



Does the Index of Child Right Fulfillment Explain the Children's Wellbeing in Indonesia?

Nanda Restu Vebrianna^{1*}, Lukman Hakim², Tetuko Rawidyo Putro³

^{1,2,3} Faculty of Economics and Business, Sebelas Maret University, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: A safe city for children becomes the evidence of the role and the action of the government to improve children's well-being. This city also prevents any violence against children by collaborating the roles of the government and the parents. This research reviews the determinant factors of children's well-being in Indonesia based on the factors of parents' contributions and government role. This research's contribution is - to the children's well-being in Indonesia by fulfilling their rights. The implications of the study are - to determine the index of children's fulfillment and to explain the children's well-being seen from the factors of parent and government roles. This research applied multiple linear regression on the panel data from 2018 to 2021 in Indonesia. The research findings included the index of child rights fulfillment in Indonesia could explain the factors of children's well-being in Indonesia with the collaborated roles from the parents and the government. However, specific attention is important for the government expenditure on various sectors to optimize the children's well-being. Low realizations for government expenditure were observable in the educational and social well-being sectors.

KEYWORDS: Children's Well-being, Government Expenditure, Linear Regression, Macro Economy and the Impacts.

INTRODUCTION

Sustainable establishment and development as stated in the SDGs of developing countries, including Indonesia, are to improve the economic welfare of the people sustainable, to keep the living environment and inclusive development, and to realize excellent management of improving the national life from a generation to generations (Gowdy, 2005).

The other primary goal of SDGs, Sustainable Development Goals 2030, is to eradicate poverty (Ishartono & et al., 2016). This goal includes efforts to improve all populations of various ages. The specific objective of the targeted achievement is to provide equal rights and economic source access for the citizens, starting from basic rights and services. The fulfillment of basic rights becomes a matter to consider in the effort of poverty eradication. The primary goals of SDGs go along with Indonesia's preparation efforts to encounter the golden age after independence, in the future year, 2045. That moment, the golden age of Indonesia, will be full of individuals aged between 32 and 51 years old. Thus, those aged 32 years old in that year are children born or living in 2023. The basic rights to eradicate poverty in 2045, in the golden age, should have been considered and become the priority in the SDGs. This matter goes along with the effort of improving the sustainable community's well-being and welfare. Children are the future generation of a nation. Thus, they must receive their rights to realize the national ideals. Therefore, their welfare and well-being must be improved, cared for, nurtured, and focused, especially on the rights to grow and develop based on their ages and their potential. The "Convention of Children's Rights" stated in the United Nations defines children are individuals aged between 0 and 18 years old. Unfulfilled basic rights for children's development and growth indicate low children's well-being. The realizations of low well-being could be bullying, violence against children, lack of child right fulfillment, child victimization, or a child committing a crime. These situations interrupt the growth and development of children's lives. In this context, working children and children with early marriage, under 18 years old, may lead to high stunting prevalence. These problems become a set of problems to prevent because the problems hinder children's growth and development normally, including physical and psychological growth. These matters influence the future generation and life of the children.

The annual violence rate of Indonesia is still dominated by violence against children, more than 50% of the whole violence case rate. Therefore, children's well-being should receive specific attention for excellent sustainable development. The government has put some efforts to meet children's rights, such as by issuing the Law of Child Protection. Article 26(1), Law Number 35 the Year 2014, about Child Right Protection asserts that children's right fulfillment is the responsibility of the parents. Thus, the parents must nurture and protect the children. (Thomson, 2014) explains the efforts of realizing the benefits for children require the parents to



provide adequate time and materials. Children must grow and develop adequately to realize positive results (Yue et al., 2017). Thus, parents must provide balanced time to support and control the children. From the material aspect, parents do not only provide excellent meals and shelters but also an excellent environment and education. Therefore, children's well-being is inseparable from the economic and social situations of the family (Sisha, 2020). These two indicators of children's well-being become the parts and the efforts to monitor the achievements of SDGs, starting from the basic right fulfillment and socio-economic community by observing the rights of the children to grow in the environment (Nomaguchi & Milkie, 2020a).

