

What Makes People Choose "Child Labour"¹ in Indochina Countries?: The Effect of Subjective Indexes-

Semura Kaori²

Summary

This paper will analyze the determinants of 'child labour' with the Asia Barometer data-set, focusing on the respondents' subjective evaluation of the social welfare system and the education (system) as variables. The data used in this analysis is that of three Indochinese countries in the 2004 survey, and the method of analysis used is a Binary Logistic Regression. As the result of analysis, in Laos and Cambodia the significant influence of the subjective evaluation is observed, but in Vietnam, any influence of those indexes are not observed. Addition to this, there is more influence of subjective evaluation of the social welfare than that of education. However, 'serious worry' that is one index used as the subjective evaluation of the social welfare system has the negative effect, and this result seems to be related to the thought about the future.

Key word: Child Labour, the evaluation of the social institutions, Indochinese countries

1. Introduction

After the Second World War, international society has tackled many problems, including child labour³. In spite of the great effort of many actors and a decline tendency in the global child labour figures, but according to the ILO⁴, in 2008 there are still 215 million child labourers in the world.

What makes people send their own child(ren) out to work?⁵ It is the purpose of this paper to answer this question through the analysis of Asia Barometer data. It is very interesting that every year (from 2003 to 2008) questionnaires of Asia Barometer include one question related to the

¹ This paper does not analyze child labour in strict sense of the word.

² Ph.D Candidate (the Graduated school of Arts and Sciences, University of Tokyo, Japan),
Research fellow (The Japan Society for Promotion of Sciences)

³ However child labour is not the problems only after Second World War.

⁴ <http://www.ilo.org/ipec/lang--en/index.htm>

⁵ There is also the possibility that children go to work by their own will, but this paper does not deal with these case, because of the limitation of data.

problem of child labour, which is “If the main breadwinner of your household should die or became unable to work due to illness, how your household would maintain the household budget?”⁶. This question does not inquire directly about child labour and this question may also be asking the idea about how to deal with the risk in life or the relation between private support and public support. However this question has nine or ten possible answers, and one of them is “Would send one or more of the children out to work”, enabling us to understand the attitude of respondents about sending children out for work in the event of a household’ crisis. The result of this question in the survey 2004⁷ is shown bellow in Table 1.

	Another adult member of the family would become the main breadwinner	Would send one or more of the children out to work	Would get support from relatives	Would get support from neighbors	Would get social welfare payments	Depend on retirement allowance	Have an insurance policy to cover such a situation
Cambodia	75.0%	73.8%	25.6%	5.7%	4.0%	9.2%	8.0%
Laos	71.3%	71.5%	35.6%	3.7%	7.5%	1.9%	5.8%
Myanmar	79.5%	70.5%	23.9%	6.8%	4.5%	3.9%	3.7%
Indonesia	66.3%	60.7%	23.3%	4.0%	4.7%	9.2%	8.8%
Philippines	53.0%	39.8%	22.4%	2.2%	39.9%	12.9%	22.3%
Vietnam	54.6%	38.4%	15.3%	4.9%	4.9%	6.8%	22.8%
Brunei	65.3%	29.2%	23.8%	5.6%	28.0%	5.1%	7.1%
Malaysia	54.9%	27.1%	24.6%	9.7%	11.7%	10.6%	23.1%
Thailand	50.0%	24.6%	42.9%	5.5%	20.6%	10.7%	23.8%
China	74.5%	23.5%	26.0%	10.4%	25.4%	12.7%	17.8%
Singapore	62.5%	12.8%	17.2%	1.9%	18.5%	7.7%	32.8%
Japan	71.2%	6.6%	8.7%	1.0%	30.3%	10.3%	39.8%
South Korea	79.7%	4.0%	10.9%	3.6%	12.8%	10.0%	53.2%

Table 1 Results of Question 14 (2004)

The frequency of the answers varies considerable by country, but among seven choices⁸, the difference of the choice of sending children out to work is the biggest, from 73.8% in Cambodia to 4.0% in South Korea. Additionally, compared to countries in East Asia, the percentage of Southeast Asian Countries is relatively high, especially in Indochinese countries (Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam).

Aside from the above results, according to a report by UNICEF published in 2011, the percentage of child labour in Cambodia is 45%, in Laos is 11% and in Vietnam is 16%⁹. Furthermore,

⁶ This is Q.14 for 2003, 2004 and Q15 for 2005, Q.16 for 2006, Q.17 for 2007, Q.18 for 2008.

⁷ This question is asked in every year, but because most countries in Southeast Asia are famous with child labour or street children and the survey 2004 focused on that region, so here we would like to pick up the result of 2004. For reference, the result of the survey 2006 and 2007 is also similar with this result.

⁸ This table does not include 2 choices, “other” and “Don’t know”.

