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This paper is part of a series of working papers produced by UNICEF’s Office of Research – Innocenti in collaboration with the University of Oxford’s Young Lives research programme. Under its multi-country study on The Drivers of Violence Affecting Children, the Office of Research has undertaken research in Italy, Peru, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe which examines how structural, institutional, community and individual factors interact to affect violence in children’s lives, with a particular focus on the risks and experiences of violence by gender and age.

Complementing UNICEF’s multi-country study, a number of papers have been produced using the longitudinal quantitative and qualitative data produced by the Young Lives research initiative. Young Lives is an international study of childhood poverty, initiated in 2000, which has followed 12,000 children in Ethiopia, India (in the states of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana), Peru and Viet Nam. This set of papers aims to understand various aspects of children’s experiences of violence, and the impacts of violence on children’s lives over time, across different settings.

Two papers use the quantitative data from the four Young Lives study sites to examine the issues of corporal punishment and bullying, their prevalence, impacts on children and the social support available to them. (Ogando Portela and Pells, *Corporal Punishment in Schools: Longitudinal Evidence from Ethiopia, India, Peru and Viet Nam*; Pells, Ogando Portela and Espinoza Revello, *Experiences of Peer Bullying among Adolescents and Associated Effects on Young Adult Outcomes: Longitudinal Evidence from Ethiopia, India, Peru and Viet Nam*, published respectively in 2015 and 2016 by the UNICEF Office of Research).

The remaining four papers draw primarily on the qualitative research undertaken in each country to obtain in-depth insights into children’s experiences and perceptions of violence. As the surveys were not originally designed specifically to analyze violence, there are some limitations to the data, discussed in each paper. However, taken together, the papers illuminate the varied experiences of violence, primarily physical and emotional, that affect children in different country contexts, and in different settings – home, school and community. The findings show how experiences of violence condition children’s life chances and key transitions (including schooling, friendships, emotional well-being etc.), and also shed light on children’s own agency and their responses to violence across multiple contexts.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRONYMS</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Backward Caste or Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP MERG</td>
<td>Child Protection Monitoring and Evaluation Reference Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>UN Committee on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCPU</td>
<td>District Child Protection Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoI</td>
<td>Government of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICPS</td>
<td>Integrated Child Protection Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITDA</td>
<td>Integrated Tribal Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWCD</td>
<td>Ministry of Women and Child Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACG</td>
<td>National Action and Coordinating Group against Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCPCR</td>
<td>National Commission for Protection of Child Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NREGS</td>
<td>National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>Other Caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PET</td>
<td>Physical Education Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Physical Therapy (Physical Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLR</td>
<td>Qualitative Longitudinal Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReE</td>
<td>Right to Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAARC</td>
<td>South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF</td>
<td>South Asia Forum for Ending Violence against Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAIEVAC</td>
<td>South Asia Initiative to End Violence against Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAQ</td>
<td>self-administered questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Scheduled Caste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Scheduled Tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Transfer Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN CEDAW</td>
<td>UN Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN CRC</td>
<td>UN Convention on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Union Territories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Violence against children in many forms is widespread in India, and the effects may extend well into adulthood. This paper has been commissioned as part of the UNICEF Multi-Country Study on the Drivers of Violence Affecting Children in Italy, Peru, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe. The Multi-Country Study analyses how individual, family, community, institutional and structural level factors interact and contribute to violence in children’s homes and communities, and aims to develop better national strategies for the prevention of violence against children. This paper is based on results from Young Lives, a longitudinal study of 12,000 children in four developing countries: Ethiopia, India, Peru and Viet Nam. Drawing on qualitative data gathered from children and young people in rural communities in Andhra Pradesh, India, over a period of seven years, the paper provides an account of children’s and young people’s experiences of violence at home, at school, and in communities.

Physical and emotional violence towards children in India appears to be so widespread that it is often difficult to trace the direct effects of poverty; the findings suggest that a range of factors appear to play a role, especially age and gender norms. Using a case study approach, the paper explores children’s and young people’s perceptions and fears of violence at home, in school, and in communities, and whether children’s experiences of violence have implications for their life trajectories, for example, relating to decisions to stay on at school, or move away from home or leave an employer because of maltreatment. Based on children’s accounts of violence, we conclude that it is important to take a holistic, gender-sensitive life-course approach to understanding violence towards children, and that tackling historically-entrenched norms and patterns of behaviour is a vital way forward, via a combination of top-down (social policies and laws) and bottom-up approaches (working with children, families, teachers, and communities).

Key findings:

- Children’s experience and understanding of violence
  - Violence against children in many forms is widespread in India, with the effects extending well into adulthood.
    - A 2007 study by the Ministry of Women and Child Development found that just under 70 per cent of children (aged 5 to 18) in 13 states reported experiencing physical abuse (Kacker et al., 2007).
    - A 2009-2010 study found that almost all children and young people experience corporal punishment in school (NCPCR, 2012). In addition, data from Young Lives suggest that children experience corporal punishment at residential hostels.
  - Violence is seen as an acceptable way to respond to ‘transgressions’ by young women and girls, who are subjected to specific forms of patriarchal violence underpinned by strong gender norms. Boys and men perpetrate much of the violence experienced by girls.
  - More generally, violence is often seen as an acceptable way to discipline children.
    - Beyond experiencing violence themselves, children and young people often witness violence in the home and at school. This may include violence between and from parents as well as older siblings in the home, teachers and other staff in schools as well as care staff at residential hostels.
    - Boys are also the targets of violence, and boys report higher levels of physical violence than girls, both at home and at school.
      - Young Lives data from the states of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana show that nearly 60 per cent of boys aged 15 in 2009 reported experiencing physical violence from family members, compared to
just over 25 per cent of girls. In school, two-thirds of boys reported experiencing physical violence from teachers, compared to just over 50 per cent of girls.

- Wealth does not appear to be a significant factor linked to reports of violence experienced by children at the hands of family members and teachers. Rather, children across all socio-economic levels within the Young Lives pro-poor sample experience physical violence, suggesting that it is both normalised and widespread.

### The drivers of violence against children

- **Within families, violence experienced by children is often part of an intergenerational cycle.** Some children who have experienced violence say they will not use it in future, but end up using violence as they become young adults. In addition, the normalization of violence across generations can mean that its reproduction becomes ‘invisible’ or no longer recognized or seen as problematic.

- **At the institutional level, experiences of violence at school are intertwined with poverty.** Indirect consequences of poverty, including economic constraints and the need to work, increase the risk of violence at school for many children.
  - Children reported that missing school, not completing homework or not understanding lessons, being tired as a result of balancing schooling and work, and the inability to pay fees (on time) or afford school uniforms may lead to corporal punishment.
  - Poverty and the associated experiences of violence at school may damage children’s educational trajectory and, therefore, their future prospects, exacerbating their poverty status as adults.

- **At the community level, gender norms in the form of dominant masculinity and social norms around girls’ reputations intersect to generate a cycle of violence towards women.** This violence is used by both men and women against other women and girls.
  - Gender norms play out in the form of harassment (known across South Asia as ‘eve-teasing’) perpetrated by young men, involving acts such as catcalls, singing at women, and groping them in public spaces. Valid fears of such harassment limit the mobility of young girls and women.
  - Analysis of qualitative data from Young Lives shows that conformity to gender norms also underlies much of the violence used by women to change and regulate the behaviour of girls and young women and to control and protect their reputations.

- **Children’s experiences of violence must be understood holistically, particularly the linkages between different parts of children’s lives.**
  - Poverty often requires children’s labour, and they may be punished if they do not work. But when they do work, they may miss school (or are less well prepared for lessons), and may be punished through physical violence by teachers. Multiple factors contribute, therefore, to their experiences of violence.

### Children’s resources against violence

Children have limited resources to draw on in dealing with situations of violence. Nevertheless, they do exercise agency in a variety of ways to confront violence in their lives.

- **Children may remove themselves from situations of violence,** by, for example, refusing to go to school, running away from home or leaving their village or work to escape violence.

- **Some children intervene (often violently) to protect others from violence.** This includes individual young boys and men intervening to protect their mothers and sisters, as well groups of girls who confront individual boys.
There is a clear pattern of violence reinforcing violence in these methods of intervention, contributing to the perpetuation of the cycle across generations. Thus, attempts to intervene in situations of violence may not challenge cultures of violence in any way.

- **Girls and young women may seek community support from village elders to address widespread instances of violence**, such as ‘eve-teasing’.
  - While a group of girls planned to seek the support of village elders in dealing with such instances of violence, the extent to which the community would be receptive to this was unclear.

- **Informal sources of support appear to be important for children and young people in dealing with violence**, particularly such gender-based violence as eve-teasing.
  - Assistance from trusted adults in the community (not necessarily parents or village elders), may be a source of support for some young women.

- Despite children’s efforts to exercise some agency in dealing with situations of violence, there is a culture of silence around violence that makes discussion of such instances somewhat taboo.

**Recommendations**

Programmes to address the violence that affects children need to recognize the broader context of violence in India. Since violence against children and women remains largely a taboo subject for families to deal with, the prevention of violence against children needs to be addressed in a more general way, as a first step towards violence prevention that aims for widespread safety, with safe schools, safe transport and safe communities.

- Develop inclusive programmes to raise awareness about the consequences of unsafe or violent behaviour, in all of its forms, across all settings including families, schools and the media – this should include separate and targeted campaigns that address critical issues raised such as violence and discrimination in schools and families.

- Assess on-going campaigns to establish whether their messaging and constituency are aligned with findings in this report. Are current campaigns directed at certain genders or certain age groups? How are campaigns addressing the ‘silence’ around violence? Are campaigns focused on either schools or homes – are connections between these places of violence made? For example, evaluations of existing girls’ and (women's) self-defence programmes could be undertaken. How are these experienced by girls and others in families and communities?

- Develop, implement and test different safety net approaches – that is approaches that focus on social support and full and safe access to services – for adolescent girls and boys, with curriculums that include gender socialization issues. This should include a review of current adolescent programming underway by the Population Council for example and other organizations. UNICEF could take the lead in this review.

- Strengthen and improve implementation of legislation. Programmes need to work with communities and parents, as well as with teachers, to improve awareness and implementation of existing legislation.
INTRODUCTION

Gender-based violence became a huge focus of concern in India, after the horrific incident of the rape and murder of a 23-year-old student in Delhi in late 2012 (the Nirbhaya case1). Large scale demonstrations that followed demanded an end to violence against women. Violence, in general, is a concern, and research evidence suggests that violence against children in many forms is widespread in India, and that the effects may extend well into adulthood (Contreras et al, 2012). Research also shows that children routinely witness domestic violence, but that responses differ by gender: young men see violence as an acceptable way to respond to transgressions by young women and girls (Jejeebhoy et al, 2013). Girls and women are subjected to specific forms of patriarchal violence, for example sexual violence. Boys are also victims of violence, particularly physical violence as seen in the data collected here. Across all types of violence, little is known about how children perceive its effects, and in particular how girls’ and boys’ perceptions shift as they grow and change (see Appendix 1 for a statistical snapshot of violence affecting children in India).

This paper has been commissioned as part of the UNICEF Multi-Country Study on the Drivers of Violence Affecting Children in Italy, Peru, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe. The Multi-Country Study analyses how individual, family, community, institutional and structural level factors interact and contribute to violence in children’s homes and communities; and aims to develop better national strategies for the prevention of violence against children. This paper principally draws on results from Young Lives, a longitudinal study of 12,000 children in four developing countries: Ethiopia, India, Peru and Viet Nam. Drawing on qualitative data gathered from children and young people in rural communities in Andhra Pradesh, India, over a period of seven years, this paper provides an account of children’s and young people’s perspectives on violence at home, at school, and in communities.

