THE VATSALYA UDAYAN: A SYSTEM OF CARE FOR INDIAN ORPHANS

A Thesis

Presented to

The Honors Tutorial College

Ohio University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for Graduation

from the Honors Tutorial College

with the degree of

Bachelor of Arts in Social Work

---

by

Megan Tara Casebolt

June 2011

This thesis has been approved by

The Honors Tutorial College and the Department of Social Work

Dr. Warren Galbreath
Assistant Professor, Social Work
Ohio University Eastern Campus
Thesis Advisor

Dr. Solveig Spjeldnes
Assistant Professor, Social Work
Honors Tutorial College, Director of Studies
Social Work

Dr. Jeremy Webster
Dean, Honors Tutorial College

Table of Contents

Introduction

Brief Background

India is a country with over five thousand years of history. Hindu princes, Mughal Emperors, and British colonialists ruled the country during this time (Stein, 2010). Four major world religions were founded on the Indian subcontinent: Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, and Sikhism. Followers of Christianity, Judaism, B'haism, and Islam live in India as well (Clothey, 2006). There are a total of twenty-two officially recognized Indian languages and hundreds of dialects spoken in India, with English and Hindi as the two official languages of the government (Ramasamy, 2005). Officially, there are six main ethnic groups, but hundreds of different caste, tribal, and regional groups, each with their own language, customs, and beliefs (Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs, 2010; Guha, 1999). India as a federal government is comprised of twenty-eight states and seven union territories (Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs, 2010). This data indicates that India is an incredibly diverse and complicated country. This preexisting diversity in combination with a long history of multiple governments and rulers makes the situation in India quite complicated.

In 1947, the people of India gained their independence after more than 200 years of British rule (Wolpert, 2004). In only 63 years, India has gone from a colony of the British Empire to the largest democracy in the world and the second most populous country on Earth. Many changes have occurred in the last six decades in the political, economic, and social structures of India. The original economic model for

the country was a public enterprise, socialist structure (Khanna, 1971; Mishra, 1975). India now has a free market economy (Balasubramanyam, 1984; Jain, 2000; Mathur, 2004). The Congress Party was the political party in power for the first three decades of the Indian Republic. A Hindu nationalist party called the Bharatiya Janata Party (Indian People's Party) has taken been trading power back and forth with the Congress Party for the last couple of decades (Hargrave, 2008; Jannuzi, 1989). The traditional Hindu caste system is being slowly displaced, at least in urban areas, but the government provides an affirmative action programs for Untouchables, the lowest caste in India (Deshpande, 2008; Narula, 2008; Sharma, 1999).

I believe that Westerners should fully understand India's diversity and uniqueness. Because of the heterogeneity within the population of India, it is impossible to make blanket statements about the country as a whole. Everyone has different beliefs and customs that affect the way that they live their lives. However, a researcher can examine general trends and government programs, which affect everyone no matter his/her religion, language, or ethnic group. Also, researchers can investigate the historical development of a country and the effect that history has had on the modern governmental structures and policies of a country. Because religion is such a critical part of the culture of India, a researcher should also consider the effects that the different religions practiced in India has had on the people and the government. For most Indians, their religion is a part of their everyday lives. Religious beliefs and practices permeate every moment of people's lives. This is a

distinct difference between life in India and life in the United States that anyone studying India should understand (Brass, 2005; Clothey, 2006).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of my study is to discover the effects of history, religion, and government policy on programs to care for orphaned children in India. Throughout the history of India, there have been different government structures in place, each with its own ideology and policies. These governments all had different programs in place to care for orphaned children. The people in power in some of these governments were from other countries, and they based programs for orphans on the programs that existed in their home country (Stein, 2010). This had an effect on the development of programs for orphans. For example, the Mughal Empire was comprised of Persian Muslims that based their adoption policy on Islamic law (Harrison, 1980; Hasan, 1985). Another element that had an effect on care of orphaned children was the religion of the people implementing programs. Some religions, such as Hinduism, include specific adoption rituals and regulations (Clothey, 2006). The intersections and interactions of history, politics and religion made the child welfare programs of India what they are today. In this thesis, I will explore the effects that these three factors have had on the development of programs to care for orphans.

There are two main theories that I will be incorporating in this thesis project. One is family systems theory. The family structures in India are different than those in the United States, and these differences in the types and qualities of families have

also had an effect on care of orphans in the Indian context (Chauhan, 2001, Diwan, 1993). I will also use globalization theories. Globalization has had a tremendous influence on India and most of the rest of the "third world." The economic, political, and social structures of India have all been changed by the connections that modern globalization has created (Robertson, 1992). Some of these changes have also had an impact on the way that orphans are cared for in India (Appadurai, 1996, Soumyen, 2002). Particularly because with globalization came international non-profits and NGOs, trying to help the people of India. Most of the workers for these non-profits are outsiders, working within a Western framework, trying to use interventions and practices that work in the Western world without thinking about whether or not they are applicable to the new culture in which the workers are practicing (Tandon, 2996).

In the summer of 2008, I traveled to India and volunteered at a children's village in rural Rajasthan called the Udayan, which was run by an NGO called Vatsalya. This children's village was not like other institutions for children. The purpose was not to have the children get adopted by another family, but to give them a family in which to grow and develop. Once taken in by Vatsalya, the children stayed at the Udayan until they were adults (Vatsalya, 2009a). The couple that started Vatsalya and the Udayan was Indian but both went to college in the United States (J.H. Gupta, personal communication, July 31, 2008). This made the management and structure of the Udayan an interesting combination of elements of Indian culture and Western philosophies and ideologies about childcare. I will use this institution as a case study for my thesis. In the summer of 2009 I volunteered at an organization

called SOS Children's Village in Gaborone, Botswana. This organization has been in existence since 1947 and has children's villages all over the world, including several in India (SOS Children's Villages International, 2010c). SOS and Vatsalya are based on similar theories, but SOS functions on a grander, global scale. I will use this organization as an example of what the Udayan could be in a larger context.

Many Americans might refer to the Udayan as an orphanage. They take in children that have either been orphaned or given up by their parents for various reasons, usually economic. This is the basic purpose of an orphanage. However, Vatsalya identifies the Udayan as a children's village. This is because of many reasons. For one, the Udayan does not allow children in their care to be adopted. Also, the purpose of the facility is to give the children a permanent place to stay and a familial environment. It is not an institutional facility like most orphanages (Vatsalya, 2009e). The Udayan is structurally different from the SOS Children's Villages. SOS villages consist of many "families," mothers with children assigned to them (SOS Children's Villages International, 2010e). The Udayan places the children in houses based on their age and gender. Most SOS villages have approximately one hundred or more children living in the homes (SOS Children's Village International, 2010e). The Udayan only has sixty children at most in their facility (J.H. Gupta, personal communication, July 31, 2008). These are major differences between the two "villages." Even though these two organizations are structurally different, they both self identify as children's villages. Because of this, I will be referring to both organizations as children's villages throughout this document. I believe that it is

important, as a professional and academic, to refer to an organization by the terms it uses to identify itself.

Research Questions

I have four main research questions that I will explore in this thesis project. What programs have been in place to care for orphaned children throughout the history of India? What impact has religion had on the care of orphaned children in the Indian context? What impact have the different political structures and governments of India had upon the care of orphans? What impact has globalization and international non-profits and NGOs had upon the care of orphaned children in India?

Relevance to Social Work Practice

Social work as a profession is increasingly more international. More and more social workers are working in foreign countries and with populations that originated in countries outside of the United States (Alphonse, George, & Moffatt, 2008; Cox & Pawar, 2006; Mayadas & Elliot, 1997; Midgley, 1997; Sarri, 1997). Therefore, social workers need to understand the programs and policies other countries have in place. This is key to culturally competent social work practice. The National Association of Social Workers defines cultural competence as "the integration and transformation of knowledge about individuals and groups of people into specific standards, policies, practices, and attitudes used in appropriate cultural settings to increase the quality of services, thereby producing better outcomes" (National Association of Social Workers, 2001). Even if the social workers are not working in another country, they often will have clients from foreign countries and will have to work within their

cultural framework. Cultural competency includes having an understanding of the programs and policies that the clients are accustomed to and using these as a comparison and starting point when introducing them to American programs and policies. There is also the potential that U.S. social workers can learn from the experiences of social workers from around the world. One strategy is to review interventions and programs used by foreign social workers and consider whether or not they would be effective in America.

As a part of this project, I am considering the effect of non-profits and NGOs, especially international organizations. Many social workers will work for a non-profit or NGO as some point in their career (Brilliant, 1997). Some social workers will work for these organizations in a foreign country or on international issues. I believe that it is important for social workers to consider the impact that their organization is having on the local population of the country in which they are working. International NGOs and non-profits expand into new countries because they believe that they will be able to help the people and may have the best interests of the population at heart. However, these organizations can sometimes have a negative impact on the community because they base their interventions on a Western framework, or Western cultural values, or how they think that life should be and people should live without consideration for the culture of the people with whom they are working (Tandon, 1996). This makes it seem that the culture of the indigenous populations is insignificant and is contrary to the social work values, principles, and ethics. Also,

working in this way takes away the client's rights to self-determination and empowerment.

Literature Review

The literature thoroughly documents the situation of children in India. Social work literature has covered three main areas concerning Indian children based on the Indian government's policies and programs: health and sanitation programs; education programs; and rights and protection. These are the areas that I will be discussing in the following literature review. I also touch on literature covering care of orphans that are populations at risk, foster care and adoption, care for the elderly, and literature on the different family structures in India.

Rights and protection.

One area discussed extensively in the Indian Council on Child Welfare (ICCW) Journal and the Indian Journal of Social Work has been children's rights and child protection (Gadgil, 1998; Jaitley, 1998; Krishnamurthy, 1994; Padmanabhan, 1994; Panicker, 1998; Prasad, 1998; Rane and Billimoria, 1998). Several pieces of legislation passed by the Indian government guarantee certain rights and protections for children. Three main articles in the Indian constitution specifically discuss children's rights: 24, 39, and 45. Part Three of the Indian constitution lists all of the fundamental rights of Indian citizens and all of the other rights guaranteed to Indian adults also apply to children, but the three articles listed above are rights that are specific to children. Article 24 states: "No child below the age of fourteen years shall be employed to work in a factory or mine or engaged in any other hazardous

employment" (Constitution, 1947, p. 15) The point of this article is to prevent exploitation of children by employers and to reduce child labor rates. This idea is further supported by the Factories Act of 1954, the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act of 1976, the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act of 1986, and the National Policy on Child Labour of 1987 (Ministry of Women and Child Development, 2006). The Indian government passed all of these pieces of legislation to prevent the exploitation of children through child labor. Article 39(e) of the Constitution specifically addresses concerns of poverty leading to exploitation and states: "that the health and strength of workers, men and women, and the tender age of children are not abused and that citizens are not forced by economic necessity to enter avocations unsuited to their age or strength" (Constitution, 1947, p. 22). However, child labor is still a problem in India. Because of the crippling poverty in many parts of India, children are forced to work to help their families survive economically. Children are more economically practical to employ because they are a cheap source of labor (Padmanabhan, 1994). Understandably, child labor is an important child's rights issue in which social workers in India involve themselves.

Article 45 of the Constitution guarantees the right of all children to get an education. This article originally read: "The State shall endeavor to provide, within a period of ten years from the commencement of this Constitution, for free and compulsory education for all children until they complete the age of fourteen years" (Constitution, 1947, p. 23). The Constitution (Eighty-Sixth Amendment) Act of 2002 reworded Article 45 to state: "Provision for early childhood care and education to

children below the age of six years. – The State shall endeavor to provide early childhood care and education for all children until they complete the age of six years" (Constitution, 1947, p. 23). Obviously this was a distinct change in the State's focus on education from making sure all children receive a complete primary education to education as a part of child care for young children. I will discuss the specific government programs for education in a later section.

The government also is responsible for protecting children. The state government receives some of the responsibility originally assigned only to the federal government. Each state is responsible for passing laws and creating programs to protect children from the specific threats that exist in that part of the country (Bhakhry, 2006; Krishnamurthy, 1994). One way that the federal government of India develops goals and strategies to achieve them is through the Five Year Plans. There have been eleven of these plans since Indian independence. In the Tenth Five Year Plan, which covered 2002 through 2007, one of the foci was on a rights-based approach to the protection of children (Bhakry, 2006). In the same time period, the government implemented the National Commission for Protection of Child Rights Act of 2005, the National Plan of Action for Children of 2005, and the Integrated Protection Scheme (Ministry of Women and Child Development, 2006). All of these laws had a focus on protection of children's rights. India has also participated in the international movements to ensure children's rights and the protection of children. The government of India ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1992 and signed the World Declaration on the Survival, Protection, and Development of

Children (Jaitley, 1998; Prasad, 1998). In addition to this, India ratified all of the optional protocols of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (Bhakry, 2006).

According to Panicker, there are four main categories of rights that social workers working with children should keep in mind: right to survival, right to development, right to protection, and right to participation (1998, p. 276). The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child uses the same general categories (Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 1990). Survival includes not just the right to life but also the right to healthcare and other lifesaving options. Education and a standard of living that create an acceptable environment for children's development are considered developmental rights for children (Rane, 1998). Right to protection "include protection from discrimination for children without families, freedom from all forms of exploitation, inhuman abuse or degrading treatment and neglect and the right to special protection in situations of emergency and armed conflict" (Rane, 1998, p. 259). The right to participation is the one category of children's rights that is most often overlooked. Because children cannot vote, adults do not often think about their ability to participate in the society and government of any country, including India. However, children should still have freedoms of expression, thought, and religion and access to information that they can use to make their own decisions (Rane, 1998; Rao, 2007).

Health and sanitation.

There was a focus on health and sanitation in Indian legislation relating to children in the 1990s and early 2000s. The Infant Milk Substitutes, Feeding Bottles,

and Infant Foods (Regulation of Production, Supply, and Distribution) Act of 1992, the Pre-natal Diagnosis Techniques (Regulation and Prevention of Misuse) Act of 1994, the National Nutrition Policy of 1993 and the National Health Policy of 2002 all provided rules and regulations for the health of children (Ministry of Women and Child Development, 2006). In 2001, the Central Government of India spent 0.21% of the GDP on water supply, sanitation, housing, and urban development and 0.25% of the GDP on health and family welfare (Mooji, 2005). There was a distinct emphasis on care for infants in the health legislation because of the high infant mortality rates in India (Rane, 1998). One of the causes of the high infant and child mortality is a lack of education concerning hygiene and diet (Srivastava, 1998; UNICEF, 2010). The National Nutrition Policy was passed because of concerns about childhood malnutrition. High poverty levels lead to higher levels of malnutrition amongst the Indian population as a whole. This problem with malnutrition affects children more than adults because the children require more nutrients to grow and develop properly. Also, when an expectant mother is malnourished, it affects the development of the fetus and once the baby is born, if a mother is so undernourished that she cannot produce milk, this further contributes to child malnutrition (Prasad, 1998).

The Integrated Child Development Services Scheme (ICDS) was created to combat malnutrition, morbidity, and mortality. This Scheme provides immunizations and nutrition supplements for children from birth to age 2 to give them a good, healthy groundwork for them to build on for the rest of their lives (Prasad, 1998; Kapil, 2002). By doing this, ICDS tries to break the cycle of malnourishment and poor health that

affects the people of India, especially the women (Panicker, 1998; Gupta, 2001). There are other programs implemented by the government to address health and nutrition problems for children and mothers. These include: The Child Survival and Safe Motherhood Programme, Vitamin A Prophylaxis Programme, Diarrhoeal Diseases Control Programme, Programme for the Control of Acute Respiratory Infection, and Safe Motherhood Initiatives. In addition to the ICDS program, the Special Nutrition Programme, Balwadi Nutrition Programme, Midday Meal Programme, Iodine Deficiency Disorders Control Programme, and Prophylaxis against Nutritional Anaemia program all deal with nutritional deficits that children face (Prasad, 1998, p. 57).

Education.

As mentioned previously, Article 45 in the Indian Constitution guarantees children the right to an education. The article originally guaranteed an education for all children through age fourteen. It was amended to guarantee an education for children through age six. This marks a major change in the education focus of the government (Constitution, 1947). According to the literature, the change in focus has been because of the low level of children in school. Since the change in the Constitution and the focus on primary education, enrollment in primary school has risen. However, drop out rates are still high so children that enroll in primary school are not making it out of that level of education (Padmanabhan, 1994). The drop out rate of children is approximately 39% and 61% of children are still in school by age 10 (Save the Children, 2008). Also, the literacy rate in India is very low, with a wide

discrepancy between the literacy rates of men versus women. Men in India are almost twice as likely to be literate compared to women, but the literacy rate of men is still unacceptably low (Prasad, 1998). The literacy rate of men in India is 75% and the literacy rate of women is 51% (United National Statistics Division, 2010). There are also literacy rate disparities between rural and urban areas, and also amongst different regions, castes, tribes, and economic groups (Panicker, 1998).

The National Policy on Education of 1986 was the major piece of legislation passed regarding education for children (Ministry of Women and Child Development, 2006). The Early Childhood Education Scheme started in 1982 to prepare children 3-6 years old for school, similar to the American Head Start and Early Head Start programs (Prasad, 1998). Voluntary organizations are the main people who are implementing the programs that are a part of the scheme, not the government (Panicker, 1998). According to ICCW, these pre-school education programs are essential for laying the groundwork for the rest of a child's education. Also, the children going to the crèches where the education programs take place provide the children with a healthy, sanitary environment where older children can go with their younger siblings. The older siblings get to study without having to worry about caring for their younger siblings (Gadgil, 1998). Also, if children are being educated and spending their days in school, they are not spending their time working in dangerous jobs (Srivastava, 1998). This focus on elementary education was also incorporated into the seventh Five Year Plan, which covered 1985 through 1989 (Sharma, 1989). The ninth Five Year Plan (1997-2002) changed the educational focus from elementary

education for all to education for children in disadvantaged or deprived groups (Bhakhry, 2006).

Foster care and adoption.

The focus of this thesis project will be on the history and development of adoption and foster care as a form of care for orphaned children in India and I will be expanding on this information in the rest of the thesis project. This section is merely a brief overview of the literature. One definition of adoption is "the method provided by law to establish the legal relationship of parent and child between persons who are not related by birth, with the same mutual rights and obligations that exist between children and their natural parents" (Damania, 1998, p. 5). Adoption has a long history in India through one of the main religions, Hinduism. Adoption is a part of Hindu practice, and there are specific rituals and regulations that govern adoption in Hindu families. These adoptions were usually adoptions by parents that did not have children and needed a child, specifically a son, to fulfill some of the rituals required when a parent dies. The main concern in these adoptions was the parent's – not the child's – interests (Bhargava, 2005; Gopalkrishnan, 1994; Saraswathi, 1993).

There are two main laws governing adoption in India: the Guardian and Wards Act of 1890 and the Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act of 1956 (Ministry of Social Welfare, 1981; Ursekar, 1976). The Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act only applies to Hindu parents, so families of all other religions fall under the Guardian and Wards Act (Ministry of Social Welfare, 1981). Throughout Indian history, attempts to pass overarching adoption laws have been made but none of them have succeeded

(Rajan, 2002). The closest thing to a general adoption policy is some of the adoption regulations in the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection) Act of 2000 (Bhargava, 2005).

Though not very popular, foster care is another option to care for children in India. It is not a tradition in Indian homes to care for children that are non-kin especially if the family does not plan or cannot adopt the child. Parents that do agree to take foster children generally want young children that are available for adoption, preferably newborns, so that if the parents chose to adopt their foster children they can raise them (Ministry of Social Welfare, 1981). There are some foster care schemes that are operated through the Ministry of Social Welfare, but these programs have had mixed popularity and success in different states throughout India (Khan, 1991). All of this said, there has been a tradition of something similar to adoption when children stay in the homes of teachers or board with another family while pursuing an education. These are similar to apprenticeship relationships in place in Europe and the United States in previous generations. Children would live in the homes of their teachers, and would be educated in matters academic and skills related (Modak, 1976). However, the connotations of these relationships are not the same as modern foster care.

Care for elderly people.

Much concern has been expressed about how India will handle elder care now that joint families are less common, more families have both parents working, and life expectancy is higher (Jamuna, 2003). There are three ways that elderly people in

India are cared for: care by adult married children, care by a spouse, and institutional care (Jamuna, 2003, p. 127). Traditionally, adult children, especially daughters and daughters-in-law, care for elderly parents. However, as increasingly more families are shifting from a joint structure to a nuclear structure, this is becoming more difficult. It is much harder for one child and their spouse to care for elderly parents than for all of the children and spouses that are in one home to assist each other in caring for the parents (Jamuna, 2003). For these reasons, institutional care is becoming more prevalent (Jamuna, 2003).

Changes in family structures have also lead to changes in the social networks of the elderly. An elderly person who is a part of a joint family structure has a larger network to draw from than an elderly person that lives in a nuclear family home (van Willigen, 2003). However, when an elderly person is cared for at home, their social network does not change from the network they have had most of their lives. When placed in institutional care, their social network expands because they are associated with caregivers and other elderly residents in the institution (van Willigen, 2003). The social networks of men and women differ as well. When women marry, they move into their in-laws home and are separated from their biological family. In recent decades, this practice has been less common, but in some traditional communities, the practice persists. Also, because traditionally women stay in the home to work, they are more socially isolated, which means that women generally have smaller social networks than men (van Willigen, 2003). Since men generally die before women, many women live the last few years of their lives as widows. Some women live

decades of their lives as widows because they married much older men at a very young age. Widows are considered social pariahs in some parts of Indian culture. When they do not have children to care for them, their situation is even worse. Therefore, the stressors of aging and finding care as an elderly person weigh more heavily on women as they age (Lamb, 2000).

The elderly and children are in a similarly vulnerable position because both groups are reliant on others to care for them. Indian culture is traditionally very respectful towards elderly people, considering them wise and knowledgeable and looking to them for advice about important decisions, but despite this tradition, increasing numbers of elderly Indians spending their final years in institutions or are becoming homeless. There will be approximately 100 million over the age of 60 by 2013, but there are only 4,000 old age homes. There aren't enough homes to hold all of the elderly people that need care outside of their families (Westhead, 2009). Approximately 2.86% of elderly people in India are living alone and .03% are living with non-relatives. Many of those considered living alone are living in institutions without relatives (Prasad, 2007). I believe that this trend is linked to care for children in an important way. If the highly respected elderly are not cared for by their children or extended family, then what are the chances that extended family members are able to care for orphaned children? If care for children has the same trajectory as care for the elderly, then more children will be placed in institutions as well. Social workers, nurses, and other helping professionals worldwide agree that institutionalization is not the healthiest or more effective way to care for children. Their physical, emotional,

mental, and intellectual development is negatively effected by institutional care. Institutionalization is not the optimal situation for anyone, but especially for children.

Family structures.

There are two different types of family structures in India: the nuclear family and the joint family. The nuclear family is a family that consists of a mother, father, and children living in a household together. Traditionally, this is the type of family that Westerners grow up in, although this is becoming less likely. Joint families are families where more than two generations of a family live together under one roof, often sharing the economic burden of the family. The concept of a joint family is outlined in Hindu scripture, making this common in India. Because of this joint families in India are sometimes called Hindu families. The idea behind a joint family is that all of the members of an extended family are living in the same house together. Because traditionally women move in with their in-laws when they get married, a joint family household usually consists of parents, their sons, the sons' wives, and all of the children of these couples. All of these people pool their resources and help each other with household tasks (Hoole, 2002).

Some of the literature covers the controversy over whether or not the joint family was ever really a dominant family structure in India. Some scholars claim that joint families were never really the most common family structure in India, making the claim that nuclear families are replacing the joint family an irrelevant argument (Niranjan, 2005). There is also controversy surrounding the issue of whether or not joint families are replacing nuclear families in India and why this is occurring Some

scholars think that the economic changes that have recently taken place in India have caused young people to move to cities, breaking apart joint families. Others believe that joint families have broken down because of the effect of globalization and young Indian trying to emulate Western families (D'Cruz, 2001; Khuda, 1985). Not only has the literature on this family structure discussed Hindu joint families in India, but joint families in the Diaspora as well. The Diaspora refers to populations of Indians living outside of India. The articles I sourced have specifically studied the Indian community in South Africa. There is a large Indian population in South Africa, especially in the city of Durban, so there have been studies done on Hindu joint families in Durban as well (Jithoo, 1991; Singh, 2008). There are also studies that provide the perspective of non-Hindus that marry into Hindu joint families by asking these individuals what they think of the structure of their new family (Cotrell, 1975). I will discuss more of this literature in a later chapter.

Gaps in the literature.

One of major gaps that I see in the literature about care for orphans in India is no study is available on the interactions between the different governments that have been a part of Indian history and the programs and policies in place to care for orphaned children. There is a dearth of literature that compares or contrasts orphan care policy and practice throughout Indian history under the various rulers and government structures from the 1400s-present time. The relationship between religion and care for orphans will be discussed as well. While some studies have been done on

Hinduism and orphans, there has not been research on the other major religions of India and orphans, which I will cover.

Methods

This thesis project is divided into two major sections: the history and development of child welfare programs for orphans in India, and a case study. For these two segments, I used very different research methods. The entire project is a qualitative research study, so the methods I used were all qualitative in nature, but the specific methods used for each part were divergent. According to Creswell (2003), there are several characteristics of qualitative research. The first is that the setting is natural, or that the research takes place in a real environment, not a laboratory. The second characteristic is that multiple interactive and humanistic methods are used, or that the researcher finds several ways to interact with the subjects. Another characteristic is that elements of the research emerge as the researcher is working instead of the project being predetermined. Also, it is necessary for the qualitative researcher to interpret data. The social phenomena being studied must be viewed in a holistic fashion, or all elements of a phenomenon must be considered, not just those most relevant to the study. In qualitative research, the researcher must be self-reflective and see how he/she affect his/her own study. Multiple types of inquiry should be used. Lastly, the reasoning used by the researcher should be complex (Creswell, 2003, pp. 181-183). All of these characteristics were used throughout this study. I will describe the specific methods used in the next two sections.

