MARCH 2022

What do we know about the effectiveness of interventions targeting child work/child labor?

The international community has long recognized the right of children to be protected from labor exploitation through several United Nations (UN) conventions and protocols, most notably article 32 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), which specifies that no children should perform any "work that is likely to be hazardous or to interfere with the child's education, or to be harmful to the child's health or physical, mental, spiritual, moral or social development." Child labor and child work targeted for elimination are defined by international conventions such as the International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention on the Worst Forms of Child Labour (1999), or through national child labor laws.[1]

This synthesis highlights key findings from studies identified through a CLEAR systematic evidence review that examined the impacts of interventions designed to reduce or prevent child labor and child work targeted for elimination (as defined by the study authors).[2] CLEAR found 56 reports of 73 distinct studies published from January 2006 to May 2018.[3] Of these studies, 30 received a *high* or *moderate* causal evidence rating which means that we have a good degree of confidence that the studied interventions caused the measured impacts on outcomes.[4]

Overview

The interventions examined in the studies to reduce or eliminate child work and child labor are varied (Table 1).

Table 1. Types of interventions examined in the synthesis

Intervention	Description
Conditional cash transfers	Conditional cash transfer programs provided financial assistance to households with conditions to receive the payment (e.g., 85% school attendance in a month).
Unconditional cash transfers	Unconditional cash transfer programs provided financial assistance to households without any required conditions.
Training/Technical Assistance (TA) Programs	Training/TA included financial literacy, livelihood planning and household management, entrepreneurship training, farming practices, and jewelry making.
Scholarship Programs	Programs provided financial support for children to attend school.
Food Programs	Programs provided food directly to the children (school meals program) or to the household (take home rations program).
Other Programs	The other category included interventions such as tutoring and alternative schools, as well as interventions with multiple components (i.e., access to schools, school construction, school supplies/textbooks, take-home rations, small business loans, and awareness raising campaigns).

As summarized in Table 2, the majority of studies (41 out of 72 studies) found a reduction in child work/child labor. For those that examined the effects on school participation, the majority (40 out of 59 studies) found an increase in school enrollment or attendance with no studies finding unfavorable outcomes. The most frequently evaluated interventions were cash transfers, conditional (42 studies) or unconditional (13 studies).

[1] Please see reference documents at www.ilo.org and https://ilostat.ilo.org/ for more information on child labor definitions, guidance, measurement, considerations, and variations by country.

[2] For more information on CLEAR, including how CLEAR conducts systematic reviews, see https://clear.dol.gov/.

[3] See the CLEAR Child Labor Review Protocol (https://clear.dol.gov/reference-documents/child-labor-review-protocol) to learn more about the literature search parameters and the specific criteria used to determine which studies were eligible for inclusion in the systematic review.

[4] See the CLEAR Causal Evidence Guidelines, Version 2.1 (https://clear.dol.gov/reference-documents/causal-evidence-guidelines-version-21) for information on the evidence guidelines used to determine the causal evidence ratings.

ICF prepared this synthesis in March 2022. The U.S. Department of Labor's Chief Evaluation Office funded this synthesis and the underlying systematic review. The contents do not represent the views or policies of the Department.

Table 2. Overview of the evidence base[1,2]

Intervention	Total number of studies	Studies rated high or moderate	Favorable Impacts [a]	No Impacts [b]	Mixed Impacts [c]	Unfavorable Impacts [d]
Outcome: Reduction in child work/child labor (72 studies)						
Conditional cash transfers	42[3]	18	22 (10)	12 (4)	2 (1)	6 (3)
Unconditional cash transfers	13	5	10 (3)	1	1 (1)	1 (1)
Training/Technical Assistance (TA) Programs	7[4,5]	2	4	3 (2)	-	-
Scholarship Programs	4[6]	2	2 (1)	1 (1)	1	-
Food Programs	4	1	2 (1)	1	-	1
Other Programs	2	2	1 (1)	-	-	1 (1)
Outcome: Increase in school participation (59 studies)						
Conditional cash transfers	36[3]	13	24 (9)	10 (3)	1 (1)	-
Unconditional cash transfers	12	5	10 (5)	2	-	-
Training/Technical Assistance (TA) Programs	4[4]	2	2	2 (2)	-	-
Scholarship Programs	4[6]	2	2 (1)	2 (1)	-	-
Food Programs	2	1	2 (1)	-	-	-
Other Programs	2	2	-	-	2 (2)	-

Key: [a] Indicates the number of studies that found at least one favorable impact in the outcome domain. These studies had at least one statistically significant favorable impact and no statistically significant unfavorable impacts.
[b] Indicates the number of studies that found no statistically significant impacts in the outcome domain.
[c] Indicates the number of studies with mixed impacts in the outcome domain. These studies had some statistically significant favorable and some statistically significant unfavorable impacts.
[d] Indicates the number of studies that found at least one unfavorable impact in the outcome domain. These studies had at least one statistically significant unfavorable impact and no statistically significant favorable impacts.

