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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This report contains a comparative analysis of the household survey instruments developed or used by the three agencies ILO, UNICEF and the World Bank for the purposes of collecting information on child labour. In addition, the usefulness of input from other household surveys, such as the USAID DHS, and qualitative instruments such as the ILO-UNICEF rapid assessment tool, on child labour measurement instruments is assessed.

2. The report explains the similarities and differences in the various survey instruments by comparing sampling sizes and methodologies; analysing the questionnaires by clarifying who is asked what, age limits, the definitions used etc.; and comparing and contrasting SIMPOC, MICS and LSMS data sets. These survey instruments are not static but develop over time. This has especially been the case for questions on child labour. The report therefore aims at describing this development and looks at the most recent survey methodology. In addition to this, however, it is necessary to present earlier surveys and the type of data upon which most of the existing literature on child labour is based.

3. The point of departure is the definition of child labour and worst forms of child labour as stated in ILO Conventions 138 and 182 and the Convention of the Right of the Child. It is striking that until recently the survey instruments on child labour have not specifically focused on trying to identify child labourers in accordance with the above conventions or national legislation. Instead, data on economically active children has been published as a proxy for child labour data. Being economically active is a term developed for monitoring adult labour market participation but, as documented in this report, it is not that well suited to measuring child labour. This paper aims at contributing to the task of developing a new common understanding among the three international agencies (ILO, World Bank and UNICEF) on core indicators for child labour and on how to capture and produce child labour data. The new special emphasis on the worst forms of child labour makes it necessary to focus particularly on these issues.

4. Although both the ILO SIMPOC programme and the MICS survey approach have moved towards more specific child labour tools, there is still a need to improve the methodology. The data sets comprise several surveys where important lessons have been learnt and new ways of collecting data have shown to be useful. Some of these examples are described in this report together with some attempts that were proven unsuccessful.

5. The last section includes a comparison of the different approaches and identifies some areas for further development in order to develop a new standard instrument for collecting data on child labour. The most recent SIMPOC instrument is the basis for much of this discussion.
1. HOW THE DEFINITION AND DATA HAVE DEVELOPED TO DATE

6. Child labour is a complex phenomenon. Not all work done by children can be regarded as child labour. A distinction must be made between child labour, on the one hand, and activities considered part of a natural socialisation process, on the other hand. Child labourers are those entering the labour market, or taking on too much work and too many duties at too early an age. The challenges in both developing legal instruments and measuring child labour relate to how child labour is conceptualised. Child labour is not defined by the activity itself as equal to work, play, going to school or other activities that children might be occupied with, but by the effect the activity has on the child.

1.1 International legal instruments defining child labour

7. A quick look at the historical development of the international legal instruments that today form the basis for national legislation on child labour provides insight into how the definition of child labour has evolved over time. The first attempt to define child labour in an international convention was made by the International Labour Organisation (ILO) at its founding congress in 1919. From the time of the first convention, which settled on fourteen years as the minimum age for public and private industrial undertakings, to the adoption of Convention 138 in 1973, a gradual development of the concept took place (including more and more industries, types of work and raising the minimum age). The idea was to determine which activities children should not be allowed to undertake in the labour market. Hence the ILO definition has until recently always been based on the child’s relation to the labour market. A more comprehensive approach was taken through the adoption of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) in 1979, in which the definition of child labour was based on the effect that the work may have on the child, regardless of whether the work could be classified as labour market work or not. This child rights principle was adopted by the ILO in 1999 through Convention 182 (C 182) on the Worst Forms of Child Labour. These three conventions, ILO Convention 138 (C 138), the UN Convention for the Rights of the Child, and ILO Convention 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour, form the basis for the international definition of child labour.

8. The conditions set forth in the three conventions are basically of a qualitative nature. The work or activities undertaken by a child, defined as a person under the age of eighteen, should not be hazardous or harmful to the child’s health and physical, mental, moral, or social development. In addition, for children of primary school age, the work or activity should not interfere with the child’s education. However, since the qualitative conditions for child labour are difficult to translate into exact measurable figures such as the number of hours worked, some general guidelines are necessary in order to develop workable protection instruments. To make the qualitative definition operational, age limit conditions are constituted (in C 138) based on the current knowledge of the effect of work on children.1 There are various age limits, depending on the kind of work, when compulsory education normally ends, and whether the country is developing or industrialised.

---

1 The Convention on the Rights of the Child calls for minimum ages to be implemented, but does not specify them. However, through the work of the UN Committee for the Rights of the Child, the reference in the CRC to relevant international standards on minimum age for employment has been interpreted as ILO Convention 138. ILO Convention 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour covers all children under the age of 18; this convention refers to ILO Convention 138 as the basic child labor convention.
9. Firstly, there is a general definition of a child as a person less than eighteen years of age. No person under eighteen should undertake work that involves health-threatening or hazardous activities. Secondly, the minimum age of legally entering the labour market as a full-time worker is set at fourteen years of age for developing countries, and fifteen in other countries. In all cases, full-time work must begin only after the age of completing compulsory education. Thirdly, the minimum age for entering the labour market doing light work is set at twelve for developing countries, and thirteen in other countries. At this age, the child can do some work outside of the household, provided that it does not interfere with schooling. The child may also enter into vocational training. If a child is under twelve to thirteen years of age, he or she should not be active in the labour market, but may still undertake duties within the household or under the guidance of the parents and as a part of the socialisation process, provided the work does not interfere with schooling or pose a threat to health. The figure below gives a graphic illustration of the definition of child labour.

![Figure 1. Definition of Child Labour in International Conventions (Dark areas are defined as child labour; lighter areas indicate allowable or acceptable work)](image)

10. As indicated in Figure 1, the ILO Convention 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour generates a need to define and map the different types of child labour. This is especially the case for those under the age of fourteen or fifteen, where one might be a full time worker but not engaged in the worst forms of labour or, on the other hand, be a part time worker engaged in some of the worst forms of child labour.

1.2 The development of core indicators and statistics on child labour

11. Looking at the development of the survey instruments on child labour, the points of departure have been different. Until recently, the instruments have not specifically focused on trying to identify child labourers in accordance with national and international legislation. Instead, data on economically active children has been published as a proxy for child labour data. The "economically active population" comprises all persons who furnish the supply of labour for the production of economic goods and services, as defined by the United Nations systems of national accounts and balances, during a specified time-reference period. It includes persons in "paid employment" and those in "self-employment" (such as employers, own-account workers and members of producers' co-operatives; unpaid family workers, persons engaged in the production of economic goods and services for own and household consumption; and apprentices who receive pay) as well as the unemployed (including first-time jobseekers).²

12. Two kinds of discrepancies or measurement errors relative to the internationally agreed definition of child labour occur when using economically active as a proxy for child labour. First, child labourers working within their own household are excluded from the statistics of working children. In fact, the definition of economically active is drawn in such a way that if a person is undertaking activities like caring for animals

and fetching water for irrigation, he or she is regarded as working or economically active, while a person undertaking activities such as caring for siblings and fetching water for cooking is regarded as not working or non-economically active.

13. The second type of measurement error has the reverse outcome. A child above twelve to thirteen years of age who works, for example, in the family shop or on family-owned land, but combines work and school in such a way that school performance does not suffer and is not exposed to dangerous working conditions, is not a child labourer according to the definition, but is regarded as being economically active.

14. In general, in countries with a low primary school enrolment rate, the figures of economically active children will tend to be lower than the number of child labourers. In countries with a high primary school enrolment rate, the combined figure of full-time and part-time economically active children will tend to overestimate the number of child labourers.

15. In 1995, the ILO published child labour statistics based on labour market surveys, including four so-called experimental surveys (Ghana, India, Indonesia, and Senegal), where working children had been specifically looked at using the number of economically active children as a proxy for child labourers. Twelve percent of children between ages five and fourteen were found to be working full-time and an equal number working part-time. As a result of using economically active as proxy for child labour, the ILO found that among full-time workers boys outnumbered girls at a rate of three to two. Based on these figures, it was estimated that in developing countries alone, at least 120 million children between the age of five and fourteen are in full-time work; the figure rises to 250 million if those in part-time work are included (ILO 1995).

