondents did not have a mother
- 1 respondent was an orphan
This is typical of the rural representation whereby most women are housewives. They usually raise children and attend to the farm. Unfortunately these two duties are rarely quantified economically. This was clearly reflected during the interviews. When the respondents were asked what their mothers did for a living they would say:

'Ekaraga mucii'meaning "she stays at home".

This was quite different when they were asked what fathers did for a living. They would answer;

'Kaarimaga'meaning "he is a farmer".

The later is quantifiable economically.

Approximately, 38% (110) of the parents were employed (formal, informal or self employed) and 62% (181) unemployed i.e. they solely depended on their small farms for livelihood.

**Major Cash Crops**

The respondents were asked to rank the first three cash crops that were grown in their homes. Coffee was the most ranked cash crop with 28% (42) of the responses. It was followed by maize 13% (20), beans 11% (16), tea, macadamia nuts and pawpaws with 9% (13) of the responses each, bananas 7% (11), mangoes 6% (9), avocados 5% (8) and tobacco 3% (5).

Therefore, the study area was found to be predominantly a coffee zone. The findings also reveal that pawpaws, bananas and Mangoes were picking up as major cash crops in the area. This can be attributed to the prevailing poor market prices in coffee and tea industries. Another explanation would be the impact of new technology in the Kenyan agricultural sector. Informal observation by the researcher indicated that most farmers had planted new breeds in their farms as opposed to the traditional ones.
The shift from the traditional cash crops to horticulture has intensified the demands for labour. Unlike tea and coffee, which are perennial crops, horticultural crops are usually seasonal and need more care.

### Table 6: Distribution of 'Responses' of respondents by major Cash Crop Grown in their Homes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of crop</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macadamia Nuts</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paw paws</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bananas</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangoes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avocados</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main Source of Drinking Water**

Most people in Kyeni division use the river as their main source of drinking water. When asked to mention their main source of drinking water at home, slightly over half 53% (80) of the respondents reported that the river was their main source of drinking water whereas 21% (31) reported the well, 13% (20) the tap, 12% (18)
the borehole and 1% (1) the lake. Informal observation by the researcher showed that most homes had taps but were dry. Therefore some well to do families resulted into digging boreholes within the home compound to ensure that they had water within their reach.

Table 7: Distribution of Respondents by Main Source of Drinking Water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Water</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>River</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borehole</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of residential House

Most, 65% (97) of the children interviewed lived in mud houses. Respondents were asked to indicate their main type of residential houses under the categories. Majority of the respondents 62% (93) reported that their main type of residential house was built of mud (with iron sheet roof), 35% (53) reported that it their house was built of stone or wood whereas 3% (4) lived in mud houses (with grass thatched roof).
Table 8: Distribution of Respondents by Main Type of Residential House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Housing</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mud (Grass thatched roof)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mud (Iron sheet roof)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone/Wooden</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Source of Lighting

The main source of lighting in most homes was found to be the lantern. This is typical of any rural setting where electricity is rare. Asked what source of lighting they use at home 68% (102) of the respondents reported to use the lantern, 20% (30) used the tin lamp and the rest 12% (18) were using the PSE source (pressure lamp, solar energy or electricity).

Table 9: Distribution of Respondents by Main Source of Lighting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tin lamp</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantern</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE source</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 The Child Labour Phenomenon

This section examines and interprets various relationships between the key independent and dependent variables of the study. This is done by cross tabulating both the dependent and independent variables and interpreting the percentages. Where possible, a chi square test is given to test the statistical significance of the findings.

The findings are analyzed into three broad categories; child labour in relation to the child's socio-economic background, child labour in relation to the child's personal characteristics and child labour in relation to the child's performance in school.

4.2.1 Child Labour and Child's Socio-Economic Background

Various indicators were used to determine the child’s socio-economic background. These were family size, marital statuses, educational and occupational statuses of the child's parents, main type of residential housing and the main source of lighting.

Child Labour and family Size

The study found out that children who came from small families were working for fewer hours than those children from large families. Approximately 85% (41) of children from small families worked an average of 21 and 40 hours per week compared to 74% (76) of children from big families and 26% (26) of children from big families worked for 41 or more hours compared to 15% (7) of the children from small families.
Table 10: Distribution of Respondents by Child Labour and Family size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Working hours</th>
<th>1-3 Children</th>
<th>4 or more Children</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>85.0 (41)</td>
<td>74.0 (76)</td>
<td>78.0 (117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 and more hours</td>
<td>15.0 (7)</td>
<td>26.0 (26)</td>
<td>22.0 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32.0 (48)</td>
<td>68.0 (102)</td>
<td>100.0 (150)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 20.91; \text{df}=1; \text{level of significance}=0.000 \]

The relationship between child labour and family size was found to be statistically significant at 0.000 level of significance.

These findings are supported by those of Muturi (1994) who found out that children from large families worked for longer hours than those from small families. She argued that large families had more needs to be met than smaller families and hence require more resources to meet these needs. A second explanation for the above finding is that children who come from small families are in most cases of younger parents who are probably more educated and have better incomes hence are able to cater for their children's need as opposed to parents who have many children and lowly educated. Alternatively older parents were likely to have a bigger size of land than younger parents due to land scarcity, which is on the increase in
the study area, and therefore more work to be done in the farm (Goldsmith, 1995). In addition, discussions with the parent showed that parents are more educated and are therefore less likely to involve their children in excessive domestic chores because of its impact on schoolwork.

