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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to establish the impact of child labour on the enrolment, retention and academic performance of pupils in primary school in Kilifi County. The specific objectives are: to determine the forms of child labour; to examine effects of factors influencing child labour and enrolment of pupils; to establish the impact of child labour on enrolment and retention rates of pupils, to determine the effect of child labour on the academic performance of the individual pupils in K.C.P.E and to suggest ways of minimizing child labour in Kilifi County. The study employed a descriptive survey design. The study employed simple random to select the schools for the study. Stratified random sampling was also be used to ensure equal representation of boys and girls per school. Purposeful sampling was also used to select a DEO per District and a District Children’s Officer. Questionnaires and structured interviews were administered to different respondents. Descriptive statistics was used in the presentation and interpretation of results. Data obtained was presented using pie charts and tables. There were different forms of child labour as revealed by the study but although pupils worked, they did not work for pay, profit and family. The activities they were involved in included housekeeping by their parents/guardians’ and it was on a regular basis hence working for 1-4 hours. On factors influencing child labours in relation to retention in school, the study revealed that 58.4% of the pupils said that the main reason for parents letting children work was to supplement family income. On the impact of child labour on enrolment and retention, the study established that pupils were aware of their friends who dropped out of school and the main reason was to care for sickly parents. On the contrary the headteachers said the reasons for pupils dropping out of schools, was child labour as result of poor background, early pregnancies and marriages. On the other hand pupils who were absent from school repeated their classes because of dismal academic performance. The headteachers suggested that the government should provide for orphans and vulnerable children needs and the government should enforce the law on child labour respectively. The following conclusions can be drawn. The forces that produce child labour are many, complex and interrelated. High numbers of children from poor families are joining economic activities as workers. On the effects of child labour on enrolment the reason given was pupils’ dismal performance as a result of household chores. On the enrolment and retention the pupils indicated that their colleagues dropped out of school and classes and that were more affected being classes 4-6. On the way forward to minimize child labour in relation to enrolment the headteachers, DEOs and children officers felt that the government efforts have not been reciprocated by the county administration. The following are the recommendations for the study. Poverty emerged as the most constraining factor on working children. Parents should be sensitized on the importance of children education this would encourage them to take their children to school rather than supplementing family income. Dropout rates can be curbed through empowerment of the parents, hence children continue with their education. The government through the Ministry of Education can help reduce the child labour on enrolment and retention encouraging pupils to remain in school hence high concentration levels in class and better academic performance. The government through the Ministry of Labour, Ministry of Education, Science and Technology and the Ministry of Interior and Coordination of National Government (county administration) should work together to curb the menace of child labour as this will reduce the number of children involved in the labour market.
1

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background Information to the Study

Child labour refers to work undertaken by children aged between 5 years and 17 years that prevents them from attending school, which is exploitative, hazardous, or inappropriate for their age. Children of ages 16-17 years are legally able to work in Kenya; however they are protected from working under hazardous conditions or the Worst Forms of Child Labour (WFCL). WFCL includes slavery, prostitution, forced or compulsory labour, involvement in illicit activities and forced recruitment for use in armed conflict. Child labour is a long time international vice that denies children from attending school at their tender ages, instead they work for their own or family survival. Child labour has always been associated with high levels of poverty but it goes beyond forced labour in various illicit activities on behalf of the powerful people in society (Ottolini, 2012).

There were about 215 million children working fulltime (ILO 2004). These children do not go to school and have little or no time to play, without proper nutrition or care. They are denied the chance to be children and over half of them are exposed to the worst forms of child labour such as working in hazardous environments, slavery and other forms of forced and illicit labour including drug trafficking and prostitution, as well as being involved in armed conflict. Of an estimated 215 child laborers around the globe: approximately 114 million (53%) are in Asia and the Pacific; 14 million (7%) live in Latin America; and 65 million (30%) live in sub-Saharan Africa (Robin, Carol, Jennifer 2004).
The Kenyan constitution does not prohibit child work; instead it defines the types of light work to be undertaken by children such as helping in household chores and in farms, provided the work is performed outside school hours and it does not interfere with their schooling, physical and moral development. The law under Employment Act, 2007, and the Children’s Act 2010, defines a child in Kenya as a person below the age of 18 years. Child labour means the employment of children in the age group of 5 to 14 years with or without payment. Children who are paid for some work outside their homes or children who work in hazardous environment can be said to be child labourers. Child labour is also defined as any situation where a child provides labour in exchange for payment. The situations including: where a child’s labour is used for gain by any individual or situation whether or not the child benefits directly or indirectly; where a child provides labour as an assistant to another person and his/her labour is deemed to be labour of that other person for the purpose of payment; and where there is written contract of service and the employee is a child (Children Act, 2010).

Section 56 of the Children’s Act (Kenyan Laws) prohibits employing a child below the age of 13 years in any form of undertaking. However it allows employment of children from the ages 13 to 26 years for light work, and defines those of 16 to 18 as employable. In section 58 and 59 of the Act, the minimum age for employment in an industrial undertaking is 16 years, unless child is an apprentice under the Industrial Training Act (Cap. 237, Laws of Kenya). The law also puts a time limit for a child in industrial undertaking as between 6.30 am to 6.30 pm.

While the law requires children to be in school, poverty and family circumstances force many children into child labour schemes at the expense of their education, health and
safety, as well as their childhood. High unemployment levels and poor families rely on children employment in order to achieve basic necessities. More than one-fourth of world’s people live in extreme poverty (United Nations, 2005). Also children walk long distance to reach a school. This problem makes many children in such areas to drop out of school to look for paying engagements elsewhere and subsequently become labourers. As much as access to education has been made compulsory and free, and actually enshrined in the Kenya Constitution, 2010, access to education is still limited in some Counties in Kenya. Many children are not going to school because they are unable to meet basic school necessities, hunger and lack of motivation from parents and communities at large. The situation has pushed children to work for some gainful income in various places (ILO, 2012).

Kenya introduced free and compulsory primary education in line with the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and enhancing the achievement of one of the pillars of the Decade on Education for Sustainable Development (DESD) (UNESCO, 2008). Nevertheless, not all children are in school. The government has subsequently set up a control mechanism that has worked reasonably well in rural areas. Enrolment is monitored and controlled through the Provincial Administration and the District Education Boards to enforce its implementation, especially in the rural areas. The Provincial Administration and the District Education Boards at the district level have been mandated to implement government educational policies. By mandating the village elders or Village chairmen to have the responsibility of ensuring that children go to school in their areas of jurisdiction, the local administration have managed to set up a tight system of control. Cases of non-school-going children are reported by the village elders to the sub-chief or chief.
The Gross Enrolment Rate (GER) for 2004 stood at 108.0 % (for boys) and 101.6 % (for girls) giving an overall GER of 104.8% at this level. This was an improvement over the GER figures for 2002, which stood 88.2%. In spite of this achievement, there are a number of challenges related to Child Labour activities which force children to drop out of school. These need to be addressed if access and retention of children in school is to be realized (Republic of Kenya, 2006).

Child labour has been identified as a major problem facing all societies in the world. It has continued to deny many children access to education and retention in school. The International Labour Organization (ILO) estimates that 218 million children are engaged in worst forms of child labour (ILO, 2006). Child labour continues to be a problem in Kenya as many children are engaged agriculture, domestic service, quarries, fishery and prostitution (ILO/IPEC, 2007). Approximately two (2) million children are working in various domestic work, fishing, prostitution, mining, quarrying and transport. These children constitute part of the 3.5 million who were estimated to be out of school, (ANPPCAN, 2005).

According to ILO report on child labour sociologists like to distinguish between “internal” and “external” forces (ILO, 2004). Internal forces are those acting within a family to produce particular outcomes such as child labour. An example would be the health or child-rearing practices of a parent. Internal issues may include difficult family situations: single-parent families, family illness or incapacity to work, dysfunctional families, unsupportive or unprotective families, poor family values, low level of education (of the child or the parents) and low parental skill level (Bainham, Lindley,
Martin Richards, and Trinder, 2003). External forces are those working on families from the outside, and are therefore likely to affect many families simultaneously. An example of this would be a national economic crisis. Family poverty plays a significant role in whether a child will work. External factors may include belonging to a minority population (racial or ethnic) and suffering social exclusion, strong peer group and external influences, with material values, socio-economic dislocation (economic crisis, political and social transition), the effects of HIV/AIDS and the special situation of girls. Other family-related factors, including family dysfunction and cultural influences, prove important in distinguishing the causes of child labour. It is also important to consider the demand side of child labour, which can significantly impact a child’s likelihood of working. Children often find themselves forced to drop out of school in favour of working in order to help supplement family income or simply to support themselves (Alexandrescu, 2002).

Economists prefer to sort factors according to whether they operate on the “supply side” or “demand side” of markets. A market is an institution which brings buyers and sellers together to determine what will be exchanged at what prices. In the case of child labour, the market includes those who provide child labour, such as the households the children live in, and those who utilize it. So demand-side factors refer to those things that make households more or less willing to offer children’s labour, while the supply side is influenced by employers of this labour. Of course, when the child is employed within the household the two sets of individuals will be the same, but the factors can still be distinguished (Moyi, 2011).
Patrinos and Psacharopoulos (1997) as quoted in Moyi (2010) argue that schooling and child labour are not mutually exclusive activities and could even be complementary activities. The assumption that children either work or attend school is no longer valid. There exists a complex relationship between child labour and education. Working children have been found to pay their own school fees as well as those of siblings (Bass, 2004). Even when work does not prevent children from attending school, it may reduce study time or tire the children, reducing concentration and learning. Heady (2003) found that working children had substantially lower reading and mathematics test scores than non-working children in Ghana, even after controlling for innate ability measured by the Raven’s Test.

Migration towards urban centres has led to the creation of large informal settlements in which infrastructure and social control is lacking. At the same time, alternatives and opportunities for non-school-going children are much more readily available in urban areas than in the countryside. In the environment of free and compulsory education, which can be well enforced at the village level, the willingness of parents and even other community members to discuss the issue of non-enrolment has now taken roots in Kenya. The children who are not enrolled or dropped out of school tend to leave their villages in search of work in the closest market places. The lucrative opportunities in the tourism sector and high poverty levels in the Coastal region have encouraged parents to let their children work to help to complement the family income. Kilifi County has not been left out in this scenario, with several case reported of child labour in various parts of the County. The marginalization of children in the country is being exacerbated by the combined effect of poverty and the HIV/AIDS pandemic. Over 56% of Kenyans now live
below the poverty line while life expectancy at birth is just 47.2 years (HDR, 2005). Kilifi County is further faced by elevated levels of poverty and poor infrastructural development. There is poor enrolment and transition in schools. Kilifi District Development Plan 2008-2012 notes that the total enrolment in primary schools in 2008 stood at 108,171 pupils while that of secondary schools stood at just about 8,126 (ROK, 2008). Enrolment in youth polytechnics across the county averages 600 students. This mirrors the wastage in the education (ILO, 2012).

