DISCUSSION PAPERS IN ECONOMICS

Working Paper No. 01-17

Evaluating the Impact of Working While in School on School
Progress: The Case of Rural Bangladesh

Cristóbal Ridao-Cano
Department of Economics, University of Colorado at Boulder
Boulder, Colorado

November 2001

Center for Economic Analysis
Department of Economics

University of Colorado at Boulder
Boulder, Colorado 80309

A

%   #   1

$ 1   2   1   1   - $ 1

                              # $ 1   1

        #   #   -   1

3   3 2 $

                              1   -

1   1   # 1   1   2

1   # $ #$

[4] There is a growing parallel literature ikSLffrH-ffx7/JN.NomR47EN7N7J-Hz/ehH-Z,RRnl ..Z 7N7.Zfi..e,R/liH-.mK.ff/t

1   #   3   3 2 $

1   -

                    1   1   B   1   -

                 $ 1 $ 1   1

                    # $ 2   4   #

          1   #   1   - $ 1   #

    1   1   2   1 $ #$ 1   1   4

          1   -

       4   #   - $

        4( )-30020   201670 47010 9( )-4(( )54(9-2( )8020)-4((

---

5 This pattern is very systematic so as to be attributed only to age misreporting arising from the lack of official birth registry in many rural areas.

*'$)))   ?))) $ #

   #- 5   DG   1

                                                    -8

                    #   1   %   1

                    1   09 /9   #-

   #   1   1   #   #$

-

[13] It is worth noting that in looking at grade-specific survival rates, the big difference between working and non-working children starts occurring at the beginning of the second cycle of primary (i.e. grade 3), which coincides with an increase in the required schooling time.

[14] This gender difference may be partly explained by selection on observables and unobservables, but it may also indicate that working girls are more likely to combine productive activities with household chores (which I am not considering here) than working boys, so that they end up working longer hours.

1 < $ 0++' =-

5 $ # $ $ 1

1 # C - 5 1

1 # C $

- $ 1 1

2 # $

2 # -

-

I T 1222 (3)-249( )2020 (167( )-2167(6)]0)-390003 V $ (

/- $(U_w \; U_1)$ $(U_w \; U_0)$ $(Z \; X)$

5   <0=   C   %   %

1   # 2   1   -

              4                    $(U_1\$ \; U_0\$ \; U_w)$ #

      1   B   %

$$= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & {}_{10} & {}_{1w} \\ & 1 & {}_{0w} \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$ <&=

      $S2$

7 2 1 $ 1 $= S_1 - S_0$

4 2 - 8 $ 1 C 1 1

1 1

1 - $

0 $= 1\ (S_1 = 1\ \ S_0 = 0)$ 1 # 1

1 1 -

/- $= 0$ 1 # $(S_1 = 1\ \ S_0 = 1)$\$

1 # $(S_1 = 0\ \ S_0 = 0)$-

*- $= -1\ (S_1 = 0\ \ S_0 = 1)$ 1 #

1 1 1 1 -

1 % # / *- (

$^{-19}$ $ 1 1

$$^{ATE}(\ ) \quad = \qquad |\ X = \ .$$

$$= \quad \text{r}\ S_1 = 1 \mid X = \ .\ - \quad \text{r}\ S_0 = 1 \mid X = \ .$$

$$= \qquad \beta_1 - \qquad \beta_0 \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad <?=$$

2 $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ < = $\qquad\qquad$ 2 $\quad$ 1

1 $\qquad$ # 1 $\quad$ 1 $\qquad\qquad$ # $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad X = \ \$$

\#

$$^{TT}(\ W = 1) \quad = \qquad |\ X = \ \ W = 1$$

$$= \quad \text{r}\ S_1 = 1 \mid X = \ \ W = 1 - \quad \text{r}\ S_0 = 1 \mid X = \ \ W = 1$$

$$= \quad \frac{\ \beta_1 \ \ \beta_w \ _{1w} - \ \ \beta_0 \ \ \beta_w \ _{0w}}{\beta_w} \qquad\qquad <' =$$

2 $\quad$ <D = $\qquad\qquad$ 2 $\quad$ 1 $\qquad\qquad\qquad$ 1

$\qquad\qquad X = \ $ 1 $\qquad$ # $\qquad$ 2 $\qquad$ 1 $\quad$ 1 $\qquad$ <W = 1= $\qquad$ <W = 0=