⁹ The definition of child labour of data is different from definition of the ILO.

Cambodia is one of the SIMPOC¹⁰ target countries, which is the program that the ILO organized to monitor the situation of child labour and this means Cambodia is one of the countries that situation of child labour is relatively serious and merits pay attention. On top of that, in Vietnam the problem of street children was very serious especially in 1990's and 2000's (Yoshii[2009], Kuroda[1997]) and in Laos as well¹¹. So, this research will take Indochinese countries as the subject of analysis, using Asia Barometer data on the theme of child labour.

On the analysis, many previous researches focus on the objective determinants, which is observed as background information, like household income or expenditure per capita, family assets, educational background of the parents, and the language used in the family. However it is unnatural that the subjective indexes are not taken into consideration as the determinants of child labour, because sending child out to work is usually a consequence of decision making, usually on the part of parent, so this surely related with the parent's way of thinking, the sense of values or the evaluation of the social institutions related to child labour, such as education or social welfare. Therefore, the analysis in this paper adds subjective indexes to test the possibility of their influence on child labour and the result will offer some suggestions for the future studies about child labour.

2. Literature Review

2.1 The definition of Child Labour

Who are the child labourers? – This question looks like very easy but it is difficult to answer, because there are the conflicting definitions of child labour, which is very confusing. Firstly, the ILO defines child labour in following way:

“The term “child labour” is often defined as work that deprives children of their childhood, their potential and their dignity, and that is harmful to physical and mental development. It refers to work that is mentally, physically, socially or morally dangerous and harmful to children; and interferes with their schooling by: depriving them of the opportunity to attend school; obliging them to leave school prematurely; or requiring them to attempt to combine school attendance with excessively long and heavy work (ILO[2004])”.

In this definition, the ILO distinguish child labour from children's work and whether that is child labour or not depends on the nature or the details of work in which children are involved. However, this is relatively new definition and prior to this, child labour was usually defined by two conventions of the ILO regarding child labour: is the C138 Minimum Age Convention (1973) and

¹⁰ SIMPOC = the Statistical Information and Monitoring Programme on Child Labour

¹¹ <http://sva.or.jp/index.html> Shanti Volunteer Association (NGO)

the C182 Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention (1999)¹². Under this definition child labour is:

- (a) All economic activity done by children until age 11
- (b) All economic activity done by children aged 12 to 14, excluding permitted 'light work' in sense of Convention 138
- (c) All economic activity carried out under hazardous conditions by children aged 15 to 17
- (d) 'The worst forms' of child labour carried out under age 18
(OECD [2003:14])

However, as the ILO [2004] and the OECD[2005] have pointed out, mainly because of statistical reasons many surveys include children's activity wider than these definitions. For example, every year the UNICEF publishes a report about the state of children in the world and there is data about child labour in the report but the definition of the statistics is as follow;

"Children are considered to be involved in child labour under the following conditions:

- (a) children 5-11 years old who, during the week preceding the survey, did at least 1 hour of economic activity or at least 28 hours of household chores
- (b) children 12-14 years old who, during the week preceding the survey, did at least 14 hours of economic activity or at least 28 hours of household chores."

(UNICEF [2011])

Thus, the definition of child labour is not unified even within the UN. Furthermore, the statistical surveys of each country do not always follow these guidelines, though they are sometimes conducted under the original definition. Because of the statistical situation (or the limitations of data), most of literature which tries to analyze child labour through statistical data also are not fully careful about the definition; for example, some literatures regards every working children as a child labour (ex. Sasaki[2002], Patrinos&Psacharopoulos[1997], Ballescás[1991]). Therefore, when referring to child labour studies, care must be paid the problem of conflicting the definitions about child labour before discussing the further specific points.

2.2 Child Labour studies

Apart from this problem, there is a vast amount of literature about child labour; the oldest examples are from the 18th century because it was during the Industrial Revolution that child labour was firstly regarded as a social problem. The main purpose of those literatures was to try to

¹² You can get the contents of these conventions on the website of the ILO (<http://www.ilo.org/>)

understand the situation of child labour, such as details of jobs, working hours and wages, and find the determinants, both demanding and supplying side, to make the policy to eliminate child labour and to protect and care for children and to promote children's schooling.

Then, according to current literatures consider, what are considered the determinants of child labour? Of course, there are many determinants¹³ but many studies mention that poverty as the first determinant (Ballescás[1991:3]). For example, according to Nozaki & Abe[2007], the main reason children go to work in factories is economic hardship and this account for about 47% of their cases. Hatsuoka also mentions that poverty is the biggest factor leading to child labour (Hatsuoka[1997:35]). However, according to the OECD[2003], some literature shows that the relation between household poverty and child labour is weak or is not linear. Moreover, poverty is the important variable, but there is also the problem of how measure poverty to analyze its effect on the occurrence of child labour. About this point, in the current studies(especially quantitative studies), the household income or expenditure per capita, some kind of living standard indexes are used as the indicator of poverty¹⁴.