Notes:
[1] The number in parentheses indicates the number of studies that received a high or moderate causal evidence rating.
[2] Four studies used a regression discontinuity design to evaluate impacts and were reviewed using CLEAR's descriptive guidelines; therefore, they do not have a causal evidence rating but are included in the table and review.
[3] One study has a conditional cash transfer bundled with a household grant while another examines the impact of any cash transfer (conditional or unconditional).
[4] Two studies have training bundled with a financial incentive.
[5] Two studies also examined the impact on a reduction in child injuries; no impacts were found.
[6] One study has a scholarship bundled with a stipend.

Studies receiving a low causal evidence rating provide valuable information about the intervention. Causal evidence ratings are based on the quality of the study, not the intervention. A low rating does not mean that the intervention was ineffective or had unfavorable outcomes. Low-rated studies often reflect the most rigorous methods authors could use given the circumstances. Thirty-nine studies received a low causal evidence rating based on their study design, but 24 found a reduction in child work/child labor and 21 found an increase in school participation. When interpreting the findings from low-rated studies, we cannot attribute the findings solely to the intervention as other factors are likely to have contributed to the observed outcomes.

Table 3 at the end of this brief summarizes all studies included in the review with information about the intervention, study design, rating and impact(s), with links to profiles that summarize each study on the CLEAR website.

Key takeaways

▶ **Conditional cash transfers (CCTs) reduced child work/child labor and improved school participation outcomes but the effectiveness differed by child characteristics and outcomes.** Studies examining CCT interventions found favorable outcomes; however, the effectiveness differed by sex, the age of the child, or type of work (e.g., economic labor, farm labor, or household chores). For example, Nicaragua's Atención a Crisis decreased the hours spent in economic work for boys only (Del Carpio & Macours, 2010) but decreased the hours spent in farm labor and household chores for all children (Del Carpio et al., 2016).

▶ **Unconditional cash transfers (UCT) reduced child work/child labor and improved school participation.** Studies examining UCT interventions found favorable impacts on child work/child labor, including reduced participation in paid work for all children (Miller & Tsoka, 2012), reduced participation in paid domestic work for all children (Covarrubias et al., 2012), and reduced rates of participation in child labor (Edmonds & Schady, 2012). In addition, all five high-rated studies found increased school attendance or enrollment. These high-rated studies provide a small body of credible, quality evidence of promising interventions to reduce child work/child labor and improve school participation outcomes.

Promising interventions to reduce child work/child labor and improve school participation outcomes

- Bono de Desarrollo Humano (BDH) program
- CWCLP Project
- Malawi Social Cash Transfer Scheme (SCTS)
- PROGRESA/ Oportunidades
- Red de Protección Social (RPS)
- Schooling Incentives Project
- Social Cash Transfer Pilot Program (SCTPP)

▶ **Training/TA programs may decrease child work/child labor and increase school participation.** Two studies of a household management and livelihood planning training program for women found a reduction in child work/child labor (both in Karimli et al., 2018) and a study of an entrepreneurship training program found a decrease in child work and an increase in school attendance (de Hoop et al., 2016). Another study of farming technical assistance found improved school attendance rates in addition to lower rates of paid work (Woldehanna, 2010). This small body of literature shows promise to potentially reduce child work/child labor but the studies received a low causal evidence rating or were not rated and should be interpreted with caution.

▶ **Food programs had mixed impacts on child work/child labor outcomes but favorable school participation outcomes.** Take home rations reduced productive labor for all children, with larger decreases for girls than boys while the school meals program increased all labor (productive labor plus domestic labor/household chores) for boys only (Kazianga et al., 2012). However, both food-for-education programs increased school enrollment for all children.

▶ **Only one high-rated study of a scholarship program had favorable impacts on child work/child labor and school participation outcomes.** This study of a scholarship paired with a stipend found lower rates of involvement in carpet weaving (a worst form of child labor) among youth ages 10-16 and higher levels of school attendance (Edmonds & Shrestha, 2014). Another study of a scholarship program found reduced child labor and increased school attendance but the study was low-rated (Sparrow, 2007). More evidence is needed to draw stronger conclusions of the effectiveness on child work/child labor.

▶ **The only high-rated study of an "other" intervention found improved child labor and school participation outcomes.** A study of a program that included access to community schools and small business loans, awareness raising campaigns, and take-home rations found reduced time spent in economic activities, increased time in school-related activities, and increased school enrollment and attendance (ICF International, 2013). Another study of a tutoring program found a reduction in the number of hours worked per day but the study was low-rated (Andisha et al., 2014).

Where are the gaps in the research on interventions targeting child work/child labor?

- ***Additional research is needed to determine the effects of training/TA, scholarships, and food programs on child labor outcomes.*** The systematic review found 13 studies that tested the impacts of training/TA interventions, scholarships, or food programs on child labor outcomes. Of these studies, less than half were rated high or moderate. Only two high-rated studies (one scholarship program and one food program) found a reduction in child work/child labor. Two studies of training/TA interventions received a high causal evidence rating but found no impacts of the intervention. More rigorous, credible research would enable us to draw stronger conclusions about the effectiveness of training/TA interventions, scholarship programs, and food programs.
- ***Exploring the context and implementation of the cash transfer programs (conditional and unconditional) would further explain the effects of cash transfers on child labor outcomes.*** Variation in the findings among both conditional and unconditional cash transfer programs may be due to several factors including the features of the intervention, the implementation of the intervention, and the context where the intervention took place. For example, conditional cash transfers differed according to the cash transfer amount received by the household as well as the conditions for receipt of the transfer (e.g., school enrollment, school attendance rate, health clinic visits). Also, the interventions were implemented at the local government level in many countries and the conditionality was monitored by a local school; resulting in a lack of enforcement of the conditionality.