$U_w = \ _w\$$ $\qquad\qquad _w = -Z\beta_w\text{-}\ $G $\quad \$$ D $\qquad$ 4 $\qquad$ 2

1 $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ 1 $\qquad\qquad$ # $\qquad\qquad$ - D

\# 20

$$^{MTE}(\ \ _w) \quad = \qquad |\ X = \ \ U_w = \ _w$$

$$= \quad \mathrm{r}\left(S_1 = 1 \mid X = , \ U_w = \ _w\right) - \mathrm{r}\left(S_0 = 1 \mid X = , \ U_w = \ _w\right)$$

$$= \quad \left[\frac{\beta_1 + \ _{1w} \ _w}{\sqrt{1 - \ _{1w}^2}}\right] - \left[\frac{\beta_0 + \ _{0w} \ _w}{\sqrt{1 - \ _{0w}^2}}\right] \qquad \text{<+=}$$

1 $\quad _w = - \ \beta_D$- $\qquad \$5 \qquad$ D

N <-- $\quad = ^{-}$

8 # $ 2 2 1

$_k = 1$ $_k = 0$-

5 $ D D -

$ 5 % D $ 1 1

1 D $ 1 1 #

1 1 -22

4 2 2 1 U_w

$U_1 - U_0$ # U_w $U_1 - U_0$

$X = $ - U_w $U_1 - U_0 = 0$\$ $_{1w} = {}_{0w}$\$

5 <?=- $ 1 # ⊬ #

1 $ 1 -

#-   0++/ 2   2

    1                    $ 1 $ 1

                            -                  2   #

                    1                        $ #

        #   -

                #   l

    1                              $ #   _23

L   #   % $ 1   1

    #   % $ 1

<0+' >=$!   <0++&=- $ #

$ 1   1   J   1 1
1   -   1
              2   1   26

G   1   B   # $

$ - $ 1

1   #

1   1   -   4   C   4

1   -

1   1 # $ #

-

1   <   #

1   =$ 1

< - -   =   -   %

1   %   #   -

1

#[29]

8   #$ #   1 $

1   1 $ #$

$ 4 $ $ B   < - -

$ #   =$ #   4   < - -

$ #$ 1   #=$

D $ #   #   -

---

[29] This information is available from the migration history of each individual in the sample.

1   1   C   %

D   0+?′ [30]   5

[31]

1   4   1   # $

1   1 $ # 1

4   %   -

1   C   C

1   # 2   1

1   #   4 $ #$ D $

4   #- $

1   < 1 $ = 1

1   #   #   -

$

-                        1 $ 1 $

1   2 $ $ $

-

*

-

---

[30] See Fauveau (1994) for a detailed description of the program.

[31] The village where the child resided

$ 4 @ 1

C - $ 1

1 $ #

1 - 8 #$ 4

$ #

-

1 C $<W^*$=$ C

1 $<S^*$=

J   J   #   1

                              -   2

          1   1 $ ‑34   2

                    #   1 $ 1

2

$ 2

2   J   -36   2   #   #

$ H   1   1

1   1   -   2   1

<   0*-+   =   2   2

-                1 $ 1   2 $ 1

4   #   1 $ 1   1

1 - % $ 2 #

- 1

$ 1 1 < 4 = # -

D

B - ($

$$TT\left(\overline{}_w\ W=1\right)\ =\ \ \ \mid X=\overline{}_w\ W=1\ =-0\ \ \left(0\ 0\ \right)$$

1   -   5   #

$ 1 $ $ 1   1

5　　　C　　　　　　　　1　　　　　　　　1　　2　　　　　　1

1 -

5　$　　$　　　　　1　　　　　　　#　1

1　　　　　　　1　-

1　　　　　　　#　1　　　　　　#　　　#　　$= -1$ $(S_1 = 0$

$S_0 = 1)$$　　$　　　1　1　　　　　　　#　　　　　　　　1

1　　　　　　1　-　　　　%

2　$　　　　#　　　　　　$Z\beta_w$　　U_w-

(　1 #　　　　　　　　1　　　　　$ U_w$$　　　　#

06 6

X $Z\$$ $\$1$

$Z\beta_w$

$<Z\beta_w\$ \ X\beta_1\$ \ X\beta_0=$

$$Z\beta_w \ X\beta_1 \ = \ -0$$

$$Z\beta_w \ X\beta_0 \ = \ -0$$

$$X\beta_1 \ X\beta_0 \ = \ 0 \quad 0$$

$$Z\beta_w \ (X\beta_1 - X\beta_0) \ = \ -0 \ 1 \ 0$$

[41] This latter effect is, however, smaller and less statistically significant than the former. The finding that working children have unobservable characteristics that are positively associated with the school outcome in the non-working state is very robust to changes in model specification. This relationship could indicate that parents may select for work children whom they judge to be more able to combine school and work responsabilities, because of their greater physical and mental fitness and/or greater self-disciplinwR/morH-.ffKEZx,/7.,H