**Child Labour and Marital Status**

Marital status was also found to impact on child labour in this study. Children whose parents were in a marriage relationship were found to work for slightly fewer hours than those children from single parent families.

Approximately 77% (94) of the children whose parents were married worked between 21 and 40 hours compared to children 74% (20) from single parent families and 23% (28) of children whose parents were married worked for 41 or more hours compared to 26% (7) of children whose parents were single.

**Table 11: Distribution of Respondents by Child Labour and Marital Status of the Parents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours of Work</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>77.0 (94)</td>
<td>74.0 (20)</td>
<td>77.0 (114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>23.0 (28)</td>
<td>26.0 (7)</td>
<td>24.0 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82.0 (122)</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.0 (27)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0 (149)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One Child was orphaned.

χ² = 63.15; df = 1; level of significance 0.000

The relationship between child labour and marital status was found to be statistically significant at 0.000 level of significance.
The findings can be explained by the fact that single parents have to fend for their children on their own unlike married parents who share the burden. Therefore they are likely to have fewer resources to meet their children's needs. Focus group discussions with the parents revealed that most of the single women were more likely to involve themselves with business activities compared to women who were married. For example, they may venture into self employment activities such as selling farm produce in the market which makes them less available at home and hence they are more likely to involve their children in household chores as they look for extra income available at home.

Child Labour and Educational Status

Educational status of both parents impacted heavily on child labour in this particular study. It was found that the higher the educated statuses of the parent the less the child was involved in child labour.
From the table, it can be deduced that 81% (51) and 84% (43) of the children whose fathers and mothers respectively had secondary education and above worked between 21 and 40 hours per week. This is compared to 77% (41) and 76% (48) of children whose fathers and mothers had primary education only and 50% (1) and 40% (2) of children whose fathers and mothers had no formal education at all.

Likewise, 19% (12) and 16% (8) of children whose fathers and mothers had secondary education and above worked for 41 or more hours per week compared to 23% (12) and 24% (15) of children whose fathers and mothers had primary education as opposed to 50% (1) and 60% (3) of children whose fathers and mothers had no formal education at all. However, the chi square test between child
labour and the parents' level of education indicated no significant relationship between the two variables.

An explanation to this is that there are intervening variables involved such as the indisputable rural characteristics of the study area, whereby children regardless of their socio-economic status are called upon to help in household chores.

Nevertheless the findings show some influence on child labour. It was found that children whose parents had secondary education and above worked for fewer hours than those whose parents had primary education or no formal education at all. This relationship was even stronger when mothers’ education was related to child labour. In their studies, Muturi (1994) and Kayongo-Male and Walji (1984) found out that well educated mothers knew the need to educate their children and thus reduced these children’s contribution to child labour. Kagunye (1999) also found out that the more educated the mother, the more likely she was in a position to get a well paying job and be able to meet the needs of her children and thus engage her children less in child labour.

Child Labour and Occupational Status

The occupational status of the parent was also found to relate to child labour. Those children whose parents had an extra income apart from farm work worked for fewer hours than those children whose parents relied wholly on the farm as the only source of income to meet the needs of their children.

Table 13 below shows the employment status of the parents gauged against child labour. Approximately 80% (60) and 83% (29) of children whose fathers and mothers respectively were in employment worked between 21 and 40 hours compared to 74% (51) and 75% (84) of the children whose fathers and mothers were not employed. Alternatively, 20% (15) and 17% (6) of children whose fathers
and mothers were employed worked for 41 or more hours compared to 26% (18) and 25% (28) of children whose fathers and mothers were not employed.

Unlike the relationship between child labour and fathers' occupation, that of mothers' occupation was found to be statistically significant at 0.000 level of significance.

Table 13: Distribution of Respondents by Child Labour and Employment Statuses of the parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housrs of work-k</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Not Employed</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>(111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(75)</td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td>(144)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 55.39; \text{df} = 1; \text{level of significance} = 0.000 \)

A good explanation for the discrepancy in hours of work between children whose parents were employed and those whose parents were not in any form of employment would be that parents who are employed can afford wage labour and therefore their children are involved less in work. A second explanation is the fact that the employed parents have more resources to cater for their children's needs and hence need their children less to contribute to family labour.
These findings are supported by those of Odera (1981) who found out that mothers who are working and also farming were likely to earn more money which would enable them to hire workers rather than overwork their children. However, these findings contrast those of Goode (1964) who found out that mothers working outside home involve their children in work more often to keep them at home.

Child Labour and Type of Residential House

Type of residential house as an indicator of socio-economic status was found to relate to child labour. Children whose main house was built of stone/wood were defined as belonging to a higher socio-economic status than those whose houses were made of mud with iron sheet roof or with grass thatched roof.