History and Development

For the history and development section of my thesis, I used primary and secondary sources. Primary sources are documents or physical objects that are from

the time period that is being studied or original research written by the original researcher (Gravetter, 2006; Weinberg, 2002). This can include letters, manuscripts, pieces of legislation, news stories, poems, plays, buildings, clothing, journal articles based on original research, etc. Anything that was created during the time period that a researcher is writing about qualifies. The primary sources that I used were mainly pieces of legislation that have been passed by the Indian Parliament and the British colonial government of India that are relevant to orphans. To analyze these pieces of legislation, I used a policy analysis structure explained in the next chapter. A secondary source is something that takes a primary source and interprets or analyzes it. There must be at least one step removed from the primary source used (Gravetter, 2006; Weinberg, 2002). Some examples of secondary sources are textbooks, journal articles based on previous research, commentaries, etc. The secondary sources used include journal articles and books written by Indian and foreign experts. Most of these were commentaries on and critiques of programs and legislation used by the Indian government to care for children. Many of these texts were gathered from the Library of Congress during my time in Washington, DC in the summer of 2010.

Case Study

The second section of my thesis is a case study of the children's village where I volunteered in the summer of 2008. It was located in rural Rajasthan, about halfway between New Delhi and Jaipur. During my stay, there were fifty-five children and about a dozen staff. There was a constant stream of American and European volunteers, staying anywhere from a week to six months. All of the volunteers lived

on the campus of the children's village in our own volunteer cottage, so we were available if the children or staff needed us twenty-four hours a day for our entire stay. Volunteers were involved in all aspects of daily life from cooking to teaching classes to putting the children to bed at night. We also were often invited to accompany the children on field trips to local temples or the city. All of these ways of participating in daily life made it very easy to observe all of the different aspects of life and relationships at the children's village. Because my research study involves interviews with human subjects, I needed to receive IRB approval. I received exempted status because my study fell into Category 2 ("research involving the use of educational tests, survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior") and Category 4 ("research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if publicly available or recorded without identifiers") (See IRB Approval page, Appendix E).

The main method used in gathering data for my case study was participant-observation. This research method is commonly used in anthropology and ethnography or any other field where observations of culture are a key element of research (Spradley, 1980). According to Jorgensen (1989), there are seven major features of participant observation:

- A special interest in human meaning and interaction as viewed from the perspective of people who are insiders or members of particular situations and settings

- Location in the here and now of everyday life situations and setting as the foundation of inquiry and method
- A form of theory and theorizing stressing interpretation and understanding of human existence
- A logic and process of inquiry that is open-ended, flexible, opportunistic, and requires constant redefinition of what is problematic, based on facts gathered in concrete settings of human existence
- An in-depth, qualitative, case study approach and design
- The performance of a participant role or roles that involves establishing and maintaining relationships with natives in the field
- The use of direct observation along with other methods of gathering information (pp. 13-14)

Because I lived at the children's village full-time and I was always in contact with the children and the staff, working with them and being a part of their lives, it would have been almost impossible for me to not use this research method. I went to the children's village knowing that I wanted to research child welfare in India, but other than that, I was open to whatever I found that was interesting and needed to be researched. The more information I received, the more my study developed. I observed the relationships amongst the children and staff and paid attention to how children from different families interacted with their biological siblings and the other children in the children's village. To develop a more solid case study, I took the information that I had collected and formulated interview questions for the co-

founders and psychiatrist at the children's village. I recorded all of my observations of daily life at the children's village and wrote down information of note from my conversations with some of the staff. Because many of the staff spoke a limited amount of English and my Hindi was not advanced enough to conduct an interview, it was impossible to officially interview these staff members, but they still had insightful comments to make that I made sure to record. Each evening, I returned to the volunteers' house and recorded my observations for that day on my computer. When I returned to the United States, I organized these observations into categories. All of these steps are integral parts of the participant observation process.

Another method that I used for my case study was interviews. While at the children's village, I conducted interviews with the co-founders of the NGO that administered the children's village and the on staff psychologist. These interviews all took place on the campus of the children's village. I developed questions for each individual based on their areas of expertise. For example, the questions I asked the psychologist were about her knowledge of the psychological conditions of the children when they came to the children's village and how they changed during their stay. These interviews were recorded on a digital audio recorder and transcribed afterwards.

To analyze the interviews, I used qualitative analysis software called ATLAS.ti (Friese, 2004). To use this software, the researcher chooses a group of themes that he/she will look for throughout the interviews. He/she then creates codes to represent each of these themes. Whenever he/she come across one of the themes anywhere in the interviews, he/she uses the appropriate code to mark it. After the coding process is

complete, the researcher can then look through the interviews and count the number of times each code has been used in each interview and how often the codes were used in all of the interviews together. Using the coding system also helps researchers to see the context in which certain themes are discussed (Friese, 2004). The steps involved in using ATLAS.ti are the same as in a qualitative analysis model called constant comparison. In fact, qualitative analysis programs like ATLAS.ti were created based on the constant comparison model. In this model, researchers look at their documents for categories and code these categories. They then compare the codes in each document to find similarities and differences between documents. This process can be done using ATLAS.ti, except the computer makes finding all of the places where a particular code has been used easier (Strauss, 1987).

The research for my history and development section of the thesis was based on analysis of primary and secondary source documents. Many of these sources were collected from the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C. in the summer of 2010. Also, I made use of a policy analysis model to scrutinize the policies concerning orphans in India. I utilized several methods in the case study segment of the thesis. While at the children's village in India, I observed the staff, children, and structure of the facility and recorded anything that I thought was interesting or unique about this particular institution. Also, I interviewed three members of the staff (the co-founders and the psychologist), tailoring the questions I asked each of these people according to their particular area of expertise. These interviews were recorded, transcribed, and analyzed using ATLAS.ti.

Theory

There are two theories that I will use to analyze the information that I have collected about the history of child welfare programs for orphans in India: globalization theory and family systems theory. I will also use a policy analysis model to review the pieces of legislation that the Indian government has passed concerning orphans.

Globalization Theory

Globalization is a term that has been commonly used in academics in recent years, but one that can be difficult to understand. There has been much debate amongst scholars about what exactly is involved in globalization and the effect that it is having on the world. Through my research, I have found many different definitions of the concept, some of them specifically referring the economics and others to globalization on a broader scale. Narula (2003) defines globalization as "freeing a country's economic frontiers to allow unrestricted international trade in goods and services, entry and exit of foreign capital and technology, and giving the foreign investors a treatment similar to that given to domestic investors" (p. 1). In contrast, Robertson (1992) states that "globalization as a concept refers both to the compression of the world as a whole and the intensification of the consciousness of the world as a whole" (p. 8). The first definition considers only the economic elements of the globalization process, while the second refers to the general process of the world becoming a more interconnected place. Other scholars see globalization as a continuation of the age of empires and that it is a new form of imperialism. This is

based on the fact that the original idea behind globalization was to help the poor to gain wealth and decrease inequality when in fact there has been a distinct increase in economic inequality since the inception of the globalization concept (Stewart-Harawira, 2005). The increase in inequality is because globalization affects people of different socio-economic status differently; most importantly, globalization negatively affects the poor while not affecting the rich (Narula, 2003).

Some scholars consider many of the elements a part of economic liberalization. Soumyen (2002) defines liberalization as "the diminution or progressive elimination of the control of the state over economic activities" (p. 2). In addition, he states that external liberalization, which leads to fewer government controls on foreign trade, is essentially globalization (Soumyen, 2002). This emphasis on the economic side of globalization is common in the academic sources that I have researched. However, there are cultural and political elements to globalization as well, such as the following. Whether or not globalization encourages international homogeneity or universality is being debated copiously (Robertson, 1992). Another issue that is debated is whether or not the homogenization that is occurring should be considered Americanization, making the rest or the world like the US, or commodization, or making goods and services into commodities that would not have previous been considered commodities (Appadurai, 1996). To sum up, scholars of globalization have been debating whether or not globalization is leading to countries becoming more and more alike and whether or not other countries are becoming more like the United States economically and culturally.

Much research has been done on the effect of this homogenization and loss of indigenous culture in Africa, and this research is easily applied to India as well (Cooper, 2002; Depelchin, 2005). This is because India and many African countries have been colonies of European superpowers and most of Africa gained independence within a couple of decades of Indian independence. Since independence, Indian and African countries have been trying to make their economies and political systems fit within the structure that had already been created by Europe and the United States. African countries and India have to trade and work with America and Europe to be able to continue to grow and develop (Cooper, 2002; Depelchin, 2005). All of these similarities between the situation of much of Africa and India make many theories about globalization and indigenous culture that were created on the African continent relevant to India as well.

One key text in the globalization debate is Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1979). According to Said, many of the Western academics studying Eastern cultures in the 19th and 20th centuries romanticized and stereotyped these cultures, boiling complex cultures down to very simplistic elements. These stereotypes generally showed Eastern cultures as being barbaric, backwards, and weaker than Western cultures. Said claims that Europe and the United States used these ideas to justify creating empires and taking over colonies. Essentially, Western countries used the idea that Eastern cultures were more primitive than their own to warrant making Eastern countries into colonies. Specifically, Said's work was referring to the Middle East and European attempts to colonialize countries in this area, but for several reasons the

points that he made in his text are relevant to the Indian context as well (Said, 1979). First, India was being ruled by a Muslim empire very similar to Middle Eastern empires during the time period before India became a British colony. Also, one of the main countries that was involved in creating colonies in the Middle East or being a part of Middle Eastern politics was England, which was also the country that colonized India. Third, the tactics that the British used in ruling the Middle East and India were similar (Kedourie, 1978).

Cultural globalization is an area of study within the greater globalization conversation. According to Niezen, the idea that globalization is a cultural phenomenon is contradictory for several reasons. First, with globalization comes a large increase in the ability for people across physical and cultural borders to communicate. This massive increase in communication amongst different people has lead to a homogenization of world cultures and a decrease in the ability of a person and a culture to remain autonomous and maintain the ability to self-identify. This makes the world a less diverse, and therefore less global, place. Also, new technologies have lead to the ability for people to travel and move far from their homes. This had lead to a de-localization of cultures worldwide (Niezen, 2004). Consider the number of local dialects that have been added to the list of dead languages. There are over 500 languages that are now considered extinct, or the last person on Earth who spoke that language is dead (The Linguist List, n.d.). The increase in access to people and information from all around the world and need for more efficient communication has lead to a loss of culture via this languages that are

now lost to us all. Basically, Niezen's theory is that globalization has lead to loss of culture and an increase in the homogenization of human culture and society (Niezen, 2004). This is an assertion with which I agree, and I believe applies to social work practice, especially as social work becomes a more global field.

There are social aspects to globalization as well. Every political, economic, or environmental decision that is made has an effect on the social climate of a country as well. Many of the changes made as a result of globalization have been under one of these three categories. According to Schaeffer, changes in these arenas can have drastic and potentially devastating effects on the social fabric of a country. Schaeffer claims that the political decision on the British government to divide the Indian subcontinent up into India and Pakistan in 1947, when it granted India independence, was a result of globalization and had many social consequences. India was a colony of the British Empire, something that would not have occurred in a less globalized world. Many of the decisions that were made around Indian independence and the Partition were not supported by the Indian people at large, but they had no control over choices that the British made (Schaeffer, 2005).

The British Empire thought that by creating a separate home country for the Muslim population of India, they would solve some of the problems and infighting that were occurring between Muslims and Hindus. In reality, the creation of a separate Muslim state further exacerbated the issue. Approximately 500,000 people died during the months following the Partition, attempting to cross the border between what would now be known as Pakistan and India. Ever since Partition, the

relationship between India and Pakistan has been volatile and violent, leading to four declared wars, the ongoing Kashmiri conflict, and several other minor skirmishes. Also, the conflict between India and Pakistan has lead to an increase in nuclear proliferation in the region as the two countries race to have more nuclear arms. These political decisions have lead to countless social consequences, including the aforementioned deaths, continuing distrust between Hindus and Muslims in both countries, and the destruction of most of Kashmir (Schaeffer, 2005). Globalization, even when it immediately affects politics or economic, has many consequences for the society at large.

One aspect of globalization that has particular relevance to children in India is the increasing number of INGOs, international non-governmental organizations. These are organizations that work in more than one country or do their work in a country other than the one in which they are based. Many organizations in place to care for orphans are INGOs; therefore INGOs are important to understand. There has been a distinct increase in international volunteerism in recent decades. Many of these international volunteers work with INGOs while pursuing their volunteer work (Edwards & Gaventa, 2001). Arguments have arisen against development work through INGOs. Several of these are outlined by Kamat (2002): it continues a culture of colonialism; the alienation and atomized society of the West can be no ideal model for the Third model; development is a hoax because most of the money goes back into developed countries in the form of loans and import payments; of all countries developed as much as Western countries, we would have drastic shortages in

resources; and the West's history of extraction and exploitation has produced its wealth, making the demand to develop predicated upon the colonization of people and land in the Third World.

There is also some negative debate about whether INGOs should be accountable to donors or the people that they serve. Some state that they should be doing what the people that are giving the organizations money think needs to be done. Others say that the whole purpose of INGOs is to serve a population or a community and that the organizations should do whatever is needed in that community. Proponents of this argument claim that the donors, while meaning well, are not necessarily a part of the community that is being served; therefore, the donors do not know from personal experience what is needed. If an organization decides to be accountable to the donors, it could affect their services to the community, and if they decide to be accountable to the community, they could lose the support of their donors (Tandon, 1996). These arguments are against INGO work in the Third World, including India, and will be a part of my thesis argument.

Family Systems Theory

Systems theory basically states that people interact with others within a group and these groups interact with each other in different ways. Basically, people and groups create networks of interaction (Weltman, 1973). Family systems theory asserts that a family is a system. A practitioner working with an individual cannot work with them without taking into account the effect that his/her family has had on the person. People are a product of the families in which they were raised so families are key to

individual therapy. Also, a practitioner of family therapy must consider the family as a group of people interacting with one another and where members have an effect on one another. The structure of the family in which a person is raised would, therefore, have an affect on their personality. This theory of families as a system is used in family therapy, individual therapy, and social work and sociological research (Ackerman, 1984; Becvar, 1982; Broderick, 1993). This theory was developed in the West, so it focuses on the family at its most basic unit, or a nuclear family. However, I believe that some of the tenets of the theory are relevant to other family structures, such as joint and extended families.

The family is the most basic unit of human society. There are many different kinds and structures of families. The most common family structure in the Western world is the nuclear family, or a household consisting of parents and children only. There are also extended families, or grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc. that are related to each other but do not live in the same household (Becvar & Becvar, 1982, Broderick, 1993). However, in India another family structure is quite common. Joint families have several key characteristics: they consist of multi nuclear families, which are related to each other either by birth or marriage, all living under one roof, cooking from the same hearth, owning common property, etc (Chauhan, 2001). Generally, the joint family was fraternal, or the nuclear families of brothers living together. This is because in traditional Indian culture, women move from their family's home to the home of their in-laws. The property of the family is divided up amongst the brothers,

as are the duties necessary to care for family property. Also the women in the family divide the household duties, such as caring for the children (Sontheimer, 1977).

Many studies have claimed that the traditional joint family has been breaking down in recent decades, leading to an increase in the number of nuclear families (Chatterjee & Srivastava, 1975; D'Cruz & Bharat, 2001; Diwan, 1993; Khatri, 1975; Khuda, 1985; Ministry of Women and Child Development, 2006; Sontheimer, 1977). Traditionally the joint family was responsible for child socialization, marital adjustment, and the roles of individual members (Saraswathi & Kaur, 1993). Also, joint families generally care for any children from their family unit that are in need of care, especially if their parents have died or are unable to care for the children for some other reason (Ministry of Social Welfare, 1981; Ministry of Women and Child Development, 2006). The transition of families from joint to nuclear has lead to orphaned children that are not a part of a joint family that could care for them. As a result orphaned children have to be placed in institutions or in a non-kin family for care.

Discussing families in terms of just joint and nuclear is simplifying the conversation. Vatuk identifies nine different family structures in his work (1972). These families differ not just on the number of nuclear family units in a household but also on the number of non-related people living in the household (Vatuk, 1972). This makes a discussion of families even more complex. Much of the literature on families in India discusses families as either nuclear or joint, as was discussed above. While this is the easiest way for the discussion to be held, it is not necessarily the best way to

discuss something as complicated as families. However, due to the increased complications that a comprehensive discussion of families would add, I will be discussing families in terms of joint or nuclear.

Policy Analysis Model

I will be using a policy analysis framework created by Prigmore and Atherton (1986) when considering the policies in place concerning orphans in India. This framework is presented on pp. 50-58 of their book *Social Welfare Policy*. There are ten questions that need to be asked when looking at a piece of legislation to determine its effectiveness:

- Is the policy under consideration compatible with contemporary "style"?
- Is the policy compatible with important and enduring cultural values, particularly equity, fairness and justice?
- Is the policy compatible with social work's professional value and ethical system?
- Is the policy acceptable to those in formal decision-making positions?
- Does the policy satisfy relevant interest groups?
- Is the policy based on knowledge that has been tested to some degree?
- Is the policy workable? That is, can the programs that flow from the policy be carried out in the real world?
- Does the policy create few problems for both the public and the beneficiaries?

- Is the policy reasonably effective?
- Is the policy efficient? (Prigmore & Atherton, 1986, pp. 50-58).

There were several different policy analysis models that I considered (Chambers, 2000; Gil, 1981; Gilbert & Terrell, 2010; Karger & Stoez, 2006). The reason that I chose the Prigmore and Atherton model was because of its emphasis on cultural competence and ethics. The questions about policies being based on cultural values and acceptable to government officials and relevant interest groups made it possible for me to take into consideration the fact that some of the regulations discussed were passed by colonial governments. These laws were based on similar legislation in place in England at the time, but not based on the cultural beliefs and values of the Indian people. The English colonial government imposed the laws on their Indian subjects. Other policy analysis models did not take these issues into account, making it difficult for me to discuss these issues that were important to me.

Some of these questions will be difficult to answer considering that these pieces of legislation were created in a different culture and context than this particular analysis framework. Also, one of the laws still in use was passed by the British Colonial government in 1890; therefore, some of the information about interest groups and acceptability to decision-makers will not be available or will no longer be relevant to the current government. Because of this, some of the pieces of legislation that I will be discussing shall be held to every element of this policy analysis model, while other laws I will consider more generally. However, in general, this framework will be very useful when I am considering the effectiveness of the legislation in place for Indian

orphans. This framework considers the policies from many different angles and perspectives, making it possible to truly engage a policy's effectiveness. In this particular situation, the emphasis on considering the cultural beliefs of the country in which the policy was created is exceedingly important. While India and the US have basically the same government system (both are democracies), the cultures of the two countries are very different and must be considered when analyzing legislation (Palmer, 1971; Wilson, 2012).

There are two main theories that I used in this thesis: globalization theory and family systems theory. Globalization theory concerns the world becoming a more compressed and interconnected place in many different ways. The economies, cultures, and politics of countries around the world have become more intertwined in recent decades and globalization theory discusses the reasons behind this and the reasons why this is occurring. Also, this theory is related to international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) and their work in the international community. Family systems theory states that a family is a system made up of the interactions of individuals. Members of a family are a product of these interactions and the system that is created from them (Becvar & Becvar, 1982, Broderick, 1993). I also used a policy analysis model to evaluate the pieces of legislation relevant to adoption, foster care, and other programs for orphans. This model was taken from a text on policy analysis in social work by Prigmore and Atherton (1986). In the text, there is a list of questions for a reader to use to when he/she are analyzing a piece of legislation. These

questions were specifically written for social workers to use while considering legislation that practitioners would be using in the work place.

History of India and Development of Child Welfare Programs for Orphans

Early India: 2500 B.C.-10th cent.

The first human civilization in India was located in the Indus River Valley and began around 2500 B.C. From this beginning, the Harrapan, Aryan, and Vedic ages of Indian history emerged. Hinduism began to be formed into a belief system that would become an integral part of Indian society. Throughout this early part of Indian history, the subcontinent consisted of a series of empire and kingdoms ruled by Hindu and Buddhist leaders. There was no one, unifying empire that controlled all of the area that is modern day India. Hinduism was also not a unified religion. People from different areas of the country worshipped different gods and goddesses and had specific beliefs that were indigenous to that area. However, some religious texts, such as the Rig Vedas, Bhagavad-Gita, and Ramayana, were common elements in these unique, local versions of Hinduism. The Brahmans, or priestly caste, were responsible for leading the religious life of India. They were also the educated part of Indian society; therefore they were the people who read all of the traditional religious texts. These texts included all of the rules and ceremonies that regulated the daily lives of the Hindus (Metcalf, 2006).

During this early time period, no one is sure of the specific date, the caste system was implemented in Indian culture. The legend of the origins of the caste system is a part of the Rig-Veda, one of the oldest Hindu texts. There are four main castes: Brahmans, Rajanyas or Kshatriyas, Vaishyas, and Shudras. Brahmans are the priestly caste, the highest caste in Indian society. Next are the Kshatriyas, or the

warrior caste. The third caste is the Vaishyas, or the merchant caste. Shudras are the lowest caste in the system and are manual laborers. The original caste system was based on the job that a person held in society, but later became an inherited system. However, jobs were also traditionally inherited so it was common that people of a particular caste would hold a job associated with their caste (Deshpande, 2008). In addition to these castes from the legend, are the Untouchables. Untouchables are the lowest class in Indian society, so low that they are not included in the caste system. These people would have been responsible for jobs that were considered unclean, like handling dead bodies, excrement, or leather. Strict rules of conduct were in place to police interactions between people of different castes. For example, anyone who came into contact with an Untouchable was considered unclean and needed to be ritually cleansed. Contact extended to the shadow of an Untouchable crossing the shadow of someone of another caste (Narula, 2008). Technically, in modern India the caste system is outlawed, but for all practical purposes is still a part of the social construct of Indian society and these beliefs about needing to cleanse oneself after contact with an Untouchable are still held by some (Sharma, 1999).

The Laws of Manu is the earliest text written in a poetic manner in the Dharmasastra Hindu tradition. In accordance with Hindu tradition, this text records the words of Brahma, one of the gods of the Hindu pantheon. Historians debate when this text was written, with the time frame being between 200 BCE and 200 CE. This text lays down the rules that regulated everything in Hindu life from marriage to religious ceremonies, to punishments for different crimes. Adoption is mentioned in

the Laws of Manu several times in the section referring to inheritance procedures. Law IX, 168 states "That (boy) equal (by caste) whom his mother or father affectionately give, (confirming the gift) with (a libation of) water, in times of distress (to a man) as his son, must be considered as an adopted son (Datrima)" (Buhler, 1971, pp. 361-362). This passage is defining who would be considered an adopted son. According to Law XI, 142, "An adopted son shall never take the family (name) and the estate of his natural father; the funeral cake follows the family (name) and the estate, the funeral offerings of him who gives (his son in adoption) cease (as far as that son is concerned)" (Buhler, 1971, p. 355).

This law is stating that men who have been adopted can no longer be known by their biological father's name and cannot inherit the biological father's estate but instead are known by the name if their adopted father and inherit from the adopted father's estate. The presenting of the funeral cake refers to the ceremonies that the oldest son is required to perform during his father's funeral. If the adopted son was the eldest or only son, he was responsible for fulfilling these ceremonial obligations. The last reference to adopted sons in the Laws of Manu occurs in Law IX, 162: "The legitimate son of the body, the son begotten of a wife, the son adopted, the son made, the son secretly born, and the con cast off, (are) the six heirs and kinsmen" (Buhler, 1971, p. 359). This passage is clarifying which men can inherit the family property. Another passage refers to men in a family who cannot inherit.

The fact that this early piece of Indian literature mentions adoption so many times and outlines specific regulations for adopted children is evidence that adoption

was practiced in early Indian society. According to researchers, adoption in early India usually took place because a married couple did not have a son or any children. Generally, children were adopted from with a couple's extended family, because if the child was related, the adoptive parents knew who the child's parents were, what his or her caste was, and the history of the child's family. It was very rare for parents to adopt a child from outside of their family. In these situations the child was adopted to help the parents make sure that the funeral ceremonies would be fulfilled or to continue the family line. The needs of the child were not the parent's major consideration. Because the need of the parents was for a male child to complete the funeral ceremonies, girls were not adopted (Bhargava, 2005; Government of India, 1960; Groza, 2003; Ministry of Social Welfare, 1981).

There were several different types of adoption in ancient India. The first is Kritrima, or the adoption of a child that has been orphaned. Illatom is when a couple adopts their future son-in-law before he is married to their daughter. Dwayamushtayara is another form of adoption that is mentioned in ancient sources, but was not recognized under Hindu law so there was not much information about it. In addition to these types, specific ethnic groups, religious minorities, and schools of Hinduism had their own forms of adoption (Gopalkrishnan, 1994). Some of these different forms of adoption had specific rules. For example, parents were not allowed to adopt girls, only boys, or orphans. Also, widows and unmarried men or women were not permitted to adopt. This was the case in some schools of Hindu laws, but not in others, making the situation for orphans complicated (Ursekar, 1976). Another

form of adoption or guardianship was for a master in a certain craft to adopt a boy to be his apprentice, caring for him and educating him at the same time. This was called the Hindu Gurukul conception (Kulkarni, 1976).

