

INFLUENCE OF AGRICULTURAL CHILD LABOUR EXPERIENCE ON STUDENTS' DECISION TO STUDY AGRICULTURE IN DELTA STATE, NIGERIA

Albert Ukaro Ofuoku and Magdalene Nneka Ugbechie

Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Delta State University, Asaba
Campus, PMB 95074, Asaba, Delta State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT: *This study investigated the effect of child labour experience in agriculture on the decision of students to study agriculture in tertiary institutions in Delta State, Nigeria. Delta State University and Delta State Polytechnic students of agriculture were purposively selected for the study. Random selection of students was done in each agriculture area of specialization in the tertiary institutions based on 10% of the population to result to a sample size of 151 students. Data for the study were elicited with the use of questionnaire and were analyzed with the application of descriptive statistics and Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMC). Most (52.98%) of the student were males. The students were mainly (96.02%) in the age bracket of 20-29 years. Most (76.16%) of the student had 6-10years of working experience in their childhood years in either family or others farms as many (64.90%) were residents in rural settlements, where majority (64.24%) of them did not witness extension agents' visit to their farms. The involvement index of the children in poultry farming was 0.48; in arable crop production, 0.60; in fish farming, 0.20 and in plantation agriculture, 0.12. Some of them experienced hard labour (47.68%); no remuneration (no pay) (51.66%) and injuries (54.97%). Only 6.62% of them originally sought for admission to study agriculture. The reasons given by those who originally applied to read agriculture for doing so ranged from self employment, interest, lucrative nature of agriculture and familiarity with farming activities. Their involvement in agricultural child labour positively influenced their decision to study agriculture. It is therefore recommended that extension agents should interact with farm families in order to encourage the children on agriculture; farmers should be encouraged to simply mechanize their farming activities; farm families should be encouraged to give their children only non-hazardous activities to carry out and the children should only be involved in farming activities during the holidays in order not to compromise their schooling.*

KEYWORDS: Influence, Child Labour, Agricultural Labour, Involvement Index, Farm Families

INTRODUCTION

The issue of child labour has been on among scholars, United Nations organs, government and non-governmental organization (NGOS) the world over. International Labour Organisation (ILO) and Cornell University ILR School (2005) suggest that child labour is any form of work done by any child of below 18years of age. Though, there is no record of the population of the children engaged in child labour in delta state, Nigeria; UNICEF (2006) asserts that about 15million children who are below the age of 18years engage in labour in Nigeria. An estimated 250 million children who are below 18years are working in developing countries. Included in that estimation are many children who are involved in various works related to agriculture. Cases of child labour are mostly related to agriculture in most developing countries. It is

estimated by ILO (2010) that all over the world, 60% of children of between the ages of 5-17 years are engaged in agriculture. This implies that over 129 million boys and girls work in agriculture and unpaid farming household members. This also means that most children engaged in agricultural activities reside in rural areas, since Muhammed and Adeoye (2006) estimated that about 75% of Nigerians are rural dwellers. Asamu (2005) found that children are engaged in various sub-sectors of agriculture. These sub-sectors include perennial and annual crops and livestock farming, culture and capture fisheries and cattle rearing.

There are a lot of hazards that adversely affect children's health and most of these works violate children's fundamental human rights and, most often than not, are lethal to their bodies and deprive them of school hours thereby preventing them from acquiring knowledge that will be useful to them in the future. According to ILO (1998) any work that constitutes harm to the health of a child and violates the child's fundamental human rights, and is known to be dangerous to his/her body and does not allow them to go to school to acquire knowledge for their development in the future, is regarded as child labour. Ofuoku *et al* (2014) opine that agricultural activities are associated with a lot of hazards, especially in the extant low standards of health and safety which may lead to injury and death. Most times, children working in farms are affected by pesticides and herbicides which they apply without wearing protective gears. Deformities, life-long disease, endocrine and neurological problems, child cancers, etc are consequence of children's contact with pesticides and herbicides (Johnson-Micheal, 2013).

There are many other effects of child labour on children (Ofuoku *et al*, 2014), which according to Muhammed and Adeoye (2006) are poor performance in academics, academic wastage, poor retention in class, high rate of dropout, deficit in achievement and fatigue. Accidents that are harmful to children have been known to have happened to them in the field. Ofuoku *et al* (2014) state that children have sustained injury from weeding hoes, cutlasses or chemical inhalation.

