

Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies
Institute of Educational Research

**An Assessment of the Impact of KURET Project
Intervention in Eliminating Child Labour and Promoting
Education**

BY
GENENE MITIKU

JULY 2008
ADDIS ABABA

**An Assessment of the Impact of KURET Project
Intervention in Eliminating Child Labour and Promoting
Education**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE
STUDIES OF ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MA IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
AND DEVELOPMENT IN INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH**

**By
Genene Mitiku**

**July 2008
Addis Ababa**

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
School of Graduate Studies
Institute of Educational Research

**An Assessment of the Impact of KURET Project
Intervention in Eliminating Child Labour and Promoting
Education**

By

Genene Mitiku

Institute of Educational Research

Approved by the Examining Board

Chairperson, Dept, Graduate

Advisor

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Glory and honor to the almighty God, whose grace has sustained me and made this study come in to a reality.

I am grateful to my advisor Dr. Wanna Leka, for his advice, constructive comments and his continues encouragement.

I would like to appreciate Alemeselam Fekadus contribution for this advice and comments from the beginning to the end of my studies.

My deepest thanks goes to my wife W/ro Yemisirach Tilahun and my four children for their encouragements, especial thanks to my beloved son Joseph Genene.

Especial thanks to W/ro Demekech Feyissa, Dr. Fissiha Etianna, W/ro Genet Solomon, and Menegisteab Tegegne.

I would like to extend my appreciation to World Vision Ethiopia, all Gurage Area Development Program staff members and, KURET project staffs who have been enormously helpful during my study. My thanks goes to World Vision Gurage Area Development Program.

I am also grateful to the respondents of this study and for those who assisted me during the field survey. With out their honesty and tolerance, it would not have been possible to gather all the required data in the adverse rainy season.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to assess the impact of KURET project at SNNPR, Gurage Zone Ezea Woreda targeted primary schools. The study examines the working condition of beneficiary students before and after the intervention, the type and level of intervention under taken by the project, difference of academic achievements between beneficiary and non beneficiary students. Methodologically the descriptive case approach encompassing multiple techniques of sampling design is employed. The data were collected through questionnaires, interviews, focus group discussions and document analysis. The data drawn were transcribed and analyzed. Although the findings indicate that KURET project played a significant role in child labour alleviation, awareness creation and providing opportunities of education for the targeted children. On other hand, the project intervention is not comprehensive and multisectoral in its approach. Moreover, the livelihood support for children and for their families is not practical. Furthermore, the beneficiary students were not better than non beneficiary students in their school attendance, promotion and repetition rates and in their academic performance. Thus the project achievement seems partially effective. Therefore, this study suggests improvements on the type and level of interventions in to a comprehensive and multisectoral approach and the demanding nature of the link between lively hood support and intervention for long lasting effect. Furthermore the objective of the project should be practical at all levels to respond more effectively and efficiently for the need of children, their families and to sustainably reduce child labour in the study area.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Sample size of Beneficiary and Non Beneficiary students by School	41
Table 2	Background Data.....	45
Table 3	Beneficiary students' working condition and hours before KURET intervention.....	46
Table 4	Beneficiary students Working conditions and hours after KURET intervention.....	48
Table 5	Students' Say about the Type of Support they are getting from KURET Project.....	50
Table 6	Beneficiary Students view about the support they get from KURET Project.....	50
Table 7	Beneficiary student's response towards the level of intervention of the project	51
Table 8:	Frequency and percentage distribution of two years average score of beneficiary and non beneficiary students of the year 2006 and 2007	53
Table 9	Independent Sample t-test for the year 2006 and 2007.....	54
Table 10	Frequency and Percentage of Promotion and Repetition rates of Beneficiary and Non beneficiary students for the year 2006 - 2007.....	55
Table 11	Frequency and percentage distribution of School Attendance of Beneficiary and Non beneficiary students for the year 2007.....	56
Table 12	Beneficiary Students' view about KURET project contribution to their academic achievement.....	57

Acronyms

ABEC	Alternative Basic Education Centers
A.A.U	Addis Ababa University
AED	Academy of Educational Development
CBOs	Community-based Organizations
CCEC	Community Capacity Enhancing Committee
CDW	Child Domestic Work
CLSR	Child Labour Survey Report
CRC	Convention of the Rights of Child
CSA	Central Statistical Agency
EI	Education Initiative
FBOs	Faith-Based Organizations
FDRE	Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
ILO	International Labor Organization
IRC	International Rescue Committee
KURET	Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, Ethiopia Together
MoFED	Ministry of Finance and Economic Development
MOE	Ministry of Education
NFE	Non-formal Education
NGOs,	Non-governmental Organizations
PAVE	Pathway Advancing Viable Educational Approach
SNNPR	South Nation and Nationalities People Region
SPSS	Statistics Program for Social Science
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
UN	United Nation
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
U.S	United States
USDOL	United States Department of Labour
WFCL	Worst Form of Child Labour
WHO	World Health Organization
W V E	World Vision Ethiopia
UCW	Understanding Children Work

TABLE OF CONTENTS

No	Title	Page
I	Acknowledgments	v
II	Abstract	vi
III	List of Tables	vii
IV	Acronyms	viii
V	Table of Contents	ix

Chapter one - Introduction

1.1	Background of the Study.....	1
1.2	Statement of the Problem.....	5
1.3	Purpose of the Study.....	5
1.4	Objectives of the Study	5
1.5	Significance of the Study.....	6
1.6	Delimitation of the Study.....	7
1.7	Limitations of the Study.....	7
1.8	Definition of Terms.....	7
1.9	Organization of the Paper.....	8

Chapter two - Review of Related Literature

2.1	Introduction.....	9
2.2	Historical Background of Child Labour	9
2.3	The Concept of Child Labour.....	11
2.4	Theoretical Perspective of Child labour.....	15
2.5	Typology of Child Labour.....	20
2.6	The Incidence of Child Labour.....	21

2.7 Factors of Child Labour	23
2.8 The Effect of Child Labour	26
2.9 Education and Child Labour.....	28
2.10 Intervention	36

Chapter three - Methodology

3.1 Research Design	40
3.2 Study Area.....	40
3.3 Sampling Technique.....	40
3.4 Sampling Size	41
3.5 Source of Data.....	42
3.6 Data Collection Instruments	42
3.7 Data Analysis.....	43

Chapter four - Data analysis

4.1 Description of Data Analysis	45
4.2 The Working Status of Beneficiary Children before KURET Intervention	46
4.3 Beneficiary Students Working Condition and Hours after Intervention.....	47
4.4 Type and Level of Intervention Undertaken by KURET Project.....	48
4.5 Level of Intervention Under Taken by KURET Project.....	51
4.6 Comparison of Student’s Academic Achievement of the year 2006 and 2007.....	53
4.7 Comparison of School Attendance, Repetition and Promotion rate of Students’	55
4.8 Discussions.....	58

Chapter five - Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Summary of the Findings	64
5.2 Conclusions	65

5.3 Recommendations.....66
References.....68
Appendix75

DECLARATION

I declare that the thesis entitled Assessment on KURET Intervention in Reducing Child labour and Promoting Education is my own work, that it has not been submitted for any degree or examination in any other university, and that all the sources I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged as complete references.

Name of Student _____

Signed: _____

Date: _____

**This Thesis Has Been Submitted For Examination
With My Approval as Addis Ababa University Advisor**

Name _____

Signature _____

Date of Approval _____

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Child labour is a major international problem stemming mainly from socio economic factors. Child labour is defined as work which is harmful to health, safety and moral development of the child (ILO 2006e).

The issue of child labour is not a new phenomenon. To greater or lesser extent, children in every society have always been part of the household labour and still do take part in the day to day activities of their families. In earlier times, it was assumed that child labor was useful for children's well being and development.

Child labor was first recognized as a social problem with the introduction of the factory system in late 18th-century in Great Britain, Children regularly worked in the family house holds, but their employment in the factories soon amounted to virtual slavery, especially among the British. After the industrial revolution, child labour was taken as a social problem believed to harm children's physical and mental development throughout Europe. The notion that child labor is a social problem and the accompanying idea, that a child should be protected against such practice came to the fore when the systematic exploitation of children by their employers became rampant (ILO, 2002d).

The incorporation of various interests of the child into values and norms of international social behavior by the humanitarian law has emerged recently. It can be said that it is in

UN convention on the rights of the child, 1989 that the main norms of international behavior, designed to provide a single and consistent set of values for the protection of child rights, are found. State parties to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, for example, are required to set a minimum age for employment, The main international and legal instruments related to child labor are the Conventions of the ILO Article 138 "Minimum age" (1973) and the Article 182 on "Worst forms of child labor" (1999), specifically target child labor. Ibid

Article 32 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the child states that: "State parties recognize the rights of the child to be protected from economic exploitation and from performing any work that is likely to be hazardous or to interfere with the child's education, or to be harmful to the child's health or physical, mental, spiritual, moral or social development". However, millions of children around the world are victims of physical, sexual, emotional and economic abuse. Child maltreatment is an enormous global problem with a serious impact on the victims' wellbeing and development throughout their lives. According to ILO, child labor is the most common form of Child abuse, a fatal type of child maltreatment and a serious violation of the child's right to education (ILO, 1996). From the first international child labour convention (1919), which saw working children in terms of wage employment in formal-sector manufacturing, the world's position on child labour has evolved and expanded over the years.

It has come to address non-industrial work by children, and most recently, to prohibit any kind of work, paid or unpaid, that is injurious to children, and to set out safeguards and protections for children who work. However, child labor remains a widespread and

growing phenomenon in today's world. Many children worldwide are engaged in all forms of work; in shops, in agriculture, in factories, market places, street corners and in household chores facing extremely dangerous, exploitative and abusive conditions. Some children work for long hours in poor and unhealthy environment. Some of the underlying causes of child labour are poverty, insufficient or unbalanced economic growth, broken homes and unemployment in the formal sector (Assefa Bequele & Myers, 1995).

In contemporary times, child labor has become a global concern and it is attracting the attention of various stakeholders like, UNICEF, ILO, NGO's and private agencies as well as of governments. The concern can be explained in terms of humanitarian, developmental and economic dimensions. The humanitarians concern refers to the protection of children from abusive and exploitative type of work. Children have a right to education, health, and to grow by enjoying their childhood. The developmental concern refers to the cognitive development which includes children's access to education. It is assumed that in many cases child labour either substitute schooling or affects the quality of education negatively. The economic concern refers to the long term impact of child labour on capital formation and its contribution to the increasing number of adult unemployment in developing countries (Anker, 1999).

Similar to other developing countries, child labor is a widespread problem in Ethiopia. Child labor below the age of 14 continues to flourish. It is a growing phenomenon that is largely aggravated by the persistent poverty. Children participate in different economic and non-economic activities that range from domestic work to exploitative and hazardous

wage labor. Recent data indicates that 58.1 % of boys and 41.6 % of girl's ages 5 to 14 are working In Ethiopia. The majority are working in the agricultural sector (95.2%), followed by services (3.4 %), manufacturing (1.3 %), and other sectors (0.2%). (UCW, 2007).

Ethiopia has taken measures in conformity with the international legal frame work. The ratification of ILO conventions have been made by the Government on 27/05/1999 and 02/09/2003, respectively. This step would contribute towards the improvement of the situation of children. Ethiopia would have to commit itself to pursue policies and strategies that ensure the abolition of child labor, particularly for those below 14 years of age old. (KURET, 2005)

Efforts are being made by many stakeholders including the government, donor agencies NGOs and others in a coordinated manner to address the situation and improve the livelihood of the population at the individual and community level. Regarding the need to involve communities, NGOs have an important role to play. They often have detailed knowledge of local conditions and are closer to community members than government institutions. NGOs can also be more creative. They often innovate and implement new approaches to protect children; they can be more flexible in their activities than governments (Bequele and Myers, 1995).

In this regard World Vision Ethiopia an NGO plays significant role in partner with KURET Ethiopia, in reducing child labour through education. KURET is a four-year grant project funded by the US Department of Labour (USDOL). It operates in four East African countries (Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda and Ethiopia) it has been operating in

Ethiopia especially in Ezea woreda since the end of 2005. However; the impact of KURET intervention in reducing child labour through education has not been assessed to ascertain the project's impact and viability. Hence this study has been carried to assess the impact of KURET contribution in Ezea Woreda.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The situation of child labor is a very serious problem in Ethiopia, especially in the rural areas, to the extent of affecting the psychological, physical and intellectual development of children including their rights to education. Child labour in Gurage Zone is a serious problem (KURET, 2005). KURET project took the initiative to undergo an intervention to alleviate this problem. Yet there was no any form of assessment to evaluate the impact of the intervention in eliminating child labour in the area.

Detailed evaluative study, at the community level, especially focusing on the beneficiaries is not yet made this can be proved from KURET project report for the year 2006. And finally, as a researcher of education in relation with development, Ezea KURET project is an ideal area of study. This is because the project component focuses on using education as a means to reduce child labour. Thus this study attempted to assess the impact of KURET project intervention in reducing child labour and promoting education in Ezea Woreda.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of the study was to assess the impact of intervention under taken by KURET project in reducing child labor and promoting education in Ezea Woreda, Gurage zone, SNNPR.

1.4 Objectives

Major Objective

The major objective of the study is to assess the impact of KURET project intervention in reducing child labour through education.