Research (reviewed below) shows that physical and emotional violence towards children in India is widespread. This means that it is difficult to trace a direct link with poverty, and a range of factors appear to play a role, especially age and gender norms. There are intricate ways in which poverty creates exposure to other vulnerabilities, all of which this paper attempts to unpack. Using a case study approach, the paper explores whether children’s experiences of violence have implications for their trajectories, for example, relating to decisions to stay on at school, or move away from home or from an employer because of maltreatment. Based on the children’s descriptions of violence, we conclude that it is necessary to take a holistic, gender-sensitive life-course approach to understanding violence towards children, and that tackling historically-entrenched norms and patterns of behaviour is a vital way forward, via a combination of top-down (social policies and laws) and bottom-up approaches (working with children, families, teachers, and communities).

1 India does not allow publication of victims’ names. The case has consequently become known as the Nirbhaya (the ‘fearless one’) case. Violence against girls and young women persists – a widely reported case was of a 15-year-old girl being attacked in Delhi in March 2016 – see http://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/mar/09/indian-girl-dies-after-being-raped-and-set-on-fire
The paper is structured in four sections. Section 1 sets out definitions, background and context of international, regional and national social policies addressing child protection in India, and briefly reviews existing literature. Section 2 describes the methods, sample, and Young Lives data analysed in the paper. Section 3 presents methodology; Section 4, analysis of survey data; Section 5 presents a series of case studies; Section 6 presents some coping tactics used by children, and discussions and conclusions are found in the final two sections.
1. DEFINITIONS AND BACKGROUND

Most research on violence in India draws on Article 19 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child: “all forms of physical or mental violence, injury and abuse, neglect or negligent treatment, maltreatment or exploitation, including sexual abuse” (UN CRC 1989); and the definitions used by WHO in the World Report on Violence and Health (2002):²

> the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against a child, by an individual or group, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in actual or potential harm to the child’s health, survival, development or dignity.

(As cited by Pinheiro, 2006.)

No single law covers child protection in India, and there exist a large number of legislations and schemes that have been framed to act as safeguards to protect children from violence and abuse. The policy context is changing rapidly (see Appendix 2 for discussion of international treaties, regional initiatives, and national legislation and policies). In this paper, we discuss individual acts of violence committed against children, including emotional and physical violence; interpersonal violence in the family in the form of physical punishment of children, and domestic violence observed by children; institutional violence in the form of corporal punishment occurring in schools and hostels and finally, different types of community-level violence including gender norms in the form of sexual harassment of girls and other abuses occurring in community settings. We also analyse children’s responses to these multiple types of violence.

The UN Secretary-General’s Study on Violence against Children (Pinheiro, 2006) raised awareness of this rights violation, but high levels of violence continue to be reported worldwide. Until the 2000s, research on violence against children, child abuse and child maltreatment tended to be dominated by United States’ models of research, much of it focused on parental behaviour and the links to later (undesirable) outcomes for individual children (Ember and Ember, 2005). The implications of children’s experiences for their immediate well-being (taking a rights-based approach rather than focusing on the impact of violence on their developmental outcomes) have been less well researched, especially in the global South (for an important exception see Beazley et al., 2006). Nor indeed has research in the global South explored the effects of violence on children’s trajectories and outcomes. Typically, violence against or affecting children is analysed within particular settings – such as schools or the home – and fails to recognize the ways macro-structural factors related to the economy and gender, for example, influence the places where children study, work, play, eat and sleep. Studies based on individual outcomes rarely capture power imbalances based on gender or age, though they may disaggregate by socio-economic status, gender or ethnicity. Further, as Ripoll-Núñez and Rohner (2006: 231–2) note:

---

² Aligning with global definitions to the extent possible, in this paper instances of violence affecting children are considered acts of commission – that is, words or actions that cause harm, potential harm or threat of harm. Acts of commission are deliberate and intentional, and include physical, emotional and sexual abuse. Acts of omission differ from acts of commission. Rather, they refer to the failure to provide for a child’s basic physical, emotional, or educational needs or to protect a child from harm or potential harm, and are frequently referred to as forms of neglect (WHO 2009 and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention), http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/childmaltreatment/definitions.html
research is limited by the fact that the targets of punishment – children themselves – are only rarely asked to be the source of information. Thus little is known about children’s perceptions of their own experiences.

The little research that has been carried out in India to date has also tended to use Western-informed models, approaches and survey instruments with some adaptations, to research child abuse. The research that does exist is scattered, mostly quantitative and pays minimal attention to cultural contexts of poverty, patriarchy and the effects of rapid social change. Finally, the focus on child sexual abuse runs the risk of focusing on a single (although profoundly unacceptable) phenomenon and can distract from the many other forms of violence that children face, especially the socially-sanctioned sexual harassment of girls after menarche.

3 For general findings on violence towards children in India, see Deb and Walsh, 2012, Kacker et al., 2007 and UNICEF, 2015. For studies of corporal punishment in schools, see NCPCR, 2012, Morrow and Singh, 2014, Ogando Portela and Pells, 2015 and Parkes, 2015. On attitudes to violence and gender norms see Das et al., 2014 and Jejeebhoy et al. 2013. On ‘eve-teasing’ and sexual harassment, see Chakraborty 2016a, 2016b, Akhtar, 2013, Iyer, 2016 and Sodhi and Verma, 2003. On developmental consequences for men of childhood exposure to violence, see Contreras et al., 2012. Finally, for domestic violence and its effects on children see Bhat and Ullman, 2014 and Jejeebhoy, 2013). Kacker et al. (2007) found that the majority (69 per cent) of 12,447 children aged 5 to 18 from 13 states reported physical abuse. They also found that younger children (5-12 years of age) reported higher levels of abuse than other age groups; boys and girls were found to be equally at risk of physical abuse (of those children who reported physical abuse 54 per cent were boys and 46 per cent were girls); people in positions of trust and authority were the main abusers; and most children (70 per cent) never reported the matter to anyone.
2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS

The field of violence research has been dominated by ecological models derived from Bronfenbrenner’s work but with a considerably narrower focus than originally envisioned by Bronfenbrenner (Bronfenbrenner 1979).4 Such models focus on and situate the individual child as ‘nested’ at the heart of a series of concentric circles, and thus protected from the more distant, outer layers and levels – within families, that are nested within communities, then within societies. This makes it difficult to trace how social structural factors, such as poverty, affect and intersect with intra-familial relationships, and how social protection systems might be used to ameliorate children’s lives. An alternative approach would reverse the model (or turn it inside out), to explore how social structural factors affect parents and children directly via poverty and social norms relating to gender over the life-course (including how notions of masculinity affect boys’ and girls’ behaviour) and to enable a longitudinal approach. Too often, ecological models are used and interpreted in ways that are static and one-dimensional and cannot account for stages in the life-course and how children change over time and according to their gender and stage of development.

This paper explores how violence affecting children manifests in children’s lives in the India study sites and explores the unequal power dynamics operating along gender, age and other status markers that form the wider context within which violent acts occur. The drivers of violence are triggers that can interact at multiple levels (individual, inter-personal, social, institutional and structural) to increase or reduce children’s risk of experiencing violence. At the end of this paper, we return to the theoretical model to explore how it fits with empirical findings and how it might be further developed.

---

4 Bronfenbrenner (1979) saw the process of human development as being shaped by the interaction between an individual and his or her environment. The specific path of development was a result of the influences of a person’s surroundings, such as their parents, friends, school, work, culture. As a result of his groundbreaking work in ‘human ecology’, these environments – from the family to economic and political structures – have come to be viewed as influencing part of the life course from childhood through adulthood.
3. METHODS, ETHICS, SETTING

In order to explore children’s experiences of violence in Andhra Pradesh and Telangana, we drew on survey and qualitative data from Young Lives, a longitudinal study of child poverty. Young Lives is a study of childhood poverty in four low- and middle-income countries, Ethiopia, India (the former state of Andhra Pradesh), Peru and Viet Nam, over a 15-year period, 2002–2017. A total of 12,000 children are followed in two cohorts, 2,000 born in 2000/2001 (the Younger Cohort), and 1,000 born in 1994 (the Older Cohort) in each country. To date, Young Lives has collected four rounds of survey data from children, their households and their communities, in 2002, 2006, 2009 and 2013. Our research draws on survey data from the third round of data collection, in 2009, when the children in the Older Cohort were aged 15, with 966 children surveyed. Findings from the survey data are complemented by four rounds of qualitative data, gathered in 2007, 2008, 2010 and 2014. The qualitative research was embedded within the collection of survey data, as illustrated in Figure 1.

Figure 1 – Young Lives survey design
3.1 SAMPLING

The 2001 survey covered 20 sites in Andhra Pradesh, using sentinel-site sampling, with oversampling of sites in poor areas. The sites included urban and rural areas, representing a range of regions and contexts that reflect ethnic, geographic and political diversity. Within each sentinel site, 100 households with a child aged between 6 and 18 months (Younger Cohort) and 50 households with a child between 7 and 8 years (Older Cohort) were randomly selected (see Barnett et al. 2012).

For qualitative research, four study sites – three rural and one urban – were selected from the 20 survey sites in order to provide insights from diverse contexts on the basis of location, ethnicity and socio-economic status, and to include sites from differing regions, reflecting the main ethnic or caste groups. In rural areas, the population is predominantly Hindu, while in urban Hyderabad, it is predominantly Muslim. 50 children (25 in each cohort) and their caregivers were drawn from survey participants in the qualitative sites (in 2007) for qualitative longitudinal research (see Crivello et al. 2013; Morrow and Crivello 2015). The same children and families were followed at each round. Survey and qualitative research were conducted by local research teams fluent in local languages. Qualitative interviews were voice-recorded, transcribed, and translated. Research teams were rigorous in checking data quality and translation and in reflecting on data interpretation.

The qualitative research was framed around a broad set of topics, including children’s well-being, their experiences of transitions (such as changing schools), and their time use and daily experiences. Research teams were encouraged to follow what children wanted, or were willing, to talk about. The Young Lives qualitative research team in Andhra Pradesh has been consistent over time, with the same fieldworkers involved in each round, and a very good rapport has been developed with children and families over the four rounds of qualitative fieldwork, as shown from the conversational style of some of the interview extracts. A range of qualitative research methods was used, including one-to-one interviews, group discussions and creative activities (such as drawings of a child ‘doing well’ or ‘doing badly’, and body-mapping, see Crivello et al., 2013 for a comprehensive description of methods). Violence, in many forms was mentioned on many occasions and by all age groups, including during group discussions about what constitutes a child ‘doing well’, in children’s descriptions of what they liked and disliked about school (during interviews), and so on.

This paper uses a case-study approach, focusing on children in rural areas (under-researched in India; the few studies that have been conducted have tended to cover urban areas). Ten cases, six girls and four boys, were selected for detailed analysis because they had mentioned violence in their interviews, and because their narratives were varied and detailed, rather than in order to present representative cases. Table 1 provides a brief description of the children profiled and their family situations.

