

University of Cape Town



CENTRE FOR
SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

**WHO DOES THE HOUSEWORK?
AN EXAMINATION OF SOUTH
AFRICAN CHILDREN'S
WORKING ROLES**

Rachel Bray

CSSR Working Paper No. 45

Published by the Centre for Social Science Research
University of Cape Town
2003

Copies of this publication may be obtained from:

The Administrative Officer
Centre for Social Science Research
University of Cape Town
Private Bag
Rondebosch, 7701
Tel: (021) 650 4656
Fax: (021) 650 4657
Email: kforbes@cssr.uct.ac.za

Price in Southern Africa (incl. VAT and postage): R 15.00

or it can be downloaded from our website
<http://www.uct.ac.za/depts/cssr/pubs.html>

ISBN 0-7992-2211-9

© Centre for Social Science Research, UCT, 2003

CENTRE FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE
RESEARCH

Social Surveys Unit

**WHO DOES THE HOUSEWORK?
AN EXAMINATION OF SOUTH
AFRICAN CHILDREN'S
WORKING ROLES**

Rachel Bray

CSSR Working Paper No. 45

October 2003

Rachel Bray is a Research Associate in the Social Surveys Unit, Centre for Social Science Research at the University of Cape Town.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Liziwe Kweyama and Noxolo Mahobo for assisting me in research sessions with children in Masiphumelele. Thanks are also due to Ann McKellar and colleagues at the Centre for Living Hope and to the volunteers running the Life Skills Programme at Ocean View High School for providing opportunities to meet and work with children who use their facilities.

Who Does the Housework? An Examination of South African Children's Working Roles

Abstract

This paper examines available survey data on children's participation in household work in the light of findings of primary ethnographic research with children and their families in two neighbouring urban communities. Its purpose is to shed light on the current process of policy development on child labour in South Africa, particularly in the light of mounting concern around additional work burdens on children caused by HIV/AIDS. The analysis contextualises children's work in the home within broader socio-economic trends and cultural norms around child-rearing, thus exposing the need to question the classification of different types of 'work' and 'risk' used in surveys. The ethnographic study revealed that the participation of children in everyday household chores is viewed as a function of their roles as members of a household and family, as part of their duty to their seniors and as an opportunity to learn skills required in adulthood. In this context, risk factors to child well-being are related not to their working roles, but to aspects of the broader socio-economic and physical environment that restrict or compromise children's development opportunities. A key lesson to be drawn from this paper is that the ability to question and re-frame international measurement criteria relies on the availability of longitudinal surveys and qualitative research on childhood, schooling and household dynamics in a variety of contexts in South Africa.

“Child labour is work by children under 18 which is exploitative, hazardous or otherwise inappropriate for their age, detrimental to their schooling, or their social, physical, mental, spiritual or moral development. The term ‘work’ is not limited to work for gain but includes chores or household activities in the child's household, where such work is exploitative, hazardous, inappropriate for their age or detrimental to their development”

(Definition of child labour adopted by the South African Department of Labour, 2003)

South Africa, like many other nations, is currently in the process of drafting a National Child Labour Action Programme with a view to protecting children from exploitative labour practices. The momentum behind this process comes from a decade of efforts to focus attention on exploitative or harmful child work, steered primarily by the United Nations International Labour Organisation and its now almost universally ratified¹ 1999 Convention on the Worst Forms of Child Labour (No. 182). Thus far, the South African process has involved analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, and a series of consultations around the particular work sectors in which children are engaged, their associated risks and appropriate policies to address these (Bosch and Associates, 2002:1). Its aim is to distinguish ‘child labour’ from ‘child work’, the former being defined as “kinds of work (that) are harmful or pose serious risk of harm for children” (*ibid*).

Domestic work, both paid and unpaid, is one of the work sectors under debate with respect to its inclusion in the category ‘child labour’ and in the proposed national programme of action. The logic behind its inclusion is that work in a child’s own home, or the home of others, has the potential to compromise seriously a child’s development and short or long term well-being, even to the point of exploitation. Yet, as will be demonstrated in this paper, there are a number of conceptual and ideological issues that make the definition and measurement of domestic work by children very problematic. Until recently, we had no nationally representative data sources on children’s work activities within and outside the home. Those now available shed some light on the picture, but their contribution to greater understanding of work by South African children has been limited by methodological problems and the nature of analyses conducted to date (Bray, 2002:13). The result has been very different interpretations of the nature and scale of work conducted by children, as well as of resultant effects on child well-being (*ibid*). There is clearly a need to look more closely at the data available and to contextualise household work by children in a broader social and cultural understanding of household dynamics and childhoods across South Africa.

Within the last year, concern around work in childhood has been expressed from another angle, namely the social and psychological impacts of HIV/AIDS. Links have been drawn between rising rates of adult morbidity and mortality, and subsequently orphanhood, and an increase in numbers of children who have primary responsibility for household chores. Both the media and policy bodies commonly refer to the possibility that orphaned children will leave school (and perhaps also the home) in order to beg for money in urban areas, spend long hours caring for sick relatives without emotional support, and/or take

¹ By February 2002, 115 nations had signed ILO Convention 182 and 19 had expressed their intention to do so. Signatory nations are obliged to assess the nature of child work in their particular country context and to draw up a national action plan to protect children from exploitation in the workplace.

responsibility for meeting the basic needs of younger siblings or grandparents (Bosch and Associates, 2002:38; UNDP, 1999:142-143 cited in Rau, 2002:11; Wax, 2003). It is difficult to judge whether these concerns are substantiated owing to the absence of direct references to research findings. Within the last year, some evidence has emerged from within South Africa that children living in communities where AIDS is exacerbating chronic poverty are taking on a larger share of household work and missing school (Booyesen and Arntz, 2002; Giese *et al*, 2003). Yet we still know little about the effects of this form of work on children's overall development, or on other factors affecting strength and vulnerability in childhood such as levels of social cohesion in the family and community. It is therefore difficult to know how to identify and respond to situations in which a change in a child's working role indicates serious compromises to well-being.

In the light of these concerns, this paper aims to contribute to our understanding of work in childhood and to the debate around policy responses to such work. In particular, the paper will:

1. Examine available survey data in greater detail to generate information on the distribution of household work by age, gender and population group,
2. Contextualise children's work in the home within broader socio-economic trends and cultural norms through the analysis of qualitative data,
3. Describe patterns of children's participation in different aspects of household work that may shed light on their future roles in households and communities affected by AIDS, and
4. Comment on the conceptual basis to analyses of child work that informs the current preparation of a national programme of action.

Perspectives on child work and child labour

Given the international political environment outlined above, the focus of recent research and discussion on child work has been on assessing the nature of the 'the problem' – in other words, the numbers of children engaged in 'child labour', and on trying to understand the nature and severity of its negative impacts on children's well-being. Such a starting point places work by children in a negative light, and raises questions about the way in which 'harmful' and 'risky' work are defined. As recently observed, the process in which a situation is identified as 'child labour' "involves mixing empirical observations about what children do with ideas about the nature and value of their activities" (Ennew *et al*, in progress:4). Thus, the term 'child labour' "is not an objective, technical descriptor of a particular pattern of human relations, but a rhetorical label that blends description with negative value judgements" (*ibid*). As I will shortly demonstrate, there is evidence of such a mixing of empirical data and value

judgement in the way in which domestic work by children is measured and reported upon in South Africa. Consequently, it is difficult to capture a clear picture of children's participation in household functioning, or to understand the relationship between working in the home sphere and broader social, economic and cultural processes.

Before embarking on the empirical analysis, it is instructive to consider the way in which domestic work by children has been conceptualised and measured internationally. The inclusion of domestic work – whether within the family home or an employer's home – in definitions of harmful or exploitative child labour has long been a matter of contention. Greatest concern is expressed around children doing domestic work in the homes of employers or wider family members, owing to the potential for physical, emotional and sexual abuse (ILO, 2002:29). Research has begun to expose these largely hidden vulnerabilities amongst the large numbers of Asian children who live and work in an employer's home (Boyden *et al*, 1998:107). Although less common in Africa as a whole, child domestic service is well-documented in West Africa where clear links have been found with child trafficking (ILO, 2001). Within the last year, questions have arisen around the incidence of child trafficking in South Africa in the light of anecdotal evidence of rural children being taken to urban areas for domestic service (Bosch and Associates, 2002:27). Some fear that the economic pressures on AIDS affected families will mean that more children need to earn an income, and hence may be at risk of these forms of exploitation (ILO, 2002:42).

Household work in a child's own home is often considered benign owing to a relatively safe physical environment and the understanding that work in a family context is part of a normal, healthy childhood. The potential costs of such work most frequently highlighted relate to the time spent doing household chores that either prevent children attending school or hinder their educational progress. An additional cost, often implicit in documents describing domestic work by children, relates to the sense that children are taking on 'too much' responsibility. Attempts to either qualify or quantify manageable levels of household work for children of different ages are usually lacking. Hence any judgements of risk are made without reference to context. An underlying challenge to researching, measuring and legislating over domestic work is that it occurs within the private sphere of the household, so is both hidden from view and connected to the sensitive realm of family decision-making. In this paper, I illustrate the spectrum of risk factors that have been associated – either explicitly or implicitly – with household work by South African children, and the extent to which these marry with our wider knowledge of well-being and risk in childhood and transitions to adulthood.

Leaving aside for now such attempts to judge 'risk' and focusing on the economics of domestic work done by children, we find some diverse perspectives. Domestic work can be viewed as an everyday activity that has no

direct bearing on the household economy (cleaning, washing clothes, etc), meaning that those who engage in it have no economic or productive role. Such work is not included in calculations of gross domestic product for example. Yet on closer inspection, domestic activities can be considered integral to the productive capacities of a household because they underpin the well-being of those who earn an income. The term ‘reproductive work’ is sometimes used to capture the productive nature of these chores (for example in the analysis of the Time Use survey; Budlender *et al*, 2002:10). If we take the latter view, the participation of children in domestic work gives them a productive role in the household and community – at least from the point of view of social scientists looking in upon people’s everyday lived experiences. It therefore becomes relevant to find out the nature of children’s tasks and how these influence other aspects of their lives, in order to inform policy that can bolster strengths and reduce vulnerability in childhood. A vital element to this enquiry is an exploration of the social, economic and cultural context of work by children within or for the home. The very fact that we recognise differences in the way domestic work is perceived begs the question as to whether or not children, their families and communities consider such activities to be part of household production and ‘work’. Here we can expect cultural variation owing to differing norms around child-rearing and children’s place within society. These require investigation if our policy and programming responses are to be culturally meaningful and effective.

