

Report

Need Assessment for Creches and Child Care Services

Commissioned by the
Ministry for Women and Child Development,
Government of India

Dr. Kumud Sharma, Project Director, Honorary
Dr. Vasanthi Raman, Project Coordinator
with
Ms. Pooja Dhawan, Research officer

Conducted by
Forum for Creches and Child Care Services(FORCES)
and Centre for Women's Development Studies (CWDS)

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Preface and Acknowledgements | 01 |
| Key Findings of the Study | 03 |
| 1. Introduction | 11 |
| 2. Demographic and Social Profile of Respondents..... | 18 |
| 3. Work, Employment Status and Economic Profile of Respondents' Households | 26 |
| 4. Mothers and Child Care | 37 |
| 5. Awareness and Use of Existing Schemes | 52 |
| 6. Case Studies of SEWA and Mobile Crèches | 72 |
| 7. Recommendations..... | 85 |
| Appendices | |
| Recent Policy Initiatives | 89 |
| Appendices II, III and IV -- Tables | 95 |

Preface and Acknowledgements

The study was undertaken in April 2011 with the support of the Ministry of Women and Child Development, Government of India. The aim of the study was to do a Need Assessment of crèches and Child Care Services. At the time the study was sanctioned, there was already a discussion within the government about exploring the possibility of Anganwadi Centres cum Crèches. In a sense, this gave the study a sharper focus.

The study was undertaken by the Forum for crèches and Child Care Services (FORCES) and the Centre for Women's Development Studies (CWDS) where the secretariat is currently located. The project team consisted of Dr. Kumud Sharma, Chairperson, CWDS and Project Director (Honorary), Vasanthi Raman, Project Coordinator and Visiting Fellow, CWDS and Pooja Dhawan, Research Officer.

In order to conduct the study across six states, we had six state level partners. Our state level partners were United Forum for Justice (Assam), Mobile crèches (Delhi), Mahila Chetna Manch (Madhya Pradesh), Institute for Socio-Economic Development (Orissa), Seva Mandir (Rajasthan) and the Gandhian Institute of Studies Trust (Uttar Pradesh).

There was an advisory team which consisted of C.P. Sujaya, Dr. Neetha, Dr. Mridula Bajaj, Devika Singh, Dr. Rajni Palriwala, and Savitri Ray, with whom two meetings were held to discuss the conduct of the project. The inputs of the team were particularly valuable in working out the contours of the study and the questions to be addressed.

We would like to record our appreciation of our state level partner organisations for having directed and conducted the field work in these states often under difficult conditions, when the weather was unsuitable due to heavy rains, requiring repeated visits to the field sites. We would particularly like to thank our team of field investigators who did the field work despite heavy odds.

The data entry, processing, and tabulation was done by Mahila Chetna Manch. We would particularly like to thank Mr. M.L.Sharma and his team from Mahila Chetna Manch for patiently attending to many requests and queries regarding data entry and tabulation.

The many discussions that have taken place over the last four to five years within the FORCES network have contributed in very important ways to our understanding of many issues related to the present study.

However, there have been important policy changes initiated by the Government of India within three months of the completion of the study and presentation of the draft report at a national consultation on July 30th 2012.

The document titled " ICDS Mission : Broad Framework of Implementation" (October 2012) envisages a series of programmatic , management and institutional reforms, including changes in norms along with putting the ICDS in a Mission Mode for the purpose of continued implementation of the ICDS scheme in the Twelfth Plan period. We have included a brief discussion of this in Annexure 1 titled: Recent Policy Initiatives.

We would like to thank the staff at CWDS for always attending to so many requests which made our task so much easier. A special word of thanks to Sundaresh, first for helping out with computer related work at any time it was needed and more specifically for helping format the text and getting it ready for printing. We also appreciate the technical assistance of Sandeep Mishra who readily helped in translating many of our tables into diagrams and charts, and for giving valuable suggestions.

Finally, a special mention of Savitri Ray, National Coordinator, FORCES and Awdesh Yadav, Assistant Coordinator who have always been supportive.

Kumud Sharma
Chairperson
CWDS and Project Director

Vasanthi Raman
Project Coordinator
Visiting Fellow, CWDS (2011-2012)
Convenor, FORCES

Date: December 2013

KEY FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Purpose of Study: Need Assessment of Crèches and Child Care Services across Six States, April 2011- June 2012, Commissioned by the Ministry of Women and Child Development, Government of India, Conducted by FORCES-CWDS

States Studied: Assam, Delhi, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh. Twelve districts covered across the six states, with two districts in each state. Two blocks in each district with at least 2 or 3 villages in each block and in the case of Delhi, it would be municipal wards.

Methodology: The questionnaire was supplemented by FGDs and interviews. Selection of the respondents: Respondents were selected from across occupational categories. The respondents were mothers of children under six.

The focus of the study was two-fold: the functioning of the ICDS centres along with the growing need for crèches and child care services for the vast majority of women and families who can no longer fulfil the child care needs. The two problems are linked particularly if the possibility of ICDS centres functioning as crèches were to be explored. We view the provision of crèches and day care as part of an integral whole wherein the needs for care of the young child and the mother/worker are addressed. Thus the gender dimensions of the project have far reaching implications.

The study took as its starting point the diversity of the situations of mothers and families, specifically children across the diverse regions and socio-economic and cultural niches of the country. Thus six states were selected, the six states being Assam, Delhi, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh. Different occupational categories were also another important criterion.

The final sample of 2880 households/mothers with children below the age of six was selected from among seven occupational categories, i.e. Agricultural labourers, home-based artisans and workers, brick kiln workers, construction workers, domestic workers, fishing communities and tea plantation workers. A small sample of 120 Anganwadi Workers was also part of the study.

FINDINGS

The socio-economic profile of respondents/mothers:

1. Twenty five per cent of our sample of respondents/mothers consisted of women who were agricultural labourers, 15% home-based artisans and workers, 13.8% brick kiln workers, 26.7% construction workers, 6.8% domestic workers, 6.2% representing fishing and 6.18% tea plantation workers. The overwhelming majority of our respondents were Hindus (86.4%) with 12.2% being Muslims and 1.2% being Christian. A miniscule percentage of 0.1% were categorised as 'others', i.e. belonging to other religious categories. A significant percentage of our respondents were

Scheduled Castes (31.7%) and Scheduled Tribes (25.2%) and Other Backward Classes (30.9%), constituting an overwhelming majority of our sampled population. The category of 'others' (i.e. general or upper castes) constituted 12.1 % of our sample. The percentages that have been derived from our sample broadly reflect the social composition of Indian society.

2. Out of a total child population of 4839 children in the 0-6 age group, 52.8% are boys and 47.2% are girls. This uneven ratio of boys to girls is observed across all the states with the exception of Orissa where there is a slightly higher percentage of girls (50.6%) to boys (49.4%).
3. Out of the 2880 households, 66.6% have between 4 -6 members, while 17.2% have between 7-9 members.
4. Seventy-seven per cent of respondents across states and occupational categories reported that their families were nuclear families with only 23% being reported as joint families.
5. Regarding the status of employment, about 69.6% of the respondents is that of paid casual labour with another 14.9% being paid contract labour. There is another 5.7% who are paid regular labour, 6% who have self owned businesses and 0.1% who are employers; another 1.7% are own account workers and 1.7% are unpaid helpers.
6. If one were to compare the status of employment of the respondent with that of the head of the household/spouse, one can note certain differences. Thus, 60.1% of the heads of the household/spouse are employed as paid casual labour, with another 19.9% being paid contract labour. The comparable figures for the status of employment of the respondent are 69.6% paid casual labour with 14.9% being paid contract labour. Needless to say, there is a gendering of employment patterns, which reflects the vulnerability of women even in the midst of an overall vulnerability of the entire household. This accounts for the differences in the status of the respondent and that of the spouse/head of household.
7. The overwhelming majority of our respondents (81.9%) get payment on a piece rated basis with only 17.7% being paid on a time rated basis. Similarly a comparison between the wage payment system prevalent among the respondents and that among the spouse/head of household shows that 74.8% are piece rated with another 25.2% being time rated. Here too one can note the gender discriminatory patterns operative, with a significantly higher percentage of women being paid on a piece rated basis.
8. A perusal of the data regarding the number of days of employment of respondents shows that 48.9% of agricultural labourers get employment for a period of 4 to 6 months in a year, with another 18.7% getting employment only for 1 to 3 months; about 26.4% get employment for 7 to 9 months and a small percentage of 4.4% for about 10-12 months.
9. A large majority of households (69.7%) across states are involved in a single occupation. However, there are significant variations at the state level, with Rajasthan having 92%, Assam 53% and UP 34% respondents being involved in multiple occupations.

10. Twenty five per cent of our respondents get paid on a daily basis, with another 31.4% getting paid on a weekly basis, 17.6% on a fortnightly basis and only 16.4 on a monthly basis.
11. A look at the annual household income across states and occupations reveals that 5% of the sampled households fall in the category of households earning less than Rs, 10,000. With UP having 17.7% of such households in its sample followed by Assam with 5.8%. (The monthly income totals to a maximum of Rs. 833) There are 35% of households the annual income of which are between Rs. 10,000 and Rs. 20,000, with Assam having 78.9% of such households in its sample followed by UP with 52.3%. (The monthly income totals to a maximum of Rs. 1666) Households having an annual income of between Rs. 20,000 and 40,000 constitute 40.9% of the sampled households. There are 18.9% of households having an annual income of Rs. 40,000 and above.
12. Approximately 34% of our respondents have BPL cards and 21.8% have APL cards with 5.2% having AAY cards. Nearly 37% of respondents have no card at all.

Prevalent Child Care Patterns

13. Across all occupational categories, in 80% of the cases, the mother is the sole caregiver for children in the age group of 0-6 months. Interestingly, here too there are variations across occupations, with the percentages ranging from 100% for tea plantation workers and 40% for the domestic workers, 50% for the fishing community and 56.3% for the brick kiln workers. Amongst agricultural labourers and home-based artisans, the percentages rise upto 90% and 93.4% respectively.

The percentage of cases where the mother is the sole care giver falls in the age group 6 months – 3 years to 61.3%. There are 4.6% children involved in child care in this age group and when children are helped by others, the percentage goes up to 7.5%. In this age group, the role of other members of the household and relatives increases in child care. In a miniscule percentage of the cases (0.6%), crèches are taken to recourse to and this can largely be found among the domestic workers and the construction workers.

In the age group 3-6 years, the percentage of cases where the mother is the sole caregiver goes down even further to 49.2% and the role of others increases. The occupation-based variation also reflects this with the figures for the fishing community actually going down to 0.6% and the mother with others goes upto 48%, indicating that the mother's role is negligible and supplemented a great deal by extended kin network. However, the situation with the tea plantation has not changed very much with 95% mothers still being solely in charge of child care, also indicative of both the work situation wherein both parents are generally working in the tea gardens and ironically no availability of crèches where it is supposed to be provided by the employer.

The overall percentage of children involved in child care is around 5.9% across all occupational categories. However, this percentage goes up to 19.1% among domestic workers, around 7% among construction workers, home-based artisans, and brick kiln workers, while it is 3.1% for agricultural labourers.

14. Sibling Care

There are a total of 484 children who are involved in care of their younger siblings. Contrary to popular perception, it is not girls alone who are involved in child care and there is a significant percentage of boys who are also involved in child care.

15. Child Care Patterns: Variations across Family Type

There is a distinct variation across family type regarding child care that is visible from the data. In the age group 0-6 months, the role of the mother as sole giver in nuclear families is higher than that of mothers in extended families. There is a slightly higher percentage of children involved in child care along with members in another household. In extended families, there is a greater role for other members in the household and lesser dependence on children.

The proportion of dependence on other members of the household, children (in extended families) and children and members in another household, neighbours, (in nuclear families) varies as the child grows up. In the age group, 3-6 years, the proportion of children involved in child care increases to 13.7% in nuclear families and 7.8% in extended families.

The increasing nuclearisation has meant that the burden of care falls on the mother or to a lesser extent on other children at times when mothers cannot afford to be mothers alone but have to work to earn and contribute to already depleted family incomes.

14. Maternity Leave

Across states and occupational categories only 5.9% of respondents were entitled to maternity leave. The bulk of those entitled to maternity leave are tea plantation workers in Assam and they constitute 27.1% of Assam's state sample. There is a small sprinkling of brick kiln workers, mainly in MP (7.3%), agricultural workers (3.6%) and construction workers (1.8%)

15. Combining Work and Child Care.

The overwhelming majority of respondents (87%) across states stated that they find it difficult to work and take care of the child because of lack of time, inability to work properly and that children remained unsafe and neglected.

16. Need for Crèches

Ninety seven percent of the respondents stated that they would use a crèche if it was made available. The preference was for the crèche to remain open for at least 8 to 9 hours and/or to coincide with working hours of the mother. The large majority of our respondents, 76.6% would prefer it near the home while a not insignificant 19.9% would prefer it near the workplace. This is not surprising given the nature of our sample. The overwhelming majority of tea plantation workers (84.3%) would prefer it near the workplace. A sizeable percentage of brick kiln workers (28.8%) would also like it near the workplace, as also 22.8% of construction workers and about 15. % of agricultural labourers as well.

17. Preferred Child Care Arrangement across Occupational Categories

The overall figures show that 69.4% would prefer a full time crèche, while another 16% would prefer an AWC and 13.3% would prefer child care at home.

The preference for full time crèches ranges from a lower percentage of 52.3% among agricultural labourers to a high percentage 90.9% among domestic workers and 87.6% among the tea plantation workers. The preference for full time crèches is about 79% among home based artisans and 76.7% among construction workers and 61. 5% among brick kiln workers.

18. Use of Anganwadi Centres

Across the six states, 55.9% of respondents and/or their children use the AWC while 44.1% of respondents do not use it.

The state-wise variations show that the use of the AWC is highest in Orissa with 99.6% of respondents and/or children using it, followed by MP (86.3%). The percentage of respondents in Assam using the AWC is 48.9%, UP 45.4%; the poorest use of the AWC is shown in Delhi and Rajasthan's use, i.e. 26.3% and 19.5%.

The percentage of all children in the 0-6 age group across six states using the AWC is 38.20%. The percentages for children 0-3 years is 32.70% while that for the 3-6 age category is 40.70% .

If one to peruse the state level data, the highest percentage for use by children in the 0-3 years category is 79.20% by Orissa and 56.90% by MP, followed 28% in Assam. The poorest usage of the services is in Rajasthan (1.80%), while Delhi is at 14.90% and UP is at 11.80%.

The state level data for the use of services by the 3-6 age group suggests that there is a greater usage of services by this age group even at the state level. Expectedly, in Orissa the usage goes upto 84.60 % followed by MP with 60%, Assam with 34.20%,

UP with 31.80%, Delhi with 14.10%. Rajasthan is still the lowest with a percentage of 3.10%

One of the most important reasons given by the respondents for the non-use of the AWC is that it was far from their home. Thirty one percent of respondents cited this as a singular reason for not using it. In Rajasthan, 58% of respondents and 27.7% in UP cited this as the most important reason for non-use of the AWC.

Other reasons cited for non-use included the poor quality of the services, work schedule not permitting the use of the AWC.

19. Availability of Services at the AWC.

The respondents stated that toilet facilities, water supply and electricity were poor. Take Home Rations (THR) and Supplementary Nutrition (SNP) as also growth monitoring and the educational component were a weak aspect of the programme across the six states. But on both these counts, the performance of Madhya Pradesh and Orissa was far above that of the other states, with Delhi and Rajasthan faring the poorest. It would seem that immunisation and provision of food were the most used aspects of the ICDS programme.

20. Suggestions for better functioning of AWCs

There were a range of suggestions which are given below. The percentages mentioned relate to the responses that were given by the respondents.

Improved Quality and regular Availability of SNP -- 88.2%
Improved Non-Formal Pre-School Education – 93.6%
Improved Infrastructure with Toilet facilities -- 93.3%
Increase of number of workers – 85.5%
Awareness Generation through Regular Mothers' Meetings – 91.6%
Regular Presence of AWW and AWH – 91.4%
Safe Drinking water – 86.9%
Regular Weighing and Provision of basic medicines – 90.1%
AWC should be in the locality and be accessible – 76.2%
Workers language should be the same as that of the children – 71.6%

21. Anganwadi Worker

The overwhelming majority of the AWWs were Hindus (90.8%) and Muslims were 7.5%. The caste profile shows that 19.2% were Scheduled Castes (SC), 9.2% were Scheduled Tribes (ST), 40.8% were Other Backward Classes (OBC) and 29.2% of them were entered as General, which would mean upper castes.

A perusal of the educational profile of the AWW s shows that 48.3% had studied between class 10 and 12, 24.6% had done their graduation and about 7.6% were post-graduates, while 13.6% had studied between class5 and 9.

The majority of AWWs (91.5%) had received training while 8.5% had not received any training. Most of the training was induction training (87%). There was no other kind of training.

A significant percentage of 42.4% stated that the working hours of the AWC was 4 hours while another 33.1% stated that it was 5 hours and another 15.3% said that it was 6 hours.

Monthly Honorarium

The majority of the AWWs (52.5%) stated that they received a monthly honorarium between Rs 1500-2000, a smaller percentage (25.4%) received between Rs. 2000-2,500. A miniscule percentage of 1.7% received between Rs. 2500-3000. There was a small percentage of 6.8% who received between 3,500-4000. This latter segment was in Delhi.

Regularity of Honorarium received

There were only 39% who received their honorarium regularly and the majority of 61% did not receive it regularly.

Grievance Redressal System

A majority of the AWWs (58.5%) stated that there was no grievance redressal mechanism while 41.5% stated that there was one.

Numbers of Children Enrolled in the AWC

A significant percentage of the AWW s (46.7%) stated that there 20-40 children enrolled in the AWC, another 16.9% stated that 41-60 children were enrolled and 22.9% stated that 61-80 children were enrolled.

Provision of Take Home Rations

A majority of 52.5% AWWs stated that THR is provided while the response of 47.5% AWWs was in the negative

Provision of Supplementary Nutrition (SNP)

Nearly 77% of the AWWs stated that SNP was provided while 20.3% stated that it was not provided.

One of the reasons cited for the non-provision of SNP by 70.8% of AWWs was delay in supplies while another 16.7% pointed to inadequate supplies, while 4.2% cited a delay in money transfer.

Problems Encountered in the Performance of their Duties

Some of the problems cited by the AWWs encountered in the performance of their duties were: 1) No building of its own; 2) AWCs were far from their homes; 3) a lot of time was taken by maintaining many registers; 4) Parents don't send their children to the AWC; 5) Difficulty in keeping children clean and maintain cleanliness at the AWC.

INTRODUCTION

The study was undertaken at a time when there has been an intense discussion both among government and voluntary organisations and groups of concerned citizens regarding the deplorable plight of young children, which highlighted the unacceptably high levels of malnutrition prevalent among children. The data of NFHS 3 substantiate this.

The situation of children under six has been the subject of policy attention for some time. The Government of India has been seized of the matter since the mid-1970s when the flagship programme of the ICDS was launched and it is unique in that it is perhaps the only state sponsored programme catering to the survival and development needs of children under six and pregnant and lactating mothers. However, despite the State's clearly spelt out priorities in supporting such a major programme, and investment of public resources and its tremendous potential, the outcomes with regard to the situation of children and even mothers is far from satisfactory.

If one were to analyse the broad contours of the economic and social situation in the country particularly since the 1990s, the effects of policy changes have had a far reaching impact on the lives of the vast majority of the working people of the country, with increasing casualisation, depleted employment opportunities, declining livelihood options, sharply falling real incomes, a steep increase in overall inequalities, all leading to an atmosphere of extreme uncertainty and distress.

The impact of this has predictably fallen on the most vulnerable sections of our population, the women and children. The numbers of people in the unorganised sector have for a long time constituted the vast majority of workers, but since the last three decades, these numbers have increased exponentially, with women forming a significant section of the unorganised sector. About 12 crore women are in the workforce and 90% of them are in the unorganised sector. Eighty percent of the female workforce is rural and 75% of them are in agriculture. The overwhelming majority of the female work force are poor agricultural labourers faced with the dual responsibility of somehow eking out a livelihood in increasingly adverse situations and being mothers, home makers and workers as well.

The children, particularly young children upto 6 years, have felt the cumulative impact of the crisis in the most palpable ways, i.e. in the form of high rates of malnutrition and high morbidity and mortality rates specifically among the poorest and most marginalised sections of the population. Given the above backdrop, the need for crèches is a serious issue that needs urgent policy attention. The existing scheme, the Rajiv Gandhi National Crèche Scheme for Children of Working Women (2006) is woefully inadequate catering to only 9 lakh children and the actual reality on the ground regarding the number of crèches under this scheme is even more dismal. The RGNCS caters to the children in the age group of 0-6 years from families of working mothers with a monthly income of less than Rs.12, 000. According to the Five Year Strategic Plan document (2011-2016) of the MWCD, only 22,599 crèches are functional even though the requirement is much higher but no estimates are apparently available.

Thus there are two problems that stare us in the face and need urgent attention: the functioning of the ICDS centres and the growing need for crèches and child care services for the vast majority of women and families who can no longer fulfil child care needs. The two problems are linked particularly if the possibility of ICDS centres functioning as crèches were to be explored. It is necessary to view the provision of crèches and day care as part of an integral whole wherein the needs for care of the young child and the mother/worker are addressed. The underlying gender dimensions have also far reaching implications.

The Backdrop of Policy Initiatives

There have been important policy initiatives from the government and other concerned citizens' groups as well. The Inter-Ministerial Group on Restructuring of ICDS initiated by the Planning Commission has been an important initiative which has attempted to look at the gaps and lacunae in the functioning of the ICDS with suggestions to put the ICDS in a "Mission Mode". There has also been the Prime Minister's Council for India's Nutrition Challenges, a special programme meant to specifically address the issue of malnutrition among children. Over the last five years, the National Rural Health Mission has also been established with a wide network of Accredited Social Health Activists (ASHAs). Under this scheme, Nutrition Rehabilitation Centres (NRC) have also been set up with the express purpose of treating children with Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM). As of now a total of 657 NRCs are functioning across 12 states.

More recently, in September 2011, the Report of the Inter- Ministerial Group on ICDS Restructuring is also an important initiative, which has put forth the need for comprehensive programmatic, management and institutional reforms. Apart from the special focus on the under-3s, what is significant is that the report suggests options for flexibility and additional services wherein crèches will be provided in 5% AWCs based on State/District Programme Implementation Plans. Convergence with MNREGA will be strengthened with the aim of supportive child care provisions. An additional Anganwadi worker has also been proposed. The report envisages the AWC as the hub of ECCD services wherein all services for the young child and the mother will converge. The restructuring of ICDS is proposed through what is known as the Mission Mode.

There have been important inputs from citizens groups. The Working Group for Children under Six, has in an important document – Strategies for Children under Six – has come out with concrete recommendations for the 12th Plan. This has followed from the earlier document –Strategies for Children under Six: A Framework for the 11th. Plan, which was a comprehensive one, laying out both an approach as well detailed strategies for children under six. Apart from underlining the critical importance of the first six years of life, especially the first two years which have a lasting impact on the quality of life of a human being, the document emphasises the point that the care of the young child is a social responsibility which cannot be left to the family alone. Social intervention is required to ensure that the needs of child health, child development / education and child nutrition are provided simultaneously in the same system of care. While underlining the interlinked needs of the child, the document also emphasises the need for age specific interventions.

A significant focus of the document is on the issue of nutrition and nutritional needs of children and its inextricable link with the nutritional status of the mother and hence the need for a life-cycle approach to deal with the issue of malnutrition which would tackle both the prevention and the management of malnutrition.

The three essential components of early child care would comprise: 1) A system of food entitlements; 2) A system of child care; and 3) A system of health care.

There have been many debates and discussions around the issue of children under six, and relatedly the functioning of the ICDS, a programme which had visualised an integrated approach.

The Present Study

The main thrust of the present study is the need assessment for crèches and child care services. The question of child care is inextricably linked to the situation of the mother and families. We examine the state of the existing care services, specifically the ICDS, the only programme that is meant to cater to the interlinked needs of the young child and the mother. The study, however, goes beyond viewing the woman as principally a mother and examines the need for care services in a context where the woman as a worker has acquired an increasing predominance in our social landscape in recent times and yet has to fulfil the care-giving needs of a mother as well. Thus the focus of the study is the worker/mother and her needs and requirements as perceived by her and also examining the use of the existing services, specifically the ICDS, the only scheme the purpose of which was to cater to the interlinked needs of the young child and the mother. Another reason why an analysis of the performance of the ICDS in the selected areas was undertaken was also because the possibility of the AWC cum crèche was already being explored by the government.

The Rajiv Gandhi National Crèche Scheme for Children of Working Mothers initiated in 2006 was meant to cater to precisely the needs of working mothers. However, the outreach has been inadequate. According to the Annual Report of the MWCD, 2009-10, 0.08 million children had been reached through 31718 crèches, whereas in 2012, the number of crèches was 22, 599. It needs to be noted that the need for child care services has also been emphasised in the National Policy for Children (1974) as also the National Policy for Children (2013), the National Policy for Education (1986), the National Policy on Early Childhood Care and Education (2013), the National Policy for Empowerment of Women (2001) and the National Plan of Action for Children (2005).

The MWCD's Five Year Strategic Plan 2011-2016 acknowledges that while there were some provisions for crèche and day care facilities for women in the organised sector for which there were various legislations (Factories Act of 1948, Mines Act, 1952, Plantation Act, 1951, Inter-State Migrant Workers Act, 1980 and the MNREGA, 2005, all of which make provision of day care mandatory), the needs of the large section of women in the unorganised sector were unaddressed.

More importantly, recent sample surveys conducted by the MWCD have shown that several of the crèches were almost non-existent and among those that were functioning gaps in provision of SNP, infrastructure, education, timings of crèches were noticed. Reasons identified for lacunae in the scheme were lack of reliable data on working women requiring such services, proper procedures while selecting the location, NGO and crèche worker, inadequacy of infrastructure and low financial grants. (MWCD 2011:89-90).

There were certain assumptions underlying the present study. One important assumption was that the situation of children, women and families varies considerably in the different ecological zones and occupational groups. Thus diversity of locations and varied occupations is something that needs to be factored in so that context sensitive interventions may be explored, while keeping the universalist programmatic imperatives in place. The other important focus of the study is on marginalised sections of our society, i.e. on the scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, and other backward classes and on minorities.

The situation of children, women and families is further compounded by the fact that there is poor access to crèches and day care. This is extremely important for the working women, the young child and particularly the girl child who is most often the care giver thereby sacrificing her own needs and interests for a childhood to fulfil care giving needs of the mother and the family.

Out of the broader category of children under six, the age group of 0-3 is critical since this is the age group where appropriate care or the absence of it would be not only be critical for attaining the developmental milestones, but the absence of appropriate interventions can have long lasting impact on the life of the human being. Much of available data on survival and malnutrition highlights the criticality of this age group. Nine of 15 MDGs also highlight the problems of survival and development in this age group. In this context, the data of the NFHS 3 draw attention to high percentages of anaemia prevalent in the age group of 6 months to 36 months and this is particularly so in the backward states like Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar but also in the state of Punjab. In a state like Madhya Pradesh, the percentage has gone up from 71% to 81% between NFHS 2 and 3. If one were to analyse the high levels of malnutrition of children under the age of three years among the SCs and STs, the situation is even more alarming. Approximately 44% of children of SCs and STs are stunted, while more than 50% of children in this age group are underweight. The condition of the Muslims is not much different in many states.

