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Abstract

Almost all out-of-school children are in developing countries, especially in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa where child labour is a serious problem. While the number of child laborers decreased somewhat from 2000-2004, a huge number of out-of-school children are child laborers, most of whom work out of poverty. Recent studies have shown that child labour depresses school enrollment rates, negatively affects school achievement, and decreases graduation rates. Given these realities, recent cash transfer programs have a comprehensive social protection approaches that encourage schooling by providing beneficiary compliance with requirement of schooling, vaccine, or other health-related conditions. These cash-transfer programs have tried to dismantle the intergenerational poverty cycle and thus have improved school attendance while reducing the number of child laborers. These programs will contribute not only to achieving one of the EFA goals, universal primary education but also as a long-term educational investment for children.
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Prologue—Child Labour—some historical and current perspectives

Child labour is not a recent phenomenon. It has existed over the centuries not only in the impoverished areas of developing countries, but also in developed countries until the beginning of the 20th century (Cunningham & Viazzo, 1996; Weiner, 1991). According to Pallas (1993), who examined the role of schooling in the social contexts of four industrialized nations (the U.S., Germany, Great Britain, and Japan), family was the central place in which children played, learned, and worked in pre-industrial societies. The family decided whether children were mature enough to be independent and start a new family. To illustrate, in U.S. pre-industrial periods, many children were engaged in various forms of productive labor, such as domestic work and agricultural work under parental surveillance. Family needed the income from children, and the work was typically supervised by parents or neighbors; thus child labour was not considered a social problem (Pallas, 1993).

The negative aspects of child labour were first spotlighted during industrialization in Great Britain when cheap child laborers in exploitative factory working conditions became apparent, and it is during this period when the term “child labour” was first coined (Cunningham & Viazzo, 1996; Zelier, 1985; UNICEF, 2005). With the introduction of high-speed machinery, working children were replaced by mature adult laborers. Moreover, formal schooling and certification gradually began to be required to obtain qualified positions for more technical work (Horrell & Humpheries, 1995). Exploitative working conditions also resorted to people. As a result, throughout the industrialization periods in many developed countries the idea that children should remain in school longer was fostered in order to secure adult working positions and to save them from exploitative working environments (Cunningham & Viazzo, 1996).

As an attempt to fight child labor problems, a number of schools were established. For instance, in the U.S. where industrialization impacted school development, there was a conspicuous increase in the number of formal schools during the 1880s-1890s; twice as many formal schools as professional schools were constructed (Kett, 1977). Another

---

Nashaw (1986) explains that in 1920 more than two-thirds of working children ages 10 - 14 were in agricultural labor in the U.S. Regardless of the type of work, the economic contribution from children had a great impact; e.g. in 1920, sons and daughters contributed 83% and 95%, respectively, of their income to the family economy (Cunningham & Viazzo, 1996, p. 15).
example can be drawn from Great Britain. During the early stages of industrialization, an increasing number of children were hired at factories, and their household economic contributions were great. However, with the coming of the 20th century, the percentage of child factory labour decreased while the percentage of children in school increased (Cunninghhan & Viazzo, 1996)²

Accordingly, child labour, industrialization, and schooling were historically inseparable elements in developed countries in the early 20th century.³ After industrialization, the central socializing force changed from the household to school and children and adolescents were segregated from adults both socially and physically (Pallas, 1993). It should be recapitulated that child labour in pre-industrial periods was not highly correlated with poverty. Further, the reality that industrialization reassigned children from labour to schooling has led some economists such as Gary Becker (1997) to argue that the process of industrialization or economic growth will lead developing societies into the modern world or that economic growth and modernization will vanquish child labor as well.⁴

The situations in contemporary developing countries where child labour is still a serious problem are different from pre-industrial periods in developed nations. Various empirical studies that describe situations in Africa (c.f. Canagarajah & Nielsen, 2001; Cockburn, 2001; UNICEF, 2005) and South Asia (c.f. Delap, 2001; Toor, 2001), where child labour is most concentrated have argued that poverty is the primary reason why children work. Although it should be noted that poverty is not the sole reason why

---

² For boys under twelve, the percentage of child labor participation decreased from 34% (1851) to 5% (1911) and for girls under twelve, 18% (1851) to 3% (1911) respectively (Cunninghan & Viazzao, 1996, p. 43).
³ The number of child labor increased until 1900 in Spain though many of these children worked for family establishment. The income from children ages 10 - 14 was substantial for their household until the second half of the 19th century. After the industrialization, however, the percentage of children under 14 working in the factories decreased (1909, 2.5%; 1910, 1.4%; 1914, 1.2%; and 1920, 1.0% respectively). Technological innovation in the textile industry, that had been brought as a part of industrialization, together with a rise in living standard, demographic change, the introduction of compulsory schooling, and the development of primary and technical education, contributed to the great decline in child labor in Spain (Tiana-Ferrer, 1986).
⁴ Similarly, Fallon and Tzannatos (1998) in their World Bank's position paper articulate that "widespread poverty is the major cause of harmful child labor in developing countries." Thus, "reducing poverty through economic development, and promoting other improvements such as changes in basic education, are essential element of effective strategies to attack child labor" (Fallon and Tzannatos, 1998, p. v).
children work, as child labour relates to cultural aspects such as gender norms (Delap, 2001) as well as more general determinate issues such as children’s age, education, gender, and parental employment conditions (Dehejia & Gatti, 2001), the majority of the child labour literature asserts that it occasionally perpetuates an inter-generational trap rooted in poverty (The International Center on Child Labor and Education, www.knowchildlabor.org; Wahba, 2001); i.e. “child labour is both a cause and a consequence of poverty.” Similarly, Longford (1995), who spent many years in Africa as a government official, contends that "poverty is the primary cause of child labor" where parents remain unemployed or have low-income (p. 474). Post (2001a) who studied child labor in three Latin American nations argues that 59% of the working children named "poverty" as their reason for working. In brief, a large body of literature exploring why children work argues that poverty is the principle cause of child labour, although cultural aspects, human rights, education, and adult employment are also interlinked and have been the topic of vehement discussions.

In the area of child labour, two conspicuous contemporary trends are worth attention. First, since 1990 and onward child labour has been referred to in connection with “human rights” and “education.” Particularly after the worldwide ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), child labour issues have also been discussed from the perspective of human rights (Tomasevski, 2003; Hammarberg, 1997; Hammarberg, 2000), and an inextricable linkage between child labour and education has also been focused since the World Conference on Education for All (1990) and Dakar Framework for Action (2000) (Post, 2001a; Maitr & Ray, 2002; ICCLE, www.knowchildlabor.org). Since 1999 international organizations such as UNICEF, have also shifted gears to a more education-focused approach for working children, especially girls. In 2002, the UN also released an agenda for the 21st century called “A world fit for children.”

Secondly, the world has witnessed inter-agency cooperation among governments, UNICEF, World Bank and ILO since the late 1990s, and two conferences in the late 1990s (Amsterdam and Oslo) reached agreement over illegalized forms of child labour. This was particularly evident after the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention (No.182, 1999) was established and rapidly ratified by a large number of countries, although
Convention 182 is sometimes critically viewed as a compromise among international organizations such as UNICEF and ILO, whose original objectives and perspectives on child labour differ (Post, 2001a; Myers, 1999). It is without a doubt true that since 2000 and thereafter international organizations whose objectives on child labour had been different have been cooperating toward the elimination of the worst forms of child labour. For instance, UNICEF (2005) emphasizes elimination of the worst forms of child labour stating, “it is now a priority for UNICEF and other international agencies to take action to end the worst forms of child labour, which included an estimate of 180 million children” (p.10). Such examples of inter-agency cooperation have been observed through the joint research initiatives called “Understanding Children’ Work (UCW) (2000)” among ILO, UNICEF, and the World Bank, and through international initiatives called “Global Task Force” among ILO, UNICEF, WB, UNESCO and Global March against Child Labour that officially took effect in 2005 at the Beijing EFA high level group meeting.

Subsequent sections of this paper give a synopsis of contemporary trends in child labour including its definition, forms, and current estimates, as well as the programs that try to eliminate child labour. The final section examines the relationship of child labor to education, especially primary education, as it relates to one of the EFA Dakar goals.

I. Recent Trends in Child Labour

1. Contemporary definitions of child labour

Child Labour is both a cause and a consequence of poverty—the international Center on child Labour and education—(http://www.knowchildlabor.org).

According to the ILO’s official data, an estimated 218 million children were counted as child laborers as of 2004 (Hagemann, Diallo, Etienne, Mehran, 2006). Just as the problems of child labor have been around long enough to attract attention, so has the term "child labor.5" Although following the ILO Convention No.182 of Worst Form of Child Labour, the term child labour is generally interpreted as “all cases in which children are exposed to harm at work whether or not children are less than 14 years old or less” (UNICEF, 2005, p. 10), the meanings and implications of child labour have been

---

5 The term child labour is a paradox, for when labor begins…the child ceases to be. (Rabbi Stephen Wise, 1910, addressing a conference on child labour in America (in Vivian Zelizer, Pricing the Priceless Child, 1994, p. 54 in David Post, 2001a, p. 127).
highly dependent on its social, cultural, and economic contexts as well as missions, strategies, and objectives of each working organization (Post & Sakurai, 2001; Post, 2001a).