ILO (2014) indicts poverty as the principal cause of child labour in agriculture, as well as lack of or inadequate access to adult labour, traditional view on child's involvement in agricultural activities, lack of adequate technology restricted access to formal education.

Traditionally, children's engagement in agriculture is considered as a way of imparting farming skills on the children. UNICEF (2006) points out that in the traditional sense, children working with their families acquire skills which they would need when they become adults. ILO (2010) argues that engagement of children in agricultural operations may have positive consequences, since it enhances inter-generational transfer of social and technical skills to ensures food security of the child in the future.

According to Apantaku (2004) most of the secondary school students in Abeokuta and Environs do not like agricultural science as a subject. This may not be unconnected with the attitude of most Nigerians who do not encourage anyone to be involved in the practice of agriculture or farming. Adekojo (1998) states that most Nigerians consider anyone involved in agricultural practice as poverty stricken. As a result of this many youths migrate from rural areas to urban areas in search of white collar jobs. Many parents, including the ones in the rural areas, do not want their children to be involved in farming or be trained in agriculture. Most of these parents want their children to become medical practitioners, lawyers, journalists, business executives and accountants. These will consequently complicate productivity deficit which is being tackled. In the presence of all these negative attitudes, youths are needed to raise agricultural production level.

Individuals have distinct values, differential abilities aptitudes and interest for occupation and work (Apantaku, 2004). Consequently, there are variation in their interest and choice of various life careers. Aspiration or interests vary with individuals. The success or failure of any person in a career depends on the aspiration or interest of such individual towards a career. The question now is whether involvement in child labour in agriculture is a determinant factor for students' choice of study in agriculture in Delta State, Nigeria

Ofuoku *et al* (2014) found that many children were engaged in crop farming in combination with schooling as some were engaged in farm work during holidays only, while a few of them were engaged in farm work without schooling. This may enhance their comprehension of the school education in agriculture. ILO (2013) suggests that children's involvement in some agricultural activities is not always regarded as child labour. It further observes that there are some age-specific tasks that pose lower risk and do not inhibit the child's schooling and leisure time, that are considered as normal part of the child's growing process in the rural milieu. Participation of children in such non-hazardous activities and the ones that do not inhibit their formal educational achievement can make positive contribution to transfer of technical and social skills and children's food security from generation to generation (ILO, 2013; Ofuoku *et al*, 2014).

Acquisition of improved self-confidence, self esteem and farm work skills are said to be attributes always found in young people that are involved in some aspects of agricultural operations. It is therefore expected that their participation in such farm operations will aid to arouse their interest in farming and inform their decision to study agriculture in tertiary institutions.

Many students who have farm experience have been observed by Apantaku (2004) to jettison the study of agricultural science in secondary schools for some obvious reasons. These reasons may also apply to the case of students who sought admission into tertiary institutions. The result of this study will be useful for policy makers in agricultural extension agency management and education management in their quest to build the interest of youths in the study and practice of agriculture.

Conceptual frame work

Human beings under rate decision-making daily. They do this because of situations that arise every day (Agbamo, 2006). Children as human beings are not left out in this process. According to Ofuoku *et al* (2008), it means mental challenges with ideas, problems and the solution to issues that confront them being translated into concrete guidelines for actions or opinions that are actionable. It encompasses taking cognizance of various variables or factors for choice making, discriminating based on experience and the involvement of farming households' children in farming.




Figure 1: conceptual frame work for decision making to study agriculture.

Children's decision-making to study agriculture is informed by such factors as income earned to farming parent; attractiveness of farm products; knowledge and skill acquired by the student, during childhood years in the family farm; household food security and the problem of unemployment of graduates who read non-agriculture courses of study may prompt children to take up a career in agriculture in the future and consequently decide to study any area of agriculture that is of interest to him or her (figure 1).