National data sources and analyses

In the last five years, two national surveys have been conducted that help to fill the long-standing gaps in information around child work in South Africa, namely the 1999 Survey of Activities of Young People (SAYP) and the 2000 Time Use Survey (TUS). The SAYP aimed to gather information on “the extent, character, patterns, determinants and consequences of children’s work activities on a national basis”² (Statistics South Africa, 2001:1). The fact that it was commissioned by the Department of Labour, but funded and guided by the International Labour Organisation’s Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (ILO-IPEC) indicates the intended use of data in defining and measuring

² This survey initially covered 30 550 households from all provinces and types of settlement, and gathered basic information regarding the activities of children aged 5 to 17 years (referred to as phase I). A probability sub-sample of 6110 households was then taken from the households that contained at least one child involved in economic work or unpaid domestic work, and more detailed information regarding their activities was collected (phase II).

‘child labour’, and contributing to the process of national policy design around the worst forms of child labour as laid out in ILO Convention 182.

The Time Use Survey (2000), was designed to “provide new information on the division of both paid and unpaid labour between women and men, and greater insight into less well understood productive activities such as subsistence work, casual work and work in the informal sector” (Budlender *et al*, 2001:1). Although priority was given to gender disaggregation, the decision to sample those aged 10 years and over means that the survey offers age-specific data that can tell us something about the time older children spend on a range of activities. These include economic work, housework, care work, learning, leisure and travel.

Problems of category and measurement

This section discusses both the conceptual frameworks used, and the principal findings presented, in two recent official reports on child work in South Africa; namely Statistics South Africa and the Department of Labour’s report on children’s work-related activities written following the SAYP (2001), and the ILO-IPEC commissioned national report on child domestic work (Budlender and Bosch, 2002).

The SAYP report purposefully avoids defining child labour owing to the need for wider debate across the country about the types and levels of work that are considered harmful (Statistics South Africa, 2001:3). Instead, it uses a distinction between ‘economic’ and ‘non-economic’ work activities to present a profile of the types of work done by South African children, and a series of time cut-offs to both describe the extent of their participation in these and to provide a proxy indicator for work that could be considered harmful (see figure 1 below).

Figure 1: Categorisation of work by children used in the SAYP analysis

	<i>Types of work included</i>	<i>Higher risk cut-offs</i>	<i>Lower risk time cut-offs</i>	<i>Reference period used</i>
<i>Economic work</i>	Work for pay (in cash or kind), profit or family economic gain	3 hours per week minimum	no time limit where there is another indicator of risk OR 1 hour per week minimum	12 months preceding the interview
	Unpaid domestic work in child's own home that does not contain their parent, spouse or grandparent			7 days prior to the interview
	Fuel and water collection			
<i>Non-economic work</i>	School maintenance	5 hours per week minimum		
	Unpaid domestic work in own home containing a parent, grand-parent or spouse	7 hours per week minimum		

Information extracted from the Country Report on the SAYP 1999 (Statistics South Africa, 2001).

The definitions laid out in figure 1 follow ILO conventions and are reported to be the preference of the South African Department of Labour (Statistics South Africa, 2001:35). The logic behind the use of two different time cut-offs for ‘economic work’ is to enable distinguish those children who are greater risk from those at some risk (Statistics South Africa, 2001; Bosch and Associates, 2002). The higher cut-offs are associated with a narrow definition of child work, and the lower ones with a broader definition. No explanation is given for the lack of time-based distinction between high and low risk ‘non-economic’ work, and – rather confusingly – the official report presents analysis of children’s participation in school maintenance and household work using the above time cut-offs in both the section on a broad definition of child work (i.e. using the low cut-off points) and the section reporting on the situation of children who work longer hours considered detrimental to their well-being (Statistics South Africa, 2001:35, 53 - 54).

A very clear distinction is drawn between the domestic work done by children in their own home when a mother, father, spouse or grandparent is present and work done by children in homes not shared with one of these relatives. The survey followed the reasoning of the ILO, namely that children living apart from one of these close relatives are at greater risk of exploitation (Bosch and Associates, 2002:26). The lack of evidence-based proof or clear explanation of this hypothesis within South Africa is somewhat surprising given that a significant proportion of African children live apart from their parents or grandparents³. The question therefore is whether this relatively common scenario does in fact raise the level of risk to children, or whether the definitional framework created for international use contains some culturally inappropriate assumptions in the South African context. One may ask, for example, whether consideration was given to the variety in African household composition and how these relate to a history of labour migration, or to the spectrum of cultural norms around child-rearing that are not modelled exclusively on the parent-child relationship. Research has shown the continuing effects of apartheid-era urban pass laws that forced men to leave their families in search of work, thereby raising the proportion of female-headed households and dispersing family members (Booyesen and Arntz, 2002; Jones, 1993). In a cultural context where extended family members already played a significant role in child-rearing, this situation contributed to children’s mobility and their care by a series of different people (Jones, 1993; Ramphele, 2002).

The second of these two official reports was commissioned by ILO-IPEC as part of a series of on child domestic work from a number of countries. The purpose of the series “is to provide an in-depth analysis of child domestic workers – a widespread worst form of child labour – at the country level”

³ Of the total sample of children interviewed for the SAYP, 9% were living in such households. We know from other survey data that rates of co-residence of African children and parents are lower than amongst other population groups (Bray 2003:16).

(Roselaers in Budlender and Bosch, 2002: preface). The ILO's emphasis on identifying child labour (and its 'worst forms'), as well as their sponsorship of the SAYP, have meant that the report focuses on children employed as domestic workers either for payment in cash or kind, and draws primarily on the SAYP data. Nevertheless, it does contain some analysis of children's unpaid work in their own homes, and makes limited use of the Time Use survey in this regard.

In outlining the key findings of the above official reports, I begin with those pertaining to child work in general and move onto those related to household work. Examples of differences in interpretation of child work in South Africa that relate to survey design and analytical techniques are given, and the ways these informed my approach to secondary and primary research on the topic of household work. Evidence of the impact of child work as presented in the two official reports is discussed alongside my own findings in subsequent sections.

The SAYP report states that 45% of all South African children are involved in some form of work if the broad definition (i.e. the lower time cut-offs shown in figure 1) are used. This figure falls to 36% if the narrower definition (i.e. the higher time cut-offs) are used. If 'work' is defined as a minimum of three hours of economic work per week, and/or 7 hours of household chores and/or 5 hours of school maintenance, figures show that the vast majority of working children are African, a slightly higher proportion are girls, and the proportion of younger children who work is less than that of older children (Statistics South Africa, 2001:5). When participation rates in work (defined using the above higher time cut-offs) are compared between population groups, we find rates of 41% amongst African children as compared to 22%, 10% and 9% amongst coloured, Indian and white children respectively (*ibid*). Analysis of settlement area, as well as inter-provincial differences between proportions of children who work, indicate that 'child work' as defined in this study is primarily a rural phenomenon. The proportion of working children living in rural areas was 51% as compared to 30% in urban informal areas, 35% in commercial farming areas and 19% in urban formal areas (*ibid*:5). Rural children are more likely than those living in other areas to be engaged in economic work that has negative impacts on their well-being (such as causing or exacerbating illness, injury or tiredness) (*ibid*:79). These patterns lead authors of the SAYP to conclude that children who do either economic or non-economic work are "likely to be from those communities...which were discriminated against in the past by apartheid, particularly African children" (*ibid*:79).

If we examine SAYP data on the distribution of children's work⁴ between different types of activity, we find that three quarters of working children are

⁴ To be classified as engaged in 'work', children must be engaged in at least one activity for a period of time equal to or exceeding the higher cut offs of 3 hours per week for 'economic activities', 7 hours per week for household chores, and 5 hours per week for school maintenance.

engaged in some form of ‘economic activity’. At first glance this figure suggests a very high proportion of children engaged in the wider employment market (with varying effects on well-being), and a very low proportion doing household chores and school maintenance (tasks that are presented as lower risk). But, if we disaggregate the figure given for ‘economic activities’, we see that the most common activity is fetching wood and water⁵ (62%) followed by help with farming (15%) and ‘unpaid domestic work’, meaning household work by children living in households without a parent, grandparent or spouse (7%) (calculated using figure 17; Statistics South Africa, 2001:46). A slightly different analytical perspective, and perhaps one that is shared by children who engage in these tasks, would classify these as regular domestic chores that children do, and/or are distributed across household members currently in residence. Here questions are raised about the classification of these activities as ‘economic’, and the associated connection between these activities and risks to well-being.

While the SAYP report acknowledges the apparently artificial nature of the division of children’s work into ‘economic’ and ‘non-economic’ activities (*ibid*:12), there is no discussion around alternative classifications and how these might impact data interpretation. In order to advance our analysis and understanding, we need to examine evidence of the nature and depth of any impact of these tasks, and other ‘non-economic’ tasks, on children’s current and longer-term well-being.

Household work

Analyses that focus specifically on children’s participation in household work show how very different conclusions can be drawn through the use of different data sets and different analytical definitions of ‘excessive work’. Use of Statistics South Africa’s cut-offs (of 7 or more hours per week) to analyse the SAYP data produces a figure of 12% of South African children who engage in household chores, a trend of increasing engagement with age (7% of 5-9 year olds, 15% of 10-14 yrs, 19% of 15-17 yrs) and a larger proportion of girls than boys (an increase of between 3% and 9% across the age groups) (Statistics South Africa, 2001:53).

⁵ High rates of children’s engagement in water and wood collection are explained by the lack of piped water and electricity in rural communities, particularly the former homelands (Statistics South Africa 2001:79).

Use of even higher cut-offs⁶ that are graded by age produce a figure of only 1% of South Africa's children engaging in household chores for excessive hours relative to their age (Budlender and Bosch, 2002:xi). The difference between these figures begs questions around the duration of household work considered acceptable for children of different age groups, and how the cut-offs are defined. No empirical or theoretical explanation is given of how the specific figures for each age group were arrived at. Subsequent analysis of the Time Use survey challenges both these figures by producing a figure of 7% of children aged 10-17 years were doing such chores for 'excessive' hours as defined by the higher age-graded cut offs (*ibid:xi*). Potential reasons for the apparent gross underestimation of children's participation in household work in the SAYP data relate to the methodology in the context of understandings of 'work'. The SAYP enumerators did not specify tasks that constitute 'household work' and it is likely that children neglected to report tasks that they consider to be just part of a normal day. Further clarity on such methodological issues is important because one or other set of findings will be used to substantiate, or otherwise, the existence of a problem and an appropriate response.

When using the higher and age-graded cut-offs and the SAYP, the population group, settlement area, gender and age distribution of household work is found to be similar to that recorded for work in general. Almost all children doing excessive hours of household work (as defined above) are African, almost three-quarters live in ex-homeland areas, most (60%) are girls, and two thirds of children are aged 5-9 years (*ibid:xi*). This apparent 'majority' of younger children is an artefact of the graded age cut-offs, and therefore does not contradict SAYP data cited above. Older children may be spending as much or more time in these activities, but their totals are insufficient to be classified as 'excessive'. Here the implicit assumption is that risks associated with household work decrease with age, a relationship posited in international documents on child labour. The problem here is that without locally generated data that tell us something about the relationships between age and the changes in young people's responsibilities and aspirations relating to work, schooling and family life, we are in fact relying on value judgements derived from international norms rather than a sound comprehension of intra-national social dynamics.