Thus it would seem that the socio-economically backward states are also those with populations belonging to the most marginalised sections who are in need of urgent attention. Here too, the fact that large numbers of women belonging to these sections are being crushed under the double burden of being mothers and workers can hardly be overemphasised. The disparities even in the more developed states are a cause for concern. A cursory examination of the situation of the young child reveals that children from the SCs and STs and children in the backward regions (and generally the two overlap) need immediate and urgent intervention. Again, the gender dimensions need to be kept in mind. The most vulnerable component of the marginalised population is the young girl child.

Our own observations show that it is in the poorest regions and among the poorest sections that even the little that reaches them in terms of supplementary nutrition is highly valued. The situation of children in the 3-6 age group also calls for intervention, since here too, there seems to have been much neglect, particularly in the area of education. The importance of education and its value has a differentiated response among the community. Among those sections of the community which are not the poorest, there is a greater awareness of the need for pre-school education.

All in all, the diversity in the situation of children does not merely arise out of the different ecological niches but also out of the different locations in the social hierarchy. Therefore the responses to the government programmes also vary.

The present research was envisaged as a first step towards mapping the need for childcare services that can enable informed policy decisions by bridging crucial data gaps on the conditions of women and children particularly in the diverse and varied backward regions of the country. The fact that the present study appears at a time when many important and significant policy initiatives have been taken which coincide with the findings of this study is a cause for satisfaction. Moreover, the ongoing debate and discussions over the last few years both among the government and citizens' initiatives means that the time for the idea has come particularly on the question of crèches and day care for the large numbers of women in the burgeoning informal sector.

Research Questions and Objectives

The research questions comprised of two components: one being the focus on existing schemes such as the ICDS and the RGCS and its outreach and problems in implementation; the second being assessing the mothers' and the community's need for crèches and care services and thereby also exploring the possibility of alternative models such AWC cum Crèches. These questions were to be analysed keeping in mind the diversity of needs based on specific categories of occupations.

The Study Areas and the Rationale for Selection

Six states were selected keeping in mind the different ecological zones in the country, the rationale behind this being that the requirements of mothers/families and specifically children vary according to the different zones that they inhabit, their livelihood patterns and a diversity of socio-cultural practices regarding diet and child care, thereby requiring context specific interventions.

The ecological zones and the states within those zones were:

Ecological Zones and States within those zones:

- Coastal Zone – Orissa
- Plateau Region -- Madhya Pradesh
- Desert Region – Rajasthan

- Plains Areas – Eastern UP
- Special Category – North East – Assam
- Urban Area – Delhi

Different occupations were identified which broadly were representative of different occupations in the overall economy; these, apart from reflecting their geographical spread also reflected the size and importance in the economy. These were: Agricultural Labour, Fishing Communities, Home based Artisans and Workers, Construction Workers, Brick Kiln Workers, Tea Plantation Workers and Domestic Workers.

Methodology

The study adopted a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods, though the structured questionnaire /schedule was the principal tool supplemented by interviews and FGDs.

Determining the sample

The six states were selected keeping in mind the principle of ecological zones, social indicators of backwardness and presence of large sections of marginalised populations, specifically the presence of SCs and STs. Two districts in each state and two blocks in each district were selected on a similar basis. In each block two to three villages were to be selected. In each of the selected villages, households from certain specific occupational categories would be selected on a random basis. Household selection was not only done on the basis of occupations but also on whether the household had children below the age of six. *Thus our sample of households are only those which have children below the age of six.* Occupational categories were distributed across states depending on the salience or predominance of these in each of the states. The total sample size is 2880 households and the working mothers from the different occupation groups were the principal respondents. A small sample of 120 anganwadi workers were also selected on a random basis in order to elicit responses both about the functioning of AWCs as also the challenges they faced in the performance of their duties.

The districts covered are as follows:

| | | |
|----------------|----|--|
| Assam | -- | Dhubri and Jorhat |
| Delhi | -- | South Delhi, Southwest Delhi, West Delhi and Northwest Delhi |
| Madhya Pradesh | -- | Betul and Raisen |
| Orissa | -- | Keonjhar and Puri |
| Rajasthan | -- | Udaipur and Barmer |
| Uttar Pradesh | -- | Ghazipur and Varanasi |

At the field level, it was found that in certain states the number of households in specific occupational groups to be covered had to be expanded to include other occupational groups as well. For example, in Assam when the field work was conducted it was found that the agricultural season was over and agricultural labourers were involved in other occupations. The reality on the ground was that agricultural labourers had to do multiple occupations in

order to earn a livelihood. Thus, they were listed as either domestic workers, brick kiln workers, home-based artisanal workers, while they are also agricultural labourers.

Our main tool was the structured questionnaire, which was supplemented by Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with groups of mothers and other members of the community, including some with CDPOs, AWWs and some AWHs as well. Some teachers and Panchayat members were also interviewed.


Our focus was on the use of existing services and the perceptions and needs of the mothers, but we also attempted to look at the use of other supplementary schemes like that the use of the Public Distribution System (PDS), access to a functional PHC etc. along with the food and diets of the respondents and the children so as to get a integrated picture of our respondents' lives and their existential situation.

Finally, on the basis of our study we have put forth a certain set of recommendations which we thought would feed into the new policy initiatives that were already being planned.

II

DEMOGRAPHIC AND SOCIAL PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

The Profile of Respondents across States and Occupational Categories




Our total sample of respondents/mothers was 2880.

Twenty five per cent of our sample of respondents /mothers consisted of women who were agricultural labourers, 15% home-based artisans and workers, 13.8% brick kiln workers, 26.7% construction workers, 6.8% domestic workers, 6.2% representing the fishing community and 6.18% tea plantation workers. (Table 2.1 in annexure)

Approximately 13.2 % of the total sample comprised of respondents/mothers from Assam, with Delhi comprising 14.9%, MP 16.7%, Orissa 18.4%, Rajasthan 14.9% and UP comprising 21.9% of the total sample of respondents/mothers

A state-wise breakdown of the occupations shows that tea plantation workers comprised 6.1% of the total sample while comprising 46.8% of Assam's sample.

While agricultural labourers constitute 25% of the total sample, in Assam they are just 1.7% of the total sample but are 13.2% of the state's respondents; in MP, they constitute 9% of the total sample but 54% of the state's respondents; in Orissa the percentage is 6.9% of the total sample but 37.7% of the state's respondents; in UP they are 7.3% of the total while constituting 33.4% of the state's respondents.



Home based artisans and workers constitute 15% of the total sample. A state wise breakdown reveals that in Assam, they comprise only 1.6% of the total sample but are 12.6% of the state's respondents; in Delhi, they are just 4.2% of the total but comprise 28.1% of the state's respondents; in MP they are 2.4% of the total but 14.7% of the state sample; in Rajasthan, their percentage is 3.2% of the total but 21.8% of the state sample; in UP, the percentage is 3.5% of the total but 16.3% of the state's sample.

Brick kiln workers are 13.8% of the total sample. In Assam , they are just 1.9% of the total but 14.7% of the state; in MP, the percentage is 5.1% of total and 31% of the state sample; in Rajasthan, the figures are 5.1% and 7.9% ; while in UP the percentage is 5.5% of the total but a substantial 25.2% of the state sample.


Construction workers are 26.7% of the total sample. In Assam they constitute only 0.1% of the total and 1.05% of the state; in Delhi they are just 3.4% but constitute 35.5% of the state's respondents; in Orissa, they are 5.2% of the total while comprising 28.3% of the state sample; in Rajasthan, while comprising only 5.2% of the total, they are 70.2% of the state's sample; in UP they are 5.4% of the of the total and 24.9% of the state's respondents.

Domestic workers constitute 6.8% of the total sample. In Assam, they comprise just 1.5% of the total sample but 11.5% of the state's respondents; in Delhi, they are 5.3% of the total but 35.5% of the state sample.

Fishing community workers are confined to Orissa alone and they constitute 6.2% of the total sample but 33.9% of the state's respondents.


Likewise tea plantation workers are confined to Assam and they represent 6.1% of the total sample but comprise 46.8% of the state sample.

Religious Composition of Respondents/ Mothers



The overwhelming majority of our respondents were Hindus (86.4%) with 12.2% being Muslims and 1.2% being Christian. A miniscule percentage of 0.1% were categorised as 'others'. (Table 2.2 in annexure)


Caste Composition of Respondents/Mothers




A significant percentage of our respondents were Scheduled Castes (31.7%) and Scheduled Tribes (25.2%) and Other Backward Classes (30.9%), constituting an overwhelming majority of our sampled population. The category of 'others' (i.e. general or upper castes) constituted 12.1 % of our sample. (Table2.3 in annexure)

The percentages that have been derived from our sample broadly reflect the social composition of Indian society.

Children in the Category of 0-6 years in Respondents' Households



Out of a total child population of 4839 children in the age group of 0-6 years, 52.8% are boys and 47.2% are girls. This uneven ratio of boys to girls is observed across all the states with the exception of Orissa where there is a slightly higher percentage of girls (50.6%) to boys (49.4%). (Table 2.4 in annexure)



Out of the 2880 households, 66.6% have between 4-6 members, while 17.2% have between 7-9 members. (Table 2.5 in annexure)

Age Profile of Respondents

The overwhelming majority of respondents (86.6%) fall in the age sets of 21 to 35 years. Those in the age group 21 -25 comprise 29.6% of the respondents while 39.3% are those from the age group of 26-30 years. Those in the age group of 31-35 comprise 17.7% of our sample with a small percentage of 4.7% from the age group of 15-20 years. State wise variations show that Assam has 7.6% of respondents in the age group of 15-20 followed by MP with 6.6% and Rajasthan having 4.8%.

Marital Status of Respondents /Mothers across States


The overwhelming majority of our respondents are married (98.1% with negligible percentages for those divorced (0.2%), separated (0.1%), deserted (0.2%). Those who are widowed are 1.1% of the sample.

Age at Marriage of Respondents/Mothers

Across the six states, 16.7% of the marriages of respondents took place between the ages of 10 and 15, while 54.7% took place between 16 and 18 years. About 23.8% of the marriages took place between the ages of 19 and 21.

The state profile shows that Rajasthan has the highest percentages of marriages of respondents between age 10 and 15 (32.4%), with UP having 25.5%, followed by Delhi with 14.3%, MP 13.7%, Assam 7.8% and Orissa with 5.1% of respondents having got married between the age of 10 and 15.

The statewide pattern that emerges reveals that the maximum percentage of marriages of respondents/mothers seem to have taken place between the ages of 16 and 18. The highest percentage is in MP with 63.7% in this age group but with 39.7% at the age of 18. Assam has 51%, Delhi 59.8%, Orissa 39.4%, Rajasthan 55.9% and UP has 59.5% of respondents whose marriages took place between these ages. In Orissa, there is a significant percentage of respondents who married at the of age of 20 (25.1%)




Seventy-seven per cent of respondents across states and occupational categories reported that their families were nuclear families with only 23% being reported as extended families. Nuclearisation has been expectedly highest (89.7%) in Delhi followed by Assam (86.8%) and then by UP (82.5%) and Rajasthan (81.8%) with MP at 75%. Orissa is the state wherein nuclearisation is less pronounced at 47.3% with extended families accounting for 52.7%. An occupation wise breakdown for Orissa reveals that agricultural labour, construction workers and fishing account for this slight edge of the extended family form. Thus it would seem that there are factors that are specific to Orissa that would need to be analysed. (Table 2.6 in Annexure).

An analysis of the variations in occupations shows that nuclearisation is the growing trend, with agricultural labourers and fishing community workers being a little slower than the other occupational groups in the move towards nuclear families, but this trend is restricted to Orissa.

Extent of Female headed Households in Respondent/ Mothers' Households


The majority of the households were male headed (83.6) while there were 16.3% female headed households. MP and Orissa had a significant percentage of female headed households, 11.5% and 12.3% respectively.




Seventy one per cent of the respondents are illiterate. Out of the 29 % who are literate, 59% have studied upto class 5 while another 32% have studied between class 6 and class 9. Literacy levels across occupations shows that the percentage of literacy for agricultural labourers is 38.8%, home-based artisan and workers 43.6%, brick kiln workers is 19.3% , domestic workers 18.2% , construction workers 19.8% , tea plantation workers 20.2% and fishing community 31.1%. (Table 2.7a and 2.7b in Annexure)

School going Children in the age group 6-14 in Respondents' Households disaggregated by Gender across States and Occupational categories.

A perusal of the data shows that overall there is a significant percentage of children in the age group 6-14 going to school. The total for all the states is 75.7% for boys and 73.3% for girls. (Table 2.8a and 2.8b in Annexure).



The state level data shows that Assam is the poorest in this regard with only 54.4% of boys and 48.2% girls going to school; Orissa is a close second in this, with just 66% boys and 53.4% girls. Rajasthan has a high of 87.2% for boys and 83.4% for girls with Delhi interestingly having a lower percentage of school going boys (77.6%) than girls (83.6%). MP also displays a similar trend with 78.3% boys and 82.2% girls going to school.




The occupation wise breakdown shows that while the overall percentage among respondent/mothers' households for both boys and girls is 74.4%, brick kiln workers have the lowest percentages for children going to school, with just 59.3% for boys and 59.9% for girls. The overall percentages are highest for home based artisans and workers (85.9%) and domestic workers (80.6%). Gender based differentials are observed in all occupational categories with domestic workers exhibiting slightly higher percentages for girls than boys. Considering that the bulk of the sample of domestic workers is in Delhi, this is unsurprising.

III


WORK, EMPLOYMENT STATUS AND ECONOMIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS' HOUSEHOLDS WORK AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Nature of Employment of Major Occupation of Respondents/Mothers




About 69.6% of the status of employment of the respondents is that of paid casual labour with another 14.9% being paid contract labour. There is another 5.7% who are paid regular labour. There is about 6% who have self owned businesses and 0.1% who are employers; another 1.7% are own account workers and 1.7% are unpaid helpers. (Table 3.1 in Annexure).

Nature of Employment of Major Occupation of the Head of the Household/Spouse of Respondent




If one were to compare the status of employment of the respondent with that of the head of the household/spouse, one can note certain differences. Thus, 60.1% of the head of the household/spouse are employed as paid casual labour, with another 19.9% being paid contract labour. The comparable figures for the status of employment of the respondent are 69.6% paid casual labour with 14.9% being paid contract labour. There is a gendering of employment patterns, which reflects the vulnerability of women even in the midst of an overall vulnerability of the entire household. This accounts for the differences in the status of the respondent and that of the spouse/head of household. (Table 3.2 in Annexure)

Wage Payment System of Respondents/Mothers



The overwhelming majority of our respondents (81.9%) get payment on a piece rated basis with only 17.7% being paid on a time rated basis. The state wise figures reveal that 100% of our respondents in Rajasthan get paid on a piece rated basis, followed by Delhi with 98%, MP with 85%, UP with 79%, Assam with 77% and Orissa 58%. The time rated mode of payment is highest in Orissa with 41.8%, followed by Assam (22.8%), UP with 20%, MP with about 14.6% and last of all Delhi with only 1.6% of its respondents getting paid on a time rated basis. (Table 3.3 in Annexure).

Wage Payment System of Respondent's Spouse/Head of Household




Similarly, a comparison between the wage payment system prevalent among the respondents and that among the respondent's spouse/head of household shows that 74.8% are piece rated with another 25.2% being time rated.

The significant point that needs to be made is that the differences that do obtain between the economic status of the respondent (mother, woman) and that of the spouse, point to the gendered dimensions of social and economic processes and the acute vulnerability of women. (Table 3.4 in Annexure)

Number of Days of Employment of Respondents /Mothers in a year across States and Occupational Categories

A perusal of the data regarding the number of days of employment of respondents shows that 48.9% of agricultural labourers get employment for a period of 4 to 6 months in a year, with another 18.7% getting employment only for 1 to 3 months; about 26.4% get employment for 7 to 9 months and a small percentage of 4.4% for about 10-12 months.



Amongst the home-based artisans and workers, the picture is slightly better, with about 50% getting employment for about 7 to 9 months and 28.4% for 4 to 6 months; 16.5% get work for 10 to 12 months. This slightly favourable picture is also reflected in the state wise percentages, with 64.07% of home-based artisans and workers of UP getting employment for about 7 to 9 months, 57.4% in Rajasthan, and 56.2% in Assam. (Table 3.5 in Annexure)

Similarly, 48.9% of the brick kiln workers get employment for 7 to 9 months and another 40.2% for about 4 to 6 months and a meagre 6.5% for 10 to 12 months. The state percentages also reflect this with 65.1% of the brick kiln workers of MP getting employment for 7 to 9 months, followed by those of Rajasthan (64.7%), Assam with 41.07% and UP with 33.3%.

The overall picture for construction workers is bleak with 45.9% of the construction workers getting employment only for 4 to 6 months, 18.2% for 1 to 3 months, another 18.3% for 7 to 9 months and with just 16.3% getting employment for 10-12 months.

The state wide picture is not very encouraging with 68.2% of the sample of construction workers in Rajasthan getting employment only for 4 to 6 months. In UP, the figure is 45.2% and in Orissa it is 48%. For those getting employment for 7 to 9 months, the percentage for Delhi is 57. There is a significant percentage of those getting employment for 10 to 12 months: Delhi having 41.02% and Orissa with 32.6 %.

Domestic Workers

This is one category wherein 56.5% of the sample get employment for 10 to 12 months with another 21.7% for 7 to 9 months and 21.2% for 4 to 6 months.

The state wise variation is not that visible since the largest sample of domestic workers was from Delhi and a smaller sample from Assam. A large percentage (68.8%) had employment for 10-12 months, 23.3% for 7 to 9 months. In Assam, predictably, 70.4% of the sample of domestic workers got employment only for 4 to 6 months and 15.9% for 7 to 9 months and a mere 13.6% for 10 to 12 months.

Tea Plantation Workers

Since the sample of tea plantations is restricted to Assam, the overall percentages are the same. Expectedly, a significant percentage (48.3%) had employment for 10 to 12 months, while another 31.4% for 7 to 9 months, another 4.4% for 4 to 6 months and a not insignificant 15.7% had employment for only less than a month. It would seem that those who got employment for 10 to 12 months would be permanent workers in the tea gardens, while the others are most likely engaged in tea plucking on a temporary or casual basis.


Fishing Community Workers

Our sample of those involved in fishery is solely from Orissa. An overwhelming majority of the sample (95%) get employment for 10-12 months while a mere 5 % had employment for 7 to 9 months. This category has been relatively economically stable with slightly higher income levels.

Number of Respondents/Mothers Involved in More than One Occupation across States

A large majority of households (69.7%) across states are involved in a single occupation. However, there are significant exceptions to this overall percentage. Rajasthan has only 8% of respondents who are involved in a single occupation, i.e. 92% are involved in other occupations as well, principally in working on one's own farm (90.4%). Assam is another state where the respondents are involved in more than one occupation (53%). Of those

involved in multiple occupations, 28% are daily wagers working on an irregular basis, 16.5% are working on own farm, and another 4.2% are involved in domestic work. UP has 34% of the respondents in the state who are involved in more than one occupation, Principally, 14% of these are part of the paid labour force, 9.2% are involved in daily wage work on an irregular basis, with another 6% working on own farm. (Table 3.7 in Annexure).



A point that needs to be made is that in an uncertain and unstable employment situation, distinctions between principal and secondary occupations are often blurred and one may merge into another. What needs to be underscored is that those in the vast 'informal' sector are desperately looking for any and all forms of work that will add to their meagre income.

Periodicity of Payment of Respondents/Mothers

Twenty five per cent of our respondents get paid on a daily basis, with another 31.4% getting paid on a weekly basis, 17.6% on a fortnightly basis and only 16.4 on a monthly basis.

Orissa has the largest percentage of respondents (74.1%) who get paid on a daily basis, followed by UP (26.3%) and Assam (26%).

MP has the largest percentage of respondents who get paid on a weekly basis (77.7%), followed by UP (30.9%), Orissa (25.6%), Assam (23%) and Rajasthan (15.3%)

Two states, i.e. Rajasthan and Assam account for a significant percentage of respondents who get paid on a fortnightly basis, 57.9% and 41% respectively. In Rajasthan, it is the construction workers who account for this, while in Assam it is the tea plantation workers where the mode of payment is on a fortnightly basis.

Delhi accounts for the highest percentage of respondents who get paid on a monthly basis (72.3%) followed by UP (16.6%). Domestic workers in Delhi account for this large percentage, while the composition of this component is more mixed in UP.

The periodicity of payment is an important indicator of the stability or otherwise of the employment as well as reflective of the vulnerability of those working or seeking work.

Number of days spent on major occupation in a week by respondent /mother across states

Across the six states, 39.9% spent 6 days, another 28.9% spent 7 days and 16.3% spent 5 days in a week on the major occupation

Number of days spent on major occupation in a week by spouse/head of household of respondent across states

Across the six states, 52.6% spent 6 days while another 32.8% spent 7 days a week. A perusal of the above two tables show that even in the midst of such uncertainty of employment, it would seem that men are better placed in terms of availability of employment.

Number of hours spent in a day on major occupation by respondents/mothers across states

Across the six states, 45.5% of the respondents spent 8 hours a day, 14.1% spend 6 hours, another 9.1% spent 7 hours while 6.4% spent 10 hours a day on the major occupation.

Distance of Work Place from Home of Respondents/Mothers across States


A significant percentage of respondents (45.6%) stated that the distance was less than one kilometre, while 36.2% stated that the distance was between 1 and 3 kilometres and 17.9% stated that it was more than 3 kilometres.

Migration Status of Respondents/Mothers across States and Occupational Categories

Only 13.7% of the respondents across states and occupational categories migrate for work. Across occupational categories, brick kiln workers and construction workers are the most mobile group, with 6.5% of brick kiln workers and 5.2% of construction workers migrating for work.

ECONOMIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS' HOUSEHOLDS

Average Annual Household Income across States and Occupational Categories of Respondents' Households



A look at the annual household income across states and occupations reveals that 5% of the sampled households fall in the category of households earning less than Rs, 10,000, with UP having 17.7% of such households in its sample followed by Assam with 5.8%. (The monthly income totals to a maximum of Rs.833)

The occupational groups which seem most vulnerable are construction workers, brick kiln workers and agricultural labourers, the percentages for these being contributed to by these groups in UP specifically.


There are 35% of households the annual income of which are between Rs. 10,000 and Rs. 20,000, with Assam having 78.9% of such households in its sample followed by UP with 52.3%. The other end of the scale is occupied by Delhi which has only 1.3% such households in its sample. MP, Orissa and Rajasthan have 27%, 35% and 21% respectively. (The monthly income totals to a maximum of Rs.1666).

Households having an annual income of between Rs. 20,000 and 40,000 constitute 40.9% of the sampled households. The monthly income at this income bracket will be a maximum of Rs. 3333 for a household.

Approximately 70% of Rajasthan's sampled households fall in this category followed by 63.3% of MP's sample and 53.2% of Orissa's sample. 28.5% of UP's sample and 14.4 % of Assam's.

On an average, significant percentages of the households of agricultural labourers (46.4%), home based artisans (42.7%), brick kiln workers (44.2%), construction workers (45.7%) and fishing workers (47.2%) fall within this income bracket. Tea plantation workers are one group with only 14% within this bracket since 84% of them earn between Rs. 10,000 and 20,000. The other category that has only 10% of households within this income bracket is that of domestic workers since 70% of households have an income of Rs. 40,000 and above and most of whom are located in Delhi.

There are 18.9% of households having an annual income of Rs. 40,000 and above, with the spread being as follows: 70% consisting of domestic workers, followed by 26% home based artisans and 25.2% construction workers and 16.6 % fish workers and a meagre 7.7% of brick kiln workers and a negligible 1.1% for tea plantation workers. The minimum monthly income would be Rs. 3333 per household. (Table 3.8 in Annexure).



The overwhelming majority of our sampled households (87%) own their house, but if this is viewed alongside the nature of house, one sees the majority of the households have kuchha houses. About 28% own less than one acre of land with another 12.6% owning between 1.1 to 3 acres of land and another miniscule 1.3% owning between 3.1 to 5 acres of land. Livestock animals (milch animals) are owned by another 27.9% and 7.9% own animals used for cultivation i.e. ploughing. Hens and chicks are owned by 11.2%. Vehicles are owned by 4.4% of respondent households and another 2.1% own electrical equipment. A meagre 0.6% own shops and another 0.3 % own factories.

State wise variations show that Rajasthan has a high percentage of respondent households (57.4%) who own less than one acre of land, followed by Assam (42.8%), Delhi (28.8%) and UP with 25%.


Among those households who own between 1.1 to 3 acres of land, Rajasthan has 28.4% followed by Orissa (23.3%) and MP (15%). (Table 3.9 in Annexure)

Number of Respondents' Households Who Have Taken Loans

Thirty five per cent of the total respondents' households have taken loans. In 81% of the cases, the source of the loan is the informal moneylender, in 14% it is the employer; microfinance groups accounted for 19.8% of loans while banks accounted for a mere 5.8%. The purpose of the loans was generally food, medical expenses and marriage, death and related rituals. This totalled to 80.2% with medical expenses amounting to 38.6%. House construction and related expenses amounted to 16.9%, production related expenses to 9.8% and education a mere 2.5%.

The amounts taken were meagre. Fifty percent of the respondent households took loans which amounted to less than Rs. 10,000 while another 34.1% borrowed between Rs. 10,000 and 20,000; in a mere 5.9% of cases the loans were between Rs. 21, 000 to 30,000. The rate of interest varied between 0% (7.2 % of respondents), and 8 to 10% (17.9% of respondents). The vast majority of the respondents (68%) paid an interest at the rate of between 2% and 7%.


Number of respondents' households having BPL/APL/AAY Card



Nearly 37% of respondents have no card at all. The startling figure here is for the state of Delhi where 83% have no card, followed by Assam where 63.6% have no card.


Approximately 34% of our respondents have BPL cards and 21.8% have APL cards with 5.2% having AAY cards. If one peruses state level figures one finds that Orissa has the highest percentage of respondents (71.8%) having BPL cards, followed by Rajasthan having 49% having BPL cards, Assam 31% , MP 24% and UP 22.6%. The highest percentage of AAY cards are found in MP (9.1%), followed by Orissa (8.8%) and UP (8%).(Table 3.10 in Annexure)

Housing and Access to Amenities



A perusal of the table shows that a large majority of respondents own their houses (78.6%) and 7.2% have rented their houses. A small percentage (1.5%) lives in quarters. (This is largely in the case of Assam tea plantations). (Table 3.11 in Annexure)

Type of House of Respondents



The majority of houses owned by respondents are kuccha (67.6%) while another 14.6% are pucca houses, with 15.6% being mixed. (Table 3.12 in Annexure)

Source of Drinking water

Across all the six states, 61.8% of the responses pointed out that a hand pump was the principal source of drinking water, 17% of responses mentioned that they used a tap and another 8.6% used wells, about 4.1% were dependent on tankers, 2% used ponds and 1.9% used tube wells. What is revealing is that 25.8% of Delhi's respondents were dependent on tankers. Respondents used more than one source.

