Counting Child Domestic Servants in Latin America

DEBORAH LEVISON
ANNA LANGER

COUNTING CHILD domestic servants seems a commonplace task. In fact, it is both difficult and important. Child domestic servants are among the most vulnerable of child workers and the most invisible. They may be treated well and allowed to attend school, or they may be secluded in their employers' homes, ill-treated, overworked, and unable to leave or report their difficulties to kin. In this analysis we ask how many children in six Latin American countries are employed as domestics, how many live with their employers, whether domestics make up a high proportion of child workers, and whether they are disadvantaged in school attendance. Our hope is that this information will be useful to policymakers, nongovernmental organizations, and activists seeking to identify child domestic servants and improve their lives.

We have been told that it is not possible to count child domestic servants.[1] Too many of them are "invisible": they are engaged in informal work, hidden away in residences, and sometimes identified to census and survey enumerators as relatives rather than servants. If they are in fact both relatives *and* servants—as in the Cinderella story, told worldwide in many versions, which recounts the tale of a step-daughter who served as a maid[2]—they themselves may prefer to be identified as family members. There are many reasons why counting and identifying trends in the use of child domestics may be difficult; we discuss these below. Still, under some conditions, we assert that we can make reasonable estimates of child domestic servants. Using census data made available through the IPUMS-International project,[3] we present estimates, time trends, and descriptive information about child domestics for six Latin American countries: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, and Mexico.[4] We know of no other large-scale attempt to count

child domestics. Our focus on Latin America is practical: when we began this project, the IPUMS-International census data collection did not include a critical mass of censuses from any other region that allowed us to identify domestic servants.[5]

Our earliest data are from 1960, but the starting date varies by country; in some cases we can follow trends over four decades, in other cases only three. We expect to see changes over time for a variety of reasons, as Latin American countries have experienced large-scale social and economic changes over the relevant time period. Prominent among these changes are demographic transition; expanding access to education; increases in women's labor force participation; economic fluctuations and trends, such as sectoral shifts in labor force opportunities; and effective human rights campaigns. Some of these changes imply decreases in child domestic service; other imply increases. Many of these social changes have happened (or are happening) more or less simultaneously; in this article we do not attempt to attribute particular causes to the observed patterns related to child domestics.[6]

We use the term "child" as it is used in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child: to indicate that a person is under 18 years of age. Although we recognize that many adolescents in poor countries are effectively adults by their mid-teenage years, we use the term child to refer to both younger children and adolescents. Because very few children can provide useful labor before approximately the age of 5 years, we initially searched for domestic workers aged 5–17 years. Most of the child domestics we identify are between ages 10 and 17, so our analysis focuses on that age range.

Conceptual difficulties in defining domestic servants

Most authors writing about child domestic servants do not include a definition of what they mean by "domestic servant." After all, it seems obvious: a domestic servant is someone who does domestic work in someone else's home, for pay or in-kind remuneration. But what is domestic work, and how much of it does one need to do (for someone else) in order to be classified as a domestic servant? In some parts of Africa, for example, young girls may labor from morning to nightfall under the direction of their mothers and female kin, yet this work is not counted as domestic service (Reynolds 1991). Similarly, girls who are fostered into a family may spend their days in various types of domestic labor—are they servants? What about, in Brazil, when young country cousins want to escape the stagnation of their rural towns and move in with distant kin in the city, in exchange for domestic services—are they servants? What if they only do domestic work during part of each day and attend school for part of the day—do they count? In other situations, children who are not related to the family take care of their "patrons," doing whatever

work needs to be done, including much domestic work. The rewards for doing this may be undefined and depend on the good will, resources, and networks of the patron. The point here is that some people are not called servants by the people for whom they perform services, yet they may perform the same tasks as others who *are* called servants.

Another difficulty concerns the tasks performed. Typical tasks performed by domestic servants include cleaning the home; shopping for food; preparing food for cooking; cooking and serving meals; washing dishes; washing clothing and linens; drying and ironing laundry; child care, including dressing, diapering, feeding, taking to and from school, and watching children; and care for the ill, disabled, or elderly, including the most intimate types of care. This is a long list, but it is by no means all-inclusive. Some domestic servants sweep the yard, water plants, care for kitchen gardens, or work in their employers' fields. Others care for poultry, goats, pigs, or other farm animals. How can we tell whether someone is more of a domestic servant or more of a farm hand?

Clearly there is a continuum, with one end denoting people who are obviously domestic servants and the other end denoting people who obviously are not. In between, it gets fuzzier. Yet, we have to draw an arbitrary line if we are to count child domestic servants, since we have to define each child in our census samples as either a domestic servant or not. To a great extent, the location of this line is determined by the data that were collected in the censuses of the six countries in our study and, more importantly, by the people responding to census enumerators.

The IPUMS-International data

The availability of integrated public use samples of census microdata allows us to investigate the presence of child domestic servants in a number of low- and middle-income countries. We have chosen to investigate child domestics in countries for which samples are available through IPUMS-International and for which particular information was collected that helps us to identify domestic servants. Data from multiple censuses per country were used to examine trends in the use of child domestic servants over time. While the years available differed by country, all the censuses (and the one survey) in our sample were conducted between 1960 and 2002. Appendix Table A1 gives the years in which these censuses were conducted and provides other characteristics of the samples.

Samples

We initially included individuals between the ages of 5 and 17 years in our samples. We excluded individuals in group quarters who were not living with

relatives;[7] these individuals are unlikely to be available for domestic service. In any case, they comprise a small portion of the population in our age range (in general, less than one percent). Because the numbers of 5–9-year-olds in our sample working in domestic service were so small as to make estimates problematic, our final sample focuses on 10–17-year-olds.

Table A1 describes the samples used in the analysis. For each country and census year, we indicate the sample density, enumeration rule, and ages for which labor force information—for occupation and industry in particular—was collected. The earliest age at which labor force activity was recorded has important implications for our estimates. The table also indicates how many 10–17-year-olds were included in the sample and provides our conservative estimate of the total number of 10–17-year-old domestic servants in the sample, by sex, including only those employed in the reference period. These are sample sizes; they are *not* the estimated number of domestics in the population, which is shown in Table 1 and Table A3. The small number of male domestics in these samples is the main reason that much of the analysis focuses on female domestics.

Defining child domestics

The measures of child domestic service used here are based on information from two sources within Latin American census data: employment-related information, in particular the child's occupation and industry, and relationship to head of household or family (that is, to the census reference person). In almost all cases the countries used in this analysis have both of these sources of information on domestic servants.

Occupation and industry data are collected for individuals who are recognized as members of the labor force. (Definitions of the census universes for labor force questions are given in Table A2.) Most Latin American censuses have for some decades recognized domestic service as a distinct occupational category or set of categories. The second source of information comes from a description of how an individual is related to either the head of the household or the head of a subfamily. In Latin America, it is standard to include "domestic servant" as one possible relationship to the reference person.

