



# The interaction between child labour and household income: A statistical survey in the industry of Turkey\*

Aslı Yenipazarlı<sup>a\*</sup>, Umut Evlimođlu<sup>b</sup>, Gülşah Erbey<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Ass. Prof. Dr., Adnan Menderes University, Aydın 09860, Turkey

<sup>b</sup>Ass. Prof. Dr., Adnan Menderes University, Aydın 09860, Turkey

<sup>c</sup>Economist, İzmir, Turkey

## Abstract

The aim of this study is to find the extent of the income of child labour, and its contribution to the family income. In order to reach demographic and economic features of child labour a statistical survey study has been applied to 100 children working in the industrial sector. The results have been put and analyzed in different tests in SPSS 16.0 program. In this study, different results could be reached about the working conditions, the social and economic environment and future expectations of child labour. An important result was the contribution of child labour to the household income. In addition, children who are working are not able to get a sufficient education. A significant factor affecting children to be working at that age, is the level of family education and income. Another data point is the low level of child labour income, which doesn't change in time frequently.

© 2014 European Journal of Research on Education by IASSR.

*Keywords: Child labour, Employment, Household income, Statistical survey study.*

## 1. Introduction

Referring to the economic life, school-age children usually are working in difficult conditions at the very top of their performances, with low wages. Most of these children are not provided with any social security. Especially, child labor in agriculture causes unpaid family labour. Unpaid family labour is usually seen in rural areas and stems from the low level of education in these regions.

In urban areas, child labor is mostly seen in the industry and in the service sector, because of low level of household income. There are many reasons for child labor participation in production, in terms of both employers and families: In terms of employers, they are lower cost and easy dismissed; in terms of families, there is poverty and illiteracy, which are the most relevant factors. Most of the uneducated parents don't encourage their children to get a good education. This causes children to get away from school life. Families in this mindset mostly prefer working children who can earn money at low wages. That is why children end their educational life and continue the pattern of poverty. This low education again leads to people to work in a risky business environment.

Popular opinion in high-income countries often seems to hold that child labor in developing countries is nearly always a form of child abuse, in which children work in hazardous conditions in run-down factories for allous businesses. There have been recent attempts to combat child labor by lowering employment opportunities for

\* This study has been presented in the IASSR European Conference On Social Sciences, Rome 2014.

\*corresponding author, [ayenipazarli@adu.edu.tr](mailto:ayenipazarli@adu.edu.tr)

children through harmonized international child labor standards and by consumer boycotts of products produced by child laborers (Edmund E.V. and Pavcnick N., 2005).

In this study, after evaluating the literature on child labour, the data and methodological perspective for the analysis of the relation between child labour and household income will be determined. Some descriptive and demographic features of survey sample will be introduced. Some findings on the survey data and statistical findings will be discussed. As the last part, some concluding remarks and policy objectives on the term child labour and to decrease or prevent this problem are to be brought up.

## **2. Literature**

The concept of child labor is a reality, existing all over the world in different forms. Child labor usually stems from the facts such as poverty or poverty- related aspects. After 1990's and after the spread of globalization, various policies and methods combatting with this problem came into question.

Child labor can be expressed as a mode of running a job, which harms people under the age of 18 physically, mentally and morally. This mode can exploit and deprive them from education (ÇSGB, 2007: 9). Also, child labour is preferred by employers, while they are providing them with cheap labour, they can be run into work informally and they are unaware of their rights (Avşar and Öğütöğulları, 2012: 12).

"The Seventh 5 Year Development Plan, Special Commission Report on Children" of SPO (State Planning Organization) defined "working children" as people participating in production in marginal working areas such as agriculture, besides artisans and craftsman due to their socio-economic status. They are aiming to earn money or acquiring a profession who has not passed the age of nineteen (Günöz, 2007).

Child labour is not only a problem of less developed countries, but is also seen in many industrialized countries. International Labour Organization (ILO) accomplished some projects named as ILO/ IPEC, in the context of fighting with the worst modes of child labour. In these projects all countries and institutions apply different models depending on the size and structure of their own problem and on the capacity of their institutions and resources (TISK and TURK-IS, 2007: 5).

