

Impact of education interventions for working children

Anna Ormert
Future Seed
21 September 2018

Question

What does the evidence say about the short and long-term impact of education interventions for working children?

Contents

1. Overview
2. Scholarships, school subsidies and other financial incentives
3. Non-financial incentive schemes
4. Conditional cash transfer programmes
5. Interventions to improve quality of formal education
6. Transitional education and informal learning initiatives
7. References

The K4D helpdesk service provides brief summaries of current research, evidence, and lessons learned. Helpdesk reports are not rigorous or systematic reviews; they are intended to provide an introduction to the most important evidence related to a research question. They draw on a rapid desk-based review of published literature and consultation with subject specialists.

Helpdesk reports are commissioned by the UK Department for International Development and other Government departments, but the views and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of DFID, the UK Government, K4D or any other contributing organisation. For further information, please contact helpdesk@k4d.info.

1. Overview

Recent global estimates indicate that 152 million children – 64 million girls and 88 million boys – are engaged in child labour across the world (ILO 2017b: 8). According to these same estimates, 71% of child labourers work in the agricultural sector and 69% in unpaid work within their own family. Nearly half of all those in child labour are doing 'hazardous work' (ibid).¹ According to the ILO, the total number of children in child labour has declined by about 94 million since 2000, although this trend has slowed significantly in recent years (ILO 2017a: 10).²

Four policy areas have been identified as key to tackling the problem of child labour: legal standards and regulation, social protection, labour markets and – the topic of this review – education. This report is one of a two-part series. The first (Ornert 2018) examines the links between education and child labour, including children combining school and work; education as a tool for getting children out of child labour and poor quality education pushing children out of the classroom and into work. This report examines the available evidence on short and long-term impacts of interventions targeted at working children.

Key findings include:

- The existing body of evidence on the impact of education interventions on children in work is mixed. There is a relatively substantial volume of research which examines the impacts of conditional cash transfers linked with children's education. There is also a smaller body of evidence around the impact of financial incentives to children and their families (including scholarships and school subsidies). The evidence on other types of education interventions – such as provision of non-financial subsidies (for example, Food-for-Education or free transportation), improving quality of education as well as transitional or informal learning programmes for working children- is much more fragmented and patchy.³
- Research on the impact of education interventions on working children tends to focus on short-term impacts (measured as enrolment and attendance; grade progression or attainment). This reflects, in part, the short-term nature of many of the interventions themselves. Importantly, short-term impacts 'do not necessarily lay the foundation for long term sustainable results' (ILO 2017a: 20).
- Because they aim to reduce the overall cost of education, the impacts of cash transfers, financial and other subsidies are generally perceived to be greater for children from lower socio-economic backgrounds.
- Many studies also find gendered variation with regards to impacts.
- Some evaluations report negligible impact which may be, at least in part, due to the short time-frame for implementation of many interventions. The ILO (2017a: 43) notes that 'sustainable change usually takes longer to achieve than the 48-month period of a typical project'.
- Longer-term impacts are more difficult to study, although a handful of evaluations do provide insights into these (for example, Barham et al 2012; Filmer and Schady 2014 and Edmonds and Shrestha 2015).
- An intervention may have multiple, competing or diverging impacts. For example, interventions that succeed in improving access, enrolment and attendance may lack the

¹ Defined as 'work that directly endangers their health, safety and moral development' (ILO 2017b: 8).

² There is concern that official statistics may also not fully capture the number of working children, including those who are more difficult to access, such as street children and children (mostly girls) working in domestic capacity in their own, or other people's, households.

³ It is possible that a greater number of internal evaluations have been carried out but that these are not publicly available.

capacity to meet increased demand for education, thereby lowering the quality of services (see, for example, the unintended negative consequences highlighted by Grisewood 2008; de Silva and Sumarto 2014: 3; Zhang et al 2016; ILO 2017a).

Interventions that increase enrolment may not increase attendance; interventions that increase school attendance may not substantially decrease child labour (see for example, Kazianga et al 2013 and, de Hoop and Rosati 2013 separate analyses of the same data from the BRIGHT programme in Burkina Faso).

- Unintended negative consequences of interventions may be related to a mis-match between short- and long-term objectives and impacts (Zhang et al 2016) or, simply, an intervention's lack of long-term sustainability.

This review identified a number of gaps in the research, including:

- With the exception of the literature on conditional cash transfers, there is a general gap in research examining the impact of interventions around education interventions for working children.
- There is a need for more research on the longer-term impact of education interventions for working children. In particular, there is a need for additional research that looks at long-term impacts for girls (Barham et al 2012: 22)
- There is a need for more data which illuminates variation of impacts (e.g., by gender, age, etc.) (Miller and Tsoka 2012; Kazianga et al 2013)
- While research indicates that schooling conditions affect school participation, there is little evidence that schooling conditions impact on child labour – the relationship between the two merits more research (de Hoop and Rosati 2013: 29) The evidence is limited around the impact of education interventions that address child labour more generally (Dammert et al 2017: 3).
- The evidence on the impact of improved quality of education is limited (Rosati and Rossi 2007: 16; De Hoop and Rosati 2013: 20).
- There is a lack of literature around the impacts of transitional and informal education initiatives.

