
Impact of Parental Unemployment on their Adolescence Children

Archana Bagale*

**Transplant Co-ordinator, Shahid Dharmabhakta National Transplant Centre, Bhaktapur, (Mphil-PhD scholar, Child Development, TU, M.Sc Nursing, MA Child Development and Gender Socialization), Nepal.*

Corresponding Email: *archanamachhindra2045@gmail.com

Received: 05 November 2023

Accepted: 25 January 2024

Published: 07 March 2024

Abstract: *Introduction: Unemployment means a situation where a person searches for employment but is unable to find work. It is key measure that has impact on economy [1].*

Methodology: Convenience Sampling Method was used to collect data from respondents. The sample size was 30. Sampling Tool: Self-Administered questionnaire was given to 30 respondents from government school (Class 10 and 11)

Results: Near to half of respondents were of age 16. More than half of respondents i.e. 53.3% were male. Majority of respondent's father were literate i.e. 86.7%. Two third of respondent's father i.e. 66.66% were involved in other occupation like private sector where as majority of respondent's mother i.e. 86.66% were housewife. Forty Percentages of respondents talks to parents about impact of low socioeconomic status on their life with their parents daily whereas 33.3 % of respondent's didn't talk to them about the problem. Majority of respondents i.e. 86.66% had no impact on their grade due to their low socio-economic status. More than three fourth of respondents i.e. 73.3% had no impact on social life and 66.7% of respondents have impact on diet and nutrition due to poor socioeconomic status. There was no statistically significant association between parental unemployment and its impact on their adolescence children.

Conclusion: More than three fourth of respondents i.e. 73.3% had no impact on social life and 66.7% of respondents have impact on diet and nutrition due to poor socioeconomic status. There was no statistically significant association between parental unemployment and its impact on their adolescence children.

Keywords: *Adolescence, Parental, Unemployment, Impact, Children.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Unemployment means a situation where a person searches for employment but is unable to find work. It is key measure that has impact on economy [1].

The COVID 19 pandemic has been creating humanitarian and economic crisis worldwide. The global economy was decreased by 3.3 percentage in 2020 [2].

Due to COVID, eighty percent of the workers in the informal sector and 1.4 million in home-based work are at severe risk of losing jobs. The report from International Labor Organization (ILO) shows that 1.6 to 2 million jobs have been disrupted in Nepal in various sectors like business, manufacturing, construction, transport, accommodation, food services, real estate and administration [3].

The socioeconomic scale used in India was modified to use in Nepal. The family income stated in Indian rupees (INR) in original scale is converted to Nepalese rupees by multiplying with 1.6 (INR 100 = 160 NR) and the conversion factor between NCPI for 1976 (Kuppuswamy's scale was proposed in 1976) and NCPI 2018 has been determined. The family income of less than 36000 per month was considered as family with low socio-economic status [4].

American Psychological Association reviewed the literatures on the effects of parental unemployment on children. There are various effects of parental unemployment on children like material deprivation, the psychological impact, family roles and relationships, children's health and behavior, child abuse, school progress, and decrease in care [5].

Parental job loss can have adverse effect on physical mental, social and cognitive wellbeing of their children. There is increased exposure to stress in childhood that can reduce the immune system enduring systematic inflammatory response leading to impaired cognitive and emotional development of key behavioral domains [6].

The objective of study was to find out the impact of parental unemployment on children

2. RELATED WORK

The problem of unemployment is raising in developing country like Nepal. It has many effect on lives of people as well as in their family. The lack of job leading to poverty, illiteracy decreasing quality of life and the vicious cycle is being repeated in lives of people. Moreover there are physical, emotional, social, financial, spiritual impact of unemployment on people and their children as well. Vocational and skilled based education by government to people helps in reducing the problem of unemployment and its consequences.

The poverty, material deprivation, and subjective financial stress are major distinct dimensions of economic hardship. The majority of the theoretical and empirical literature on the effects of economic hardship on children has treated material deprivation and subjective financial stress as only mediators of the effects of income poverty, not considering the independent effects of each dimension or the effects of their combinations [7].

3. METHODOLOGY

Descriptive Cross-sectional design was used. Convenience Sampling Method was used to collect data from respondents. Self-Administered questionnaire was given to 30 respondents from government school (Class 10 and 11) of Balaju, Kathmandu. Tool was prepared from extensive literature review.

Master chart was prepared. Data were entered in Microsoft Excel 2007 and converted into SPSS 21 version for statistical analysis. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to

analyze the data. Sociodemographic data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Chi-Square test was used at 95% Confidence Interval where p value of 0.05 considered statistically Significant to find association between prevalence between impact variable and selected variable.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: Sociodemographic variables of respondents N=30

Age	Frequency
15.00	2(6.7%)
16.00	14(46.7%)
17.00	10(33.3%)
Sex	
Male	16(53.33%)
Female	14(46.66%)
Education(Father)	
Illiterate	4(13.3%)
Literate	26(86.7%)
Education(Mother)	
Illiterate	8(26.66%)
Literate	22(73.33%)

Near to half of respondents were of age 16. One third of respondents were of age 17 years i.e. 33.3%. More than half of respondents i.e. 53.3% were male. Majority of respondent's father were literate i.e. 86.7%. Majority of respondent's mother were literate i.e. 86.7%.