As an example, two of the major international organizations traditionally working on behalf of child labor issues, the ILO and UNICEF had utilized quite different child labour concepts and categorizations until at least the early 1990s. Trade unions, consumer groups and the International Labour Organization (ILO) often used “child labor” and “child laborer” instead of “working children,” implying that children should be kept away from the labor force at least until they reach a minimum working age on the basis of the fact that these organizations historically tended to protect and secure adult labor markets (ILO, 1997; Post, 2001a; Myers, 1999). In other words, the ILO's primary concern was to protect adult employment and wages, the idea that “children's economic freedom should be abridged to protect the economic welfare of adults” has been reiterated implicitly in various forms of child labor legislation (Myers, 1999, p.15).

Conversely, UNICEF and other UNICEF-affiliated NGOs (c.f. Save the Children) referred to “child labor” according to article 32 of the Conventions on the Rights of the Child, in which child labour includes any economic activities impeding or hindering the child's full development or education. This UNICEF tradition continues, as these organizations often describe child labour as “working children” (www.unicef.org). As noted, what is defined as child labour has been a controversial topic, and many child rights advocates such as UNICEF, Save the Children Fund, and especially Radda Barnen have argued that "child labor" refers to work that violates children’s human rights (Post, 2001).

UNICEF’s categorization of child labour was not identical with that of ILO. UNICEF emphasized the place of work, as in: 1) unpaid work within the family, 2) work within the family but outside the home, and 3) work outside the family, which also distinguish from street children6 (James, Jenks, & Prout, 1998, p.105).

---

6 The term "street children", a word coined in Latin America during the 1980s when many of the Latin American countries suffered from the structural adjustment policies, is also defined in many different ways. Generally, according to the definitions by UNICEF and by the International Catholic Bureau, street children are categorized as "children on the street" and "children of the street." The former means those who do not go home but sleep on the street and / or retain little contact with their families, while the latter means those who sleep at home and / or remain in contact with their families (Blunt,
1998, p.105). On the other hand, the ILO categorized child labour as follows: 1) agricultural laborers, 2) domestic laborers 3) street laborers, and 4) factory laborers with wages. Myers (2000), former educational consultant of UNICEF and the ILO, argues that ILO, other labor ministries, and the World Bank have overall similar perspectives categorizing child laborers as “victims,” or what he calls a "labor market perspective," (ILO) and "economic development perspective," (WB) a view which classifies children as economic motivators (Figure 1). Myers argues that these two perspectives are different from UNICEF’s definition, as well as those of other child advocates NGOs, social scientists, and educators who classify children as "protagonists" or "subjects" (Myers, 2000). Terminology usage varies at the individual level as well. For instance, James et al. (1998) notes that some protectionists, such as Nichols (1992), view "child work" as a positive element in child development, but claims that "child labor" is exploitative, as the latter potentially impairs the health and development of the children. By contrast, Salazar (1988) insists on the impossibility of defining the content of "child labor" and "child work," as it is difficult to judge which work is hazardous and which is not (James et al., 1998).

Although agencies such as ILO, WB, and UNICEF working on child labour issues originally had different concepts on child labour, following the establishment of the Worst Form of Labour Convention 182 in 1999 as well as inter-agency research cooperation such as Understanding Children’s Work in 2000, a growing consensus has emerged that child labour refers to unacceptable forms of child work. According to UCW’s key note (2003) and UNICEF (2005) which cited ILO’s definitions on child labour, the current official definitions of child labour among ILO, UNICEF, WB, and other organizations are as follows:

1. **Child work or children’s work** is a general term covering the entire spectrum of work and related tasks performed by children
2. **Child labour** refers to a subset of children’s work that is injurious to children and that should be targeted for elimination.
3. **Hazardous work** refers to
   - Physical, psychological or sexual abuse;

---

1994). These classifications are still unclear, and this obscurity and difficulty in arguing "who are the street children" make the study of street children more difficult.
- Work that is underground, under water, at dangerous heights or in confined spaces;
- Work with dangerous machinery, equipment and tools, or which involves the manual handling or transport of heavy loads; and
- Work in an unhealthy environment which would expose children to hazardous substances, agents or processes, or to temperatures, noise levels, or vibrations which might damage their health.

4. (Unconditional) worst forms of child labour includes “children of any age below 18 who are involved in forms of slavery and forced labour, including forced recruitment for use in armed conflicts, commercial sexual exploitation (prostitution or pornography), illicit activities (particularly the production or trafficking of drugs) and hazardous work that jeopardizes their lives, health or morals.”
(The level of “harmfulness” increases from 1 to 4 above). (Figure 2).

In terms of age, the ILO’s official definition of child labour has clear categories as follows, “child labour is a narrower concept than economically active children” based on ILO Conventions No. 138 and 182, the term, “child labour” was also defined as;

In ages 5-11 = all children at work in economic activity;
In ages 12-14 = all children at work in economic activity minus those in light work;
In ages 15-17 = all children in hazardous work and other worst forms of child labour
(ILO, IPEC, 2002, p. 19)

Although overall consensus over the terms has been met, in reality there still remain differences among organizations in the usage of terms such as child labor, child work, and working children. To illustrate, although ILO’s new approach focuses on “centrality of child welfare,” ILO and World Bank still seem to imply that child labour per se is a negative consequence of society. As observed in the WB’s description, “the World Bank recognizes that child labour is one of the most devastating consequences of persistent poverty and has adopted a clear position to help reduce harmful child labour through its ongoing poverty reduction efforts and new initiatives” (WB, http://web.worldbank.org; Hagemann, et al., 2006), UNICEF tends to clearly reiterate that child work, child labour, and the worst forms of child labour are completely different and thus contends that their priority is to end the worst forms of child labour (UNICEF, 2005, p. 10, emphasis added).

In sum, although the terminology has been legislatively fixed to equate child labour with harmful work, in practice there are still various ways by which individual researchers or

---

7According to ILO, 9 out of 10 economically active children are child laborers. (ILO, IPEC, 2002).

2. Various forms of child Labour and Numerical Estimates of Child Labour Worldwide

Two recent publications released by the 2002 ILO report “Every Child Counts—New Global Estimates on Child Labour” and its most recent publication entitled, “Global Child Trends 2000-2004” brought out in May 2006 portray recent pictures of child labour around the world. These publications feature both the number of economically active children as well as the more narrowly defined category of child laborers. ILO estimates that in 2000 there were 245.5 million children between the ages of 5 and 17 that fit the category of “child laborer.” Between the ages 5 to 14 there were 210.8 million economically active children in 2000, of which approximately 186.3 million were counted as child laborers less than age 15 years old and 109.7 million were less than 12 years old (ILO, 2002, p. 22).

In 2004, the total number of 5-17 year old children categorized as child laborers decreased to 217.7 million. It is worth noting that in the past 5 years, the number of child laborers worldwide generally decreased (Table 1). In particular, there is a sharp decrease among the children in hazardous work from the year 2000 (170 million) to 2004 (126 million). This trend corresponds to the drastic increase in the number of the signatory countries for ILO 182. However, it should also be noted that the number of very young female child laborers ages 5-11 slightly increased, resulting in more female children working than male children for the age group of 5-11 in the year 2004. This is in sharp contrast to the worldwide trend of decreasing child labour (see bold figures in the table). Similarly, the number of children in hazardous work in the year 2004 should be

---

8 The International Center on Child Labor and Education (ICCLE) argues that huge numbers of out-of-school children are simultaneously child laborers. About 103 million children are recorded as out of school children of elementary school age, and this number (103 million) almost matched with child laborers under the age of 12 (109.7 million) yet child labour is still one of the largest causes of students being out of school. For instance, school fees, lack of government resources, poor quality of schools, and social barriers and discrimination such as conflicts, HIV-AIDS, Disability and Discrimination are also the key factors for a student leaving primary school without graduating (ICCLE, www.knowchildlabor.org).
highlighted. For the small age 5-11 cohort, it decreased from the year 2000, and yet it still outnumbers that of the age 12-14 cohort.

Table 1. ILO’s official data on children in economic activity, child labor, hazardous work, and worst forms of labour by gender in the year 2000 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender &amp; age group</th>
<th>1-a Economically active children (‘000s) in 2000</th>
<th>1-b Economically active children (‘000s) in 2004</th>
<th>2-a Child laborers (‘000s) in 2000</th>
<th>2-b Child laborers (‘000s) in 2004</th>
<th>3-a Children in hazardous work (‘000s) in 2000</th>
<th>3-b Children in hazardous work (‘000s) in 2004</th>
<th>4-a Children in the worst forms of child labour (‘000) in 2000</th>
<th>4-b Children in the worst forms of child labour (‘000) in 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-11 years old</td>
<td>109,700</td>
<td>107,647</td>
<td>109,700</td>
<td>107,647</td>
<td>60,500</td>
<td><strong>40,235</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>56,300</td>
<td>53,103 (49.3%)</td>
<td>56,300</td>
<td>53,103 (49.3%)</td>
<td>30,700</td>
<td>20,325</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>53,400</td>
<td>54,544 (50.7%)</td>
<td><strong>53,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,544</strong></td>
<td>29,800</td>
<td>19,909</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14 years old</td>
<td>101,100</td>
<td>83,072</td>
<td>76,600</td>
<td>58,105</td>
<td>50,800</td>
<td><strong>34,157</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>52,700</td>
<td>44,706</td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td>31,848</td>
<td>30,600</td>
<td>20,693</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>48,400</td>
<td>38,366</td>
<td>35,100</td>
<td>26,257</td>
<td>20,200</td>
<td>13,464</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17 years old</td>
<td>140,900</td>
<td>126,683</td>
<td>59,200</td>
<td>51,911</td>
<td>59,200</td>
<td>51,911</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>75,100</td>
<td>70,609</td>
<td>34,400</td>
<td>32,250</td>
<td>34,400</td>
<td>32,250</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>65,800</td>
<td>56,073</td>
<td>24,800</td>
<td>19,661</td>
<td>24,800</td>
<td>19,661</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>351,700</td>
<td>317,402</td>
<td>245,500</td>
<td>217,663</td>
<td>170,500</td>
<td>126,302</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>Unobtainable due to data imbalances (ILO, 2006, p. 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>184,100</td>
<td>168,418</td>
<td>132,200</td>
<td>117,201</td>
<td>95,700</td>
<td>73,268</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>167,600</td>
<td>148,983</td>
<td>113,300</td>
<td>100,462</td>
<td>74,800</td>
<td>53,035</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- For children under the age of 12, any economic labour is considered child labour; thus, economically active children are equivalent to child laborers; similarly, for children ages
15-17, the number of hazardous workers is equal to the number of child laborers, as this category of work is considered child labor for this age group.

