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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study on child labour in tobacco growing areas of Uganda, was initiated and fully sponsored by British American Tobacco Uganda Ltd. (BATU). Given their prominent position in the tobacco industry locally and internationally and their corporate image and obligation to conduct their business responsibly in the communities where they operate, BATU sanctioned the undertaking of this study after recognizing that, there could be significant child labour in tobacco growing areas, particularly, within those communities with whom BATU conducts business. Engaging child labour does not only impair the full development of the child engaged, but is also illegal and contravenes the International Labour Organisation (ILO) conventions, to which Uganda is a signatory.

Against the above background, BATU contracted Social Development Consultants Ltd. (SODECO) to empirically;

- Determine the socio-economic and cultural environment of child labour in Uganda’s tobacco growing areas;
- Establish the nature, magnitude, causes and effects of child labour in tobacco growing areas;
- Find out any ongoing efforts to address the child labour problem in Uganda’s tobacco growing areas;
- Generate suggestions on how to effectively deal with the problem of child labour in tobacco growing areas of Uganda.

SODECO employed both quantitative and qualitative methods in this study of child labour in tobacco growing areas in the district of Arua, Apac, Masindi and Rukungiri. A total of 1627 tobacco farmers from the named districts were interviewed using structured questionnaires. Quantitative data was enhanced by qualitative data obtained from 60 Key Informant interviews from the districts under study, and Focus Group discussions with 200 child labourers (50 child labourers per district). Data
obtained was scientifically analysed using the appropriate computer packages to generate results which were consequently interpreted in light of the study objectives.

The study found that tobacco growing, which is at household small farms, was a very important and indispensable economic activity for most of the households in the study area and that child labour was “Universally” prevalent in all these areas, either as family labour, or hired labour.

Boys were found to be more affected than girls (ratio 2:1) and the average age was 9.2 years with a range of 4-18 years.

Major causes of child labour were found (in order of importance) to be – household poverty, low cost of child labour, ignorance of the law and its effects on child labour, HIV/AIDS, insecurity/internal displacement.

The study recommends that child labour should be acknowledged to exist. There must also be demonstrated willingness to address this problem by all the parties concerned.

Among the measures recommended are; coalition building among key stakeholders, withdrawal of these children and sending them either to school or for vocationalisation, fighting household poverty, sensitization and awareness campaigns targeting farmers, communities and children themselves, review of existing legal framework on child labour and intensification of social service programmes especially in the field of education, so as to attract and retain these children in schools.
CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Child labour has been known to exist for hundreds of years. It has been described in different forms to “positively” portray it as a form of apprenticeship in factories or contributing to family income and as a means of teaching children cultural roles and responsibilities, values and domestic chores in a family setting. Child labour is one of the most important emerging issues in current times.

1.1 Background and Rationale

Current estimates indicate that up to 250 million children worldwide under the age of 14 are engaged in some form of exploitative child labour. In tobacco farming, particularly in developing countries, there is a recognized child labour problem. Child labour, however, is a worldwide phenomenon and there is no concrete evidence to suggest that the tobacco sector is worse off than other sectors when it comes to child labour. As the only International tobacco group with a significant interest in tobacco leaf growing, BATU are committed to their obligation to conduct their business responsibly in the communities where they operate, and are ready and willing to work with other stakeholders to address the issues revolving around child labour.

British American Tobacco Uganda Ltd. (BATU) recognises the need to end the use of child labour in the tobacco-growing sector and to provide children with an upbringing that gives them the best chance to succeed in all aspects of life. There is, however, lack of information on the extent of the problem of child labour in tobacco growing; on the socio-economic environment of the phenomena; and the causes, manifestation and effects of child labour in tobacco growing in Uganda. There is therefore need for accurate and reliable information both on the extent and causes of child labour, as a basis for articulating solutions to the problem in tobacco growing areas in Uganda.
1.2. Statement of the Problem.

BATU expressed concern that there could be significant child labour in tobacco growing areas in Uganda in general, and those of its out-growers in particular. Engaging child labour is known to affect child health, retard their physical and mental development and deprive children of meaningful education and training opportunities that could enable them become responsible and productive adults (Kooijmans, 1998). Besides, engaging child labour contravenes the International Labour Organisation of the United Nations (ILO) Convention 138 to which Uganda is a signatory.

BATU expressed an interest to address the problem of child labour in tobacco growing areas in Uganda but lacked adequate information regarding the nature, spread, magnitude and causes of child labour in Uganda in general and among BATU farmers in particular. The cultural influences on child labour were also unknown. BATU therefore contracted Social Development Consultants (U) Ltd (SODECO) to conduct a study in the main tobacco growing areas of Arua (West Nile), Apac (Central North), Rukungiri (South West) and Masindi (Western) Uganda.

1.3 Objectives of the study

- To understand the socio-economic and cultural environment of the phenomenon of child labour in Uganda’s tobacco growing regions.
- To understand the causes, magnitude, and effects of child labour.
- To find out ongoing efforts, if any, to address this problem.
- To generate suggestions on how effectively the problem of child labour can be dealt with, in tobacco growing areas.
1.4 Terms of Reference

BATU contracted Social Development Consultants (U) Limited (SODECO) to carry out the study on child labour in tobacco growing areas in Uganda with the following Terms of Reference:

- To conduct a study in Arua, Masindi, Rukungiri, and Apac districts so as to identify the factors associated with child labour in tobacco growing, in these areas.
- Identify the most affected areas and estimate the nature and magnitude of the problem.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW.

2.1 Introduction

This section presents an analysis of some of the existing information on child labour in general and in the tobacco growing sector in Uganda and in other parts of Africa in particular, which offer relevant contexts to the study. The studies conducted in a number of African countries including Uganda, Tanzania, Kenya, Malawi, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Ghana, Mozambique, and South Africa have been reviewed. The review attempted to look at the causes and the extent of child labour in the tobacco-growing sector in these countries. However, this review is limited due to several reasons:

- Generally, there is not much available information on child labour practices in the tobacco-growing sector. For many of the countries, there exists little information on child labour at all.\(^1\)
- Most of the data and information on child labour is on a more general level, and does not give possibilities for particular analysis on the tobacco sector\(^2\).
- Existing information is fragmented, of variable quality and in many instances difficult to get hold of.

The above constraints partly underscore the rationale for a study on child labour in tobacco growing in Uganda.

The research team has attempted to review much of the available documents and literature concerning child labour in tobacco growing.

\(^1\) See, for example, report on child labour in the tobacco growing sector in Africa; produced by Fafo to provide background material for the conference “Eliminating Child Labour: Establishing Best Practice in Tobacco Farming” in Nairobi 8-9th October 2000.

\(^2\) (See, for example, Andvig, 1999)
2.2. Conceptual issues in child labour.

Different definitions have been provided to explain child labour. The commonly used definition was provided by the ILO. Child labour is often associated with work performed by children that is detrimental to their physical and mental development. This type of work often interferes with the child’s education thus, negatively affecting the child’s prospects for career development (Kooijmans 1998). According to ILO Convention 138, child labour refers to:

“Children prematurely leading adult lives, normally working long hours for low wages under conditions damaging to their health and to their physical and mental development, sometimes separated from their families, frequently deprived of meaningful educational training opportunities that could open up for them a better future”.

Some authors have gone to the extent of defining child labour in terms of age. Even the ILO specifies the minimum age of 15. That is, children under the age of 15 are regarded as not eligible for paid employment. However, according to Eldring, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi (2000), this indicator is often controversial and complex to use in Africa when looking at some of the definitions of the economically active population (EAP) on the continent. In some countries on the continent, the EAP are those persons 12 years and above\(^3\). However, in this study we propose to stick to the provisions of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda as regards the age of working children, and those of ILO as specified above.

---

The main indicator of child labour has been identified to be:

“\textit{If work is at the expense of the children’s education both in cases where children are kept away from school and where children combine work and school in such a way that their school performance suffers.}”  

2.3 Child labour: A Global Problem

Child labour is a worldwide phenomenon and is not only a problem in the South, but also affects many developed countries (Katikaneni 1998). Child labour is a growing social problem across the globe. Estimates of the number of child workers range from between 100 million and 200 million in the world, depending on the definitions used. Africa has the largest incidents of child labour with an estimated 40 percent of all children between five and fourteen years of age regularly engaged in work (Kooijmans (1998). Child labour is prevalent in Africa, especially in the agricultural sector. The ILO estimates that there are more than 23 million child workers in Africa. An unknown number of these children are to be found within the tobacco growing sector, which is claimed to employ more children than any other agricultural cash-crop in the world (Elshof 1995).

2.4 Nature and extent of child abuse and neglect

“Child domestic workers is probably the largest and most ignored group of child workers. Of this “invisible workforce,” 90% are girls aged between 12-17 years old, some working for as long as 15 hours per day” (UNICEF 1999). Child domestic labour is “invisible” because, each child is employed separately and works in seclusion of a private house unlike children in a factory on the street. (UNICEF 1999).

---

4 See, for example, Eldring, Nakanyakane & Tshoaedi, 2000.
The rate at which child labour is engaged in the world is appallingly high. By 1996, the ILO estimated 250 million child labourers in the world; the proportion represented by child domestic workers was not known, but was believed to be high. It is also estimated that domestic work was the largest employment category of girls under age 16 in the world (ILO, 1996). Child labour is highest in poor countries, as Asia and Africa account for 90% of the working children. India has the largest number of working children, i.e. about 14.5 million below the age of 14 years (India Census 1981). Italy had the highest number of working children in the developed world, i.e. 1.5 million (Fyfe, 1989). Africa has the largest number of children working for wages. The ILO records show that 29 million children under 15 years of age were in regular employment in Africa in 1978. In Uganda, estimates of working children are not known. However, about eight years ago, 2.8 million children of school going age were not in school and could be working (Pinto, 1992).

Child domestic work has been found to have features that distinguish it from other forms of child labour (UNICEF 1999) as follows;

- Domestic work is among the lowest status, least regulated, and poorest remunerated of all occupations, whether performed by adults or children;
- Most child domestic workers live in, and are under the exclusive, round-the-clock control of the employer (normally the female head of household). They have little freedom or free time;
- About 90% of child domestic workers are girls; their powerlessness within the household renders them vulnerable especially to sexual abuse;
- Since it is possible for very young children to undertake light household tasks, the age of entry can be as young as five years;
- Many child domestic workers do not handle their earnings; some are unpaid; the earnings of others are commonly given to parents or people often referred to as ‘aunties’, but who in reality are unrelated recruitment agents;
The live-in child domestic is cut off from her or his own family, has little opportunity to make friends, and almost no social exchange with peers.

In Uganda, a number of laws have been put in place in relation to employment but have not come out specifically in the protection of child domestic labourers. For example;

- The Worker’s Compensation Act provides for the compensation to all workers for injuries suffered in the course of employment. The Act does not specifically provide for child workers. The Act stipulates medical certification of injury arising out of employment. The procedures described in the Act are too complicated for a child to follow, like the need for a contract with the employer. Given the illegal and clandestine nature of child domestic labour, very few employers regularize their relationship with the child domestic labourers.

- The Trade Union Decree 20/1976 relates to regulation and formulation by employees membership of minors in trade unions and gives them equal voting rights as ordinary members. The decree defines the minor as a person below the apparent age of 16 years. This definition is ambiguous particularly the term “apparent age” which may not be an easily ascertainable determinant of age. The children are not even aware of their membership rights.

- The Trade Dispute (Arbitration and Settlement Act 1977) provides for means of settling trade disputes generally, as well as disputes relating to the provision of essential services. It provides for the establishment and composition of arbitration tribunals, boards of inquiries, the industrial court and other means of controlling and regulating strikes and lockouts. Trade disputes are handled by boards of inquiry, the arbitration tribunal, or the industrial court. But the disputes by people in the informal sector and therefore, those of children in domestic service, are generally not addressed by the industrial court.
In Uganda, considerable measures have been taken to reduce the incidence of child abuse. These include;

1. The 1995 Constitution which defines children as any body below 18 years of age and guarantees the rights of children. The Constitution also prohibits the gainful employment of children under 18 years of age.

2. The Children’s Statute 1996, is already in place. Its main purpose is to reform and consolidate the law relating to children, providing for the care, protection and maintenance of children, providing for local authority support for children, establishing a Family and Children Court, making provision for children charged with offences and for other connected purposes. The Statute emphatically states in Clause 9; “No child shall be employed or engaged in any activity that may be harmful to his or her health, education, mental, physical or moral development”.

3. There is the NGO Board established by an Act of Parliament which regulates the activities of NGOs that handle children activities.

According to Baguma et al (1995), the extent of child abuse can be guessed at using the concept of vulnerability. This is because, it is the vulnerable children who are the catchment area of child abuse. Types of vulnerable children are listed by different countries in the sub-region. In Kenya, vulnerable children are the street children, including parking and beach boys, orphans, destitute children, child labourers (including ayahs), children suffering abuse, handicapped children e.g. Nomads’ children, imprisoned children, married children, and child prostitutes (UNICEF1988). This categorisation to a large extent applies to Uganda as confirmed by the Social Affairs Department (Kakama, 1992: personal communication). To the list add children from very rich families who are neglected by their parents or abused by domestic workers.
2.5 Causes of child labour.

A number of factors have been cited as influencing and affecting the supply of child labour. There are economic and social factors and legislative factors which come into play, in influencing child labour. Top on the list of the cited factors are poverty, failure of the education system and lack of law/legislative enforcement agencies. The following section touches upon some of the factors identified as having a direct link with the prevalence of child labour. The review of causative factors, has been guided largely by the report on child labour in the tobacco growing sector in Africa, which was presented at the conference on “Eliminating Child Labour: Establishing Best Practice in Tobacco Farming”, held in Nairobi 8-9th October 2000.

2.5.1 Poverty

In most of the reports, including ILO studies, poverty\(^5\) has been well documented as one of the major forces that create the flow of children into the workplace (ILO 1995). The entrance of children into the “world of work”, is seen as a survival strategy for children and their families. According to Bonnet (1993), children in Africa are unable to attend school because their families/households cannot afford to pay for their education. The household cannot afford to pay for their children’s education if the cost of schooling is too high and the household income is too low. Inability of households to meet the basic needs of children (education, food, shelter and clothes) in most cases is said to force children to be engaged in employment in their endeavour to improve their conditions and livelihood. The argument is that, poverty does not cause child labour but there is a strong relationship between the two. Thus, child labour is often found in socially and economically marginalised communities (Bonnet 1993).