Additionally, the educational background of parents, especially the mother's, has negative effect on the occurrence of child labour (OECD[2003], Nozaki&Abe[2007])¹⁵ and the age of the head of household is also one of the determinants(Sasaki[2002]). Generally, the higher the educational background of the parents, the lower children's participation in labour and this is usually interpreted that parents with high educational background understand the value of education and they are supposed to try their children send school as long as possible (Nosaki&Abe[2007]). In addition, according to Sasaki[2002], the age of head of household has a negative effect on the occurrence of child labour. The age of head of household seems to be considered as the age of parents in his studies. However, he does not interpret how this determinant affects on the occurrence of child labour.

Furthermore, not mentioned by OECD[2003] but many literatures consider the number of children (or sibling) as the important determinant On the analysis about child labour in Philippine, Ballescás[1991] said "the supply of child labour is assisted by the parental sense of value that having many children is good" and according to Patrinos&Psacharopoulos[1997], number of siblings is important on child labour but in conjunction with their age and activities (schooling or not schooling). Furthermore, Fujino[1997] said that there is "child labour hypothesis" which the reason why many children in developing countries is the children's contribution for household budget as child labour, so she tested this hypothesis with the Census data of India and concluded the hypothesis is true. The result of her analysis, the relation of cause and effect is reverse to the analysis of Ballescás[1997] and

¹³ For example, globalization, industrial structures, the structure of labour market etc. are mentioned as the determinants of demanding side (Hatsuoka[1997], OECD[2003], Tani[2000]).

¹⁴ For example, Sasaki[2002] used the household expenditure per capita, Patrinos&Psacharopoulos [1997] used family income.

¹⁵ Sasaki[2002] uses the educational background of the head of household as the parental educational background in his analysis, but in his literature this variable is not significant.

Patrinós&Psacharopoulos[1997], so it is need to be careful but it is certain that the relation between number of children and child labour¹⁶.

Besides of this, there are still more determinants like the children's age, the gender, rural or urban, indigenous or not, language, parental jobs and so on. However, these determinants do not always have significant influence on the children's participation on labour, their effects vary according to countries, data and way of analysis. Therefore, there is not still complete consensus on the cause of child labour.

2.3 Critical Review

2.3.1 Lack of Institutional Perspective

The object of child labour studies is the child labour who are already on the labour and this is the social problem that we must to solve as early as possible, so it is certainly reasonable that the most literature try to make clear the situation of child labour or the determinants of child labour because the results of those study are the materials to make a policy to solve this problem. However we must draw attention to the lack of institutional perspective, especially the perspective about social welfare or safety net system. Of course some qualitative literatures mention the social welfare or child welfare on the context of care for children who are child labour (Tani[2000], Yoshii[2009]). But on the quantitative literatures, researchers behave as it were no institution like them. Certainly those systems often have not been fully prepared on many developing countries. However it is pretty curious that much of literature do not mention about those systems because whether useful or not most of country do have those systems.

Besides, some literatures about social welfare mention that the delay of policy about social service and social welfare make the solution of difficulties in the life of the social disadvantaged people difficult (Kuroda et.al.[2003]), so it is clear that social welfare is important to solve the difficulties of the social disadvantaged, surly including child labour. Therefore, there is need to include the institutional perspective on the analysis of determinants of child labour. Then here we can draw one hypothesis as follow;

H1: Index about social institutions have effects on the decision making about child labour.

2.3.2 Possibility of Subjective Index

One more important point is that most of determinants are objective index like household income, gender, educational background of parents and so on. But as you can imagine easily, every child with same background is not always participate in work. Whether child participate in work or

¹⁶ Some literature (ex. Sasaki[2002]) do not mention about number of children but mention about the family size.

not is usually on the decision of parents or family, so it is not strange that subjective determinants (like parent's value about child, work, family, for example) influence on such decision making. Of course, current child labour studies mainly deal with child labour which already occurs, so it seems no meaning to pay attention to the subjective index on the point of time of decision making. But this is not the reason we do not need to think about the relation between the occurrence of child labour and the sense of value or thought of parents¹⁷. Then, from this point, we can draw one more hypothesis as follow;

H2: In addition to the objective indexes, the subjective indexes also have effects on the decision making about child labour

Here, two hypotheses were drawn from the critical review, however the data will be used in the analysis of this paper is the data-set of Asia Barometer survey, which is unique and different from the data usually used in the analysis on the child labour studies. Therefore, it is not appropriate to apply these hypotheses immediately and there is need to control the hypothesis depending on the nature of data-set. After looking them in next chapter, hypothesis on this paper will be presented.

