

# Community-Based Child Safety and Protection: A Study in Kamrup Metro, Assam

Dr. Sangita Mahanta<sup>1</sup>, Sashi Prabha Roy<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Professor, University of Science and Technology Meghalaya

<sup>2</sup>Department of Social Work, University of Science and Technology Meghalaya

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100700468>

Received: 22 July 2026; Accepted: 28 July 2026; Published: 04 August 2026

## ABSTRACT

Child safety and protection are essential for ensuring the healthy growth, development, and well-being of children. A safe environment includes not only physical protection but also emotional support, education, dignity, and protection from neglect, abuse, exploitation, and other forms of harm. The present study was conducted in Fatasil Ambari, Kamrup Metro, Assam, to examine community-based child safety and protection mechanisms. The study adopted a quantitative approach with a descriptive research design. The sample size consisted of 100 respondents, including children, parents, teachers, community members, children and staff members of child protection homes, and members of the State Child Protection Society. A purposive sampling technique was used for this study. Primary data were collected through a structured interview schedule, while secondary data were collected from government reports, journals, books, and relevant publications. Quantitative data were analysed using frequency and percentage methods to assess awareness levels, existing protection mechanisms, and challenges related to child safety. The findings highlight the importance of strengthening awareness, community participation, reporting mechanisms, and institutional support for effective child protection. The study provides valuable insights for policymakers, educators, and social workers to enhance community-based child protection systems and create a safer and more supportive environment for children.

**Keywords:** Community-Based Child Protection, Child Rights, Awareness, Policymakers, Capacity building

## INTRODUCTION

Child protection is a critical concern in every society, as every child has the right to grow in a safe, healthy, and supportive environment. However, many children continue to experience violence, neglect, exploitation, abuse, and unsafe living conditions that negatively affect their physical, emotional, and social development. Child protection refers to preventing and responding to all forms of violence, exploitation, abuse, and neglect while ensuring that children live with dignity, safety, and proper care (UNICEF, 2023). In India, child protection has emerged as an important social issue due to the increasing concerns related to child labour, sexual abuse, trafficking, and other forms of exploitation. To address these challenges, the Government of India has introduced various legal and policy frameworks, including the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act, 2012, and the Integrated Child Protection Scheme (ICPS). These initiatives aim to provide care, protection, and rehabilitation for vulnerable children. However, a gap continues to exist between policy provisions and their effective implementation, particularly in rural and semi-urban areas (Paulo, 2023). The Constitution of India provides a strong foundation for child rights and protection. According to the United Nations (2010), constitutional provisions such as Article 15 ensure protection against discrimination and allow special provisions for children, while Article 21A guarantees free and compulsory education for children aged 6–14 years. Article 23 prohibits trafficking and forced labor, Article 24 protects children from hazardous employment, and Article 38 promotes social justice and welfare. These provisions collectively support children's rights, protection, and overall development.

According to the World Health Organization (WHO, 2024), violence against children has long-term consequences on their mental health, education, and social development. Therefore, child protection is not only

a matter of welfare but also an essential component of social development. Effective child protection requires cooperation among families, communities, institutions, and government agencies. Assam, located in Northeast India, is characterized by cultural diversity and unique socio-economic challenges. Despite its natural and cultural richness, the state faces issues such as poverty, unemployment, limited healthcare access, and educational challenges. In many rural and tea garden areas, socio-economic difficulties contribute to school dropout, child labour, and inadequate child care. In urban areas such as Kamrup Metro, rapid urbanization and changing family structures have created additional challenges for child safety. Factors such as poverty, domestic violence, substance abuse, and lack of parental supervision can negatively influence children's physical and emotional well-being (Das, 2019). Various organizations and government initiatives, including Childline 1098, UNICEF programmes, and child protection homes, contribute towards creating safer environments for children through awareness generation, emergency support, and rehabilitation services (The Assam Tribune, 2025). According to the United Nations (2022), an effective child protection system requires strong legal frameworks, community participation, and coordination among different stakeholders. In this context, community-based child protection mechanisms play an important role in identifying risks, improving awareness, and ensuring timely support for vulnerable children. The present study focuses on Kamrup Metro, Assam, to understand existing child safety and protection mechanisms and identify challenges in their implementation. The findings of the study will be useful for policymakers, social workers, educators, and organizations working in child welfare by providing insights into strengthening community participation and developing a safer environment for children's overall growth and development.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The reviewed literature provides an understanding of various dimensions of community-based child protection, including child health, family support, institutional mechanisms, child labor, and the role of government and community stakeholders. Previous studies highlight that effective child protection requires coordination between families, communities, government agencies, and child welfare organizations.