Specific objectives

- To investigate the working status of beneficiary students before and after the intervention.
- To assess the extent of improvements of their working condition and hours.
- To explore the type and level of intervention undertaken by the project
- To compare the difference of academic performance between beneficiary and non beneficiary students.
- To assess the beneficiary and non beneficiary students' educational condition in terms of school attendance promotion and repetition rates.

On the bases of the above objectives the study attempted to answer the following questions.

1. What was the status of beneficiary students' working conditions before KURET intervention?

2. Was there improvement in their working condition after the KURET project intervention?
3. What was the type and levels of intervention undertaken by the project?
4. Was there any significant difference between beneficiary and non beneficiary students in their academic achievement as measured by their average score?
5. How did the beneficiary and non beneficiary students' status in terms of their school attendance, promotion and repetition rate?

1.5 Significance of the Study

KURET project is relatively a new one in Ethiopia. The outcomes of this research is believed to benefit the Government, NGOs, educators, researchers, the community as well interested stakeholders involved in reducing child labour and promoting education..

1.6 Delimitation of the Study

Child Labour related interventions have been implemented by a number of organizations in different regions of Ethiopia. However, the scope of this study is delimited to assess the impact of KURET Project at SNNPR specifically in Ezea Woreda. Furthermore the study dealt only with Grade 5-8 beneficiary and non beneficiary students. However, the study did not consider all the non beneficiary students.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

The study is not conducted in all 12 Woredas targeted under KURET project due to financial and time constraint. In addition all beneficiary students from grade 1-6 were not

included because of their ability to fill the questionnaires properly. This was also evidenced during pilot study. Further more all non beneficiary students were not included in the study. Furthermore all non beneficiary students were not included in the study due to the proximity, financial and time factors. There fore this study could be generalized only to the group studied.

1.8 Definition of Terms

Child Labour : - Work undertaken by children under the legal minimum working ages. The law normally lays down various minimum ages for different types of work. (E.g. normal full-time work, light work, and hazardous or potentially harmful work)

KURET: - (Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, Ethiopia Together) KURET is a four year grant project founded by the US department of labour. It operates in four East African countries on child labour reduction and related activities.

1.9 Organization of the study

This study is presented in five chapters. The first chapter includes introduction, the second chapter is about reviewed literatures related to the study, the third chapter includes methodology, the forth chapter includes data analysis and chapter five includes summery, conclusion and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITRATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a theoretical and conceptual base for the study by reviewing the literature related to child labour and the interventions. The chapter is organized in to 5 major sections, the first section looks at the history of child labour, the second part deals with the concept of child labour, the third part deals with theoretical bases of child labour, the fourth part deals with child labour and education and the last part deals with child labour interventions.

2.2 Historical Background of Child Labour

Child labor is not a new phenomenon in different parts of the world, at different stages of history; the laboring child has been a part of economic life.

Before the end of the 18th century, child labour went largely unquestioned. Indeed, during the early part of the industrial revolution in Britain, the main problem was seen as entailing too little work for children, rather than too much. Subsequently, the view developed that increasing demand for child labour was a mark of industrial development. Then, in the 1830s and 1840s, child labour began to be questioned in response to changing conceptions of childhood and to the activities of extra-Parliamentary pressure groups such as the emerging labour movement (Cunningham., 2001).

Child labour is a complex problem whose roots are deeply embodied in cultural, social, political, and economic structures and traditions of societies. Historical evidence indicates that some of the worst forms of child labour occurred in Europe during the industrial revolution (Basu and Van, 1998). Children have also been part of the economic life in America. What is new today is the increased awareness of, and concern for children who work as labourers as a result of the globalization process (Basu, 1999).

Today child labour has emerged as one of the most important issues on the global agenda and a subject of heated debates. Private agencies, NGOs, government and international organizations including the ILO and the UNICEF have, therefore, been logged into seeking ways to reduce the incidence of child labour. But even today there are no simple

and easy short term solutions to the problem. More than 99 percent of the incidence of child labour is found in the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America where children are contributing as high as one third of the family income (Patrinos and Psacharopoulos, 1997)

There may be several reasons why the issue of child labour should be an important social and economic concern. But, at least two are worth serious consideration. In the first place, child labour is actually a violation of children's human rights. It implies that young children are forced to undertake work that may be abusive and beyond their physical capability. Child labour is often significantly undervalued in the labour market (Assefa Bequelle and Boyden, 1988).

They also work long hours. Apart from being a violation of children's human rights, child labour is also a disinvestment in human capital formation as it has a detrimental effect on the subsequent private and social returns from it .Child labourers are deprived of freedom, childhood, education, fun and play, and natural development. In principle, childhood should be a period of school learning, of recreation, of physical, mental and social development. Thus, understanding child labour is important not only because young children are made to undertake work obligations that may be beyond their physical capability but also because of its long term effect on human capital formation and on the children's future welfare (Ravallion and Wodon, 1999).

The perpetuation of child labour is neither in the best interest of the children and their

families; nor is it in the best interest of the social and economic wealth of nations. Child labour is particularly exploitative and of a hazardous nature in Sub Saharan Africa due to the region's unique socio economic, cultural, and developmental circumstances. (UNICEF, 1997).

2.3 The Concept of Child Labour

Child labour covers a wide range of ethical, economic, and legal issues and hence may have different meanings in different societies. It can range from acceptable and constructive work that makes children less marginalized, to the most exploitative conditions that constrain the mental and physical development of children.

It can range from any help within the household and/or on the farm to wage work, trading, or heavy physical work (BMZ, 1997). Whether all kinds of economic activities including unpaid work - a family farm, household enterprise and domestic work, which are detrimental to the health, education and normal development of the child should be taken as child labour or whether it should be viewed only as wage employment are still controversial issues. What constitutes child labour, therefore, lacks a uniform definition the result of which may lead to different estimates of the number of working children percent (Jayaraj and Subramanian, 1997).

The two major conventions, the ILO Convention 138 and the UN Convention on the Right of the Child are used as benchmarks for providing a working definition for child labour. The overriding principle in these Conventions is that work should not interfere

with the education and the fullest mental and physical development of the child. Accordingly, the main criteria for determining child labour are the age of the child and the nature of the work. Age is a crucial factor because up to a certain age the primary occupation of children should be obtaining an education and other activities which are appropriate for their healthy development, including play. But age alone may not always be a sufficient base for defining child labour (Blanc, 1994).

However, the ILO convention article 138 is used as a benchmark for providing working definition for child labor for many writers (Assefa 2000). In this convention the basic principle is that child work should not interfere with the education and the fullest mental and physical development of a child. ILO in 1986 asserted child labor as: Not children working for few hours to earn additional pocket money; not children helping on family farms; not youngsters doing household chores; but children prematurely leading adult lives; working long hours for low wages under conditions that are damaging to their health. Physical and mental development; deprives from meaningful educational opportunities that would open up for them a better future (Assefa, 2000,)

Hence a person below 15 years is often treated as a child and international labour standards have established a set of minimum acceptable ages for different types of employment. Some even believe that any kind of activity performed by a child below the age of 15 is illegal and should be banned. On the other hand UNICEF considers all those below the age of 18 as children and argues that unless the work endangers children's physical, cognitive, social and psychological development it may not necessarily be bad

(UNICEF, 1997).

In addition as Rodgers and Standing , (1981) stressed, the definition of child labour must be related to a particular social framework as well as to chronological age. But although age plays an important role in defining the period of childhood, it may not be sufficient criteria for defining child labour.

Some people argue that child work will contribute towards socialization, training and self esteem if it is conducted under appropriate protection and supervision (Blanc, 1994). Under such perspectives, child work could even be meaningful and constructive and can have some learning value (Assefa Bequelle and Boyden, 1988; ILO, 1995). According to this view only regular participation of children in the labour force to earn a living or supplement household income should be considered as child labour. In other words a child could be classified as a “labourer” if he or she is economically actively engaged in work done on a regular basis for which he or she is remunerated.

On the other hand, several other people argue that all forms of child work that might have negative implications on the normal development of the child could be considered as exploitative and should be banned. If children are unable to attend schools and have insufficient time for play and recreation their mental and physical development could be seriously hampered.

Moreover, Assefa Bequelle and Myers (1995) stressed, the concept of work hazard needs to be child centered, focusing not only on factors of immediate jeopardy but also those

that menace child development over the long term.

Thus, it is essential to understand child labour in its broadest sense in order to capture its different forms. Considering only the participation of children in paid work could be too restrictive ignoring the plight of millions of children toiling in the informal sector. Work in the informal sector is usually a serious burden and a risk to children since the relationship between work, learning and play is often out of balance.

There is no universally accepted definition of child labor; varying definitions of the term are used by international organizations, non-governmental organizations and other interest groups. However, child labor can be conceptualized in terms of its broad and narrow meaning. In the former case it encompasses all forms of child work. Light or simple to the level of hazardous and exploitative activities performed by children. The latter concept excludes simple and light work which doesn't have detrimental effect to the child's health, physical development and/or schooling (ILO, 2002).

Despite their differences in conceptualizing child labor among scholars and organizations, there is a common understanding that child labor, particularly the hazardous and exploitative one affects child schooling and physical development. Thus it is agreed that children in one way or another should be protected from undertaking hazardous work at their young age. Any form of children's work (and not just hazardous work) which limits their capabilities to lead a "worth-while" life as children or in future as adults, should be seen as intolerable

It is clear that, several aspects of child labour put excessive physical, social and psychological strains on the child and hamper the child's physical, social and psychological development (UNICEF, 1986, ILO, 1992). So children should be protected from work that hinders their right to education, threatens their safety, and jeopardizes their physical and psychological development. The question is, therefore, not whether children should work or not, but from what age and doing what, are the issues that need to be addressed.

Therefore, child work, be it in the form of unpaid domestic work or in the form of paid work, can be exploitative when a child works either full time at too early an age, or works too many hours and endures undue mental physical, social, or psychological stress as a result of the work. It can also be exploitative when children live and work on the streets or work for inadequate pay, or work in jobs with too much responsibility, or are denied access to education. Moreover it may not be work per se that is bad, but the long term effect of work on the child that determines whether work is exploitative or not. Ibid

2.4 Theoretical Perspective of Child Labour

The literature on child labor is enormous but it is scattered across the social sciences lacking a common theoretical foundation. Despite a multitude of studies devoted to the issue of child labor, the basic matters as to what constitute child labor, what causes it, how it affects children and the society and how to best deal with it remains as debatable issues. Review of literature on the issue reveals that the most commonly used approaches

can be described in terms of four general perspectives. Each of the perspectives has different views regarding children, on the work of children and on how the problem can be addressed. The four general perspectives are, namely, the human capital perspective, the labor market perspective, social responsibility perspective and the child centered perspective (Anker & Melkas 1996; Boyden, & Myers, 1998).

The Human Capital Perspective

The human capital perspective views child labor through the lens of national economic development. According to this perspective, under development is one of the chief causes of child labor. These perspectives point out that low income and poverty are driving forces behind the prevalence of child labor world wide. The proponents of this perspective argue that the remedy to the problem of child labor is to eradicate poverty and its causes. They suggest that one of the most effective ways to break the self-perpetuating cycle of poverty in developing countries is by providing enhanced income option for the future children by promoting policies and activities that develops their educational skills and other capacities that are needed for their eventual contribution as adults to national economic development and their own economic progress (Psacharopoulos, 1999; Fallon & Tzannatos, 1998).

The human capital perspective strongly argues that the removal of children from work should be accompanied by nuanced adjustment programs for their rehabilitation, education and direct assistance. This perspective sees economic development as the best

over all cure for the problem of child labor (Anker and Melkas 1996; Gootaert & patrions, 1999).The human capital perspective is not against child work that can contribute to their development as a responsible adults and helpful to them and their families. However, it is against child labor that denies their right to education and that exposes them to physical and mental abuse (Psacharopoulos, 1999; Anker 1999).The human capital perspective argues that child labor without schooling perpetuates a vicious cycle of poverty across generations. These perspectives suggest that increased income contribute to rising incomes and economic development. Moreover, in addition to emphasizing to the importance of education, the human capital perspective also gives a strong attention on value and attitudes such as entrepreneurship that can promote economic growth (Anker and Melkas 1996; Gootaert & patrions, 1999).

The Labor Market Perspective

The labor market perspective in general argues that here is a negative relationship between child labor and adult employment. This perspective is mainly concerned about the potential impact of child labor on adult labor markets. This perspective points out that child labor would supersede adult labor which brings adult unemployment and child servitude which in turn worsen working class poverty.

According to this perspective, since child labor increases the supply of work force in the labor market, it will reduce wage rates and/or increase adult unemployment. The labor market perspective advocates recommend policies that discourage economic participation of children in order to protect adult employment and wages from child workers

competition. This perspective argues that the state has the highest responsibility in eradicating child labor by using minimum prohibition on work and compulsory education (Boyden and Myers, 1998).

According to labor market perspective, children are not able to recognize own best interest because they are innocent, ignorant and incompetent to defend themselves. Such a view of childhood makes children free of responsibility to make economic contribution to families and obliges adults to take the care of children. This perspective assumes that excluding children from work and forcing them to attend school will benefit both children and adult workers (Lavallette, 1999).

Many scholars (Boyden & Myers, 1998), criticize the labor market perspective by contending that this perspective places adult workers' interest before it is mainly concerned about the labor market of adults and ignores children situational reality.