- For the column 4.b, age-sensitive data is not available for children in the worst forms of child labour.
- 2006 estimates are from 60 national household surveys.

Child labour is mostly invisible. For instance, nearly 70% of child labour occurs in agriculture, in which only 1 or 2% are in export-oriented agriculture (ICCLE, available from [www.knowchildlabor.org/child_labor/kinds_of_child_labor.php](http://www.knowchildlabor.org/child_labor/kinds_of_child_labor.php)). These children typically harvest fruits, carry products, and are typically exposed to high levels of toxic pesticides calibrated for an adult male safety threshold (Sakurai, 2005). This percentage almost perfectly matches the ILO’s (IPEC’s) newly released figure of 69% (2006) for all working children in the age group of 5-14.\(^9\)

Children also work in manufacturing, but solely roughly 5% work in this category. Child labour can be found in stone quarries, for instance, as well as coal mines in Brazil, El Salvador, Zimbabwe, and Mongolia. However this latter sector occupies only 1% of the entire employment sector which employs children. The total percentage of children in manufacturing, mining, and construction is about 9% according to ILO (2006), which approximately matches the percentage that ICCLE documents. Conversely, it is worth noting that ILO documents that 22% of working children ages 5-14 are in service sectors such as wholesale and retail, failing to distinguish child domestic laborers, which also comprise a higher percentage of child labor particularly among girls (ICCLE, ibid). In many developing counties, domestic chores are often underestimated or even described as being “idle”; this also explains why higher percentages of girls than boys are represented as “being idle”\(^10\), not attending school, and not attending employment (World Bank, 2005). Therefore, it would be unrealistic to consider that all child labor in the world have been accurately described in even the ILO’s publications (under sectoral distribution of children’s work, p.17) partially because the organization utilizes national household data, which often underestimate the time spent on household chores (World Bank, 2005).

Regional desegregation of working children ages 5-14 is partially available from ILO’s data (2006); more than half of working children are in Asia and the Pacific, while

---

\(^9\) This is the percentage of all the economically active children for the age group of 5-14.

\(^10\) World Bank’s PREM note argues that in rural Morocco for instance, 38% of girls and 19% of boys were reported as idle in 1998.
Sub-Saharan Africa holds the highest percentages of working children (26.4% v.s.18.8%). It should also be noted that there is a regional discrepancy in that Latin America experienced a drastic reduction in the percentage of working children from the year 2000 to 2004 (from 16.1% to 5.1%) while neither Asia and the Pacific (19.4% to 18.8%) nor sub-Saharan Africa (from 28.8% to 26.4%) experienced radical reductions (See Figures 3 & 4 in the appendix). This fact also adds the impression that child labor decreased between 2000 and 2004 yet did not equally decrease across different regions and across ages.

**Worst Form of Child Labor**

Children also work in the sector designated as the worst forms of employment. The current ILO data (2002) does not segregate the two age groups 5-11 and 12-17; if children ages 5-17 are examined, 8.4 million children were estimated to work in the worst forms of child labour as defined by ILO’s Convention 182. This segregation is as follows:

**Table 2. Estimated number of children in Worst forms of child Labour, 2000 (ILO, 2002) this data is unavailable from the ILO’s 2006 report)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Estimated Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trafficked children</td>
<td>1.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in forced &amp; bonded Labour</td>
<td>5.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in armed conflict</td>
<td>0.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in prostitution &amp; pornography</td>
<td>1.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in illicit activities</td>
<td>0.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.4 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Trafficking of children took place worldwide, yet the purposes of trafficking differ; for boys more forced labour and for girls for commercial sexual exploitation and domestic work. Children in forced and bonded labour were concentrated in the Asia-Pacific region, yet this form of labor exists in Africa and Latin American regions too. Children in armed conflict are mostly ages 15-17, and boys overwhelmingly outnumber girls. Children in prostitution and pornography exist in Latin America and the Caribbean and in the Asian Pacific region, the form is both the commercial sexual exploitation for tourists and domestic market, typically involving girls ages 15-17. Children in illicit activities may include drug production and trafficking, the age of the children varying widely (ILO, 2002, p. 26).

Regional estimates of the worst form of child labor are described in below the Table 3. Overall, it should be noted that contrary to the typical image of child labour that children work in industry or service sectors, the employment sector which holds the largest number of children is the agricultural sector.
### Table 3. Estimated number of children in worst forms of child labour, 2000 (ILO, 2002) this data is unavailable from the ILO’s 2006 report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region*</th>
<th>Trafficked ('000)</th>
<th>Forced &amp; Bonded Labour ('000)</th>
<th>Armed conflict ('000)</th>
<th>Prostitution &amp; Pornography ('000)</th>
<th>Illicit activities ('000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia/Pacific</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>m/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrialized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Region represents the origins of trafficking flows. In some cases origin and destination are identical. (ILO, 2002, p. 27).
- Note that for those of the children categorized as the worst forms of child labor, the newest data available is from the year 2000, published in 2002. This data is not available in ILO’s 2006 report.

### 3. International conventions relating to various aspects of child labour and the extent to which they have been ratified

In the field of child labor, conventions and recommendations have been the primary pillars to protect children from child labour. Such legislative frameworks have been formulated by International Labour Organisation (ILO).\(^{11}\) Throughout the approximately 90 years of its history, the primary strategy to combat child labour and education for the ILO has been through legislation, formulating international labor standards and protections in the form of conventions (ILO, [www.ilo.org](http://www.ilo.org)). National officials have supported these conventions by ratification, and NGOs and other UN agencies have encouraged the government to ratify.

The first attempt by the ILO to adopt legislation for working children took place in 1919. This legislation arose in the Great Britain to protect children in hazardous working conditions under the industrialization. It was called "Minimum Age Convention No.5,"

---

\(^{11}\) Because the ILO is a labor organization, the ILO has a tripartite structure with workers, employers and governments participate as equal governing organs. The ILO, which aims at "the promotion of social justice and internationally recognized human and labour rights," was created in 1919 with the support of two industrialists Robert Owen (1771 - 1853) and Daniel Legrand (1783 - 1859) to improve the most exploitive working conditions exacerbated by industrialization.
which defined that child labor under the age of 14 years as illegal. Subsequently, nine more comprehensive Minimum Age Conventions\textsuperscript{12} including Industry (1919, 1937), Maritime Work (1920, 1936), Agriculture (1921), Trimmers and Stokers (1921), Non-Industrial Employment (1932), Fishing (1959), Underground Work (1965) were adopted (Table 4).

The ILO adopted other types of conventions to protect child labor; 1930 Forced Labour Convention 29 and 1957 Abolition of Forced Labor Convention 105. However, few of the conventions, except for industry and agriculture, touched upon “education.” As an example, 1919 Minimum Age Convention No. 5 allows Japanese children over 12 to work in industry as long as "they have finished the course in the elementary school" (Article 5 of Convention 5, 1919).\textsuperscript{13} This regulation came much later in Western countries. Although each of these earlier stages of ILO conventions were ratified by certain numbers of countries, these forerunners of later conventions were not considered “comprehensive,” as they did not illegalize child labour across different employment sectors (ILO, 1996).

The most cardinal and notable pieces of legislation by the ILO regulating child labor arrived in 1973 and 1999; Minimum Age Convention 138 and the 1999 Worst Forms of Child Labor Convention 182. The Convention 138 revised the terms set forth in the earlier conventions and consolidated "principles that had been gradually established in various earlier instruments" thus, it is considered as a replacement of previous conventions concerning child labor (ILO, 1996, p.24).

Convention 138 (1973) was innovative in several ways. First, it compels signatory countries to pursue national policies to effectively abolish child labor in all economic activities—whether it is paid work or non-paid work. Second, from the education perspective, Convention 138 was considered progressive because it set the minimum work age relative to compulsory education, stating that "the minimum age for admission

\textsuperscript{12} Ratification of the ILO Conventions on Minimum Age are as follows; Minimum Age (Industry 1919), Minimum Age (Industry, Revised, 1937), Minimum Age (Sea, 1920), Minimum Age (Sea, Revised, 1936), Minimum Age (Agriculture, 1921), Minimum Age (Trimmers and Stokers, 1921), Minimum Age (Non-Industrial Employment, 1932), Minimum Age (Non-Industrial Employment, Revised, 1937), Minimum Age (Fishermen, 1959) Minimum Age (Underground Work, 1965), and Minimum Age (1973) (ILO, 1996, 29).