Glaser (2020) in the study of Emotional Abuse and Neglect (Psychological Maltreatment): A Conceptual Framework highlighted that emotional abuse and neglect have serious negative effects on children's psychological development, emotional well-being, and social functioning. The study emphasized that creating a supportive family environment, early identification of risks, and community-based interventions are essential for preventing child neglect and promoting child protection.

Ministry of Women and Child Development (2021) in the report titled Revised Integrated Child Protection Scheme (ICPS) highlighted the importance of strengthening community-level child protection structures for effective implementation of child protection policies. The report emphasized coordination among government agencies, non-governmental organizations, and community groups to identify vulnerable children, provide timely support, and improve accountability within the child protection system.

International Labor Organization (ILO) (2024) in the report titled Global Estimates of Child Labor: Results and Trends examined the global situation of child labor and identified poverty, economic insecurity, and limited educational opportunities as major factors contributing to child exploitation. The report emphasized the need for stronger social protection systems and collaborative efforts to eliminate child labor, particularly in developing countries.

Arisi (2024) in the study of Global Report on Children Care and Protection: Understanding and Preventing the Separation of Children from Their Families highlighted the importance of family-based care and support systems in preventing child neglect and separation. The study emphasized that emotional, social, and economic support from families plays a significant role in ensuring children's safety, security, and healthy development.

The Assam Tribune (2025) in the report titled Child Labor Rescues in Assam Highlight Need for Stronger Community-Based Protection reported the rescue of eight child laborers in Kamrup district through coordinated efforts by district authorities, police, and non-governmental organizations. The report highlighted the continued need for effective monitoring, enforcement of child protection laws, and collaboration among different stakeholders to strengthen child welfare mechanisms in Assam.

Although existing studies have examined child protection from different perspectives, significant gaps remain. Previous research has mainly focused on legal frameworks, child labor, health issues, and government programmes, while limited attention has been given to understanding the effectiveness of community-based child protection mechanisms at the local level. In particular, there is limited research examining awareness, participation, and coordination among parents, schools, communities, child protection homes, and the State Child Protection Society (SCPS) in Kamrup Metropolitan District, Assam. Therefore, the present study attempts to address this gap by analyzing the role of different stakeholders and exploring the challenges and opportunities in strengthening community-based child safety and protection systems.

### Statement of the Problem

Child protection is one of the major social concerns in Kamrup Metro District, Assam. In urban areas such as Kamrup Metro, factors such as parental work commitments, poverty, limited community awareness, and inadequate supervision contribute to the physical, emotional, and social vulnerability of children. Although child protection laws and programmes, including the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act, 2012, and the Integrated Child Protection Scheme (ICPS), have been introduced, their implementation at the community level remains a challenge. Issues such as child labor, domestic violence, abuse, neglect, and psychological distress continue to affect many children in both urban and rural areas. In many cases, incidents of violence remain unidentified or unreported due to the absence of effective community-based child protection mechanisms and local support networks. Ensuring child safety requires the active participation of families, schools, teachers, community leaders, and government agencies. Therefore, the present study seeks to examine the strengths and weaknesses of community-based child protection mechanisms in Kamrup Metro District, Assam, and to understand the challenges in strengthening child safety at the community level.

### Objectives of the Study

- I. To understand the role of community-based child protection systems in Kamrup Metro district of Assam.
- II. To identify major challenges faced by community members and protective committees in implementing child welfare programmes.
- III. To understand the awareness levels among parents, teachers, and local leaders about child protection in the study area.
- IV. To study the strategic intervention and capacity building solutions to improve child safety processes at the grassroots level.