- ***Research is needed to understand which groups of children benefit most from interventions targeting child work/child labor and why.*** Several studies found different impacts by sex, age and based on the type of child work/child labor (e.g., paid work, farm labor, household chores). Additional research could provide information about which components are most effective for different subgroups.
- ***More research is needed to understand the longitudinal effects of interventions targeting child work/child labor.*** Many studies examined the effects of an intervention one to two years after program implementation with fewer studies investigating impacts five years or more after implementation (e.g., Behrman et al., 2011). More research is needed to determine how long-lasting the impacts are on child work/child labor. Also, longitudinal research can provide information about sustained changes in individuals, households, communities, and industries.
- ***There is little integration of findings across interventions beyond the significance of the impact.*** Ideally child labor outcomes could be standardized or even monetized to compare the cost/benefit ratio of different interventions. For example, the effect of child labor on human capital accumulation can be examined by calculating the impact of an additional year of schooling on lifetime earnings. The cost of different interventions can then be compared to their impact on these common metrics for cost/benefit analysis.

Table 3. Summary of studies found in the systematic review

Publication	Intervention	Study Design	Causal Evidence Rating	Outcome Effectiveness			Profile
				Child work/Child labor	Education	Health & safety	
Conditional Cash Transfers							
Akresh et al. (2016)	Burkina Faso Nahouri Cash Transfer Pilot Project (NCTPP)	RCT	High	Unfavorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/Study/Evidence-randomized-evaluation-household-welfare-impacts-conditional-and-unconditional-cash
Amarante et al. (2013)	National Plan for Social Emergency Assistance (PANES)	Difference-in-differences	Low	No impacts	No impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/teenage-school-attendance-and-cash-transfers-impact-evaluation-panes-amarante-et-al-2013
Amarante et al. (2013)	PANES	RDD	N/A	No impacts	No impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/teenage-school-attendance-and-cash-transfers-impact-evaluation-panes-amarante-et-al-2013
Arraiz & Rozo (2011)	Red de Oportunidades	Matched comparison group	Low	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/same-bureaucracy-different-outcomes-human-capital-how-indigenous-and-rural-non-indigenous
Attanasio et al. (2010)	Familias en Acción	QED	Low	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/child-education-and-work-choices-presence-conditional-cash-transfer-programme-rural-colombia
Badillo Bautista (2009)	PROGRESA/ Oportunidades	RCT	High	Favorable impacts	N/A	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/evaluating-direct-and-indirect-effects-conditional-income-support-program-case-progresa
Barrera-Osorio et al. (2008): Suba	Conditional Subsidies for School Attendance – Basic	RCT	Moderate	No impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/conditional-cash-transfers-education-design-features-peer-and-sibling-effects-evidence-1
Barrera-Osorio et al. (2008): Suba	Conditional Subsidies for School Attendance – Tertiary	RCT	Moderate	Favorable impacts	No impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/conditional-cash-transfers-education-design-features-peer-and-sibling-effects-evidence-2
Barrera-Osorio et al. (2008): San Cristobal	Conditional Subsidies for School Attendance – Basic	RCT	Moderate	Favorable impacts	No impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/conditional-cash-transfers-education-design-features-peer-and-sibling-effects-evidence
Barrera-Osorio et al. (2008): San Cristobal	Conditional Subsidies for School Attendance – Savings	RCT	Moderate	No impacts	No impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/conditional-cash-transfers-education-design-features-peer-and-sibling-effects-evidence-0
Behrman et al. (2011)	PROGRESA/ Oportunidades	RCT	High	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/do-conditional-cash-transfers-schooling-generate-lasting-benefits-five-year-followup