---

\(^5\) Poverty refers to the incapacity of households to meet and sustain their basic needs. Also refers to instances where household income falls below a given poverty datum line and lack the resources to enable them to move from the prevailing status.
2.5.2 Cheap Labour vis-a-vis Demand for Child Labour

Literature shows that children are most likely to be employed when their labour is cheap (Sabata, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi, 2000). One of the most emphasized arguments for the use of child labour has been the issue of cheap labour provided by children as compared to adults. Most of the children are employed on contract basis and in most cases their work is said to be more seasonal as compared to adults who tend to be more permanent. In some instances, children are not paid at all because employers, especially in the domestic and agricultural sector give them accommodation and food. Lastly, children are casually hired and fired, as they are not protected by legislation, it is cost-effective for employers, as they do not have to pay unemployment benefits.

2.5.3 HIV/AIDS and Child Labour

The relationship between HIV/AIDS epidemic and the prevalence of child labour is reported to be extremely important and relevant in Africa where more than 23 million people are believed to be HIV-infected; and more than 2 million having died of AIDS in 1999. The infection and deaths have mostly affected those in parenting age and thus, have an impact on income security and survival of the household (Sabata, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi, 2000).

Even though there is no clear-cut link between AIDS and child labour, it is said that child labour is likely to increase in communities where the extended family is not intact. Adult deaths as a result of AIDS can result in financial strain for children, making it difficult for them to attend school. This might in most instances call for the re-organisation of children’s life due to loss of parents. Children are likely to take responsibility for their own survival and thus, become child labourers (Andvig 2000).

All the possible causes for child labour that are listed above, are frequently mentioned in the available information from the different countries, namely, poverty, lack of access to education, children offering cheap labour, and orphanage. Furthermore, lack
of appropriate legal framework and government policies are emphasized as important areas for improvement. This is because, laws and statutes are not very useful unless they are followed up by efficient implementation processes.

2.6 Existence and Causes of Child Labour in Selected Tobacco Growing Countries in Africa

2.6.1 Introduction
This review includes information on the child labour situation in a number of tobacco growing African countries such as Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. These tobacco growing countries share a number of characteristics with Uganda, namely, in terms of economic, labour market as well as social indicators.

2.6.2 Ghana
In Ghana, the tobacco-growing sector is small but basing on information available on child labour in general, or on the commercial agricultural sector in particular, the prevalence of child labour is frequent, especially within the agricultural sector. On the basis of the 1992 Ghana Living Standards Survey, it was estimated that around 28 percent of children between 7-14 years – which means 800,000 children nationwide were involved in child labour. Two thirds of these children were also going to school, and in total, 20 percent of the boys and 17 percent of the girls were both working and schooling. Ninety percent (90%) of all school children were involved in household chores. Ninety three percent (93%) of the working children were involved in farming activities (household level agricultural activities), and child labour would normally take place in the informal sector.

Most of the child workers are employed in family farms. Children with parents involved in agricultural self-employment are more likely to work than other children.
Children constituted about 12 percent of the labour force, although in total numbers of labour hours, they contribute 5.3 percent (Canagarajah & Coulombe).

According to GLSS (Canagarajah & Coulombe), the typical profile of a child worker in Ghana is as follows:

### Table 1: Profile of Child workers in Ghana.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average age: Urban</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age: Rural</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average hours in labour market per week for child workers</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average hours in household chores per week for child workers</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of child workers in labour force (wage work)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in trade:</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in farming:</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School participation rate for children under:</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child labour contribution to total hours of participation nationally</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A survey on child labour conducted by Ghana Statistical Service (GSS 1994) concluded that at least 11 percent of the surveyed children were working for wages, and another 15 percent work without remuneration. The majority of the working children were between 10-14 years, and more than three-quarters were female. 70 percent were unpaid family workers and no one was engaged in the public sector. On average, working children in Ghana earn one sixth of what an adult earns.

A GAWU/IUF/ILo workshop report on child labour listed the following as the worst forms of child labour in agricultural/rural areas in Ghana; child slavery/debt bondage, illegal mining, handling of agro-chemicals, handling of dangerous agricultural tools, human porterage, brewing and tapping, picking, fishing, contract farm labour, and, herding. The workshop report indicates the following as possible causes of child labour in Ghana; low family incomes, large family sizes, lack of resources to develop
land, discriminatory land tenure systems/pressures on land; piece-rate system of work, low wages of formal sector employees, tribal ethnic conflicts, underemployment, and certain traditional/cultural beliefs and practices. Others are: irresponsible parentage, lack of proper legislation, large informal sector, debt bondage, single parenthood; societal acceptance of child labour as part of child upbringing; collapse of extended family systems; preference of boy education to girl education; and lack of social protection for orphans.

2.6.3 Kenya

In Kenya, child labour is a serious phenomenon affecting both the mental and physical development of children and also affecting the employment and conditions of adult employees (Eldring, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi, 2000). According to these authors, since the colonial period, the agrarian society has been exposed to the use of child workers in Kenya. According to Bahemuka, et al (2000), child labour continue to be a serious problem in Kenya and many children are working on plantations and as street vendors. It is estimated that about 60 percent of the workforce in plantations in the Central Province are children. ANPPCAN, a Kenyan non-governmental organization focusing on child issues estimated that in 1999, about 3.5 million children aged between 6 and 14 years were child labourers and a significant majority was in agriculture.

Poverty is cited as the main reason for the prevalence of child labour in Kenya. Children are regarded as a source of livelihood for poor families. Related to this, child labour is associated with the rapidly changing lifestyle with more focus on monetary rather than subsistence economy. According to Bahemuka, et al (2000), as the kinship ties are broken by the shift from communalism (subsistence farming) to dependence on monetary economy, parents have no relatives to turn to, thus children are required to look for employment to provide for the family.
There is also a strong linkage between child labour and Economic Structural Adjustment Programmes (ESAPs) of the World Bank. Although the ESAPs were meant to alleviate poverty, they had negative implications for the well being of families (Bahemuka, et al 2000). ESAPs had an ideological baggage that emphasised free market system and cost sharing. This meant, for example, that parents had to pay for their children’s education and other basic needs in life. Bahemuka, et al (2000) argues also, that the introduction of ESAPs led to the increase in number of retrenchments in Kenya. The introduction of ESAPs meant the lifting of government subsidies from education and other social capital services. Thus, the costs had to be borne by poor parents and inability to afford by most parents resulted in most parents sending their children to work or look for employment (Bahemuka, et al 2000).

There is increasing demand by employers for child labourers (Eldring, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi, 2000). Most employers often are said to offer children jobs as they can be easily exploited and paid less than adults. The demand by employers for child labourers is facilitated by the desperate state of most parents as they are unemployed. It is said that for most parents, if a child can secure a job they cannot hesitate to send their children to employers (Bahemuka, et al 2000). Eldring, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi (2000) argue that for many employers, especially in agriculture, the use of child labour has an economic benefit. Child labourers do not have contracts, are paid less, are not provided with benefits and are regarded as seasonal workers, which means that employers can be able to save.

Politically induced economic problems are also cited as contributing towards the escalating number of child labourers in Kenya. As a result of ethnic clashes and displacement of people, children have been forced to look for employment in order for them to contribute towards the household income. This is especially happening in households where parents were killed. Further more, according to Bahemuka, et al (2000), the education system has to a certain extent been responsible for the problem of child labour. They argue that the present education system is characterised by
major flaws in terms of cost, availability and quality and thus, lead many poor parents to perceive child labour as a preferred option. These factors have led many children to drop out of school. The introduction of cost sharing in education meant that parents have to buy books, school uniforms and pay numerous levies.

Bahemuka, et al (2000) also point out that many children see their educated predecessors jobless and this makes them feel that learning is pointless. This indicates that the prevalence of child labour in Kenya cannot be attributed to single factor but there are numerous factors. Thus, Bahemuka, et al (2000) conclude that: “Socio-economic and political factors are driving children to work. Nonetheless, these factors hinge on the demise of the family structure that respected children and upheld their well being as future movers of society.”

2.6.4 Malawi.

Child labour is found in several sectors including large commercial farms, smallholdings, domestic work, micro industries and the informal sector. Studies indicate that child labour is much higher on the tobacco estates (Eldring, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi 2000). According to these authors, Malawi is generally regarded as one of the countries in the region with the highest incidence of child labour. Child labour in Malawi is also to a large extent explained by poverty, lack of resources, (especially educational) as well as poor institutional and regulatory settings. Poverty and economic necessity exert major pressures on families to make use (as early as possible) of the time and labour of children to assist family survival, often at the expense of schooling (Eldring, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi 2000).

Eldring, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi (2000) further report that about 5 million children are affected in one way or the other by work activities on the farms. The formal employment in agriculture altogether stood at about 3.5 million people in 1995. There is an estimated 589,000 tenants at the large-scale estates in Malawi, each with approximately four to five children. This gives a rough estimate of 2.5 million
children living on large-scale tobacco farms alone. Studies of similar sectors in other countries in Southern Africa have found that children’s work in the traditional agricultural sector, is closely linked to that of female labour and has two peaks of seasonal labour demands (Loewenson, 1992).

At these peak periods children over ten years can contribute about a third of the labour input. They provide the ‘adjustable labour’ during periods of intense farm activity, and women depend at these times on children’s assistance. Eldring, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi (2000) report that there seems to be a clear gender division of child labour in the farming sector. The girls’ labour, as it includes domestic and childcare work was persistent throughout the year, while boys’ work was more seasonal, being agriculturally based.

For crops demanding seasonal labour peaks, such as tobacco, children of farm workers provide a captive labour group. Many children are employed on a piece or task wage basis. Many children employed in the agricultural sector are on contract or casual workers and their employment contract provides no entitlement to protective clothing, benefits during sickness, holidays and vacation leave and hours of work other than specified in their individual agreed contract if they have one. According to Eldring, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi (2000), actually most children do not get wages, but are rather working for extra food to their households.

According to the a report presented at the Conference on the Elimination of Child Labour in Tobacco growing in Nairobi on 8-9th October 2000, in Malawi, children are casually hired and fired. Even when working on a piece rate, which ‘neutralises’ any lower productivity amongst children, they are often paid a ‘children’s wage’. Girls are most vulnerable. When girls are sent to school it is often only for the first few years, while boys are expected and motivated to stay in school longer. With the farm workers’ minimum wage well below the poverty line, large-scale farm households are in a constant struggle for survival. The involvement of children is

---

6 This conference was attended by Dr. T. Mutesasira the Team Leader of this study.
stimulated through piece wage practices for adult workers, particularly female casual labour. Male workers recruit women to increase output and women recruit children, so that the employer formally employing and paying one person may actually be paying for the labour of three or more (Eldring, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi, 2000).

The IUF/ITGA/BAT Conference Report (2000) notes that the transformation of societies from subsistence agriculture to wage labour on commercial farms often hides the exploitation of children that takes place on commercial farms. Child labour is also hidden when children assist in domestic labour, thereby freeing the adults from spending longer hours on the farms in the growing of the commercial crop for which they are employed. This labour by the children is not measured and accounted for (Eldring, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi, 2000).

Eldring, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi, (2000) further report that in Malawi, it is not by accident or choice that children get involved in the production of tobacco. The system is designed so that a tenant has no choice but to involve his entire family in the production of tobacco. Tenants are recruited on the basis that they have a family, which they will bring to the estate to work. In this way, the farmer is assured of labour by the entire family and a contribution, which is higher than what can be produced by a single tenant. The farmer will however, often use the argument that hiring a tenant with a family is more stable and less prone to desertions.

Previous studies indicate that the use of child labour on the tobacco estates in Malawi and other southern Africa countries is continuous and part of the overall labour market. Children are usually not employed directly on the estates, but work as part of the tenant family. When a tenant is employed on the estate, he or she is employed as the head of the household and responsible for fulfilling the quota required by the estate owner.
This quota cannot be grown unless the entire family of the tenant is involved in the growing of tobacco. Children are then directly involved in all aspects of tobacco growing (Kamkondo & Wellard, 1994). According to these authors, in Malawi, seventy-eight per cent of children between ten and 14 years worked either full-time or part-time with their parents at the estates.

In addition to this, children under ten years of age were also found working alongside their parents as full-time workers in almost all the tasks of tobacco cultivation. About 43 per cent of the estates had children as direct labourers, and 46 per cent as casual labourers. The following forms of child labour have previously been identified on the tobacco estates in Malawi:

(a) **Forced labour**, in which cases children are taken away from their parents and forced to work on the estates in exchange for food and clothing. Children are in these cases not earning money and are prevented from going to school or attending to other social activities. These however were said to be relatively rare in Malawi.

(b) ‘**Voluntary labour**’ where children enter into arrangements with estate owners in order to earn a direct wage. Children in this setting perform all sorts of duties as a means of assisting their own families with extra income.

(c) ‘**Bonded labour**’ where the responsibilities of the parents are transferred onto the children when they themselves, are unable to perform their responsibilities on the estates, (Eldring, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi, 2000). This happens when the tenant is ill or has passed away and has incurred some form of debt to the estate owner. In these cases where children take over the responsibility of the parents, they are responsible for paying off the debt through their own labour.
Work pressure of the tenant is generally passed down to the children. Children help out in the field regardless of sex. Children above nine years of age are heavily involved in light tasks like clearing fields, making nursery beds and watering nurseries during the first phase of tobacco production; uprooting, transporting and transplanting seedlings and weeding during the second phase; picking, transporting, tying/sowing the leaf, picking down the dried tobacco and bundling during the last phase. (Eldring, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi, 2000). Children of nine years and older were excused from very few tasks like curing the leaf and to some extent sorting and grading tobacco. Only a few of this age group were reported doing nothing.