16. At the Sixteenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians in 1998, ILO discussed the concepts, definitions, measurements, and classifications of child labour in more depth. The conference recommended that work of a domestic nature (household chores) performed by children in their own parents’ or other relatives’ homes where they actually reside, should be included in mapping children’s schooling and non-schooling activities. This approach would identify those children who are working more than the number of hours a day that may be considered normal to learn common household chores and related activities, that is, child labourers. However, it was recommended that the final data compiled on these children should then be tabulated separately from the data on children who are economically active. The recommendation indicates that non-market work of a domestic nature in the parent’s or guardian’s household would then be classified and tabulated in various ranges according to the number of hours of performing such work in order to establish a threshold beyond which the activity could be deemed as constituting child labour. Together with the adoption of the new convention on the worst forms of child labour in 1999, the conference opened the way for a new survey instrument built around the SIMPOC programme presented in the next section.

17. Parallel to this, UNICEF initiated its own process for obtaining better data on child labour based on the definition in the CRC. The UNICEF 1997 State of the World’s Children Report, which focussed specifically on child labour, cites the ILO estimate of 73 million working children, buts adds that using the CRC definition of child labour would put around 90 million children (mainly girls) in India alone to this figure.

18. After the Oslo Conference on Child Labour in 1997, the World Bank was also drawn into the work of developing better child labour data. The World Bank bases its survey instrument, the LSMS, on the ILO definition of economically active children.
In the World Bank review paper on child labour it is acknowledged that “there is no systematically data collection on child labour” (World Bank 1995, 7). A special project was set up under the Social Protection Unit, and, inter alia, a number of papers were commissioned on the various dimensions of the child labour measurement challenge.

19. These three initiatives were brought together in 2000 under the joint ILO-UNICEF-World Bank programme entitled ‘Understanding Children’s Work’.

2. THE PRESENT STATISTICS

20. This section looks at the work of the three agencies individually in improving data on child labour. Each agency has developed its own survey instruments, namely the Living Standard Measurement Survey (LSMS) of the World Bank, the Statistical Information and Monitoring Programme (SIMPOC) of the ILO, and the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) of UNICEF. A short presentation of each is provided below. In addition, important information can be taken from a number of other sources with regards to concepts, methodology and comparable data. In Appendix I individual data sets from all three sources are presented in more detail.

2.1 The World Bank Living Standard Measurement Surveys

21. The main objective of the World Bank’s Living Standard Measurement Surveys (LSMS) is to collect household data that can be used to assess household welfare, to understand household behaviour, and to evaluate the effect of various government policies on the living conditions of the population. Accordingly, LSMS collect data on many dimensions of household well-being including consumption, income, savings, employment, health, education, fertility, nutrition, housing and migration.

22. Given the fact that the LSMS surveys are multi-topic integrated household surveys and not single-topic surveys, it is possible to get information on children’s activities in modules other than the economic activity module. For example, the household enterprise module asks which family members participate in the business. The education module asks about absences in the last month and the reasons for those absences. The agricultural activities module asks which family members are involved in many stages of the production process. Because the main focus of the LSMS survey is not economic activity (it is just one of many modules) it becomes necessary to look through the entire survey to get all of the information that is available.

23. Three different kinds of questionnaires are normally used: the household questionnaire, which collects detailed information on the household members; the community characteristics questionnaire, in which key community leaders and groups are asked about community infrastructure; and the price questionnaire, in which market vendors are asked about prices. A fourth type of questionnaire, school or health facility questionnaires, is sometimes used as well.

24. As welfare is measured by consumption in most LSMS research on poverty, this aspect is strongly emphasised in the questionnaires. A wide range of income information is also collected. For individuals in formal sector jobs, most surveys contain detailed questions about wages, bonuses and various forms of in-kind compensation. Information is usually sought on secondary as well as principal jobs. At the household level, lengthy agriculture and small enterprise modules are designed to yield estimates of net household income from these activities.
25. Collecting data on a variety of individual characteristics (including health, education, fertility and migration) from the same households makes it possible to analyse the important relationships among the different aspects that make up the quality of life, such as the impact of parents' education on child nutrition, or the effect of health status on employment. One of the main benefits of the LSMS survey instrument is that it collects individual level information so that researchers can look at the range of information from all of the sectors for each individual.

26. Several recent LSMS surveys have implemented the community level questionnaire using focus group methodology to give a broader context to the quantitative data. In addition, several recent surveys have included a separate qualitative survey designed to find those issues that don't come up in quantitative surveys, such as cultural context, and to discover issues that need to be added to the quantitative survey for further study.

2.1.1 Concepts

27. The standard LSMS uses the ILO approach to determine whether a person was economically active during the last seven days or over the past twelve months. This is normally done by mapping wage employment, unemployment, farm labour and self employment. No special attention used to be given to the fact that children may be “employed” without pay and hence this may underestimate the number of child labourers in the labour market in many of the LSMS data sets.

28. The most recent LSMS survey from Guatemala (2001), however, contains many features that were not included in earlier surveys. In this questionnaire, there is a series of screening questions to identify individuals who are doing either paid or unpaid work. The survey asks initially if the respondent worked during the last week.

29. If the respondent says "No", a series of questions follows to verify that the respondent truly did not work:

   a. Did you work even one hour?
   b. Did you work in a family business?
   c. Did you work as an unpaid apprentice?
   d. Did you sell something in the streets or in a kiosk?
   e. Did you help on the family farm?
   f. Did you clean cars or shoes, or collect trash?

30. If the response to any of these questions is yes, the respondent fills in the economic activity module. Normally, information on time spent collecting firewood and fetching water is collected.

31. Furthermore, the surveys map school attendance but not normally household work. Therefore, the LSMS makes it possible to divide children into four groups only: children only attending school, those combining school and labour market work, those only in labour market work, and those neither working nor in school.

32. Sometimes as in the case of the Ghana 1987-88 survey, days and hours spent doing household chores is collected for each household member above the cut-off age (for Ghana seven years of age). The Nicaragua 2001 questionnaire also includes a question about the number of hours spent in domestic household chores for all individuals whether they are "working" or not. General time use modules are included in some surveys, for example the Jamaica surveys.
33. Household members are defined to include "all the people who normally live and eat their meals together in this dwelling." Those who were absent for more than nine of the last twelve months are excluded, except for the head of the household and infants less than three months old. Information on migrated children is, however, normally collected.

2.1.2 Samples

34. The samples in the LSMS are relatively small, ranging from 1500 to 5000 households. The sample is normally drawn in two steps based on Enumeration Areas and randomly chosen households within these areas.

35. The recommendation is that the economic activity module be administered to all household members from the age when formal education begins. For example, if children first enrol in school at the age of 7, it is recommend that all individuals 7 and older respond to the module. In some LSMS survey the cut of age may be higher, like at the age of ten, due to national regulations.

2.1.3 Questions asked

36. The household survey contains modules (sections) that aim to collect data on household demographic structure, housing conditions, schooling, health, employment, migration, expenditure and income, household non-agricultural businesses, agricultural activities, fertility and contraceptive use, savings and credit, and anthropometric (height and weight) measurements.

37. The individual designated by the household members as the household head provides responses to questions on general household information, or indicates which member would know the answer. In most sections of the questionnaire, each member of the household is asked to respond for himself or herself, however parents are allowed to respond for younger children.

38. It is recommended that questions on employment be asked of all household members (above the cut-off age). As mentioned above, these questions are based on the ILO standards. Information about both current and usual work is collected. For work performed in the last seven days, information is collected on hours, length of employment, type of employer, taxes, distance and travel time to work, money and in kind compensation, and benefits. Similar questions are asked on the secondary job.

39. In some LSMS surveys, the head of household is the only member interviewed, but these surveys are the exception and rather than the rule. One of the fundamental tenets of the Living Standards Measurement Study is that all individuals who are capable of responding should respond for him or herself. It is never recommended that the head of household respond for all members of the household.