When children were orphaned or deprived of their parents, they usually would be taken in by their extended family so that children were rarely abandoned (Damania, 1998). Within the joint family structure of early Indian society, where all of the members of an extended family lived under one roof and shared the duties of raising the family, taking in the children of a dead relative was not an inconvenience to the family as a whole. Also, Hindu laws required that joint families were liable to care for all of the dependents of any member of the family that died because all of the property of the member of the family was absorbed by the family, leaving the children without monetary support (Gupte, 1970).

Muslim India: 10th cent. - 1858

Muslim rulers started moving into India in the tenth century. There was a series of sultanates based around specific cities in India and Pakistan. In the 1500s the Mughal Empire started consolidating the many different kingdoms and sultanates of India and Pakistan into one, cohesive empire. The first ruler of this Empire, Babur, was Persian by ethnicity and a Muslim (Hasan, 1985). This empire ruled most of India and Pakistan until the mid-1800s. The emperors of the Mughal Empire varied in their religious beliefs and level of conservatism. Emperor Akbar, who ruled in the 1600s, was famous for his tolerance of other religions. He created a new state religion that was a conglomeration of Islamic, Hindu, Buddhist, and Christian beliefs called

Godism and is famous for being married to women of all of the major Indian religions (Harrison, 1980). On the other end of the spectrum is Aurangzeb, the last great Emperor of the Mughal Empire. One of the most conservative Mughal Emperors, he imposed Sharia law on all Indians, no matter their religious beliefs, placed heavy taxes on Hindus, and destroyed Hindu temples and shrines (Lane-Poole, 1964). Because of these differences in the beliefs of these emperors, they also had different policies that they imposed on the Indian population. However, some of the basic tenets of Islam have specific things to say about the treatment of orphans, which specified some of the policies regarding children in an Islamic empire (Richards, 1993).

Muhammad, the founder of Islam, was an orphan; thus there are many references in the Qur'an to helping orphans. Several verses state that good Muslims should do their duty to orphans, in addition to a list of other populations in need. Also, Muslims are told that they should not steal the property of orphans or take advantage of them. People that are guardians of orphans should be careful to judge when they think the orphan they are caring for is ready to be responsible for his or her own property, but they should not keep an orphan's property for themselves or spend all of an orphan's money before he/she is old enough to inherit (Abdel Haleem, 2005). However, the Qur'an forbids formal adoption. Guardianship of orphans is encouraged and considered necessary, but an actual adoption of a child is not allowed (Fernea, 1995).

Despite this written rule, evidence exists that informal adoptions occurred during the time of the Mughal Empire. There were rules in place to govern these

informal adoptions. If children were adopted informally, they were not to take the name of their adoptive family, but retain the name of their biological father – unlike earlier practices. The importance of blood relationships was emphasized in inheritance laws, placing any blood relative higher than an adopted son. These policies were in place in many Muslim empires in the Middle East and Africa during the same time period as the Mughal Empire in India (Fernea, 1995). Based on this information about adoption in these other Muslim empires, one can infer that the same policies were practiced by Muslims in India during the Mughal Empire, especially when one considers that these policies were in place in the empires where the early Mughal leaders had originated. The Mughals generally allowed the Hindu population of India to continue their religious and social practices as long as the Hindus continued to pay their taxes and follow any regulations the Empire put into place (Richards, 1993). This would suggest that throughout the Mughal Empire, the traditional Hindu forms of adoption were still being practiced.

The English in India: 1600s-1947

The English began their relationship with India through the British East India Company. The Company started trading spices, fabrics, and other goods with India in the early 1600s. Over time, they gained control of a few port cities. The Portuguese and French also traded with India at the same time, but in the southern part of the country that was not under Mughal jurisdiction. This meant that these Europeans had very little interactions with the Mughal emperors. Aside from a few territorial battles between the Portuguese and the Mughals, few interactions occurred. The British was

the main European power that dealt with the Empire. Eventually, the Company displaced the governments of several states, setting up Company versions of colonial governments. They began expanding into the rest of the country, slowly taking over states under Mughal Empire control. In 1858 the East India Company was terminated and control of India was transferred to the British crown, after which the British Raj system was started. The British ruled Indian until 1947 when India was granted independence. A combination of a large independence movement led by Mahatma Gandhi and the economic difficulties of the British government maintaining their presence in India after World War II made it necessary for the British to grant independence to India (Roberts, 1952).

During the time period when India was a colony of the British Crown, England was going through the Industrial Revolution and more of the population was moving to urban areas. This had an effect on the children of England; many juveniles were prostitutes in the cities, and others were being placed in workhouses. English society at large had an ambivalent attitude towards orphaned, delinquent, and destitute children at this time. Because of this, most orphaned children were placed in institutions like workhouses, poorhouses, and reform schools (Horn, 1997). Children who still had parents lived in workhouses and poorhouses and were forced to work, but orphaned children were especially vulnerable to being placed in workhouses and poorhouses and being forced to work (Rose, 1991). Some social reformers tried other ways to care for orphaned children, such as preliminary foster care system. Also, unions could adopt orphaned or neglected children that had parents who were in the

union. Once the union adopted the children, they placed them in cottage houses, foster homes, or could pay to put the children in orphanages or boarding schools that were funded by charitable societies or churches. In these cases, the union had guardianship of the children and overruled parental rights (Horn, 1997).

It is impossible to estimate the number of orphaned children in England in the 1800s because definitions of orphan and child differed. Some defined a child as anyone who had not been married yet, not children of a certain age, and since children married during a range of ages, it is difficult to know the number of children. Also, an orphan could be defined as a child that had lost either or both parents. However, evidence indicated that a large numbers of orphans lived in urban areas in England during the Industrial Revolution (Laslett, 1977). During this time period in India, orphaned children were generally cared for by their families. Whenever kinship care was not possible, religious and philanthropic groups set up orphanages. The colonial government did not get involved in issues with orphans except in extreme emergencies (Ministry of Social Welfare, 1981).

Guardians and wards act.

The only piece of legislation that was passed by the British colonial government concerning orphans was the Guardian and Wards Act of 1890 (British Colonial Government of India, 1890). This law did not legalize adoption, but made it possible for adults to take in a ward until the child was 18 years of age (Bhargava, 2005). It was the first guardianship act that covered all of India. According to this law, there were two types of guardians: guardians of person and guardians of property.

Guardians of person were responsible for caring for the ward on a day-to-day basis. Guardians of property were to care for the property of the ward. They were responsible for protecting the wards property and handling property according to the ward's best interests. Guardians had custody of the child, but the child was not a legal, legitimate child of the guardian. Thus, the child could not inherit the guardians' name or property unless inheritance of property was stipulated in the guardians' will. Both of these categories were assigned by the courts and guardians were given remuneration for the care that they provided (British Colonial Government of India, 1890). These rules were based on the laws in place for guardians in England. Also, the law did not supersede the personal and religious laws of the Indian population, no matter the religion that the people practiced (Mitra, 1969).

The Guardian and Wards Act is difficult to analyze using all of the questions in the Prigmore and Atherton model because it was written in the past by a colonial government, but there are certain elements that can be considered. Since the law was written by a colonial power and not by the native population, it is not compatible with the cultural values of the people of India. However, the law allowed Indians to maintain their traditional forms of adoption, giving the law a certain amount of cultural competence. Since the Guardian and Wards Act was created based on the English experience in their own country, it was based on previous knowledge, but knowledge that had been gathered in another country and culture (Prigmore, 1986). This practice was common amongst European colonial governments (Osterhammel, 2005).

Independent India: 1947 - present

After a long non-violent struggle, India became an independent nation in 1947. Ever since, India has been the largest democracy in the world. The Indian government structure is based on the British Parliamentary system with a bicameral legislature, Supreme Court, Prime Minister, and a President in place of the King or Queen. The young Indian government has had to contend with many obstacles. The sheer number of people to be governed in India is daunting. The population of India in 2011 is approximately 1.2 billion, making India the second most populous country in the world after China (CIA, 2011). Adding to this challenge is the ethnic, religious, and cultural diversity of the country along with twenty-two different languages and hundreds of dialects that makes governance a complex undertaking (Guha, 1999; Ramasamy, 2005). When the legislature is writing a bill, they have to think about the effect that the law would have on all of the different groups in India. Specific religious and ethnic groups have different sets of personal laws that might be at odds with national legislation, so the government has to be delicate when creating new laws (Guha, 2003). The two main pieces of legislation passed concerning orphans during this period in Indian history are: The Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act and the Juvenile Justice Act (Bhargava, 2005).

Hindu adoption and maintenance act.

The Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act was passed by the Indian government in 1956. This piece of legislation made it possible for Hindus and people who adhered to a religion that developed from Hinduism (Sikhism, Jainism, and

Buddhism) to legally adopt children. Muslims, Christians, Jews, and other religious groups were not able to adopt under this law and still had to follow the Guardians and Wards Act of 1890. This meant that people of these other religious groups could not adopt legally using this law (Government of India, 1960). There are many provisions in the Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act that defined a valid adoption. The three most important provisions are that the person adopting legally and economically can do so, the person being adopted can be adopted, and the person giving the child for adoption is the legal parent of the guardian of the child and can therefore give the child for adoption. These provisions are key because if a child cannot legally be adopted or the person giving the child up for adoption is not their legal guardian, then any adoption that is attempted would be illegal. One major change in this law from previous Indian adoption traditions is that women can now adopt. Male Hindus who are "sound of mind" and are not a minor can adopt legally. If men are married, they have to have their wife's consent before adopting, and if a man has more than one wife, he must have the consent of all of his wives before an adoption can take place (Malik, 1970; Parliament of India, 1956).

Women that are "sound of mind" and not a minor can adopt if they are unmarried, widowed, divorced, or have a husband that has decided to renounce the world, convert from Hinduism, or has been declared by the courts to be insane. People that are allowed to give a child to be adopted are the father, mother, or legal guardian. If a couple is adopting a son, they cannot have a Hindu son, son's son, or son's son's son living. Also, if a couple is adopting a daughter, they must not have a

living Hindu daughter or son's daughter. These children can be either blood related or adopted. An adopted parent must be at least twenty-one years older than the child if the child is of the opposite gender as the parent. An adoption that has met all of these requirements is considered valid, then the adoptive parents cannot renege and the child cannot repudiate their adoptive status and return to their birth family (Malik, 1970; Parliament of India, 1956).

When analyzing this law using the Prigmore and Atherton model, I can utilize most of the questions that are a part of the model. After comparing the language in this law with other laws passed in the same year, the Hindu Adoptions and Maintenance Act is consistent with the style of the time when it was written. Because of the references to specific religious groups and Hindu religious beliefs, it is obviously in accordance with the cultural values of the Hindu part of the population. However, this law does not apply to the non-Hindu part of the Indian population, which violated the concepts of fair and equitable jurisprudence. Otherwise, there is no evidence that this law is not compatible with social work values and ethics. The law seems to emphasize social justice because it expands the ability to adapt to more people. This legislation also places more of an emphasis on the situation and needs of the children than previous traditions, which focused on the needs of the parents. This is an example of respecting the dignity and worth of the children (Prigmore, 1986).

According to the literature, politicians who supported the law and administrators charged with enforcement find the law acceptable. However, the available literature does not indicate whether or not the Hindu Adoptions and

Maintenance Act fulfills the needs of interest groups (Bhargava, 2005; Chowdry, 1980; Damania, 1998). Adoption that has been occurring in cultures throughout history, which would suggest that this program is based on previous knowledge and practices. The program that is created from this law is not overly complicated. Basically, it allows adults to legally adopt and sets up the protocols necessary for adoption. Because of this, I would say that the policy is workable. I can't see any ways that this policy would create problems for the general public or the people that will be directly affected by the law. Because the policy only applies to the Hindu portion of the population, I would not say that it is entirely effective, and I have not found an evaluation of the policy to see whether or not it is effective for the people that the policy does apply to. However, I believe that it would be fairly efficient. It was difficult to find any critique of this law from the standpoint of effectiveness and efficiency. The only costs involved would be paying the social workers and judges that will be involved in the adoption process (Prigmore, 1986).

Several attempts have been made to create an overarching adoption law since independence, but all of these legislative efforts have failed to pass the Indian Parliament. These attempts were made in 1955, 1965, 1967, 1970, and 1972. The attempt in 1955 to pass an Adoption of Children Bill was scaled back to the Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act by a Member of Parliament who had been assured that the Adoption of Children Act would be reintroduced soon after the Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act was passed. Other versions of the Adoption of Children Act were attempted during the other years listed above (Baig, 1976). Each time a bill was

proposed, a religious minority would protest the bill, claiming that their rights were being denied by these adoption laws. According to their claims, the laws violated their personal and religious laws and that violation of these laws was unconstitutional. Because of these arguments against a nationwide adoption law, none of these pieces of legislation were ever passed (Baig, 1976). Until the Juvenile Justice Act (Care and Protection of Children) Act was passed in 2000, no law existed that allowed all Indian citizens to adopt (Ursekar, 1976).

In modern India, the government has taken a more analytical approach to dealing with children. Approximately eighteen million children are living on the streets in India, which is the largest population of street children in any country in the world (Hitesh, 2008). Generally, these children are divided into two categories: children on the street and children of the street. "Children on the street" usually live in a home with their family and sometimes attend school, but spend most of their time on the streets, typically begging, rag picking, or engaging in some other economic activity. "Children of the street" actually live on the streets, usually alone or with gangs of other children. Some of these children are orphans, others have been abandoned, and others have run away from home (Rosa, 1992). The Indian government has their own way of categorizing these children: children in need of care and protection, or children in conflict with law. Children in need of care and protection are children who are orphaned, abandoned, destitute, runaways, suffer from abuse or neglect, told to beg by their parents, and the children of alcoholics, prostitutes, criminals, etc. Children in conflict with law come from the same

situations as children in need of care and protection but have done something that was against the law (Ministry of Social Welfare, 1981).

Juvenile justice act.

These two categories of children were defined in the Juvenile Justice Act (JJ Act). The first version of this piece of legislation was passed in 1986 (Ministry of Law and Justice, 1986). An amended version was passed in 2000. This new version was named the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act (Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, 2000). An amended version, known as the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Amendment Act, was passed in 2006. This document listed several amendments to the JJ Act of 2000 (Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, 2006). Being the most recent version of the law, I will analyze the JJ Act of 2000, but I will include any amendments from the JJ Amendment Act of 2006. The Juvenile Justice Act of 1986 focused primarily on the conditions of juvenile delinquents. It created policies and procedures for how to deal with children that had committed crimes, including the creation of juvenile courts, juvenile welfare boards, and special homes for juvenile offenders to be housed in during their sentence instead of placing them in jail with adults. The situation of neglected juveniles is accounted for in the act, as procedures were put in place for police officers and government officials that had suspicions about whether or not a child was being neglected. However, there is very little emphasis placed on neglected children in the act (Ministry of Law and Justice, 1986).

The Indian government renewed and amended the Juvenile Justice Act of 1986 with the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act of 2000. From the change in title, one can see a change in attitude toward the children under the purview of the law. This new law placed more emphasis on the rehabilitation and social reintegration of children that had committed crimes once they were removed from the juvenile justice homes that were created by the 1986 law. Chapter IV of this law focuses on the rehabilitation and social reintegration of the children. There are several environments in which the children can be rehabilitated: children's or special homes, adoption, foster care, sponsorship, and after-care organizations. Children's homes are institutions where children can stay after finishing their time in the juvenile justice home. Adoption is an option available to children that are orphaned, abandoned, neglected, and/or abused. Children could be adopted through guidelines created by each state and through the decisions of each individual Child Welfare Board. This means that each state in India can create its own adoption regulations, and the Boards can then decide whether a situation fits within these regulations or not. In some states, Christians, Jews, Muslims, and other non-Hindus can legally adopt for the first time in Indian history. Any children's home or government institutions specifically for orphans will be considered adoption agencies and can place children in adoptive homes as per the regulations and approval of the local Board (Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, 2000).

Foster care serves several functions in this law. It can be considered a temporary placement for children who are about to be adopted. Other children may be

placed in foster care until such time that they can be returned to their families. The children are in the foster home for rehabilitation and once the rehabilitation process is complete, they return home to their parents. Again, individual state governments create the regulations for these foster care programs. Sponsorship is a program where a person provides financial support to individual families, children's homes, or special homes. This money can be used to pay for the child's education, medical costs, or nutritional needs. State governments create the regulations for these programs as well. An after-care organization rehabilitates the child while they are living at home with their parents. These organizations are created, managed, and regulated by the state governments. The regulation of all of these programs to rehabilitate juveniles are the responsibility of the individual states within the country, but all states must have these programs to be in compliance with the law (Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, 2000).

This law also stated that children could be cared for by a fit person or placed in a fit institution. A fit person is "a person, being a social worker or any other person, who is prepared to own the responsibility of a child and is found by the competent authority to receive and take care of the child" (Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, 2000, p. 2). A fit institution is "a government or a registered non-governmental organization or a voluntary organization prepared to own the responsibility of a child and such organization is found fit by the competent authority" (Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, 2000, p. 2). A fit person or fit institution is found fit by the government agencies in charge of care of children in their

state. These people and institutions can take in children that are being rehabilitated or after rehabilitation (Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, 2000).

In the JJ Amended Act, there were a few changes to the sections on rehabilitation of children. In the list of children that could be adopted, a provision for children that had been surrendered by their parents was added. Adoption is now to be regulated by the state government and by guidelines issued by the Central Adoption Resource Agency, an organization of the Central government that will be discussed further. State governments are required to identify at least one or more of their institutions or voluntary organizations in each district to serve as an adoption agency. In the section listing people that can adopt, language was added allowing people to adopt regardless of whether they were married or single, whether or not they were the same sex as the child, whether or not they had living children, or whether they were a childless couple, which differs from some of the provisions in the Hindu Adoptions and Maintenance Act. As an explanation, the list of people that the children could be restored to upon finishing their rehabilitation included parents, adopted parents, foster parents, guardians, fit persons, or fit institutions (Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, 2006).

It appears that the JJ Act, 2000 is written in accordance with the style of other laws passed around the same time. This act was created to put the Indian juvenile justice system more in line with the programs used in other countries but was written in a way that it was still compatible with the cultural values of the Indian people (Chaturvedi, 2008). It definitely made the juvenile justice system more fair and just

for the children that are a part of the system. Because the law created a program to separate juvenile offenders from adults and create special services for the juveniles, the emphasis is on service. However, this law is in accordance with social work ethics in theory, but not necessarily in practice. Police corruption and delays in trials for juveniles make the law distinctly unjust for juvenile offenders (Prigmore, 1986). The juvenile justice literature includes reports that criticize the Juvenile Justice Act. Although the JJ Act of 1986 made the juvenile justice system more in line with systems in other countries and international regulations for children's human rights and made it no longer necessary for the Indian government to rely on laws passed by the British government, the law was flawed. For one thing, no emphasis placed was on the rehabilitation of former juvenile offenders (Kethineni, 2000). This omission was remedied in the 2000 version of the law.

One argument against all of the versions of the JJ Act is that they have been passed in a rush and without complete consideration of the effect that the law will have on children and the juvenile justice system. Also, distinguishing between children in conflict with law and children in need of care and protection is not necessarily appropriate since children often commit crimes out of necessity. However, there are positive elements to the law as well. Again, it made the juvenile justice laws up to date with modern standards. The Indian system is now more similar to juvenile justice in Western countries and adheres to juvenile justice regulation in international human rights documents. It also kept children out of adult jails (Shanmugavelayutham, 2002). There are also some differences between the ideals of

the law and the implementation of these ideals. For example, all of the children are presumed innocent until proven guilty, but societal stigma affects all children who are involved with the justice system. Also, the law states that the children will be tried in a timely fashion, but many children wait weeks before being seen by the Boards (Rickard, 2008). These mixed critiques of the law imply that not everyone was happy with it, but no law is flawless.

Again, mixed critiques of the law imply that not all interest groups are satisfied, but some people indicate that the law improved the juvenile justice system (Kethineni, 2000; Rickard, 2008; Shanmugavelayutham, 2002). The current literature recognizes that children should not be placed in adult prison facilities, meaning that this law is based on previous research. On the surface, it would appear that this policy is workable in the real world. However, documented evidence shows that some corrupt police officers in India misuse this piece of legislation. Some police officers take advantage of the children living on the streets by demanding bribe money not to arrest them. In some cases the police beat children when they refuse to pay their bribes or take the children to juvenile facilities and claim that the children have committed crimes when they have not (Ganesan, 1996). It can take a long time for the child to be seen by one of the Welfare Boards or be tried by a juvenile court. During this time, the child must stay in the juvenile justice home. This corruption leads to an abuse of the JJ Act (Ganesan, 1996). The corruption of the police could lead to problems for both the children, who are supposedly the beneficiaries, and the general public. The general public would be affected by children being held illegally because

the taxpayers fund the juvenile justice homes, and it is a waste of taxpayer money for innocent children to be in the homes. These problems might also affect the effectiveness and efficiency of the policy (Prigmore, 1986).

The legal situation involved in adopting children is even more complex than the two laws just explained leads one to believe. Technically, Indian children cannot be adopted without proof that their parents are dead, making them orphans, or unless their parents sign a relinquishment form. Many orphaned children are abandoned at a very young age with no documentation of who their parents are and how the parents can be contacted. Furthermore, many children in India are not officially registered with the government when they are born. This means that legally, these children do not exist. It is difficult for a parent to fill out a legal document for a child that is legally nonexistent. Also, India has a very low literacy rate. Many children are abandoned because their parents are too poor to continue caring for their children. These desperately poor parents are generally also uneducated, making it unlikely that they would be able to read and understand a relinquishment form. Legally, a child can be adopted without a relinquishment form if a committee grants relinquishment. However, like most things involving the government in India, this process is very long and complicated. The intense bureaucratic process makes granting a relinquishment difficult unless a corrupt committee member is willing to accept a bribe (Seale, 2010).

The central adoption resource authority.

The Central Adoption Resource Authority (CARA) is a part of the Ministry of Women and Child Development, which is the national body responsible for all

adoption related activities. It was created in 1990 after a decision of the Cabinet to have a better way for the government to deal with orphans and adoption. This organization has created guidelines for in-country, inter-country adoptions and family adoptions (the adoption of a child be a biological family member). The in-country guidelines were passed in 2004, and the inter-country guidelines in 2006. These guidelines are periodically updated and amended to keep up with changing trends and policies. The promotion of in-country adoptions is the main goal of CARA. No child is given up for adoption in another country without all efforts to have the child adopted in India first (Central Adoption Resource Authority [CARA], 2011a). On their website, CARA has a database of the number of children that are adopted in country and out of country. Since 2000, the number of children adopted in country and out of country adoptions has decreased. However, these numbers do not include in-country adoptions made by state licensed adoption agencies (CARA, 2011b). The reasons behind why in-country adoptions have decreased are unclear, however the decrease in out of country adoptions could be because of the CARA policy that children cannot be adopted out of country until all other options have been exhausted. In addition to creating the guidelines that all adoption agencies must follow, CARA gives funds to NGOs and government children's homes (CARA, 2011a).

Foster care.

Foster care, while considered a viable option to care for children in America, is not necessarily the best way to deal with orphaned children in India. While foster care is in use in India, it is not very popular (Khan, 1991; Kulkarni, 1976; Modak, 1976;

Saraswathi, 1993). The lukewarm reaction to foster care in India is because traditionally Indian people do not to care for non-kin children. Also, parents often resist caring for a child whose background, especially the caste of which the child is a member, is unknown. Also, some agencies are not experienced in dealing with foster care and the money provided to foster families is considered inadequate in some cases. Parents that do foster generally want an infant so that they can raise the child from birth and eventually adopt the child. Also, foster parents tend to request children that are of the opposite gender of their biological children. The few foster care programs that do exist are located to certain cities spread across the country and are not regulated by the Indian government (Khan, 1991; Ministry of Social Welfare, 1981; Saraswathi, 1993). Because foster care is so unpopular and the use of it is limited, it is impossible to find statistics on the number of children in care. There are four types of foster homes in India: free homes, where the parents are not paid; work homes, where board and lodging are given in exchange for a return of services; boarding homes, where the foster parents are paid; and adoptive homes, where the placement will eventually lead to adoption (Chowdry, 1980).

Institutions.

As previously, children can be placed in a number of institutional settings including juvenile justice homes, children's homes, etc. Best practices consensus is that institutions are not the best environment to house and care for children. Some studies have found evidence that living in an institution retards the mental, physical, and emotional development of children (Eapen, 2009). Very few of these studies have

been conducted in India, but the studies that have been done agree with studies done in other countries. One thing that has been discovered about the Indian situation is that there are many children that are living in institutions that have siblings that have not been placed in institutions, while others have siblings living in different institutions. This has an effect on institutionalized children as well (Reddy, 1989). Based on these studies, the Indian government prefers to place children in adoptive homes, foster home, or cottage homes similar to SOS Children's Villages as opposed to institutional orphanages (Saraswathi, 1993). There are several SOS Children's Villages located in India. This is an international organization that creates communities to raise orphaned children. These communities are groups of cottages with housemothers. Children are assigned these mothers, along with any siblings (Chowdry, 1980). The mothers are able to give the children more individual attention than the staff of an orphanage would (Ministry of Social Welfare, 1981). The Indian government has encouraged organizations to use this model to care for orphaned children instead of placing the children in institutions (Saraswathi, 1993). This organization will be discussed in detail later.