Education is the key tool in preventing child labour while child labour acts as an obstacle to children attending school. Universal access to education, and particularly, free and compulsory education should be secured and children should not go for employment until the minimum age for entry to employment. Employing children has an adverse effect on their ability to develop into productive members of society. When children are left to work and at the same time go to school, they will always perform poorly in school and therefore not be able to acquire the quality education they need for productivity in future. Poor performance discourages the learner to continue in school, and consequently drop out of school. This creates a cycle of an uneducated work force whose chance to improve their standard of living is limited. The end result is future generations that perpetuates the vicious circle of poverty due to lack of education. There is a high dropout rate in primary schools in Kilifi county and intermittent school-going children who end up performing poorly in national examinations. The performance of the County in national examinations, especially KCPE, has been dismal, something that has made the researcher to undertake this study to find out the impact of child labour on enrolment, dropout rates and retention rates of pupils in primary schools in Kilifi County.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

Child labour has existed in Kenya for many years. During the pre-independence days, children were sent by their parents to work in farms and homes of white settlers in order to earn money to pay taxes for their parents. Today, due to high incidences of poverty and the changing family structures and values systems, children are known to work in the commercial agriculture sector, in tourism, stone mining, fishing and salt mining industries, in order to supplement family incomes. In urban areas children are employed in the informal sector as domestic helpers, street beggars and hawkers. Child prostitution and other forms of child exploitation is known to exist in the major cities of Mombasa, Malindi and Nairobi where young girls of below 18 years are involved as commercial sex workers (Suda, 2001).

Even with the introduction of free primary education, there is still poor enrolment of pupils, high dropout rates and low retention rates in primary schools, which have caused most schools in the county to register low performances in national examinations. The County also records the poorest enrolments rates with pupils dropping out of school at an alarming rate. Children of school-going ages are seen in towns loitering or selling merchandise in bus stops and market places (County Directors’ Office Kilifi, 2014). The issue is whether child labour has an impact on the academic performance of individual pupils and schools has anything to do with the children being out of school most of the time working for pay. Hence it is against this background that the researcher wished to carry out a research.
1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to establish the impact of child labour on the enrolment, retention rates and the academic performance of pupils in primary school in Kilifi County.

1.4 The Objectives of the Study

1.4.1 General objective

The general objective of the study was to establish the impact of child labour on the enrolment, dropout, retention rates and the performance of pupils in primary school in Kilifi County.

1.4.2 Specific objectives

The specific objectives were:

i. To determine the forms of child labour in Kilifi County.

ii. To examine factors influencing child labour in the selected primary school in Kilifi county.

iii. To establish the impact of child labour on enrolment and retention rates of pupils in the selected primary schools in Kilifi County.

iv. To determine the effect of child labour on the academic performance of the individual pupils in K.C.P.E in the selected primary schools in Kilifi County.

v. To seek suggestions on ways of minimizing child labour in Kilifi County.

1.5 Research Questions

i. What are the forms of child labour in Kilifi County?

ii. What are the factors influencing child labour in selected primary schools in Kilifi County?
iii. What is the impact of child labour on enrolment and retention rates of pupils in the selected primary schools in Kilifi County?

iv. What is the effect of child labour on the academic performance of the individual pupils in K.C.P.E in the selected primary schools in Kilifi County?

v. What ways are appropriate in minimizing child labour in Kilifi County?

1.6 Significance of the Study

Kenya has a primary school net enrolment ratio of 76% and 77% for boys and girls respectively (UNICEF 2006). After a decline in enrolment in the 1990s, as a consequence of structural adjustment programmes (SAP) and the “cost sharing” for public services, enrolment is on the increase again. The perceived relevance and benefits of education are related to the quality as well as the highest level of education that a child is likely to achieve. In the perception of parents and students themselves, the most important set of skills taught at primary school level is the ability to read and write, which is seen as a basic prerogative and necessary to secure even the most basic job (outside the village). The findings of this project may be important to different stakeholders interested in the child labour and its impact on children of school going age. Such stakeholders include; teachers, pupils, parents, the government and sponsors. Teachers in particular may device ways of attracting pupils in school. Programmes can also be initiated by the government and other interested stakeholders for teachers, parents and pupils that will cultivate for development of attitude towards the education of the child.

The findings of this study may provoke further research in the area of child labour in Kenya and other parts of Africa. Lastly the results of this study may help improve the home and school environment for the benefit of the child.
1.7 Scope of the Study

The study was carried out in Kilifi County on selected primary schools on the issues of enrolment, drop-out rates and retention trends, social service officers who deal with issues of children to gather information on the child labour and gather information from parents of whose children have been withdrawn from school to engage in gainful work.

1.8 Limitations of the Study

The major limitations of the study are; inadequate data collecting tools. The tools were designed in a way to sieve out errors and were subjected to validation from experts. Some of the working related activities that children are engaged in are carried out under cover, making it difficult to get information on that. However, all possible means were used to generate meaningful data for this study.

1.9 Assumptions of the Study

The assumption of this study is that child labour is the main factor that withdraws pupils from attending and remaining in school. It is taken as any engagement by a child for an income and which does not accord the child time to go school.

1.10 Theoretical Framework

The study is guided by a theoretical model on exploitative child labour by Carol and Swinnerton, (2002) where parents are considered to have imperfect information about whether employment opportunities available to their children are exploitative or not and whether or not to exploit their child workers. In this model, a ban on exploitative child labour is desirable because it allows children to go to school and resolves the problem of imperfect information faced by parents. The ban on child labour leads to an increase in the wages of child workers, and that organization profit, even for some that do not exploit
child workers. The ban is perceived to have ambiguous effects on the economic level of the household and that parent considers child employment to contribute to income levels at home.

1.10.1 Conceptual Framework

The theoretical model above can be explained by a modified conceptual model where child labour is driven by ignorant parents, high poverty levels and retrogressive cultures. The breakthrough of the vicious circle of child labour is through education, observance of human rights and enforcement of labour laws to ensure the child goes to school. It is quality education in school that there is productive labour for the family and the nation as a whole. The productive workforce has enhanced education, enforce labour laws and observe human rights. All these have enhanced the level of income and reduced the poverty levels and this guarantees quality education.

**Figure 1.1 Conceptual Frameworks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Extraneous</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents income</td>
<td>Forms of child labour</td>
<td>School enrolment and retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of child labour on education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.11 Operational Definitions of Terms

**Child Labourer:** Is a person below the age of 18 years out of school who is engaged or employed in any work outside the homes with or without payment.
**Child Labour:** Is defined as any situation where a child provides labour in exchange for payment including where a child’s labour is used for gain by any individual or situation whether or not the child benefits directly or indirectly or where a child provides labour as an assistant to another person and his/her labour is deemed to be labour of that other person for the purpose of payment.

**School Enrolment:** Is the number of pupils admitted in a year in every class in a school

**Retention rate:** Is the rate at which pupils remain in school and those pupils who are able to proceed to the next class in the education level
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction
Various researches have been done on child labour with respect to the forms and the contributing factors. Many of these researches have been done on the major contributing factors in child labour here in the country and oversees with little done on the impact of child labour on enrolment, retention and academic performance of pupils in primary schools. In this chapter, a discussion on the impact of child labour on enrolment, retention and academic performance of pupils in primary schools were done in the following areas: forms of child labour, child labour and enrolment and retention rates of pupils in primary schools, child labour and the academic performance and ways of minimizing child labour.

2.2 Forms of Child Labour in Relation to Enrolment
In Kenya, children primarily work in the informal sector. They work, often with their families, in subsistence and commercial agriculture e.g. on tea, coffee, rice, and sugar plantations. Children also work in herding and in fisheries. Children also work in domestic service, construction, transport, quarries, and mines, including gold mines. In urban areas, some street children are children who managed to escape from abusive domestic service situations. A baseline report on child labour in Kilifi shows that the district is one of the districts in the country that is faced by numerous child labour practices. The most common include sexual exploitation of children, child domestic labour, children selling illicit brews, farm labour, quarrying, fishing, hawking, touting and children being exploited for entertainment among others (ILO, 2012). Children are
engaged in commercial sexual exploitation and are reported to engage in prostitution within bars, discos, brothels, massage parlors, and on the streets. While the majority of children exploited in prostitution are between 13 and 17 years, children as young as 9 years are reported to be involved. Many girls who hawk or beg during the day reportedly engage in prostitution at night. In the agricultural sector, girls are sometimes forced to provide sexual services in order to obtain plantation work. Sudanese and Somali refugee children are also alleged to be involved in prostitution in Kenya. The growth of the tourism industry has been accompanied by an increase in children's involvement in prostitution, including in the coastal towns of Malindi, Mombasa, Kilifi, and Diani (United States Department of Labour, 2007).

The overwhelming poor social economic situation in the country the number of children entering the labour market have steadily increased. This is forcing children to work in order to fend for themselves or to supplement family income. Reliable statistics are not available to determine the level and incidences of sexual exploitation of street working children but observations seem to indicate that a lot of children are involved in child prostitution and child abuses in the slums of both Nairobi and Mombasa. This can be witnessed in some street corners in Nairobi and Mombasa where young girls are visibly noticed soliciting clients for prostitution. The Children Department in their reports approximate about 15,000 children as being engaged in the streets of Mombasa alone and another 10,000 children being engaged in commercial sex work countrywide (ANPPCAN, 2008).
The Children Act (2002) protects children from employments, hawking, commercial sexual work, and participation in manufacture, distribution and use of narcotic and psychotropic substances. The law also protects, children from sexual exploitation including prostitution and pornography. It outlaws any form of neglect by parents including excessive beating or any form of physical or mental abuse in the juvenile justice and penal systems. It is hoped that the implementation of this law will help the elimination of all forms of abuse including child labour.

A study by ANPPCAN (2001) shows that in Nairobi, for the last three decades, the Dandora Municipal Dump Site (within Njiru and at the edge of Kasarani districts) has been one of the largest dumpsites in Africa and the only dump site in Nairobi located 8 km away from the Nairobi’s Central Business District. According to the findings of a baseline survey done by ANPPCAN Kenya and Kindernothilfe (ANPPCAN, 2008), it presents a significant incidence of Worst Forms of Child Labour. Findings of 700 sampled children indicate that 65% of them had dropped education to sort out and recycle wastes and earn between Ksh.50-150 (USD 0.60-1.8) a day. About 61% of them had been working on the dumpsite for a period of 1 year to 4 years. Hence this study wishes to find out the forms of child labour in relation to enrolment.

2.3 Factors Influencing Child Labour in Relation to Retention in School

Admassie (2002) asserts that poverty is the main, if not the most important factor compelling parents to deploy their children into work obligations. Fallon and Tzannatos (1998) describe child labour as one of the most devastating consequences of persistent
poverty. The incidence of child labour decreases as the income and resources of households increase (Admassie, 2002).

A different school of thought argues that researchers need to look beyond household poverty to the policy environment (Hiraoka, 1997; Post, 2002; Weiner, 1991). Post and Weiner find that differences in school attendance and child labour rates in Latin America and Asia reflect differences in education policies and national laws. Weiner (1991) maintains that in India, regional variations in child labour and school attendance rates are due to the belief systems governing the elites and the political coalitions toward the expansion of school education (Weiner, 1991). Therefore, to fully understand the relationship between child labour and schooling patterns, we need to look at household decisions in the context of socioeconomic, cultural, and political forces that constrain those decisions. Whether or not a child works depends not only on the income of the household in which they reside but their status within the household.