Table 14: Distribution of Respondents by Child labour and type of Residential House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours of work</th>
<th>Mud (Grass thatched or Iron sheet roof)</th>
<th>Stone Wooden</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>61.0 (57)</td>
<td>88.0 (49)</td>
<td>71.0 (106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>39.0 (37)</td>
<td>12.0 (7)</td>
<td>29.0 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>63.0 (94)</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.0 (56)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0 (150)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 10.67; \text{ df}=1; \text{ level of significance}=0.001$

Approximately 61% (57) of the children whose main type of residential housing was made of mud (iron sheet or grass thatched roof) worked between 21 and 40 hours compared to 88% (49) of children whose main type of residential housing was stone/wood. Alternatively 39% (37) of children whose type of residential house was built of mud worked for 41 or more compared to only 13% (7) of those children.
whose residential house were made of stone/wood. The relationship between child labour and the type of residential house was also found to be statistically significant at 0.000 level of significance.

**Child Labour and Main Source of Lighting**

The main source of lighting was another indicator of socio-economic status of the child and was found to relate to child labour. Source of lighting was either tin lamp, lantern, pressure lamp, solar or electricity (PSE source). Approximately 63% (19) of respondents whose source of lighting was the tin lamp worked between 21 and 40 hours compared to 80% (96) of the children whose source of lighting was either lantern or PSE source. In addition, 37% (11) of children whose main source of lighting was tin lamp worked for 41 hours and above compared to only 20% (24) of the children whose main source of lighting was lantern or PSE source.

**Table 15: Distribution of Respondents by Child Labour and Source of Lighting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours of Work</th>
<th>Tin lamp</th>
<th>Lantern/PSE source</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>63.0 (19)</td>
<td>80.0 (96)</td>
<td>77.0 (115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>37.0 (11)</td>
<td>20.0 (24)</td>
<td>23.0 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>80.0 (120)</td>
<td>100.0 (150)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 83.63; \ df = 1; \ level \ of \ significance = 0.000 \]

Those children whose source of lighting was the tin lamp (low socio-economic status) were found to work for longer hours those children whose main source of lighting was lantern or PSE source (high socio-economic status).

A chi square test between child labour and the main source of lighting was found to be statistically significant at 0.000 level of significance.
Altogether, the study found that the child's socio-economic background in many ways contributed to the child's involvement in child labour. Cross tabulations of the dependent variable (child labour) which was measured in terms of hours of work per week revealed some relationship with various key independent variables; family size, marital, educational and occupational status of the child's parents, main source of lighting and type of residential housing. Most of these relationships were also statistically significant at 99% level of confidence.

Specifically, the study found out that a child's socio-economic background contributed in many ways to the child's engagement in child labour. Children of high economic background worked for fewer hours than those who were from low economic statuses. The former have also more resources to meet their needs and therefore their children are less likely to contribute to family income in terms of child labour. The findings verified the study's first hypothesis, which stated that: "the child socio-economic background contributes to child's engagement in child labour."
4.2.2 Child Labour and Personal Characteristics

The child’s personal attributes and particularly sex and birth order were hypothesized to determine the quantity of work the child performed at home.

Child Labour and Sex

Table 16 below shows that approximately 79% (55) of the boys worked between 21 and 40 hours compared to 78% (62) of the girls. 21% (15) of the boys worked for 41 or more hours compared to 22% (18) of the girls.

Table 16: Distribution of Respondents by Child Labour and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours of work</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>79.0 (55)</td>
<td>78.0 (62)</td>
<td>78.0 (117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>21.0 (15)</td>
<td>22.0 (18)</td>
<td>22.0 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47.0 (70)</td>
<td>53.0 (18)</td>
<td>100.0 (150)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings reveal no significant differences in hours of work by sex in the study. This is unlike in the olden days when there were clear demarcation of children’s work activities between girls and boys (Kayongo-Male and Walji, 1984 and Onyango, 1989). The findings show that parents tend to orient their children into work activities without any reference to their sex. These findings are supported by those of Gichuru (1998) who found out that sex typing was no longer important in the children’s performance of household chores.

Popular household chores such as; cooking, fetching water, fetching firewood, washing clothes, cleaning utensils, milking, feeding livestock ‘watering plants, baby care, and cleaning the compound were done by both girls and boys. Most of the children reported to do farming only during weekends particularly on Saturdays.
(Sunday is observed as a church day) except during planting and harvesting seasons when there was a lot of work in the farms. It was found that many boys engaged in work activities that were initially done solely by girls. Boys were found to cook, clean utensils or fetch firewood; duties that were initially done by girls. Likewise, girls were also involved in boy-activities such as milking and attending to livestock.

Some of the children viewed work activities at home as a duty and an obligation as members of the family. They felt that it was their duty to help with domestic chores when they are out of school. One boy said,

“I really feel for my mother. She wakes up very early in the morning to milk the cows, goes to the farm and comes to prepare lunch for my young sisters who are very young. She goes back to the farm only to come back in the evening with firewood on her back to prepare supper. I have to help her to do the rest of the household activities.”