Publication	Intervention	Study Design	Causal Evidence Rating	Outcome Effectiveness			Profile
				Child work/Child labor	Education	Health & safety	
Behrman et al. (2011)	PROGRESA/ Oportunidades	Matched comparison group	Low	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/do-conditional-cash-transfers-schooling-generate-lasting-benefits-five-year-followup
Behrman et al. (2012)	PROGRESA/ Oportunidades	Matched comparison group	Low	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/are-conditional-cash-transfers-effective-urban-areas-evidence-mexico-behrman-et-al-2012
Benedetti et al. (2016)	Bono 10,000	RCT	High	No impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/do-education-and-health-conditions-matter-large-cash-transfer-evidence-honduran-experiment
Berhane et al. (2015)	Social Cash Transfer Pilot Program (SCTPP)	QED	Moderate	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/Study/Evaluation-social-cash-transfer-pilot-programme-Tigray-region-Ethiopia-endline-report-Berhane
Borraz & González (2009)	Ingreso Ciudadano	Matched comparison group	Low	Favorable impacts	No impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/impact-uruguayan-conditional-cash-transfer-program-borraz-gonzalez-2009
Bustelo (2011)	Red de Protección Social (RPS)	RCT	Moderate	No impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/three-essays-investments-childrens-human-capital-bustelo-2011
Cardoso & de Souza (2009)	Income Transfer Programs	Matched comparison group	Low	No impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/impact-cash-transfers-child-labor-and-school-enrollment-brazil-cardoso-de-souza-2009
de Hoop et al. (2017)	Pantawid Pamilya Pilipino Program (Pantawid)	RCT	High	Unfavorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/child-schooling-and-child-work-presence-partial-education-subsidy-de-hoop-et-al-2017
de Lima Amaral et al. (2014)	Bolsa Familia	QED	Low	Unfavorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/impact-brazils-bolsa-familia-program-school-attendance-age-grade-discrepancy-and-child-labor
Del Carpio & Macours (2010)	Atención a Crisis – Basic	RCT	High	Favorable impacts	N/A	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/Study/Leveling-intra-household-playing-field-Compensation-and-specialization-child-labor-2
Del Carpio & Macours (2010)	Atención a Crisis – Basic + Business Grant	RCT	High	Mixed impacts	N/A	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/Study/Leveling-intra-household-playing-field-Compensation-and-specialization-child-labor-3
Del Carpio et al. (2016)	Atención a Crisis	RCT	High	Favorable impacts	N/A	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/impact-conditional-cash-transfers-amount-and-type-child-labor-del-carpio-et-al-2016

Publication	Intervention	Study Design	Causal Evidence Rating	Outcome Effectiveness			Profile
				Child work/Child labor	Education	Health & safety	
Fenton et al. (2016)	Cash Transfer Program	RCT	Low	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/wealth-differentials-impact-conditional-and-unconditional-cash-transfers-education-findings
Ferreira et al. (2009)	CESSP Scholarship Program (CSP)	RDD	N/A	Mixed impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/own-and-sibling-effects-conditional-cash-transfer-programs-theory-and-evidence-cambodia
Ferro et al. (2010)	Bolsa Escola	Matched comparison group	Low	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/impact-conditional-cash-transfer-programs-household-work-decisions-brazil-ferro-et-al-2010
Galang (2016)	Pantawid	Matched comparison group	Low	No impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/do-conditional-cash-transfers-reduce-child-labor-evidence-philippines-galang-2016
Galiani & McEwan (2013)	Programa de Asignación Familiar (PRAF-II)	RCT	Low	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/Study/heterogeneous-impact-conditional-cash-transfers-Galiani-and-McEwan-2003
Gee (2010)	RPS	RCT	High	Favorable impacts	N/A	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/reducing-child-labour-through-conditional-cash-transfers-evidence-nicaraguas-red-de-protecci%C3%B3n
Helfand & Souza (2010)	Bolsa Escola	Statistical modeling	Low	No impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/impact-conditional-cash-transfer-program-human-capital-formation-brazil-helfand-souza-2010
Hirata (2008)	Tekoporã	Difference-in-differences	Low	Favorable impacts	No impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/heterogeneous-impact-cct-programmes-child-labor-case-tekopor%C3%A3-paraguay-hirata-2008
Hoddinott et al. (2009)	Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP)	Matched comparison group	Low	No impacts	No impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/Study/impact-Ethiopia%E2%80%99s-Productive-Safety-Net-Program-schooling-and-child-labor-Hoddinott-Gilligan
Hoddinott et al. (2009)	Partial PSNP	Matched comparison group	Low	No impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/Study/impact-Ethiopia%E2%80%99s-Productive-Safety-Net-Program-schooling-and-child-labor-Hoddinott-0
Hoddinott et al. (2009)	PSNP and Other Food Security Program (OFSP)	Matched comparison group	Low	Unfavorable impacts	No impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/Study/impact-Ethiopia%E2%80%99s-Productive-Safety-Net-Program-schooling-and-child-labor-Hoddinott-1
Lincove & Parker (2016)	RPS	RCT	Moderate	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/influence-conditional-cash-transfers-eligible-children-and-their-siblings-lincove-parker-2016