### METHODOLOGY

The present study was conducted in Fatasil Ambari, Kamrup Metropolitan District, Assam, along with four child protection homes, namely Snehalya, Care U365, Assam Child and Women Welfare Society, and Parijat Academy, as well as the State Child Protection Society (SCPS), Assam. These areas were selected purposively, as Fatasil Ambari represents a socially and economically vulnerable community where children are exposed to multiple protection-related risks, while the selected institutions are actively engaged in child care, rehabilitation, education, and protection services. The SCPS, Assam, was included as the nodal government agency responsible for the implementation and monitoring of child protection programmes in the state. As per the Census of India (2011), the population of Kamrup Metropolitan District was 1,253,938. The universe of the study comprised 880 individuals, including parents and community members, students and teachers from one government and one private school located in Fatasil Ambari, children and staff members from the four selected child protection homes, and officials of the State Child Protection Society (SCPS), Assam (Source: Field Work Data).

The study adopted a quantitative research approach with a descriptive research design. The sample size was 100 respondents, including parents and community members, students, teachers, children and staff members of child protection homes, and officials of SCPS, Assam. A purposive sampling technique was used for this study. Primary data were collected through a structured interview schedule, while secondary data were obtained from government reports, books, peer-reviewed journals, NGO publications, census reports, and relevant official websites. The collected data were analyzed using statistical tools such as frequency and percentage distribution

in order to examine awareness levels, identify prevailing challenges, and assess the effectiveness of community-based child protection mechanisms in Kamrup Metropolitan District, Assam.

## DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Table1: Gender Distribution of Respondents (N = 100)

| Gender | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|--------|-----------|----------------|
| Male   | 55        | 55%            |
| Female | 45        | 45%            |
| Total  | 100       | 100%           |

Source: Field Work by researchers

The table shows that 55% of the respondents were male and 45% were female. The relatively balanced representation of both genders indicates that the study captured perspectives from both men and women regarding child safety and protection. This distribution strengthens the reliability of the findings by reflecting diverse experiences and responsibilities related to child protection within the community.

Table 2: Age Distribution of Respondents (N = 100)

| Age Group      | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|----------------|-----------|----------------|
| 10–18 years    | 40        | 40%            |
| 19–35 years    | 30        | 30%            |
| 36–60 years    | 25        | 25%            |
| Above 60 years | 5         | 5%             |
| Total          | 100       | 100%           |

Source: Field Work by researchers

The table indicates that the largest proportion of respondents (40%) belonged to the 10–18 years age group, followed by 19–35 years (30%), 36–60 years (25%), and above 60 years (5%). The inclusion of children, parents, teachers, and community members provided perspectives from different age groups, enabling a comprehensive understanding of child safety and protection from both beneficiaries and caregivers.

Table 3: Awareness of Child Rights among Respondents (N=100)

| Respondent Category                                                                                                       | Aware | Not Aware | Total |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| Care U365 Children                                                                                                        | 4     | 1         | 5     |
| Snehalaya Children                                                                                                        | 5     | 0         | 5     |
| Assam Child and Women Welfare Society Children                                                                            | 4     | 1         | 5     |
| Parijat Academy Children                                                                                                  | 5     | 0         | 5     |
| Parents/Community Members                                                                                                 | 15    | 5         | 20    |
| One Government School Students                                                                                            | 15    | 5         | 20    |
| One Private School Students                                                                                               | 7     | 3         | 10    |
| One Government School Teachers                                                                                            | 10    | 0         | 10    |
| One Private School Teachers                                                                                               | 10    | 0         | 10    |
| Child Protection home staff member (1 Care U365, 1 Snehalaya, 1 Parijat Academy, 2 Assam Child and Women Welfare Society) | 5     | 0         | 5     |
| SCPS (Assam) Members                                                                                                      | 5     | 0         | 5     |
| Total                                                                                                                     | 85    | 15        | 100   |

Source: Field Work by researchers

The findings show that 85% of the respondents were aware of child rights, while 15% were not aware. Awareness was highest among teachers, child protection home staff members, SCPS members, and children from Snehalaya and Parijat Academy. Comparatively lower awareness was observed among some parents, school students, and children from Care U365 and Assam Child and Women Welfare Society. The findings indicate that although awareness of child rights is generally high, variations exist across different stakeholder groups.