According to Eldring, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi (2000), it is not easy for tenant children to go to school. In some areas, access to school is still a problem. A more frequent problem is that poverty and the labour markets on the estates may force them into work and out of school. Given the poverty conditions of the tenant families, they are unable to afford their children the opportunity of attending school. Loosing the extra labour on the estates is feared to be detrimental to many tenant households either by their own choice or because the estate manager forces them to leave the children at work rather than at school. Parents of children on the estates sometimes actively or passively pledge their children’s labour for access to a loan or to pay back a debt (Eldring, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi, 2000).

The HIV/AIDS virus is also said to have left many children as orphans with nowhere to go and they end up staying on the estates in order to support themselves and their household. Often children also end up working with no incentive to go to school because they feel they ‘have no clothes in order to be presentable enough to go. Hunger also forces children to work instead of attending school as this allows them to buy food and solve immediate survival problems (Eldring, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi, 2000). Thus, even when primary education is free, as is the case in Malawi today, many children are still employed as part of tenant families on the tobacco estates, and
tenant children are twice as likely to be in full-time employment on the estates than their age-mates in the small-holder and other paid employment sectors (Kamkond & Wellard, 1994).

Eldring, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi, (2000) conclude that the structure and operation of the tenancy system does in itself promote child labour.

By bringing the whole family onto the estates and making the remuneration dependent first and foremost upon production, children are easily brought into work by parents concerned with the survival of their family. The lack of access to schooling and other social facilities for tenant families increases the extent to which children are used on the tobacco estates. It is not easy for tenant children to go to school and lead a life that draws them away from being exploited for their labour.

Given the poverty conditions of the tenant families, they are often unable to afford their children the opportunity of attending school. Free education in Malawi is not free as long as it is not accessible to the majority of the poor tenant children. Access to schools is also a problem and thus tenant children are trapped into working on the tobacco farms. When distance to schools is added to the children's obligations on the estates and at home, school often gets low priority (Eldring, Nakanyane & Tshoaedi, 2000).

The above authors reckon that an understanding of the institutional arrangements within which tenants find themselves, can allow for the development of policies that can address the extent of child labour. Tenants themselves do not have any written or specified contract with the farm owners and there is no reason to believe that children who work on the farms are protected in any way. The children work as part of the family and in this way their labour is hidden. Changing the incentives that households get can encourage school attendance and thus, discourage child labour. Anti-poverty programmes also would decrease a family’s reliance on child income. In addition,
lowering the direct costs of schooling or providing financial incentives to attend school can increase attendance.

According to Grimsrud & Melchior (1997), within the developing nations where child labour is prevalent, the following become important in addressing the use of child labour; supportive measures to develop the education system, supportive measures which subsidize the cost to the family, of sending children to school, supportive measures, which eliminate the families’ risk of lost income in the agricultural sector, the upgrading of technology within the agricultural sector, which increases educational requirements, the provision of support to research and reporting on child labour and education, the fight against child labour involves legislation, such as the setting of minimum age levels for different kinds of work, and policy measures that aim at minimizing the causes of child labour (Grimsrud & Melchior, 1997).

2.6.5 Mozambique

In Mozambique, due to limited economic opportunities, many families are either working in the agricultural sector and earning low wages or are unemployed. Under such conditions, child labour in the country is said to be a common practice. Children’s labour is mostly used to supplement the family income, which is not adequate to be survived on. In rural areas, children sometimes work alongside their parents or independently in seasonal harvests on commercial plantations. They are usually not paid in wages, but instead employers buy them books and other school necessities (Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, 1998). In some cases, children are made to work by their families in order to settle debts.

Mozambique children normally work on family farms or in the urban informal sector where they perform such tasks as guarding cars, collecting scrap metal, or selling trinkets and food in the streets. The informal labour sector is unregulated. Children are also employed as domestic labourers (Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, 1998).
2.6.6 South Africa.

In South Africa, child labour has a long history from the early days of slavery in the Cape and most of the African slaves captured were children (Bosch and Gordon 1996). The use of children on farms is said to have continued even after the abolition of slavery. In South Africa, child labour has been prevalent in the farms, which are marginal areas and where the practice is less conspicuous.

It is said that the apartheid system made it possible for farmers to control their workers and their workers’ families in a way that made the families real dependants of the farmer, unable to subsist anywhere outside the farm (Malatji, undated). The use of children as child labourers on the farms took place in different ways or forms, but the most prevalent form was that the children of tenants or living on farms were drawn into work with other members of their families. Bosch and Gordon (1996) report that simultaneously, cases of child labour are not reported because the parents of child labourers are threatened that farmers might dismiss or even evict them from their farms. Also, some parents are not prepared to lose the financial contribution of the child to the family income. Most studies have indicated that child labour is widespread in South Africa’s agricultural sector. SAAPAWU (1997) estimated that there were over 70,000 children employed on farms. A number of factors have been identified in South Africa as leading to the use and prevalence of child labour in the agricultural sector.

Common amongst the reasons for child labour in the agricultural sector are the following; poverty, demand for cheap labour and high illiteracy rate among the farm workers. Others have attributed the demand and the use of child labour in the agricultural sector to lack of stringent measures and laws to protect children against employers (SAAPAWU 1997). Most children/pupils have often worked on farms during school hours as this work was regarded as part or a form of training in agriculture (Bosch and Gordon 1996).
2.6.7 Tanzania.

In Tanzania, child labour remains a serious problem of social concern throughout the country in general and in Tabora region in particular (Kaijace and Kanyala 1998). According to Kaijace and Kanyala (1998) the decline in economic performance and provision of social services forced many children to seek employment in order for them to supplement their family-income, and it is estimated that child labour is practiced in the agricultural sector, especially in tobacco plantations and in the informal sector.

According to the research undertaken by the Tanzania Federation of Trade Unions (TFTU), of the 9 million Tanzanian children under the age of 15, only 5 percent is involved in one form or another of child labour (Gumbo 1999). The ICFTU report estimates that almost 30 per cent of the children between the age of 10 and 14 years are working in Tanzania. Also, the number of children employed in the tobacco farms depends on the size of the farm – the smaller the farm, the smaller the number of children employed.

As a result of the heavy activities involved in the tobacco-growing sector, many children employers prefer to employ boys rather than girls. Kaijace and Kanyala(1998) have reflected that the labour force in the agricultural sector is made up of male working children, comprising of standard VII leavers, illiterates, and drop outs from primary education aging between 13 and 15 years old. A study conducted by Kaijace and Kanyala (1998) in the Urambo District argued that tobacco-growing employers expect the working children to do the following activities in tobacco plantations; Clearing tobacco and other crops on plantations, making bricks, domestic works, constructing tobacco drying sheds, preparing tobacco nurseries, sowing tobacco seedlings, watering tobacco seedlings, transplanting tobacco seedlings and tilling tobacco ridges, fertilizing tobacco plants, weeding tobacco and other crops, cutting poles and logs of firewood, carrying poles and logs of firewood
from forests, plucking tobacco leaves, hanging tobacco leaves on poles in tobacco drying sheds, smoking tobacco leaves, hanging out tobacco leaves from poles in drying sheds, plaiting tobacco leaves, grading tobacco leaves, tying tobacco leaves in bundles, selling tobacco, burning tobacco stems, and, harvesting other crops.

The study also indicated that children employed in the agricultural sector and more importantly, those involved in tobacco plantation, are seasonally paid from between 50 000 and 100 000 Tanzanian shillings (T-Shs).

In most instances, the agreements between the employers and the working children would indicate that the children are to be paid once after the selling of tobacco in either May or June, when the tobacco growing season ends. The arrangement is different from child labour in the informal sector. In the informal sector, the working child is paid monthly pay ranging between 4,000 and 6,000 TShs. But the child labour has to finish the agreed work before the payment can be processed. Kaijace and Kanyala (1998), have also indicated in their study that there are three broad hazards facing children involved in the tobacco-growing sector.

The three hazards are as a result of:

- dangerous working environment including; injuries, falling sick, burns, humiliation, snake bites, malnutrition and death,
- excessive physical strain including; loss of reasoning capacity and being overworked for longer hours,
- the act of the working child migrating from his/her own place of domicile including, the loss of one’s progressive ethical moral values and permanent loss of education.

A number of factors have been cited in the literature around the causes of child labour in Tanzania. Poverty and the demand for child labourers by employers are the dominant. Studies have shown that children are engaged in child labour mainly because their families are poor. According to the Country Reports on Human Rights
Practices for 1998, some children are forced into child labour by parents or guardians in need of extra income. Secondly, the liberalisation of the economy and introduction of economic structural adjustment programmes has marked a shift from state provision of subsidies on social services like education and welfare. This had a negative implication for poor parents and the unemployed communities.

Many families found it difficult to provide their children with school fees, uniforms, books and other educational requirements. Thus, forcing many children to drop out from schools. Most of the dropouts looked for employment as an alternative to supplement their household income. Thirdly, Kaijace and Kanyala (1998), argued that the demand for cheap labour by most employers was another reason for children to be involved in child labour. They further argue that employers in Tanzania, prefer children below the age of 15 years because they are cheaper and less demanding compared to adult employees. Thus, he concludes that the prevalence of child labour in Tanzania is a result of “push-pullover” effect.

2.6.8 Zambia

In Zambia, the declining economy has a major impact not only on the adults but the children as well. Statistics from UNICEF (1997) show that almost 3 million children under the age of 15 come from poor families who cannot afford food, or health care services and education fees (Mbulo, 2000). Since their families are unable to attend to their needs due to unemployment, and even if still in employment, the wages are too low to maintain the whole family. As a result, many children have taken to the street as beggars, car washers or helping shoppers with their groceries. It is estimated that the number of street children in Lusaka has increased from 35 000 in 1991 to 90 000 during the year 1998, (Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1998). The 1999 Government survey estimates that the total number of children between the ages of 5 and 17 years engaged in full-time and part-time employment amounts to 563,044 (Child Labour News Service, 2000).
2.6.9 Zimbabwe

In Zimbabwe, child labour is widespread. Scattered evidence indicates that both the incidence of child labour and the number of child workers are quite high. Child labour is found in several sectors including large commercial farms, traditional farming in communal areas, domestic work, small-scale mining and gold-panning operations, micro industries and the informal sector. Agriculture is the most important sector in Zimbabwe, both regarding the total employment and for formal sector employment. Studies have shown that children in the communal farming areas are involved in a variety of tasks; helping in household production, including agricultural work such as herding, weeding and planting, and domestic work such as fetching water, foraging for food, fetching wood and child care work.

Reynolds (1991), found that children’s work in the traditional agricultural sector is closely linked to that of female labour and there are peaks of seasonal labour demands. At these peak periods, children who are over ten years of age can contribute about a third of the labour input. They provide the “adjustable labour” during periods of intense farm activity, and women depend at these times, on children’s assistance. Reynolds found a clear gender division of labour in traditional farming. Male children spend less time on farm work than females, and with reduced domestic tasks, spend much less time overall working than female children.

In Zimbabwe, female labour was persistent throughout the year, and it includes domestic and childcare work, while male work was more seasonal, being agriculturally based. Women appeared to be less able to demand labour of their male children than their female children, with an overall consequence that male children had more leisure time than their female children did. According to the 1992 census, about 1.18 million people or 11 per cent of the population live on the 4,500 large farms in 279,178 households. This produces an estimated 800,000 children living on large-scale farms (Loewenson, 1992).
The formal employment in agriculture stood at 331,000 in 1994. Most children employed in the agricultural sector are contract workers and their employment contract thus provides no entitlement to protective clothing, benefits during sickness, holidays and vacation leave and hours of working other than what is specified in their individual agreed contracts, if they have one. In Zimbabwe, for crops demanding seasonal labour peaks, such as cotton, coffee, tea and tobacco, children of the farm workers provide a captive labour group. Most children are employed on a piece or task wage basis. In a survey among union health and safety representatives in 1992, it was indicated that children were working under both direct and indirect contracts of employment, doing general work, picking cotton, removing insects from tobacco leaves, and loading and off-loading tobacco, spraying pesticides, herding animals and doing household work (Loewenson, 1992).

Children were reported to be working for four to twelve hours a day, in the peak season and earning, if employed directly.

2.7 Existence and Causes of Child Labour in Tobacco Growing Areas in Uganda

In Uganda, there is a dearth of information on the phenomenon of child labour not least, in the agricultural and tobacco growing sector. However, the indicators of the phenomenon are apparent. Agriculture is the most important sector of Uganda’s economy in terms of its contribution to employment and the GDP. According to the World Bank report, 46 percent of Uganda’s population is living below the national poverty line. There has been a decline in poverty in the recent years, as the proportion of Ugandans in consumption poverty fell from 56 percent in 1992 to 44 percent in 1997. The average household consumption rose by 17 percent over the same period. Low rates of economic growth, effects of civil disorder, unequal distribution of resources, land shortage, low levels of education and limited access to markets are highlighted as important factors behind poverty (MFPED 2000).
Children under 18 years make up half of Uganda’s population, a fact that creates a great need for resources within the educational sector. In 1997, government introduced a policy of free education for four children in every family (the Universal Primary Education Programme). This has led to a huge increase in primary school enrolment – from 2.6 million in 1996 to 6.5 million in 2000 (MPED 2000). However, there have been problems in implementing the programme, due to strained finances, instability in some areas and infrastructure problems.

In 1998, about 55 percent of school age children were in school (US Department of State 1999). Enrolment rates in secondary and tertiary education remain low, with only 10 percent of the secondary school age population in school. Whereas Uganda is well ahead of most countries in Africa in primary education, it is behind the others when it comes to secondary education (MFPED 2000).

Uganda ratified the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1989, and has also ratified ILO Conventions No. 5 on the Minimum Age for Industry, No. 123 on the Minimum Age for Underground Work and No. 124 on Medical Examination of young persons. Provisions of these conventions have been incorporated into the national labour legislation. The Employment Decree No. 5 of 1975 prohibits children under 18 years from employment in dangerous and hazardous jobs. Those under 17 years are not supposed to work at night, while those under 16 years are not allowed to work underground. A child under 12 years is only to be employed on light work prescribed by the Minister.