---

5 See Mukherji (2008) for a detailed discussion of poverty trends in Andhra Pradesh and in India in general. “Economically, Andhra Pradesh and India saw similar growth of per capita income during the 1990s. Official statistics show that poverty declined rapidly in India and particularly in Andhra Pradesh, and the rural poverty rate (in 2008) was less than half the national poverty rate” (Mukherji, 2008, pp. 23–4). As noted above, Andhra Pradesh divided in 2014 to form Telangana and Andhra Pradesh: the population of Andhra Pradesh is 49.3 million (now the 5th largest state in India) and that of Telangana is 35.2 million (12th largest) (Government of India, 2011). Poverty rates are similar across the two states.
We analysed children’s narratives where violence was mentioned, as well as some caregivers’ accounts, across all four rounds of data collection. We then further sorted these by topics, including violence at family, school and community levels (see Crivello et al., 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites (all names have been changed)</th>
<th>Child’s name (all names have been changed)</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Family composition</th>
<th>Main caregiver</th>
<th>Main economic activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katur (poor rural drought-prone area of Rayalaseema in AP)</td>
<td>Ravi</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Aged 12, he lived with his parents, brothers and younger nephew. Migrated throughout Andhra Pradesh during his childhood, and had returned to the village; by the time he was 20, was married, and living with his family.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Subsistence farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patna (remote tribal area)</td>
<td>Bhavana</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Father died when Bhavana was six or seven. Seasonal migration for work to Mumbai with family members during childhood. Married in 2011, living with in-laws.</td>
<td>Mother, then in-laws/ husband’s family</td>
<td>Construction work in Mumbai, and seasonal agricultural work (paddy and groundnut).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poompuhar (poor rural community in southern Telangana)</td>
<td>Yaswanth</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Lived with his mother (father died when he was seven). Sister married, incurring dowry debts to family. Struggled at school and wanted to support his mother.</td>
<td>Mother (roles had reversed over time and Yaswanth wanted to support his mother)</td>
<td>Labourers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chandani</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>At boarding school for girls.</td>
<td>Hostel/boarding school</td>
<td>Farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramya</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Lived with parents, one of five children, four girls and a boy.</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Land-owning farmers (small scale); father is village secretary for neighbouring panchayat (village council).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranadeep</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Lived with parents.</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tejaswini</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Lived with parents and younger brother.</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Wage labourers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharmuka Priya</td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Lived with parents and younger brother.</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Labourers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarada</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Lived with parents, and siblings</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Labourers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 LIMITATIONS

There are a number of limitations to the approach we have taken. First and foremost, it is important to note that Young Lives surveys are not dedicated child-protection or violence prevalence surveys, but rather consist of a set of general questions and measures related to children's general well-being, experiences of poverty, and progress over time. The child survey in 2009 asked a direct question of 15 year-olds about being beaten/physically hurt by parents and teachers in a self-administered questionnaire (SAQ). There were practical difficulties with administering the questionnaire and survey results were disappointingly meagre, with low response rates. Because of very low levels of literacy among rural 15 year olds in Andhra Pradesh, the SAQ was not ‘self’-administered, but carried out by fieldworkers (the SAQ had been piloted with literate children in urban areas). Fieldworkers were matched by gender (i.e. male fieldworkers interviewed boys, female fieldworkers interviewed girls), but this did not negate difficulties – as discussed elsewhere, age/status hierarchies can be as powerful as gender differences in data-gathering (Morrow, 2009). Many values were missing and violence may therefore have been under-reported because children may have been unwilling to disclose fully to fieldworkers; under-reporting on sensitive issues like violence is common worldwide. The question about being hit at home and school was dropped from Round 4 of the survey, so we cannot undertake longitudinal analysis to see if the same children report being hit from one round to the next. Furthermore, the survey did not ask about risk factors such as alcohol abuse, gender role attitudes, and witnessing parental violence.

The Young Lives sample is pro-poor and while broadly representative, it cannot shed light on violence experienced by affluent children and young people. Also, by focusing on cases of children and young people who mentioned violence in the course of the research, we risk over-emphasising episodes of violence in what may be relatively non-violent settings. In Young Lives qualitative research, interviews are conducted in homes, fields, or in village community premises, occasionally schools, so the contexts of data gathering are likely to affect how violence is reported, as children may feel inhibited if they feel they can be overheard.

Finally, while the ability to generalize may be more limited in qualitative work, it is uniquely suited to unpack or explain the phenomena observed through large quantitative surveys such as those conducted by Young Lives. Qualitative longitudinal research is particularly useful to illustrate the importance of exploring children's experiences and their agency over the course of their childhoods, adding context to the broad trends found in the survey data. A biographical, longitudinal approach is useful for capturing the links between differing aspects of children's lives, as we show in relation to the links between violence at home, in schools and in communities, as well as for explaining diverging experiences and trajectories (Morrow and Crivello, 2015).

3.3 ETHICS

Young Lives has research ethics approval from the University of Oxford, and consent was obtained from parents and children for participation (see Morrow, 2009). All the names of people and places in this paper have been changed.

Asking children about their experiences of violence raises profound questions about research ethics, balancing whether the benefits outweigh the risks, and about the responsibilities of researchers to
report instances of violence. Young Lives follows Save the Children Child Protection Guidelines (Save the Children, 2003) and has systems in place to support children who report that they are at risk of immediate harm (see Morrow, 2009). A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for fieldworkers was developed in collaboration with research teams, setting out basic guidance about research procedures and respectful communication with research participants (see www.younglives.org.uk). All fieldworkers undergo training in research ethics, and fieldwork manuals contain detailed ethics guidance. In Andhra Pradesh, no children were referred for further support, though the research team did give a group of girls some advice about addressing ‘eve-teasing’. The dilemma was that children described episodes that are clearly harmful (and in the case of corporal punishment by teachers, an illegal activity). Indeed, so many children were at risk of corporal punishment in schools that it would not have been possible to remove each child from danger. A balance had to be struck between intervening in children’s lives and raising awareness (see CP MERG, 2012; Myers and Bourdillon, 2012). It could be argued that it should not be necessary “to collect data about such experiences in order to promote what is a fundamental human right” (Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children 2012: 19), but research evidence is vital for the development of policies and practices to address multiple forms of violence affecting children and young people. We hope that the findings of research can be used “to raise awareness about the reality of children’s experiences of [violence], to counter myths, and to add weight to arguments” (Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children 2012: 19), especially where legislation may have been passed but is clearly not effective (Morrow and Singh, 2014).
4. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

4.1 STRUCTURAL FACTORS – POVERTY, ECONOMIC SHOCKS, DEBT AND HOW THESE IMPACT ON FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS

Our analysis of survey data finds that all groups of children experience violence (see also Kacker et al. 2007; Deb and Modak, 2010; Deb and Walsh, 2012). However, qualitative data reveal a more complex picture, including the likelihood of children experiencing violence related to poverty and inequality, as our detailed case studies below show.

4.2 CHILDREN’S EXPERIENCES OF VIOLENCE

Based on analysis of the question ‘Have you ever been beaten or physically hurt by ‘teacher’ and ‘somebody from your family?’ asked of 15 year-olds, we can clearly see that boys reported more violence within households and schools than girls. As noted in Table 2, almost 59 per cent of boys reported having been physically hurt by family members as compared to 26 per cent of girls, while a still larger percentage of boys reported being physically hurt by teachers (66 per cent) as compared to girls (51 per cent). It is noteworthy that more violence was reported in schools for both girls and boys compared to the home. Because so many children report this type of violence, it is difficult to trace its direct causes or its impact.

Table 2 – Percentage of children reporting being beaten or physically hurt by family members and teachers at age 15, n = 966, data gathered 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female %</th>
<th>Difference %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children beaten or physically hurt by family members</td>
<td>58.9 (279)</td>
<td>25.8 (127)</td>
<td>33.1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children beaten or physically hurt by teachers</td>
<td>66.0 (313)</td>
<td>51.0 (251)</td>
<td>15.0***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: chi-square test of association is significant at *** = 1% level and ** = 5% level; Number of observations in parentheses.

In Table 3, Other Caste (OC), and Scheduled Castes (SC), and so-called ‘Backward Castes’ (BC) reported remarkably similar rates of being hurt by family members or teachers. Close to 45 per cent of BC children, 44 per cent of OC children and 41 per cent of SC children reported being hurt by family members, whereas 62 per cent of BC children, 61 per cent of SC children and 59 per cent of OC children reported being hurt by teachers. Scheduled Tribe (ST) children were least likely to report violence at home and by teachers (31 per cent and 37 per cent respectively). The difference among ST children is especially driven by much lower rates of reporting among females (as compared with females of other castes).

Economic shocks include drought, crop-loss, livestock-loss, death, illness in households, etc.

The Hindu caste system divided society into a five-fold hierarchy, with Brahmins at the head, followed in order by Kshatriyas, Vaisyas or traders, Shudras or servants, and dalit/untouchables. Scheduled Castes (SCs) are the lowest in the caste structure and were earlier considered to be ‘untouchables’/dalit. SCs have been subjected to discrimination and had no access to basic services, including education. So-called ‘Backward Castes or Classes’ (BCs) are people belonging to a group of castes who are considered to be ‘backward’ in view of their low level in the caste structure. Other Castes (OCs) are disadvantaged Shudra castes. Scheduled Tribes (ST) are indigenous communities that are traditionally disadvantaged and live in forests and mountainous areas. If they do continue in school, ST children tend to have to stay in hostels, often from a very young age.
Table 3 – Percentage of children reporting being beaten or physically hurt by age 15 by Caste and gender, 2009, n = 966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste</th>
<th>Family Members</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male %</td>
<td>Female %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Caste</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Tribe</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backward Caste</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Caste</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 4, below, girls are less likely to report experiences of violence across all castes, with three times more ST boys being beaten than ST girls.

Table 4 – Percentage of children reporting being beaten/physically hurt by family members by age 15, by caste and gender (n = 966) 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caste</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female %</th>
<th>Difference %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Caste</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>26.9***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Tribe</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>31.7***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backward Caste</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>35.3***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Caste</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>33.3***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: chi-square test of association is significant at *** = 1% level

Table 5 shows that wealth does not appear to be a significant factor affecting reports of violence experienced by children at the hands of family members (though it does appear to be a factor in relation to school). Children across all wealth terciles in the Young Lives sample experienced being beaten or physically hurt. Overall, this suggests that levels of reported violence are high across all groups. It is clear from the quantitative findings that boys reported more violence than girls within home and in school.

As Table 4 above shows, children (particularly boys) from SC, BC and OC groups, reported being hit more than ST children. Scheduled Tribe girls reported the least violence. The reasons for low reporting among ST children are unclear, but we speculate that this could be because most tribal children are in residential schools and these schools are less violent. Further, teachers may be more cautious, fearing that tribal children will drop out (in groups as well as individually) of school if they are beaten.

The findings are broadly in line with what is already known, and the fact that boys experience more violence from teachers than girls at 15 relates to cultural norms relating to appropriate behaviour towards girls – girls are rarely beaten after attaining menarche. With boys, the expectations of

---

8 The overall wealth index used in Young Lives is a composite of three elements of equal weight: housing conditions, consumer durables and service access.
taking up responsibilities grow with age and when not met may lead to punishments. Teachers tend to punish boys using discipline throughout their schooling (Uma Vennam, personal communication, 2015, see also Iyer, 2016). Thus, in statistical terms, wealth does not seem to be a significant variable – across all terciles we see violence at relatively the same levels for boys and girls. Caste seems a more significant determinant than wealth. However, when we explore qualitative data, we can see in more depth how poverty intersects with violence in children’s lives, from their point of view.

**Table 5 – Percentage of children reporting being beaten or physically hurt by age 15 by wealth index (data gathered in 2009)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wealth Index (R3)</th>
<th>Family Members</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male % (n)</td>
<td>Female % (n)</td>
<td>Male % (n)</td>
<td>Female % (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom Tercile</td>
<td>61.7 (92)</td>
<td>29.3 (51)</td>
<td>64.4 (96)</td>
<td>51.7 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Tercile</td>
<td>63.6 (105)</td>
<td>24.7 (39)</td>
<td>66.1 (109)</td>
<td>54.4 (86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Tercile</td>
<td>51.0 (79)</td>
<td>23.1 (36)</td>
<td>67.1 (104)</td>
<td>47.4 (74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>58.9 (279)</td>
<td>25.8 (127)</td>
<td>66.0 (313)</td>
<td>51.0 (251)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: chi-square test of association is found not significant
5. QUALITATIVE RESEARCH: WHAT CHILDREN SAY

The following section presents case study examples based on qualitative research from four boys and six girls in three sites in rural Andhra Pradesh/Telangana. It is important to reiterate that these case studies are selected examples, and cannot be representative of all children. First, we analyse an example where poverty, as a structural (macro) factor, appears to have shaped two children's trajectories – a young man and a young woman – observing how poverty affects interpersonal relationships within families, how violence becomes normalised through the life-course and the gendered nature of violence. The second section looks at institutions, specifically children's experiences of corporal punishment in schools and hostels. The third section examines in more depth the social norms related to gender-based violence described by girls in schools and communities, and the importance of social relationships. Finally, we describe children's strategies and capacities to act in response to violence.