Table 4: Awareness of POCSO Act and Juvenile Justice Act (N=100)

| Respondent Category                                                                                                       | Aware | Not Aware | Total |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| Care U365 Children                                                                                                        | 3     | 2         | 5     |
| Snehalaya Children                                                                                                        | 4     | 1         | 5     |
| Assam Child and Women Welfare Society Children                                                                            | 3     | 2         | 5     |
| Parijat Academy Children                                                                                                  | 4     | 1         | 5     |
| Parents/Community Members                                                                                                 | 15    | 5         | 20    |
| One Government School Students                                                                                            | 8     | 12        | 20    |
| One Private School Students                                                                                               | 4     | 6         | 10    |
| One Government School Teachers                                                                                            | 10    | 0         | 10    |
| One Private School Teachers                                                                                               | 10    | 0         | 10    |
| Child Protection home staff member (1 Care U365, 1 Snehalaya, 1 Parijat Academy, 2 Assam Child and Women Welfare Society) | 5     | 0         | 5     |
| SCPS (Assam) Members                                                                                                      | 5     | 0         | 5     |
| Total                                                                                                                     | 68    | 32        | 100   |

Source: Field Work by researchers

The table reveals that 68% of the respondents were aware of the POCSO Act and the Juvenile Justice Act, whereas 32% were not aware. Awareness was highest among teachers, child protection home staff members, and SCPS members, reflecting their direct involvement in child protection activities. In contrast, awareness among school students and children from some child protection homes was comparatively lower, indicating differences in legal awareness across respondent categories.

Table 5: Awareness about Child Helpline 1098 (N=100)

| Respondent Category                                                                                                       | Aware | Not Aware | Total |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|
| Care U365 Children                                                                                                        | 4     | 1         | 5     |
| Snehalaya Children                                                                                                        | 5     | 0         | 5     |
| Assam Child and Women Welfare Society Children                                                                            | 4     | 1         | 5     |
| Parijat Academy Children                                                                                                  | 5     | 0         | 5     |
| Parents/Community Members                                                                                                 | 15    | 5         | 20    |
| One Government School Students                                                                                            | 12    | 8         | 20    |
| One Private School Students                                                                                               | 6     | 4         | 10    |
| One Government School Teachers                                                                                            | 10    | 0         | 10    |
| One Private School Teachers                                                                                               | 10    | 0         | 10    |
| Child Protection home staff member (1 Care U365, 1 Snehalaya, 1 Parijat Academy, 2 Assam Child and Women Welfare Society) | 5     | 0         | 5     |
| SCPS (Assam) Members                                                                                                      | 5     | 0         | 5     |
| Total                                                                                                                     | 81    | 19        | 100   |

Source: Field Work by researchers

The findings indicate that 81% of the respondents were aware of Child Helpline 1098, while 19% were not aware. Awareness was highest among teachers, child protection home staff members, SCPS members, and children from Snehalaya and Parijat Academy. Comparatively lower awareness was observed among school students and some



children from other child protection homes. The findings suggest that awareness of emergency child protection services is relatively high, although differences remain among stakeholder groups.

Table 6: Availability of Child Protection Committee/Club (N=100)

| Respondent Category                                                                                                       | Available | Not Available | Total |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------------|-------|
| Care U365 Children                                                                                                        | 3         | 2             | 5     |
| Snehalaya Children                                                                                                        | 4         | 1             | 5     |
| Assam Child and Women Welfare Society Children                                                                            | 3         | 2             | 5     |
| Parijat Academy Children                                                                                                  | 5         | 0             | 5     |
| Parents/Community Members                                                                                                 | 13        | 7             | 20    |
| One Government School Students                                                                                            | 14        | 6             | 20    |
| One Private School Students                                                                                               | 7         | 3             | 10    |
| One Government School Teachers                                                                                            | 8         | 2             | 10    |
| One Private School Teachers                                                                                               | 8         | 2             | 10    |
| Child Protection home staff member (1 Care U365, 1 Snehalaya, 1 Parijat Academy, 2 Assam Child and Women Welfare Society) | 5         | 0             | 5     |
| SCPS (Assam) Members                                                                                                      | 5         | 0             | 5     |
| Total                                                                                                                     | 76        | 24            | 100   |