Article 34 of the Uganda Constitution (1995) specifically addresses the right of children, and defines children as persons under the age of 16 years. The Uganda Children’s Statute of 1996 outlines broad protection for children. Section 9 provides that; “No child shall be employed or engaged in any activity that may be harmful to his or her health, education, mental, physical or moral development”. However, the implementation of the law has been hampered and the Government has been unable to
enforce prohibitions on child labour, especially in the informal sector (US Department of State 1999).

According to the Uganda Federation of Employers, Uganda lacks a clearly defined and written policy on employment and child labour. The Employment Decree has several shortcomings and does not adequately address the protection of the majority of the working children in Uganda. The decree is only confined to industrial undertakings within the formal sector, while the bulk of working children are found in the rural and informal sector. Furthermore, the Minister has not defined what light work entails. Mwaka & Tumushabe (1996) state that despite legal provisions, many children are employed and work under terrible conditions. Furthermore, that in spite of the good sound of the various laws and statutes, implementation is still to be realized amidst cultural and religious resistance, and poverty.

In 1991, it was estimated that about 355,000 children aged 10-14 years were economically active in Uganda (ILO/UNDP Report 1995). Based on the 1991 Population and Housing Census, it was reported that 17.1 percent of girls and 14.6 percent of the boys between 10-14 years were economically active (Mwaka & Tumushabe 1996). Two studies of child labour in the rural and urban informal sectors in Uganda established the following:

- 11.9 % children aged between 10-14 years are working
- Child labour is concentrated in the agricultural, construction, commerce/trade and domestic sector
- The majority of working children were either orphans, delinquents (who had run away from home due to mistreatment) or those from poor families.
- The working children earn very low wages, and are sometimes not paid at all
- The children worked under very harsh conditions.
In 1999, the Federation of Uganda Employers (FUE), in co-operation with ILO conducted a study on child labour among 115 employers in the agricultural sector (FUE 1999). The study covered the tea, coffee, sugar, rice and tobacco agricultural sub-sectors. Twenty one percent (21%) of the employers were within the tobacco-growing sector. They found that in all sub-sectors, at least eight out of every ten employers interviewed admitted that children were employed. According to the report, big agricultural enterprises, particularly within tea and sugar sub-sectors, do not employ children as a matter of policy and workers are not even allowed to be assisted by their children (39 percent of the employers allowed this). However, the workers were said to work with their children informally and without the approval of the employers. Other main findings in the study were;

- Less child labour on unionized plantations
- 71 percent of the employers in the tobacco sub-sector did not know the laws governing child labour, compared to 63 percent in general
- Employers who were unaware about laws governing child labour tended more often to employ children
- Equal share of boys and girls are employed
- The children take part mostly in field based activities
- General working conditions are poor
- Occupational health and safety are very low
- Most children are employed as casual labourers

The common reasons given from the employers on why children were working were;
- Most of the children are orphans with no one to cater for them
- Existence of employment/jobs also influences child labour
- Most of them don’t go to school and are therefore redundant
- Poverty
- Desire to earn quick money
2.8 Conclusion

From this review of literature, it is apparent that child labour is a growing phenomenon affecting all sectors including the tobacco sector. Among factors that have been identified in the literature which are associated with child labour are - poverty, large families, HIV/AIDS - (orphans), cheap child labour and poor social services. There has been a recognized need to end this child labour problem in a number of countries. However, in Uganda, there is a dearth of information crucial to alleviating the problem. The FUE’s study indicates that child labour is prevalent in the tobacco sector and other commercial agricultural sub-sectors in Uganda. However, a lot more needs to be established, including the following information:

- Information on the extent of child labour in Uganda’s tobacco growing sector,
- The influence of poverty and economic pressure on families in relation to deployment of child labour in tobacco growing,
- Child labour, schooling and the overall UPE programme,
- Child labour and HIV/AIDS,
- Child labour and children’s health and the hazards of the working environment,
- The impact of institutional arrangements in which tenants find themselves in tobacco growing regions,
- The overall influence of socio-economic and political factors and the extent to which they hinge on the demise of the family stutter

This study therefore, will attempt to examine these and other related factors in order to come up with a well-documented analysis that would aid in the minimizing or even total elimination of child labour in the tobacco growing sector in Uganda.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design.
Quantitative tools (for interviewing Tobacco farmers and children working on farms) and Qualitative tools were designed, reviewed by BATU and agreed on. Research Assistants of at least O-Level standard with knowledge of the local languages were recruited and trained. The tools were pre-tested in the field and adjusted accordingly.

3.2 The Area of the Study.
The four districts of Arua, Apac, Masindi and Rukungiri were purposively selected by BATU to represent the four major tobacco growing regions of Uganda namely; West Nile, Central North, Hoima-Mubende belt, and South West.
According to BATU, the districts selected above acknowledge and appreciate the problem of child labourers in their areas.

The profiles of the Districts under study are stated below. (Source: Population Secretariat, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development).
### DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>776600</td>
<td>532801</td>
<td>333800</td>
<td>507100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population growth rate (percent)</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of population below 5 years</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.79</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>19.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of females aged 15-49 years</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.75</td>
<td>44.43</td>
<td>45.20</td>
<td>42.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of population female</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.77</td>
<td>50.97</td>
<td>49.41</td>
<td>51.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of population urban</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total area in Km²</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7879.2</td>
<td>6541.2</td>
<td>8448.0</td>
<td>2858.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land area in Km²</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7730.2</td>
<td>5891.5</td>
<td>8448.0</td>
<td>2685.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life expectancy at birth (1991)</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crude birth rate per 1000 live births</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crude death rate per 1000</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infant mortality rate per 1000 live births(1991)</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total fertility rate (1991)</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>8.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of households with latrines (1991)</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.03</td>
<td>33.13</td>
<td>67.97</td>
<td>91.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of households with safe water</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td>41.72</td>
<td>29.63</td>
<td>26.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literacy rate (1991)</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female literacy rate (1991)</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Hospitals</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Health Centres</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Dispensaries</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Beds</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>919</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Doctors</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Dentists</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Nurses</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Midwives</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Health Sub- Districts</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Sub – Counties</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Sub-Districts with Health centre IV</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub – Counties with Health centre III</th>
<th>Arua</th>
<th>Apac</th>
<th>Masindi</th>
<th>Rukungiri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: The geographical areas where the study was carried out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>COUNTIES</th>
<th>SUB COUNTIES</th>
<th>PARISHES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W/Nile</td>
<td>Arua</td>
<td>Terego</td>
<td>Katrini</td>
<td>Ayivu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ocopi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Olua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ozoro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maracha</td>
<td>Ambidiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dranzipi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lamila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oluvu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Apac</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ngai</td>
<td>Akuca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aramita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iceme</td>
<td>Awungu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Omolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orupo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aboke</td>
<td>Akwiridiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aramita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dagoace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>Rukungiri</td>
<td>Rujumbura</td>
<td>Bwambara</td>
<td>Bwambara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nyabubaale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kikarara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bikurungu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>Masindi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Budongo</td>
<td>Nyantonzi &amp; Kasenene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karujubu</td>
<td>Kibwona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kisita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kihuha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Sample Size.

The sample size was arrived at using a precision rate of 7%, the estimated national child labour rate of 15.9%, and the total number of farmers in the four districts. Arua therefore provided 935 respondents, Masindi 488, Apac 70 and Rukungiri 300.
Table 3: Number of registered farmers in tobacco growing districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>No/farmers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arua</td>
<td>18,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masindi</td>
<td>9,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apach</td>
<td>1,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rukungiri</td>
<td>6,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,862</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: BAT(U)Ltd. Records 2001*

3.4 Sampling procedure.

Two tobacco growing sub counties (one peri-urban and another rural) were purposively selected in each of the districts. One parish was selected through multi stage random sampling and two zones were randomly selected from each Parish. Using the registered farmers as a sampling frame in the selected zones, farms to provide respondents were randomly selected. Key informant interviews were held with LCs, farmer leaders, NGO officers and representatives of the business community dealing in tobacco extension workers, youth and women leaders and BATU field officers.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS.
This is a two-part data presentation for both quantitative and qualitative findings. The quantitative data dwells on tobacco farmers while the qualitative data captures the circumstances in which children engage in tobacco growing. It was observed that there was no commercial tobacco farming in the study areas. Tobacco is a small holding household crop.

4.1 Quantitative Section
A structured questionnaire was administered to tobacco farmers in Arua, Masindi, Rukungiri and Apac.

Table 4: Distribution of Farmers Interviewed by Districts (see 3.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Farmers Interviewed</th>
<th>Percentage of Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apac</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rukungiri</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masindi</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arua</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1 Family Size, Age Distribution and Employment.
Most families (45%) had 5-8 persons in the family. Seventy five percent (75%) of the families had from 1 to 4 family members only under 18 years of age. However, 72% of the family members were employed on family farms and only 25%, were employed on other farms as paid labour.

Since most families are of 5-8 persons and 75% had 1-4 persons under 18 years of age, it is therefore implied that the majority of the families employed child labour on their tobacco farms.
The average age of tobacco farmers was 38 years, 74% of whom were men with an average of 6 family members working on the tobacco farm. All farmers had stayed in their residence for at least five years at the time of the survey and the majority of those who changed residence into their current areas, were due to resettlement (45%) and in search for jobs (18%). The rest of the changes in residence were due to other reasons like education, job transfers and insecurity.

4.1.2 Sex of the Child Labourers

(a) Family members

Over all, only 30% of the farmers interviewed had girl family members employed compared to 63% with boy family labourers. Of the families employing their daughters, over a half of them (56.6%) employed only one girl child while 28% employed two girls under the age of 18 years. In contrast with the families employing their own boys, 68.9% had 2-4 boys employed on the farms under 18 years of age.

(b) General

Of all the farmers interviewed, only 36% were found to employ girls who are not family members on the farm. Of these families, over 30% of them had one girl while the same proportion had each at least three girls on the farm.

For the boys, 46% of the farms employed boys who were not family members. Half of those farms each had at least two under age boys in employment! The majority of the farmers were deploying their own children on their family tobacco farms.

4.1.3 Child Labour and Schooling.

The farmers confirmed that, of those child labourers who were enrolled in school, the majority of them (70%) had never dropped out of school. However, 25.2% had been out of school at some point in order to help on the family tobacco farm. The average number of school going child labourers was 2 per family.
The relationship (through cross tabulation) between nature of family and child labour indicates that:

- Child labourers from monogamous families are more likely to go to school than those from polygamous families;
- Monogamous families engage children more frequently than polygamous families whether it is during school days or weekends or after school hours or holidays.
- For child labourers who do not go to school, the reasons for not going to school are stronger for monogamous than polygamous families.

The relationship between child labour and the number of children in a family indicates that:

- The fewer the children in the family, the more intensively are children engaged in tobacco farming activities whenever they can get hold of them whether during school days, weekends, after school or during the holidays.
- For those families whose children dropped out of school, the fewer the children at home the lesser the interest to go back to school and vice versa if given opportunity.
- The bigger the number of children in a family, the fewer the hours worked by child labourers on the family farm.

Comparisons were made between child labour and the relationship to the owner of tobacco farm (own children and relatives). These comparisons indicated that:

- Almost all child labourers related to the owner of the farm go to school.
- Those related to the owner of the farm spent less time on the family tobacco farm than those not related.
- Those related to the owner of the farm are better rewarded financially and more frequently than those not related.
Table 5: Child labourers who go to school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you go to school?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never gone to school</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1402</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of child labourers (82%) were found to be going to school. They are distributed between P 5 – P.7 (47.2%), and P.1 – P.4 (42%). Most of these children work on weekends (53%) and others after school hours (17%). Of the children who said they were not going to school, the majority (65%), have at one time been to school while 32% have never been to school.

The most common reason given for not going to school was lack of money (37%). Other reasons given were helping on the tobacco farm (18%) and to allow other children have basic education, still related to lack of funds! (17%).

Over all, therefore, 54% don’t go to school for lack of money! The fact that parents exist or not, does not contribute to children’s education, confirms that the non-availability of cash is the overriding factor for children not going to school. Whether at school or not, working on tobacco farms is the main activity for child labourers. A significant number of children leave school to work on tobacco farms especially during peak tobacco seasons like planting, weeding and harvesting, leading to absenteeism in school.

4.1.4 Socio economic and cultural environment

Marriage offers strong ties among communities as the nuclei for production; most of the farmers were married (88%).
Table 6: Age bracket to consider one a child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Bracket</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 7 years</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 11 years</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 15 years</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 18 years</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any body under 18 years</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person still living with parents</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1592</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 34% of the respondents know the legal age limit of children while over 45% consider children to be only those below 15 years!

Most families 94% were stable and had spent at least 5 years in their area. Some families (45%) had come through the resettlement scheme while 18% came looking for jobs and later settled.

4.1.5 Major Source of Family Income.
Tobacco was found to be the main source of income for 90% of the households interviewed.

Figure 1: Main Source of Income for the households.
Tobacco leads as the main but not sole source of income for 90% of the households interviewed. Lack of capital is cited as the reason for not growing tobacco by 35% of those whose major source of income is not tobacco. Other sources of income cited include simsim, cassava and groundnuts.

**Table 7: Family’s gross income during last 6 months**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than shs 500,000</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shs 500,000 - 1,000,000</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shs 1,000,000 - 5,000,000</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5,000,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1586</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family gross incomes do not exceed shs 500,000/= for most tobacco farmers (75%). Only a few are doing better, though earning between shs 500,000 – 1,000,000 (18%). There are wide income disparities between the poor (low cash income) and the rich (high cash income).

**Table 8: Contribution of tobacco to family income.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% - 99%</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% - 74%</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% - 49%</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 25%</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1585</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About 65% of the families interviewed get half (and over) of their family income from tobacco alone. Eleven percent (11%) get their income (100%) solely from tobacco.
Table 9: Contribution of Children to Tobacco income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No contribution</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10%</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% - 20%</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21% - 50%</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50%</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 20% of the interviewed farmers stated that children made no contribution at all to their tobacco incomes. The majority however confessed that children make significant contributions to their tobacco incomes in various proportions (See table 9).

Table 10: Family expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500,000</td>
<td>1284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shs 500,000 - 1,000,000</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000 – 5,000,000</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5,000,000</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most families (82%) have less than shs 500,000 to spend on their needs every six months. Comparing income and expenditure, the low earners hardly make a surplus. Fortunately most of them (47%) fully own the land they farm on though customary tenancy exists (30%).