In some ways, both of these sources are inadequate, insofar as the respondent may not be well informed about the activities of the child in question or may wish to mislead the enumerator. While all the censuses in our study are based on questions posed to respondents by enumerators (rather than mail-in questionnaires), census procedures almost always rely upon a principal respondent for each household or family. Adults at home at the time of the enumerator's visit typically respond on behalf of children, especially younger children. (Older adolescents, if present, may or may not be allowed

to self-report.) Responding adults may not be well informed about, for example, the number of hours worked per week by a particular child. They may wish to stretch the truth: a distant relative living-in and doing the household's domestic work may be described as a relative rather than a servant, for example. This is especially likely for younger children. The stigma of domestic service contributes to the statistical invisibility of child domestics. Publicity campaigns opposing child labor increase misreporting, as respondents learn to be fearful of repercussions for the use of child servants.

Using the first source of information, labor force variables relating to industry and occupation of employment, we determined whether an individual was reported as being included in domestic service industries and/or occupations. In some cases industry and occupation variables provided identical information. In other cases, both were needed. For example, in the 1991 Argentina census, individuals were identified as domestic servants if they were labeled as being in an "other service activities" industry and a "workers in domestic services, non-specialized" occupation.[8]

One issue that arose with the use of labor force data was whether to include domestic workers who were unemployed at the time of the census. Because children tend to move in and out of employment more frequently than adults, on any particular census day we would expect to find unemployed child domestics who had been employed the previous month and who would be employed again shortly (Levison et al. 2007). We do not include unemployed domestics in our conservative estimates, shown in Table A3. However, because our goal is to count the numbers of children who usually work as domestics, we include the unemployed in our "best guess" counts of child domestics, shown in Table 1. In any case, they make up a very small fraction of all domestics.

Using the second source of information, on relationship to household head, we identified whether an individual was categorized as a domestic servant by his or her household relationship. In a substantial number of cases, individuals recognized as being servants of the household or family head were not reported to be members of the labor force.[9] A sensitivity analysis, discussed below, includes estimates of the extent to which child domestics would be undercounted if we based our counts solely on labor force or household relationship information.

We are unable to distinguish between full-time and part-time work in this analysis; hours of work are not known for part of our sample. Given the irregular nature of domestic labor, estimated hours of work would, in any case, be especially likely to be mismeasured (by the child) or misreported (by employers or parents) because of ignorance, carelessness, or shame. If data were available, the distinction between full- and part-time work would be important to the extent that children working part-time, for instance, may be able to attend school more easily than those working full-time.

TABLE 1 "Best guess" estimates of numbers of live-in and live-out child domestic servants and proportions female, ages 10–14 and 15–17 (weighted) in six Latin American countries

	Ages 10–14							Ages 15–17						
Country/ year	Total in age group (000s) (1)	Number in labor force (000s) (2)	Percent of (2) female (3)	Number of live-out domestics (000s) (4)	Percent of (4) female (5)	Number of live-in domestics (000s) (6)	Percent of (6) female (7)	Total in age group (000s) (8)	Number in labor force (000s) (9)	Percent of (9) female (10)	Number of live-out domestics (000s) (11)	Percent of (11) female (12)	Number of live-in domestics (000s) (13)	Percent of (13) female (14)
Argentina														
1970	2,167.4	179.6	36.8	20.6	92.7	26.4	87.7	1,241.1	463.3	33.4	39.7	96.2	43.2	96.6
1980	2,437.0	65.2	32.5	8.3	96.8	4.9	97.6	1,398.9	453.6	32.5	44.6	98.1	26.3	97.2
1991	3,338.2	80.8	38.4	6.2	89.2	5.2	89.8	1,757.2	442.4	35.7	40.2	92.6	13.9	97.4
2001	3,416.3	20.0	32.2	2.3	72.9	0.8	57.7	1,913.4	132.7	30.6	16.3	81.7	2.0	89.3
Brazil														
1960	7,297.6	1,132.7	24.3	77.9	91.4	—	—	3,734.1	1,649.9	27.5	144.4	94.4	—	—
1970	11,859.4	1,464.2	25.1	80.1	95.5	71.0	95.4	6,392.5	2,310.7	30.7	163.6	97.3	173.5	96.6
1980	14,206.7	1,833.3	29.5	174.7	93.5	79.4	96.1	8,462.8	3,397.1	33.4	286.8	96.1	165.7	97.2
1991	17,037.2	1,455.8	29.3	164.7	93.9	48.2	97.4	9,223.1	3,306.9	33.4	341.5	94.8	130.4	97.3
2000	17,337.8	1,137.0	32.5	89.7	93.6	11.6	95.7	10,716.9	2,789.1	35.7	292.6	94.7	46.2	95.5
Chile														
1960	807.0	29.5	30.1	1.9	82.6	6.6	83.8	431.4	126.2	30.8	5.6	94.0	24.0	91.7
1970	1,116.3	22.2	30.4	4.2	88.6	—	—	573.0	113.1	29.7	22.7	92.0	—	—
1982	1,215.4	2.7	45.9	—	—	—	—	773.0	100.5	30.8	21.6	93.0	—	—
1992	1,205.8	8.2	25.9	0.9	76.6	0.7	92.8	692.6	78.3	28.2	7.3	84.3	7.0	95.6
2002	1,398.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	756.0	66.2	38.3	1.5	86.8	0.8	97.4

Colombia													
1964	2,269.6	243.4	25.5	5.1	76.2	55.6	78.1	1,089.8	396.8	26.6	8.4	88.1	61.6	88.5
1973	2,891.7	233.3	26.6	6.5	87.2	39.8	89.5	1,448.2	407.3	30.2	10.8	94.6	67.3	94.5
1985	3,169.5	288.2	33.9	19.0	87.5	26.1	77.3	1,920.0	504.7	34.9	35.1	94.4	67.0	84.6
1993	3,722.0	286.5	25.4	5.6	91.0	21.3	85.3	1,969.6	482.7	28.1	13.7	94.5	53.9	90.6
Costa Rica														
1963	174.8	13.9	18.1	0.8	75.6	1.4	83.5	81.0	31.4	22.3	1.8	90.7	2.7	99.4
1973	273.8	15.2	19.6	0.9	97.8	1.5	87.7	136.3	44.3	26.1	3.0	99.0	4.4	99.3
1984	270.8	15.8	14.7	0.9	98.9	0.6	90.3	166.8	47.5	19.8	2.9	100.0	2.2	98.2
2000	429.9	10.5	17.8	0.6	90.0	0.3	51.9	241.1	41.0	21.9	2.6	92.7	0.7	95.5
Mexico														
1960	4,278.4	—	—	31.4	87.4	—	—	2,113.7	—	—	52.4	91.9	—	—
1970	6,395.4	424.3	32.8	41.7	95.9	—	—	3,159.7	978.5	32.7	99.8	95.6	—	—
1990	10,438.3	431.8	24.7	25.1	94.4	25.8	81.5	6,028.2	1,493.0	28.1	73.8	93.6	59.5	92.4
1995	10,636.7	896.4	28.0	48.7	96.1	8.1	91.1	6,122.3	2,045.0	33.1	129.8	94.3	48.1	94.0
2000	10,883.6	566.7	30.3	36.0	92.2	7.6	87.9	6,209.1	1,826.1	34.5	99.7	94.7	44.1	93.9

NOTE: Estimates for 10–14-year-olds are based partly/only on household information for some ages in some samples. "Best guess" estimates also include unemployed children whose last job was as a domestic servant, depending on data availability (see Table A3). Dashes indicate categories for which data are not available—see Table A2.
SOURCE: Authors' calculations using IPUMS-International (Minnesota Population Center 2008).