Source: Field Work by researchers

The table shows that 76% of the respondents reported the availability of a Child Protection Committee/Club, while 24% reported its absence. Availability was consistently reported by Child Protection Home staff members, SCPS members, and children from Parijat Academy. In contrast, lower availability was observed among some parents, school students, and children from Care U365, Snehalaya, and Assam Child and Women Welfare Society.

Table 7: Participation in Child Protection Training/Programmes (N=100)

| Respondent Category                                                                                                       | Participated | Not Participated | Total |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|------------------|-------|
| Care U365 Children                                                                                                        | 3            | 2                | 5     |
| Snehalaya Children                                                                                                        | 4            | 1                | 5     |
| Assam Child and Women Welfare Society Children                                                                            | 3            | 2                | 5     |
| Parijat Academy Children                                                                                                  | 4            | 1                | 5     |
| Parents/Community Members                                                                                                 | 8            | 12               | 20    |
| One Government School Students                                                                                            | 10           | 10               | 20    |
| One Private School Students                                                                                               | 5            | 5                | 10    |
| One Government School Teachers                                                                                            | 9            | 1                | 10    |
| One Private School Teachers                                                                                               | 9            | 1                | 10    |
| Child Protection home staff member (1 Care U365, 1 Snehalaya, 1 Parijat Academy, 2 Assam Child and Women Welfare Society) | 5            | 0                | 5     |
| SCPS (Assam) Members                                                                                                      | 5            | 0                | 5     |
| Total                                                                                                                     | 65           | 35               | 100   |

Source: Field Work by researchers

Table 8: Knowledge of Reporting Mechanism and Safety Support (N=100)

| Respondent Category                            | Know | Do Not Know | Total |
|------------------------------------------------|------|-------------|-------|
| Care U365 Children                             | 4    | 1           | 5     |
| Snehalaya Children                             | 5    | 0           | 5     |
| Assam Child and Women Welfare Society Children | 4    | 1           | 5     |
| Parijat Academy Children                       | 5    | 0           | 5     |

|                                                                                                                           |    |    |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|-----|
| Parents/Community Members                                                                                                 | 16 | 4  | 20  |
| One Government School Students                                                                                            | 14 | 6  | 20  |
| One Private School Students                                                                                               | 7  | 3  | 10  |
| One Government School Teachers                                                                                            | 10 | 0  | 10  |
| One Private School Teachers                                                                                               | 10 | 0  | 10  |
| Child Protection home staff member (1 Care U365, 1 Snehalaya, 1 Parijat Academy, 2 Assam Child and Women Welfare Society) | 5  | 0  | 5   |
| SCPS (Assam) Members                                                                                                      | 5  | 0  | 5   |
| Total                                                                                                                     | 85 | 15 | 100 |

Source: Field Work by researchers

The table shows that 85% of the respondents knew about the reporting mechanism and safety support, while 15% did not know. Knowledge was highest among Government and Private School teachers, Child Protection Home staff members, and SCPS members. Among children, Snehalaya and Parijat Academy showed higher knowledge than Care U365 and Assam Child and Women Welfare Society.

Table 9: Discussion of Child Safety by Teachers/Caregivers (N=100)

| Respondent Category                                                                                                       | Yes | No | Total |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|-------|
| Care U365 Children                                                                                                        | 4   | 1  | 5     |
| Snehalaya Children                                                                                                        | 5   | 0  | 5     |
| Assam Child and Women Welfare Society Children                                                                            | 4   | 1  | 5     |
| Parijat Academy Children                                                                                                  | 5   | 0  | 5     |
| Parents/Community Members                                                                                                 | 16  | 4  | 20    |
| One Government School Students                                                                                            | 15  | 5  | 20    |
| One Private School Students                                                                                               | 7   | 3  | 10    |
| One Government School Teachers                                                                                            | 10  | 0  | 10    |
| One Private School Teachers                                                                                               | 10  | 0  | 10    |
| Child Protection home staff member (1 Care U365, 1 Snehalaya, 1 Parijat Academy, 2 Assam Child and Women Welfare Society) | 5   | 0  | 5     |
| SCPS (Assam) Members                                                                                                      | 5   | 0  | 5     |
| Total                                                                                                                     | 86  | 14 | 100   |