Publication	Intervention	Study Design	Causal Evidence Rating	Outcome Effectiveness			Profile
				Child work/Child labor	Education	Health & safety	
Lopez-Calva & Patrinos (2015)	PROGRESA/ Oportunidades	RCT	Low	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/exploring-differential-impact-public-interventions-indigenous-people-lessons-mexicos
Maluccio (2009)	RPS	RCT	Low	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/education-and-child-labor-experimental-evidence-nicaraguan-conditional-cash-transfer-program
Orbeta & Paqueo (2013)	Pantawid	RCT	Low	No impacts	N/A	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/does-pantawid-foster-dependence-or-encourage-work-evidence-randomized-experiment-orbeta-paqueo
Pais et al. (2017)	Bolsa Familia	Matched comparison group	Low	Unfavorable impacts	N/A	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/influence-bolsa-familia-conditional-cash-transfer-program-child-labor-brazil-pais-et-al-2017
Ranzani & Rosati (2014)	Oportunidades	RCT	Moderate	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/impact-oportunidades-school-participation-and-child-labour-ranzani-rosati-2014
Woldehanna (2010)	Public Work Programme (PWP)	Matched comparison group	Low	Favorable impacts	No impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/Study/Productive-safety-net-program-and-children%E2%80%99s-time-use-between-work-and-schooling-Ethiopia-4
World Bank (2011)	Keluarga Harapan	RCT	Moderate	Unfavorable impacts	Mixed impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/Study/Program-Keluarga-Harapan-Main-findings-impact-evaluation-Indonesia%E2%80%99s-pilot-household-0
Unconditional Cash Transfers							
Asfaw et al. (2014)	Kenya Cash Transfer Programme for Orphans and Vulnerable Children (CT-OVC)	RCT	Low	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/cash-transfer-programme-productive-activities-and-labour-supply-evidence-randomised-experiment
Covarrubias et al. (2012)	Malawi Social Cash Transfer Scheme (SCTS)	RCT	Moderate	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/protection-production-productive-impacts-malawi-social-cash-transfer-scheme-covarrubias-et-al
de Hoop & Rosati (2016)	Labour Intensive Public Works (LIPW)	RCT	High	Unfavorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/Study/Labor-intensive-public-works-and-childrens-activities-case-Malawi-de-Hoop-and-Rosati-2016
de Hoop et al. (2014)	CT-OVC	RCT	Low	Favorable impacts	No impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/Study/impact-Kenya-CT-OVC-programme-childrens-activities-de-Hoop-Ranzano-and-Rosati-2014

Publication	Intervention	Study Design	Causal Evidence Rating	Outcome Effectiveness			Profile
				Child work/Child labor	Education	Health & safety	
De Silva & Sumarto (2015)	Bantuan Siswa Miskin (BSM)	Matched comparison group	Low	Favorable impacts	N/A	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/how-do-educational-transfers-affect-child-labor-supply-and-expenditures-evidence-indonesia
Edmonds & Schady (2012)	Bono de Desarrollo Humano (BDH)	RCT	High	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/poverty-alleviation-and-child-labor-edmonds-schady-2012
Fenton et al. (2016)	Cash Transfer Program	RCT	Low	No impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/wealth-differentials-impact-conditional-and-unconditional-cash-transfers-education-findings-0
Luseno (2012)	Mchinji Social Cash Transfer Pilot Scheme (SCTPS)	RCT	High	Mixed impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/effect-mchinji-social-cash-transfer-pilot-scheme-childrens-schooling-work-and-health-outcomes
Miller & Tsoka (2012)	SCTS	RCT	Moderate	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/cash-transfers-and-childrens-education-and-labour-among-malawis-poor-miller-tsoka-2012
Owoko (2014)	CT-OVC	Post-test only	Low	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/effects-cash-transfers-child-labor-and-schooling-kenya-owoko-2014
Schady & Araujo (2006)	BDH	RCT	Low	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/cash-transfers-conditions-school-enrollment-and-child-work-evidence-randomized-experiment
Woldehanna (2010)	Direct Support Program (DSP)	Matched comparison group	Low	Favorable impacts	No impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/Study/Productive-safety-net-program-and-children%E2%80%99s-time-use-between-work-and-schooling-Ethiopia-3
Yap et al. (2009)	Programa de Erradicacao do Trabalho Infantil (PETI)	RCT	Low	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/limiting-child-labor-through-behavior-based-income-transfers-experimental-evaluation-peti
Training/Technical Assistance Programs							
Berry et al. (2015)	Aflatoun	RCT	High	No impacts	No impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/impact-financial-education-youth-ghana-berry-et-al-2015-0
Berry et al. (2015)	Honest Money Box	RCT	High	No impacts	No impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/impact-financial-education-youth-ghana-berry-et-al-2015-1
de Hoop et al. (2016)	Eliminating Child Labour in El Salvador through Economic Empowerment and Social Inclusion	RDD	N/A	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/eliminating-child-labour-el-salvador-through-economic-empowerment-and-social-inclusion-impact