A second example of the problems encountered in interpreting statistical findings due to the absence of contextual data relates to household structure and its possible impact on work by children. The SAYP survey indicates that one

⁶ These cut-offs are 14 hours or more per week for 5-9 year olds, 21 hours or more per week for 10-14 year olds, 45 hours or more per week for 15-17 year olds. They were designed to indicate excessive amounts of potentially harmful unpaid domestic work, and are therefore higher than those used when considering paid work and are graded by age group. The rationale for their use is that most families expect children to make some contributions to household chores, and that work in one's own home is not defined as illegal unless it constitutes 'abuse' as defined in the Child Care Act (Budlender and Bosch, 2002:37).

fifth of boys and one tenth of girls doing excessive hours of household work in their own homes do not share these homes with close relatives (parent, grandparent or spouse). The fact that neither the significance of this finding, nor reasons for the gender difference, are explored in the national report (Budlender and Bosch, 2002:38), suggests a level of uncertainty around these data. This is confirmed by the authors' acknowledgement of the crudeness of an approach that measures vulnerability using co-residence with parents or grandparents. The qualitative research described later in this paper sheds some light on these figures and the measurement approach.

In summary, the available quantitative data suggest that much of the 'child labour' story in South Africa is about household work. What does not emerge from analyses of these data sets is who does what kind of domestic tasks, which groups of children spend significant periods of time on these tasks, and what effects they have on children's lives in the short and long term. The SAYP gives us a broad demographic profile of children doing paid and unpaid domestic work, but we cannot find out the distribution of particular tasks by age, gender or population group – something that we would anticipate to vary considerably given South Africa's history and socio-cultural composition. Moreover, owing to the decision not to include questions about health, safety and other potentially harmful effects of unpaid household work in the SAYP, we can only hypothesise around potential effects amongst certain groups of children. Budlender and Bosch (2002:3), the authors of the ILO-commissioned report on child domestic work, state their intentions to explore a range of variables affecting children's participation in domestic work. Yet, they are unable to offer substantial information on a number of these including the benefits and problems associated with particular tasks, social isolation, and changes in attitudes and social perception around child work. In debating these limitations, it is important to recognise the scope of different research approaches. For example, "the cumulative factors that would indicate that work is harmful are very difficult to capture in a survey" (Statistics South Africa, 2001:3). Here we see the role of qualitative research that investigates work in the everyday experiences of children, and hence provides the possibility of moving beyond a generalised picture that cannot relate to broader social and cultural patterns at household and community level.

A second look at domestic work: Combining quantitative and qualitative analysis

When we apply a qualitative perspective to some of the survey findings, we find that categories are not so clear cut as the designers of surveys may hope them to be. For example, the questions raised above regarding the role of fuel and water

collection in bolstering figures depicting economic (and potentially high risk) work illustrate the fuzzy boundary between ‘work’ and ‘non-work’ – particularly within the domestic sphere. The following sections of the paper draw on my own recent analyses of time use statistics and primary data generated through an ethnographic approach. In comparing and contrasting findings generated through these different approaches, I intend to sharpen our focus on children’s participation in household work and its wider social and economic implications.

Methods employed

Statistical analysis of the Time Use Survey (TUS) and the first wave of the Cape Area Panel Study (CAPS) data was undertaken to investigate how population group, age and gender influence children’s engagement in domestic work in their own homes, and to compare the time children spent on household chores with that spent on other activities (see tables 1, 2 and 3 in appendix one). The data generated were then used to consider whether concerns around levels of household chores make sense in the context of a closer analysis of what we know of the nature of these chores, the contexts in which they are conducted, and hence any potential impact on child well-being and development.

The potential for a disaggregated analysis of the Time Use survey is somewhat limited by the sampling frame used in both this survey and the SAYP⁷. Owing to the small numbers of children in various ages, gender and population group sub-samples, results of the population specific analysis are interpreted with caution, the possibility of further disaggregation by settlement type was excluded, and discussion focuses on the largest sample, namely African children.

Primary data collection was conducted in two urban poor neighbourhoods on the Cape Peninsula, one of which is inhabited primarily by African, Xhosa-speaking families, and the other by coloured, Afrikaans-speaking families⁸. This qualitative component was designed to complement the survey analysis through the adoption of ethnographic research techniques. The legitimacy of ethnography is derived from the researcher’s engagement with the lives of his or

⁷ While the SAYP sample covers all nine provinces and four different types of settlement, disproportionate numbers of children from each racial group and settlement area were purposefully included in order to reflect the expected differential incidence of working children across settlement areas (Budlender *et al*, 2001:15). The sample is thus a more accurate reflection of the wider population and its activities, but any disaggregation of children’s activities by age, gender and population group must work with low numbers of respondents in some sub-groups (for example, there are fewer than 50 individuals in the four sub-groups of Indian boys and Indian girls aged 10-14 and 15-17 years).

⁸ Situated only 3 kilometres apart, Masiphumelele is an informal settlement of approximately 23,000 people, and Ocean View an area of housing created under apartheid for ‘coloured’ people who were moved from the ‘white’ areas of Simon’s Town and Kommetjie.

her research subjects and a close understanding of the local social structure⁹. In an effort to establish rapport and trust between participants and researchers, information was collected through regular interaction with a small number of children and contact with their families. A combination of visual and oral methods were employed to give insight into work-related activities in the context of children's everyday lives and household functioning (see tables 4 and 5 in appendix two).

Work inside the home: who does what?

A comparison of proportions of children engaged in core domestic activities (cooking and food preparation, cleaning inside the house, laundry and ironing) shows clearly that more African children perform these tasks than coloured, Indian and white children. On average, African girls spend well over one hour per day preparing food or cooking (75 minutes among 10-14 year olds and 100 minutes amongst 15-17 year olds), although comparable time is spent in these activities by older coloured and Indian girls, and younger white girls. These same groups spend approximately one hour per day cleaning in the house, although it is interesting to note that younger coloured boys and older Indian boys also reported spending an average of more than one hour cleaning.

Across the population groups sampled in both the TUS and CAPS we see clear age and gender differences in time spent in household work as well as participation rates (see table 3). Within the African sample, a third of boys aged 10-14 years reported spending part of their day cooking, as did 65% of girls of the same age, 41% of boys aged 15-17 years and 80% of girls in this older group. Participation rates in cooking amongst all population groups follow the same age and gender trend; the lowest were amongst younger boys, then older boys, followed by younger girls and the highest rates were amongst the older girls. This trend is mirrored in rates of engagement in cleaning amongst African and coloured children, but not amongst Indian and white children where younger children of both sexes are less involved than older children. The ethnographic data also reflect high rates of engagement with cleaning and cooking amongst African and coloured children. In the particular urban communities researched, it appears that girls have the primary role in tasks within the home itself. In the light of other research, this pattern can be interpreted as the socialisation girls into a female role that is centred around the maintenance of a home. An ethnographic study of the use of domestic appliances in relation to notions of gender propriety amongst families in Soweto found that both men and women subscribed to the paradigm that 'proper' womanhood lies in domestic vigour

⁹ Owing to the short time period allotted to fieldwork (10 weeks), the ethnography is limited in its ability to present a full picture of children's lives in the context of family and community structures.

(Meintjies, 2001:351). Interestingly, when compared to their African peers, the gender distinction in domestic roles was reflected even more strongly by coloured children (see table 3). Their accounts of task division across the age spectrum within their own homes indicate that gender allocated patterns of household work in childhood become even more established in adulthood.

Some African mothers and aunts interviewed laughed when we asked them how much work they thought boys could do in the home, exclaiming that boys were not interested in such things as they prefer to play. Yet the data show clearly that African boys do contribute to household chores, particularly when there are no sisters or mother-figures available to do such work. In the light of teenage boys' assertions that they too cook, clean and wash clothes, I wondered whether the cultural norms influencing gender dynamics of children's involvement in household work were changing in this generation, perhaps alongside urbanisation and associated adult employment patterns. However, the greater participation ratio of boys to girls in rural areas than in urban areas reflected in the SAYP data does not support this hypothesis. For example, disaggregation of the SAYP data by sex and area type shows that a slightly greater proportion of boys are doing long hours of unpaid household work in rural ex-homeland areas (40% of all children fitting this category) than in urban informal areas (34%). The gender and area distinction is even more strongly marked in inter-provincial comparisons. For example, there are no boys who do long hours of unpaid domestic work in the Western Cape sample, however boys represent 31% of the total sample of children doing such work in the Eastern Cape¹⁰. Interestingly, boys in Masiphumelele often reported their work contributions using phrases such as 'washed my uniform', 'ironed my shirt', or 'cooked my lunch', whereas girls reported cooking, cleaning and ironing for the whole family. Boys also reported tasks relating to the physical structure of the home and to agricultural subsistence (such as fixing leaks or broken items, gardening, sweeping the yard, tending cattle and caring for pets), indicating an external-internal role division between boys and girls that was mirrored in reported adult roles. The conclusion drawn is that African boys do participate in domestic work, although in most cases they do these tasks less frequently and for shorter hours than girls, and often for their own benefit as opposed to that of the household. Boys living in households where there are no female children or adults who spend time at home appear to take on an equivalent domestic role as girls in other households.

In attempting to understand the factors underlying gendered work patterns, we see the relevance of wider socio-cultural and economic processes at work in particular communities such as Masiphumelele. Amongst the Xhosa, the male role is traditionally associated with the homestead and farm, and

¹⁰ These figures are derived from SAYP data presented in tables 22 and 23 in Budlender and Bosch 2002:38.

particularly with cattle. Although daily life in urban informal settlements provides few opportunities to exercise this role, we see it reflected in boys' reports of work in the yard, on the fabric of the house and in tending animals. Moreover, in Masiphumelele, women are often the main breadwinners owing to the relative availability of domestic work in the locality and the fact that many men rely on irregular daily contract work. The assumption of domestic responsibilities by men and boys in some households is perhaps related to these wider employment patterns, in addition to the mobility of household members.