Estimated levels and trends

Our goal is to provide estimates useful to researchers, policymakers, and activists. While one purpose might call for the most careful, conservative estimates, another might reasonably want to include invisible domestics, using an estimate designed to do this. We thus present several different estimates of the numbers of child domestics discernible using samples of census data. Some users will prefer our most conservative estimates of the numbers of child domestics, presented in Table A3: the table excludes unemployed children and includes only ages for which we have labor force information. The estimates presented in Table 1, on the other hand, are our "best guess" estimates of the numbers of 10–17-year-old child domestic servants in these six countries. In Table 1 we have included all the bits of information we have. In Table A3, when we had labor force information starting at age 12 (as in Costa Rica), then the entire estimate was for ages 12–14, rather than 10–14. In Table 1, we added information for 10- and 11-year-olds, based on the relationship-to-head question, to the more complete data for 12–14-year-olds. Because unemployed domestic servants are likely to resume work subsequently as domestics, they have also been included in these estimates. The estimates in Table 1 are not substantially larger than the conservative estimates, and most of the differences are for the younger age group.

Table 1 is divided into two sets of columns, with columns (1) through (7) referring to ages 10–14, while columns (8) through (14) refer to ages 15–17. We include estimates of numbers for labor force employment and numbers of live-in and live-out domestics, also providing the total number of children in the age group so that readers may calculate any of a number of percentages.[10] Additional columns show the percentage female for each estimated number. It is important to keep demographic trends in mind when using Table 1. Column (8) most clearly reflects the increase in numbers of youth resulting from increasing numbers of women in childbearing ages, changing fertility rates, and mortality decline. Brazil, for example, had 3.7 million 15–17-year-olds in 1960 and 10.7 million in 2000. It is noticeable that employment growth rates rarely keep pace with population growth rates for this age group, indicating declining labor force employment rates.

Overall child employment

In some countries, the percentages of girls and boys who work in the labor force have been declining since the 1960s (see Table A4). In Argentina, declines have been monotonic since the first available sample for 1970. In Brazil, the same can be said for boys since 1960, but for girls declines have been steady only since 1980. In Chile and Costa Rica declines are monotonic on the whole, with minor exceptions. Colombia's patterns are more complicated. The country's employment percentages do not vary substantially between 1964

and 1993 for three of the four age-sex groups. For 15–17-year-old boys, however, employment declined from 57 percent in 1964 to about 36 percent in the 1980s and 1990s. Employment also fell for 15–17-year-old girls between 1985 and 1993. Mexico's employment rates fluctuate somewhat but do not show substantial declines over the four decades presented here.

A higher share of boys than girls is employed, in both age groups and in every country and sample. Generally, girls make up fewer than one-third of youth employed in the labor force (Table 1, columns 3 and 10).

Employment as domestics

In every country, sample, and both age groups, boys who are in the labor force are substantially less likely than girls to be employed as domestic servants (Table 1, columns 5, 7, 12, and 14). In fact, fewer than 5 percent of employed boys are typically domestics. For this reason, most of our discussion focuses on girls. Table A4 shows, for six countries and two age groups, the percentages of girls who are employed, the percentages of *employed* girls who are domestic servants, and the percentages of *all* girls who are domestics. A key finding of this analysis is that domestic service accounts for a substantial fraction of girls' labor force employment—a remarkably high fraction in some samples. Among employed girls, at least 20 percent are domestic servants in most samples. In the earlier census samples, sometimes 60 to 80 percent of employed girls were domestics. In more recent samples, 30 percent is more common.

Argentina and Colombia display close-to-monotonic declines in the percentage of employed girls who are domestic servants between the mid-1960s and the end of the century. In Brazil, Costa Rica, and Mexico, the percentage of employed girls who are domestics first increases, then declines. A similar pattern can be seen when examining the estimated numbers of all girls who are employed as domestics—in this case, for all countries except Chile and Argentina. It should be noted that data for the 1960s are not available for Argentina; perhaps we would find a similar pattern if we had such data.

It is likely that as social norms changed in Latin America, the demand for child domestics was less elastic than the demand for other kinds of child workers. That is, as more and more children began to spend greater amounts of time in school, the reduced availability of a family's own children for domestic work, combined with the increase in women's labor force participation, meant that many households must have felt an increased need for help in accomplishing household tasks and caregiving. Thus, even while the total rate of labor force employment was falling for children, the demand for child domestics was strong enough to increase employment in both absolute numbers and as a percentage of all employed children. Eventually, however, a combination of other social factors—including the normative realization that children should be in school and should not be full-time workers, smaller

numbers of available children owing to fertility decline, and increased use of labor-saving devices among the middle class—led to declines in both absolute numbers of children who are domestics and percentages of employed girls working as domestics.

While a relatively small proportion of girls was employed as domestics in the most recent census years—at or below 5 percent in most countries (with Brazil slightly higher)—Table 1 shows that the absolute numbers of child domestics were substantial in the larger countries: over 400,000 in Brazil, over 180,000 in Mexico, and over 90,000 in Colombia (summing cols. 4, 6, 11, and 13).

Comparing younger and older employed girls who are domestics, we find that in almost every case a higher percentage of the older girls are domestics. This could, in part, be due to parents moving girls out from other forms of employment as they reach puberty. An illustrative example for such a tendency is given in Madsian (2004: 130), who writes about Brazilian children working as peanut vendors: "Parents, above all, are concerned that their daughters maintain their virginity and live up to the image of the ideal woman. The street is a constant source of danger, and may even lure girls to prostitution. Regularly the girls, and occasionally also the boys, are solicited for sexual services [as they sell peanuts]. Hence, around the age of 15, girls tend to stop working on the street." Other girls may enter domestic service simply because it is an obvious means of first employment, given the training in domestic skills that most receive in their own homes.