Publication	Intervention	Study Design	Causal Evidence Rating	Outcome Effectiveness			Profile
				Child work/Child labor	Education	Health & safety	
Karimli et al. (2018)	Trickle Up	RCT	Low	Favorable impacts	N/A	No impacts	https://clear.dol.gov/study/integrating-economic-strengthening-and-family-coaching-reduce-work-related-health-hazards-0
Karimli et al. (2018)	Trickle Up Plus	RCT	Low	Favorable impacts	N/A	No impacts	https://clear.dol.gov/study/integrating-economic-strengthening-and-family-coaching-reduce-work-related-health-hazards
Mert & Kadioglu (2016)	The Streets are Not the Solution	ITS	Low	No impacts	N/A	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/nursing-interventions-help-prevent-children-working-streets-mert-kadioglu-2016
Woldehanna (2010)	Agricultural Extension Support Programme (AES)	Matched comparison group	Low	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/Study/Productive-safety-net-program-and-children%E2%80%99s-time-use-between-work-and-schooling-Ethiopia-2
Scholarship Programs							
Datt & Uhe (2014)	Nepal scholarship programs	Matched comparison group	Low	Mixed impacts	N/A	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/Study/little-help-may-be-no-help-all-Child-labor-and-scholarships-Nepal-Datt-and-Uhe-2014
Edmonds & Shrestha (2014)	Schooling Incentives Project – scholarship	RCT	High	No impacts	No impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/you-get-what-you-pay-schooling-incentives-and-child-labor-edmonds-shrestha-2014
Edmonds & Shrestha (2014)	Schooling Incentives Project – stipend + scholarship	RCT	High	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/you-get-what-you-pay-schooling-incentives-and-child-labor-edmonds-shrestha-2014-1
Sparrow (2007)	Jaring Prengaman Sosial (JPS)	Instrumental variables	Low	N/A	No impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/protecting-education-poor-times-crisis-evaluation-scholarship-programme-indonesia-sparrow-2007
Sparrow (2007)	JPS	Regression	Low	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/protecting-education-poor-times-crisis-evaluation-scholarship-programme-indonesia-sparrow-2007
Food Programs							
Kazianga et al. (2012)	School meals program	RCT	High	Unfavorable impacts	Mixed impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/Study/Educational-and-child-labour-impacts-two-food-education-schemes-Evidence-randomised-trial-2
Kazianga et al. (2012)	Take home rations	RCT	High	Favorable impacts	Mixed impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/Study/Educational-and-child-labour-impacts-two-food-education-schemes-Evidence-randomised-trial-1

Publication	Intervention	Study Design	Causal Evidence Rating	Outcome Effectiveness			Profile
				Child work/Child labor	Education	Health & safety	
Other programs							
Andisha et al. (2014)	DESTINO CEC	Regression	Low	Favorable impacts	N/A	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/reducing-child-labour-panama-impact-evaluation-andisha-et-al-2014
Andisha et al. (2014)	DESTINO EPA	Regression	Low	No impacts	N/A	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/study/reducing-child-labour-panama-impact-evaluation-andisha-et-al-2014-0
de Hoop & Rosati (2014)	BRIGHT project	RDD	N/A	Unfavorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/Study/Does-promoting-school-attendance-reduce-child-labour-Evidence-Burkina-Faso%E2%80%99s-Bright-project-0
ICF International (2013)	CWCLP Project	RCT	Moderate	Favorable impacts	Favorable impacts	N/A	https://clear.dol.gov/Study/Impact-evaluation-Combating-worst-forms-child-labor-reinforcing-policy-response-and-0

Note: RCT is a randomized controlled trial; ITS is an interrupted time series; QED is a quasi-experimental design; RDD is a regression discontinuity design.

Publications included in the review

Akresh, R., de Walque, D., & Kazianga, H. (2016). *Evidence from a Randomized Evaluation of the Household Welfare Impacts of Conditional and Unconditional Cash Transfers Given to Mothers or Fathers.* Washington, DC: World Bank.

Amarante, V., Ferrando, M., & Vigorito, A. (2013). Teenage school attendance and cash transfers: An impact evaluation of PANES. *Economia,* 61-93.

Andisha, N., Chiquito-Saban, O., Emmerich, E., Figueroa, A., Jiang, Y., Lee, J. H., Manning, D., Ortega-Sanchez, A., & Gawande, K. (2014.) Reducing child labour in Panama: An impact evaluation. *Journal of Development Effectiveness, 6*(2), 128-146.

Arriaz, I., & Rozo, S. (2011). *Same bureaucracy, different outcomes in human capital? How indigenous and rural non-indigenous areas in Panama responded to the CCT*. Inter-American Development Bank, Office of Evaluation & Oversight.

Asfaw, S., Davis, B., Dewbre, J., Handa, S., & Winters, P. (2014). Cash transfer programme, productive activities and labour supply: Evidence from a randomised experiment in Kenya. *The Journal of Development Studies, 50*(8), 1172-1196. doi: 10.1080/00220388.2014.919383

Attanasio, O., Fitzsimons, E., Gomez, A., Gutierrez, M. I., Meghir, C., & Mesnard, A. (2010). Child education and work choices in the presence of a conditional cash transfer programme in rural Colombia. *Economic Development and Cultural Change, 58*(2), 181-210. doi:10.1086/648188.

Badillo Bautista, C. (2009). *Evaluating the direct and indirect effects of a conditional income support program: The case of Progresa* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses A&I. (Accession No. 1314572898)

Barrera-Osorio, F., Bertrand, M., Linden, L.L., & Perze-Calle, F. (2008). *Conditional cash transfers in education: Design features, peer and sibling effects. Evidence from a randomized experiment in Columbia* (World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 4580). Washington, DC: World Bank.

Behrman, J. R., Parker, S. W., & Todd, P. E. (2011). Do conditional cash transfers for schooling generate lasting benefits? A five-year followup of PROGRESA/Oportunidades. *Journal of Human Resources, 46*(1), 93-122. doi:10.3368/jhr.46.1.93

Behrman, J. R., Gallardo-Garcıa, J., Parker, S. W., Todd, P. E., & Velez-Grajales, V. (2012). Are conditional cash transfers effective in urban areas? Evidence from Mexico. *Education Economics, 20*(3), 233-259.