Table 2: Occupation of Parents N=30

Occupation(Father)	Frequency(Percentage)
No	4(13.33%)
Labor	6(20%)
Other	20(66.66%)
Occupation(Mother)	
No	2(6.66%)
Housewife	26(86.66%)
Labor	2(6.66%)

Two third of respondent's father i.e. 66.66% were involved in other occupation like private sector where as majority of respondent's mother i.e. 86.66% were housewife. Only 13.33 % of respondent's father and 6.66% of respondent's mother were unemployed.

Table 3: Type of House of respondent N=30

Type of House	Frequency(Percentage)
Owner	4(13.33%)

Rented	26(86.7%)
--------	-----------

Table 3 depicts that majority of respondent were residing in rented house i.e. 86.7% while only 13.33% of respondent resides in own home.

Table 4: Impact of Socioeconomic Status on family life N=30

Talk to parents about problems	Frequency(Percentage)
Most Days	12(40%)
More than once a week	4(13.3)
less than once a week	4(13.3%)
hardly ever	10(33.3%)
Impact on mental health	
Worrying	8(26.7%)
low self esteem	4(13.3%)
satisfaction in life	18(60%)

Table 4 depicts that majority of respondent's father and mother has good emotional status i.e. 86.7%. Whereas only 13.3 % of respondent's parents had poor emotional status. Only 40 % of respondents talk to Parents about their problems where as one third of respondents i.e. 33.3% hardly communicate their problems with their parents.

Table 5: Impact of Socioeconomic status on mental health of respondents N=30

Impact on grade	Frequency(Percentage)
Yes	4(13.33%)
No	26(86.66%)
Impact on Carrier	
Yes	8(26.7%)
No	22(73.3%)
Impact on Diet	
Yes	20(66.7%)
No	10(33.3%)
Impact on Social Life	
Yes	22(73.3%)
No	8(26.7%)

Table 5 depicts that majority of respondents i.e. 86.66% had no impact on their grade due to their low socio economic status. More than three fourth of respondents i.e. 73.3% had no impact on social life and 66.7% of respondents have impact on diet and nutrition due to poor socioeconomic status.

Table 6: Impact of Socioeconomic status on mental health of respondents N=30

Emotional Status of father	Frequency(Percentage)
Good	26(86.7%)

Poor	4(13.3%)
Emotional Status of Mother	
Good	26(86.66%)
Poor	4(13.3%)
Family Communication	
Good	24(80%)
Poor	6(20%)
Family Conflict	
Yes	20(66.66%)
No	10(33.33%)
Quarrel Frequency	
most days	4(13.3%)
more than once a week	2(6.7%)
less once a week	6(20%)
Hardly ever	18(60%)

Table 6 depicts that 40% of respondents talk to parents about impact of low socioeconomic status on their life with their parents daily whereas 33.3 % of respondent’s didn’t talk to them about the problem. More than half of respondent i.e. 60% hardly ever quarrel with parents. Only 13.3% respondents quarrel most of the days with their parents.

Discussion

Near to half of respondents were of age 16. More than half of respondents i.e. 53.3% were male. Majority of respondent’s father were literate i.e. 86.7%.

In this study majority of respondent were residing in rented house i.e. 86.7%. Similar finding was found in the study done in UK around 70% of the adolescent people in each sample lived in rented housing, although home-ownership was far higher in couple families than in lone mother families (75% compared with 46% in the youth sample) [8]

Majority of respondent’s father and mother have good emotional status i.e. 86.7%. Whereas only 13.3 % of respondents’ parents had poor emotional status. Majority of respondent’s father and mother have good emotional status i.e. 86.7%. Whereas only 13.3 % of respondent’s parents had poor emotional status.

In this study 40% of respondents talk to parents about impact of low socioeconomic status on their life with their parents daily whereas 33.3 % of respondent’s didn’t talk to them about the problem. The finding is consistent with the similar study done in Britain where, around a third of the young people in each sample experienced high family conflict or poor family communication [8]. This finding is inconsistent with the similar study done in Europe where the exogeneity of parental unemployment with respect to adolescents' grade was confirmed. The parental unemployment was associated with a decline in grades of adolescents. Periods of economic decline, i.e. in 2011–2013, were found to be associated with deterioration in adolescents' grades [9].

In this study majority of respondents i.e. 86.66% had no impact on their grade due to their low socio-economic status. The finding is inconsistent with the similar study done in Germany where Parental unemployment has an adverse effect on the likelihood of entering tertiary education [10]. The finding is inconsistent with the study done among students in Nigeria, high rate of poverty which affected many parents in thirty- six states of federation includes Abuja the federal capital of Nigeria. However, the rate of drop out increasing daily basis because their parents could not perform their responsibility as parenting who have devoted to caring for their children education. Moreover, the population of unemployed parents is too high in Nigeria [11].