The most important structural issues are poverty and the low level of family income. In countries which couldn't complete the industrialization process, with high population growth rate, so in countries with young population structure, families are directing their children mostly to work instead of educating themselves.

It is possible to introduce the factors causing child labour from two different ways. The first of it is to determine the factors directing children to supply labour. And the second one is to put forth why people demanding labour prefer children to run a business. The factors affecting the demand of child labour are having cost and competition advantages. The factors determining the supply of child labour are (Tunçcan, 2000:243-250):

- a) Poverty
- b) Unemployment
- c) Rapid and unplanned urbanization
- d) Population growth
- e) Level of education
- f) Traditions
- g) Responsibility

On 20th November 1989, The United Nations General Assembly acknowledged the Convention of Rights of Children. In September 1990 in New York, World Summit for Children has been realized. At this summit 27 targets to provide a better future for every child have been stated, a universal call was published. One of these targets was the protection of children especially in difficult conditions (ÇSGB, 2006, 7).

ILO 2013 Report determined that, between 2000 and 2012 child labor, children in employment and hazardous work slightly decreased. For example in 2000 child labor for the age group 5-17 in the World was almost 16 % of total population at this age group, it decreased to 10.6 % in 2012.

While child labour involvement is much higher among boys than girls for the 5-17 years age group as a whole (99.8 million versus 68.2 million girls), this overall gender gap is a reflection entirely of gender differences in child

labour among older children. There is almost no difference by sex in the involvement of 5-11 year-olds in child labour – boys and girls each make up roughly half of the overall child labour population for this age group.

A gender gap begins to appear in the 12-14 years age range, where boys account for 52 per cent of all child labourers and outnumber girls by 2.2 million. The gender gap rises dramatically in the 15-17 years age range, where boys account for 81 per cent of all child labourers. The new global estimates also provide an update on the sectors where child labourers are found. Agriculture is by far the most important sector, accounting for 59 per cent of all those in child labour and over 98 million children in absolute terms. But the numbers of child labourers in services<sup>12</sup> and industry<sup>13</sup> are by no means negligible. A total of 54 million are found in the services sector (of which 11.5 million are in domestic work) and 12 million are found in industry. Boys outnumber girls in all sectors with the important exception of domestic work, a form of work that is hidden from public view and outside the reach of workplace inspections, leaving these children particularly vulnerable to exploitation and abuse ( ILO, 2013).

In Turkish economic structure, employing child labour exposes the country with two different problems. The first one is that the employment of uneducated child labour is against human rights and freedom, against the understanding of welfare state and against the content of positive law (Bulut, 1997: 60). The second one is that the children who have to work in bad working conditions are forced to endure low wages, unstable(long) work hours and incurring some problems of health and social security issues (Küçükkalay and others, 2000: 109).

In 2012, 15.6 % of the total workforce was formed by labour in the 15-24 age group. In March 2012, non-institutional population in Turkey increased with 1 million 312 thousand people to 73 million 326 thousand people. The non- institutional working age population in the same period increased with 1 million 196 thousands people to 54 million 438 thousand (SIC, 2012).

The age groups related to working children with respect to ILO studies are determined in two ways: In order to do calculations about children in economic activities, the following age groups were used; 5-9, 10-14 and 15-17. Child labour and dangerous child work conditions are estimated within the age groups of 5-11 and 12-14 age ranges are utilized. The reason for this range is ILO's contract with Nr. 138, which refers to "the lowest age to be employed" (Sunal, 2011).

