CEPREMAP

Child Fostering in Senegal

Simon Beck

Philippe De Vreyer

Sylvie Lambert

Karine Marazyan

Abla Safir

Janvier 2014

Abstract: This paper is about child fostering in Senegal, a practice widespread in Sub-Saharan Africa whereby children are temporarily sent to live with a host family. Using a rich household survey conducted in Senegal in 2006-7, the paper aims at describing the selection into fostering of both households and children and at examining the impact of fostering on the well-being of children (host, foster- and siblings left behind) measured through their school enrollment, labour and domestic work. Results suggest a wide heterogeneity among foster children, inducing differences in their well-being. The main sources of such heterogeneity come from the child's gender and his duration of stay in the host household. Whether the fostering has been formally arranged between parents also seems to matter. Results are reassuring regarding the well-being of fostered children relative to their host siblings, even if they might not fare as well as children not involved in fostering. On average, education and labour outcomes of foster children are not different from those of their host siblings. In particular, results do not support the idea that fostered girls might be overloaded with domestic tasks: they do not seem to spend more time at it than their host sisters.

Résumé: Cet article traite du confiage au Sénégal. Le confiage est une pratique très répandue en Afrique sub-saharienne qui consiste à envoyer temporairement un enfant vivre dans une famille d'accueil. Grâce à une enquête auprès des ménages très complète conduite au Sénégal en 2006-2007, cet article décrit les caractéristiques des ménages et des enfants qui participent au confiage et les compare à celles des autres ménages. Il cherche également à évaluer l'impact du confiage sur la scolarité, l'activité économique et le travail domestique des enfants, tant pour les confiés eux mêmes que pour leurs hôtes et pour les frères et sœurs de confiés restés dans leur ménage d'origine. Les résultats soulignent une grande hétérogénéité au sein des enfants confiés, hétérogénéité qui se traduit par des différences de bien-être. La principale source d'hétérogénéité est liée au sexe de l'enfant et à la durée de son séjour dans la famille d'accueil. Il semble que le caractère formel ou non du confiage joue aussi un rôle. Les résultats sont rassurants en ce qui concerne le bien-être des enfants confiés relativement à celui de leurs hôtes, même si leur situation n'est pas aussi favorable que celle des enfants qui n'ont aucun rapport au confiage. En moyenne, les résultats en termes d'éducation et de travail des enfants confiés ne sont pas différents de ceux de leurs hôtes. En particulier, les résultats ne confirment pas l'idée que les filles confiées pourraient être exploitées en terme de travail domestique par leur famille d'accueil : en fait, elles ne passent pas plus de temps au travail domestique que les filles biologiques de cette famille.

Child Fostering in Senegal

Simon Beck [1]
Philippe De Vreyer
Sylvie Lambert
Karine Marazyan
Abla Safir[2]

January 10, 2014

This paper is about child fostering in Senegal, a practice widespread in Sub-Saharan Africa whereby children are temporarily sent to live with a host family. Using a rich household survey conducted in Senegal in 2006-7, the paper aims at describing the selection into fostering of both households and children and at examining the impact of fostering on the well-being of children (host, foster- and siblings left behind) measured through their school enrollment, labour and domestic work. Results suggest a wide heterogeneity among foster children, inducing differences in their well-being. The main sources of such heterogeneity come from the child's gender and his duration of stay in the host household. Whether the fostering has been formally arranged between parents also seems to matter. Results are reassuring regarding the well-being of fostered children relative to their host siblings, even if they might not fare as well as children not involved in fostering. On average, education and labour outcomes of foster children are not different from those of their host siblings. In particular, results do not support the idea that fostered girls might be overloaded with domestic tasks: they do not seem to spend more time at it than their host sisters.

Keywords: fostering, family structure, education, child labour, Senegal

[2] Simon Beck, CREST-INSEE, 18 boulevard Adolphe Pinard, 75675 Paris cedex 14, France (simon.beck31@gmail.com); Philippe De Vreyer, Paris Sciences et Lettres - Université Paris-Dauphine, LEDa, UMR DIAL, Place du Maréchal de Lattre de Tassigny, 75775 Paris Cedex 16, France (Devreyer@dial.prd.fr); Sylvie Lambert, Paris School of Economics-INRA, 48 bd Jourdan,75014 Paris, France (sylvie.lambert@psemail.eu); Karine Marazyan, IEDES - Université Paris 1, 49 bis rue de la Belle Gabrielle, 94736 Nogent sur Marne, France (karine.marazyan@gmail.com); Abla Safir, World Bank, MSN: MC 7-717, The World Bank, 1818 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20433, USA (asafir@worldbank.org)

1. INTRODUCTION

Child fostering is a practice whereby children are temporarily sent to live with a host family. The fostering period can vary from being relatively short to being very long (becoming a permanent move), but in any case, links with the biological family are kept. This practice is particularly widespread in Sub-Saharan Africa. According to the data presented in this paper nearly 10 per cent of Senegalese children aged less than 15 years are currently fostered (12.5 per cent of those less than 18), 32 per cent of households either send or receive foster children, and 14 per cent of adults have been fostered in their childhood. Similar numbers ranging from 15 to 26 per cent of households hosting a foster child are found in Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Niger and Mali (Akresh, 2009; Vandermeersch, 2002). According to the Demographic and Health Survey reports for 11 West African countries, the proportion of foster-children among children younger than 14 years old varies between 5.9 per cent in Burkina Faso to 16.8 per cent in Liberia and equals in average to 9.5 per cent in the region.

Fostering has been criticised by NGOs (non-governmental organisations) and international agencies, such as UNICEF (1999) because they fear that the well-being of the children experiencing fostering is at risk. Their worry is in part that child fostering is a disguised form of child labour, in particular with girls fostered to become housemaids (Pilon, 1992). More generally, the suspicion that altruism is stronger towards one's own biological children than towards any other children and the idea that the mother-child relationship is essential to children's well-being are fuelling these worries. This latter view is challenged in numerous societies where, on the contrary, parents are not seen as the most adequate educators to prepare children to face the difficulties of life (Alber, 2003; Bledsoe, 1990a).

Actually, as described by several authors (Bledsoe, 1990a; Bledsoe and Isiugo-Abanihe, 1989; Goody, 1978; Isiugo-Abanihe, 1985; Notermans, 1999; Oppong and Bleek, 1982, for example), fostering fulfils several purposes and the impact on child welfare likely depends. First, it is a way to transfer the educating and training responsibility of a child to adults that might be in a better position to take this responsibility than biological parents, either because they live near a school while the parents live in places where no or few schooling infrastructures are available or because they can help with apprenticeship for example. In such a case, fostering is a way to invest in the human capital of the child (Ainsworth 1996; Isiugo-Abanihe, 1985). Second, fostering provides work force for domestic chores or care for elderly to households who need it for lack of a sufficient number of offspring (Ainsworth, 1996; Isiugo-Abanihe, 1985). Host parents might indeed have asked for a child to be sent to them (see Bledsoe and Isiugo-Abanihe, 1989 on grand-mothers asking for a foster grand-child). Third, it is also a way to adapt the size and the dependency ratio of the household to the economic situation: in hard times, a child is sent to live somewhere else (Goody 1982; Isiugo-Abanihe 1985). Divorced or unmarried mothers might foster their young children to their own mother either because they do not have the financial ability to raise them or in order to (re)marry. Finally, fostering plays a social role by strengthening ties between origin- and foster-households (Alber, 2004; Bledsoe and Isiugo-Abanihe, 1989; Goody, 1978; Isiugo-Abanihe, 1985; Oppong and Bleek, 1982). Marazyan (2013a) shows that in Cameroon men who are the elder brother in their sibship have a higher proclivity for hosting foster children than other men and ascribes this finding to the specific social role of elders.

Whether the foster child suffers or not from this situation is difficult to judge on a priori grounds. We will leave aside the question of the potential psychological cost of fostering. This would certainly be of interest but it would be beyond the scope of this research and we do not know

of any sources that would allow us dealing with it in the case of Senegal. We concentrate here on education and child labour. Despite a sizable anthropological and demographic literature on the impact of fostering on fostered children that highlights the vast heterogeneity of situations (Bledsoe et al., 1988; Castle, 1995; Notermans, 2008; Verhoef, 2005; Verhoef and Morelli, 2007), there is little quantitative evidence on the impact of being fostered, in particular due to lack of data. Akresh (2004) uses data he collected himself on fostering in a rural area of Burkina Faso and that contain information on both sender and host households of all the fostered children of the sample. Contrary to previous papers, this enables him to compare the situation of each fostered child to that of his siblings who stayed behind. He concludes that, even if foster children's situation is worse than that of their host siblings, it is still better than the current situation of their non-fostered biological siblings and that of children of households not involved in child fostering.[3]

The objective of this paper is to examine whether fostering is detrimental to foster children, with respect to their schooling and involvement in child labour in the context of Senegal. The difficulty with this topic is that, in order to identify a causal effect of fostering, the main question that needs to be answered is that of what would have happened to the foster child, if he had remained with his biological parents. However, this counterfactual situation is never going to be observable. Hence, what should be the comparison point for the current situation of foster children is unclear. Akresh (2004) compares foster children to their siblings left behind and to biological children not involved in fostering. We follow a similar approach in this paper, comparing foster children to biological siblings left behind and to host siblings. We also compare foster children to children belonging to households not involved in fostering.