More than three fourth of respondents i.e. 73.3% had no impact on social life and 66.7% of respondents have impact on diet and nutrition due to poor socioeconomic status. The finding is consistent with the similar study done in China where parental unemployment has a negligible effect on family income and that parents devote more time to their children by monitoring their diet and focusing on their nutritional balance. Regardless of the direction of influence, the impact of unemployment on children's dietary nutrition is significant [12]. The finding is consistent with the similar study entitled “Parental unemployment, social insurance and child well-being across countries” parental unemployment is strongly negatively associated with the children’s life satisfaction across countries and years [13].

Impacts:

Social Impact: less social interaction, social stigma, inferiority complex in social status, dress, less interaction with friends, low frequency of outing
Emotional/ Mental Impact: Low self-esteem, poor communication, isolation, irritation, depression.
Economic Impact: less pocket money, no money for day time snacks, less money for dress, fashion, low quality of stationary, no books, only one pair of school dress, less dress according to season.
Physical Impact: poor quality of life, health, poor hygiene.
Impact on Carrier: not much focused on carrier, ignore the carrier that are costly. Not much impact is seen in respondents as in other studies it is because the study is done in Capital City.

Recommendations

- Employment opportunity to young adults, so that the social, educational and economic problems of adolescent’s child can be minimized
- Education and health must be free to all children So that the various social problem and stigma to the adolescence regarding their education, choice of subject of interest is not affected by parent’s economic status. Money to be invested in education and health can be reduced from general people out of pocket payment. All capable adolescence can choose carrier of interest and enjoys better health through the equal facilities if Nation.
- Quotas for higher education and technical carrier helps genius student to read the subject of their interest in future.
- Intersect oral and multisectoral coordination between line ministries like health, education social development and national and international organizations to build the base of nations i.e. children

5. CONCLUSION

More than three fourth of respondents i.e. 73.3% had no impact on social life and 66.7% of respondents have impact on diet and nutrition due to poor socioeconomic status. There was no statistically significant association between parental unemployment and its impact on their adolescence children.

6. REFERENCE

1. H. Axelrad, M. Malul, and I. Luski, “Unemployment among younger and older individuals: does conventional data about unemployment tell us the whole story,” *Journal for Labour Market Research*, vol. 52, no. 1, Mar. 2018, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12651-018-0237-9>.
2. Rastra Bank, “Current Macroeconomic and Financial Situation of Nepal (Based on Annual Data of 2021/22) Real Sector.” Accessed: Dec. 07, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.nrb.org.np/contents/uploads/2022/08/Current-Macroeconomic-and-Financial-Situation-English-Based-on-Annual-data-of-2021.22-2.pdf>
3. H. B. Jha, “Unemployment remains the biggest challenge for Nepal,” ORF, Dec. 18, 2020. <https://www.orfonline.org/expert-speak/unemployment-remains-biggest-challenge-nepal/>
4. R. Sharma, “Revised Kuppuswamy’s socioeconomic status scale: Explained and updated,” *Indian Pediatrics*, vol. 54, no. 10, pp. 867–870, Aug. 2017, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13312-017-1151-x>.
5. “APA PsycNet,” psycnet.apa.org. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1983-23142-001> (accessed Jan. 24, 2024).
6. M. Nikolova and B. N. Nikolaev, “Family matters: The effects of parental unemployment in early childhood and adolescence on subjective well-being later in life,” *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, vol. 181, May 2018, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2018.05.005>.
7. A. Schenck-Fontaine and L. Panico, “Many Kinds of Poverty: Three Dimensions of Economic Hardship, Their Combinations, and Children’s Behavior Problems,” *Demography*, vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 2279–2305, Dec. 2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-019-00833-y>.
8. D. Sables, “Industry, Heritage, the Media, and the Formation of a British National Cultural Memory,” *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 978–1010, May 2017, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10761-017-0396-3>.
9. R. J. Arneson, “Meaningful Work and Market Socialism,” *Ethics*, vol. 97, no. 3, pp. 517–545, Apr. 1987, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1086/292864>.
10. H. Lehti, J. Erola, and A. Karhula, “The heterogeneous effects of parental unemployment on siblings’ educational outcomes,” *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, vol. 64, p. 100439, Dec. 2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2019.100439>.
11. G. C. Unachukwu, K. E. Emesi, and A. N. Anyanwu, “Academic Engagement as Predictor of Secondary School Students’ Academic Achievement in Mathematics in



- Anambra State,” *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND EVALUATION*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 1–15, Aug. 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.56201/ijee.v8.no4.2022.pg1.15>.
12. J. Pieters and S. Rawlings, “Parental unemployment and child health in China,” *Review of Economics of the Household*, Jun. 2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11150-019-09457-y>.
 13. K. F. Hansen and A. Stutzer, “Parental unemployment, social insurance and child well-being across countries,” *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, vol. 204, pp. 600–617, Dec. 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2022.10.023>.