4.1.6 Existence, nature and magnitude of child labour.

Child labour exists in almost all the tobacco farms surveyed. The most common form of child labour on farms is family labour as reported by 60% of the respondents. Family labour is sometimes ‘Forced labour’ because once parents give orders,
children don’t have much alternative but to oblige. The other form is largely voluntary labour (25%).

The majority of the farmers interviewed (64.4%) admitted employing children on their farms, while 33.2% denied this. There was a minimum of 2 male children employed per farmer among (32.7%) of the interviewed farmers. A reasonable percentage (26%) of farmers had only one male child on farms. The corresponding numbers for girls were – two girls in employment (33%) and one girl (31%). The number of children employed per farm ranged from 0 to 4 with an average of 2 children per family working on the tobacco farm.

Three months before the survey, 38% of the farmers had employed children and 24% had had one male child on the farm. In the same period, 30% of the farmers had employed 2 girls and 27% of farmers had one girl employed on the farm. When the period was stretched to six months before the survey, 30% of the farmers admitted having employed 2 boys while 22.6% had employed three boys. Only 21.4% had employed only one boy.

Among girls, 30.5% of farmers had 2 girls employed while an almost equal tally 30% had one girl employed on the farm. Only 19.3% had gained services of at least 3 girls on the farm.

Most children start work on farms at the ages of between 8-15 years with the average age being 9.2 years. This age bracket constitutes 68.4% according to the respondents. However, children who are as young as 4-7 years (11.6%) are reported to work on tobacco farms.

A big number of farmers (48%) admitted employing their sons and daughters to work on their farms. A significant number (25.7%) of the children were reported to be from neighbours and relatives (22.6%) respectively.
The relationship of a Child labourer to the farm owner influenced terms of payments in such a way that, when the child labourer was a son/daughter of the farmer, remuneration was in the form of education and meals, while if not, the terms were casual/short term and remuneration was in the form of small cash allowances. The relationship to the farmer did not influence hours worked on the farm and allocation of tasks across age groups. Child labourers work for long hours (average of 8.7 hours per day), and are often too tired to do anything else useful (71.5%) and have very little time as free hours (average of 2.4 hours) to do anything of their choice like playing with friends, going to amusement centres, read/study or rest.

Rewards for outside child labour is in form of commissions (56%), allowances (29%) per work completed and at the end of every tobacco season. The average monthly earnings for child labourers is less than shs. 5,000/= . In case of sickness or injuries, however, 89% of the employing farmers cater for children’s medical requirements.

The relationship between nature of family and child labour indicates that:

- Monogamous families are more influential in the determination of terms of employment whether these are permanent, contractual, casual/short term or seasonal.
- Child labourers from monogamous families spend more time on tobacco farms than those from polygamous families.

### 4.1.7 Activities Children are engaged in on tobacco farms.

The responding farmers stated that children are involved virtually in all activities that take place on a tobacco farm but to varying extents. In order of frequency, the commonest were reported to be harvesting (31.7%), planting of tobacco (24.9%), Nurseries (21.2%), land opening (8.3%), suckering (6.5%), and weeding 3.7%
The task/activity allocation among children by farmers does not indicate preferential treatment across age groups. Children are indiscriminately engaged in all tobacco farm activities except for those activities related to marketing.

4.1.8 Causes and Effects of Child Labour.

The reasons given for employing children on tobacco farms were in order of importance stated to be supplementing the family income 33.7%, pay own school fees 22.2%, gaining experience 17.8%, develop work ethics 12.3%, help on in-house enterprises 8.8% and others 5.2%. On the whole, it is inadequacy of family resources (poverty) which was the most outstanding (55.9%), cause of child labour.

Children on the other hand offer child labour because they want to improve their living standards (85%) when both parents are alive, 7.5% when both parents are dead and 7.5% when living with single parents), be independent (63% when both parents are alive, 32% when parents dead and 5% when living with single parents) and ensure that household enterprises operate fully. This shows that children offer labour on tobacco farms due to poverty irrespective of whether their parents are alive or not. While poverty was construed to mean cash income by this study, its causes directly or indirectly cause child labour in a simultaneous manner.

The effects of child labour include interference with their education. Many children (78%), who go to school stop schooling to attend to tobacco farms during peak periods.

The relationship between nature of family and child labour indicates that:

- Monogamous families reward child labour better than polygamous families in terms of money, frequency of payments and other benefits.
- Monogamous families offer a lesser risky working environment than polygamous families with regard to the various types of risks, their frequency of occurrence, their seriousness when they occur and post risk attention.
• Monogamous families perform better than polygamous families on reasons for not employing child labour such as leaving the children to go to school, allowing the children to rest and enabling children to acquire their own skills first.

4.1.9 Reasons for Preference of Child Labour.
Majority (68.7%) of the farmers interviewed liked child labour and preferred children to continue offering the same while 31.3% were against. Farmers preferred child labour because it was cheap (48.6%) while others (21.9%) stated that there was shortage of labour. Farmers who are against child labour gave the major reasons as; children should go to school (36.9%), children can’t handle heavy assignments (24.3%), it is illegal (9.2%), children are not available (8.1%), and children need close supervision 6.2%. When asked what the best alternatives were to working on tobacco farms, 80.2% of the farmers stated they should attend school, go for skills training for better jobs (9.3%), help in household jobs (5.4%) and look for better paying jobs (4.2%).

4.1.10 Child Labour and Leisure.
Most farmers, (91%), admitted that children employed on tobacco farms got time off work to relax or play. The hours of rest and leisure ranged from 2-5 hours, (24.1%), to over 5 hours, 47% with the average being 2 hours for leisure per day. The free time was reported to be utilised for playing with friends 34.4%, and working with parents 22.6%.

4.1.11 Occupational hazards of Child Labour on Tobacco Farms.
To a great extent, most tobacco farmers (70.9%), were aware of the risks these children were exposed to by working on tobacco farms. A reasonable number however, 29.2% were not aware at all!
In order of frequency, the occupational hazards were listed as light injuries (59%); exposure to chemicals (14%); exposure to smoke and dust (8%); burns (7%); crush injuries (5%) and others (7%).

Despite the reasonable awareness of the occupational hazards, 51.5% of the farmers provided no protective gear/clothing to these children working on their farms. However in the case of injury 87.9% of the farmers provided medical care.

**4.1.12 Payment for Child Labour.**

Since most of the farmers confessed that they prefer child labour because it is cheap, it is, therefore, not surprising to find that the majority of them (58%), pay their child labourers by incentives in form of meals (which may not be readily available at home) and small allowances. Others give them clothes etc etc.

**4.1.13 Farmers’ knowledge and practice of the law on child labour.**

The majority of the farmers 52%, were not aware that there was a law prohibiting child labour. Only 47.5% confessed to knowledge of the law. Further still 57.7% of the farmers had never heard of any organisation sensitising communities on child labour legislation in their area. However, 41.7% admitted having seen some organisations doing the sensitising.

Asked why they don’t stick to the law on child labour, the farmers who said they were aware of such a law stated that they had not been sensitised (32%); that there were many redundant children coupled with shortage of labour (25%) and that the law was not enforced (24%). However, the majority of the farmers 66.7% showed willingness to participate in programmes to eliminate child labour while 33.1% bluntly said No!

The major reasons for willing to participate in child labour elimination programmes were given as; Child labour interferes with education 58.7%, interference with full development opportunities of the child (21.8%), illegality of the practice (16.2%). Farmers not willing to participate in the child labour elimination programme gave their reasons as interference with their tobacco production business (28.5%), increase
of household poverty 20.4%, shortage of labour (20%) no alternative employment for children (19.8%) and interference with culture and custom (19.3).

4.2 Qualitative Section.

This section presents results of the qualitative interviews conducted with children found working on tobacco farms and Key Informants. The interviews were conducted in the four districts of the study area namely; Apac in Central North, Arua in West Nile, Masindi in the West and Rukungiri in South Western Uganda.

4.2.1 Results of Qualitative Interviews with Child Labourers on Tobacco Farms.

A total of 200 qualitative interviews were held with children found working on tobacco farms. Fifty children (50) were interviewed per District. Masindi has the highest concentration of child labourers among the districts surveyed. In all the thirty-six parishes visited, Kasenene parish had more children on tobacco farms followed by Nyabubale. At sub-county level, Bwambala beat seven others in numbers of children found on tobacco farms. The common age bracket of child labourers falls within the 14-17 year age bracket.

The study revealed that twice as many boys than girls were working on the farms.

4.2.2 Family Background

Masindi had the highest number of children originating from within followed by Rukungiri, Apac and Arua, respectively. This implies that Arua has the highest number of migrant child labourers and Masindi the least.

In most cases, the parents of the children were alive and lived with their children in monogamous family settings.

The most common number of children per family was 4 – 6 children although a few families had 7 – 9 children. The majority of these children met were either first or second-borns in almost equal proportion.
Tobacco emerged as the major source of income for most homesteads. Other significant income was collected from simsim, cassava and groundnuts farming.

4.2.3 Education
Most children interviewed were enrolled in school and attended classes from P.5 to P.7. Some children reported finding time to help on farms on weekends. A lesser proportion work on the farms after school hours. The majority of children, cited lack of money as the main reason for working on tobacco farms. A few also cited loss of their parents as the reason for resorting to farm work. The orphans were however willing to return to school if an opportunity arose.
Those who did not prefer schooling said that they preferred working and getting married. The main reason advanced for fearing to go back to school was that they might encounter problems catching up with the rest of the children while at school.

4.2.4 Tobacco related labour
The majority of children were found employed on class B farms (according to BATU classifications) owned by men, who in many instances were their parents. Few were working at their uncles'/unties’ farms or sought to work on outside farms.

Children under the care of their parents said that they could not refuse to work on the family tobacco farms (“forced labour”). Only a small proportion admitted that they had a choice to refuse if they so wished.
Most children had laboured for over 2 years on farms and were mostly involved in weeding and less in harvesting the crop. They were needed least in tending to nurseries. This therefore keeps children on seasonal employment when a significant number are taken on for short term contracts or casual engagement. More of the earnings from tobacco farms go to supplementing family income than to paying the children’s school fees.

---

7 BATU classification of farmer category
A= Very good  B= Good  C= Acceptable  D= Room for improvement  Z= Very poor
Most children are in the garden by 7.00 a.m. and spend 4 – 6 hours working on the crop. Only a few spent less than 4 hours. By then, the majority describe themselves as still fit to do some other work while a good number intimated they are often too tired to do any work after working on tobacco farms.

In a week, children spend 1 – 4 days working on a farm in the main, but a few said they exceeded to make 5 – 6 days. In spite of this, the majority admitted that they take off free time between 2 – 4 hours per day to play with friends or rest.

According to over half of the children interviewed, their work is rewarded at every end of season. In addition, they receive other benefits mainly in form of meals or cash tokens. Most of the children would put their monthly earnings at less than shs 5000/=, although a few earn between shs 5,000 and 10,000/=.

A very big proportion of children considered their work on the farms risky. The risks/injuries experienced by the vast majority of children were diseases of the respiratory tract, bruises, cuts, wounds, and punctures. Others were body aches and pains and skin diseases related tobacco work. About half of the children admitted that most injuries are light and do not stop them from working. Other children said that the injuries are occasional or rare while a few said that they were very common. In most cases of injury, their parents foot the medical bill. To a less extent, the employer also met the bills. This situation remained the same irrespective of the nature of farmer (parent or not) and farmer category.

About as many children interviewed were satisfied with their working conditions as those who were dissatisfied. Most complained of low earnings and secondly, long working hours. They also cited the lack of protective wear and care.
Surprisingly, about as many children said that it was good for children to be employed on tobacco farms as those who said that it was not good. The former cited the problem of poverty in homes and the latter were concerned about the effect of child labour on schooling. Most children said that they were aware that they should not be in employment at their age. The majority were of the view that the laws prohibiting child employment should be abolished. However, a significant proportion said that the laws should instead be strengthened. In order to ensure that children under 18 years of age are not employed on tobacco farms, children suggested that household poverty should be addressed first and universally accessible free education be provided, i.e. education at no direct cost at all.

4.2.5 Results from Adult Key Informant Interviews.
A total of 60 Key Informants were interviewed using KI interview guides. Their distribution was as follows; Arua – 15, Apac 18, Rukungiri 12 and Masindi 15. The results of the KI interviews are reflected under the sub themes below.

4.2.6 Existence of child labour on tobacco farm in the area.
In all the districts under study, the respondents acknowledged presence of child labour on tobacco farms. The problem was stated to be more pronounced in Arua and Rukungiri followed by Apac and least reported in Masindi. Over 86.7% of the Key informants acknowledged the existence of the problem of child labourers on tobacco farms in their area. Only in Arua was it admitted that it was starting to phase out though slowly. A few of the Key informants called the problem seasonal.

4.2.7 Reasons for prevalence of child labour on tobacco farms.
Overall and in order of magnitude, child labour was reported to be common because of poverty in the households, its being cheaper than ordinary labour market costs and shortage of labour at peak periods.

By districts, Arua gave reasons for child labour as poverty, followed by shortage of labour, while for Rukungiri and Apac, the reasons for employing children on tobacco
farms weighed equally and were listed as poverty in households, cheap child labour and tobacco being labour intensive. For Masindi district, the main reason for employing children was stated as Poverty.

4.2.8 Attitude towards Child Labour.

Overall, most of the KIs considered employing children on tobacco farms as normal, while a few said the contrary. By Districts, most of the interviewees of Arua and Apac said it was normal while in Rukungiri and Masindi, a reasonable number of the respondents said child labour on tobacco farms was not considered normal.

4.2.9 Age affected most.

Overall, the most affected age bracket is 10 – 18 years. Most of the respondents in Masindi and Rukungiri respectively stated that most of the children who are employed on tobacco farms fall in this age bracket. However, for Arua and Apac they employ children in the younger age bracket of 6 – 15 years in contrast to Rukungiri and Masindi.