This paper contributes to the literature in two ways. First, we use data that are nationally representative of Senegal, hence shedding light on fostering in this country as a whole, rather than providing results restricted to small areas. Second, contrary to most of the quantitative literature dealing with child fostering, we are able to identify precisely who is fostered in a household. In general, children living without any of their parents despite at least one of them being alive are considered as fostered. We are able to distinguish children who are explicitly fostered and declared as such by the host household from (non-double-orphans) children living without parents but not declared as fostered. The empirical analysis shows that this distinction matters and these two groups of children do not have the same trajectory.

We describe how foster children and households engaged in fostering differ from those who are not. We then study how the outcomes of foster children diverge in the short run (during childhood) from non-fostered children, in terms of child labour, involvement in domestic tasks and schooling. Clearly, some impacts of fostering are likely to emerge in the long run only (impact on the marriage market or labour market, for example), and would then affect the well-being of adults fostered in their childhood. This longer run impact is studied in Coppoletta et al. (2011).

The results we present show a vast heterogeneity among foster children, mirroring a similarly large heterogeneity in the motives and patterns of fostering. A non-negligible part of foster children are born in the household they are fostered in. In total, foster children do not differ much from their host siblings in terms of education and labour outcomes. When it comes to schooling, some divergences might be observed but it is rather in favour of foster children, which is to be linked with the fact that schooling is one of the important motives for fostering. In addition, our results do not support the idea that fostered girls, formally sent, might be overloaded with domestic tasks: they do not seem to spend more time on them than their host sisters.

---

[3] A child or a household is said to be not involved in fostering when the household does not foster any child out and does not host any foster child.

The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 describes the data used. Section 3 presents summary statistics on the foster children while section 4 describes the households that foster in and out. We assess in section 5 the relative outcomes of fostered children, and section 6 concludes the study.

2. DATA: THE PSF SURVEY

This paper utilises data from an original survey entitled *Pauvreté et Structure Familiale* (henceforth PSF) conducted in Senegal in 2006-7. The PSF survey results from cooperation between a team of French researchers and the National Statistical Agency of Senegal.[4] It is a nationally representative survey covering 1,800 households spread over 150 clusters drawn randomly from the census districts so as to insure a nationally representative sample. A total 1,781 records can be used.

Senegal is a West African country, with a population of 13.7 million (World Development Indicators[5]), predominantly Muslim (94% of the population, CIA world factbook[6]; in the PSF survey 95% of adults 15+ are Muslim), and made up of over twenty ethnic groups, the largest being Wolofs/Lebous (43.3%) followed by Pulars (23.8%), Sereres (14.7%), Diolas (3.7%) and Mandinkas (3%) (CIA world factbook).[7],

Senegal has a Human Development Index that ranked it 154th in 2012 (UNDP, 2013). GDP grew at an average of 5 per cent per year in the 10 years before the PSF survey (1995-2005) (Government of Senegal, 2013). At that date, nearly half of the population was still living with an income below the national poverty line (World Development Indicators). Having faced a series of economic shocks, the annual growth rate of GDP per capita staggered in the period 2005-11 at an average of 0.5 per cent per year and poverty only decreased modestly over the same period, from 48.3 per cent to 46.7. More than half the population is rural (55%) and the challenges faced for poverty reduction are even more acute in rural areas (Government of Senegal, 2013).

Almost half the population is under 15, and Senegal faces several challenges to provide basic services to its young and growing population. That said, in the case of education, which we examine in this paper, since the 1990s, Senegal has put a lot of efforts into improving its educational outcomes. Gross primary school enrolment rates rose from 55 per cent in 1994 to 81 per cent in 2006, at the time of the survey (World Development Indicators). For another outcome we examine in this paper, namely child labor, it should be noted that Senegal has also adopted a national framework to prevent and eliminate child labor (Government of Senegal, 2013).

The size of the households in the survey is very large, greater than 8.5 on average, rising to more than 40 members in extreme cases. Moreover household structure is rather complex. A household is quite far from the nuclear family standard as it can be extended vertically (intergenerational extension), horizontally (siblings) and is polygynous for a quarter of the married men. On average, a third of the household members are neither the head, nor one of his wives or children. Two-thirds of households include extended family members. A child is very likely to live with other children with whom s/he might share only one parent or none (more than

---

[4] Momar B. Sylla and Matar Gueye of the Agence Nationale de la Statistique et de la Démographie of Sénégal (ANSD) on the one hand and Philippe De Vreyer (University of Paris-Dauphine and IRD-DIAL) Sylvie Lambert (Paris School of Economics-INRA) and Abla Safir (now with the World Bank) designed the survey. The data collection was conducted by the ANSD thanks to the funding of the IDRC (International Development Research Center), INRA Paris and CEPREMAP. The survey is described in detail in De Vreyer et al., 2008.
[5] World Development Indicators, http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators
[6] CIA world factbook, https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/
[7] The respective figures in the PSF survey are 41%, 28%, 13%, 4% and 6%).

half of the children live with at least one child with whom they have no parent in common).

This survey collects the usual information on individual characteristics, as well as a detailed description of household structure and budgetary arrangements. Households are divided into subgroups (or cells) according to the following rule: the head of household and unaccompanied dependent members, such as his widowed parent or children whose mother do not live in the same household, are grouped together. Then, each wife and her children and, potentially any other dependent under her care, make a separate group. Finally, any other family nucleus such as a married child of the household head with his/her spouse and children also form separate groups. This decomposition emerged from field interviews as being the relevant way to split the households in groups.

Children in this paper are defined as those aged less than 18, who are not married and whose parents are not both deceased (i.e. not double orphans). Children can be divided into three main groups. The biggest group is made of biological children, defined here as those children for whom at least one parent lives in the household. The sample contains 5,986 such children. Those children belong to the cell of their mother if she resides in the household, in that of their father otherwise. A second group is made of explicitly fostered children. They are household members under 18 years old, whose parents are not present in the household but at least one of them is alive and are explicitly identified as fostered child by the host household that also indicates which household's member has primary responsibility for them. We counted 580 such children in the sample. A last group of 265 children is composed of children who have no parent in the household, have at least one living parent residing somewhere else, are not married to any household member, but are not declared as fostered by the host household.[8] They are not explicitly or formally fostered, despite being cared for by foster parents. For lack of a better word, we call them "other non-biological children" (or "other non-bio" for short). In general, quantitative studies on fostering cannot distinguish these two groups of children since the fostering status is inferred from the absence of parents, despite them being alive.[9] We show below that the distinction matters and that the fact that the host household signals them as fostered or not, which might reflect the existence or the absence of an explicit agreement between biological parents and host parents, has an informational content that is relevant for their well-being. In total, the share of children in the sample who do not live with any of their parents while not being double orphans is about 12.5 per cent.[10]

Fostered children and other non-bio are assigned to the cell of their primary care giver. For fostered children, they are in general fostered to a particular person, so that identification of the relevant cell is easy. For other non-bio, we rely on the declaration by the household of who is in charge, despite the fact that it does not seem to be the result of an explicit arrangement with the family of origin of those children. For all the children who are present in the household, information on their education and labour (economic, domestic) is gathered. For both foster-children and other non-bio, information on their parents is also collected, regarding in particular the location of their current residence, their education and occupation.

In addition, the survey obtained information on all the children of household members, younger than 25 and residing somewhere else. The fostering status of these children is collected

---

[8]   We exclude domestics.
[9]   Castle (1995) observed also, on a sample of 77 children less than 5 years old that some of them are explicit foster-children and some others look like foster-children but are not called foster-children
[10]   This number compares well with what was found in the 2010-11 DHS for Senegal (Sene and Pigois, 2012) in which 15.1 per cent of children less than 18 are found not to live with any of their parents, including in addition to foster children double orphans as well as young brides. If we include them as well, PSF contains 14.6 per cent of children living without a biological parent.

as well as their current education and occupation. Information is obtained on their place of residence and on the host household (when they reside with a household). In total, there are 360 children fostered out (aged less than 18, declared as fostered out by their biological parent and not residing with the other parent).[11] Therefore, our data allow us to study fostering both from the point of view of receiving households (where fostered in and host children can be compared) and sending households (where fostered out and their biological siblings can be compared).

Biological children can themselves be divided according to the involvement of their household in fostering. The sample includes 3,586 children who live in households not involved in fostering, 1,432 host children (i.e. growing up with either a foster-child or an "other non-bio"), 643 children who are the siblings of a child fostered-out and 325 children of households which both send and receive foster-children and/or other non-bio.

Table 1: Sample composition

Status	No.	Per cent	Percent among Bio.
Biol. child.	5986	87.6	100
Biol. child. not involved in fostering	3586	52.4	59.9
Biol. child. host	1432	20.9	23.9
Biol. child. left behind	643	9.4	10.7
Biol. child. both host and left behind	325	4.7	5.4
Fostered child	580	8.5	.
Other non-bio	265	3.9	.
Fostered out	360		

Notes: The sample includes all children below 18, not married and not double orphans. The column Per cent gives the percentage of a given subgroup who lives in the household. The last column considers only biological children and indicates how they are distributed according to the involvement of their household in fostering. The category of fostered out children cannot easily be compared to any of these reference populations since by definition they do not live in the household.