G $ $

    1   #   1   1   2   1 $

#$ 1   1   4   1   -   1

        - 8 $ @   B

    1    $ 1   1

-   # 1

1   1 $ #   #   #

    1   - $ 1   1

                                                    1   #   I

4   1   -   1

                    1   # I   #

          1   %   -

     4   #   - $

                              #

                         $ 2

1               $ 2 $ 1   #

          #   1   -

     $ 1

Table 1. Children by Work Status

	All	Girls	Boys

Table 4.1. Switching Probit Model for Child Work and the Transition to Secondary School (Coefficient Estimates)

	Work equation	Transition to secondary equations	
		Working state	Non-working state

Table 4.2. Switching Probit Model for Child Work and the Transition to Secondary School (Marginal Effects)

| | Work equation | | Transition to secondary equations | | | |
| | | | Working state | | Non-working state | |
	Coeff.	t-ratio	Coeff.	t-ratio	Coeff.	t-ratio
Girl	0.007	0.316	0.090	1.411	-0.014	-0.951
School entry age	0.033	4.443	-0.069	-2.832	-0.020	-3.824
Current age	-0.006	-1.242	0.015	1.450	0.013	3.815
In school in or after 1992	-0.073	-2.436	0.210	2.259	0.111	5.903
Mother's education	-0.013	-2.622	0.041	2.314	0.017	4.131
Father's education	-0.005	-1.742	0.013	1.762	0.007	3.012
Modern latrine	0.001	0.061	0.149	1.665	0.057	3.969

Table 5. Marginal Effects of Model Covariates on the Average Treatment Effect (ATE) and the Treatment Effect on the Treated (TT)

	ATE		TT	
	Coeff.	t-ratio	Coeff.	t-ratio
Girl	0.104	1.579	0.113	1.810
School entry age[1]	-0.014	-1.190	-0.049	-1.195
Current age	-0.005	-0.725	0.001	0.037
In school in or after 1992	0.099	1.039	0.252	3.408
Mother's education[2]	0.004	0.544	0.025	0.791
Father's education[3]	-0.000	-0.009	0.006	0.441

- - - 0.791 Father's edu141

-0.009

Figure 1. Estimated Marginal Treatment Effects (

Table A.2. Kaplan-Meier Estimates of Survival Rates to Each Grade

	All		Girls		Boys	
	Survival	Std.Error	Survival	Std.Error	Survival	Std.Error
Primary						
Grade 2	0.9882	0.0024	0.9848	0.0039	0.9917	0.9546
Grade 3	0.9601	0.0044	0.9655	0.0058	0.9546	0.0067
Grade 4	0.9091	0.0065	0.9134	0.0090	0.9047	0.0094
Grade 5	0.8621	0.0078	0.8668	0.0152	0.8573	0.0113
Junior secondary						
Grade 6	0.7078	0.0105	0.6774	0.0152	0.7386	0.0143
Grade 7	0.6703	0.0109	0.6409	0.0157	0.7000	0.0150
Secondary						
Grade 8	0.6240	0.0114	0.5949	0.0163	0.6533	0.0158
Grade 9	0.5625	0.0120	0.5078	0.0172	0.6171	0.0165
Grade 10	0.5223	0.0125	0.4553	0.0179	0.5888	0.0171
Higher secondary						
Grade 11	0.4025	0.0141	0.3282	0.0194	0.4760	0.0199
Grade 12	0.3220	0.0162	0.2639	0.0219	0.3796	0.0237
Higher education	0.2505	0.0222	0.1783	0.0323	0.3155	0.0309

Notes: Based on unweighted data. The likelihood ratio test for the null hypothesis of no gender differences in survivor functions is rejected ($\chi^2(1) = 13.75$ (0.000)).