2. Scholarships, school subsidies and other financial incentives

Poor families may face obstacles to sending their children to school, despite holding positive attitudes to education (Dammert et al 2017: 6). Even where education is free (e.g., absence of school fees), families may struggle to pay the related costs (books, pens, uniforms, transportation), presenting a barrier to enrolment and/ or resulting in poor children dropping out of school. Financial incentives, such as scholarships and subsidies are intended to lower the costs of education to increase school enrolment and attendance.

Sparrow (2007) examines the effectiveness of the Indonesian Social Safety Net scholarship programme, introduced to preserve access to education for children from the poorest households during a national financial crisis.⁴ 4 million scholarships (paid in monthly cash transfers) were made available to primary and secondary school students (half aimed at girls), to be spent according to the students' discretion. Their impact was most significant for rural children in primary schools, who were living below the poverty line (Sparrow 2007: 29). They were most vulnerable to the crisis because poor rural households facing resource constraints often reduced investment in their youngest children's education, whilst protecting the education of older

⁴ Prior to this Indonesia had steadily improving enrolment rates, including near universal primary school enrolment (Sparrow 2007: 1).

children. This reflected 'differences in future earnings from secondary and primary education, the fact that households have already invested in secondary education of older children, and the relatively low secondary school enrolment amongst students from poor families' (ibid). Gender variation was also observed, with greater positive impact of the scholarship programme for boys than girls – though the study does not explain these differences.

Edmonds and Shresta (2015) analyse two interventions in Kathmandu that provided scholarships and stipends to promote schooling and deter child labour for children in hazardous labour at carpet factories. The first provided scholarships for direct, out-of-pocket school expenses. The second, the scholarship plus an in-kind stipend conditional on school attendance for the duration of one year. In the short-term, paying for education expenses promoted schooling - but only at the beginning of the school year when expenses occur; attendance dropped after this. The second intervention had greater impact, resulting in increased school attendance, lower grade failure and reduced involvement in carpet weaving. Over the long term, however, the effects of schooling incentives (on schooling or weaving) did not persist past the year of support. In the short-term, the second intervention also reduced girls' involvement in both carpet weaving and grade failure by significantly more than boys'. Nevertheless, in the longer term (after 16 months), there was no evidence of significant impact on schooling attendance, attainment or child labour for either boys or girls (Edmonds and Shreshtra 2015: 23).

de Silva and Sumarto (2014) present evidence that school vouchers which subsidised education schemes decreased time spent by children on income-generating activities). The authors also find that households in receipt of educational transfers, scholarships and assistance spent more on voluntary educational goods than they would have without these interventions. The recorded impact was greatest for poorer families.

In spite of the importance given to raising the schooling levels of girls for many developing countries, there is a surprisingly 'sparse' body of evidence on programs that specifically target girls to increase their school enrolment, particularly in the context of child labour (Filmer and Schady 2008: 609). One such study, by Filmer and Schady (2008), examines the impact of a scholarship programme for poor girls in Cambodia. The programme awarded scholarships to girls from poor households, completing their final year of primary school. The scholarship program significantly increased enrolment and attendance rates, with the greatest impacts recorded for girls with the lowest socioeconomic status.

Zhang et al's (2016) study of the Child Labour Elimination Actions for Real Change (CLEAR) Project examines the project's impact on children's school attendance and involvement in exploitative and hazardous child labour in tobacco-growing districts in Malawi. In the short-term, CLEAR effectively provided income-generating opportunities for families and communities to protect them against loss of earnings from children returning to school. However, the project's success in returning children and adolescents to school also had unintended negative impacts, including creating overcrowded classrooms and high children-to-teacher ratios, which lowered the quality of education. In the longer term, the study found that many students who were successfully reinserted in primary school found themselves unable to continue with their secondary education, because secondary school fees were not directly covered by the programme or related efforts. The authors conclude that greater attention is needed to align short-term objectives (e.g., reducing the number of children working and increasing education enrolment) with longer-term objectives (e.g., education completion and employment opportunities) (Zhang et al 2016: 70).