The Ministry of Woman Empowerment and Child Protection, KPPPA, measures children's well-being with the Index of Children's Rights Fulfillment, IPHA. However, the indicators could only measure the achieved children's rights. In this case, the achievement dealt with provincial institutions to implement children's rights.

On the other hand, any cities or regencies that could realize the status of safe cities for children based on the given index must measure the support and effort of the government to realize and encourage the basic children's rights in the regency's environment. Unfortunately, this set of actions could not observe the individual well-being (Ma et al., 2023). The subjectively measured unit could also measure and describe individuals in life to explain the quality of the children instead of the obtained material conditions (Conica et al., 2023).

The Convention of Child Rights by the United Nations in 1989 applies the normative framework to ensure children's capability to share and express their life experiences (Main & Bradshaw, 2012). In recent years, the initiation of international studies has been collecting information on various aspects of children's well-being. The report of Innocent Care by UNICEF reviewed the children's well-being multi-dimensionally. Besides that, the Children's Society of Good Childhood Report and International Child Welfare Survey focused their attention on the international stakeholders to understand the perspective of children's lives. This research contributes significantly to improving the understanding of children's well-being. The results found the importance of social capital considerations, such as the family, school, compassion relationship in a community, and socio-economic situation (poverty and lack of materials).

Studies about children's rights could explain the children's well-being in Indonesia. Thus, the goal of SDGs, to eradicate poverty, could be achieved by considering the roles of parents and government. Law Number 1 of Republic Indonesia, Number 4 the Year 1979 explains that children are those younger than 21 years old, unmarried, and have the potential to carry out the national ideals, and future national generation. Children's well-being refers to life order to guarantee the development and the growth of children normally and comprehensively both in physical and community conditions. The community and government commit to ensuring the children's well-being (Heymann et al., 2017).

Well-being is observable from two aspects. The first one is the general well-being based on the fulfilled condition by most people until certain limitations. The second aspect is - fulfilling the basic life aspects. The examples are: providing meals, clothes, shelter, excellent health, excellent education, proper jobs, and secured shelters in Kementerian Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak/the Ministry of Woman Empowerment and Child Protection (Kota, n.d., 2016). From the well-being aspect, children with excellent well-being refer to children with proper activities based on their ages, such as playing or studying.

(Dalirazar, 2003) also found the influence of per-capita income, distributed income, literacy, socio-economic conflict, and military conflict on the children's well-being. Collectively, these factors influence the children's health. Moreover, the per-capita income directly influences the children's health and nutritional status. The development of per-capita income improves the children's living support (Buehler, 2020). Thus, high per-capita income leads to excellent children's fulfillment and well-being. (Abington & Blankenau, 2013) explain the distribution of income to measure the received incomes by every individual or domestic family. The income distribution of a country or a province is measurable from the Gini ratio, with a coefficient between 0 and 1. The value of 1 shows the under-average distribution while the value of 0 shows a perfectly average distribution of the incomes.

Income distribution is an important socio-welfare factor (Fleurbaey et al., 2014) Children are the parts of the community. Therefore, income distribution influences children's well-being. High income distribution in a certain area leads to high children's well-being in this area (Dalirazar, 2002)

(Gunes & Ural Marchand, 2020) explains that the expected academic year becomes the indicator for humans, including children. Children's literacy skills also influence the cognition and psychomotor to protect and nurture children (Nordtveit, 2008). The expectations of schools toward both male and female students influence the children's well-being. An example is - the high education of parents and long teaching hours improve the children's well-being. This matter also indicates that the children will have improved



cognition and education. The other indication is - children will have the opportunity to go to school. (Nomaguchi & Milkie, 2020b) explain that the government is part of fiscal policy. The government must regulate the financial policy by applying varied government structures and mechanisms to regulate the fiscal policy. For example, the government declares the expenditure and tax instead of financial policy (Barnes et al., 2017). Fiscal policy is not the goal of a macroeconomic policy. Health status also increases due to public expenditure for the health sector. Excellent health also improves wellbeing and vice versa. This matter is also important for children.