A child’s age, gender, birth order, and relationship to the head of household also affect this decision (Manda, Kimalu, Nafula, Kimani, Nyaga, Mutua, Mwabu and Kimenyi, 2003). Older children are more likely to work because they are more physically developed, can obtain higher wages, and face higher schooling costs. On average, girls work more than boys. Studies have found that female-headed households tend to be poorer than male-headed households. Despite the higher poverty, female headed households have been linked with greater educational participation for children (Lloyd and Blanc, 1996). This study wishes to establish the factors influencing child labour in relation to retention in school.
2.4 Effects of Child Labour on Education

The most common approaches to estimating the effect of child labour in schools is the instrumental variables approach which considers the school attendance and performance in tests/examinations (ILO, 2012). This has been done by using other variables not caused by education, to predict involvement in child labour and then using this prediction rather than child labour itself as an explanatory variable in a regression predicting school attendance. Beegle et al. (2005), which employed this approach for Vietnamese children whose data, were collected during the 1990s to evaluate the extent of child labour in affecting children’s performance in schools. There is poor enrolment and transition in schools. Kilifi District Development Plan 2008-2012 notes that the total enrolment in primary schools in 2008 stood at 108,171 pupils while that of secondary schools stood at just about 8,126 (ROK, 2008c). Many young people who drop off the formal education system lack alternatives with proper mechanisms and linkages to enable them acquire requisite skills that would allow them to actively and decently participate in the labour market (ILO, 2012). The study also aims at finding out the effects of child labour on education.

2.5 Child Labour and Academic Performance

Studies on the relationship between child labour and education compares the educational outcomes of children who don’t work, or who work less, and those who do work, or work more. Therefore, there is need for accurate measurement of all the variables which school attendance, school academic performance or skill acquisition, and each of these can be approached in more than one way. A boundary line can be drawn between child labour and child academic performance through differentiating the basis of the type of work
involved. Children who engage in tasks that are of economic production are usually designated as child labourers, while the rest are considered as domestic chores. Other researchers use hours of work as the sorting variable. In such cases it is common to make a more-or-less arbitrary distinction between those who work more or less than a certain number of hours per week, specifically during the school hours in a year. This analysis focuses on education since hours of work may compete most directly with hours of schooling or studying. The most comprehensive study of this phenomenon is Levison et al (2006), who tracked the work experience of a large sample of children in Brazil. They compared two approaches to measurement. In the first, a researcher asked whether children worked during the past week, where work status is self-reported and is restricted to market work. In the second, the same definition of work was used, but the reference period would be the four months prior to the survey. With frequent spells of work and non-work, it would be expected that the number identifying themselves as workers under the second approach would be greater. Levison et al. restricted their sample to six cities during the early 1980s and late 1990s, totalling just less than 400,000 children with complete data.

According to Lingeve and Poipoi (2012), pupils who were involved in child labour in Suba and Homa Bay districts had a significantly lower academic achievement mean score than those not involved. The results also indicated that boys not involved had a significantly higher academic achievement mean score than girls not involved. Furthermore, boys involved in child labour activities had a significantly higher academic mean score than girls involved in child labour activities. It was concluded that there were child labour and gender effects on academic achievement of primary school pupils in
Suba and Homa Bay districts. In Kilifi there are more girls involved in child labour than the boys and this study also wishes to find out the effects of child labour on academic performance.

2.6 Ways of Minimizing Child Labour in Relation to Enrolment

The law sets the minimum age for employment at 16 years. The law on minimum age does not apply to children who work in agriculture or apprenticeships. However, the law does prohibit all types of child labour that are hazardous, exploitive, or would keep children under 16 years from attending school. In October 2007, President Kibaki signed five new laws that reform the labour code, including the Employment Act of 2007. The Employment Act defines the worst forms of child labour as "slavery, child prostitution, illicit activities or work likely to injure the health of a juvenile (ages between 16-18)." The Act also prohibits children from engaging in night work between 6:30 p.m. and 6:30 a.m., and stipulates that children between 13 and 16 years can only engage in light work which is not harmful to their health, development, or education, unless their work is part of a vocational training program (Diego, 2012).

The new law also provides for fines and up to 1 year imprisonment for employers caught employing a child in any of the activities prohibited by the Act; these fines increase in cases where children are injured or killed while performing one of the prohibited activities, with the law stipulating that a portion of the fines are to be used to benefit the child and/or their immediate family. The law prohibits slavery, bonded and forced labour, and servitude. The law also prohibits rape; defilement; the procurement of girls under 21 years for the purpose of unlawful sexual relations; the commercial sexual exploitation of children; and the transportation of children for sale. The law also criminalizes the
trafficking of children for sexual exploitation, including prostitution, pornography and sex tourism. For child trafficking, the minimum penalty is 10 years of imprisonment plus a fine, and, for trafficking involving sexual exploitation, the minimum penalty is 15 years of imprisonment, a fine, or both (Diego, 2012).

The law also prohibits children under 18 years from being recruited into the military and holds the Government responsible for protecting, rehabilitating, and reintegrating children involved in armed conflict into society. The Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development is responsible for enforcing child labour laws, but according to United States Department of State (USDOS), the Ministry's enforcement of the minimum age law is limited. The police anti-trafficking unit is responsible for combating trafficking, though, according to USDOS, it is not effective. In 2007, two children who were trafficked from rural Kenya to Tanzania for agricultural labour were later rescued. Also in 2007, two men were indicted for allegedly trafficking two Ethiopian children to Kenya for domestic service; these indictments were obtained by a community policing and child protection police unit (Diego, 2012).

The Government of Kenya's National Development Plan for 2002-2008 recognizes child labour as a problem and calls for an evaluation of the impact of child labour on the individual and the country, as well as its implications for the quality of the future labour force. The Ministry of Education indicated in its Gender and Education Policy that it would improve programs to prevent child labour and facilitate child workers' return to school as a means of increasing children's participation and gender equity in primary education (Constitution of Kenya, 2010).
The Government provides monthly cash transfers to orphans and very poor parents, whose children engage in agricultural work on plantations and in other sectors, as a means of compensating families for their children's labour. The child's attendance at school is a prerequisite for receiving these financial incentives. In December 2007, the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Communications Commission of Kenya, with NGO support, launched a hotline that children and adults can use to report cases of child labour and trafficking and receive counselling and referrals for assistance (Diego, 2012).

The Government of Kenya continues to participate in a 4-year, USD 5 million Time bound Project on the Elimination of Child Labour funded by United States Department of Labour (USDOL) and implemented by ILO-IPEC. The project aims to withdraw 15,000 and prevent 7,000 children from exploitive labour in domestic service, commercial sexual exploitation, commercial and subsistence agriculture, fishing, herding, and informal-sector street work. In June 2007, the First Lady of Kenya participated in ILO-IPEC's activities that marked the World Day against Child Labour and delivered an address on the problem which was broadcasted over both national television and radio outlets (ILO, 2012).

The Government also collaborated with ILO-IPEC on the implementation of two other child labour and education projects, namely a USD 1.15 million regional project to provide skills training to urban youth, funded by the Government of Canada, and a USD 1.79 million inter-regional project addressing child labour through education and training activities, funded by the Government of Norway. The Government of Kenya continues to
participate in the 4-year Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia Together (KURET) project, funded by USDOL at USD 14.5 million and World Vision at USD 5.8 million. Implemented by World Vision, in partnership with the International Rescue Committee and the Academy for Educational Development, the project aims to withdraw or prevent a total of 30,600 children from exploitive labour in HIV/AIDS-affected areas of these four countries through the provision of educational services (Diego, 2012).

The Government of Kenya also participated in the Community Based Innovations to Reduce Child Labour through Education (CIRCLE) global project, funded by USDOL at 8.1 million and USAID at USD 500,000 and implemented by Winrock International and various community-based organizations. In response to the 2006 joint Government / UNICEF study on commercial sexual exploitation and child sex tourism, the Children's Department worked with NGOs to host several workshops in 2007 to encourage local government officials and stakeholders in the tourism industry to implement the ECPAT Code of Conduct ((Diego, 2012).

Also in 2007, USDOS awarded a USD 300,000 grant to the American Center for Labor Solidarity for a project to build the capacity of local organizations in Mombasa to combat trafficking in persons and provide services to victims. The Government continued to work closely with the IOM on the country's anti-trafficking initiative. In 2007, the National Steering Committee to Combat Human Trafficking established a subcommittee charged with drafting Kenya's National Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking. Kenya's National Police are participating in an East Africa regional anti-trafficking project being implemented by UNODC/INTERPOL that aims to develop a regional anti-trafficking
strategy; bring national trafficking legislation in line with the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress, and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children; establish offices to combat trafficking; and develop training materials for the police force and prosecutors (United States Department of Labour, 2007).

The Ministry of Home Affairs incorporated activities to combat trafficking into its annual work plan in response to the joint Government/UNICEF study on commercial sexual exploitation on Kenya's coast. Several ministries continued to implement a trafficking education, awareness, and inspection program for the country's 68 foreign employment agencies (United States Department of Labour, 2007). This would help in eliminating child labour and help the pupils being retained in schools. This study then wishes to establish ways of minimizing child labour.

2.7 Summary of Literature Review

Child labour refers to work undertaken by children aged between 5 years and 17 years that prevents them from attending school, which is exploitative, hazardous, or inappropriate for their age. Education is the key tool in preventing child labour while child labour acts as an obstacle to children attending school. Universal access to education, and particularly, free and compulsory education should be secured and children should not go for employment until the minimum age for entry to employment. Working children have been found to pay their own school fees as well as those of siblings. Even when work does not prevent children from attending school, it may reduce study time or tire the children, reducing concentration and learning.
From the literature review there exists a knowledge gap on forms of child labour, to examine factors influencing child labour in the selected primary school, impact of child labour on enrolment and retention rates of pupils, the effect of child labour on the academic performance of the individual pupils in K.C.P.E and ways of minimizing child labour. Hence this study wishes to fill these gaps to show the influence of child labour on enrolment of pupils.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This chapter gives a discussion of the methodology that was used in the research. The research design, variables, population and sample, instrument used to collect data are described. A discussion of the pilot study, methods used in the collection of data determination of the tool validity and reliability and data analysis procedures are also described.

3.2 Research Design
The study employed a descriptive survey design. The design is chosen because it is convenient for capturing the opinions of participants on a phenomenon (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). Measuring dropout and retention rates as well as performance levels can be done accurately, through survey research. The study obtained data from an array of samples of the pupils, parents, teachers and education officers from the County, then described the information to establish a causal relationship between child labour and the schooling variables such as performance in tests/examinations, dropout and retention rates. The study was conducted in Kilifi County in selected primary schools. Schools with high dropout rates and those that have persistently performed poorly in district and national examinations were selected from the County directors’ office records.

3.3 Target Population
The population of the study included the schools that have persistently recorded poor results in the districts and national examinations and those that have recorded high dropout rates, pupils from the selected schools who have displayed tendencies of
repetition, poor performance in tests and who have been engaged in some gainful employment were included in the study. The study targeted 510 schools in Kilifi County. The study targeted population also included, 256,499 pupils, 510 head teachers, 6 District Education Officers and 6 children’s officers in the county were also considered.

Table 3.1 Target Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pupils</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>DEOs</th>
<th>Children officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Schools</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of Male</td>
<td>131,078</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of Female</td>
<td>125,421</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total population</strong></td>
<td><strong>256,499</strong></td>
<td><strong>510</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Sampling Techniques

Sampling is the procedure a researcher uses to gather people, places or thing to study. It is the process of selecting a number of individuals from a population such that the selected group contains element representative of the characteristics found in the entire group (Orodho and Kombo, 2002). The study employed simple random sampling to select the schools for the study. The researcher compiled a list of all the schools in Kilifi County then assigned them a number and placed them in a basket. Then blindly picked the numbers randomly from the basket and this formed the list of schools to be used in the study. Stratified random sampling was also used to ensure equal representation of boy and girls per school. Since the research cannot cover all the 510 public primary schools in Kilifi County, a sample was selected to take part in the study. The 510 schools have
256,499 pupils. There are five districts in Kilifi County, ten schools in each of the districts were considered. This contained 10% of the total population which is allowed in descriptive studies (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). Hence 25,000 pupils were selected from the 50 schools. Out of the 50 public primary schools, the researcher employed random sampling to select 4 schools per district schools. Twenty (20) primary schools were selected making to 39.2% of the selected population, which was higher than the recommended minimum sample size of 10% (Gay, 1992). Stratified random sampling was used to ensure that all categories of schools were selected, that is, mixed gender primary schools and boarding primary schools.