Throughout the history of India, there have been different programs and traditions in place to care for orphans. This has been because of the different governments that have been running the country and because of the laws and regulations that are a part of the various religious groups in India. Several pieces of legislation were passed to create opportunities for the care of orphaned children. The British Colonial government passed the Guardian and Wards Act. The independent

Indian government passed the Hindu Adoptions and Maintenance Act and the Juvenile Justice Act. All of these acts have expanded the ability of the Indian population to adopt. There are other care opportunities for orphans, including foster care, sponsorship, and institutions. Foster care is used in India, but its use is minimal for cultural reasons. Institutions are not considered an ideal environment for children, so the Indian government encourages child welfare workers to place children in children's villages like SOS Children Village's instead.

Case Study

Two organizations will be discussed as a part of this case study. The first is Vatsalya, an Indian NGO that ran the children's village where I volunteered in the summer of 2008. Second is SOS Children's Villages, an international NGO that has over 2,000 children's villages in 132 countries (SOS Children's Villages International, 2010g). I became aware of SOS Children's Villages when I was studying abroad in Botswana in the summer of 2009, and I was assigned to a volunteer experience at the children's village in Gaborone. The system of care that these two organizations use is very similar. Vatsalya works on a grassroots level in one country, and SOS operates on an international scale, but the basics are essentially the same.

Vatsalya

Background.

In the summer of 2008, I went to India to volunteer at a children's village. The non-profit organization that ran the children's village was called Vatsalya, which means unconditional motherly love in Sanskrit. The main administrative offices for Vatsalya are based in Jaipur, Rajasthan (Vatsalya, 2009b). Vatsalya has many different programs in place that cover issues from caring for street children to empowering rural women (Vatsalya, 2009f) to an HIV education program for truck drivers (Vatsalya, 2009c). There are six total programs for children in the Jaipur area including education, health care, vocational training, and foster care programs for street children and the children's village where I worked (Vatsalya, 2009d). The Udayan, which means rising and moving ahead in Sanskrit, is the name of the

children's village where I stayed 24 hours a day, seven days a week during my time in India (Vatsalya, 2009a). This children's village was started in 2000 after a couple of years of planning, raising money, and building the necessary infrastructure (Vatsalya, 2001). During my stay, 55 children were housed at the Udayan, ranging in age from infants to seventeen, that were cared for by a several 'aunties' (auntie is a term of respect for an older woman in India), teachers, and administrative staff members.

This children's village started operations in 2000 with children that were living on the streets in the city of Jaipur (Vatsalya, 2001). Jaipur is a fairly large urban area, with a population of over 2.5 million. Most of the children who live at the Udayan are from this city or were found there (Vatsalya, 2010a). Some of the children at the Udayan are orphans, but others have parents, especially single mothers, that have given their children to the Udayan because they could not afford to take care of them. This is usually because their husbands have died, left, or been arrested and they do not have other relatives in the area that can help them care for their children. Many of these women are probably the first generation of their family to live in the city. Most of them were probably born in a village in rural Rajasthan or another province. Any family members that the mothers have living are still in the village and, therefore, cannot help them care for the children. So the mothers are left to fend for themselves, trying to earn enough money on their own to feed, cloth, and shelter themselves and their children.

According to tradition, if the mothers had stayed in their home villages, the joint family system would have taken care of this problem (Saraswathi and Kaur,

1993). Mothers, sisters, aunts, and in-laws of these women would have helped them take care of their children and fathers, brothers, uncles, and in-laws would provide the financial support. Because these women are in cities, separated from their family members and unable to afford to go back home, they have to make things work on their own. Eventually, they get to the point where they can't afford to take care of their children on their own anymore, and that is when they come to Vatsalya to take their children to live in the Udayan. These women have moved away from the traditional family unit and are unable to fall back on this family for support. This is something that is occurring in much of India, a move from the traditional joint family to the more modern nuclear family. Part of this is because of young people trying to be more modern and Western, and part of it is because of pure necessity. People have been forced to move from their childhood villages to the cities to find work as job opportunities in agriculture have decreased and positions in industry and the service sector have increased (Saraswathi and Kaur, 1993).

The Udayan itself is located just outside of the village of Achrol, which is about an hour northeast of Jaipur. It is a contained campus with the children's rooms, a school, a dining area, a small farm, a herd of cows, houses for some of the staff and teachers, a carpentry shop, a tailor's shop, administrative offices, a cottage for the volunteers, a playground, and a small infirmary. The staff includes an administrator, two aunties that care for the little children, several teachers, two cooks, two assistant cooks/bakers who used to be children of the Udayan, a cleaning auntie, a tailor, a carpenter, a farmer and herder, a part time doctor, a part time crafts and dance teacher,

and a part time psychologist. In addition to the paid staff are dozens of volunteers that come to the Udayan from around the world. Most of the children spend their entire day on the campus of the Udayan, eating, going to school, sleeping, and playing all at one location. A few children who are particularly academically inclined that attend a school in one of the larger towns nearby. There are four main sleeping buildings for the children divided up by their gender and age: one building for girls under eleven, another for boys under eleven, a third for girls over eleven, and a fourth for boys over eleven. There are two aunties, one of which stays in the younger girls' house and another that stays in the younger boys' house. One of the male teachers stays in the older boys' house at night (See Appendix D).

There was a general routine for every day at the Udayan. All of the children get out of bed around 6:30 a.m. and are at breakfast by 7 a.m. By around 7:30 a.m. the children are finished with breakfast and head to the basketball court to do their daily morning exercises and stretches. During this time, one of the students reads a couple of the headline articles from the day's newspaper aloud to the other children so that they can keep up with what is happening in the rest of India. Around 8 a.m. all of the children are in their classes. There is a preschool/kindergarten for all of the little children and classes of differing levels of difficulty for the older children (See Appendix D). Many of the children are not in the class that they should be based on their age because they were living on the street or in impoverished conditions, causing large gaps in their education. Therefore, it is impossible to define the grade levels based on the ages of the students (J.H. Gupta, personal communication, July 31,

2008). The children learn Hindi, English, math, science, and all the other subjects that are required by the Indian education system. There is a break from 10:30-11a.m. and school is over by 1 p.m. (See Appendix D).

After school, many of the children bathe before lunch is served at 1:30 p.m. The children are allowed free time indoors after dinner until 5 p.m. Everyone is supposed to stay indoors during this break because this is the hottest part of the day. Outside playtime is from 5 p.m. until dinner around 7:30 p.m. (See Appendix D). The children are required to do some form of active play during this time unless they are sick or injured because the Udayan places an emphasis on the importance of physical exercise (Vatsalya, 2009e). A physical education teacher teaches the children how to play several sports, including cricket and soccer. After dinner the children are to go back to their rooms to do their homework, read, play, and get ready for bed. On Wednesdays and Sundays school is not in session, so the children do homework, play, and do as they wish. On some of these days a dance and crafts teacher comes from the city to teach traditional Indian dance to any of the older children who wish to participate and traditional arts and crafts. Occasionally, the parents of some of the children will come and visit on these free days (See Appendix D).

Some of the older children over the age of fifteen do not go to school during the day and instead either help out with chores around the Udayan campus or receive training in a field that they wish to pursue as adults (Vatsalya, 2010e). These children are still enrolled in the Indian Open School system, where children can be educated at home by their parents or by local teachers or tutors in the evenings instead of attending

school during the regular school day (J.H. Gupta, personal communication, July 31, 2008). The teachers that live on the campus of the Udayan teach these older children during the afternoon break and in the evening after dinner. All of the older children are required by the Udayan to receive vocational training in two areas such as cooking, baking, housekeeping, carpentry, tailoring, dance, and farming. It is necessary for them to chose two so that if their first field of choice does not work out, then they have a back-up plan. The small number of children who have high academic ability are allowed and encouraged to continue their education with post-secondary opportunities like trade schools and university. However, because of the breaks in their education, most of the children do not have the education level to be able to qualify for these post-secondary educational opportunities (Vatsalya, 2010e).

Though the town is 3 or 4 km away, the children and staff members of the Udayan are still involved in the local village of Achrol. Many people in the community have donated money to the Udayan and many of them also invite small numbers of the children to come to their homes for dinners, parties, and religious services. Several of the temples, churches, and mosques in the area invite the children to attend services at their locations (See Appendix D). Vatsalya has a policy of not subscribing to one particular religion because many of children were orphaned at a very young age, making it difficult for the staff at the Udayan to determine what faith was practiced by the parents of the children. Also, since Vatsalya accepts any children who are in need of a home, there is no religious discrimination and the children are allowed and encouraged to continue to practice whatever religion they choose.

Because of this policy, the administrators of the Udayan accept invitations to attend religious ceremonies from all churches, mosques, temples, etc. in the area (Hitesh, 2008).

This practice allows the children to learn about all of the major religions of the region by participating in their services and seeing first hand the way that they worship (Hitesh, 2008). The staff determines which children attend which outings purely based on prior attendance. Because of this practice, children are not sent to only events of one particular religion but are sent to events of all religions. There are also several staff members at the Udayan, mainly teachers, who live in the village of Achrol; they encourage their friends and neighbors to help the children in any way that they can (See Appendix D). Because of all of these factors, the Udayan has not only created an internal community, but an external one as well. They are actively involved in the life of the village, and the village is actively involved in their lives as well. It is a symbiotic relationship.

History of the children.

The children at the Udayan are from a variety of situations. Some of them are orphans who have no parents or guardians and were trying to survive alone on the streets. According to Karnika, the Udayan psychologist, these children experience the most trouble adjusting to life at the Udayan. They have lived on the streets for years and have been forced to live through some difficult situations. Some, especially the boys, have become addicted to drugs. The most popular drug of choice of street children is sniffing a glue-like chemical. Some of the girls have been forced into

prostitution to survive. One little girl, who was about eight years old the summer I was at the Udayan, had a very sad story. She was orphaned when she was three years old and was forced to live on the streets. To survive, she sought protection from the male rickshaw drivers that slept on the streets between shifts. These men forced her to perform sexual favors for them in exchange for their protection. The Udayan took her in when she was seven. Thankfully, she had contracted no sexually transmitted diseases, but she was very psychologically damaged. She thought that if she behaved in a seductive way she would get whatever she wanted. This is a habit that the staff of the Udayan was still trying to break a year later (Karnika, personal communication, July 29, 2008).

Some have one parent who is still living, usually the mother, who cannot afford to care for her children on her own anymore and might have to resort to having her children work or beg to make ends meet (J.H. Gupta, personal communication, July 31, 2008). There was a set of three sisters at the Udayan with whom I became very close during my stay there. These girls had a mother and older brother that were still alive, but their mother could not afford to care for them and their brother barely made enough to support himself and his mother. As a result, the girls were taken to the Udayan. During school holidays, the girls returned home to visit their mother. They always came back different. Their mother tried to force them to beg while they were staying with her, which their brother did not approve of and discouraged. This led to many arguments between their mother and brother during their visits. The girls always came back to the Udayan with a different attitude than they had been when

they left. Generally, these sisters were very sweet and kind and were always smiling and happy. The middle sister in particular was incredibly happy and talkative, constantly smiling and telling stories. After they visited their mother, they were quiet, sad, and downtrodden. It would take weeks for them to return to their usual personalities. Vatsalya takes these children in to protect them from begging on the streets or working in factories and to keep them from falling in with the street gangs or children that would encourage negative behaviors such as drug use and/or drinking (Hitesh, 2008).

A few of the children have two parents who are still alive, but one of their parents is in jail or in some other situation where he/she cannot help care for his/her family and the other parent cannot manage alone. One set of brothers at the Udayan had a mother who had been forced to work to make ends meet because her husband had been imprisoned. It quickly became clear to her that she could not care for all of her children on her own, so she took them to the Udayan. The boys were allowed to go and visit her whenever they had a holiday, but they were not allowed to visit their father. Again, in these situations, the Udayan takes in the children to make sure that they don't get placed into worse situations. Usually the reason that parents cannot keep their children is because of money, but sometimes it is for other reasons like a new spouse not wanting children that are not biologically theirs' living in the home. If the parents can prove to Vatsalya that they have improved their situation, they are able to regain custody of their children. Whenever there are multiple siblings in a family, Vatsalya does its best to make sure that they have found and can take care of all of the

children in the family. Once at the Udayan, the children are encouraged to maintain their family ties with their biological siblings, but they are also encouraged to form familial relationships with the other children on the campus (J.H. Gupta, personal communication, July 31, 2008).

Most of the children who live at the Udayan have come from difficult circumstances. I do not know the story of every single child, but I know what happened to quite a few of them before they came to the Udayan (probably 75%), and that gives me a good idea of the kind of lives that they were leading before they were taken in by Vatsalya. Many of the children had been abused by someone in their family, such as one of their parents, an aunt, an uncle, or a grandparent. The abuse was verbal, physical, and sexual. Some of them decided to run away from home to escape the abuse and ended up at the Udayan; others were brought to the Udayan by their relatives, social workers, or police officers. Most of the children who ran away from home were taken in by street gangs of children that encouraged them to commit crimes, do drugs, drink alcohol, etc. Others were taken in by groups of adults who said they would care for the children and instead took advantage of them, taking all of the money that they earned, forcing them to perform acts against their will, and abusing them physically and sexually. Some of the children were orphaned and brought to the Udayan by their extended family members because they could not afford to care for the children. Still others have parents and were well taken care of at home, but their parents had to give their children up because they could not maintain the level of care that they wanted for their children (J.H. Gupta, personal

communication, July 31, 2008; Karnika, personal communication, July 29, 2008). These are the many different lives that the children at the Udayan lived before coming together as a community.

The children came to Vatsalya with many different problems, physical and mental. For this reason, a psychologist and a doctor are on staff. These medical professionals conduct an initial assessment of the mental and physical health of the children and plan the treatment of specific children accordingly. Many of the children are mentally scarred by their life experiences. Most have posttraumatic stress disorder, depression, and other psychological conditions that cause them to feel guilty and angry. Their psychological damage causes erratic behavior, making it difficult for some of them to interact with the other children normally, and distrustful of all adults, including the adult caretakers at the Udayan. Some of them come to the Udayan infected with diseases, some of them easy to cure, others not. These diseases can include anything from tuberculosis to simple infections to sexually transmitted infections. Others were addicted to some common drugs and/or alcohol that the children on the streets use to try and forget about their troubled lives and their pain. The medical doctor treats the physical problems and the psychologist treats the mental problems; the latter is usually more difficult to cure (Karnika, personal communication, July 29, 2008).

The Udayan tries to take in as many children as possible, even if the children are physically ill or have emotional problems. For example, one little boy that the Udayan took in had almost died of tuberculosis. His mother had been sick while she

was pregnant with him and he became infected in infancy. For the first couple of years of his life, he was completely bedridden, barely able to move. He did not learn how to walk until he was three years old, and he is very small for his age. He was almost five when I was there, and the two-year-old toddler was larger than him. After some time, he recovered and was able to play and run like any other five year old boy. However, they do not have the capacity to care for all children who are brought to them. There are not enough staff members trained in health care services for the Udayan to be able to take in children with serious physical or mental disabilities. The staff members don't have the time and training to provide the extent of care that a child with a serious disability would need in addition to doing their jobs. There have been a couple of occasions when the Udayan has received a child that at first appeared normal, and then a mental disability came to light that made it hard for the staff to care for the child and caused the child to experience conflict with the other children in the Udayan. In these situations the Udayan administrators have been forced to find some other site where those children can be cared for (J.H. Gupta, personal communication, July 31, 2008).

Observations.

I recorded observations of the relationships amongst the children and staff during my time at the Udayan. My observations supported the information provided by the staff in the interviews that I conducted. The children at the children's village were very close, treating each other like siblings. They protected each other, cared for each other, and occasionally fought like siblings (Karnika, personal communication,

July 29, 2008). For example, one day we went to a local goddess temple for a religious ceremony. All the way to the temple on the bus, one of the boys and one of the girls bickered, the boy claiming that the girl hit him, the girl saying she had done no such thing, etc. When we got to the temple, one of the local village children started teasing the little girl because she had short hair. All of the little girls at the Udayan had their hair cut short to prevent the spread of lice. I saw this and tried to intervene, but the boy that had been fighting with her on the bus got there first. He immediately started telling the village girl off for teasing "his sister," telling the girl that it did not matter that his sister had short hair, she was still prettier and smarter than any of the girls in the village. I later told the boy that this was not the most appropriate thing to say in this situation as it was rude and insulting, but the fact that he defended one of the girls from the Udayan and claimed her as his sister warmed my heart. I told him that in the future, he should find a less confrontational way to deal with these sorts of situations, but he should continue to defend his brothers and sisters.

Staff members acted as parental figures for the children: feeding, bathing, clothing, teaching, caring for, and advising them like parents would. Sometimes the children would get angry at the staff when they were given a direct command or were reprimanded. However, this is the same reaction that a child would have to his/her parents in a similar situation. In this situation, there are multiple adults that have authority over the children, making it slightly more complicated than dealing with two parents, but the authority structure at the Udayan is similar to a joint family.

During my time at the Udayan, we added a couple of children to our community (See Appendix D). When the children first arrived, they were usually very shy and wouldn't associate with the other children, or they were very angry, acting out and disturbing the other children and the staff. I was told about one little boy who was very angry, yelling at the staff and fighting with the children. He was also a kleptomaniac, stealing all of the staff member's cell phones and taking the keys to the Udayan's jeep and driving it into a hole in the dessert outside of the gates of the Udayan. This child had some other obvious signs of serious mental illness, including kleptomania, so Vatsalya had to take him to another facility that had the ability to care for him.

Many of the children had been through serious psychological trauma, which affected their behavior. After a couple of weeks living at the Udayan, they generally started socializing with the other children and staff more and were less likely to lose control of their emotions. The structure and consistency created by the Udayan helped these children find a new family and deal with their problems from their previous life (Karnika, personal communication, July 29, 2008). An example of this is one little boy was added to the Udayan family during my time there. He was nine years old, which is above the age that Vatsalya will generally accept boys. However, he had no signs of drug abuse or other problems that the staff usually had with older boys, so they took him in despite his age. For days, he did not speak to anyone, going about his days like a zombie. He would eat and sleep and go to school, but he would not communicate with anyone and would hardly look anyone in the face. After Karnika

spoke to him, she realized that he had been seriously abused, to the point that his mother had beaten him whenever he spoke in the house. His grandmother had brought him to Vatsalya for this reason. Now we realized why he would not speak; he was afraid that if he talked to anyone he would be punished. The staff tried to explain to him that this was not the case, but he still would not talk. Then, one day, one of the four-year-old girls walked up to him during their playtime. She took his hand and told him that she knew his voice had been scared away, but that it was okay for him to talk to her because she was too small to be frightening. He stared at her for a couple of minutes, and then he started to talk. A couple of days later, he was talking to everyone, raising his hand in class, smiling, laughing, and telling jokes. It seemed he just needed someone that was not in a position of authority to coax him out of his shell.

Interviews.

To gather more information about the children living at the Udayan and see if my observations were accurate, I interviewed the two cofounders of Vatsalya and the part time psychologist. Each of these people had his/her own area of expertise, and I tailored the questions for each interview to his/her knowledge. Hitesh, one of the cofounders, is knowledgeable about the specifics of the Juvenile Justice Act and the economics of running the children's village (H. Gupta, personal communication, July 28, 2008). Jaimala, the other cofounder, is familiar with the stories of the individual children and the day-to-day activities of running the children's village (J.H. Gupta, personal communication, July 31, 2008). Karnika, the staff psychologist, knows the

most about the specific traumas that affected the children when they were taken in by Vatsalya and how well the children had been progressing during their stay (Karnika, personal communication, July 29, 2008). Interestingly, even though these people were all asked different questions and their knowledge bases were different, similar themes arose in all of the interviews. I noticed these themes when I read the transcriptions of the interviews and used them as codes when analyzing the interviews through Atlas/ti. These codes included: background, children's problems, family, government, help the children, JJ Act/Homes, and model.

'Background' meant the background of the children at the children's village, what their families were like, how they had lived before getting to the Udayan, etc. This code appeared four times in the interviews with Jaimala and Karnika. I asked Karnika if there were differences between the behaviors and background of the children that had parents still living and the children that did not. She said that sometimes the children that had parents who were still alive could be more likely to misbehave because they knew they could always go back to their parents is they had too. Gender differences were also noted. Karnika said: "The male kids who have parents are more, you know, that can figure out and go ahead and become a little rebellious. While the girls I think are, in India the girls are always suppressed and oppressed, but out here we feel that because we have given them so much freedom and respect, that they are very happy here" (Karnika, personal communication, July 29, 2008). She went on to tell me that there had been a couple of boys with living parents that had tried to run away, but the girls never tried to run away. She hypothesized that

the reason for this was because the girls felt they had more support at the Udayan then they would at home.

When I asked Jaimala about the children's background, she gave me some general statistics:

> I would sat that about 60% of the children are orphaned, 50 to 60% are orphaned, about 20 to 30% are abandoned, meaning that their parents are either abusive or just don't care or they are so poor they have just left them on their own and the remaining 10 to 20% are children who have one of the parents, mostly mothers, single mother situations, where we came to know about them from the relatives around, or some of the children are even from the city, or their mother came and found us…and shared their story with us (J.H. Gupta, personal communication, July 31, 2008).

These statistics gave me a general idea of the children's background and the demographics at the Udayan. While about half of the children were orphaned, many of the children were not. The children with a living parent had the Udayan to provide the support and care that their parents could not. Knowing that some of the children still had living parents helped me to understand the children's emotions. Sometimes the children that still had parents would get upset and start calling for their mothers. During holidays, the orphaned children would look despondent and depressed because they knew that the other children were going to visit their parents. Being able to distinguish between these two groups of children helped me to know how to work with specific children. The children that had parents would occasionally try and use the fact that they had parents against us in arguments and claim that they could always leave and go back to their parents. Children that didn't have parents would get very upset when these comments were made because they felt these statements were caused

by an under appreciation of the Udayan and all they had done for all of the children that live there.

'Children's problems' referred to the specific psychological, physical, and emotional issues with which the children presented when they came to the Udayan. These problems were discussed four times during the interviews, and again, the code was used by Jaimala and Karnika. Jaimala used this code often when referring to how Vatsalya chose who was going to be accepted to stay at the Udayan. She told me that orphaned children were always accepted, no matter how many other children they had at the Udayan at the time. They always do background research to make sure that the children are actually orphans because some mothers have brought their own children pretending to be a distant relative and claiming that the child is orphaned. When a mother comes to Vatsalya with their children because they cannot afford to care for them, then Vatsalya generally takes the children.

There are some rules about children they cannot take. For example, boys over the age of eight are usually not accepted because they usually have developed some negative behaviors living on the streets that are difficult to break. If the child has a serious mental or physical disability, Vatsalya cannot take them because the staff of the Udayan does not have the training to care for such children. For example, children that are autistic or need to live in a wheelchair would not be accepted because the Udayan would not be able to accommodate their needs (J.H. Gupta, personal communication, July 31, 2008). When I asked Karnika about the psychological state of the children, she talked most about the children that had run away from home.

Karnika told me: “Most of them are psychologically distorted…And definitely a child is under a lot of psychological pressure because firstly, you do have a parent, you do have your other siblings, you’ve left them behind for something else. And you’ve run away, your parent’s don’t know where you are” (Karnika, personal communication, July 29, 2008).

The idea that the Udayan feels like a family environment for the children was marked with the code ‘family.’ Family was used as a code four times during Jaimala and Karnika’s interviews. Jaimala discussed the joint family system during her interview, discussing how the structure of the Udayan was based on this system. They set out with a specific goal of creating a family-like environment at the Udayan for the children. I had noticed that the children all treated each other like family. When I asked Jaimala if this behavior was enforced or occurred naturally, she said, “I think that it comes actually, like it is passed on from the elder children to the smaller ones, and they just see each other and that is just how the environment is created” (J.H. Gupta, personal communication, July 31, 2008). When I asked Karnika about the family feeling of the Udayan, she said, “we tell them, that you are to speak with the staff, they are like relatives at home who just guide you, tell you why you should do this and why not, and you have your siblings at home and these are your friends” (Karnika, personal communication, July 29, 2008).

When the code ‘government’ was used, the interviewees were referring to their belief that the government should be responsible for taking care of orphaned children, but was not doing so and the Udayan was filling this void. This code appeared seven

times in the interviews and was used by Hitesh and Jaimala. Hitesh discussed the fact that the Indian Constitution has certain protections for children and that India is a signatory of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, which also states specific rights that all children worldwide should have. He also said that he thought it should be the responsibility of the government to take care of orphaned, abandoned, and needy children. The JJ Act places much emphasis on dealing with children who have committed crimes. Hitesh stated, "But what about the children who, who are like, abandoned children, orphaned children, neglected children. There is nothing so far in the mind of the government that deals with this…the government must do something for these children. So I think a lot to do with that kind of emphasis and a little less with the group of children who have committed crimes" (H. Gupta, personal communication, July 28, 2008).

Jaimala discussed the very small amount of money that the government gives to organizations like the Udayan to help the organization care for the children. Each month the government will provide 675 rupees per child. This equals about $15 US per child per month. This is supposed to cover the cost of medicine, school, food, clothes, and anything else the children need. The Udayan spends approximately 2,800 rupees per child per month, or about $62 US. Their children get three simple meals a day, medical care, schooling, two school uniforms, two regular outfits, and a little bit of money is set aside for small entertainments like field trips. Because the amount of money from the government is so small and the process of getting it is so complicated,

the Udayan does not use any government funds to care for their children (J.H. Gupta, personal communication, July 31, 2008).