There are very few studies on the impacts of financial incentives for working children's education beyond the short term. One exception is Filmer and Schady's (2014) evaluation of the 'medium-term' impact of educational scholarships for poor children in Cambodia during three years of lower secondary school.⁵ The authors find 'substantial effects' of the scholarships on both school enrolment and grade attainment, but little impact on children's (academic) learning outcomes. They do note, however, that children may acquire 'important non-cognitive skills' (e.g., discipline, perseverance, motivation and work ethic) (Filmer and Schady 2014: 690). With regards to longer-term impacts, they state that 'it may still be too early to tell whether the labour market outcomes of children who received scholarships will eventually be better than those of children who did not receive them' (ibid).

There is evidence that increasing access to education does not always correspond to a decline in children's participation in economic activities or household chores (see Orrnert 2018: 5). Indeed, some interventions may increase children's involvement in work to fund their participation in education, as found by de Hoop and Rosati's (2013) examination of the impact of school subsidies on access to education and children's work in Burkina Faso. The authors suggest that time for schooling was reallocated away from leisure, rather than work. The short-term impact of this intervention may therefore have included creating competing time pressures and challenges for children balancing employment and schooling. The authors note some gendered variation in impact. Whilst children 'in all subgroups' increased their school participation, girls did so without decreasing the amount of time they spent on work; boys – particularly those without female siblings – appeared to increase their participation in work. The authors conclude that in order to achieve both increased school participation and reduced participation in children's work, education programs 'may either have to be combined with different interventions that effectively reduce child work or they may have to be tuned more carefully to the incentives and constraints the child labourer faces.' (de Hoop and Rosati 2013: 22)

Several studies highlight the danger of unintended negative consequences of interventions. For example, short-term impact of projects aiming to boost school enrolment has increased demand for education services (and, possibly, access to them) (ILO 2017a: 35). In several African countries, however, the demand for educational services outstripped national capacity to enrol students (Grisewood 2008: 64; ILO 2017a: 35). As a result, the quality of education suffered and many children found themselves in over-crowded, under-equipped classrooms with poorly trained teachers (Grisewood 2008: 77; Zhang et al 2016: 70; ILO 2017a: 35).

3. Non-financial incentive schemes

Non-financial incentives or in-kind subsidies (for example, school meals, free transport, support with homework etc) have also been used to incentivise education for working children. Evidence on the impact of these type of interventions is hard to find, although the evidence indicates that in-kind incentive programmes can have positive impacts for working children in education.

One such intervention is the Burkinabé Response to Improve Girls' Chances to Succeed (BRIGHT) programme in Burkina Faso delivered in 132 rural villages (evaluated by both

⁵ Although the focus of the paper is not explicitly on education and child labour or working children, it does state that the majority of children in the study did work, 37% for pay and 40% without pay (Filmer and Schady 2014: 687).

Kazianga et al 2012 and de Hoop and Rosati 2012). The intervention included the construction of a primary school and the provision of direct incentives for school participation in the form of school meals for all pupils and take-home rations for female pupils.

Kazianga et al (2012) assess the impact of two food-for-education (FFE) schemes on education and child labour outcomes for children from low-income agricultural households in northern rural Burkina Faso, as part of the BRIGHT programme. The two schemes involved: (1) school lunches provided to boys and girls each day at school; and (2) take-home rations of 10 kg of cereal flour each month, for girls, conditional on 90% attendance rate. After one year, the study finds that both interventions increased overall enrolment of children in school by 3–5%. Impact on attendance was more mixed: it grew for children who were already enrolled in school, but decreased among children who enrolled at the start of the study. The authors suggest that this lower attendance was by children who would not have enrolled in school without the interventions/ 'Even with the somewhat greater risk of absenteeism, this group [...] had more schooling that if they had not enrolled at all' (Kazianga et al 2012: 755). The interventions also led to lower rates of involvement in farm labour and off-farm productive tasks, particularly among girls. There is no evidence that one type of transfer was more effective than the other: improved mathematics scores were recorded for girls in both school meals and THR villages (Kazianga 2012: 755). The study does not provide insights into longer-term impacts of the intervention.

The BRIGHT programme in Burkina Faso is an interesting example of the diverse impacts that can result from the same intervention. Evaluating the same project data, de Hoop and Rosati (2013: 1) find that despite the marked increase in school participation, BRIGHT did not decrease children's participation in economic activities or household chores.⁶ The authors observe gendered differences, as benefits were distributed according to gender (girls received take-home rations, boys did not). Girls and boys with female siblings – who may have been affected by increased school participation of female siblings and potentially benefited from spill-over effects of the take-home rations - increased their school participation, but exhibited limited changes in involvement in work (de Hoop and Rosati 2013: 1). Boys without female siblings, however, appear to have increased their participation in work activities. The authors find little evidence that working while attending school had any detrimental effect on school attendance (de Hoop and Rosati 2013: 2).