Living in versus living out

We are able to discern whether a domestic servant is "living in"—that is, residing with her employers—or "living out" by the way in which she was enumerated. Those children who were identified as domestic servants by the household relationship question must have been "living in" (if they were correctly enumerated). Children who were enumerated with their own families but were identified by their labor force information as domestic servants were assumed to be "living out." We observe this distinction in status because of its implications for the relative agency and privileges of a domestic servant. Children who live with their own kin may report abuses by employers, while live-in domestics may have much more limited access to kin or others who could assist them. A child domestic's place of residence may also have implications for his or her schooling.

School enrollment

Based on the literature, we expected domestic workers to be disadvantaged in terms of education relative to other workers in their age groups and to non-workers, even if domestic service provided some children with educa-

tional advantages. Oyaide (2000), for example, found that among 159 child domestics identified in various parts of Lusaka, Zambia, only one was attending school. We do not make a causal argument here, because any association between school enrollment and domestic service may be due to who becomes a servant (a selection issue). Ainsworth (1992) found that children in Ivory Coast who left rural areas to become domestics in urban areas were less likely to be in school than other children of the households in which they worked, but the child domestics were more likely to be in school than the siblings they left behind.

Most census questions on school enrollment translate to something like, "Is [this person] going to school?" (See Table A2.) Our analysis confirms that domestic workers[11] are disadvantaged in enrollment in comparison to non-working individuals in their age group. Our evidence shows, however, that domestic workers are not always disadvantaged in comparison to workers in other industries. The pattern for Brazil is typical of Latin America: Brazil's school enrollment-by-age figures shift upward over the decades, with peak enrollment at about ages 10–11 (not shown).[12] Enrollment typically declines with age throughout the teen years, as children enter more adult roles.

In Brazil, live-out domestics had an advantage in education over live-in domestics until the late teen years in decades prior to 2000. Moreover, in earlier decades, younger live-in domestics clearly had an advantage over other (non-domestic) workers. By 2000, however, older (age 13+) live-in domestics were substantially less likely to be enrolled in school than live-out domestics or other workers. Similarly, in Mexico, a clear live-in advantage in school enrollment in 1990 changed to a clear live-in disadvantage by 2000.

In Colombia in 1973 and 1993, domestic workers who lived with their employers were more likely to be enrolled in school than live-out domestics or other workers. This advantage did not exist in 1985, a year in which enrollment levels for all child workers were high relative to other years.

Costa Rica shows the most decided advantage for younger live-in domestics with respect to school attendance, with a slight advantage continuing at some older ages. Child domestics in Costa Rica are more likely to attend school than other child workers.

We note that where a shift has occurred over time in the degree of educational advantage of live-in versus live-out domestics, it has become more of a disadvantage to live in. Overall, however, live-in child domestic servants were not necessarily disadvantaged in enrollment compared to live-out servants.

Without a better understanding of the direction of causality or potential selection issues, we cannot explain the reasons underlying these patterns. For example, it seems likely that as fewer families have felt the need to place children in live-in situations to ensure them regular meals, those who have remained in live-in service are from the most destitute families—that is, increasingly selected—and are least able to leave employers who keep them

out of school. On the other hand, it could be that as school became accessible to more children, only those children who did very poorly dropped out and became live-in domestics. In the latter scenario, children are selected according to lack of educational achievement rather than poverty (although the two are highly correlated), and causality runs from school to domestic service rather than vice versa. Both patterns may occur within one population of child domestics.

Sensitivity analysis

We have already mentioned our first type of sensitivity analysis, in which we compared conservative estimates of child domestic servants (Table A3) with our "best guess" estimates (Table 1). The more conservative estimates were produced only for samples and/or age groups where both of our primary sources of information—labor force and household relationship—were available. The "best guess" estimates took into account all available data that might inform us about the children's work.

Other studies of child domestic workers may have to rely only on household status information or only on labor force information. In either case, the result will be an undercount of child domestic workers. Table A5 reports the degree to which the number of child domestics estimated is sensitive to availability of labor force or household relationship information, focusing on recent samples for which labor force information is available for the entire age group in question. If we had only one source of information, to what extent would we underestimate the number of child domestic servants, compared to using both sources of information (conservative estimate, as in Table A3)?

Inadequate labor force measures

The labor force status of some child domestic servants is not acknowledged by the adults responding to census enumerators. According to Table A5, column (2), this is a relatively small problem in most of the countries included in this analysis. In Brazil and Chile, for example, 99 percent of domestics are identifiable using labor force information. The greatest degree of misreporting is found in Costa Rica: 7 percent of 15–17-year-old domestics were not identifiable using only labor force data.

Inadequate household relationship measures

Household relationship measures also failed to identify some domestic servants identified by labor force measures. In many cases this is to be expected, because live-out domestic servants are not enumerated with the households of their employers. For example, if a live-out domestic servant lives with her parents, she should be enumerated as "child" according to the household

relationship information. Table A5 (column 3) shows the percentage of child domestics who were identified using only the household relationship information. In Colombia 80 percent of domestics were identifiable through the relationship information only, but in the other five countries much smaller proportions were identifiable in this way. In Argentina and Brazil, over 85 percent of domestics would be overlooked if one were using only household relationship information.

Imputed live-in domestic servant status

Given the high potential for non-reporting of the true work status of relatives acting as servants ("Cinderellas")—especially in countries with highly visible anti-child-labor campaigns—we consider the extent to which we might have underestimated the number of live-in child domestics. We do this using the household and/or family relationship information. It is possible to detect people in the household who do not have a clearly identified relationship to the head. Thus, "other relatives," "*agregados*" (in Brazil), and "non-relatives" are possible domestic servants, although clearly some of them are not. For example, an adolescent non-relative in a census enumeration may be the live-in partner of a family member. A few censuses have a category for "child of a servant." Because we suspect that older children of servants are treated more like servants than like the sons and daughters of the head of household, since their parent is a live-in domestic, we consider this small group to be possible domestic servants. Because most domestic servants are girls (see Table 1), we considered only females in arriving at an estimated number of unreported domestics. The total number of girls in this "Cinderella" group, which gives an upper bound for the number of hidden live-in female domestics, is reported in column (5) of Table A5.

The numbers of co-resident children and youth who may be domestic servants seem much too large—surely not all of them are domestic servants, even on a part-time basis. In column (6) of Table A5, we assume arbitrarily that 25 percent of them are in fact domestic servants. (We continue to search for qualitative evidence on which to base this percentage.) We expected these imputations to substantially increase our estimates of the numbers of child domestic servants. Oddly enough, they do in some countries but not in others. For Mexico, they increase the original estimate by only 3.5 percent. Advocacy organizations could play a role in identifying hidden child domestic servants. In terms of absolute numbers, this issue is most pressing in Brazil and Colombia.

