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Background

Concern for child well-being:
- Fundamental rights and directive principles of state policy.

Integrated Child Protection Scheme:
- Protection of child rights
- Best interest of the child
  - Punitive measures against perpetrators of abuse and crime against children
  - Rehabilitation of children in need of care
  - Regulatory framework to create a protective environment
  - Provision of child friendly services
Background

Protecting child rights is a major development challenge:
- Children are not full economic and social agents.
- They are particularly vulnerable to the deprivation of their basic needs.
- Exposure to household, economic, social, and cultural vulnerabilities is high.
- Heavy dependence on public provision of goods and services.
- Failure to protect child rights contributes to child poverty.

Deprivation is multidimensional:
- Well-being is a multidimensional concept.
- A child may be deprived in more than one dimensions of well-being.
- Limited effort to highlight deprivation through multidimensional perspective.
Child Deprivation

Distinct domains of deprivation.

A child is counted as deprived in one or more domains depending on the number and type of deprivation it experiences.

Different domains have different importance at different ages of the childhood period.

Interventions to address domain-specific concerns are essentially different.

Five domains of child well-being:

1) Survival; 2) Growth; 3) Development; 4) Protection; 5) Environment
Objectives

Measurement of child deprivation in India and states through a multidimensional perspective.

Focus on five domains of child well-being:
- Survival
- Growth
- Development
- Protection
- Environment.

Analysis of regional, residential and social class disparities in child deprivation.
Analytical Strategy

Measure child well-being in terms of outcomes of domain-specific interventions.

Deprivation is measured in terms of coverage of services and access to facilities.

Measure deprivation separately in the five domains of child well-being.

Combine domain-specific deprivation index into one, single index of child deprivation.

The approach reflects the whole child perspective of child deprivation.
Indicators

1.1 Women who did not receive full antenatal care during their last pregnancy ($S_1$).
1.2 Newborn without first check up within 24 hours of birth/discharge ($S_2$).
1.3 Newborn who weighed less than 2.5 Kg at birth ($S_3$).
1.4 Children (12-23 months) not fully immunised ($S_4$).
2.1 Children (0-23 months) not initiated breast feeding within 1 hour of birth ($G_1$).
2.2 Children (0-59 months) who are stunted ($G_2$).
2.3 Children (0-59 months) who are wasted ($G_3$)
3.1 Children (3-6 years) not attending preschool education ($D_1$)
4.1 Girls (10-19 years) ever married ($P_1$)
5.1 Households practising open defecation ($E_1$)
Child Deprivation Index

\[ SDI = \frac{3}{4} \left( S_1^3 + S_2^3 + S_3^3 + S_4^3 \right) \]

\[ GDI = \frac{3}{3} \left( G_1^3 + G_2^3 + G_3^3 \right) \]

\[ DDI = D_1 \]

\[ PDI = P_1 \]

\[ EDI = E_1 \]

\[ CDI = \frac{3}{5} \left( SDI^3 + GDI^3 + DDI^3 + PDI^3 + EDI^3 \right) \]
RSoC 2013-14

Conducted by the Government of India, Ministry of Women and Child Development.

It is the latest survey to strengthen the data system on children and women in India.

Covered 105,843 households in 29 states.

Union Territories have not been covered.

Key indicators reflecting the situation of children at national and state level have been released as national and state fact sheets.

These fact sheets constitute the basis for the present analysis.
Child Deprivation Index (CDI)
Survival Deprivation Index (SDI)
Growth Deprivation Index (GDI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>OB</th>
<th>OT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development Deprivation Index (DDI)
Protection Deprivation Index (PDI)
Environment Deprivation Index (EDI)

Overall:
- Total: 0.455
- Rural: 0.616
- Urban: 0.128

Caste-wise:
- SC: 0.581
- ST: 0.689
- OB: 0.187
- OT: 0.280
Child Deprivation in States

CDI is the lowest in Kerala (0.256) but the highest in Nagaland (0.598).

CDI is also low in Goa, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh.

CDI is at least 0.500 in Jharkhand, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Odisha and Rajasthan in addition to Nagaland.

In 14 states, CDI ranges between 0.400-0.500.

In 7 states, CDI ranges between 0.300-0.400.

There is no state where child deprivation is either very high or extreme.
Child Deprivation in States
Child Deprivation in States
Child Deprivation in States
Child Deprivation in States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
<th>Extreme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residence Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDI</th>
<th>SDI</th>
<th>GDI</th>
<th>DDI</th>
<th>PDI</th>
<th>EDI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart illustrates the inequality measures for different types of residence.
Social Class Inequality

CDI: 0.207
SDI: 0.063
GDI: 0.106
DDI: 0.123
PDI: 0.189
EDI: 0.615
Deprivation Inequality in States
Conclusions

Child deprivation remains quite pervasive and varies widely across states.

Deprivation in different domains is different.

Residence and social class inequalities are very strong.

There is no universally applicable prescription.

Decentralised approach is needed. Every state has its own concern.

It is important to address the local context of child well-being.
Conclusions

An integrated approach is needed.

The ICDS need to be reinvigorated to cover the period from conception to 18 years of age.

There is a need to evolve a system to regularly measure and monitor child deprivation through multi-dimensional perspective.

Child deprivation is the result of both factors exogenous and factors endogenous to child well-being efforts.

Little is currently known about factors endogenous to child well-being efforts.

The influence of these factors can be minimized by improving the needs effectiveness and capacity efficiency.
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