40. In all LSMS surveys, there is an age below which adults respond for the children. This age varies by country, but usually ranges from 10-12. The adult that responds for the children can be either male or female. It is recommend that the interviewer find the individual who is best prepared to respond for the child. The reality of survey implementation is that it is not always the best informed adult, but every effort is made to get the best information possible.

41. Work related illnesses during the last thirty days are reported as well as accidents during the last year. An example of additional relevant information collected in other parts of the survey is expenditure on healthcare and medicine collected for the whole household.
42. Data are normally collected for each household member five years or older on self reported literacy and innumeracy, school attendance, completion and current enrolment. For all individuals who attended school during the past twelve months, data is collected on expenses, scholarships, and distance and travel time to school.

2.1.4 General

43. When using LSMS surveys for analysing child labour, one needs to draw on information from several of the modules, including the education module, the migration module and the household enterprise module. In the cases where these modules include information on the hours spent on household work and the potential health threat posed by work activities, it is possible to extract the number of child labourers from the LSMS instrument. Such information is more likely to be found in the most recent LSMS surveys. With regard to employed children and/or the worst forms of child labour, the surveys are often based on a relatively small sample, making it difficult to analyse such characteristics present in only a part of the sample.

44. The LSMS instrument is, given its purpose, uniquely suited to analyse the connection between household living standards and child labour. Due to the relatively few surveys that have collected information on household work, most analyses made on the basis of LSMS surveys use economically active children as a proxy for child labour.

2.2 ILO Statistical Information and Monitoring Program on Child Labour

45. ILO launched its Statistical Information and Monitoring Program on Child Labour (SIMPOC) in January 1998 as an interdepartmental program to help member countries generate comprehensive, reliable and comparable quantitative and qualitative gender sensitive data on child labour in all its forms. The overall objectives of the SIMPOC include developing standard indicators of child labour at the national level, measuring the incidence, causes, and consequences of child labour, and measuring the impact of intervention programs and policies.

46. Since its establishment, SIMPOC has become a focal point for the process of developing better survey methodologies on child labour. Parallel to this, datasets have been made available on the internet for a wider research community.

47. The most important development has been moving beyond using economically active children as a proxy for child labour. The way of asking about economic activities has changed by including non paid or remunerated work, and progress has been made in mapping non market work like housework.

48. Important developments have also taken place in sampling procedures, using a multi stage stratified sampling design to make sure sufficient numbers of both working and non working children are included in the sample.

49. Improvements in the instrument need to be taken into consideration when referring to data from the earlier surveys. In appendix I, there is an example of an earlier survey from Pakistan which methodologically today would not be repeated.

50. Efforts are aimed at developing a new standard instrument on child labour by the end of 2001. This is elaborated further in section 4.
2.2.1 Concept

51. The objectives have been to both develop a standard module (core questions) that can be linked to labour force surveys and a special household survey for child labour.

52. In addition, under the SIMPOC program, the ILO has looked at methodology for supplementary approaches to the household-based survey. These include community/town/village level surveys (key informants), employers and workplace surveys, street-level child labour inquiries and rapid assessment methodologies. The rapid assessment (RA) methodology is a joint ILO-UNICEF approach.

53. The development of a methodology to quantify the worst forms of child labour has been a special challenge. These worst forms are difficult to measure through traditional household surveys because they involve relatively few children, the incidences are often clustered, the information can be difficult to obtain because the activity is illegal and immoral, and lastly because they often involve children not sleeping in a registered household.

54. The SIMPOC programme has also tried through household based surveys to focus particularly on the worst forms of child labour in the labour market for children working for someone not in their own household. This is a very small group and therefore it has been necessary to design a very particular sampling procedure in order to secure a sufficient number of respondents. The benefit of this methodology is the ability to describe the different trades where economically active children are occupied, as well as wage levels and potential heath risks.

2.2.2 Sampling

55. The sample sizes in the ILO assisted labour force surveys are relatively large, up to 10,000 households, or normally more than twice the size of a LSMS survey. The ILO approach normally implies pegging a labour force survey.

56. The SIMPOC standard manuals call for a complete listing of households in all areas covered to be established prior to the sample selection of the households for interviews. During the listing exercises, certain basic information is to be collected on each household: e.g., the total number of household members, the number of children in the age group five to seventeen, and total number of persons aged seventeen and above, and an indication of the number of children aged five to seventeen who may be engaged in economic activities. Such information is used for further stratification and selection of the required number of households for the sample.

57. Then, it is recommended to use a multi-stage (two or three stages) stratified sampling design to select the required number of households. Using the household listing as a sampling frame as well as the basic information collected during the listing, all listed households in each unit of the segment can be grouped into three strata, for example:

(i) Households with at least one paid child worker (in the specific age group);
(ii) Households without a paid child worker but having at least one child working as an unpaid family worker (in the same specific age-group); and
(iii) Other households (in the same age-group).

58. As a final stage in the sample selection procedure, a specified number of households in each of the above three strata is selected by means of a self-weighting systematic sampling design with probability proportional to size.
2.2.3 Questionnaire design

59. The household-based sample survey uses a questionnaire divided into several parts.

60. Normally, the first part of the questionnaire is addressed to the head of the household, or his/her proxy, and asks questions about household composition, the demographic characteristics of each household member, household composition, and the economic characteristics of household members aged five years and above. This may be followed by a second part addressed to the head of the household, or his/her proxy, which includes questions on detailed child activities and conditions for those aged five to seventeen.

61. A special part is normally addressed to each child between five and seventeen years of age usually residing in the same household about their activities and conditions of work.

62. The type of data collected includes questions addressed to the Head of the Household concerning each child in the household aged five to seventeen.

- Schooling and non-schooling activities (both economic and non-economic, "current" and "usual", and duration of "usual" employment or work); primary (principal) and secondary (subsidiary) economic activities of each child aged five to seventeen who is a member of the household; many details on the current economic activity of the child including the type of occupation, goods produced or services rendered, and, when working for someone else, the employer’s industry and location of the workplace.
- Earnings and other benefits; working hours and conditions; the child’s contributions to the household.
- Work-related injuries and illnesses suffered by the child caused by his/her work in the past; other safety and health aspects at the workplace.
- Housekeeping activities carried out regularly in own parents/guardians household; the types of tasks and number of hours devoted to such work on a daily/weekly basis.
- In the case of children aged five to seventeen who work and live somewhere else, details on where they live, their occupations, earnings, their contributions to the household, why and how they left the household to work elsewhere, etc.

63. Questions addressed directly to children aged five to seventeen.

- If attending school or training institution and if not, the main reason for not going to school or training institution.
- If combining schooling and work (whether economic or non-economic work, including housekeeping activities), the effect of such work on schooling.
- Work-related injuries and illness, other safety and health aspects at the workplace in the past; types and seriousness of the injuries/illness; responsibility for covering costs of medical treatments and hospitalisation.
• Age when started work for the first time; reasons for working and whether or not satisfied with percent job; if not satisfied, reasons why; own perceptions about working; current choice and future plans.

64. Both sections may further include questions on whether the child is working for someone else, name and address of the workplace of the employer, industry, relationship with the employer, salaries/wages and mode of payment, hours of work and whether working also during evenings/night or on weekends and public holidays; details on all other benefits, for example, paid holidays, overtime pay, full or subsidised meals/uniform/training, etc.; social security benefits (including health, family or unemployment insurance and pension plans) and union membership of the child. The questionnaire also asks whether the child is supervised or not on the job by adult(s), and negative consequences of working (for example, frequency of exhaustion, heavy physical work, stressfulness, risks, and types of hazards with details of each category). These are all examples of questions where the number of potential respondents are so few that a large and stratified sample is necessary.

65. With regard to health and hazardous working conditions, only market work is normally mapped. The same is the case when asked about the age of starting to work. But information on idleness and accidents are asked from, or about, all children.

66. As can be seen, in addition to the traditional labour market focus, considerable progress has been made in including questions about the child’s work in their own household. Information about non market child labour can now be obtained and analysed from the more recent SIMPOC surveys. This information includes more details on hazardous forms of non market work and domestic services on the borderline between fostering and work arrangements.