3. Date, Method and Hypothesis

3.1 Data used in Analysis

The analysis on this paper uses the data set of Asia Barometer 2004 survey, mainly because of the variable¹⁸. And 2004 survey includes about 13 countries but here we use the three Indochinese countries: Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. The case number is 800 in Vietnam and Laos, 812 in Cambodia.

3.2 The Mature of the Data and Hypothesis

3.2.1 The Nature of the AsiaBarometer Dataset

For the analysis of this paper, it is necessary to check the nature of the data-set itself and the nature of the question that this analysis will use as the dependent variables.

About the former nature, the questions of Asia Barometer survey are highly subjective or personal for the purpose of the international comparison, so there is no data about the social

¹⁷ These subjective indexes sometimes treat as the cultural determinants; for example 'the culture of poverty', 'the sense of value that working is the opportunity of socialization for children' etc.

¹⁸ As the determinant of child labour, the number of children is important, but that question only in the survey 2003, 2004, 2005 (However, the data in those years is also incomplete, because there is limitation on the age of children).

institution in each country, but there is data about the evaluation or the idea for those institutions. This thing looks like crucial to test the hypothesis (H1), however, excepting Japan and South Korea, the survey were conducted in the urban area (in most cases, conducted in big cities). Because of this, it seems that there are no significant differences about social institutions during respondents¹⁹. If there is difference, that is whether respondents think those institutions is useful/usable for themselves or not, or the evaluation of them.

Different from usual child labour studies, the analysis on this paper will not be conducted with the data of child labour. As already mentioned in the part of introduction, this paper will use question which ask the way to deal with the crisis of household budget in the future and focus on the choice of no.2. Therefore, there are some specific natures; firstly in strictly meaning this paper cannot analyze the child labour but the attitude toward the children's working in the case of household's crisis²⁰ and secondly, because this question takes the way of two multiple answer, the choice is affected by the other options in the question. In other words, respondents also have the other way to deal with the risk in household life, so the answers of respondents will be affected by the evaluation of those ways, especially their evaluation of the social welfare system in own society seems to have the strong effect. Thirdly, sending children out work related with the education for them, so it is natural to think that the choice of respondents would be affected by their evaluation of the education also.

3.2.2 The Hypothesis in This Paper

Because of the nature of the data-set (maybe this is also able to be expressed 'the limitation of data-set'), it is impossible to test the hypothesis H1 immediately and it is seems like not meaningful so much in this case. However, because of the nature of the question (q46), the evaluation of the social welfare system and the education seems to be the important variable. It is clear that the evaluation is the subjective index, and it is also undeniable that the social welfare system and the education is the part of social institutions. Then, it is possible to put H1 into this analysis by combine with the H2. This is an irregular way, but suitable with the data. Therefore, this paper sets the hypotheses of this analysis as follow;

H3-1: The evaluation of the social welfare system affects on the choice of 'child labour'.

H3-2: The evaluation of the education (system) affects the choice of 'child labour'²¹.

¹⁹ If the data include the rural data or if the plural countries are put into the analysis, the differences on the social institutions is much bigger and the analysis with those indexes would be more meaningful.

²⁰ Furthermore, as mentioned in former chapter, there is the problem about the definition of child labour and we cannot know how about the children's work is.

²¹ About H3-2, there is already the effect of the educational background of parents are considered as the index of the valuation about the education, but the correlation between the educational

It is likely with both hypotheses that the high evaluation has a negative effect on the choice of 'child labour'. However, as mentioned in the next section, there are a few kind of variable that is able to be used as the evaluation of the social welfare system / the education (system), and some variables are a little difficult to distinguish negative and positive. Because of this, the hypotheses are presented in a simplified form.

3.3 Dependent Variables and Statistical Method

Q49_2 (the second option of the question 14 in questionnaire of 2004 survey) are taken as the dependent variable. This variable is answered by binary way (Not Mentioned=0, Would=1), so the binary logistic regression would be choose to analyze the influence of each variables. The analysis will be conducted by countries and the each result will be compared.

3.4 Independent Variables

Independent variables we use are 'Poverty', 'Age of parent', 'Gender of parent', 'Educational background of parent', 'Number of children'. The question asks respondents the way to deal with the crisis of household budget and on that context the option 'sending child out to work', so in the analysis on this paper we consider the respondents as 'parent'. Therefore age, gender, educational background of respondents treats as those of parent in usual child labour studies. And the details of each variable are shown follow²²;

+ Poverty: Usually economic situation of household is used as this determinant, for example household income, household expenditure per capita, living standard. However on the cross country analysis, there are some difficulties on the usage of the direct index about income/expenditure because there is difference on the value of the amount of money each country. So this time we choose the living standard index (q39), for the convenience of comparison. But q39 is the subjective question about their own living standard, that's why we have to pay attention the results of analysis when we interpret them. And for the analysis, to the easier interpret we use recorded data (high=5 and low=1).