**Child labour and Birth Order**

Table 17 below shows that, approximately 78% (75) of the children who were 1st – 3rd borns worked between 21 and 40 hours per week compared to 80% (43) of the children who were 4th or more borns. Approximately, 22% (21) of the children who were 1st – 3rd borns worked for 41 or more hours compared to 20% (11) of the children who were 4 or more borns.
Table 17: Distribution of Respondents by Child Labour and Birth Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours of Work</th>
<th>Birth order 1-3 hours</th>
<th>Birth order 4 and above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>78.0 (75)</td>
<td>80.0 (43)</td>
<td>79.0 (118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>22.0 (21)</td>
<td>20.0 (11)</td>
<td>21.0 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64.0 (96)</td>
<td>36.0 (54)</td>
<td>100.0 (150)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2=10.67$; df=1; level of significance=0.001

From the findings, it can be deduced that first-born children are most often called upon to help parents with household duties compared to younger children. Discussions with the parents yielded the information that older children were more mature and skilled to take up responsibilities bestowed to them by the parents. Therefore they are likely to work for longer hours. These findings were found to tally with those of Kayongo-Male and Walji (1984) who argued that parents could easily entrust older children with household duties including those of taking care of the very young siblings.

Therefore, child's personal characteristics were found to influence children's work activities at home to some degree. Hence the second hypothesis was modified to read that, “the child’s personal attributes may or may not determine his/her involvement in child labour.”
4.2.3 Child Labour and School Performance

School performance was measured using the following key indicators; Exam score, hours of study per week and rate of completion of school-homework.

Child Labour and Examination Score

Table 18 below shows that of the category of children who scored 250 and less out of the total 700 marks, none came from the category of children who worked between 21 and 30 hours per week. Only 4% (5) of the children who worked between 21 and 30 hours scored 250 or less marks compared to 6% (2) of those working for 41 or more hours a week. Approximately, 67 % (2) of the children who worked between 21 and 30 hours scored between 251 and 350 marks compared to 81% (91) of the children who worked between 31 and 40 hours and 85% (29) of those who worked for 41 or more hours. 33% (1) of children who worked between 21 and 30 hours scored 351 and more marks compared to 15% (17) of those who worked between 31 and 40 hours and 9% (3) of those who worked for 41 or more hours.
Table 18: Distribution of Respondents by Child Labour and Examination Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250 or less</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.0 (5)</td>
<td>6.0 (2)</td>
<td>5.0 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-350</td>
<td>67.0 (2)</td>
<td>81.0 (91)</td>
<td>85.0 (29)</td>
<td>79.0 (119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351+</td>
<td>33.0 (1)</td>
<td>15.0 (17)</td>
<td>9.0 (3)</td>
<td>16.0 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.0 (3)</td>
<td>75.0 (113)</td>
<td>23.0 (34)</td>
<td>100.0 (150)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2=69.36$; df=1; level of significance=0.000

These findings reveal that the more a child was engaged in work activities at home the poorly s/he performed. These findings tally with those of Kagunye (1999) who found child labour to have tremendous effect on the child performance in terms of examination score. Nkinyangi (1980) also found out that those children who worked for long hours while in school performed very poorly in examination leading them to drop out of school eventually.

**Child Labour and Study Hours**

The difference in hours of study compared to hours of work indicate clearly that children work activities at home reduces significantly the time the child can be involved in own reading. Approximately 33% (1) of the children who worked between 21 and 30 hours per week studied between 1 and 10 hours per week compared to 71% (80) of children who worked between 31 ad 40 hours and 74% (25) of those who worked beyond 41 or hours. Approximately, 68% (2) of the children who worked between 21 and 30 hours studied for 11 or more hours per week compared to only 29% (33) of children who worked between 31 and 40 hours and 26% (9) of those who worked for more than 40 hours per week.
Child Labour and Rate of Completion of School - Homework

Child labour was also found to influence the child’s rate of completion of school homework. The fewer the hours the child worked the higher was his/her rate of completion of school-homework.

Table 20 below show that, approximately 100% (3) of the children who worked between 21 and 30 hours completed their homework always compared to 78% (90) of those who worked between 31 and 40 hours and 74% (23) of those who worked...
for 41 or more hours. Approximately, 14% (16) of children who worked between 31 and 40 hours completed their work often compared to 6% (2) of those who worked for 41 or more hours. The highest number of children who rarely completed their work 20% (6) came from the category of children who worked for 41 or more hours per week compared to 9% (10) of those who worked between 31 and 40 hours.

Table 20: Distribution of Respondents by Child Labour and Rate of Completion of School-Homework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate of completion of school</th>
<th>Hours of Work</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>31-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>100.0 (3)</td>
<td>78.0 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.0 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.0 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.0 (3)</td>
<td>77.0 (116)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 116.16$; df=1; level of significance=0.000

In terms of school performance, the study found that the more hours the child spends in child labour, the less time he/she is left with for study and rarely will he/she complete his homework. Those children, who engaged in child labour performed poorly in examinations, rarely did their school homework and in most cases were left with very little time to study. Thus, the third hypothesis of the study that child labour affects the child's performance in school was accepted.

Child labour was therefore found to be one of the contributing factors to poor performance in primary day schools. Group discussions with the pupils yielded the same results. The pupils unanimously agreed that their work activities at home to some extent impacted negatively on their schoolwork. Many cited fatigue from
household/agricultural chores as interfering with their concentration in class and also in their studies when at home. Some pupils reported to travel up to two kilometers to sell milk before going to school. Others said they had to go to the river one or two trips before preparing for school. Work activities early in the morning made the pupil to loose concentration during class and this contributed greatly to poor performance in examinations because what is usually tested is what the teacher has taught in class. The pupils argued that even though studying on their own improved performance this is only so if some basic understanding of the topic has been grasped in class.