The welfare of child domestic servants

While many differences exist in the conditions under which children perform domestic work, child domestic servants are exposed to several characteristic

threats. For one, they may not be allowed to take breaks or may be required to work long hours. Child domestic workers may also suffer from a lack of access to education, which can contribute to social isolation and diminished future labor force opportunities (Oyaide 2000). UNICEF considers domestic work to be among the lowest-status, least-regulated, and most poorly remunerated of all occupations, for both adults and children, and reports that most child domestics are live-in workers who are under round-the-clock control by their employers (UNICEF 1999).

When exploitation of child workers is extreme or conditions are akin to slavery, the ILO considers domestic service to be a "worst form" of child labor (Black 2005). Accounts of beatings and sexual abuse are not uncommon among qualitative studies of child domestic servants.[13] Because they frequently live with their employers out of the view of others, child domestic workers may be particularly exposed to this type of exploitation. The following summary of findings from Haiti echoes features found in the limited number of other studies from around the world:

> [Servant] children living outside the home tended to have a heightened risk of treatment as second class citizens and also a heightened risk of physical and sexual abuse—though neither is inevitable. According to field interviews, the living conditions of servant children tend to be distinctly different from other children in the same household. They sleep in the least desirable places, e.g., on a section of carpet in the outside kitchen or on the floor at the foot of a bed. They eat different food. They do significantly more work than other children in the household. They may well carry the workload of adult domestic servants and more. According to direct observation by informants, such children are subject to public humiliation and corporal punishment including beatings with cooking pots, shoes, whips, or fists. They may well not go to school, or if they do, it is an inferior school and in any case a different school from those attended by other children in the household. They are subject to sexual abuse by other children in the household and sometimes by adults, yet they would not be likely to be allowed to marry the sons or daughters of the household served. (Smucker and Murray 2004: 35–36)

In our analysis we differentiate between live-in and live-out domestic servants as a way of taking account of these heightened risks. We are unable, however, to compare actual conditions of employment, either within the domestic service occupation or in comparison to other sectors of employment. What evidence exists comes from small-scale studies and appears to be context-specific. Moreover, negative reports are likely to be highlighted in the reports of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs)—often for fundraising purposes—while positive reports may be overlooked. It is not possible, on the basis of media or NGO reports, to estimate the proportion of live-in child domestics who are abused.

Some observers are careful to note that one should not automatically assume that child domestic work is exploitative or worse than what a child would experience if he or she were not a domestic worker. For many families, placing a child in a stable household that has a higher standard of living than the parents' household is seen as beneficial (UNICEF 1999); for the most vulnerable families and for orphans, it may be a way to ensure that a child is fed, clothed, and sheltered. Some children are sent from rural homes to be domestics in urban areas, in an effort to allow them to further their education.

Policy implications

Whether or not census data can be used to accurately identify child domestic servants depends to a great extent on the census tradition in particular countries. We encourage statistical agencies to (1) include a servant category among the relationship-to-reference-person options; (2) specify domestic service as an occupation, unmixed with other occupations; and (3) collect labor force statistics starting no later than age 10. Higher age cut-offs may overlook many child workers.

A key finding of this analysis is that domestic service accounts for a substantial fraction of girls' labor force activity. Combined with information from qualitative studies about the poor conditions under which many children work as servants, this finding points to a need for a substantial emphasis on domestic service in programs aimed at reducing the deleterious effects of work on children.

Our results also indicate a need for additional research to determine what percentage of children are hidden domestic servants, or "Cinderellas." For example, Smucker and Murray (2004) document a variety of arrangements for children in Haiti who live or work away from their biological parents. A *restavèk* is "a person who lives with others and serves them, an unpaid domestic servant"; labeling someone a *restavèk* relegates him or her to "the lowest possible servile status" (p. 21). Other categories are identified by terms indicating adoptive kinship (*pitit*), living with an extended family (*pitit kay*), or less pejorative terms for unpaid servant children (*timoun*). In all of these cases, however, children living away from their parents are expected to perform certain domestic tasks, and unpaid servants are expected to work much harder than the children of the house.

Similarly, Jacquemin (2004: 384–385) describes three types of child domestics in Abidjan, Ivory Coast: the *little niece*, who works for kin; the *hired help*, who works for strangers and whose payment goes directly to her guardian; and the *little paid maid*, who also works for strangers but is paid directly in cash. The author notes that "some paid maids consider that they only started to 'work' when they had their first [employment] placement where they re-

ceived a monthly salary, while during the months or even years before that, they had been carrying out exactly the same tasks," but in the role of little niece or hired help (p. 392). These distinctions imply that standard labor force questions designed for adults may not identify all domestic servants, even if the individuals are allowed to speak on their own behalf.

Maggie Black (1997) has written a handbook about how to identify and interview possible child domestic servants. She points out there is "pressure in numbers": "without estimates of numbers, we cannot make the point that this is a large group of child workers and deserves serious attention" (p. 41). Michael Bourdillon (2009: 1) states that support for child domestic workers "should be a matter of urgency." He writes that such support means showing support for children who "have tried to overcome adversity by working for themselves and their families, often in painful situations" (p. 13) and argues convincingly that a ban on child domestic work will not accomplish this.[14] Programs to improve the working conditions of child domestics will need funding based, to some extent, on the numbers of child domestics in the community.

We have shown that in the six countries we examined the census data point to substantial numbers of child domestic servants, in addition to the more readily identifiable domestic servants at later labor force ages. The fact that the great majority of identifiable domestics are girls, and that they are engaged in something as seemingly mundane as housework, may render many or all of them invisible to policymakers. The status and well-being of all of these children, however, deserves further attention.

TABLE A1 Characteristics of census samples included in the analysis of child domestic servants in six Latin American countries (unweighted sample sizes)