+ Gender: we will use the gender index (q273) recorded to the dummy variables (Male=0, Female=1).

background and the valuation on the education is sometime different from the usual, so using both variables is also meaningful to verify the effect of these determinants.

²² The number of each question is not the number on the questionnaire of the survey 2004 but the number on the integrated code-book.

+ Age: As this determinant, we will use the cohort data (q275).

+ Educational background: the questionnaire has asked educational background of respondents, but educational system of each country is different so we will use the variable recorded 3 groups (q276).

+ Number of children (number of siblings of child): Here we use the continuous variable of the number of children under 18 years old (q234). There is limitation about the age of children and this is a little problematic on the number of children of older respondents.

About these variables (background indexes), there are frequency distributions on the table2. Adding to them, we use the subjective indexes, that is the evaluation of social welfare system and the evaluation of education (system).

+Evaluation of social welfare: In the questionnaire, there are 2 questions which are able to consider as the valuation of social welfare. They are 'Degree of satisfaction about social welfare system (q33)' and 'Serious worry about social welfare system (q118_21)'. It is possible to consider both of them as the index indicate the evaluation, but if they are put into the analysis, there is a risk of making the interpretation difficult, because these two question ask the different things: 'worry' and 'satisfaction'. However, it is also possible to think these two idea separately (for example, 'worry' usually mentioned about something in future and 'satisfaction' usually mentioned about something already happen or now happening²³) and this analysis is the new attempt so it is difficult to estimate how these each idea make the effect on the dependent variables. Therefore, we will use both variables for the analysis in this paper. For the analysis, q33 was recorded to make easy the interpretation. (q33: very satisfied =5, Q118_21: worry =1)

+ Evaluation of education: Like the evaluation of the social welfare, we use 2 questions to show the evaluation of the education, that is 'Degree of satisfaction about education system (q28)'

²³ According to the dictionary, 'Worry' means 'to make somebody/yourself anxious about somebody/something' and 'anxiety' means 'the state feeling nervous or worried that something bad is going to happen', and 'Satisfaction' means 'the good feeling that you have when you have achieved something or when something that you wanted to happen does happen; something that gives you this feeling'. (Oxford advanced learner's Dictionary)

and 'Serious worry about education (q118_20)'. Furthermore, there is one more question about evaluation of education, that is, 'Trust on public education system (q151)'. In addition to 'satisfaction' and 'worry', 'trust' is also another idea, so if three of them put into, the result of the analysis maybe more difficult to interpret than social welfare, because it is pretty difficult to distinguish these three words, especially 'satisfaction' and 'trust'²⁴ is not same but similar.

However, only q151 asks about the public education system, not similar to other two questions, so there is a possibility that this variable has a different effect on the choice of the respondents. Therefore, this analysis tries to use 3 of variable on the analysis. For the analysis, q28 and q151 were recorded to make easy the interpretation. (q28: very satisfied =5, q151: trust a lot =4, q118_20: worry =1)

Then we use 5 variables as the subjective indexes. The frequency distributions of these indexes are shown on the Table 3 and Table 4.

3.5 Models

With these variables, we prepare 2 models as bellow;

Model 1: Background indexes

(living standard, age, gender, educational background, number of children under 18)

Model 2: Model 1 + subjective indexes (= the valuation of the social welfare/ education)

4. Result of Analysis and Discussion

4.1 Result of analysis

The results of analysis are shown in the Table 5. About model 1, three countries have a similar result, to be concrete, educational background and age has significant influence on the choice of 'child labour', the direction of influence is also same; age has a positive effect and educational background has a negative effect. However the direction of influence of age is different from the analysis of Sasaki[2002]. About the strength of influence varies from country to country. In Cambodia, the effect of the educational background is stronger than age, however in Vietnam and Laos the power relationship of these variables is reversed. Adding to this, in Laos the effect of educational background disappear with subjective indexes in model 2. The other variables like standard of living, number of children under 18 years old and gender are not significant in all three

²⁴ 'Trust the belief that somebody/something is good, sincere, honest, etc and will not try to harm or trick you.' (Oxford advanced learner's Dictionary)