The Time Use data relating to children's participation in shopping by age, gender and population shows that relatively few children shop regularly (participation rates varied between 4% amongst young African males and 14% amongst older Indian females), and of these most spent an average of under 30 minutes shopping in that day¹¹. Rates of children's participation in home maintenance and pet care in this national sample are also very low. Yet, both adults and children in Masiphumelele and Ocean View frequently identified these three activities as tasks done by children. The specific characteristics of these two urban poor neighbourhoods may explain these differences; shops are relatively accessible, pets more common than in rural areas and the need to repair self-built shacks and low quality housing regular. The ethnographic data show that children do not spend much time doing these activities, nor in fuel and water collection, and their inclusion in both their own and adult's reports of 'what children do' may be more reflective of ideas around roles in childhood – and in these cases urban poor childhoods – than of children's actual responsibilities and associated risks. Both boys and girls in Masiphumelele are regularly sent to the local Spaza shops by adult family members, and helping an adult with grocery shopping in the local supermarket was ranked as one of the most enjoyable household tasks. A trip to the local shopping mall was the highlight of many children's week. Some parents considered it risky to send children alone on errands outside the community, although greater emphasis was placed on increasing levels of danger to children within the community (specifically relating to the abduction and rape of young children, and exposure to drugs and alcohol among older children). The findings generated through qualitative enquiry show clearly that it is not the tasks children do that carry inherent risks to their well-being, but the wider social and physical context in which they are performed.

¹¹ The one exception was much higher averages (90-175 minutes) amongst Indian children, probably due to relatively high socio-economic status and urban residence in this sector of the population.

Daily production: The role of fuel and water collection

Earlier in the paper I raised questions around the interpretation of child work presented through an analysis of the SAYP data that relate to the classification of wood and water collection as economic work. Here I reflect on the differences in findings generated in the SAYP and Time Use survey in the light of methods used in the two surveys, and in relation to the perspectives of children and family members in Masiphumelele and Ocean View. When compared to the statistics generated from the SAYP data, my analysis of the Time Use data finds a very small proportion of African children who reported collecting fuel the previous day, yet those who do so spend more than an hour doing so (averages of 69-96 minutes depending on age and gender; see table 1 in appendix one). Rates of participation in water collection were higher (11% – 20%), and the time spent slightly lower but approximate to one hour per day. A child who performed one or both of these activities approximately 3 times in a week would therefore be classified as performing ‘economic work’ in the SAYP¹². It is possible that the combination of a 7 day reference period and three hours per week time cut-off used in the SAYP analysis produces a picture of lots of children engaged in potentially problematic levels of work. In contrast, the Time Use survey may underestimate the numbers of children who do these chores, and indeed the time spent, because a proportion of respondents did not collect fuel or water during the day prior to being interviewed (but did so on other days that week).

For different reasons, it is probable that both surveys present a skewed picture of children’s engagement in fuel and water collection. In the case of the SAYP analysis, the significance of this bias lies in the inclusion of fuel and water collection in definitions of economic, and thus potentially problematic, work by children. We know that the combination of poor infrastructure, cultural norms around child-rearing and the fluidity of household composition mean that it is very common for African children, especially those living in rural areas, to undertake the type and duration of activities considered by the SAYP to be ‘economic work’¹³. In this context, it only makes sense to designate these

¹² The SAYP asked children whether they collected wood or water within the last seven days. In contrast, the Time Use survey asked children to report each activity conducted in half hour periods of the previous day. Hence the SAYP would reflect more than 3 hours spent on collecting wood or water over the past week as ‘economic work’, even if the child performed this task only once or twice in the week (or at the weekend only), or if the child’s combined ‘economic’ activities amounted to 3 or more hours that week.

¹³ ‘Economic work’ is defined in the SAYP analysis as participating in one or more of the following tasks for more than 3 hours per week; fetching wood or water, working for pay, profit or family gain (e.g. agriculture), and doing household chores in a home not shared with a parent, grandparent or spouse (see figure 1).

activities as harmful or risky to children if there is evidence that participating in this form of 'work' has negative effects on child well-being.

According to the SAYP data, 93.4% of children doing economic activities for at least 3 hours per week were attending school (Statistics South Africa, 2000: table 7.7). Interestingly attendance rates amongst African children were higher (94%) than those amongst coloured children (85%). Analysis of attendance rates by area type indicates that coloured children living and working on commercial farms are least likely to attend school. Furthermore, it is only when participation rates of over 36 hours per week (i.e. approximately 5 hours per day) are reached that school attendance drops significantly (Statistics South Africa, 2001:61). Fewer than 1% of children who engage in economic activities and report missing school cited their involvement in this work as the reason for missing school (Statistics South Africa, 2000: table 7.10). Instead, the primary reasons for missing school appear to be economic (inability to afford school), health-related (reported illness), family related (pregnancy and child-rearing amongst girls) and the poor quality of schooling (disinterest in school) (Statistics South Africa, 2001:64). These figures indicate that school attendance is prioritised over work by both children and family members in the vast majority of cases. Moreover, the intermittent character of many children's engagement in fuel and water collection (suggested by the difference between participation rates recorded in the SAYP and the Time Use survey) indicates a degree of flexibility around children's contributions to the household: Only in rare instances when the family is under considerable pressure would children's work be critical to household survival. The emphasis placed on regular school attendance by all children and parents in Masiphumelele supports these conclusions. The few instances in which children had missed school for significant periods of time appeared to be related to social and economic problems in mother-headed households (for example, the inability to afford a child's registration and uniform costs and lack of knowledge around access to assistance through social workers).

Given that school attendance alone is insufficient to guarantee a child's educational development, it is important to examine the effects of work on children's experiences of school and their educational achievement. The SAYP survey asked those children engaging in any form of work whether they experienced various difficulties relating to school¹⁴. The analysis concludes that working children faced difficulties catching up with work and finding time to study more frequently than children who work, and that those doing a combination of unpaid household chores and school maintenance were more likely to face these problems than children doing other kinds of work (Statistics

¹⁴ The question asks whether children are experiencing one or more of a specific set of difficulties; problems catching up with lessons, absence of or lack of support from teachers, high costs of school supplies, books or transport, no time to study, and school too far from home.

South Africa, 2001:63). Given the fact that children were not asked whether these difficulties were caused by their work activities or not, and the likelihood that children combining school maintenance and household chores are from under-resourced rural or urban informal areas (*ibid*:35), the problems faced by children probably arise from a bigger picture of poor schooling quality (in terms of both educational input and physical resources) rather than work participation *per se*. In terms of educational achievement, a larger proportion of children who do economic work aged between 10-14 years are not literate¹⁵ as compared to their peers who do not do such work (*ibid*:65). However, this difference disappears once children reach 14 years, and in fact reverses amongst 17 years. Clearly, this does not amount to conclusive evidence for the negative impact of work on long-term educational achievement.

When asked to compare what children have to do in Masiphumelele with what they have to do in their home villages in the Transkei, both adults and children unhesitatingly reported more work for children in rural settings. The adults felt that being a child in Masiphumelele was ‘easier’ than in the Transkei, owing to the presence of piped water and electricity, the absence of subsistence agriculture and the relative ease of sweeping a linoleum shack floor as compared to a mud floor. Implicit in these responses is the sense that tasks are more difficult if they require regular physical exertion and excessive amounts of time. No mention was made of serious health hazards for children, or of negative consequences on their school performance. In this context, the most plausible potential sources of harm to children who spend long hours doing household chores are levels of tiredness that affect school attendance and performance, or treatment by other household members that would amount to abuse (e.g. corporal punishment, sexual abuse or forced containment in the home). The SAYP is of no help here because questions relating to impact are only asked of those children engaged in economic activities for pay, profit and family gain (thereby excluding children engaged in fuel or water collection and household chores).

Care work by children

Most surveys of work-related activities ignore care-giving activities or list them only as secondary activities (Budlender *et al*, 2001:21). One advantage of the Time Use Survey (as compared to the SAYP) lies in the provision made for the discrete measurement of time spent caring for children and elderly, disabled or sick adults. Moreover, the questionnaire was designed in such a way that allows insight into cultural understandings of care; in other words whether it is seen as

¹⁵ Here ‘literate’ is defined as having completed at least 5 years of education.

a discrete activity, or whether it is seen as something that is part of everyday life and therefore not worth reporting¹⁶.

An assessment of care activities performed by children is important not only with respect to deepening our understanding of the roles children currently perform in the household, but also in relation to household responses to rising rates of AIDS-related sickness and death. If children were performing some degree of care prior to, or in the early stages, of high rates of illness and death within the home, we can expect that their care role will increase in the foreseeable future. As indicated in tables 1 and 3, far fewer African (and coloured) children engage in child care or care across the age spectrum, than in other domestic tasks such as cooking and cleaning. However, amongst those that do, the average time spent is much longer. Girls are more likely to be caring for others than boys, however it is important to note that – contrary to much popular opinion – boys also perform this role. Although the numbers of children reporting specific care of adults in the TUS were too small to merit analysis, the increase in participation rates noted when all care-related activities for children's and adults were combined, suggests that children are likely to have some kind of role in the care of sick adults, and of child or adult dependents in households where principal carers have died. In Masiphumelele, where rates of AIDS are high¹⁷, adults were asked who they turn to for help in the home when they are sick. Their responses indicate that female relatives living close by or in other parts of Cape Town, and/or neighbours, are the first port of call. No-one I spoke to knew of households in which children have primary care responsibilities for a sick person. Nevertheless, a number of adults mentioned this scenario as a distinct possibility in the near future owing to the increasing likelihood that relatives and neighbours are over-stretched in running their own households. If we take a step back and consider these observations from the point of view of child well-being, we see that the social connectedness of the household, and particularly mothers, is critical in pulling in extra resources that serve to protect children when households are under extreme pressure. Analyses of kin and neighbourhood networks and of social capital therefore become important in our efforts to understand risk and vulnerability related to work amongst children affected by HIV/AIDS.

Sharing work within the household

The official SAYP report indicates that living apart from both parents is not necessarily a factor encouraging work among children, but that living with only

¹⁶ Different codes were assigned in order to distinguish spontaneous mention of care activities from activities mentioned after prompting. Amongst the sample of children, there were negligible differences between these two categories and the overall numbers are too small for analysis.

¹⁷ To date, there are no reliable statistics of HIV prevalence in Masiphumelele.

one parent (particularly the mother) may make it more likely that children engage in paid and unpaid work (Budlender and Bosch, 2002:8). We know that a large proportion of children live with their mother but not their father (28% of SAYP sample), another significant proportion live with a grandparent or spouse rather than a parent (20%) and that a further 9% live in households that do not contain a parent, grandparent or spouse (Statistics South Africa, 2001:6). These residential patterns are particularly common for African children (Bray, 2003:16). We therefore have good reason to investigate the social and economic dynamics within the households of children who live with their mother, or with neither parent. Often the mother, or another adult from the extended family, is the sole earner in the household owing to the combination of high fertility rates amongst unmarried women, high rates of teenage pregnancies and a history of labour migration. It is argued that mother-headed households tend to be poorer and in greater need of a child's income and/or contributions to household maintenance, owing to the relative difficulties experienced by women in finding a job, and in earning a wage comparable to that of men (Budlender and Bosch, 2002:8).