Country/ year	Sample density (%) (1)	Enumeration rule[a] (2)	Labor force data collected (3)	10–17 years			
				Total (4)	Domestics (5)	Female domestics (6)	Male domestics (7)
Argentina							
1970	2.0	de facto	age 10+	68,169	2,584	2,430	154
1980	10.0	de facto	age 14+	405,850	9,046	8,805	241
1991	10.0	de facto	age 14+	678,252	7,789	7,175	614
2001	10.0	de facto	age 14+	532,968	2,132	1,718	414
Brazil							
1960	5.0	de facto	age 10+	551,588	11,048	10,320	728
1970	5.0	de facto	age 10+	947,460	24,874	23,980	894
1980	5.0	de jure & de facto	age 10+	1,075,606	34,145	32,691	1,454
1991	5.8	de jure	age 10+	1,551,439	39,840	37,997	1,843
2000	6.0	de jure	age 10+	1,713,976	28,010	26,510	1,500
Chile							
1960	1.2	de facto	age 12+	14,922	452	408	44
1970	10.0	de facto	age 12+	168,929	2,641	2,420	221
1982	10.0	de facto	age 15+	198,837	1,988	1,865	123
1992	10.0	de facto	age 14+	189,836	1,524	1,358	166
2002	10.0	de facto	age 15+	215,419	196	179	17
Colombia							
1964	2.0	de facto	age 12+	67,187	2,604	2,177	427
1973	10.0	de facto	age 10+	433,982	12,384	11,463	921
1985	10.0	de jure	age 10+	492,643	14,082	12,173	1,909
1993	10.0	de jure	age 10+	569,168	9,374	8,433	941
Costa Rica							
1963	6.0	de jure	age 12+	15,049	381	357	24
1973	10.0	de jure	age 12+	41,011	962	936	26
1984	10.0	de jure	age 12+	43,760	641	630	11
2000	10.0	de jure	age 12+	67,093	415	374	41
Mexico[b]							
1960	1.5	de jure	all ages	96,499	1,250	1,128	122
1970	1.0	de jure	age 12+	112,870	1,091	1,037	54
1990	10.0	de jure	age 12+	1,629,126	18,410	16,871	1,539
1995	0.4	de jure	age 12+	83,790	885	834	51
2000	10.6	de jure	age 12+	1,829,769	21,271	19,991	1,280

[a]"De facto" censuses enumerate people where they actually are at the time of the enumeration, whereas "de jure" censuses enumerate people with the households to which they belong in a legal sense. For example, children boarding at school would be counted as residing in the school dormitory in a de facto census, whereas they would be listed with their parents in a de jure census.

[b]Mexico 1995 is not a census; it is a comparable household survey. We do not differentiate between this survey sample and samples derived from censuses.

NOTES: Columns (5)– (7) use the same conservative definition of employment as used in Table A3. Counts of domestics for Mexico 1960 include unemployed workers.

SOURCE: Authors' calculations using IPUMS-International (Minnesota Population Center 2008).

TABLE A2 Definitions of the census universe for labor force and current school questions, and other notes, six Latin American countries

Country/year	Who is considered to be a member of the labor force?	Who is in the universe for the current schooling question? (approx. question in italics)	Other notes
Argentina		*¿Asiste a algún establecimienta educacional?*	
1970	Employed or experienced unemployed	Persons age 5+	
1980	Employed or experienced unemployed	Persons age 5+	
1991	Had a job last week	Persons age 3+	
2001	Had a job last week	Persons age 3+	
Brazil		*¿Freqüenta escola (ou creche)?*	
1960	In the labor force	Persons age 5+ registered for school (even if temporarily absent)	No relationship-to-head code for domestic servant
1970	In the labor force	Persons age 5+ registered for school (even if temporarily absent)	
1980	Persons who were employed	Persons age 5+ registered for school (even if temporarily absent)	
1991	Persons who were employed	Persons age 5+ registered for school (even if temporarily absent)	
2000	Persons who were employed	Persons age 5+ registered for school (even if temporarily absent)	
Chile		*¿Asiste actualmente a un establecimienta de enseñanza regular?*	
1960	Persons who ever worked	Only heads of households	
1970	Either worked, did not work but had a job, or seeking work between April 13 and 18	Persons age 5+	No relationship-to-head code for domestic servant
1982	Persons who ever worked	Persons age 5+	No relationship-to-head code for domestic servant
1992	Persons who ever worked	Question not asked	
2002	Working or seeking employment	Question not asked	

Colombia		*¿Asiste actualmente a algún establecimienta (centro) de enseñanza...?*	
1964	In the labor force	Question not asked	
1973	With a job or experienced unemployed	Persons enrolled in school age 5+	
1985	Employed or seeking work	Persons age 5+ (imposed by IPUMS-I)	No occupation or industry data, so used "class of worker" variable for 1985
1993	In the labor force; not new workers	Persons enrolled in school age 5+	
Costa Rica		*¿Asiste a la escuela… / Está matriculado en algún centro de enseñanza regular?*	
1963	Employed or unemployed	Persons age 7+	
1973	Persons who ever worked	Persons age 5+	
1984	Persons who ever worked	Persons age 6+	
2000	Employed week prior to census	Persons age 6+	
Mexico		*¿(Actualmente) Vá a la escuela?*	
1960	Question(s) not asked	Question not asked	No relationship-to-head code for domestic servant
1970	Worked the previous year	Persons age 6+	No relationship-to-head code for domestic servant
1990	Persons who were employed	Persons age 5+	
1995	Worked the week before the census or did not work but had a job	Persons age 5+	
2000	Persons who were employed	Persons age 5+	

SOURCE: IPUMS-International (Minnesota Population Center 2008).

TABLE A3 Conservative estimates of numbers of child domestic servants by sex and age group (weighted) in six Latin American countries

	Younger girls and boys (ages depend on data availability)								Older girls and boys (ages 15–17)						
Country/ year	Ages included (1)	Total in age group (000s) (2)	Number employed[a] (000s) (3)	Percent of (3) female (4)	Number of live-out domestics (000s) (5)	Percent of (5) female (6)	Number of live-in domestics (000s) (7)	Percent of (7) female (8)	Total in age group (000s) (9)	Number employed[a] (000s) (10)	Percent of (10) female (11)	Number of live-out domestics (000s) (12)	Percent of (12) female (13)	Number of live-in domestics (000s) (14)	Percent of (14) female (15)
Argentina															
1970	10–14	2,167.4	179.6	36.8	20.3	92.6	26.4	87.7	1,241.1	463.0	33.3	39.4	96.2	43.2	96.6
1980	14	472.0	65.2	32.5	8.2	96.8	4.9	97.6	1,398.9	452.8	32.4	43.8	98.1	26.3	97.2
1991	14	518.9	78.0	36.8	6.2	89.2	2.5	97.3	1,757.2	442.4	35.7	40.2	92.6	13.9	97.4
2001	14	616.1	19.4	31.5	2.3	72.9	0.2	63.2	1,913.4	132.7	30.6	16.3	81.7	2.0	89.3
Brazil															
1960	10–14	7,297.6	1,132.2	24.3	77.4	91.5	—	—	3,734.1	1,649.1	27.5	143.6	94.4	—	—
1970	10–14	11,859.4	1,463.1	25.0	79.0	95.4	71.0	95.4	6,392.5	2,308.7	30.6	161.6	97.3	173.5	96.6
1980	10–14	14,206.7	1,833.3	29.5	174.7	93.5	79.4	96.1	8,462.8	3,397.1	33.4	286.8	96.1	165.7	97.2
1991	10–14	17,037.2	1,455.8	29.3	164.7	93.9	48.2	97.4	9,223.1	3,306.9	33.4	341.5	94.8	130.4	97.3
2000	10–14	17,337.8	1,137.0	32.5	89.7	93.6	11.6	95.7	10,716.9	2,789.1	35.7	292.6	94.7	46.2	95.5
Chile															
1960	12–14	484.6	28.2	30.3	1.7	81.0	6.5	83.3	431.4	125.8	30.7	5.1	95.2	24.0	91.7
1970	12–14	656.8	22.1	30.2	4.1	88.6	—	—	573.0	112.7	29.5	22.3	92.2	—	—
1982	none	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	773.0	98.8	29.9	19.9	93.8	—	—
1992	14	232.8	8.1	25.2	0.9	74.7	0.7	92.8	692.6	77.6	27.7	6.7	83.8	7.0	95.6
2002	none	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	756.0	65.9	38.1	1.2	87.5	0.8	97.4