3. WHO ARE THE FOSTERED CHILDREN?

Basic characteristics of children are presented separately for biological, fostered in, other non-biological and fostered out children (Table 2). In theory, the children fostered in (formally) and those fostered out should statistically be identical since it is the same group seen from two different positions: origin or destination. Several characteristics look similar, except for the gender composition. The difference is due to the fact that fostered-out children include those children sent to live in Koranic boarding schools and who are exclusively boys, while fostered-in children only include children residing in households, because collective housing was excluded from the PSF sample.[12] Fostering takes place early: the average age of children when fostering

---

[11] We include as fostered out children who are not declared fostered out but are not married, are not living with any of their biological parent and are currently living away from the household for the following reasons: education, difficult economic situation in the origin household, divorce of the parents, death or illness of one of the parent, provide help to host household.

[12] There are 55 per cent of girls among the fostered in while girls account for only 46 per cent of the fostered out. This is because about 19 per cent of the boys are fostered out to a religious guide, while nearly none of the girls are. Excluding children living in collective living places or fostered to religious guides, the girls account for 51 per

starts is about 4. It appears slightly higher for fostered-out children than for fostered-in children and this is also because children fostered-out to Koranic boarding schools are fostered slightly later. The low average age at fostering for both fostered-in and other non-bio also reflects the fact that some of them are born within the household (see below). Lastly, fostered children and other non-bio are more often single-orphans than biological children. The proportion is slightly higher among the children explicitely fostered-in.

Table 2: Child's sex, age, age at fostering and parents' living status by child's status

Status	Boys	Age	Age at fost.	Rural	One parent	Both parents
	Per cent (N)	Mean (N)	Mean (N)	Mean (N)	Alive	Alive
Biol. child	51.3 (5986)	8.0 (5986)	--	54.1 (5986)	7.4 (5986)	92.6 (5986)
Fostered in	45.1 (580)	10.4 (580)	4.2 (559)	52.0 (580)	26.8 (557)	73.2 (555)
Other non-bio	52.5 (265)	11.4 (265)	4.0 (257)	37.7 (265)	21.6 (255)	78.4 (255)
Fostered out	54.1 (360)	11.1 (360)	5.5 (215)	48.3 (346)	16.1 (266)	83.8 (266)

Notes: The sample includes all children below 18, not married and not double orphans. Children for whom the information about one parent is missing while the other is known to be alive have been assigned to the group of those for whom one parent is alive. For children fostered in and other non-bio, some observations are dropped because information is not available for any of the parents. For the fostered out, the Table indicates that 48.3 per cent are currently fostered to a rural household. If one looks at their origin, 50.8 per cent of the fostered out come from a rural household.

A result that sheds light on the other non-biological children and their relation to their host household is that a high proportion (60.4 per cent) of other non-biological children have lived in the host household since their birth, while this is the case for only slightly more than a third of the fostered children (Table 3). As a result, other non-bio have on average been present in the household for more time than the fostered in (7.5 years vs. about 6 years). Nevertheless, when looking only at those who were not born in the household, the result is reversed with other non-bio arriving at the age of 10 and having been present for about three years against an arrival between age 6 and 7 and a 4.5 years stay for fostered children. In other words, other non-bio are more often born in the household but when it is not the case, they arrive later in the household than children fostered in.

Table 3: Duration of stay in the household (in months)

	Fostered in		Other non-bio		p-value
	N	%	N	%	(different mean)
Percentage born in the hh	580	34.3	264	59.8	0.00
Age at fostering	559	4.2	257	4.0	0.52
Age at fostering when not born in the hh	360	6.6	99	10.4	0.00
Length of stay in months	559	76.0	257	91.4	0.00
Length of stay in months when not born in the hh	360	55.9	99	37.3	0.00

Notes: Sample includes children below 18, not married and not double orphans who are not living with any of their parents.

cent of the fostered out, closer to what is observed for the fostered in.

We now turn to examining the position of fostered children and of other non-bio in their households (hosting them or sending them), given their relation to the household head (Table 4). A total of nearly 36 per cent of other non-bio children are grand-children of the household head, whereas it is the case for only 25.7 per cent of fostered-in children and less than 17 per cent of biological ones. A large proportion of children fostered in, explicitly or not, are therefore in the care of their grand-parents, in particular when they were born in the household (in line with the descriptive literature that points to the role of grand-mothers (Alber, 2004: Bledsoe and Isiugo-Abanihe, 1989)). However, this is far from being the whole story in the Senegalese context. A fair share of these children are living in their uncle's household, as nephews and nieces of the household head. Indeed, about 23.5 per cent of both fostered-in and other non-bio children are nephews and nieces of the household head, against only 7 per cent of biological children. Also to be mentioned is that 19 per cent of the fostered-in and 12 per cent of the other non-biological children have no link with the household head. If the existence and intensity of a biological link impacts the attention given by the household head to the fostered child, then these differences might play a role in the well-being of children.

Table 4: Child's relation to household head and position in household by child's status

Variables	Biol. child	Fostered in	Other bio	nonFostered out
N	5986	580	265	360
Biological child (per cent)	68.9	0	0	74.4
Grand child (per cent)	16.6	25.7	35.9	5.3
Sibling (per cent)	1.6	0.2	6.0	1.4
Nephew/niece (per cent)	7.2	23.8	23.8	4.4
Cousin (per cent)	0.1	1.9	2.6	0
Bro./sist. in law (per cent)	0	1.7	3.8	0.3
Other parent (per cent)	3.2	19.8	14.0	2.8
No link (per cent)	1.3	19.0	12.5	1.9
Unknown (per cent)	0	0	0.4	9.4
Mb. of hh head's cell (per cent)	12.0	54.7	59.6	31.4
Female hh head (per cent)	17.1	26.2	34.3	18.9

Notes: The sample includes children below 18, not married and not double orphans. For fostered-out children, the last line indicates the proportion of children coming from female headed households. In the first 3 columns, the indicated relation is that to the head of household in which the child lives. For fostered out children, we report the relationship to the head of their household of origin.

We next zoom in on whether children belong specifically to the cell of the household head. Since the household head is likely to have a better control over household resources, belonging to the head's cell is not neutral in terms of well-being. The majority of fostered-in and other non-biological children belong to the cell of the head of household, which means that either they have been fostered explicitly to him/her or that s/he took responsibility for them. Parents in general foster their children to a specific person and might try to ensure for them the best possible access to resources.[13]

---

[13] Only 12 per cent of biological children live in the cell of the household head, which is not surprising, since the household head is most often a man and children are allocated to their mother's cell if she is present in the

A last descriptive note related to the relationship between children and adults is that fostered children and other non-bio are more often than biological children homonymous to their care giver (Table 5). This could be the case simply if families systematically avoided to give the first name of the parent to their child, but this does not appear to be the case. Informal field discussions suggest both that it is difficult to refuse to host a homonymous child and also that alliance strategies drive the name given to a newborn child. In such a case, it is only natural for this child to spend some of his upbringing in the care of the person he was named after.[14]

Table 5: Homonymy

		Same name as cell's head	Same name as hh head
	N	%	%
Biol Children	5985	6.0	1.7
Fostered in	580	10.2	4.7
Other non-bio	265	9.0	4.9

Notes: Sample includes children below 18, not married and not double orphans.

Turning to the fostered-out, about 74 per cent are children of the household head, which is very similar to the proportion for biological children (less than 69 per cent). Thus, fostered-out children do not appear to be massively fostered for reasons linked to a relative disadvantage of their parent within their own household. For instance, one could have imagined that a woman living in her brother's household would feel some pressure to have her children living elsewhere. This does not seem to be a large part of the story. Finally, for only about 30 per cent of the fostered-out, their main care-giver is a household head. Here again, this is due to the fact that a fair share of fostered-out children are living with a religious guide or in some type of collective place (religious boarding schools, or non religious ones). Female-headed households do not seem to be more likely than others to foster out their children (about 22 per cent of households are female headed, 38 per cent of them being headed by a widow). As the last line of Table 4 indicates, slightly more than 19 per cent of the fostered-out come from female headed households while this is the case for nearly 17 per cent of the biological children. Interestingly though, female headed households are more likely to host a child, in particular other non-biological children.

This description can be complemented with simple regressions, including household fixed effects, showing the correlates of the probability of being a fostered-in child rather than a biological child (Table 6).[15] Only few exogenous correlates can be introduced. It appears that fostered-in children are more likely to be girls (given that we miss boys fostered out to religious guides). They are older and more likely to be the first born child among their own sibship. They are also more likely to be single orphans, either maternal or paternal. Except for gender, the same characteristics determine whether a child will be another non-bio child.

---

household and not to that of their father.

[14] It is also worth noting that in aggregate, there are about 30 per cent more children fostered in 2005 relative to 2003, 2004 or 2006. It might be related to the invasion of desert locust that devastated the crops in the northern half of the country during the autumn of 2004 and left the population in a dire situation.

[15] The number of observations is smaller than what is indicated above due to missing values for some variables. Logit model is estimated and odd-ratios are presented (a coefficient greater than one indicates that the variable and the event are positively related whereas a coefficient lower than one indicates the variable and the event are negatively related.

When comparing fostered out children to children living with at least one parent, the former are more likely to be older and with a deceased parent.

Table 6: Probability of being a fostered in child (resp. other non-bio) vs. biological child

Variables	(1) Fostered in	(2) Other non bio	(3) Fostered out
Male	0.797**	1.172	1.252
	(0.0858)	(0.187)	(0.190)
Age	1.072***	1.123***	1.100***
	(0.0116)	(0.0161)	(0.0140)
First born	2.078***	2.254***	-
	(0.191)	(0.316)	
Deceased mother	6.062***	3.622***	2.526**
	(1.863)	(1.374)	(1.166)
Deceased father	3.177***	2.195**	2.305***
	(0.637)	(0.819)	(0.597)
Constant	0.0357***	0.00815***	0.0146***
	(0.00520)	(0.00182)	(0.00257)
Observations	6,326	6,041	6,201

Notes: Sample includes children below 18, not married and not double orphans, leaving in households involved in fostering, or not. Notes: robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Logit model of being a fostered child rather than a biological child. Odds ratios are reported.