Children's participation in domestic chores occurs within broader patterns of role division within households, and we can therefore expect that the nature and extent of their participation will be affected by both household structure and internal relationships. For example, we would expect that the presence of adults who are physically able to do the work, and who fulfil cultural norms around domestic tasks, would reduce children's engagement in domestic tasks. Research in a number of contexts across South Africa shows that elderly members of households make significant contributions to domestic functioning and household economies through their pensions and work in the home (Barbarin and Richter, 2001; Ramphela, 2002). We might expect therefore, a greater share of domestic and other forms of work for children living in households in which the only adults of working age are out working or seeking work, and there are no elderly members who claim a pension and/or undertake a significant share of the domestic tasks. While verification of this relationship would require analysis of intra-household dynamics, further insight into the role of the elderly can be gained by comparing their contributions in the domestic sphere, with those of children using the Time Use survey (see table 1). The participation rates in domestic tasks conducted by over 60 year olds mirror those of children, and the average time spent on them is greater amongst the elderly. These patterns suggest that the presence of a grandparent (and particularly a grand-mother) might relieve children of some domestic responsibilities. A further interesting trend that emerges from table 1 is a similar pattern of engagement in terms of gender and task – but higher rates of participation – amongst young adults. Indeed it is in this age group, and particularly amongst women, that we see the highest participation rates and high average time spent per day. The implications of this trend are twofold; firstly that the presence of

someone (particularly a woman) aged between 18 and 25 years (whether an older sibling, another relative or non-kin) is likely to reduce the amount of household work required from children. Secondly, in our efforts to identify large work burdens on children, we may be overlooking a group of people who spend the majority of their time doing domestic tasks, the implications of which in terms of remuneration or the ability to access educational or other employment opportunities, we know very little about. During the course of five of the sixteen interviews conducted with children's care-givers in Masiphumelele, it became evident that a young woman belonging to the extended family had primary responsibility for domestic chores. Usually a niece or sister-in-law of one of the parents, these young women are often fairly recent arrivals from the Eastern Cape. Some have brought a young child and although I was unable to ask directly about any remuneration for their domestic work, the impression gained is that it is paid only in kind, in the sense of allowing the young woman (and any children) to be a member of the household. In all five of these households, the mother is absent during the day; most are domestic workers for one or more employers in the nearby suburbs, and one had left her family to live in Gauteng. Fathers, when present, have regular or occasional jobs outside the immediate community. It appears that the inclusion of a young woman benefits the household by enabling both parents, or mothers who head households, to earn cash income. For these young women, the arrangement fulfils the immediate needs of a new immigrant, namely bed, board and the networks enjoyed by the urban household. All the mothers I spoke to recounted coming to stay with a sister or cousin when they first came to Masiphumelele, and over time moving into their own accommodation. Questions remain around the nature and level of costs of their domestic role to these young women, as most are attempting to complete high school or find a route into paid employment in the formal job market.

What is 'work', when is it problematic and who is at risk?

One of the most striking features of the data generated through visual methods exploring 'work we do' is children's inclusion of a whole spectrum of activities relating to leisure and education, as well as to those activities that are officially defined as 'work'. For example, children in Masiphumelele and Ocean View included homework, sports practice, going to church, baby-sitting, ironing, feeding the dog and fixing bicycles without apparent discrimination between these activities. The impression gained is that they are all considered 'part of life', and the ability to earn a little pocket money from some activities viewed as an added bonus but not something that clearly distinguishes 'work' from 'non-

work'. None of the children or adults participating in the ethnographic study recounted problems connected to children's tasks in the home. The only work activities considered problematic for children were lifting heavy loads (for example emptying bricks from trucks delivering to house construction sites within Masiphumelele), working with electricity, and begging at the nearby traffic lights or shopping centre (this was considered improper, and potentially dangerous to children).

The sense in which work, and particularly work in the home, is part and parcel of being a child and a household member, is substantiated by children's references to wanting to assist their mothers, and to fulfil the requests of their elders. Amongst the children surveyed in the SAYP who engage in economic work for pay, profit or family gain, 59% indicated that the principal reason for their work is out of a sense of duty to help their family (Statistics South Africa, 2001:52). Other significant reasons were to earn pocket money (16%) and to assist their family income (15%). These data imply that work is something expected of children and therefore not considered out of the ordinary in most situations. The responses of adults in Masiphumelele to the question of what they considered the most important thing children should learn further clarify this picture. While some adults referred to the importance of completing formal education, all mentioned respect for others, and particularly of their elders. Ethnographic research on attitudes to children and child-rearing amongst African communities in other parts of the country indicates a pervasive expectation that children should respect their elders (Ramphela, 2002; Swart-Kruger, 2001). Interestingly, the recent media promotion of children's rights in South Africa has been interpreted in some quarters as a move to undermine traditional notions of respect for seniors and thus of parental authority (Swart-Kruger, 2001). In Masiphumelele, most parents who had heard of children's rights spoke of the right to go to school, to have enough food and to be loved. Some younger parents mentioned the need to listen to children and to respect their views.

In terms of understanding the impact of domestic work in the context of children's lives more broadly, both the quantitative and qualitative data consulted suggest that in only rare cases do tasks within the home take up such large amounts of children's time that they interfere with educational and social development. Girls, and children who live in poorly resourced rural areas, are most likely to engage in household work that has a negative impact on their performance at school and their participation in social activities. Yet the relationship is not one of simple cause and effect: The problems children experience in achieving at school relate more directly to the educational environment than the household tasks they perform. In assessing risk, our attention should therefore turn to aspects of the wider social structure and the ways these are filtered through particular household responses. For example, results of the SAYP survey cited earlier show that coloured children living on

commercial farms are least likely to attend school, and have fairly high rates of participation in household work (Statistics South Africa, 2001:48). The CAPS data also suggest that more coloured than African children aged 14-17 years are engaged in income generating work (see table 3), but further calculations are required to assess the impact of these low levels of work participation on schooling. Furthermore, to assume that the reason children do not attend school is because they are working would be to ignore the very poor provision of education and the powerlessness of families on commercial farms that are features of a history of structural dependence akin to bonded labour. Levine's (1999; 2002) ethnographic work on wine farms in the Western Cape showed clearly that risks faced by children who work are part and parcel of the socio-political relationship of suppression and exclusion in which they and their family are embedded.

If we compare the proportion of time African children surveyed in the Time Use survey spent on domestic chores with that on other activities, we see that within each age and gender group, the average time spent watching the television, socialising with family or friends and participating in sports or religious activities is much greater (see table 2). The diaries kept by teenagers in Masiphumelele reflected this pattern, and showed that domestic work is fitted in around educational and recreational activities. Here the influence of the broader social structure is felt in the presence of social settings that contribute to child development such as sports teams, youth clubs and church choirs. In many rural areas, access to quality schooling and extra-curricular activities is much more limited than in this urban informal community.

A comparison of children's time spent on homework with that on domestic work raises some interesting questions about the root causes of poor school achievement. According to the Time Use data, the proportion of African girls who reported cooking and cleaning on the day prior to the interview was greater than that doing homework. We have no evidence to suggest that domestic work prevented girls from doing homework (their rates of engagement in the latter are higher than those of boys). From the point of view of children's engagement with the educational process and their ability to succeed within it, the more interesting statistic is the relatively low participation rates in homework across the age and gender groups (averages ranging between 34% and 49%; see table 2).

A notable omission from the SAYP survey is any question relating to the positive influence of work on child well-being. When asked which work activities they enjoyed, and why, young children (aged 7-9 years) in Masiphumelele mentioned cleaning windows, sweeping floors etc "because it makes our house nice and tidy", and older children (10 -17 years) reported their satisfaction in being able to cook a meal for their family or assist in other core aspects of household functioning. In a recent series of focus group discussions

with working children around the country¹⁸, children said that they do household work because they like to live in a clean place, and that they view this role as their way of contributing to the family and as an essential life-skill for adulthood (Clacherty, 2003:4). The impression gained from both studies is that participating in household chores contributes positively to children's self-esteem and their sense of belonging to, and being valued within, a household unit. If we reflect on the role of work in adulthood, this should not be surprising. Research carried out with adults on the psychological and sociological impact of working (and not working) indicates that "work is one of the most powerful of all sources of self-esteem, human capital development, cognitive sophistication, and even overall 'happiness' and 'contentment' " (Ennew *et al*, in progress:11). The difficulty lies in accepting that children too may derive these and other benefits from a working role.

The case of Thandi, a nine year old girl from Masiphumelele is interesting in this regard. During discussions and drawing sessions around work in the home, Thandi was reticent in talking about what she does at home as compared to her peers who reeled off long lists of jobs. When asked whether she waters plants, irons her uniform or helps with the shopping, she shook her head. At first glance, this girl seemed fortunate in the lack of chores she is required to do. After an hour in her home interviewing her mother, the situation looked very different. The home is bare and unkempt, with only a few very worn items of furniture and there is no garden of any kind. Although I did not see the kitchen, Thandi's mother's account portrayed a daily struggle to afford food. In other words, the reason Thandi did not report much household work is because there is very little to clean or to cook. In a context of scarce resources, children's involvement in domestic work can therefore be considered a positive indicator of social and economic well-being.

A further benefit of doing domestic work available to some children is the potential to earn a small income. Children residing in Masiphumelele spoke of occasional casual income generating activities; younger children collect scrap to sell for recycling, and those aged 13 and over sell sweets or fruit and vegetables within the neighbourhood. Sometimes the income generated was given to their mothers for household use, and on other occasions children used it to cover taxi fares to school or to buy snacks in the school break times. Young teenagers (aged 13-15 years) living in Ocean View reported a wider range of tasks from which it is possible to earn an income. Some children are paid pocket money by parents in exchange for cleaning the house, baking, washing clothes or sweeping the yard. Others are paid by neighbours for washing cars, baby-sitting, house-

¹⁸ Ten participatory workshops with children living and working in a range of settings were conducted earlier this year as a means of consulting children in the process of formulating the National Programme of Action on Child Labour (Clacherty and Associates, 2003).

sitting, doing the shopping, cleaning, or taking children to crèche¹⁹. Interestingly, a number of young teenagers reported work that begins to involve them in the local economy, for example painting houses, fixing bicycles, being a taxi conductor and dancing or singing in the local shopping mall. Although the majority of children and parents emphasised the importance of completing high school education before seeking full time work, children said that it was sometimes necessary to look for casual work from the age of 15 years. In both communities, adult unemployment is high and the majority of available opportunities lie in casual manual labour (for boys) and in domestic work (for girls). Early involvements in these work activities, and the social networks that accompany them, are likely to benefit children's longer-term employment prospects and their immediate well-being in terms of a cash income. Children who replace school with income-generating work may compromise their abilities to acquire work that is more stable and better paid in the future. On the other hand, work experiences could prove to be more useful than extra schooling in acquiring secure employment.