'Help the children' referred to the staff of the Udayan wanting to help the children heal from their previous experiences and find a future; this code was used three times by two of the interviewees, Jaimala and Karnika. Jaimala told me that the whole reason that she and Hitesh started the Udayan in the first place was because they wanted to help children. Previously, both of them had jobs in the health arena, but they felt they wanted to do more with their lives, so they started the Udayan. Karnika emphasized the importance of education for the children. She discussed the fact that most of the children did not have the academic ability to go to college, so the Udayan placed an emphasis on vocational training instead of increased schooling. Many of the children have had an inconsistent education because of their lives on the streets or parent's inability to afford to send them to school. Because of this, they do not have the necessary education level to attend college. Any child that wants to take college entrance exams is allowed, but most do not bother. She said that the Udayan cannot financially support the children after they turn 19 and move out of the Udayan and told me, "I think that has been told to them and that they have a sort of charge to decide about their futures and we ask them…what do you want to do and we are there to help and guide them" (Karnika, personal communication, July 29, 2008). The children know that they will be on their own once they reach adulthood, but that the staff at the Udayan will be available to help them develop the skills that they will need to succeed later in life.

Whenever the interviewees referred to the JJ Act or JJ Homes, I coded it as 'JJ Act/Homes.' Hitesh and Jaimala used the code JJ Act/Homes seven times during the interviews. Jaimala has written a book on the conditions of the JJ Homes. She went to many of the homes to observe the children and staff and interviewed children that were current and former residents of the JJ Homes. When I asked her to describe them, she said, "the biggest thing that you feel is the sense of total indifference and unaccountability is there. So even when they have resources, like the buildings are fine, they have resource but they are not utilized in a way that makes children feel warm, rooted, loved, cared for, and again, lots of things are done according to the books and rules" (J.H. Gupta, personal communication, July 31, 2008). Hitesh described to me the different parts of the JJ Act. He told me how it affected street children, abandoned children, orphaned children, neglected children, and children that had committed crimes. Also, how the Act had created ways for people and institutions to be approved by the government to take in and care for children without homes (H. Gupta, personal communication, July 28, 2008). There are many different rules involved in this Act, so his explanation provided me with a useful perspective. Although, I could read and analyze the law from the perspective of a helping professional, I did not have to work with the law regularly and I am not Indian. Hitesh is Indian and dealt with the law, so having his perspective was helpful.

The last code was 'model,' or the belief that the Udayan should serve as a model to other organizations and the government. Throughout the three interviews, the code 'model' was used three times. This is a subject that was brought up

independently by Hitesh during the interview, and something that I brought up with Jaimala because I thought it was an important point. Hitesh stated: "the thing is that Vatsalya can become a model institution, that is what our intention is, where other institutions, government institutions, and individuals can come and learn that there are different aspects of the child's life, the child's development is important, the child's protection is important, education is important, and all of these aspects" (H. Gupta, personal communication, July 28, 2008). Jaimala was a little more skeptical about the idea of other organizations and the country learning from them and using Vatsalya as an example, but she considered it as a possibility. She also said: "It takes one woman for somebody to, to decide something or to have an idea click and the, you know, just do it" (J.H. Gupta, personal communication, July 31, 2008). I thought this was interesting as well. It goes well with the idea that one person has the capability of changing the world. While Jaimala might not have changed the whole world, she has changed the world for the children that she has helped at the Udayan. As you can see, Jaimala talked about all of these areas about which I questioned the staff. Hitesh focused mainly on the legal and government aspects of the children's village, while Karnika focused on psychological problems of the children and their development and healing. This fits well with their jobs, as Hitesh is an administrator and Karnika is a psychologist.

Family at the Udayan.

The whole idea behind the Udayan is to create a family environment for the children. The point of the Udayan is not for the children to be adopted by new

families. Since many of the children still have parents, Vatsalya in only a temporary guardian and, therefore, cannot let the children be adopted. In fact, some of the children eventually are returned to their biological parents if the parents can prove that they have the monetary and emotional capability to care for their children. However, if abuse or neglect of any kind is confirmed, the children are not allowed to return to their parents (J.H. Gupta, personal communication, July 31, 2008). Even if the staff of the Udayan could give the children up for adoption, they wouldn't. The children form strong bonds with all of the other children as if those children were their siblings. They take care of each other, support each other, and treat each other as if they are their blood relatives. Also, the children consider the aunties and the teachers at the Udayan as their adult relatives, not necessarily parents, but aunts and uncles who are there to take care of them. The volunteers are like older siblings and friends who support and care for them and attend to their needs. One need that the volunteers can fill is physical affection. Some Indians do not believe in being overly affectionate with children. Volunteers are usually from the West, where the exact opposite idea is the norm (See Appendix D).

This is a similar idea to the joint family system in India, when many generations and branches of the same family live in the same household and all take care of each other. The children are taken in and cared for until they are nineteen at the Udayan, given training in a field in which they can develop a career, and released out into the community to find their way with support from the Udayan if needed. It is just like a regular family. This means that sometimes problems arise such as

arguments and disagreements. The Udayan staff considers these problems part of the natural course of life. All arguments and problems between different people in the Udayan are sorted out and resolved in similar ways that they would be in a family unit, through discussion and negotiation.

Effects of the Udayan.

Hitesh Gupta, one of the founders of Vatsalya and the Udayan, truly believes in the system that Vatsalya has set up to care for the children (H. Gupta, personal communication, July 28, 2008). Both Jaimala and Hitesh think that more citizens of India need to start taking responsibility for the children in need of care and protection in their country. Also, they think that the government needs to do more to provide for their future citizens (H. Gupta, personal communication, July 28, 2008; J.H. Gupta, personal communication, July 31, 2008). While the Juvenile Justice Act of 2000 creates systems to declare people and institutions fit to care for children in need of care and protection and provides for funding streams for these people and institutions, there is so much red tape and so many hoops to jump through that some organizations don't even bother to apply for funding from the government (H. Gupta, personal communication, July 28, 2008). The amount of money they would receive is so negligible that many don't bother (J.H. Gupta, personal communication, July 31, 2008). This is the situation in which Jaimala and Hitesh find themselves, but they still manage to provide adequate physical and emotional care for as many children as possible.

As noted earlier, Hitesh wants other organizations and the Indian government to use the Udayan as a model when creating new childcare programs (H. Gupta, personal communication, July 28, 2008). I agree that the Udayan should serve as a model, especially since many social workers agree that children should not be placed in institutions, which is the only alternative for many orphaned children in India. The Udayan provides the emotional and physical care that children really need in a situation that a family provides without the child being adopted. Since many of these children cannot be adopted because their parents are still alive and have not given up their right to guardianship, this is a much better situation for the children than being placed in an institutional orphanage or continuing to live in poverty with their parents, forced to beg or prostitute themselves.

During my time at the Udayan, I was told the stories of many of the children by the staff, other volunteers, and older children. These children had all had very difficult lives. Some of the girls had been living on the streets, trading sex with the rickshaw drivers and vendors for protection and safety. Many of them had been forced to bribe policemen not to arrest them for running away from home and living on the streets. A few of the children had been abused, usually by aunts and uncles that had taken them in after the death of his/her parents. Some of the children had a parent in jail, usually a father. The children who had living mothers that had been forced to give them up for economic reasons were allowed to visit the mothers during holidays. When the children came back from these visits, they always seemed different. They were greatly affected by seeing the situations that their mothers had to live in,

especially knowing that they were going to be able to leave and come back to the Udayan after a couple of days. It took weeks for the children to pull themselves out of the depression and sadness that enveloped them after trips home. Some were more affected than others and the older siblings generally tried to hide their emotions and be strong for their little brothers and sisters, but all of the children changed after trips home. Children without living family members were forlorn and lost whenever they were left at the Udayan while the other children went to visit their families. It was difficult to watch the children deal with such serious emotions after all that they had already been through.

Vatsalya is a grassroots organization, created by Indians for Indians. The married couple that founded the NGO were educated in the United States, but they were born and raised in India (H. Gupta, personal communication, July 29, 2008; J.H. Gupta, personal communication, July 31, 2008). They created the Udayan based on the values of Indian culture, including the joint family system. There have been many international volunteers and donors involved with the Udayan, but none of these people have influenced the way that the Udayan is organized or the philosophies on which it is based. Because of this, this organization had not been affected by globalization. It has maintained its connection to local culture and values. This makes the Udayan different from other childcare organizations in India that were founded by non-Indians, local branches that are a part of a larger international organization, or religious organizations and therefore function based on religious values instead of local cultural values.

SOS Children's Villages International

SOS Children's Villages International (or SOS-Kinderdorf International) was founded in 1949 in Austria by Hermann Gmeiner. Gmeiner created SOS to care for children who were orphaned after World War II (SOS Children's Villages International, 2010c). Since 1949, SOS has spread all over the world and now has a total of over 2,000 children's villages in 132 countries and territories. Each country creates a national association with its own Board of Directors and rules. These national associations are a part of the SOS umbrella organization and must follow all rules and standards set by the international organization (SOS Children's Villages International, 2010g). The organizational structure of SOS Children's Villages International includes a General Assembly, which consists of representatives from the national associations and partners, an International Senate, the Executive Committee of the Senate, a President, a Secretary General, and the General Secretariat. The offices of the Secretariat are located in Innsbruck, Austria (SOS Children's Villages International, 2010f).

All SOS villages are organized in the same basic way. Many individual homes make up the village. There are specially trained mothers that are in charge of each home (SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2004). These mothers are supposed to be between 25 and 40 and must be single, divorced, or widowed. In some countries the women are supposed to not have any children of their own, but each country can come up with its own, more specific regulations when choosing the mothers (SOS Children's Villages International, 2010h). Children are assigned to a house and a

mother for the entirety of their time in the village. Whenever there are multiple children from the same family, they are assigned to the same house and mother (SOS Children's Villages International, 2010b). In addition to the mothers, there are aunties, or mothers in training, that help the mothers care for the children. The mothers are given a stipend from the village and are responsible for buying groceries, clothing, and school supplies for their children. Children are sent to the schools in the local village or town so that they are integrated into the community. They are not to be completely isolated from the community in which the village is located (SOS Children's Villages International, 2010e). Many of the villages have preschools on site that accept students from the local community as well as children from the village. This associates the orphans at the children's village with other children their age (SOS Children's Villages International, 2010a).

The children who are placed at the village spend the rest of their childhood living there. When the children reach adolescence, they can either stay with their SOS family until they have gotten a job and made enough money to move out on their own, or they can move into the youth community (SOS Children's Villages International, 2010d).

Youth communities are places where young people that grew up in the children's village live while they are receiving job training (SOS-Kinderdorf International, 2004). Youth who choose to live in the youth community can still visit their SOS family whenever they want, just like any other young person (SOS Children's Villages International, 2010d). Once the youth have gotten a job and saved enough money to

become financially independent, they move out of the youth community and live on their own. Even at this point, many of the children maintain connections with the SOS village where they grew up. Some of them return to the village throughout their adulthood to visit their SOS mother, see the village, and show their families where they grew up. In some countries, there are associations of former SOS children that keep in touch with and support each other for years after they have left the village (SOS Children's Villages International, 2010i).

The children that live at SOS Children's Villages leave the villages to lead fairly successful lives. A study was conducted on the success of the children once they leave the village, and the results have been mostly positive. One study interviewed over one thousand former SOS children from twenty countries (Pittracher, Rudisch-Pfirtscheller, & Westreicher, 2004). The participants were asked questions about their marital status, number of children, career, housing, independence, life satisfaction, ability to integrate, and education level. A majority of the adults interviewed were married with children. Most had achieved at least a high school education and were able to find jobs after leaving the village. The participants were generally satisfied with their lives, housing situation, and jobs. Many of the participants stated that they considered the village that they grew up in their home and their SOS family their family. Some of the interviewees felt that they had not receive adequate support from SOS during their adolescence while transitioning from life in the village to life in the outside world, but others felt adequately supported. This

depended on the specific country and village in which the children had grown up (Pittracher, Rudisch-Pfurtscheller, & Westreicher, 2004).

Specifics about what children are taken in by the village, how much money is given for the care of each child, where the children go to school, how many houses will be a part of each village, etc. are up to each national association to decide. While these associations are a part of the international umbrella organizations, all decisions regarding the day-to-day administration of the villages are left to the national associations (SOS Children's Villages International, 2010g). SOS Children's Villages International helps each country create the initial structure for the national association and enforces certain international regulations on all of the associations, but most decisions are up to the association (SOS Children's Villages International, 2010f). This makes SOS less susceptible to the effects of globalization. Each national association can adjust the general structure of the children's villages to fit with the specific cultural values of its country. This means that a SOS Children's Village in India and one in Russia will not be exactly the same. There will be specific activities and rules that are based on the beliefs, values, and traditions of the country in which the village is located.

SOS in India.

SOS Children's Villages in India was founded in 1964. Hermann Gmeiner met Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, the first Prime Minister of India, in 1963. Nehru was impressed by the concept of SOS Children's Villages and created a committee to look into the possibility of creating and SOS national association in India. This committee

is still in existence and has been in charge of all SOS programming in India since it was created. The national association was founded in 1964 and the first village was built outside of Delhi. Throughout the political unrest and environment and natural disasters of the 1980s, 90s, and early 2000s, SOS Children's Villages was there to provide support to their communities and take in children that were orphaned by these disasters. Today, there are forty SOS Children's Villages with youth facilities and kindergartens in India, spread throughout the country. These include villages specifically for Tibetan children that are in exile in India (SOS Children's Villages International, 2010k). Mothers in Indian villages have to meet all of the criteria of the international organization and are required to "respect each child's family background, cultural roots, and religion" (SOS Children's Villages of India, 2010). This is because of all of the different religious and ethnic groups in India. The children at SOS are as diverse as the country itself. They will not necessarily always be placed with a mother who is of the same religion, ethnic group, or caste so the mothers must be accepting of children from all of these groups.

The Vatsalya Udayan and SOS Children's Villages are similar in many ways. The children placed with these organizations are given a place to live and grow up, a sort of replacement home. These children are not only provided with their physical needs, but their emotional needs as well. They are living with adult staff that serve at their parents and other children that they connect with like siblings. In both cases, the children are kept with their biological siblings, but are still encouraged to develop relationships with the other children as well. There are some differences between the

two organizations. SOS Children's Villages are organized into many small houses, each with a mother and several children that live like an independent family. At the Vatsalya Udayan, the children are placed in homes based on their age and gender. However, the Udayan has fewer children to take care of and a smaller staff, so they can't divide the children up the way that SOS Children's Villages does. Despite these differences, both organizations provide the children with a safe, supportive environment where orphaned, abandoned, and neglected children can grow up. Both of these organizations are effective and provide the children in their care with the support and love that they need. Because of this, they should be used as a model for other childcare organizations in India and, with proper evaluation, throughout the world.

Conclusion

Analysis and Discussion

India has had a long, complex history. Many different governments have controlled the country, each with its own beliefs and ideals that have lead to very different policies and practices (Guha, 2003; Harrison, 1980; Hasan, 1985; Metcalf, 2006). The traditional ways to care for orphans and legislation passed to create programs for orphans are examples of the differences amongst these regimes. Ancient Indians adopted sons to fulfill the traditional and religious duties of a son in Hinduism. A couple could only adopt a boy if they had no sons, grandsons, or great-grandsons living to perform these rituals. These adoptions benefitted the parents but were not necessarily in the best interest of the children. Couples were not allowed to adopt female children at all (Bhargava, 2005; Buhler, 1971; Gopalkrishnan, 1994; Kulkarni, 1976; Metcalf, 2006; Ursekar, 1976). When the Muslim city-based sultans and Mughal Emperors ruled the country, they allowed the Hindu population to continue their traditional adoptions. Muslims are technically not supposed to adopt according to the Qur'an, so generally Muslims in India did not adopt children. They could be guardians of children and any property that belonged to those children, but not adopt. However, the Qur'an does state that Muslims have a religious duty to help orphans whenever they can, so it can be hypothesized that Indian Muslims did something to address the needs of orphans during this time period (Abdel Haleem, 2005; Fernea, 1995; Richards, 1993).

Under British colonial rule, Hindu's were allowed to continue their religious adoptions. The British also passed the Guardian and Wards Act, a law that allowed legal guardianship of children and their property, but not legal adoption (Bhargava, 2005; British Colonial Government of India, 1890; Mitra, 1969). This law was based on similar legislation and programs in place in England during the same time period (Horn, 1996; Laslett, 1977; Rose, 1991). After independence, the Indian Parliament passed the Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act of 1956 that allowed all Hindus (which includes Buddhism, Jainism, and Sikhism, all of which branched out of Hinduism) to adopt but not non-Hindus (Government of India, 1960; Malik, 1970; Parliament of India, 1956). There were attempts to pass countrywide adoption laws, but each time a bill was proposed to Parliament, a minority group would protest, claiming that these laws violated their personal and religious laws (Baig, 1976). Non-Hindus were not allowed to legally adopt until the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act was passed in 2000 (Ministry of Law, Justice, and Company Affairs, 2000).

The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act of 2000 technically allows anyone to legally adopt. However, the rules are complicated. There is a section of the legislation that discusses the rehabilitation and socialization of children who have committed crimes. One of the methods that can be used to rehabilitate children who are orphaned or have to be permanently removed from their homes is to allow them to be adopted. According to the law, adoption is the best way to

rehabilitate children who have committed crimes. Adoption is only described in the law in this capacity as a rehabilitation tool.

However, the adoption regulations in the JJ Act are written in such a vague and ambiguous way that the Central Adoption Resource Agency uses the JJ Act, 2000 as a general adoption regulation. Because of the ambiguity inherent in the law, all people in India of all religious groups have started adopting. This was not an intention of the law, it is just something that occurred spontaneously. Also, since the adoption regulations were presented as a rehabilitation strategy, it was harder for non-Hindu minorities to protest the law as a violation of their rights to religious and personal freedoms. Basically, the government included adoption regulations as a part of a fairly popular piece of juvenile justice legislation (Chaturvedi, 2008; Ganesan, 1996; Kethineni, 2000; Ministry of Law, Justice, and Company Affair, 2000; Rickard, 2008; Shanmugavelayutham, 2002).

Other bureaucratic issues make the adoption process even more complicated. Many children born in India do not receive legal birth certificates because they are not registered at birth. This means that legally, these children do not exist. Adopting a child that doesn't legally exist is a complex process. In addition to this, many orphaned children were abandoned by their parents without any contact information. These parents did not fill out relinquishment forms, so they are technically still the legal guardians of their children. Children cannot be adopted without a relinquishment form. It is possible for a committee to grant a relinquishment for a child, but this is a very complicated and bureaucratic process. Unfortunately, due to the highly

bureaucratic and sometimes corrupt nature of the Indian government, especially in more rural areas, this process is either impossible or requires bribes to the correct committee members (Seale, 2010).

One childcare program popular in the United States is foster care. This program may work with children and families in the United States and Europe, it does not work well in India. Indians do not have the cultural history of taking in children that are not a part of their extended family. When a child is going to be adopted, taking in a child from outside of the family is acceptable, but when the situation is temporary, as is the case with foster care, it is not a sustainable solution. Factors specific to India make foster care an inappropriate option. First, although technically the caste system is outlawed, there are people who still maintain prejudice based on caste. People with these beliefs are not willing to take in a child whose caste they don't know or that is from a lower caste. Also, traditionally there are biases against having children out of wedlock. Many orphans and abandoned children are the product of single mothers. Therefore, some people will not be willing to take in these children because they consider the children's background questionable. The last problem is that parents that take in children want to be able to adopt the children eventually. They do not want children that they will only care for temporarily. When parents with this mindset are willing to become foster parents, they generally choose very young children that they can bring up in whatever way they see fit and feel comfortable adopting eventually. All of these issues make using foster care as a

childcare program in India untenable (Chowdry, 1980; Khan, 1991; Kulkarni, 1976; Ministry of Social Welfare, 1981; Modak, 1976; Saraswathi, 1993).

The case studies of Vatsalya and SOS Children's Villages International both demonstrate the globalization and family systems theories presented earlier. Vatsalya uses a system of care for the children that mirror the traditional joint family system of India. The children that are taken in by Vatsalya are encouraged to consider the staff and other children at the Udayan as their family members. Vatsalya was not just a temporary way station for the children between leaving their biological families or being removed from the streets and being adopted. Children taken in by Vatsalya stayed there until age nineteen or, in the case where they still had living parents, their parents could afford to care for them again. Creating a new family in which the children could grow, learn, and heal from the traumas of their previous lives was the primary concern for the staff of the Udayan. Vatsalya provides an education, vocational training, and money to get on their feet in adulthood just like a family would. In addition to this, the Udayan is always there for the children to go back to and visit if they feel a need to stay connected to their Udayan family (Vatsalya, 2009a; Vatsalya, 2009b; Vatsalya, 2009e).

The goal of Vatsalya is to create a familial environment for the children. Some might say that this is an ideal that cannot be accomplished. My findings indicate otherwise. Based on my observations of the children and staff at the Udayan during my stay there, I believe that they truly created a family for the children there. The children all played, talked, and occasionally fought like biological siblings would.

The aunties and other staff treated the children like they were their own blood, caring for them when they were sick, teaching them everything that they know, and telling them the appropriate way to behave. International volunteers were like older brothers and sisters, and the children referred to them as such. All of the volunteers at the Udayan during my stay were female, and all of us were referred to as "didi" or big sister (see Appendix D). The children accepted us from the moment they saw us. I will never forget, my first day at the Udayan, I was walking to breakfast, and one of the littlest children, a five year old boy, ran up to me and took my hand, chatting with me in Hindi like we had known each other our entire lives. This feeling of welcome was extended to everyone that walked through the gates of the Udayan. I have not found any other studies about this organization or a model similar to the model used by the Udayan and no information about negative aspects of this model.

There were several new children that came to the Udayan while I was there, and each of them was welcomed with open arms. They were included in games and classroom conversations from the very first day. The other children made sure that these new members of the family got their fair share of food at the meals and understood that they were allowed to eat until they were full. New children were made to understand that they had the right to the clothing, food, toys, and books that they were given on their arrival. Many of the new children were shy and unsure, but once they saw how open the other children were, they started to come out of their shells, and after a week or two, they were playing and laughing just like the other children. They soon came to believe that they had a right to a happy life, just like all

other children (Vatsalya, 2009a; Vatsalya, 2009b; Vatsalya, 2009e; see Appendix D). This is the way that a family should be, and this is what Vatsalya created. Obviously there are problems with the organization. No organization is perfect. It would be ideal that the children be raised in their biological families, but as this is impossible for the children at the orphanage, the environment of the Udayan is an effective alternative.

SOS Children's Villages International uses a similar structure as Vatsalya to care for the orphans that they take in. The focus is more on a nuclear family structure than on a joint family, but that is appropriate since most of the countries in which SOS operates do not have a tradition of joint families. There is a general structure that all SOS Children's Villages are supposed to follow, but the specifics of who is selected to become a mother, which children are allowed to live at the village, and what mother the children are assigned to are made by the local village and the national association of the country in which the village is located. In other words, policies and practices regarding the eligibility of children, qualifications for staff positions, and rules for the treatment of children are left up the national associations and local villages. Because these decisions are left to the national association to make and, therefore, can be adapted to the specific culture of each country with SOS Children's Villages, the potential problems of globalization is not relevant in this situation (SOS Children's Villages International, 2010a; SOS Children's Villages International, 2010b; SOS Children's Villages International, 2010e).

If SOS mandated more regulations about the day-to-day decisions related to the administration of the villages, the regulations would be less likely to be compatible with the culture of the countries where villages are located. A homogenization of the structure of the villages would occur, making the villages unable to adapt to the culture of the communities surrounding them. However, the lack of specific regulations and the allowance for each village to be relatively autonomous counterbalances this potential homogenization. Because the headquarters of SOS are located in a European country, the villages would likely become based on the ideologies of the Western world, creating the Westernization that opponents of globalization fear. It is positive that SOS has managed to overcome this problem and allow the villages to remain connected to the organization and yet autonomous at the same time. I saw this village autonomy first hand while volunteering at the SOS Children's Village in Gaborone, Botswana. The HIV epidemic has severely affected Botswana. Because of this, many of the children at the SOS Village in Gaborone had been orphaned due to HIV and some of these children have been infected with the disease. The care of HIV-infected children is very difficult, but this village faced the challenge head on and took in as many of these HIV orphans as possible. I believe this shows the ability of the village to make their own decisions.

The concern addressed earlier regarding accountability of an INGO to the donors or the people that they serve might be relevant in this situation. SOS works with many corporate partners, some of which provide funds to the organization as a whole and others that sponsor specific projects, programs, or villages. If there are

specific goals that the corporate partners would like to see accomplished that the organization does not think would be appropriate then this could create complications that can impede program development. However, my observations indicate that because SOS has long-standing relationships with their corporate partners, this is not an issue for this organization (SOS Children's Villages International, 2010j). Evidently, as long as the children are being cared for in a safe, supportive environment, the donors and sponsors of SOS Children's Villages International are satisfied that their money is going towards a good cause. This means that SOS as an organization does not have to chose between their financial support and serving the children in the best way possible. They can put the children first in all situations without being concerned with losing their economic support. This not only speaks to the effectiveness of SOS and it programs, but also the flexibility and trust of the donors and sponsors. No matter how successful a program is, if the donors and sponsors don't trust the administrators to make sure the program is as effective as possible, they will cease donations and support.

Recommendations

Based on the research that I conducted for this thesis project, I developed several recommendations for social workers that work in the arena of international social work, specifically with children. The Vatsalya Udayan uses a system of care based on Indian beliefs and values and on the Hindu joint family system that is unique to India. Because of this, the Udayan is perfectly suited to care for orphans in India. It is also an effective system of care, not only for orphaned children, but abandoned

and neglected children as well. Orphaned and neglected children were given a loving, very large family and a stable place to live where they grow up and become productive members of society. Children that had to be abandoned by their parents for economic or other reasons were given a safe and secure home that could be permanent or temporary depending on the needs of the child and the parents. The children could spend the rest of their lives at the Udayan if they needed to or they could be returned to their parents once the parents were in a position to reclaim their children. Because of this, I believe that the Udayan is a model that should be used by other childcare organizations throughout India.