Looking now at the reasons reported for fostering in (explicitly), we see in Table 7 that girls are much more likely to be fostered to help their host household than boys (18.4 per cent against 5.1 per cent).[16] This is hardly surprising since girls are much more involved in domestic tasks than boys. However, 21.8 per cent of girls and 27.8 per cent of boys are fostered in for (formal) schooling reasons. It is also interesting to note that about 17 per cent of girls and 18 per cent of boys are fostered due to parental problems (sickness, death or divorce). The proportion of children that have both of their parents alive is much lower among fostered-in and other non-biological than among biological children (around 73 per cent against 92 per cent, Table 2). For some children, fostering then seems to be a way to help taking care of them once one of their parent is deceased. The "other" category includes various motives for fostering, from freeing the mother so that she can work and/or migrate to a simple mention of a "difficult situation" at home. In addition, it can also be noticed that among fostered children, in particular among boys, the probability that at least one parent migrated abroad is much higher than in the general population, and it is even more true when the mother is the migrant. Among children whose mother migrated, 50 per cent are fostered (vs. about 6.3 per cent among those whose mother lives in Senegal.

---

[16] This table is restricted to explicit fostered-in children, since data is only partial for other non-biological and fostered-out children.

Table 7: Reasons for fostering by child's sex, fostered-in only

Variables	Male	Female
	%	%
Help	5.1	18.4
Problem with parents	18.1	17.2
Going to public School	27.8	21.8
Going to koranic School	4.2	0.4
Other	45.0	42.2
N	216	261

Notes: The sample includes children below 18, not married and not
double orphans who are not living with any of their parents.

Table 8: Fostering and parental international migration

Status	N	Father migrated	Mother migrated	Both parents migrated
		%	%	%
Biol. child	5063	1.0	0.1	0.0
Biol. boys	2624	1.0	0.1	0.0
Biol. girls	2439	1.0	0.2	0.0
Fostered in	434	11.6	8.9	5.6
Fostered in boys	189	14.8	11.3	8.4
Fostered in girls	245	9.0	6.9	3.5
Other non-bio	187	10.2	8.9	4.1
Other non-bio boys	102	11.8	13.4	5.7
Other non-bio girls	85	8.2	3.7	2.2

Notes: The sample includes children below 18, not married and not
double orphans, living in households involved in fostering.

Finally, it can be seen in Table 9 that children are mostly fostered to their maternal family, and in this case, in more than 40 per cent of the cases to their grand-parents (while this is the case for only a quarter of those fostered in their paternal lineage). Maternal grand-mothers seem to be the persons towards whom mothers naturally turn to when they need to foster out their child (in order to remarry for example) and, as suggested by Alber (2004), maternal grand-mothers might also be more likely to ask for a child. Combined with the fact that children who are not formally fostered are more likely to live with a grand-parent (Table 4), these results suggest that a sizeable share of non-biological children might be the offspring of women who have needed to leave them behind, but did not foster them formally, perhaps hoping the separation would not last.

Table 9: Fostering to maternal/paternal side

		Maternal side	Paternal side
	N	%	%
Fostered in	580	40	28
Other non-bio	265	40	27
Fostered-out	360	43	24

Notes: The sample includes children below 18, not married and not double orphans, not living with any of their parents. Some children cannot be assigned to a particular lineage either because they are not fostered within the family or because they are fostered to older siblings

4. WHO FOSTERS CHILDREN IN OR OUT?

Households may receive fostered children (explicit or not), send fostered children out, do both or neither. In the sample, nearly 18 per cent of the households receive a fostered child, 11 per cent foster a child out and 3 per cent (i.e. 54 households) do both: they send one or several children away and host at least one child (Table 10). Among households receiving a fostered child (whether they also send one out or not), a third receive 2 or more children. If other non-bio are included, the proportion of households who receive a child rises to nearly 24 per cent and only 61 per cent of the households are not involved at all in any children exchange practice. Here, nearly 40 per cent of the households who host a child host more than one.

From simple descriptive statistics, it appears clearly that households involved in fostering are bigger and more likely to have a polygamous head than households who are not involved in fostering. The positive association between fostering in and polygamy can be explained by a network effect (polygamy increases the size of the extended family and hence increases the number potential foster children). An additional interpretation could be a higher demand for domestic activities in households that are polygamous and host foster-children (Bledsoe, 1990b). The positive association between sending a child and polygamy could be due to rivalry between wives leading some of them to send away children at risk in this rivalry, as suggested by Notermans (1999) in the case of Cameroon.

Table 10: Involvement in fostering, at the household level

Type of involvement	Strict definition of fostering		Large definition of fostering		HH size	Polygamous households	Non co-residing polygamous hh
Type of involvement	N	%	N	%	Mean	%	%
HH not involved in fostering	1212	68.1	1105	62.0	7.4	23.4	12.4
HH receiving a foster child	316	17.7	423	23.8	10.3	37.3	19.9
HH sending a child away	199	11.2	177	9.9	8.0	32.3	17.6
HH receiving and sending	54	3.0	76	4.3	11.3	53.7	26.5
Total	1781	100	1781	100	8.1	27.8	1781

Notes: The sample includes children below 18, not married and not double orphans. The strict definition of fostering focuses only on fostering children. The large definition includes other non bio children. Results for the mean household size and percentage of polygamous households are given only for the strict definition of fostering. Non

co-residing polygamous households are those where at least one spouse is living in another place.

A multinomial analysis gives a clear description of the observable differences between households who have different involvement in fostering. Control variables include the size of the household and the gender composition of the biological children, location of residence (rural or Dakar - other cities being the reference group), distance to school,[17] characteristics of the household head (age, gender, education, marital status, including polygamy status, and ethnic group), and own fostering experience of adult members in the household. Finally, as control for the household living standard, we use total consumption per adult income earner in the household.[18]

Table 11 shows the estimation in the case where other non-bio are excluded so that only children formally fostered in are considered. The results indicate that larger households, and households that have a set of biological children with an unbalanced gender composition before fostering (either more boys or more girls) are more likely to foster-out a child. Characteristics of schooling infrastructure affect both the probability to foster-in and to foster-out. Consistent with the schooling motive, distance to schooling facilities is positively associated with fostering out. Rather surprisingly, distance to primary schools increases also the probability to host a foster-child. This might reflect that education is not the main reason for fostering in children. The probability to foster-in a child is also higher if the household is polygamous and if it witnessed a positive or a negative shock in the last 5 years. The results also confirm that the fostering experience of adults (in particular of women) in the household increase this probability. Most of these results remain if we include other non-biological children among the fostered-in children (the point estimates are slightly higher).

---

[17] Distance to school is measured by the time it takes to reach the nearest primary school using the usual transportation means. Note that this measure is only an imperfect measure of availability of schooling since, even when a school is present nearby, it might not offer all the necessary education levels. Often, rural school offers teaching only for the first few levels of primary schooling. Hence we might overestimate the availability of schools, and therefore underestimate the role of the lack of adequate local supply of education in prompting fostering.

[18] Total expenditure per capita is the usual measure of living standard. It is usually preferred to income as expenditures are less volatile if households smooth their consumption when income fluctuates. Ideally, we would like to have per capita expenditures before any fostering in or out took place, but we cannot access this information with these cross-sectional data. In the present case, we resolved to use consumption per adult income earner as the household size is impacted by the presence of fostered children. The number of income earners is less likely to depend on fostering. The idea is that a household that reaches a level of expenditures thanks to one income or wage is better of than the one that reaches the same level with multiple very small income sources.

Table 11: Probability of sending children, receiving children or both

Variables	Receiving hh	Sending hh	Receiving and sending hh
Number of members before fostering	0.0135	0.0298**	0.0460***
	(0.0135)	(0.0130)	(0.0156)
More boys among children before fostering	0.0335	0.454**	0.0842
	(0.158)	(0.178)	(0.237)
More girls among children before fostering	0.00631	0.336*	-0.0334
	(0.161)	(0.184)	(0.231)
HH per earner consumption excluding rent (log)	-0.0516	-0.103	0.0645
	(0.0608)	(0.0732)	(0.0871)
HH in Dakar	-0.269*	0.211	-0.00598
	(0.153)	(0.180)	(0.257)
Rural HH	0.107	0.315	0.334
	(0.169)	(0.197)	(0.254)
Primary school lt 30 min	0.944***	1.278***	0.438
	(0.261)	(0.361)	(0.377)
Primary school between 30 and 60 min	0.534	1.052**	0.701
	(0.340)	(0.412)	(0.453)
Female headed HH	0.0891	1.004	0.871
	(0.597)	(0.666)	(0.783)
HH head's age	0.0106**	0.00464	-0.00502
	(0.00532)	(0.00524)	(0.00822)
Female * Age head	0.00518	-0.0169	-0.0102
	(0.0111)	(0.0132)	(0.0159)
HH head ever been enrolled in a French sch.	0.177	-0.0532	-0.128
	(0.164)	(0.182)	(0.257)
HH head ever been enrolled in a Koranic sch.	0.113	0.188	-0.231
	(0.156)	(0.171)	(0.250)
HH with a polygamous hh head	0.414***	0.259	0.623***
	(0.133)	(0.160)	(0.195)
HH head Wolof	0.0760	-0.414**	-0.525**
	(0.165)	(0.179)	(0.235)
HH head Serere	-0.0475	-0.231	-0.195
	(0.209)	(0.222)	(0.301)
HH head Poular	0.189	-0.280	-0.499*
	(0.175)	(0.188)	(0.266)
Positive shock in the last five years	0.207	0.00659	0.400*
	(0.140)	(0.155)	(0.223)
Negative shock in the last five years	0.284*	0.120	0.297
	(0.154)	(0.178)	(0.257)
One female cell head had a fostering experience	0.429***	0.174	0.621***
	(0.142)	(0.170)	(0.216)
One male cell head had a fostering experience	-0.000367	0.197	0.765***
	(0.159)	(0.167)	(0.216)
Constant	-2.682***	-2.228*	-4.562***
	(0.957)	(1.146)	(1.293)
Observations	1,445	1,445	1,445

Note: The sample includes all households involved or not in explicit fostering. Reduced sample size is due to missing values. Multinomial probit estimation. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. The consumption variable used here excludes rent expenditure. The analysis excludes other non biological children from the definition of fostered-in children. Households not involved in fostering are the reference.