Concluding discussion

This paper has drawn on quantitative and qualitative data sources on children's working roles in the home in order to explore consistency and difference in findings and gain insight into the complementarity of each approach. It is evident that the results of survey analysis presented in official documents on child labour in South Africa require some careful examination before they can be sensibly used to build a picture of children's work activities. For example, the conclusion reached in the official report of the SAYP that 45% of all South African children aged between 5 and 17 years (inclusive) are engaged in some form of work (Statistics South Africa, 2001:1), is one that denotes a significant child labour problem in South Africa. For many, this figure seems implausible in the light of widespread adult unemployment and high rates of school enrolment. The paper has demonstrated the need to question both the classification of different types of 'work' and 'risk' used in survey analyses, as well as the ways in which questionnaire design and implementation can skew primary data.

The measurement criteria used in the SAYP analysis and in guiding the formulation of a National Child Labour Action Programme are drawn from international experience and world-views on work and childhood. While these offer a valuable starting point, they are limited in their ability to connect with the particular cultural and socio-economic context of South African childhoods.

¹⁹ Teenagers in Ocean View reported earning R20 for an afternoon's babysitting (or R100 for a whole week), and about R60 per day for cleaning other people's yards. These figures were not verified through further interviews with adults said to be paying these amounts.

As demonstrated in preceding sections, a number of the categories and measures present a confusing picture when applied to the South African data (for example calculations around wood and water collection). The relationship between criteria used to analyse child work from survey data, their underlying conceptual logic and features of South African social fabric discussed in the paper are summarised in figure 2 (appendix one).

Of course, research into relatively uncharted waters must begin with some sort of frame of reference. The problems begin when insufficient attention is paid to the applicability of measures to the South African context. Other countries have experienced these problems in their efforts to respond to international agendas and to understand the particular dynamics of child work in their own contexts. A recent analysis of research and policy efforts to address child labour in South East Asia, concludes that “there is considerable lack of fit between global and local discourses, together with certain confusions as national governments and civil society try to reconcile various international definitions with national realities (which are themselves constructions combining culture, history, economics, politics and globalized constructions)” (Ennew *et al*, in progress: 40).

It is important that we recognise and address the misfits between international concepts and local realities for two reasons. First, because the policy formulation process demands definitions of hazardous child work that must be eliminated, there is a danger that international criteria are used to create a rigid definition of ‘unacceptable child work’ that cannot adapt to social change, for example the shifts in roles within and compositions of households affected by HIV/AIDS. It is very possible that children whose school attendance becomes erratic owing to a shortage of food and cash at home, as well as reduced capacity of adults to run the household, may well spend more and more time working in the domestic and productive/economic sphere. If the definition of unacceptably ‘hazardous’ child labour is based on time cut-offs and includes work in the home, we may find that such children and their household members are criminalised for their best efforts to keep the household functioning.

The second reason for caution in the use of international frameworks to study and respond to child work relates to the detection of risks to child well-being, and even of exploitation. If our focus is on identifying children engaged in certain forms of work activities, are we not in danger of ignoring different areas of risk affecting children who work and as well as those who do not? These might include children who regularly miss days or weeks of school owing to economic and/or psychosocial pressures in the household, or those who feel trapped at home by a sense of responsibility to sick relatives and an absence of alternative carers.

As I write, the draft National Child Labour Action Programme is scheduled to be presented to the government and wider public within days. The consultative process has resulted in some significant shifts in thinking from the

conceptual frameworks used in the SAYP analysis. The draft Action Programme states that under certain criteria some forms of domestic work amount to “hazardous work to be considered worst forms of child labour” (Department of Labour, 2003:66). The criteria suggested for identifying whether or not this is an acceptable form of child work are based not on pre-set time cut-offs, but on the circumstances in which children work. The specific conditions identified are work where the child can be called upon any time of the day or night to perform services, work that requires a child under 15 years to be away from family loved ones for long periods of time, work where the child is unreasonably confined to the employer’s premises, and work environments that have been found to be highly stressful psychologically (*ibid*).

With respect to household chores within a child’s home, the distinction between work in a home shared with a parent, grandparent or spouse and that in a home where none of these are present, appears to have been dropped. The draft policy document advises that the relevant criteria are neither who children are working with or for, nor certain time periods, but the effects of the work or the working environment on the child’s development. These criteria make good sense in the context of the particularities of the South African situation discussed in this paper. Yet two major challenges remain for those who must implement this policy. The first challenge lies in accessing data on the effects of work on educational development (school attendance and performance, skills learnt in the work sphere) and on social development (constraints placed on children’s ability to play and socialise, as well as benefits of a working role). Such information requires child-centred survey design and complimentary qualitative studies to shed light on the inter-relationships between work and child development. The second challenge lies in the scope for action once work is found to be harmful to child development. The draft programme document recommends a series of measures to protect children engaged in household work, namely the provision of guidelines²⁰ on the types and amounts of work appropriate for children of different ages, a review of the child protection laws (specifically those in the draft Children’s Bill) to ensure that “the definition of abuse provides adequately for domestic work”, and the promotion of more equal distribution of household work between boys and girls through the life-skills curriculum (*ibid*:49). Attention is drawn to the likely increase in numbers of children taking on significant care responsibilities as the full impact of the AIDS pandemic is felt. Although none of the above measures specifically address care-giving roles, a general recommendation is made earlier in the document to extend the accessibility of different forms of child care facilities as a measure to reduce children’s care-giving responsibilities for their younger sibs (*ibid*: 31).

²⁰ The document does not specify who these guidelines are directed towards, nor how they will be disseminated.

Interestingly the document recommends that “fetching fuel or water for very many hours or over long distances should not be referred to here as a worst form of child labour but rather as *detrimental forms of child work to be dealt with as a priority*” (*ibid*:65). The measures recommended relate to the effective roll-out of services, particularly water and electricity (*ibid*: 46-47), hence placing responsibility on the state rather than family members to reduce the numbers of children who spend many hours doing these tasks.

A key lesson to be drawn from this paper is that the ability to question and re-frame international measurement criteria relies on the availability of qualitative research on childhood and household dynamics in a variety of contexts in South Africa. Although very small-scale, the ethnographic research conducted for this paper provided information that both describes child work in the specific communities investigated, and assists the interpretation of statistical calculations made using national quantitative data sets.

Put briefly, the main findings from the ethnographic study were that the participation of children aged 7 years and upwards in everyday household chores is viewed as a function of their roles as members of a household and family, and as part of their duty to their seniors as well as an opportunity to learn skills required in adulthood. None of the children consulted spoke of work that was overly burdensome, and all were involved in extra-curricular sports or social activities as well as attending school. In this context, the risk of exploitation was not explicitly connected to work within or outside the home, but to power relationships in the extended family or community context (for example, young children were said to be at risk of rape and other forms of abuse). It is of course plausible that the power relationships through which a variety of physical, social and economic abuses take place may be manifest in a restricted and repressive domestic role. Those at greater risk of these forms exploitation are teenagers and young adults who have entered sexual relationships or marriage, and/or are recent rural immigrants offered lodging by extended family in exchange for their domestic work. For the most part, teenagers – especially girls – do their share of domestic tasks, and some earn a small income from selling food items in the locality. Adults were concerned about teenagers being attracted into shebeens and social networks that encourage high alcohol consumption, drug use, crime and early sexual relationships. Some parents and teenagers spoke of teenagers’ attraction to income-generating work and of the difficulties this would pose in completing high school, but poor employment opportunities in the locality seem to prevent many young people taking on work that would prevent school attendance²¹.

In these two urban poor communities, the risk factors to child well-being are related not to their working roles, but to aspects of the broader socio-

²¹ Supporting evidence is provided by the CAPS data which indicate very low rates of African children engaged in income-generating work or actively seeking such work (see table 3).

economic and physical environment that restrict or compromise their development opportunities. At household level, factors preventing children attending school include the inability to afford school uniform and shoes, and the mobility of adult carers. At community level, crowded classrooms, over-stretched teachers, poor quality housing and adult under-employment all place constraints on child development. Given that the relative levels of wealth and service provision in these two urban communities are greater than many poor, and particularly rural, communities, we need to ask how the picture changes for children growing up in these settings. Research indicates that similar household and community-level factors negatively influence child well-being, but that they are more pervasive and severe in very poor communities with a high incidence of AIDS (Booyesen and Arntz, 2002; Giese *et al*, 2003). We have reasonable evidence to suggest that in such settings children are taking on more work in the home, including care-giving, and seeking income generating work outside the home. Yet we know little about how these changing roles affect child well-being; what are the physical and psycho-social effects of long working hours and responsibility for family members? Why are some children able to fulfil these roles without severely affecting their well-being, whereas others are not? Are there particular combinations of risk factors that make children vulnerable to economic, emotional or physical exploitation?

Questions like these demand an examination of the social, physical and economic context in which children are working, rather than attention to the tasks performed and their direct impacts. For example, a research approach that investigates work as one aspect of children's social capital would take account of the educational, care-giving, cultural and economic environment, as well as the role of work in strengthening social networks, trust and support within the family and community (Harpham, 2003). Although these may seem obvious components of research on child work, the paper clearly demonstrates that these are lacking in studies conducted thus far. By measuring children's participation in certain activities that are pre-defined as 'work', the SAYP analysis abstracts children from their social context and treats them as a special group in need of protection. Without knowledge of household or community dynamics, we know little about why children in certain situations do particular tasks, nor of the associated costs and benefits to their well-being. Time use statistics go some way in fleshing out the context of child work by enabling analysis of the time children spend in different types of work as compared to education, leisure and social activities, as well as insight into the inter-generational distribution of domestic and other work tasks (as shown in tables 1 and 2). The analysis conducted for this paper is based on population, age and gender group averages, and therefore cannot capture specific intra-household and community dynamics

(for example, the social and economic characteristics of households in which children spend long hours in domestic chores including care-giving²²).

This paper is restricted in scope owing to the limited use of several quantitative data sets and the localised nature of the qualitative study. I cannot comment on the nature and context of household work performed by children across South Africa's diverse geographical and social spectrum. Furthermore, the data currently available do not allow us to trace changes in children's work patterns over time, nor to relate participation in domestic work to educational and other developmental outcomes. This is where panel studies offer the potential to analyse work in childhood in the context of opportunities and constraints experienced by children, and broader changes in household and community dynamics. It would be useful to explore similarities and difference in these areas across different geographical and cultural spaces, for example through data now being generated by Birth-to-Twenty (BTT), the Cape Area Panel Study (CAPS) and the Kwa-Zulu Natal Income Dynamics Study (KIDS). In addition, there are opportunities for a more nuanced enquiry of changes in children's working roles in planned and emerging studies of the impact of AIDS, particularly where multi-disciplinary and open-ended approaches are used to explore the responses of children and households in particular community contexts.

Directions for further research

The purpose of this final section is to offer some pointers towards research that would advance our understanding of the way children divide their time between work, educational activities and leisure, and of the resulting longer term affects on development and well-being.