Access to Toilet

Across the states, 77.2% of the respondents stated that they had no access to a toilet, while only 22.8% had access to one. In four of the six states over 90% of the respondents stated that they had no access to a toilet. Delhi was the only state where 66.7% stated that they had access to a toilet. In Assam, 35.8% of the respondents had access to a toilet while 64.2% did not have access to one.

Access to a functional PHC


Across all the states, 49.8% have access to a functional PHC while 50.2% have no access. State-wise variations show that Assam fares best with 80.3% respondents giving a positive response, in Delhi, 57.4% respondents state that they have access, while 42.6% say they have no access; in MP 43.3% have access, while 56.7% have no access, in Orissa, 63.8% access the PHC while Rajasthan and UP have a poor percentage of access, with just 26% and 35.4% respondents stating that they have access to a functional PHC

CHAPTER IV

MOTHERS AND CHILD CARE

Prevalent Child Care Patterns


Child Care Patterns Across Occupations for Respondents' Children in the category 0-6 months



Across all occupational categories, in 80% of the cases, the mother is the sole caregiver for children in this age group. Interestingly, here too there are variations across occupations, with the percentages ranging from 100% for tea plantation workers and 40% for the domestic workers, 50% for the fishing community and 56.3% for the brick kiln workers. Amongst agricultural labourers and home-based artisans, the percentages rise upto 90% and 93.4% respectively.

But if the mother is helped by others, the figure goes up to 84%. In 3.4% of cases, only children are caregivers but in the cases where children are helped by others, the percentage goes upto 5.3%. In about 4.2% of the cases, members of the household are involved in care of the infant. (Table 4.1a in Annexure)

Child Care Patterns across Occupations for Respondents' Children in the Age Group 6 months – 3 Years




The percentage of cases where the mother is the sole care giver falls in this age group to 61.3%. If this figure is combined with others helping mothers, then the percentage goes up to 74.2%. The occupational variations reflect the prevalence perhaps of availability of extended kin networks. Thus among the fishing community, there are only 2.5% cases where the mother is the sole caregiver, and where the mother is helped with others, the percentage goes upto 48.9%. Amongst the home based artisans, the mother is the sole caregiver in 90% of the cases, as also amongst the tea plantation workers, where the percentage is 93.8%.

There are 4.6% children involved in child care in this age group and when children are helped by others, the percentage goes up to 7.5%. Amongst the domestic workers, a larger percentage are involved in child care (22.5%), among the brick kiln workers, it is 7.4% where children are involved in child care. Among agricultural labourers and home-based artisans, there are approximately 3% each where children alone are involved in child care. In this age group, the role of other members of the household and relatives increases in child care. Thus in 10.6% of the cases, other members of the household are involved in child care.

In a miniscule percentage of the cases (0.6%), crèches are taken to recourse to and this can largely be found among the domestic workers and the construction workers. (Table 4.1b in Annexure)

Child Care Patterns across Occupations for Respondents' Children in the Age Category 3-6 years




In this age group, the percentage of cases where the mother is the sole caregiver goes down even further to 49.2% and the role of others increases. Thus mother with others, the percentage goes up to 65.4%. The occupation-based variation also reflects this with the figures for the fishing community actually going down to 0.6% and the mother with others goes up to 48%, indicating that the mother's role is negligible and supplemented a great deal by extended kin network. However, the situation with the tea plantation has not changed very much with 95% mothers still being solely in charge of child care, also indicative of both the work situation wherein both parents are generally working in the tea gardens and ironically no availability of crèches where it is supposed to be provided by the employer. Domestic workers are one category wherein the mother's sole care-giving role has declined to 32.6%. The same can be said of construction workers where the mother's sole care giving role has declined to 38.2%; among brick kiln workers, the percentage is 47.3%. However, once again among both the agricultural labourers and home-based artisans the percentages hover around 73%, indicative of the load of work and care borne by the mothers.

The overall percentage of children involved in child care is around 5.9% across all occupational categories. However, this percentage goes up to 19.1% among domestic workers, around 7% among construction workers, home-based artisans, and brick kiln workers, while it is 3.1% for agricultural labourers.

The role of other members of the household along with others amounts to a percentage of 11.8% across occupational groups. But this figure goes up to 21.3% among the fishing community, once again pointing to the role of the extended family network; for the construction workers, the figure is 15.2%; for the brick kiln workers it is 7.6% and for agricultural labourers it is 11%. The role of crèches for child care overall is a miniscule 0.7%. The only occupational group where crèches exists as an option are the domestic workers, the majority of them being from Delhi, (4.2%) and to an extent for the brick kiln workers where the percentage is 2.1%. The school as an option is also limited with just 1.6% across all occupational categories. But for the domestic workers there is a not insignificant percentage (14.8%) where school is an option. (Table 4.1c in Annexure)

Patterns of Sibling Care for Respondents’ Children in the age category of 0-6 years disaggregated by Gender across States and Occupational Categories




There are a total of 484 children who are involved in care of their younger siblings.


Contrary to popular perception, it is not girls alone who are involved in child care and there is a significant percentage of boys who are also involved in child care. The proportion of children of brick kiln workers and construction workers involved in care of younger siblings is higher than that among other occupational groups. (Table 4.2 in Annexure)

Child Care Patterns: Variations Across Family Type Across States for Respondents’ Children in the Age Group 0-6 months, 6 months – 3years and 3-6 years.

There is a distinct variation across family type regarding child care that is visible from the data.




In the category 0-6 months, 89.9% of the respondents/mothers in nuclear families are solely involved in child care, with 6% of children in the household and 4% of relatives in another household pitching in. In the extended family, 82% of the respondents/mothers are almost solely involved in child care, with 4% of children in the household, 12% of other members of the household being involved in child care.



In the age group of 6 months to 3 years, the percentage of mothers/respondents who are solely involved in child care falls to 78.1% in nuclear families and 64.5% in joint families. The percentage of others involved in child care in this age category also increases. The percentage of children increases to 8.7% in nuclear families, while it is more or less stationary in joint families at 4.9%. In nuclear families, there are about 9.8% of relatives in


another household who help out in care work. But in joint families, the role of other members of the household is obviously greater (26.6%).



In the age group of 3 to 6 years, the role of the mother as sole giver falls even further to 67.4% in nuclear families and to 57.7% in joint families. The role of children as care givers increases to 13.7% in nuclear families and 7.8% in joint families. The role of other members in care is obviously absent in nuclear families, whereas in joint families it is 28.3%. Among the nuclear families, the role of relatives in another household is about 11.4%. neighbours also pitch in (3.5%) and school is about 2.6%. (Table 4.3a, 4.3b and 4.3c in Annexure)

The increasing nuclearisation has meant that the burden of care falls on the mother or to a lesser extent on other children at times when mothers cannot afford to be mothers alone but have to work to earn and contribute to already depleted family incomes .

Whether Respondents (Mothers) Give Exclusive Time for Child Care across States and Occupational Categories




A majority of respondents (57%) stated that they were unable to give exclusive time for child care, while for 42.5% of respondents the answer was in the positive.

A perusal of the state level data show that in two states, Rajasthan and Assam, 88.6% and 86.8% respectively stated that they were not able to give exclusive time for child care; this was followed by UP where the percentage was 61.6% , Orissa with 55.5% , MP with 41.3%.

The occupational wise break-up of the table shows that there are indeed occupational variations; with agricultural labourers and home based artisans and workers, the response was approximately 50:50, i.e. 50% were not able to give time while 50% could do so.

Amongst the brick kiln workers, 66.3% respondents said that they could not provide time, while among the construction workers the percentage goes upto 70.7%. The tea plantation workers are one group wherein the percentage of respondents who could not give exclusive time for child care was highest, 84.3%. Amongst the domestic workers and the fishing community workers, the percentage of negative responses was 26.3% and 27.8%. (Table 4.4 in Annexure).

Number of Respondents Entitled to Maternity Leave



Across states and occupational categories only 5.9% of respondents are entitled to maternity leave.


A perusal of occupation wise data show that 55.1% of tea plantation workers, 7.3% of brick kiln workers, 3.6% of agricultural workers and 1.8% of construction workers got maternity leave.

The bulk of those entitled to maternity leave are tea plantation workers in Assam and they constitute 27.1% of Assam's state sample. There is a small sprinkling of brick kiln workers, mainly in MP (7.3%), agricultural workers (3.6%) and construction workers (1.8%) . (Table 4.5 in Annexure)

Difficulties Faced by Respondents in Combining Work and Child Care


The largest percentage of respondents across states stated that they find it difficult to work and take care of the child (49%), while another 24% said that they find it difficult to manage the time. Another 14.2% stated that they could not work properly, while 8.7% stated that the children remain neglected and unsafe. There was a small percentage (11.7%) who faced no difficulty.

Number of Times Respondents/Mothers Breastfeed the Child



Of the 1305 respondents who have children who are being breastfed, 45.8% stated that they breastfeed the child 3 times a day, while 18.4% feed them 4 times a day; another 10.7% feed the child 5 times, 6.9% feed the child for 6 times, while 9.7% are able to feed the child only twice a day. (Table 4.6 in Annexure)

Till What Age Have Respondents Breastfed Their Children




Those respondents/mothers who have breastfed their child/children for less than six months amount to 4.9%. A significant percentage of 19.6% have breastfed for six months, another 20.7% have breastfed for 6months to a year. The percentage falls to 3.9% in the age group of one year to one and a half year and the percentage goes up to 16.4% in the age group of one and a half to two years. There is small percentage of 5.1% who have fed the child for after the age of two. Twenty percent are still feeding the child. (Table 4.7 in Annexure).

Where Does the Child Stay While the Mother Works?

A large percentage of our respondents (42.5%) stated that the child goes with the mother to the worksite; another 15.9% stated that the child stays at home with siblings, 17.7% with other family members of the household, and 7.2% stayed with relatives in another household. There was a small percentage of 3.6% who stayed with neighbours and 3.4% were at school. There were 451 no responses.

Whether There is a Worksite Child Care Arrangement and Where It is Located



For the overwhelming majority of our respondents, i.e. 96.8% there is no worksite child care arrangement. Only 3.2% of our respondents have access to worksite child care arrangement.

The location of the child care arrangement in 42.9% of the cases is in a shed. This is specifically applies to the tea plantations in Assam. There are 9.9% of cases where it is under a tree. Here again this refers to the tea plantation workers. In 40.7% of the cases, it is located in a room with ventilation. The latter percentages refer to the construction workers in Delhi and 4.4% are in rooms without ventilation, again referring to Delhi. (Table 4.8 in Annexure).


The two categories of occupations in our sample which are entitled to worksite child care are the tea plantations and the construction workers. The Plantation Labour Act of 1951 enjoins on the employer to provide worksite child care in the plantations, since a large percentage of the workforce in the plantations are women. Similarly, construction workers (large numbers of whom are also women) are also entitled by law to child care at the worksite. But in both these cases, the laws have hardly been implemented.

Perceptions about Care Needs

Perception of Respondents on Care Needs of Children across States


Across all the six states, 82.6% of the responses highlighted the question of food and feeding. This was followed by education which was emphasised by 55.9% of the responses; clothing followed with 40.8% of the responses highlighting this; 25.8% of the responses emphasised proper care , 16.9% play materials and toys , with cleanliness accounting for 13.9% of responses and medicines accounting for 13.5% of the responses.

Respondents' Perception Whether Present Child Care Needs are Fulfilled or Not across States



Less than a quarter of mother's responses (22.5%) were positive, i.e. child care needs were being fulfilled. The large majority of responses (77.1%) were negative. State wide variations indicate that 54.7% in Delhi stated that child care needs were fulfilled, followed by MP (37.5%). These responses fall to a mere 5% in Assam and 7.9% in Rajasthan. (Table 4.9 in Annexure)

Whether Respondents Would Use a Crèche Facility if Made Available




The response was overwhelmingly positive across states, 97.8%. (Table 4.10 in Annexure)

How Would a Crèche Facility Benefit the Respondents?

The information provided by this table points to the undeniable reality of mothers having to earn to contribute to the fast declining family incomes along with having to fulfil the responsibilities associated with being home-maker, in particular child care.


A total of approximately 51% of the responses highlighted the fact that children will be looked after properly while the mothers work, that they would be able to work properly, that the mother would be tension free while working and that the mother would be able to work and earn more; the child would be in safe custody while the mother works. The next category of responses relates to the basic needs of the child like food (7.8%) and education (6.6%) and that a crèche would be the best possible arrangement (4.1%). About 3% responses highlighted the fact that they could leave the child there for the entire day.

The Number of Hours for which Respondents would like to Keep their Children in Crèches (Time in Hours) across States



A significant percentage of responses (20.9%) indicated that they would like the child to be in the crèche for 8 hours. Another 16.7% would like the children to be in the crèche for 6 hours and another 16.5% would like the crèche to be open for the whole day. Nine percent of the respondents would like the crèche timings to coincide with working hours of the respondent. (Table 4.11a in Annexure).

The Number of Hours for which Respondents would like to Keep their Children in Crèches (Time in Hours) Across Occupational Categories



The occupation wise variation is interesting insofar as it points to greater similarities regarding the situation of working mothers across categories and yet there are differences arising from specific occupations. (Table 4.11b in Annexure)

At least 20% of responses from respondents from **agricultural labour** households would like the crèche to be open for 8 hours, while another 19% would like it for 6 hours , 8.7% would like it to open for 10 hours and another 8.7% would like the timings to coincide with the respondent's working hours. Eleven per cent would like the crèche to be open for the whole day.

Among **home-based artisans**, nearly a quarter of the respondents would like the crèche to be open for the whole day, followed by about 17.4% who would like it to open for 6 hours, 9.5% would like it for 8 hours and another 8.6% would like it to coincide with the respondent's working hours.

Twenty per cent of the responses from the **brick kiln workers** would like the crèche to be operative for at least 8 hours, another 16% for the whole day with 13.2% preferring the crèche to coincide with the working hours of the respondent.


Responses from among **the construction workers** reveal that 24.3% of them would like the crèche for the whole day, while another 27% would like the working hours of the crèche to be 8 hours, a smaller percentage (10.6%) would like the timings of the crèche to coincide with the respondent's working hours.

The **domestic workers'** preferences seem to be 6 hours (21.5%), followed by 18.8% of the responses where the preference is for the crèche timings to coincide with the respondent's working hours. There are 12% and 13% preference for 7 and 8 hours respectively. Strangely, there is only a 9.4% preference for a crèche for the whole day.

The responses among the **fishing community** are in some ways predictable since this is one occupation where there is some household support available for child care. There is only 5.6% of the responses where there is preference for a whole day crèche and even a smaller percentage (2.2%) for the crèche timings to coincide with the working hours of the respondent. However, the preference for a crèche for specific number of hours exists. Thus 46% would prefer a crèche for 6 hours, another 14% would prefer it for 7 hours and 18% would like it for 9 hours.

The situation among **the tea plantation workers** is relatively simple since work timings are fixed in an organised industry. Thus 51.1% of the responses are in favour of a crèche for 9 hours and another 39.2% of the responses would like the crèche to run for 8 hours. There is a small percentage of the responses (8%) in favour of a crèche for a whole day.


The Preferred Child Care Arrangement across Occupational Categories



The overall figures show that 69.4% would prefer a full time crèche, while another 16% would prefer an AWC and 13.3% would prefer child care at home.

The preference for full time crèches ranges from a lower percentage of 52.3% among agricultural labourers to a high percentage 90.9% among domestic workers and 87.6% among the tea plantation workers. The preference for full time crèches is about 79% among home based artisans and 76.7% among construction workers and 61.5% among brick kiln workers. (Table 4.12 in Annexure).

Where Would the Respondents Prefer Child Care Arrangement?



The large majority of our respondents, 76.6% would prefer it near the home while a not insignificant 19.9% would prefer it near the workplace. This is not surprising given the nature of our sample. The occupational variations are significant for policy interventions. The overwhelming majority of tea plantation workers (84.3%) would prefer it near the workplace. A sizeable percentage of brick kiln workers (28.8%) would also like it near the workplace, as also 22.8% of construction workers and about 15% of agricultural labourers as well. (Table 4.13 in Annexure)

CHAPTER V

Awareness and Use of Existing Schemes

Awareness of Existing Government Schemes

Awareness Levels of Respondents about Rajiv Gandhi National Crèche Yojana

The overwhelming majority of the respondents (99.7%) had no knowledge about the RGNCY.

Awareness Level of the Respondents about Kishori Shakti Yojana

Ninety nine percent of the respondents had no knowledge about the KSY.

Awareness Levels of Respondents about Janani Suraksha Yojana


Awareness levels on this scheme were relatively high, with 47.9% respondents being aware of this scheme. State wide variations show that awareness was highest in Assam (91.6%), followed by MP (70%), Orissa (65%), Rajasthan (39.3%), UP (21.3%) with the poorest levels of awareness being in Delhi with only 11.6%.

Awareness levels of Respondents about Rashtriya Matritiva Labh Yojana (National Maternity Benefit Scheme)

The overwhelming majority of the respondents (98.5%) were not aware of the scheme.


Use of Anganwadi Services

Whether there is an Anganwadi Centre near the Home of Respondents




Seventy two percent of the respondents across the states stated that the AWC was close to their residence, while 27.3 % stated that the AWC was far from their residence. There are some state level variations with 62.3 % of the respondents from Rajasthan stating that the AWC was far from their residence; similarly, 42.5% from UP and 43.5% from Delhi stated that the AWC was far from their residence. (Table 5.1 in Annexure)

Registration of Respondents in AWCs across States and Occupational Categories




About half the respondents (50.4%) were registered in the AWC, while 49.6% were not registered. The lowest figures for registration were in the states of Rajasthan (14.2%), Delhi (19.8%) and UP (34.4%). Assam has a registration of 52.9%. The state of Orissa has the highest registration of 96.4%. and MP has 78.3% registration. (Table 5.2a and 5.2b in Annexure).



The pattern of registration across occupational categories shows that the highest percentage of registration is among the fishing community (92.8%), followed by the tea plantation workers (72.5%) and then by agricultural labourers (69.1%). The lowest percentages of registration are among the domestic workers (25.8%), construction workers (36.2%), home based artisans ((39%) and brick kiln workers (39.7%).

Use of Anganwadi Centre by Respondents and Children across States



Across the six states 55.9% of respondents and/or their children use the AWC while 44.1% of respondents do not use it.

The state-wise variations show that the use of the AWC is highest in Orissa with 99.6% of respondents and/or children using it, followed by MP (86.3%). The percentage of respondents in Assam using the AWC is 48.9%, UP 45.4%; the poorest use of the AWC is shown in Delhi and Rajasthan's use, i.e. 26.3% and 19.5%. (Table 5.3 in Annexure)

Number of Responses regarding Use and Non-Use of AWC Services across Occupational Categories (*This includes those who are currently using and those who have used it in the past*)

Only 20.6% of children below the age of six used the AWC and its services and only 2.5% of respondents used the AWC. The use of the services by both respondents and children together brought the percentage upto 33.2%. The percentage of neither respondent nor child using the AWC and its services is 43.6%.


The state wise variation shows that the percentages for the use of AWC by children below 6, Assam fares best with 29.2% use, followed by Orissa (27.7%), UP (25.7%), Delhi (19.5%), and MP (10.2%)

The percentage for the use of the AWC just by the respondent is a mere 2.5%. The picture is the same in the case of the states as well.

It is only in the case of the services of the AWC by both the respondent and the child that the percentage climbs upto 33.2%. Analysis of the state level picture shows that both Orissa and MP with 69.2% and 70.2% respectively perform the best, followed by Assam at 20.5%, UP at 18.9%, Rajasthan at 9.5% and Delhi with a miserable 3.3%.

There are two points to be noted here: One, it would seem that the AWCs are generally used by both mother and child less often by either separately; and secondly, the factors of state level governance do seem to affect the use and non-use of services. (Table 5.4 in Annexure)

State-Wise details about the use of AWC by children in the age group 0-6



The percentage of all children 0-6 across six states using the AWC is 38.20%. The percentages for children 0-3 years is 32.70% while that for the 3-6 age category is 40.70%.

If one were to peruse the state level data, the highest percentage for use by children in the 0-3 years category is 79.20% by Orissa and 56.90% by MP, followed 28% in Assam. The poorest usage of the services is in Rajasthan (1.80%), while Delhi is at 14.90% and UP is at 11.80%.

The state level data for the use of services by the 3-6 age group suggests that there is a greater usage of services by this age group even at the state level. Expectedly, in Orissa the usage goes upto 84.60 % followed by MP with 60%, Assam with 34.20%, UP with 31.80%, Delhi with 14.10%. Rajasthan is still the lowest with a percentage of 3.10% . (Table 5.5a in Annexure).

Reasons for Not Using the AWC


One of the most important reasons given by the respondents for the non-use of the AWC is that it was far from their home. Thirty one percent of respondents cited this as a singular reason for not using it. In Rajasthan, 58% of respondents and 27.7% in UP cited this as the most important reason for non-use of the AWC.

Other reasons cited for non-use included the poor quality of the services, work schedule not permitting the use of the AWC.

Distance of AWC from Home of Respondent across States

Across the six states, 75.8% of the respondents stated that the AWC was less than one km from home, while another 20.4% stated that it was between 1 and 2 km from home and a small percentage of 2.2% said that it was between 2 and 4 km.

Premises Where AWC is Housed across States




According to information received from respondents, about 25.9% of the AWC are housed in rented buildings. State wise variations are interesting with Rajasthan having no rented buildings at all, while Delhi has 97.9% rented buildings. UP has 28.9% rented buildings, Orissa has 21.4%, MP 29.5 and Assam 1.6%.

About 15% AWCs are housed in primary school buildings while 34.2% have their own buildings, 19.1% are in government buildings, 2.2% in Community building, and 1.6% in Panchayat buildings.


Assam seems to have the highest percentage of own buildings (74.2%), Rajasthan 59.5%, Orissa 33.2%, MP 37.8% and Delhi has no own buildings at all. UP has 10.4% own buildings. (Table 5.6 in Annexure).

Condition of AWC Building



Responses received show that 69.3% stated that the buildings were pucca, while 15.3% stated that it was semi-pucca and 10.4% stated that it was kuccha. About 3.5% stated that it was in an open space. The highest percentage of pucca buildings were in Assam, followed by Rajasthan (98.8%), MP (76.8%), Orissa (57%) UP (68.2%). Delhi had the least percentage of pucca structures (41.6%).(Table 5.7 in Annexure)

Facilities Available At the AWC



Toilet

A large majority of the respondents (68.4) stated that there was no toilet and 31.6% stated that there was a toilet.

Water

Sixty per cent of respondents stated that hand pump was the source of water, while a small minority of responses (6.9%) mentioned the well as the source of water.


Electricity

According to 70.9% of respondents, there was no electricity, while 29.3% stated that electricity was available. Delhi was one state where 68.2% of respondents stated that there was electricity. (Table 5.8 in Annexure)

Number of Days the AWC Opens in a Week


According to 74.2% of respondents, the AWC opens for six days in a week; 4.5% respondents stated that it opens for four days, with 8.7% stating that it opens for 7 days in a week, the latter responses coming from Orissa.

Whether Take Home Ration (THR) is Provided



Nearly 47% of the respondents stated that it was provided while 51.1% stated that it was not provided. The highest percentage of positive response came from MP (89.4%), followed by Orissa (53.4%) and then by Assam with 39.2%. The poorest performance in this regard is Rajasthan (1.2%) and Delhi (2.9%). (Table 5.9 in Annexure)


Whether Supplementary Nutrition for Children is Provided Regularly



The overall responses indicate that this aspect of the programme is weak. Overall, only 45.3% of respondents gave a positive response while 32.2% gave a negative response. And interestingly, 22.5% of respondents did not know about this.


The state picture shows that in MP the response was positive in the case of 76.6% of respondents, in Rajasthan it was 70.2% , in Delhi it was 74.3% while in Orissa, UP and Assam, the percentage of positive responses were 26.1%, 29.7% and 25.3% respectively. (Table 5.10 in Annexure)

Whether Regular Weighing of Children is done



Responses from the field show that this is a weak aspect of the AWC. Across all the states, there was a positive response from 45.5% of respondents while 25.4 gave a negative response. Once again, there were a significant percentage of respondents who did not know (29.1%). The picture in the states shows that MP had the highest percentage of positive responses (83.1%) with Assam at 57.5%. In the other states the positive responses were poor. (Table 5.11 in Annexure).

Whether Children Have Received Immunisation or Not Across States



There seemed to be the highest percentage of positive responses for polio (73.9%), followed by tetanus injections (63.5%), measles (50.7%) and diphtheria (28.6%) There were multiple responses to this question. (Table 5.12 in Annexure)

Awareness Levels Regarding SNP for Pregnant Women

The table shows that the levels of awareness are relatively high, at 68.3% with 29.7% of respondents stating that they did not know. The picture at the state level shows that awareness levels are highest in MP (74.7%) and Orissa (67%) followed by Assam (35%). Delhi and Rajasthan are states where the awareness levels are low, with 8.8% and 9% respectively.

Awareness Levels Regarding Health Check ups for Pregnant and Lactating Mothers

There were 59.8% positive responses and 38.1% negative responses.

Highest awareness levels are prevalent in MP (62%) and Orissa (69%), followed by Assam with 36.8%, UP 17.1%. The poorest awareness levels are in Delhi and Rajasthan with percentages remaining in single digits.

Awareness Levels Regarding Tetanus Injections for Pregnant Women

There was a high percentage of positive responses (74.9%) and 22.9% negative responses. Highest awareness levels are in MP (78.9%) and Orissa (79.4%) followed by Assam (37.6%), UP (33.3%). Delhi and Rajasthan lag far behind with 2.5% and 10.2%.

Awareness Levels Regarding Health and Nutrition Education

There was poor awareness levels about this aspect of the AWC programme, with 39.7% positive responses and 57.9% negative responses.

Awareness Levels Regarding SNP for Children

This is one aspect of the ICDS programme that has evoked high awareness levels. A large majority of respondents (82.7%) gave a positive response while just 15.6% were not aware of this. Once again, the highest awareness is visible in MP and Orissa., followed by Assam.

Awareness Levels Regarding Immunisation for Children

Another aspect of the ICDS that has generated such an overwhelmingly positive response from the respondents (87.8%) with just 10.5% respondents being unaware. Orissa has the highest percentages (94.1%) with MP having 80.2%.

Awareness Levels Regarding Referral Services

There is poor awareness of referral services, with just 31.9% of respondents indicating awareness about it while 65.9% were unaware about it.

Awareness Levels Regarding Pre-School Education

About 53% of the respondents indicated awareness of the pre-school component of the ICDS programme, while 45% were not aware of it. These percentages are broadly indicative of the trend cross states as well, with even Orissa just having 58.4% awareness levels and MP 48.3%

Awareness Levels Regarding Nutrition and Health Education

Awareness levels are poor with just 36% of respondents being aware of it and a sizeable percentage of responses were negative (53.1%)

Awareness Levels Regarding Growth Monitoring

Forty five percent of respondents were aware while 53.1% were not aware about it.