On the other hand, negative farm experience such as the drudgery involved as a result of the usage of crude farm implements; health effects of chemical application and other farming activities; academic deficit may prompt a student to hate farming and decide against taking up a career in agriculture in the future and consequently will not choose to study any field of

agriculture in the tertiary institutions. Many farming household heads (HHs) prefer their children becoming medical doctors, lawyers, journalists, or army officers to taking up a career in agriculture. These parents create hatred for agricultural profession in themselves and in the minds of their children. When children associate weeding or hard manual labour with agriculture, a negative opinion about agriculture as a course of study or as a career is created in them (Zhiri, 1998; Ogunrinde 2002).

Objectives of the study

This study sought to establish the influence child labour in agriculture experience on student's decision to study agriculture in tertiary institutions in Delta State, Nigeria. Specifically, the study was aimed to examine the socio-economic characteristics of the students; determine the types of farm operation they were engaged in and their level of participation in farming in their childhood years; ascertain the programme of study they originally applied to study; identify the reasons for choice of agriculture programme among those who originally applied to study agriculture; and examine the influence of their level of participation in agricultural child labour on their decision to study agriculture. It is hypothesized that there is no significant relationship between students' level of participation in agricultural child labour and their decision to study agriculture.

METHODOLOGY

The study was done in Delta State, Nigeria. The state is located between longitude 5°00, and 6°45 east of the Greenwich meridian and latitude 5°00 and 6°30 north of the equator. It shares its southern boundary with Bayelsa State and Atlantic Ocean; in the north, it shares boundary with Edo State; in the east, with Anambra state and Imo State; and in the west with Ondo State.

The state hosts or have some tertiary institutions among which are a university, colleges of education and polytechnics. However, the university and one polytechnic run programmes in agriculture; at degree, certificate and diploma levels respectively.

The state is vegetatively under the cover of mangrove swamp forest in the south, fresh water swamp and rain forest in the central part, and derived savannah in the north. Agriculture is the major employer of labour in Delta State. Farming activities in the state include crop, livestock, poultry and fish farming, though these are mostly carried out on small scale.

The population of the study included all the students studying agriculture or agricultural science in all the tertiary institutions in Delta State that have agriculture in their course offerings. Students in various areas of study in agriculture/ agricultural science were purposively selected out of Delta State University (the only university offering agriculture in the state) and Delta State polytechnic Ozoro (the only polytechnic offering agriculture) was chosen.

Stratified random sampling method was applied to select respondents from among students of agriculture/agricultural science in Delta State on the basis of 10% from each area and levels of study in agriculture in each tertiary institution that has been purposively chosen or selected, as shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1. Summary of stratified random sampling of student of agriculture (respondent) at 10% of population

Tertiary institution	No of students/ Year of study	No selected (10%)/ Year of study	Total
<i>Delta State University</i>	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	
Agricultural economics	36 54 40 42 41	4 5 4 4 4	21
Agricultural extension	25 23 18 12 19	3 2 2 1 2	10
Crop science	25 23 13 31 27	3 2 1 3 3	12
Soil science	23 19 14 5 1	2 2 1 1 0	6
Animal science	36 43 23 33 29	4 4 2 3 3	16
Fisheries	10 21 30 33 11	1 2 3 3 1	10
Forestry and wildlife	9 12 30 10 4	1 1 3 1 0	6
<i>Delta State Polytechnic, Ozoro</i>			
Agriculture technology	280 87 36 32 28	9 4 3 0 4	4
Agricultural management and extension	40 38 55 38 0	4 4 6 4 0	18
Fisheries technology	44 24 7 9 0	4 2 1 1 0	8
Total			151

This gave a total of 151 students of agriculture in the tertiary institutions that offer programs in agriculture.

Primary data were collected from the selected students of agriculture/agricultural science with the use of questionnaire. The instrument applied in the collection of data for this study was subjected to validity test which included face contact, criterion and construct validity. This was done by the lead author and his colleagues in Rivers State University of Science and Technology, Port-Harcourt. The reliability test was done with the use of test-retest method. The retest was done three weeks after the retrieval of the questionnaire for the initial responses. The result showed a high correlation level between the initial and second responses ($r=0.823$).

Objectives i and iii were met with the application of descriptive statistics such as frequency, counts and percentages. Objectives ii and iv were addressed with the application of mean derived from 4-point Likert's-type scale of 4-strongly agree 3=agree, 2=disagree and 1=strongly disagree. Objective v was met with hypothesis. The hypothesis was tested with the application of person's product moment correlation (PPMC) correlation analysis.