The Time Use Survey data presented in table 2 provoke further questions regarding the relationship between work-related activities, educational activities, and educational outcomes. For example, we see that fewer African children report doing homework on the day prior to the survey, than report cooking or cleaning. Moreover, girls who do these tasks have spent equivalent or longer amounts of time on them than on homework. Boys and girls who reported caring for children or sick adults also spend equivalent amounts of time in these tasks to time doing homework. Hence, the question arises as to what determines time spent on homework. Possible influencing factors include aspects of the home environment, the school culture and its specific demands with respect to homework, and the individual child's competence and attitude towards school and homework.

²² Samples derived from the Time Use Survey would be too small for statistical analysis of this nature, but may offer insights that could inform the design of qualitative research.

One way of examining this relationship using existing TUS and CAPS data would be to run a regression that would determine specific variables that influence time spent on homework. Suggested variables for such a study include family size and structure, residential location, presence of a paid domestic worker, parent or carer's educational background and attitudes towards education, birth order, age, gender, socio-economic status, time spent doing domestic work or care work, child's school achievement and the expectations of the school regarding time spent on homework. Clearly this would be a complex analysis requiring careful preparation, particularly because a number of these variables are not easily quantified. For these reasons, it would be important to contextualise such a statistical exercise in qualitative analysis of attitudes and practices around homework in relation to other activities children engage in. Ideally a comparative approach would be adopted in order to capture the influence of socio-cultural and historical features of particular communities on such attitudes and practices. Moreover, such a study would rely heavily on observational techniques (rather than interviews alone) in order to reveal the factors that influence children's decisions around homework, household work and leisure activities.

Research approached in this way has enormous potential to shed light on relationships between home and school activities, and broader developmental outcomes. Other topics to explore include factors affecting time spent in school and in broader social activities versus time spent in the home, especially when children have a care-giving role. In essence, such studies require statistical analysis that takes the child as the unit of analysis, incorporates key features of children's immediate and wider socio-economic and cultural environment, and is conducted in the light of findings from on-going qualitative research.

References

- Barbarin, O. and L. Richter. 2001. *Mandela's Children: Growing up in post-apartheid South Africa*. London: Routledge.
- Bosch & Associates. 2002. Towards a National Child Labour Action Programme for South Africa: Discussion Document. Pretoria: Department of Labour; produced in cooperation with the International Labour Organisation (ILO) International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC).
- Booyesen, F. and T. Arntz. 2002. Children of the Storm: HIV/AIDS and Children in South Africa. *Social Dynamics* 28(1): 170-192.
- Boyden, J., Ling, B. and W. Myers, 1998. *What Works for Working Children* Radda Barnen, Stockholm, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Bray, R. 2002. Missing Links? An examination of contributions made by social surveys to our understanding of child well-being in South Africa. *Working Paper No. 23*, Centre for Social Science Research, University of Cape Town.
- Bray, R. 2003. Predicting the Social Consequences of Orphanhood in South Africa. *Working Paper No. 29*, Centre for Social Science Research, University of Cape Town.
- Budlender, D. and D. Bosch. 2002. *South Africa Child Domestic Workers: A National Report*. Report submitted to the International Labour Organisation (ILO) International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC). May 2002, Geneva.
- Budlender, D. Chobokoane, N. and Y. Mpetsheni. 2001. A survey of time use: How South African women and men spend their time. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa.
- Clacherty, G. 2003. When I finish my work it is after six. My heart is so sore because I have not played. Report on Children's Participation Process Towards a South African Child Labour Programme. Pretoria: Save the Children Sweden and Department of Labour.
- Department of Labour. 2003. The National Child Labour Action Programme for South Africa: Draft for consideration by government departments and other stakeholders. Pretoria: Department of Labour, Government of South Africa.
- Ennew, J. Myers, W.E. and D. P. Plateau (in progress) The Meaning, nature and scope of child labour. Draft for the Colloquium on 'Combating Abusive Child Labour' Iowa, July 2003.
- Giese, S., Meintjies, H., Croke, R. and R. Chamberlain. 2003. *Health and social services to address the needs of orphans and other vulnerable children in the context of HIV/AIDS: Research report and Recommendations*. Report submitted to the National Departments of Health and Social Development by the Children's Institute, University of Cape Town. 31st January 2003.

- Harpham, T. 2003. Measuring the social capital of Children. *Young Lives: An International Study of Childhood Poverty, Working Paper No. 4*. London: Save the Children.
- International Labour Office (ILO). 2002. *A future without child labour: Global report under the follow-up to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work 2002*. Report of the Director General, International Labour Conference 90th Session, 2002, Report 1 (B). Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Jones, S. 1993. *Assaulting Childhood: Children's Experiences of Migrancy and Hostel Life in South Africa*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Levine, S. 2002 *In the Shadow of the Vine: Child Labour in the Western Cape*. Seminar presented in Centre for African Studies, February 2002.
- Levine, S. 1999 Bittersweet Harvest: Children, work and the Global March against child labour in the post-apartheid state. *Critique of Anthropology* 19 (2), 139-155.
- Meintjies, H. 2001. Washing machines make lazy women: Domestic appliances and the negotiation of women's propriety in Soweto. *Journal of Material Culture* Vol. 6 (3): 345-363.
- Ramphela, M. 2002. *Steering by the Stars: Being young in South Africa*. Cape Town: Tafelberg Publishers.
- Rau, B. 2002. *Intersecting Risks: HIV/AIDS and Child Labour*. ILO Working Paper for the In Focus Programme on Promoting the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Statistics South Africa. 2000. *Child labour in South Africa: Tables. Survey of Activities of Young People 1999*.
- Statistics South Africa. 2001. *Survey of Activities of Young People in South Africa 1999: Country report on children's work-related activities*. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa, Department of Labour and International Labour Organisation International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC).
- Swart-Kruger, J. 2001. Isikathi Sokulala: How boys and girls in a South African squatter camp experience bedtime. In *International Journal of Anthropology* 16 (2-3), 99-111.
- UNDP, 1999. *Human Development in Thailand*. Geneva: UNDP.
- Wax. E. 2003. A Generation Orphaned by AIDS: Kenyan children struggle to survive as relatives shun them or take advantage. *Washington Post Foreign Exchange Service*, Wednesday, August 13, 2003.

Appendix one

Table 1: Comparison of time use between African children, young adults and elderly persons, by gender and activity type, Source of data: Time Use Survey (2000).

	Males 10-14 years			Females 10-14 years			Males 15-17 years			Females 15-17 years			Males 18-25 years			Females 18-25 years			Males 60+ years			Females 60+ years		
	Total Min	%P	Of P Min	Total Min	%P	Of P Min	Total Min	%P	Of P Min	Total Min	%P	Of P Min	Total Min	%P	Of P Min	Total Min	%P	Of P Min	Total Min	%P	Of P Min	Total Min	%P	Of P Min
Cooking / food prep	15	33%	47	49	65%	75	80	80%	100	29	41%	70	90	70%	128	24	31%	78	78	61%	128			
Cleaning inside home	14	32%	43	31	55%	56	42	65%	65	25	39%	65	51	63%	81	3	3%	94	46	55%	84			
Washing /ironing	7	18%	41	12	25%	48	22	34%	64	9	14%	66	25	31%	89	4	4%	91	21	19%	112			
Shopping	1	4%	29	2	8%	22	3	10%	28	5	11%	44	5	9%	57	0.3	0.5%	60	3	5%	67			
Caring for children	2	3%	63	4	6%	72	9	9%	103	2	3%	64	43	34%	126	0.5	2%	25	13	13%	103			
*General caring	3	6%	53	7	10%	73	21	22%	96	3	4%	68	40	40%	100	2	3%	59	14	16%	85			
Farming/ gardening	0.7	1%	71	0.7	0.7%	98	0.2	0.4%	45	1	1%	104	0.2	0.1%	173	8	6%	139	9	6%	153			
Tending animals	8	9%	86	0.3	0.7%	45	0.03	0.2%	15	4	4%	91	0.1	0.1%	69	6	8%	74	2	3%	60			
Collecting fuel	6	9%	69	3	4%	78	0.5	0.5%	96	3	3%	97	4	4%	104	4	3%	123	4	4%	109			
Collecting water	8	16%	51	11	20%	56	8	15%	55	3	6%	43	7	12%	55	2	4%	38	4	6%	59			

Key

Total Min = Mean time spent per day for whole population (including those who do not report participating in the activity)

% P = Percentage of group who reported engaging in the activity for any part of the previous day.

Of P Min = Mean time spent per person engaged in activity (in minutes).

* These figures represent incidence of reported care for children and sick, elderly or disabled adults (total of all 'care activity' codes hence includes travel related to care, supervision of those needing care and teaching children).

Note: In order to exclude faulty data, cases of more than 6 hours per day spent in one activity were excluded.

Table 2: A comparison of time use amongst African children across different work-related, educational and social activities.

	Males 10-14 years			Females 10-14 years			Males 15-17 years			Females 15-17 years		
	Total Min	%P	Of P Min	Total Min	%P	Of P Min	Total Min	%P	Of P Min	Total Min	%P	Of P Min
Cooking / food preparation	16	33%	47	49	65%	75	22	41%	53	80	80%	100
Cleaning inside home	14	32%	43	31	55%	56	25	44%	56	42	65%	65
Washing / ironing	7	18%	41	12	25%	48	11	22%	51	22	34%	64
Shopping	1	4%	29	2	8%	22	3	8%	33	3	10%	28
Caring for children	2	3%	63	4	6%	72	1	2%	51	9	9%	103
* General caring	3	6%	53	7	10%	73	2	5%	48	21	22%	96
Farming / gardening	0.7	1%	71	0.7	0.7%	98	2	2%	98	0.2	0.4%	45
Tending animals	8	9%	86	0.3	0.7%	45	7	9%	76	0.03	0.2%	15
Collecting fuel	6	9%	69	3	4%	78	2	3%	81	0.5	0.5%	96
Collecting water	8	16%	51	11	20%	56	5	11%	47	8	15%	55
^Attending school or other educational institution	190	65%	292	193	67%	288	192	63%	304	190	63%	302
Homework and studies	27	35%	78	31	39%	79	42	43%	98	49	49%	100
Travel related to learning	40	66%	60	45	67%	67	43	64%	67	46	64%	72
Participating in religious activities	15	22%	66	17	24%	70	13	22%	61	16	20%	81
Socialising with family	63	56%	112	73	58%	126	50	49%	102	56	51%	110
Socialising with non-family	65	55%	119	60	57%	105	81	63%	128	60	57%	106
Participation in indoor/outdoor sports	35	31%	112	12	11%	112	35	29%	121	6	6%	93
^Watching TV	90	54%	166	86	53%	162	89	55%	162	35	47%	160

Source of data: Time Use Survey (2000).