5.1 FAMILY VIOLENCE – POVERTY CYCLES, GENDER AND CULTURES OF VIOLENCE

Ravi was a Scheduled Caste boy living in Katur. When he was first interviewed in 2007, aged 12, he was living with his parents, brothers and younger nephew. He had stopped attending school three years earlier, at the age of nine, to help to pay a family debt by working as a debt-bonded labourer on a neighbouring farm belonging to a family from the Kamma Caste. The debt of 20,000 rupees ($388) was incurred by his family to pay for his older brother’s education.

His parents had migrated from Katur in search of work, often leaving the children in the care of their grandmother, who cared little about their education. As a result, Ravi often missed school. As a full-time farm labourer, he picked groundnuts, cleaned the cattle sheds, swept floors and fetched water, but he hoped to go to school again one day when the debt was paid off.

Ravi described how his father sometimes beat his mother and said that this made him unhappy. He was close to his mother and was very upset when his father was drunk and beat her, and pleased when his mother tried to hit back. His mother talked about the drink, but not about the beating. She said:

\[
\text{At home, my husband used to drink and neglected his family responsibilities. The children said to him: 'By having food you can fill your stomach but by drinking you can never do it. It's not the right way to be.' He nods his head at that moment but continues doing the same thing every evening.}
\]

Katur is a poor and drought-prone rural community in the Rayalaseema region of Andhra Pradesh. During the non-agricultural season, most inhabitants take part in work provided under the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS), introduced by the Government of India in 2005. This guarantees 100 days’ work per year for Rs 100 per day and aims to prevent seasonal migration from rural areas. Some families also migrate to nearby villages, towns and cities in search of work. Katur has a government primary school up to Grade 7 (age 14), and children continue their education at a high school approximately three kilometres away, along a deserted route. Some changes have been observed within the community, including slightly improved facilities in the primary school. In 2010, the community had experienced a severe drought, with poor groundnut yields.
Ravi said: “When my mum and dad fight I feel very bad. When my dad beats my mum we go and try to stop him. Me and my brother go.” Ravi talked about getting married in the future. The 12-year-old Ravi declared that he would not beat his wife like his father beats his mother: “I won’t beat her. If I beat my wife, she will also beat me. If I am perfect, why would she beat me?”

A year later (2008), he was interviewed again, aged 13. He had left Katur for dangerous work in the quarries, but he liked it because he worked with a friend. He recounted leaving work as a bonded labourer not only because of the sheer physical load but also because he had been badly treated – his master beat him with a broomstick if he failed to attend, he had no holidays during festivals, and he had to keep working during the heavy rains. His master’s wife used to dictate to him, “Go! Take out the cow dung, clean the place and do the work.” He was ashamed:

I didn’t feel like working there for them. ... Everyone pointed a finger at me and were saying that I alone [in my family] was working as a farmhand. ... in my family I was the only one who was a farmhand. That is the reason why I did not feel like sticking to it. ... I came away, ... whenever I did not turn up for work they would beat me. So, I left. ... That’s the reason.

At home, however, the beatings continued. Ravi explained that his mother forced him to work and his father beat him if he missed work, so “then I ran away.” However, he was now earning money, and had learnt some skills. His family members treated him equally with his brother and his parents were planning to send him to learn masonry work.

When interviewed for the third time, in 2010, aged 16, Ravi no longer mentioned domestic violence between his parents. However, he described how he was drawn into fighting his brother-in-law who was hitting his sister, to protect his sister and her son. Caught up in the violence, he said:

I was provoked and angry. I hit him back. I beat him with my bare hands. He fell down flat. He was in bed for three days. We thought he wouldn’t come back. We moved out and rented another room, but he turned up, saying, ‘How dare you hit me?’ ... and again he picked on me.

Interviewer: What happened then?

Ravi: My sister intervened and told me to calm down. She told me not to get involved and to go inside. He pulled me out and started hitting me. Then he started hitting my sister. I had to free her.

Interviewer: What happened after that?

Ravi: He went away and did not come back home for a week. But then he came and caught hold of my nephew’s neck and held him against the wall. I tried to stop him. I said, ‘Take your hands off him.’ Then he said, ‘This is my son and I’ll do as I please.’ But he released him anyway. ... He hasn’t turned into a good man. Whenever he came he fought with my sister and he would go away for a few days and come back again only to hit her.
Ravi said he hated people who drink and again declared that his own future will be different. He wanted to earn money, get married to a good-looking woman from the same background, chosen by his parents. He wanted to be a mason, and work to support himself and his family because both his parents were suffering from ill-health.

In 2014, aged 20, Ravi had returned to Katur, and had married the previous year. Before his marriage, he had stayed with his elder sister in Tirupati for a while, where he had worked as a mason, and said the disputes and violence with his brother-in-law had stopped. His sister looked after him well, and he sent money home. He felt the family's financial situation was now good, and that they were able to withstand difficulties. He and his wife took good care of his parents. Ravi described his marriage at some length, and said that his wife was four months pregnant.

He wanted to take care of her, but despite his early experiences of witnessing his father's violence towards his mother, he also said that when his wife tells lies, “she gets a beating... I hit her when she tells anything... she won’t keep quiet [after the quarrel], she keeps muttering to herself... she just nags, I get angry.”

Thus, violence in the form of fights and family quarrels, runs through Ravi’s childhood accounts. His father’s drinking led to domestic violence. The family’s poverty led to Ravi taking on the family debt at an early age, but his employer beat him and treated him badly. He took action by leaving the village, and found other work, as a response to how he had been treated. He also fought with his brother-in-law, in an attempt to protect his sister. At the age of 12, he had said he would not hit his wife in the future, as a response to witnessing his father hitting his mother. But the reality was that he readily admitted, 7 years later, to hitting his wife. Thus, violence has passed down the generations and the cycle has been repeated. The key message from Ravi’s account is that gender norms – in the form of dominant masculinity – intersect with poverty, indebtedness, and age from middle childhood to young adulthood generating a cycle of violence towards women as well as reinforcing and connecting to cycles of violence toward children. Thus, violence affecting women is linked to violence against children, and gender inequalities and masculinities are a root of both.

How do these powerful gender norms play out for girls? In her first interview Bhavana, aged 12, also from a very poor family in Katur, described the way in which violence was used to resolve disputes throughout her childhood. Bhavana’s father had died when she was aged 6 or 7 years. The cause of Bhavana’s father’s death is unclear, though he may have been murdered after he had been drinking, in a dispute over money sent back from Mumbai (allegedly, hit or stabbed by his own brother). Bhavana’s mother described how when she herself had married and moved to a strange village, she had not wanted to live with her in-laws because they were drunkards, “They boozed and fought in the evenings, they beat their children.” Bhavana had left school after Grade 2 (age seven). She worked throughout her childhood and the family migrated to Mumbai for 6 months each year, where an uncle found them work. In 2010, aged 16, she said, “I used to think it would have been better if I had been to school”, but now “it is better if we learn to work in the fields”, and her mother told her that if she learned to work hard, her future in-laws would look after her well.

By 2010, Bhavana was working in construction and road building with her brother and sister-in-law in Mumbai, as well as undertaking seasonal agricultural work, harvesting groundnut and transplanting
and harvesting paddy. She married in 2011, and by 2014 was living with her in-laws. The village she has moved to is peaceful and her mother said ‘They don’t fight, they don’t booze, there is not much noise’, yet Bhavana appeared to be lonely and isolated, unable to understand her in-laws when they spoke in Kannada not Telugu. Her mother said that Bhavana’s husband treated her well, but sometimes scolded her, and was lazy, sometimes missing work (he was an Auto-rickshaw driver, but spent money playing games and going to movies). His parents shouted at and scolded Bhavana and she would telephone her mother, crying. According to her mother, “Sometimes she says she’s happy. What to do? We got a son-in-law, just like my sons, all are good for nothing.” Her mother had scolded Bhavana’s husband, and said that he was now working regularly.

Bhavana’s case study emphasises how violence becomes normalised through generations, leaving girls vulnerable to contracting marriages similar to those of their mothers – ones which expose them to isolation and (in this case) emotional abuse. Bhavana’s mother described her own experience of getting married, moving to a new place to live with strangers (her in-laws) who were violent. Her experiences of vulnerability and isolation as a result of the marriage are not unusual in anyway, and this may indeed have affected the type of marriage she contracted for her daughter and the levels of vulnerability and risk that Bhavana accepted as a ‘normal’, anticipated part of marriage. Her mother even compared her experience with Bhavana’s, noting that her daughter’s marriage was not as bad as her own. She did not seem to see Bhavana’s experiences of isolation and vulnerability to verbal abuse by her in-laws as problematic nor that this replicated another generation of abuse. The normalising of physical violence within the marriage that Bhavana’s mother experienced, may have meant that Bhavana’s own experiences of verbal/emotional abuse were considered as unimportant.

5.2 INSTITUTIONAL VIOLENCE – CORPORAL PUNISHMENT AT SCHOOL, AND THE INTERSECTIONS OF POVERTY

As described elsewhere (Morrow and Singh, 2014), families’ economic circumstances powerfully affect children’s experiences at school. The costs of schooling, the need for children to do paid or unpaid work to support their families, and prejudice related to social positioning/caste/class all affect children’s capacity to attend school regularly and to meet the school’s expectations. The direct consequences of poverty and implications for children are clear when they describe being punished for not having a uniform or the right equipment, or money to pay fees (in the case of private schools, see Singh 2013; Singh and Sarkar 2013). Yaswanth, aged 15, described how he had been beaten at school for not wearing a uniform:

*If [my] uniform is not there, I don’t go because the PT [physical therapy, i.e. physical education] master will beat me. ... if it is not washed, I will not wear it, so I don’t go. ... I have two pairs [sets of uniform], sometimes mother may not [have] washed clothes due to lack of time. (Interviewed in 2010)*

One mother described how sometimes the fear of being beaten stopped her daughter going to school:

*Mother: She studies well, she goes regularly and returns, but when there is no dress [uniform] and when we delay the fee payment then she will not go, she refuses to go. ... she says she will not go and she hides behind that wall... and says*
that "Sir will beat me, they will beat me."
Interviewer: Will they punish her if she won’t go in uniform?
Mother: Yes, but if we explain to them, then they will give two days’ time.
(Interviewed in 2008)

Indirect consequences of poverty can be traced in the intersections of children’s time spent in school and work. Economic constraints and family circumstances meant that boys and girls in rural areas frequently engaged in seasonal agricultural work on family land, and missed school for days, weeks, or months at a time. Tasks were gendered, and boys, for example, described having to get up in the middle of the night to switch on irrigation pumps when the electricity supply is available, which made them tired the next day. In some parts of Andhra Pradesh, girls and boys spent long hours engaged in cotton pollination work (Morrow and Vennam, 2009). When they do return to school, they face punishment. When interviewed in 2007, aged 12, Ramya, from Poompuhar, explained the difficulties that she faced in having to manage work in the fields as well as regular school attendance. “I feel very bad when Teacher scolds me. I like to be regular to school, do homework, but I cannot do it all. It is difficult, but I have no choice but to do it.” She described how she felt if she was in trouble and how and why the teachers disciplined the students:

I get hurt if teachers scold me. Sometimes they also beat us. Madam beats us more. She sometimes beats with stick. Everybody, all teachers, hold a stick whether they beat or not to discipline the students. ... If we do not complete our homework, she beats. She scolds if homework is not done. She beats if homework is not done. She beats if [we are] not regular to school.