Two older studies that provide insights into the impacts of Food-for-Education interventions include Dureya and Morrison's (2004) examination of food subsidies conditional to children's regular school attendance in Costa Rica; and Ravallion and Wodon's (2000) study of monthly food rations, linked to children's primary school attendance in rural Bangladesh. Both of these studies suggest that the intervention increased schooling, but had a more limited impact upon children's involvement in child labour. Although the Costa Rica intervention increased school attendance, it did not necessarily strengthen student pass rates (Dureya and Morrison 2004: 15). The impact of the in-kind benefits in this intervention was potentially weaker than the impact of cash transfers in other contexts; however, the authors highlight that there could be several other reasons for this (e.g., higher opportunity costs, lower returns to education or varying amounts of transfers) (ibid: 16).⁷

⁶ It is not clear how these might differ from the off-farm productive tasks referred to by Kazianga et al (2012).

⁷ The authors also warn against making inter-country comparisons (Dureya and Morrison 2004: 16).

In the Food-for-Education intervention in Bangladesh, Ravallion and Wodon (2000: 16) conclude that 'even a stipend with a value considerably less than the mean child wage was enough to assure nearly full school attendance amongst participants.' Although incidents of child labour declined, they did so at a much lower rate than the increase in education, suggesting that 'parents are clearly substituting other uses of their children's time, so as to secure the current income gain from access to the program with modest impact on earnings from their children's work' (ibid).

Colombini's (2013) evaluation of IPEC's Tackle Project examines the impacts of Guyana's (2011) School Retention and Child Labour Prevention Programme, which aimed to prevent absenteeism, truancy and drop-out by providing in-kind incentives. These included free transport to and from school, a hot meal three days a week, and an after-school programme to assist children with homework, parenting workshop and psychosocial support for children and parents/guardians. Short-term impacts included enabling students to get to school on time, focus better during lessons and benefit from tutoring and counselling support. Better exam results and lower teacher turnover rates were also observed. A connection was established between attendance, transportation and hot meal support; the free bus service was identified as key to the intervention's success (Colombini 2013: 14-17). An additional, unintended positive outcome was free travel to and from school for teachers, which enabled them to start lessons on time and maintain discipline among students on the bus (ibid). The evaluation does not highlight the long-term impacts of this programme.

4. Conditional cash transfer programmes

There is a fairly substantial body of evidence related to the impact of conditional cash transfer (CCT) programmes⁸⁹(See, for example, de Hoop and Rosati 2014; Bastagli et al 2016; de Hoop et al 2016; Dammert et al 2017). Key themes emerging from evaluations of these interventions include their positive effect on enrolment (Kondylis and Manacorda 2011: 33); school attendance (Quattri and Watkins 2016: 17); grade progression and completion (Quattri and Watkins 2016: 17). Some of the findings are mixed. Several studies suggest that cash transfers may increase school attendance and reduce child labour (Kondylis and Manacorda 2011: 33; Miller and Tsoka 2012: 499-500 ; de Hoop and Rosati 2013a; de Silva and Sumarto 2014: 3; de Hoop et al 2016: 3; see also Rosati 2016). Kondylis and Manacorda (2012: 33) highlight, however, 'with few exceptions, the increase in enrolment appears larger than the fall in child labour, implying that increased enrolment comes in part from reduced inactivity'. Hoop and Rosati (2013a: 3) suggest that more evidence is needed on the effects of cash transfer programs on child labour. Moreover, whilst evidence points to many positive impacts of CCT programmes, many of these (for example, enrolment and grade attainment) reflect short-term impacts (Quattri and Watkins 2016:

⁸ Although unconditional cash transfer programmes are not examined in this review as they are not explicitly linked to education interventions, data on them can be found in some of the studies examined in this section (see for example, Hoop and Rosati 2014 and Rosati 2016).

⁹ Miller and Tsoka (2012: note that there is a particularly strong body evidence from evaluations of CCT's in Latin America, but far fewer from the African context.

17). Evidence is 'notably lacking' on the longer-term impacts (Barham et al 2012: 1). This may be because large-scale CCT programmes are a relatively recent intervention¹⁰ (ibid: 3).

Rosati (2016: 7) suggests that conditional cash transfers have a stronger impact on school participation than unconditional cash transfers. Nevertheless, it is more difficult to assess whether conditionality related to education has an impact on child labour (ibid). Interestingly, the author highlights the case of one study of a cash transfer programme (Taysir) in Morocco, examining whether an unconditional cash transfer programme open to all poor households can be as effective in increasing enrolment in education as a conditional programme (i.e., whether a 'nudge' could be as effective as a 'shove'). Enrolment for the unconditional cash transfer programme was school-based, 'conferring implicit endorsement of education' (Rosati 2016: 8). Findings indicate that a rural cash transfer program simply 'labelled' as supporting education had a significant impact on school participation despite no attached conditionality on school attendance (ibid).