67. The four experimental surveys undertaken by the ILO in 1995 concluded that measuring use of time is difficult as well as time-consuming, and that measuring children’s use of time presents its own range of problems. One disadvantage of most of the techniques is that they require the child and/or parents to recall information, opening the way for selective memory and socially desirable biases. The ILO concluded that the survey technique which relied on asking children to recall, when presented with a list of different activities, how they spent their time over the past three days was not very satisfactory for the purpose of investigating children’s activities or the intensity of the work. Even when presented with a long list of economic and non-economic activities, many children could not recall the activities in which they had been engaged during the twenty-four hours preceding the date of the survey. And even when they were able to identify the activities, they had little recollection of the amount of time spent on each. Most children seemed to remember only those activities that they liked most, especially those in which they earned “good” money.

2.3 UNICEF Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey

68. The governments that signed the World Summit for Children Declaration and the Plan of Action for Children also committed themselves to monitoring progress toward the goals and objectives set for the year 2000. The Plan of Action called for each country to “establish appropriate mechanisms for the regular and timely collection, analysis and publication of data required to monitor social indicators related to the well-being of children”.

69. UNICEF’s initial monitoring strategy was to collect existing data from various sources. But it was recognised that current data on key indicators for assessing
progress were lacking for many countries. In response, UNICEF developed the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) as a household survey tool for countries to adopt in order to fill data gaps.

70. The focus of the MICS surveys is on a number of child welfare indicators including infant mortality, education, water and sanitation, malnutrition, immunisation, health, childbirth, family planning and child labour.

71. The survey instruments are comprised of a household questionnaire, a questionnaire for women of reproductive age (aged 15-49) and a questionnaire for children under five. The child labour section is found in the household questionnaire and is supposed to be answered by the child’s caretaker, usually the mother.

2.3.1 Concept

72. Child labour is defined as children in households aged five to fourteen who are currently working (paid or unpaid; inside or outside home). The data are calculated separately for paid, unpaid and domestic work of more than four hours’ duration per day.

2.3.2 Sampling

73. The recommended overall sample size is in the range of 2,500 to 14,000 households. The roster requires information on the mother or primary caretaker of any children aged five to fourteen. The questions about children’s work in the child labour module are answered by this caretaker.

2.3.3 Questions asked

74. The interviewer asks questions about the level of education which, together with the age, provides an indication on performance in the form of repetition. Further information is collected about the number of days in school last week, and any repetition in the last year.

75. The first question in the child labour section is whether during the past week the child worked for a person who was not a member of the household. The reply categories are ‘Yes for pay,’ ‘Yes, unpaid’ or ‘No.’ Information on hours worked is also collected. Further information is collected on work outside the household during the past year as well as information on household work, work on the family farm or in a business. All in all, the child labour section only contains nine questions.

2.3.4 General

76. This is a less comprehensive survey design than that of the SIMPOC and LSMS, as the children themselves are not interviewed and, generally speaking, the questionnaire is shorter. The MICS approach differs from the two other survey methodologies by asking questions of the mother rather than the child. This reduces time spent in the field and the cost of applying the survey, but may influence the results.

77. The child labour questions are specifically designed to obtain as much information as possible on this issue, and do not contain all the adult labour market measurement characteristics that are found in the questionnaires designed by the other agencies.
78. By omitting all questions on job seeking, unemployment and secondary employment much is gained in terms of shortening the questionnaire and not very much is lost in terms of information. This is the only instrument systematically collecting information on housework, and it includes a category of unpaid work outside the household.

79. The main gaps are information on the type of work or activity, which is needed for an indication of whether the work is health threatening. Furthermore, health and nutrition status is only collected for children younger than five. An important opportunity for collecting data that could show the link between children’s work and their health was lost with the decision not to extend the age limit for questions on health and nutrition to fourteen.

2.4 USAID Demographic and Health surveys

80. Another important provider of data is the USAID. USAID have initiated and are financing demographic and health (DHS) household surveys in a number of countries.

81. The DHS surveys use a questionnaire not very different from the one used by the UNICEF MICS surveys. Work is defined as working for someone not member of the household, for pay or not for pay. In addition, work on the family farm or in the family business, and household work, are mapped. Work for someone who is not a member of the household is divided into categories more suited for child labour activities than standard industrial categorization.

82. The questions are asked to the head of the household and the term child labour is used in the heading of the module, both probably effecting the results.

83. Education status is also mapped. The surveys do not normally include mapping conflicts between work and education activities or health and safety questions linked to work or other activities.

84. In some cases special child labour modules have been included (Malawi 2000, Tanzania 1999 and Colombia 2000). In others relevant information can be obtained. The Bolivia 1998, Peru 1996 and Peru 2000 surveys contained questions on the activities of children aged six in the last week. The India 1998-9, Ghana 1998 and Guatemala 1998-9 survey contained questions about the main reason for not going to school among children age 6. The Egypt 1995, Egypt 2000 and Eritrea 1995 surveys asked where children aged 6 worked during the last month, and the Bangladesh 1999-2000 survey asked whether children age 5 years and above were currently working.

2.5 Qualitative surveys

85. Qualitative survey techniques are often used in order to obtain a deeper understanding of the phenomena surveyed, but cannot be used to generate general data.

86. Nevertheless, these surveys deserve some attention in a report on generating data on child labour because they contribute to the process of developing proper survey instruments by helping to understand and define concepts and indicators.

87. As we have seen, the concept of “work” is defined differently in the different instruments. The same is the case for indicators such as the amount of household work that should be used as a threshold for defining child labour. The ILO Zimbabwe survey, for example, sets five hours a day of household work as the threshold for defining child labour, while the threshold used in the MICS surveys is four or more hours a day of household work.
88. These and other concepts and indicators are based on knowledge obtained primarily from qualitative, rather than quantitative, research. One example of this type of research methodology is the rapid assessment methodology developed by the ILO-International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) together with UNICEF.

2.5.1 Concept

89. In qualitative research such as the rapid assessment methodology, the aim is not to go out and count the number of children in each category but to investigate what types of activities children actually undertake in order to aid the construction of relevant categories. Semi-structured interview guides are, however, often used and numerical data, such as hours of undertaking different activities, may be collected.

90. Some numerical data may be obtained as background information or through interviews, but these usually cannot be generated to larger populations. Rapid assessments do not use structured questionnaires as in the household surveys.

91. Through using the rapid assessment methodology, one may focus on identifying and describing what children actually are doing at different times of the day, the different hazardous, unhealthy or illicit conditions some of these activities involve, the characteristics of those children undertaking activities that may be defined as child labour, and the characteristics of their families and social networks. Rapid assessment methodology may be particularly suited to determine the existence of hidden or hard to access forms of child labour.

2.5.2 Sample and data collection

92. Rapid assessment is a research methodology that uses several data collection strategies contemporaneously in order to achieve an understanding of the specific social reality or situation in a particular socio-cultural context.

93. The challenge in qualitative research is to get access to the informants who can best describe child labour and other activities undertaken by children. The ILO-UNICEF Rapid Assessment tool advises that several data collection strategies be used.

94. These could include collecting existing information, discussions and consultations with knowledgeable individuals and organisations, in depth discussions with key informants, observations, individual interviews and group interviews.

95. Focus groups bringing a number of children together may sometimes create dynamics that cannot be obtained through individual interviews, and are therefore widely used in the rapid assessment methodology.

96. Several methods can be used to identify which children to interview. The ILO-UNICEF approach is to start with discussions with country-level counterparts and partners to reach consensus on country-specific approaches. Local, national and regional consultations should be used to ensure consistency on issues of child labour, and to distinguish between work as a culturally perceived socialisation process and labour detrimental to a child’s development. Discussions and deliberations could include community leaders, both traditional (chiefs) and modern (such as Village Development Councils), as well as representatives from other community-based organisations, NGOs, women’s groups, international organisations, national government agencies and ministries (especially labour ministries).
2.5.3 General

97. The ILO has initiated a number of rapid assessment studies with a particular focus on the worst forms of child labour outside the household. These include studies of street children, drug trafficking, child soldiers, domestic services, children in bondage, and children in the commercial agriculture, fishing and mining sectors.