Ranadeep, also from Poompuhar, interviewed at the age of 13 in 2008, was also involved in cotton pollination work (Morrow, 2013a). He described how he had missed school to go to work, and when he returned to school, “They [the school management] beat us. ... They hit us because I didn’t go to school for one month, and they have taught the lessons and I missed [them].” Ranadeep’s mother described this in more detail:

My boy scolds me for this. He liked going to school, but we stop him, he makes a lot of argument. Otherwise, we cannot run the family, we don’t get labourers in time and there is no other way for us, so we had to do it like that. When he is absent without intimation to teachers, they shout at him and he is terrified. ... His father goes there and informs them. ... they scold us, they say, how will he get on if he is absent for such a long time? ... we try to pacify them by telling them about our problems at home.

---
10 Poompuhar is a very poor rural community in southern Telangana. The major occupations are in agriculture, and daily wage labour. Children were involved in cotton seed pollination work which meant they missed school for two to three months each year, though this declined between 2007 and 2008. A new local secondary school had opened by 2010, and children were attending school regularly. Seasonal migration (from spring until June/July) was common, but the introduction of NREGS meant that wages have risen and there was plenty of work in public works (a railway track, and canal) as well as subcontract work on small farms. By 2014, the village had a railway station.
The situation in Poompuhar had altered over time and by 2010 (Round 3 of qualitative research) more children were attending school (Morrow, Tafere and Vennam, 2014). In 2010, Tejaswini attended the local primary school and mentioned that she had stopped going to school for about ten days during Grade 3, aged about 8 years, as she had to take care of her younger brother while her parents worked as ‘coolies’ in wage labour. She said she had run away from home several times after being beaten. In 2010, she described how, if children miss school to work, the teachers visit the houses and tell parents to send the child to school, otherwise they will complain to the police:

... and the police will come and take them. ... One time I did not go to school for 10 days, and they wrote it down. Many children who don’t go to school... they write it down and complain to the police, and the police will come and take them.

However by 2014, Tejaswini had reached puberty, and had left school altogether after Grade 8, because she was needed for work in cotton pollination and harvesting. She described how her teachers at primary school would beat her if she missed school, so she told her parents she wanted to either work or go to school, not both. She had attended Grades 6 and 7 at high school, and said that she had been beaten in Grade 8:

Yes, it happened in Grade 8. Sirs, they used to beat us, saying you come 2 days, and you don’t for 2 days. They give TC [transfer certificate to another school] and say that they will do something. We become sad... ‘we have removed your name [from the register], you can go’. We used to say, ‘Sir, we had work and went to the village for that’.

Interviewer: how did you feel?
Tejaswini: I] felt sad. Sir used to tell that if we repeat, then they will give TC and send us away. I told my mother and scolded her... [asked her] to send us either to school or to work in farms. They should send us to school...

Tejaswini did not want to go back to school if she was at risk of being beaten for absence. Her example shows how poverty exposes children to more violence at school,¹ and that violence may lead directly to children leaving/discontinuing school, thereby potentially exacerbating children’s later experiences of poverty. This illustrates how violence and poverty are intertwined, and how children’s experiences of violence shape their life trajectories.

Another girl in Poompuhar, Shanmuka Priya, described several forms of violence over the years. She said she hit other children to try to protect herself and her younger brother; in 2010 she talked about being beaten by teachers for being late and for not understanding the lessons, adding that teachers also beat children for being dirty. She said she was beaten by her parents if she cried or asked for money. She also said male teachers beat children more than female teachers. In 2014, she said she thought primary school teachers hit the children because the teachers were ‘from the

¹ See Young Lives Corporal Punishment data from Andhra Pradesh, as presented in Ogando Portela & Pells, 2015, p 24.
village’ and did not know it’s a crime to ‘mishandle’ children, whereas high school teachers were from further afield and are aware that the government would punish them if they beat the children:  

_Those who are from the village feel that they can beat us because nobody would care. But those who come from other places are afraid of our background. ... I like the teachers who come from far. ... We’ve good teachers and they teach well. They don’t beat us. They are jovial with us; they let us play during playtime. We have PET (Physical Education Teachers) and Drawing teachers now. It has changed like that, the environment is nice and cool in this place._

Shanmuka Priya continued:

_No-one is going to the cotton fields now. ... all the sirs went around the houses in the villages and told them that the police will come and arrest the fathers... they said I have to go to school every day. If I miss even for one day the police will come and take your father away. They got scared. That’s why they are sending me to school. ... So I am going regularly. Whenever they tell me to come and work in the fields, I cried. ... I cried everyday saying that I want to go to school. ... I don’t feel like working in the field... working on the buds for one day is alright, but working everyday makes me feel enough is enough._

_Interviewer: what did they say in your house? Shanmuka Priya: I did not tell... if I tell them, they will beat me._

These examples from Poompuhar highlight the need to understand the linkages between different parts of children’s lives from a more holistic point of view. Poverty often requires children’s labour, and in turn children may be punished if they do not work. But when they work, they also miss school and if they return to school they are punished again. However, Shanmuka Priya’s account also suggests that norms may be changing as policies relating to corporal punishment in schools are implemented, because teachers now know ‘it is a crime to mishandle children’.

Children also describe violence in hostels attached to their schools. For example, Vishnu, aged 12 when interviewed in 2014 and also from Poompuhar, had been sent to school in the nearby town from a very early age, where he stayed in a residential hostel. He was doing well at school, his mother did not send him to work in the fields, and he said he feels safe when he is at home. However, he described violence towards children by the wardens (‘aunties’) in the hostel, and first described this aged 7 in 2008. He described crying when he was beaten, but said he had no option but to stay in a hostel in order to study. He remembered his home and his mother with fondness, because his mother never beat him. In 2014, he mentioned some violence at school where older boys beat younger boys – there was a quarrel and a chair was broken.

_12 Shanmuka Priya’s understanding is that the primary school teachers are from the local community and therefore do not hesitate to punish the children. Because they are local, they believe that parents will not complain about them. High school teachers who have come from outside the community cannot take the same liberties and believe that parents might register a complaint if their children are punished. There are no ongoing programmes in the State to train teachers in positive discipline, but teachers are aware that corporal punishment is banned (personal communication, Uma Vennam)._
Analysis of Young Lives survey data (Table 4, page 28) suggested that Scheduled Tribe children reported the lowest levels of being physically hurt by family members and teachers. Yet violence still occurs as can be seen in the case of Chandani, from Patna, the Tribal site. Chandani was from a slightly more affluent family. She studied in a boarding school for tribal girls, but found it difficult to adjust. (Her parents were asked not to visit her often so that she could adjust to the boarding school). In 2010, aged 9, she described being beaten by her teachers for bad marks and for not knowing her lessons. She said she was afraid to complain and that when children did complain to other teachers about their maths teacher, they were scolded afterwards. When interviewed in 2014, aged 12, she mentioned that sometimes her teacher was intoxicated – she said:

> ... his words are not understandable. Recently he beat all the boys. ... They have not done the project work, he asked us to do project work and we didn’t do. [He] beat us all. He said “You have not done?” When I said no sir, he beat me hard. That’s why he beaten us all. Then with stick he beat us on the head.

Chandani also described how the physics teacher insulted the children:

> [He] always used to tell that ours are “dumb-heads, your head is full of shit and if that is removed, then you will able to study. God has given all promises to you but not education,” like that he scolds us. He teaches us about space. But he beats severely. ... In 2nd year, he beat one senior boy. He bled from the ear.

Interviewer: Did he beat you too?

Chandani: No, ... but he threatens... he says that “by tomorrow, by this time, I will be here, be careful, if you don’t solve the problems, then your back will be torn off”.

Fear of further punishment meant that children did not want to tell their parents about physical punishment they experienced at school (Morrow and Singh 2014). For example, a 9-year-old boy, interviewed in 2010, explained:

> Boy: I do not like my school, since the teachers beat me badly. They beat with a stick on my back, even if we are sitting and talking.

Researcher: Do you not complain to your parents?

> Boy: No, because they only beat because we must study well. My mother will thrash me very hard, if she knows I am not answering in class.

Children are left with no recourse when threatened or beaten, and if they are staying in hostels, cannot complain to parents.

In summary, children experience routine violence at school and in school residences, with boys experiencing particularly high levels that persist into adulthood. This needs to be understood in the

13 Patna is a very poor rural community in the Srikakulam district of Andhra Pradesh. The two tribal groups living in the area are Savara and Jathapu. Jathapu people speak Telugu, but the Savara have a different language and script, and find school difficult (Telugu is the main language of instruction). Produce and goods are traded through a barter system, but a cash economy is developing rapidly as a result of the introduction of NREGS. Numerous government programmes and interventions have been in place, including schools run by the Integrated Tribal Development Agency (ITDA). Children attend local primary schools, then move to nearby towns to continue in secondary school, staying in hostels.
contexts both of social norms related to how children should be raised, and what schooling should be like, as well as how children learn and how a ‘good’ teacher should act. In some cases, children say they do not want to continue in school because of the fear of being beaten (Ogando Portela and Pells 2015; Morrow and Singh, 2014).

5.3 GENDER NORMS, AND THE POVERTY-WORK-GENDER NEXUS: VIOLENCE IN THE COMMUNITY

Our final set of examples focuses on the role of social norms relating to girls’ reputation once they have reached puberty, and how these norms play out in the form of eve-teasing, defined earlier. Sarada, a girl with disabilities, was aged 12 when first interviewed in 2007; she lived in Poompuhar and had been ambitious throughout her childhood. Her family belongs to a low-caste community (BC) and took out a loan to build a new house when their old house collapsed. Sarada and her younger siblings were taken out of school to work to pay off the debt. However, Sarada insisted on going to school, and the local self-help group for people with disabilities provided her with support, enabling her to continue into secondary school. However, this involved a bus journey, which was physically difficult (her disability meant she could walk short distances, but had problems standing for any length of time) and she described harassment, shouting, and indeed beating other students herself to get on the bus. By 2010 she was working at weekends to pay for a car to take her to college.

When interviewed in 2014, aged 20, Sarada was two years into her degree. The family financial situation had improved (though her younger siblings were still debt-bonded to neighbours). Sarada was teaching part-time in a night school and wanted to become a professionally qualified teacher. She said she earned respect in the community for being a good teacher. She said she had been taught at college that teachers should not beat children. However, Sarada profoundly disliked the eve-teasing by boys at college and was acutely aware of how boys dominate, take over, and control physical space. The college had a shift system, where girls’ classes start at 9am and finish at 1.30 pm. The boys attend college in the afternoon. Sarada said that:

> Sometimes it feels that we, the girls, should have a separate college from the boys’ college. Even before us leaving the college, the boys would come and sit on the step and won’t give us space to go down the steps. ... Boys come even before we leave. We don’t pay attention to them. The girls would say that these boys are just loafers. ...

Like other girls in Young Lives qualitative research (Morrow 2013b), Sarada was fearful of marriage – she said her mother is ‘nagging her’ about getting married. She has told her mother that ‘if she insists on marriage’ she will ‘commit suicide’. Sarada described how her older sister, who had been working and studying in Mumbai, had been brought back to marry and live in the village. Violence was used to control her:

> Because of that marriage, we had a tough time financially as we had to give dowry and gold. We were worried whether she would adjust to village life. She doesn’t know any work here. In the beginning she refused to work, and threatened that she
will run away to Mumbai. Her husband beat her up and wanted to divorce her. My parents reminded him that they had informed him beforehand about her not knowing any farm work. He is the one who wanted to marry her, so he slowly taught her the work and they are both fine now. They have a daughter now.

Sarada said that

Whenever I see my elder sister and my parents, I wonder what kind of husband I will end up with. When I compare their life with mine, I think my life is the best and I will remain like this.

Sarada also described seeing a woman being ‘horribly’ beaten by her husband:

Did you see the lady sitting here a little while ago? When her husband beat her up, I was shocked... he beat her when all of us were there. She was holding her infant son in her arms and he banged her head on the metal almirah (cupboard). Even when my parents fight, I always scold my mother, why do they curse each other in offensive language, and later talk to each other as if nothing has happened? She says that I don’t understand it now, but I will understand after I get married.