Marx (1867) has mentioned the reasons to employ child labour and discussed this phenomenon stemming from the labour demand. The use of muscles are indispensable for machines, that means workers with flexible muscles with incomplete improvement of their body can be run into work. Therefore, the first result of the capitalistically usage of machines will be the child and women's labour. This will increase the wage labour in time under the domination of capital. Marshall (1920) accepted also the usage of child labour before the Industrial Revolution. But the moral and physical disturbances arising from working under bad conditions are culminated after the Industrial Revolution. According to Marshall, "the most valuable capital is the human capital". According to him, to build less school, makes it possible not to understand the importance of schools which are not built. This also makes people less skilled. Marshall also paid attention to the reverse of this aspect and he mentioned that attaching importance to human capital will change the earnings positively in time, which will be reflected to the next generation in a good way. Psacharopoulos (1997) studied the levels of education of working children. In his study household surveys of Bolivia and Venezuela are used. His findings were that working children contributed most to the household income. In addition he found that working childrens decreases the level of literacy by approximately two years. Grade repetition is common in Latin America and this phenomenon is closely related with the term "child labour". Another study of Hazan and Berdugo (2002) investigated the improvement of child labour in development process, human capital and the fertility of child bearing women. In the early stages of development, the trap of being underdeveloped and an intensive child labour, lead to a high fertility with a low household income. With the technological progress, the difference between children's and adult's wages increased. The utility of employing child labour decreased in time. At the advanced stages of development employing child labour disappears and fertility decreases. Prohibition of child labour will speed up this process and help to reach a Pareto Optimal Equilibrium.

Dayıoğlu (2005) discussed the negative relationship between education and labour force participation. By using data for the years between 1994-1999 she examined the negative relationship between the labour force participation and education participation of children. But between these years in 1997 Turkey experienced an increase in compulsory education from 5 to 8 years. This increase helped to reach higher level of participation in education. This improvement gained an important success in fighting against child labor. This study analyzed the size and the depth of this improvement. Another study of Guarcello, Mealli and Rosati (2010) analyzed the effects of shocks and

the constraints in use of credits on supply of child labour and on participation in education. Findings of the study put the role of constraints in use of credits on labour force participation of children and participation in education forth. Moreover, this study emphasized the effects of shocks on household decisions and that it pushes children into workforce. In addition they emphasized that the social security increased participation in education and decreased labour force participation.

### 3. Methodology

Today child labour is not only a problem in Turkey, it is also a problem all over the world. Especially, in developing countries employing child labour is a serious problem. As a result of participation in labour force for a child, some consequences can occur, such as; disruption of education, physically and pscologically negative effects for a child etc. Especially for children of poor families fighting with life and poverty to participate in workforce would be a must.

Children of families living in rural areas and working in agriculture begin in early ages to work as unpaid family workers. Also in urban areas especially in industry, trade and services, child labour can be seen more often. Children working on streets have the most dangerous conditions. Internationally, many projects on preventing child labour are accomplishing. In this respect, in this study these topics below will be used to investigate:

1. to analyze the effects of earnings by child labour on household income,
2. to determine the reasons for child labour,
3. to determine the working conditions and their income level,
4. to set up the socio-economic and demographic conditions of their families.

As the sample of the survey, industrial firms in Izmir-Turkey are randomly determined. Child labour in this sample is employed informally, so children working in this area are also selected randomly. Face to face interviews with a hundred children is applied despite the conservative and opposite attitudes of employers.

To apply the survey; 21 poll questions were prepared to ask these 100 children. Data obtained as a result of the survey, are analyzed with different tests by using SPSS 16.0 program. A different hypothesis for each analysis was formed and with appropriate calculations they have been interpreted. In conclusion, 0.05 level of significance is used.

Hypotheses;

1. There is no significant difference between sex and educational level
2. There is no significant difference between monthly family income and the reason to work
3. There is no significant difference between the number of working people in family and the number of siblings
4. There is no significant difference between the first and the current salary
5. There is no significant difference between monthly family income and the current salary of child labour.

### 4. Findings

In this section, general findings on survey with children participated in evaluated. They were analyzed with cross tables.

Table 1. General Information About Participated Children

Age Distribution	%	Sex	%	Education Level	%	Educational Status	%	Future Expectation	%
7-10	3	Male	65	Elementary school	5	Studying	81	Will continue to study	43
10-12	2	Female	35	Secondary school	21	Non- studying	19	Study and work	14
12-14	10			High school	63			Get profession in sector	33

14-16	22	University	11	No expectation	7
16-18	63			Other	3

As shown in Table 1, more than half of the children answering survey (65 %) are composed of male children. Female workers are about 35 %. This explains that more male and less female child workers are employed in industry. Most of participants are at the age group of 16-18, this is 63 % of the total. 22 % represent the age group of 14-16. The lowest rate is derived from the age groups of 7-10 and 10-12. From these obtained data, a conclusion can be derived, because of difficult working conditions in industry relative to services and commerce, the number of workers from youngest ages are less than other workers at older ages of childhood.