98. The examples from Ethiopia and Yemen (see appendix I) show how information can be obtained through qualitative research in order to aid the design of good quantitative research tools.

99. In particular, these two examples cast light on such issues as remuneration, where money sometimes goes directly to the parents, on health risks and on the worst forms of child labour. Information given by domestic servants on the difficulties of being away from their families raises the question of whether domestic work should be considered as one of the worst forms of child labour, even if these children are better fed than others interviewed.

100. Street vending and shoe-shining activities, on the other hand, may not in general be considered one of the worst forms of child labour, but the work could involve a hazardous environment or dangerous activities.

101. This implies that in order to capture the worst forms of child labour through surveys, we need to ask not only about types of occupation, but more specifically about the work environment and different activities undertaken.

2.6 World Health Organization (WHO)

102. The World Heath Organization has taken up the question of children's environmental health, including the health effects of child labour. The aim is to develop, test and provide countries with a methodology for assessing the effects of environmental risks on the health of working children. This should complement the work done by the ILO on rapid assessments and the mapping of child labour, especially since child labour is defined in part by its health impact on the child.

103. WHO has undertaken in coordination with IPEC a pilot project for assessing the health of 150 children working in the sugar cane industry, fishing activities and scavenging in El Salvador. The results of this control study are being analysed and will be published by the end of 2001. The data collection format and guidance material will be revised in the light of the experience gained in El Salvador and made available to other countries.

3. TOWARDS A NEW INSTRUMENT FOR COLLECTING DATA

104. Looking at the present statistics and survey instruments on child labour, we see that several different approaches are in use. As a result, figures on child labour for the same country differ depending on the survey methodology and instrument applied.

105. Are there any lessons to be learned that could lead to a better and more comprehensive approach? There are at least three identifiable factors that could improve the quality of child labour data.

- Firstly, we need a more common understanding of the concept, which can then be used to develop a set of questions. Here, we need to draw on the experience of qualitative research.
• Secondly, we need to design a survey that collects this information in a way that gives us sufficient data to analyse. The sample size and selection procedures are critical to achieving this.
• Thirdly, we need to analyse the data in a way that gives us the most accurate information.

106. Using the most recent SIMPOC survey as the basis for developing a new common instrument, the comments below aim at pointing to important lessons and good examples from the other surveys, and at identifying gaps and areas for further consideration.

3.1 Concept of child labour

107. Being economically active or in the labour market is, as mentioned above, not the same as being a child labourer. Nevertheless, it might be useful to use this concept as a point of departure. But even identifying the economically active children is problematic, because most children (more than 80 per cent of those economically active) work in their own household or on the family farm, and even those working outside the household in most cases work together with their parents or other family members. Such children help, for example, a parent employed in the fields of large farms or plantations to fulfil a production quota or assist in the family business, and hence do not directly receive wages. Only a relatively small proportion of children are employed directly by an employer.

108. The way that questions are posed should take these facts into consideration. Both the earlier ILO surveys and LSMS use the adult labour market categorisation for children, i.e. the terms ‘paid wage labour,’ ‘unemployed,’ ‘farm labour’ and ‘self employed.’ As mentioned previously, many children, even among those working outside the household, do not receive wages. Their remuneration is often part of a parent’s pay. Sometimes children start working without pay in order to obtain a paid position in the enterprise at a later stage. In Gambia, the MICS survey found that two per cent of children aged five to fourteen worked for pay, and that four per cent worked outside the household without pay. Even if some of the LSMS surveys include questions in the questionnaire that try to identify non-paid work in the labour market, asking about paid labour as an entry question to the child labour module may lead to non paid child workers being underrepresented.

109. The common tendency, however, seems to be to keep the term economically active or active in the labour market as defined by the ILO but to drop the condition of pay or remuneration. This is done in the most recent SIMPOC instrument.

110. Then in addition comes the non market work which include housework and work duties at school (as defined in the SIMPOC survey from Zimbabwe).

111. The MICS and DHS surveys use a third approach by dividing labour market work into two: labour market work for someone in your own household and labour market work for someone outside your own household.

112. This leaves us with three different types of work:

| Labour market work for someone outside the household | Labour market work for someone in the household | Non labour market work: Housework and duties at school |
113. The use of these different categories of child work raises the issue of how to understand the term ‘work’ in other parts of a survey questionnaire. For the question, for example, of what age a child began working, it would be natural to only ask for labour market work outside the household, but for the question of whether a child had any work-related accidents, all types of work would need to be considered.

114. For the concept of non economically active child labourers or non market work, more needs to be done, including through rapid assessment studies, to develop appropriate survey methodologies. As we could see from the SIMPOC Zimbabwe survey, three per cent of children worked five hours or more per day in their own households, and from the MICS in Gambia that four per cent of the children worked four hours or more each day in household activities.

115. In addition, the notion of what does and does not constitute work varies within different cultures and between individuals. Children, especially, can have very different perceptions of what they do. A typical answer from a child might be that on a given day he or she did nothing. This response could mean anything. In order to enumerate and quantify the activities of children, one must go beyond this and get the child to explain in more detail.

116. Another problem is posed by the fact that child labour is prohibited in most countries and asking direct questions about children working could, therefore, lead to inaccurate answers. Moreover, many of these surveys and modules are named child labour surveys. The ILO survey in Zimbabwe provides an example of this problem when the survey had to be renamed child activity survey instead of child labour survey.

3.2 Survey design

117. The sample size will always be a compromise between the desirable and the achievable. In order to map children’s activities and the general magnitude of child labour, a relatively small sample may be sufficient. However, if we want to address the types of work that children do and the health risks involved in different occupations, a large sample is needed. This is especially the case for the approximately five to ten per cent of children in wage labour, which indicates that a special sample may have to be drawn here. The SIMPOC approach, using a multi stage stratified sampling design to make sure sufficient numbers of both working and non working children are included in the sample, addresses this problem.

118. Regarding mapping the worst forms of child labour, Convention 182 leaves us with a dilemma. Some of the specific activities or occupations mentioned in the convention are so uncommon that you would not find a significant number of children in these occupations through a normal sample design. However, the general principles of the worst forms of labour apply to all the different activities undertaken by children, including housework and hence call for national representative samples. The findings in the rapid assessment studies underpin this.

3.3 Survey methodology

119. The next important question is who is the respondent. In a few LSMS only the head of the household, usually the father, is interviewed. Experience has shown that the father is not always informed about the activities of all the children, and that the mother may be better informed about the activities of the children than the father is. The MICS approach of interviewing the mother is therefore better. The best and
also the most extensive approach is that adopted by SIMPOC and in general in LSMS where all members of the household above a certain age are interviewed.

Interviewing the children is, however, time-consuming and involves special methodological challenges. It is not likely that children ten or younger will be able to respond properly on their own. On the other hand, the presence of an adult could influence the answers given by the child. Some general recommendations could be made for the group 5 to 10 years of age. Here, an adult or elder sibling needs to be present. Siblings or the mother or daily caretaker is probably the best person to be present. In any case, the survey should record whether the child is answering for him or herself, or if the child is assisted by an adult.

3.4 Definition of children and households

As we can see from the different surveys described in this report, different cut-off ages are being used. A natural cut-off age would be the age of normally starting primary education, but this differs from country to country and for international comparisons a common approach would be preferred. This should, however, be picked up again when analysing the data. One should expect a different activity pattern for children at the age of 6 in a country were this is the starting age for primary education than in a country were this happens first at the age of 7. The same goes for older children aged 12 and above. Here both school legislation and national minimum working age legislation will have to be taken into consideration when explaining the findings.