Benedetti, F., Ibarrarán, P., & McEwan, P. J. (2016). Do education and health conditions matter in a large cash transfer? Evidence from a Honduran experiment. *Economic Development and Cultural Change, 64*(4), 759-793. doi:10.1086/686583

Berhane, G., Devereux, S., Hoddinott, J., Hoel, J., Roelen, K., Abay, K. Kimmel, M., Ledlie, N., & Woldu, T. (2015*). Evaluation of the social cash transfer pilot programme, Tigray region, Ethiopia-endline report*. New York, NY: UNICEF.

Berry, J., Karlan, D., & Pradhan, M. (2015). *The impact of financial education for youth in Ghana* (Working Paper No. w21068). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. doi:10.3386/w21068

Borraz, F., & González, N. (2009). Impact of the Uruguayan conditional cash transfer program. *Cuadernos de economia, 46*(134), 243-271. doi:10.4067/S0717-68212009000200006

Bustelo, M. (2011). *Three essays on investments in children's human capital* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/4837518.pdf

Cardoso, E., & de Souza, A. F. (2009). The impact of cash transfers on child labor and school enrollment in Brazil. In P. F. Orazem, G. Sedlacek, & Z. Tzannatos (Eds.), *Child labor and education in Latin America: An Economic perspective.* Houndmills, U.K. and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Covarrubias, K., Davis, B. & Winters, P. (2012). From protection to production: Productive impacts of the Malawi Social Cash Transfer scheme, *Journal of Development Effectiveness, 4*(1), 50-77.

Datt, G., & Uhe, L. (2014). *A little help may be no help at all: Child labor and scholarships in Nepal.* Monash Business School Department of Economics Discussion Paper, 50/14.

de Hoop, J., Kovrova, I., & Rosati, F. C. (2016). *Eliminating child labour in El Salvador through economic empowerment and social inclusion: Impact report.* Retrieved from http://www.ucw-project.org/attachment/07032017224El_Salvador_IE_07042016_web.pdf

de Hoop, J., & Rosati, F. C. (2016). *Labor intensive public works and children's activities: The case of Malawi.* Retrieved from http://ucw-project.org/attachment/11052017285Public_work_malawi_dehoop_rosati.pdf

de Hoop, J. & Rosati, F. C. (2014). Does promoting school attendance reduce child labour? Evidence from Burkina Faso's Bright project. *Economics of Education Review*, 39, 78-96. doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2013.11.001

de Hoop, J., Friedman, J., Kandpal, E., & Rosati, F. (2017). *Child schooling and child work in the presence of a partial education subsidy.* Retrieved from http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/501961504719564270/pdf/WPS8182.pdf

de Hoop, J., Ranzani, M., Rosati, F. C. (2014). *The impact of the Kenya CT-OVC programme on children's activities* (Working Paper). Retrieved from http://www.ucw-project.org/attachment/The_impact_of_the_Kenya_CT-OVC20140423_144552.pdf

de Lima Amaral, E. F., Goncalves, G. Q., & Weiss, C. (2014). The impact of Brazil's Bolsa Familia Program on school attendance, age-grade discrepancy, and child labor. *Journal of Social Science for Policy Implications, 2,* 101-125.

De Silva, I., & Sumarto, S. (2015). How do educational transfers affect child labor supply and expenditures? Evidence from Indonesia of impact and flypaper effects. *Oxford Development Studies, 43*(4), 483-507. https://doi.org/10.1080/13600818.2015.1032232

Del Carpio, X. V., Loayza, N. V., & Wada T. (2016). The impact of conditional cash transfers on the amount and type of child labor. *World Development, 80*, 33-47. doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.11.013

Del Carpio, X. V., & Macours, K. (2010). *Leveling the intra-household playing field: Compensation and specialization in child labor allocation.* In R. K. Akee, E. V. Edmonds, & K. Tatsiramos (Eds.), Child Labor and the Transition Between School and Work (pp. 259-295). Bingley, UK: Emerald Publishing Limited.

Edmonds, E. V., & Schady, N. (2012). Poverty alleviation and child labor. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, *4*(4), 100-124.

Edmonds, E. V., & Shrestha, M. (2014). You get what you pay for: Schooling incentives and child labor. *Journal of Development Economics, 111,* 196–211. doi:10.1016/j.jdeveco.2014.09.005

Fenton, R., Nyamukapa, C., Gregson, S., Robertson, L., Mushati, P., Thomas, R., & Eaton, J. W. (2016). Wealth differentials in the impact of conditional and unconditional cash transfers on education: Findings from a community-randomised controlled trial in Zimbabwe. *Psychology, Health & Medicine, 21*(8), 909-917.

Ferreira, F. H. G., Filmer, D., & Schady, N. (2009). *Own and sibling effects of conditional cash transfer programs: Theory and evidence from Cambodia* (Policy Research Working Paper 5001, Impact Evaluation Series). Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Ferro, A. R., Lúcia Kassouf, A., & Levison, D. (2010). T*he impact of conditional cash transfer programs on household work decisions in Brazil.* In R. K. Akee, E. V. Edmonds, & K. Tatsiramos (Eds.), Child Labor and the Transition between School and Work (pp. 193-218). Bingley, UK: Emerald Publishing Limited.