By looking at the educational status of participants, 63 % of them are studying at highschool and 21 % are studying at secondary school. The rate of children studying at elementary school and at university is less. The most important reason for this can be that employers do not want to employ children graduated from elementary school. But people graduated from university don't want to work for low wages in difficult conditions. There were no children who never went to school, this arises from the compulsory education system. Most of children participating 81 % also studies. So, children both working and studying aim to contribute to family income. 43 % of these children want to continue going to school, but 33 % of them want a profession on this industrial field. The rest 14 % prefer both working and studying. 7 % have no expectations for the future.

Table 2. Socio- Economic Features

No of Siblings	%	No of Individuals working in Family	%	Monthly Family Income (TL)	%
None	15	Only me	3	0-500	1
2	54	Father and me	47	501-750	9
3	20	All siblings	10	751-1000	5
4 or more	11	Father and siblings	32	1001-1500	31
		Mother and me	4	1500+	54
		Mother and all siblings	3		
		All of us	1		

Table 2 findings Show that 54 % of participants have 2 siblings, 20 % have 3, 11 % have four or more and 15 % don't have any sibling. According to number of individuals working, 47 % of them said that he/she and their father are working, 32 % work with his/her siblings. This proves that only 1 % of individuals in a family work with all other family members.

Table 3. Family Findings

Educational Status of Parents	Mother(%)	Father (%)	Job of Parents	Mother (%)	Father (%)
Did not go to school	6	1	Doesn't work	78	7
Elementary	43	22	worker	3	17

Secondary	16	29	Officer	6	17
High school	30	34	Self Employed	10	45
University	5	14	Retired	3	14

Table 3 findings shows that, according to educational status of parents; almost half of the mothers are lower educated (elementary school graduated) than fathers. Low education level of mother can be a reason of almost 78 % nonworking mothers. About fathers, the evaluation can be made as mostly self employed people. So while fathers do not have any job guarantee, the pressure and necessity of family dictates that children start working and earning money.

Table 4. Findings On Working Conditions 1

Working Duration	%	Sector	%	Reason to work	%
0-6 months	33	Machinery	10	Contribution to family	28
6-12 months	38	Food	23	For his/her needs	37
1-5 years	25	Tekstile	12	To get profession	19
5 years and more	4	Electric-Electronic	18	Family Strains	13
		Chemical- Oil	7	Other	3
		Otomotive	18		
		Furniture	6		
		Other	6		

Data obtained from Table 4 indicate that most children (more than 2/3 of all) participating in this survey are working for one or less year in that firm. This is quite a high rate. This can be an indicator that these children often change job or that employers easily lay them off. The food sector has the highest child labour range followed by the automotive and electric-electronic sectors. This can be a conclusion of higher rate of male participants to the survey. The food sector takes the highest part, because less technical knowledge is needed in that sector than in other sectors. In addition as the reasons to work for child labor, contributing to the family income and to meet their own needs are leading factors. Getting a profession comes after these reasons. This fact also can be explained as a consequence of almost 63% of participants coming from 16-18 age group. As a result almost 37 % of participants have to meet their own needs, because their families are failing to meet their needs. So these people should take part in worklife at early age and earn money to meet their needs.

Table 5. Findings For Working Conditions 2

Daily Working Time	%	Mode of Operation	%	Social Security	%	Wages	%
3-5 hours	20	Full time	49	Yes	86	0-500	68
5-7 hours	33	Part time	50	No	14	501-750	17
7 hours or more	47	Shift	1			751-1000	9

	1001-1500	5
	1500 and more	1

From Table 5 some findings on working conditions of child labour can be derived. So, 86 % of participants have social health security, the rest 14 % don't have any social health security. Half of them work full-time, the rest works part-time. There is a contradiction, 81 % of all participants seem to study but 49 % of them are full-time employed. This can be explained with the fact that child labour does not attend school regularly in order to earn money and they get employed at least on an internship basis. In this respect the term "child labour" hinders education. Looking at wages they earn, most of them 68 % work for wages lower than 500 TL. Increasing wages decreases the number of child labour working for higher wages. From this findings child labour can be expressed as low cost for employers.