We consider separately the probability to receive or send more boys than girls and the probability to receive or send more girls than boys (Table 12). When only one child is fostered, out or in a given household, this variable simply depends on the gender of that child. Note that 28 per cent of the host households foster in more than one child. First, being a polygamous household is positively correlated with sending girls but not boys. Richer households (with higher total consumption per adult income earner in the household) are less likely to receive and to send boys. Households living in Dakar are more likely to send girls and less likely to receive boys than households in other urban areas. The fostering out of girls is also more likely in large households. It is also interesting to note that the correlation between the imbalance in the gender composition of the family before fostering tends to be corrected by children moving out: households with more boys are more likely to send a boy out while those with more girl send their girls away. Positive shocks are positively correlated with receiving boys while the probability of receiving a girl increases with negative shocks. A natural interpretation of this difference, consistent with observations of section 3, is that girls are more often sent to a household who needs some help.

These various results are consistent with the fact that foster children are not an homogenous category: some are fostered for schooling reasons, explaining the role of schooling infrastructure, some are fostered in order to face shocks and others play a social role. What comes out clearly though is that households who participate in fostering are not a random subset of households.

In a household, children fostered in and out are associated with a particular cell. In total, the 1,781 households are composed of 4,375 cells. Nearly 65 per cent of these cells belong to households who do not participate in any fostering. Among the rest, 40 per cent are directly involved in fostering while 60 per cent are not, but belong to households where some other cell participates to fostering. Restricting the analysis to households who receive a foster child, we estimate a logit model of the probability to be the cell of the care giver (Table 13), introducing household fixed effects. It comes out very clearly that for the most part, foster children are fostered to the household head or to a spouse of the head, and not to the richest cell head. They are also more likely to be sent to a cell headed by a young man (perhaps a young uncle or an older brother). However, the older the cell head, the more she is likely to be a woman (likely a grand-mother). The gender composition of the cell does not have any effect on the decision to host a foster child.

Table 12: Probability of sending or receiving more boys than girls and more girls than boys

Variables	More Girls Receiving HH	More Girls Sending HH	More Boys Receiving HH	More Boys Sending HH
Number of members before fostering	0.0158	0.0448***	0.0152	0.00471
	(0.0161)	(0.0163)	(0.0168)	(0.0145)
More boys among children before fostering	-0.00635	-0.343	-0.0463	0.877***
	(0.188)	(0.234)	(0.197)	(0.221)
More girls among children before fostering	0.176	0.377*	-0.219	0.102
	(0.184)	(0.212)	(0.209)	(0.249)
HH per earner consumption excluding rent (log)	0.0263	0.0182	-0.126*	-0.226**
	(0.0695)	(0.0862)	(0.0758)	(0.0947)
HH in Dakar	0.00258	0.379*	-0.550***	0.217
	(0.184)	(0.226)	(0.191)	(0.229)
Rural HH	0.284	0.319	-0.0570	0.306
	(0.200)	(0.263)	(0.212)	(0.241)
Primary school lt 30 min	0.994***	0.894**	0.912***	1.689***
	(0.328)	(0.445)	(0.345)	(0.540)
Primary school between 30 and 60 min	0.517	0.605	0.632	1.538***
	(0.427)	(0.522)	(0.430)	(0.580)
Female headed HH	0.365	0.761	-0.611	1.351
	(0.698)	(0.837)	(0.723)	(0.931)
HH head's age	0.00812	0.00425	0.0151**	0.00255
	(0.00662)	(0.00660)	(0.00616)	(0.00679)
Female * Age head	0.000212	-0.0129	0.0166	-0.0263
	(0.0132)	(0.0168)	(0.0132)	(0.0188)
HH head ever been enrolled in a French sch.	0.181	0.114	0.201	-0.219
	(0.196)	(0.236)	(0.210)	(0.227)
HH head ever been enrolled in a Koranic sch.	0.0373	0.360*	0.150	-0.0283
	(0.188)	(0.219)	(0.192)	(0.212)
HH with a polygamous hh head	0.387**	0.410**	0.497***	0.206
	(0.152)	(0.202)	(0.163)	(0.191)
HH head Wolof	0.175	-0.561***	-0.114	-0.120
	(0.197)	(0.216)	(0.207)	(0.235)
HH head Serere	0.140	-0.303	-0.192	-0.0469
	(0.247)	(0.273)	(0.256)	(0.279)
HH head Poular	0.252	-0.310	-0.0156	-0.215
	(0.213)	(0.229)	(0.211)	(0.244)
Positive shock in the last five years	0.113	-0.134	0.335*	0.0685
	(0.163)	(0.183)	(0.179)	(0.196)
Negative shock in the last five years	0.316*	0.253	0.142	-0.0183
	(0.176)	(0.215)	(0.197)	(0.212)
One female cell head had a fostering experience	0.518***	0.285	0.381**	0.0577
	(0.165)	(0.210)	(0.179)	(0.226)
One male cell head had a fostering experience	-0.0698	0.0655	0.0585	0.246
	(0.192)	(0.223)	(0.202)	(0.199)
Constant	-4.375***	-4.076***	-2.012*	-1.143
	(1.078)	(1.377)	(1.176)	(1.438)
Observations	1,216	1,216	1,206	1,206

Notes: Sample covers all households involved or not in explicit fostering. Reduced sample size is due to missing values. When examining the probability to receive/send more girls than boys (resp. more boys than girls), households that receive/send more boys than girls (resp. more girls than boys) are dropped from the sample. Note: Multinomial probit estimation. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$. The consumption variable used here excludes housing expenditure. Among the fostered in we exclude other non biological children. Households not involved in fostering are the reference.

Table 13: Probability of being the receiving cell in a receiving household

Variables	Being the receiving cell Formally fostered only
Female headed HH	-1.720***
	(0.608)
Cell head's age	-0.0181
	(0.0115)
Female * Cell head's age	0.0592***
	(0.0112)
Cell head is HH head	2.176***
	(0.355)
Cell head is HH head's spouse	0.839***
	(0.320)
Consumption per capita at cell level (rent excluded)	-2.108***
	(0.334)
Cell head ever enrolled in French school	-0.0219
	(0.274)
Cell head ever enrolled in Koranic school	-0.0175
	(0.283)
Number of members in the cell before fostering	0.0605
	(0.0497)
More boys among children in the cell before fostering	-0.0852
	(0.240)
More girls among children in the cell before fostering	-0.101
	(0.248)
Cell head had a fostering experience	0.269
	(0.234)
Number of cells	934
Number of households	311

Notes: The sample includes all households hosting a foster child. Note : Fixed effect logit estimation. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$. The regression excluded households made of only one cell and all households in which all cells care for a foster child. As this regression controls for household's fixed-effect, the reading is the following: given that the household hosts at least one foster child, the cell of the household head is more likely to be the cell of the care giver than other cells in the household. The variable "More boys among children in the cell before fostering" reflects the gender composition of children below age 18 in the cell before fostering took place.

5. IMPACT OF FOSTERING

Methodological issues

The outcomes we examine are related to education: we look at the probability to have ever attended school and current attendance. Admittedly, there is much more to education than entry into school, but if a difference appears at this level, then it is likely to really matter. We also look at economic and domestic activities. The first one is whether the child is currently engaged in economic work. Regarding domestic work we consider whether a given child spends more than

28 hours a week completing household chores (which is the threshold beyond which participation to domestic work is seen as being detrimental).[19]

Evaluating the impact of fostering on children is made difficult by selection issues and also by the fact that fostering is likely to impact all the children belonging to the households involved. First, one cannot make the assumption that households involved in fostering and fostered children are chosen randomly even if they have the same observed characteristics. Host households and households that foster out their children are likely to have unobserved characteristics that increase the probability that they get involved in fostering and that could have an impact on children's outcomes. Similarly, fostered children might be chosen based on unobserved characteristics that could also have such an impact. For instance, it could be that children fostered for education purposes have higher than average cognitive abilities. This is an argument that families give to justify the fostering of one particular child among their offspring. Moreover, it is not possible to assume on a priori grounds that non fostered children, either in the host or the origin household, are not impacted by fostering. If they are, this challenges the estimation strategy consisting in comparing fostered children with their biological siblings left behind to evaluate the effect of fostering on the fostered, limiting the bias due to household level selection.