In their study of the short-term impacts of cash transfers on the education and labour of children from poor households in Malawi, Miller and Tsoka (2012: 516) find that intervention, in the form of a monthly conditional cash transfer, resulted in increased enrolment, higher educational expenditures, lower absenteeism as well as reduced labour outside the home. There was some variation with regards to both age and gender. For example, the greatest enrolment gains were for boys aged 16-18, while the intervention had the greatest impact on reducing absenteeism for girls (the reasons for the latter are not clear). Boys and girls in intervention households showed similar differences in work; both were more likely to engage in household chores and less likely to work outside the home, compared with non-recipient children. Despite positive short-term impacts of the intervention, longer-term improvements were not evident; the authors attribute this to the weak quality of the education system in Malawi preventing longer-term improvements and the lack of accompanying supply-side interventions to bolster educational capacity.

Rosati (2016: 2) notes that the impact of cash transfers on child labour may be reduced if the transfers enable investment in productive assets (for example, for farming or small business activities) that make it profitable for children to work. Transfers may also 'increase the returns to child work indirectly, through changes in the adult labour supply—for example, if household members devote more time to productive activities and less time to household chores, children's time will become more valuable in household chores' (ibid). Rosati (2016: 7) highlights two interventions where cash transfer programmes led not only to increased school attendance, but increased involvement by the same children in child labour.¹¹ The author suggests that accompanying supply-side interventions (for example, improved educational infrastructure to meet increased demand for schooling) may increase the efficacy of CCT interventions. There is evidence that this has contributed to the success of CCT's in Latin America (Miller and Tsoka 2012: 501-502).

Several studies examine whether the amount of CCT affects its impact. Amarante et al (2011) study the effects of an emergency social assistance program on school attendance and child

¹⁰ The first such programme began in the late 1990s.

¹¹ The interventions were the Bright program in Burkina Faso which was designed to improve access to quality education for girls (Kazianga et al 2013; Rosati 2016) and the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) in the Philippines (see de Hoop et al 2016), a CCT program to eradicate extreme poverty by investing in children's health and education.

labour in Uruguay, finding that the intervention did not significantly change children's engagement in either activity. The authors conclude that either the size of the transfer was inadequate to promote school attendance or the determinants of child school attendance were more complex.¹² Filmer and Schady (2011: 150) examine the impacts of a CCT intervention in Cambodia that made payments - conditional upon school attendance - of varying amounts to 'otherwise comparable households'. They find 'sharply diminishing marginal returns to transfer size' (ibid: 156). In other words, modest cash transfers' (equivalent to approximately 2% of the consumption of the median recipient household), had a substantial impact on increasing school attendance (approximately 25 percentage points); a somewhat larger transfer, however, did not raise attendance rates above this level.

De Hoop et al (2016) examine the impact of partial subsidies for child education on children's participation in paid work in the Philippines. The authors find that receipt of a partial subsidy elicited 'compensatory behaviour in the form of concomitant increases in schooling and participation in paid work by the same children' (de Hoop et al 2016: 25). This contrasts with evidence about other cash transfers, which increase schooling while decreasing paid work by children (ibid). de Hoop et al (2016) find that the rise in children's participation in work for pay outside the household was due to children who, without the project, would have been neither in school nor in work. These children started attending school; they also started working in order to pay for the cost of attending school. Similarly, Rosati (2016: 9) suggests that if the amount of the transfer is lower than the costs of sending a child to school this increases the perceived returns of child labour. Additional resources beyond the cash transfers that can help households pay for increased costs associated with schooling can help reduce the pressure on children to engage in paid work outside the household (Rosati 2016: 7).

Evaluations of CCT's in Latin America indicate that diverse impacts can result due to different contextual factors, characteristics of children and families (e.g., socio-economic status, age and gender of children) and components of programmes (Miller and Tsoka 2012: 501). In many CCT interventions, however, the increase in school attendance is much greater than the reduction in child labour, since children can combine work and schooling (Rosati 2016: 5). An unintended effect of cash transfers intended to promote children's education can be to increase their economic activities, if these are necessary to afford the additional costs related to schooling (e.g., school fees, uniforms, transportation) (Rosati 2016). de Silva and Sumarto (2014: 3) also highlight the unintended negative consequences of CCT interventions.

Despite the positive evidence of the impact of CCTs on years of attendance and attainment, evidence on effects on achievement is more limited and mixed. Barham et al (2012) note that 'there is little evidence on whether these children are actually learning'; even less evidence on the long-term sustainability of gains in learning (ibid: 21). Comparing data collected in 2000 and 2010 from the same households and individuals who took part in a CCT intervention in Nicaragua, the study examines the long-term sustainability of learning outcomes; whether simple conditionality on school attendance is sufficient to improve learning (Barham et al 2012: 1).¹³ The study finds that the short-term programme impact of a one-half year increase in schooling was sustained after the end of the programme; moreover, significant gains in learning (language and

¹² The latter may require complementary interventions (see Ornert 2018).