As noted, Sarada’s younger siblings did not attend school but worked as debt-bonded labourers. Despite being taught that teachers should not beat children, Sarada said she and her older sister beat their younger sister, because she would not listen when they told her to do things. She was “always on the phone” listening to music, which can “damage a girl’s reputation”.

I told my older sister when she came here. She beat her and said it is not good for girls to carry a phone. Even now, people in the village say, ‘who might be calling her?’ She never did anything like that. She used to send messages to the people she knew. She has friends who worked with her in cotton fields. Both those girls are married now so she sends messages to them. I can understand it. But my mother keeps on screaming at her. She doesn’t understand.

Sarada said she was scolded for the same thing when she was younger, but now she understood how damaging it can be:

I used to say it but now I have realised that it is not good. I realised how people talk and it gives the wrong impression to others when they see a phone in a girl’s hand. ... Lots of people said bad things about me. I felt very bad when I hear them. That’s why I stopped using it.

This illustrates harmful gender norms, and how they effectively isolate girls (not only physically but socially) and sanction their attempts to build independent networks. Sarada talked about how much she herself had changed over time – she used to swear at people, but had become more patient: “If anybody says anything, I just listen with one ear and let it out from another ear. Before, I used to become very angry and I would try to fight with them.” She said that:

My mother says that I used to be very loud and always ready to pick a fight with people. She said now as I have changed, [my younger sister] has become
quarrelsome and loud. When [younger sister] is at home, no one likes to even step in front of the house. If the children come to watch serials in the night, she shouts at them for every little thing. She is not that educated so she talks very crudely... She talks very crudely. ... Lots of people commented about her loud mouth, ... They said that she talks loudly and curses when she comes to the water tap.

Sarada said of her sister:

...at work she keeps threatening the owners that she will leave in the afternoon and the sun gets hot, and she won’t be working anymore after the debt is cleared. Everybody says that she is a stubborn girl and leave her alone. There is a slight change in her this month after we all scolded her. I even hit her on the head with a small bucket. My mother is scared if I hit her, she would go and kill herself. There are a few deep ponds near our house where one boy committed suicide because his parents scolded him. Mother is scared she [younger sister] would also do that if we scold her excessively. I also did not scold that much. Sometimes she listens and follows what I say... she is obeying me nowadays. She is alright.

Despite knowing that teachers should not beat children, Sarada hit her sister, and violence was seen to have solved the problem. There seemed to be gradual acceptance in Sarada’s account as she became resigned to gender norms, meting out punishment on her younger sister to control her, not least to protect her reputation. Here the cyclical nature of gender norms and violence, used as a means to change behaviour demonstrates the varied and powerful role of gender, and that women can and do exert power over other women.

The importance of girls’ reputations is clearly linked to flirting, eve-teasing and harassment. The next two examples, Tajaswini and Shanmuka Priya, also from Poompuhar, elaborate on how gendered social norms control girls’ mobility and relationships (Chakraborty, 2016a; Iyer, 2016; Hallman et al, 2013 for South Africa).

On reaching puberty, Tejaswini was not allowed out to see her friends, “Because boys from the street aren’t nice... they misbehave. So my parents don’t let me go anywhere.” She said one girl in her street was being harassed by boys “who tell her they love her and write her letters.” In 2014, Shanmuka Priya, aged 13, noted that girls are ‘commented on’ by boys if they go anywhere alone. Like Tejaswini, after puberty she was no longer allowed to play with other children. Shanmuka Priya described how her mother had seen boys taking photos of girls and misusing the photos, and was afraid to let her daughter out, forbidding her from talking to boys. Shanmuka Priya mentioned that she was teased by a friend’s brother-in-law in Grade 5. She said she was fearful and ‘worried’ when she saw strangers. During the final interview, she saw a photo of someone who used to tease a friend of hers – giving her gifts and letters. She described how he was eventually beaten by the girl’s uncle, given a Transfer Certificate (to another school), and subsequently absconded from the village.

Shanmuka Priya said that the village had changed, and girls don’t go out alone because of fear; she mentioned that elders in the village thought that the changes are due to ‘the movies’. She also mentioned children getting drunk, littering and breaking doors and windows of the school. She said it was important for girls to be educated, “because after a girl gets married, her husband may say
that she doesn’t do household work nor is she educated, and will abuse her and beat her.” Interviews with mothers of girls in Poompuhar, and the sarpanch (village headman), suggest that the village is safe for girls, and it is more likely that the girls are feeling that the village has changed because they are post-puberty so restrictions have been placed on their mobility – as Shanmuka Priya’s mother said, “It’s only a precaution that our girls stay at home safely. Talking too much outside, it can’t be the same as childhood now.” These examples illustrate how there is a clear point in a girl’s life-course when she begins to be restricted in her freedoms (movement, choice, etc) because of gender inequality and patriarchy. Recently, it has been reported that panchayats (villages councils) in other parts of India (Gujarat) are imposing bans on young women accessing mobile phones, in order to control their independence and mobility (Singh, 2016).
6. AGENCY – WHAT CAN CHILDREN DO?

As we have seen, children are sometimes too frightened to act because they risk further punishment if they complain. When asked what she would do when she was hit or beaten, Tejaswini said, “What else [can I do], other than weeping?” On the other hand, she also described a situation in primary school where some girls were at first beaten by the headmaster for attending extra tuition classes after school, but they complained to other teachers and were able to change the situation.

The headmaster used to beat us if we attended tuition. Boys used to complain that we were attending tuition so he used to beat all the girls... so we complained to teachers in the high school, we asked what is wrong if we attend [extra] tuition? Students from Grades 4 and 5 told the high school teachers, so they came here, and the high school headmaster spoke with our headmaster here. From then onwards, we were allowed to attend the tuition. ... If you study at both the places, then you would get more knowledge.

Complaining or seeking help as a group (rather than individually) may also be seen by children as a safer way to respond. Young girls in Poompuhar had already successfully complained to village elders about the poor quality of school food, and were planning to complain to the panchayat about the boys’ behaviour in the village. In a group discussion, 12 to 13 year-old girls described generalised fighting in the village related to water availability, when waste water was flowing into other people’s property, and discussed at length harassment by boys at school, describing instances where boys had written graffiti on walls targeting girls. They said about boys:

They should stop behaving in a vulgar and violent way. And they should not commit any offence. They should not write any graffiti upon the school walls and hurt the sentiments of girls. The people should learn to be sensitive. ... The boys must have brotherly affection and treat the other girls in the village and also in the schools as their sisters. This is what we wish for our village. This is how we want our village to be. ... They should not write any vulgar words on the school walls. It would be well appreciated if the school is maintained neatly.

Interviewer: Suppose it goes on like this, what action do you want to take against it?
Girls: We want to bring it to the notice of the elders. We want to complain against it to the elders and ask them to initiate proper action.
Interviewer: How do you plan to do it? Do you want to go together and tell them? Shanmuka Priya, Likitha, and another girl: Yes, all of us want to go together and tell them whenever the next flag hoisting14 is held. Actually we not are scared of going together and telling them but we can never go and tell it personally. All alone we cannot go and tell them we are very scared to do it. We are scared.

---

14 Flag hoisting takes place twice a year on Independence Day (Aug 15) and Republic Day (Jan 26) when all the village elders also attend the function at school and enquire about how the school is doing. The girls had planned to speak out at the next occasion.
Interviewer: Are you even scared of telling the village elders?

Shanmuka Priya: So far we have told them about the food cooked [reference to quality of school meals]. And gradually we will tell them this. Slowly we will tell them. We want to tell them about these entire issues, one after the other including these vulgar acts. We are waiting for that. We want to tell them about this also.

In addition to complaining or actively seeking help, children described other strategies to deal with forms of violence. One of these is avoidance, as we have seen in cases where children simply refused to go to school because of fear of being hit. Ravi was generally mistreated at work and beaten by his master, so he left the village to seek work elsewhere. Tejaswini had run away from home several times after being beaten. Children may also intervene physically to stop violence – sometimes using violence themselves against the perpetrators. Ravi described (at age 12) trying to stop his father beating his mother, and later he described intervening (violently) to protect his sister who was being beaten by her husband. In the case Shanmuka Priya described above, the girls said they took their own action after a boy harassed a girl – another example of violence reinforcing violence, and moving in perhaps surprising ways, expressing girls’ collective power over boys:

Shanmuka Priya: Actually, the girls hit him. All of them hit him together in one go.
Interviewer: And were you inspired by that and did the whole class decide to take action in a similar way?
Shanmuka Priya: Yes... And after we saw that incident, we gained courage and confidence. Then we decided to hit back any fellow and kick him. Whoever played fool with us we wanted to teach him a lesson. ... We told them.
Interviewer: And after beating them what happened?
Likitha: He is not coming to school anymore after he was thoroughly thrashed. He went away to a different village and he is living there.

The girls’ actions here do not challenge a culture of violence, but rather feed into perpetuating it.

Girls expressed feeling safer when boys are not around, and this was linked to changes as boys and girls grow – particularly once girls reach puberty (though see Iyer, 2016, for a discussion of ‘rakhi’). In an interview, Shanmuka Priya described how she talks with her friends during school breaks:

“We talk and share if something happens at home or if someone has seen something, like [boys] teasing girls.” Like Sarada, she thought that:

... there should be schools only for girls, and another school only for boys. It would be good... a few guys, rough fellows, intentionally get in the way of girls and they touch girls, I don’t like it. ... I witnessed some... when we sit, they stare at us... it happens in our class also.

Poignantly, when Shanmuka Priya was looking through the photos in an album given to children by fieldworkers at the final round of qualitative research, (Crivello, forthcoming) she was reminded of her childhood and how it had changed in relation to boys. She said ‘I feel happy seeing these [photos]. I wish things remained the same as they were then’. Sarada described at length an episode where
she had been harassed by a boy who rang her several times, and the action she took:

*He called again in the night. Including my parents, all of us were eating dinner. I kept the phone on silent mode. ... Then I got scared that my parents would scold me. There is one lady who taught me tailoring in the summer. .. I call her Akka (sister). I went to her and told her what has happened. She is also a handicapped lady. ... She called back that boy and scolded him and said that I am her sister. When she scolded, he said he just talked to me for time pass [to pass the time]. She also said that my marriage had been fixed and not to call me anymore. ... Akka told me the consequences of such incidents. She said people would think that I have some kind of relationship with him, and I should not be doing such things. I told her that I did not call him or anything. She did not believe me. ... Akka scolded him saying that he is not from our caste and not our relative, why is he harassing us like that? This went on for one month. After that, he stopped calling. ... I did not tell anyone except Akka and she solved the problem... that Akka is close to me, so I went and told her.*

Interviewer: Are incidents like this common nowadays? Is it normal to have boys as friends?

*Sarada: One should not have boys as friends. People would misunderstand if anyone has boys as friends, it seems. People would start saying that this girl is going out with this boy or with that boy and she will get a bad name.*

Thus, some girls and young women described informal sources of social support to resolve difficulties related to eve-teasing which, because of powerful patriarchal gender norms, has become a habitual and expected part of a girl’s life. From this research, it is not clear whether boys and young men availed themselves of informal sources of social support as frequently. Earlier, we described the case of Ravi, the young man who intervened in his parents’ quarrels and subsequently tried to protect his sister when she was beaten by her husband. These efforts to employ agency are sometimes successful and at other times not. And violence, as is so common, is shrouded in silence – for both males and females. As Ravi concluded, no one talks about the difficult things in their lives: “Even if we have difficulties, we don’t like to share them. We prefer to share only our happiness.”
7. DISCUSSION

We have seen that violence exists in many forms and many settings. The case studies from Young Lives show the evolving nature of children’s experiences of violence with age, with shifting perceptions of what constitutes violence, as well as shifting behaviours around what is acceptable. This is illustrated in Ravi’s case study, where witnessing and experiencing violence at home and in the community as a child led him to vow never to use it, a view which seems to have disappeared by the time he is 20 years old and talks about sometimes beating his pregnant wife, “She gets a beating... I hit her when she tells anything... she won’t keep quiet [after the quarrel], she keeps muttering to herself... she just nags, I get angry.” Revealing this discrepancy between intentions expressed at an early age and behaviour described at a later age provides potential entry points for violence prevention interventions.