Source: Field Work by researchers

The table shows that 86% of the respondents agreed that they discuss child safety, while 14% reported that they do not. Positive responses were highest among Government and Private School teachers, Child Protection Home staff members, SCPS members, and children from Snehalaya and Parijat Academy. However, comparatively fewer positive responses were reported by Government and Private School students.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### • Child rights awareness

The findings indicate that awareness of child rights was relatively high among respondents. However, the level of understanding varied across stakeholder groups. Teachers, child protection home staff, and State Child Protection Society (SCPS) members demonstrated better knowledge than parents and school students. Although many respondents had heard about child rights, practical understanding of their application remained limited.

### • Community-based child protection mechanisms

The study found differences in awareness of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act, 2012 and the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015. Higher awareness was observed

among teachers, SCPS members, and child protection professionals, whereas comparatively lower awareness was found among parents and students. The findings indicate unequal dissemination of legal awareness among different stakeholder groups.

- **Child vulnerability and family context**

The study highlights that children's vulnerability is closely associated with poverty, family instability, neglect, and limited educational opportunities. Evidence from child protection homes indicates that many children requiring institutional care belong to economically and socially disadvantaged families. These findings demonstrate the close relationship between family circumstances and child protection needs.

- **Institutional support and child protection homes**

The findings show that Care U365, Snehalaya, Assam Child and Women Welfare Society, Parijat Academy, and the State Child Protection Society (SCPS) provide shelter, education, counselling, rehabilitation, healthcare, and psychosocial support to vulnerable children. These institutions play an important role in supporting government child protection services.

- **Reporting mechanisms and protection services**

Although awareness of Child Helpline 1098 and other reporting mechanisms was relatively high, the findings indicate that awareness does not always lead to reporting. Fear, social stigma, family pressure, and lack of confidence in formal systems continue to discourage reporting of child protection concerns.

- **Role of parents**

The study found that parents are the primary caregivers responsible for ensuring children's safety and well-being. Children from supportive family environments were found to experience better protection than those from families affected by poverty, neglect, or limited parental supervision. The findings indicate that parental involvement plays an important role in preventing child vulnerability.

- **Role of teachers**

Teachers emerged as key stakeholders in child protection because of their regular interaction with children. The findings indicate that teachers contribute to child safety by promoting awareness, identifying behavioural changes, encouraging disclosure of concerns, and guiding children towards appropriate support services.

- **Role of social workers**

The study identified social workers as essential professionals within the child protection system. They provide counselling, case management, rehabilitation, family intervention, awareness programmes, and coordination with Child Welfare Committees, schools, NGOs, and government agencies. Their role contributes significantly to the protection and rehabilitation of vulnerable children.

## SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Develop a community-based child protection action plan**

Local authorities should prepare ward-level child protection action plans involving schools, NGOs, health workers, police personnel, and community leaders. Such coordinated planning will improve early identification of vulnerable children, prevention of risks, and timely response to child protection concerns.

- **Introduce child protection education in schools**

Child protection education should be included in school activities through life-skills education, awareness



sessions, and interactive classroom discussions. This will help children understand their rights, identify unsafe situations, and develop confidence to seek help when required.

- **Strengthen child-friendly reporting systems**

Child-friendly reporting mechanisms should be developed through help desks, confidential complaint systems, and digital platforms in schools and communities. These facilities will encourage children and caregivers to report abuse, neglect, and exploitation without fear.

- **Improve coordination among child protection agencies**

Better coordination should be established among government departments, Child Welfare Committees (CWCs), District Child Protection Units (DCPUs), police, NGOs, and healthcare institutions through regular meetings and joint monitoring systems.