The Social Responsibility Perspective

The social responsibility perspective argues that poverty is not the major explanation of child labor. According to this perspective, the problem of child labor is caused by social differentiation with in society, racial and cultural discrimination, and dysfunctional family and community relationships. This perspective is mainly concerned about marginalization and exclusion of children from the protection and essential services that should have been given to them by the society.

The perspective argues that the most effective way to eliminate child labor is not through reduction of poverty or legal enforcement of child labor laws. The solution to the problem lies in better connecting them to the protective and enabling elements of society and this protective mobilization of society is achieved through reinforcement of families, public pressure on government to make them more responsive to children, organization of children to define their own interests and improved basic services for children (Myers 2001).

The Child-Centered Perspective

The child-centered perspective indicates that children must have a stable and nurturing environment in order to become self-sustaining adults capable of caring for their own families. This perspective recognizes children as persons with rights and voices of their own and puts their interests first without filtering them through prior adult agenda. This perspective strongly argues that there is a need to actively participate children in community development to ensure that their interests are met. According to this perspective children are capable of being actors in their development and they have ideas and plans as well as adults and they also have the capacity to change things and get things done (Boyden and Myers, 1995).

The child-centered perspective views child labor as work which undermines children's wellbeing and individual and social development. This perspective defines work to comprise much more than economic participation and it gives support for policies that

guarantee children's rights, welfare and development. This perspective strongly emphasizes on the need to make national policy and other labor actions more accountable for children (Myers & Boyden, 1995). The child-centered perspective is highly dominated by modern ideas of human right and human development. The respective argues that no longer should children be seen as not heard and they should be consulted and involved. This perspective indicates that children by taking part in development activities acquire skills and confidence that not only helps them now but in later life (Myers, 2001).

2.5 Typology of Child Labour

The forms in which child labour manifests itself are complex and differ from place to place and from time to time. The range of different employment relations may vary from wage labourers in the formal sector to self-employment and unpaid family workers. Child work could also be classified on the basis of whether children are working on a part time or full time basis. So it may be difficult to come up with a common classification list on the types and forms of child employment. Different people have used different classification criteria. On the basis of employment relationships, child labour can be categorized into five major groups (Fyfe, 1985).

These are domestic work, non-domestic and non-paid farm work, wage labour, employment in the informal sector and bonded or tied labour. A similar classification has been proposed by Hemmer et al (1996) who classified child labour into seven categories. According to him, child labour can be either in the form of wage employment in which children are paid wages on the basis of time rate or piece rate; or in the form of unpaid work in a family enterprise and/or in the form of domestic or household work. Domestic

work includes cleaning, cooking, and looking after younger brothers and sisters at home, which is one of the most dominant forms of child labour in African countries. It can also be manifested in the form of assistantship where a child is required to assist a worker who is employed by others. Different forms of apprenticeship programs (children on a training programme), forced and bonded child labour (bondage labour, slavery, etc.) and self-employment (children who work on their own) are other forms of child labour

Mendelievich (1979) classified working children into children who work on their own account, wage earners paid on the basis of time and piece rate, apprentices' children who assist an adult worker who in turn works for an employer, and children who work with their family without any direct remuneration. Mendelievich's classification has disregarded the most exploitative form of child labour, i.e., bonded child labour.

Child labour can also be classified into full time and part time labour as suggested by Grote (1999). Children who are in the full time labour category will not be able to attend schools. On the other hand those in the part time child labour category may either be attending full school time or are attending a constrained school time.

Child labour can also be grouped into two on the basis of who makes the decision to put the child into work, i.e., employment on the basis of a family decision or employment on the basis of a child's decision (Hemmer et al, 1996). In the case of a family decision a child may work within the family economy, or could be employed in the labour market as a wage labourer or may be put under forced labour. If child work is on the basis of the

child's decision the child may either be self employed or become a wage earner in the labour market. Non-paid farm work is predominant in the rural areas where children, both male and female start working on their parents' farms at a very early age (ILO 2000).

2.6 The Incidence of Child Labour

In the year 2002, the international labour organization (ILO) estimated that there were 211 million economically active children between the ages of 5 to 14 worldwide. This latest global estimate is remarkably lower when it is compared with the one estimated by ILO in 1995 which was 250 million economically active children with in the same age category (ILO, 2002).

Among the total working children worldwide, 171 million were involved in work that by its nature is hazardous to their safety, physical or mental health and moral development. Moreover, some 8.4 million children were engaged in so-called unconditional worst forms of child labour, which include forced and bonded labour, the use of children in armed conflict, trafficking in children and commercial sexual exploitation (ILO, 2000). In contemporary times, the incidence of child labor is very high in Third World countries, and it has been that way for several decades now. Among the total working children in the world, 61% are found in Asia. 32% in Africa, and 7% in Latin America, and less than 1% in US, Canada, Europe and other wealthy nations (ILO, 2000).

In Africa one child in three is at work and only a tiny proportion of child workers are involved in the formal sector and the vast majority work for their families, in homes, in the

fields or on the streets (ILO, 1996). This indicates that we live in an age when child labour is almost extinct in some parts of the world, and an enduring phenomenon in others.

There is no denying fact that child labour exists in Ethiopia in an extensive scale. According to ILO, the number of children engaged in economic activities in Ethiopia aged below 14 is estimated at 7.5 million which represents about 49 percent of the total population of that age group (ILO, 1999).

A sample survey conducted in 48 major towns in Ethiopia shows the informal sector is providing employment for about 166,405 people in Addis Ababa and this accounts for about 23% of the total urban informal sector employment in the country. Out of the total people employed in the informal sector in Addis Ababa, 3,269 were under the age of 10; 27,065 were between the ages of 10-14 and 52,130 were between the ages of 15-19. These figures show that there is a wide spread incidence of child labour in the city of Addis Ababa Central Statistical Agency (1997 E.C).

2.7 Factors of Child Labour

Child labor is a universal phenomenon; however, the nature of the work performed by children, their working condition and the situations that pull or push them to work varies from society to society. In general, the causes of child labour can be explained in terms of the demand and supply side factors.

From the supply side, some of the underlining causes of child labor are poverty, rapid urbanization and migration, traditional factors, inadequate regulation and ineffective enforcement of laws and other social, economic, political and contextual factors. From the demand side, many employers are keen to recruit children because they are less aware about their rights, less troublesome and more submissive than adult workers. Moreover, child workers are less likely to complain about their wage and working conditions and they are also much cheaper than adult workers (Jensen & Nelson, 1997).

Supply Side Factors

Poverty

Jensen and Nielson (1997) claim that poverty is the main cause of child labor. They argue that absence of child labor is a luxury that many parents in developing countries can not yet afford. For destitute parents trapped in poverty, children still serve as major contributors to family income. Child labor is often a response to households to the need of satisfying basic requirements that are critical for survival. Poor households in developing countries are forced to put their children to work because they can not afford to feed idle and unproductive children.

There is direct relationship between child labor and poverty. However, it can not be said that poverty necessarily causes child labor. There are regions in developing countries where

child labor is extensively practiced while in other equally poor countries it is not. Thus, the idea that poverty and child labor are closely related should not be taken as an excuse for preventing the problem of child labor. (ILO, 1996).

Rapid Urbanization and Migration.

Rural-Urban migration and urbanization are the causes for increasing rate of child labour in urban areas of developing countries. Many families migrate to urban areas due to rural push and urban pull factors. Child migrants looking for economic opportunities that often do not exist contribute to the large increase in number of child laborers in the cities of developing countries (Salazar, 1988).

Due to the rapid urbanization the number of people living in urban areas has shown a drastic increase over the last four decades and the trend is likely to continue. Based on the United Nations estimate, 17% of the population of developing countries in the 1950's lived in urban areas. This figure increased to 32% in 1988. By the year 2025, it is estimated to increase to 57% such increases, coupled with worsening economic trends, put children and their families into urban poverty and this forced children to work in order to cope with the chronic poverty (UNICEF, 1997).

Traditional Factors.

In many societies, the attitude that children should work to support their families and themselves is deeply rooted in the local customs and cultural beliefs. The supply of child labor only arises where societal and family stances and attitudes tolerate or even approve

child labor. According to Liner (1976), children in developing countries are seen as economic assets and one of the reasons why parents in developing countries have children is to be profitable. Parents in developing countries depend on the contribution of their children either in cash or in kind for survival.

Demand Side Factors

Economic theories underline that production starts with the assumption profit maximization. One of the major reasons for businesses in the informal sector to hire children is because they are cheaper than adults. Firms are motivated to hire child laborers if the marginal product of child labor is greater than that of adult workers (ILO, 1996). Moreover, employers can force children to do any work even risky ones, such as working with chemicals, because they have no power to challenge (Zebenay, 1998).

In the informal sector where firms operate under stiff competition, employing child laborers has advantages than adults. Children are better suited to fluctuating demand of labor because they can be laid off when business is slack as they do not have rights as workers and many not join labor unions (Assefa, 2000).

2.8 The Effect of Child Labour

Children are very sensitive to work hard than adults. They are not only more susceptible to hard working than adults but also more strongly affected by hard work. Children differ from adult workers most importantly because they are still in the process of growing up. Their normal development can be severely endangered by hard work. For instance carrying heavy

load can prematurely distort their growing bodies. Moreover, children suffer more from chemical hazards and they have less resistance to diseases. Imperative dimensions of children development that can be affected by child labor over a long period of time are: physical development including overall health, coordination, strength, vision, and so forth needed to survive and contribute to adulthood.

Cognitive development including literacy, basic cultural knowledge, vocational skills and other knowledge required to live a reasonably successful life, and Emotional development including adequate self-esteem, family attachment, feelings of love and acceptance and so forth. (Assefa 2000)

Physical Hazard of Child Labor and Health Problems.

Researches have shown that because of differences between children and adults child workers are considerably more vulnerable to work place health and physical hazards. Occupational accidents are determined by the physical working environment, tools and equipment used to perform tasks. Child workers are more vulnerable to occupational injuries.

The injuries include burns, cuts, electric shocks and even loss of limbs, eyesight and hearing damage. They also suffer from the effect of fatigue due to long hours and monotonous work and malnutrition resulting from food intake. The other factor which contributes to accident is the competition among children to retain job (Basu, 1999)

Psychological Work Hazards.

One of the most serious and most common non physical consequences of child labor is psychological work hazards. Working children compare them selves with other children that do not work and they suffer from the feeling of low self-esteem. Some child migrants also suffer from lack of social and economic support as they are separated from their parents and friends. In addition, work separates child laborers from educational opportunities and there by flitters away their chance to develop the essential skills that they need in the future as adults (Assefa, 2000).

Effects of Work on Education.

Education holds the promise of improving survival, wellbeing and wealth. Despite the fact that education is highly spreading in the recent decades, the problem of making it viable to all children still remains. The national census and labor data suggest that working children have low school enrollment, attendance and completion rate than non-working children. Even after enrolled in school, working children tends to lag behind than that of their non-working peers (Boyden & Myers, 1998).

2.9 Education and child labour

The Human Rights Framework for Analyzing Child Labour and Education

As early as 1921, when the International Labour Organization (ILO) passed the first Minimum Age Convention, the world has attempted to protect children's right to

education and to prevent any child labour which would prejudice their school Attendance (UNICEF 2000).

The human rights approach to child labour calls for a profound analysis of the causes contributing to child labour, and a multi-sectoral response to the problem: provision of accessible, affordable and quality education; interventions aimed at increasing household income of poor families; reform and implementation of laws on minimum age of employment, truancy, teachers' minimum qualification and mandatory teaching hours; birth registration (without which it is impossible to establish whether a child is old enough to attend school or to work); and civic education aimed at all levels of society to promote and respect the fulfillment of child rights, and ensure that law enforcement effectively (UNICEF, 2005).

The Relationship between Education and Child Labour

As child labour is inextricably linked to poverty, so is its effective abolition linked to education. While accessible, good quality educational opportunities can help keep children out of unacceptable forms of work, the absence of public education systems, quality schools and training programs serves to perpetuate child labour. Child labour in turn prevents children attending and benefiting from school. HIV/AIDS impacts indirectly on child labour through education by affecting both pupil and teacher populations. Research from Zambia provides the most thorough assessment so far of the educational disadvantages of AIDS orphans, who are more likely to be out of school than children orphaned for other reasons (ILO 2002).

Education as a Preventive Strategy against Child Labour

In 1997, UNICEF developed the Global Child Labour Programs, whose most important sub-programs were “Education as a Preventive Strategy against Child Labour.” Implemented in 30 countries between 1999 and 2002, the programs used a multi-sect-oral, child rights approach to implementing four components: provision of quality, relevant and affordable education; improvement in family economies; raising of awareness in and respect for children’s rights; and the enforcement of child labour laws. All four components were to be implemented at Policy, institutional, school and community level (UNICEF, 2003).

The experience showed that it is relevant to use education as a main entry point for the targeted children (i.e., those engaged in child labour), but there was only partial effectiveness in interventions. Therefore, education can only be an adequate alternative to child labour if it is accessible, affordable, of good quality, non-discriminatory, safe, and linked with income generating opportunities. Ibid

Good Education Systems can Prevent Child Labour

A range of approaches to ensure that children withdrawn from child labour, those who remain working in the short term, as well as those at risk of being drawn into labour, are

provided with and able to derive the maximum benefit from education. School readiness programs – for very young children – provide an excellent opportunity to spread the word to parents and communities about developmental needs, rights and the importance of education.