7.1 IMPLICATIONS OF OUR FINDINGS FOR THE CONCEPTUAL MODEL

Our findings have implications for theoretical models that are commonly used to address child protection. The focus in much previous research and measurement of trends in child maltreatment has been on parents/caregivers as perpetrators of abuse against (individual) children, and on the long-term outcomes for children. This individualistic and essentially family-centric approach inadvertently masks the social environment of children’s lives and notably the context of poverty, which can be seen as a structural driver that also manifests at the level of families, placing huge pressures on them. While children themselves did not make a clear link between poverty and violence in their descriptions, we can see that poverty can contribute to the vulnerabilities that expose children to the risks of violence. Poverty may mean that children have to work, which in turn causes them to miss school. Or for those who do attend school, poverty may mean families cannot afford uniforms or books and that children may be beaten when such items are missing. Worse, children are left with little recourse when patterns of violence appear to be reinforced at home: if they complain, they risk further beating from their parents.

A family-centric approach also downplays the extent to which negative patterns are reinforced in environments that might (perhaps idealistically) be assumed to be wholly ‘enabling’ or supportive, such as children’s homes, schools, and communities. The qualitative research shows how some educators, parents, older siblings, and peers commit acts of violence against children, and the extent to which children who live in communities rife with violence perpetrated by adults and older children they know, love, and are told to respect, then learn violence as a legitimate way to express their emotions or attempt to control others’ behaviour.

Some theoretical approaches that use adaptations of Bronfenbrenner’s ecological framework imply a focus on the individual child, without enough attention to socio-structural contexts in which children, families and communities exist. This misapplies the framework, which if used as intended, positions the child in relation to the family, community and wider society. While it is beyond the scope of this paper to analyse the impact of the structural levels of society, these also play an important role: while India has regulations and laws to protect adults and children from violence, the resources and capacity required for their implementation fall short. In Ravi’s case, poverty acts
at both the ‘inner’ circles of the socio-ecological model (individual/family) and at the outer levels (institutional/structural). In some cases, violence at home and in school reinforce each other – when children are too frightened to tell parents that they have been punished at school.

As children approach adulthood, boys and girls appear to gradually conform to social norms, including norms that support the use of violent behaviour; this was the case even when children showed earlier signs of resistance or questioned the use of violence. Gender dynamics shift and fluctuate throughout childhood too – boys in middle childhood are subject to disciplinary power and control by adults, but as Ravi’s case shows, they gradually take on this role themselves as they attain adult status through marriage. Girls are subject to social domination by adults (parents, teachers and so on) and, as they mature, they are also dominated by boys within their communities, as well as other girls (including older siblings), and finally by their in-laws and husbands when they marry. Power relations render children liable to various forms of violence, and these power relations differ according to age, race, class/caste and gender throughout the course of childhood and well into adulthood (Ennew, 1986). Thus, as we have seen, women and girls themselves are implicated in restricting the space of other (often younger) girls, so this relates to power and status hierarchies, linked to age, birth order and so on. Any models that are used to develop policies to address violence in childhood need to be attuned to account for changing gender norms as children move through various developmental stages.

7.2 VIOLENCE, INTERVENTIONS AND POLICIES

7.2.1 Violence in the home

In families, parents use violence to discipline children, and children witness their fathers beating their mothers, as well as older siblings using violence to control younger siblings or to try to protect older sisters. Our analysis shows that girls and boys use violence in retaliation and to protect themselves from further harm. In the international literature, parents are often seen as perpetrators of violence, but in collective cultures older siblings may be responsible for disciplining younger children – as illustrated in the case of Sarada and her older sister trying to control their younger sister’s behaviour. Ravi described trying to stop his father beating his mother, and his brother-in-law from beating his sister, but then he himself described beating his wife, repeating a cycle of gender-based violence.

Existing social policies are often confusing: for example, The National Policy for Children, adopted in April 2013, provides for protection of children from ‘all forms of violence’, but refers to corporal punishment only in connection with education and within schools, so that corporal punishment at home remains outside the ambit of the law. We could speculate that this is confusing and contradictory. In other words, gaps in laws and social policies may mean children can witness violence at home, understand it as acceptable and therefore do not report it, whereas they may be aware that corporal punishment at school is illegal and they can and should report it (as Sarada and Shanmuka Priya. seem to be).

7.2.2 Violence in schools

How policy plays out in practice is most visible within institutions such as schools and hostels, where children report violence at the hand of teachers, who are powerful, respected, higher-status
adults. Children across all wealth terciles experienced being beaten or physically hurt by teachers. Schools are obvious entry points for interventions, particularly since enrolment rates at primary school have increased rapidly and most children will have some experience of primary school.\textsuperscript{15} Das et al. highlight, “The critical importance of targeting elementary and middle school-age youth for violence prevention efforts, including creating opportunities for youth to question and challenge inequitable gender and sexual norms” (Das et al 2014 p.10). Again reflecting on Ravi’s case study, intervening at this critical period in children’s developmental cycle may also give them more tools to carry forward their anti-violence views and resist the pressures they will face later in life to replicate violent adult behaviours.

There are indications that corporal punishment by teachers is slowly being addressed in India; recent social policies are beginning to take hold and this is encouraging, as evidenced by Sarada and Shanmuka Priya, who both knew that teachers should not hit children. Jejeebhoy et al. (2013) show that if girls choose to continue education at secondary school age they may feel safe at least when teachers are present to control boys’ behaviour. However, Young Lives data also show that older boys continue to experience corporal punishment in considerable numbers in secondary school. Envisaging how schools can deliver programmes intended to discourage violence by boys is problematic when teachers themselves use or threaten violence to control them. Using schools as platforms to deliver anti-violence programmes also implies that they cannot be part of the cycle of violence.

\textbf{7.2.3 Gender-based violence}

Gender-based violence, seen within this research in the form of sexual harassment and domestic violence, controls and curtails girls’ mobility and shrinks their spheres of influence. Often females’ social support networks are reduced or restricted so that they have nowhere to go, except to individuals within their families or households and close female friends. Numerous campaigns to address gender-based violence in India have fallen short. Focusing entirely on girls’ education with the aim of empowering them, while failing to explore and challenge boys’ attitudes and behaviour towards girls and women, runs the risk of exacerbating the situation, as boys feel increasingly excluded from education and community programmes targeted at girls. That boys, for example, appear to be more prone to various forms of violence, especially corporal punishment from teachers and family members, is of concern. Boys also learn that violence is a way to solve problems and exert power. The results of our analysis of longitudinal data show that both girls and boys are vulnerable to violence in different ways and in different settings.

\textbf{7.2.4 Violence in the community}

Communities are also potential entry points for programmes and interventions especially for children no longer at school or who never attend school. A recurrent theme in accounts for rural India seen in this paper and in other studies, is the role that alcohol consumption by men and boys

\textsuperscript{15} An obvious limitation to using schools as entry-points for the delivery of anti-violence programming is that many children do not attend school, attend school infrequently, or are early school leavers and these children due to a variety of situations, may be equally vulnerable to forms of violence.
plays in domestic violence; children witness their fathers hitting their mothers, and find this understandably profoundly upsetting (Jejeebhoy et al 2013). Alcohol consumption in communities is also linked to generalized fighting within villages in children's accounts.

While little surfaced in terms of effective strategies for combating the detrimental effects of alcohol, other community-based mechanisms for reducing violence were observed. Social networks, such as those formed by school-going girls in one of the case studies above, appeared to offer protection from abuse and can even, in some cases, reform school practices such as ensuring girls access to tutoring. Ensuring that girls and boys have positive and reinforcing social networks at early stages could promote positive collective change.

7.2.4 Violence in the home, at school, and gender-based violence: How these interact and reinforce each other

Young Lives data show that for younger children – girls and boys – schools may be experienced as frightening and risky places if teachers use corporal punishment, and relationships of trust and respect are unlikely to develop. For girls, the fear and risk is broad and includes the journey to and from school as well as fearing harassment and risk to their reputations from boys while in school. The reinforcement of these practices at home gives children few possibilities to avoid violence. Hence the importance and urgency of determining and developing appropriate interventions. While this is not clear cut, acknowledging how girls’ and boys’ experiences of violence change throughout their childhoods into early adulthood is a fundamentally important finding of our qualitative longitudinal analysis, as is the importance of ensuring that programmes need to be inclusive and appropriate for age and gender.
8. CONCLUSION

Our findings suggest that reinforcing positive change may mean disrupting and dismantling the cultures and cycles of violence operating at various levels of society. Powerful gender norms of masculinity and femininity are influenced by different factors as children move through different physical spaces (home, community and school settings) and as they move across the life cycle. What it means to be a man, i.e., occasionally violent (reflecting patriarchal masculinity), appears to become more entrenched as children move through childhood towards adulthood. Further, the actual shrinking space of influence that girls experience as they marry and become mothers is equally entrenched. A gendered life-course approach (that helps identify when/at what age/stage interventions are likely to be most effective) that intersects with an analysis of status/caste hierarchies might help to direct prevention resources both earlier and more effectively. To this end, policies and the programmes and the practices they influence need to start when children are young, and need to be well targeted towards boys and girls, differentiating as required. What may work for younger children may be inappropriate as they move into school, begin to meet some of the societal institutions, and experience violence from multiple directions.
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### APPENDIX 1 – STATISTICAL SNAPSHOT OF VIOLENCE AFFECTING CHILDREN IN INDIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homicide</strong></td>
<td>In 2012, 2 in every 100,000 children were killed. With 9,500 victims (10 per cent of the global figure), India is the third largest contributor of child homicides after Nigeria and Brazil (based on WHO Global Health Estimates, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical violence</strong></td>
<td>One in five adolescent girls (12 million) have experienced physical violence since age 15 (based on Census 2011 data). For girls aged 15-19 who have been subjected to physical violence, the major common perpetrators are: for married girls, the husband (33 per cent); for non-married girls, the mother or stepmother (41 per cent), the father or stepfather (18 per cent) and teacher (11 per cent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual violence</strong></td>
<td>Around 10 million girls under the age of 20 (1 in 20) have been victims of forced sexual intercourse or another form of forced sexual act at some point in their lives. One third of girls who experienced forced sexual intercourse suffered sexual violence between the ages of 15 and 18 years (although many girls experienced sexual violence throughout childhood). Among girls who had ever experienced sexual violence, the most commonly reported perpetrator was a current husband or partner (77 per cent). Only 3 per cent of girls reported sexual violence by a stranger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intimate partner violence</strong></td>
<td>34 per cent of married girls aged 15-19 have experienced physical, sexual or emotional violence by their husband or partner. 13 per cent of married girls aged 15-19 experienced sexual violence by their husband. Married girls aged 15-19 are 10 times more likely to experience sexual violence than unmarried girls. 45 per cent of girls and 47 per cent of boys justify wife beating.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: UNICEF India (2015).*

APPENDIX 2 – LEGISLATION AND POLICIES RELATING TO VIOLENCE AFFECTING CHILDREN IN INDIA

INTERNATIONAL TREATIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

India ratified the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) in 1992. Article 19 (1) of the CRC requires member states to protect children from “all forms of physical or mental violence, injury or abuse, neglect or negligent treatment, maltreatment or exploitation, including sexual abuse, while in the care of parent(s) legal guardian(s) or any other person who has the care of the child.” The Committee on the Rights of the Child has consistently interpreted the Convention as requiring member states to protect children “from corporal punishment and other cruel or degrading forms of punishment” and has recommended that prohibition should be accompanied by public education to promote positive discipline (UN CRC, 2006).