\textsuperscript{13} This is worth noting because Japan took into consideration the fulfillment of compulsory education as a requirement for work entry already 90 years ago.
to employment shall not be less than the age of completion of compulsory schooling and in any case, shall not be less than 15 years" (Article 3 of C138, 1973). This happened for the first time in the ILO legislation except that the Japanese government had previously considered education in a legislative framework for children to work. However as a drawback, since this convention requires all signatory countries to take necessary measures, such as the provision of appropriate penalties in an attempt to "ensure the effective enforcement of the provisions of the convention," not only the countries such as India and Bangladesh where child labour is still a serious problem but also some countries such the U.S. and Mexico where child labour still exist in the agricultural employment sector, have failed to ratify it. It should be noted, though, that the number of signatories drastically increased from the year 2000 through 2006 (95 signatories in 2000 vs. 153 in 2006). As of April 2006, it has been signed by 153 countries.

Although this legislation was enacted in 1973, only 19 countries ratified it in the 1970s. Fifty-eight countries ratified it in the 1990s and 48 countries ratified it after 1995. This rapid increase in the number of ratifying countries in the 1990s and in the 2000s suggests that many countries have begun to advocate protecting children from labor yet only recently. Some potential influence may have been drawn from the Convention on the Right of the Child (1989), because it institutionalized the idea of children’s human rights, and that the signatory countries of Convention 138 also ratified the CRC (Myers, 1999). In addition, the CRC forces its member countries to "take legislative, administrative, social and educational measures" that "provide for a minimum age or minimum ages for admissions to employment" (Article 32 of the CRC, 1989).

Another pillar of the ILO child labour convention was adopted in 1999: the 1999 Worst Forms of Child Labor Convention 182. Enumerating the worst forms of labor, such as trafficking of children, debt bondage, slavery, prostitution, and other illicit activities, it aims at the complete elimination of the worst forms of child labor.\(^\text{14}\)

\(^{14}\) It defines the worst forms of child labor as:
- All forms of slavery or practices similar to slavery, such as the sale and trafficking of child, debt bondage, serfdom and forced or compulsory labor;
- Forced or compulsory recruitment of children for use in armed conflict;
- Use of a child for prostitution, production of pornography or pornographic performances;
- Use, procuring or offering of a child for illicit activities, in particular for the production and
Convention 182 possesses distinct differences from Convention 138 in its content and in the process of ratification by the signatories. Three clear differences from Convention 138 and Convention 182 are:

1. The definition of “child” was reiterated in C182; While there is no clear definition of the "child" in the Convention 138, Convention 182 defines children as people under the age of 18, the same age as the CRC's definition of the child,

2. The way each convention involves education differs; The Convention 182 stipulates that access to free basic education to remove all children from worst forms of child labor or education is a deterrent to child labor while Convention 138 regulates the minimum age at work with the completion of compulsory education as Article 7 of Convention 182 states:
   
   Each member shall, taking into account the importance of education in eliminating child labor, take effective and time-bound measures to:
   (a) prevent the engagement of children in the worst forms of child labor;
   (b) provide the necessary and appropriate direct assistance for the removal of children from the worst forms of child labor and for their rehabilitation and social integration;
   (c) ensure access to free basic education, and wherever possible and appropriate, vocational training, for all children removed from the worst forms of child labor;
   (d) identify and reach out to children at special risk; and
   (e) take account of the special situation of girls.

3. The process of ratification differs considerably; ratification process was slow after its inception for the Convention 138. However, as of April 2006, 170 countries have already ratified Convention 182, which was established in June 1999.

The advent of Convention 182 was welcomed with broad international signatories. Thanks to the impact of the CRC, there has been a universally institutionalized ideology that any hazardous child labor, such as prostitution, trafficking of drugs or other illicit activities is apparently a violation of the children's right and thus should be terminated.

trafficking of drugs;
- Work which is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of children (ILO, Convention 182, 1999).
This is why so many countries ratified it quickly. However, Convention 182 was also described as “strategic retreat” from C138 in that it only prohibited the “worst form of child labour” (Post, 2001a, p.127). In addition, it was established under some dilemmas among the child rights based advocates who support children's own will, supporting child work to some extent, and labor unions whose ideal standpoint is the full elimination of child labor. Therefore this convention was considered to be adopted amid an ideological compromise among international organizations (Myers, 1999). Approximately 20 countries have not yet adopted this convention including Eritrea, Guinea-Bissau, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Cuba, Haiti, Suriname, Afghanistan, Australia, Cambodia, India, Kiribati, Myanmar, Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, Vanuatu, Armenia, Latvia, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan as of April 2006. It should also be noted that Afghanistan, India, and Somalia, where child labor is a continuing problem, still have not ratified either of these international conventions.

Table 4. ILO conventions on child Labour and UN conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ILO Conventions on child labor</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.6 Night work of Young Persons (Industry), 1919 (denounced)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.7 Minimum Age (Sea), 1920 (denounced)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.16 Medical Examination of Young People (Sea) Convention, 1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.29 Forced Labor Convention, 1930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.58 Minimum Age (Sea), 1936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 90 Night Work of Young People (Industry), 1948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.105 Abolition of Force Labor Convention, 1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.112 Minimum Age (Fishermen), 1959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.123 Minimum Age (Underground Work), 1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 124 Medical Examination of Young Persons (Underground Work), 1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 182 Worst Forms of Child Labor Convention, 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UN declarations and the Conventions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976 The International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights, and on Economic, Social and Cultural Right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989 The Convention on the Rights of the Child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Governmental / UN / or INGO’s efforts and initiatives to remove child labour from work in India and Nepal (Note. Since all efforts that have tried to remove child labour are related somewhat to education and poverty reduction, such programs were described in section II-2; this subsection focuses more on child labour policies and trends)

Child labour is rooted in poverty and its relation to education is often considered two sides of the same coin. This is why most child labour advocacy organizations have incorporated a three-way paradigm involving 1) poverty alleviation, 2) eradication of child labour through legislative as well as other types of interventions and 3) educational intervention (c.f. Global March against Child Labour & ICCLE, 2006; ILO, 2006; Fellon & Tzannatos, 1998; Grimsrud, 2003). The author documents the cases of India and Nepal because the former country experiences one of the largest number of child laborers in the world and has not yet ratified either of the ILO’s comprehensive child labour conventions (Convention No.138 & Convention No.182) and the latter country has large percentage of child labour out of its total child population ages 5-14 (see, The World Bank, “Child Labour in South Asia” http://lnweb18.worldbank.org/sar/sa.nsf/2991b676f98842f0852567d7005d2c6a/6114c39 34e4776238525696000487390?OpenDocument). The second part of this subsection compares Nepalese efforts to protect children from work with those efforts in India.

Poverty and child labour are still witnessed in India, but these problems are distributed unequally throughout the country. Of the 28 states, 83% of the impoverished people reside in only eight of the states, e.g. Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, West Bengal, Orissa, Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan, and Assam, in which 84% of out-of-school children aged 6-11 and 72% of child laborers aged 5-14 reside (Census 2001 released in 2005 cited in Child Labour Report, Global March Against Child Labour & ICCLE, 2006). About 80% of the parents of child laborers responded in the 2005 survey that stopping child labour would result in an economic crisis (ibid, p. 21). A large number of parents pointed to financial support as the main rationale for child labour, ahead of other reasons such as lack of good schools or lack of success on examinations (ibid) (Figure 5).

Recent economic reforms in India starting in 1991 have barely reached the poor. According to the figures released by the Indian Planning Commission, over 260 million people, or about 26% of the population, are below the poverty line. The 2001 official
The 2001 census released in August 2005 indicates that the rate of child labor among 5-14 year olds in India increased from 11.59 million in 1991 to 12.66 million in 2001 (Global March against Child Labour & ICCLE, 2006).\textsuperscript{15} The 2001 census records 226 million children aged 6-14, of which 65.3 million were not attending any educational institutions when the survey was conducted (ibid, p. 13). A gender imbalance exists as well; out-of-school girls outnumbered out-of-school boys, 33% to 25%, respectively. Regarding child labour employment periods, out of 12.66 million child laborers, approximately 5.77 million were identified as “main workers” who worked more than 6 calendar months per year, and the other 6.88 million children were identified as “marginal workers” who worked less than 6 months per year (ibid, p.14). Most of these employed children in India are either in agriculture or cultivation and few are in manufacturing (Figure 6).

\textbf{Child labour Policy and Interventions in India}

In order to address the problem of child labour, the Indian Ministry of Labour has 1) adopted statutory legislation against child labour, (yet the country fails to ratify two of the most important ILO child labour conventions, C138 & C182) and 2) has implemented project-based activities. The following are two of the national child labour conventions so far the country has adopted:

\textbf{Bonded Labour System Abolition Act, 1976}: it purports to abolish all debt agreements and obligations arising out of India’s long standing bonded labour system. It frees all bonded laborers, cancels any outstanding debts against them, prohibits the creation of new bondage agreements and orders the economic rehabilitation of freed bonded laborers by the state. And,

\textbf{Child Labour Act 1986}: it seeks to ban employment of children working in certain hazardous occupations; the hazardous occupations are identified and received by the expert committee from time to time. The Act also regulates the work of children in certain other industries. However there is no specific or all encompassing prohibition on the work for children. There are sectors such as domestic service, agriculture, urban and rural informal sectors where children work in large numbers. (Cited from \textit{Review of Child Labour, Education and Poverty Agenda: India Country Report 2006} by the Global March against Child Labour & ICCLE, 2006, p. 16).

\textsuperscript{15} Unofficial sources has claimed that there are 25 to 30 million child workers if domestic and other types of uncounted child labor are taken into consideration (Global March against Child Labor & ICCLE, 2006).
The drawbacks of these conventions include the fact that they contain loopholes, meaning that child labour convictions have been rare. For instance, few cases involving child labour has been prosecuted (1543), and even fewer convictions have resulted (278); other cases are pending (ibid).