Awareness Levels Regarding Supplementary Nutrition for Malnourished Children


Responses show that this is one aspect of the AWC programme that is least known. Only 13.7% of respondents were aware of it while 83.9% were not aware.

What Should Be Done to Enable the AWCs to Function Better?

There were a range of suggestions which are as follows and which generated responses the percentages of which are given below:

| | |
|---|----------|
| Improved Quality and regular Availability of SNP | -- 88.2% |
| Improved Non-Formal Pre-School Education | - 93.6% |
| Improved Infrastructure with Toilet facilities | -- 93.3% |
| Increase of number of workers | - 85.5% |
| Awareness Generation through Regular Mothers' Meetings | - 91.6% |
| Regular Presence of AWW and AWH | - 91.4% |
| Safe Drinking water | - 86.9% |
| Regular Weighing and Provision of basic medicines | - 90.1% |
| AWC should be in the locality and be accessible | - 76.2% |
| Workers language should be the same as that of the children | - 71.6% |

Use of Anganwadi Centre if it Opens for Longer hours and has Proper Facilities




Ninety four per cent of respondents stated that they would use the AWC if it remained open for longer hours and had better facilities. Three percent stated that they would not use the AWC. (Table 5.13 in Annexure).

Anganwadi Worker


A total of 120 Anganwadi Workers were interviewed with 20 AWWs interviewed in each state.

Religious and Caste Composition




The overwhelming majority of the AWWs were Hindus (90.8%) and Muslims were 7.5%. The caste profile shows that 19.2% were Scheduled Castes (SC), 9.2% were Scheduled Tribes (ST), 40.8% were Other Backward Classes (OBC) and 29.2% of them were entered as General, which would mean upper castes. (Table 5.14 and 5.15 in Annexure).

Age Profile




There were 28.8% of AWWs who were between the ages of 26-30, 17.8% were between 21-25, about 14.4% were between 36-40 and a significant 20% were between the ages of 41-50, with a small percentage of 5.9% who were between 56-60. (Table 5.16 in Annexure).

Educational Levels of AWWs




A perusal of the educational profile of the AWWs shows that 48.3% had studied between class 10 and 12, 24.6% had done their graduation and about 7.6% were post-graduates, while 13.6% had studied between class 5 and 9. (Table 5.17 in Annexure)

Distance of AWC from the Home of the AWW




About 64.4% stated that the distance was less than 1 kilometre while another 16.9% stated that it was between 1 and 3 kilometres, a smaller percentage of 6.8% who mentioned that it was between 3 to 4 kilometres. There were about 11.9% whose home was more than 4 kilometres. (Table 5.18 in Annexure)

Working Hours of the AWW




A significant percentage of 42.4% stated that it was 4 hours while another 33.1% stated that it was 5 hours and another 15.3% said that it was 6 hours. (Table 5.19 in Annexure)

Duration of Work as AWW




Nearly a quarter (24.6%) had been working for 1-3 years, while another 17.8% for 4-6 years, another 22% had been working for between 10-12 years, a smaller percentage (6.8%) for 13-15 years. There were also about 6.8% who had been working for 19-21 years. (Table 5.20 in Annexure)

Training




The majority of AWWs (91.5%) had received training while 8.5% had not received any training. Most of the training was induction training (87%). There was no other kind of training. (Table 5.21, 5.22a, 5.22b, and 5.22c in Annexure)

Monthly Honorarium




The majority of the AWWs (52.5%) stated that they received a monthly honorarium between Rs 1500-2000, a smaller percentage (25.4%) received between Rs. 2000-2,500. A miniscule percentage of 1.7% received between Rs. 2500-3000. There was a small percentage of 6.8% who received between 3,500-4000. This latter segment was in Delhi. (Table 5.23 in Annexure).

Regularity of Honorarium received




There were only 39% who received their honorarium regularly and the majority of 61% did not receive it regularly. (Table 5.24 in Annexure)

Any Additional Cash Incentive




The majority of AWWs (71.2%) received nothing. However, 20.3% stated that they got paid maternity leave, 2.5% stated that they got a cash award and 7.6% got insurance. (Table 5.25 in Annexure)

Grievance Redressal System




A majority of the AWWs (58.5%) stated that there was no grievance redressal mechanism while 41.5% stated that there was one. (Table 5.26 in Annexure)

Numbers of Children Enrolled in the AWC




A significant percentage of the AWWs (46.7%) stated that there 20-40 children enrolled in the AWC, another 16.9% stated that 41-60 children were enrolled and 22.9% stated that 61-80 children were enrolled. (Table 5.27 in Annexure)

Provision of Take Home Rations



A majority of 52.5% AWWs stated that THR is provided while the response of 47.5% AWWs was in the negative. (Table 5.28 in Annexure)

Provision of Supplementary Nutrition (SNP)



Nearly 77% of the AWWs stated that SNP was provided while 20.3% stated that it was not provided.

One of the reasons cited for the non-provision of SNP by 70.8% of AWWs was delay in supplies while another 16.7% pointed to inadequate supplies. While 4.2% cited a delay in money transfer. (Table 5.29 in Annexure)

Problems Encountered in the Performance of their Duties

Some of the problems cited by the AWWs encountered in the performance of their duties were: 1) No building of its own; 2) AWCs were far from their homes; 3) a lot of time was

taken by maintaining many registers; 4) Parents don't send their children to the AWC; 5) Difficult to keep children clean and maintain cleanliness at the AWC.

AWWs Perception about the Need for Crèches in the Community

A significant percentage of the AWWs (54.2%) stated that an important reason is that small children could be left there. Another 66% stated that parents would be able to work properly and earn more. About 38.4% AWWs stated that the crèche would be good since they would be open the whole day and that children would get all the facilities.

Facilities Required for the AWC to Function as AWC cum Crèche

Nearly 50% stated that toys and play materials would be needed, while 45.8% emphasised nutritious food. The need for a building came next in order of preference as a necessity (33.9%), with proper water supply. More than one third of the responses highlighted the need for more workers and helpers, another quarter emphasised the need for trained personnel. Further it was mentioned that there had to be an increase in the working hours of the AWW as also an increase in the honorarium.

CHAPTER VI

CASE STUDIES OF SEWA AND MOBILE CRÈCHES

SEWA

The need for child care services for women in the informal sector was highlighted initially in 1988 by the Shram Shakti Report (The National Commission on Self-Employed Women and Women in Informal Sector).

Thus the critical issue of child care for women working in the informal sector has been seen as part of important entitlements for working women by both SEWA and Mobile Crèches. However, SEWA's work has been informed by the understanding that child care is an entitlement of women workers, and to that extent it is more a holistic perspective.

Self-Employed Women's Association (SEWA) is a trade union formed in 1972. It is seen as a confluence of three movements – the labour movement, the cooperative movement and the women's movement. Apart from the issue of employment, social security is an important part of the agenda of SEWA. Thus, health care, child care, savings and insurance are part of the programme of the organisation.

In an important paper, *Child Care and Decent Work*, Anandalakshmy and Mirai Chatterjee highlight the role and contribution of women workers in the informal sector, in the backdrop of recent changes worldwide. There are certain significant points in the paper: a) The dramatic changes in the world of work over the last two decades and the increasing informalisation of the economy and the lifting of trade barriers with globalisation; b) The numbers of women in the workforce has increased substantially over the past two decades, with more than 75% of women in the informal economy in Asia, Africa and Latin America while in India the figure rises to 90%; c) informal workers in most parts of the world are also highly vulnerable, with the women workers being the most vulnerable. There is a clear overlap between informal employment, poverty and gender. d) While women workers contribute to the economy, they also contribute to the family and the community; their role in the family is also crucial though their labour is not visible, nor acknowledged. One of the major responsibilities of women is child rearing and child care. e) Time spent in child care affects her ability to participate in the workforce and economy. The critical issue is that women have most often been left to their own individual devices to deal with the question of child care, with no adequate societal and governmental responses to what is an essentially an economic and social problem. f) The root cause is not only the invisibility of women's work but also the failure to acknowledge the social and economic contribution of women, and more importantly the critical question of child care from the worker's point of view. g) While the experts on ECCD have highlighted the crucial importance of child care from birth onwards, the same appreciation and understanding does not exist for workers' right to child care, especially for women workers.

SEWA's programme of child care has been informed by a perspective which views child care as an integral part of a worker's entitlement along with organisation of women workers in the informal sector. Thus the entry point to child care is from the women worker's needs.

SEWA's child care programme has been implemented through cooperatives and local organisations across the state of Gujarat. In Ahmedabad, the Sangini Child Care Workers' Cooperative is running the centres and has linked with the ICDS and the Social Welfare Board to expand and carry on its activities. In Kheda district, the Shaishav Child Care Workers' Cooperatives run centres for under six children of tobacco workers and agricultural labourers. In Surendranagar district, the Balvikas Mandal runs the child care centres for the children of salt workers. In Banaskantha district, the Banaskantha DWCRMA Mahila SeWA Association (BDMSA) runs the centres for children of rural workers, involved in dairy agriculture etc.

SEWA's first child care programme was started in 1972 in Ahmedabad in 1992 in Surendranagar district among the salt pan workers with the collaboration of the Gujarat State Rural Workers Development Union. In Anand and Kheda districts, the first crèches were started in 1989. In 1996, there were almost 21 such centres in different villages. Seventy five per cent of the operating funds were provided by the Gujarat State Rural Workers Development Union while 25% was provided by SEWA for the child care centres. A report brought out by SEWA in 2000, titled " Reclaiming Childhood: A case Study of Child Care Centres for the Children of Salt Pan Workers " documents the process whereby the idea of child care was initially introduced and explained to the women workers. through a series of meetings. A small survey was conducted in 1995 on 150 women workers whose children were using the Balwadis so as to ascertain their responses and needs so as to bring out necessary changes in the operation of these balwadis.

The findings of the study showed that one of the major impacts of the child care centres was that there was an increase in the earnings of the women as well peace of mind of the mothers. A large percentage of women started working overtime. There was also a significant improvement in the health of the children attending these centres, as also an improvement in the mental and emotional growth of the children.

There were however, important suggestions from the women regarding the following:

- 1) It was suggested that the timings of the centres should coincide with the work schedule of the women. The centres were open only for 4 hours. It was their suggestion that it should be open for more than 8 hours a day.
- 2) They also suggested that there should be more toys, games and play equipment
- 3) There was also a suggestion for increased quantity of milk for the children and also better ventilation in the centres.

An impact assessment of the Child care programme of SEWA was done by Association for Stimulating Knowhow (ASK) in 2011. The study assesses the impacts of SEWA Child Care on the children enrolled, mothers of children, siblings of the children, as well as at the household level. The study is further highlighted by comparisons with the impacts made by

ICDS centres and in relation with the lifestyles of children who do not access any child care services.

The impacts of the child care centres on mothers of children enrolled are assessed in relation to changes in work patterns, mobility, increased peace of mind due to services availed and enhanced awareness on maternal and child health related issues. The core benefits derived could be classified as – a) Improvement in the working life and mobility of mothers and b) Development of the child. One significant finding is the level of comfort and peace of mind experienced by the mothers whose children attend child care centres as compared to those not accessing any child care service. The earnings of mothers whose children access the child care centres have also registered an increase and they are also able to attend to other chore outside the home. There is also a greater awareness and interest in child care activities and also in the health and development of the child as compared to those who access the ICDS Centres. A majority of the siblings of children attending the child care centres are able to attend school and spend significantly less time on child care. This is principally due to the fact that the SEWA centres are open for the full day and coincide with the working hours of the mothers. As far as education is concerned, the study notes that dropouts from school are the highest amongst those who do not access any child care services due to burdens of child care and even household responsibilities, while amongst those attending the ICDS centres the attendance at school, punctuality and regularity etc are significantly better whereas these are highest among children attending SEWA centres is the highest. Thus if there is a gradation, then SEWA centres perform best, with the record of the ICDS centres coming next and those who do not access any centre the performance of children is the poorest.

The study highlights extremely significant fallout of the prevalence of child care facilities on the household and family dynamics. It would seem that with the increase mobility of women and reduced household responsibility, there is a corresponding increase in the work undertaken by mothers, better household income and quality of life. This has had an impact on family dynamics and there is greater peace and harmony among the family members with the women feeling more independent at not being confined to the household.

However, we would like to point out some shortcomings of the study. One major shortcoming is the comparison of SEWA child care services with the ICDS centres. The ICDS centres were never envisaged as child care centres. It is in a sense inappropriate to compare SEWA child care centres with Anganwadi centres which are supposed to open only for four hours.

Secondly, the study does not explore the viability and sustainability of the model. Thus, for example, the study does not discuss why the SEWA child care centres have dwindled from 118 in 1999 to about 49 in recent times. What the study does is to establish the positive impact of child care centres on women, children and families and that has been substantiated well.

Our own brief field visits to SEWA Child Care centres in 2012 were very useful in observing the functioning of the centres as also the problems faced. We visited three centres in Ahmedabad city which were run by the *Sangini* Child Care Workers' Cooperative. There were 27 centres being run in the city by Sangini. There were 10 centres run by SEWA which were supported by the Rajiv Gandhi National Crèche Scheme (RGNCS) for which funds were provided. Later support to two of the crèches was stopped and currently only 8 of these were functioning. The child care workers include coordinators, supervisors and teachers. The coordinators are expected to visit each centre under their control. Each supervisor has 9 centres under her and she is required to visit each centre four times a month. There are two teachers in each crèche who attend to the activities of the centre.

The three centres visited were Parikshitnagar Crèche, Aman Chowk Crèche and Saijpur in Ahmedabad. In Kheda and Anand District, the Shaishav Child Care Workers Cooperative is running 21 centres in these districts, and catering to a large population of tobacco workers. Both the Parikshit nagar Crèche and the Aman chowk Crèche are predominantly Muslim areas. Aman Chowk Crèche was started in 2002. Raisodh Crèche in Kheda district and Khunzrao crèche in Anand district that we visited were started in 1989.

In each crèche there were approximately 25-30 children upto to the age of six. The crèche is open for the duration of the mothers' working hours, approximately 8 hours. Each crèche has generally two to three teachers (*sevikas*) who run the crèches, cook the two meals that are provided at the centre and very often also bring the children from their homes to the centres. Thus in Parikshitnagar crèche, about 75% of the children are brought to the centre by the *sevikas* while the rest are brought by the mothers.

The child care centre also provides referral services. Any case of severe malnutrition or illness is sent to the PHC. Immunisation of children is also done at the centre, through the services of the health worker from the PHC.

The child care workers (teachers, supervisors, coordinators) were dedicated and sincere, with a long record of service as *sevikas*, ranging from a minimum of ten to a maximum of 26 years. All those involved in childcare were also shareholders of the cooperatives and have gone through training at different points of time. The children of the crèches we visited seemed healthy and happy. The *sevikas* were continuously engaged in various activities with the children, such as play, reciting poems, learning names of animals, fruits, counting and playing various games as well as training children in basic hygiene. The role of the *sevikas* is crucial to the running of the centres. The *sevikas* themselves have gained a great degree of self-confidence as well as pride in their work over the years. There are also regular meetings conducted with the parents so as to both involve and educate them on the child care needs. The crèches are funded through various sources, including a monetary contribution from the parents of the children attending the crèches. Each parent contributes Rs. 75 per child per month in the urban areas and Rs.50 per month in the rural areas. But this is obviously a small contribution to the share for running the crèches, which according to our SEWA sources works out approximately to Rs. 20,000 per month. SEWA raises its fund through

multiple sources, i.e. employers, members of SEWA, mothers, Panchayat members, farmers give donations in kind etc.

The most significant contribution of SEWA has been that the crèches run according to the timings of the mothers' working hours, according to Jyoti Macwan who is the elected General Secretary of SEWA. In places where the mothers are vegetable vendors, the crèches open early. This has helped mothers in increasing their working hours thus enhancing household income, and also helped them work better. However, constraints of space are a major problem.

However, it is necessary to point out that these crèches are attended principally by children whose mothers are members of SEWA. While Anganwadi centres also function in the areas where the crèches are functioning, all mothers do not send their children to the SEWA crèches. They either do not access any child care or send their children to the AWCs, since the facilities provided are free.

The question of sustainability of the model is an important one that Jyoti Macwan raises. Funds are a major problem. The fact is that the number of crèches have come down from 118 in 1999 to a mere 48 in 2012-13. The reason for shutting them down according to SEWA is that the state government withdrew its support for many of the crèches and SEWA was unable to raise adequate funds for running them. Mirai Chatterji in her discussions with us in March 2012 stated that in the ultimate analysis, it will be the State that would have to take the principal responsibility to run child care services on a large scale. Various civil society organisations could help to provide models and expertise.

MOBILE CRECHES

Background

Mobile Creches (henceforth MC) started its journey in 1969 in response to the needs of the migrants working on construction sites and those living in the urban slums. A large number of people migrate to urban centres from rural areas giving rise to a number of serious problems which need to be addressed.

Most of the workers at the construction sites are migrants from neighbouring states. These migrants come to the city in the hope of finding better livelihood opportunities but the absence of the desired skills amongst them relegates them to the informal sector and thus prevents their upward mobility. Since they primarily possess the ability to do physical labour they are employed for transforming the urban spaces. Consequently this gives rise to an expanding construction industry which relies mainly on the cheap rural population for labour.

These construction sites lack all basic amenities like clean drinking water, public health centre, proper sanitation etc. The workers are subject to exploitation and very often are not even paid the minimum wages for their services. The Building and Other Construction

Workers Act (1996) does provide for crèches where there are 50 women on the site but this provision is easily evaded. Besides, many states have not framed the rules with regard to crèches on site. (Mobile Creches was actively involved in the campaign for legislation for the protection of the rights of construction workers).

The population of workers at the construction site is mostly young since hard physical labour is difficult beyond a certain age. A large number of children on the construction sites are consequently below the age of 6. There is no provision of a child care arrangement at the construction sites and the poor economic condition of the parents makes it difficult for them to afford such services. Further, since most of these migrants come to the city in the unit of a nuclear family leaving the larger family behind in the village, they lack the support system which plays an important role in providing care services to the children in the family. However, in the absence of such a support system in the cities, the children are either left on their own or in the care of older siblings. This adversely affects the growth of the younger children and hampers the schooling/education of the older siblings.

What makes the situation worse is the transient nature of the work. The construction workers are constantly on the move, moving from one site to another and from one state to another. Because of this the identity of the workers remains undetermined which prevents them from deriving the benefits of the public support services and other entitlements. Majority of the children are not immunised due to lack of identity and stability in their parent's lives. Exposed to a hazardous and unhealthy environment, recurrent health problems pose another challenge. The workers are not able to take care of the health and nutrition of their children and are themselves also subject to many health hazards. A majority of the women at the construction sites face health risks and this has a direct impact on the well-being of the children as well. In the absence of a congenial environment the cognitive and stimulation aspects of early childhood do not get addressed, resulting in low levels of development having lasting consequences for later life.

Intervention by Mobile Crèches

It was in response to the need of child care services which include both crèches and day care that MC came into being in 1969, in Mumbai and Delhi. This is a specific case study of MC in Delhi and the National Capital Region (NCR). MC started its journey by addressing the needs of the children at a construction site in Delhi. Over the years it has expanded its scope of operations and has become a pioneer in providing childcare and development services and an advocate for the rights of the young child in the country.

Mobile Crèches since its inception has reached out to 750,000 children, worked at 600 construction sites and trained approximately 6000 child care workers.

A significant feature of MC is that it has been involved in the formulation of policy through participation in committees and working groups constituted by various ministries and government bodies to formulate programmes and policies for the young child. Examples of such interventions are the Building and Other Construction Workers Act 1996, National Plan

of Action for Children 2005 and the Working Group for Children under Six constituted to provide inputs for the 11th Plan. The Working Group for Children Under Six also brought a revised and updated version for the 12th Plan. More recently, MC has also been actively involved in the discussions for the formulation of the Early Childhood Care and Education Policy which was approved by the Government in September 2013. As a result of its consistent efforts over the years, MC has also been identified by the Ministry of Women and Child Development, Government of India as one of the leading organisations in the training and capacity building in the Restructured ICDS as also in the scheme of Anganwadi- Cum- Creches Scheme. MC is also one of the founding members of an all India network, Forum for Crèche and Child Care Services (FORCES), set up in 1989, whose mandate is to advocate the interests and concerns of the mother and the young child.

The mission of MC as stated by one of the MC documents is to ensure Early Child Care and Development of young children of economically deprived groups at urban construction sites and urban slums. There are two components of the programme; on the one hand, the crèches for the children upto six and on the other the Day Care Model which covers nutrition, health and education for children upto the age of 12. The overall emphasis is to ensure holistic development of children with a special focus on children upto the age of 6. Age specific intervention is an integral part of the whole approach. Currently, 18 centres are being run in Delhi and NCR and on an average 1200 children are attending these centres. The Day Care Model similarly addresses children's needs in a holistic manner; it is proactive preventive

The efforts of the organisation are directed at three levels – field interventions, training and advocacy and legislation. The most direct form of positive action that MC engages in is field intervention. These focus on children belonging to the age group 0-6 with education inputs for older children in the slums and construction sites in Delhi and National Capital Region.

Childcare facility on construction sites and urban slums

On the construction sites the child care facility is either run entirely by Mobile Crèches or is supported by it. In case of support, the other party is the builder. Mobile Crèches has initiated this support system because it institutionalises the child care facilities and does not make them dependent on the presence of Mobile Crèches. Three models of day care are followed by Mobile Crèches:

- Crèches operated and managed fully by MC and financed partly by the builder
- Crèches where personnel management and financial responsibility rests fully with the builder but the initial set-up, training and other inputs are provided by MC
- Crèches where the complete responsibility rests with the builder and MC plays the role of a consultant.

The day care facility of MC caters to the needs of the children in the age group 0-12 with non-formal education for those above the age of 6. It runs for the whole day for 6 days a week. Healthy, nutritional food is provided to the children at the centres along with non-

formal education which includes play activities, visits to famous places, parks etc. The children are divided into specific age groups and are provided food and education appropriate to their age. This takes care of the age specific needs of the children. The following services are provided at the centre –

- Centres remain open 6 days a week from 9 a.m. until 5 p.m. The helper stays beyond 5 p.m. and even on Sundays if required.
- Centres are supported by staff who provide services of safety/security, food, medicine, immunisation, weighing, play and educational activities;
- Provision of three meals a day including breakfast (suji and milk), lunch (khichdi or daliya) and an afternoon/evening snack. Undernourished children are served a special diet of eggs and banana daily;
- Cleanliness at the centre and amongst the children, through change of clothing, bibs for eating etc.;
- Regular immunisation and health services through visits by doctors 3 to 4 times per month
- Educational and play activities, especially activities that stimulate child cognitive development and learning.

Community participation is essential to ensure the desired results. The community is engaged in the issues of child care via street theatre, folk songs and other performances. One of the unique features of on-site intervention is *Saathi Samuh*, which is a programme designed to build leadership at the community level to sustain awareness regarding good child care practices as also to help families in accessing state services. As construction workers move from site to site, state to state, it is difficult to sustain community bonds which are crucial for sustaining quality child-care. Through the initiative of *Saathi Samuh* efforts are made to create leaders to advocate the issues of child-care within the community. This helps to sustain community bonds and is an effective means to reach the migrants in their own languages, beliefs etc.

In urban slums, Mobile Creches follow a multi-strategic approach. Their intervention in urban slums is along five lines:

- Generating awareness to create an environment more conducive to Early Childhood Care and Development,
- Encouraging family-based intervention to ensure a change in childcare practices,
- Providing community women with the training to operate community-based crèches and day-care centres,
- Forging links between governmental and non-governmental actors and the migrants in order to address these issues more effectively,
- Constituting women and youth groups to advocate these issues.

All these efforts are geared towards creating a stake in childcare for as many people as possible. The centres are based on providing services similar to those at the construction sites mentioned above. The intervention in the slums is managed by a community group

(CBO), who is trained by MC. Like the construction sites where MC provides a facilitator's role, the aim is to institutionalise the intervention and make it sustainable through the CBO.

Responding to the needs of the community

The users of the day care centers come from diverse backgrounds, for both construction sites and slums. Despite varying backgrounds in terms of geography, language, caste, religion, there is no significant evidence of conflict in the use of crèche facilities, nor any differentiation among the children on the part of the centre staff. However this was not always so, and it is possible that this inclusion has been influenced by the values and ethos with which MC runs the centres. Earlier there was considerable discrimination based on caste in terms of provision of food and other activities. However, with the consistent intervention of MC, this situation has changed over the years. The absence of conflict over diversity is also linked with the need for the centre.

The day care centres at the construction sites as well as the urban slums respond directly to the needs of the community. The women feel secure that their children are safe at the centre while they go to work. The provision of nutritional food and non-formal education play an equally important role in generating a demand amongst the community for these centres. The centres are located close to the worksite making it possible for the mothers to breastfeed their children and they have a separate space for crèche, balwadi, non-formal education, kitchen, toilet and play area.

In addition to catering directly to the child care needs, mothers' meetings are organised by the *Saathi Samuh* which provides a space for the discussion of various issues of concern as well as issues pertaining to women like domestic violence, alcoholism and other gender related issues. In the case of slum centres, links with local NGOs help address women's strategic issues beyond those relating to childcare. Outreach services are also provided which help in establishing a link with schools and the public health centre so as to connect the families to health and education facilities. These centres thus cater to the diverse needs of the community, especially to those of the mothers and the children.

Management, Training and Financing

The MC model essentially rests on a supervisor, centre in-charge, teachers and helper, across three groups of children – 0-3 years, 3-6 years and 6 years and above.

- The supervisor holds overall responsibility for the MC run centres, and provides guidance and oversight for multiple MC supported centres. For the MC run centres, the supervisor is responsible for 2-3 centres, for the MC supported centres, one supervisor is responsible for 5 centres.
- The centre in charge is responsible for the operations at the centre.
- The teachers actually provide the direct input to the children, in the form of feeding, stimulation activities, play etc for the crèche; education and play for the balwadi; and education for non formal education.

- The helper provides overall support of washing, cleaning etc, as well as specific help to the crèche when more hands are needed. The helper also keeps children beyond the centre timings in the evening for parents that work overtime and pick their children later than the stipulated time of 5.00 - 5.30 p.m.

Mobile Creches norms for staff children ratio are typically in the range of 1 staff for 10-12 children for the crèche. However, this varies depending on the particular model: the norm is followed strictly within the MC run centres, but varies in the other centres. The tasks of all staff are well defined and the MC run centres have detailed protocols that are required to be followed, prominently displayed on the walls of the centre. These elaborate clearly defined milestones with respect to weight, nutrition requirements, immunisation requirements, vitamins and supplement requirements, developmental milestones etc. The centres however are visibly different in the manner and extent to which these protocols and milestones are displayed and followed.

Human resources are the key to running the centres effectively and thus training and capacity building of the staff and CBO members constitutes the central pillar of effective management. The training programme comprises of 35 workshops spread over six months, in addition to a 12 day orientation programme. The programme includes :

- sensitisation to ECCD and attitude building;
- principles of ECCD;
- skill development relating to stimulation (for the crèche), holistic development of child, cognitive development, nutrition, health, hygiene, role for worker, community communication etc; and other inputs.