	N	Standard of living					Educational background			Number of children(under 18)				gender	age group			
		high	relatively high	average	relatively low	low	high	middle	low	0	1	2	over 3	female	20's	30's	40's	50's
Vietnam	800	0.8	7.8	79.9	8.6	2.9	20.4	33.4	45.8	31.4	27.0	28.3	9.0	51.0	27.6	29.1	30.1	13.1
Laos	800	0.8	3.4	65.8	23.1	7.0	16.9	28.8	54.3	9.5	21.0	26.3	38.5	50.0	32.8	27.1	28.1	12.0
Cambodia	812	0.6	7.0	75.2	11.9	5.2	13.5	26.1	60.3	28.8	18.3	21.4	22.4	52.5	35.5	32.3	20.7	11.6
Ave. 2004 countries	10,685	2.1	8.7	73.1	12.1	3.6	24.3	38.3	37.4	27.1	23.5	21.5	18.4	51.8	29.5	29.5	25.5	15.5

Table 2 Descriptive statistics of Indochina countries and average of all countries (2004)_1 (%)

“Standard of living”= q39 , “ Educational background”= q276, “Number of children(under18)”= q234, “gender”= q273, “age group”= q275

	Satisfaction on social welfare system					Satisfaction on Education				
	very satisfied	somewhat satisfied	neither satisfied nor	somewhat dissatisfied	very dissatisfied	very satisfied	somewhat satisfied	neither satisfied nor	somewhat dissatisfied	very dissatisfied
Vietnam	11.5	20.1	51.8	7.6	2.6	28.6	26.9	37.1	6.5	0.9
Laos	6.5	53.1	22.4	9.9	2.9	11.9	45.3	15.9	24.0	2.9
Cambodia	6.8	29.1	33.3	21.7	7.6	19.3	25.0	34.7	16.3	4.6
Ave. 2004 countries	12.7	33.3	25.4	13.4	4.4	21.5	41.0	22.5	11.6	2.8

Table 3 Descriptive statistics of Indochina countries and average of all countries (2004)_2 (%)

“Satisfaction on social welfare system”= q33, “Satisfaction on Education”= q28

	serious worries on SW. system	serious worries on Education	Trust on public education system			
	worry	worry	trust a lot	trust to a degree	Don't really trust	Don't trust at all
Vietnam	13.6	42.8	45.0	41.3	11.8	1.1
Laos	11.1	39.3	42.4	45.1	12.0	0.4
Cambodia	15.3	42.9	26.4	49.9	19.2	3.8
Ave. 2004 countries	16.9	32.6	27.5	39.5	12.3	2.5

Table 4 Descriptive statistics of Indochina countries and average of all countries (2004)_3 (%)

“Serious worries on SW. system”= q118_21, “Serious worries on Education”= q118_20, “Trust on public education system”= q151

countries.

Interestingly the influence of subjective indexes in the model 2 is completely different among three countries. First of all, in Vietnam any significant influence of the evaluation of the social welfare system and education are not observed. Then in Cambodia, though there is no significant influence of the evaluation of the education, the serious worry on social welfare system has effect on the choice and the influence is stronger than the other significant variables, but the influence is negative. This means that the respondents who *do not* worry about social welfare system tend to choose 'child labour' to maintain their household budget in case of crisis. Compare to Vietnam and Cambodia, in Laos much more influence of the subjective indexes are observed. Both of the evaluation of social welfare system (satisfaction and worry) has significant influence, and the influence of the trust on public education system is also significant. The direction of influence of these three variables is negative. At a glance, these results seem to be contradictory but there is some point which we have to pay attention also, so we would like to discuss this problem in the next section.

In addition, about the power relationship between each variable which is significant on the model 2, in case of Cambodia, the serious worry on social welfare system has the strongest influence and the educational background has the second strongest effect on the choice. In case of Laos, it is same with Cambodia that the serious worry on social welfare system has the strongest influence, but the second is the age of respondents, then after that, the satisfaction on social welfare system and the trust on public education system follow. During five subjective indexes on the model 2, the significant indexes are mainly the evaluation of social welfare system and the evaluation of education is observed only in Laos (and only one index in three indexes prepared).

4.2 Discussion

Results got from the analysis are as mentioned former section, then here we would like to discuss about them. There are 4 points that should be discussed, so we take up them for discussion one by one.

First of all, we discuss the effect of age. The significant influence of age is observed in three countries and the direction of influence is positive, that is, the older respondents tend to choose 'child labour'. It is able to interpret this result by the two ways: the first way is to interpret by the generation gap and the second way is to interpret by the difference of the life stage. The first way means that during the childhood of the older respondents children's working is much more usual. The problem of child labour in each three countries is also remaining, but compare to before, the problem has been improved very much. So, the younger person may tend to avoid more strongly the way which sends children out to work to maintain their household budget. On the other hand, the second way of interpretation means that the question asks about 'your household' and then respondents maybe