Kathuri and Pals (1993) came up with a guide for determining needed size of a randomly chosen sample from a given finite population of N cases such that the sample proportion P will be within plus or minus 0.05 of the population proportion P with a 95% level of confidence. From this guide, a sample of at least 623 pupils was chosen from a population of above 10,000 cases. Since there were 10,000 primary school pupils in the selected schools, a sample of 623 pupils was chosen, which was in line with Kathuri and Pals, (1993) guidelines.

The pupils to take part in the study were drawn from class 6 to class 8. Class 1-5 pupils were not included because they have not fully been dropping out of school for child labour. Out of the 20 schools for the study, 17 are mixed primary schools 3 are boarding primary schools. The researcher targeted a sample size of 208 pupils from class 6, 208 class 7 and 208 from class 8. From each of the 20 schools, random sampling was used to select 11 pupils from class 6 that is 5 boys and 6 girls will be selected.
Purposeful sampling was also used to select a DEO per district and a district children’s officer. All the principals of the selected schools participated in the study. As such, the sample for the study comprised of 6 DEOs, 5 Children officers, 20 headteachers and 623 pupils.

3.5 Data Collection Instruments

The field data collection was carried in all the selected primary schools with the help of research assistants who acted as interpreters. The secondary data was collected through the review of relevant documents. The primary data was collected through questionnaires and structured interviews administered to different respondents. The questionnaires were administered by the research assistants to the teachers and pupils. Where a respondent cannot read and write the researcher assisted them. The researcher conducted face to face interviews with Head teachers, Children officers and DEOs were deemed appropriate. Other methods include general observations and taking of photographs to support data collected. Questionnaires were used as the main tool guided by the nature of data to be collected, the time available as well as by the study objectives. The target population is largely literate and is unlikely to have difficulties responding to questionnaire items. The questionnaire were developed and modified from Teacher Concerns Inventory (Fimian, 1984) and Leadership Practices Inventory (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). The tool was used in obtaining quantitative data.

3.5.1 Validity of the Instruments

It is the extent to which research instruments measure what they are intended to measure (Oso & Onen, 2009). To establish validity, before pilot study, the instruments were given to two educational professionals to evaluate the relevance of each item in the instrument
to the objectives and rate each item on the scale of very relevant (4), quite relevant (3), somewhat relevant (2) and not relevant (1). Validity was determined using Content Validity Index (C.V.I). 

\[ \text{C.V.I} = \frac{\text{items rated 3 or 4 by both judges}}{\text{total number of items in the questionnaire}} \]

Kothari, (2004) stated that at least 0.7 coefficient validity of research instrument is acceptable in research. Thus the research items were accepted if the coefficient value is equal to or greater than zero point seven (0.7).

### 3.5.2 Reliability of the Instruments

Reliability is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials (Mugenda and Mugenda, 1999). Split half-technique was used in assessing reliability of the research instruments before pilot study. Kathuri and Pals (1993) state that items with reliability coefficient of at least zero point seven (0.7) are accepted as reliable in research. Thus a coefficient value of zero point seven (0.7) made items of the research instrument acceptable for study.

### 3.6 Data Collection Procedures

A letter of introduction was obtained from Kenyatta University to introduce the researcher to the National Commission for Science and Innovation. The permit of the study was presented to the County Director of Education, Kilifi County and headteachers’ of participating schools. There was a familiarization visits to the schools that took part in the study for introduction and establishing time for administration of instruments. The headteachers’, and pupils questionnaires were administered by the researcher and
completed questionnaires were collected immediately they finish filling in. Interviews were conducted with the DEOs and the children officers.

3.7 Data Analysis

Data analysis refers to the interpretation of collected raw data into useful information (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). After editing and sorting out the questionnaires for completeness, returns, and coding analysis of the data was done. The quantitative data analysis, descriptive statistics was used to analyze the data to give the percentages (%), and frequencies (f). Data was presented in form of tables which helped to explain the relationship between the variables of study. Qualitative data analysis was carried on qualitative data from the open ended question. Themes were created and this helped in explaining the data. Computer software, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used.

3.8 Logistical and Ethical Considerations

The respondents were assured of confidentiality before filling in the questionnaires. Confidentiality was observed and no experiments were conducted. The questionnaire is culture-fare and the rights of the individual were observed also. The researcher did not transport of subjects, to the venue being used for research purposes. Instead the researcher visited the respondents in their location.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Introduction
This chapter presents a descriptive analysis of the data gathered in relation to the impact of child labour on enrolment of pupils in selected primary schools in Kilifi County, Kenya. In this study, a total of 6 DEO, 6 children officers, 20 headteachers and 623 pupils filled in the questionnaires. The returned questionnaires were from 564 pupils, 20 headteachers, 6 DEOs and 5 children officers who were key informants. Analysis and data interpretation was based on these returns. About 90.5% of the pupils returned their questionnaires, the headteachers, the DEOs and children’s officer as targeted also returned their questionnaires. The return rate was hence considered adequate to provide required information for the purpose of data analysis. The data collected was coded manually; descriptive statistics were used to interpret quantitative information. Data presented was guided by the study objectives.

4.2 Background Information
This section presents the characteristics of personal attributes of individual respondents. They include; gender and age for the headteacher while the pupils included gender, age, number of times missed school and reason for missing school. The rationale behind inclusion of these attributes in the analysis is to have some introduction on impact of child labour on enrolment and the role played by both the pupils. The headteachers gender and age helps the study understand their administrative roles.
4.2.1 Headteachers Demographic

The headteachers were asked to indicate their gender. The results are as shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Gender of the Headteachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: F= Frequency  \( \% = \) Percent

It is clear that there were more male headteachers than their female counterparts. This implies that there is no gender parity among the respondents that may have an impact on girls enrolment in primary schools since they lack role models. These results agree with Kindi (2011) who noted that girl child have lagged behind in education due to lack of positive female role models. Female administrators play an important role in the management of schools and other educational institutions as role models to the girl child’s education.

4.2.2 Age of the Headteachers

The researcher enquired from the headteachers their ages. The age of the headteacher is important since the higher the age the higher the commitment to work hard and achieve goals. This agrees with Olembo, Karagu and Wanga (1992) who observed that age helped the principals to improve on his understanding and adaptability to instructional and administrative functioning. The results are as shown in Table 4.2.
Table 4.2 Age of the Headteachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: F= Frequency   % = Percent

Half of the headteachers were aged 41-50 years while 42.9% of them were aged over 50 years and 7.1% were aged 31-40 years. Hence all the headteachers were people who had attained age of people who can head primary schools when they have acquired the qualifications.

4.2.3. Pupils’ Demographic Data

Pupils’ demographic data would inform the research whether they are of age to take responsibility in their family as child labourers. The results on their gender are as shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 Pupils’ Responses on their Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>564</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Slightly above half of the pupils were boys (52.7%) while 46.8% of them were girls. This shows there was gender parity between the pupils in the study. This does not correspond with the population ratio which was supposed to be half of each category. That is boys and girls but in most schools girls had missed class than boys. The researcher then sought to establish their age. The results are as shown in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Pupils response on their age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 – 10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 12</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 – 14</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total     | 564| 100.0|

Majority (73.9%) of the pupils were aged between 13-14 years of age while 19.1% of them were aged 11-12 years of age only 5.3% of them were aged 7-10 years. The age of 13-14 shows that the pupils are young adults translating to the next level of life of adolescents. At this stage they need parental guidance on the kind of activities they need to undertake. They still are not ready for labour market.

The study then sought to know number of days pupils missed school and the reasons for missing school the results are as shown in Tables 4.5.
Table 4.5: Number of days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days absent</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 days</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 days</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 days</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 15 days</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>564</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About 39.5% of the pupils had missed school for 1-5 days for the last four weeks while 4.6% indicated they had missed 6-10 days with another 3.2% missing 11-15 days. 1.1% had missed for above 15 days. On the reasons given for the children missing school, 37.7% of them indicated they were sick, 6.9% of them indicated they were working and 4.8% of them were taking care of siblings. This implies that there are children who miss school because of health reasons, others for work and also take care of siblings which are also considered as a form of child labour. The findings on health reasons agrees with Ombudsman (2011) noted that children may suffer from a long-term or recurrent illness, with doctors advising they attend class on a certain number of hours each week. They may be physically ill or injured, or suffering with mental health problems including anxiety, depression, and school phobia and school refusal associated with depression. Hence there was need for UK local authorities to ensure children with health problems are not without education for more than 15 working days. So, if a child cannot attend school
because of a health problem, after 15 days the council must intervene and provide suitable education for a minimum of five hours a week.

4.3 Forms of Child Labour

This study first sought to know whether the children work for pay, profit, for family, or for any other favour. The results from the pupils are as shown in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6 Number of Pupils’ Working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay, profit, family or exchange of other favours</th>
<th>Pupils</th>
<th>Headteacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>564</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slightly above half of the pupils (53.7%) did not work for pay, profit, family or exchange or for any other favour while 41.5% of the pupils worked for pay, profit, family or exchange or home use during the last 7 days. This implies that children labour is real in Kilifi County among primary school pupils. From the headteachers questionnaires all the headteachers agreed that they were aware of pupils who worked for pay/profit, for their family or did something in exchange for home use during the last 7 days prior to the study. The DEOs and the children officers also indicated that they were aware of pupils who worked for pay, profit, for their family or worked in exchange of home use. The result concurs with ILO (2004) on child labour sociologists like to distinguish between “internal” and “external” forces. Internal forces are those acting within a family to
produce particular outcomes such as child labour. They also agree with Alexandrescu, (2002) who noted that children often find themselves forced to drop out of school in favour of working in order to help supplement family income or simply to support themselves. The researcher then sought to know the nature of work in which the pupils were mainly engaged in during the last 7 days. The results are as shown in Figure 4.1.

![Figure 4.1 Pupils Response on the Nature of Work they did](image)

**Figure 4.1 Pupils Response on the Nature of Work they did**

About 25.5% of the pupils said they had part time work, while 9.6% had temporary work, with another 9.0% of them having seasonal work, 5.9% of them had full time work and 1.6% had permanent work. This shows that there pupils who were able to come to school although later were supposed to be reporting to their work. The pupils indicated that they were involved in grazing, building houses, fishing, fetching water, household chores, cutting stones in the quarry, feeding chicken, fetching fire wood, hawking, washing clothes, weeding, cooking and tilling the land. These results agree with those of the headteachers, DEOs and the children officer who noted that pupils were involved in part time work, others worked temporary and others were fulltime. The headteachers, the DEOs and the children officers indicated that children were involved in household chores,
cultivating, planting crops, hawking, burning charcoal, grazing livestock, cutting building stones in the quarry, boda boda riding, selling water, plaiting hair, cutting grass for the livestock, casual labourers, fishing, mining, tapping, prostitution, and selling groundnuts. These results agree with those of a baseline survey done by ANPPCAN Kenya and Kindernothilfe (ANPPCAN, 2008) which presented a significant incidence of Worst Forms of Child Labour. The findings of 700 sampled children indicate that 65% of them had dropped education to sort out and recycle wastes and earn between Ksh.50-150 (USD 0.60-1.8) a day. About 61% of them had been working on the dumpsite for a period of 1 year to 4 years. The results also agrees with ILO (2012) a baseline report on child labour in Kilifi shows that the district is one of the districts in the country that is faced by numerous child labour practices. The most common include sexual exploitation of children, child domestic labour, children selling illicit brews, farm labour, quarrying, fishing, hawking, touting and children being exploited for entertainment among others.