- **Expand mental health and psychosocial support services**

Counselling, trauma care, and psychosocial support should be made available in schools, child care institutions, and communities. These services will support children dealing with abuse, neglect, emotional difficulties, and stressful experiences.

- **Promote community participation in child protection**

Local communities should be encouraged to participate through youth groups, women's groups, self-help groups, and volunteers. Active community involvement can help identify vulnerable children and create a safer environment.

- **Strengthen rehabilitation and after-care services**

Children leaving institutional care should receive continued support through education assistance, vocational training, career guidance, and follow-up services to ensure successful rehabilitation and independent living.

- **Promote technology-based child protection services**

Digital platforms, mobile applications, online awareness programmes, and communication systems should be developed to improve access to information, reporting facilities, and coordination among child protection stakeholders.

- **Enhance capacity building of child protection professionals**

Regular training programmes should be organized for social workers, teachers, police, staff members of child protection homes and child protection officials to improve their skills in counselling, legal procedures, case management, and child-friendly interventions.

## CONCLUSION

The present study provides an understanding of the existing child protection environment and the experiences of different stakeholders involved in ensuring child well-being. The study highlights that child protection is not only a legal or institutional concern but also a social responsibility that requires continuous attention from families, communities, and organizations. The findings demonstrate that children safety is influenced by the social environment in which they grow, including family relationships, community support, educational settings, and access to protective services. The involvement of various stakeholders reflects the interconnected nature of child protection, where each group contributes differently towards creating a secure environment for children. The study further indicates that despite the presence of child protection frameworks and support systems, ensuring the complete well-being of children remains a continuous process. Child protection requires long-term commitment, sensitivity towards children's experiences, and an approach that considers their emotional, social,

and developmental needs. Overall, the study concludes that building a child-friendly society requires a collective vision where children are recognized as individuals with rights, dignity, and potential. Sustainable child protection can be achieved when efforts are directed towards creating supportive environments that allow every child to grow safely, participate actively in society, and achieve their full potential.

## REFERENCES

1. Arisi, W. (2024). *Global report on children's care and protection: Understanding and preventing the separation of children from their families*. sos children village international report.
2. Batta, S. (2022). *Safety and Child Protection Manual*. Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce & Industry (FICCI ARISE). [https://ficci.in/spdocument/20830/FICCI-School-Safety-Manual-Report\\_Web.pdf](https://ficci.in/spdocument/20830/FICCI-School-Safety-Manual-Report_Web.pdf).
3. Das, N. (2019). *Challenges in implementing child protection programs in Assam: A community perspective*, *North-East Development Journal*, 12(3),77-95.
4. Glaser, E. (2020). Emotional abuse and neglect (psychological maltreatment): A conceptual framework. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 43(2),127-130.
5. Government of Assam . (2020). *Child rights and helpline*.Government of Assam. <https://police.assam.gov.in/frontimpotentdata/child-right-and-helpline>.
6. International Labour Organization. (2024). *Global estimates of child labour: Results and trends*. Geneva: ILO.
7. Medrano, C. (2020). *Community involvement in child protection:Lessons for Indian states*. New Delhi, India: Ministry of Women and Child Development.
8. Ministry of Women and Child Development . (2021). *Study on child abuse in India: Patterns,prevalence, and prevention*. New Delhi, India: Ministry of women and child development.
9. NITI AYOOG. (2025). *Online safety for children : Protecting the next generation from harm*. Govt of India.
10. Paulo, S. (2023). *World report on violence against children*. Geneva. Switzerland: United Nations.
11. The Assam Tribune. (2025). *Child labor rescues in Assam highlight need for stronger community-based protection*. Guwahati, Assam.
12. UNICEF. (2023). *Child protectionin India: Policies programs,and community-based strategies*. New Delhi, India.
13. United Nations. (2022). *The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child*. New Delhi: New Delhi publication.
14. WHO. (2024). *Countries pledge to act on childhood violence affecting some 1 billion children*. *World Health Organization*. <https://www.who.int/news/item/07-11-2024-countries-pledge-to-act-on-childhood-violence-affecting--some-1-billion-children>.