	Cambodia				Laos				Vietnam			
	model 1		model 2		model 1		model 2		model 1		model 2	
	B	EXP(B)	B	EXP(B)	B	EXP(B)	B	EXP(B)	B	EXP(B)	B	EXP(B)
Standard of living	-0.102	0.903	-0.058	0.943	-0.131	0.877	-0.128	0.88	-0.002	0.998	0.046	1.047
Education background	-0.341	0.711***	-0.326	0.722**	-0.202	0.817*	-0.170	0.844	-0.283	0.753***	-0.240	0.787**
Number of children(under 18)	0.079	1.082	0.074	1.077	-0.028	0.973	-0.047	0.954	-0.062	0.94	-0.054	0.947
Gender (female=1)	0.282	1.325	0.304	1.355	-0.011	0.989	-0.034	0.966	-0.007	0.993	-0.060	0.942
Age group	0.210	1.234**	0.213	1.237**	0.267	1.306***	0.285	1.330***	0.454	1.575***	0.474	1.606***
Satisfaction on SW. system			0.137	1.147			-0.184	0.832*			-0.037	0.964
Satisfaction on Education			0.067	1.069			-0.118	0.889			-0.041	0.96
Trust on public education system			-0.012	0.988			-0.239	0.787*			0.168	1.183
Serious worries on Education			0.021	1.021			-0.069	0.933			0.240	1.271
Serious worries on SW. system			-0.405	0.667*			-0.532	0.587**			0.058	1.059
constant	1.224	3.402	0.528	1.695	1.154	3.172	3.042	20.95	-0.898	0.407	-1.552	0.212
N	812				800				800			
Psuedo-R ²	0.060		0.071		0.035		0.061		0.080		0.093	
Chi_square	30.799		35.612		18.649		31.217		46.48		50.61	
Degree of freedom	5		10		5		10		5		10	

Table 5 Binary Logistic Regression (Exp(B)= odds ratio)

*** = p<0.01, ** = p<0.05, * = p<0.1

assume their own family when asked this question. If so, because the older respondents have older children, it is easier than the younger respondents to choose the option no.2. With results of the further analysis about the other countries, it may be possible to clarify that these ways are true or not. However, on this time, we have to stop here.

The second is the point about the relation between the educational background and the evaluation of education. In Cambodia and Vietnam, on the both model the educational background is significant (negative) and on the model 2, any variables about the evaluation of the education do not have significant influence. On the other hand, in Laos, the educational background has significant positive effect on the model 1, but on the model 2 that influence disappears, and instead of that, the trust on public education system has significant influence (negative). As mentioned on the part of literature review, the negative effect of the educational background is usually understood as parents understand the value of education and evaluate education high. However according to the result of Laos, it is possible to think that the influence of the educational background is spurious in some cases, in other word, the influence of educational background should not always be considered as the indication of the evaluation of the education.

The third point is the problem about the influence of the evaluation of the social welfare system. In Cambodia and Laos, serious worry about social welfare system has the negative effect on the choice of child labour. This result means that respondents who do not worry about social welfare choose the 'child labour'. In addition to this, in Laos the satisfaction on social welfare system has the negative effect on the choice. Then, how do we interpret these results? The influence of the satisfaction on social welfare seems to be natural, but the problem is the influence of the worry. Because, 'worry' is not the positive word on the usual meaning and it is more natural that the serious worry on social welfare is positive. People usually worry about something if there is a bad point or an insufficiency. However, if we turn our attention to the difference between the meaning of 'worry' and the meaning of 'satisfaction/dissatisfaction', there is a hint to interpret results.

As a matter of course, 'worry' and 'satisfaction / dissatisfaction' is different from each other. 'Satisfaction / dissatisfaction' is the feeling to something in the present time (or sometime, in the past time), on the other hand, 'worry' is the feeling of an anxiety to something in the future. Therefore, when the people worry about something, the future is on their mind. Then, the serious worry on the social welfare system means that respondents think about their future life and evaluate the social welfare system low, so it is possible to say that respondents who do not worry about the social welfare system are the people who evaluate the social welfare system high or the people who do not think about their future life. It is difficult to think that respondents who evaluate the social welfare high choose their children sending out to work to maintain the household budget. Therefore, by the process of elimination, the negative effect of serious worries on the social welfare system means that respondents who do not worry about the social welfare system just care about life in present time and do not so much care about the future. However this is the one possibility of interpretation and there is no enough evidence to support this idea, so on this point further study is expected.

The last discussion point is the case of Vietnam, which any subjective indexes do not have significant influence. The case of Vietnam means that the respondent's choice of child labour does not relate with the differences of the evaluation of the social welfare or education, but only depends on the differences of the objective indexes, that is, young or old, high educated or no educated. Therefore, according to the case of Vietnam, current literatures which mainly used those variables are also reasonable in some countries. However, as this paper shows, in other cases like Cambodia and Laos there is a strong likelihood that the subjective indexes do have influence on the choice of child labour, so it is still necessary to pay attention to the subjective indexes.