The training is carried out locally by the MC training department, and conducted over a nine-month period, which includes 6 months of workshops and 3 months of on field internships at the day care centres. The initial training is succeeded by periodic in service refresher courses, based on an annual training plan developed by MC.

The centres at construction sites are financed jointly by MC and builders, while those at the slums are financed from funds generated from the community, with support from MC. The builders typically provide the space and building infrastructure, in addition to some funds for operational costs. Costs for the centre run by MC are approximately Rs 1400 per child per month; of this approximately Rs. 1,000 constitutes operational costs and the rest of the costs relate to personnel and administration. Operational costs include food, educational material, medicine and doctors' fees, general care for cleanliness etc, and communication for community awareness. The personnel costs include salaries for the teachers for crèches, balwadis, non formal education and the centre in charge; and monitoring costs relating to supervisor salary.

Achievements

There has been a change over the years regarding the understanding of child care and development needs of children. Although for most women the principal reason for sending their children to the crèches is the safety and security of the children, a deeper understanding of child development is gaining ground. There is a greater focus on the children per se. Several construction sites had centres for child care prior to MC's intervention but the scope of these centres was limited. MC's intervention in the creches has brought about marked improvements in the quality of nutrition and education provided at the centres. There is now a greater focus on the overall development of the children. This has resulted in a greater number of children accessing the centre than earlier.

The capacity and understanding of care workers with respect to holistic childcare needs has perhaps witnessed amongst the most significant shifts. The concept of holistic development has taken deeper roots. With the introduction of relevant teaching material, focus on nutrition and growth monitoring, an atmosphere conducive for the overall development of the child has been created. This has led to changes in the development indicators. Monitoring data for construction sites reveals that 67 percent of the children who stayed for a minimum period of four months improved their nutritional status; 65 percent of families overall were linked with PHCs and 91 percent of children staying for a minimum of two months were age appropriately immunised.

Finally, contractor perspectives have shown a shift as well. While earlier contractors were insensitive to the needs of labour, there is now a greater willingness to invest in addressing at least some of these needs. It is MC that has brought different agencies, both government and NGOs, together to focus on the needs of early childcare. In the slums, community mobilisation and awareness has led to increased demand for childcare services, resulting in the opening of 80 Anganwadi centres on demand.

Action Research

MC initiated the process of analysing and evaluating its strategy with the specific aim of examining the issue of malnutrition of children under six. The findings of the action research project were brought out in a publication: Tackling Malnutrition of Children under Six: Evidence From Two Case Studies. The purpose of carrying out the action research project was to document the results of two kinds of interventions, one community based in Madanpur Khadar, a Resettlement Colony, and the other centre based, i.e. Mobile Crèches. An examination of the two approaches would be specifically valuable at a time when the country is faced with widespread malnutrition. The research was carried out between 2003-2007 in Madanpur Khadar by Dr. Vandana Prasad.

One significant point that has been made in the introductory paragraphs of the study is that it is not one single strategy but a *comprehensive set of multipronged strategies in their entirety that are likely to be the most effective in tackling the problem of persistent malnutrition in the country*. These integrated strategies emphasise the public provision of

care, nutrition education, nutrition counseling, food and health care. It is also acknowledged that the ICDS with the comprehensive and integrated thrust of its programmes comes closest to having the potential of tackling child malnutrition. Dr. Prasad also takes issue with the approach and assumptions articulated in the series of articles in the Lancet that intensive nutrition counselling along with breast feeding would result in positive effects in child malnutrition as well. The study of the Madanpur Khadar Resettlement Colony in fact showed that despite significant impact regarding IYCF, malnutrition did not improve and even worsened as the children grew older. What the study showed was that poverty, living conditions (specifically water and sanitation), inadequate health care and lack of energy, motivation and time of the caregivers (mothers in this case) emerged as the key factors. Principally, the study highlighted not merely poor quality food at infrequent intervals but also affordable care arrangements and the inability to buy good quality food.

The action research was extremely important for a variety of reasons

The methodology used by the study does make significant points regarding the interventions for tackling malnutrition in both the case studies. The methodology comprised of three kinds of interventions: 1) a planned systematic, two year long household level community health worker- based action research between 2004 and 2007; 2) Liaison between the community, health and other related services and to create pressure groups or sustaining and improving this relationship; and 3) General community level sensitisation on ECCD issues and dissemination of information.

The results of the action research showed moderate improvement on a series of separate indicators like ante natal care, decrease in number of home deliveries without trained birth attendant, improvement in the percentages of babies receiving colostrum, improvement in immunization, etc. *However despite many gains on specific indicators, 67% of children were malnourished at 18 months.* The community processes resulted in the allocation of an extra ANM. *What is significant is that the study states that no major intervention was either planned or made on the overarching determinants of child health and nutrition such as poverty or status of the involved women.* However, some efforts were made to mobilise women and organise them into SHGs.

The case study of MC highlights the comprehensive nature of the services offered at the centres. (These have been mentioned earlier in this report). About 1500 children access the programme, but the population of children are in constant flux due to the nature of construction activity. It was decided to study the impact of the services provided by MC upon the vulnerable population of children of construction workers within a period of 6 to 12 months to evaluate the impact on malnutrition itself rather than its many determinant processes.

Hence 752 children of ages upto 3 years from 21 centres of MC were studied from April 2006 to March 2007. Out of the 752 children, 205 availed of the services from 6 months to one year. The results showed that 71% of children had moved up or had retained normal grades, while 10% had deteriorated.

The concluding remarks highlight the need to have a holistic approach to the question of child nutrition which also encompasses wider social and political issues such as access and equity, the relation between poverty and hunger and its long term impact on generations. The need for a comprehensive package of services which includes maternity entitlements among a host of other entitlements like sanitation, water and a clean environment.

The current emphasis which fragments the question of child malnutrition into various units and medicalises an essentially social and political problem is due equally to the political choices that have been made.

CHAPTER VII

Recommendations

The present study was undertaken at a time when the proposal for converting AWCS into crèches or having AWC cum Crèches was under active consideration by MWCD. Besides, there was already an active and engaged debate on the need for an integrated and holistic approach to the questions of children under six. Thus the Working Group of Children under Six had brought out a document "Strategies for Children under Six – A Framework for the 11th Plan". (June 2006) Subsequently, in September 2011, the Report of the Inter-Ministerial Group on ICDS Restructuring came out with a proposal for restructuring the ICDS. Besides, there have also been proposals to convert ICDS into a Mission Mode. There has also been the PM's Council on India's Nutritional Challenges.

The following recommendations flow out of the study. Almost all the suggestions have emerged from the data and responses from the field; we have only put some tentative figures for consideration to the Ministry for Women and Child Development along with suggestions regarding the overall implementation.

There are two aspects of the recommendations: 1) The overall functioning of the ICDS and 2) the question of AWC cum crèches, both of which have emerged from the study. We have also included some recommendations regarding the overall implementation which have emerged from other studies and evaluations and which are now broadly accepted, e.g. issues of convergence, decentralisation etc.

Among the suggestions for the programmatic implementation strategies are the following:

- Need for Convergence of many departments, ICDS, health, water and sanitation, PDS, development programmes if the interest of children under six are to be best served. Mechanisms have to be put in place at all levels (village, block, district, state and national levels along with monitoring at the highest, i.e. the national level.
- Our data shows that the state level governance factor is important in accounting for the relatively better performance of some states as opposed to others. Thus it is necessary to strengthen state level, district level and local government (panchayats, municipalities) and active involvement if the programme along with community participation so that the entire programme is owned by the community in substantive ways. Thus committees at various levels need to be put in place along with monitoring mechanism if the AWC cum crèche is to be the hub of all ECCD services for the young child. Thus decentralisation is extremely important along with active monitoring at the National level.
- While the Report of the Inter-Ministerial Group on ICDS restructuring suggests a Mission Mode, along with concrete suggestions for implementation, it does not deal with the question of AWC cum Crèches.

- The need for crèches for working women has emerged very strongly from the study. Since our respondents have been principally women who have to work and combine care of the young child, their double burden of work and care has emerged as a critical issue that needs to be urgently addressed if both the needs of the working women and the children have to be addressed. Such an intervention is necessary to ensure, health, nutrition and safety for the young child. Alongside, the needs of the mother, specifically maternity entitlements need to be integrated into the programme.

The crèches should not be restricted to working women alone, but should be available to all mothers who require such services. The crèches should cater to all children below six.

There should be at least one crèche in every village and in the case of larger villages, more than one depending on the size of the village.

Location: This is an important criterion since a large percentage of families in certain states do not access the services because of distance. The AWC cum crèche should be located at a distance of less than one kilometer so that families can access the crèche. Our own study suggests that while the majority of our respondents would like the crèche near the home, some occupational groups, like tea plantation workers and brick kiln and construction workers would prefer it near the work site. This will have to be factored into the implementation aspect.

Timings of the Crèche : Full time or 9 hours.
Ratio of Child to Worker : 1:10

❖ Age-Specific Interventions and Strategies

Many reports, studies have highlighted the problems regarding both policy and implementation. Interventions for the young child have to address dimensions of care, health, nutrition, development and education. These various aspects of the needs of the young child which are essentially integrated however require age-specific interventions and strategies. The three age groups are 0-6months, 6 months to 3years and 3 -6 years.

❖ Personnel

There has been a long standing demand for an additional AWW so that the pre-school learning and education could be adequately taken care of. As of now, there is only one AWW and one helper. If indeed, the scheme of AWC cum crèches comes into operation, the provision of an additional worker and an additional Helper is necessary. Both will have to be full time if they have to fulfil the needs of both the under threes and the 3-6s have to be met.

There is also need to examine the status of the anganwadi worker. In certain states, like in Puducherry and Tamil Nadu, they have been given the status of government employees. This is also because these states have a commitment to the ICDS. The Anganwadi Worker

is crucial to the implementation of the programme in the field. Adequate remuneration and safeguards have to be built into the programme so that this ensured. With appropriate monitoring mechanisms in place, the performance of the AWW can also be monitored . There is also need for a better rationalisation of services between the ASHA and the AWW so that there is no duplication and all children are reached.

❖ **Remuneration**

Both the AWWs should get a remuneration of Rs. 5000 per month once they are made full time.

Two Helpers/cum cook with a remuneration of Rs. 3000 per month

❖ **Training:** Annual Refresher Training for AWWs and Helpers, Supervisors, CDPOs, District POS, and State Officials

❖ **Infrastructure:** Most AWCs do not have their own buildings; they are rented. The AWC cum crèche should have their own buildings. This is an important demand that has emerged from the study.

❖ While all AWCs should be converted into AWC cum crèches, initially 25% of AWCs could be converted so that mechanisms and systems are in place.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Coverage

| | | |
|---|---|-------------|
| Total children under six | - | 9 crores |
| Children Covered Under AWC cum Crèche (10 children per Centre -35 Lakh) | | |
| 25% of AWC to be converted into crèches | - | 3,50,000 |
| Severely malnourished children covered | - | 2.25 crores |
| Pregnant and lactating mothers covered | - | 1 crore |
| Anganwadi buildings to be built and equipped per year | - | 1 lakh |
| Anganwadi Centres to be equipped per year | - | 2 Lakh |
| Recurring Costs | | |
| Supplementary Nutrition | | |
| SNP children (@Rs. 5 per day for one year) | | |
| SNP women (@ Rs.8 per day for one year) | | |
| Food/SNP for Children in Crèche (@Rs.10 per day for one year) | | |
| Education Kits / Health Kits/Crèche materials | | |

Remuneration for AWWs/Helpers @ Rs. 5000 per month for 2 AWWs and Rs. 3000 per month for 2 Helper cum cook cum crèche worker, or according to the Minimum Wages prevalent in the state, whichever is greater

AWC Rent till AWCs have their own buildings
Rs. 300 per centre per month in rural areas
Rs.3000 per month in urban areas

Non-Recurring Costs: This will include Equipment and furniture. Anganwadi buildings and Training for AWWs and Crèche helpers.

Recent Policy Initiatives

In July 2012, the draft report was discussed at a national consultation held by CWDS-FORCES. However, since then, the Ministry of Women and Child Development, Government of India which had been involved in a series of consultations, came out with a policy document on the Strengthening and Restructuring of the ICDS. The document titled " ICDS Mission : Broad Framework of Implementation" (October 2012) envisages a series of programmatic, management and institutional reforms, including changes in norms along with putting the ICDS in a Mission Mode for the purpose of continued implementation of the ICDS scheme in the Twelfth Plan period. The document also is committed to a restructured and strengthened ICDS scheme in a Mission Mode with an overall budget allocation of Rs. 1,23,580 crores as the Government of India's share. Other sources of additional funding will also be explored. Convergence with other programmes and schemes including MNREGA will also be explored.

The main features of the restructured ICDS involve programmatic, management and institutional reforms which include 'repositioning' the AWC as 'a vibrant ECD centre' which will be the first outpost for health, nutrition and early learning. The focus will be on the under-3s, care and nutrition counselling for mothers of under-3s, identification and management of severe and moderate underweight children through community based interventions. There is an emphasis on decentralised planning and management, flexibility to states in implementation with regard to innovations and strengthening governance, including PRIs, partnership with civil society and also introducing Annual Programme of Implementation Plan (APIP) and MOUs with states and Union Territories.

The significant structural change is that the ICDS will be implemented in what has been termed as a Mission Mode with a National Mission Directorate and National Mission Resource Centre, which is supposed to be operational from the first year of the Twelfth Plan.

The restructured and strengthened ICDS will get operational in phases with 200 high burden districts in the first year, i.e 2012-2013. (The high burden districts selected in the first phase are from the states of Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Uttaranchal, Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Haryana, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Nagaland, Punjab, West Bengal and the Union Territory of Daman and Diu.) In the second year (2013-14), another 200 districts which would include districts from special category states and the North Eastern Region (NER) and the remaining districts would be covered in the third year (2014 -15).

As part of the new policy thrust, norms for different components have been revised, including supplementary nutrition, along with other items like kits, rent for AWCs, purchase of vehicles, administrative expenses etc.

New components under the ICDS Mission including cost sharing between the Centre and the States will be implemented in a phased manner. (The cost sharing pattern including staff salary would be 75:25 for all states except NER where it will be 90:10)

In order to address the serious problem of malnutrition, a Nutrition Counsellor cum Additional Worker (per AWC) would be provided in the 200 high burden districts. For other districts, there is a provision of link worker. The incentives provided for link workers and ASHAs would be linked to outcomes.

The most significant additional element in the proposed new policy is that 5% of the existing AWCs would be converted into AWC- cum- crèches on an experimental basis.

With the purpose of transforming the AWC into a 'vibrant ECD centre', the package of services have been redesigned and strengthened. The new package would include Early Childhood Care, Education and Development (ECCED) which would include ECCE/Pre-school non-formal education and supplementary nutrition), Care and Nutrition Counselling (which would consist of IYCF promotion, maternal care and counseling, care, management of underweight children among others), Health Services, Community Mobilisation, Awareness, Advocacy and IEC.

Mother and Child Protection Cards will be introduced using new WHO standards for child growth and development and these would be universalised with funds being provided within the overall budgetary allocations.

As part of the programme of strengthening governance, upto 10% of the projects would be given to PRIs and NGOs and voluntary organisations.

Management of moderately and severely undernourished children (through Sneha Shivirs), IEC, strengthening, evaluation and monitoring and grading and accreditation of AWCs and reward scheme would also be introduced according to the new policy.

With regard to the health component, the National Rural Health Mission (NRHM) would provide the doctors on monthly basis or at least once a quarter. Mandatory provisions under NRHM would be drawn upon to provide doctors from the NRHM and AYUSH or even trained Registered Medical Practitioners (RMP) where necessary.

As part of the reformulated policy thrust, human resource management would be strengthened. Selection procedures, minimum qualifications (Matriculation and age limit of 18-35 years) for the appointment of AWWs and AWHs, a separate cadre for the ICDS in states and UTs, permitting states to fill up posts on a contract basis, opening cluster offices to manage and oversee a cluster of AWCs, rationalising appointment of AWWs as Supervisors, etc have been envisaged in the Broad Framework of Implementation.

Training and capacity building at different levels with the setting up of state training institutes in 10 states, strengthening of NIPCCD as a Training Resource Centre for ICDS,

strengthening of monitoring and accreditation, development of course curricula etc. The requisite budgetary allocations would be provided as per the financial norms of the Broad Framework of Implementation.

Institutional arrangement of ICDS Mission

The institutional arrangements for the ICDS Mission would comprise a National Mission Steering Group (NMSG) under the chairpersonship of the Minister in charge of MWCD would be constituted and this will be the apex body for providing direction and policy for the implementation of the ICDS. An Empowered Programme Committee (EPC) under the Chairmanship of the Secretary, MWCD would be formed at the national level for planning, implementation and monitoring of the ICDS Mission. The ICDS Mission will report to the Prime Minister's Council at the national level on nutrition, child development including early learning. The State Mission will report to the Chief Minister. District Missions will also be operationalised as per the phasing plan of the ICDS Mission.

There would be national ICDS Mission Directorate to be headed by the Joint Secretary as Mission Director vested with executive and financial powers as approved by the National Mission Steering Group (NMSG). Similar institutional arrangements will be operationalised at the state level. Decentralised planning and management is to be ensured through the Annual Programme of Implementation (APIP) and MOUs with flexibility to states for innovations.

The goal of the ICDS Mission would be to attain three main objectives: 1) prevent and reduce young child under-nutrition (percentage of underweight children 0-3 years) by 10 percentage points; 2) enhance early development and learning outcomes in all children 0-6 years of age; 3) improve care and nutrition of girls and women and reduce anemia prevalent among young girls and children and women by one fifth. Annual Health Survey (AHS) and District Level Household Survey (DLHS) will be used as baseline for measuring the outcomes of the ICDS Mission.

There are a few points which are significant in this policy initiative which are of relevance for the present study and for FORCES. One of these is the revamping of the ICDS which was urgently needed and the other is the provision for day care services and crèches.

One element of this initiative is the focus on the under-3s, which has arisen out of the serious concern regarding the situation of the children of this age group, particularly regarding malnutrition. While one of the three main objectives of the ICDS Mission is to 'enhance early development and learning outcomes in all children 0-6 years of age', there is a separate policy for ECCE, as part of the RTE under the Ministry of Human Resource Development, which has been approved in September 2013. There has been extensive discussion on the Draft ECCE Bill among practitioners, policy analysts and activists. The rationale behind this initiative is to include children from three years to six years under the Right to Education Act. The draft bill has been discussed and critiqued in many forums initiated by the government of India. One of the main criticisms of the draft Bill was that it

focused too narrowly on schooling and that the developmental needs of children of 3-6 years had been sidelined. Thus one of the suggestions was to title the bill as ECCED so as to incorporate this dimension. The regulation of the private sector was another serious concern and the Draft Bill does only partially address this dimension. The other serious concern was that of Public Private Partnership (PPPs). There was certainly a consensus among FORCES and many other organisations and networks that education should not be privatised. Some of these concerns were addressed by the Draft.

The second was the attempt to divide children into under -3s and 3-6s. The attempt to push through a separate Bill for Early Child Care and Education (ECCE) seemed to be guided by an entirely different perspective and framework than that underlining the ICDS. The vision of ICDS incorporated the needs of the young child and the mother in a holistic and integrated framework, whereas the Draft Bill on ECCE focussed exclusively on education though the emphasis on the holistic needs of the young child was incorporated after discussion. Thus we have a situation wherein the ECCE dimension of the young child is likely to be addressed not merely by the ICDS but also by schools.

AWC-Cum-Creches

The initiative to start AWC-cum- Creches in 5% of the AWCs is at least testimony to the longstanding demand for crèches and day care, particularly for women in the unorganised sector., though the percentage is woefully inadequate even on an experimental basis.

One of the most significant acknowledgements of the proposed AWC-cum-Creche Scheme is that it is essential for the care and development of children whose mothers go for work and that it is specifically required where there are no adult caregivers at home after the mothers have left for work (Annexure I, p.56, ICDS Mission, Broad Framework of Implementation). There is also an acknowledgement that the Rajiv Gandhi Creche Scheme is limited to 22,000 creches for the entire country and these are managed by mother NGOs with no involvement of the state government.

The AWC is considered best suited to function as a day care centre since they provide the requisite services of supplementary nutrition, pre-school education and health check up for children under six. Augmentation of physical infrastructure, human resources and care related facilities and equipments would be needed specifically for children under 3 years of age.

The additional facilities envisaged are as follows:

There is a provision for an additional creche worker who will be responsible for children under 3 and for providing supplementary nutrition with the honorarium for such a worker being equivalent to that of the AWW, i.e Rs. 3000 per month. Experience on the ground shows that there is a differential between the AWW and the creche worker in the AWC and this will have to be addressed. There are provisions for providing breakfast/ mid morning snack, lunch and an evening snack for children who stay in the crèche the whole day. The cost of the supplementary nutrition will be Rs. 6 per day per child in addition to the normal

SNP provisions at the AWC for 300 days in a year. Additional space (6-8 sq ft) for each child has been allocated so that there is adequate place for the child to play, rest and learn in a safe environment. In those AWCs where additional space would be required, provision has been made for construction of additional space with the cost sharing between the Centre and the State being 75:25. The cost has been budgeted under the AWC upgradation scheme at Rs. 1 lakh per unit for 2 lakh units. However, the AWC-cum Creche upgradation would get top priority. The AWC would be open for at least 8 hours and the timing would be set in accordance with the mothers' requirements and may differ from area to area. The timings may coincide with primary school timings so that the older siblings may pick up the younger ones from the crèches.

All the workers at the AWC would require base training for operationalisation of crèches since this new element in the basket of services to be provided for mothers and children under six. Greater specialisation for pre-school education will be required for AWW 1 and training for crèche management and care and stimulation for under 3s will be required for the Creche Worker. Supervisors and CDPOs will also need to be trained on the new model of AWC-cum Creche so that efficient monitoring will take place.

The AWC-cum- Creche model will be started on a pilot basis in 5% of the AWCs on a 75-25% cost sharing basis between the Centre and the States. Initially the implementation will begin in the urban areas and the ratio between urban and rural will be on 60:40 basis. Of the 60% crèches in the urban areas, 17% will be in the metropolitan cities. What is significant is that the document states that States 'may explore the engagement of non-governmental organisations in implementing the model.' In case the State government implements the model on its own, it could draw on the services of NGOs for providing training and technical support. States interested in piloting the model would need to work out detailed implementation plans to be approved by the AIPs.

The schedule for the implementation of the AWC-cum-Creche Model in 70,000 AWCs has also been spelt out, with 28,000 creches in the metropolitan areas, 30,000 in other urban areas and only 11,900 creches in the rural areas at the end of five years.

Some of the key issues that emerge out of the above policy initiative are as follows: For the first time, a longstanding demand of many activists and professionals and organisations, i.e., the demand for crèches for working women has been officially seriously acknowledged. It has also been recognised that the RGCS has not fulfilled the need for crèches.

However, the AWC-cum Creches is being implemented on an experimental basis in only 5% of the AWCs, (70,000) which is an extremely small percentage and that too over a period of 5 years. It is our view that even on an experimental basis, it could have been upscaled to at least 20%. More disturbing is the fact that for the first time the new policy explicitly gives official sanction to the notion of the Public-Private Partnership, which can be extremely problematic if there are no safeguards, accountability and monitoring.

While the endeavour to professionalise the ICDS with an emphasis on training and capacity building is welcome, the question of accreditation is fraught with problems since it would imply a gradation of the ICDS into a superior and inferior one which was against the original vision of the ICDS. Along with that the permission given to the States and UTs to appoint personnel in vacant posts on a contract basis again undermines the entire vision of the ICDS. If indeed, accountability is the purpose, then better methods could have been devised which does not divide the care workers into two categories. However, it is necessary to reiterate the need for professionalisation of the cadre of care workers and specifically recognise them as workers and not continue to categorise them as mere volunteers.