Statistical tests can be called "Parametric tests" and "Non-parametric tests". To determine the appropriation of one of these tests, a normality test needs to be applied. If data is normally distributed, a parametric test needs to be applied, if not a non-parametric test should be followed. For this aim two tests "Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test" or "Shapiro-Wilk Test" can be used.

Cross tables are being created to determine the normality of distribution for a specific set of data for two or more variables and to determine the common elements of these variables (Özdemir, 2008). To identify if there is statistically significant relationship between variables or not appropriate hypotheses are being established with 95 % confidence interval ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ). Variables in this survey are analyzed with appropriate tests.

Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) Test aims to test if a random selected variable comply with a specific distribution (normal, uniform or poisson) or not. Principally (k-s) test is based on the comparison of the cumulative distribution function of sample data with proposed cumulative distribution function. With the help of this test it is possible to investigate whether the data obtained from sample expose normal distribution or not. For only one sample Kolmogorov – Smirnov Test is based on the examination of two cumulative distribution functions (Gangam, 1998:196). The first one is the distribution function stated in Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ). The second one is observed distribution function obtained from the sample. 51 and more is used for sample size.

Table 6. Normal Distribution (One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test)

		Age	Number of Workers (Family)	Job of Father	Family Income	Number of Siblings	Industry Sector
<b>N</b>		100	100	100	100	100	100
<b>Normal Parameters*</b>	Mean	4,4000	3,0000	2,7700	4,2800	2,2700	4,0200
	Std.Deviation	,96400	1,23091	1,10878	,98555	,85108	2,17878
<b>Most extreme Differences</b>	Absolute	,363	,292	,242	,307	,314	,153
	Positive	,267	,292	,208	,233	,314	,153
	Negative	-,363	-,192	-,242	-,307	-,226	-,118
<b>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z</b>		3,632	2,917	2,422	3,075	3,145	1,531
<b>Asymp.Sig. (2-tailed)</b>		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	0,018

Kolmogorov- Smirnov Test is used to find out if data obtained from the survey results comply with normal distribution or not. In Table 6, in the last row significance (Asymp. Sig.) values calculated with statistical significance tests are greater than the critical 0.05 level, proving that distributions of observed factors are normal. But significance levels from survey questions are smaller than the critical value. Therefore it is more useful to use non- parametrik Kruskal- Wallis H Test.

#### 4.1. The Examination Of Sex and Level of Education

Kruskal-Wallis H Test is being used to compare measures of two or more independent samples relating with a dependent variable. So it tests if there is a significant difference between two distributions or not. It is a non-parametric type of one side variance analysis. In the non-parametric tests, median instead of arithmetic average is more suitable for comparing the measures of groups. Median, is the middle value of a serie ordered from lower to bigger or from bigger to lower. decomposition.

In this section, first of all, Kruskal Wallis Test investigated the sex of child labour and the level of education.

Table 7. Distribution of Sex and Education Level (Kruskal-Wallis Test)

	Education Level	Number	Mean Rank
Sex	Elementary	5	58,00
	Secondary	21	63,24
	High school	63	48,16
	University	11	36,18
	Total	100	

While analyzing Kruskal- Wallis makes it possible to examine more than one independent samples. The hypothesis of test is stated as:

$H_0$ : There is no significant difference between education level and sex of child labour.

$H_1$ : There is significant difference between educaiton level and sex of child labour.

According to the test results, ki-square= 10,947, f (calculated) = 0,012 for significance level  $\alpha = 0,05$   $f < \alpha$ . Therefore,  $H_0$  is rejected. That means; there is a significant difference between educational level and sex of child labour. The factor sex affects the level of education. Meanrank(significance level) for secondary school is 63,24, therefore, sex differentiates more on people at secondary school.