5. Conclusion

As a result of analysis, the determinants lead the respondent's choice of the 'child labour' is different by country; the age and the educational background are significant in Vietnam, those two variables and the serious worry on the social welfare system is significant in Cambodia, and in Laos, the age, serious worry and satisfaction on the social welfare system, trust for the public education system is significant. These results are very interesting at some point. Firstly, there is no effect of the subjective indexes in some country, but there is certainly significant effect of them in other country. Secondly, the way of influence of the subjective indexes is different by country. Furthermore, the direction of the influence of one subjective index is different from usual estimation, so there is a need for further analysis about this point.

This analysis tries to adopt some subjective indexes into the model as the new attempt and according to the result, this attempt offers some suggestions on the child labour studies, but in the same time, the some problems also remain. As mentioned above, the results of analysis are different by country, but what is the factor of those differences? This analysis uses the data of Indochinese three countries, which is neighbor nations and at one time were the one colony of French, so these three countries often are considered as similar. Nevertheless, many differences are observed in this analysis and the differences are very difficult to explain, probably because the knowledge of the area study is necessary to make the detailed explanation. However, it is sure that this analysis offers something new view to the current child labour studies.

References

<Japanese>

バレスカス、M.R.P.、河口和也・森正美・大森なほ美・井手理紗子訳[1991]『フィリピンの子どもたちはなぜ働くのか：アジアの子どもの社会学』明石書店 (Ballescás, M.R.P., *Why do children in Philippine work? : Sociology about Children in Asia*)

藤野敦子[1997]『発展途上国の児童労働：子だくさんは結果なのか原因なのか』明石書店

(Fujino Atsuko, *Child Labour in Developing Countries: Is it the result or reason to have many children?*)

初岡昌一郎編[1997]『児童労働：廃絶に取り組む国際社会』日本評論社 (Hatsuoka Shoichiro eds., *Child Labour: International Society trying to eliminate them*)

黒田学[1997]「ベトナムにおける子どもの生活と福祉の課題：1995年ホーチミン市第8区不就学児家族の生活調査から」『岐阜大学地域科学部研究報告』第1号、pp.85-101 (Kuroda Manabu, “Children’s life and welfare issue in Vietnam: from the Family Life Survey(1995) for children not enrolling the public school on the 8th district of Hochiminh city”)

黒田学、向井啓二、津止正敏、藤本文朗編[2003]『胎動するベトナムの教育と福祉：ドイモイ政策下の障害者と家族の実態』文理閣 (Kuroda Manabu et als eds., *Social Welfare and Education in Vietnam : The Situation of The People with Disabilities and Their Family under The Renovation Policy*)

野崎明、阿部道子[2007]「タイにおける児童労働問題に関する理論的・実証的研究：製造業部門の児童労働を中心に」『東北学院大学経済学論集』第164号、pp.175-226 (Nozaki Akira, Abe Michiko, “A theoretical and empirical study about the problem of child labour in Thailand: the case of child labour on manufacturing industry”)

日本労働研究機構[2000]『「先進国」における児童労働（資料シリーズ no.99）』日本労働研究機構 (The Japan Institute of Labour, *Child Labour in ‘Developed Countries’*)

谷勝英[2000]『アジアの児童労働と貧困』ミネルヴァ書房 (Tani Katsuhide, *Child Labour and Poverty in Asia*)

佐々木勝[2002]「エクアドルにおける児童労働と学校教育参加決定の相互関係」『経済論集（関西大学）』第52巻第2号、pp.211-226 (Sasaki Masaru, “The relation between child labour and participation for school education in Ecuador”)

吉井美智子[2009]『立ち上がるベトナムの市民とNGO：ストリートチルドレンのケア活動から』明石書店 (Yoshii Michiko, *Vietnamese Citizen and NGO: from The Care Activity for Street Children*)

<English>

Basu, Kaushik[1999] “Child labor: Cause, Consequence, and Cure, with Remarks on International Labor Standards”, *Journal of Economic Literature*, no.37, pp.1083-1119

ILO[2010a] *Accelerating action against child labour - ILO Global report on child labour 2010(Report of the Director-General, International Labour Conference, 99th session, 2010)*, Geneva

ILO[2010b] *Global child labour developments: measuring trends from 2004 to 2008*, Geneva

ILO[2004] *Child Labour: A Textbook for University Students*, Geneva

OECD eds.[2003], *Combating Child Labour: A Review of Politics*, Paris (= OECD 編著、豊田英子 訳[2005]『世界の児童労働：実態と根絶のための取り組み』明石書店)

Patrinós, A.H. &Psacharopoulos,G.[1997] “Family size, schooling and child labour in Peru: An

empirical analysis”, *Journal of Population Economics*, no.10, pp.387-405

UNICEF[2011] *The state of the world’s children 2011 – Adolescence: An Age of Opportunity -* , New York