There is no perfect way to solve the selection issues involved in fostering and even randomised experiments that could affect the probability of fostering by changing the economic situation of the household (for instance, a randomised distribution of cash transfers to families) could perhaps better assess the impact of fostering on households as a whole, but would not solve the issue of the endogeneous selection of the specific child that a household chooses to foster and would not solve either the fact that the situation of siblings of fostered children also changes after fostering.

Therefore our approach will rather rely on the careful choice of groups of children being compared. As we saw in descriptive statistics, children in our data may be classified in several categories:

- Fostered in children (FI), either explicitly or not;
- Fostered out children (FO);
- Biological children of host households (BHH);
- Non fostered biological children of sending household (BSH);
- Children of households not involved in fostering (BNI).

As noted earlier, statistically, fostered-in and fostered-out children should be the same, but from an observational point of view they differ in that fostered-in children are observed in their host household while information on fostered-out children is collected in their household of origin. Evaluating the impact of fostering on foster children amounts to comparing FI or FO children with other non fostered children. In addition to a general comparison allowing to infer differences in outcomes between the 5 groups listed above, children fostered-in can be compared to their host siblings and fostered-out children to their biological siblings. It might seem the most natural way to proceed. However, even in the absence of endogenous selection, such a comparison will be misleading if non fostered children are affected by fostering. Marazyan (2013b), using the same data, analyses the impact of fostering on non-fostered children. She concludes that host siblings are more likely to be ever enrolled in formal school, provided they are young enough at the time of arrival of the foster child.

---

[19] According to UNICEF, children 5-14 engaged in household chores for more than 28 hours per week can be considered as engaged in child labour (http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/stats_popup9.html).

Impact of fostering on fostered children

All the results presented here distinguish fostered-in children in 4 categories, according to whether they are formally fostered or not and whether they are born in the household or not. We start our investigation of the impact of fostering on foster children by studying school enrolment. The dependent variable is the probability of having ever been to school and the model is estimated by maximum likelihood. As one can see in Table 14, children fostered in do not differ on average from all other children in the sample (columns 1 to 3). When limiting the comparison group to host biological children (BHH), we find that fostered boys born in the household fare better with respect to schooling than fostered children not born in the household, other non-bio and host siblings (columns 4 to 6). This is true for both the ever enrolled variable and the current school enrollment variable (Table 15). The same positive impact is inexistant for girls.

When comparing FI to children left behind in sending households (BSH), no difference is observed (columns 7 to 9 in Tables 14 and 15). This last result is confirmed by the comparison between children fostered out and biological children left behind in sending households that shows that these two groups of children have similar schooling outcomes (results not shown).

Turning to labour outcomes, when compared to their host siblings, it appears that children fostered in are not more likely to be engaged in economic work. Surprisingly though, other non-bio not born in the household are less likely to be working (Table 16). Decomposing by gender shows that this effect is driven by girls. All other children, controlling for observable characteristics, have the same probability of being at work. This result still holds when fostered-in children are compared to children having a fostered-out sibling (BSH). The last 3 columns show here again that girls living away from their parents without having been formally fostered are less likely to work. Otherwise, as expected it can be noticed that educated parents reduce the probability of working while having parents who are farmers increases it.

We also looked at the probability of doing more than 28 hours of domestic work per week (Table 17). When fostered children are compared to all children, including those not involved in fostering, fostered girls not born in the household appear to be more often loaded with domestic chores than others. Nevertheless when the comparison group is restricted to biological children hosting fostered children (BHH), this effect disappears. If fostered girls do more domestic labour on average, they do not do more than their host siblings. This is congruent with the idea that households who host foster children need them for domestic tasks, but it does not support the assumption that they are exploited relative to their host siblings. This is not to deny the existence of cases of abuse, it just suggests that those abuses are not the rule.

Table 14: Probability of having been enrolled at school

Variables	(1) All children	(2) All boys	(3) All girls	(4) all FI vs BHH	(5) boys FI vs BHH	(6) girls FI vs BHH	(7) all FI vs BSH	(8) boys FI vs BSH	(9) girls FI vs BSH
Fostered born in HH	0.329	0.698	0.0131	0.380	0.909*	-0.0520	0.0867	0.619	-0.287
	(0.420)	(0.517)	(0.493)	(0.409)	(0.530)	(0.484)	(0.387)	(0.554)	(0.476)
Fostered not born in HH	0.227	0.287	0.127	0.234	0.515	0.00527	0.0181	0.330	-0.165
	(0.225)	(0.318)	(0.275)	(0.231)	(0.345)	(0.286)	(0.264)	(0.393)	(0.328)
Other born in HH	-0.0899	0.232	-0.553	-0.105	0.345	-0.653	-0.238	0.317	-0.677
	(0.453)	(0.579)	(0.503)	(0.419)	(0.546)	(0.465)	(0.412)	(0.498)	(0.498)
Other not born in HH	0.0194	-0.130	0.171	0.116	0.105	0.165	-0.0471	0.0817	-0.0344
	(0.366)	(0.526)	(0.467)	(0.377)	(0.559)	(0.470)	(0.391)	(0.642)	(0.486)
Age	-0.0207	0.0348*	-0.0783***	-0.0173	0.0177	-0.0546*	-0.0107	0.0576	-0.0776**
	(0.0136)	(0.0194)	(0.0195)	(0.0226)	(0.0297)	(0.0329)	(0.0270)	(0.0394)	(0.0357)
Male	0.00799			-0.0954			0.171		
	(0.0952)			(0.154)			(0.174)		
Father ever enrolled in French school	1.212***	1.246***	1.239***	0.984***	1.154***	0.901***	0.916***	1.082***	0.848**
	(0.238)	(0.295)	(0.221)	(0.271)	(0.332)	(0.307)	(0.300)	(0.399)	(0.355)
Mother ever enrolled in French school	1.158***	0.967***	1.407***	1.014***	0.793**	1.306***	0.794***	0.424	1.083**
	(0.212)	(0.261)	(0.292)	(0.287)	(0.333)	(0.444)	(0.286)	(0.432)	(0.470)
Father farmer	-0.128	-0.216	-0.0219	-0.262	-0.435	-0.0574	-0.0182	0.00669	0.00776
	(0.173)	(0.218)	(0.217)	(0.225)	(0.320)	(0.294)	(0.238)	(0.329)	(0.316)
Father inactive	0.0107	0.00949	-0.0246	-0.0982	-0.140	-0.0233	-0.537	-0.826*	-0.277
	(0.174)	(0.219)	(0.212)	(0.274)	(0.361)	(0.390)	(0.375)	(0.486)	(0.438)
Mother farmer	-0.192	-0.259	-0.110	-0.452	-0.237	-0.664*	-0.215	-0.183	-0.274
	(0.234)	(0.283)	(0.266)	(0.308)	(0.381)	(0.389)	(0.314)	(0.404)	(0.382)
Mother inactive	-0.250*	-0.355**	-0.153	-0.648***	-0.673**	-0.649**	-0.316	-0.441	-0.261
	(0.144)	(0.174)	(0.180)	(0.238)	(0.291)	(0.281)	(0.249)	(0.301)	(0.326)
Rural	-0.862***	-0.952***	-0.810***	-0.676***	-0.954***	-0.412	-0.530**	-0.650**	-0.473
	(0.140)	(0.179)	(0.177)	(0.215)	(0.277)	(0.275)	(0.239)	(0.306)	(0.331)
Cell head is HH head	0.290*	0.138	0.418**	0.107	-0.151	0.315	-0.0673	-0.692**	0.445
	(0.158)	(0.197)	(0.198)	(0.239)	(0.305)	(0.312)	(0.251)	(0.339)	(0.319)
Constant	1.016***	0.533*	1.561***	1.372***	1.028**	1.657***	1.131***	0.712	1.800***
	(0.225)	(0.295)	(0.303)	(0.398)	(0.509)	(0.501)	(0.431)	(0.609)	(0.593)
Observations	3,137	1,585	1,552	1,219	617	602	883	427	456

Notes: Sample covers children between 3 and 18, not married and not double orphans (children fostered out excluded). Logit models of the probability of having ever been at formal school. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. FI stands for fostered-in children, BHH stands for biological children of hosting households and BSH for biological children of sending households.