This prompted the research to enquire the status of employment the pupils were in. The results are as shown in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Pupils Responses on the Status of Employment they had

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Employment</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own employment</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Worker</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid family worker</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>564</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Slightly below half of the pupils (48.4%) said they were unpaid family workers while those who responded, 18.6% of them had their own employment, 14.9% of them were casual workers and 5.9% of them were employed. The current paid employment was reported to daily by 18.6% while 4.8% were paid weekly and monthly respectively, and 1.1% was paid yearly. This result corresponds with those of the headteachers, DEOs and the children officers who noted that majority of the pupils were unpaid family workers, casual workers, and a few were in business. This implies that all the respondents had known of pupil who had worked for the family, had their own business and others who were just casual labourers. This concurs with ILO (2012), in a baseline report on child labour in Kilifi shows that the district is one of the districts in the country that is faced by numerous child labour practices. The most common include sexual exploitation of children, child domestic labour, children selling illicit brews, farm labour, quarrying, fishing, hawking, touting and children being exploited for entertainment among others.

The researcher then sought to know from the pupils whether they had been involved in housekeeping activities by their parents/ guardians’ on a regular basis for the last week. Majority (68.6%) of the pupils indicated that they had been involved in housekeeping activities by their parents/ guardians’ on a regular basis for the last week while 31.4% of them said they were not involved in housekeeping on a regular basis during the last week by their parents/ guardians. When asked about the number of hours worked each day, majority (66.4%) of the pupils indicated that they had worked for between 1-4 hours while 6.4% of them had worked for 5 hours and above. The researcher observed that some pupils were overworked by their parents and guardians hence this may have
contributed to dismal performance in KCPE and also affects the enrolment. The results agrees with Post (2002) who noted that despite many children combining work and school, they do not know enough about these children. He also found many child workers in schools and that the policies that lower costs of schooling would discourage child labour. According to the Government of Kenya, the free primary education policy increased enrolment by about 2.3 million, from 5.9 million in 2002 to 8.2 million in 2007 (Republic of Kenya, 2008).

4.4 Factors Influencing Child Labour in Relation to Retention in School

The study wished to identify from the pupils, headteachers, DEOs and children officers the reasons that would make parents let their children work. The results from the pupils are as shown in Table 4.8.

**Table 4.8: Reasons for Parents Letting Children Work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for working</th>
<th>Pupils</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To supplement family income</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot afford school or training fees</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help in family business/ farm</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education or training programme is not useful</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education or training institutions are too far</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child not interested in schooling</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority (58.4%) of the pupils said the reasons for the parents letting children work was to supplement family income, while 42.0% of them said that the parents could not afford
school or training fees, and 20.0% of them noted that it was to help in family business/ farm. About 9.0% of the pupils noted that education or training institutions are too far and children were not interested in schooling and only 3.1% who noted that the parents felt that education or training programmes were not useful.

All the headteachers concurred with the pupils on the reason for parents letting their children work as it was to supplement family income and they could not afford school or training fees, 80% said education or training institutions were too far while 70% help in family business and farm; and 65% child not interested in school.

The DEOs and children officers were asked to indicate the main reasons for parents letting their children work. All the DEOs and all the children officers indicated that one of the main reasons for parents letting the children to work was to supplement family income and cannot afford school or training fees. Another reason for the parents letting their children work was to help in family business/ farm, education or training institution were too far and the child not interested in schooling or training fees and payment of outstanding family debt. Other reasons for parents letting the children work was that they could not afford the high lifestyle they lived, hence needed someone who could provide for them money to buy the narcotic drugs and clothes. This implies that parents also have reasons to keep their children back at home which includes children working to supplement family income, parents not affording school or training fees, and children helping in family business/ farm. The results agrees with those of Admassie (2002) who noted that poverty is the main if not the most important factor compelling parents to deploy their children into work obligations. Fallon and Tzannatos (1998) also described
child labour as one of the most devastating consequences of persistent poverty. The incidence of child labour decreases as the income and resources of households increase (Admassie, 2002).

On the other hand the research enquired from the pupils’ reasons for not working during the last seven days for those who did not. The results are as shown in table 4.9.

**Table 4.9: Pupils responses Reasons for not working during the Last 7 days**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for not working</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No work available</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting to start arranged job</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied with home duties</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time students</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awaiting reply to earlier enquiries</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off season in agriculture</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness or injury</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On vacation/ leave</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority (57.6%) of the pupils said that they were full time students while 16.0% of them were waiting to start arranged work, 15.4% were ill or hand injury, and others were on vacation. About 14.4% of them had no work available, and 8.0% were occupied with home duties, and awaiting reply to earlier enquiries, and it was off season in agriculture. This implies that majority of the pupil were in class and had part time jobs hence they were in school because of different reasons. The researcher observes that child labour
cannot be approached separately from the issue of schooling. Patrinos and Psacharopoulos (1997) argue that schooling and child labour are not mutually exclusive activities and could even be complementary activities. The assumption that children either work or attend school is no longer valid. There exists a complex relationship between child labour and education. Working children have been found to pay their own school fees as well as those of siblings (Bass, 2004). Even when work does not prevent children from attending school, it may reduce study time or tire the children, reducing concentration and learning. Heady (2003) found that working children had substantially lower reading and mathematics test scores than non-working children in Ghana, even after controlling for innate ability measured by the Raven’s Test.

4.4.1 Child Opinion on Stoppage to Work

The research asked the pupils what would happen if the children stopped working. The results are as shown in the Table 4.10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects of children stopping to work</th>
<th>N=564</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household living standard will fall</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household enterprise cannot operate fully/ labour not affordable</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household cannot afford to live</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing will happen</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority (61.1%) of the pupils indicated that the effect of children stopping to work was that the household living standard will fall, 27.1% of pupils noted that nothing would
happen, while 24.5% of them noted that the household enterprise cannot operate fully /labour not affordable and 22.3% of them noted that the household cannot afford to live. This they said would make them lack food to eat hence the family would go hungry; they also noted that they would lack to sit for examinations, lack school fees, become poor and they would lack money for emergency.

4.4.2 Use of Children Earnings

The pupils were asked to indicate what they did with their earnings. The results are as shown in Table 4.11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sharing earnings</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, all by myself</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes part by self</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, all directly through the employer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, part through the employer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>564</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About 31.9% of the pupils said they gave part and part was left with self, while 20.2% noted that they never gave while 9.6% of them gave all to parents by themself and 4.3% of them said yes, all directly through and 2.7 gave part through the employer. The study sought to establish the percentage the given earnings contribute to the monthly income of
the family by the pupils, 20.7% of them noted that it contributed less than 20% while 16.5% of them noted it contributed from 20% to 50% of the monthly income of the family and 13.8% of them noted that it contributed to 50% to 80% of the monthly income of the family. On the other hand only 3.7% of them who noted it contributed to over 80% of the monthly income of the family. This responses were also cited by all the headteachers, DEOs and children office who noted that pupils income in some families was the breadwinner especially where children were orphaned hence contributing to 100% of the family monthly income. Others noted that the children earnings contributed to between 20-80% of the monthly income in the family. This implies that pupils went for employment since they were orphaned others contributed highly to their monthly income of the family. The results agrees with Emerson and Souza (2007) who noted that child labour could be a way to financing education that an individual would not otherwise have access to, which, in turn, could lead to better outcomes for older child or adolescent workers. On the hand Admassie, (2002) asserts that poverty is the main, if not the most important factor compelling parents to deploy their children into work obligations. He also notes that incidence of child labour decreases as the income and resources of households increase.

The researcher sought to know whether the pupils were able to make any saving on the part of their earnings. The results are as shown in Table 4.12.
Table 4.12: Saves Part of the Earnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saving earnings</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, regularly</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, occasionally</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>564</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most (31.9%) of the pupils noted that they had not saved part of their earnings, while 26.6% of them said they had occasionally saved part of their earnings and 16.0% of them said they regularly saved part of their earnings.

4.5 Impact of Child Labour on Enrolment

The study sought to know from the pupils, headteachers, DEOs and the children officers whether there were pupils who had dropped out of school. The results for the pupils are as shown in table 4.13

Table 4.13: Pupils Responses on Friends who dropped Out of School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drop out</th>
<th>Pupils</th>
<th></th>
<th>Headteachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>564</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Majority (76.1%) of the pupils indicated that there were some friends who had dropped out of school and 21.8% of them said there were no pupils who had dropped out school. All the headteachers confirmed that there were pupils who had dropped out of their school, with the DEOs, and the children officers indicating that they had received reports of pupils who had dropped out school in their time of stay in the district. This prompted the researcher to enquire from the headteachers the classes that were more affected.

Majority of the headteachers (78.6%) noted that classes 4 to class 6 were more affected than other classes with an approximate 10% of pupils per year. The researcher observes that this was a high rate of drop out compared to the rate of enrolment and retention. The DEOs and the children officers also noted that there was rampant drop out cases reported to their offices and they are persuading the parents to encourage their children back to school. The results concurs with those of Lingeve and Poipoi, (2012) who noted that pupils who were involved in child labour in Suba and Homa Bay districts had a significantly lower academic achievement mean score than those not involved. The results also indicated that boys not involved had a significantly higher academic achievement mean score than girls not involved.

This made the researcher wish to know the reasons given by the pupils for drop out. The reasons are as shown in Table 4.14.
Table 4.14: Pupils Responses on Reason for Friends Dropping out of school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for dropping out</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being orphaned</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To care for siblings</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To care for sickly parents</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They got employment</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 564

Most of the pupils (31.9%) felt that their colleagues dropped out of school because they had to care of sickly parents, while 26.6% of them dropped out school to care for their siblings, 25.5% indicated that their colleagues dropped out school because they got employment and 16.0% felt that their colleagues dropped out school since they got employment. The headteachers also gave reasons for pupils dropping out of schools, with majority of them citing child labour as result of poor background, early pregnancies and marriages, family conflicts, indiscipline, lack of ambitions, focus or vision, and others noted lack of clothes. The DEOs also noted that the main reason that made pupils in their district drop out of school was child labour with other reasons being, early pregnancies and marriages, lack of parental guidance, retrogressive cultural practices and being orphaned.

The children officers also echoed the same sentiments as those of the DEOs, headteachers and pupils and also added that some pupils lack motivation for education since they don’t have role models in the society, family support, poverty and drug and substance abuse was also a major contributor to child drop out. The other factors include age at enrolment, poor attitude towards education, ignorance of parents, lack of school fees and school
uniform also contributed to pupils drop out. The result agrees with those of Weiner (1991) maintains that in India, regional variations in child labour and school attendance rates are due to the belief systems governing the elites and the political coalitions toward the expansion of school education. Therefore, to fully understand the relationship between child labour and schooling patterns, need to look at household decisions in the context of socioeconomic, cultural, and political forces that constrain those decisions. Whether or not a child works depends not only on the income of the household in which they reside but their status within the household. Manda et al (2003) also assert, that a child’s age, gender, birth order, and relationship to the head of household affect the decision whether they participate in learning or not. Older children are more likely to work because they are more physically developed, can obtain higher wages, and face higher schooling costs.