In terms of India’s project-based initiatives, a project-based action plan has provided for educational services in the form of non-formal education under the auspicious of National Child Labour Project (NCLP), which operates in 100 districts in 13 different states in which the child labour problem is the most serious. According to the India Country Report (The Global March against Child Labour & ICCLE, 2006), a total of 4077 special NFE schools are in operation, and 203,850 children had enrolled as of September 2005. However, the project-based action plan approach also suffers from some limitations; for instance, the number of NCLPs are still intended for only a limited number of child laborers, and the vocational training provided to children enrolled in NFE schools under the NCLP has not been realistic due to a lack of “synergy and coordination” between poverty alleviation and education (ibid, p.16).

International organizations such as ILO, World Bank, and other NGOs have been supporting the Indian government through bi-lateral as well as multi-lateral projects which have rescued child laborers from hazardous labour and provided vocational training to their families. For example, ILO has operated 175 projects against child labour. Currently ILO, coupled with NCLP and the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA), two of the major Indian government projects, target 80,000 Indian children in hazardous employment sectors, mainly in manufacturing industries (ibid). Similarly, the World Bank has cooperated with the Indian government through social and economic development initiatives. For instance, the World Bank, as well as the Asian Development Bank, have contributed a total of US $1239 million in order to implement primary and elementary education projects in India. The World Bank has assisted children and their parents through District Poverty Innovation Projects (DPIPs) by releasing child labour and providing alternative employment for their parents in several districts where poverty is a serious problems; these projects were started between 2000 and 2005 in Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, and Jharkhand, all of which experience high percentages of child labour (p.17).
Finally, NGO has also supported child advocacy in India. Two of the representative agencies are the Bachpan Bachao Andolan (BBA) and South Asian Coalition of Child Servitude (SACCS), both of which have been trying to release child labour, especially the worst form of child labour—bondage and forced labour—though various types of rehabilitations including persuasion, legal intervention, and direct action. Despite these endeavors, child labour is still firmly rooted in India and will require more attention and intervention from the perspectives of poverty rehabilitation, educational advocacy and reduction of child labour (ibid).

India is not the only country in which child labour is still a firm problem. South Asia has the largest number of child labourers in the world and Nepal is not an exception. However, if legislation and governmental and non-governmental efforts in Nepal are compared with those in India, there are several distinct differences. The author chose this country due to the similarities in child labour (c.f the problem of bonded labour is still common), large percentage of child labour in total child population and the availability of literature utilizing the most recent national household data (Banskota, Sharma, Shrestha & Dorman, 2005).

In Nepal, over 20% of the population falls in the age group of 5-14 years old (6.2 million). According to the Nepalese National Child Labour Survey, the total number of school-only children, “working children” (i.e. those in school and out-of-school), and work-only children are as follows:

**Dissegregation of child labour in Nepal** (Banskota, et al. 2005, p. 18 and p.29)

- Total children between ages 5-14: 6.2 million
- Working children (in-school and out-of-school): 2.6 million (41.6% of children ages 5-14)\(^{16}\)
- Economically active children\(^{17}\) 1.7 million (26.7% of children ages 5-14 and 64.1% of all working children aged 5 to 14. Of these 1.7 million children, 1.6 million are in the agricultural sector.

---

\(^{16}\) The “total number of children ages 5-14 (6.2 million)” does not necessarily identified with the sum of 1) child laborers; 2) working and schooling children; 3) schooling only children. This is typically because there are unrecorded children such as “not schooling or not working children”, such as domestic laborers.

\(^{17}\) The Nepalese national child labour study recorded 50 different economic activities outside the home as “paid activities” or economically active (Banskota et al., 2005, p. 18).
Child labour (work only): 1 million (16.1% of children ages 5-14).
- Worst forms of child labour (1.8% of children ages 5-14).

As is always the case with child labour, most economically active children in Nepal are found in the agricultural sector (94% or 1.6 million). In Nepal, most child laborers are girls and a large percentage of working girls do not attend any schools, which is one of the characteristic traits of Nepalese child labour. Unlike India, a country exhibiting slow progress in terms of child labour legislation ratification, Nepal is quite progressive. For instance, the country ratified two of the most important international child labour conventions, the Minimum Age Convention 138 and the Worst Form Convention 182 in 1997 and 2002, respectively. Further, the country has several national laws that safeguard children.

- The Labour Act (1992)
- The Children’s Act (1992)
- The Child Labour Prohibition and Regulation Act (1999)

In addition to this legislative framework, since the mid-1980s and onward Nepal has implemented national development plans that promote child development and the elimination of child labour (Banskota et al., 2005). Such examples are seen in the Tenth Plan (2002-2007) which targets protection of children from “illegal recruitment, girl’s trafficking and rehabilitation of exploited women and children” (p. 5). In addition, the Ministry of Labour and Transport Management reviewed child labour policies in order to detect any gaps and contradictions between social policies and legislation regarding child labour. The Nepalese government also endorsed the National Master Plan for the Elimination of Child Labour, which strives to eliminate the worst forms of child labour by 2009 and child labour itself by 2014.

IPEC and other international donors and INGOs have also assisted Nepal; a total of 29 organizations have worked on child labour issues in Nepal, and NGOs network group called Children at Risk Networking Group (CAR-NGW) was established in 1992 and encompasses approximately 240 registered NGOs. More and more organizations are becoming actively engaged in child labour issues. Despite these networks, a lack of coordination has sometimes resulted in e.g. multiple (13) child labour programs in one district yet none in other poorer districts. In addition to more effective enforcement of
legislation, better coordination and safeguarding of child labour programs are required in Nepal (Banskota, et al. 2005). In sum, compared to child labour advocacy efforts in India, Nepal is more advanced in terms of legislative efforts and advocacy movements by civil agencies and others, yet both countries still face the problem of coordination among various stakeholders and institutions for the effective implementation of safeguarding projects against child labour.
II. Child Labour and Primary Schooling

Almost all (94%) of out-of-school children of primary school age are in developing countries, predominantly in south Asia (35%) and sub-Saharan Africa (40%) (World Bank Data available from www.developmentalgoals.org/Education.htm in ICCLE: www.knowchildlabor.org/child_labor/education_poverty.php; internet accessed in April 2006). These developing regions correspond to areas in which child labour is a serious problem. ICCLE points out that over 100 million children of primary school age are not enrolled in school, and huge numbers of them are child laborers who basically work from economic needs. Becker (1965) as well as Rosenzweig and Evenson (1977) found that parents expect some immediate economic contributions from children due to financial needs (Denes, 2003). Accordingly, child labour, education, and poverty have been referred to as a “triangular circle,” meaning that poor children are more likely to work in developing nations and, if children have to work, then they are less likely to attend primary or secondary school, resulting in a pervasive cycle of poverty that spans generations (ICCLE, www.knowchildlabor.org; Weiner, 1990; Grimsrud & Stokke, 1997).

At the same time, other reasons such as transportation costs (Canagarajah & Nielsen, 1999), limited school facilities, geographical isolation from schools, transportation costs, low school quality, political unrest, household characteristics, HIV/AIDS, and gender bias have also been documented as factors that affect school participation (Denes, 2003; Deb & Rosati, 2002). In consideration of these other factors, a large body of research has attempted to disentangle the relationship between child labour and school performance; however, existing studies have found negative effects of child labour even after controlling for other factors\(^\text{18}\) (c.f. Grootaert & Kanbur, 1995; Grimsrud & Stokke, 1997; Assaad, Lebison & Zibani, 2001; Post, 2001a; Neri, Gustafsson-Wright, Sadlacer, & Orazem, 2005; Levinas, 2001; Ravallion & Wodon, 2000; Rosati, & Rossi, 2001; Salazar & Alarcon, 1998; Weiner, 1990). This section discusses the child labour problems in relation to primary schooling.

\(^{18}\) A study from Ghana by Heady (2000) discusses a significant negative effect of child labour on academic achievement. Post (2001a) also discusses overall negative impact of employment on school achievement in Chile Mexico and Peru.
1. Effects of work on a) starting primary school b) completing primary school; and c) benefiting from it; and d) learning achievement

About 150 million children (100 million of whom are girls) who are enrolled in school will leave before completing elementary school. Generally, the opportunity schooling cost, i.e. the “implicit cost of the time that children devote to schooling, traveling to school, and doing homework at home” and the demands of child labour are highly correlated (Grimsrud, 2001, p.15). If the cost of schooling increases, then the percentage of child labour also increases. There is also a positive correlation between limited household income and child labour and the rate of school dropout (Neri, et al. 2005). This explains why children from wealthier family are more likely to attend school than children from poorer families (Deb & Rosati, 2002). Then, how does child labour affect primary school enrollment rates? Although various factors other than child labour, such as parental employment and cost of educational opportunities, have occasionally affected enrollment rates in several countries (Dar, Blunch, Kim & Sasaki, 2002), does child labour necessarily influence school enrollment and completion rates? Various studies have explored the effects of child labour on school enrollment; Jensen and Nielsen (1997) examined Zambia and Psacharopoulos and Arriagada (1989) studied Brazil.