#### 4.2. The Examination Of The Relation Between Monthly Family Income and The Reason To Work

Kruskal- Wallis Test in this section is used for analyzing the monthly family income and the reason to work for a child. The hypotheses stated are:

$H_0$ : There is no significance difference between monthly family income and the reason to work for a child.

$H_1$ : There is significance difference between monthly family income and reason to work for a child.

Table 8. The relation between Monthly Family Income and Reason To Work (Kruskal Wallis)

Monthly	Reason	Number	Mean rank
---------	--------	--------	-----------

Family Income			
	Contribution to family	28	36,50
	For his/her needs	37	64,97
	To get a profession	19	44,00
	Family want	13	50,19
	Other	3	45,17
	Total	100	

The analyzes of Table 8 show that, there is a relationship between monthly family income and the reason to work. Monthly family income significantly differs according to the reason to work. As a result, child labour especially works for his/her own needs with the rate of 64.97 %. So, it means that insufficient income level of families force children to work even if to meet their own needs. Children working for themselves affect the family income more than children who are working to contribute to the family income.

In Table 9, Kruskal Wallis Test tried to analyze the relation between the number of siblings of child labour and the number of individuals working in family. The hypotheses are:

$H_0$ : There is no significant difference between number of working individuals in family and the number of siblings.

$H_1$ : There is significant difference between number of working individuals in family and number of siblings.

Test results are: ki-square =19.141, f(calculated)=0.000 has been found. At the significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$   $f < \alpha$   $H_1$  is accepted. So, increase in the number of siblings increases the number of working individuals in family. This can be an indicator for children to participate into the workforce at early ages, and to contribute to household income arises from demographic features of households. This factor (number of individuals) affects directly early participation into workforce whether by parent forces or by aiming to contribute to household income.

Table 9. The Relation Between Number Of Siblings and Number of Working Individuals In Family

	Number of Siblings	Number	Mean rank
Number of working individuals in family	None	15	31.50
	2	54	46.92
	3	20	63.28
	4 or more	11	70.77
	Total	100	

In Table 10, the relation between the first and the current wage of child labour is analyzed. As method used in this analysis, Wilcoxon Signed- Rank Test is applied for comparing the measures for different periods of the same variable. This test often used for intergroup investigations. This analysis is based on ordering difference points from low to high not paying attention to the sign. Then the order numbers of (+) and (-) difference numbers are added. The situation tested in fact is the difference between these the additions of these order numbers (Büyüköztürk, 2002:157). The hypotheses are:

$H_0$ : There is no significance difference between the first and the current wage.

$H_1$ : There is significance difference between the first and the current wage.

Table 10. The relation between Current wage and the first wage

		Number	Mean rank	Sum of
<b>First wage</b>	Negative rank	18a	11,50	207,00
	Positive rank	7b	16,86	118,00
<b>Current wage</b>	Correlation	75c		
Total		100		

a= Current wage< First wage, b= Current wage> First wage, c= Current wage= First wage

According to Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test: At  $\alpha=0,05$  significance level  $f$  (calculated) value= 0,191.  $0,05 < 0,191$  ( $\alpha < f$ ) So,  $H_0$  accepted. This means that, there is no significance difference between the first and the current wage. The wages do not differ much in time for child labour.

#### 4.3. The Examination Of The Relationship Between Monthly Family Income and The Current Wage of Child Labour

For this aim as a second method, Kruskal-Wallis Test is applied. The hypotheses are:

$H_0$ : There is no significant difference between monthly family income and current wage of child labour.

$H_1$ : There is significant difference between monthly family income and current wage of child labour.

Table 11. The Relation Between Monthly Family Income and Wage of Child Labour (Kruskal-Wallis Test)

	Current Wage	N	Mean Rank
<b>Monthly Family Income</b>	0-500 TL	68	44,42
	501-750 TL	17	59,53
	751-1000 TL	9	68,78
	1001-1500 TL	5	65,00
	1500 TL and more	1	73,50
	Total	100	

In Table 11, calculated  $f=0,014$ , significance level  $\alpha=0,05$   $f < \alpha$  So,  $H_0$  rejected. There is a significant difference between monthly family income and current wage of child labour. Monthly family incomes from children working for over 1500 TL. and for 751-1000 TL are higher than the others. Participating into workforce and earning money also contributes to family income, can be concluded.