They were also of the opinion that some parents were negligent as far as their children’s education was concerned. Some of the girls claimed that their parents were too busy in their own work to oversee their children’s schooling. One of the girls during the discussions had this to say;

“My mother is never found home........... She is either in Nairobi half of the week and the rest of the days are spent preparing for the trip”.

The child claimed that she is left to take care of her younger siblings and still go to school. This greatly reduced her time to do school homework.

The headteachers interviewed felt that children’s work activities at home were essential but nevertheless needed monitoring and regulation so that schoolwork is not compromised. If not regulated children’s work at home can lead to poor performance.

The headmaster of Mukuria primary school, Mr. Kavungura observed,

“A pupil in class is preoccupied with unfinished tasks at home. They are always wondering when they will be — out to water the animals, take the animals, take the
milk to the market or feed the baby. Schoolwork is such an enormous task and one needs a clear mind”.

This view is also held by Zani (1993) who argues that child labour is detrimental to schooling. The pupils also argued that concentration is minimal after engaging in work activities and then settling down to study in the evenings. It was only after a few minutes that supper is usually ready and afterwards one is pushed to sleep. Such pupils would rarely complete their school homework or revise what had been taught. They therefore end doing poorly in school. The pupils cited this to be a reason why boarding primary pupils perform better than them in national examinations.

4.3 Other factors Influencing School Performance

It must be pointed out that this study was limited to finding out the impact of child labour on school performance and thus has the weakness of not analyzing other (non child labour) factors that influence school performance. Nevertheless, the study found out that child labour was not the only cause of poor performance in primary day schools. Other factors contributed as well. Among those highly ranked as contributing to poor performance were lack of school requirements (e.g. text books), lack of teacher commitment, parental ignorance on the value of education, lack of basic needs (e.g. food), drug abuse, peer pressure (influence), poverty, female circumcision and early marriage, impact of HIV/AIDS endemic and over-stretched curriculum.

The pupils were of the view that they could not rely solely on teachers to pass examinations. The head teachers during in depth interviews expressed the same sentiments. They needed to study on their own which was not usually possible due to lack of text books. Primary day schools lacked basic textbooks, which incapacitated both the teachers and pupils. It was found that pupils relied heavily on
teacher’s notes to pass examinations. Some of these notes were outdated, as sometimes the teachers did not have access to the many of the textbooks recommended. The blame was partly shifted to the government for not providing at least some basic textbooks to needy schools for use as part of the cost sharing policy.

At the same time, the 8-4-4 syllabus was cited to be changing every now and then making buying of the textbooks a very expensive affair. A parent during the group discussions regretted for the many text books, which she had bought for her daughter when in standard two and her younger son currently in the same class could not use them.

The pupils also cited lack of commitment from both the teachers and the parents to contribute to poor performance. They said that some parents were very discouraging and even questioned the relevance of education in modern day society where unemployment ranked very high. They would openly tell their children that they didn’t have money to take them to secondary. This made the pupils to loose hope and just goes to school to pass time. Some of the parents preferred children to work instead because the activity was more rewarding at the time than being in school. Boys were found to leave school and engage in brick making, a popular economic activity on the lower parts of Embu. Those living near Mount Kenya region left to work in the timber industry that was thriving at the time of the study. Children living in the tea zones abandoned school during pick season to engage in wage labour.

Data emerging from the pupils were that boys were more prone to wage labour than girls. This to some extent explains the fact that there were fewer boys than girls in most of the schools visited. Pupils who participated in focus group discussions said that some teachers would ill-advice some pupils to drop out of school so that they could employ them as farm labourers or house helps in their
homes. Others lacked commitment in their work and failed to attend classes making it impossible for pupils to cover the syllabus. According to these pupils, such teachers in most cases had enrolled their children in boarding schools and cared less for the pupils in the schools they taught. The pupils felt that some teachers were unfair to some of the pupils because of their poor socio-economic backgrounds. One of the girls who came from a very poor background and whose parents were casual workers in teachers’ farms shared her view;

"mwalimu uyu niagwice muno, niwici vava waku, mami waku kana ringi nimamuratagira wira. Kwoguo nieciria wikarie tao, yaani ndwina vata, niagwoca ta aciari aku". (This teacher knows you too well; s/he knows your mother, your father, may be your mother works for her sometimes. So she thinks you are like her, that you are useless, she takes you like the way she takes your mother that you cannot help yourself, so she picks on you all the time).

Throughout the discussions the pupils were of the view that teachers should not be teaching in the area they come from. They argued that this would make pupils to feel at ease because the teacher does not know their backgrounds. Also they were of the view that when teachers are in one school for along time, there is a tendency to run it as their own. They stop being innovative and hardworking.