¹³ The study focuses on boys and acknowledges a need for similar research on long-term outcomes for girls (Barham et al 2012: 22).

math achievement) were recorded. The authors conclude that corresponding schooling and achievement gains imply 'important long-term returns to CCT programmes' (ibid: 2).

5. Interventions to improve quality of formal education

Despite widespread agreement that low-quality schooling is linked with pushing children out of the classroom and into work (see Ornert 2018), there is a lack of detailed evidence around the impact of interventions aiming to improve school quality (Rosati and Rossi 2007: 1)

The ILO (2017a) evaluates 14 projects related to child labour, many with significant education components. The report highlights the positive impact that interventions to support schools in Sub-Saharan Africa in creating more child-friendly environments have for pupils. The report suggests that (short-term) positive impacts include 'increased enrolment, reduced absenteeism and drop-out and improved relationships between teachers and children' (ILO 2017a: 31). The report raises concern, however, over whether these positive impacts will be sustainable following the end of the project. There is also evidence that poor quality education had a negative impact on pupils – for example, inadequate support for teenage mothers on a vocational training project, led them to drop out (ILO 2017a: 21). Based on the analysis of these and other interventions, the report finds that quality of education services is as important as access to them in order to enrol and retain working children in school (ibid: 21). Nevertheless, it goes on to say that 'the need for educational infrastructures, equipment and trained teachers is rising faster than the capacity to deliver them and further support is needed in order to keep children in school.' (ibid: 34).

Another study which illuminates the impact of quality of education in more detail is Rosati and Rossi's (2007: 1) evaluation of the impact of a school quality program in Mexico - the Compensatory Education Program (CONAFE) - on school attendance and child labour. Key components of CONAFE which were intended to boost quality of education included: improving infrastructure and updating computers and other equipment (desks, bookcases, etc.); providing learning materials to each student (notebooks, pens, pencils, etc.) and professional development and training to all educational staff; and giving monetary incentives to teachers and principals to reduce high teacher turnover and absenteeism.¹⁴ Rosati and Rossi (2007: 15) suggest that improved school quality not only increased attendance, but also reduced involvement of children in work. They suggest that 'parents value quality of education: when they observe an improvement in the learning achievements of their children, they increase their involvement in education by reducing their participation to economic activities' (ibid).

The Burkinabé Response to Improve Girls' Chances to Succeed (BRIGHT) programme, outlined in Section 3 of this review also constructed new 'girl-friendly' schools in 132 villages (Kazianga et al 2013). These schools included many resources uncommon in public elementary schools in Burkina Faso, including multiple classrooms and multipurpose halls, a playground, desks, chairs, metal bookshelves and a manual pump to provide clean water. A number of amenities were also directed at encouraging the enrolment of girls, such as separate latrines for boys and girls, more female teachers and the delivery of gender sensitivity training to teachers and ministry officials. As noted in an earlier section of this report, all students received school meals each day they attended school and girls were also eligible for take-home rations, conditional on 90 percent

¹⁴ Additional components were institutional strengthening, updating informational systems and evaluation planning; as well as provision of support to school management.

attendance each month. All students received school kits and textbooks. The intervention also targeted parents directly with an extensive information campaign on the potential benefits of education (particularly of girls' education) and an adult literacy training program for mothers. Kazianga et al (2013) conclude that infrastructure shapes families' decisions to enrol their children in primary school. The girl-friendly schools increased overall enrolment and improved the test scores of all children in the village. The enrolment rates of girls increased by almost 5 percentage points more than boys, although the difference in their achievement (measured by test scores) was negligible (ibid).

6. Transitional education and informal learning initiatives

As noted in Ornnert (2018), transitional and informal education programmes can enable former child workers to 'catch' up with their peers and prepare them for (re)integration into the mainstream education system (sometimes they re-join formal education with a group of younger cohorts). They can also provide an alternative for working children who don't have access to the formal education system. The evidence around impact of such interventions is limited, though it is possible that internal evaluations of such interventions exist, but are not publicly available.

The ILO (ND) highlights non-formal education (NFE) in its Consolidated good practices of the International Program on the Elimination of Child Labour, including 'bridge schools' (defined as 'intensive transitional education programmes aim to help former working children catch up for the years they have 'lost' in working without going to school' (ILO ND: 80). Bridge schools have been set up in a number of different countries (India, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Brazil), in response to local needs. In many cases, ILO (ND) cites these as successful, although recorded impacts are mainly short-term – for example, numbers of children enrolled in NFE or integrated into formal education or training; retention and grade promotion rates. It also makes some reference to less quantifiable outcomes, such as increased confidence, discipline, awareness of rights and increased academic aspirations of former working children (ILO ND: 81-82). The study emphasises notes that 'there is not one, single 'recipe' for successful bridge course. Different target groups in different countries, and even localities, require different strategies.' (ILO ND: 82). One common theme identified in the report is the potential lack of opportunities for further education or employment for former working children; rapid reintegration into formal schools or vocational training is therefore vital (ILO ND: 82).