This relationship can be also evaluated through Spearman Rank Correlation method in Table 12. This method as different from simple correlation can obtain ordinal values. Spearman rho ( $\rho$ ) coefficient, without any hypothesizing on distributions, can describe the relation between two variables through a monotonic function.

Table 12. The Relation Between Monthly Family Income and Current Wage of Child Labour(Spearman Rank Correlation)

Spearman'srho	Current wage	Monthly family income
---------------	--------------	-----------------------

<b>Current wage</b>	Correlation coefficient	1,000	0,350**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0,000
	N	100	100
<b>Monthly family income</b>	Correlation coefficient	0,350**	1,000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	
	N	100	100

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0,01 level (2-tailed)

The results obtained from various tests, a significant relationship between variables has been found.  $F= 0.000$  and calculated Spearman Rank Correlation coefficient = 0,350. This shows a significant and positive correlation between family income and current wage of child labour. Working children who earn money could contribute to the family income.

## 5. Discussion and Conclusion

Within countries, the incidence of child labor varies by gender; by age of child; and by household income level. Moreover, the incidence of child labor varies dramatically over the year in response to variation in labor demand and to household income shocks. Child labor has long term effects on the well-being of the child, lowering years of schooling etc. (Orazem et al., 2009).

In this study a survey is applied to 100 children working in the industry sector in Izmir-Turkey. Most of the participants to the survey fall into the 16-18 age group and are male. Nearly 80 % of them are continuing to go to school, but 20 % dropped out the school. There stated future expectations are that 43 % are willing to continue school, 33 % prefer to get a profession on current industrial sector. 14 % of them are willing both to go to school and to work together. The remaining 7 % do not have any expectation for the future. Family characteristics show that more than half of them come from at least 3 children families. Most of them work with their father and other siblings. Depending on the number of working individuals in family, more than half of the participants have as monthly family income more than 1500 TL. which proves the contribution of child labour to the household income. Educational status of their parents show that, 43 % of mothers are graduated from elementary school. 34 % of fathers are graduated from high school. Low level of mother education can be a reason of passivity of mothers rather than fathers in workforce. Most of the fathers are self employed people. In this respect, fathers don't have any job security. So families rather prefer working children. It can be evaluated.

More than 2/3's of the survey participants began working less than one year with their current employer. This can be explained by the easy lay off conditions for the employers. Sectoral distribution of working child labour indicates that most of them are in food sector, automotive and electric-electronic follow suit. It can also be concluded that of male participants dominated this survey. Reasons for early entrance into the workforce can be evaluated as to meet their own needs and to contribute to household income. Gaining a profession or trade is less important factor for the children. Since, 63 % of participants are from the 16-18 age group and 37 % of them can be expected as trying to meet their own needs. Families are failing to meet the needs of their children and it forces children to work at early ages. As for the wages they earned, 68 % of participants are working for less than 500 TL wages. Increasing wages decreases number of working children. As a result child labour is accepted as low cost for employers.

For the sample in this survey, findings from cross tables prove that there is a relationship between monthly family income and reason to work. Tests conclude that child labour especially work to meet their own needs. This arises from low and insufficient level of family income. Increasing number of siblings also increases also the number of working individuals in family. Household population is a factor affecting children to be forced working at early ages. Wage earned by child labour changes the household income and living conditions. Wages of child labour will

not change rapidly over time, because children do not work in the same business, and child labour is accepted as unskilled labour.