Children whose early childhood experiences are positive perform better in school, and they are less likely to drop out and be drawn into child labour. Such programs can also help detect special needs of children. Good education system should includes, children friendly schools, flexible response in education, economic incentives and compensations, children centered method of teaching Apprenticeship and vocational trainings, strengthening of secondary education (UNICEF, 2005).

Children-friendly Schools

Children friendly schools can provide a safe learning environment, equitable access, and also recognition of children's rights and responsibilities. Participation of children, families and communities is key to the philosophy. For example, the M.Venkataraingiah Foundation in India uses a multi-faceted approach strategy to prevent early drop-out and involvement in child labour, by motivating parents, easing enrolment problems and bridging the gap between home and school.

The programs involve government teachers' groups, local community elders; employers/landlords involved in bonded labour and locally elected representatives. As a

result of the systematic extension of these programs, 85 villages have been made child labour free in the past decade (ILO, 2002c)

Flexible Response in Education

Flexible timetables and other forms of flexibility in education can also help to accommodate the needs of working children and their families, as a transitional measure. In Mexico, for example, the national Agricultural Day Laborers' Programs of the Secretariat of Social Development addresses the needs of children of migrant workers, who often work together with their families and may live away from their home areas for months at a time, thus missing school. The programs allow children to enroll in a school in one state and attend in another. The Government is also undertaking a non-formal education (NFE) programs for urban child laborers, aimed at using community and family strengths to ensure that working children and adolescents stay at school. A model was designed, targeting 90 per cent of the children working in streets and public places. It is currently operational in 35 towns with the aim to achieve national coverage by 2002. The Government also offers academic and training grants. Different forms of NFE have been tested and implemented (ILO, 2002a)

NFE is crucial in smoothing the transition from work to school for child laborers who are not ready or able to make the move straight from the workplace to formal school (United States Department of Labor, 1998). NFE programs that combine basic education with practical life and work skills are responsive to the needs of former child laborers, enabling them to re-enter the labour market later in better jobs. NFE is not normally an alternative to

the state-run formal system, but rather a stepping stone to mainstreaming children into formal schools as and when they are ready. IPEC's general guideline is that children under 10 years old should go directly to mainstream education systems, those aged 11-12 should leave NFE within 12 months and enter the formal system, and for older children NFE can lead either to mainstreaming, or to vocational training, higher education or employment. Ibid.

Economic Incentives and Compensation

The ILO has found that economic incentives, if they are implemented as a part of a comprehensive approach that includes improved educational quality, awareness raising and community involvement, can encourage parents to send children to school, and thus help to reduce child labour. The food-for education programs are one of many schemes that provide compensation in return for school attendance. Other mechanisms include school meals, family food supplements, school vouchers, cash stipends, skills and vocational training that bring in some income, micro-credit loans and scholarships. For example, *bolsa escola* is a family stipend/school scholarship initiative that has been taken up on a national scale in **Brazil** and is now being extended to the least developed countries in Africa. (ILO, 2002b)

It provides a minimum monthly salary to poor families that agree to keep all their 7-14-year-olds enrolled in and recording 90-per-cent attendance in school. Unemployed adult family members have to be enrolled in the national employment system. At the same time, a School Savings Programs was implemented as an additional incentive. The school drop-out

rate was reduced to a minimal level. Such schemes can alleviate poverty in the short term as well as increase a family's assets in the long term. And the cost need not be prohibitive: in Brazil, it was 1 per cent of the Federal District's annual budget. Education programs can form part of the response to a crisis, thus preventing the children affected being drawn into child labour. Ibid.

Child-centered Teaching Methods

High-quality education means that teachers must be trained and confident in children-centered teaching approaches and methods, and skilled in classroom management and in evaluating learning. Teacher training is a feature of the Time-Bound Programs in the United Republic of Tanzania, where less than 50 per cent of primary school teachers have a Grade certificate (even lower for female teachers) and the better teachers are concentrated in urban areas (ILO, 2006a).

Apprenticeship and Vocational Training

Apprenticeship and vocational training also have a crucial role to play in preparing young people for decent work and preventing child labour. Traditional apprenticeship systems can be upgraded by, for example, providing access to capital and credit, work premises, craft associations and technological improvements. Skills upgrading of trainers, through intensive evening courses, can be an effective means of improving informal

apprenticeships, as has been demonstrated in the United Republic of Tanzania. (ILO, 2006b)

Vocational Training Schemes

Vocational training schemes could be much improved by better market research to determine not only what skills are in demand now, but also what skills will be in demand in the next five to ten years when these young people will be attempting to support their own families. Better follow-up programs need to be put in place to support trainees once they graduate.

For former child laborers who have missed out on formal schooling, broader forms of vocational training that provide basic education, life skills (including job seeking and work habits) and a range of transferable skills, rather than a single skill, may be the most effective. For example, a project in North West Frontier Province in Pakistan has enabled the Directorate of Manpower and Training to deliver six to ten months' pre-vocational and vocational training in car repair, tailoring and domestic wiring to around 100 boys and 200 girls; an evaluation in mid-2001 showed the children's interest to be high. Models are needed of how such training can be provided at a reasonable cost and on a large scale. (IPEC: Evaluation report, 2002)

Global studies showing that despite significant progress in efforts to abolish child labour, an alarming number of children are trapped in its worst forms. Despite the increasing commitment by governments and their partners to tackle child labour worldwide, it remains

a problem on a massive scale. While there has been significant progress towards the effective abolition of child labour, the international community still faces a major uphill struggle against this stubbornly pervasive form of work that takes a tragic toll on millions of children around the world. The ILO's most comprehensive study on the subject, notes that there has been a worldwide response to calls for abolishing child labour, especially in its worst forms, through direct action at the local, national and international levels. Ibid

Research indicates many causes of child labour, all of which must be addressed. While poverty is a major factor, there are many other related causes such as economic and political instability, discrimination, migration, criminal exploitation, traditional cultural practices and a lack of decent work for adults.

Many suggested that, education should be the bedrock of a national budget. It is a long-term investment in a more secure future. Cutting educational funding slows economic growth and limits productive lives. Actions must also be taken to enable parents to enroll their children in school. Education must not stop at primary level if young people are to be adequately prepared for the labour market and for decent work within it, rather than being confined to low-skilled, unprotected jobs in the informal economy.

To sum up Research indicates that they early years of life are critical to the formation and development of intelligence, personality and social behavior thus, integrated childhood interventions that aim to improve a child's health and nutrition and increase his or her educational development can have positive effect .

2.10 Intervention in Child Labour Context

The main intervention in child labour context is that the effort to eliminate the worst form of child labour. The participation of community based organization, grass roots organization in rural and urban neighbor represent significant organizational break through in the Struggle to combat child labour. The intervention level both multilateral and bilateral agencies including the international program on the elimination of child labour and UNICEF which are supported program in combating child labour through local of organization (Emerging Good Practices. 2006)

The Importance of Interventions in Child Labour Context

Child labor is a serious problem that violates children rights to education, and exposes to risks, hazardous conditions and exploitation. The survey estimates that there were 18,197,783 children in Ethiopia, according for 32.6% of the estimated 55.9 million totals of 9, 21,062 male and 8,926,721 female children aged 5-17 years. Majority of the children live in the rural areas 86.7%. The result also shows about 84% were living at least with one of parents (CSA, 2001)

In Ethiopia many children are put to work at a very early age, particularly in rural areas when they often begin to assist in farm activities or herding livestock. About 54% of children in the age group of 5-9 years 29.7% for the age group 10-14 years and 25.9% for children who start work below six years by region, SNNP scored the highest percentage about 51% and the lowest was reported in Addis Ababa (17.5%). In Addis Ababa

compared to other regions a higher proportion of children that are put to work a higher ages were observed, that is 15.2% at age 10 and 11.2% above age 11. (Ibid)

On the basis of the above reality it is possible to conclude that child labour is one of the labour challenges facing Ethiopia today, even though the magnitude of the problem of child labour is not known due to the lack of comprehensive national statistics and the fact that has been observed through different organizations and research institute reports.

Child labor affects children healthy development, education and hinders child rights. These also affect prosperity of nations and the development of the country. Hence interventions through NGOs, CBOs, Government Organization and at community level is crucial in combating child labor. Therefore, child labor elimination is possible through the concerted efforts of a number of key partner intervention, governments, international organizations, employers and their organizations, trade unions, NGOs, local communities and the children themselves.

Types and Levels of Interventions

Types of Interventions

In the field of child labor, a comprehensive approach would involve at least five types of interventions. Education and training, Welfare services, protected work, Advocacy, and Regulations and enforcements are the type of interventions. These interventions would further need to be applied at four principal levels in the society (Fyfe1993).

Levels of Interventions

The levels of interventions should include multisectoral approach like the child, the family, the communities and the government levels. As clearly stated by Grote (1998) intervention to curb the problem of child labour should be based on the type or types of child labour arrangements and the institutional and administrative capacity of the country in question. The problem of child labour cuts across all aspects of activities: economic, social, political, cultural and legal issues. So it can only be solved by considering a broad range of issues.

It calls for an integrated approach, encompassing legal, economic and social measures including advocacy, raising of public awareness, and community mobilization and empowerment. Given the complexity of the problem and the multiple factors contributing to child labour no single intervention may be sufficient in itself. Any attack on child labour must be comprehensive. Prevention, removal and rehabilitation should be the main cornerstones of a broad strategy, which a comprehensive action program for child labour should contain. Some policy implications could be forwarded on the basis of our empirical study (Assefa, 2000).

Some even argue that legislation whether for compulsory education or a direct ban on child labour cannot be effective in the absence of economic progress and the right policy is to wait for economic progress (Basu, 1998). Therefore, any strategy to combat the problem of child labour should be combined with anti-poverty measures. Anti-poverty actions in the form of promoting income generating schemes or direct cash transfer for families and child workers could be important intervention mechanisms. Provision and expansion of health services and welfare support schemes need to be considered. A sort

of social security system for working children might also have to be contemplated, (Assefa, 2000).

By far, the most effective and sustainable instruments for reducing the incidence of child labour lie in the progresses made to reduce poverty and bring about sustainable development. In an environment where family income cannot provide children with the basic necessities like food, shelter, health care and clothing, child labour will persist out of sheer necessity.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research design

This study has considered both quantitative and qualitative research design. The rationale behind using the qualitative design was to increase understanding about dynamics, opinions and perceptions of people in the study area on the impact of KURET interventions. The researcher has also used inferential and descriptive statistics to compare the academic performance of beneficiary and non beneficiary students. Beneficiary students work condition, working hours, school attendance, promotion and repetition rate have been described using percentage.

3.2 Study area

The study was conducted in SNNPR, Gurage zone, Ezea Woreda, KURET Project. The intervention of KURET project begun at the end of 2005, however, this study focused on the students who were beneficiaries and non beneficiaries for the year 2006 and 2007.

3.3 Sampling Technique

In this study, the number of schools that have been used for the research were eight primary schools under KURET project in Ezea woreda. Hence, from the existing eight schools six primary schools, namely, Agena, Yeheweneye, Yekemene, Yeneberese, Kotergedera and Zegebaboto Primary Schools were selected purposely for the study.

The proximity and the accessibility to the schools have been taken as the main criteria for selecting these six schools.

3.4 Sample size

According to the study of Assefa Bequele, (2000), the age standard of working children in Ethiopia is (8-15). The total population of targeted students under KURET project from grades 1-8 was 770 for the year 2006 and 2007. The population of beneficiary students from grade 5-8 for the year 2006 and 2007 was 112.

The whole beneficiary students from grade 5-8 have been taken as a sample size because they were small in number. In addition, 112 non beneficiary students have been selected randomly to compare their academic achievements with that of beneficiary

students. Hence the total sample size of both beneficiary and non beneficiary students was 224 as indicate in the Table 1 below.

Table 1 Sample size of Beneficiary and Non Beneficiary students by School

No	School	Beneficiary Students		Non Beneficiary students		Total		Total
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
1	Agena	10	16	17	12	27	28	55
2	Zegebaboto	5	3	5	2	10	5	15
3	Yeneberese	14	6	9	9	23	15	38
4	Kotergedera	4	2	3	3	7	5	12
5	Yehewenye	15	15	20	9	35	24	59
6	Yekemene	16	6	18	5	34	11	45
Total		64	48	72	40	136	88	224

As indicated in table 1 from the total of 112 students there were 62 male and 46 female beneficiary students participated in the study. This also indicated that the disparity between male and female beneficiary students. Less number of female students than male students was helped by the project. On the other hand from the total of 112 students 74 male and 42 female non beneficiary students were participated in the study. From the above data we can conclude that most of male students were helped by the project.

3.5 Sources of Data

In this study both primary and secondary sources were used. The primary source included the respondents themselves (students, interviews as well as focus group discussion members). The documents obtained from the study area were taken as secondary sources.

A. Document: the document obtained included:-

1. The average scores of beneficiary and non beneficiary students in 2006 and 2007
2. The drop out and repetition records of both groups in 2006 and 2007
3. School attendance list of both groups in 2006 and 2007

B. Respondents

1. 2006 and 2007 entry male and female students who were beneficiaries of KURET project interventions.
2. 2006 and 2007 entry female & male students who were non beneficiaries.
3. Community representatives including women, youth, Kebele association woreda.

3.6 Data Collection instruments

To collect data for this study the following instruments have been used: questionnaires, Focus Group Discussions, interviews, field notes and document analysis. Questionnaires and interview guides were pilot tested to improve the quality and clarity.

Focus group discussions and interview guide

Representatives in terms of participation in community and KURET project activities were selected for the focus group discussion.