Obviously there are limitations to my study. I have not worked at other programs in India that work with a different structure or model, so there could be other effective models already in existence in India. Also, I was only living at the Udayan for three months. This gave me time to understand how the Udayan works and the structures that they utilize, but not the time that I would have liked to delve into the situations of the children once they have left the Udayan. Indeed, the organization was so young that they had only graduated a couple of children by 2008 and those children had all gone on to work for the Udayan. However, because the Udayan has such a similar structure to SOS Children's Villages International, which has been in existence for decades and has proven its effectiveness, I propose that the Udayan will prove itself to be quite effective in the future.

SOS Children's Villages uses a fairly similar structure as Vatsalya, with the one difference that they place the children into individual homes with others and

siblings instead of living in homes based on their age and gender. This means that the children are placed into one of a group of small, nuclear family homes within the larger village. However, all of the children in the village play together, go to school together, and live like a large family network even if they all stay in separate houses. All of the children in the village are there to support and help each other. In my opinion, this is the best combination of nuclear and joint family systems. The children get the support of the other children and adults that live in the village, but they get to go home to their own SOS mother every night. In many ways, this reminds me of the old saying it takes a village to raise a child. SOS Children's Villages has already proven that it has the adaptability and capacity to function in many different countries. Over sixty-two years of existence, this organization has proved itself to be effective at raising children to be contributing member of society and has made it possible for children in over one hundred countries to grow up in a family that supports and cares for them. Other organizations and governments could use this organization as a model to care for orphans worldwide. Again, SOS is not a perfect organization. It cannot take in all of the orphaned children in the world and there are only so many women that would be willing to work for the organization as mothers, but on the whole, it has demonstrated itself very effective.

Because I am not an Indian and do not work professionally in the Indian context, I feel like it would not be appropriate for me to make suggestions for future policies, but there are certain changes that I think must be made. The policy that children not be adopted abroad until all efforts have been made to have them adopted

in India has been abused by certain agencies. These agencies simply keep children in institutions until they can claim that all efforts have been made and then send the children abroad to be adopted by foreigners. This is detrimental to the children because it means that they must stay in institutions for much longer than is necessary. Also, more efforts should be made to provide children with birth certificates. Living in this modern age without a birth certificate makes it very difficult for children to be productive members of society. Not only can they not be adopted, they cannot apply for a passport, a driver's license, or any other form of identification.

Future research should be conducted on other programs in India that are working with orphans. It would be interesting to see whether there are other grassroots organizations that are developing unique and effective ways to care for orphans. Also, I think it would be a valuable exercise for social workers to conduct similar studies into the development of child welfare programs in other "third world" countries. Western social workers and policy makers might be able to learn other effective practices from these studies. It could also prove helpful for Western social workers that are working with immigrant families to understand the child welfare systems that these immigrants are accustomed to. Social workers in the field of international adoption could also gain helpful information from these studies, as adoption laws in foreign countries have an effect on Westerners' ability to adopt.

I learned quite a bit about the idea of cultural competence in social work whilst working abroad, and I have developed some suggestions for social work best practices while working internationally. The first thing I would suggest to social workers is that

they do their research before beginning their work. To be competent, a social worker needs to know the history of the country and the different programs that have been developed for the population on which the social worker will be focusing. This will show the worker what has and hasn't worked in the past and can guide them in their development of new programs. Also, the worker needs to be aware of the specific values, beliefs, and customs of the culture in which he/she is working (Lum, 1999). For example, an American social worker in India might think that using foster care would be a good idea because it works in the United States, but because certain elements of Indian culture, a foster care program will not be a good idea in the Indian context.

International social workers also need to learn from other organizations, local and international (Healy, 2001). Grassroots organizations that have been created by members of the local population for their own people, like Vatsalya, should be given careful consideration by foreign social workers. The social worker might not agree with the way that the program is administrated and organized, but these programs have been developed to work within that specific cultural context and there is an opportunity to learn from these organizations. Also, I think that social workers can learn from successful international organizations. Most of these organizations are successful for a reason. SOS Children's Villages International works in a large number of countries in such an efficient way because they allow each country to edit and modify the general structure of the organization to fit within the local culture. Other successful international non-governmental organizations work well on this large

scale for a reason, and if a social worker is trying to develop a similar organization, he/she can learn from these preexisting programs. There is no reason to reinvent the wheel.

Social workers also must be careful of their personal biases and opinions when they begin work in foreign countries (Clifford & Burke, 2007). Social workers must not come into a new environment thinking that they know everything and they are going to fix all of the problems in their new community. Just because programs or interventions have been successful in other situations and communities does not mean that they will have the same results everywhere. Foster care is a reasonable childcare program in the United States, but because of differences of culture and religion, foster care is not a viable solution for orphans in India. I believe Shelley Seale articulated this idea best:

> Us outsiders, the humanitarian agencies and foreign aid programs, will always fall short in one important way. We do not and cannot know what is best for India. It is not a matter for us to come and instruct or order; for efforts undertaken in that way, no matter how well intentioned, will always fall in their arrogance. Foreigners rarely fully understand the society the think to 'improve,' and the potential for imposing their own cultural bias can result in negative consequences for those whose lives they seek to change. We should come to listen, to learn, to assist where and when asked (Seale, 2010, pp. viii-ix).

A social worker that is new to a country, no matter how much previous research he/she has done, cannot fully understand all of the aspects of that country's cultural, social, political, and economic structures. There are some parts of Indian culture that have been changed since globalization has started to connect the world but many elements of Indian culture have stayed the same, even in recent decades. I have done

research on India throughout my college education, and there is still much for me to learn. After traveling there and living with the people of India, I realized how little all of my university classes had truly prepared me. It would take years of living in India to even begin to understand the country, and then I would only be able to completely comprehend the small part of the country in which I was living.

Social workers are not the only ones that need to be careful about making decisions based on a small amount of information about a country. All Americans, especially policy-makers, must be culturally competent and aware of this as well. In a speech about Vietnam in 1967, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. said:

> The Western arrogance of feeling that it has everything to teach others and nothing to learn from them is not just. This call for a worldwide fellowship that lifts neighborly concern beyond one's tribe, race, class, and nation is in reality a call for an all-embracing and unconditional love for all mankind (King, Jr., 1974).

These words are even more relevant today than they were forty-four years ago. In a world where people on opposite sides of the world can communicate in seconds through the Internet, the Earth seems to be getting smaller. We are all becoming more interconnected and informed of the problems of others. It is becoming more and more difficult to ignore the suffering of millions of human beings all over the world. Millions of people volunteer abroad each year, trying to do something good for the world. While these people are well meaning, it is important that they do not travel the world with the mindset that they are going to fix all of the world's problems because they know best. Nothing will be accomplished with this mindset. We must all

communicate and learn from each other if are going to make a real concerted effort at making the world a better place.

References

Abdel Haleem, M.A.S., translator (2005). *The Qur'an*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ackerman, N.J. (1984). *A theory of family systems*. New York: Gardner Press, Inc.

Alphonse, M., George, P. & Moffatt, K. (2008). Redefining social work standards in the context of globalization: Lessons from India. *International Social Work, 51*(2), 145-158.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Baig, T. A. & Gopinath, C. (July 1976). Adoption – The Indian scene. *The Indian Journal of Social Work*, *37*(2), 135-140.

Balasubramanyam, V.N. (1984). *Economy of India*. London: George Weidenfeld and Nicolson, Ltd.

Becvar, R. J. & Becvar, D. S. (1982). *Systems theory and family therapy: A Primer*. Lanham: University Press of America.

Bhakhry, S. (2006). *Children in India and their rights*. New Delhi: National Human Rights Commission.

Bhargava, V. (2005). *Adoption in India: Policies and experiences*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Brilliant, E. L. (1997). Nonprofit organizations, social policy, and public welfare. In Reisch, M. & Gambrill, E. (Eds.), *Social work in the 21st century* (68-79). London: Pine Forge Press.

British Colonial Government of India. (1890). *Guardian and Wards Act, 1890*. New Delhi, India.

Broderick, C. B. (1993). *Understanding family process: Basics of family systems theory*. London: Sage Publications.

Buhler, G. (1971). *The laws of manu*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsiass.

Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs. (2010, July 14). Background note: India. *U.S. Department of State.* Retrieved from http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/3454.htm# on April 6, 2011.

Census Commission of India. (2001). Table – 3: Population, population in the age group 0-6 and literates by sex – Cities/Towns (in alphabetic order): 2001. *Census of India 2001*. Retrieved from http://web.archive.org/web/20040616075334/http://www.censusindia.net/results/town.php?stad=A&state5=999

Central Adoption Resource Authority. (2011a). *About us*. Retrieved from http://www.adoptionindia.nic.in/about_us.htm

Central Adoption Resource Authority. (2011b). *Database*. Retrieved from http://www.adoptionindia.nic.in/database.htm

CIA. (2011). India. *The world factbook.* Retrieved from https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/in.html

Chambers, D. E. (2000). *Social policy and social programs: A method for the practical public policy analyst*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Chatterjee, B. & Srivastava, R. G. (1975). *Perspectives on the child in India*. New Delhi: Central Institute of Research & Training in Public Cooperation.

Chaturvedi, T. (2008). Juvenile justice system: India's contributions. *Vidhigya: The Journal of Legal Awareness, 3*(2), 51-58.

Chauhan, R. (2001). Joint family in a changing society: A case study of Himachal Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Social Work, 64*(4), 573-583.

Chowdry, D. P. (1980). *Child welfare and development*. Delhi: Atma Ram.

Clifford, D. & Burke, B. (2007). "Competence in social work ethics." In O'Hagan, K. (Ed.) *Competence in social work practice: A practical guide for students and professionals*. 2nd ed. (75-93). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Clothey, F. (2006). *Religion in India: A historical introduction*. London: Routledge.

Cooper, F. (2002). *Africa since 1940: The past of the present*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cottrell, A.B. (May, 1975). Outsiders' inside view: Western wives' experiences in Indian joint families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family,* 400-407.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.

Damania, D. (1998). *Counselling for adoption: The setting up of an Indian adoption programme*. Mumbai: Tata Institute of Social Sciences.

D'Cruz, P. & Bharat, S. (2001). Beyond joint and nuclear: The Indian family revisited. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 32*, 167-194.

Depelchin, J. (2005). *Silences in African history: Between the syndromes of discovery and abolition*. Dar Es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers.

Deshpande, A. (2008). Caste and diversity in India. In Davis, J. B. & Dolfsma, W. (Eds.), *The Elgar companion to social economics* (171-187). Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.

Diwan, P. (1993). *Joint family system, debts, gifts, maintenance, damdupat, benami transaction, and pre-emption*. Allahabad: Wadhwa & Co.

Eapen, D. (2009). Institutionalized children, the underprivileged. *International Journal of Nursing Practice, 15*, 349-352.

Edwards, M. & Gaventa, J., Eds. (2001). *Global citizen action*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Fernea, E.W., Ed. (1995). *Children in the Muslim Middle East*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Friese, S. (2004). *ATLAS.ti user's guide*. Berlin: Thomas Muhr, ATLAS.ti Scientific Software Development.

Gadgil, S. (Jan-March & April-June, 1998). ICCW – In the service of children. *ICCW Journal*, 27-34.

Ganesan, A. (1996). *Police abuse and killings of street children in India*. New York: Human Rights Watch.

Gil, D. G. (1981). *Unraveling social policy: Theory, analysis, and political action towards social equality*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Schenkman Books, Inc.

Gilbert, N, & Terrell, P. (2010). *Dimensions of social welfare policy*. 7th ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Gopalkrishnan, T. P. revised by Pant, P. C. (1994). *T.P. Gopalkrishnan's the Hindu Adoptions and Maintenance Act, 1956*. 4th ed. Allahabad: Law Book Co.

Government of India. (1960). *The Hindu Adoptions and Maintenance Act 1956 (Act 78 of 1956)*. Hydrabad: Andhra Law Times.

Gravetter, F. J. & Forzano, L. B. (2006). *Research methods for the behavioral sciences*. Belmont: Thomson Wadsworth.

Groza, V., Kalyanvala, R., & Kendra, B. S. S. (January 2003). Indian families adopting Indian children. *The Indian Journal of Social Work, 64*(1), 93-112.

Guha, R. (2003). *India after Gandhi: The history of the world's largest democracy*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Guha, S. (1999). *Environment & ethnicity in India 1200-1991*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gupta, A. (2001). Governing populations: the integrated development services program in India. In Hansen, T. B. & Stepputat, F. (Eds.), *Ethnographic explorations of the postcolonial state* (65-96). Durham: Duke University Press.

Gupte, S. V. (1970). *Hindu law of adoption, maintenance, minority and guardianship*. Bombay: N. M. Tripathi.

Hargrave, Jr., R. L. & Kochanek, S. A. (2008). *India: Government and politics in a developing nation*. 7th ed. Boston: Thomson Learning, Inc.

Harrison, J. (1980). *Akbar and the Mughal Empire*. St. Paul: Greenhaven Press, Inc.

Hasan, M. (1985). *Babur, founder of the Mughal Empire in India*. New Delhi: Manohar.

Healy, L. M. (2001). *International social work: Professional action in an interdependent world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hitesh, J. (2008). *Eighteen million question marks!: The street children of India.* Jaipur: Vatsalya.

Hoole, C. (Jan 2002). Redeeming the South Asian family: Mission as extending the household of God. *Transformation, 19*(1), 37-41.

Horn, P. (1997). *The Victorian town child*. New York: New York University Press.

Jain, R. B. (2000). *Command economy to market economy: Restructuring and transformation*. New Delhi: Deep & Deep Publications.

Jaitley, A. (Jan-March & April-June 1998). Promotion and protection of rights of the child. *ICCW Journal*, 35-49.

Jamuna, D. (2003). Issues of elder care and elder abuse in the Indian context. *Journal of Aging and Social Policy, 15*(2-3), 125-142.

Jannuzi, F. T. (1989). *India in transition: Issues of political economy in a plural society*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Jithoo, S. (1991). Indians in South Africa: Tradition vs. westernization. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 22*(3), 343-357.

Jorgensen, D. (1989). *Participant observation: A methodology for human studies*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.

Kamat, S. (2002). *Development hegemony: NGOs and the state in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Kapil, U. (July 2002). Integrated child development services (ICDS) scheme: A program for holistic development of children in India. *The Indian Journal of Pediatrics 69*(7), 597-601.

Karger, H. J. & Stoesz, D. (2006). *American social welfare policy: A pluralistic approach*. 5th ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Kedourie, E. (1978). *England and the Middle East: the destruction of the Ottoman Empire, 1914-1921*. Hassocks: Harvester Press.

Khan, M. B. A. (March-April, 1991). The foster care system in India. *Child Welfare, 70*(2), 243-259.

Khanna, R. ed. (1971). *Public sector in India: Ailments and remedies*. New Delhi: Institute for Socialist Education.

Khatri, A. A. (August 1975). The adaptive extended family in Indian today. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 633-642.

Khuda, B. E. (1985). The nuclearization of joint family households in a rural area of Bangladesh. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 16*(3), 387-400.

King, Jr., M. L. (August 1974). Beyond Vietnam – A time to break silence. New York, Clergy and Laity Concerned [Meeting]. Riverside Church, New York City. 4 April, 1967.

Krishnamurthy, K. G. (Jan-June, 1994). The child in India's development plans. *ICCW Journal*, 3-14.

Kulkarni, A. (July, 1976). Adoption and foster care – Domestic and international. *The Indian Journal of Social Work*, *37*(2), 165-170.

Lamb, S. (2000). *White saris and sweet mangoes: Aging, gender, and body in North India*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lane-Poole, S. (1964). *Aurangzib and the decay of the Mughal Empire*. Delhi: S. Chand.

Laslett, P. (1977). *Family life and illicit love in earlier generations: Essays in historical sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The Linguist List: International Linguistics Community Online. (n.d.). List of extinct languages. *The Linguist List: International Linguistics Community Online*. Eastern Michigan University. Retrieved from http://linguistlist.org/forms/langs/get-extinct.cfm on May 2, 2011.

Lum, D. (1999). *Culturally competent practice: A framework for growth and action*. Pacific Grave: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Malik, B, Ed. (1970). *Commentaries on Hindu Adoptions and Maintenance Act, 1956 (Act No. 78 of 1956)*. Allahabad: Law Publishers.

Mathur, V. (2004). *Disinvestment of public sector enterprises in India: Policies and challenges*. Delhi: New Century Publications.

Mayadas, N. S. & Elliott, D. (1997). Lessons from international social work: Policies and practices. In Reisch, M. & Gambrill, E. (Eds.), *Social work in the 21st century* (175-185). London: Pine Forge Press.

Metcalf, B. D. & Metcalf, T. R. (2006). *A concise history of modern India*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Midgley, J. (1997). Social work in international context: Challenges and opportunities for the 21st century. In Reisch, M. & Gambrill, E. (Eds.), *Social work in the 21st century* (59-67). London: Pine Forge Press.

Ministry of Law and Justice. (1986). *The Juvenile Justice Act, 1986*. (Act No. 53 of 1986). New Delhi: The Gazette of India.

Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs. (2000). *The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000*. (Act No. 56 of 2000). New Delhi: The Gazette of India.

Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs. (2006). *The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Amendment Act, 2006*. (Act No. 33 of 2006). New Delhi: The Gazette of India.

Ministry of Social Welfare. (1981). *Profile of the child in India: Policies and programmes*. New Delhi: Ministry of Social Welfare, Government of India.

Ministry of Women and Child Development. (2006). *India: Building a protective environment for children*. New Delhi: Ministry of Women and Child Development, Government of India.

Mishra, G. (1975). *Public sector in Indian economy*. New Delhi: Communist Party of India.

Mitra, B. B. (1969). *BB Mitra's the Guardians and Wards Act; with the Indian Majority Act and the Hindu Minority and Guardianship Act*. Calcutta: Eastern Law House.

Modak, U. (July, 1976). Foster family care – An Indian perspective. *The Indian Journal of Social Work, 37*(2), 141-150.

Mooij, J. E. (2005). *Reforms and children: Issues and hypothesis regarding the impacts of reform policies on the welfare of children in India*. London: Young Lives, Save the Children UK.

Narula, S. (2008). Equal by law, unequal by caste: The "untouchable" condition in critical race perspective. *Wisconsin International Law Journal, 26*(2), 255-344.

Narula, S. (2003). *Globalisation: India's experience for the African continent*. Occasional Paper, No. 7. Addis Ababa: Development Policy Management Forum.

National Association of Social Workers. (2001). *NASW standards for cultural competence in social work practice.* Retrieved from http://www.naswdc.org/practice/standards/NASWculturalstandards.pdf

Niezen, R. (2004). *A world beyond difference: Cultural identity in the age of globalization*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Niranjan, S., Nair, S., & Roy, T. K. (2005). A socio-demographic analysis of the size and structure of the family in India. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 36*(4), 623-651.

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. (1999, Sept. 2). *Convention on the rights of the child.* Retrieved from http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/crc.htm

Osterhammel, J. (2005). *Colonialism: A theoretical overview*. Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers.

Padmanabhan, B. S. (Jan-June, 1994). Child care: Emerging horizons. *ICCW Journal*, 79-82.

Palmer, N. D. (1971). *The Indian political system*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Panicker, R. (Jan, 1998). Children's rights: Challenges and future trust. *Indian Journal of Social Work, 59*(1), 276-290.

Parliament of India. (1947). *Constitution*. New Delhi: Gazette of India.

Parliament of India. (1956). *Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act, 1956*. (Act No. 78 of 1956). New Delhi: The Gazette of India.

Pittracher, B., Rudisch-Pfurtscheller, A. & Westreicher, B. (July 2004). *Tracking footprints: Global report 2002/2003.* Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf Hermann Gmeiner Akademie. Retrieved from http://www.sos-childrensvillages.org/What-we-do/family-based-care/childrens-village/Pages/tracking-footprints.aspx

Prasad, S. (2007, Nov 27). *Life of elderly in India*. (Unpublished study). Centre for Development Studies, Kerala. Retrieved from http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/5935/ on March 30, 2011.

Prasad, V. (Jan-March & April-June 1998). Children vs. the state: The politics of child care. *ICCW Journal*, 50-61.

Prigmore, C. & Atherton, C. (1986). *Social welfare policy: Analysis and formulation* (2nd ed.). Toronto: D.C. Heath and Company.

Rajan, A. (2002). *Sociology of human rights: A study of Indian experience in child welfare*. Mumbai: Himalaya Publishing House.

Ramasamy, A. (2005). *Struggle for freedom of languages in India*. Madurai: Puthu Vasantham Pathippagam.

Rane, A. & Billimoria, J. (Jan, 1998). Child right advocacy in India. *Indian Journal of Social Work, 59*(1), 256-275.

Rao, J. (2007). The history of child rights in India. *UNICEF.* Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/india/children_3220.htm on April 6, 2011.

Reddy, S. R. (1989). *Institutionalized children.* Allahabad, India: Chugh Publications.

Richards, J. F. (1993). *The Mughal Empire Pt. 1, Vol. 5*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roberts, P. E. (1952). *History of British India under the company and the crown*. London: Oxford University Press.

Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization, social theory and global culture*. London: Sage Publications.

Rosa, A. C. S., de Sousa, R. E., Borba, R., & Ebrahim, G.J. (Feb. 1992). The street children of Recife: A study of their background. *Journal of Tropical Pediatrics, 38*, 34-40.

Rose, L. (1991). *The erosion of childhood: Child oppression in Britain, 1860-1918*. London: Routledge.

Said, E. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Random House, Inc.

Saraswathi, T. S. & Kaur, B., Eds. (1993). *Human development and family studies in India: An agenda for research and policy*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Sarri, R. (1997). International social work at the millennium. In Reisch, M. & Gambrill, E. (Eds.), *Social work in the 21st century* (387-295). London: Pine Forge Press.

Save the Children. (2008). Worryingly high school drop out rates in India and Bangladesh. *Latest news*. Retrieved from http://www.savethechildren.net/alliance/media/newsdesk/2006-02-14.html on April 4, 2011.

Schaeffer, R. (2005). *Understanding globalization: The social consequences of political, economic, & environmental Change.* 3rd ed. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Seale, S. (2010). *The weight of silence: Invisible children of India.* Hot Springs, South Dakota: Dog's Eye View Media.

Shanmugavelayutham, K. (July, 2002). The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2000: A critical analysis. *Indian Journal of Social Work, 63*(3), 422-435.

Sharma, A. & Sood, N., Eds. (1989). *Approach and strategies of child development in India: a review*. New Delhi: National Institute of Public Cooperation and Child Development.

Sharma, B. K. (1999). *The origins of the caste System in Hinduism and its relevance in the present context*. New Delhi: Indian Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; Katmandu: Samdan Publishers.

Singh, A. (2008). A critical evaluation of attitudes towards nuclear, joint and extended family structures among people of Indian origin in Durban, South Africa. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 39*, 453-470.

Sontheimer, G. (1977). *The joint Hindu family: Its evolution as a legal institution*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.

SOS Children's Villages International. (2010a). *Early development*. Retrieved from http://www.sos-childrensvillages.org/What-we-do/education/early-development/Pages/default.aspx

SOS Children's Villages International. (2010b). *Entering a village.* Retrieved from http://www.sos-childrensvillages.org/What-we-do/family-based-care/childrens-village/Children-growing-up/Entering-a-village/Pages/default.aspx

SOS Children's Villages International. (2010c). *History*. Retrieved from http://www.sos-childrensvillages.org/About-us/History/Pages/default.aspx

SOS Children's Villages International. (2010d). *Leaving the village.* Retrieved from http://www.sos-childrensvillages.org/What-we-do/family-based-

care/childrens-village/Children-growing-up/Leaving-the-village/Pages/default.aspx

SOS Children's Villages International. (2010e). *Living in a village.* Retrieved from http://www.sos-childrensvillages.org/What-we-do/family-based-care/childrens-village/Children-growing-up/Living-in-a-village/Pages/default.aspx

SOS Children's Villages International. (2010f). *Organizational structure*. Retrieved from http://www.sos-childrensvillages.org/About-us/Organisational-structure/Pages/default.aspx

SOS Children's Villages International. (2010g). *Our organisation*. Retrieved from http://www.sos-childrensvillages.org/about-us/Pages/default.aspx

SOS Children's Villages International. (2010h). *Profession: SOS Children's Village mother.* Retrieved from http://www.sos-childrensvillages.org/What-we-do/family-based-care/childrens-village/Pages/Profession-SOS-mother.aspx

SOS Children's Villages International. (2010i). *Staying in touch.* Retrieved from http://www.sos-childrensvillages.org/What-we-do/family-based-care/childrens-village/Children-growing-up/Staying-in-touch/Pages/default.aspx

SOS Children's Villages International. (2010j). *Corporate partners.* Retrieved from http://www.sos-childrensvillages.org/Get-involved/Corporate-partners/Pages/default.aspx

SOS Children's Villages International. (2010k). *Where we help: Asia: India – Overview.* Retrieved from http://www.sos-childrensvillages.org/Where-we-help/Asia/India/Pages/default.aspx

SOS Children's Villages of India. (2010). *Our roots*. Retrieved from http://www.soscvindia.org/charity/sos_updates/who_we_are.php?page=1

SOS-Kinderdorf International. (Feb 2004). *SOS Children's Village: Manual for the SOS Children's Village organisation.* Innsbruck: SOS-Kinderdorf Hermann Gmeiner Akademie. Retrieved from http://www.sos-childrensvillages.org/What-we-do/family-based-care/childrens-village/Pages/SOS-Childrens-Village-Manual.aspx

Soumyen, S. (2002). *Contemporary issues in globalization: An introduction to theory and policy in India* (2nd ed.). New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Srivastava, A. K. coordinator (1998). *Child development: The Indian perspective*. New Delhi: National Council of Educational Research and Training.

Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stein, B. (2010). *A history of India*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Tandon, R. (1996). Board games: Governance and accountability in NGOs. In Edwards, M & Hukme, D. Eds, *Beyond the magic bullet: NGO performance*

and accountability in the post-Cold War world (53-64). West Hartford: Kumarian Press.

UNICEF. (2010, March 2). India: Statistics. *Info by country*. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/india_statistics.html#75

United Nations Statistic Division. (Dec 2010). Indicators on literacy. *Social indicators*. Retrieved from http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/products/socind/literacy.htm

Ursekar, H. S. (July, 1976). Legislation supporting adoption. *Indian Journal of Social Work, 37*(2), 159-164.

van Willigen, J. & Chadha, N. K. (2003). Social networks of old people in India: Research and policy. *Journal of Aging and Social Policy, 15*(2-3), 109-124.

Vatsalya. (2009a). *A detailed sketch of Udayan: Vatsalya's rehabilitation program.* Retrieved from http://www.vatsalya.org/Udayan-Detail-44.aspx

Vatsalya. (2009b). *About us.* Retrieved from http://www.vatsalya.org/About-Us-24.aspx

Vatsalya. (2009c). *Health & HIV-AIDS.* Retrieved from http://www.vatsalya.org/Health-and-HIV-AIDS-26.aspx

Vatsalya. (2009d). *Street children & youth.* Retrieved from http://www.vatsalya.org/Street-Children-and-Youth-25.aspx

Vatsalya. (2009e). *Udayan*. Retrieved from http://www.vatsalya.org/Udayan-38.aspx

Vatsalya. (2001, Nov.). *Vatsalya annual report*. Jaipur: Vatsalya. Retrieved from http://www.vatsalya.org/Vatsalya-Publications-27.aspx

Vatsalya. (2009f). *Women's empowerment*. Retrieved from http://www.vatsalya.org/Womens-Empowerment-29.aspx

Vatuk, S. (1972). *Kinship and urbanization: White collar migrants in North India*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Weinberg, D. Ed. (2002). *Qualitative research methods*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Weltman, J. J. (1973). *Systems theory in international relations: A study in metaphoric hypertrophy*. Lexington, Mass: Lexington Books.

Westhead, R. (2009, April 18). No room at home for elderly in India. *The Star.* Retrieved from http://www.thestar.com/World/Columnist/article/620526 on March 29, 2011.

Wilson, J. Q. (2012). *American government: Brief version.* 10th ed. Boston: Wadsworth.

Wolpert, S. (2004). *A new history of India*. 7th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendix A

Jaimala Interview

We are sitting in Jaimala's room at Udayan on her very large bed. There are about eight kids lying on the bed as well along with the five or six kids lying on the floor and window seat. Before the interview began, the kids promised Jaimala that they wouldn't make a sound, a promise with mixed results. Jaimala looks uncomfortable, like she is about to go into an interrogation room or something.

Me: So tell me a little bit about the history of Udayan and Vatsalya. If you can. *I laugh*

Jaimala: No, I…You didn't talk with Hitesh about this?

Me: I talked to Hitesh a little bit about it but I mostly talked to him about, um, the. the JJ Act and the laws and how the laws affected it, so I didn't talk to him about why and how it was founded and why you decided to, to do the projects that you do.

Jaimala: Are you talking of Udayan or are you talking of Vatsalya?

Me: Both, a little.

Jaimala: Both. Ok. Well, uh, basically these, it is difficult to answer this question and I am sorry if, like, if I sound like I am bored to answer this question because I am asked this question so often and I have been frustrated because I can't find a good answer for that. The answer to it is that, just, I, you know, we all want to do something in our lives. I, we had this, um, um, desire to do something like, it has to be a combination of challenging, creative and something to do with human being, with life, and I think, you know, I'm human and I would like to work with children the most and so it came down to that so just this work that we have chosen to do is, uh, is everything. It's challenging, it's creative and it's satisfying at the same time because at the end of the day, you know, you are seeing children get proper food and care for childhood. That's it. And my dream or my vision includes, like, everything for them but I also don't think that I can do it all. So, while we can try to give them as much as possible for today and try to lead them to a better tomorrow it is not certain that they will get there. So we are also, like, are open about… Open means like, uh, how to say it. Like, we are trying to do our best. Like there is, in Sanskrit there is in our, I think our epic Gita says, uh…*phrase in Sanskrit*…that means your job it to do, not to expect results from it. So you just plant to seeds and don't wait for the fruit, don't, don't look for the fruit. If you sew the seeds, the fruit will come automatically. It is not like…and we, we work with that kind of philosophy. We do what we can do, the rest of the things, it's part their destiny, part their own doing. You know, from what we

are giving them, how much are they going to take. So this is how Hitesh and I look at it.

Me: I understand that Vatsalya also has, um, an AIDS…uh…some sort of AIDS task force or something like that, an AIDS office or something?

Jaimala: HIV AIDS? *I nod.* Ok. Yeah, yeah, yeah we have. Actually, when we started Vatsalya, our immediate focus was to be children, it was supposed to be focused totally on children, but then because both me and Hitesh have a background in public health, and, uh, we had almost 15 years of experience of working in the health before starting Vatsalya, uh, people started asking us why we want to just do away with all of the experience and qualification and all of the investment that we had made in it and the energy and learning and making connections and doing things, so, we said…and it made sense to us, like, ok, why, why leave that, so there was, there was a place for us in that field which we thought, ok, we would like to go, so we just, we just continued to take that, uh, keep, pursue that and between me and Hitesh, you know, we have chosen to keep and to pursue that interest and we have, like, an understand, you know, it is not hard and fast, but I work more with the children and he works with the health. So we have this health wing of Vatsalya, which has various programs, one of which is HIV AIDS, and through which we cover the truckers. And also we work with the street children who might be of high risk for HIV AIDS because of their life that they lead on the streets, so we do have those two programs. Yeah, and we have clinics and we have counseling services and we have outage workers and they go out into the field and contact these people, the truck drivers and, you know, the prostitutes, to whom the truck drivers go. So there are specified corners to which these commercial sex workers, we call them, they are there so we contacted them, test them for the HIV AIDS. Um, I think the test them for STI, not for HIV AIDS and once you have a positive STI you are referred for the HIV test.

Me: Um, back to Udayan. I, if I remember correctly there are 55 children here right now?

Jaimala: Yes, 54, 55.

Me: Um, what's sort of the background of the kids? You know, were they all street children? I understand that some weren't necessarily on the streets, they were just at risk of being street children and at risk of becoming orphans and all that, so what's a little bit of that?

Jaimala: Yeah, um, if you divided them into percentage, I would say that about 60% children are orphaned, 50 to 60% are orphaned, about 20 to 30% are abandoned, uh, meaning that their parents are either abusive or just don't care or they are so poor they have just left them on their own and the remaining 10 to 20% are children who have one of the parent, mostly mother, single mother situation, where, um, we came to

know about them the relatives around, or some of the children are even from the city, um, or their mothers came and found us and then they came and shared their story with us. Which was, like, uh…if you summarize that they were totally, um, you know, kind of helpless and frustrated with the circumstances that they found themselves in after their husbands either left them, or disappeared just, or died, so they didn't know what to do and then they had this growing daughters who were at risk, uh, you know, all kinds of risks for going bad, so then we just saw that in this situation that if we didn't take those children, they would be the next to be on the street somehow, some time. So, so it was in a way we felt it was in a was better that you could take them before they were rather than just reading about them, or you know, find them on the streets. So we have some children who, uh, will return back to their families, whatever that is, a mother is usual. But then there are about 60 to 70% who will have to find their own lives who found them mostly on the street, um, sleeping, begging, mostly that. They do things when they are on their own, they would collect plastic bottles and sell them, and shoe shining, and rag picking is, uh, a thing that is common. So those kinds of things they are in to.

Me: OK. I've noticed that here that here at the Udayan it is a very family-like environment with the aunties that live in the buildings with them and all of the volunteers being know as didis and all of that. Was that done on, on purpose?

Jaimala: Yes, exactly. Actually, actually, we do this, um, India has a tradition of joint family system, which unfortunately now is, um, is vanishing slowly. Um, but um, this joint family system means like you have, like, generations living together, you have grandfather and grandparents and the parents and the children and their children and sometimes they all live together. It makes it a very complete community kind of feeling and that's what we have, that we have created here, even though there is no one related actually, but, uh, and it's, it's very natural here for like, uh, to call people by, by, you know, address them through relationship rather than, um, calling them by, you know, Sir, Madam and all that and, and those formal things. Yeah, we have, we have done it on purpose, so that the children feel like, it's like a home, not an institution, though it is. So…uh…it helps because this is what that we feel children have been missing. It's not the food, it's not fun, it's not even the freedom that they had on the streets is the best thing that one wishes to have, that you can do whatever you want whenever you want and, um, children made enough money to feed themselves enough of the stuff that they want and that is good or bad is a different thing, but if they like it they can have it. Um…so, so, the major thing, the main thing that we can offer them is this sense of bonding and relationship and connection. So we have actually created that. So basically our, like, Udayan, we talk to children and we say, like, we, we respect. We have, like, four basic principles that we follow. That is one that is respect nature, then respect culture, respect people, and then respect yourself, that comes then. But if you do the respect of the other three, you are respected automatically, so, um, being humble but then giving others their space and respecting nature is also one of the main things that we try to teach. And then we also

try, like, not go towards modern, uh, you know, side. Although we don't want them to decry of the modern things, you know, science and the technological, you know, um, comforts, we say, the facilities. But at the same time they should be comfortable living with pure nature. So that is what we try to do. So that is why we use, we have like cattles here and we have biogas plant and solar gas system and we grow our own vegetables as far as possible and we have our crops. So children are made to be close to the nature and that.

Me: Um, I've also noticed that the kids all take very good care of each other. They act like they're brothers and sisters even if they're not. I know many of them are actually related, but, were they told to treat each other that way, or did they just sort of do it naturally?

Jaimala: I think that it comes actually, like it is passed on from the elder children to the smaller one, and, and they just see each other and that is just, um, how the environment is created.

Jaimala has to tell some of the children to be quiet because they are starting to get a little bored and restless. She gives them a talking to in Hindi and then the children quiet themselves and we can return to the interview.

Me: Ok, um, I know that some of the children have parents that are still living and I was wondering, um, I know that some of the children go visit their parents, um, during holidays and that some of their parents come here and see them but others I was talking to just don't visit their parents. Was that their decision, your decision, the decision of the parents, based on the situation?

Jaimala: No, we never decide not to visit parents, like, we don't prevent children from visiting their parents provided we trust, uh, that number one that they are their parents, uh, secondly that they are in a position to take care of them. For example, we have only one case in Mushcand and Rehan…excuse me, I'm sorry

Jaimala's phone rings and she has to get up and answer it. She has a short conversation and then she returns to the interview.

Jaimala: I was telling you about Muschand and Rehan?

Me: Mmhm

Jaimala: And, um…um…their, uh…father is in jail for murder for 17 years and their mother has been living with, like, she has changed partners three times, so, uh, that is clearly a situation where these small children cannot be entrusted to these people and so we have clearly told them that they can come to visit them if they want but they will never be sent to live with them. And we would be willing to go legal if they…if

this woman insists on taking her children. In fact, Rehan does not even recognize, uh, her and Muschand knows that she is her mother but she doesn't know the father, though she has, mother has told her that she should, she's supposed to call, but then I had a talk with her. So in this situation only we are intervening in the sense that we are preventing a relationship between so called parents and the children. But rest of the cases we have not, like we don't prevent them. Like if they have, even if it is a distant relative and they want to visit them we will understand because it's nice for the children to have a feeling, you know, that they have people outside of this premises also. And, uh, but we always keep telling them that this is their family, this is their home and they need not look to somebody like oh, would somebody take us, can we go or not. I mean, it is totally up to them. If they wish, they can.

Me: Um, I was also wondering how you decide…I am sure people bring you more kids than you can possibly handle taking. How do you decide which ones to, to keep here and which ones you can't?

Jaimala: Well, we are making it very simple, like, um, our first and strict criteria is that the child has to be orphaned, totally orphan, no parents. If the child is orphaned, we take the child, I mean, there is no other thing that we, we need to assert it. But we do go to the place that the child is brought from and make sure of that because sometimes we have been brought children who are not orphans, but we were told they were orphans because, and it's very, we have had some shocking incidences when the mother herself left the children saying they are orphans because she was…having an affair with another man and that man wouldn't keep the children. So it was quite a shock for us. But then that also taught us to, to make our own inquires when such requests come. So we do that now. So the first thing we insure is that the child has to be orphaned. When that it there, we just take the child, there is nothing, uh, more. But then in the case of like, um…a child who is like in a single mother situation or an abusive father situation, we take that also. In boys and girls we have practical rules, like we'll have boys not older than eight years in Udayan. They can grow here bigger than that but we will not take them from outside bigger than that. And then girls can be of any age. So these are the simple things we follow. But, it also is like, we don't go by actual books, our own books. If child is in front of us and you feel oh no, this child needs us, so then we just take the child. So…it's more on human interaction basis rather than rules that are based. That's how we do it.

Me: OK. Um, switching to another form of "taking care" of street children, um, could you tell me a little bit about, um, the, the JJ Homes that you visited while you were writing your book? And the conditions there?

Jaimala: Yeah, it's, the book, I have tried to describe the condition in the book, uh, and it is like, um, any other place that is run by government in India, which is like a welfare institution. They are, um, that the biggest thing that you feel is the sense of, uh, total indifference and unaccountability is there. So even when they have

resources, like the buildings are fine, um, they have resources but they are not utilized, um, in a way that makes children feel warm, rooted, loved, cared for, and again, lots of things are done according to books and the rules. So at most there there is quite, I would say, um, in some cases scary, some cases very dull and, um, you don't want to stay there. Um, then also because of that sense of indifference the, the level of hygiene, the level of quality of the food and, and the overall ambience of the place is not what you want children to be there. So, no I, I actually don't like to criticize them much because, uh, that's, uhm, it doesn't serve any purpose, um, that's the way the whole system here is so just saying JJ Homes are like that doesn't, like, anything that is run by government in India has a big problem, very big problem, because there is too much bureaucracy there. So, nobody…you can't hold one person accountable for anything, it is the whole system. For the smallest thing, like, you go up to the top level and then ultimately it comes down to the lowest level and then you keep, like, moving from top to bottom, top to bottom, so it, it's a different thing. I mean, if you talk to an individual in the system, you will find them ok. But when you talk of a particular activity or a particular system, then they are hopeless. So it's the system, it's not even the people, it's the system. I would say that the government should give up this responsibility to the NGOs. They can do a much better job.

Me: I remember you mentioning at one point, and I asked Hitesh about this and he wasn't sure, that the JJ Act prescribes specific monetary regulations to JJ Homes, like amounts of money that they can spend on food or something like that per child or something? Could you tell me a little more about that, like the amount and that kind of thing?

Jaimala: Yeah, there is. Yeah. But I don't know what he has referred to, but I know that there are like, um, there are certain, there is an amount of money that is prescribed per child per day for food, for this and that, which is in total it comes out to be 675 per month per child for everything. Now that is the most ridiculous amount I mean, you have ever heard. Even if you go to the government people and you ask them who decided that, nobody knows that. And you ask them what you can do with this money, they don't know. You cannot have, um, I think…like 675, we spend here in Udayan about 2800 rupees a month and this is 675 and at Udayan you see, like, it is not a luxurious place, you get a simple three meals, we don't even give them fruits because we don't have money for that, the rice are given alternate days because they are expensive, the sweet is only once a week, um, and the children they have some outing, they have them some sports here, they, they get some, they have some clean uniforms, um again, um, what else they have. They have medical care covered and lots of that is done as a charity, as a welfare donation, time donation and not charged for. But still, like, with that amount we barely manage this. So imagine 675 rupees for food, education, dress, outings, picnic or entertainment or medical care, it's just impossible. So, uh, yes, the gov, they do have that, and one the reasons that we have not gone for the government support is basically this, because if this is the money they give, you cannot do anything with that and on the top of that then they sit on your head

to demand thousand papers and thousand inquires and they want to check this and there's always cut for this person and that person when the grant is released. Already you are getting 675 and then if someone asks for 20% cut then that, so it's bad. I am going on record saying that, but that's an open secret, everybody knows that, that is how the system works. Very insufficient money and then that money doesn't come to us. So it is a very ridiculous amount that they have prescribed for us.

Me: Yeah, that's like…

Jaimala: That's why these homes are like, you know, they are more like jails, because they are just kept indoors you just feed them. That's it. And there is no breakfast usually in the government homes, they only give lunch and dinner and chapatti and come gravy and then chapatti and come gravy in the night, that's it. On Sunday they might have some special thing but that's it. So that is the minimum possibility, like, they are not starved there and they have something to put on themselves, that's it. So…education in anyway is free in India, you can send children to a school, but, uh, we don't know how they manage with this 675.

Me: That's less than 10 American dollars. That's pretty ridiculous. *Actually, it is about $17, but still, it is not enough.*

Jaimala: Yeah

Me: Do you think that the government is doing enough about the problem of street children? *Jaimala scoffs.* No?

Jaimala: No. I mean, absolutely not. Which is why I say that they don't even have to do because sometimes, you know it is, the system is in such a bad shape, reviving it will take years and making it correct, but the children need it today and the children are, you know, the way…there are other things the government can focus on. And, uh, they can have better monitoring and supervisory system for the NGOs, but let them do this job. Or maybe if they want to do it themselves they need to do like a lot of work with their staff themselves because the attitude change is very crucial. Everybody thinks, oh, it's our job, like, like it's a job. It's not a commitment to the children, it is not like, oh they are our children now let us invest in them. People don't work like that. So when you do things like that when it concerns children, you don't get the results. So the run away rates of the homes in the government homes is just like…*Jaimala snaps her fingers*…you…they are there today and then tomorrow suddenly you see in the newspaper that ten children ran away, seventeen children broke the main gate and ran away. And that keeps happening. Because there is nothing to retain them.

Me: Hitesh mentioned, um, using Vatsalya as sort of, the Udayan, as sort of a model for the government and other NGOs to use in creating their own orphanages. Do you agree with that?

Jaimala: Well, I…it's…I don't know if my agreeing makes any difference. I mean, it is the people who want to do that have to agree to it. And, that again is a big, big task here. Uh, um, it's…it's…you know India unfortunately, we are very good individually in India. But when it comes as a teamwork, as a network, we are very weak. That's also as a system, this country needs to work. Um, we don't learn from each other as team. That's sort of inherent def…defic…deficiency in our system. You…individually, everybody's smart and intelligent and they have creative ideas and they can do wonderful things. then put them together and they, because they have so much individual ideas, they don't make team. The same thing is here also, when we are doing it that means you are saying that replicating this model. Now somebody learning from us and then doing it…it…I…I don't see anybody interested in that, as of now. But I am also not saying that, like, you know, it is impossible. It takes just one woman for somebody to, to decide something or to have an idea click and then, you know, just do it. So maybe it's possible. People are looking at it and, like, there are some institution who have seen it and talk about it and they already started, like, the same thing like should we make it a model to replicate. So, maybe it will happen, but, uh, it's for the whole system and country to decide.

Me: Is there anything else that you would like to tell me about Vatsalya or street children or JJ Homes or anything that we've talked about?

Jaimala shakes her head.

Me: No? Ok. Thank you!!

The whole interview had been a bit uncomfortable on Jaimala's part. It seemed that she did not feel comfortable with the camera and the direct questions that I was asking and possibly what I would be using the answers for. This seemed strange to me because after a month of talking to her on a regular basis I knew that she had no qualms whatsoever about expressing her opinion of these matters, and the government especially, to anyone that would listen. And in those private conversations, she was much less inclined to use phrases such as like, you know, um, and uh. This is just further proof that she was uncomfortable with the interview.

Appendix B

Hitesh Interview

We are sitting in Om Prakash's bedroom on the Udayan campus. It is fairly hot and humid so the fan is on and the door is open. You can hear the kids running past and talking and the ducks quacking at everyone. Hitesh is just wearing a t-shirt and some swim trunks and is sitting on Om Prakash's bed relaxing against a pillow. He looks completely relaxed, like he has done hundreds of interviews before. He is reading the newspaper and talking about a bombing in a state close to Rajasthan the day before.

Me: Ok, so…turn the volume up…all right. So, um, Jaimala told me that you know… a lot about the JJ Act and some of the other laws that affect…um… orphans and street children so I thought I would ask you about those…um…but anything that I won't ask you about just feel free to talk about because I just worked out come general questions…just guidelines kind of stuff. So…um…if you could just briefly…uh…explain the JJ Act to me. Cause I read it…but…it was kind of hard to completely understand.

Hitesh: I see. Well, in India…uh…we have an Indian Constitution. We are governed by that. So…as part of the Constitution there are different Acts. An Act means…uh…if you are protected in the act you can be like…uh…there is a Juvenile Justice Act, which is defined as up to 18 years. We consider the definition of a child after 18 years…that is after, you know, the International Convention says the child has permission, which was held in 1994. So…India was one of the signatories. And it was part of this signatory that they ensured the rights of the children. The JJ Act was basically…uh…enacted after that in 2000. We have now, right now, JJ Act 2000 and it is in the process, the operation is in the process. The JJ Act…uh…means that any juvenile who commits at any time a crime will have to be governed under that act. That is what the JJ Act is. So…that's it.

Me: OK. All right. Um. So this act has a lot of effect on the street children in India, correct?

Hitesh: It has an effect on the, definitely a lot more on the street children…uh…uh…but it is also on children that commit any kind of crime like, uh, you know, theft, stealing and, uh, um, rape and, uh, murder or, uh, all different kind of crimes. Uh, yes, street children are also governed through that act but mostly on the criminal, you know, side. Criminal offense and juvenile offense.

Me: So the JJ Act has absolutely nothing to do with children who haven't committed any crimes?

Hitesh: Yes.

Me: OK.

Hitesh: That's right.

Me: Um…does the JJ Act have any effect at all on Vatsalya and how it's run or how it deals with some of the children here who might have committed crimes?

Hitesh: Yeah, that happens. But once that Act is passed by the Parliament of India, in different states that Act is sent and all of the states are supposed to be on the basis of that Act making JJ Rules. All acts, that is not just this Act. All states have to work on the Act and then different states have to make up their own rules and once there is those JJ Rules are…uh…you know, finalized that has to be approved by the…uh…State Assembly. The State Assembly is the Chief Minister and his cabinet, and her cabinet or his cabinet. So that cabinet must approve the JJ Rules. The Rajasthan JJ Act was here and it was converted to the JJ Rules and now it was the JJ Rules was approved by the cabinet and that becomes applicable in Rajasthan. Under that in Rajasthan there are fit institutions, they are classified as fit institutions and fit individuals. That is given by the government of Rajasthan and the Ministry of Social Justice and Environment. There is a national Ministry of Social Justice and Environment and there is a state Ministry of Social Justice and Environment. If any individual or institution wants to work with children, for instance an institution like Vatsalya, they have to apply under that category of fit institutions. All right? So once it is finalized and they get certification that this institution is a fit institution certain things are meant. If it is a fit institution is means that that institution can keep children on the premises and their home, with them, and the fit individual certificate is also a similar thing. Say if Jaimala wanted to keep orphaned children or any kind of individual that wants to keep children, then the individual gets a fit individual certificate by the government. After that, then…um…that lady or the man can keep…uh…children. See Vatsalya has one fit institution certificate so that's why Vatsalya is allowed to be keeping children on its premises and can bring children on its premises. And they can stay…the certificate means that they can stay 24 hours, which means day and night. It is not required for those institutions where they only stay for the day hours.

Me: Oh, ok. Ok. And so, tell me a little bit about…um…the JJ Homes and how do they work, how do they run, who's in charge of them, that kind of thing?

Hitesh: JJ Homes are most…you see, any any institution that is recognized as a fit institution is a JJ Home. In one way Vatsalya can also rehabilitate children who have committed an offense and that…um…the Chief Magistrate can decided to keep that child here and that is also possible but that's not practical in the view of the government. JJ Homes are run by the government. And uh….um…uh…in Rajasthan we have…uh…32 districts and now 33…ah…we have added another district to the

District Assembly within the last six months so practically, you know, 32, 33 districts but JJ Homes are there only in 9, uh, districts' headquarters. The rest of the districts' headquarters didn't have some homes there. But very recently the Department has…uh…um…approved to open JJ Homes in all districts so there are on papers 33 JJ Homes, on paper. It will take some time for them to all be in existence. So practically there are much less JJ Homes in existence as the Department has approved.

Me: And…uh…the children that are sent there are only those that have committed crimes?

Hitesh: Yes. Uh…JJ Homes keep only the worst children who are, who have committed crimes because that comes through our Magistrate, we call the CJM, that is the City Judicial Magistrate, and the City Judicial Magistrate sits every 15 days in JJ Home and the trial is done in the JJ Home. It is done by the Magistrate which has 18 official members, the JJ Home committee members. Each JJ Home must have its own committee. These committee members are from…uh…the social community, are from, you know, outside families, they can be businessmen and they form a committee and…uh…then the commission a recommendation to the Magistrate if the child is to be kept at the JJ Home where the Magistrate presides from. A child…uh…are…children are not supposed to be in any prisons…uh…in any case and…uh…children are put to the Magistrate and he decides and while the process is going on children are not to be kept in the JJ Home for more than 15 days…so…that, that's the one aspect of it. Another aspect is that these children, who are placed in a JJ Home, the conditions are that they are given food, they are given shelter, night shelter. Uh…there are many other aspects we can list for example…uh…the personal development they get is not appropriate with this. Another is everything is very small so, um, many key aspects are missing.