Economic development that raises the incomes of the poor is the best way to reduce child labor around the world. But it may take a long time. Policy choices and accompanying investments that have been made in two areas appear particularly relevant to the decline in child labour over the last 12 years. The first is education. The worldwide Education For All (EFA) movement has helped marshal major new investments in improving school access and quality, which in turn has provided more families with the opportunity to send their children to school rather than to the workplace and has made it worthwhile for them to do so. It is not chance that the rapid decline in child labour since 2000 coincided with a major increase in school attendance. The second policy area is social protection. While extending access to social security also remains a pressing challenge globally, there is clear multi-country evidence indicating that investments in social security are associated with lower levels of child labour.

## References

- Avşar, Z., & Öğütöğulları, E. (2012). Child Labor and Strategies On The Fight With Child Labor. *Journal Of Social Security*, 2012/1, 9-40.
- Bulut, I. (1997). The Problems Of Children Working On Industrial Region. *A Book Section- Problems On Pyscological and Social Development, Confederation Of Turkish Employer Unions Publication*, Ankara.
- Büyükoztürk, Ş. (2002). *Handbook For Data Analysis For Social Sciences. Pegem A Publications*. Ankara.
- CSGB (2006). *Time Dependent Policy and Program Framework for Preventing Child Labor*, Ministry of Labour and Social Security, Ankara.
- Dayioğlu, M. (2005). Patterns Of Chance In Child Labour In Schooling In Turkey: The Impact Of Compulsory Schooling. *Oxford Development Studies*, 33:2, 195-210.
- Edmund, E.V. & Pavnick N. (2005). Child Labor In the Global Economy. *Journal Of Economic Perspectives*. V.19, N.1, 199-220.
- Erbey, G. (2012). *Child Labor As A Form of Informal Employment and Household Income: A Survey In Izmir Industrial Region*. (Unpublished Ms Thesis). Adnan Menderes University/ Institute For Social Sciences, Aydın.
- Gangam, H. (1998). *Nonparametric Statistical Technics*. Gazi University Publication, Ankara.
- Guarcello, L., Mealli, F. & Furio, C. R. (2010). Household Vulnerability and Child Labour, The Effect Of Shocks, Credit Rationing and Insurance, *Journal Of Population Economics*. 23, 169-198.
- Günöz, M. (2007). The Problem Of Child Labour In Turkey and Recommendations For Solutions. Profficiency Thesis, *Turkish Republic, Ministry Of Labor and Social Security, Turkish Labour Institute*. Ankara.
- Hazan, M., & Berdugo, B. (2002). Child Labour, Fertility and Economic Growth. *The Economic Journal*. 112:482, 810-828.
- ILO-IPEC (2013). *World Report On Child Labour: Economic Vulnerability, Social Protection and The Fight Against Child Labour*. ILO International Programme On The Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC), Geneva.
- Küçükkalay, M., et al. (2000). The Problems Of Child Labor and Its Preventions In Turkey and The World., *Süleyman Demirel University, Journal Of Economic and Business Science*., V.5, S.1, 103-118.
- Marshall, A. (1920). *Principles Of Economics*. 8th Edition, Macmillan, London.
- Marx, K. (1867). *Capital:A Critique Of Political Economy* (Translated By: Mehmet Selik and Nail Satlıgan). Yordam Books, İstanbul.
- Orazem, P. F., Sedlacek, G., & Tzannatos, Z. (2009). *Labor and education in Latin America: An economic perspective*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Özdemir, A. (2008). *Advanced Research Methods and Their Applications*. Beta Publ, İstanbul.
- Psacharopoulos, G. (1997). Child Labour versus Educational Attainment Some Evidence From Latin America, *Journal Of Population Economics*. 10, 377- 386.
- SIC (2012). [ [http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt\\_id=1007](http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=1007) ]
- Sunal, O. (2011). The Relation Between Income Level and Child Labor: A Comparison Between Countries. *Başkent University, Faculty of Commercial Sciences, Ankara University Journal of Social Sciences*. V.66, S.1, 120-121.
- TISK & TURK-IŞ. (2007). Working Children In Turkey and The World. *Tisk and Turk-Is Center Of Social Support For Working Children*, Publication No:281, Adana.
- Tunçcan, N. (2000). Child Labour: Causes, Sizes and Its Position In Globalized World. *Journal OF Confernces On Social Politics*. V. 43-44, S.1, 243-259