Enrollment rates

Exploring the data from multiple Latin American countries, where many children combine work and school, Sedlacek et al. (2005) explored two effects on educational achievement; 1) whether or not child labour depresses school enrollment rates and 2) whether child labour negatively affects school achievement. They argue that child labour negatively affected enrollment rates in Latin America and that still stronger adverse effects were found in the students’ educational attainment. Utilizing the national household survey data from Brazil (PNAD 1996), Ecuador (LSMS, 1995), Nicaragua (LSMS, 1998), and Peru (LSMS, 1997), Sedlacek et al. (2005) explored primary and

19 However, it should be noted that “school enrollment” does not simply mean enrolling in 1st grade. Most studies utilized much broader definitions, including e.g. “school attendance” (c.f. Assaad et al., 2001).
secondary school enrollment. Their findings were consistent; in all countries, Brazil, Ecuador, Nicaragua and Peru, children who were not employed were enrolled in higher percentages than employed children (Brazil, 93% v.s. 79%; Ecuador, 93% v.s. 75%; Nicaragua 85% v.s. 56%; Peru, 97% v.s. 92%, respectively). This empirical result matches the findings of Post and Pong (2000) who examined academic achievement among working and non-working middle school students in Chile, Mexico, and Peru.

In another example that documents the relationship between child labour and enrollment rates, Assaad et al. (2001) explored the effects of child work on school enrollment rates in Egypt. More concretely, utilizing the household survey data from the Egypt Labour Market Study (ELMS-1998), they asked whether child labour reduces school attendance rates. They found that “for both boys and girls work is strongly associated with not being in school” (p.23) and they found much stronger detrimental effects from working in girls than boys, as girls assume more domestic chores than boys. Therefore girls start working much earlier than boys in Egypt, which affects 1st grade enrollment rates. The presence of women other than the mother should make it easier for girls to attend school, but the presence of younger siblings still nonetheless interfere with attendance.

Grade repetition rates

In addition to enrollment rates, grade repetition rates are also affected by child labour. One study that compared Panamanian children ages 5-17 who combined working and schooling with schooling-only children has interesting results. Grade repetition is still quite serious in Latin America, and Panamanian children are no exception; this rate is unequally higher for the children engaged in both working and schooling. For instance, according to a child labour survey by CGR/DEC (2000) in Panama, while 40.2% of students who were engaged in solely schooling were not behind grade at the primary school level, the percentage decreased to 14.5% for the students who combine working and schooling as of year 2000 (ILO, IPEC, Central America, 2003, p. 109).

Similar results were obtained in the study of Sedlacek et al. (2005) who also analyzed the effects of child labour on grade repetition. Utilizing the results of a household survey of 16 Latin American countries covering 10-16 year old children, their
regression analysis led them to conclude that after controlling for family characteristics and other variables, working children were significantly less likely to be in the appropriate grade than non-working children. They further found that reducing the probability of work by 10% would decrease the lag at school by 12.3%. In sum, they consistently found that child labour participation negatively affected school attendance as well as grade repetition.

**Attendance, Achievement, and Dropping out**

Several other studies exploring the effects of child labour on achievement in developing countries have suggested similar results. Duro (2001), for instance, found that working children in Argentina obtained lower scores than non-working children. Guarcello (2005) explored the impact of child work on school attendance and performance in five countries: Brazil, Kenya, Lebanon, Sri Lanka, and Turkey, and conclude that work reduces the rate of retention, and in some countries the number of hours worked also increased the probability of dropping out. However, one atypical finding from Guarcello (2005) was that in some countries being a working child does not necessarily affect “actual learning outcomes” such as test scores (p.56). This is a rare example suggesting a neutral impact of child labour on achievement.

Rosati and Rossi (2001) explored the effect of child labour on school attendance and the effects of hours worked on school performance. Utilizing the two national household data sets from Pakistan and Nicaragua, whose economic as well as social structures differ widely, the authors regressed the probability of falling back in the course of study on the number of hours worked, adjusted for a set of explanatory variables such as income, household composition, area of residence and parental education. From statistical analysis of the Pakistan data, the authors argue that child labour adversely affected school retention rates. Furthermore they found that hours worked also affected retention rates, concluding that even a few hours of work may “nontrivially influence school outcomes” (p.31). In the same way, the authors explored the data from Nicaragua and found that an additional hour worked significantly increases the probability of grade

---

20 The authors explains the limitation of the countries selected for this study, and their characteristics of working children, the characteristic of the questionnaire and the problem of sample design.
repetition, and even an hour of work per day increases the probability of failing at school (Rosati, & Rossi, 2001). These results from two developing countries in different regions imply that not only working versus not working but also the number of hours worked is a detrimental factor that affects school achievement; thus, they stress the risk that any child labour would damage accumulation of human capital (education) and child welfare.

Ray and Lancaster (2004) also explored hours worked by children on schooling effects by utilizing multi-country evidence based on SIMPOC data. They asked to what extent does children’s work at ages 12-14 negatively affect school attendance and performance (p. 29) and concluded that hours worked had a significantly negative influence both on children’s school attendance and performance, and in some countries, such as Cambodia, hours worked detrimentally reduced children’s ability to read and write. The authors made an essential concluding remark suggesting the need for non-formal education, which an increasing number of children in developing nations have utilized.

While the effects of child labour is traditionally evaluated using school enrollment and dropout rates, a recent provocative study by Sanchez, Orazem and Gunnarsson (2005) explored the effect of child labour on mathematics and language achievement test scores in the 3rd and 4th grades at primary schools in Latin America. This is a very atypical study, because effects of work on achievement test scores are often explored in the context of high school and beyond (e.g. D’Amico, 1984; Montimer, Finch, Rhu, Shanahan & Call, 1996). Analyzing the Comparative International Study on Language, Mathematics and Associated Factors data, collected from 13 Latin American countries in which students’ results of achievement tests at school were included, their conclusion was clear; child labour is associated with deteriorating performance on language and mathematics tests in every country examined after adjusting for school and household demographic variables, and the adverse effects of child labour were larger when children were engaged in regular work. They conclude that child labour would never be “complementary or neutral with respect to academic performance provided that the child remains enrolled in school” (p. 4).

These countries include: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Honduras, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Dominican Republic, and Venezuela. Costa Rica and Cuba dropped out from the study.
Overall, while an overwhelming majority of studies have described negative impacts of child labour on school enrollment, retention rates, achievements, and dropout rates, there is variation depending upon gender, regions, and most importantly the nature of the work and the data. Nonetheless, it is worthwhile to note that there is no single study that clearly illustrates “positive impacts” of child labour on academic outcomes. Given the fact that more and more non-formal educational institutions have been built, educational effects need to be broadly considered and more longitudinal results would further help to understand the dynamics of child labour problems.

**Box 1. Theoretical explanations of the effects of child labour on achievement**

In the field of child labour, while many theories have been elaborated to explain “why do children work,” unlike the effects of adolescent employment on academic achievement, except for arguing that child labour would deprive their potential human capital accumulation, limited literature on child labour have utilized theoretical frameworks to explain why working children or child labour have certain different academic attainments such as lower outcomes. However, occasionally the lower achievements by working children are a problem because it blocks accumulation of human capital (c.f. Rosati & Rossi, 2001).

Human capital theory, formulated by two economists, Theodore Schultz (1961) and Gary Becker (1964) encourages investment in education and other relevant work training because such investment will entail increased income in the future. They argue that by such investment, people accumulate appropriate knowledge, skills, or abilities, and thus become a more productive labor force than those without these assets. Accordingly, individuals with better skills, longer education and experience of relevant work are considered more productive and thus may expect higher income (Shultz, 1961; Becker, 1964).

Under the rubric of human capital theory, education is not the only category that can confer on people the necessary skills and knowledge. Work can also instill children with good knowledge, responsibility, cooperation, or other forms of skills that are otherwise unobtainable and which will be utilized in future work (Ruhm, 1997; Osterman, 1980). This concept is accepted in developing regions such as Latin America to promote the positive impacts of light work by children (c.f Boyden, 1999). However, it should be noted that this idea that “work gives children something to learn” is observed in adolescent work context. This is because in reality, most child labor takes place in either agriculture or domestic chores where such accumulated skills can hardly be obtained. Therefore, most literature implies that such human capital accumulation for the younger children can only take place at school but not in the workforce (Rosati & Rossi, 2001; Post & Pong, 2000; Sedlacek et al., 2003). Child labor is considered harmful to children’s welfare because it may “interfere with human capital accumulation” affecting

---

22 Shultz (1961) indicates that by additional education, people obtained “36% to 70% of the hitherto unexplained rise in the earning of labor” (p.13).
Another concept that explains the effect of child labour on achievement is zero-sum theory. The zero-sum model assumes that the time and energy that students utilize for their employment will be directly subtracted from the time and energy which otherwise are available for either school related activities, or time with their family and friends (Neumann & Morgenstern, 1944). While there are some limitations, this theoretical model has been often used to explain deleterious effects from excessive employment in secondary school (Carr, Wright & Brody, 1996; Marsh, 1991; Greenberger & Steinberg, 1986; Oettinger, 1999; Hansen & Jarvis, 2000). This theory is applicable to explain worldwide child labour problems, especially in the context of working children/adolescent who combine work and schooling.

2. Project description: of the programs which attempt to help children to combine schooling with some work and which provide schooling instead of working—case studies from Brazil and Mexico

What can be done to help students from impoverished families remain in school without dropping out? While there are several programs designed to tackle these problems, among the most well-received are the cash-subsidy programs found for instance, in Brazil and Mexico where the dropout rate is a serious problem. Brazil experiences a very high primary enrollment rate (96%), yet its completion rate is only 37% due to a dropout rate over 20% (World Bank 2001, p. 2 in Denes, 2003). The country is suffering from high rates of primary school repetition (20.6%) (male 23.0% and female 18.1%, 2002-2003), which is the highest in Latin America and the Caribbean. Less than 90% (88.7%) of the students in this country proceed to secondary education (UNESCO, 2006). Doubtless to say, this is much lower than Guatemala (94.2%), one of the impoverished developing countries in this region (UNESCO, 2006).