Sud (2010) examines the effectiveness of Child Labour Project Schools (CLPS) - incentivised, informal learning programmes - in rural and urban areas of the Punjab region of India. The aim of CLPS is to support the mainstreaming of child labourers (including migrant labourers), particularly those who were too old to start mainstream schools, into the formal education system. The CLPS programme provided a monthly financial stipend for students and, unlike mainstream schools, did not have 'hidden costs' attached (e.g. monthly fees on top of admission fees, books, uniforms). These informal learning programmes used an accelerated curriculum to help working children catch up to their peers. Short-term, the flexible schedules offered by CLPS accommodated working children (they could attend school during the rainy season and work during dry season), encouraged retention and reached child labourers from diverse areas (Sud 2010: 27-28). Once the children begin formal schooling, however, the author suggests that 'it is unlikely that the government school calendar allows for the same flexibility' (Sud 2010: 27). It is therefore unclear what the longer-term impacts of being integrated into formal mainstream education would be for these working children.

7. References

Amarante, V. (2011) *School attendance, child labour and cash transfer: An impact evaluation of PANES*. PEP Policy Brief 164618, Partnership for Economic Policy. <https://ideas.repec.org/p/ags/peppbr/164618.html>

Balagopalan, S. (2018) 'Afterschool and during vacations': on labour and schooling in the postcolony. *Children's Geographies*. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14733285.2018.1490008>

Barham, T. et al (2013) *More schooling and more learning? Effects of a three-year conditional cash transfer program in Nicaragua after 10 Years*. IDB Working Paper Series No. IDB-WP-432. Washington, DC: Inter-American Development Bank. <https://publications.iadb.org/bitstream/handle/11319/4584/MORE%20SCHooling%20and%20more%20learning%20full%20body.pdf?sequence=1>

Bastagli, F. et al (2016) *Cash transfers: What does the evidence say? A rigorous review of impacts and the role of design and implementation features*. London: Overseas Development Institute. <https://www.odi.org/publications/10505-cash-transfers-what-does-evidence-say-rigorous-review-impacts-and-role-design-and-implementation>

Colombini, J. (2013) *Good practices in tackling child labour through education: Selected examples from the IPEC TACKLE project*. Geneva: International Labour Organisation. https://www.ilo.org/ipec/Informationresources/WCMS_IPEC_PUB_22956/lang--en/index.htm

Dammert, A.C. et al (2017) *Effects of public policy on child labor: Current knowledge, gaps and implications for program design*. Policy research working paper 7999. Washington D.C.: The World Bank. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/108841488913017526/pdf/WPS7999.pdf>

de Hoop, J. and Rosati, F.C. (2013) *Does promoting school attendance reduce child labour? Evidence from Burkina Faso's BRIGHT project*. Working paper, Understandings Children's Work Programme. http://www.ucw-project.org/attachment/Burkina_Faso_Bright_Project_child_labor_impact_evaluation_13110220140321_162359.pdf

de Hoop, J. and Rosati, F.C. (2014) *Cash transfers and child labour*. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 6826. Washington, DC: The World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/17715/WPS6826.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=yen/749621468338433968/Cash-transfers-and-child-labor>

de Hoop, J. et al (2016) *Complementarities between schooling and child work in the presence of an education subsidy*. Rome: Understanding Children's Work. http://www.ucw-project.org/attachment/01032017466Complementarities__schooling_child_work_Philippines_Mexico.pdf

de Silva, I. and Sumarto, S. (2014) *How do educational transfers affect child labour supply and expenditures? Evidence from Indonesia of impact and flypaper effects*. MPRA Paper No. 66767, The SMERU Research Institute. https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/66767/1/MPRA_paper_65311.pdf