Galang, I. M. (2016). *Do conditional cash transfers reduce child labor?: Evidence from the Philippines* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Tokyo, Japan: The University of Tokyo.

Galiani, S., & McEwan, P. J. (2013). The heterogeneous impact of conditional cash transfers. *Journal of Public Economics, 103,* 85-96. doi:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2013.04.004

Gee, K.A. (2010). Reducing child labour through conditional cash transfers: Evidence from Nicaragua's Red de Protección Social. *Development Policy Review, 28*(6), 711-732.

Helfand, S.M., & Souza, A.P. (2010). *The impact of conditional cash transfer program on human capital formation in Brazil.* University of California, Riverside, CA: Sao Paulo School of Economics.

Hirata, G. I. (2008). *The heterogeneous impact of CCT programmes on child labor: The case of Tekoporã in Paraguay*. Brazil: International Poverty Centre/UNDP.

Hoddinott, J., Gilligan, D. O., & Taffesse, A. S. (2009). *The impact of Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Program on schooling and child labor*. Retrieved from http://ssrn.com/abstract=1412291

ICF International. (2013). *Impact evaluation: Combating worst forms of child labor by reinforcing policy response and promoting sustainable livelihoods and educational opportunities in Egypt, 2011-2012.* Calverton, MD: Author.

Karimli, L., Rost, L., & Ismayilova, L. (2018). Integrating economic strengthening and family coaching to reduce work-related health hazards among children of poor households: Burkina Faso. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *62,* S6-S14.

Kazianga, H., De Walque, D., & Alderman, H. (2012). Educational and child labour impacts of two food-for-education schemes: Evidence from a randomised trial in rural Burkina Faso. *Journal of African Economies, 21*(5), 723-760. doi:10.1093/jae/ejs010.

Lincove, J. A., & Parker, A. (2016). The influence of conditional cash transfers on eligible children and their siblings. *Education Economics, 24*(4), 352-373.

Lopez-Calva, L. F., & Patrinos, H. A. (2015). Exploring the differential impact of public interventions on indigenous people: Lessons from Mexico's conditional cash transfer program. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, *16*(3), 452-467. doi:10.1080/19452829.2015.1072378

Luseno, W. K. (2012). *Effect of the Mchinji Social Cash Transfer Pilot Scheme on children's schooling, work and health outcomes: A multilevel study using experimental data* (Doctoral dissertation). University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses A&I (Accession No. 1240627043).

Maluccio, J. A. (2009). *Education and child labor: Experimental evidence from a Nicaraguan conditional cash transfer program.* In P. F. Orazem, G. Sedlacek, & Z. Tzannatos (Eds.), Child labor and education in Latin America: An economic perspective (pp. 187-204). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan. doi.org/10.1057/9780230620100_12

Mert, K., & Kadioglu, H. (2016). Nursing interventions to help prevent children from working on the streets. *International Nursing Review 63,* 429–436. doi:10.1111/inr.12301

Miller, C., & Tsoka, M. (2012). Cash transfers and children's education and labour among Malawi's poor. *Development Policy Review, 30*(4), 499-522.

Orbeta, A., & Paqueo, V. (2013). *Does Pantawid foster dependence or encourage work? Evidence from a randomized experiment*. Philippine Institute for Development Studies.

Owoko, S. A. (2014). *Effects of cash transfers on child labor and schooling in Kenya* (Unpublished master's thesis). Nairobi, Kenya: University of Nairobi.

Pais, P. S. M., Silva, F. D. F., & Teixeira, E. C. (2017). The influence of Bolsa Familia conditional cash transfer program on child labor in Brazil. *International Journal of Social Economics*, *44*(2), 206-221.

Ranzani, M., & Rosati, F. (2014). *The impact of Oportunidades on school participation and child labour.* Rome, Italy: Understanding Children's Work.

Schady, N. & Araujo, M. C. (2006). *Cash transfers, conditions, school enrollment, and child work: Evidence from a randomized experiment in Ecuador*. Retrieved from https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/8452

Sparrow, R. (2007). Protecting education for the poor in times of crisis: An evaluation of a scholarship programme in Indonesia. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, *69*, 99-122. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0084.2006.00438.x

Woldehanna T. (2010). *Productive safety net program and children's time use between work and schooling in Ethiopia.* In J. Cockburn & J. Kabubo-Mariara (Eds.). Child Welfare in Developing Countries (pp. 157-209). New York, NY: Springer.

World Bank. (2011). *Program Keluarga Harapan: Main findings from the impact evaluation of Indonesia's pilot household conditional cash transfer program.* Retrieved from http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/589171468266179965/Program-Keluarga-Harapan-impact-evaluation-of-Indonesias-Pilot-Household-Conditional-Cash-Transfer-Program

Yap, Y. T., Sedlacek, G., & Orazem, P. F. (2009). *Limiting child labor through behavior-based income transfers: An experimental evaluation of the PETI program in rural Brazil.* In P. F. Orazem, G. Sedlacek, & Z. Tzannatos (Eds.), Child Labor and Education in Latin America (pp. 147-165). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan. doi.org/10.1057/9780230620100_10