Discussions with the parents revealed that they were willing to give their children good education but they had no resources to do so. However, female parents did accuse their male counterparts of being absorbed in the traditional liquor and regretting their children’s education. The chairlady of Ikura women group who was one of the participants had this to say;

"The children are left to the mother to provide their school requirements which they cannot adequately. This has made many children to drop out of school as we mothers cannot manage on our own."
Another contributing factor to poor performance in the schools was lack of food. This occurs when there is a shortage of rainfall in the area. Many households go without food and poor families are the worst hit. Children attend school without food and are unable to concentrate in class. Many are forced to look for employment during such spells. The parents were of the view that the government should work with willing NGOs in the area to have feeding programs in primary day schools. They cited a local NGO (Child Nutrition Project – CNP) working in the area at the time of study as having contributed a lot in provision of food for some needy children in some schools but it was sadly pulling out. Nevertheless, its impact was greatly felt and appreciated by these parents, thus, the need to have such programmes.

The Aids scourge was also found to contribute to children's poor performance in schools. There were cases of orphaned children as a result. The costs of treatment coupled with the social stigma were at the expense of their education. Children whose parents were ailing lacked concentration in class and had a duty to look after their parents instead of attending class. In the long run they performed very poorly or dropped out of school altogether.

The pupils during the discussions also mentioned drug abuse as a contributing factor to poor performance. Those children who engaged in delinquent behaviors such as drinking alcohol or cigarette/bhang smoking performed poorly in school. Many school going children unfortunately were found to be involved in this vice due to peer influence.

Female circumcision and early marriages especially on the upper parts of the district was commonly practiced. Girls who had undergone circumcision felt that they were mature and were not supposed to mix with their fellow classmates who had not undergone the rite. They ended up performing poorly in school.
Lastly, the wide curriculum was found to contribute to poor performance. The pupils were fatigued and stressed leading to poor performance.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the study found out that the child's socio-economic background contributes to the child's engagement in child labour. Various indicators of socio-economic statuses were found to have relationships with child labour. Children whose parents had secondary education and above, were employed and in a marriage relationship were found to work for fewer hours than those whose parents had primary or no education, unemployed and single. The child's personal attributes were found to have no significant impact in determining the child's involvement in child labour. Girls and boys performed similar chores at home but first born children were found to contribute more in terms of hours put into work compared to younger children. Parents entrusted older children with more responsibilities when they were away.

The study also found out that child labour impacted negatively on school performance. Those children who worked for very long hours performed also very poorly in examinations, they rarely completed their homework and were left with very little time to study. Child labour however, was not the only contributing factor to poor performance in primary day schools. Other factors included lack of text books, parental ignorance on the value of education, lack of commitment from teachers, peer influence, drug abuse, HIV/AIDS, female circumcision, early marriages and an over-stretched curriculum.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter's aim is to summarize the major findings of the study while at the same time trying to find out the extent to which the study's objectives and hypothesis were achieved. It also highlights areas of further research to the world of academics and finally recommends ways and means of improving the lives of children both in their education and work activities to policy makers.

5.1 Summary Findings

It must be pointed out that the study's major objective was to identify the socio-economic/demographic factors that contribute to the child's engagement in child labour as well as to find out the impact of child labour on school performance.

As stated in chapter one, the first objective of the study was to identify the socio-economic/demographic factors that contribute to child labour. It was found that various socio-economic factors influenced the child's participation in child labour. These included the child's position of birth, family size, the child's parents' marital, educational and occupational statuses, main source of lighting at home and main type of residential housing.

The child's socio-economic background greatly influenced the child's participation in child labour. The higher the child's socio-economic status, the less the child was likely to work. For example, children who were from big families were found to
work for longer hours than those who were from small families. This is because large families had more needs to meet and hence needed more resources to meet those needs. In addition, children from single parents worked for longer hours than those who were from married couples. A single parent solely provided for her children and was usually away from home leaving household chores to the children. Informal observation shows that most of the women who went to the city to sell farm products were single mothers. They were found to be away from home for days leaving the children on their own.

Likewise, the parents' educational as well as occupational statuses determined a child's involvement in child labour. It was found those children whose parents had secondary education and above worked for fewer hours than those whose parents had primary or no education at all.

Children whose parents were employed were also found to work for fewer hours than those children whose parents' main source of income was the farm. An explanation for the observed discrepancy was that parents who had an extra income (other than farming) could afford to hire wage labour and hence involve their children less in household/agricultural activities. They were probably more educated and knew the value of education and hence engaged their children less in work activities to give them time to study. In addition, children who were better housed performed fewer chores than those who were poorly housed. Children who were better housed were probably of more well up parents who had a good source of income and of a higher educational status. Their ability to hire wage labour coupled with their understanding e.g. the repercussions of child labour enabled them to

At the same time, it was found that children whose main source of lighting was the tin lamp worked for longer hours than children whose sources of lighting were pressure lamp, solar energy or electricity (PSE) source). Thus, the study found out that a child's socio-economic status as a very important contributing factor to the child's engagement in child labour. This confirmed the study's first hypothesis that
the child’s socio-economic background contributes to the child’s engagement in child labour

At the same time, it was found that children whose main source of lighting was the tin lamp worked for longer hours than children whose lighting were pressure lamp, solar energy or electricity (PSE source).

Thus, the study found that a child’s socio-economic status as a very important contributing factor to the child’s engagement in child labour. This confirmed the study’s first hypothesis that the child’s socio-economic background contributes to the child’s engagements in child labour.