Before selecting the focus groups, the researcher consulted Gurage Area development program manager and project facilitator in order to facilitate the selection of appropriate people for focus group discussions. Participants of the focus group discussions included women, youth, community leaders, Woreda officials and beneficiaries in the project areas as well as project facilitator. There were 10 participants in the focus group discussions.

Focal teachers, school directors, project facilitators and community representatives were interviewed to get further information and enrich the data gathered through other instruments.

3.7 Data Analysis

To compare school attendance, promotion rate, repetition rate and average scores of beneficiary and non beneficiary students' percentage comparison and t-independent samples test have been used.

The qualitative data gathered through the interviews, field notes and focus group discussion were coded and categorized and discussed along with the quantitative data. Hence, the qualitative data were used to enrich the quantitative data.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Description of Data Analysis-

The result of this study is presented in six parts. The first part includes the Background information of respondents; the second part includes the status of beneficiary children

before KURET intervention. The third part is about beneficiary students' working conditions and hours they work after the intervention. The fourth part discusses the types and levels of interventions undertaken by KURET project while the fifth part presents comparison of beneficiary and non beneficiary students' academic achievement. The last part compares school attendance, repetition and promotion rate of the beneficiary and non beneficiary students.

Table 2 Background Data

Category		Beneficiary	Non Beneficiary	Total
Age	10-12	48	50	98
	13-15	58	53	111
	16-18	6	9	15
	Total	112	112	224
Sex	Male	64	72	136
	Female	48	40	88
	Total	112	112	224
Grade	5	30	23	53
	6	29	13	42
	7	37	51	88
	8	16	25	41
	Total	112	112	224

As can be seen in Table 2, the majority of beneficiary students were between the ages of (13-15) which is (51.7%). On other hand most of non beneficiary respondents were under the same age with (47.3%). In addition 64 (57.1%) male beneficiary and 72 (64.2%) male non beneficiary students included in the study. Regarding the grade levels, both groups of respondents were taken from grade 7. Furthermore, 37 (33.0%) beneficiary and 51 (45.5%) non beneficiary students were included in the study.

4.2 The status of Beneficiary children before KURET intervention

Table 3 Type of work done by Beneficiary students' before KURET intervention

In this section both working status and working hours of children before the intervention was analyzed. An attempt was made to find the working conditions and hours beneficiary students spent per day before the intervention of KURET project.

As can be seen in Table 3, a large proportion of beneficiary students 73 (65.2%) were involved in normal child work and 28 (25.0%) students were engaged in child labour and 11 (9.8%) were involved in the WFCL. This indicates that most of the beneficiary students were engaged in normal child work before the intervention.

No	Item	No	%
1	Type of Work usually performed by children before intervention		
	a) Normal Child Work	73	65.2
	b) Child Labour	28	25.0
	c) Worst form of Child Labour	11	9.8
	Total	112	100
2	Time spent by children per day working before intervention		
	a) 1-3 hours	23	20.5
	b) 4-6 hours	15	13.4
	c) 7-9 hours	7	6.3
	d) 10-12 hours	66	58.9
	No Data	1	.9
	Total	112	100

Table 3 also indicates that the amount of time the beneficiaries used to spend before KURET project intervention. Among, 112 students, 66 (58.9 %) of beneficiary students reported that they are working from 10-12 hours per day, and 23 (20.5%) of these students used to spend 1-3 hours and the other 15 (13.4%) worked 4-6 hours per a day.

Most students were involved in normal child work. Yet, they spent large amount of time on it. The same Table 3 indicates that some students were involved in child labour and few others were involved in WFCL before the intervention. Table 4, shows the contribution of KURET project in reducing and improving this situation.

4.3 Beneficiary students Working Conditions and Hours of work after KURET intervention

An attempt was made to assess the beneficiary students' response towards their working condition and hours they spend per day after the intervention.

Table 4 Beneficiary students Working conditions and hours of work after KURET intervention

As indicated in Table 4, after the intervention all beneficiary students were involved in

No	Item	No	%
1	Type of work performed by children after the intervention		
	a) Normal Child Work	112	100
	b) Child Labour	-	-
	c) Worst form of Child Labour	-	-
	Total	112	100
2	Time spent in normal child labour in a day after the intervention		
	a) 1-3 hours	112	100
	b) 4-6 hours	-	-
	c) 7-9 hours	-	-
	d) 10-12 hours	-	-
	Total	112	100

normal child work and the time they spent on it per day is only from 1-3 hours. To put it in other words, the 35% of the beneficiary students who were involved in child labor as well as in WFCL have been helped by the project to get involved in normal child work only on normal child work. Moreover, the 58.9% of the beneficiary students' who used to spend 10-12 hours working were helped to spend only 1-3 hours per day on normal child work.

4.4 The Types and Levels of Interventions undertaken by the project

The type of interventions on child labor context includes education and training, welfare services, protected work, advocacy, regulation and enforcement. KURET Gurage ADP project has a plan to increase access to education, improve quality and relevance of education, increase awareness of key stakeholders and increase support for the education

of targeted children. Since 2005, the project was involved in reducing child labor and improving access to education for children covered under the project.

The qualitative data gathered through Focus Group Discussions and interviews indicated that the project has played a vital role to alleviate child labor and accessing education for the children. During the interview with the project facilitator and school Directors, they agreed on that, the focus of KURET project in Ezea Woreda is mainly on accessing education and awareness raising activities. They suggested that it is a good beginning and has been considered as a pioneer project in reducing child labour and accessing education in the area. All the interviewees highly appreciated the efforts which have been undertaken by the project so far to reduce or eliminate child labour in Ezea Woreda. Nonetheless all are commented on the scope, in that the project accessing education and awareness promotion.

In addition, they suggested that, if KURET has a plan to reduce child labor effectively, it needs to give emphasis for additional type of interventions like increasing Livelihood support which aimed to improve parents' economy, children's nutrition, health services and vocational trainings. During the focus group discussion conducted with community representatives, they emphasized more on family income improvement and vocational training tailored to development. Table 5 below shows the type of the project support provided for beneficiary children.

Table 5 Type support Beneficiary students get KURET project

1. Which type of support provided for you by the project?					
No	Type of Support	Yes	%	No	%
1.1	school fee	7	6.3	104	92.9
1.2	financial support	6	5.4	105	93.8
1.3	nutrition support	5	4.5	106	94.6
1.4	Uniform	3	2.7	108	96.4
1.5	Educational materials	102	91.1	8	7.1
1.6	Livelihood support for my family	7	6.3	104	92.9

of
from

Most of the students (91.1%) said that KURET project support is limited to educational materials such exercise books, pen, pencil and the like. The data gathered through interviewing school directors, focal teachers and project facilitators supports what the students have said. Both the interview results and the focus group discussions indicated that the project is limited more to educational material support than other supports such as welfare services, livelihood supports and the like.

Table 6 Beneficiary Students views about the support they get from KURET Project

No	Item	Yes	No	No response	No data
1	Is the project support comprehensive in its approach?	15 (13.60 %)	95 (84.40 %)	-	2 (2 %)
2	Is the project support regular?	95(84.8 %)	16(14.3 %)	-	1(0.9 %)
3	Is there a link between your education and KURET support	81(72.3 %)	30(26.8 %)	-	1(0.9 %)
4	Do you think that the project	16(14.3 %)	95(84.8%)	-	1(90.9 %)

	support contribute in child labour reduction?				
5	Do you think that KURET project support is sufficient?	16(14.3 %)	95(84.8 %)	-	1(0.9 %)
6	Does the support of KURET project meet your needs?	92(82.1 %)	19(17.0 %)	-	1(90.9 %)

Most beneficiary students (more than 80%) do not feel that t KURET project support is comprehensive in its approach, successful in providing support and useful in reducing child labor. However, more than between 70 % – 85 % of these students’ said that the project support is regular and there is a link between their education and the support they get.

4.5 Levels of interventions under taken by KURET project

The levels of the intervention undertaken by KURET project is identified from the interviews, focus group discussions, and document analysis and are shown in Table 7.

Table 7 Beneficiary students’ response towards the level of intervention of the project

1. At what level does the project intervention is implemented?									
No	Level of Interventions	Yes	%	No	%	No data	%	Total	% Total
1.1	Child level	103	92.0	8	7.1	1	.9	112	100
1.2	Family level	4	3.6	107	95.5	1	.9	112	100
1.3	Community level	8	7.1	103	92.0	1	.9	112	100

Most students’ response (more than 90%) indicates that KURET project has been at child level. In other words, the project focuses on children by giving support such as

educational material (exercise books, pens, school bags pencil etc) and school readiness program¹ which helps to prepare children for the New Year education.

Focal teachers, directors and project facilitators were interviewed about the type and the level of intervention. The following is summary of the interviews and focus group discussions.

The strength of the project, according to these groups, is its contribution to create and increase awareness, give training to teachers on how to teach, minimizing the time students spend in working, thereby helping them spend more time on their education and give material support to students. Yet, these same groups have suggested that the project has to be extended and upgraded to the level of giving livelihood support at family and community level, if it is to bring real change and improve students' life thereby improving their education. The project's support should include nutrition and health services, income generating projects, improving learning environment and incentive for teachers if it is really to help students learn best or if it is planned to improve their academic performance.

Most of the focus group discussion members and other interviewees felt that the project is limited only to giving material support to beneficiary students. They seem to be in doubt about the sustainability and effectiveness of the intervention in reducing child labor or improving academic achievement of the beneficiary students if the project intervention is limited to school materials as it stands now.

¹ School readiness program is a form of program that prepares students for the next academic year.

From the discussions presented above one can see that the intervention is limited at child level. However, in principle, this kind of intervention should include at least family and community level.

Hence, KURET project's intervention does not seem to be comprehensive in its approach as the level is only limited at child level. Expecting success with out participating families and community members is not realistic as the above discussion indicates

4.6 Comparison of Beneficiary and Non Beneficiary Students' Academic Achievement of the Years 2006 and 2007

Table 8: Frequency and percentage distribution of two years average score of beneficiary and non beneficiary students

Range based on MOE scale	Year	Type of Students			
		Beneficiary		Non Beneficiary	
		No	%	No	%
90-100 (Excellent)	2006	-	-	3	2.67
	2007	-	-	5	4.46
80-89 (Very good)	2006	7	6.25	15	13.69
	2007	6	5.35	20	17.87
60-79 (Good)	2006	35	31.25	43	38.39
	2007	35	31.25	34	30.35
50-59 (Fair)	2006	47	41.96	36	32.14
	2007	53	47.32	36	32.14
Below 50 (Poor)	2006	21	18.75	15	13.39
	2007	18	16.07	17	15.17

Group	Year	N	\bar{x}	S	t-calculated	t-critical
Beneficiary	2006	110	58.3	9.39	3.13	1.96
	2007	112	58.4	8.71		
Non Beneficiary	2006	112	62.9	12.23	3.76	1.96

Table 8 above indicates that in the years 2006 and 2007 the average scores of beneficiary students were not with in the range of 90-100 (Excellent), while 3 – 5 % of non beneficiary students in the years 2006 and 2007 had an average score had an average score with in this range. In addition, more non beneficiary students had average scores in the two years that fall with in the range of 80-90 (very good) and 60-70 (good) than the beneficiary students. Furthermore, more beneficiary students' average score fall with in the range of 50-59 (fair) and below 50 (poor) than non beneficiary students. Hence, Table 8 above shows clear difference in academic achievement as measured by average scores. The non beneficiary students had a greater average score than the beneficiary student

In order to see if the deference in average scores of the two groups indicated in table 8 statistically significant or not a t-test was carried out as shown in table 9 and 10.

Table 9: Average Scores Independent Sample t-test for the Year 2006 and 2007

	2007	112	64.4	14.79		
--	------	-----	------	-------	--	--

Note: alpha level of 0.05 was used to test the significance

Average score for two beneficiary students were missing. And hence the comparison is made without them. As Table 9 above indicates. Since the non beneficiary students have t -calculated (3.13) is greater than t -critical (1.96) the observed difference is significant and the non beneficiary students achieved better academically as measured by average score.

In the same Table 9, we can see that non beneficiary students achieved better academically as measured by the average score. Both tables indicate a significant difference as t -calculated is greater than t -critical. Hence KURET project did not seem to improve students' academic achievement. Looking at Table 8, one can see that the beneficiary students did not have an improved average score in the year 2007 when compared to their score in the year 2006. Yet, they were under the project in these two years. (That is 2006 and 2007)

4.7 Comparison of school attendance, repetition and promotion rate of the beneficiary and non beneficiary students

Table 10 Frequency and Percentage comparison of Promotion and Repetition rates of Beneficiary and Non beneficiary students for the year 2006 - 2007

Year	Beneficiary students				Non Beneficiary Students			
	Promoted	%	Repeated	%	Promoted	%	Repeated	%
2006	90	80.3	20	17.80	98	87.5	12	10.71
2007	91	81.25	21	17.85	98	87.5	12	10.71
Total	181	80.83	41	36.65	186	83.03	24	21.42

Source: - From students' school record of 2006 and 2007

Table 11 shows that more beneficiary students repeated grades than non beneficiary students. For example, in the year 2007 17.85% of the beneficiary students repeated grades while about 10% of non beneficiary students repeated grades. 87.5% of the non beneficiary students promoted to the next grades while 80% of the beneficiary students promoted to the next grade levels. This implies that the contribution of KURET project in improving promotion rate is not significant. It can be said also that the difference in the promotion rate between the years of 2006 and 2007 is not significant for both groups.