Colombia															
1964	12–14	1,327.7	226.4	22.0	4.9	76.5	43.7	80.5	1,089.8	396.6	26.5	8.2	87.7	61.6	88.5
1973	10–14	2,891.7	233.1	26.5	6.3	87.3	39.8	89.5	1,448.2	407.1	30.1	10.5	94.8	67.3	94.5
1985	10–14	3,169.5	287.8	33.8	18.6	87.3	26.1	77.3	1,920.0	503.5	34.7	33.9	94.4	67.0	84.6
1993	10–14	3,722.0	286.3	25.4	5.4	90.9	21.3	85.3	1,969.6	482.2	28.0	13.2	94.4	53.9	90.6
Costa Rica															
1963	12–14	100.6	13.7	17.7	0.6	85.7	1.4	86.3	81.0	31.3	22.4	1.7	96.0	2.7	99.4
1973	12–14	161.1	15.1	19.4	0.9	97.7	1.4	90.4	136.3	44.3	26.0	2.9	99.0	4.4	99.3
1984	12–14	162.5	15.7	14.2	0.9	98.9	0.5	94.4	166.8	47.4	19.6	2.7	—	2.2	98.2
2000	12–14	254.7	10.5	17.8	0.6	90.0	0.2	60.0	241.1	41.0	21.9	2.6	92.7	0.7	95.5
Mexico															
1960[b]	12–14	2,530.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	2,113.6	—	—	—	—	—	—
1970	12–14	3,761.5	413.8	31.1	31.2	94.9	—	—	3,159.7	956.6	31.2	77.9	95.1	—	—
1990	12–14	6,340.5	427.8	24.3	25.1	94.4	21.8	84.9	6,028.2	1,493.0	28.1	73.8	93.6	59.5	92.4
1995	12–14	6,388.3	895.4	27.9	48.7	96.1	7.1	90.2	6,122.3	2,045.0	33.1	129.8	94.3	48.1	94.0
2000	12–14	6,466.2	566.2	30.3	36.0	92.2	7.1	89.3	6,209.1	1,826.1	34.5	99.7	94.7	44.1	93.9

[a]Includes domestic servants who were not enumerated as economically active.
[b]For Mexico 1960, current employment is not known. Estimates are based on reported occupation and industry.
NOTE: Estimates are reported here only for ages with available labor force information and exclude unemployed children. Dashes indicate categories for which data are not available.
SOURCE: Authors' calculations using IPUMS-International (Minnesota Population Center 2008).

TABLE A4 Selected employment characteristics of samples by sex and age group (weighted) in six Latin American countries

	Percent employed				Percent of employed girls who are domestics		Percent of all girls who are domestics	
	10–14		15–17					
Country/year	Female (1)	Male (2)	Female (3)	Male (4)	10–14 (5)	15–17 (6)	10–14 (7)	15–17 (8)
Argentina								
1970	6.2	10.3	24.9	49.7	63.4	51.6	3.9	12.8
1980	1.8	3.6	21.0	43.7	60.2	46.7	1.1	9.8
1991	1.9	3.0	17.9	32.5	32.9	32.1	0.6	5.8
2001	0.4	0.8	4.3	9.5	32.5	37.1	0.1	1.6
Brazil								
1960	7.5	23.5	23.3	66.9	25.7	29.9	1.9	7.0
1970	6.2	18.5	21.3	52.0	39.1	46.0	2.4	9.8
1980	7.7	18.1	26.4	54.4	44.2	38.5	3.4	10.2
1991	5.0	12.0	23.9	47.9	47.2	40.9	2.4	9.8
2000	4.3	8.7	18.7	33.3	25.7	32.2	1.1	6.0
Chile								
1960	2.2	5.1	17.5	41.3	80.0	69.7	1.7	12.2
1970	1.2	2.8	11.4	28.2	54.9	61.8	0.7	7.0
1982	0.2	0.2	7.7	19.8	—	63.2	0.0	4.8
1992	0.3	1.0	6.3	14.6	63.2	57.1	0.2	3.6
2002	0.0	0.0	6.7	10.6	—	7.1	0.0	0.5
Colombia								
1964	5.3	15.9	18.9	57.2	78.6	56.8	4.2	10.7
1973	4.3	11.8	16.1	41.3	66.3	59.9	2.9	9.7
1985	6.6	12.1	19.1	35.9	35.5	47.4	2.3	9.0
1993	4.0	11.3	13.5	35.9	31.7	45.4	1.3	6.1
Costa Rica								
1963	2.8	13.0	17.2	60.3	70.1	62.1	2.0	10.7
1973	2.2	8.8	16.7	48.7	72.1	62.8	1.6	10.5
1984	1.7	9.9	11.3	44.9	63.2	52.3	1.1	6.1
2000	0.9	3.9	7.6	26.2	36.2	34.0	0.3	2.6
Mexico								
1960	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1970	4.1	8.7	18.8	42.0	23.0	24.8	0.9	4.7
1990	2.1	6.2	13.8	35.3	41.9	29.5	0.9	4.1
1995	4.8	12.0	21.9	44.4	21.6	24.8	1.0	5.4
2000	3.2	7.2	20.1	38.8	23.2	21.6	0.7	4.3

NOTE: Dashes indicate categories for which data are not available.
SOURCE: Authors' calculations using IPUMS-International (Minnesota Population Center 2008).