4.2.10 Distribution of child labourers by sex.

Overall, boys are more involved in tobacco growing activities in a ratio of 1: 1.6 (girls: boys i.e. for every 10 girls employed there are 16 boys employed on tobacco farms). However, in the district of Arua, both girls and boys are reported to be equally affected.

4.2.11 Activities children are involved in on tobacco farms.

In ascending order, the activities the children are mostly involved in on tobacco farms are weeding, transplanting, harvesting, watering, transporting firewood and tobacco leaf, curing and topping. Children are reported to be least involved in marketing, roping and nurseries, as these require experience and skills which the children lack.
4.2.12 Seasonal Variation in employment of children on tobacco farms

The majority reported seasonal variation in the employment of children on tobacco farms. In Arua and Apac there was total concurrence about the seasonal variation while in Rukungiri and Masindi, there was a divided opinion.

4.2.13 Reasons for employing children on tobacco farms.

Overall, there were multiple responses from the respondents as to why children are employed on tobacco farms. They are presented below in the ascending order.

**Reasons for employing children.**

1. Child labour is cheap  
2. Poverty in households  
3. Orphans (lack of parental care)  
4. Children don’t complain at work  
5. Lack of alternative employment  
6. Scarcity of affordable labour  
7. Minimise production cost  
8. Parents’ use of force  
9. Not prioritizing education

It is worth noting that the low cost of child labour, poverty in households and lack of parental care in case of orphans are the major factors contributing to the continued prevalence of child labour on tobacco farms.

4.2.14 Terms and Conditions for child labourers on tobacco farms.

This is a question where a big number of the respondents were most reserved. It required a lot of probing, assurance and patience. The rewards to child labourers for working on tobacco farms ranged from money to food, clothes and empty promises.
4.2.15 Whether children work only on family farms.

The majority of the respondents stated that children work on both family farms and other farms but it was reported that they “spend more time on family farms than elsewhere”. This trend is most pronounced in Rukungiri, followed by Arua and Apac. In Masindi, the respondents reported that children in equal proportions work on both family and outside farms, and others work on family farms only. A few in Masindi were reported to work on other families’ farms only.

4.2.16 Risks to child labourers on tobacco farms.

The majority of the Key informants consider the work on tobacco farms risky. But a few don’t think it is risky at all.

Exposure to fumes, dusts and chemicals and working long hours without rest were stated by the respondents to be the most outstanding risks followed by physical injury, missing lunch especially in Apac and Rukungiri, and snake bites which were reported to be the highest risk in Masindi District. It is worth noting that these children are caned (corporal punishment) while at work on the farms while others learn smoking and some are sexually abused!

4.2.17 Terms of employment on tobacco farms.

The majority of the respondents state that the terms of employment of the children on tobacco farms are unfair. In the majority of KIs the nutritional requirements of the children are not met, they receive a very low pay for the jobs done (this is proved earlier on among the reasons for employing children – cheap labour). Sanitation (in forms of toilet facilities, water for drinking and bathing) are not adequately taken care of. The employers are very harsh to these children who are not given time off for leisure.
4.2.18 Hours worked per day.
Most of these children were reported to spend 10 – 12 hours per day working on tobacco farms. Only a few were reported to work for less than four hours a day. Probably these may be the ones who work on family farms only. Most of the child labourers were reported to have no rest at all during a working day while only a few, acknowledged that some children rest for a short time.

4.2.19 Evidence of excessive physical strain on the part of child labourers.
About half of the informants acknowledged existence of excessive physical strain on child labourers, while a similar number said did not know of any. Evidence of excessive physical strain was reported in form of excessive fatigue at the end of the day, back and neck pain and bruises.

4.2.20 Communication between child labourers and their families when not working on family farms.
The majority of the respondents stated that child labourers working on outside farms (other than those of their families) do not communicate with their parents and/or relatives. This was said to be so especially where children left home without the consent of the parents or after a misunderstanding with their parents.

4.2.21 Coping mechanisms at the village/community level to deter/mitigate child labour on tobacco farms.
The majority of the respondents reported absence of coping mechanisms at the village level to deter/mitigate child labour. Where they were reported to exist, they were not effective at all. Such mechanisms were cultural practices and village bye-laws. These were reported to exist in Apac, Arua and Rukungiri. The apparent lack of effective community coping mechanism is due to the fact that community leaders are also tobacco farmers and may not favour any mechanism to their disadvantage. Other
respondents ended up mentioning those coping mechanisms being spearheaded by NGOs like those implementing the Early Childhood and Nutrition Project.

4.2.22 Policies and/or programmes designed or being initiated to solve the child labour problem.

(a) District level.
The majority of respondents did not know of the existence of any policies and/or programmes that have been or are being initiated at district level to solve the child labour problem. Apac and Rukungiri displayed the highest levels of ignorance followed by Arua and Masindi. A small percentage of the respondents have knowledge of some programmes but limited understanding about them such as their names, areas of operation, their target groups, methods and actual activities these organizations/programmes are involved in. Only Masindi and Arua mentioned a few of these initiatives including Bye Laws and the Child Statute but could not go further.

Respondents’ knowledge of organizations (NGOs and CBOs) involved in child labour was also limited. For example, most of the respondents have never heard of any child labour organizations in their area and those who have heard about them some could only remember their names and very little of the organizations’ target areas/groups and methods of work. The most commonly reported organizations in all the study districts are FIDA, National Council for Children, Ministry of Health (Early Childhood and Nutrition Project), Action Aid, Save the Children Fund and Ministry of Education and Sports [for Discussion: would any approach to solve the problem begin with understanding the approaches of these organizations]

(b) National Level.
Respondents’ knowledge of laws, policies and/programmes that have been or are being initiated to solve the child labour at National level was averagely high. However, like at the district level, respondents’ knowledge was restricted to just
names of ministries (Health, Education, Gender) and international agencies (ILO and UNHCR) and very little of the associated programmes, target areas/groups and methods used/being used.

4.2.23 Suggestions on the best way to eliminate child labour in the tobacco growing sector.

Respondents provided their carefully considered solutions to the child labour problem in tobacco growing. Analysis of their responses produced the following suggestions in order of preference:

List of Suggestions to Eliminate Child Labour in Tobacco Growing
(Multiple answers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poverty reduction at household level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sensitize children about disadvantages of child labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Free secondary education to lessen burden on parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Intensify enforcement of child Bye Laws from district to subcounty levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sensitize farmers about the disadvantages of child labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Provision of free farm inputs and a pre-planting labour fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Formation of active facilitated community steering committees against child labour (community vigilantes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Use of posters and mass media in local language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>BAT should offer loans to cover transport and weeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Create other job opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Modernize and mechanize tobacco farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Introduce other new cash crops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSION

This chapter, combines the findings of the quantitative and qualitative investigations of the study and discusses them in light of the study objectives and literature available, on the subject of child labour. Opinions formed in this chapter are entirely based on the study findings.

5.1 Importance of Tobacco.

Tobacco has been found to be a very important cash crop in the districts under study. The results show that for 90% of the households in the study sample, tobacco is the major source of income. Tobacco also contributes over half of the family incomes among 65% of the households and is the sole source of income among 11% of the households. The study also reveals that in contrast to some African Countries, tobacco growing in Uganda is at household level and not large commercial farms.

These are very important socio-economic revelation to BATU, policy makers and planners, because decisions and policies that affect tobacco will affect the lives of many innocent people especially at household level. Tobacco production therefore, is confirmed to be significant to the economy.

5.2 Existence, and magnitude of child labour in tobacco growing areas.

As indicated by the results, child labour exists in all the tobacco growing areas under the study. The tobacco farms employ more boys than girls in a (ratio of 2:1). The average age at which children engage in child labour is 9.2 years. Child labour exists irrespective of the socio-economic status, demographic characteristics of tobacco farm families and farmer category. Since Tobacco has been identified to be the major source of income in 90% of the homes, there is no way children can be kept a way from such an activity. A similar scenario is found in coffee and banana growing areas where children help out in coffee and banana production. It is unfortunate that the
The majority of the child labourers are of school-going age! This is very surprising especially with the advent of UPE.

These findings do not differ in general with those found in literature review except, for the average age of 13 years. The only available information on Uganda’s child labour indicates that the age range for child labour is 10 – 14 years and that children are employed in all sectors of the economy. It is silent about sex distribution.

5.3 Magnitude and Form of Child Labour.
Most of the children found on tobacco farms offer labour to the farm. It is a common phenomenon for children to work on the farms either as family labour or, to a lesser extent, hired labour. Much of family child labour is “forced labour” where children are seen as property of the estate owner and work for personal or family benefit in the gardens. Hired labour on the tobacco farms is basically voluntary labour where children themselves enter into arrangements with estate owners in order to earn a wage. Findings indicate that children in this setting work to assist their families with extra income or meet their personal needs. There is limited existence of bonded child labour where responsibilities of deceased parents are transferred to their children. This is mainly because tobacco growing in Uganda is not on large commercial estates as in Malawi or Zimbabwe. There are HIV/AIDS orphans among the child labourers but the majority are not. This may be because of the extended family system where children are taken over by relatives after death of parents.

5.4 Causes and Effects of Child Labour.
5.4.1 Causes.
The Study findings indicate reasons for engaging child labour as supplementing family income, pay for education, gain experience and develop work ethics in order of importance. This suggests that the main driving force behind child labour on tobacco farms is poverty. Most families are too poor to afford a decent living and end up “encouraging” their children to fend for themselves at a tender age while
others just cannot afford to pay school fees for their children, hence child labour in search of school fees. A great majority of farmers acknowledge the contribution of children to their family incomes. Tobacco being the source of livelihood to most of the tobacco families coupled with traditional (read cultural also) beliefs that children are a family property and ignorant of the legal implications of child labour on the part of parents/guardians, they find no other feasible alternatives but to employ children on their farms. Relatively, child labour (as findings indicate) is a softer spot for farmers to get. Child labourers are cheap, easily available, easy to manipulate and are fully submissive.

The other cause of child labour which is gaining prominence, though still small, is HIV/AIDS. Adult death as a result of AIDS results in financial strain for children because AIDS takes away, in majority of cases, those in parenting age. The resultant financial strain offsets the income security and survival of children, hence the search for labour within the nearest available opportunities.

Poverty was found to be statistically significant as a cause of child labour when family income was used as the proxy for poverty. Further analysis does not indicate that rich farmers (as shown by farmer category and income) do not employ family labour. It can be deduced, therefore, that by just exogenously increasing farmer’s incomes would reduce child labour. Other causes of poverty such as ignorance, cultural beliefs and custom, absence of enforced regulation also cause the engagement of child labour in a simultaneous relationship.

Other stand alone, but insignificant causes of child labour are employment scouts and insecurity/displacement.

5.4.2 Effects
Children working on tobacco farms are generally engaged in all farm activities with the predominant ones being harvesting, nurseries, planting and land opening. There is
neither evidence of preferential allocation of tasks across ages nor is there evidence of prohibiting children from employment in dangerous and hazardous tasks.

Child labourers are employed mainly as short term/casual labourers to basically earn through meals, education and some little cash. Those who don’t earn education are children of the farmers who are on “forced labour”. A significant number of child labourers secure very little free time during working hours because there is usually too much work and they have to go school. Work on tobacco farms takes priority over school activities especially during peak tobacco seasons (planting and harvesting). Child labour on tobacco farms is mixed with education. While this is a clear interference of children’s education, the extent to which this interference and its impact on child educational performance is not known. The prima facie conclusion, however, is that since the children do not have enough time for their educational activities due to work on tobacco farms, child labour greatly impairs their performance at school. These children (majority) are interested in education and would be too happy if circumstances that forced them into child labour were addressed.

The findings further indicate that child labourers are not provided with adequate protective gear while at work and that a significant proportion of farmers, do not even know what protective gear is, let alone its use and importance. The ILO International Convention of 1993 defines a working environment for children as one which ensures the “right of the child to be protected from economic exploitation and from performing any work that is likely to be hazardous or interfere with the child’s education …….”. This environment is far from being observed in Uganda’s tobacco growing areas largely due to ignorance and not sheer discardment.

Knowledge of occupational hazards exists among farmers as basically light injuries and exposure to chemicals. Where injuries do occur, farmers take responsibility for
medical care. However, provision of protective wear and sensitization about health and safety with regard to chemicals are none-existent.

5.5. Existing Initiatives to solve the problem.

In anticipation that the respondents were aware of child labour as a problem, the study sought to find out whether they were aware of any initiatives to solve the problem at the local, district and national levels. As findings indicate, a significant proportion of farmers do not appreciate that child labour is a problem though, a less significant but also influential, proportion are aware that child labour is a problem. The existing initiatives are restricted to simple cultural coping mechanisms, Bye laws and the Children Statute at the local and district levels. There is no significant evidence to indicate that the community has been involved in any of the initiatives due to lack of sensitization and enforcement of bye laws. However, a significant number of farmers are willing to participate in child labour elimination programs.

At national level, the community is aware of some programmes especially those of the National Council for Children, Ministry of Health (Nutrition and Early Childhood Project) and Ministry of Education. Their awareness of these programmes is scanty. This is a conformation of the fundamental weaknesses to top bottom approach to planning. While the Government, and through Government, the ILO have well articulated policies and programmes at national level, their impact at the grassroot level is very remote.

5.6 Suggested Solutions to the Child Labour problem in Tobacco Growing Areas in Uganda.

As findings indicate, respondents provided the self felt solutions to the child labour problem in their areas.

The response have been analysed and presented in their order of preference as follows:
(a) Sensitisation and enforcement.
It is suggested that both farmers and children be sensitized on the meaning of and
dangers of child labour as well as on how they can be involved to eliminate it. In
addition, they suggested that existing bye laws and related regulatory laws should
be enforced by relevant authorities in collaboration with the local communities.

Sensitisation should be handled with as much care as is necessary to ensure
sustainability of the benefits created by such sensitization programmes. As is
indicated in literature review, sensitization programmes were not successful in
Ghana and Tanzania because of lack of sustainability provisions.

(b) Poverty reduction at household level.
It is suggested that tobacco farm families be facilitated to fight poverty within
their households through provision of soft loans and a seasonal labour fund.