- Edmonds, E.V. and Shrestha, M. (2014) *You get what you pay for: Schooling incentives and child labour*. Journal of Development Economics, 111: 196-211.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304387814001047>
- Filmer, D and N. Schady (2008) *Getting girls into school: Evidence from a scholarship program in Cambodia*. Economic Development and Cultural Change, 56: 581-617.
<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPUBSERV/Resources/477250-1186007634742/Filmer&SchadyGettingGirlsSchool.pdf>
- Filmer, D. and Schady, N. (2011) *Does more cash in conditional cash transfer programs always lead to larger impacts on school attendance?* Journal of Development Economics 96(1): 15-57.
- Filmer, D and Schady, N. (2014) *The medium-term effects of scholarships in a low-income country*. Journal of Human Resources, 49(3): 663-694.
- Grisewood, N. (2008) *Best practices in preventing and eliminating child labour through education*. Arlington, VA: Winrock International. <https://www.winrock.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/winrockenglish.pdf>
- ILO (2017a) *Meta-analysis of evaluations on ILO child labour programmes and projects in Africa, 2009-2014*. Geneva: International Labour Organisation.
http://www.ilo.org/ipec/Informationresources/WCMS_IPEC_PUB_30355/lang--en/index.htm
- ILO (2017b) *Ending child labour by 2025: A review of policies and programmes*. Geneva: International Labour Organisation.
http://www.ilo.org/ipec/Informationresources/WCMS_IPEC_PUB_29875/lang--en/index.htm
- ILO (ND) *Education as an intervention strategy to eliminate and prevent child labour: Consolidated good practices of the International Program on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)*. Geneva: International Labour Organisation.
https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/sites/default/files/documents/2006_02_edu_goodpractices.pdf
- Kazianga, H. et al (2012) *Education and child labour impacts of two food-for-education schemes: Evidence from a randomised trial in rural Burkina Faso*. Journal of African Economics, 21(5): 723-760. <https://academic.oup.com/jae/article-abstract/21/5/723/784400>
- Kazianga, H. et al (2013). *The effects of 'girl-friendly' schools: Evidence from the BRIGHT school construction program in Burkina Faso*. American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 3 (5): 41-62. http://leighlinden.com/BRIGHT_Schools.pdf
- Kondylis, F., and Manacorda, M. (2012) *School proximity and child labour: evidence from rural Tanzania*. Journal of Human Resources 47(1): 32-63.
- Miller, C. and Tsoka, M. (2012) *Cash transfers and children's education and labour among Malawi's poor*. Development Policy Review 30(4): 499-522.
http://interactions.eldis.org/sites/interactions.eldis.org/files/database_sp/Malawi/Social%20Cash%20Transfers%20Programme/Mchinji3.pdf
- Ornert, A. (2018). *Evidence on links between child labour and education*. K4D Helpdesk Report. Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies.

Ravallion, M. and Wodon, Q. (2000) *Does child labour displace schooling? Evidence on behavioural responses to an enrolment subsidy*. Washington D.C.: The World Bank.
https://sites.hks.harvard.edu/cid/archive/events/cidneudc/papers/neudc_qw.pdf

Rosati, F.C and Rossi, M. (2007) *Impact of school quality on child labour and school attendance: the case of the CONAFE compensatory education program in Mexico*. Understanding Children's Work.
<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/768621468281957903/pdf/439370WP0Box321dard1CONAFE01PUBLIC1.pdf>

Rosati, F.C., (2016) *Can cash transfers reduce child labour? IZA World of Labour*, Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA). <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/148518/1/iza-wol-293.pdf>

Sparrow R. (2007) *Protecting education for the poor in times of crisis: An evaluation of a scholarship programme in Indonesia*. Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics 69(1): 99-122.
http://www1.worldbank.org/prem/poverty/ie/dime_papers/565.pdf

Sud, P. (2010) *Can non-formal education keep working children in school? A case study from Punjab, India*. Journal of education and work, 10(1): 1-26.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13639080903448300?journalCode=cjew20>

Zhang, Y. et al (2016) *Child labour elimination actions for real change (CLEAR) project: Final report*. Geneva: Eliminating child labour in tobacco growing foundation.
https://www.impaqint.com/sites/default/files/files/CLEAR_FinalEvaluationReport_IMPAQ_toECLT%5B1%5D.pdf

Acknowledgements

We thank the following experts who voluntarily provided suggestions for relevant literature or other advice to the author to support the preparation of this report. The content of the report does not necessarily reflect the opinions of any of the experts consulted.

- Su Corcoran (Manchester Metropolitan University)
- Virginia Morrow (University of Oxford)
- Maria Quattri (Overseas Development Institute)

Suggested citation

Ornert, A. (2018). *Impact of education interventions for working children*. K4D Helpdesk Report. Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies.

About this report

This report is based on six days of desk-based research. The K4D research helpdesk provides rapid syntheses of a selection of recent relevant literature and international expert thinking in response to specific questions relating to international development. For any enquiries, contact helpdesk@k4d.info.

K4D services are provided by a consortium of leading organisations working in international development, led by the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), with Education Development Trust, Itad, University of Leeds Nuffield Centre for International Health and Development, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (LSTM), University of Birmingham International Development Department (IDD) and the University of Manchester Humanitarian and Conflict Response Institute (HCRI).

This report was prepared for the UK Government's Department for International Development (DFID) and its partners in support of pro-poor programmes. It is licensed for non-commercial purposes only. K4D cannot be held responsible for errors or any consequences arising from the use of information contained in this report. Any views and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of DFID, K4D or any other contributing organisation. © DFID - Crown copyright 2018.