ANNEXURE

Table 2.1 - The profile of respondents'/mothers across states and occupational categories

| Occupational categories | Assam | Delhi | M.P | Orissa | Rajasthan | U.P | Total |
|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Agricultural Labourers | 50 | 0 | 260 | 200 | 0 | 211 | 721 (25%) |
| Home based Artisans | 48 | 121 | 71 | 0 | 94 | 103 | 436 (15%) |
| Brick kiln workers | 56 | 0 | 149 | 0 | 34 | 159 | 398 (13.8%) |
| Construction workers | 4 | 156 | 0 | 150 | 302 | 157 | 769 (26.7%) |
| Domestic workers | 44 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 198(6.8%) |
| Fishing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180 | 0 | 0 | 180 (6.2%) |
| Tea Plantation workers | 178 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 178 (6.18%) |
| | 380 (13.2%) | 430 (14.9%) | 480 (16.7%) | 530 (18.4%) | 430 (14.9%) | 630 (21.9%) | 2880 |

Table 2.2 - Religious composition of respondents/mothers

| | Hindus | Muslims | Christians | Others |
|--------------------|--------------|-------------|------------|----------|
| No. of respondents | 2489 (86.4%) | 352 (12.2%) | 35 (1.2%) | 4 (0.1%) |

Table 2.3 - Caste composition of respondents/mothers

| | SCs | STs | OBCs | Others |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| No. of respondents | 913 (31.7%) | 726 (25.2%) | 891 (30.9%) | 350 (12.1%) |

Table 2.4 - Children in the age category 0-6 years in the respondents'/mothers' households across states

| Children in 0-6 age category | Assam | Delhi | M.P | Orissa | Rajasthan | U.P | Total |
|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Males | 342 (56.1%) | 340 (53.5%) | 440 (51.2%) | 440 (49.4%) | 373 (53.1%) | 621 (54.5%) | 2556 (52.8%) |
| Females | 268 (43.9%) | 296 (46.5%) | 420 (48.8%) | 451 (50.6%) | 330 (46.9%) | 518 (45.5%) | 2283 (47.2%) |
| Total | 610 (12.6%) | 636 (13.1%) | 860 (17.8%) | 891 (18.4%) | 703 (14.5%) | 1139 (23.5%) | 4839 |

Table 2.5 - House hold size across states

| No. of persons in family | States | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 (0.5%) |
| 3 | 85 | 74 | 62 | 31 | 86 | 57 | 395 (13.7%) |
| 4 | 109 | 109 | 98 | 118 | 79 | 122 | 635 (22%) |
| 5 | 109 | 105 | 107 | 144 | 100 | 146 | 711 (24.7%) |
| 6 | 50 | 74 | 98 | 134 | 85 | 133 | 574 (19.9%) |
| 7 | 16 | 43 | 58 | 65 | 46 | 80 | 308 (10.7%) |
| 8 | 7 | 13 | 24 | 23 | 20 | 45 | 132 (4.6%) |
| 9 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 5 | 7 | 27 | 56 (1.9%) |
| 10 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 28 (0.9%) |
| 11 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 10 (0.3%) |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 11 (0.4%) |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 (0.1%) |
| 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (0.03%) |
| 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 (0.03%) |
| Total | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

Table 2.6 - Nature of family across occupations and states

| | | | Occupational Categories | | | | | | | Total |
|----------------|--------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------|
| | | | Agricultural labourers | home based artisans | Brick kiln workers | Construction workers | Domestic workers | Fishing | Tea plantation workers | |
| Nuclear family | States | Assam | 49 | 47 | 51 | 4 | 43 | 0 | 136 | 330 (86.8%) |
| | | Delhi | 0 | 105 | 0 | 145 | 136 | 0 | 0 | 386 (89.7%) |
| | | MP | 197 | 48 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 363 (75.6%) |
| | | Orissa | 89 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 251 (47.3%) |
| | | Rajasthan | 0 | 74 | 31 | 247 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 352 (81.8%) |
| | | UP | 158 | 79 | 144 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 520 (82.5%) |
| | Total | 493 (68.3%) | 353 (80.7%) | 344 (86.4%) | 597 (77.6%) | 179 (90.8%) | 100 (55.5%) | 136 (76.4%) | 2202 (77%) | |
| Joint family | States | Assam | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 42 | 50 (13.2%) |
| | | Delhi | 0 | 16 | 0 | 11 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 44 (10.3%) |
| | | MP | 63 | 23 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 117 (24.4%) |
| | | Orissa | 111 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 279 (52.7%) |
| | | Rajasthan | 0 | 20 | 3 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 (18.2%) |
| | | UP | 53 | 24 | 15 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110 (17.5%) |
| | Total | 228 (31.7%) | 84 (19.3%) | 54 (13.6%) | 172 (22.4%) | 18 (9.2%) | 80 (44.5%) | 42 (23.6%) | 678 (23%) | |

| Literacy Level | | States | | | | | | Total |
|----------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| A. Illiterate | | 274 (72.2%) | 298 (69.4%) | 287 (59.8%) | 342 (64.5%) | 366 (85.2%) | 486 (77.2%) | 2053 (71%) |
| B. Literate | | 106 (27.8%) | 132 (30.6%) | 193 (40.2%) | 188 (35.4%) | 64 (14.8%) | 144 (22.8%) | 827 (29%) |
| | Up to 5th | 79 | 54 | 92 | 146 | 37 | 79 | 487 (59%) |
| | 6th-9th | 27 | 55 | 90 | 37 | 17 | 35 | 261 (32%) |
| | 10th-12th | 0 | 18 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 23 | 66 (7.9%) |
| | Graduate | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 10 (1.2%) |
| | Post graduate | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 (0.3%) |
| | Professional course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Total A+B | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

Table 2.7 b- Educational level of respondents/mothers across occupational categories

| Educational levels | Across occupational categories | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| | Agricultural labourers | Home based Artisans | Brick kiln workers | Domestic workers | Construction workers | Tea plantation workers | Fishing | |
| Illiterate | 441 (61.2%) | 246 (56.4%) | 321 (80.7%) | 162 (81.8%) | 617 (80.2%) | 142 (79.8%) | 124 (68.9%) | 2053 (71.3%) |
| Literate | 280 (38.8%) | 190 (43.6%) | 77 (19.3%) | 36 (18.2%) | 152 (19.8%) | 36 (20.2%) | 56 (31.1%) | 827 (28.7%) |
| Total | 721 | 436 | 398 | 198 | 769 | 178 | 180 | 2880 |

Table 2.8a - School going children in the age category 6-14 in the respondents'/mothers' households across states

| | TOTAL BOYS | BOYS GOING TO SCHOOL | TOTAL GIRLS | GIRLS GOING TO SCHOOL |
|-----------|------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| ASSAM | 147 | 80 (54.4%) | 166 | 80 (48.2%) |
| DELHI | 228 | 177 (77.6%) | 324 | 271 (83.6%) |
| M.P | 226 | 177 (78.3%) | 309 | 254 (82.2%) |
| ORISSA | 242 | 160 (66.1%) | 249 | 133 (53.4%) |
| RAJASTHAN | 298 | 260 (87.2%) | 326 | 272 (83.4%) |
| U.P | 456 | 355 (77.8%) | 455 | 330 (72.5%) |
| Total | 1597 | 1209 (75.7%) | 1829 | 1340 (73.3%) |

Table 2.8b - School going children in the age category 6-14 in the respondents'/mothers' households across occupational categories - disaggregated by gender

| Occupational categories | Total Boys | Boys going to school | Total Girls | Girls going to school |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| Agricultural labourers | 363 | 293 (80.7%) | 413 | 313 (75.8%) |
| Home based artisans | 242 | 208 (85.9%) | 311 | 250 (80.4%) |
| Brick kiln workers | 241 | 143 (59.3%) | 247 | 148 (59.9%) |
| Construction workers | 477 | 348 (72.9%) | 511 | 366 (71.6%) |
| Domestic workers | 108 | 87 (80.6%) | 165 | 135 (81.8%) |
| Fishing | 80 | 63 (78.8%) | 81 | 57 (70.4%) |
| Tea plantation workers | 86 | 67 (77.9%) | 101 | 71 (70.3%) |
| Total | 1597 | 1209 (75.7%) | 1829 | 1340 (73.3%) |

| | | States | | | | | | Total |
|--|----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| Nature of employment of major occupation of respondents | Paid casual labour | 141 (37.1%) | 263 (61.1%) | 375 (78.1%) | 341 (64.3%) | 423 (98.3%) | 463 (73.4%) | 2006 (69.6%) |
| | Paid contract labour | 68 (17.8%) | 155 (36%) | 56 (11.6%) | 21 (3.9%) | 0 (0%) | 131 (20.7%) | 431 (14.9%) |
| | Paid regular labour | 159 (41.8%) | 2 (0.46%) | 1 (0.2%) | 1 (0.18%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (0.47%) | 166 (5.7%) |
| | Own account worker | 8 (2.1%) | 10 (2.3%) | 12 (2.5%) | 2 (0.37%) | 0 (0%) | 17 (2.69%) | 49 (1.7%) |
| | Unpaid helper | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 33 (6.8%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 15 (2.38%) | 49 (1.7%) |
| | Employer | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (0.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (0.1%) |
| | Self owned business | 2 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 165 (31.1%) | 7 (1.6%) | 1 (0.15%) | 175 (6%) |
| | Total | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

| | | States | | | | | | Total |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| Nature of employment | Paid casual labour | 87 | 180 | 356 | 309 | 345 | 426 | 1703 (60.1%) |
| | Paid contract labour | 72 | 179 | 56 | 40 | 52 | 163 | 562 (19.9%) |
| | Paid regular labour | 139 | 15 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 175 (6.2%) |
| | Own account worker | 49 | 30 | 31 | 13 | 1 | 11 | 135 (4.8%) |
| | Unpaid helper | 8 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 35 (1.2%) |
| | Employer | 2 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 (0.4%) |
| | Self owned business | 6 | 2 | 1 | 165 | 22 | 5 | 201 (7.1%) |
| | NA | 17 | 21 | 11 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 59 |
| Total | | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

| | | States | | | | | | Total |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| Wage payment system | Piece rate | 293 (77.2%) | 422 (98%) | 408 (85%) | 308 (58%) | 430 (100%) | 498 (79%) | 2359(81.9%) |
| | Time rate | 87 (22.8%) | 7 (1.6%) | 70 (14.6%) | 222 (41.8%) | 0 (0%) | 126 (20%) | 512 (17.7%) |
| | No response | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 2 (0.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (0.9%) | 9 (0.3%) |
| Total | | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

| Wage payment system | States | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| Piece Rate | 235 | 396 | 387 | 310 | 325 | 456 | 2109 (74.8%) |
| Time Rate | 128 | 13 | 82 | 218 | 99 | 172 | 712 (25.2%) |
| NA | 17 | 21 | 11 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 59 |
| Total | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

NA* -Includes non-responses cases as also separated and widowed. "NA" figures differs from table to table depends upon no responses

Table 3.5 - Number of days of employment of the respondents/mothers in a year across states and occupational categories

| No. of days of employment | States | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| Agricultural labourers | | | | | | | |
| <1 Month | 1 (2%) | 0 | 5 (1.9%) | 2 (1%) | 0 | 2 (0.9%) | 10 (1.3%) |
| 1-3 Months | 0 | 0 | 30 (11.5%) | 46 (23%) | 0 | 59 (27.9%) | 135 (18.7%) |
| 4-6 Months | 46 (92%) | 0 | 111 (42.6%) | 105 (52.5%) | 0 | 91 (43.1%) | 353 (48.9%) |
| 7-9 Months | 3 (6%) | 0 | 91 (35%) | 42 (21%) | 0 | 55 (26%) | 191 (26.4%) |
| 10-12 Months | 0 | 0 | 23 (8.8%) | 5 (2.5%) | 0 | 4 (1.8%) | 32 (4.4%) |
| Sub-Total | 50 | 0 | 260 | 200 | 0 | 211 | 721 |
| Home based artisans | | | | | | | |
| <1 Month | 0 | 4 (3.3%) | 2 (2.8%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 (1.3%) |
| 1-3 Months | 0 | 10 (8.3%) | 5 (7.04%) | 0 | 1 (1.06%) | 0 | 16 (3.6%) |
| 4-6 Months | 15 (31.2%) | 33 (27.5%) | 32 (45.07%) | 0 | 31 (32.9%) | 13 (12.6%) | 124 (28.4%) |
| 7-9 Months | 27 (56.2%) | 47 (39.1%) | 24 (33.8%) | 0 | 54 (57.4%) | 66 (64.07%) | 218 (50%) |
| 10-12 Months | 6 (12.5%) | 26 (21.6%) | 8 (11.2%) | 0 | 8 (8.5%) | 24 (23.3%) | 72 (16.5%) |
| Sub-Total | 48 | 120 | 71 | 0 | 94 | 103 | 436 |
| Brick kiln workers | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| <1 Month | 0 | 0 | 2 (1.3%) | 0 | 0 | 2 (1.2%) | 4 (1%) |
| 1-3 Months | 0 | 0 | 5 (3.3%) | 0 | 0 | 8 (5.03%) | 13 (3.2%) |
| 4-6 Months | 33 (58.9%) | 0 | 33 (22.1%) | 0 | 12 (35.2%) | 82 (51.5%) | 160 (40.2%) |
| 7-9 Months | 23 (41.07%) | 0 | 97 (65.1%) | 0 | 22 (64.7%) | 53 (33.3%) | 195 (48.9%) |
| 10-12 Months | 0 | 0 | 12 (8.05%) | 0 | 0 | 14 (8.8%) | 26 (6.5%) |
| Sub-Total | 56 | 0 | 149 | 0 | 34 | 159 | 398 |
| Construction workers | | | | | | | |
| <1 Month | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 (2.6%) | 1 (0.6%) | 9 (1.1%) |
| 1-3 Months | 0 | 1 (0.64%) | 0 | 21 (14%) | 83 (27.4%) | 35 (22.2%) | 140 (18.2%) |
| 4-6 Months | 3 (75%) | 1 (0.64%) | 0 | 72 (48%) | 206 (68.2%) | 71 (45.2%) | 353 (45.9%) |
| 7-9 Months | 1 (25%) | 90 (57.6%) | 0 | 8 (5.3%) | 2 (0.6%) | 40 (25.4%) | 141 (18.3%) |
| 10-12 Months | 0 | 64 (41.02%) | 0 | 49 (32.6%) | 3 (0.9%) | 10 (6.3%) | 126 (16.3%) |
| Sub-Total | 4 | 156 | 0 | 150 | 302 | 157 | 769 |
| Domestic workers | | | | | | | |
| <1 Month | 0 | 1 (0.6%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (0.5%) |
| 1-3 Months | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4-6 Months | 31 (70.4%) | 11 (7.1%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 (21.2%) |
| 7-9 Months | 7 (15.9%) | 36 (23.3%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 (21.7%) |
| 10-12 Months | 6 (13.6%) | 106 (68.8%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 (56.5%) |
| Sub-Total | 44 | 154 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 198 |
| Tea Plantation workers | | | | | | | |
| <1 Month | 28 (15.7%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 (15.7%) |
| 1-3 Months | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4-6 Months | 8 (4.4%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 (4.4%) |
| 7-9 Months | 56 (31.4%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 (31.4%) |
| 10-12 Months | 86 (48.3%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 (48.3%) |
| Sub-Total | 178 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 178 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Fishing community | | | | | | | |
| <1 Month | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1-3 Months | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4-6 Months | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7-9 Months | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 (5%) | 0 | 0 | 9 (5%) |
| 10-12 Months | 0 | 0 | 0 | 171 (95%) | 0 | 0 | 171 (95%) |
| Sub-Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180 | 0 | 0 | 180 |
| Total | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

| Table 3.6 - No of days of employment of the head of household/spouse in a year across states | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-----|--------|-----------|-----|--------------|
| No of days in a year | Assam | Delhi | M.P | Orissa | Rajasthan | U.P | Total |
| Less than a month | 22 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 33 (1.2%) |
| 1-3months | 0 | 3 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 40 | 61 (2.2%) |
| 4-6months | 18 | 7 | 140 | 224 | 63 | 182 | 634 (22.5%) |
| 7-9months | 186 | 124 | 225 | 70 | 192 | 242 | 1039 (36.8%) |
| 10-12months | 137 | 274 | 87 | 231 | 166 | 159 | 1048 (37.1%) |
| N.A | 17 | 21 | 11 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 59 |
| Total | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

Table 3.7 - Number of respondents/mothers involved in more than one occupation across states

| Involvement in more than one occupation | States | | | | | | Total |
|---|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| Employed in the paid labour force | 2 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (2.3%) | 27 (5%) | 1 (0.2%) | 77 (14%) | 118 (4%) |
| Self Employed as a weaver or artisan | 5 (1.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.1%) | 1 (0.2%) | 7 (1.1%) | 14 (0.4%) |
| self employed as owner of a trade or business | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.1%) | 0 (0%) | 17 (2.6%) | 18 (0.6%) |
| Working in own farm | 63 (16.5%) | 1 (0.2%) | 2 (0.4%) | 0 (0%) | 389 (90.4%) | 38 (6%) | 493 (17.1%) |
| Irregular daily wage earner | 107 (28%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (0.6%) | 14 (2.6%) | 3 (0.6%) | 58 (9.2%) | 185 (6.4%) |
| Agricultural labourer | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.03%) |
| Brick Kiln Worker | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 1 (0.1%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0.3%) | 4 (0.1%) |
| Domestic | 16 (4.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 1 (0.1%) | 18 (0.6%) |
| Others | 3 (0.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.1%) | 1 (0.2%) | 14 (2.2%) | 19 (0.6%) |
| Single occupation | 183 (47%) | 429 (99.7%) | 463 (96.4%) | 485 (91.5%) | 34 (8%) | 416 (66%) | 2010(69.7%) |
| Total | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

Table 3.8 - Average annual household income across states and occupational categories of respondents' households

| Yearly income | | | States | | | | | Total | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| | | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | | UP |
| Less than 10000 Rs. | Occupational categories | Agricultural labourers | 7 (14%) | 0 | 1 (0.38%) | 0 | 0 | 28 (13.2%) | 36 (4.9%) |
| | | Home based artisans | 0 | 2 (1.6%) | 2 (2.8%) | 0 | 0 | 9 (8.7%) | 13 (3%) |
| | | Brick kiln workers | 9 (16.07%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (2.9%) | 28 (17.6%) | 38 (9.5%) |
| | | Construction workers | 0 | 1 (0.64%) | 0 | 1 (0.6%) | 0 | 47 (29.9%) | 49 (6.3%) |
| | | Domestic workers | 6 (13.6%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 (3%) |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| | | Fishing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 (1.1%) | 0 | 0 | 2 (1%) |
| | Total | | 22 (5.8%) | 3 (0.69%) | 3 (0.62%) | 3 (0.5%) | 1 (0.2%) | 112 (17.7%) | 144 (5%) |
| 10,000-20,000 Rs. | Occupational categories | Agricultural labourers | 42 (84%) | 0 | 67 (25.7%) | 78 (39%) | 0 | 127 (60%) | 314 (43.5%) |
| | | Home based artisans | 29 (60.4%) | 3 (2.4%) | 28 (39.4%) | 0 | 8 (8.5%) | 55 (53.3%) | 123 (28.1%) |
| | | Brick kiln workers | 45 (80.3%) | 0 | 35 (23.4%) | 0 | 3 (8.8%) | 70 (45.7%) | 153 (38.4%) |
| | | Construction workers | 3 (75%) | 0 | 0 | 11 (7.3%) | 82 (88.1%) | 78 (49.6%) | 174 (22.6%) |
| | | Domestic workers | 30 (68.1%) | 3 (1.9%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 (16.7%) |
| | | Fishing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 (35%) | 0 | 0 | 63 (35%) |
| | | Tea plantation workers | 151 (84.8%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 151 (84.8%) |
| | Total | | 300 (78.9%) | 6 (1.3%) | 130 (27%) | 152 (35.3%) | 93 (21.6%) | 330 (52.3%) | 1011 (35%) |
| 20,000-40,000 Rs. | Occupational categories | Agricultural labourers | 1 (2%) | 0 | 176 (67.6%) | 108 (54%) | 0 | 50 (23.6%) | 335 (46.4%) |
| | | Home based artisans | 18 (37.5%) | 22 (18.1%) | 41 (57.7%) | 0 | 67 (71.2%) | 39 (37.8%) | 187 (42.7%) |
| | | Brick kiln workers | 2 (3.5%) | 0 | 87 (58.3%) | 0 | 28 (82.3%) | 59 (37.1%) | 176 (44.2%) |
| | | Construction workers | 1 (25%) | 22 (14.1%) | 0 | 89 (59.3%) | 208 (68.8%) | 32 (20.3%) | 352 (45.7%) |
| | | Domestic workers | 8 (18%) | 12 (7.8%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 (10.1%) |
| | | Fishing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 (47.2%) | 0 | 0 | 85 (47.2%) |
| | | Tea plantation workers | 25 (14%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 (14%) |
| | Total | | 55 (14.4%) | 56 (13%) | 304 (63.3%) | 282 (53.2%) | 303 (70.4%) | 180 (28.5%) | 1180 (40.9%) |
| 40,000+ | Occupational categories | Agricultural labourers | 0 | 0 | 16 (6.1%) | 14 (7%) | 0 | 6 (2.8%) | 36 (4.9%) |
| | | Home based artisans | 1 (2%) | 94 (77.6%) | 0 | 0 | 19 (20.2%) | 0 | 114 (26%) |
| | | Brick kiln workers | 0 | 0 | 27 (18.1%) | 0 | 2 (5.8%) | 2 (1.2%) | 31 (7.7%) |
| | | Construction workers | 0 | 133 (85.2%) | 0 | 49 (32.6%) | 12 (3.9%) | 0 | 194 (25.2%) |
| | | Domestic workers | 1 (2.2%) | 137 (89.5%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 (70%) |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|------------|-----------|----------|-------------|
| | Fishing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 (16.6%) | 0 | 0 | 30 (16.6%) |
| | Tea plantation workers | 2 (1.1%) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 (1.1%) |
| | Total | 4 (1.05%) | 364 (84.6%) | 43 (8.9%) | 93 (17.5%) | 33 (7.6%) | 8 (1.2%) | 545 (18.9%) |

Table 3.9 - Ownership of productive assets across states

| | States | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| (A). own house | 211 (55.5%) | 386 (89.7%) | 446 (92.9%) | 518 (97.7%) | 422 (98.1%) | 523 (83%) | 2506 (87%) |
| (B). Less than 1 acre land | 163 (42.8%) | 124 (28.8%) | 31 (6.4%) | 95 (17.9%) | 247 (57.4%) | 158 (25%) | 818 (28.4%) |
| 1.1-3 acre | 5 (1.3%) | 30 (6.9%) | 72 (15%) | 124 (23.3%) | 122 (28.4%) | 12 (1.9%) | 365 (12.6%) |
| 3.1-5 acre | 1 (0.2%) | 11 (2.5%) | 14 (2.9%) | 0 (0%) | 13 (3%) | 1 (0.1%) | 40 (1.3%) |
| 5+ acre | 0 (0%) | 5 (1.1%) | 8 (1.6%) | 0 (0%) | 15 (3.5%) | 0 (0%) | 28 (0.9%) |
| (C).Livestock -animals providing milk | 105 (27.6%) | 30 (6.9%) | 113 (23.5%) | 34 (6.4%) | 312 (72.6%) | 211 (33.4%) | 805 (27.9%) |
| (D).Livestock- animals used in cultivation | 12 (3.1%) | 6 (1.3%) | 49 (10.2%) | 116 (21.8%) | 38 (8.8%) | 8 (1.2%) | 229 (7.9%) |
| (E). Hen | 135 (35.5%) | 3 (0.6%) | 18 (3.7%) | 111 (20.9%) | 5 (1.2%) | 51 (8%) | 323 (11.2%) |
| (F). Shop | 0 (0%) | 2 (0.46%) | 2 (0.4%) | 8 (1.5%) | 2 (0.5%) | 5 (0.79%) | 19 (0.6%) |
| (G).Factory | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 1 (0.1%) | 1 (0.2%) | 6 (0.9%) | 10 (0.3%) |
| (H). Vehicle | 0 (0%) | 6 (1.3%) | 16 (3.3%) | 52 (9.8%) | 27 (6.3%) | 28 (4.4%) | 129 (4.4%) |
| (I). Electrical equipments | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 13 (2.7%) | 20 (3.7%) | 9 (2.1%) | 21 (3.3%) | 63 (2.1%) |
| (J). Others | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0.4%) | 19 (3.5%) | 1 (0.2%) | 4 (0.6%) | 26 (0.9%) |
| Total | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

Table 3.10 - Number of respondents' households who have a ration card

| Ration card | States | | | | | | Total |
|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| APL | 11 (2.8%) | 54 (12.5%) | 108 (22.5%) | 73 (13.7%) | 185 (43%) | 198 (31.4%) | 629 (21.8%) |
| BPL | 118 (31%) | 18 (4.1%) | 116 (24.1%) | 381 (71.8%) | 211 (49%) | 143 (22.6%) | 987 (34.2%) |
| AAY | 9 (2.3%) | 1 (0.2%) | 44 (9.1%) | 47 (8.8%) | 0 (0%) | 51 (8%) | 152 (5.2%) |
| No card | 242 (63.6%) | 357 (83%) | 212 (44.1%) | 29 (5.4%) | 34 (7.9%) | 238 (37.7%) | 1112 (38.6%) |
| Total | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

| | | States | | | | | | Total |
|---|---------------------------|--------|-------|-----|--------|-----------|-----|--------------|
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| Residential status of respondents/mothers | Family Owned | 198 | 174 | 439 | 526 | 424 | 502 | 2263 (78.6%) |
| | Rented | 4 | 141 | 31 | 4 | 6 | 21 | 207 (7.2%) |
| | mothers' house | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 (0.07%) |
| | quarter | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 (1.5%) |
| | provided by government | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (0.03%) |
| | self built on garden land | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 (0.1%) |
| | Other | 126 | 115 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 354 (12.3%) |
| | not mentioned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 (0.2%) |
| Total | | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

| | | States | | | | | | Total |
|------------------------------|---------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| Type of house of respondents | Kuccha | 321 (84.5%) | 111 (25.8%) | 442 (92%) | 455 (85.8%) | 312 (72.5%) | 307 (48.7%) | 1948 (67.6%) |
| | Pucca | 14 (3.7%) | 182 (42.3%) | 9 (1.9%) | 12 (2.3%) | 68 (15.8%) | 137 (21.7%) | 422 (14.6%) |
| | Mixed | 45 (11.8%) | 136 (31.6%) | 28 (5.8%) | 63 (11.9%) | 49 (11.4%) | 129 (20.5%) | 450 (15.6%) |
| | Other | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 57 (9%) | 58 (2%) |
| | jhopdi | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.03%) |
| | nhi hai | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.03%) |
| Total | | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

4.1 a - Childcare patterns across occupations for respondents' children in the age category of 0 -6months

| | Agricultural labourers | Home based artisans | Brick kiln workers | Construction workers | Domestic workers | Fishing | Tea plantation workers | Total |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|---------|------------------------|-----------|
| Only mother | 65 (90.2%) | 43 (93.4%) | 31 (56.3%) | 45 (77.5%) | 2 (40%) | 2 (50%) | 21 (100%) | 209 (80%) |
| Mother with others | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (9.1%) | 5 (8.6%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (4.2%) |
| Total | 65 (90.2%) | 43 (93.4%) | 36 (65.4%) | 50 (86.2%) | 2 (40%) | 3 (75%) | 21 (100%) | 220 (84%) |
| Only children | 1 (1.3%) | 1 (2.1%) | 5 (9.1%) | 1 (1.7%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (3.4%) |
| Children with others | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (5.4%) | 2 (3.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (1.9%) |
| Total | 1 (1.3%) | 1 (2.1%) | 8 (14.5%) | 3 (5.2%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 14 (5.3%) |
| Other member of the HH | 3 (3.8%) | 1 (2.1%) | 1 (1.8%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (2.2%) |
| Other member with others | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (3.6%) | 3 (5.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (1.9%) |
| Total | 3 (3.8%) | 1 (2.1%) | 3 (5.4%) | 3 (5.2%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (4.2%) |
| Relatives in another HH | 1 (1.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0.7%) |
| Relatives with others | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.8%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0.7%) |
| Total | 1 (1.2%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.8%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (20%) | 1 (25%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (1.5%) |
| Pregnant | 2 (2.7%) | 1 (2.1%) | 7 (12.7%) | 2 (3.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 12 (0.4%) |
| N.A | 649 | 390 | 349 | 716 | 193 | 177 | 157 | 2631 |
| Total | 721 | 436 | 404 | 774 | 198 | 181 | 178 | 2892 |

* THERE ARE 249 HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN IN THE AGE CATEGORY 0-6MONTHS