Most rural households (including tobacco farmers) are inherently poor not due to
lack of more money only but also due to a host of other factors combined in a
complex to poverty manner. Besides, findings indicate that inadequate income is
not solely responsible for employing children.

(c) Free Secondary Education.
Farmers suggest that secondary education should be free or reasonably subsidized
to lessen school fees burden on them. There is no evidence in the findings to
support this proposal, because the introduction of UPE does not seem to have had
any significant impact on reduction of child labour on tobacco farms especially,
on the primary school going age.
(d) Mechanisation of tobacco farming.

Farmers suggested that tobacco farming should be mechanized through provision of appropriate tools and equipment. While this is possible, tobacco growing is by its very nature labour intensive and grown on small family holdings which may make mechanization less cost effective. Given Uganda’s technology levels especially in the agricultural areas, and the land tenure system in the tobacco growing areas, the realization of this proposal in the foreseeable future seems remote.

SUMMARY OF THE COMPARISONS BETWEEN SOME OF THE FINDINGS AND THE LITERATURE REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding of the study</th>
<th>Comparisons with the Literature Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at which most children start work on farms is 10-14 years with the average age</td>
<td>• This finding tallies with findings of Eldring, Nakanyane and Tshoadei, (2000); as well as earlier findings by Pinto (1992); many children under 15 years were found to be in regular employment in Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being 9.2 years</td>
<td>• Uganda, ILO/UNDP report 1995 showed 17.1 boys &amp; 14.6 girls between 10-14 years were economically active, as did also Mwaka &amp; Tushabe (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at which respondents considered an employee a child was put at 15 years and below</td>
<td>• Their perception was consistent with the Uganda Employment Decree No.5 of 1975 which describes any body under 18 years, a child. Law prohibits anybody under 18 years from being employed in dangerous/hazardous jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A significant percentage of child labourers had never been to school</td>
<td>• Inability of households to meet basic needs of children(education, food, shelter and clothes) in most cases is said to force children to engage in employment in their endeavour to improve their conditions and livelihood (Bonnet 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An estimated 2.8 million children of school-going age were not in school and were said to be working (Pinto, 1992) – Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children contribute 16-26% of tobacco earnings but are lowly paid and in most cases</td>
<td>• Loewenson, (1992) in South Africa, it was found that children working in traditional agricultural sector peak as seasonal labour demands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the child labourers are children of the tobacco farmers. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farmers confirm that they employ children on their farms mainly to supplement family income and pay school fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country Reports on Human Rights Practices (1998) – Mozambique. In rural areas children sometimes work alongside their parents or independently in seasonal harvests (Kaijace &amp; Kanyala, 1998) Tanzania; the decline in economic performance and provision of social services forced many children to seek employment in order to supplement their family income, especially on tobacco farms.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities: Children are mostly engaged in harvesting (32%), planting (25%) and attending nurseries (21%).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eldring, Nakanyane &amp; Tshoaedi; (2000) children above nine years of age are involved in light tasks like clearing fields, making and watering nursery beds, harvesting, weeding – Malawi.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kaijace and Kanyala; (1998) – Tanzania Urambo district. Children work on nurseries, weeding, plucking, hanging, smoking, grading, tying, selling, burning and harvesting tobacco.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child labour is a serious problem on tobacco farms with regard to spread, magnitude and effects.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child labour is cheap on tobacco farms with farmers having absolute discretion on what terms, what form and how much to pay child labourers.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children on commercial plantations were usually not paid in wages, but instead employers buy them books and other school necessities. In some cases, children are made to work by their families in order to settle debts ((Kaijace &amp; Kanyala, 1998).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This is confirmed by a number of studies.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Children are most likely to be employed when their labour is cheap (Sabata, Nakanyane & Tushabe, 2000) employers give them accommodation and food.

- Mwaka & Tushabe, (1996) – children earn very low wages and sometimes are not paid at all.
- Eldring, Nakanyane & Tushabe, (2000) most employers often are said to offer children only token payments like food (Bahemuka, et al, 2000).
- Eldring, Nakanyane & Tushabe; (2000) child labourers do not have contracts, are paid less, are not provided with benefits and are regarded as seasonal workers, which means that employers can be able to save.
- Sabata, Nakanyane & Tushabe (2000) – Children are most likely to be employed in labour that is cheap.
- Kaijace & Kanyala, (1998) demand for cheap labour from children was another reason for children to be involved in child labour (Tanzania).
- Sabata, Nakanyane and Tshoaedi (2000) children are regarded as a source of livelihood for poor families. Related to this, is the changing lifestyle and increased dependency on the monetary economy.

There are occupational hazards on tobacco farms, the most serious ones being injuries and exposure to chemicals.

- (Mwaka & Tumushabe 1996) – despite legal provision, many children are employed and work under terrible conditions.

More male children on farms than girls

Female and male children seem to be equally treated on tobacco farms. Reynolds (1991) found a clear gender division of labour on traditional farming. Male children spent less time on farm work than females, and with reduced domestic tasks spent much less time overall working than female children. Consequently male children had more leisure time than female children did (Zimbabwe).

Farmers admitted that most of the children employed do not have

- Lowenson, (1992) – most children employed in the agricultural sector are contract workers and
their employment contracts provide no entitlement to protective clothing (Zimbabwe).

(Mwaka & Tumushabe 1996): in spite of the existence of good and sound laws and statutes, implementation is still to be realised amidst cultural, religious resistance and poverty citations.

(Mwaka & Tumushabe, 1996) most children do not go to school and therefore redundant and the existence of employment opportunities influence child labour.

Kooijmans (1998), & ILO
This type of work often interferes with the child’s education, thus negatively impacting on the child’s prospects for career development. ILO Convention 138 … p.1 & 2 & Literature review

5.7 Conclusion.
This study has established that the problem of Child labour on tobacco farms abundantly exists in all the four Districts. Child labour in tobacco growing areas is intense and widespread, manifesting itself largely in form of family labour and to a less extent, as voluntary and bonded labour. It exists in all tobacco growing families regardless of their social, economic status or demographic characteristics and it is most pronounced in Arua and Rukungiri Districts.

Boys are more affected than girls in a ratio of 2:1. The child labourers’ average age is 9.2 years, (range of 4-18 years). The children are involved in almost all activities of the farm without due consideration for age.

It has been established that children are employed on tobacco farms because their labour is cheap, readily available and the children are very easily maneuvered. These factors have been found to be compounded by household poverty, where parents are “forced” to promote child labour by allowing their children to work on tobacco farms even at the expense of missing school.
Tobacco is therefore not the problem and should be looked at, like any other cash crops e.g. coffee, bananas, tea etc. Even among cattle keepers, there is child labour. The main problem is household poverty!

Ignorance of the evils of child labour by both farmers and children was found to be very prevalent in all the districts under study. The other stand alone causes of child labour are HIV/AIDS, employment scouts and insecurity/displacement. Customs, Cultural beliefs and Level of Education of families were not found to be key factors contributing directly to child labour.

Child labour in most cases interferes with the educational and recreational demands of children. The occupational hazards to children associated with work on tobacco farms are known to both farmers and children but no significant preventive and protective initiative are in place to mitigate them. Knowledge of the law against child labour has been found to be scanty but the majority of farmers are willing to cooperate to eliminate child labour.

Initiatives to solve the child labour problem exist but are poorly coordinated and their impacts are scanty because the target beneficiaries i.e. employers (farmers) and child labourers have not been involved.
CHAPTER SIX

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Child labour which exists on tobacco farms mostly as family labour should be addressed without any further delay.

2. In view of the positive attitude towards education by both farmers and children, sustainable arrangements must be made to cater for the education or vocationalisation of children already employed on tobacco farms.

3. Low household incomes must be sustainably improved by the relevant authorities in order to avert poverty.

4. Programmes to sensitise farmers, communities and children themselves on evils of child labour and how they can be involved to overcome these evils must be designed and introduced in tobacco growing areas.

5. The existing laws need to be reviewed and strengthened so as to specifically address the problem of child labour on tobacco farms.

6. Tobacco production is labour intensive and the basic production units are poverty stricken families. BATU should consider providing bigger interest free “production loans” to meet labour costs.

7. A dissemination workshop for this study should be arranged for all stakeholders. Thereafter, national, regional and district “child labour committees” be set up to sensitise, monitor and demobilize child labourers while implementing recommendation No. 2 above. Other such stakeholders are Ministry of Education, Uganda Federation of Employers, National Gender and Social Development and International Programme for Elimination of Child labour (IPEC/ILO) and NGOs handling children’s welfare.
8. While UPE is a commendable programme, it is still true that there are many poor parents in the tobacco growing areas who cannot afford the little that is asked of them for the education of their children. BATU should therefore, consider investing more in the primary schools in the tobacco growing areas (subsidizing UPE costs) so that the school children are not kept away for lack of necessary school requirements.

9. Similar studies should be done for other cash crops and the livestock sector, to enable a holistic approach to the problem of child labour.
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APPENDIX

Quantitative and Qualitative Instruments used in the study
SURVEY ON TOBACCO FARMERS

CERTIFICATION  (To be filled at the end of the interview).
I certify that I have personally interviewed the below named Respondent and all responses have been recorded accurately to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Signature of Enumerator………………………….. Date:…………………….

Edited by:…………………………………………… Date:…………………….
(District Supervisor)

Reviewed by:………………………………………… Date:…………………….
(Regional Supervisor)

Checked by: ………………………………………. Date: …………………….
(Statistician)

SECTION A:  IDENTIFICATION

Questions
  1. Date of the Interview  ………………./……………./   2002.
     Day  Month       Year

     ………………………

  5. Name of the Interviewer ………………………6. Age …………7. Sex
     …………………

SECTION B:  BIOSOCIAL DATA

Q8a. District of birth of farmer…………………………………………………………………..

Q8b. What is the family size?
  1.  1 – 4   2.  5 – 8   3.  9 – 12   4.  over 12

Q9. How many family members work on the farm?
  1. less than 5  2.  5 – 10  3.  11 - 15   4.  over 15
Q10. How many family members are under 18 years of age?
   1. 1 – 4  2. 5 – 8  3. 9 – 12  4. over 12

Q11. How many family members under 18 are working on the farm?
   1. females (…….)  2. males (…….)

Q12. In addition to family members, how many workers (under 18) does the farm employ from outside?
   1. females (…..)  2. males (……)

Q13. Do the child labourers go to school?
   1. Yes  2. No  3. Never gone to school

Q14. If Yes to Q13, what class?

Q15. If Yes to Q13, when do they work on tobacco farms.
   1. During school days if there is a lot of activity
   2. Weekends only
   3. Holidays only
   4. After school hours
   5. Other specify…………………

Q16. If No to Q13 have they ever gone to school?
   1. Yes  2. No

Q17. If No to Q13, why?
   1. Lack of money
   2. To let other children also have basic education
   3. Because I was a girl
   4. Family instability
   5. After death of parents
   6. Pregnancy
   7. Internal displacement
   8. Poor academic performance
   9. To help on the tobacco farm.

SECTION C: SOCIO ECONOMIC & CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT

Q18. Marital status of farmer
   1. Single  2. Married
   3. Widow/Widower  3. Divorced

Q19. In your culture (farmer), what age bracket is considered for one to be a child?
   1. 0-3 years  2. 4-7 years  3. 8-11 years
   4. 12-15  5. 16-18  6. Any body under 18 years
   7. Other specify……………………
Q20. How long have you been residing in this area?
   1. Less than 1 year  2. 1-2 years  3. 3-5 years  4. over 5 years

Q21 If answer to Q8a. is not current district why did you change your residence?
   1. Job transfer  2. Found a business  3. Looking for a job
   4. Education  5. Insecurity  6. Resetlement
   7. Others, Specify……………………

Q22. Is tobacco your main source of income?
   1. Yes  2. No

Q23. If no to Q22 why?
   1. Land not enough  2. Labour not enough
   3. Capital not enough  4. Poor tobacco yields on my land
   5. Others specify……………………

Q24. During the last 6 months, what was your family’s gross income?
   1. Less than 500,000  2. Shs. 500,000 to 1,000,000
   3. 1,000,000 to 5,000,000  4. over 5,000,000

Q25. Of this income in Q24 approximately what percentage is tobacco contributing?
   1. 100%  2. 75% – 99%  3. 50%-74%
   4. 25%-49%  5. less than 25%

Q26 Of this monthly average, what proportion do children working on tobacco activities contribute?
   1. No Contribution  2. Less than 10%  3. 10% to 20%
   4. 21% to 50%  5. More than 50%

Q27 During the last 6 months what was your average family expenditures?
   1. Less than 500,000=  2. Shs.500,000= to 1,000,000=
   3. 1,000,000= to 5,000,000=  4. Over shs 5,000,000
   5 Other (specify) ……………………

Q28. What is the tenure of your Land?
   Fully owned  2. Customary tenancy
   3. Rented/Leased  4. Rent fee with/without owner’s consent
   5. Others specify……………………

SECTION D: EXISTENCE, NATURE AND MAGNITUDE OF CHILD LABOUR

Q29. What is the most common form of child labour in this area?
   1. voluntary  2. forced  3. bonded  4. Family
   5. others specify ………………
Q30. Have you employed children on this farm in the last 12 months?
1. Yes 2. No

Q31. If answer to Q30 is Yes how many?
1. currently(……..males, ……… females)
2. last three months ( ………males, ………females)
3. last six months (………..males, ……………females)
4. last twelve months(……..males, ……………females)

Q32. If answer to Q30 is Yes at what age do they usually start working on average?
1. 0-3 years 2. 4-7 years 3. 8-11 years
4. 12-15 5. 16-18 6. Other specify……………..

Q33. If answer to Q30 is Yes where do children come from?
4. Migrant from other distant areas

Q34. If answer to Q30 is Yes which of the following tobacco related work is/was child/children engaged in?
1. Nurseries 2. Land Opening 3. Planting

Q35. If answer to Q30 is No why don’t you employ children?
1. can’t handle heavy assignments 2. law does not allow me
3. easily get injured 4. can’t work for long hours
5. not available 6. they go to school
7. require a lot of training 8. others specify …………..