The study also found out that the sex of the child was not a significant factor in determining the child’s involvement in child labour. Both girls and boys were found to engage in one or more similar work activities. Male children were found to be performing ‘female oriented chores’ such as cooking, fetching water and cleaning utensils. Girls were also engaged in boys work such as milking and attending to livestock. Therefore sex typing was found to be no longer important in children’s socialization into work activities. However, the child’s position of birth was found to be an important factor in determining the child’s involvement in child labour. First-born children worked for longer hours than the younger children. This is because parents put a lot of trust in older children to perform domestic chores than they did to the young ones. Therefore the study concluded that the child’s personal attributes were likely to determine the child’s involvement in child labour thus modifying the study’s second hypothesis to read that;

“The child’s personal characteristics may or may not influence the child’s involvement in child labour”.
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The second objective of the study was to find out the impact of child labour on school performance. A major finding of the study was that child labour has a tremendous effect on school performance. It was found that children who worked for long hours at home performed poorly in examinations (e.g. only 16% of the pupils interviewed had scored over half the examination score); they also studied for very few hours and rarely completed their school homework. Generally, it was found that children who engaged in child labour before or after school were fatigued and could not study on their own. When in class they lacked concentration and easily slipped into sleep. These findings confirmed the study’s third hypothesis that children’s work activities at home affect their performance in school.

Nevertheless, the study found out that child labour was not the only contributing factor to poor performance in primary day schools. Others included; lack of school text books requirements, lack of teacher commitment, parental negligence and ignorance on the value of education, lack of basic needs (food, school uniform), peer influence and drug abuse, lack of school fees, HIV/AIDS, female circumcision, early marriages as well as an over-stretched curriculum.

5.2 Recommendations

To meet the study’s third objective, which was to recommend policy measures that can be taken to curb the ever-increasing problem of child labour, the study came up with the following recommendations;

1. There is need to sensitize the parents on the need to regulate their children’s work activities at home to give them enough time for school work. This is because the study found out that children who worked for long hours at home performed poorly in examinations, had fewer hours for study and rarely completed their school – homework and this greatly influenced how they performed in examinations. The Ministry of Education in conjunction with the
children's department needs to hold seminars with parents highlighting the place of children's works activity vis-à-vis education. This will help the parents understand the important role education plays in the child's development and his/her place in society. Such an understanding from the parents will lessen children's work activities at home and thus adding more man-hours to school work.

2. There is need to boost the rural economies with an aim of improving the socio-economic statuses of the rural parents. This is because the study found out that a child's poor socio-economic background contributed greatly to the number of hours that a child worked. The government should devise measures to ensure farmers are reasonably paid for their product so that they can be able to hire wage labour when there is need. This will in the long run reduce the children's man hours at home and also in the farm leaving them with more time to put to their schoolwork.

3. Lastly, to the academicians, there is need for further research into the dynamics and complexities of the child labour phenomenon and how it impacts on vital institutions of our society.
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Appendix 3

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

School _______________________________________________

Zone ________________________________________________

How are you? My name is ___________________________________ _ _  and I am a postgraduate student at the University of Nairobi.

I am carrying out a study on children’s work activities at home and how it is likely to affect their performance in school. You are among a large cross-section of standard seven pupils in Kyeni division whom I am interviewing. Your response will be a representative of other school going children in the district.

The information you give will be treated with confidence and will help to shed light on children’s work activities in relation to their performance in school. It will also enable policy makers to enact laws pertaining to children’s work and their schooling.

Section 1

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Name</td>
<td>_____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Age</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Sex</td>
<td>1. Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Birth order e.g. 2/8</td>
<td>____________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.5 Religion 1. Catholic
   1. Anglican
   2. Pentecostal
   3. Baptist
   4. Salvation Army
   5. Others (specify)

1.6 Marital status of the parents
   1. Married
   2. Divorced/separated
   3. Single parent
   4. Widowed
   5. Others (specify)

Section II

2.1 What is your father’s highest level of education?
   1. None
   2. Primary
   3. Secondary
   4. University
   5. Doesn’t know
   6. N/A
2.2 What is your mother’s highest level of education?
   
   1. None
   2. Primary
   3. Secondary
   4. University
   5. Doesn't know
   6. N/A

2.3 Is your father employed?
   
   1. Employed
   2. Not employed

2.3.1 If employed, specify the type of employment?
   
   1. Formal employment
   2. Informal employment
   3. Self Employment e.g. Businessman

2.4 Is your mother employed?
   
   1. Employed
   2. Not employed

2.4.1 If employed, specify type of employment?
   
   1. Formal employment
   2. Informal employment
   3. Self employment e.g. business lady
2.5 Does your family grow any of the following types of cash crop? If yes, please rank the first three cash crops grown at home (e.g. 1, 2, or 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of cash crop</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Coffee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tobacco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Macadamia nuts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pawpaws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bananas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mangoes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Avocados</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Maize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Beans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Others (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 Main source of lighting (Rank if more than one)
1. Tin lamp
2. Lantern
3. Pressure lamp
4. Solar
5. Electricity
6. Others (specify)

2.7 Type of residential Housing (Rank if more than one)
1. Mud (grass thatched roof)
2. Mud (iron sheet roof)
3. Stone
4. Wooden
5. Others (specify)
2.8 What is the family's source of drinking water? (Multiple answers are possible—rank if more than one)
   1. Tap
   2. Well
   3. Borehole
   4. River
   5. Others (specify)

Section III

3.1 How often do you perform the following activities in a week?
   1. Always
   2. Most Often
   3. Often
   4. Rarely
   5. Never
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Farm Work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cleaning the house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cleaning utensils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Washing clothes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fetching firewood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fetching water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Milking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Feeding livestock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Child care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Going to the shop/market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cleaning the compound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Selling farm produce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Cooking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Others (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 On a typical school day, which activities are you likely to perform and for how long?