**Pupil’s Repetition of Grades/ Classes**

The pupils were asked to indicate whether they have ever repeated any grade. The results are as shown in Table 4.15.

**Table 4.15: Pupils responses on Repeating a Grade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response on repeating</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I have repeated a grade</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I have not repeated a grade</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>564</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority (60.1%) of the pupils had not repeated a grade while 39.9% had repeated a grade. The main reason they gave for the repetition were absenteeism hence never did
any exam, other reasons included getting low marks, poor performance, lack of school fee, lack of uniform, lack of motivation in the studies, lack of sanitary pads, they were assigned to take care of their siblings, they had a lot of house chores, transfer to a new school and being orphaned. The results concur with the Republic of Kenya (2008c) which noted that there was poor enrolment and transition in schools. Kilifi District Development Plan (2008-2012) notes that, the total enrolment in primary schools in 2008 stood at 108,171 pupils while that of secondary schools stood at just about 8,126 (ROK, 2008c). ILO (2012) argues that many young people who drop off the formal education system lack alternatives with proper mechanisms and linkages to enable them acquire requisite skills that would allow them to actively and decently participate in the labour market.

4.6 Effects of Child Labour on Academic Performance

The most common approaches to estimating the effect of child labour in schools is the instrumental variables approach which considers the school attendance and performance in tests/examinations. This has been done by using other variables not caused by education, to predict involvement in child labour and then using this prediction rather than child labour itself as an explanatory variable in a regression predicting school attendance. This prompted the researcher to enquire from the pupils and headteachers whether pupils got homework. The results for the pupils are as shown in Table 4.16.
Table 4.16: Pupils responses on whether they got Homework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Got homework</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I am given homework</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I am not given homework</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>564</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16 it is clear that majority (89.4%) of the pupils got homework while 10.6% did not get homework. When asked how much homework they got and at what frequency, most pupils said that they got homework for all the subjects of the day, which was much, a few exercises, and others noted that they received little homework if any. The headteachers noted that all the pupils in their school got homework that was adequate.

When asked whether pupils completed their homework, majority (70.7%) of the pupils noted that they completed their homework while 29.3% did not complete their homework. The main reason as to why the pupils did not complete their homework was the house chores were much, other reasons given they had to work, lack of lighting, taking care of siblings and lack of time. The headteachers also noted pupils sometimes came to school without completing their homework because they had a lot of work at home, lighting system at home, and laziness, lack of seriousness, lack of parental support, and lack of time to concentrate on homework at home since they have to focus on family issues. The results disagrees with those of Ondieki 2012) who noted that parents can support their children’s schooling by attending school functions and responding to school obligations like parent-teacher conferences. They can become more involved in helping their children.
improve their schoolwork by providing encouragement, arranging for appropriate study
time and space, modelling desired behaviour (such as reading for pleasure), monitoring
homework and actively tutoring their children at home. Instead in the study parents
encouraged pupils to do extra household chores.

The researcher then wished to know whether the pupils were tired at school. The results
are as shown in Table 4.17.

Table 4.17 Pupils Response on Feeling Tired in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling tired</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About 29.3% of the pupils felt tired in school and 70.7% were not. This made the
researcher to enquire from the pupils whether they enjoyed school with 95.7% of them
indicating that they did enjoy school and 4.3% of them indicating they did not enjoy
schooling. The researcher then asked whether pupils worked hard in school with 96.3%
of them indicating they worked hard at school and 3.7% did not work hard. This would
lead to the performance in class with pupils being asked to rate their performance. The
results are as shown in Table 4.18.
Table 4.18: Rating by Pupils of their Performance in Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance in Class</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>564</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A high percent (61.7%) of the pupils rated their performance in class as good, while 24.5% rated it excellent, 11.2% rated it poor and 2.7% rated it very poor. This implies that majority of the pupils who enjoyed being in school also performed well in school while those who never enjoyed coming to school did not perform in school. The headteachers also noted that performance of the pupils in class was poor (78.5%) and only a few who said it was good (21.4%). This implied that both the headteacher and the pupils needed to make some adjustment towards learning so that the performance could raise. The researcher observes that when there is a positive attitude towards the problems facing the pupils back at home then pupils could be helped by the school to change their attitude towards school hence improving their performance.

The pupils were asked to indicate their future plans. The results are as shown in Table 4.19.
Table 4.19: Future Plans for the Pupils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupils Plans</th>
<th>N= 564</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Go to school full time</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete education/training and start to work</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work full time in household chores or housekeeping</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work part time in household enterprises or business</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find a better job</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large number (61.7%) of the pupils said they would wish to complete education/training and start to work, while 55.3% of them would wish to go to school full time and 2.7% said they would like to work full time in household chores or housekeeping and household enterprises. This implies that to majority of the pupils education had a lot of value since it would help them get better jobs. When asked other future plans they had the pupils noted that they would wish to be given opportunity to attend school without any hiccups, since they had future dreams of becoming doctors, bank managers and other prominent positions. Hence they would wish to report their parents to the chief of the area to take action against their parents who ask them to work instead of schooling. The results agree with ILO (2012) who noted that in their campaign against child labour, the Federation of Kenya Employers (FKE) was to implement an action programme focusing on corporate social responsibility (CSR) and child labour, which would include awareness-raising activities; developing a guide for employers on eliminating child labour and a concept note on CSR and child labour elimination; and providing financial support to schools to initiate income generating projects to implement school feeding programmes and educational services to prevent children from dropping out of school. FKE was also
to promote safe work for youth through advocacy and capacity building of informal economy businesses and with children and parents. Hence this would help the children to achieve their goals in life.

4.7 Ways of Minimizing Child Labour in Relation to Enrolment

The law sets the minimum age for employment at 16 years. The law on minimum age does not apply to children who work in agriculture or apprenticeships. However, the law does prohibit all types of child labour that are hazardous, exploitive, or would keep children under 16 years from attending school. In October 2007, President Kibaki signed five new laws that reform the labour code, including the Employment Act of 2007. The study sought from the headteachers, DEOs and the children office the ways of minimizing child labour in this region. The results are as shown in Table 4.20.

Table 4.20: Suggestions on Reduction of Child Labour in the Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions</th>
<th>N= 20</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government to provide for orphans and needy children needs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government should enforce the law on child labour</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide lunch programme in school</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All stakeholders to address the issues</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers should be alert to help these children</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents being informed of the importance of education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents to carry out their duties without involving children for many hours</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All the headteachers felt that the government should provide for orphans and children needs and the government should enforce the law on child labour respectively. About 75% of the headteachers suggested that they should have lunch programmes in their schools and 65% of them felt that all stakeholders should address the issue of child labour. Fifty five (55%) felt that teachers should be alert to help these children, with half of them indicated parents should informed of the importance of education and 40% felt that parents should carry out their duties without involving children for many hours. The DEOs indicated that the government should economically empower the community, provide intensive civic education/ sensitisation, reinforce laws and rights of children, enforce Children’s Act and Labour laws should be followed to the later. The children officers on the other hand felt that campaigns against child labour, prosecution of perpetrators of child labour, waiver of nursery school fees, educating of parents on the importance of education, addressing challenges of poverty in the region, prohibiting children to work in hazardous places, school feeding programmes to be introduced and enhance child friendly schools in this region would help to reduce child labour in the region. According to Diego (2012) the Employment Act defines the worst forms of child labour as slavery, child prostitution, illicit activities or work likely to injure the health of a juvenile (ages between 16 -18.) The Act also prohibits children from engaging in night work between 6:30 p.m. and 6:30 a.m., and stipulates that children between 13 and 16 years can only engage in light work which is not harmful to their health, development, or education, unless their work is part of a vocational training program.
4.6.2 Mechanisms for Enforcing School Enrolment for all Children

The researcher then sought from the headteachers, DEOs and Children officers whether the government has mechanisms for enforcing school enrolment for all children. All the headteachers indicated that the government has put in place mechanisms for enforcing school enrolment for children. This also corresponded with the DEOs and the children officers sentiments. When asked whether the mechanisms are effective, the headteachers noted that more effort needed to be put in place, FPE money is not sufficient hence parents are requested to supplement some little amount which in turn makes them keep children away from school, others noted that no action is taken against parents whose children are out school or those who pull children out of school. The provincial administration is not aggressive in the Education for All. Since poverty levels are too high in the region, children are pulled out of school to assist the parents work for food. They also noted that some parents are reluctant since they have not seen any action being taken against those who do not enrol their children to school. The DEOs agreed with headteachers and also noted that the mechanisms are not strictly followed hence the rate of child labour still increases since the provincial administration has not put measures in place. The children officers on the other hand notes that the mechanisms involves the provincial administration who are relaxed hence not strictly followed to the later. The education agencies have also relaxed hence the schools do not follow children who don’t come to school to know what happened. The school meal programme has increased retention rate, but some cases go unreported by the school administration since not much is done to curb the menace. The researcher observes that for the mechanisms to work well all the stakeholders should take their role with a lot of enthusiasm. This would encourage parents to enrol their children to school and also retain them. The results agree with the
United States Department of Labour, (2007) who noted that the Ministry of Home Affairs incorporated activities to combat trafficking into its annual work plan in response to the joint Government/UNICEF study on commercial sexual exploitation on Kenya's coast region. Several ministries continued to implement a trafficking education, awareness, and inspection program for the country's 68 foreign employment agencies.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter contains the summary, conclusions and recommendations of the study. It also has suggestions for further research.

5.2 Summary of the Study
The purpose of the study was to establish the impact of child labour on the enrolment, retention rates and the academic performance of pupils in primary school in Kilifi County. The general objective of the study is to establish the impact of child labour on the enrolment, dropout, retention rates and the performance of pupils in primary school in Kilifi County. The specific objectives were; to determine the forms of child labour; to examine factors influencing child labour; to establish the impact of child labour on enrolment and retention rates of pupils; to determine the effect of child labour on the academic performance of the individual pupils in K.C.P.E and to seek suggestions on ways of minimizing child labour in Kilifi County. The study employed a descriptive survey design. The study targeted 256,499 pupils, 510 head teachers, 6 District Education Officers and 6 children’s officer. The study employed simple random sampling to select the schools for the study. Stratified random sampling was also be used to ensure equal representation of boys and girls per school. The primary data was collected through questionnaires to pupils and principals. The questionnaires for the DEOs and children officers were also carried out. A coefficient value of zero point seven (0.7) made items of the research instrument acceptable for study. The data was analysed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics were used in the presentation
and interpretation of results. The respondents were protected and all procedures were explained to them and participation was based on consent of the subject. Confidentiality was observed and no experiments were conducted.