Q36. On what terms are the children employed?
5. Others, specify…………………………

Q37. Are there any child labourers on this farm who go to school?
1. Yes 2. No

Q38. If Yes to Q37, At what level of education are they normally?
1. Primary 2. Secondary 3. Tertiary

Q39. How do you get the children you employ?
1. They search for work themselves 2. From my relatives
5. Other specify……………..
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SECTION E: CAUSES AND EFFECTS OF CHILD LABOUR

Q40. Why is/are your child(ren) engaged in tobacco work?
1. To gain experience/acquire training/appreciate value of work.
2. To supplement family income/important to family well-being
3. To help pay family debts
4. To pay his/her own schooling
5. To help in own household enterprise
6. To earn money to start child’s own business.
7. Others, specify ………………………

Q41. Would you like this children to continue offering labour on this farm?
1. Yes  2. No

Q42. If Yes to Q41 what advantages do you have by employing children?
1. cheap labour  2. shortage of other labour
3. easy to manipulate  4. can work for longer hours
5. do not pressurize over payment  6. easy to get
7. others specify …………………

Q43. If No to Q41 What would you wish them to do now?
1. Attend school only
2. Undergo skills training for a better job
3. Look for a better job
4. Help in household enterprise  5. Others, specify…………………..

Q44. Do children who work on this tobacco farm usually have free time off work?
1. Yes  2. No

Q45. If Yes to Q44, what is the approximate number of hours of free time per day?
1. less than 2 hours  2. 2 - 5 hours  3. 4 – 5 hours
4. over 5 hours  5. others specify………………

Q46. If No to Q44 why?
1. they don’t want  2. they go to school after work  3. there is too much work
4. others specify ……………

Q47. If Yes to Q44, what do they usually do during their free time?
1. None  2. Play with friends
3. Go to movies/amusement centers  4. Window shopping or shopping
5. Sleep/rest  6. Study/read
7. Others, specify…………………

Q48. Has the child working on this farm ever stopped schooling or dropped out of school?
1. Yes  2. No

Q49. If Yes to Q48, What was the main reason?
1. To help in family tobacco farm
2. Cannot afford to go to school
3. Not interested in school
4. School is too far
5. Illness/disability
6. Others, Specify …………………

Q50. Do you know of any occupational hazards on this farm?
1. Yes  2. No

Q51. If Yes to Q50, which ones?
1. Bruises, Cuts/wounds/ punctures
2. Amputation, loss of body parts
3. Crushing injuries
4. Burns
5. Others, specify………………

Q52. If Yes to Q50, what types of protective wear do you provide?(multiple respo
1. gloves
2. boots
3. rain coats
4. None
5. other specify…………

Q53. If Yes to Q50, who provides medical care in the event occupational hazards occur?
1. farmer
2. children themselves
3. relatives
4. others specify………………

Q54. Are you aware of any law regarding the employment of children?
1. Yes  2. No

Q55. Have you seen anybody/organization talking about child labour laws?
1. Yes  2. No

Q56. If Yes why are you not sticking to the laws about child labour?
1. they are not enforced
2. I have no choice because of shortage of other labour and excessive work on the farm.
3. others specify………………
SURVEY ON CHILD LABOURERS 5 – 18 YEARS OLD

INSTRUCTION:  Administer questionnaire to children found working on tobacco farms/related activities, and falling in the age category 5 – 18 years old.

CERTIFICATION (To be filled at the end of the interview).
I certify that I have personally interviewed the below named Respondent and all responses have been recorded accurately to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Name of Interviewer ……………………………….
Signature of Interviewer………………………… Date:…………………….

Edited by:………………………………………… Date:…………………..
(District Supervisor)
Reviewed by:………………………………………… Date:…………………….
(Central Supervisor)
Checked by: ………………………………………. Date: …………………….
(Statistician)

SECTION A: IDENTIFICATION
Questions
3. Date of the Interview  ……………../…………../ 2002.

Day   Month   Year


5. Age of Respondent……………. 6. Sex of Respondent ……………………..

SECTION B: FAMILY BACKGROUND

Q7.  What is your district of birth?
……………………………………………………………………
Q8.  Are both your parents alive?
1. YES  2. No  3. Mother only  4. Father only

Q9.  Who of your parents are you living with now?
1. Both  2. None of them  3. Father  4. Mother

Q10. Were you born in a polygamous or monogamous family?
1. polygamous  2. monogamous

Q11. How many children are you in the family?
1. 1-3  2. 4-6  3. 7-9  4. 10 – 12  5. 13 and above.

Q12. What is your birth order in the family?
1. 1st born  2. 2nd  3. 3rd  4. 4th  5. Others specify…………

Q13a. Is tobacco the major source of income of your parents?
1. YES  2. No

Q13b. If NO to Q13a, what is the major source of income?
1. simsim  3. ground nuts  5. salaries/wages
2. cassava  4. matooke  6. trade and commerce
7. others specify……..

SECTION C: EDUCATION

Q14. Do you go to school?
1. YES  2. No  3. Never gone to school at all

Q15. If YES to Q14, what class?

Q16. If YES to Q14, when do you work on tobacco farms.
1. During school days if there is a lot of activity
2. Weekends only  4. Holidays only
3. After school hours  5. Other specify…………………

Q17. If No to Q14, why?
1. Lack of money  6. To let other children also have basic education
2. Because I was a girl  7. Family instability
3. After death of parents  8. Pregnancy
4. Internal displacement  9. Poor academic performance
5. To help on the tobacco farm. 10. Others specify……………. 
Q18. For those who dropped out of school (Q14) would you be willing to resume schooling now if an opportunity arose?
   1. YES
   2. No.

Q19. If No to Q18 why?
   1. get married
   2. I want to remain on my job
   3. I will find a problem catching up
   4. I want to go back to go back to my family
   5. I am now too old for school
   6. I am interested in business
   7. Others specify…………..

SECTION D: TOBACCO-RELATED LABOUR

Q20. Employing Farmer category (BATU classification)
   1. Very Good (A)  3. Acceptable (C)  5. Very Poor (Z)
   2. Good (B)       4. Room for improvement (D)  6. New (N)

Q21. Sex of employing farmer
   1. Male
   2. Female

Q22. Are you related to the owner of the tobacco farm/nursery
   1. YES
   2. No

Q23. If YES to Q22, what relationship?
   1. Parents
   2. Brothers/Sisters
   3. Uncles/Aunties
   4. Other specify……………………

Q24. If No to Q22 who found you this job?
   1. Parent
   2. employment scouts
   3. Relative
   4. myself
   5. a friend doing a similar job(peers)
   6. other specify

Q25. If answered 1 or 2 to Q22 did you have a choice as whether to accept or refuse this job?
   1. YES
   2. No

Q26. For how long have you been on this type of job?
   1. less than six months
   2. 13 – 18 months
   3. Over 24 months
   4. 6-12 months
   5. 19 – 24 months

Q27. What tasks or activities are you normally engaged in during tobacco growing? (Numerous responses)
   1. Nurseries
   2. Weeding
   3. Harvesting
   4. Land Opening
   5. Topping
   6. Curing
   7. Planting
   8. Suckering
   9. Grading/sorting
Q28. What are your terms of your employment?
2. Contractual(per assigned tasks) 5. School vacation

Q29. Why are you engaged in tobacco growing at this age? (Numerous responses)
1. To gain experience/acquire training
2. It is our culture
3. To supplement family income/important to family well-being
4. To pay for my schooling
5. To be economically independent
6. Pay schooling for my brothers/sisters
7. Others, specify…………………………

Q30. When do you wake up to start work on tobacco farm?
1. Before 5.00 am 3. 6 – 7.00 am 5. Beyond 8.00 am
2. At 6.00 am 4. 7 – 8.00 am

Q31. How many hours do you usually spend on tobacco growing per day on average?
1. Less than 4 hours 3. 7 - 9 hours
2. 4 – 6 hours 4. Over 9 hours

Q32. After work on a tobacco farm, Which of the following statements describes you best?
   a. often too tired to do any work
   b. Often too tired to read books
   c. Can still do some other work
   d. Can still read books.
   e. Can still play games
   f. Too tired to play any games

Q33. How many days do you work in a week?
1. 1-4 days 2. 5 - 6 days 3. 7 days

Q34. Do you usually have free time off work from this farm?
1. YES 2. No

Q35. What is the approximate number of hours of free time per day?
1. less than 2 hours 2. 2 - 4 hours 3. 5 – 6 hours
3. over 6 hours

Q36. If YES to Q34, what do you usually do during your free time?
1. None 4. Play with friends
2. Go to movies/amusement centers 5. Visit friends and relatives
3. Sleep/rest 6. Study/read
Q37. Are you always financially rewarded for your labour on tobacco farm?
   1. YES  2. No  3. Sometimes

Q38. If YES to Q37, how often are you rewarded?
   1. Daily  3. Monthly  5. Per work completed
   2. Commission basis  4. every end of season  6. Others, specify………

Q39. Do you receive other benefits from your employer besides money?
   1 YES  2 No

Q40. If YES to Q39, in what form?
   1. Meals/allowance,  4. Housing/allowance,  7. Education allowance,
   2. Bonuses,  5. Transportation allowance,  8. Medical allowance

Q41. What is your monthly earning from this farm?
   1. Less than 5,000=
   2. 5,000= to 10,000=
   3. 11,000= to 15,000=
   4. 16,000= to 40,000=
   5. 21,000= to 25,000=
   6. 26,000= to 30,000=
   7. Over 30,000=

Q42. Do you consider some aspects of your work risky or dangerous to your life?
   1 YES  2 No

Q43. If YES in Q42, how?
   1. Get diseases of the respiratory tract(chest)
   2. Prone to accident  5. Might get burned  8. Other specify….
   3. May lose sight  6. May suffer physical mutilation
   4. Skin disease  7. May impair hearing

Q44. Have you ever experienced any injuries or illnesses while working on tobacco related activities?
   1 YES  2 No

Q45. If YES to Q44, which of the following injuries/illnesses have you suffered from?
   (Multiple Responses)
   **Injuries:**
   2. Bruises, Cuts/wounds/ punctures
   3. Amputation, loss of body parts  4. Crushing injuries
   3. Burns  5. Others,
   specify……………….
Illnesses:
6 Skin diseases (including skin allergy, sores, rashes etc)
7 Body aches/pains related to tobacco work
8 Eye problems
9 Ear problems
10 Respiratory (cough, chest pain, breathing)
11 Abdominal pains, stomach upsets, diarrhea, vomiting
12 Others, specify……………………………

Q46. If answer to Q44 is YES, How serious was the injury or illness?
1. Not serious, continued working
2. Stopped work temporarily
3. Required hospital admission

Q47. In your opinion how would you describe the frequency of these injuries/accidents?
1. very common 2. occasional 3. rare

Q48. If you fall sick or get an accident while on duty who pays for your treatment?
2. fellow employees 4. friends 6. Others, specify:………

Q49. Are you satisfied with working conditions on this farm?
1 YES 2 No

Q50. If No to Q49, which ones are you not satisfied with? (Multiple responses)
1 Inadequate working space 7 Work on school days
2 Lack of clean water supply 8 low earnings
3 Noisy environment 9 No Protective wear/care
4 Poor sanitation 10 No Medical care
5 Problem of flooding of work area 11 No negotiating machinery with employer
6 Long working hours 12 Others
specify……………..

SECTION E: ATTITUDE TOWARDS CHILD LABOUR.

Q51. Do you think it is good for children below 18 years to be employed in tobacco farms?
1. YES 2. No
Q52. If YES to Q51, why?
1. To improve living standard of the household
2. Be independent
3. Household enterprise can operate fully
4. Others, specify...........................

Q53. If No to Q51, why?
1. go to school
2. rest
3. improve my skills
4. others specify..................

Q54. If YES to Q51, are you aware of any laws that prohibit the employment of children below 18 years on tobacco farms?
1. YES
2. No

Q55. If YES to Q54, what do you think should be done?
1. Abolish them
2. Strengthen them
3. I don’t care
4. Others specify............... 

Q56. If No to Q54, what do you think should be done to ensure that children under 18 years are not employed on tobacco farms?
1. Address the issue of household poverty
2. Make education free for all
4. Sensitize the public about child labour
5. Start programmes targeting tobacco farmers to eliminate child labour

END OF INTERVIEW
BATU SURVEY ON CHILD LABOUR IN TOBACCO GROWING AREAS IN UGANDA
EXECUTED BY SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS (U) LTD.
(SODECO)
KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS.

Questions to Guide the Discussion

1. Is there a child labour problem in this area associated with tobacco growing?
2. How common is this problem?
3. Why is it common?
4. Is engaging child labour in this area considered normal? Why? What form?
5. What age range of children is affected most and why?
6. Are boy and girls affected equally? If not why?
7. Who find the jobs for the children?
8. What activities (tasks) are children involved in on tobacco farm?
9. Is there a seasonal variation in the employment of these children? When? Why?
10. Why are children “employed” on tobacco farms?
11. Under what terms and conditions are children engaged in tobacco related employment?
12. Do children offer labour only on their family’s farm tobacco farms or on other tobacco farms elsewhere?
13. How risky is the working environments of child labourers on tobacco farms?
14. How fair are the terms of child labour employment on tobacco farms with regard to sanitation pay, nutrition, treatment, leisure etc?
15. How many hours are children subjected to labour daily? – When do they start work? When do they leave work? Do they ever rest? Etc
16. Is there evidence of excessive physical strain on the part of the child labourers on tobacco farms? Which one?
17. Do child labourers communicate with their families and/or relatives if they are not working on their own farms?
18. Are there any coping mechanisms at the village level to deter and/or mitigate child labour on tobacco farms? Which ones?

19. Do you know of any policies and/or programs that have been or are being initiated at the District level to solve the child labour problem in this area? Which ones, whom are they targeting, What methods are they using?

20. Do you know of any programs/projects that have been or are being initiated by Non-Governmental Organisations/Community Based Organisations to solve the child labour problem in this area? Which ones, whom are they targeting, What methods are they using?

21. Do you know of any law, policies and/or programs that have been or are being initiated at the National level to solve the child labour problem in this area? Which Ministry(ies), Which programmes, Whom are they targeting, What methods are they using?

22. What suggestions do you have on the best way to eliminate the problem of child labour in tobacco growing in this area?