(a) Before going to school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Time taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Farm Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cleaning the house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cleaning Utensils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Washing clothes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fetching water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fetching firewood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Milking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Feeding livestock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Child care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Going to the shop/market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cleaning the compound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Selling Farm Produce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Cooking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Others (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total time taken: 

-
(b) After School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Time taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Farm Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cleaning the house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cleaning Utensils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Washing clothes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fetching water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fetching firewood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Milking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Feeding livestock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Child care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Going to the shop/market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cleaning the compound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Selling Farm Produce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Cooking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Others (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total time taken

3'
3.3 Which duties are you likely to perform during weekends and for how long?

(a) Saturday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Time taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Farm Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cleaning the house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cleaning Utensils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Washing clothes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fetching water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fetching firewood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Milking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Feeding livestock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Child care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Going to the shop/market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cleaning the compound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Selling Farm Produce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Cooking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Others Specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total time taken

________________________________________________________________________
(b) Sunday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Time taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Farm Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cleaning the house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cleaning Utensils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Washing clothes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fetching water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fetching firewood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Milking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Feeding livestock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Child care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Going to the shop/market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cleaning the compound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Selling Farm Produce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Cooking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Others (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total time taken

3.4 Total hours of work per week
3.5 Daily work schedule during school holidays (on a typical day).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Time taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Farm Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cleaning the house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cleaning Utensils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Washing clothes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fetching water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fetching firewood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Milking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Feeding livestock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Child care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Going to the shop/market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cleaning the compound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Selling Farm Produce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Cooking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Others (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total time taken

3.5.1 Hours of work per week

3.5.2 Respondent’s average number of working hours per week

3.7 Have you failed to go to school in order to attend to home duties?

1. Yes
2. No
3.7.1 If yes, how many times in the last one-month?
   1. Once
   2. Twice
   3. 3 – 5 times
   4. 6-10 times
   5. Over 10 times

3.8 In your own view, have the home duties that you attend to affected your performance in school in that one-month?
   1. Yes
   2. No

3. 8.1 if yes, in what ways ________________________________

Section IV

4.1 Do you have time to read at home?
   1. Yes
   2. No

4.1.1 If yes, how many hours per day?
   1. Less than 1 hour
   2. 1-2 hours
   3. 2-3 hours
   4. More than 3 hours

4.1.2 Hours of own reading per week__________________________
4.1.3 If no, why don't you have time to read at home?

1. Lack of reading facilities at home
2. A lot of work at home
3. Don't you fine reading necessary
4. Others (specify)

4.2 Does your school give pupils time to read on their own (i.e. while in school)

1. Yes
2. No

4.2.1 If yes, how many hours per day?

4.2.2. Hours of school reading per week

4.3 Total hours of study per week?

4.4 Do you attend tuition during school holidays?

1. Yes
2. No

4.4.1 if yes, how many hours per day?

4.4.2 Number of tuition hours per week
4.5 For the past one month, how many times have you failed to attend school?
1. None
2. 1-2 times
3. 3-5 times
4. 6 – 10 times
5. Over 10 times

4.5.1 What were the reasons for not attending school?
1. Lack of school fees, text books, e.t.c
2. To attend to home duties
3. Sickness
4. Other (specify)

4.6 How often do you complete your school-homework?
1. Always
2. Most often
3. Rarely
4. Never

4.6.1 For the past one month, how many times have you been punished for not completing school-homework?
1. Once
2. 2 – 3 times
3. 3 – 5 times
4. 6 – 10 times
5. Over 10 times
4.8. What factors are likely to affect your performance in school? Rank from
1. Most Important 2. Important 3. Less important 4. Least important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of school fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of parental care/support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Domestic chores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Peer group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teachers commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lack of reading facilities at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lack of food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Others (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9 In your own view, what factors would help you improve your performance in school?

1. _______________________________________
2. _______________________________________
3. _________________________________
4. _____________________________________

4.10 Do you have anything else to add?

Section V

5.0 Pupil’s examination score (e.g. 245/700).

5.1 First term’s mark ________________________________

5.2. Second term’s mark ________________________________

5.3 Average score ________________________________
Appendix 4

Questions for Focus Group Discussions/ In-depth Interview.

i. What work activities are children involved with at home? In your own view do you think these activities affect children's schooling?

ii. In your own view, do you think children's work activities should be regulated i.e. monitored by the parents or guardians? If yes, why do you think so?

iii. In your own view, do you think these work activities affect children's performance in school? Say in terms of examination score, school absenteeism and completion of school – homework? Why do you think so?

iv. In your own view, what do you think are the causes of poor performance in primary days schools as opposed to their boarding counterparts in this area? Do you think that child labour contribute to this discrepancy? What can be done to improve this low of performance?

v. Do you have anything else to add in this discussion?

Thank you for your co-operation