In the third/fourth (combined) State party report to the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, dated 2011, the Government of India confirmed that corporal punishment of children is not considered an offence due to section 89 of the Penal Code (UN CRC, 2014). This was to be rectified by the drafting of a Prevention of Offences against the Child Bill which would make corporal punishment an offence. In 2011, this Bill was replaced by a bill on sexual offences, enacted as the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act 2012, but, as implied by the title, corporal punishment is beyond its scope. The National Policy for Children 2013, adopted in April 2013 (discussed in more detail below), provides for protection of children from “all forms of violence” but refers to corporal punishment specifically only in connection with education and within schools, while corporal punishment at home remains outside the ambit of the law. The Government accepted the recommendation to prohibit corporal punishment in all settings made during the Universal Periodic Review of India in 2012, and proposed amendments to the Juvenile Justice Act (presented to Parliament in 2014), to include a new section on corporal punishment. This defines and punishes such violence in line with the Penal Code provisions on the offences of causing hurt and grievous hurt and establishes sanctions. However, the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act 2015 prohibits corporal punishment only in child-care institutions.

Violence towards children is often noted in UN concluding observations on implementation of human rights treaty bodies. For example, the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (7 July 2014, CRC/C/IND/CO/3-4, Concluding observations on third/fourth report for India,) acknowledged that corporal punishment had been banned, but remained concerned that:

(a) Such prohibition in educational institutions only applies to children between 6 and 14 years;
(b) Corporal punishment is still lawful in non-institutional care settings;
(c) Corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure and as sentence for a crime is not prohibited throughout the territory of the State party; and
(d) Despite the efforts of the State party, corporal punishment continues to be widely used within the family, alternative care settings, the school and within the penal system (UN CRC 2014, para 47).
The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (UN, 18 July 2014, CEDAW/C/IND/CO/4-5 Advance Unedited Version, Concluding observations on fourth/fifth report, paras. 26 and 27) expressed concern that ‘girls are subjected to sexual harassment and violence’ (CEDAW 2014, paras 26 and 27).

REGIONAL INITIATIVES

The South Asia Initiative to End Violence Against Children (SAIEVAC) originated in 2005 as the South Asia Forum for Ending Violence Against Children (SAF), an outcome of the Regional Consultation on the UN Secretary General’s Study on Violence against Children. In 2010, SAF evolved into SAIEVAC, a regional body comprised of the 8 SAARC countries – Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka, with the purpose of implementing measures to end all forms of violence against children in South Asia. SAIEVAC has developed a work plan at regional and national level which provides a strategic framework to coordinate, standardize, and monitor progress annually. This work plan supports the development of effective and comprehensive child protection systems, and addresses key issues for the region including sexual abuse and exploitation, trafficking, corporal punishment, child marriage and child labour.

A report prepared by SAIEVAC (2011) points out that Section 89 of the Penal Code 1860 (in Jammu and Kashmir known as the Ranbir Penal Code) states:

*Nothing which is done in good faith for the benefit of a person under twelve years of age, or of unsound mind by or by consent, either express or implied, of the guardian or other person having lawful charge of that person, is an offence by reason of any harm which it may cause, or be intended by the doer to cause or be known by the doer to be likely to cause to that person.* …

The Government has confirmed that this provides a legal defence for the use of corporal punishment. Provisions against violence and abuse in the Penal Code, the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act 2000 (amended 2006), the Protection of Child Rights Act 2005, the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act 2005 and the Constitution are not, therefore, interpreted as prohibiting all corporal punishment in child-rearing.

India has responded to the SAIEVAC initiative by setting up a National Action and Coordinating Group against Violence (NACG) – a network of civil society organizations (CSOs) – and by nominating a focal point in the Ministry of Women and Child Development (MWCD). The Government of India has endorsed the regional plan from SAIEVAC and participates in the meetings of its Governing Board. In addition, the NACG has mobilized NGOs locally and has tried to leverage different issues on the public agenda, not without difficulties as it is hard to create one coalition in such a large and diverse country. SAIEVAC is an important and unique regional platform for information sharing and advocacy on violence against children, which unfolds mainly through technical and Governing Boards meetings. However, differences in national priorities and the non-binding nature of the regional plan have had an impact on the leveraging power of SAIEVAC as a common regional platform (Dora Giusti, personal communication, 2015).
NATIONAL LEGISLATION, POLICIES AND INITIATIVES


Furthermore the National Policy for Children, 2013, reiterated its commitment to:

safeguard, inform, include, support and empower all children within its territory and jurisdiction, both in their individual situation and as a national asset.
The State is committed to take affirmative measures – legislative, policy or otherwise – to promote and safeguard the right of all children to live and grow with equity, dignity, security and freedom, especially those who are marginalised or disadvantaged (MWCD, 2013 p8).

The Integrated Child Protection Scheme (ICPS) was set up by the MWCD in 2009-2010 to promote the implementation of the Juvenile Justice Act. This Scheme was further revised in 2014. ICPS stipulated setting up a District Child Protection Unit (DCPU) in each district and State Child Protection Society in every State/Union Territory, which will maintain a state-level database of all children in institutional care and family based non-institutional care and update it on a quarterly basis (among other responsibilities). Other government schemes and programmes include Childline for children in distress, the Shishu-Greha scheme for the care and protection of orphans and abandoned children and the Speak-out scheme to check child abuse (Singhi et al., 2013).

The Government of India recognises that “there is still a long way to go for putting a strong safety net for children” (Planning Commission, 2013). Even while the introduction of ICPS and the Right to Education Act has brought child protection issues into the limelight, specific challenges include the lack of state’s perspective on child protection, insufficient data and documentation, lack of adequate personnel sensitized to children’s issues and low utilization of funds. In 2015, a Supreme Court Bench of Justices, Madan B. Lokur and U. U. Lalit, admonished the MWCD for not conducting a social audit for the previous two years on the funds disbursed under ICPS to the states.¹

The implementation and roll out of ICPS by the states and monitoring by central Government, even though backed by good intentions, has been very slow and ineffective. Corporal punishment in schools (for example) continues to be used, and tragically, injuries to and sometimes the deaths of children are reported in news media. Cases of gender-based violence towards girls and their murders are also reported in the press. Policies are in place but are confusing, implementation is weak, and the budget for child protection is inadequate (though it did increase from 0.034 per cent of government expenditure in 2005-2006 to 0.06 per cent in 2008-2009 (MWCDb, n.d., p6).

The Government recognizes that despite the

large number of laws and policies promising respect for child rights, their protection and well being have not resulted in much improvement in lives of millions of Indian children who continue to be deprived of their rights, abused, exploited and taken away from their families and communities. Scant attention and feeble commitment to resolving child protection problems have resulted in poor implementation of these laws and policies; meagre resources; minimal infrastructure; inadequate services in variety, quantity and quality; and inadequate monitoring and evaluation (MWCDb, n.d., p.6).

Not only are political will and accountability needed to ensure implementation of legislation and social policies, but so too is a change in mind-sets that would prioritize protection of children from all forms of violence at national, regional, state and community level. There is also a lack of workforce capacity to adequately protect children or families who do report abuse. The lack of implementation of commitments may have had repercussions in terms of continued violence against children at individual, family, community, institutional and structural levels.

Table 1 – Laws and policies in India relating to child protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National law and policy: Child protection</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Justice (Care &amp; Protection) of Children Act 2000 and Amendment Act 2006</td>
<td>* Founded on the principles of the UN CRC, aims at providing a framework for the care, protection, treatment and rehabilitation of children in the purview of the juvenile justice system. * Mandates child protection mechanisms in all districts of the state such as the Child Welfare Committees, Special Juvenile Police Units, Juvenile Justice Boards and State/District Child Protection Units. * To support state governments in implementation of the Act, Central Model Rules were framed and notified in October, 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission for Protection of Child Rights Act 2005</td>
<td>* Provided for the constitution of National and State Commissions for Protection of Child Rights, with the mandate to look into all matters relating to children in need of special care and protection and to recommend remedial measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act 2012 (POCSO)</td>
<td>* Makes reporting of sexual abuse mandatory * POCSO was landmark legislation: the first time a special law addresses sexual violence against children. Prior to POCSO sexual offences against children were tried under laws governing adults, such as Section 376 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for rape), and there were no special measures addressing the additional vulnerability of child victims of sexual abuse. * It seeks to protect all children below the age of 18 from sexual assault, sexual harassment and pornography. These offences are clearly defined for the first time in Indian penal law. * “The Act also establishes guidelines for the police and courts to deal with victims sensitively and for the setting up of specialist child courts. Efforts are being made to train professionals who work with vulnerable children” (Singhi et al., 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Law Amendment Act 2013</td>
<td>* Passed after the Nirbhaya case of rape in Delhi paved the way for crucial amendments to all three major criminal laws, i.e. the Indian Penal Code, the Code of Criminal Procedure and the Indian Evidence Act. * The Criminal Law Amendment Act, 2013, raised the age of consent to 18 years but under the Indian Penal Code, (drafted in 1860), sexual intercourse between a man and his wife aged over 15 years, is an exception to rape. As a result, sexual intercourse with a wife aged between 15 and 18 years does not amount to rape under the IPC (see CCL-NLSIU, 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National law and policy: Child protection</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Prohibition of Child Marriage Act 2006** | • Prohibits marriage for girls below the age of 18 and boys below the age of 21 years of age.  
• Prescribes penalties for the permitting, performing and promoting of child marriages.  
• Child Marriage Prohibition Officers are to be appointed by respective states to prevent child marriages and sensitize the community. |
| **High Court of Delhi, landmark judgement, 2000** | • In 2000, a landmark judgement was made in the High Court of Delhi, challenging the legality of corporal punishment. The judgement directed the Government of India to ensure “that children are not subjected to corporal punishment in schools and they receive education in an environment of freedom and dignity, free from fear” (Delhi High Court, 2000, p11-12). |
| **National Charter for Children 2003 and National Plan of Action for Children 2006** | • Identified as priorities the prohibition and elimination of corporal punishment in schools. |
| **Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act 2009** | • Also known as the Right to Education Act, it guarantees school for children between the ages of 6 and 14  
• Banned the use of corporal punishment by teachers.  
• Paragraph 1 of Article 17 of the Act provides that “No child will be subjected to physical punishment or mental harassment.” |
| **Draft Bill entitled Prohibition of Unfair Practices in Schools Bill, November 2012** | • Addresses corporal punishment inter alia and was cleared by the Central Advisory Board of Education Committee in November 2012.  
• Following this, a set of guidelines issued by the Ministry of Women and Child Development banned the physical punishment of students. These stipulate that head teachers will be responsible for the prevention of corporal punishment. Teachers found guilty of infringement could be denied promotion and even increments.  
• A ‘Child Rights Cell’, where children can lodge complaints, will be set up in all schools. A first violation of the ban on physical punishment will invite up to one year in jail, or a fine of Rs 50,000, or both. For subsequent violations, imprisonment could be extended to three years, with an additional fine of Rs 25,000. |
| **National Policy for Children 2013** | • States that in schools, the State shall “ensure no child is subjected to any physical punishment or mental harassment” and “promote positive engagement to impart discipline so as to provide children with a good learning experience” (Para. 4.6(xvi)). |
| **Advisory for Eliminating Corporal Punishment in Schools under Section 35(1) of the RTE Act, 2009** | • Sets out the national law relevant to corporal punishment in schools, international human rights standards, steps that may be taken to promote positive child development without resorting to corporal punishment, and the role of national bodies in implementing the RTE Act, stating (p. 18): “This advisory should be used by the State Governments/UT (Union Territory) Administrations to ensure that appropriate State/school level guidelines on prevention of corporal punishment and appropriate redressal of any complaints, are framed, disseminated, acted upon and monitored.”  
• However, the Act – including the prohibition of corporal punishment – applies only to children aged 6-14; neither the Act nor the Rules apply in Jammu and Kashmir, and according to Government figures for 2013, corporal punishment was banned in schools under the Act in only 34 states/territories. |