Table 15: Probability of being enrolled in school

Variables	(1) All children	(2) All boys	(3) All girls	(4) all FI vs BHH	(5) boys FI vs BHH	(6) girls FI vs BHH	(7) All FI vs BSH	(8) boys FI BSH	(9) girls FI vs. BSH
Fostered born in HH	0.253	0.802*	-0.215	0.268	0.898*	-0.252	-0.0482	0.636	-0.570
	(0.347)	(0.476)	(0.391)	(0.361)	(0.505)	(0.421)	(0.344)	(0.511)	(0.419)
Fostered not born in HH	0.0787	0.223	-0.0664	0.0969	0.402	-0.144	-0.156	0.224	-0.397
	(0.204)	(0.277)	(0.254)	(0.211)	(0.315)	(0.273)	(0.243)	(0.358)	(0.300)
Other born in HH	0.0794	0.335	-0.163	0.0307	0.399	-0.272	-0.142	0.312	-0.390
	(0.373)	(0.459)	(0.420)	(0.368)	(0.474)	(0.405)	(0.381)	(0.446)	(0.458)
Other not born in HH	0.0780	0.424	-0.272	0.175	0.598	-0.182	-0.0448	0.517	-0.478
	(0.329)	(0.430)	(0.444)	(0.346)	(0.479)	(0.459)	(0.357)	(0.528)	(0.469)
Age	-0.105***	-0.0562***	-0.158***	-0.130***	-0.0967***	-0.174***	-0.111***	-0.0703*	-0.162***
	(0.0132)	(0.0178)	(0.0206)	(0.0219)	(0.0271)	(0.0311)	(0.0261)	(0.0366)	(0.0343)
Male	0.0662			0.0285			0.156		
	(0.0893)			(0.148)			(0.162)		
Father ever enrolled in French school	0.893***	0.970***	0.852***	0.811***	0.966***	0.730***	0.784***	0.882***	0.708**
	(0.182)	(0.225)	(0.186)	(0.212)	(0.272)	(0.255)	(0.238)	(0.318)	(0.300)
Mother ever enrolled in French school	0.817***	0.716***	0.923***	0.654***	0.534**	0.783**	0.774***	0.547	0.920**
	(0.162)	(0.199)	(0.218)	(0.218)	(0.264)	(0.311)	(0.236)	(0.335)	(0.364)
Father farmer	-0.135	-0.167	-0.0842	-0.263	-0.348	-0.137	-0.0952	0.0910	-0.213
	(0.165)	(0.204)	(0.214)	(0.207)	(0.299)	(0.274)	(0.210)	(0.300)	(0.285)
Father inactive	0.00599	0.0286	-0.0400	0.135	-0.00659	0.367	-0.223	-0.470	0.0219
	(0.159)	(0.199)	(0.200)	(0.256)	(0.320)	(0.396)	(0.369)	(0.481)	(0.443)
Mother farmer	0.0215	-0.0877	0.158	-0.161	0.0511	-0.362	0.0940	0.0153	0.166
	(0.222)	(0.269)	(0.255)	(0.272)	(0.363)	(0.343)	(0.284)	(0.378)	(0.343)
Mother inactive	-0.124	-0.243	-0.00881	-0.429**	-0.287	-0.594**	-0.0909	-0.206	-0.00556
	(0.123)	(0.155)	(0.156)	(0.201)	(0.263)	(0.240)	(0.212)	(0.279)	(0.286)
Rural	-0.568***	-0.577***	-0.605***	-0.465**	-0.699***	-0.238	-0.221	-0.375	-0.138
	(0.128)	(0.162)	(0.169)	(0.196)	(0.262)	(0.249)	(0.213)	(0.282)	(0.296)
Cell head is HH head	0.174	-0.139	0.488***	0.138	-0.308	0.593**	0.0556	-0.625**	0.682**
	(0.136)	(0.178)	(0.170)	(0.215)	(0.289)	(0.281)	(0.225)	(0.308)	(0.294)
Constant	1.381***	0.974***	1.941***	1.947***	1.631***	2.399***	1.538***	1.376**	2.027***
	(0.212)	(0.264)	(0.316)	(0.357)	(0.451)	(0.464)	(0.400)	(0.570)	(0.537)
Observations	3,137	1,585	1,552	1,219	617	602	883	427	456

Notes: Sample covers children between 3 and 18, not married and not double orphans (children fostered out excluded). Logit regression on the probability of being currently enrolled at formal school. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. FI stands for fostered in children, BHH stands for biological children of hosting households and BSH for biological children of sending households.

Table 16: Probability of being engaged in economic work

Variables	(1) All children	(2) All boys	(3) All girls	(4) all FI vs BHH	(5) boys FI vs BHH	(6) girls FI vs BHH	(7) all FI vs BSH	(8) boys FI vs BSH	(9) girls FI vs BSH
Fostered born in HH	-0.156	-0.201	-0.125	-0.200	-0.132	-0.191	-0.239	0.0990	-0.410
	(0.507)	(0.601)	(0.562)	(0.458)	(0.585)	(0.509)	(0.447)	(0.564)	(0.534)
Fostered not born in HH	0.0553	-0.286	0.327	0.0151	-0.240	0.268	-0.0694	-0.185	0.0556
	(0.256)	(0.372)	(0.298)	(0.257)	(0.377)	(0.310)	(0.283)	(0.408)	(0.355)
Other born in HH	0.0583	0.101	0.0458	0.0162	0.0459	0.0357	-0.0877	0.0901	-0.264
	(0.349)	(0.487)	(0.425)	(0.319)	(0.470)	(0.418)	(0.348)	(0.457)	(0.461)
Other not born in HH	-0.983**	-0.892	-1.088**	-1.003**	-0.786	-1.079**	-1.147***	-0.876	-1.430***
	(0.402)	(0.683)	(0.457)	(0.414)	(0.627)	(0.499)	(0.423)	(0.642)	(0.531)
Age	0.160***	0.131***	0.189***	0.159***	0.132***	0.183***	0.158***	0.0887**	0.233***
	(0.0177)	(0.0248)	(0.0243)	(0.0286)	(0.0407)	(0.0370)	(0.0357)	(0.0444)	(0.0483)
Male	-0.0678			-0.153			-0.379*		
	(0.114)			(0.179)			(0.203)		
Father ever enrolled in French school	-0.339	-0.479*	-0.251	-0.487*	-0.563	-0.461*	-0.382	-0.470	-0.328
	(0.207)	(0.283)	(0.223)	(0.251)	(0.362)	(0.277)	(0.313)	(0.457)	(0.324)
Mother ever enrolled in French school	-0.776***	-0.372	-1.121***	-0.925***	-0.997**	-0.895**	-0.521*	-0.237	-0.692
	(0.208)	(0.285)	(0.261)	(0.277)	(0.414)	(0.378)	(0.290)	(0.457)	(0.437)
Father farmer	0.644***	0.864***	0.455*	0.598**	0.875**	0.373	0.652**	0.767*	0.539
	(0.197)	(0.254)	(0.248)	(0.254)	(0.345)	(0.348)	(0.272)	(0.421)	(0.347)
Father inactive	-0.0994	-0.180	-0.00482	-0.00409	-0.0308	0.0708	0.328	0.262	0.404
	(0.197)	(0.279)	(0.240)	(0.308)	(0.442)	(0.355)	(0.380)	(0.544)	(0.485)
Mother farmer	0.724***	0.728**	0.697**	0.516	0.419	0.582	0.353	0.118	0.565
	(0.258)	(0.318)	(0.301)	(0.340)	(0.447)	(0.404)	(0.367)	(0.513)	(0.450)
Mother inactive	-0.416***	-0.368*	-0.474**	0.0587	0.131	-0.0645	-0.0684	-0.200	0.0278
	(0.155)	(0.211)	(0.184)	(0.232)	(0.325)	(0.282)	(0.256)	(0.360)	(0.313)
Rural	0.427**	0.646***	0.265	0.283	0.281	0.264	0.141	-0.0827	0.329
	(0.167)	(0.223)	(0.198)	(0.246)	(0.321)	(0.302)	(0.266)	(0.354)	(0.337)
Cell head is HH head	-0.0979	-0.0169	-0.115	0.0393	-0.0781	0.124	0.233	0.243	0.186
	(0.164)	(0.212)	(0.206)	(0.258)	(0.320)	(0.326)	(0.275)	(0.333)	(0.363)
Constant	-3.003***	-2.944***	-3.189***	-2.968***	-2.780***	-3.261***	-2.844***	-2.147***	-3.962***
	(0.279)	(0.414)	(0.357)	(0.467)	(0.734)	(0.559)	(0.514)	(0.722)	(0.689)
Observations	2,570	1,225	1,345	995	469	526	762	349	413

Notes: The sample is children between 6 and 18, not married and not double orphans (children fostered out excluded). Logit regression on the probability of being currently engaged in economic work. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. FI stands for fostered in children, BHH stands for biological children of hosting households and BSH for biological children of sending households.