Another question is how to define who belongs to a household. A fairly common approach is used here including all persons normally sleeping in the household. It is important to make sure that this includes both foster children and domestic servants staying in the household. For trying to capture children not sleeping in a household, as in the case of genuine street children, one should map the number of children ever born in the household, and additional information on child migration. Research from Africa indicates that many children are sent to other households for “fostering” and in several societies household composition is even changed through adopting children in order to create an optimal division of labour within the household.

3.5 Type of occupation and industry

For labour market work, there is a need to develop the question regarding type of occupation and type of industry. Both are terms taken from international standards for adult work, and these data are insufficient to identify what types of tasks the child is actually undertaking. As we saw from the rapid assessment studies it is not the occupation alone, but the tasks undertaken and operations performed by the child, which will sometimes determine whether the activity is to be regarded as child labour, or even worst forms of child labour.

While references to standards should be possible to make when analysing the data, the questions themselves need to be more suited to the type of work children actually do. Both the most recent SIMPOC instrument and the DHS have tried to do this.
3.6 Education and health

125. In view of the fact that child labour is defined in large part by the effect of work activities on a child’s education opportunities and health, sufficient information in these two areas needs to be collected.

126. In addition to the standard questions found in all the surveys described above, more information could be obtained about potential conflicts between school and work. For example, asking if a child had to drop going to school last week due to labour market work or housework? Or asking if a child had to stay away from school sometimes during the last 12 months because of having to do labour market or housework (for example, in the harvest season). These types of questions are also missing in the most recent SIMPOC questionnaires.

127. For health effects, direct questions on accidents and illnesses are included by SIMPOC and can indirectly be obtained from other modules in the LSMS surveys. What remain are a few questions enabling analysis of potential dangerous situations. Here, knowledge from the rapid assessment surveys can be used. This could include questions like: Do you always or sometimes stay overnight at your workplace (if working for someone outside the household)? Do you work outdoor without any shelter?

128. A second line of questioning would be to ask the child if he or she feels secure, tired or uncomfortable with his or her work, or what she or he would like to do most.

3.7 Socio-economic indicators

129. The relation between poverty and child labour is regarded as one of the most important determinates for child labour. Any a child labour survey should therefore include information in order to analyse this. The standard child labour survey instrument built on the most recent SIMPOC surveys therefore need to be expanded in this area.

130. Further information on other household members’ work activities are important in order to understand and analyse the total labour supply of the household and the intra household work division. Working children normally belong to a household where some sort of pooling of resources and division of tasks takes place. Typically, the adult (male) head of the household works in the labour market, while children (and adult females) work within the household. Since the demand for child labour is linked with the demand for adult labour, the analyst would be helped by information on the activities of both adults and children. General household surveys cover many of these characteristics of the household: fathers’ and mothers’ work and educational status; number, age, and gender of siblings. Special child labour surveys also need to make sure to include this type of information.

3.8 Analysing the data

131. Given a comprehensive data set, the challenge in analysing child labour is to combined the needed indicators like labour market work, housework, school performance, age, exposed heath risks etc. in order to identify the group of children coming under the definition of child labour.

132. The definition of what types of work are regarded as child labour depends, as previously mentioned, on the effect this work has on the child, and changes with age. A twelve-year old can do more than a nine-year old. As we saw in the SIMPOC
survey of Zimbabwe, the group of children aged fourteen to seventeen was analysed separately from children aged fourteen and below.

133. The definition of child labour is also dependent on data on educational status. A child who has completed basic education can do more than a child who is still going to, or should be going to, school at the basic level. On the other hand, if the child’s work seems to have an effect on school performance, it might be defined as child labour even if the child is over the minimum age for such work.

134. Hence, we need to use information about all types of activities (schooling and non-schooling, economic and non-economic activities), and we need to be able to say something about the volume or workload of the activities. It is likely that a child will participate in several activities. The combined number of hours worked in market work and non-market work would sometimes be the most important denominator.

135. The data collected should make it possible to analyse what type of activities children do, the quantity of these activities and their intensity. For work activities, we need to make sure that it has been a consistent definitions throughout the survey questionnaire.

136. We need to look at the work school nexus. Does school attendance have to be forgone because of work or are work activities something that is taken up because schools are not available. Is this conflict primarily a seasonally one or is it throughout the year?

137. Normally, all surveys map the “current” and the “usual” activity of children. “Current” applies to activities during the reference week, and “usual” to the twelve-month period preceding the inquiry date. This should be done for non market work and, in some form, for school attendance as well. Mapping the usual activities is important because this approach takes into account seasonal variations, which are characteristic of a considerable proportion of children’s activities, including schooling.

138. As mentioned earlier, many of the findings cannot be understood without having knowledge about the school system in place and minimum working age legislation.

3.9 Worst forms of child labour

139. As we have seen, the SIMPOC programme aims to collect information on the working conditions of children working outside the household, in order to map the worst forms of child labour. As very few children fall into this group, a survey design problem is immediately apparent.

140. At this point, one probably has to decide whether to collect information on child labour in general, or to carry out special surveys with specially designed samples for finding children working outside the household.

141. The first general approach should still include descriptions of the type of work (market and non-market) and operations performed, use of machines or chemicals, the time of day or night when the work is undertaken and whether the child is separated from his or her family.

142. However, if we would like to get more information on the particular occupations mentioned in Convention 182, for example, hazardous manufacturing work, prostitution or child soldiers, special surveys have to be designed.
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APPENDIX I

A.I LSMS Pakistan

The Pakistan Integrated Household Survey from 1991 is one example of an LSMS. However, here an important difference should be noted in that male respondents were interviewed by males, and female respondents by females.

Sample

This survey was undertaken as an integrated household survey with a sample of 4800 households selected using a two-stage, stratified random sample.

Questionnaire

The separation of males and females was extended even to the household roster. Only females were asked about time use. All household members aged five and above were asked about education, while all household members aged ten and above answered questions about employment and family labour. Work was divided into paid agricultural work and paid non-agricultural work.

With regard to the worst forms of child labour, the survey treated bonded labour as permanent work.

Results

The survey mapped the number of economically active down to the age of ten. In the age group from ten to fourteen it found that 5.3 per cent of children were agricultural wage workers, 3.0 per cent non-agricultural wage workers, 15.2 per cent self employed in agriculture and 2.7 per cent self employed outside agriculture. This gives a total of 26.7 per cent economically active children in the age group from ten to fourteen. For boys the percentage is 23.9 and for girls 28.4. Agricultural wage labour was found to be more common among girls: 8.8 per cent vs. 1.9 per cent for boys. These figures are higher than those found in the ILO survey and especially higher for girls. The latter finding may be explained by the use of female interviewers.

The survey also mapped average weekly working hours. It was found that children aged ten to fourteen worked between fifteen and thirty hours with the exception of boys in non-agricultural wage labour who worked fifty hours.

The gross enrolment rate in primary school is 73 per cent for boys and 49 per cent for girls. The enrolment rate for girls in Baluchistan, the most rural region, is only 23 per cent. This study also mapped reasons for not going to school and reasons for dropping out of school. Disinterest on the part of the parents was one common reason found, other reasons were the cost of going to school, distance to school, poor academic progress (for boys) and the need to help at home (for girls).

These figures indicate that among children aged six to eleven, half the girls and 25 per cent of the boys were not in school. Among children aged twelve to thirteen, 60 per cent of the girls and 30 per cent of the boys were not in school while 70 per cent of girls aged fourteen to fifteen and forty percent of boys in the same age range did not attend school.
A.II  LSMS Gambia

In 1994 an LSMS of Gambia was undertaken with a sample size of only 1400. This was one of the LSMS which limited questions on labour and education to the head of the household only. The cut-off age was seven years.

The survey followed the general LSMS standards described above for sampling, questionnaire design and concepts used.

Results

As previously mentioned, the LSMS approach divides children into four categories: Children working only, Children studying only, Children working and studying, and Children involved in no activities. The results for Gambia gave the following figures as a percent of all children aged seven to fourteen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity status</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work only</td>
<td>24.93</td>
<td>38.12</td>
<td>31.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study only</td>
<td>66.82</td>
<td>49.76</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and Study</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No activities</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>9.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.III  SIMPOC Pakistan

The child labour survey of Pakistan is an example of a survey built on the SIMPOC methodology but with some modifications. The field work was carried out in January 1996 and a draft report produced in October 1996.