Table 4.1b - Childcare patterns across occupations for respondents' children in the age category of 6months-3years

| | Agricultural labourers | Home based artisans | Brick kiln workers | Construction workers | Domestic workers | Fishing | Tea plantation workers | Total |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|------------|------------------------|-------------|
| Only mothers | 343(79.2%) | 230(90%) | 167(62.3%) | 288(50.3%) | 39 (41.9%) | 5 (2.5%) | 123(93.8%) | 1195(61.3%) |
| Mothers with others | 22 (5%) | 3 (1.1%) | 29 (10.8%) | 106(18.4%) | 1 (1.1%) | 90 (46.3%) | 0 (0%) | 251 (12.8%) |
| Total | 365(84.2%) | 233(91.3%) | 196 (73%) | 396(69.1%) | 40 (43%) | 95 (48.9%) | 123 (93.8%) | 1446(74.2%) |
| Children in the HH | 13 (3%) | 9 (3.5%) | 20 (7.4%) | 26 (4.5%) | 21 (22.5%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (1.5%) | 91 (4.6%) |
| Children in the HH with others | 9 (2.1%) | 2 (0.7%) | 16 (5.9%) | 25 (4.3%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (2.1%) | 0 (0%) | 56 (2.8%) |
| Total | 22 (5%) | 11(4.3%) | 36 (13.4%) | 51 (8.9%) | 21 (22.5%) | 4 (2.1%) | 2 (1.5%) | 147 (7.5%) |
| Other member of the HH | 26 (6%) | 9 (3.5%) | 9 (3.3%) | 11 (1.9%) | 12 (12.9%) | 5 (2.5%) | 4 (3%) | 76 (3.9%) |
| Other member of the HH with others | 2 (0.46%) | 0 (0%) | 15 (5.5%) | 74 (12.9%) | 0 (0%) | 40 (20.6%) | 0 (0%) | 131 (6.7%) |
| Total | 28 (6.4%) | 9 (3.5%) | 24 (8.9%) | 85 (14.8%) | 12 (12.9%) | 45 (23%) | 4 (3%) | 207(10.6%) |
| Relatives | 10 (2.3%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (1.1%) | 2 (0.3%) | 7 (7.5%) | 2 (1%) | 2 (1.5%) | 26 (1.3%) |
| Relatives with others | 7 (1.6%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (1.8%) | 14 (2.4%) | 0 (0%) | 44 (22.6%) | 0 (0%) | 70 (3.5%) |
| Total | 17 (3.9%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (2.9%) | 16 (2.7%) | 7 (7.5%) | 46 (23.7%) | 2 (1.5%) | 96 (4.9%) |
| Creche | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (1.3%) | 4 (4.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 13 (0.6%) |
| Crèche with others | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.3%) | 1 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0.1%) |
| Total | 0 (0%) | 2 (0.7%) | 1 (0.3%) | 8 (1.3%) | 4 (4.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 15 (0.7%) |
| Neighbour | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.3%) | 2 (0.3%) | 6 (6.4%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (0.5%) |
| Neighbour with others | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0.7%) | 16 (2.7%) | 1 (1.1%) | 4 (2.1%) | 0 (0%) | 23(1.18%) |
| Total | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (1.1%) | 18 (3.1%) | 7 (7.5%) | 4 (2.1%) | 0 (0%) | 33(1.6%) |
| Friend | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) |
| School | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (1.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1(0.05%) |
| Stays alone | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.1%) | 1 (1.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0.1%) |
| N.A | 302 | 183 | 159 | 322 | 107 | 78 | 47 | 1198 |
| Total | 735 | 438 | 427 | 895 | 200 | 272 | 178 | 3145 |

* THERE ARE 1682 HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN IN THE AGE CATEGORY 6MONTHS – 3YEARS

4.1c - Childcare patterns across occupations for respondents' children in the age category of 3 – 6years

| | Agricultural labourers | Home based artisans | Brick kiln workers | Construction workers | Domestic workers | Fishing | Tea plantation workers | Total |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|------------|------------------------|-------------|
| Only mothers | 405 (73%) | 235(73.4%) | 179(47.3%) | 315(38.2%) | 46 (32.6%) | 2 (0.6%) | 115 (95%) | 1297(49.2%) |
| Mothers with others | 27 (4.8%) | 9 (2.8%) | 70 (18.5%) | 176(21.3%) | 3 (2.1%) | 140(47.4%) | 0 (0%) | 425 (16.1%) |
| Total | 432(77.9%) | 244(76.2%) | 249(65.8%) | 491(59.5%) | 49 (34.7%) | 142(48.1%) | 115 (95%) | 1722(65.4%) |
| Children in the HH | 17 (3.1%) | 24 (7.5%) | 27 (7.1%) | 60 (7.2%) | 27 (19.1%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.8%) | 156 (5.9%) |
| Children in the HH with others | 20 (3.6%) | 6 (1.8%) | 49 (12.9%) | 80 (9.7%) | 1 (0.7%) | 11 (3.7%) | 0 (0%) | 167 (6.3%) |
| Total | 37 (6.6%) | 30 (9.3%) | 76 (20.1%) | 140(16.9%) | 28 (19.8%) | 11 (3.7%) | 1 (0.8%) | 323(12.2%) |
| Other member of the HH | 40 (7.2%) | 15 (4.6%) | 10 (2.6%) | 25 (3%) | 11 (7.8%) | 5 (1.6%) | 4 (3.3%) | 110 (4.1%) |
| Other member of the HH with others | 21 (3.7%) | 3 (0.9%) | 19 (5%) | 101(12.2%) | 0 (0%) | 58 (19.6%) | 0 (0%) | 202 (7.6%) |
| Total | 61 (11%) | 18 (5.6%) | 29 (7.6%) | 126(15.2%) | 11 (7.8%) | 63 (21.3%) | 4 (3.3%) | 312(11.8%) |
| Relatives | 12 (2.1%) | 3 (0.9%) | 7 (1.8%) | 2 (0.2%) | 11 (7.8%) | 5 (1.6%) | 1 (0.8%) | 41 (1.5%) |
| Relatives with others | 11 (1.9%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (1.5%) | 13 (1.5%) | 0 (0%) | 63 (21.3%) | 0 (0%) | 93 (3.5%) |
| Total | 23 (4.1%) | 3 (0.9%) | 13 (3.4%) | 15 (1.8%) | 11 (7.8%) | 68 (23%) | 1 (0.8%) | 134 (5%) |
| Creche | 0 (0%) | 7 (2.1%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (0.8%) | 6 (4.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 20 (0.7%) |
| Crèche with others | 0 (0%) | 3 (0.9%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.1%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (0.1%) |
| Total | 0 (0%) | 10 (3.1%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (0.9%) | 6 (4.2%) | 1 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) | 25 (0.9%) |
| Neighbour | 1 (0.1%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 3 (0.36%) | 13 (9.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 18 (0.6%) |
| Neighbour with others | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (2.6%) | 29 (3.5%) | 1 (0.7%) | 10 (3.3%) | 0 (0%) | 50 (1.8%) |
| Total | 1 (0.1%) | 0 (0%) | 11 (2.9%) | 32 (3.8%) | 14 (9.9%) | 10 (3.3%) | 0 (0%) | 68 (2.5%) |
| Friend | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.03%) |
| School | 0 (0%) | 15 (4.6%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (0.9%) | 21 (14.8%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 44 (1.6%) |
| School with others | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (0.4%) | 1 (0.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (0.1%) |
| Total | 0 (0%) | 15 (4.6%) | 0 (0%) | 12 (1.4%) | 22 (15.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 49 (1.8%) |
| N.A | 194 | 119 | 93 | 160 | 58 | 25 | 57 | 706 |
| Total | 748 | 439 | 471 | 984 | 199 | 320 | 178 | 3339 |

* THERE ARE 2174 HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN IN THE AGE CATEGORY 3-6YEARS

| Table 4.2- Patterns of sibling care for respondents' children in the age category of 0-6 years - disaggregated by gender across states and occupational categories | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-----------|------------|----------|------------|------------|----------|-------------|
| Gender | Occupational categories | States | | | | | | Total |
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| FEMALE | Agricultural labourers | 0 | 0 | 22 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 33 (55%) |
| | Home based artisans | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 6 | 24 (58.5%) |
| | Brick kiln workers | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 4 | 26 | 69 (56.1%) |
| | Construction workers | 0 | 26 | 0 | 20 | 34 | 28 | 108 (56.3%) |
| | Domestic workers | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 (66%) |
| | Fishing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 (66.7%) |
| | Tea Plantation workers | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 (66.7%) |
| | Total | 2 (33.3%) | 64 (73.6%) | 63 (70%) | 38 (48.7%) | 49 (55.1%) | 63 (47%) | 279 (57.6%) |
| MALE | Agricultural labourers | 1 | 0 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 27 (45%) |
| | Home based artisans | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 17 (41.5%) |
| | Brick kiln workers | 1 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 8 | 31 | 54 (43.9%) |
| | Construction workers | 0 | 6 | 0 | 25 | 24 | 29 | 84 (43.7%) |
| | Domestic workers | 1 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 (34%) |
| | Fishing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 (33.3%) |
| | Tea Plantation workers | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (33.3%) |
| | Total | 4 (66.7%) | 23 (26.4%) | 27 (30%) | 40 (51.3%) | 40 (44.9%) | 71 (53%) | 205 (42.4%) |
| GRAND TOTAL | | 6 | 87 | 90 | 78 | 89 | 134 | 484 |

*THERE ARE A TOTAL OF 484 CHILDREN INVOLVED IN THE CARE OF YOUNGER SIBLINGS.

| Type of family | | States | | | | | | Total |
|-----------------|--|--------|-------|-----|--------|-----------|-----|-------------|
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| Nuclear family | Self | 21 | 10 | 61 | 7 | 34 | 46 | 179 (89.9%) |
| | Other children in the household | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 12 (6%) |
| | Other members in the household | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Relatives in another household | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 8 (4%) |
| | Creche | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Neighbour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Friend | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | School | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Child stays alone | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Do not have children of this age group | 309 | 374 | 299 | 244 | 315 | 466 | 2007 |
| Total | | 330 | 386 | 360 | 252 | 351 | 525 | 2206 |
| Extended family | Self | 7 | 4 | 17 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 41 (82%) |
| | Other children in the household | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 (4%) |
| | Other members in the household | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 (12%) |
| | Relatives in another household | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (2%) |
| | Creche | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Neighbour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Friend | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | School | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Child stays alone | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Do not have children of this age group | 43 | 39 | 90 | 274 | 74 | 104 | 624 |
| Total | | 50 | 44 | 112 | 278 | 78 | 112 | 674 |
| Gr. Total* | | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

Table 4.3 b - Childcare patterns : variations across family type across states for respondents' children in the age category of 6months-3years

| Type of family | | States | | | | | | Total |
|-----------------|--|--------|-------|-----|--------|-----------|-----|--------------|
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| Nuclear family | Self | 200 | 136 | 184 | 123 | 159 | 287 | 1089 (78.1%) |
| | Other children in the household | 2 | 35 | 31 | 10 | 19 | 24 | 121 (8.7%) |
| | Other members in the household | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Relatives in another household | 3 | 16 | 36 | 73 | 2 | 7 | 137 (9.8%) |
| | Creche | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 13 (0.9%) |
| | Neighbour | 0 | 9 | 2 | 14 | 1 | 6 | 32 (2.3%) |
| | Friend | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | School | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (0.07%) |
| | Child stays alone | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 (0.14%) |
| | Do not have children in this age group | 125 | 183 | 116 | 120 | 169 | 230 | 943 |
| Total | | 330 | 393 | 369 | 340 | 352 | 554 | 2338 |
| Extended family | Self | 33 | 10 | 49 | 171 | 35 | 59 | 357 (64.5%) |
| | Other children in the household | 0 | 3 | 7 | 11 | 2 | 4 | 27 (4.9%) |
| | Other members in the household | 3 | 10 | 16 | 100 | 8 | 10 | 147 (26.6%) |
| | Relatives in another household | 0 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 20 (3.6%) |
| | Creche | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 (0.4%) |
| | Neighbour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Friend | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | School | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Child stays alone | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Do not have children in this age group | 14 | 16 | 41 | 101 | 33 | 50 | 255 |
| Total | | 50 | 44 | 116 | 397 | 78 | 123 | 808 |
| Gr. Total* | | 380 | 437 | 485 | 737 | 430 | 677 | 3146 |

***THERE ARE MULTIPLE ANSWERS TO THIS QUESTION**

| Type of family | | States | | | | | | Total |
|-----------------|--|--------|-------|-----|--------|-----------|-----|--------------|
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| Nuclear family | Self | 225 | 135 | 156 | 193 | 210 | 406 | 1325 (67.4%) |
| | Other children in the household | 3 | 49 | 39 | 28 | 58 | 92 | 269 (13.7%) |
| | Other members in the household | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Relatives in another household | 1 | 27 | 42 | 125 | 4 | 25 | 224 (11.4%) |
| | Creche | 0 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 24 (1.2%) |
| | Neighbour | 0 | 20 | 2 | 24 | 1 | 22 | 69 (3.5%) |
| | Friend | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 (0.2%) |
| | School | 0 | 43 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 52 (2.6%) |
| | Child stays alone | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Do not have children in this age group | 103 | 106 | 126 | 39 | 70 | 96 | 540 |
| Total | | 332 | 399 | 370 | 411 | 352 | 642 | 2506 |
| Extended family | Self | 29 | 9 | 41 | 209 | 36 | 81 | 405 (58.7%) |
| | Other children in the household | 0 | 1 | 8 | 29 | 8 | 8 | 54 (7.8%) |
| | Other members in the household | 4 | 10 | 17 | 134 | 14 | 16 | 195 (28.3%) |
| | Relatives in another household | 0 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 22 (3.2%) |
| | Creche | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 (0.3%) |
| | Neighbour | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 (0.4%) |
| | Friend | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | School | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 (1.3%) |
| | Child stays alone | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Do not have children in this age group | 17 | 15 | 39 | 52 | 18 | 25 | 166 |
| Total | | 50 | 45 | 115 | 437 | 78 | 131 | 856 |
| Gr. Total* | | 382 | 444 | 444 | 848 | 430 | 773 | 3362 |

*THERE ARE MULTIPLE ANSWERS TO THIS QUESTION

| Table 4.4 - Whether respondents/mothers give exclusive time for childcare across states and occupations | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| | | States | | | | | | Total |
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| Yes | Agricultural labourers | 0 | 0 | 170 | 88 | 0 | 98 | 356 (49.4%) |
| | Home based artisans | 7 | 117 | 41 | 0 | 4 | 49 | 218 (50%) |
| | Brick kiln workers | 6 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 5 | 55 | 127 (31.9%) |
| | Construction workers | 1 | 122 | 0 | 18 | 38 | 40 | 219 (28.5%) |
| | Domestic workers | 8 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 (74.2%) |
| | Fishing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 130 (72.2%) |
| | Tea plantation workers | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 (15.7%) |
| Sub Total | | 50 (13.1%) | 378 (87.9%) | 272 (56.7%) | 236 (44.5%) | 47 (10.9%) | 242 (38.4%) | 1225 (42.5%) |
| No | Agricultural labourers | 50 | 0 | 89 | 112 | 0 | 114 | 365 (50.6%) |
| | Home based artisans | 41 | 5 | 28 | 0 | 90 | 54 | 218 (50%) |
| | Brick kiln workers | 50 | 0 | 81 | 0 | 29 | 104 | 264 (66.3%) |
| | Construction workers | 3 | 31 | 0 | 132 | 262 | 116 | 544 (70.7%) |
| | Domestic workers | 36 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 (26.3%) |
| | Fishing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 50 (27.8%) |
| | Tea plantation workers | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 (84.3%) |
| Sub Total | | 330 (86.8%) | 52 (12.1%) | 198 (41.3%) | 294 (55.5%) | 381 (88.6%) | 388 (61.6%) | 1643 (57%) |
| NA* | Agricultural labourers | | 0 | 2 | | 0 | | 2 (0.3%) |
| | Home based artisans | | 0 | 1 | | 0 | | 1 (0.2%) |
| | Brick kiln workers | | 0 | 7 | | 0 | | 7 (1.8%) |
| | Construction workers | | | 0 | | 2 | | 2 (0.3%) |
| | Domestic workers | | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 (0%) |
| Sub Total | | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (2.1%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) | 12 (0.4%) |
| Grand Total | | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

NA*-No response

| Table 4.5 - Number of respondents/mothers entitled to maternity leave | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| | | | States | | | | | Total | |
| | | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | | UP |
| YES | | Agricultural labourers | 1 | 0 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 26 (3.6%) |
| | | Home based artisans | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (0.2%) |
| | | Brick kiln workers | 3 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 29 (7.3%) |
| | | Construction workers | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 14 (1.8%) |
| | | Domestic workers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | | Fishing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 (0.6%) |
| | | Tea plantation workers | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 (55.1%) |
| | Total | 103 (27.1%) | 2 (0.5%) | 40 (8.3%) | 7 (1.3%) | 0 (0%) | 17 (2.7%) | 169 (5.9%) | |
| NO | | Agricultural labourers | 49 | 0 | 242 | 198 | 0 | 206 | 695 (96.4%) |
| | | Home based artisans | 47 | 120 | 71 | 0 | 94 | 103 | 435 (99.8%) |
| | | Brick kiln workers | 53 | 0 | 127 | 0 | 34 | 155 | 369 (92.7%) |
| | | Construction workers | 4 | 154 | 0 | 146 | 302 | 149 | 755 (98.2%) |
| | | Domestic workers | 44 | 154 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 198 (100%) |
| | | Fishing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 179 | 0 | 0 | 179 (99.4%) |
| | | Tea plantation workers | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 (44.9%) |
| | Total | 277 (72.9%) | 428 (99.5%) | 440 (91.7%) | 523 (98.7%) | 430 (100%) | 613 (97.3%) | 2711 (94.1%) | |
| Grand Total | | | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

Table 4.6 - Number of times the respondents/mothers breastfeed their children in a day across states

| | States | | | | | | Total |
|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| 1 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 20 (1.5%) |
| 2 | 33 | 9 | 11 | 4 | 48 | 22 | 127 (9.7%) |
| 3 | 163 | 53 | 95 | 51 | 88 | 148 | 598 (45.8%) |
| 4 | 8 | 49 | 12 | 16 | 18 | 137 | 240 (18.4%) |
| 5 | 24 | 25 | 43 | 0 | 29 | 18 | 139 (10.7%) |
| 6 | 16 | 18 | 26 | 1 | 12 | 18 | 91 (6.9%) |
| 7 | 4 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 33 (2.5%) |
| 8 | 9 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 28 (2.1%) |
| 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 (0.4%) |
| 10 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 22 (1.7%) |
| Many times | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 (0.2%) |
| NA | 113 | 252 | 252 | 458 | 225 | 275 | 1575 |
| Total | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

| Table 4.7 - Till what age have respondents/mothers breastfed their children across states | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-------|-----|--------|-----------|-----|------|-------------|
| Till what age have the respondents/mothers breastfed their children | States | | | | | | | Total |
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | | |
| | less than 6 months | 15 | 8 | 25 | 85 | 0 | 8 | 141 (4.9%) |
| | 6 months | 115 | 9 | 152 | 256 | 0 | 32 | 564 (19.6%) |
| | 6m - 1 year | 47 | 41 | 225 | 114 | 85 | 85 | 597 (20.7%) |
| | 1 - one and a half year | 5 | 10 | 6 | 21 | 51 | 18 | 111 (3.9%) |
| | one and a half- 2 years | 1 | 143 | 14 | 23 | 109 | 181 | 471 (16.4%) |
| | Above 2 years | 2 | 102 | 5 | 1 | 11 | 26 | 147 (5.1%) |
| | still feeding the child | 195 | 106 | 41 | 30 | 171 | 278 | 821 (28.5%) |
| | No response | 0 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 28 (0.9%) |
| Total | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 | |

| Table 4.8 - Whether there is a worksite childcare arrangement | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|-------|-----|--------|-----------|-----|--------------|
| Whether there is a worksite childcare arrangement | States | | | | | | Total |
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| Yes | 45 | 43 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 91 (3.2%) |
| No | 335 | 387 | 478 | 530 | 430 | 629 | 2789 (96.8%) |
| Total | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

| | | States | | | | | | Total |
|-------|-----|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|--------------|
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| | Yes | 20 (5.3%) | 235 (54.7%) | 180 (37.5%) | 97 (18.3%) | 34 (7.9%) | 82 (13%) | 648 (22.5%) |
| | No | 360 (94.7%) | 195 (45.3%) | 290 (62.5%) | 433 (81.7%) | 394 (91.6%) | 548 (87%) | 2220 (77.1%) |
| | N.A | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (2.1%) | 0 (0%) | 2 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) | 12 (0.4%) |
| Total | | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

*N.A – PREGNANT WOMEN

Table 4.10 - Whether respondents would use creche facility if it was made available

| | | States | | | | | | Total |
|---|-----|--------|-------|-----|--------|-----------|-----|--------------|
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| Use of creche facility if it was made available | YES | 377 | 409 | 447 | 528 | 430 | 627 | 2818 (97.8%) |
| | NO | 3 | 21 | 33 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 62 (2.2%) |
| Total | | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

Table 4.11 a - The number of hours for which the respondents/mothers would like to keep their children in the creche across states (Time in hours)

| Duration for which respondents would like to keep their children in the creche (Time in hours) | Time in hours | States | | | | | | Total |
|--|---------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| | 1 | 1 (0.3%) | 3 (0.7%) | 7 (1.6%) | 4 (0.8%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 16 (0.6%) |
| | 2 | 0 (0%) | 7 (1.7%) | 55 (12.3%) | 14 (2.7%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 77 (2.7%) |
| | 3 | 1 (0.3%) | 17 (4.2%) | 40 (8.9%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (0.6%) | 63 (2.2%) |
| | 4 | 4 (1.1%) | 28 (6.8%) | 52 (11.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 31 (4.9%) | 115 (4%) |
| | 5 | 22 (5.8%) | 41 (10%) | 43 (9.6%) | 9 (1.7%) | 6 (1.4%) | 41 (6.5%) | 162 (5.7%) |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|-------------|------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|
| 6 | 39 (10.3%) | 68 (16.6%) | 10 (2.2%) | 171 (32.4%) | 10 (2.3%) | 173 (27.6%) | 471 (16.7%) |
| 7 | 21 (5.6%) | 40 (9.8%) | 4 (0.9%) | 78 (14.8%) | 23 (5.3%) | 42 (6.7%) | 208 (7.4%) |
| 8 | 98 (26%) | 54 (13.2%) | 35 (7.8%) | 169 (32%) | 108 (25.1%) | 125 (19.9%) | 589 (20.9%) |
| 9 | 116 (30.8%) | 15 (3.7%) | 1 (0.2%) | 1 (0.2%) | 45 (10.5%) | 4 (0.6%) | 182 (6.5%) |
| 10 | 0 (0%) | 8 (2%) | 10 (2.2%) | 61 (11.6%) | 2 (0.5%) | 46 (7.3%) | 127 (4.5%) |
| 12 | 0 (0%) | 2 (0.5%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 17 (2.7%) | 20 (0.7%) |
| 15 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 1 (0.04%) |
| AWC working hours | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 22 (4.9%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 20 (3.2%) | 42 (1.5%) |
| Respondent's working hours | 2 (0.5%) | 118 (28.9%) | 92 (20.1%) | 4 (0.8%) | 3 (0.7%) | 51 (8.1%) | 270 (9.6%) |
| Whole day | 73 (19.4%) | 10 (2.4%) | 72 (16.1%) | 11 (2.1%) | 232 (54%) | 67 (10.7%) | 465 (16.5%) |
| Don't know | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 1 (0.2%) | 5 (0.9%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (0.2%) |
| NA | 3 | 21 | 33 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 62 |
| Total | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

N.A – NO RESPONSE

Table 4.11 b - The number of hours for which the respondents/mothers would like to keep their children in the creche across occupations (Time in hours)

| | Time in hours | Trade | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------|------------------------|-------------|
| | | Agricultural labourers | Home based artisans | Brick kiln workers | Construction workers | Domestic workers | Fishing | Tea plantation workers | |
| | 1 | 7 (1%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (0.7%) | 3 (1.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 16 (0.6%) |
| | 2 | 31 (4.4%) | 15 (3.6%) | 15 (3.9%) | 10 (1.3%) | 2 (1%) | 4 (2.2%) | 0 (0%) | 77 (2.7%) |
| | 3 | 19 (2.7%) | 25 (6%) | 12 (3.1%) | 3 (0.4%) | 3 (1.6%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.6%) | 63 (2.2%) |
| | 4 | 41 (5.8%) | 36 (8.6%) | 14 (3.6%) | 12 (1.6%) | 11 (5.8%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.6%) | 115 (4.1%) |
| | 5 | 40 (5.7%) | 49 (11.7%) | 24 (6.2%) | 15 (2%) | 24 (12.6%) | 9 (4.7%) | 1 (0.6%) | 162 (5.7%) |
| | 6 | 134 (19%) | 73 (17.4%) | 49 (12.7%) | 92 (12%) | 41 (21.5%) | 82 (46%) | 0 (0%) | 471 (16.7%) |
| | 7 | 60 (8.5%) | 24 (5.7%) | 22 (5.7%) | 54 (7.1%) | 23 (12%) | 25 (14%) | 0 (0%) | 208 (7.4%) |
| | 8 | 141 (20%) | 40 (9.5%) | 78 (20.3%) | 207 (27%) | 25 (13%) | 32 (18%) | 69 (39.2%) | 592 (21%) |
| | 9 | 7 (1%) | 7 (1.7%) | 25 (6.5%) | 48 (6.3%) | 4 (2.1%) | 1 (0.6%) | 90 (51.1%) | 182 (6.5%) |
| | 10 | 61 (8.7%) | 3 (0.7%) | 18 (4.7%) | 39 (5.1%) | 0 (0%) | 6 (3.4%) | 0 (0%) | 127 (4.5%) |
| | 12 | 4 (0.6%) | 1 (0.2%) | 5 (1.3%) | 10 (1.3%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 20 (0.7%) |
| | 15 | 1 (0.1%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.04%) |
| | AWC working hours | 17 (2.4%) | 7 (1.7%) | 9 (2.3%) | 9 (1.2%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 42 (1.5%) |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Respondent's working hours | 61 (8.7%) | 36 (8.6%) | 51 (13.2%) | 81 (10.6%) | 36 (18.8%) | 4 (2.2%) | 0 (0%) | 269 (9.5%) |
| Whole day | 81 (11.5%) | 102 (24.3%) | 62 (16.1%) | 179 (23.4%) | 18 (9.4%) | 10 (5.6%) | 14 (8%) | 466 (16.5%) |
| don't know | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.3%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.5%) | 5 (2.8%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (0.2%) |
| N.A | 16 | 17 | 13 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 62 |
| Total | 721 | 436 | 398 | 769 | 198 | 180 | 178 | 2880 |

N.A – NO RESPONSE

Table 4.12 - The preferred childcare arrangement across occupational categories

| | Occupational categories | | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------|-------|
| | Agricultural labourers | home based artisans | Brick kiln workers | Construction workers | Domestic workers | Fishing | Tea plantation workers | | |
| Own home | 158 (21.9%) | 61 (14%) | 86 (21.6%) | 31 (4%) | 9 (4.5%) | 25 (13.8%) | 12 (6.7%) | 382 (13.3%) | |
| Neighbour or Relative | 4 (0.6%) | 2 (0.5%) | 7 (1.8%) | 4 (0.5%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (1.7%) | 20 (0.7%) | |
| AWC | 177 (24.5%) | 25 (5.7%) | 57 (14.3%) | 143 (18.6%) | 3 (1.5%) | 47 (26%) | 7 (3.9%) | 459 (16%) | |
| Full time Creche | 377 (52.3%) | 345 (79.1%) | 245 (61.5%) | 590 (76.7%) | 180 (90.9%) | 107 (59.4%) | 156(87.6%) | 2000 (69.4%) | |
| Other | 5 (0.7%) | 3 (0.8%) | 3 (0.8%) | 1 (0.1%) | 6 (3%) | 1 (0.6%) | 0 (0%) | 19 (0.7%) | |
| Total | 721 | 436 | 398 | 769 | 198 | 180 | 178 | 2880 | |