Table 11 Frequency and percentage distribution of School Attendance of Beneficiary and Non beneficiary students for the year 2007

Category	No Absent	Absent from 1-5 days	Absent from 6-10 days	Absent More Than 10 days	Total
Beneficiary Students	10(4.5%)	58(25.9%)	31(13.8%)	13(5.8%)	112(50%)
Non Beneficiary Students	18(8.0%)	50(22.3%)	32(14.3)	12(5.4%)	112(50%)
Total	28(12.5%)	108(48.2%)	63(28.1%)	25(11.2%)	224(100%)

Source: - From students' school record of 2007

As Table 12 indicates more beneficiary students were absent than non beneficiary students during the academic year of 2007. For instance, 5.8% of the beneficiary students were absent for more than 10 days while 5.4% of non beneficiary students were absent for the same duration. Only 4.5% of the beneficiary students were not absent even for a day while 8% of the non beneficiary students were present the whole year during the academic year 2007.

Table 12 Beneficiary Students' view about KURET project contribution to their academic achievement

No	Item	No	%
1	Do you think that the support of the project is useful in saving time for your study?		
	a) Yes	17	15.2
	b) No	93	83.0
	c) No response	-	-
	No Data	2	
	Total	112	100
2	Does the Project provide all teaching materials and necessary tools for your education?		
	a) Yes	43	38.4
	b) No	68	60.7
	c) No response	-	-
	No Data	1	0.9
	Total	112	100
3	Do you believe that the project support enables you to perform better in your education		
	a) Yes	10	8.9
	b) No	101	90.2
	c) No Response	-	-
	No Data	1	0.9
	Total	112	100
4	Did you see any improvement on your test results due to the intervention of the project.		
	a) Yes	44	39.3
	b) No	66	58.9
	c) No Response	-	-
	No Data	2	1.8
	Total	112	100

The Table 12 above gives more insight on KURET projects contribution to students' academic achievement as witnessed by the beneficiary students. Most of these students (83%) do not think that the project has saved their time that they can spend on their education. A good number of beneficiary students (about 61%) do not believe that the project has provided them all learning materials or necessary tools for education. More over 90% of these students do not believe that the project support enabled them to perform better in their education. More specifically, 58.9% of the beneficiary students do not believe that the support has improved their test results.

4.8 Discussions

This section Presents discussions of the interpreted data according to the research questions set before. The first research questions relates to beneficiary students working condition before KURET project intervention. The result indicated that larger number of beneficiary students 73 (65.2%) were involved in normal child work and 28 (25.0%) students were engaged in child labour. The least percentage of beneficiary students 11

(9.8%) among 112 beneficiary students were involved in worst form of child labour before the intervention of the project.

When we look for the status of working hours of beneficiary students as indicated in same Table 3, Among 112 students, 65 (58.9%) students used to spend from (10-12) hours per day and 23 (20.5%) of these students used to spend (1-3) hours. The rest 15 (13.4%) students worked from (4-6) hours per day before the intervention. This shows that most of beneficiary students used to work more than 9 hours per day. The least amount of working hours for the children was from 1-3 hours.

In general most students were involved in normal child work yet, they spent large amount of time on it. This also protects children from attending school. Further more an attempt was made to compare the beneficiary students working condition and hours after the project intervention. As can be seen from the results in Table 4 all beneficiary students were involved in normal child work and the time they spend is also reduced to only (1-3) hours. The above findings indicated that (35 %) of beneficiary students who were involved in child labour as well as in worst form of child labour have been helped by the project to get involved only in normal child work.

In addition (58.9 %) of beneficiaries who used to spend (10-12) hours working were helped to spend only (1-3) hours per day after the intervention of the project. Hence, from the evidence presented, we can say that the intervention seems to contribute to protect children from child labour as well as worst form of child labour. Moreover, the project

intervention helped to minimize long working hours per day and this also provides the opportunity of attending school for the children.

The second question relates to types and levels of the interventions under taken by KURET project in the study area.

According to the data gathered through interviews and focus group discussions the project has played a vital role to alleviate child labour and accessing education for the children. However the type of the support provided by KRUET project is limited to more educational material (Exercise book, School bags, Pen Pencil etc...) support than other support such as Welfare service, livelihood support and the like.

Moreover, the participants in the interviews and focus group discussions emphasized more on family income improvement and vocational trainings tailored to development. In addition, most of beneficiary students (91.1%) affirm that the project support is limited to educational materials.

Furthermore, most beneficiary students (more than 80 %) do not feel that KURET project support is comprehensive in its approach, successful in providing support and useful in reducing child labour, how ever between (70 %-85 %) of these students said that the project support is regular and there is a link between their education and support they get. And hence, the intervention of the project seems incomprehensive and holistic in its support provision.

This finding is consistent to (Psacharopolous, 1999; Fallon & Tzannatos, 1998). They suggest that, they suggested that “One of the most effective ways to break the self-perpetuating cycle of poverty in developing countries is by providing enhanced income option for the future children by promoting policies and activities that develops their educational skills and other capacities that are needed for their eventual contribution as adults to national economic development and their own economic progress”.

Regarding the level of the intervention of the project in the study area is identified from the questionnaires, interventions, focus group discussions and document analysis. The result indicated that the intervention is limited to child level, how ever in principle, this kind of intervention should include at least family and community level.

Moreover, the response of beneficiary students’, also similar with the above results. More than (90 %) of beneficiary students responded that KURET project intervention has been limited at child level (Table 7). In addition, focal teachers, directors and project facilitators suggested that the project has to be extend and up grade the level of giving livelihood support, if it is to bring real change and improve student’s life there by improving their education.

Therefore, from the evidence presented, it is possible to say that, the project support is not holistic and multi-sectoral in its approach. In it’s approach. The other question related to identify the difference between beneficiary and non beneficiary students in their academic performance.

An attempt was made to identify the academic achievement difference measured by their average score of two years (2006 and 2007). The result indicates that the non beneficiary students had greater average score than the beneficiary students in both academic years (2006 and 2007).

(Table 8)

In order to see the differences in average scores indicated in table 8 is statistically significant or not a t-test was carried out as shown table 9 and 10. the sample t-test for both years has shown that this difference is significant, as t-calculated (3.13%) is greater than t- critical (1.96) for the year 2006 and t-calculated (3.76) is greater than t-critical (1.96). Since the non beneficiary students have greater mean in 2006 and 2007 and t-calculated greater than t-critical in the same years the observed difference is significant and the non beneficiary students achieved better academically as measured by average score: Hence KURET project did not seem to improve students' academic achievement. This result is also consistent to the findings of (Boyden & Myers, 1998).They suggested that, "working children have low school enrollment, attendance and completion rate than non-working children. Even after enrolled in school, working children tends to lag behind than that of their non-working peers".

The last research question relates to comparison of beneficiary and non beneficiary students status of school attendance promotion and repetition rates using documents of both groups gathered from the selected schools. Regarding the status of school attendance of beneficiary

and non beneficiary students were absent than non beneficiary students during academic year of 2007. For instance, (5.4%) of non beneficiary students were absent for more than 10 days. While (5.4%) of non beneficiary students were absent for the same duration.

Only (4.5%) of beneficiary students were not absent even for a day, while (8%) of the non beneficiary students were present the whole year during the year 2007. this implies that beneficiary students were more absent compared with non beneficiary students. (Table 12). This seems that the intervention was not contributes much to minimize the absentees of beneficiary students. When we look for comparison of promotion and repetition rates of beneficiary and non beneficiary students more beneficiary students repeated grades than non beneficiaries.

(87.5%) of the non beneficiary students promoted to next grades, while (80 %) of the beneficiary students promoted to next grade level. In addition (17.85%) of beneficiary students repeated grades and about (10%) of non beneficiary students repeated grades (Table 11).

It can be said also that the difference in the promotion rate between the years of 2006 and 2007 is not significant for both groups.

Further more the response from beneficiary students in the table 13 also support the above findings. Most of these students, (83%) do not think that the project has saved their time that they can spend on their education and study.

This implies that the contribution of KURET project in improving promotion rate is not significant.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary of the Findings

The purpose of this study was to assess the impact of KRUET intervention in reducing child labour and promotion education in Ezea Woreda. In order to find reasonable answers appropriate data collection were employed questionnaires, interview, document analysis, focus group discussions were prepared and administered to collect data from 224 beneficiary and non beneficiary students, including 15 additional participants from different sectors. The collected data was analyzed through percentage and independent t-test. The following findings were observed.

1. KURET project has played a vital role in awareness raising with in the community and stakeholders by using public holidays, like Arafa, Mesekel, parents school days, and flag ceremonies in the schools. This was also evidenced through interview, focus group discussions and annual report of the project.
2. The project has played significant role in protecting children from hazardous work and long hours working. This also evidenced from the response of beneficiary students through questionnaires.

3. KURET project has contributed a lot in providing opportunities of education for targeted children, supporting educational materials like exercise books, pen and pencils.
4. The finding indicated that the type of KURET intervention is mainly on accessing education and awareness raising. Livelihood support which aimed to improve families' income, children nutrition, health services and vocational trainings were not implemented in the study area.
5. The level of intervention also limited to child level. Hence the project intervention is not holistic and multi-sectoral in its approach and implementation strategies.
6. Regarding the academic achievements, non beneficiary students had better academic achievement than beneficiary students as measured by average scores.
7. In school attendance, promotion and repetition rates also non beneficiary students had better performance, compared with beneficiary students.

5.2 Conclusions

Based on the statistical and qualitative evidence, the following conclusions are made.

- The project intervention contributes to protect children from child labour and providing opportunities of education for the beneficiary students.
- The type and level of the project intervention is not holistic and comprehensive in its approach
- Non beneficiaries students had better academic achievement than beneficiary students as measured by average scores, hence KURET project did not seem to improve students' academic achievement.
- Beneficiary students were not better than in school attendance, promotion and repetition rates compared with non beneficiaries. Therefore, the contribution of KURET project in improving school attendance, promotion and repetition rates of beneficiary students was NOT significant.

5.3 Recommendations

1. Encouraging efforts of the project in reducing child labour and accessing education, such as, awareness raising, provision of opportunities of education and support of educational material should be continued to bring about change on the issue of child labour in the study area.
2. The comprehensive approach in both types and levels of interventions which includes livelihood support has significant contribution in the development of the children and family income improvement. Hence, KURET project should increase

the type of support for children and livelihood support for parents to address the root cause of child labour.

3. Parents should be consulted and given advice on how to start income generating activities. Schemes like revolving funds and credit facilities should also have to be arranged for them. This will enable them to give up the income contribution of their children and to meet their basic needs.
4. Educational and livelihood support should be increase to upgrade the academic achievement of beneficiary students. Because education and lively hood support are highly related with the day to day life of these students.
5. Teachers who are involved in school readiness program in rainy season should be provided with incentives.
6. Teachers training on student centered teaching methodologies should continue sustainable to bring about educational quality
7. KURET project should include improving the learning environment by providing libraries latrines, workshop centers, desks, books, black boards and exercise books for schools.

8. KURET project should find a way to coordinate the effort of the project with other NGOs working in the same area to increase additional support for the children.

9. KURET project should develop working with schools to address problem of retention, attendance and performance of children.

For instance, Fyfe (1993) indicated that adaptation of school hours to family needs and education of parents on value of education is very important to bring about improvement in child labour alleviation. Health education, social security, welfare support, income generation should also be included at family level interventions.

In addition, a comprehensive approach intervention at family level has a significant role to motivate parent's participation. Furthermore the same author has indicated the importance of involving the community in such an intervention. The community level intervention should comprises provision of schooling, vocational training, community centers, and provision of community health centers, provision of protected work schemes, volunteer support, advocacy, citizens committees and pressure groups for enforcement (Fyfe 1993).

REFERENCES

- Action aid (2000). HIV/AIDS and Education Sector, Impact and Responses. London: Briefingaper.
- Alec Fyfe (2007). *The World Wide Movement against Child Labour Progress and Future direction* Geneva: ILO
- Anker, R. (1999). Conceptual and Research Framework for the Economics of Child Labor. and Its limitation. Sweden: Pearson.
- Anker, & Melkas, D. (1996). *Economic Incentives for Children and Families to Eliminate or Reduce child labor* Geneva: ILO.
- Asgahr Razavieh, Donald ary, Lucy Chesre Jacobs (2002)_& Introduction to Research in Education. USA: Wads Worth Group.
- Assefa Admasse, (2000).The Incidence of Child Labor in Africa: with Empirical Evidence from Rural Ethiopia. Discussion on Development Policy Bonn: ZEF.
- Assefa Bequelle and Boyden, (1988). *Combating Child Labour the Emerging Response to Child labour*” in Conditions of Work Digest, Vol, 7/1. ILO: Geneva,

Assefa Bequelle, A. and Myers, W. (1995). *First Things First in Child Labour: Eliminating Work Detrimental to Children*. ILO, Geneva.

Assefa Bequelle, A. and Myers, W. (1995). *First Things First in Child Labour: Eliminating Work Detrimental to Children*. ILO, Geneva.

Bachman, (2000). *A new economics of child labor searching for answers behind the Headlines*. Sweden: Pearson.