The sample design was done as follows: Enumeration blocks (EBs) in urban areas and villages in rural areas were treated as primary sampling units (PSUs). In all, 1,865 sample PSUs covered in the survey were selected from each ultimate stratum by the probability proportionate to size (PPS) method of selection. Within each sample PSU, clusters of approximately seventy-five households were formed. These clusters were treated as secondary sampling units (SSUs). One cluster from each sample PSU was selected randomly and listed all households within a cluster on a special listing form developed for the CLS. The number of households listed in this manner totalled 140,298. These households were listed according to two strata: With or without an economically active child aged five to fourteen.

The particularity about this survey is that only households within a cluster having at least one economically active child in the five to fourteen age range were included in the final stage, making this not a representative sample for all household but only for households with children in the labour marked. All in all 13,962 economically active children aged five to fourteen were enumerated by adhering to the current status approach (last week reference period) and usual status approach (last twelve months reference period). Out of 140,298 households listed, it was found that 10,438 households had economically active children, representing about 7.4 per cent.
Findings

Using the standard definition of economically active children, the report from the survey concludes that 3.3 million children were working full time, or 8.3 percent of all children aged five to fourteen. 73 percent were boys.

The incidences of child labour are hence a result of the information obtained during the listing of all the households (140,298) in the PSU. This form is not attached to the survey results so it is difficult to judge the quality of this result, but the methodology has obvious weaknesses, which seem to have had an impact on the findings.

Besides raising questions about the accuracy of the findings at the level of child labour, the possibility of analysing non-economic child labour and the relations between child labour and such key determinants as schooling, household income, number of siblings etc. is limited.

If compared with the LSMS survey which shows a gross enrolment rate in primary school (five to ten years old) of 73 per cent for boys and 49 per cent for girls, this leaves us with almost half the girls age five to ten in Pakistan neither attending school nor engaged as child labourers.

A.IV SIMPOC Zimbabwe

The Zimbabwe survey is an example of a SIMPOC survey with a national amendment pointing in another direction. Here, the definition of child labour rather than economically active children is used as a basis for mapping the phenomenon.

Sampling

The area sampling frame used for the child labour survey was the 1992 Zimbabwe Master Sample (ZMS 92) developed by the Central Statistical Office following the 1992 Population Census. A two stage geographically stratified sampling design was applied. The households were selected by random systematic sampling. A total of 13,591 households were selected from household lists of 55 176 households.

Definitions used

This survey focuses on children’s activities (economic and non-economic), income and earnings, employment conditions, and occupational health and safety of children aged between five and seventeen years. The analysis is presented by sex; province, urban and rural areas. The division of child labour into economic versus non-economic activities is based on the ILO definitions. Economic activities are further categorised into two broad areas namely:

- Activities for Pay, Profit and/or Family Gain, including the child him or herself running any kind of business, big or small; unpaid help in a family business; helping with farming activities on the family plot, food garden, cattle post or kraal; catching or gathering any fish, prawns, shellfish, wild animals or any other food, for sale or family consumption; doing any work for a wage, salary or any payment in kind; and begging for money or food in public.
• Other Economic Activities, including fetching wood and/or water; and carrying out unpaid domestic work for people in households which do not contain any of the child’s parents, or grandparents or spouse.

For non labour market child labourers two conditions were introduced, namely:

• *Housekeeping and Family Care Activities* (household chores), where either a parent or grandparent or guardian or more than one of these relatives is present in the household.
• *School Maintenance, Cleaning or School Activities*, for example, cleaning toilets, maintaining the school grounds.

However, the survey sought no information on the child labour situation at schools. Thus, non-economic activities in this survey are restricted to housekeeping activities.

This survey introduces three qualifications for being a child labourer in the labour market. These are (a) being engaged in economic activities for three or more hours per day; (b) a provision to allow for the involvement of children aged fifteen and above in some form of work in accordance with national law; (c) being involved in housekeeping activities for five or more hours per day.

These positions are consistent with the Zimbabwe labour regulations governing the employment of young persons. These regulations stipulate that while performing light work as defined in the law, a child should not work more than six hours per day.

*Lessons learned*

During data collection most children, especially those below the age of nine, could neither comprehend nor logically respond to some questions. Hence, it was difficult to seek independent information without asking the parents/guardians.

In most cases children were interviewed at their homes and their parents or employers were aware that they were being interviewed about child labour. In some cases, it was found that the children were not entirely free to give their views and perceptions of the subject without fear of retaliation from parents or employers who might be exploiting them. This was minimised through training the enumerators and explaining the purpose of the survey.

At the start, the term 'Child Labour Survey' was misunderstood and therefore created suspicion as to its objectives among parents or employers who use children for adult work. Although much of the publicity was done using this terminology, the printing of survey T-shirts and questionnaire bags was done using the term 'Child Activity Survey'.

A single study cannot capture all child labour issues without overloading the questionnaire and creating difficulties in its administration. There are yet other kinds of “hidden” activities of children that cannot be captured through the household-based approach. Other related child welfare survey modules need to be applied separately on issues such as street children, child prostitutes and living conditions in the homes of children whose activities cannot be studied by a household survey. Other supplementary information of interest could be on child sexual abuse, drug abuse, married children, orphanhood etc.
**Findings**

Without applying any cut-off point with respect to time spent in an economic activity, Table 2 shows that about 26.3% of children aged five to seventeen were involved in some economic activity or another.

Of all the children aged five to seventeen found to be economically active, more than half (53.6%) are involved in the activity for three hours and more. Proportionately this represents 14% of all children aged five to seventeen.

Among children aged five to seventeen involved in non-economic activities, 79.4% reported that they were involved for four hours and less, while 3% were involved for five hours and more, and 16.3% reported no engagement at all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%Total (5-17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Total Number of Children</td>
<td>4,667,599</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Economically Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Time Limit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (aged 5-17)</td>
<td>1,225,686</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (aged 5-14)</td>
<td>826,412</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Time Limit (at least 3 hours)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (aged 5-17)</td>
<td>657,444</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (aged 5-14)</td>
<td>406,958</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Non-economic/Housekeeping</td>
<td>140,050</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Omitting the oldest economically active children and considering the economically active children aged five to fourteen (with no time limit) and children aged five to seventeen involved in housekeeping activities for at least five hours a day, the incidence of child labour constitutes 20.7% out of all the children aged five to seventeen. However, if a cut-off of three hours or more is imposed on economically active children aged five to fourteen, the incidence of child labour drops to 11.7%.

The data show that about 81% of economically active children aged five to seventeen were attending school on a full-time basis, and about 1% on part–time basis. A 7-percentage point difference can be observed between rural and urban areas where non-attendance is highest in urban areas where it stands at 25.3%.

**A.V MICS Gambia**

The MICS survey for Gambia was undertaken in 2000 with a sample of 4528 households. Basically the standards described above for questions and concepts were applied to this survey.

**Results**

Fifty-one per cent of children in primary school were found to be attending school with 97 per cent of those entering grade one reaching grade five.

The survey found that only two per cent of the children aged five to fourteen were working for wages outside the household. Another four per cent were working outside the household without pay.

With regard to housework, four per cent worked for more than four hours a day. (The published report further states that only two per cent worked for less than two hours a
day. This is probably a reporting error, or else it is possible that the question was misunderstood.)

In addition to the six per cent of children working outside the household and the four per cent working in the household, 17 per cent were found working on the family land or in the family business.

A.VI MICS India

The MICS methodology produces some very interesting data on India. The report from this survey is not yet published but some tables have been made available.

Results

Here 2.8 per cent of all children are found to be working for pay while another 2.5 per cent work outside the household without pay. Thirty percent of these children work in agriculture and 20 per cent as domestic labourers.

In this group 31.4 per cent of the children were working in the household for more than four hours a day while 7.2 per cent were working on the family land or in the family business for more than four hours a day.