*THE RESPONDENTS DID NOT SPECIFY WHAT THEY MEANT BY 'OTHER'

| | | | States | | | | | Total |
|----------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| | | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | |
| Near the home | Agricultural labourers | 48 | 0 | 216 | 139 | 0 | 181 | 584 (80.9%) |
| | Home based artisans | 42 | 109 | 57 | 0 | 86 | 98 | 392 (89.9%) |
| | Brick kiln workers | 46 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 31 | 92 | 271 (68.1%) |
| | Construction workers | 4 | 94 | 0 | 110 | 251 | 117 | 576 (74.9%) |
| | Domestic workers | 42 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 189 (95.5%) |
| | Fishing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 174 | 0 | 0 | 174 (96.7%) |
| | Tea plantation workers | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 (11.2%) |
| | Total | 202 (53.2%) | 350 (81.4%) | 375 (78.1%) | 423 (79.8%) | 368 (85.6%) | 488 (77.5%) | 2206 (76.6%) |
| Near workplace | Agricultural labourers | 1 | 0 | 31 | 57 | 0 | 23 | 112 (15.5%) |
| | Home based artisans | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 18 (4.1%) |
| | Brick kiln workers | 9 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 3 | 66 | 115 (28.9%) |
| | Construction workers | 0 | 58 | 0 | 36 | 50 | 31 | 175 (22.8%) |
| | Domestic workers | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 (1%) |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-------|------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | Fishing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 (1.1%) |
| | | Tea plantation workers | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 (84.3%) |
| | Total | | 160 (42.1%) | 63 (14.7%) | 74 (15.4%) | 95 (17.9%) | 59 (13.7%) | 123 (19.5%) | 574 (19.9%) |
| Other | | Agricultural labourers | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 9 (1.2%) |
| | | Home based artisans | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 (1.8%) |
| | | Brick kiln workers | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 (1.3%) |
| | | Construction workers | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 12 (1.6%) |
| | | Domestic workers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | | Fishing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 (1.7%) |
| | | Tea plantation workers | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 (4.5%) |
| | Total | | 14 (3.7%) | 4 (0.9%) | 6 (1.3%) | 8 (1.5%) | 0 (0%) | 13 (2.1%) | 45 (1.6%) |
| Not mentioned | | Agricultural labourers | 1 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 16 (2.2%) |
| | | Home based artisans | 1 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 18 (4.1%) |
| | | Brick kiln workers | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 (1.8%) |
| | | Construction workers | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 (0.8%) |
| | | Domestic workers | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 (3.5%) |
| | | Fishing | | | | 1 | 0 | | 1 (0.6%) |
| | | Tea plantation workers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|----------|---------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Total | 4 (1.1%) | 13 (3%) | 25 (5.2%) | 4 (0.8%) | 3 (0.7%) | 6 (0.9%) | 55 (1.9%) |
| | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

*THE RESPONDENTS DID NOT SPECIFY WHAT THEY MEANT BY 'OTHER'

| Whether the AWC is nearby | States | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | | |
| YES | 369 (97.1%) | 243 (56.5%) | 429 (89.3%) | 530 (100%) | 162 (37.7%) | 362 (57.5%) | 2095 (72.7%) | |
| NO | 11 (2.9%) | 187 (43.5%) | 51 (10.7%) | 0 (0%) | 268 (62.3%) | 268 (42.5%) | 785 (27.3%) | |
| Total | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 | |

| Are the respondents registered in the AWC | States | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | | |
| YES | 201 (52.9%) | 85 (19.8%) | 376 (78.3%) | 511 (96.4%) | 61 (14.2%) | 217 (34.4%) | 1451 (50.4%) | |
| NO | 179 (47.1%) | 345 (80.2%) | 104 (21.7%) | 19 (3.6%) | 369 (85.8%) | 413 (65.6%) | 1429 (49.6%) | |
| Total | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 | |

| Registration | Agricultural labourers | Home based artisans | Brick kiln workers | Construction workers | Domestic workers | Fishing | Tea plantation workers | Total |
|--------------|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Yes | 498 (69.1%) | 170 (39%) | 158 (39.7%) | 278 (36.2%) | 51 (25.8%) | 167 (92.8%) | 129 (72.5%) | 1451 (50.4%) |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------|----------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|------------|-----------------|
| No | 223 (30.9%) | 266 (61%) | 240 (60.3%) | 491 (63.8%) | 147 (74.2%) | 13 (7.2%) | 49 (27.5%) | 1429 (49.6%) |
| Total | 721 | 436 | 398 | 769 | 198 | 180 | 178 | 2880 |

| Use of AWC by respondents and children | States | | | | | | | Total |
|--|----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | | |
| YES | 186 (48.9%) | 113 (26.3%) | 414 (86.3%) | 528 (99.6%) | 84 (19.5%) | 286 (45.4%) | 1611 (55.9%) | |
| NO | 194 (51.1%) | 317 (73.7%) | 66 (13.7%) | 2 (0.4%) | 346 (80.5%) | 344 (54.6%) | 1269 (44.1%) | |
| Total | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 | |

| Table 5.4 - Number of responses regarding use/non-use of AWC services across states and occupational categories | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| Use of AWC services . | | | States | | | | | Total | |
| | | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | | UP |
| Only children below 6 | Agricultural labourers | | 19 | 0 | 31 | 47 | 0 | 76 | 173 (24%) |
| | Home based artisans | | 16 | 29 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 67 (15.3%) |
| | Brick kiln workers | | 19 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 7 | 27 | 66 (16.6%) |
| | Construction workers | | 2 | 19 | 0 | 8 | 32 | 44 | 105 (13.7%) |
| | Domestic workers | | 9 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 (22.8%) |
| | Fishing | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 92 (51.1%) |
| | Tea plantation workers | | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 (25.8%) |
| | SubTotal | | 111 (29.2%) | 84 (19.5%) | 49 (10.2%) | 147 (27.7%) | 41 (9.5%) | 162 (25.7%) | 594 (20.6%) |
| Only respondent | Agricultural labourers | | 1 | 0 | 16 | 9 | 0 | 10 | 36 (5%) |
| | Home based artisans | | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 (2.3%) |
| | Brick kiln workers | | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 (2.8%) |
| | Construction workers | | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 14 (1.8%) |
| | Domestic workers | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Fishing | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| | Tea plantation workers | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 (1.1%) |
| | SubTotal | | 4 (1.1%) | 5 (1.2%) | 30 (6.3%) | 13 (2.5%) | 2 (0.5%) | 19 (3%) | 73 (2.5%) |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|------------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Both | Agricultural labourers | 0 | 0 | 180 | 143 | 0 | 42 | 365 (50.6%) |
| | Home based artisans | 3 | 9 | 57 | 0 | 6 | 37 | 122 (25.6%) |
| | Brick kiln workers | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 107 (26.9%) |
| | Construction workers | 0 | 3 | 0 | 138 | 33 | 35 | 209 (27.2%) |
| | Domestic workers | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 (3%) |
| | Fishing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 86 (47.8%) |
| | Tea plantation workers | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 (39.9%) |
| | SubTotal | 70 (20.5%) | 14 (3.3%) | 337 (70.2%) | 367 (69.2%) | 41 (9.5%) | 119 (18.9%) | 956 (33.2%) |
| None | Agricultural labourers | 30 | 0 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 83 | 147 (20.4%) |
| | Home based artisans | 28 | 82 | 5 | 0 | 86 | 46 | 247 (56.5%) |
| | Brick kiln workers | 37 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 25 | 126 | 214 (53.8%) |
| | Construction workers | 2 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 235 | 75 | 441 (57.3%) |
| | Domestic workers | 31 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 (74.6%) |
| | Fishing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 (1.1%) |
| | Tea plantation workers | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 (33.1%) |
| | SubTotal | 187 (49.2%) | 327 (76%) | 64 (13.3%) | 3 (0.6%) | 346 (80.5%) | 330 (52.4%) | 1257 (43.6%) |
| Total | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 | |

* The responses include those who are currently using the AWC as well as those who have used it in the past

Table 5.5 a - Statewise use of AWC by children

| | Children in 0-3 age category | Those in 0-3 using AWC or those who have used it in the past | % of those using AWC or those who have used it in the past | Children in 3-6 age category | Those in 3-6 using AWC or those who have used it in the past | % of those using AWC or those who have used it in the past | Total children in 0-6 age | Those in 0-6 using AWC or those who have used it in the past | % of those using AWC or those who have used it in the past |
|-----------|------------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| Assam | 242 | 68 | 28% | 368 | 126 | 34.20% | 610 | 194 | 31.80% |
| Delhi | 188 | 28 | 14.90% | 446 | 63 | 14.10% | 634 | 91 | 14.40% |
| M.P | 343 | 195 | 56.90% | 520 | 312 | 60% | 863 | 507 | 58.70% |
| Orissa | 216 | 171 | 79.20% | 675 | 571 | 84.60% | 891 | 742 | 83.30% |
| Rajasthan | 219 | 4 | 1.80% | 484 | 15 | 3.10% | 703 | 19 | 2.70% |
| U.P | 339 | 40 | 11.80% | 799 | 254 | 31.80% | 1138 | 294 | 25.80% |
| Total | 1547 | 506 | 32.70% | 3292 | 1341 | 40.70% | 4839 | 1847 | 38.20% |

* The responses include those who are currently using the AWC as well as those who have used it in the past

Table 5.5 b - Use of AWC by children - disaggregated by caste

| Social categories (0-6) | Total children | Those using AWC or those who have used it in the past | % of those using AWC or those who have used it in the past |
|-------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| SC | 1546 | 690 | 44.60% |
| ST | 1224 | 516 | 42.20% |
| OBC | 1525 | 503 | 32.90% |
| Others | 544 | 138 | 25.40% |
| TOTAL | 4839 | 1847 | 38.20% |
| | | | |

* The responses include those who are currently using the AWC as well as those who have used it in the past

| | | States | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| Where is the AWC housed | Rented building | 3 (1.6%) | 92 (81.4%) | 120 (28.9%) | 113 (21.4%) | 0 (0%) | 86 (30.1%) | 414 (25.7%) |
| | Primary school building | 42 (22.6%) | 1 (0.9%) | 8 (0.5%) | 59 (14.3%) | 24 (28.6%) | 97 (33.9%) | 231 (14.3%) |
| | Own building | 138 (74.2%) | 0 (0%) | 154 (37.2%) | 175 (33.1%) | 50 (59.5%) | 31 (10.8%) | 548 (34%) |
| | Government provided building | 0 (0%) | 1 (0.9%) | 98 (23.7%) | 148 (28%) | 1 (1.2%) | 57 (19.9%) | 305 (18.9%) |
| | Community building | 3 (1.6%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 27 (5.1%) | 6 (7.1%) | 0 (0%) | 36 (2.2%) |
| | Panchayat | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 14 (3.4%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (3.6%) | 8 (2.8%) | 25 (1.6%) |
| | mandir | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (1.4%) | 4 (0.2%) |
| | open place | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (0.9%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 5 (0.3%) |
| | don't know | 0 (0%) | 19 (16.8%) | 20 (4.8%) | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (1%) | 43 (2.7%) |
| | NA | 194 | 317 | 66 | 2 | 346 | 344 | 1269 |
| Total | | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

N.A –THOSE RESPONDENTS WHO ARE NOT USING THE AWC

| Condition of the AWC building | | States | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------|------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| | Pucca | 172 (92.5%) | 47 (41.6%) | 318 (76.8%) | 301 (57%) | 83 (98.8%) | 195 (68.2%) | 1116 (69.3%) |
| | Semi Pucca | 5 (2.7%) | 39 (34.5%) | 18 (4.3%) | 114 (21.6%) | 0 (0%) | 70 (24.5%) | 246 (15.3%) |
| | Kuccha | 9 (4.8%) | 8 (7.1%) | 71 (17.1%) | 67 (12.7%) | 1 (1.2%) | 11 (3.8%) | 167 (10.4%) |
| | Open space | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 46 (8.7%) | 0 (0%) | 10 (3.5%) | 56 (3.5%) |
| | Don't know | 0 (0%) | 19 (16.8%) | 7 (1.7%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 26 (1.6%) |
| | N.A | 194 | 317 | 66 | 2 | 346 | 344 | 1269 |
| Total | | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

N.A –THOSE RESPONDENTS WHO ARE NOT USING THE AWC

| Facilities | | States | | | | | Total | |
|--|------------------|-----------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------|-----------|--------------|
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | | UP |
| 1. Toilet | | 115 | 23 | 104 | 106 | 6 (7.1%) | 155 | 509 (31.6%) |
| Yes | | (61.8%) | (20.4%) | (25.1%) | (20.1%) | | (54.2%) | |
| No | | 71 | 90 | 310 | 422 | 78 (92.9%) | 131 | 1102 (68.4%) |
| | | (38.2%) | (79.6%) | (74.9%) | (79.9%) | | (45.8%) | |
| N.A | | 194 | 317 | 66 | 2 | 346 | 344 | 1269 |
| Total | | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Facilities | | States | | | | | Total | |
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | | UP |
| 2. Water Facilities a- Handpump, b- Well, c-Running water, d- Pond, e- Other | a | 157 | 24 | 209 | 261 | 57 | 264 | 972 (60.3%) |
| | b | 4 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 9 | 3 | 112 (6.9%) |
| | c | 8 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 5 | 33 (2%) |
| | d | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 (0.2%) |
| | e | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 4 | 27 (1.7%) |
| | e matka | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 (0.4%) |
| | e-tap | 0 | 14 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 (2.2%) |
| | e(from house) | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 (0.2%) |
| | e(tubewell) | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 (0.4%) |
| | Near Home | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (0.06%) |
| Total (Multiple) | | 174 | 48 | 239 | 377 | 87 | 276 | 1201 |
| No | | 12 (6.5%) | 65 (57.5%) | 175 (42.3%) | 151 (28.6%) | 0 (0%) | 13 (4.5%) | 416 (25.8%) |
| N.A | | 194 | 317 | 66 | 2 | 346 | 344 | 1269 |
| Total | | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

| Facilities | States | | | | | | Total |
|-----------------------|----------------|---------------|------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| 3. Electricity Yes | 18 (9.7%) | 77 (68.2%) | 123 (37%) | 135 (25.6%) | 2 (2.4%) | 117 (40.9%) | 472 (29.3%) |
| No | 168 (90.3%) | 36 (31.8%) | 291 (63%) | 393 (74.4%) | 82 (97.6%) | 169 (59.1%) | 1139 (70.7%) |
| N.A | 194 | 317 | 66 | 2 | 346 | 344 | 1269 |
| Total | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

N.A –THOSE RESPONDENTS WHO ARE NOT USING THE AWC

Table 5.9 - Whether take home ration is provided

| Whether take home ration is provided | States | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | | |
| Yes | 73 (39.2%) | 3 (2.7%) | 370 (89.4%) | 282 (53.4%) | 1 (1.2%) | 26 (9.1%) | 755 (46.9%) | |
| No | 112 (60.2%) | 91 (80.5%) | 36 (8.7%) | 243 (46%) | 81 (96.4%) | 260 (90.0%) | 823 (51.1%) | |
| don't know | 1 (0.5%) | 19 (16.8%) | 8 (1.9%) | 3 (0.6%) | 2 (2.4%) | 0 (0%) | 33 (2%) | |
| NA | 194 | 317 | 66 | 2 | 346 | 344 | 1269 | |
| Total | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 | |

N.A –THOSE RESPONDENTS WHO ARE NOT USING THE AWC

Table 5.10 - Whether supplementary nutrition for children is provided regularly

| Whether supplementary nutrition for children is provided regularly | States | | | | | | | Total |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | | |
| Yes | 47 (25.3%) | 84 (74.3%) | 317 (76.6%) | 138 (26.1%) | 59 (70.2%) | 85 (29.7%) | 730 (45.3%) | |
| No | 104 (55.9%) | 5 (4.4%) | 80 (19.3%) | 157 (29.7%) | 11 (13.1%) | 161 (56.3%) | 518 (32.2%) | |
| Don't know | 35 (18.8%) | 24 (21.2%) | 17 (4.1%) | 233 (44.1%) | 14 (16.7%) | 40 (13.9%) | 363 (22.5%) | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| | NA | 194 | 317 | 66 | 2 | 346 | 344 | 1269 |
| Total | | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

N.A –THOSE RESPONDENTS WHO ARE NOT USING THE AWC

| Responses | | States | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| | Yes | 107 (57.5%) | 39 (34.5%) | 344 (83.1%) | 169 (32%) | 25 (29.8%) | 49 (17.1%) | 733 (45.5%) |
| | No | 36 (19.4%) | 42 (37.2%) | 46 (11.1%) | 136 (25.8%) | 8 (9.5%) | 141 (49.3%) | 409 (25.4%) |
| | don't know | 43 (23.1%) | 32 (28.3%) | 24 (5.8%) | 223 (42.2%) | 51 (60.7%) | 96 (33.6%) | 469 (29.1%) |
| | NA | 194 | 317 | 66 | 2 | 346 | 344 | 1269 |
| Total | | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

N.A –THOSE RESPONDENTS WHO ARE NOT USING THE AWC

| Immunization | | States | | | | | | Total |
|--------------|----------------|--------|-------|-----|--------|-----------|-----|--------------|
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| | 1 Tuberculosis | 124 | 16 | 207 | 206 | 7 | 113 | 673 (41.8%) |
| | 2 Tetanus | 123 | 28 | 279 | 322 | 23 | 248 | 1023 (63.5%) |
| | 3 Polio | 150 | 43 | 279 | 452 | 25 | 241 | 1190 (73.9%) |
| | 4 Measles | 117 | 30 | 213 | 288 | 16 | 152 | 816 (50.7%) |
| | 5 Diphtheria | 111 | 21 | 114 | 169 | 2 | 44 | 461 (28.6%) |
| | 6 Don't know | 35 | 10 | 100 | 80 | 52 | 29 | 306 (18.9%) |
| | 7 Other | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 14 (0.9%) |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------|------------------------------------|-----|-----|------|------|-----|-----|-----------|
| | Total (1-7) Multiple Answers | 660 | 151 | 1192 | 1519 | 127 | 834 | 4483 |
| | No immunization | 1 | 41 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 59 (3.7%) |
| | N.A | 194 | 317 | 66 | 2 | 346 | 344 | 1269 |
| Total | | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 |

N.A –THOSE RESPONDENTS WHO ARE NOT USING THE AWC

Table 5.13 - Use of AWC if it remains open for longer hours & has proper facilities

| Use of AWC if it remains open for longer hours and if proper facilities are available | States | | | | | | | Total |
|--|--------|-------|-----|--------|-----------|-----|-----------------|-------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | | |
| Yes | 179 | 74 | 399 | 505 | 82 | 275 | 1514 (93.9%) | |
| No | 7 | 2 | 6 | 21 | 2 | 11 | 49 (3%) | |
| don't know | 0 | 37 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 48 (2.9%) | |
| NA | 194 | 317 | 66 | 2 | 346 | 344 | 1269 | |
| Total | 380 | 430 | 480 | 530 | 430 | 630 | 2880 | |

N.A –THOSE RESPONDENTS WHO ARE NOT USING THE AWC

Table 5.14 - Caste composition of AWWs

| | SCs | STs | OBCs | General | No AWW | Total |
|------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|-------|
| AWWs | 23 (19.2%) | 11 (9.2%) | 49 (40.8%) | 35 (29.2%) | 2 (1.7%) | 120 |

Table 5.15 - Religious composition of AWWs

| | Hindus | Muslims | No AWW | Total |
|-----|-------------|----------|----------|-------|
| AWW | 109 (90.8%) | 9 (7.5%) | 2 (1.7%) | 120 |

Table 5.16 - Age profile of AWWs

| Age | States | | | | | | Total |
|---------|--------|-------|----|--------|-----------|----|------------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| 18-20 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (0.8%) |
| 21-25 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 21 (17.8%) |
| 26-30 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 34 (28.8%) |
| 31-35 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 13 (11%) |
| 36-40 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 17 (14.4%) |
| 41-45 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 12 (10.2%) |
| 46-50 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 12 (10.2%) |
| 51-55 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 7 (5.9%) |
| 56-60 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (0.8%) |
| no form | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| total | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 120 |

| Educational Level | States | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------|--------|-------|----|--------|-----------|----|-------------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 (0.8%) |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 117 (99.2%) |
| 2a | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 (3.4%) |
| 2b | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 16 (13.6%) |
| 2c | 7 | 12 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 11 | 57 (48.3%) |
| 2d | 11 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 29 (24.6%) |
| 2e | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 (7.6%) |
| 2f | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 (1.7%) |
| No form | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 120 |

1 - Illiterate ; 2 - literate ; 2a - upto class 5th ; 2b - class 5th - 9th ; 2c - class 10th - 12th ; 2d - graduation ; 2e - post graduation ; 2f - professional course

| Distance of AWC from home of AWW | States | | | | | | Total |
|----------------------------------|--------|-------|----|--------|-----------|----|------------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| Less than 1 km | 15 | 5 | 17 | 10 | 14 | 15 | 76 (64.4%) |
| 1km-3km | 3 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 20 (16.9%) |
| 3km-4km | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 8 (6.8%) |
| More than 4 km | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 14 (11.9%) |
| No Form | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| Total | | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 120 |
|-------|--|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|

Table 5.19 - What are the working hours of the AWW

| What are the working hours of the AWW | States | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------------|--------|-------|----|--------|-----------|----|------------|-------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | | |
| 2 hours | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 (0.8%) | |
| 3 hours | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 (3.4%) | |
| 4 hours | 7 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 12 | 13 | 50 (42.4%) | |
| 5 hours | 11 | 18 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 39 (33.1%) | |
| 6 hours | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 18 (15.3%) | |
| 7 hours | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 (2.5%) | |
| 8 hours | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 (1.7%) | |
| 9 hours | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (0.8%) | |
| No Form | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | |
| Total | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 120 | |

Table 5.20 - Since how long has the AWW been working as an AWW

| Since how long has the AWW been working as an AWW | States | | | | | | | Total |
|---|--------|-------|----|--------|-----------|----|------------|-------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | | |
| less than 1 year | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 (1.7%) | |
| 1 - 3years | 0 | 7 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 9 | 29 (24.6%) | |
| 4 - 6 years | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 21 (17.8%) | |
| 7 - 9 years | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 (5.9%) | |
| 10-12 years | 15 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 26 (22%) | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--------------|----|----|---|----|----|----|----------|
| | 13- 15 years | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 8 (6.8%) |
| | 16 -18 years | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 (5.1%) |
| | 19- 21 years | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 (6.8%) |
| | 22- 24 years | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 (2.5%) |
| | 25- 27 years | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 (2.5%) |
| | 28- 30 years | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 (4.2%) |
| | No Form | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | | 20 | 20 | 3 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 120 |

| Whether the AWWs have received any training | States | | | | | | | Total |
|---|--------|-------|----|--------|-----------|----|-------------|-------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | | |
| Yes | 19 | 11 | 19 | 20 | 19 | 20 | 108 (91.5%) | |
| No | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 (8.5%) | |
| No Form | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | |
| Total | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 120 | |

| Type of training received (induction training) | States | | | | | | | Total |
|--|--------|-------|----|--------|-----------|----|------------|-------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | | |
| Yes | 18 | 6 | 18 | 17 | 16 | 19 | 94 (87%) | |
| No | 1 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 14 (12.9%) | |
| No Form | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| | NA | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Total (can be <120) | | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 120 |

N.A – NOT RECEIVED ANY TRAINING

Table 5.22 b - Type of training received (Job/Orientation training)

| Type of training received (job orientation training) | States | | | | | | | Total |
|--|--------|-------|----|--------|-----------|----|-------------|-------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | | |
| Yes | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 (1.9%) | |
| No | 19 | 11 | 19 | 20 | 19 | 18 | 106 (98.1%) | |
| NA | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | |
| no form | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | |
| Total (can be <120) | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 120 | |

N.A – NOT RECEIVED ANY TRAINING

Table 5.22 c - Type of training received (Other Training)

| Type of training received (other training) | States | | | | | | | Total |
|--|--------|-------|----|--------|-----------|----|------------|-------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | | |
| Other | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 12 (11.1%) | |
| No | 16 | 11 | 19 | 14 | 17 | 19 | 96 (88.9%) | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| | N.A | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| | no form | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Total (can be <120) | | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 120 |

N.A – NOT RECEIVED ANY TRAINING

| | States | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|--------|-------|----|--------|-----------|----|------------|-------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | | |
| Upto 1500 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 16 (13.6%) | |
| 1500-2000 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 17 | 10 | 62 (52.5%) | |
| 2000-2500 | 0 | 12 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 (25.4%) | |
| 2500-3000 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 (1.7%) | |
| 3000-3500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) | |
| 3500-4000 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 (6.8%) | |
| No form | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | |
| Total | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 120 | |

| Does the AWW receive the honorarium regularly | States | | | | | | | Total |
|---|--------|-------|----|--------|-----------|----|----------|-------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | | |
| Yes | 11 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 15 | 8 | 46 (39%) | |
| No | 9 | 20 | 7 | 20 | 4 | 12 | 72 (61%) | |
| No Form | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | |
| Total | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 120 | |

| Does the AWW receive any incentive | States | | | | | | | Total |
|------------------------------------|--------|-------|----|--------|-----------|----|------------|-------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | | |
| Cash award | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 (2.5%) | |
| Paid maternity leave | 3 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 1 | 24 (20.3%) | |
| Scholarships for children | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (0.8%) | |
| Insurance | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 9 (7.6%) | |
| Nothing | 15 | 15 | 19 | 14 | 5 | 16 | 84 (71.2%) | |
| No Form | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | |
| Total | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 22 | 21 | 123 | |

* MULTIPLE ANSWERS

| Whether the AWW has any approach in a grievance redressal system | States | | | | | | Total |
|--|--------|-------|----|--------|-----------|----|------------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| yes | 10 | 18 | 3 | 10 | 2 | 6 | 49 (41.5%) |
| no | 10 | 2 | 16 | 10 | 17 | 14 | 69 (58.5%) |
| No Form | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 120 |

| How many children are enrolled in the AWC | States | | | | | | Total |
|---|--------|-------|----|--------|-----------|----|------------|
| | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| Less than 20 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 (25.4%) |
| 20-40 | 13 | 9 | 2 | 19 | 7 | 5 | 55 (46.7%) |
| 41-60 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 20 (16.9%) |
| 61-80 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 27 (22.9%) |
| 81-100 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 (3.4%) |
| 101-120 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 (3.4%) |
| 121-140 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 (1.7%) |
| 141-160 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| 161-180 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (0.8%) |
| 181-200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 (0%) |
| 201-220 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 (1.7%) |
| No Form | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| Total | | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 120 |
|-------|--|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|

| Table 5.28 - Whether Take home ration is provided or not | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|------------|----------|------------|
| | | States | | | | | | Total |
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| Whether take-home ration is provided or not | Yes | 11 (55%) | 5 (25%) | 19 (100%) | 16 (80%) | 3 (15.8%) | 8 (40%) | 62 (52.5%) |
| | No | 9 (45%) | 15 (75%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (20%) | 16 (84.2%) | 12 (60%) | 56 (47.5%) |
| | No form | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 120 |

| Table 5.29 - Whether supplementary nutrition is provided regularly to the children or not | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|----------|-----------|------------|----------|-----------|----------|------------|
| | | States | | | | | | Total |
| | | Assam | Delhi | MP | Orissa | Rajasthan | UP | |
| Whether SN is provided regularly to the children | Yes | 4 (20%) | 20 (100%) | 18 (94.7%) | 16 (80%) | 19 (100%) | 17 (85%) | 94 (79.6%) |
| | No | 16 (80%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (5.3%) | 4 (20%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (15%) | 24 (20.3%) |
| | No form | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Total | | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 120 |