Level of participation in agricultural child labour

The respondents were classified into low, medium and high based on the participation means and index. The participation means of each farm operation was calculated by dividing the score by the sample size (n). The grand participation mean was computed by dividing the total

participation mean by the number of farm activities, while the participation index was computed by dividing the grand mean by the number of scales.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic characteristics of students

Male students of agriculture were slightly higher in population (52.98%) than the female students (47.02%) as Table 2 indicates. This implies that more males were admitted to study various respective areas of agriculture in tertiary institutions in Delta State than female students. Most (96.02%) of the students were in the age bracket of 20-29 years. However, they were already in adulthood ages, none of them was in his/her childhood age. These students had their different experiences growing up as children before they developed into adulthood. As expected, most (81.46%) of them were single, implying that they were still under the sponsorship of their parents or guardians.

They mostly (76.16%) had 6-10 years of working experience as children in either household farms or others farms. Farming, undermining the scale of operation is regarded as part of the culture of Nigerians and involvement of children is regarded as part children's up bring. Ofuoku *et al* 2014 found that children were involved in child labour in agriculture for cultural reasons of transmission of farming skills and knowledge, training of children to be independent, exposure of children to intricacies of life, and transmission of norms and values to children, and for other reasons such as dwelling on economic condition and political climate, children are also conscripted into farm labour. The economic reasons found by ILO (2010) include high cost of labour, high cost of living and low income. The political reasons they discovered include lack of political will to empower farmers and parents' ignorance of policies on child labour.

Many of the students (64.90%) were residents in rural communities, while (35.09) in urban communities. It is worthwhile to note that most of them who were resident in urban settlements had at one time or the other lived in rural areas, indicating that they also had rural experience as children.

Most (64.24%) did not witness extension agents' visit to the farms where they worked as HH members or for others. According to Agbamu (2011) there is a dearth of extension agents in Nigeria. Extension visit and interaction with farm ownership is expected to make children develop likeness or love for agriculture. This is more so as most (86.75%) of them worked in their household farms. According to Ofuoku *et al* (2014), most children are made to work on their household farms as a result of migration of adult household members.

Table 2: Demographic characteristics of students

Variables	frequency	Percentage(%)
Male	80	52.98
Female	71	47.02
Age (years)		
20-24	68	45.03
25-29	77	50.99
30-34	6	3.97
35 and above	0	0
Marital status		
Single	123	81.46
Married	28	18.54
Child labour experience in farm (years)		
<1	0	0
1-5	36	23.84
6-10	115	76.16
Residency prior to admission		
Urban	53	35.09
Rural	98	44.90
Extension visit to farm (monthly)		
None		
Once	97	64.24
Twice	30	19.87
Thrice	15	9.93
Four times	9	5.96
Farm ownership		
Household	131	86.75
Neighbour	20	13.25

Level of involvement in agricultural child labour

Table 3 indicates that four types of farming enterprises were carried out in Delta State. These include poultry farming, arable crop farming, fish farming, and plantation farming. The students were highly involved in poultry farming activities such as feeding (Mean=2.0), clearing of dirty litter from poultry pen (Mean=2.66) and egg collection (Mean=2.64), with involvement index of 0.48. This implies that most of the students were rarely involved in poultry farming activities. This is attributable to poultry health safety reasons as the children may have been suspected to have visited other poultry farms from where they may possibly convey disease vectors and diseases, especially such diseases that are contagious and air-borne. In arable farming, they were highly involved in field preparation (Mean=2.93), harvesting (Mean=2.76) planting (Mean=2.67), weeding (Mean=2.67), pesticide/herbicides application (Mean=2.60), and fertilizer application (Mean=2.57). Their involvement index is 0.60. The implication is that they were often involved in arable farming activities. However, some of these farming activities such as field preparation, weeding, pesticide/herbicide application, fertilizer application and harvesting are known to be physically and chemically hazardous. Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) of the United States of America found and declared that handling or application of toxic agricultural chemicals are hazardous to children under the age

of 16 years (US Department of Labour, 2007). However, FLSA exempts student learners on some conditions. Ofuoku *et al* (2014), Adeoti *et al* (2013) remind the world that agro-chemicals have adverse effects that can result to lifelong deformities and ailments in both born and unborn children, children are characteristically careless to the extent of forgetting or deliberately refusing to wear required protective gears. They are also careless with farming tools and implements which they use in some other arable farming activities.