Key:

Total Min = Mean time spent per day for whole population (including those who do not report participating in the activity)

% P = Percentage of group who reported engaging in the activity for any part of the previous day.

Of P Min = Mean time spent per person engaged in activity (in minutes).

*These figures represent incidence of reported care for children and sick, elderly or disabled adults (total of all 'care activity' codes hence includes travel related to care, supervision of those needing care and teaching children).

Note: In order to exclude faulty data, cases of more than 6 hours per day spent in one activity were excluded.

^ A cut off of 10 hours per day was used for school attendance and watching TV as there was a significant number of cases in the 6-10 hour bracket.

Table 3: A comparison of time use amongst African and coloured children across different work-related activities (percentage of sample who spent one or more hours in each activity within the 7 days prior to interview).

	<i>Males 14 years</i>		<i>Females 14 years</i>		<i>Males 15-17 years</i>		<i>Females 15-17 years</i>	
	African	Coloured	African	Coloured	African	Coloured	African	Coloured
Doing housework	79%	71%	86%	83%	82%	71%	94%	87%
Caring for children	12%	9%	19%	13%	11%	10%	26%	25%
Caring for adults	5%	2%	9%	2%	7%	1%	9%	3%
Income generating work	0	4%	0	5%	2%	10%	1%	8%
Looking for work	2%	1%	1%	8%	2%	10%	2%	8%
Total number in sample	95	94	94	99	263	330	386	371

Source of data: Cape Area Panel Study (2002).

Figure 2: Exploring the appropriateness of measurements currently used in South African analysis and reporting around child work

Measurement criteria	Conceptual basis to measurement (stemming from international discourse on child labour)	Issues arising in the South African context
<p>Time spent on activity with reference to criteria for harm (time cut-offs)</p>	<p>Long hours of work have a negative effect on physical or mental health, and schooling. Costs to children lie in the trade-off between hours spent working and hours spent in play, education etc ('doing what children should do')</p>	<p>Most children combine domestic work with school activities without severe negative impacts on their progress. Low rates of attendance and attainment are caused by other factors than working roles (see below). The only significant drop in school attendance is amongst the small proportion (8 %) of children who work for more than 35 hours per week (SAYP, 2000:49 and 61).</p>
<p>Physical location and social context of work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home-based or outside the home • With nuclear family members or other relatives 	<p>Children are better protected in their own home and in the presence of a parent, grandparent or spouse than they are outside the home, and/or amongst wider family or non-kin.</p>	<p>Although no national data are available, it is acknowledged that rates of physical and sexual abuse of children are high, and that the majority of this takes place within a home and/or family context. Many African children move between homes and are cared for by aunts, sisters or other relatives or friends. The assumption that these arrangements automatically pose greater risk to children is problematic.</p>
<p>Attending school or not</p>	<p>School provides an education that is critical to long term well-being and the fulfilment of 'rights'</p>	<p>Attendance does not guarantee children a positive educational experience. Schools are often under-equipped and teaching quality low. There is emerging evidence of sexual exploitation in schools. These factors play a greater role than work in determining children's educational outcomes and well-being.</p>
<p>Economic contribution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paid / payable work or unpaid work 	<p>Function of work for individual and household Conflicting frameworks: Children should be spared economic responsibility versus children as economic contributors (with participation and citizenship rights).</p>	<p>Children's domestic work is valued for its contribution to household functioning, but in most cases schooling and other leisure pursuits are prioritised. In the absence of adult carers, children take on the care of young siblings, and sick or elderly adults. Little is known about the effects of this role on their well-being.</p>

Appendix two

Methodological details of the primary ethnographic research

Sampling, access and methods

A series of focus groups were conducted with children aged 7-17 years in Masiphumelele (table 1), and with children aged 12-17 years in Ocean View (table 2).

In Masiphumelele, the focal point of this study, access to children was facilitated by a local NGO (the Centre for Living Hope) through weekly clubs for young children and teenagers respectively. Hence it was possible to structure the age composition of each participating group according to divisions used in survey design and analysis, which are consistent with South African employment/labour laws (7-9 years, 10-14 years and 15-17 years respectively).

In Ocean View, the secondary research site, access was gained through a life skills programme for grade eight students run by volunteers and integrated into the high school curriculum. The research team were invited to run a series of workshops in eight consecutive lessons on one day. This opportunity generated a large volume of data in a short space of time; however we were not able to verify the information through alternative methods (triangulation) or on-going conversations with these children²³. Owing to the lack of ethnographic context, the Ocean View data are treated as additional comparative material to the Masiphumelele analysis (rather than directly comparable community ethnography).

In Masiphumelele, semi-structured interviews were conducted with adult family members (primary care-givers where possible) of 16 of the participating children in the 7-9 and 10-14 age groups. These interviews were conducted in the respective homes, and were designed to find out how domestic work is distributed amongst household and family members, and to elicit adults' views on children's roles in the household, child-rearing, the risks children face, and the notion of 'children's rights' (see interview schedule in appendix 1).

²³ Repeated interactions with these children were not possible in the school context owing to timetabling constraints and the examination period.

Table 4: Sample description and fieldwork context in Masiphumelele

<i>Age group</i>	<i>Number of children</i>	<i>Focus group venue</i>	<i>Number of focus group sessions</i>
7-9 year olds	Group 1: 8* Group 2: 4*	1. Children's club; back room in church hall or school classroom 2. Researcher's home	Group 1: 6 sessions Group 2: 3 sessions
10-14 year olds	Group1: 14 Group 2: 10*	1. Youth club; Centre for Living Hope 2. Researcher's home	Group1: 2 sessions Group 2: 3 sessions
15-17 year olds	10	Youth club: Centre for Living Hope	5 sessions + diaries

*Interviews were conducted with adult family members of 16 of these children. Interviews with family members of the remaining 6 children were not possible owing to absence from the home (for work or travel to relatives in the Cape flats or the Eastern Cape), and in one case, to drunkenness.

Visual and interactive methods were used in the focus groups to stimulate discussion amongst the children and researchers, including;

- drawings
- silhouette figures for children to construct their families
- worksheets of household members and roles
- spider diagrams
- daily time-lines
- mapping

Table 5: Sample description and methods used in Ocean View High School

<i>Age group</i>	<i>Sample size and gender division</i>	<i>Method</i>
^12-14 year olds	78 (50 girls; 28 boys)	1. Worksheet on household composition and division of labour
	51 (29 girls; 22 boys)	2. Timeline of daily activities (weekday and weekend)
	66 (34 girls; 32 boys)	3. Spider diagram of work activities and likes/dislikes (group activity)
^15-17 year olds	6 (4 girls; 2 boys)	1. Worksheet on household composition and division of labour
	0	2. Timeline of daily activities (weekday and weekend)
	14 (5 girls; 9 boys)	3. Spider diagram of work activities and likes/dislikes (group activity)

^ Respondents in this age group were asked to provide information on the household work done by each person in their household. The data are thus able to provide insight into the work activities of children (respondents' siblings) across the age spectrum.

The Centre for Social Science Research

Working Paper Series

RECENT TITLES

- 30/03 *How Do We Know What to Do? The Importance of Experimentation in Designing Programmes and Policies to Improve South African Schooling* By J. Seekings
- 31/03 *Social Stratification and Inequality in South Africa at the End of Apartheid* By J. Seekings
- 32/03 *Do South Africa's Unemployed Constitute an Underclass?* By J. Seekings
- 33/03 *Moving Beyond the Margins: A Narrative Analysis of the Life Stories of Women Living with HIV/AIDS in Khayelitsha* By T. Soskolne
- 34/03 *The Impact of HIV/AIDS on Democracy in Southern Africa: What Do We Know, What Need to Know, and Why?* By R. Mattes & R. Manning
- 35/03 *The Impact of HIV/AIDS on Local-level Democracy* By R. Manning
- 36/03 *Does Ethnicity Determine Electoral Behaviour* By P. Norris & R. Mattes
- 37/03 *What's News: Perspectives on HIV/AIDS Advocacy in the South African Media* By J. Stein
- 38/03 *Reservation Wages-Measurement and Determinants: Evidence from the Khayelitsha/Mitchell's Plain(KMP) Survey* By R. Walker
- 39/03 *The "Risk Gap", Its Determinants and Economic Implications* By P. Anderson
- 40/03 *Highly Active Antiretroviral Therapy and Risky Sex: Is there a Link?* By N. Nattrass
- 41/03 *Panel Attrition in Survey Data: A Literature Review* By U. Lee
- 42/03 *Providing Antiretroviral Treatment for All Who Need it in South Africa* By N. Nattrass & N. Geffen
- 43/03 *Unemployment and Aids: The Social-Democratic Challenge for South Africa* By N. Nattrass
- 44/03 *Young People's Social Networks, Confidants and Issues of Reproductive Health* By A. Bakilana & F. Esau

The Centre for Social Science Research

The CSSR is an umbrella organisation comprising five units:

The Aids and Society Research Unit (ASRU) supports quantitative and qualitative research into the social and economic impact of the HIV pandemic in Southern Africa. Focus areas include: the economics of reducing mother to child transmission of HIV, the impact of HIV on firms and households; and psychological aspects of HIV infection and prevention. ASRU operates an outreach programme in Khayelitsha (the Memory Box Project) which provides training and counselling for HIV positive people

The Data First Resource Unit ('Data First') provides training and resources for research. Its main functions are: 1) to provide access to digital data resources and specialised published material; 2) to facilitate the collection, exchange and use of data sets on a collaborative basis; 3) to provide basic and advanced training in data analysis; 4) the ongoing development of a web site to disseminate data and research output.

The Democracy In Africa Research Unit (DARU) supports students and scholars who conduct systematic research in the following three areas: 1) public opinion and political culture in Africa and its role in democratisation and consolidation; 2) elections and voting in Africa; and 3) the impact of the HIV/AIDS pandemic on democratisation in Southern Africa. DARU has developed close working relationships with projects such as the Afrobarometer (a cross national survey of public opinion in fifteen African countries), the Comparative National Elections Project, and the Health Economics and AIDS Research Unit at the University of Natal.

The Social Surveys Unit (SSU) promotes critical analysis of the methodology, ethics and results of South African social science research. One core activity is the Cape Area Panel Study of young adults in Cape Town. This study follows 4800 young people as they move from school into the labour market and adulthood. The SSU is also planning a survey for 2004 on aspects of social capital, crime, and attitudes toward inequality.

The Southern Africa Labour and Development Research Unit (SALDRU) was established in 1975 as part of the School of Economics and joined the CSSR in 2002. SALDRU conducted the first national household survey in 1993 (the Project for Statistics on Living Standards and Development). More recently, SALDRU ran the Langeberg Integrated Family survey (1999) and the Khayelitsha/Mitchell's Plain Survey (2000). Current projects include research on public works programmes, poverty and inequality.