Me: Uh…I remember…um…Jaimala mentioning I remember one day when we were talking to her that the JJ Act or some other law prescribes a certain amount of money that is to be spent on each child. How much is that?

Hitesh: Um…I don't have an idea but it is very less…uh…very, very less…uh…I don't know if it is specifically but there are some things that are specifically, for example they have been given food for…for example for 10 rupees, for more than 10 rupees, they get food for maybe 10 rupees, not more than that, so very, very…uh…the description is…uh…they don't provided them anything else but food…uh…they don't talk of school, they don't talk of many other things…for example, they have a rule about the space, the children have to have a the room sizes with a certain space for each child. So it talks about that, a little of that, but its…um…uh…it's not particularly, you know, an institution where you'd find that. An institution where its very, very even.

Me: Um…In your opinion, um, are JJ Homes or privately run orphanages like Vatsalya or any that are run by religious groups that have orphanages that are very similar to this, are the JJ Homes or the private orphanages a better solution?

Hitesh: Well, the thing is that, I think this is a government responsibility. Uh…we have done all we can. So I think it is a government responsibility and the government must…uh…try to improve upon the quality and their responsibility here and …uh…at the JJ Homes. But there can be definitely institution interaction. They can work as a model…uh…and uh…work with us because it is not possible. We can keep, uh, 50 children maybe at the most 100 children but there are thousands and thousands of children…uh…so it's, it's not, uh, within the capacity of a private institution…the government can give aid by giving a grant to the private institutions and then make sure of individual aspects. The government just can make sure of individual aspects and make certain rules for the private institutions that the government is supposed to follow and that they will not, but the government cannot shed their own responsibility, um, because all money is with the government, the tax money is always with the government. So…uh…in my opinion definitely the government has to take more responsibility.

Me: So, is there anything else that you would like to tell me about Vatsalya or the JJ Act or anything?

Hitesh: Well the thing is that Vatsalya can become a model institution, that is what our intension is, where other institutions, government institutions and individuals can come and learn about are different aspects of the child's life, the child's development it is important, the child's protection it is important, education is important, and all of those different aspects. What the child needs. So that, Vatsalya can become model institution and we have been visited by the government and have issued suggestions, which are, which are going to work. Because this is a…if you asked me to name another model of this kind in the area, I can't remember. So it is a challenge. We are not only working and living with our children but also working on what has affected the child's development. So…um…that is very important. Another thing is with JJ Homes and that the child is one that has committed crimes. But what about the children who, who are like, uh, abandoned children, orphaned children…um…uh…children, neglected children. There is nothing in so far…uh…in the mind of the government that deals with this. I think that is a big chunk, there's a much, much big chunk. Uh…the government must…uh…do something for these children. So I think a lot to do with that kind of emphasis and a little less with the group of children who have committed crimes. So, by that I think Vatsalya is more responsible as a learning model. So that's what I think…uh…maybe Vatsalya can replicate, maybe another one, maybe one more, uh…but not that to spread. We want people to learn, to come here to learn. That is why we are open to the whole world. We want students to come here and suggest and see what they can learn from us.

Me: Ok. Well, that's all I have for you so thank you very much.

Hitesh's English is not the best I have ever heard and he is a very soft spoken man which makes him hard to understand at times even when you are sitting right next to him, much less on the tape of this interview. Some parts were very hard to hear and I had to infer a word or two from his previous vocabulary and the subject that he was speaking about. But all in all it was a very informative and helpful interview.

Appendix C

Karnika (psychologist) Interview

I interviewed Karnika while she was spending a couple of nights at the Udayan because the staff was on vacation. Because of this she was the main discipline person and adult so she choose to do the interview sitting outside of the room she was staying in so she could watch the children. Many kids were outside playing and several times during the interview she seemed distracted while watching them, and she stopped to say hello to some of them or to wave a couple of times throughout the interview. Karnika seemed fairly relaxed and enjoyed talking about the kids, telling me the personal stories of some of the children while answering questions.

Me: Ok, So the first thing I want to ask you about is in general how do you think the kids here feel about Vatsalya and the Udayan?

Karnika: Well, I think, uh, they are pretty happy about it and, uh, wherever you are 70% appreciate the place and 30% are probably, I wouldn't say born criminals, but they misbehave just for the heck of it. They want something to brag about. And that's something similar out there. But in general the children are definitely very happy out here and, uh, I think they are comfortable, that they have a place that they can stay. Especially those kids that are the older ones. You know, uh, none of them want to go back home because they know what the exact condition is there at the home front, but, uh, the younger ones at times do get swayed away by, uh, a little of that, ok, they would like to go back home and, uh, maybe they can do something better out there. But, uh, believe me after 10 days, when we send them home on a holiday, most of them come back early. That in itself tells us that, uh, they are pretty happy with us, they come back and tell us that they missed this place. A hand full of them maybe are the ones, like I was telling you about Abemanu, wanted to go back home and, uh, but believe me give them a fortnight and they will like it here.

Me: Is there any difference between the kids that have parent that are still living and the kids that are completely orphaned and don't have living parents?

Karnika: Yes, I think there is a difference. Because the ones who have parents, they all have somebody to look after them so they can go back. And the ones with parents have told us, they have been the ones that have been notorious. They've tried to run away from this place. They've, uh, dropped back into activities that are not appreciated by the organization. Because probably I think they have something to fall back on. There was something with Mohit. After he'd returned from his home this time, uh, you know, they say he, uh, had engaged with the activities that he was doing and he knows that we can say " Ok, thank you Mohit. We don't think we can keep you here anymore." He knows he has a father to fall back on. Whereas Karan, for example, who has nobody, will not. And we have seen this more in the case of the

boy child, the male child. The male kids who have parents are more, you know, that can figure out and go ahead and become a little rebellious. While the girls I think are, in India the girls are always suppressed and oppressed but out here we, uh, we feel that, uh, because we have given them so much, uh, freedom and respect, that, uh, they are very happy here. And we have never had a girl child run away, never had a girl child come up with something horrendous, you know they are children, they are bound to do that, but nothing of what you see in the male child, you know. The fact that they have a little backing at home.

Me: Do you think any of the children who's parents are still alive resent being separated from them and taken away?

Karnika: Yes, we did, we did have a place…

Karnika's phone rang and she had to get up and go get it from her room.

Me: So…um…the kids with living parents being resentful and stuff.

Karnika: Yeah, yeah. Um…yes, we did have one boy (Indian name I didn't understand), uh, who just left a couple of days ago and he said that why should he stay here when he has his parents to look after him.

Me: Who was this?

Karnika: (Unrecognizable Indian name again) who has just gone away. We did have a few cases like this. But on the contrary we have like Aryan…um…he, you know when he returned from his house and, uh, I asked him what did he do and, um, of course a rather rosy picture but when we actually started talking and, uh, I got to know that, uh, he cannot step out of his house, his father doesn't like that, that he interacts with the other children of the village. So he was actually just confined to his house all day and, uh, he doesn't play with anybody else, his father thinks that he gets spoiled if he interacts with the other children. So, uh, he said it was like a punishment for me. So I thought, what does his father do? Why doesn't he sit and chat with his father? And he said my father just sits and drinks all day.

Me: Um, since you are a psychologist I thought I would ask you a little bit about the kids psychological state, um, when they get here and if they get any better while they are here. Um, what we would you say a good state for them to be in would be? You know, have, have any of them ever had any psychological problems?

Karnika: Most of them are psychologically distorted. When they come in here, like, uh, couple things, when they were kidnapped or something or when they ran away from home. Himanshu, who is the latest with us, he has just come in, now, he was really beaten up by his father and two years back he ran away from home. He doesn't,

I think he lost his mother a couple of years back. And definitely child is under a lot of psychological pressure because firstly, you do have a parent, you do have your other siblings, you've left them behind for something else. And you've just ran away, your parents don't know where you are. That is what definitely works. Then the very fact that, you know, when they think about home, they do have certain good memories but the sad memories are more. So because of that and if out there do to maybe, anything, they may be out there. Maybe they didn't fit with their peer group or maybe within amongst themselves out there. They, I think, when they start feeling included then they really don't know where should they actually go. And, uh, that is the time, you know, that I think that they come and talk to me and, uh, and I think that might be a matter of fact. Everyone here, you know, they live together, and while they might fight they are not those real fights, they are able to talk to each other, so I do feel psychological things that does affect. We have seen it in a couple of cases where, uh, their learning and their study, their concentration, definitely I feel I can dedicate to psychology because they are so unstable that, um, we have to give them a lot of confidence. Like, I remember Prasaana. She just couldn't concentrate for more than five seconds and now her span of attention has increased. So maybe, now when we start working with her, uh, she can turn out to be, you know, um, maybe we can incline her a little more towards academics. And basics, at least, give her a reason to learn them rather, um, any other. Like we had, uh, Nooshin and Shanina who just went home and, uh, because their mother had found out that their older brother has turned their mother out of the house because of some argument and the mother had no home and the mother does not earn and the brother, according to them, has started indulging in all, uh, funny activities with some others that he does not approve us, and he does not approve of the mother's behavior so they had a horrible fight and the brother really hit the mother and the mother, uh, I don't even know whether, or I should say, it was right on her part or more incorrect to involve these two girls. She came here, she took them home, and when they came back, they had really once again gone back into a shell. Shanina was always joking and smiling and she was over doing it, and I knew that she was going to break down any minute and that I had to sit with her. Nooshin just got quiet and she wouldn't talk and it was, you could see her eyes, which spoke a lot. And after I talked with them and I said, uh, I spoke with Shanina and I said, was it correct on your mother's part to take you. And they said yes, who can otherwise explain it to our brother. I said were you managed to convince your brother, did you manage to convince him and they said no. And I said so what was the point of your mother involving you unnecessarily, you were also put in to all of this stress and, uh, he probably also raised his hand at these girls and he said you can jut get out of the house. So that really hit them very hard and, uh, it has, it has worked with them and Yasmin, who was not told anything, and Shanina and Nooshin thought she doesn't know anything, but when I spoke to Yasmin, she told me more than what they could tell me. So, there are full psychological problems definitely that keep coming up. Especially when, um, I know that you asked me earlier if they had parents. I think these cause more problems rather than just being, you see Karan, you see Pravine, you see Soniya, they know that they don't have anybody. Once in a while

maybe Robin, once in a while maybe (undistinguishable Indian name), they say that they have to go and we say to them nicely, you know, we tried to help you out, we looked for your people, but we were unable to do that, but here you have a home and we are all there for you and they know that, you know, Jaimala has been excellent with them, that they can walk up to her any time, and I am there for them always, whenever I am here. Even if it is not my scheduled time to be here but I have heard that there is a problem that is taken place, I need to be here, and it couldn't be that no this is not my day. And the children know that. So I feel that yes, one has, um, that they have done much much better and that we have to let them unwind. But maybe, you know, once in a while they do go, they backtrack here.

Me: So do you, do you feel that the kids get better the longer that they're here?

Karnika: Yes, yes. Definitely. Definitely they get better and uh, definitely they get better, they get more confidence and, uh, I think that older ones, since they have been there for a longer period of their life, um, they really think that this is the quality for them. They know it wherever they go, Teslema set a great example for us, she went away with her mother, but then she came back to us. So that means they know that they have a place here where they can go, they will be guided, they will be told what they can do in life, and, uh, the organization has definitely helped them to become independent. So I guess that they have to have confidence in the organization.

Me: Um, have you talked to the kids when you are talking to them about their futures?

Karnika: Oh yes, definitely.

Me: How did, especially the older ones, seem they feel about their future, whether they think that they are going, that they want to do, anything like that?

Karnika: It is, you know, we have just taken the step of, uh, taking some of the children, there are six of them, and moving them out of academics and streamlined them into some kind of vocational training. Because ultimately it has to come down to this. We know that these children are not academically inclined, partly to the fact that they are really struggling with math and science. So there is no point pushing them on that because in India we do have math and science, which will be with you until class 10. But we've got this other system called the National Open School where the children can chose any subject and make sure that the child can work. And, uh, Vatsalya tries to tell them that vocational training is ultimately what it is will help. So, uh, the children are, they do know what they are going in for but of course, uh, I think, uh, it has been an error that we have not been able to structure it that well because of some thing or the other, you know, so the problems are taking place still. But the very fact that they went to this hotel for a week is really good for their morale and, uh, for the younger ones the older ones are role model, so they feel that they are going in, they are doing this, so if they can stabilize then they can get something because according

to the policy of the organization, after they are 18, they can stay with us even after 18 but they have to be working. We cannot support them after that. So, uh, I think that has been told to the children and they have a sort of charge to decide about their futures and we ask them what do you think, what do you want to do and we are there to help and guide them and uh, you know, a couple of them want to go back after they have picked up a skill so that would be a help to them so, uh, you know, we, and because they do not have that perfect exposure so we've got to get them a lot of exposure and then they can basically chose whether they would like to do housekeeping or they would like to go to the bakery sector or they would like to go to the cooking sector or they would like to go plumbing, gardening, you know, carpentry. So these are the various skills that we feel something is in demand, that is what we've got to get them. And then, uh, we do, like Jaimala is planning to open a little café out there where we have got to learn management. Uh, if you got to have your own, uh, set up, how are you going to manage that? People coming in and people going out. So that's where management skills are also needed; for anyone to do their own, uh, set up, you need all that. So we are working on that and the children seem to be responding to it.

Me: Have any of the children expressed any interest in going to college or…?

Karnika: Yes they have. Mohet and Chandini. They want to go further but, then, you see, they want to do something like to become a doctor. Now, Mohet wants to do something with engineering. Now, uh, in that case, we don't mind, but for doctor it is very, very tough. You have got to take and clear these, you know, competitive exams and in India it is a fight against numbers. So, we really don't know if they'd be able to clear that exam. And the second thing that would turn out to be a problem would be if they would turn up with English because everything there is in English. You can't have medicine books in Hindi, no. So that would be another big problem. Not that only, all our doctors are coming from affluent schools only, they come from government schools also and they do crop up. But, you have to clear the back exams, which is really very, very, very tough.

Me: Is it in English as well, the test?

Karnika: Yes

Me: That would make it really hard then. Um…

Karnika: No, the test is in English and Hindi I think. Yeah they ask you to answer the question in Hindi or in English so you can do it but, you know, in India I think because of the population, they accept just one thousand children and the number that will be applying will be 70,000 so now…and out of the one thousand there is a reservation quota for this tribe, that tribe, and then for one community or the other and, uh, minorities. Everybody has some like that so that makes the possibility, you

only have 36% and our children are fighting for that percentage. So that will make it very difficult for them to do what they want.

Me: Um, do you think that the newer children coming here find it difficult adjusting to the Udayan especially if they come from the street and their used to just doing whatever they feel like doing?

Karnika: Yes, I think it is both. They adjust to a couple of things very quickly like they love it that they are getting food that is cooked they love it that there is somebody to cuddle them, they love getting a bed to sleep on, they love having other children around them, but yes, what they don't like is discipline. But gradually we have to explain to them what life is all about. You know, they need to know the right thing, that these are your does and these are your don'ts. Other disciplining means that this is it, no, but you know, there is a timing and we have to explain to them, why is there a breakfast time. Because the person who is cooking for us, he needs a little break. So when you explain it to them that breakfast is between 8 and 8:30, and you have to explain why they are doing it, because the poor chap, you know, doesn't get any time for himself otherwise. So when we explain it to them they do understand and the only real factor that I feel is the discipline factor which they, they are, you know, a little bit unhappy about because they are so used to making their own decisions, nobody is telling them what to do and what not to do.

Me: Do you feel that once the children get here and they get settled and they get to know people that they feel that Vatsalya is sort of a family for them?

Karnika: Yes. They do. They know they can call back on it when, like the children who've stayed with us and who've left us because, you know, they wanted to go see, the beauty of this organization and Vatsalya and this home is that we do not have a gatekeeper because the doors are open for all and closed for all. But that in itself, we tell them don't run away. Let us know if you want to leave. So this in itself speaks that yes, this is a family and we run like a family. But that's what we tell them, that you are to speak with the staff, they are like relatives at home who just guide you, tell you why you should do this and why not and, uh, you have your other siblings at home and these are your friends. And after three days out here they don't want to go back. Because they'll be playing somewhere and there will be food also, and they'll be in the streets and somebody will be hitting them or they've got to go and beg or they've got to go pick up some rags. But out here it is, oh, how they love the food, the playing, the room, the bed, the idea of having, possessing a little cupboard, the idea of, uh, you know. And that's why we change their names so that we, it can help them to forget their past, which is definitely not a happy past.

Me: Um, have any of the children had really serious complaints about Udayan and about the staff in particular?

Karnika: Not really.

Me: No?

Karnika: They have small things, like they think oh no, they started scolding me.

Me: But kids think things like that about their parents all the time.

Karnika: Exactly. Or if they go to a normal school.

Me: Do you think that the staff treats the children well and actually takes good care of them?

Karnika: Oh yes. We have an excellent. Truly, I realized something about the staff that they tell them, they are not going to tell them that they cannot supposed to do this, then they will loose credibility. But if they are sort of checking it on this no don't do this, I think that is good. I mean, that is what an elder sister or an elder brother at home is expected to do for them, or the mother or the father. And that's what they do also, they tell them they are here to look after them and they are, they know that they, you know, that the staff will always be there. I think they are excellent, a excellent job that the staff is doing.

Me: Ok. Um, well that's pretty much all the question that I have, if there is anything else that you would like to say about the kids then go ahead.

Karnika: Well I really love them and I love to be here. The children who have, uh, are full of life all you need to do is just channel all the energies in the right direction and, uh, help them, uh, basically overcome, I mean, all their problems and, uh, which obviously we cannot get rid of in a day all they deserve is that they come out of it and we definitely see them as, you know, the flowers that are really blooming. So, and uh, you know, expect, our expectations are not that they are going to really do something or that miracles are going to take place, the only thing that we really expect from them is that they are going to be good citizens of the nation and be able to stand on their own feet. And I think that is the main aim of the organization is to respect, whether it is nature, mankind, uh, you know, animals, any…anything that is, uh, here and that is how you learn to respect yourself and the organization and the children are really fulfilling it. And I am quite sure that if the older children do well, you know, it will be much, uh, it would give a lot of confidence to the younger children.

Appendix D

Vatsalya Observations

- creates a family like environment
  - children care for each other
  - volunteers act as caretakers and friends
  - one woman or "auntie" assigned to each dorm unit to care for the children 24 hours a day
  -many teachers live on the campus and act as adult relatives and caretakers of the children
  - creates a feeling of a joint family system where many generation of one family live under once roof
  - the aunties have told that they think of the children at the Udayan as their own and care for them as such
  - Jaimala has told me that this was something that was a goal for her in creating the Udayan
- cultural differences from the US
  - in America, if a child has a cold we take them to the hospital. Here there have been several cases during my time here of children getting fevers from serious infections and there has been little done for it
  - it is acceptable here for a parent to use physical punishment on children to a certain degree while in the US even the slightest sign of physical punishment could lead to child abuse charges. Also, some of the older children take it upon themselves to use physical punishment on the younger children.
  - while education is important, receiving a college degree is not. Few if any of the children here will go to college, mostly because getting a college degree only helps you get a job in very specific fields. Instead, the children receive vocational training so they will have marketable job skills when they leave Udayan
- daily routine
  - the children get up every morning around 6:30. Breakfast is at 7. At 7:30 the children go out to the basketball court and do their daily exercises. They then go to school. School goes until 1 with a break from 10:30-11. After school the children bathe and change out of their school uniforms. Lunch is around 1:30. After lunch the children have free time in their rooms until 5. They are not allowed out of their rooms at this time because of the heat. After 5 the children can go outside and play until dinner around 7:30. After dinner the children return to their rooms to get ready for bed and do homework and such.
  - on Wednesdays and Sundays there is no school so the children have the whole day to play and do homework and whatever else they would like to do. Meals are still at approximately the same time except breakfast, which is between 8 and 8:30.

- today I taught in the preschool. The little children are absolutely adorable but they are enough to drive you crazy. They all want to play with the same toy at the same time, they all want to talk at the same time. They are just like little kids in every other country on earth. It is nice to know that they have not been do damaged by their past to make them different from little kids that I know in the US that have lead perfectly normal lives. Kids can be so resilient. Especially the little one that had tuberculosis as a baby. He spent years on bed rest, too weak to play or walk to do anything little kids want to do. But he is a little terror now. Apparently one of the old aunties (she doesn't work here anymore) spoiled him rotten and severely punished any other children that made fun of him or made him mad. This gave him a little bit full of himself and made him think he can rule over the other children even though he is absolutely tiny. He is a cutie, but he is starting to make me a little annoyed because of the way he treats the other little ones.

- backgrounds of children at Udayan
  - some of the children are complete orphans meaning that there are no parents left at all
  - others have at least one parent living, usually the mother.
    - in some of these cases, the mothers cannot afford to take care of their children because they have lost their husband who was their main source of income. Because of this it is likely that these children will end up on the streets before long so the Udayan takes them in to prevent that from happening.
    - in other cases the father is the parent that is living and more likely than not he is abusive and possibly has some sort of addiction, whether it be to drugs or alcohol. In many cases with this situation, the children run away from home and live on the streets for a time before the Udayan takes them in and then they find out that the children have parents.
  - some have both parents living, but one parent is in jail or there is another situation that prevents both parents from being able to be home and take care of the children.

- things that the aunties have told me:
  - both of the aunties are from Calcutta, not Rajasthan, so they did not grow up in the same culture as the children. However, they have tried in the years since they have been at the Udayan to understand the specific of Rajasthani culture. They still cannot speak the native dialect, so when they get a new kid that can't speak Hindi and can only speak the dialect, none of the aunties can understand them. These children can only talk to the teachers that are local to the area.
  - aunties learn from the children as much as the children learn from them. The aunties do not have high school educations, so they cannot understand what the older children are learning in school. They have actually learned more about math and science from the kids then they learned when they were children in school. Also, the aunties learn from the international volunteers. None of

them could speak English before coming to the Udayan. While they are still far from fluent, they have learned some words from the volunteers and are able to communicate with those of us that can speak a little Hindi by using a cobbled together Hinglish/sign language.

- the aunties feel that sometimes the volunteers take them for granted. Most of the international volunteer are college students or recent college graduates. The vast majority of them are not India, have never been to India before, and have not taken much time to learn about Indian culture or learned to speak Hindi before coming to India. Since the aunties are not highly educated and the volunteers are very well educated, they sometimes look down on the aunties. Or at least that is how the aunties. And honestly, I was there with a large number of volunteers during my time and I have to agree with them in some cases. Some of the American volunteers complained constantly about the food, the water, the lack of electricity, the lack of Internet access, and other modern amenities. One European volunteer told me that she thought that the staff and children at the Udayan should have to learn English because she had to learn how to speak a handful of European languages and she shouldn't have to learn Hindi too. She thought they shouldn't teach Hindi at all in the schools and that all of the children should only learn how to speak, read, and write English. Whenever we went on field trips to religious ceremonies, some of the American and European volunteers didn't take the time to ask about the rituals that they were observing and just insulted the local religions, one of them actually calling Hinduism "barbaric" and "backwards." However, there were some volunteers that had taken the time to learn the language, educate themselves about the country, and avoid insulting anyone by wearing native dress. These were the volunteers that I have been spending most of my time with.

- Vatsalya as an organization

  - Vatsalya also has an HIV/AIDS education program for bus drivers and prostitutes. Apparently, Jaimala and Hitesh originally worked on health based initiatives. They created the Udayan and enjoy working with children, but their friends encouraged them to continue their health work. This made them start the HIV/AIDS program.

  - Apparently there are also programs in the city for street children. They have vans that drive around the city and provide health and education services for the children living on the streets. Jaimala told me that the drivers of the vans have developed relationships with the ringleaders of the different gangs of children. These leaders let the workers at Vatsalya know whenever there are new children in their gang and make sure that these new kids get checked out by the health workers and go to the classes provided by the educators. This is pretty cool to me. I find it impressive that they have been able to develop these trusting relationships with children that generally don't trust anyone.

- I went to the Vatsalya office in Jaipur yesterday. It is a little place, with lots of computers and people jammed in to every inch of it. Everyone there has a great

energy about them. They seem to be really committed to what they are doing. I didn't get to talk to most of them, but it was interesting just watching

OHIO UNIVERSITY
Office of the Vice President for Research

09E158

Office of Research Compliance
RTEC 117
Athens, OH 45701-2979

T: 740.593.0664
F: 740.593.9838
www.research.ohiou.edu

A determination has been made that the following research study is exempt from IRB review because it involves:

Category 2 - research involving the use of educational tests, survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior

Category 4 - research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if publicly available or recorded without identifiers.

Project Title: Historical, Theoretical and Practical Analysis of the Use of Orphanages in a Third World Context with a Special Emphasis on Children's Villages

Primary Investigator: Megan Casebolt

Co-Investigator(s):

Advisor: Karen Carlson
(if applicable)

Department: Social Work

Robin Stack

Robin Stack, CIP
Office of Research Compliance

06/02/2009
Date

The approval remains in effect provided the study is conducted exactly as described in your application for review. Any additions or modifications to the project must be approved (as an amendment) prior to implementation.