---

23 Zero-sum model as well as non-zero-sum model is a part of the game theory, which was originally developed by two mathematicians, Emile Borel (1921, 1924) and John von Neumann (1928). A few decades later in 1944, the game theory was firmly established by Neumann and an economist Oskar Morgenstern in their book, “Theory of Games and Economic Behavior” (Zagare, 1984). Zero-sum bases on interdependence choice, and presupposes conflicts that usually exist between two or more actors or objects. In other words, winning by one player equals loss by the other player. The theory argues that if we add up the wins and losses in a game, treating losses as negatives and treating wins as positives, and when we find that the sum is zero, then the sum becomes “zero-sum” (Zagare, 1984; Binmore, 1990).

24 The zero-sum model suffers from two major limitations; zero-sum presupposes mutual exclusiveness between work and school. In other words, the model hypothesizes that time and energy that is not spent on employment is spent on school-related work. Second, zero-sum ignores the interrelated aspect that employment would affect school work but at the same time, employment activities might be also affected by students’ school performance.
In parallel to higher dropout rates, 9% of children in Brazil are categorized as child laborers, even though children from impoverished households have a four-fold higher incidence of childLabour (Denes, 2003). Since the causes of child labour are related to poverty, subsidy programs have been proposed, especially in the form of cash subsidies to poor families. According to the World Bank (2001) such cash-subsidy programs have been implemented and have been well received (ILO/UNCTAD, 2001). Some examples include the following:

“Bolsa Escola” program in Brazil
“Progres” program in Mexico
“Programa de Asignacion Familiar (PRAF) in Honduras
“Red de Proteccion Social” in Nicaragua
“Beca Escolar” in Ecuador

This subsection compares the Bolsa Escola program from Brazil and the PROGRESA (Oportunidad) program from Mexico. The author chose these programs because these cash subsidy programs are essentially “pioneer projects” and therefore have been thoroughly examined (ILO/UNCTAD, 2001; Denes, 2003; World Bank, 2001).

Bolsa Escola (Bolsa Familia)

In Brazil, the Bolsa Escola program represents a departure from the modernization-based ideology and was proposed to assert that people need to view poverty as the opposite of “rich.” For the first time in its history, the government of Brazil provided a social program with wide coverage and that impacted poor populations that have historically received little attention (World Bank, 2001). Brazilian stakeholders believed that improved access to nutrition, water, education, health, and public transportation would provide incentives to mobilize impoverished citizens (Denes, 2003). Initiated in 1995 in the Federal District of Brasilia, Bolsa Escola spread nationwide thereafter with several changes such as widening the targeted age cohorts from 6-15. This widening of age-cohorts is particularly important in terms of educational policy because this amendment coincided with two important ages; the legally permissible age to begin work and the maximum age of compulsory education. Brazil ratified ILO’s C138, the most protective Minimum Age Convention, and this “matched age” means that the concept of delaying entry to work until the end of compulsory education has been approved in Brazil.
In the implementation process of this program, the Brazilian government has coordinated a “three-way relationship” between the local and states government and civil society and has appointed each stakeholder to regulate and reinforce each role (Denes, 2003). Further, the less than half of the members of the Bolsa Escola Council are municipal government officials, thereby improving the transparency of the project in terms of funding. The details of the project are described in Table 5.

**Table 5.** Comparison of Two Cash-Subsidy Programs: Bolsa Escola (Bolsa Familia) and PROGRESA (Oportunidades)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description &amp; Grant conditions</th>
<th>Bolsa Escola (Brazil) (This program was integrated to Bolsa Familia in 2003)</th>
<th>PROGRESA (Mexico) (This program was converted to Oportunidades in 2002)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description &amp; Grant conditions</strong></td>
<td>The Bolsa Escola Programs are poverty-targeted social assistance programs that give grants to impoverished families with school-aged (6-15) children. The grant (R$15 to R$45) is given a minimum number of days per month a child attends school (no more than 2 absences from school per month). This subsidy is given per child, allowing a large family that meets the conditions to receive more money than a small family.</td>
<td>PROGRESA, the national program of education, health and food, is an anti-poverty action plan by the Mexican government that targets the impoverished population (28%), 4.7 million people predominantly living in rural areas. The program granted educational stipends to those households with 3rd graders to 9th graders, and it offers food supplement support to the entire impoverished population.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Purpose** | • To increase educational attainment and thus reduce future poverty  
• To reduce current poverty  
• To reduce child labour  
• To act as a partial safely net—i.e. try to prevent poor families from falling into further poverty | • To break the cycle of poverty by providing adequate health, nutrition, and educational intervention to “improve the capacity of family to pull themselves out of poverty” |
| **Period** | Originally initiated in 1995 and increased to 60 Bolsa Escola programs in operation by 1999 | First phase was initiated from 1998-1999 |
| **Implementing agency** | The federal government; executive board was established within the Dept of Education and the Dept of Child Welfare and Social Assistance, the Governor’s office and the Council on the Rights of Children and Youth are its membership. | The Mexican federal government has financed and implemented this program |
| **Venue & cost** | • The program supports 8 million children in 5,512 municipalities per  
• After the implementation in 1998, it has increased 2.6 million in 2,100 |  |
month or 99% of the total in the country. The government distribute R$127.2 million per month and total cost is equal to R$12 per year (Partido da Social Democratia Brasileira, PSDA, 2002 cited in Danes, 2003)

- Within the municipalities, the programs target the poorest localities first; various indicators fairly evaluate family living standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific characteristics</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per child payment is given to “mother” from the Ministry of Education. This is because Brazilian women are more likely to spend a larger portion of their income on family</td>
<td>The amount of educational monthly payment gradually increases from $8.5 in the 3rd graders to $32.8 in the 9th graders, thus, acting as a watchdog to reduce the risk of dropping out of school. Additionally, girls obtain further 20-25% increase when they enroll in secondary school as in Mexico girls’ school achievement is lower than that of boys due to sexual discrimination inherent in its society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilized “clearly defined as well as socio-economic parameters” so that target citizens be kept clear and fair and are not affected by any political interpretation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two major federal programs (FGRM—Fundo de Garantia de Renda Minima and PETI—Programa de Erradicacao do Trabalho Infantil) have been instituted and recently has integrated into Alvorada Program.</td>
<td>There are several different impacts on 1) education; 2) health care; 3) household, including decision making process and 4) poverty alleviation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program impacted foreign financial sources such as international NGOs, IADB, and other bilateral and multilateral funding agencies</td>
<td>Education—increased primary enrollment rates for both boys and girls; Increased school retention rates by 10%; decreased dropout rates, especially in the transition period from primary to secondary; and increased school re-entry rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health—PROGRESA children aged 0-5 experienced 12% lower incidence of illness than non-PROGRESA children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household—Average levels of consumption increased by 2-10% especially on food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision making—PROGRESA households are less likely to be geared only by husband than non-PROGRESA households</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, it has been well-received. Decreased street children by 36% in Brasilia. Increased enrollment rates, decreased dropout rates. Overall this program was recognized as a success, yet there remain some drawbacks (lack of information to the families; imperfect dissemination of the criteria for participation). It does not create any counter effect on adult employment (i.e. it did not discourage incentive for adult employment).

A well-organized evaluation was conducted by IFPRI with the Mexican government. They chose 506 localities with 24000 randomly selected PROGRESA and non-PROGRESA households. According to the evaluation by IFPRI, PROGRESA has received overall positive evaluation yet some drawbacks include; in terms of education, while it increased enrollment, decreased dropout rates, but many children still combine school and work under this program and that no significant impacts on achievement tests (IFPRI, 2004). It does not create any counter effect on adult employment (i.e. it did not discourage incentive for adult employment).

Adequate monitoring system. Women’s participation in fund administrative levels. Further campaign for the dissimilation of project. Increase opportunities for participants in the administrative board. This program with other three cash transfer programs was integrated to a more comprehensive program called Bolsa Familia in October 2003.

How to affect educational achievement beyond simple attendance rates and dropout rates (i.e. so far, there is no impacts on standardized test results). How to increase the time for a student to spend on school assignment. How to decrease female child workers who are more likely domestic laborers. Adequate monitoring system. The program was converted to Oportunidades that aims at long-term poverty reduction effects.

This Bolsa Escola program could be seen as a symbol representing the Brazilian government’s attempt to strengthen the link between educational policy and child labour policy by trying to break the poverty cycle. The Brazilian government introduced a 1998 constitution that requires a minimum expenditure of 15% of federal budget and 25% of state and municipal funding on primary education, which offered a yearly budget of $280

---

25 Bolsa Familia program provides cash transfer to extremely poor families. The purpose is to break the inter-generational cycle of poverty by providing cash transfer to the families that meet the compliance with requirements such as school attendance, vaccines, etc (Lindert, 2005).
which was an enormous increase from $50 per student per year in the northeast, the poorest area of the country (Denes, 2003). Child labour policy has also been included in line with Bolsa Escola; the government has instituted two major programs (FGRM-Fundo de Garantia da Renda Minima or Fund of Guaranteeing Minimum Income and PETI—Programa de Erradicacao do Trabalho Infantil or child labour eradication program). The PETI program focused on child labour and provided income subsidies to poor families with children employed in hazardous labour and other employment (Denes, 2003). The Brazilian government has scaled up these two cash grant initiative programs, FGRM and PETI into one coherent program called the Alvorada Program and has further aimed at reducing poverty alleviation and social protection (World Bank, 2001).