5.3 Summary of Findings

Forms of Child Labour

The study revealed that slightly above half of the pupils (53.7%) did not work for pay, profit, family or exchange or home use during the last 7 days preceding the research study. All the headteachers agreed that they were aware of pupils who worked for pay, profit, for their family or did something in exchange or home use during the last 7 days prior to the study. These results were also in agreement with those of the DEOs and the children officers interviewed. Some of the activities the pupils were involved in were grazing, building houses, fishing, fetching water, household chores, cutting stones in the quarry, feeding chicken, fetching fire wood, hawking, washing clothes, weeding, cooking and tilling the land. On the status of employment the children had own employment, casual and unpaid family employment. The result corresponds with those of the headteachers, DEOs and the children officers who noted that majority of the pupils were casual workers, others were in unpaid family work and a few were in business. The study revealed that the 68.6% of the pupils were involved in housekeeping activities by their parents'/ guardians’ on a regular basis for the last week. Majority of the pupils (66.4%) indicated that they had worked for between 1-4 hours.
Factors Influencing Child Labours in Relation to Retention in School

The study revealed that 58.4% of the pupils said that the main reason for parents letting children work was to supplement family income. This also agreed with all the headteachers, DEOs and children officers who noted that the main reasons for parents letting the children to work was to supplement family income and cannot afford school or training fees. On the child opinion on stoppage to work, 61.1% of the pupils indicated that the household living standard would fall. On the usage of the children earnings 31.9% of the pupils said they gave part to their parents and part was left with self. On the percentage the given earnings contributed to the monthly income of the family, 20.7% of the pupils noted that it contributed less than 20%. The responses were also cited by the headteachers, DEOs and children office who noted some pupils’ income in some families contributed 100% to family monthly income. On saving of the earnings, most of the pupils (31.9%) noted that they had not saved part of their earnings. The researcher observes that child labour had an effect on retention in school. Every child should have the opportunity to develop his or her skills and potential to participate both as a citizen and as a worker. In today’s society, a certain level of schooling is necessary for each person to feel an equal. Moreover, with a rapidly changing economy, to deny schooling to any group of children is to forever deny them an opportunity to acquire skills and earn a decent livelihood. A child-centred approach to child labour is, therefore, not merely to save the child from severe exploitation, but also to ensure that she or he has the chance to a future. Hence the children lacked an opportunity to enhance their skills.
Impact of Child Labour on Enrolment

On pupils responses on friends who dropped out of school 76.1% of the pupils indicated that there were some friends who had dropped out of school to take care of their sick parents. All the headteachers confirmed that there were pupils who had dropped out of their school to work. The DEOs and the children officers also indicated that they had received reports of pupils who had dropped out school in their time of stay in the district. On the classes that were more affected, 78.6% of the headteachers noted that classes 4 to class 6 were more affected than other classes with an approximate 60 pupils per year. The DEOs and the children officers also noted that there was rampant drop out cases reported to their offices and they are persuading the parents to encourage their children back to school. This implies that there was a high dropout rate.

Although the reason given by the pupils (31.9%) for their colleagues dropping out of school was because they had to care for sickly parents this did not correspond with the headteachers also gave reasons for pupils dropping out of schools, with majority of them citing child labour as result of poor background, early pregnancies and marriages. The DEOs and the children officers also noted the main reason as child labour and also pupils lack motivation for education since they lacked role models in the community. On repetition 60.1% of the pupils had not repeated a grade. The main reason they gave for the repetition were absenteeism hence never did any exam. Dropout of pupils is a global problem and has affected students from both developed and developing countries.
Effects of Child Labour on Academic Performance

The study revealed that majority of the pupils (89.4%) got homework. The headteachers also noted that the homework given to the pupils was adequate. The study established from the pupils that majority of them (70.7%) completed their homework. The pupils noted that the main reason as to why they did not complete their homework was because of household chores being too much. The results agreed with those of the head teacher who noted that pupils sometimes came to school without completing their homework because they had a lot of work at home. This made the researcher to enquire from the pupils whether they enjoyed school with 95.7% of them indicating that they did enjoy school.

On the rating of the performance, a high percent of the pupils (61.7%) rated their performance in class as good. The results disagree with those of 78.5% of the headteacher who noted that pupils’ performance was poor. On the future plans for the pupils, a large number of the pupils (61.7%) said they would wish to complete education/training and start to work.

Ways of Minimizing Child Labour in Relation to Enrollment

The study established that all the headteachers felt that the government should provide for orphans and vulnerable children’s needs and that the government should enforce the law on child labour respectively. The DEOs indicated that the government should economically empower the community, provide intensive civic education/sensitisation, reinforce of the laws and rights of children, enforce of Children’s Act and Labour laws
should be followed to the letter. The children officers on the other hand felt that campaigns against child labour, prosecution of perpetrators of child labour.

On whether government has put in place mechanisms for enforcing school enrolment for all children, all the headteachers indicated that the government has put in place mechanisms for enforcing school enrolment for children. This also corresponded with the DEOs and the children officers sentiments. When asked whether the mechanisms are effective, the headteachers noted that more effort needed to be put in place, FPE money is not sufficient hence parents are requested to supplement some little amount which in turn makes them keep children away from school.

5.4 Conclusions of the Study

From the findings the following conclusions can be drawn. The forces that produce child labour are many, complex and interrelated. Although high numbers of children from poor families are joining economic activities as workers and continue to be exposed to various worst forms of child labour, the greatest challenge lays in unfolding its often invisible or disguised traits which make it tolerable and widely accepted within local communities. Its environmental social conditions in low income areas also highly expose children to exploitation.

The parents let children work to supplement family income hence contributing to the family income this means that parents would pull their children from school to stay home to earn. The role working children have undertaken in their family subsistence economy, as a child-household bond based on financial dependency has been established. Hence
this means that if withdrawn then it means that the household living standard would fall leading to low enrolment and retention in school.

It was clear that pupils dropped out of school and classes that were more affected being classes 4-6. The main reason was to take care of sick parents. This made them repeat a grade to catch up with what others had covered. On the effects of child labour on enrolment pupils’ the reason for the failure to complete homework was household chores causing low enrolment and retention in most schools.

On the strategies to minimize child labour, there was need for collaboration between the schools administration and the government through the county administration to prosecute the perpetrators on child labour.

5.5 Recommendations of the Study

The following are the recommendations for the study.

i. There is need for the government and other stakeholders to discourage child labour from the family level; since poverty emerged as the most constraining factor on working children. Consequently, policy reforms and poverty reduction strategies remain fundamental upstream concerns and must be pursued to tackle inequality and poverty.

ii. The children should be sensitized the importance of educating and need for them to learn other than getting involved in child labour since this would mean a bright future for the children.
iii. The school management should encourage both the parents to send their children to school since this eventually would reduce poverty in their homes when their children have received education.

iv. Parents should be sensitized on the importance of education their children rather than using them to supplement to family income. Hence this should give parents the courage to face challenges and overcoming them without stopping their children from going to school.

v. The government can help in curbing dropout rates by empowering parents through self-help programmes hence children who have dropped out of school to help their parents will be able to continue with their education more effectively. Education officers at national and county levels should work with children officers to achieve this goal.

5.6 Suggestion for Further Research

i. A similar study should be carried out on the impact of child labour on enrolment of pupils in selected primary schools in other areas of the Country.

ii. A study on parents’ awareness of the disadvantages of child labour on enrolment of pupils should be carried out in Kilifi County.

iii. A study should be carried out on the effect of stoppage of child labour on the enrolment of pupils should be carried out in Kilifi County.
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APPENDIX I: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

Dear Respondent,

I am a graduate student of Kenyatta University. I am conducting a study to investigate the impact of child labour on enrolment of pupils in selected primary schools in Kilifi County, Kenya. This is in fulfilment of the degree in Master of Education Administration.

You have been selected to participate in this study. I would very much appreciate it if you would kindly assist me by responding to all the items attached in the questionnaire. Your name and that of your school need not to appear anywhere in the questionnaire unless you wish. The information you provide is anonymous and will be used for academic research purposes only.

Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

The completed questionnaire will be picked from your office two weeks after delivery in your office.

Thank you in advance.

Yours faithfully,

Ole Keis Lesanaya Dickson
APPENDIX II: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HEAD TEACHERS

SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

1. What is your age (tick where appropriate)

   21-30 years [ ] 31-40 years [ ]
   41-50 years [ ] over 50 years [ ]

2. What is your gender?
   Male [ ] Female [ ]

SECTION B: FORMS OF CHILD LABOUR AND ENROLMENT

3. Do the pupils do any work for pay, profit, for their family or did you do anything for exchange or home use during last 7 days?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

4. If yes what types of works do pupils get involved with?
   ………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………

5. What is the nature of the work in which they were mainly engaged in during the last 7 days?
   [ ] Full time [ ] Part time [ ] Permanent
   [ ] Temporary [ ] Seasonal

6. Status of employment been?
   Business [ ] Employed [ ]
   Casual worker [ ] Unpaid family worker [ ]

7. Currently if the pupils’ are on employment, how are they paid?
   Daily [ ] Weekly [ ]
   Monthly [ ] Yearly [ ]
8. Are the children engaged in housekeeping activities or chores by their parents?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

9. Where do you think most children work? [Tick all that apply]
   At home [ ]  In the neighbourhood [ ]
   In school [ ]  On the way to school [ ]
   At the matatu stage [ ]  At family relatives/ friends home [ ]
   In the street [ ]  At the market where there are shops [ ]
   Where there are juakali/factories [ ]
   Other (specify) …………………………………………………………………...

10. For whom do the children work mostly? (more than one answer acceptable)
    [ ] Parent/Caregiver  [ ] Relative
    [ ] Family Friend  [ ] Employer

11. If children stop working, what will happen? (more than one answer acceptable)
    □ Household living standard will fall   □ Household cannot afford to live
    □ Household enterprise cannot operate fully/labour not affordable
    □ Nothing will happen
    Other (specify) ……………………………………………………………………

SECTION C: FACTORS INFLUENCING CHILD LABOUR

12. Why do children in this region engage in child labour?
    They have no parents [ ]  Parents are poor [ ]
    Their friends do it [ ]  They want to have money [ ]

13. Does culture influence child labour?
    Yes [ ]  No [ ]

14. State two ways in which culture influences child labour?
    ……………………………………………………………………………………………
    ……………………………………………………………………………………………
    ……………………………………………………………………………………………

15. If CHILDREN are working (in economic activity), what do you think is the main reason for parents letting him/her work?
    □ To supplement family income   □ To pay outstanding family debt
☐ To help in family business/farm
☐ Education or training programme is not useful
☐ Education or training institutions are too far
☐ Cannot afford school or training fees
☐ Child not interested in schooling or training
Other (specify) ………………………………………………………………………

16  Do they give part or all their earnings to their parents/guardians or other relatives?
☐ No ☐ Yes, all directly through the employer
☐ Yes, all by myself ☐ Yes, part through the employer
☐ Yes, part by self
☐ Other (specify) …………………………………………………………………

17  If they gave their earnings to their own family (e.g. parents, caregiver), how much do they contribute to its monthly income?
Less than 20% [ ] From 20% to 50% [ ]
From 50% to 80% [ ] Over 80% don’t know [ ]

18  Are there people who connect children with the employers?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

19  What do they require from children?
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

20  Do the children save any part of their earnings?
☐ Yes, regularly ☐ Yes, occasionally
☐ No

21  If yes, what is the main reason for saving?
☐ Start own business support your family
☐ Go to school ☐ Learn a trade
☐ Travel ☐ Buy food/clothes
Other (specify)……………………………………………………………………
........................................................................................................................................
SECTION D: IMPACT OF CHILD LABOUR ON ENROLLMENT

22 What are the factors influencing enrollment?

........................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................