The students had low level of involvement in fish farming in their childhood years. The involvement index of 0.22 implies that they were more often than not, not involved in fish farming activities.

The same trend was observed in plantation agriculture with involvement index of 0.12. This also implies that most times, they were not involved in plantation agricultural activities. This can be attributed to the lots of physical energy needed for most of the activities, especially when plantations are large.

Table 2: Level of involvement in child labour in agriculture (pre-university years as childr)

Activity	Very often (4)	Often (3)	Rarely (2)	Not at all (1)	Score	Mean	Grand mean score	Involvement index
Poultry farming								
brooding	2 (8)	0 (0)	1 (2)	0 (0)	10	0.07		
feeding	42(168)	48 (144)	35(70)	26 (26)	408	2.70*		
Cleaning of litter	43 (172)	47 (141)	31 (62)	30 (30)	405	2.68*		
Replacement of litter	41 (164)	46 (138)	36 (72)	28 (28)	402	2.66*	1.90	0.48
Egg collection	42 (168)	40 (120)	42 (84)	27 (27)	399	2.64*		
Sales	0 (0)	33 (99)	0 (0)	0 (0)	99	0.66		
Arable farming								
Field								
preparation	48 (192)	44 (132)	38 (76)	21(42)	442	2.93*		
planting	42(168)	46(138)	34(68)	29(29)	403	2.67*		
weeding	45(180)	42(126)	33(66)	31(31)	403	2.67*		
Pesticide/herbicides								
application	42(168)	47(141)	21(42)	41(41)	392	2.60*	2.41	0.60
Fertilizer								
application	48(192)	42(126)	22(44)	26(26)	388	2.57*		
harvesting	42(168)	47(141)	46(92)	16(16)	417	2.76*		
Processing	31(124)	36(108)	23(46)	0(0)	278	1.84*		
sales	20(80)	26(78)	10(20)	6(6)	184	1.22		
Fish farming								
Spawming								
Pond	0(0)	1(3)	0(0)	0(0)	3	0.02		
preparation	0(0)	0(0)	12(24)	0(0)	24	0.06		

Feeding Water	34(136)	26(78)	13(26)	0(0)	240	1.59		
replacement	26(104)	22(66)	0(0)	0(0)	170	1.13	0.88	0.22
Harvesting	38(152)	32(96)	8(16)	0(0)	264	1.75		
liming	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0	0		
Sorting of fish	21(84)	28(84)	24(48)	20(20)	236	1.56		
Processing	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0	0		
Sales	31(124)	33(99)	15(30)	0(0)	253	1.68	1.68	
Plantation agriculture								
Land preparation	2(8)	0(0)	2(4)	0(0)	12	0.08	0.48	0.12
Seedling planting	3(12)	0(0)	1(2)	0(0)	14	0.09		
Weeding	8(32)	1(3)	0(0)	0(0)	35	0.23		
Fertilizer application	9(36)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	36	0.24		
Pesticide/herbicide application	8(32)	0(0)	2(4)	0(0)	36	0.24		
Tapping/harvesting	5(20)	13(39)	2(4)	0(0)	63	0.42		
Processing	53(212)	11(33)	12(24)	0(0)	269	1.78		
Sales/marketing	13(52)	21(63)	2(4)	0(0)	119	0.79		

Cut off = 2.50 (≥ 2.50 high level of involvement; <2.05 = low level of involvement).

Experience on involvement in agricultural child labour

Many of the students experienced injuries, working without wages, and hard labour. Very few of them experienced being paid meagerly and loss in educational achievement (Table 1). Ofuoku *et al* (2014) observe that children could sustain injuries from the use of cutlass and other such implements used by them as they are also careless. IITA (2002) suggests that schooling and farming or farming only without enrolment in school have the consequence of poor academic performance, academic wastage, achievement deficit and high rate of school dropouts.

The use of crude implements makes farm operations to be difficult to carry out. Crude implements that are energy sapping are mostly used by farmers in the study area.