TABLE A5 Sensitivity of the most recent estimate of child domestic servants to data availability and definitions, for 15–17-year-olds, and for 10–14-year-olds when labor force information is available, six Latin American countries

Country/year and age group	Conservative estimate of domestics in age group (1)	Percent of col. (1) using labor force data only (2)	Percent of col. (1) using household data only (3)	Additional number of domestics if using "best guess" (4)	Other potential live-in female domestics ("Cinderellas") (5)	Additional (imputed) number of female live-in domestics using 25 percent of col. (5) (6)	Estimate of domestics including imputed in col. (6) (7)
Argentina 2001							
15–17	18,290	96	11	100	7,030	1,720	20,010
Brazil 2000							
10–14	101,282	99	11	0	266,556	66,626	167,908
15–17	338,860	99	14	0	355,924	88,354	427,214
Chile 2002							
15–17	1,960	99	39	310	25,590	6,370	8,330
Colombia 1993							
10–14	26,650	100	80	170	45,890	11,620	38,270
15–17	67,090	100	80	500	39,280	9,830	76,920
Costa Rica 2000							
15–17	3,280	93	20	0	6,900	1,710	4,990
Mexico 2000							
15–17	143,796	95	31	0	19,831	5,059	148,855

NOTES: Conservative estimates in (1), (2), and (3) do not include unemployed child domestics. Column (2) identifies domestics through their employment in labor force work. "Best guess" estimates in (4) include unemployed children whose last job was as a domestic servant. Column (5) uses the household relationship variable to identify all young household members who might be domestics, including "other relatives" and "non-relatives" who are not boarders/lodgers. Imputations in column (6) include only 25 percent of potential domestic servants identified in column (5).
SOURCE: Authors' calculations using IPUMS-International (Minnesota Population Center 2008).

Notes

We appreciate helpful suggestions from Ragui Assaad, Michael Bourdillon, Misty Heggeness, and Christopher McKelvey. Thanks also to Owen Thompson-Ferguson, who provided useful input at an early stage in this project.

1 Oloko (1997: 5–6) indirectly estimates the number of young domestics in Nigeria using the number of women who were government employees; she assumes that every such woman employed one young domestic. She considers her estimate conservative, since some women working in the informal sector would also employ young domestics.

2 As the story goes: "Now began a bad time for the poor step-child….They took her pretty clothes away from her, put an old grey bedgown on her, and gave her wooden shoes….and led her into the kitchen. There she had to do hard work from morning till night, get up before daybreak, carry water, light fires, cook and wash. Besides this, the [step]sisters did her every imaginable injury…" (The Brothers Grimm, *Cinderella*).

3 Minnesota Population Center (2008). The international samples of the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS-International) are freely available to researchers at «www.ipums.org».

4 These countries represented approximately 56 percent of the estimated total population of Latin America as of 2000 (United Nations *Demographic Yearbook* 2000).

5 Every year, more census samples are added to the IPUMS-International online data collection.

6 A more extended discussion of these large-scale changes and their potential effects on child domestic servants is found in Levison and Langer (2010).

7 In most cases, we exclude only those youth who are living in group quarters apart from family, such as those living in institutions or at boarding schools. Some children and youth living in group quarters were living with their families. For example, an entire family might live in a military barracks. These children were included in our sample. In some cases we could not discern whether children in group quarters were living with their families; in these cases we excluded all children in group quarters.

8 Some individuals identified in Brazil as domestic workers according to the household relationship question are categorized as being employed in agricultural industries. In these cases, the individuals were counted as domestic servants, but the rest of the individuals in that agricultural industry were not.

9 When we compute employment trends, we count such individuals as employed members of the labor force. That is, they are included in the denominator.

10 Excel spreadsheets of the tables in this article are available upon request from dlevison@umn.edu.

11 This analysis follows the conventions for Table 1 and our "best guess" estimates: unemployed domestics are counted as domestic workers.

12 Figures showing the results of this analysis are found in Levison and Langer (2010).

13 For example, Bourdillon (2007: 60) interviewed child domestics in Zimbabwe, some of whom had been beaten. Oyaide (2000: 54) documents substantial verbal abuse and humiliation among child servants in Lusaka, Zambia. Kielland and Tovo (2006: 98) cite Onyango (1991), who interviewed prostitutes in Nairobi and Cotonou and found that the majority had been sent into domestic service at an early age. Among these, most had been sexually abused, many by a member of the employer's household.

14 Bourdillon writes, "child protection is meaningless if removing children from a harmful situation results in driving them into something worse; and a ban on its own does not guarantee that the [former child domestics] will be better placed. Besides, a ban will remove from many disadvantaged children opportunities to travel, learn, prepare for the future, and escape abuse, exploitation, and poverty at home" (p. 11).

References

Ainsworth, Martha. 1992. *Economic Aspects of Child Fostering in Côte d'Ivoire.* Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Black, Maggie. 1997. *Child Domestic Workers: A Handbook for Research and Action.* London: Anti-Slavery International «www.antislavery.org».

———. 2002. *Child Domestic Workers: Finding a Voice. A Handbook on Advocacy*. London: Anti-Slavery International.

———. 2005. *Child Domestic Workers: A Handbook on Good Practice in Programme Interventions*. London: Anti-Slavery International.

Bourdillon, Michael. 2007. "Child domestic workers in Zimbabwe: Children's perspectives," in Beatrice Hunderford, Manfred Liebel, Brian Milne, and Ann Wihstutz (eds.), *Working to Be Someone: Child Focused Research and Practice with Working Children*. Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley, pp. 55–65.

———. 2009. "Children as domestic employees: Problems and promises," *Journal of Children and Poverty* 15(1): 1–18.

Jacquemin, Mélanie Y. 2004. "Children's domestic work in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire: The 'petit bonnes' have the floor," *Childhood* 11(3): 383–397.

Kielland, Anne and Maurizia Tovo. 2006. *Children at Work: Child Labor Practices in Africa*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Levison, Deborah, Jasper Hoek, David Lam, and Suzanne Duryea. 2007. "Intermittent child employment and its implications for child labour estimates," *International Labour Review* 146 (3-4): 217–251.

Levison, Deborah and Anna Langer. 2010. "Child domestic servants in Latin America: Numbers, trends, and education," Minnesota Population Center Working Paper, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis. «http://www.pop.umn.edu/research/mpc-working-papers-series».

Madsian, Carla. 2004. "Not for bread alone: Peanut vendors in Brazil," in G. K. Lieten (ed.), *Working Children Around the World: Child Rights and Child Reality*. New Delhi: Institute for Human Development, pp. 128–139.

Minnesota Population Center. 2008. *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series — International: Version 4.0*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Oloko, Sarah B. A. 1997. "Child labour: What we know: The Nigeria experience, 1986–1996," paper presented at a UNICEF Workshop, Turin, Italy, June–July.

Onyango, P. et al. 1991. *A Report on the Nairobi Case Study on Children in Especially Difficult Circumstances*. Nairobi: African Network for the Protection Against Child Abuse and Neglect.

Oyaide, Omolara Dakore. 2000. "Child domestic labour in Lusaka: A gender perspective," University of Zambia, manuscript.

Reynolds, Pamela. 1991. *Dance Civet Cat: Child Labour in the Zambezi Valley.* Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.

Smucker, Glenn R. and Gerald F. Murray. 2004. *The Uses of Children: A Study of Trafficking in Haitian Children*. Report to USAID/Haiti Mission, Port-au-Prince, Haiti.

UNICEF. 1999. *Child Domestic Work: Innocenti Digest No. 5*. Florence: UNICEF International Child Development Centre.