Table 17: Probability of doing weekly more than 28 hours of domestic work

Variables	(1) All children	(2) All boys	(3) All girls	(4) all FI vs BHH	(5) boys FI vs BHH	(6) girls FI vs BHH	(7) all FI vs BSH	(8) boys FI vs BSH	(9) girls FI vs BSH
Fostered born in HH	0.191	0.434	0.103	-0.149	-0.0759	-0.161	-0.406	-0.00630	-0.554
	(0.392)	(0.736)	(0.429)	(0.390)	(0.732)	(0.458)	(0.444)	(0.791)	(0.485)
Fostered not born in HH	0.236	-0.437	0.518*	-0.0642	-0.784	0.292	-0.306	-1.033	-0.0782
	(0.245)	(0.660)	(0.278)	(0.271)	(0.697)	(0.324)	(0.323)	(0.987)	(0.366)
Other born in HH	0.222	0.650	0.0696	-0.0460	0.0422	-0.117	-0.271	0.424	-0.614
	(0.428)	(0.812)	(0.463)	(0.418)	(0.745)	(0.511)	(0.486)	(0.763)	(0.572)
Other not born in HH	-0.389	drop	-0.242	-0.655	drop	-0.434	-1.038**	drop	-0.915
	(0.443)		(0.476)	(0.472)		(0.517)	(0.515)		(0.572)
Age	0.175***	0.0653	0.225***	0.172***	0.0453	0.235***	0.179***	0.0381	0.241***
	(0.0217)	(0.0403)	(0.0252)	(0.0324)	(0.0645)	(0.0389)	(0.0385)	(0.0739)	(0.0473)
Male	-1.182***			-1.225***			-1.602***		
	(0.179)			(0.295)			(0.357)		
Father ever enrolled in French school	-0.494***	-1.322***	-0.342	-0.643***	-1.141*	-0.546*	-0.617**	-1.945**	-0.437
	(0.186)	(0.495)	(0.210)	(0.245)	(0.616)	(0.286)	(0.294)	(0.951)	(0.357)
Mother ever enrolled in French school	-0.566**	0.244	-0.809***	-0.637**	-0.536	-0.640*	-0.172	1.408***	-0.522
	(0.253)	(0.453)	(0.274)	(0.308)	(0.803)	(0.365)	(0.334)	(0.536)	(0.417)
Father farmer	0.378*	0.514	0.315	0.396	0.154	0.526	0.891***	1.351	0.770**
	(0.207)	(0.407)	(0.239)	(0.304)	(0.658)	(0.353)	(0.322)	(0.896)	(0.350)
Father inactive	0.111	0.276	0.0786	-0.226	-0.746	-0.0265	0.438	0.871	0.393
	(0.225)	(0.439)	(0.261)	(0.371)	(0.817)	(0.403)	(0.450)	(1.149)	(0.504)
Mother farmer	-0.409*	-0.233	-0.550*	-0.458	0.232	-0.838*	-0.455	0.354	-0.704
	(0.244)	(0.411)	(0.299)	(0.365)	(0.674)	(0.439)	(0.389)	(0.770)	(0.471)
Mother inactive	-0.162	-0.185	-0.180	0.0142	0.305	-0.181	0.0754	0.244	0.0201
	(0.166)	(0.321)	(0.195)	(0.235)	(0.499)	(0.301)	(0.278)	(0.607)	(0.337)
Rural	0.426**	1.278**	0.222	0.482	0.754	0.384	0.332	0.907	0.238
	(0.197)	(0.546)	(0.203)	(0.295)	(0.754)	(0.286)	(0.285)	(0.734)	(0.325)
Cell head is HH head	-0.225	-0.265	-0.201	-0.239	-0.508	-0.163	0.0170	0.0919	0.00747
	(0.186)	(0.392)	(0.211)	(0.269)	(0.463)	(0.315)	(0.288)	(0.656)	(0.319)
Constant	-3.715***	-4.191***	-4.234***	-3.408***	-3.023**	-4.252***	-3.629***	-4.347***	-4.301***
	(0.352)	(0.837)	(0.396)	(0.592)	(1.360)	(0.640)	(0.613)	(1.074)	(0.767)
Observations	2,589	1,204	1,360	1,014	452	537	763	324	414

Notes: Sample includes children between 6 and 18, not married and not double orphans (children fostered out excluded). Logit regression on the probability of doing more than 28 hours a week of domestic work. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. FI stands for fostered in children, BHH stands for biological children of hosting households and BSH for biological children of sending households.

In a fairly natural way, most these estimations point to the fact that children born in the household are equally treated with respect to labour, whether or not their parents are present in the household.

6. CONCLUSION

This paper shows that fostering situations are vastly heterogenous and no single model can account for the variety of cases, whether it presents fostering as disguised child labour or as a way to invest in a given child's human capital.

The first point to underline is that households and individuals who engage in fostering are self-selected. Foster boys seem to be in general more educated than their biological siblings to start with and are sent to households who on average have a higher proclivity for education than non-host households. Foster girls, on the other hand, seem to be more often sent to households where children undertake more domestic work. In both cases, it is noticeable that foster children are in general treated on a fair basis relative to their host siblings: boys go to school as much as other boys in host households and foster girls do not have heavier workload than girls in host households.

Clearly, our results cannot speak to the existence of cases of abuse. They only suggest that such cases are more likely to be the exception than the rule in the fostering practice.

A number of children live in host households without having been formally fostered to them. They differ in particular in that they are much more likely than fostered children to have been born in the household and left there by their parents. They live more often with their maternal grandmother, suggesting that their mother gave birth to them and left some times later, maybe in order to (re)marry. They also appear to be less likely than other children in the household (including formally fostered children) to be engaged in economic work. This suggests in an interesting way that there is some informational content in the fact that the household formally declared a given hosted child as fostered rather than not.

The findings support several hypotheses regarding the fostering motives and do not allow to single out any one in particular: the education motive seems to be very present in particular for boys; the "shock" motive cannot be ruled out (migration, locust, shielding of education) nor can the idea that the need for domestic work prompts some households to host foster girls or that fostering helps to correct for gender imbalance within the group of siblings.

While we are not sure whether a child would have fared better, had he stayed with his biological parents, we do not uncover any evidence pointing to particularly negative outcomes for fostered children, be it compared to children in the households hosting them or in the households they left. This is somewhat good news for the design of policy interventions: it seems that there is no need for a specific targeting of foster children, which would be very demanding in terms of data collection and very costly to maintain. Instead, policies that target those households that may need a lot of domestic work or broader policies that at least ensure that domestic work does not come at the expense of schooling, should also be beneficial to foster children.

REFERENCES

Ainsworth, M. (1996). Economic aspects of child fostering in Cote d'Ivoire. *Research in Population Economics, 8*, 25-62.

Akresh, R. (2004). *Adjusting Household Structure: School Enrollment Impacts of Child Fostering in Burkina Faso*. IZA discussion paper N°1379, Institute for the Study of Labor, Bonn.

Akresh, R. (2009). Flexibility of household structure: Child fostering decisions in Burkina Faso. *Journal of Human Resources, 44*, 976-997.

Alber, (2003). Denying biological parenthood : child fosterage in northern Benin, *Ethnos: Journal of Anthropology, 68*, 487-506.

Alber, (2004). Grandparents as foster-parents : transformation in foster relations between grandparents and grandchildren in northern Benin. *Africa*, *74*, 28-46

Bledsoe C. H., D. C. Ewbank, U. C. Isiugo-Abanihe. (1988). The effect of child fostering on feeding practices and access to health services in rural Sierra Leone. *Social Science & Medicine, 27*, 627-636.

Bledsoe, C. and U. Isiugo-Abanihe. (1989). Strategies of child fosterage among Mende grannies in Sierra Leone. in Ron Lesthaeghe (Ed.) *Reproduction and Social Organization in Sub-Saharan Africa.* (pp. 442-474). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bledsoe, C. (1990a). No success without struggle: Social mobility and hardship for foster children in Sierra Leone. *Man. 25*, 70–88.

Bledsoe, C. (1990b). Transformations in Sub-Saharan African Marriage and Fertility. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *510*, 115-125.

Castle, S.E. (1995). Child fostering and children's nutritional outcomes in rural Mali: the role of female status in directing child transfers, *Social Science Medicine, 40*, 679-93.

Coppoletta R., P. De Vreyer, S. Lambert and A. Safir (2011). The long-term impact of child fostering in Senegal: Adults fostered in their childhood, *mimeo*. Paris School of Economics, Paris..

De Vreyer, P., S. Lambert, A. Safir, and M. Sylla. (2008). Pauvreté et structure familiale: Pourquoi une nouvelle enquête? *StatEco, 102*, 5-20.

Goody, E. N. (1978). Some theoretical and empirical aspects of parenthood in West Africa. In C. Oppong et al., (Eds.), *Marriage, fertility and parenthood in West Africa* (pp. 222-272). Camberra: the Australian National University Press.

Goody, E. N. (1982). *Parenthood and Social Reproduction: Fostering and occupational Roles in West Africa*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge..

Government of Senegal (2013). National Strategy for Economic and Social Development 2013-2017, Dakar, Senegal.

Isiugo-Abanihe, U.C. (1985). Child fosterage in West Africa. *Population and Development Review*, *11*, 53-74.

Marazyan, K. (2013a). An analysis of foster-children's educational outcomes when child fostering is motivated by norms: the case of Cameroon. *Mimeo.* Paris School of Economics, Paris, France.

Marazyan, K. (2013b). Resource allocation in non-traditional sibships: an empirical investigation for Senegal. *mimeo,* Paris School of Economics, Paris..

Notermans, C. (1999). Fosterage in Cameroon: a different social construction of motherhood.

mimeo, Dept. of Cultural Anthropology/Centre for Womens Studies, University of Nijmegen, Netherlands.

Notermans, C. (2008). The Emotional World of Kinship: Children's experiences of fosterage in East Cameroon, *Childhood, 15*(3), 355-377.

Oppong, C and W. Bleek. (1982). Economic models and having children: some evidence from Kwahu, Ghana. *Journal of the International African Institute*, *52*, 15-33.

Pilon, M. (1992). Confiage et scolarisation en Afrique de l'ouest, un état de la connaissance. background paper for *The 2003 EFA Monitoring Report.* UNESCO, Paris.

Sene, P. I. S. and R. Pigois. (2012). Situation des enfants. In*: Enquête Démographique et de Santé à Indicateurs Multiples au Sénégal (EDS-MICS) 2010-2011* (pp.303-314). Maryland, USA: Agence Nationale de la Statistique et de la Démographie (ANSD) [Sénégal] and ICF International.

UNICEF (1999). *Child domestic work*. Innocenti Digest 5, Unicef International Child Development Center, Florence, Italy.

UNDP (2013). *Human Development report 2013, The Rise of the South: Human Progress in a Diverse World*, United Nations Development Programme, New York, NY 10017, USA

Vandermeersch, C. (2002). Child fostering under six in Senegal 1992-1993. *Population*, *57*, 659-685.

Verhoef, H. (2005). A Child Has Many Mothers: Views of Child Fostering in Northwestern Cameroon. *Childhood, 12*, 369–390.

Verhoef, H. and G. Morelli, (2007). A Child is a child: fostering experiences in Northwestern Cameroon. *Ethos*, *35*, 33–64.