As a result of the fact that most children are used as farm labour in the household farms, they are not paid for their labour. Those who are lowly paid for their labour were those who stole time from their household schedule to make money for themselves in order to procure or acquire certain needs. Children are always exploited by farmers that hire them because of their desperate need of money.

Table 4: experience on involvement in agricultural child labour (n=98).

Experience	Frequency	Percentage
Hard labour	72	47.68
Meager pay (poor pay)	20	13.25
No pay	78	51.66
Injuries	83	54.97
Academic wastage	15	9.93

Course of study originally applied for admission to study

It is observed in Table 5 that the courses mainly intended to study by students were professional courses. These include Medicine (46.36%), Pharmacy (19.87%), Medical Laboratory Technology (17.22%), Micro-Biology (9.93%) and Agriculture (6.62%). It is glaring that agriculture was originally intended to be studied and applied for by the least percentage of students. This may not be unconnected to their experience as child labourers in agriculture. This is congruent with Apamtaku (2004) who found that most students would not like to enroll in agriculture as a course of study as a result of the drudgery involved, among other reasons, and they also preferred to enroll for other professional courses of study apart from agricultural courses.

Table 5: courses originally chose to read

Course	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Medicine	70	46.36
Pharmacy	30	19.87
Medical laboratory technology	26	17.22
Micro-biology	15	9.93
Agriculture	10	6.62
Engineering	0	0
Chemistry	0	0
Biology	0	0
Botany	0	0

Reasons for choice of course of study in agriculture (n=10)

Among the students who chose to study agricultural courses, they all decided on it for self employment creation after graduation; they all also made such choice because of their interest in agriculture and familiarity with farming activities/operations and therefore want to develop more competence in their chosen agricultural field of study.

However, 80% opted to study agriculture as their field of study because they believe agricultural business is a lucrative one. From interactions, they logically, were of view that everybody needs food; therefore, marketing of their farm produce in the future would be encouraging as they will be easily bought by agro-produce marketers and consumers. Apamtaku (2004) found that the students he studied gave the same reasons as why they would like to go

into agriculture as a career and course of study. In this era when unemployment rate is very high in Nigeria, it is believed that the surest way of getting employed is to create employment for one's self; hence they opted to study agriculture which is one of the careers where one can create job for one's self easily.

Table 6: Reasons for choice of course of study in agriculture (n=10)

Reason	Frequency	Percentage
Self employment creation	10	100
Interest	10	100
Lucrative nature of agriculture	8	80
Familiarity with farming activities	10	100

Influence of involvement in agricultural child labour and choice of study in agriculture

Table 7 shows the result of the test of the hypothesis for the study. The result ($r=0.816$) suggest that there is a significant strong positive relationship between involvement of students in child labour in agriculture, in their pre-university/ college admission years and their choice to go into agriculture as a course of study and consequently keying into the cultural purposes of involving them in child labour in agriculture. In the context of family farming, it is worthy of note that agricultural child labour contributes to inter-generational transfer of skills and to children's future food security (ILO, 2014). It is also important to note that many types of contributions children make toward household livelihood are capable of making children to develop practice and social skills for their future (ILO, 2014) and make them become interested in course of study and career in agriculture. In the context of large scale family farm, it is observed that most times, the students graduates into their family farms or prevail on their parents to establish one for them instead of going back to their family farms

Table 7: Estimation of the nexus between involvement in agricultural child labour and the choice to study agriculture.

Variable	Involvement	Choice to study
Involvement in agric child labour	1	.816
Choice of study in agriculture	.816	1

CONCLUSION

This study was done to investigate the influence of agricultural child on the choice of students to study agriculture courses in tertiary institutions in Delta State Nigeria. Most of the students studying various agricultural courses had 6-10years experience as child labourers in their family farms as many of them were from rural communities. The ones from urban communities worked on their family urban farming endeavors especially in fish and poultry farming, no matter the scale of operation.

Their level of involvement in poultry farming was fair just as their involvement in arable farming was high. However, their level of involvements in fish and plantation farming were low. They mostly experienced injuries, no remuneration, as they mostly worked in family

farms, and hard labour, especially among those who were from arable farming households. Few of them who sneaked to work for their neighbours experience little pay for their labour.

