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ILO’s data collection setup for information on children’s activities

- The International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) of the ILO, established in 1992, has as the objective to progressively combat and eliminate globally all forms of child labour (CL), and especially that its worst forms (WFCL) are eradicated by 2016.

- IPEC’s statistical unit, SIMPOC, acronym for the Statistical Information and Monitoring Programme on Child Labour, was established in 1998.

- SIMPOC’s objective is to create the framework for informed programme intervention and policy support by IPEC to national governments.
SIMPOC’s work programme

SIMPOC’s work programme has 4 platforms:

- Create/ expand/ strengthen the evidence base on CL at the national and global levels;
- National capacity building for CL data collection;
- Disseminate and encourage use of CL statistics at national and global levels; and
- Support CL research

Of the above, the first component, which is mainly primary data collection through national level field surveys of children’s work characteristics, but also includes methodology development is of relevance to this meeting, and is the focus here.
SIMPOC has supported national level CL surveys in over 70 countries (should be 75 by end-2013) and these are household based sample surveys. Also supports data gathering on children’s work conditions through:
- sector- and area- specific baseline surveys
- establishment/ school/ street based surveys
- sector- and area- specific rapid assessments

Moreover engaged in developing data collection and estimation methods for children not covered by the NCLSs, namely, ‘WFCL other than CL in hazardous work’. [This category may be assumed to have experienced violence in some form.]
Data collection on Violence experienced by Children in their Work Place

- Information on the form(s) and scale of child abuse (violence experienced by child worker) is of utmost importance for designing policies and interventions to protect vulnerable children in their work place.
- Sadly, very little reliable empirical basis exists.
- Main reasons:
  - In most countries, employment of children below a certain minimum age is prohibited by law: so where the employment is illegal, reporting on violence against such below minimum age child worker is not likely to be reported or allowed.
  - Access to child worker is often difficult at work place, and employer response may be incorrect.
  - Violated child worker may not report fearing job loss.
SIMPOC supported NCLS usually asked on health hazards at work and unsafe working conditions.

As the ‘model’ questionnaires are in a continuous process of modification, it now recommends that at least 1 multiple answer question be asked on violence and abuse faced at the work place thus:

C40. Have you ever been subject to the following at work? (Read each of the following options and mark “YES” or “NO” for all options)

1. Frequently shouted at ...(emotional abuse)
2. Repeatedly insulted/ ridiculed ...(emotional abuse)
3. Beaten/ physically hurt...(physical abuse)
4. Sexually abused (touched or done things to you that you did not want)
5. Other (Specify)......(neglect/ exploitation)
Shortcomings and issues in interpretation:

- Formulation of the question(s) depends on the sensitivity in the country and the national statistics office (which is IPEC’s national implementation partner for the NCLS), although most countries simply apply what is given in the ‘model’ Q.

- Often the respondent is an adult (may not provide the truthful answer, especially if is employer)

- Some NCLS ask this question only to wage earners, who are a small fraction of child workers

- Since the assessment of experience to violence is a ‘subjective’ judgment by the respondent, care is required in interpreting an aggregate finding.
It is useful to note that many countries value this question and have applied extended formats, but here again, caution has to be exercised in distinguishing exactly what constitutes ‘violence’.

Example: Columbia 2001 NCLS enquired if child worker is unsatisfied with job for reasons of:
- not well remunerated;
- feel sad or embarrassed because of work carried out;
- bad relationships with colleagues;
- too long working days;
- working days are with too many or too short rest breaks;
- exposed to abuse (insult, sexual harassment, threat, beaten);  
- exposed to pressures or abuses by authorities;
- doing repetitive and monotonous tasks;
- others … Not all options constitute ‘violence’ strictly.
A serious problem encountered when analysing such data is on account of the heterogeneity of the information provided which makes comparisons across statistics (findings) to this question in the NCLS of different countries difficult.

A UCW-SIMPOC Working Paper of November 2008 “Violence against children: preliminary evidence from Colombia, EL Salvador, Cambodia and Ecuador” with comparative analysis showed that:
- older child workers are more likely to be mistreated;
- no clear finding on whether boy or girl workers are more mistreated;
- wage child workers mistreated are 2.5 to 3.6 % of wage child workers population;
The UCW-SIMPOC Working Paper also showed:

- verbal abuse is by far the main form (but maybe due to reluctance to report violence in the interviews by both the employer and the child worker/parents);
- mistreatments are observed to be more in the urban areas, but this could be because wage earners are predominant in urban areas;
- mistreated child workers are mostly in agriculture (but that could be because most CL is in this sector);
- child workers encountering violence are more likely to be working outside of the family (that is, are child workers employed at a wage as a CDW or in manufacturing); and
- even self-employed child workers are subject to violence, indicating that abuse is perpetuated by those with whom contact is made, such as, the authorities.
The UCW-SIMPOC Working Paper showed that ‘per cent of mistreated child workers on the total number of child workers’ is usually lower than ‘per cent of mistreated children performing household chores on the total of children in housework’. This reveals that parents or adult members of households commonly use corporal or verbal punishment on children.

Further, although schools should represent a place of protection against abuses, violence is commonly present in school, and is committed by teachers and schoolmates, revealing that it is socially accepted and tolerated. A large share of children experiences abuses both in the workplace and at school.

All point to need of specific tools to assess VAC.
Shortcomings of data on violence in child’s work place

- ‘Item response’ to the question on violence at work place is low which could be due to respondent fatigue as this question is part of last or second-last section of a generally comprehensive questionnaire.
- When question is posed to an adult household member truth may not be revealed, while if asked to the child worker in the presence of adults (employer/parents) the facts may be suppressed due to scare of later reprisals, including possible loss of job.
- Common cases of above (identified child worker but with likelihood of incorrect responses) are:
  - Child domestic workers
  - Unpaid child family workers
  - Paid child worker in an informal sector workplace
The outcome of these shortcomings is a likely underestimate of the prevalence of VAC in CL surveys.

The underestimate is compounded by the almost total lack of statistics on children in ‘the worst forms of CL other than hazardous work’ (also called the unconditional WFCL). UWFCL are certainly illegal activities and include: (i) CSEC, (ii) use of children in illicit activities (stealing/ drug trafficking/ armed conflict); (iii) child workers in a situation of forced/ bonded labour. [All such children may be assumed to have faced some form of violence/ threat of violence of varying degree.]
The magnitude of the above issue of UWFCL is evident when it is noted that:

- the ILO 2002 Global CL Estimates mentioned that such UWFCL could be 8.4 million in 2000, and
- the ILO 2012 Forced Labour Estimates states that some 5.5 million children were in forced labour over past 10 years.

IPEC-SIMPOC is therefore:

- developing survey methodology to estimate CSEC (field manual being finalized to be published by end 2012), and
- has just published a guideline for surveys to estimate forced labour of children and adults.
Immediate agenda for methodology development

- Develop methods to estimate the remaining UWFCL, namely, use of children in armed conflict, and children in illicit activities. [Trafficking *per se* is a process, and trafficked children end up in UWFCL.]
- Refine existing CL data collection method(s) and instrument(s) for greater precision in conveying the meaning/ objective of the question to respondent.
- Immediately after the question on exposure and form of violence, add an additional question(s) on perpetrator(s) of the violence against working children, those performing household chores, and perhaps in schools.
- Some research on setting a correct lower age limit for responding to sensitive issue as VAC required.
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