23 Among the factors in 22 do you think child labour is significant?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

25 Are there pupils who drop out of school?
Yes [ ] No [ ]
b. Which classes are more affected by child labour?
Class 1-3 [ ] Class 4-6 [ ]
Class 7-8 [ ]

26 Approximately how many in a year ..............................................................

27 Reasons for dropping out
........................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................

SECTION E: EFFECT OF CHILD LABOUR ON ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

27. Do teachers give homework?
Yes [ ] No [ ]
How much?.................................................................................................................................

28. Do pupils engaging in child labour complete their homework?
Yes [ ] No [ ]
b. If no what makes them not finish it?
........................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................

c. How do they behave in class?
........................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................
29. Do pupils engaging in child labour enjoy school?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

b. Do they work hard at school?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

c. Have they repeated any class?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

d. What were the reasons for repeating?
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………

e. How is their performance in class?
   Excellent [ ] Good [ ] Poor [ ] Very poor [ ]

SECTION F: SUGGESTIONS FOR MINIMIZING CHILD LABOUR

30. What suggestions would you propose to address child labour in this region?
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………

31. Does the government have mechanisms for enforcing school enrollment for all children?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

32. Are those mechanisms effective?
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   
   Thanking you in advance
APPENDIX III: PUPILS QUESTIONNAIRES

Instructions: Tick (√) where appropriate

1.1 BIO DATA

1. What is your gender? Boy [ ] Girl [ ]

b. What is your age? 7-10 [ ] 11-12 [ ] 13-14 [ ]

2. How many days have you missed school in the last four weeks?

……………………………………………………………………………………………

3. What were the reasons?

Sickness [ ] Work [ ] Take care of siblings [ ]

SECTION B: FORMS OF CHILD LABOUR

4. Did you do any work for pay, profit, for your family or did you do anything for exchange or home use during last 7 days? Yes [ ] No [ ]

5. Can you describe your work?

……………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………

6. What was the nature of the work in which you were mainly engaged in during the last 7 days?

☐ Full-time ☐ Part-time ☐ Permanent ☐ Temporary ☐ Seasonal

7. What has your status of employment been?

☐ On your own ☐ Employed

☐ Casual worker ☐ Unpaid family worker

8. If currently in paid employment, how are you paid?

☐ Daily ☐ Weekly ☐ Monthly ☐ Yearly

9. Have you been engaged in housekeeping activities or chores in own parents’/guardians’ home on a regular basis during last week?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

10. If "Yes", indicate period worked each day

☐ 1-2 hours each day ☐ 2-4 hours each day ☐ 5-8 hours each day

☐ 9 hours or more each day
11 What do you do for fun, when not working? (more than one answer acceptable)

☐ Playing (alone or with friends/sisters/brothers)  ☐ Sports
☐ Watching TV / Video at home  ☐ Listening to music
☐ Going to cinema / video house  ☐ Reading

Other (specify) ……………………………………………………………………………

12 Where do you think most children work? ] [Tick all that apply]

At home  [ ]  In the neighbourhood  [ ]
In school  [ ]  On the way to school  [ ]
At the matatu stage  [ ]  At family relatives/ friends home  [ ]
In the street  [ ]  At the market where there are shops  [ ]

Where there are juakali/factories [ ]

Other (specify)……………………………………………………………………

13 For whom do the children work mostly? (more than one answer acceptable)

[ ] Self  [ ] Parent/Caregiver  [ ] Relative
[ ] Family Friend  [ ] Employer

14 If CHILDREN are working (in economic activity), what do you think is the main reason for parents letting him/her work?

☐ To supplement family income  ☐ To pay outstanding family debt
☐ To help in family business/farm
☐ Education or training programme is not useful
☐ Education or training institutions are too far
☐ Cannot afford school or training fees
☐ Child not interested in schooling or training

Other (specify) ………………………………………………………………………

15 If children stop working, what will happen? (more than one answer acceptable)

☐ Household living standard will fall  ☐ Household cannot afford to live
☐ Household enterprise cannot operate fully/labour not affordable
☐ Nothing will happen

Other (specify) ………………………………………………………………………
SECTION C: FACTORS INFLUENCING CHILD LABOUR

16. If you have not been working during last 7 days what has been the reason?
   - No work available
   - Awaiting reply to earlier enquiries
   - Waiting to start arranged job
   - Off season in agriculture
   - Occupied with home duties
   - Illness or injury
   - Full time student
   - On vacation/leave
   Other (specify) …………………………………………………………………………

17. Do you give part or all your earnings to your parents/guardians or other relatives?
   - No
   - Yes, all directly through the employer
   - Yes, all by myself
   - Yes, part through the employer
   - Yes, part by self
   - Other (specify) …………………………………………………………………

18. If you give your earnings to your own family (e.g. parents, caregiver), how much do you contribute to its monthly income?
   - Less than 20% [ ]
   - From 20% to 50% [ ]
   - From 50% to 80% [ ]
   - Over 80% don’t know [ ]

19. Do you pay anyone to be able to work?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

20. If Yes, who do you pay?
   - Broker
   - Employer
   - Other (specify) …………………………………………………………………

21. Do you save any part of your earnings?
   - Yes, regularly
   - Yes, occasionally
   - No

22. If yes, what is the main reason for saving?
   - Start own business support your family
   - Go to school
   - Learn a trade
   - Travel
   - Buy food/cloths
   Other (specify) ………………………………………………………………………
SECTION D: IMPACT OF CHILD LABOUR ON ENROLLMENT

23. Do you have friends who dropped out of school?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

24. What reasons would you give that made them to drop out of school?
   Being orphaned [ ]
   To care for siblings [ ]
   To care for sickly parents [ ]
   They got employment [ ]

25. Have you repeated any grades?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

26. What were the reasons?
   ………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………

SECTION E: EFFECT OF CHILD LABOUR ON ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

27. Do you get homework? Yes [ ] No [ ]
   How much?……………………………………………………………………………………

28. Do you have time to do it at home?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

29. If no what makes you not finish it?
   ………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………

30. Do you feel tired at school?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

31. Do you enjoy school?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

32. Do you work hard at school?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

33. How is do you performance in class?
   Excellent [ ] Good [ ] Poor [ ] Very poor [ ]
SECTION F: SUGGESTIONS FOR MINIMIZING CHILD LABOUR

34. If given a choice, what would you like to do in the future? (more than one answer acceptable)
   □ Go to school full-time  □ Work for income full-time
   □ Help full-time in household enterprise or business
   □ Work full-time in household chores or housekeeping
   □ Go to school part-time and work part-time for income
   □ Work part-time in household enterprise or business
   □ Work part-time in household chores or housekeeping
   □ Complete education/training and start to work
   □ Find a better job/work than the present one
   □ Learn a trade

Other (specify) …………………………………………………..

Thanking you in advance
APPENDIX IV: QUESTIONNAIRES DEOS / CHILDREN OFFICERS

SECTION A: FORMS OF CHILD LABOUR AND ENROLMENT

1. Do the pupils do any work for pay, profit, for their family or did you do anything for exchange or home use during last 7 days?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

2. If yes what types of works do pupils get involved with?
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………

3. What is the nature of the work in which they were mainly engaged in during the last 7 days?
   [ ] Full time  [ ] Part time  [ ] Permanent
   [ ] Temporary  [ ] Seasonal

4. Status of employment been?
   Business [ ]  Employed [ ]
   Casual worker [ ]  Unpaid family worker [ ]

5. Currently if the pupils’ are on employment, how are they paid?
   Daily [ ]  Weekly [ ]
   Monthly [ ]  Yearly [ ]

6. Are the children engaged in housekeeping activities or chores by their parents?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

7. Where do you think most children work? [Tick all that apply]
   At home [ ]  In the neighbourhood [ ]
   In school [ ]  On the way to school [ ]
   At the matatu stage [ ]  At family relatives/ friends home [ ]
   In the street [ ]  At the market where there are shops [ ]
   Where there are jua kali /factories [ ]
   Other (specify)……………………………………………………………………
8. For whom do the children work mostly? (more than one answer acceptable)
[ ] Parent/Caregiver [ ] Relative
[ ] Family Friend [ ] Employer

9. If children stop working, what will happen? (more than one answer acceptable)
☐ Household living standard will fall  ☐ Household cannot afford to live
☐ Household enterprise cannot operate fully/labour not affordable
☐ Nothing will happen
Other (specify) ..........................................................

SECTION C: FACTORS INFLUENCING CHILD LABOUR

10. Why do children in this region engage in child labour?
    They have no parents [ ] Parents are poor [ ]
    Their friends do it [ ] They want to have money [ ]

11. Does culture influence child labour?
    Yes [ ] No [ ]

12. State two ways in which culture influences child labour?
    ........................................................................................................
    ........................................................................................................
    ........................................................................................................

13. If CHILDREN are working (in economic activity), what do you think is the main reason for parents letting him/her work?
    ☐ To supplement family income  ☐ To pay outstanding family debt
    ☐ To help in family business/farm
    ☐ Education or training programme is not useful
    ☐ Education or training institutions are too far
    ☐ Cannot afford school or training fees
    ☐ Child not interested in schooling or training
    Other (specify) ..........................................................

14. Do they give part or all their earnings to their parents/guardians or other relatives?
    ☐ No  ☐ Yes, all directly through the employer
    ☐ Yes, all by myself  ☐ Yes, part through the employer
If they gave their earnings to their own family (e.g. parents, caregiver), how much do they contribute to its monthly income?

- Less than 20% [  ]
- From 20% to 50% [  ]
- From 50% to 80% [  ]
- Over 80% don’t know [  ]

Are there people who connect children with the employers?

- Yes [  ]
- No [  ]

What do they require from children?

- Start own business support your family
- Go to school
- Learn a trade
- Travel
- Buy food/clothes
- Other (specify)

Do the children save any part of their earnings?

- Yes, regularly
- Yes, occasionally
- No

If yes, what is the main reason for saving?

- Start own business support your family
- Go to school
- Learn a trade
- Travel
- Buy food/clothes
- Other (specify)

SECTION D: IMPACT OF CHILD LABOUR ON ENROLLMENT

What are the factors influencing enrollment?

- [  ]
- [  ]
- [  ]
- [  ]

Among the factors in 22 do you think child labour is significant?

- Yes [  ]
- No [  ]

Are there pupils who drop out of school?

- Yes [  ]
- No [  ]
23. Which classes are more affected by child labour?
   Class 1-3 [ ] Class 4-6 [ ] Class 7-8 [ ]
24. Approximately how many in a year .................................................
25. Reasons for dropping out
   ..................................................................................................
   ..................................................................................................

SECTION E: EFFECT OF CHILD LABOUR ON ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE
26. Do teachers give homework?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
   How much?...........................................................................
27. Do pupils engaging in child labour complete their homework?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
   b. If no what makes them not finish it?
      ..................................................................................................
      ..................................................................................................
      ..................................................................................................
29. How do they behave in class?
   ..................................................................................................
   ..................................................................................................
30. Do they enjoy school?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
31. Do they work hard at school?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
32. Have they repeated any class?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
33. What were the reasons for repeating?
   ..................................................................................................
   ..................................................................................................
   ..................................................................................................
34. How is their performance in class?
   Excellent [ ]  Good [ ]  Poor [ ]  Very poor [ ]

SECTION F: SUGGESTIONS FOR MINIMIZING CHILD LABOUR
35. What suggestions would you propose to address child labour in this region?
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

36. Does the government have mechanisms for enforcing school enrollment for all children?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

37. Are those mechanisms effective?
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

   Thanking you in advance
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