So many of them originally did not choose to study agricultural courses, but were given admission to study agriculture. In the midst of this, few of them made their own choice to study agricultural courses, for the reasons of creating self employment after graduation; interest in farming and familiarity with farming activities, from which they acquired farming and social skills. Another reason given by them for opting to study courses in agriculture was for the lucrative nature of agriculture related activities. The test of hypothesis showed a strong significant and positive relationship between involvements in agricultural child labour in their childhood years and their option to study various agriculture courses in the various tertiary institutions. Conclusively, their involvement in agricultural child labour influenced their option for the study of agricultural courses.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is therefore recommended that extension agencies should improve on their contact with farm families in order to also interact with their children with the mind of encouraging them to be interested in agriculture.

Farmers should be encouraged by governmental agencies and non governmental agencies to mechanize simply their farms.

This will remove the drudgery complained about the student. Farming families should be encouraged to give their children non-hazardous activities to participate in while working in the farm just as they should also be encouraged not to compromise their schooling to avoid academic deficit.

REFERENCE

- Adekojo, S.A. (1998). Functional agricultural education for self employment: an appraisal. *Nigerian Journal of Agricultural Education*, 1(1), 79-92.
- Adeoti A.I, Coster A.S and Gbolagun A.O. (2013). Child farm labour in rural households of South- West Nigeria. *International Journal of African and Asian studies*, 1, 47-56.
- Agbamu, J.U. (2006). *Essentials of agricultural communication in Nigeria*. Lagos, Nigeria: Malthouse press.
- Agbamu J.U. (2011). Problems and prospects of agricultural extension service in developing countries. In Madukwe, M.C. (ed). *Agricultural Extension in Nigeria*. Pp 216-229. Illorin, Nigeria: Agricultural Extension Society of Nigeria.
- Apantaku S.O. (2004). Analysis of senior secondary agricultural science students attitude towards agriculture as a career. *Journal Extension Systems*, 20(1), 42-54.
- Asrnu, F.F. (2005). Poverty and child labour in Nigeria challenges for youth development in the 21st century. A paper presented at International Conference on challenges of human development in 21st century Africa. Covenant university, otha, ogun state, Nigeria. Jime 27-30.
- ILO (2010). Child labour in agriculture. Geneva International Labour Organization.
- ILO (2014). Child labour in agriculture. Geneva: International Labour Organisation

- ILO (1998). World labour report Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- ILO (2013) 2000-2012 global estimates and trends.
- International Labour Organization and Cornell University. IRL school (2005). Child labour in Latin American. New York: Cornell University.
- IITA (2002). Child labour in the cocoa sector of West Africa. A synthesis of findings in Cameroon, Cote d'ivoire, Ghana and Nigeria. Croydon, UK: International Institute for Africa
- Johnson-Micheal. S.(2013). The effects of herbicides and pesticides on humans. Livestrong. Com.Retrieved August5, 2014
(<http://www.livestronge.com/article/246750-the-effects-of-herbicides-pesticides-on-humans/>)
- Muhammed, A.Y and Adeone, M.N 2006). Socio- economic implications of child labour in agricultural development of Oro community in Kwara State, as expressed by parents. Paper presented at 15th Annual Congress of the Nigeria Rural Sociology Association (NRSA). Octoberce.
- Ofuoku A.U, Idoge D.E and Ovwigho B.O (2014) Child labour in agricultural production and socio economic variables among arable farming household in Nigeria. *Journal of Rural Social Sciences*, 29 (2), 67-81.
- Ogunride, S.I. (2002). Competency-based education: A baseline for vocational technical agriculture in Nigeria. An invited paper presented at Annual Conference of the National Council for Collages of Education (NCCE). Held at NCCE-Kadunna, 21th -23rd August 2002.
- UNICEF (2006). Child labour in Nigeria: Information sheet. Abuja, Nigeria: UNICEF Nigeria.
- US Department of labour (2007). Child labour requirements in agricultural occupations under the fair labour standards Act. Child labour Bulletin 102. Washington DC: US Department of labour.
- Zhiri, S.J. (1998). Agricultural practical orientation of secondary school leaves in depressed economy: problems and prospect. *Nigerian Journal of Agricultural Education*, 1(1& 2.), 102-118.