These programs are well-received not only at the national level (national enrollment rates have increased while dropout rates have decreased) but also at the grass-root level; for instance, 56 Brazilian families interviewed replied that the new monthly-based income-subsidy actually helped in purchasing some “luxury items” such as school supplies and other household items (Denes, 2003, p. 143). Additionally, the program reduced the income gap between the beneficiaries and the non-beneficiaries, thereby reducing financial inequality (World Bank, 2001).

On the other hand, major challenges include uncertainty among some participating families about which category they represent, leading to worry about when the subsidy might be terminated. Furthermore, from the supply-side, the sustainability of the program has been raised as a major challenging perspective (Denes, 2003). Another challenge is the fact that further development of the program depends highly on “fiscal affordability” given the fact that Brazil is a highly decentralized country and shortages of funds will lead to reduced coverage of the programs among deserving cohorts (World Bank, 2001, p. iv; Sedlacek, et al. 2005).

Despite these negative aspects, the Bolsa Escola (later in December 2003, it was integrated to a more comprehensive Flagship social program, Bolsa Famila Program) has been recognized as a successful example and thus has obtained worldwide attention and assistance; UNCTAD has implemented a similar project in Mozambique and other places, and international NGOs have build schools, and the Inter-American Development Bank
also provided financial support in the form of a $500 million loan to extend government programs for poor households (Denes, 2003).

PROGRESA (Oportunidades)

Mexican PROGRESA\textsuperscript{26} (Programa de Educacion, Salud y Alimentacion, educational, health, and food program, yet it was renamed to Oportunidades in 2002) has similar as well as dissimilar aspects to the Bolsa Escola program. First, it is similar because it is also an anti-poverty program that tries to break the cycle of poverty by providing several forms of subsidies (educational stipend and food supplement support). PROGRESA was implemented in 1998, a few years after the inception of the Bolsa Escola program. PROGRESA has assisted three out of four rural poor households in Mexico, and so far the evaluation by the International Food Policy Institution (IFPRI) portrays is overall well-evaluated, as it reduced the depth of poverty level by 30% (IFPRI, 2004). In particular, this program was successful in alleviating poverty among the poorest citizens, the country’s indigenous people (Bando, Lopez-Calva, Patrions, 2004). Other successful aspects are quite similar to those of Bolsa Escola.

Several dissimilarities include that this PROGRESA has targeted two types of impoverished households; one, the households with school-aged children (3\textsuperscript{rd} graders to 9\textsuperscript{th} graders) and the other, the households without children or with children below 3\textsuperscript{rd} grade. Both groups receive stipends as an average of US$40 for households with children of 3-9\textsuperscript{th} graders and US$27 for the households without children in this age range, but the latter cohorts only receive a food stipend and not an educational stipend. Another difference is that Mexican PROGRESA allows its recipients to increase the amounts of stipends if a child attends school over 85% of the school year (World Bank, 2001). Thus, the evaluation is conducted \textit{yearly} and not \textit{monthly}, as is the Brazilian Bolsa Escola. Third, the Mexican PROGRESA was converted to Oportunidades that aims more towards long-term efforts, meaning “the ultimate outcome (of the project) is to improve labour market performance of the next generation with clear criteria of eligibility, which in many ways advanced a lot from somewhat “corrupted” former PROGRESA.

\textsuperscript{26} It was renamed in 2002 to Oportunidad, yet still the term PROGRESA has been used.
(Latapi, 2005, p.7). Finally, but not least, gender-differentiated results are more clearly documented in the PROGRESA program than in the Bolsa Escola Program (IFPRI, 2004).

Despite the fact that girls receive an additional 20% of stipend if they succeed in entering secondary school, the IFPRI’s evaluation study (2004) argues that so far the PROGRESA has not significantly reduced the incidence of child labour among female students, yet it has significantly reduced the number of male working students (IFPRI, 2004). This is probably because of the different gender roles associated with child labour, i.e. many female children engage in domestic chores and need to work in addition to school. This gender imbalance is somewhat contradicted by the increased enrollment rates documented in the same evaluation by IFPRI as a result of PROGRESA. In other words, as a result of participating PROGRESA, boys increased primary school participation rates by 1.07% while girls increased by 1.45%; for secondary school, boys increased by 3.5%-5.8% whereas girls increased by 7.2%-9.3%.

While there are some gender-imbalance effects, PROGRESA has facilitated a smooth transition from primary to secondary school. In addition to educational effects, it has also increased the cohorts who receive medical examinations, decreased the incidence of illness among 0-5 year old children by 12% compared to non-PROGRESA households, and contributed to child growth and food security by adding 2-10% of food expenditures among PROGRESA households (IFPRI, 2004). Finally, similar to the Bolsa Escola program, PROGRESA does not discourage work incentives for adult workers, and overall both projects have been received as “successful” as financial subsidy programs and as model cash-transfer programs that promote universal primary education, reduce child labour, and poverty.27

Recently more and more institutions have become involved in these cash-transfer subsidy programs, and according to the recent study by Chapman (2006), the use of

---

27 To illustrate such latecomers, the ILO and UNCTAD proposed the Minimum Income for School Attendance (MISA) Initiative in 22 African countries. MISA is also a cash transfer system targeted to poorest families and the stipend also depends on children’s monthly attendance to school. This cash instrument transfer is important incentive in order to halt further poverty cycle because poverty affects lower enrollment rates and higher dropouts and repetition rates yet for poorer families, child labour is only the immediate methods to guarantee minimum living standard. MISA initiative also incorporated human capital concepts that a child with at least primary education would in turn be more productive in the future (ILO/UNCTAD, 2001).
social transfer to facilitate education and health service has been adopted worldwide. The World Bank has implemented conditional cash transfer programs in low income countries in Africa and Asia, UNICEF has been reviewing social protection to reduce HIV/AIDS in southern and eastern Africa, and ILO/UNCTAD have been undertaking the Minimum Income for School Attendance Initiative implemented in Tanzania, Senegal and Mozambique (Chapman, 2006).

The paper has so far reviewed historical aspects of child labour, its relation to education, and progressive actions that have been implemented. Ever since the Convention on the Rights of the Child was ratified overwhelmingly by almost all over the world except for the U.S. and Somalia, the problem of child labour has received attention from rights-based advocacy institutions and has progressively received more attention, leading to a reduction in child labour from 243 million children to 211 million as of 2004. Child labour is rooted in poverty and thus in the context of developing countries, out-of-school children are almost synonymous with child laborers, often leaving domestic laborers remain uncounted (ICCLE, www.knowchildlabor.org). In this sense, the aforementioned cash subsidy programs have been integrated to more poverty-reduction social programs. In order to achieve education for all, it is necessary to further disentangle the complicated matrix of poverty, child labour and schooling. As a result, these programs contribute to achieving one of the six EFA goals, universal primary education and facilitating children’s future return from educational investment.
Figure 1. Conceptual Framework on how different international organizations view Child Labour

Concern to regulate children’s work and schooling is from perspective of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>view of child:</th>
<th>Human rights</th>
<th>Welfare consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential agent of actualization and social progress</td>
<td><strong>Rädda Barnen</strong> Because governments are unreliable as their advocates, children must mobilize for own self-interest. They have a right to work when school quality is low. Schooling can be improved, made more compatible with work in response to children's demands.</td>
<td><strong>I.D.Bank; W.Bank</strong> Utility-maximizing household firms generate and distribute welfare to children. Governments should increase productive capacity by expanding supply of schooling and create disincentives to employers (including parents) who prevent children from attending school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential victim of adult abuse and social pathology</td>
<td>With legitimation of authority from CRC, local N.G.O.’s can lobby for social clauses in trade bills and special judicial treatment for those under 18. Children need entitlements and ombudsmen. Removal of abused minors from exploitative parents.</td>
<td>Exploitation reflects unequal power or information constraint on free choices. Solutions lie in empowering families through demand-side subsidies. Min. age labor laws are needed to protect families, but governments should first target “intolerable” labor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential symptom of poverty and of social inequality</td>
<td>Renegotiations of national debt; pledges by North to channel resources to South; pledges by Latin American nations to spend min. 20% on social programs. Regional development strategies for indigenous peoples; extension of schooling to all regions.</td>
<td>Survival strategies of families depend on children when other resources are depleted. Solution is greater government or donor supply of minimum basic nutritional and educational needs for redistribution of opportunity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2: Basic distinctions in ILO child labour standard** – shaded area = child labor that needs to be abolished. (most recent official category)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Work excluded from minimum age legislation*</th>
<th>Light work</th>
<th>Non-hazardous work</th>
<th>Hazardous work</th>
<th>(Unconditional) worst forms of child Labour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 15 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 12 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cited from UCW, child labour indicators used by the UCW project, 2003, page 2; original source from *Global Report under the Follow-up to the ILO declaration on fundamental principle and rights at work* ILO, Geneva 2002).

**Note.**
- The minimum age for admission to employment or work is determined by national legislation and can be set at 14, 15, and 15 years.
- The minimum age at which light work is permissible can be set at 12 or 13 years old.
- * means household chores, work in family undertakings and work undertaken as part of education.
Figure 3.

Global trends in children's economic activity by region 2000-2004 (5 to 14 years old) (million)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other regions</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ILO, 2006, p.11)

Figure 4.

Figure 4. Global trends in children's activity rate by region, 2000-2004 (5 to 14 years old)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other regions</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ILO, 2006, p.11)
Figure 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Child Labour</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income support</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan payment</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic failure</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensive educational expense</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family business</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No good schools</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: India Country Report, Global March against Child Labour & ICCLE, 2006, p. 21. Note. Multiple answers existed, thus a total is not 100%.

Figure 6.
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