Basu, (1999). *Child labour: Cause, Consequence, and Cure, with Remarks on International labour standards* Geneva: ILO

Basu, K. and Van, P.H. (1998). *The economics of child labour, American: Economic Review*, 88 (3), pp. 412-27. *Labour Standards. Journal of Economic Literature* 37 September, (1999), pp. (1083–1119).

Blanc, (1994). *Urban Children in Distress Global Predicaments and Innovative Strategies*. Longhorn: Gordon and Breach Publishers.

Bryman, A. (2001). *Social Research Methods*. New York: Oxford University press.

Boyden and Myers, (1995). *Exploring Alternative Approach to Combating Child Labor: case Study from Developing Countries*. Sweden: UNICEF.

Boyden and Myers, (1998). *What works for working children*. Sweden: Radda Barren and UNICEF

CSA, (1997). Report on *urban informal sector sample survey*: Statistical bulletin no.174. Addis Ababa:

C.S.A, (2005). *Ethiopia: Demographic and Health Survey*. Addis Ababa.

Cunningham, (2001). *The Rights of the Child and the Wrongs of Child Labour*. New York: martin's press, 14. G Rogers and G. Standing, *Child work, Poverty and Underdevelopment* (Geneva, ILO. 1981).

E. Menedeliévich (2000). (Ed), child at work Geneva:

Edilberto Hozia (2005). Elizabeth D- Eibbons Friedrich Hubebler, and Child labour education and the principle of Non-Discrimination Working Paper New York: United Nation Childrens Fund

Fallon, P. tzannatos, Z. (1998) *Child Labour: Policy options* (Amsterdam, Aksant, 2001), pp, 41-42

Fyfe, A. (1993). Child Labour, A Guide to Project Design. ILO, Geneva.

Fyfe, (1985). All Work and No Play, Child Labour Today. Trade Union Congress, London.

Grootaert, (1998). *Child Labour and the International Policy Debate: The Education – Child Labour Trade – Off and the Consequences of Trade*. New York: Martin's press.

Grootaert & Patrions, (1999). *The Policy Analysis of Child Labor*. New York:

Hemmer et al, (1996). *Child Labour in the Light of Recent Economic Development Trends*. Study prepared for the ILO.

ILO, (1995). *Child Labour in the Light of Recent Economic Development Trends*. Study Prepared for the ILO.

ILO, (1996). *Child Labour in the Light of Recent Economic Development Trends*. Study Prepared for the ILO.

ILO, (2002a). International program on the elimination of child labor. Geneva.

ILO, (2002b). *Review of annual reports under the Declaration. Part II* Geneva, report of the Government of Mexico, pp, 421-426.

ILO, (2002c). World labour report. Geneva.

ILO, (2002d). The Future with out Child Labour Global Report Under the following up to the ILO declaration on foundational principles and rights at work International Labour Conference 90th session, Geneva.

ILO, (2002e) evaluation report combating child labour through education and training in Peshawar /Pakistan/.

ILO, Report (2006a). The role of employers' and workers' organizations in combating child labour. Geneva.

ILO (2006b). Emerging Good Practice on Action to Combat Child Domestic Labour, Geneva: universal copyright Convention,

ILO, (2007). The world wide movement against child labour Report, progress and further direction.

Jayaraj D. and Subramanian, (1997). *Child labour in Tamilradu: A preliminary Account of its nature, extent and distribution*". Working Paper No. 151. Madras Institute of Development Studies, Chennai.

Jensen p. and Nielson, s. (1997). *child labour and school attendance Evidence from Zambia*. Journal of population economics. London: oxford university press.

KURET (2005). Country Report, Baseline Study and Situational Analysis of Child Labour and Education in HIV/AIDS affected communities in Ethiopia. daystar consults International.

KURET, Report from April. (2007). - September. (2007).

KURET,(2005) final report base line study and situation analysis of child labour and education in HIV/AIDS affected communities in Ethiopia.

Lavallette, (1999) Child Labour in Britain in the Nineteenth and Twentieth cemeteries
Liverpool: University Press.

Liner (1976). Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries Liverpool: university press.

Michael Kelly (1999). "The Impact of HIV/AIDS in Schooling in Zambia". In Jesuit center for Technology.

Mendelievich's (1979). Child Labour. International Labour Review 118 (5), pp. 557-568.

MoFED, Ethiopia: Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Program. SDPRP, Addis Ababa, January (2005).

MoLSA, (2005-2010 and beyond) Ethiopia's, National Plan of Action for Children, Addis Ababa.

MOLSA (1997). "Directives to Determine the List of Activities Prohibited to Young Workers" Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Patrinos and Psacharopoulos, (1997). *Family Size, Schooling and Child Labour in Peru: An Empirical Analysis*. Journal of Population Economics 10 (4), pp. 387- 405.

Psacharopoulos, G. (1997). *Child Labour versus Educational Attainment: Some Evidences from Latin America*. *Journal of Population Economics* 10 (4), pp. 377–86.

Psacharopoulos, (1999). The Opportunity Cost of Child Labor are Vies of the Benefits of Education Bureau of International Labor Affairs. Geneva: ILO.

Ravallion and Wodon, (1999). *Does Child Labour Displace Schooling? Evidence on Behavioral Responses to an Enrolment Subsidy*. World Bank Working Paper 2116. Washington D.C.

Rodgers and Standing, (1981) *Child Work, Poverty and under development*, Geneva: ILO.

UCW (2007). *Child Labour and Youth Employment: Ethiopian country study*. Ethiopia: An Inter Agency Research Cooperation Project.

UNICEF (1997). *The State of World children*. London: Oxford University Press.

UNICEF, (1986). Report, CRP.3, *Exploitation of Working Children and Street Children*. New York.

UNICEF, (2001). Report on the state of world Children. London: Oxford University. November 7 New York.

UNICEF, (2003). *Working Paper*. New York.

UNICEF, (2002-2005). *Medium-term strategic plan for the period* UN Doc. E/ICEF/2001/13.

UNICEF, (2005). *Education as a preventive strategy against child labour: Evaluation of the Cornerstone programs of UNICEF's global child labour programs*.

World Vision Ethiopia, (2005). central branch office guraghe ADP, KURET, initiative Grant project annual report.

World Vision Ethiopia, (1999). Guraga ADP, KURET project six month Progress report.

Zebenay Atnafu, (1998). Child Labor in Urban Informal Sector. Addis Ababa.

Zerihun Gezahagn, (2004). The Situation of Child Labor in Ethiopia: With Emphasis Made to the Worst forms. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

APPENDIX 1

Respondents Profile

The Profile of Participants on Interview

No	Occupational category	Sex	Education Level	Working Organization
1	Education department head	Male	Degree	KURET national office
2	Project facilitator	Male	Diploma	KURET Gurage ADP
3	Yekemene School Director	Male	Diploma	Yekemene
4	Agena School Director	Male	Diploma	Agena
5	Yehaweneye school vice director	Male	Diploma	Yeheweneye

The Profile of Participants on Focus Group Discussions

No	Category	Sex	Education	Organization
1	Labour and social affairs representative	Male	Diploma	Governmental organization
2	Education Bureau Planning department area	Male	Degree	Governmental organization
3	Woreda Agricultural	Male	Diploma	Governmental

	office representative			organization
4	Woreda women officers representative	Female	Diploma	Governmental organization
5	Woreda Youth and Sport Affairs	Male	Diploma	Governmental organization
6	Woreda Health Office Representative	Male	Diploma	Governmental organization
7	Financial and Economic Office Representative	Female	Diploma	Governmental organization
8	Woreda Child Right Committee	Male	Diploma	Governmental organization
9	Community representative	Male	Grade 12	Governmental organization
10	Project Facilitator	Male	Diploma	NGO

APPENDIX 2

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION AND INTERVIEW GUIDES

1. What are the types and levels of intervention undertaken by KURET project in Ezea Woreda?
2. How was the working condition of beneficiary students before and after the intervention?
3. What are the improvements that could have seen due to the project intervention?
4. What is your opinion towards the support of the project provided to the targeted children?
5. What are the types of support the project provided to its targeted children?
6. Does the project included training for teachers?
7. How do you explain school readiness program?
8. What is your comment on the project intervention for further improvements?

APPENDIX 3

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERISYT
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
INSTITUET OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH**

The purpose of this Questionnaire is to collect information on the impact of KURET project intervention. The information to be collected through the questionnaire will be use only for research purposes either for, kindly request you to provide genuine information for it highly determines the success of the study. For each of the questions, you are requested to indicate according to the directions.

PART ONE Personal Data

1.1 Male

Female

1.2 Age _____

1.3 Grade _____

1.4 Name of the School _____

PART TWO:

Instruction: there are 15 Questions listed below. There fore, you are sincerely requested to show how you feel about each statement by putting “√” mark only in one of the given choices.

1. Which type of work usually performed by children’s before intervention?

a) Normal Child Work

b) Child Labour

c) Worst form of Child Labour

2. How much time were you spending per day in labour before the intervention?

a. 1-3 hours

b. 4-6 hours

c. 7-9 hours

d. 10-12 hours

3. Which type of work usually performed by children’s after intervention?

- a. Normal Child Work
- b. Child Labour
- c. Worst form of Child Labour

4. How much time were you spending per day in labour after the intervention?

- a. 1-3 hours
- b. 4-6 hours
- c. 7-9 hours
- d. 10-12 hours

5. In which areas does the project give you support?

- a) School fee
- b) Financial support
- c) Nutrition support
- d) Uniform
- e) Educational materials
- f) Livelihood support for my family

6. Is the project support comprehensive in its approach?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) No response

7. Is the project support regular?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) No response

8. Is there a link between your education and KURET Support?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) No response

9. Do you think the project support contribute in child labour reduction?

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) No response

10. Do you think that KURET project support is sufficient?

a) Yes b) No c) No response

11. Does the Support of KURET project meet your needs?

a) Yes b) No c) No response

12. At what level the project intervention implemented?

a) Child level c) Family level

b) Community level d) government level

13. Do you think that the support of the project is useful in saving time for your study?

a) Yes b) No c) No response

14. Does the project provide all learning materials and necessary tools for your education?

a) Yes b) No c) No response

15. Do you believe that the project support enables you perform better in your education

a) Yes b) No c) No response

APPENDIX 4

1.1

1.2

1.3

1.4

/

15

/ /

“√”

/ /

1.

/ / ?

/

/

/

2.

/ / ?

/

1-3

/

4-6

/

7-9

/

10-12

3.

/ / ?

/
/
/

4. / ?

/ 1-3
/ 4-6
/ 7-9
/ 10-12

5. ?

6. / /?

7. / / ?

8. ?

9. / /?

10. / /?

11. k / /

/ /

12.

13.

()?

14.

? / / / /

15.

/ /? / / / /

APPENDIX 5

AGENA BENEFICIARY STUDENTS AVERAGE SCORE

School Name	No	Students Name	Average Score of 2006	Average Score of 2007	Cumulative Average score
	1	desu moshe	54.40	51.50	52.60
	2	henoke nura	48.10	58.40	53.50
	3	anebezache bereta	44.30	52.50	48.10
	4	keberu bade	48.50	48.50	48.50
	5	asechaleche kasa	44.00	45.30	44.50

Agena	6	tamerate tadele	41.80	48.00	44.50
	7	tegesete sahela	47.10	46.10	45.40
	8	mesefene fekade	49.00	53.30	51.00
	9	aberehame berehanu	42.40	46.10	43.60
	10	tsegaye berehanu	39.20	47.80	43.30
	11	Teshome tadese	60.20	59.30	59.50
	12	netsanete tadele	57.80	59.60	58.50
	13	mezamede goraga	55.50	58.20	56.60
	14	tezeta dejeny	49.20	39.20	43.80
	15	weyenesete tekela	59.00	53.00	55.80
	16	anebezache bereta	53.80	54.80	54.30
	17	zereechi furegne	48.10	58.40	53.50
	18	baneshebi barega	44.30	52.50	48.10
	19	Zeyeneba sedefu	80.30	59.10	54.50
	20	tezeta teni	53.10	55.50	54.60
	21	eshetu gerema	50.80	57.50	54.10
	22	tateku jemale	48.70	57.20	52.60
	23	mesekereme zerega	59.50	60.20	59.60
	24	hawi melese	53.50	54.50	53.80
	25	netsanete zerega	54.50	60.10	58.00
	26	desu moshe	45.20	53.40	50.20
	27	keberu bade	49.00	53.30	51.00
	28	denewereke barega	66.00	66.21	66.00

APPENDIX 6

AGENA NON BENEFICIARY STUDENTS AVERAGE SCORE

School Name	No	Students Name	Average Score of 2006	Average Score of 2007	Cumulative Average score
	1	habetamu temerega	53.80	75.40	64.60
	2	hayatu abedi	64.70	79.70	72.20
	3	hanoke denedere	81.60	75.60	78.60
	4	haradine tesame	68.70	79.20	73.95
	5	lidiya sahela	85.50	93.30	89.40