This is very much in contrast to the LSMS figures for India which report that ten per cent of children are working full time, and that another four per cent are both working and studying.

A.VII UNICEF Rapid Assessment in Ethiopia

The Ethiopia study is part of the recently finalised UNICEF programme for documenting “the most intolerable forms of child labour in Eastern and Southern Africa” (UNICEF forthcoming). In Ethiopia, a total of 1,357 children (953 boys and 404 girls), were interviewed in seven cities. The children worked as domestics, on the street (vending, begging, shoe shining, prostitution, etc.), in the fishing industry (in Awassa), transportation of goods, and in warehouses chaffing and sorting haricot beans and wild gum (in Nazareth). The Addis Ababa study focussed primarily on street children.

The most inaccessible groups of working children were child prostitutes and domestics. The prostitutes were interviewed at a drop-in centre but with the exception of three cases, employers did not allow their domestic workers to be interviewed. Therefore, all the domestics included in this report were found in evening schools while attending classes, or while doing work outside the home, such as collecting water, purchasing goods in the market or emptying rubbish bins.

Findings

One of the most common forms of initial employment, particularly for girls, was domestic labour. Domestics were paid monthly, the minimum pay ranging from USD $ 1.22 to 2.43 per month. Children working for relatives were not given monthly salaries, but were instead promised money to visit their families in the villages.

A typical day in a domestic’s life started at 4 a.m. A small number would break for morning classes and then continue working, often without rest, until 11 p.m. Numerous girls stressed that the isolation and loneliness of their work was
exacerbated by their inability to visit their families. Most were only given one day off per month, lacked money for transportation, and feared travelling the long distance alone and getting lost. One fourteen-year old girl had not seen her family in four years. ‘I am always told that they will take me, but so far they have not,’ she said. The lack of freedom, and mistreatment by employers, together with insufficient or sporadic wages, caused some of these children to flee and seek work on the streets.

With the exception of domestic workers, who generally lived with their employers, the other children lacked proper shelter, sufficient water and sanitary toilet facilities. In rural areas, children lived in small houses of corrugated iron with mud floors. Walls and roofs leaked and most structures had no pit latrines nor other sanitary facilities.

All the children, except for domestics, lacked basic nutritional requirements. As a consequence, two thirds of the children had health problems. They also had minimal or no access to hospitals or health clinics. The children complained of dental problems, migraine headaches, kidney problems, and persistent coughs.

**Education and Concerns for the Future**

More than half of the children reported working between ten and twelve hours per day, and thirty-two percent explained that they had to drop out of school to support themselves and their families.

Children working on the streets, and children working in warehouses or in the fishing industry explained that the peak time for their work overlapped with class time. They could not afford to be in the classroom during these hours. Others could not afford school fees, school supplies and uniforms. Large families often sacrificed one child’s education for his or her siblings.

All the children worried about their future recognising the limited prospects of decent employment without an education, and expressed the desire to return to school if it were possible. Their primary concerns were ‘what to eat tomorrow’ and ‘what to feed the family.’ Food ranked first. A twelve-year old street peddler stated ‘How can I continue an education without having enough to eat?’ Child prostitutes expressed the desire to return to school if they had a stable income and a home.

Domestic workers also complained that they did not have time to do their homework. They were often late or skipped classes altogether if there were chores to be done. If guests arrived unannounced, they were required to make coffee or serve food.

**Hazardous Work and Abuse**

Children on the streets lived in conditions of severe deprivation placing them at physical and psychological risk. Their labour compromised every aspect of their childhood. Inadequate nutrition, long working hours and exposure to adverse weather conditions without proper clothing or shelter endangered their development. Hazardous conditions interfered with their physical, mental, spiritual, moral and social development. The severity of harsh living conditions was amplified for girls on the streets who faced sexual abuse, rape, unwanted pregnancy and early motherhood.

The details of their daily lives revealed the hazards of their work. Their work involved manual handling of heavy loads on the streets, in factories or when unloading fish for the market. The children in the fishing industry often had to work under water when assisting fishermen at sea. They worked with dangerous equipment when preparing fishing nets, and when cleaning, cooking and serving fish.
Children in workshops and wood processing plants also worked with dangerous equipment. In addition, many were exposed to hazardous substances, including pesticides and other agents, when weeding on farmlands. Domestics worked for long hours, from early morning to late at night, and were unreasonably confined to the premises of their employer.

Working children were also subjected to physical and sexual abuse by older children and street gangs. Their money, goods and equipment (such as shoe shining boxes) were often stolen. Policemen threatened them with imprisonment and beat them as punishment for being ‘found working on the streets without permission.’

A.VIII ILO Rapid assessment of working children in Yemen

This study was undertaken in spring 1998 (Grimsrud 1998) as a part of the International Labour Office (ILO) Bureau for Workers’ Activities (ACTRAV) programme for trade union strategies to combat child labour. Its objectives are twofold: to document child labour and to involve trade union members directly in this activity.

A systematic case-oriented approach was adopted in the study and several qualitative techniques were used. Firstly, focused discussions organised by the union with participants well acquainted with the general working life in the country were used to establish a list of sectors from the economy that should be explored. Secondly, the same focus groups helped establish the criteria for selecting children to be interviewed so that the study would cover the relevant variety of work adaptations assumed to be present in the country. Thirdly, for each case a set of interviews was designed in order to obtain views and information from the children themselves, from their parents and from eventual employers and teachers.

In all, 231 children from twelve sectors were interviewed. In 183 cases, parents and teachers and/or employers were also interviewed. The interviews took place both during school hours and in the afternoon making it possible to include children who attend school but work afterwards. The selection of children within each sector was done by the interviewers in the field, the goal being to identify and interview those believed to be the best respondents. The only criterion was that the child worked. No additional criteria such as minimum number of hours worked, whether the child received pay, or whether the child worked outside the family were given. This was done in order to capture the types of child work and child labour that are sometimes excluded in more traditional surveys.

When a child was successfully interviewed, the interviewers identified and asked to interview the head of the child’s household, his or her employer (in the case of a child working at home the head of the household would also answer this part) and the child’s teacher or former teacher.

Findings

Among the children interviewed a couple of examples show what sort of input this kind of study can provide in order to conceptualise child labour. Firstly, an eleven year old girl from Sana worked in the family home seven days a week, morning, afternoon and evening, except for Friday afternoons and evenings. Her mother worked outside the home. This meant that the 11-year-old girl was the only person doing the household chores full time. She is not paid for her work. She says she works approximately forty hours a week. She said that she was in pain caused by the work, but has had no injuries in the last year. The second example is also an eleven-
year-old girl from Sana who lives with her father, mother, four sisters and four brothers. She also combines work in the family shop with full-time school, but works more than seventy hours a week in the shop. She says that she is in pain every day because of her work, and that she has been both ill and had accidents at work in the last year. She was not remunerated directly for her work. In her class at school, seventeen out of sixty repeated grades.

One factor that seems to influence working hours is whether the child is working under the supervision of a family member or for someone outside the family. The first group works on average 42½ hours a week, while the second group works closer to an average of 59 hours a week.

The children were asked to indicate how they divided their time between different activities. Not surprisingly (and this is an important point) children, especially girls, in addition to combining work outside their home with school, also do a considerable amount of work in their own home.
### Table 3: Summary comparison of survey instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ILO-SIMPOC</th>
<th>LSMS</th>
<th>MICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent</strong></td>
<td>Head of household + child</td>
<td>Head of household + (not always) child</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample size and design</strong></td>
<td>10,000 + special group of employed children</td>
<td>2,500 to 5,000</td>
<td>5,000 to 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General time use</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labour market work, hours worked</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non labour market work/housework, hours worked</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No, except collecting firewood and water</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time spent at school</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School performance</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>Repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cut-off age</strong></td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Start of primary education</td>
<td>Maximum 10 years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of the work</strong></td>
<td>ILO adult standard</td>
<td>ILO adult standard</td>
<td>Non</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market work injuries</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non market work injuries</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of machinery and/or chemicals</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>