Agena	6	mesekereme G.yohanese	58.70	76.50	67.60
	7	marone kenera	77.00	80.20	78.60
	8	`adonabba abeba	56.40	84.50	70.45
	9	aberehame berehanu	66.60	85.60	76.10
	10	ebadoneshe mulugata	50.70	61.50	56.10
	11	aberehame mechale	63.50	88.20	75.85
	12	abba zerega	60.90	82.60	71.75
	13	abebeche dula	55.00	83.20	69.10
	14	abedere krime nura	77.50	94.10	85.80
	15	hana kefu	69.00	70.00	69.50
	16	lekeneshe adebebe	61.00	79.00	70.00
	17	melaku mechale	79.00	91.00	85.00
	18	abeba zerega	75.00	80.00	77.50
	19	metagese bireda	87.00	87.00	87.00
	20	mekedese aga	74.00	77.00	75.50
	21	mekedese agefe	69.00	77.00	73.00
	22	mechale weleda	57.80	71.00	64.10
	23	lahemetu mesa	55.40	69.00	62.20
	24	melaku mechale	70.00	85.70	77.85
	25	mesefene asefawe	82.70	80.50	.
	26	kalekidane hayela	72.10	73.20	81.60
	27	chreamelake gerema	75.70	77.00	76.35
	28	kebede tadese	90.00	88.50	89.52

APPENDIX 7

YEKEMENE BENEFICIARY STUDENTS AVARAGE SCORE

School Name	No	Students Name	Average Score of 2006	Average Score of 2007	Cumulative Average score
	1	hameza abedo	65.10	49.40	57.25
	2	metagese gebera	80.50	63.44	71.97
	3	tekekele kebatu	86.40	86.60	86.50
	4	jelalu abederesamede	68.00	49.60	58.80
	5	murade jemale	53.00	46.00	49.50

Yekemene	6	shemisu kilefa	61.00	61.00	61.00
	7	tesefaya batemariame	59.20	58.00	58.60
	8	telahune desealegne	62.00	61.00	61.50
	9	wenedu sebesebe	58.00	59.00	58.50
	10	dereshaye gamini	54.60	52.80	53.20
	11	zanaye yerega	56.00	58.00	57.00
	12	ashenafi alemu	68.40	65.60	67.00
	13	Telaye meka	68.00	67.00	67.50
	14	tesefaye habeta	70.90	42.70	56.80
	15	telahune habeta	69.00	68.00	68.50
	16	telahune keberu	67.00	58.00	62.50
	17	dereshaye zeweda	59.00	58.00	58.50
	18	metiku shewaleme	58.00	58.00	57.00
	19	murade akemele	60.00	80.40	60.20
	20	deseta feleke	61.00	59.00	60.00
	21	kedesete tsebelu	58.00	52.00	55.00
	22	beleteche keresawi	56.00	58.00	57.00
	23	leyela mehamede	62.00	63.00	62.50
	24	siti reshade	58.00	59.00	58.50

APPENDIX 8

YEKEMENE NON BENEFICIARY STUDENTS AVERAGE SCORE

School Name	No	Students Name	Average Score of 2006	Average Score of 2007	Cumulative Average score
	1	kelemuwa tesema	61.60	56.00	58.80
	2	tena sareya	83.10	70.00	76.55
	3	ferawe kefa	62.20	78.80	70.50
	4	abedereselame shekure	90.10	88.80	89.45
	5	werekotawi tehelewa	55.10	54.50	54.80

Yekemene	6	abayeneshe feker	54.00	55.50	54.75
	7	teramede fekede	54.00	55.00	54.50
	8	gatu rega	57.00	55.50	56.25
	9	tegesete shewaseko	56.00	55.40	55.70
	10	elefeneshe mogora	69.20	53.70	61.45
	11	Tsehay male	60.40	56.00	58.20
	12	tenaye badanega	60.00	58.00	59.00
	13	feseha menegesete	71.00	53.60	62.30
	14	netsanete kefa	80.00	88.50	84.25
	15	selemone tsebelu	70.00	69.60	69.80
	16	tarekegne menuta	82.70	78.10	80.40
	17	baretemane meta	76.00	65.40	70.70
	18	zemachu selani	65.50	52.00	58.75
	19	meserete tademu	56.00	54.00	55.00
	20	chalewe taja	70.00	66.00	68.00
	21	belachewe sebani	70.20	95.50	62.85
	22	keberu gerema	54.00	53.00	53.50
	23	netsanete gibe	56.40	54.50	55.45
	24	gerume weleda	63.44	57.00	60.22

APPENDIX 9

YENERESE BENEFICIARY STUDENTS AVERAGE SCORE

School Name	No	Students Name	Average Score of 98	Average Score of 99	Cumulative Average score
	1	kamile awele	62.40	65.20	63.80
	2	suliyman shemesu	59.10	62.30	60.70
	3	mehamede arebo	63.06	59.30	61.18
	4	alias mehamede	82.70	86.30	84.50
	5	nurehasen mehamede	63.90	65.30	64.60

Yeneberese	6	cheramelake mulugata	90.30	86.20	88.25
	7	mekebebe gebera	58.20	60.80	59.50
	8	tarikku haila	59.00	59.20	59.10
	9	yabonehe tezazu	58.00	60.60	59.30
	10	tegesetu shewarega	63.70	66.30	65.00
	11	hamedu kdere	54.00	55.00	54.50
	12	dseta enedshi	51.50	53.50	52.50
	13	13.00	54.20	56.60	55.25
	14	asema jmale	56.10	58.90	57.50
	15	lakeche yesherega	63.60	65.40	64.50
	16	mekedese geza	61.10	57.40	59.55
	17	zeyeneba jemale	52.50	53.00	52.75
	18	sisewereke tadele	52.80	53.60	53.20
	19	kedija nuredine	55.30	55.10	55.20
20	selame gebera	69.90	70.10	70.00	

APPENDIX 10

YENEBERESE NON BENEFICIARY STUDENTS AVERAGE SCORE

School Name	No	Students Name	Average Score of 2006	Average Score of 2007	Cumulative Average score
	1	anedu zebera	54.90	47.50	51.20
	2	belaye bereta	45.60	50.90	48.25
	3	keremu ahemedine	47.80	51.50	49.65
	4	seyefu alemu	41.30	42.00	41.65

Yeneberese	5	menure akemele	57.60	58.00	57.80
	6	raweda amine	54.16	45.94	50.05
	7	leyela yasine	45.00	51.38	48.19
	8	maregeneshe tsegaya	42.40	50.70	46.55
	9	meqedese baneshebi	47.60	48.00	47.80
	10	abedereheye sani	53.60	54.16	53.88
	11	melekamu tenekere	55.70	59.00	57.35
	12	fekerete asefa	50.08	42.50	46.25
	13	meserete mara	52.22	46.00	49.11
	14	zenebeche weleda	55.30	55.30	55.30
	15	cheru kenefe	55.20	55.20	55.20
	16	meweleda wereku	65.10	64.10	64.60
	17	kenezeneshe jemale	55.30	55.50	55.40
	18	ageze badae	54.00	52.20	53.10
	19	baretaema weleda	84.10	75.60	79.85
	20	melaku tesema	48.10	52.00	50.05

APPENDIX 11

ZEGEBABOTO BENEFICIARY STUDENTS AVERAGE SCORE

School Name	No	Students Name	Average Score of 2006	Average Score of 2007	Cumulative Average score
Zegebaboto	1	anedeamelake yerega	62.70	53.70	58.20
	2	kedesete tekela	62.70	62.10	62.50
	3	demelashe habeta	78.90	71.70	75.30
	4	yeregaleme shume	57.70	49.90	53.80
	5	dagnachewe danecheza	72.40	66.20	69.20

	6	adenewe neri	73.80	76.00	74.90
	7	tegesete demese	54.40	54.20	54.30

APPENDIX 12

ZEGEBABOTO NON BENEFICIARY STUDENTS AVERAGE SCORE

School Name	No	Students Name	Average Score of 2006	Average Score of 2007	Cumulative Average score
Zegebaboto	1	anedeamelake menegesetu	85.20	81.60	83.40
	2	msekereme gatachewe	63.50	60.10	61.80
	3	tegesete foneza	53.40	44.10	48.80
	4	dawite beza	57.00	56.30	56.70
	5	mesa nureya	57.70	53.40	55.60
	6	serani bireda	57.60	57.40	57.50
	7	hamedu shifa	59.70	60.20	60.00

APPENDIX 13

YEHEWENEYE BENEFICIARY STUDENTS AVERAGE SCORE

School Name	No	Students Name	Average Score of 2006	Average Score of 2007	Cumulative Average score
	1	Abaymesh Amede Hayle	59.30	60.40	59.80
	2	Banebata Yebero Denekeshe	52.10	51.00	51.50
	3	Afeyawreke Gezachew	48.70	46.30	47.50

Yeheweneye	4	Hayatu Wujera	67.90	70.20	69.05
	5	Jemale Kedere	53.30	56.20	55.75
	6	Enedale Kedere	81.80	89.01	84.90
	7	Werekeneshe Nuredine	51.90	49.20	50.55
	8	Gete Tsegaye	49.70	45.40	47.55
	9	Korema Kasa Mani	62.30	59.40	60.80
	10	Asenakech Fekadu Aragawe	52.20	58.30	56.70
	11	Mamushe Tesema	63.20	66.70	64.90
	12	Desu Shekure	56.90	57.00	56.90
	13	Aseter Neserane	50.20	49.70	49.95
	14	Fkedu Tesema	67.20	69.03	68.11
	15	Mikael Bekele	57.80	56.30	57.05
	16	Kebebu Asefa	63.70	67.20	65.40
	17	Meserte Denechesa	55.60	52.80	54.20
	18	Lakech sehani	54.30	56.10	55.20
	19	Getu Sbani	51.10	50.30	51.20
	20	Demese Sebani	59.80	63.70	61.70
	21	Deseta Moshe	48.10	46.00	67.05
	22	Teka Keberu	71.20	63.70	67.45
	23	Mesekereme Alemu	49.30	49.80	49.55
	24	Mareyame Moshe	60.00	64.00	62.00
	25	Hayelu Wereku	.	62.70	62.70
	26	Asechalewe Shume	49.30	56.20	52.75
	27	Gezachewe Asefa	48.70	52.40	50.55
	28	Aberehame Alemu	.	63.20	.
	29	Sofia Jemale	63.20	66.60	64.90
	30	Kebede Asefa	59.80	60.80	60.30
	31	Demekeche Asefa	52.00	51.10	50.55
	32	Kedesete Beru	58.30	59.70	59.00

APPENDIX 14

YHEWENEYE NON BENEFICIARY STUDENTS AVERAGE SCORE

School Name	No	Students Name	Average Score of 2006	Average Score of 2007	Cumulative Average score
	1	Hamedu Jemale	62.90	60.40	61.65
	2	Hyelu Fekede	55.30	53.20	54.25
	3	Hikema Reda	50.30	49.20	49.60
	4	Muhaba Abedo	61.30	55.70	58.50
	5	Melaku Shuma	76.90	79.50	78.20

Yeheweneye	6	Mesekereme Sarehe	61.80	63.40	62.60
	7	Mechale Berehanu	73.01	70.90	71.95
	8	Mechale Kasa	51.00	48.70	49.85
	9	Menure Mejibe	63.10	64.00	63.55
	10	Menegesetu Gebere	82.90	83.50	83.20
	11	Murawereke Gebere	48.70	45.90	47.30
	12	Murade Neberu	69.05	66.60	67.80
	13	Mareyame Foneza	39.10	38.00	38.50
	14	Semere Kefetewe	58.70	59.20	58.95
	15	Mulugeta Sahela	46.10	44.00	45.05
	16	Senu Mujera	49.80	55.70	52.75
	17	Syfe Ahemede	69.40	75.30	72.35
	18	Sefa Lema	58.70	52.30	55.50
	19	Sulaymane Mubareke	93.80	90.40	92.10
	20	Senetayehu Gebera	47.00	43.00	45.00
	21	Reshid Hasen	72.60	75.50	74.05
	22	Rahemete Shufa	60.90	64.30	62.60
	23	Raziku Kemale	50.90	48.20	49.50
	24	Remedane Kedere	70.20	69.30	69.75
	25	Shuwalme Abeza	53.90	57.40	55.65
	26	Shemelese Telahune	52.70	55.80	54.25
	27	Kelemuwa Habeta	48.00	44.50	46.25
	28	Behereyate Nuredane	59.30	50.40	54.48
	29	Bekele Yerega	71.90	65.40	68.60
	30	Bekele Degefe	45.60	53.60	49.60
	31	Belatu Degefe	58.01	59.00	58.50
	32	Beretukan Bureheda	63.70	62.30	63.00

APPENDIX 16

KURET Project Criteria for recruiting the children

As indicated in the profile of the organization KURET project has been used the following criteria to select target children. Children who qualify for KURET direct support are, Children aged 5-17 (not yet 18), age should be verified, Children living in highly HIV/AIDS affected areas (but not all of these children are at risk of WFCL, there is a need to take the other stated criteria in to consideration), Children removed from the WFCL (either another organization has removed them or we remove them).

In addition, Children at risk of entering in the WFCL, these are Children who are heads of households, whose siblings are engaged in WFCL, Children living with head of households who are elderly or who have no means of subsistence, Children who attend school irregularly because they have to work, Children who have dropped out of school, or never went to school and are now involved in petty work, Child mothers and their children, Orphans (especially those who have lost the breadwinner), Formerly abducted children and OVC (Orphan & Vulnerable Children), customized to the ADP priority targeting.

Furthermore, Children below 18 years of age who have lost a mother, a father or both parents to any cause. Children whose parents are chronically ill (especially the breadwinner, Children living in households that have taken in orphans and other children the community identifies as vulnerable, one critical criterion being the poverty level of the household.

As noted in the project profile in the above, various project activities that have been carried out by this organization appear to have had significant impact on beneficiaries. However, using this information as a background this study investigates the impact of the project interventions in the light of child labour reduction and promotion of educational activities.