(Dalirazar, 2002) explains that government expenditure reflects the government policy. When the government applies the guideline to purchase goods and services, the government expenditure reflects the incurred cost to execute the policy. The government sees education as an important factor in developing the national economy. This matter is observable in the public spending level in the educational field, reaching 20% of the state budget. (Gunawardena & Stich, 2021) argues that training becomes a human resource investment to provide better benefits in the future. Education is the objective of sustainable economic development. Thus, education is important for national growth and development because education contributes to aggregate production.

(Buehler, 2020b) explains that government expenditure for the socio-welfare field is reflected in the government policy. When the government applies the guideline to purchase goods and services, the government expenditure reflects the incurred cost to execute the policy. The government sees education as an important factor in developing the national economy. (Skoufias & Olivieri, 2013) explain that government expenditure influences the community interest of Northern Sulawesi citizens.

METHOD

This research reviews some determinant factors of children's well-being in Indonesia, such as the roles of the parents and the government. This research took the secondary data with panel data from 2018 to 2021 in 34 provinces of Indonesia. The applied method was panel data regression to determine the influence of various factors, including the roles of the parents and government toward the children's well-being in Indonesia with the Stata 17 program. Here is the estimated regression model of the research.

Children's wellbeing = the roles of the parent + the roles of the government

$$IKKA_i = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{PendapatanPerKapita(PPK)} + \beta_2 \text{DistribusiPendapatan(DP)} + \beta_3 \text{HarapaLamaSekolah(HLS)} + \beta_4 \text{PengeluaranPemerintah di sektor Kesehatan (KES)} + \beta_5 \text{PengeluaranPemerintah di sektor Pendidikan(PEND)} + \beta_6 \text{PengeluaranPemerintah di sektor Kesejahteraan Sosial (SOS)} + \mu_i$$

Notes: *IKKA* refers to children's well-being seen from the Index of Child Right Fulfillment (IPHA); *FaktorPeranOrangTua* or the role of parent is the contribution and the role of the parents in children's wellbeing from the per-capita income (PPK), the expected time of schooling (HLS), and the income distribution; *FaktorPeranPemerintah* or the role of government refers to the roles of the government based on the government expenditure for health sector (KES), educational sector (PEND), and social sector (SOS). Table 1 presents the definition of each variable.

Table 1. Variable Definition

| | Variable | Definitions |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Dependent | Children's Wellbeing (IKKA) | The measurement of children's well-being is based on the Index of Child Right Fulfillment, calculated on a scale of 0-100. The measurement consists of 4 groups: the civil rights and freedom cluster, the family environmental group and alternative nurturing, the basic health and wellbeing cluster, and the education benefits on the leisure time and the cultural activity cluster. The data were from the Ministry of Woman Empowerment and Child Protection (KPPPA), 2018-2021 taken from 34 provinces in Indonesia. |
| | The Factors of Parents' Roles | |
| Independent | The Per-Capita Income (PPK) | The average income of citizens in a country. The derived indicators are from the gross domestic product for each capita in thousand rupiah. The data are from the Central Bureau of Statistics. The applied data were from 2018 to 2021, taken from 34 provinces in Indonesia. |



| Variable | Definitions |
|-------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| The Income Distributions (DP) | The income distribution measures the income gaps among individuals in a domestic family with the measurement unit given by the Central Bureau of Statistics, the Gini ratio with 0 and 1 index. The data were from the Central Bureau of Statistics, BPS, from 2018 to 2021, taken from 34 provinces in Indonesia. |
| The Expected School Years (HLS) | The indicators of expected school years were useful in determining the educational system development status of Indonesian citizens. These citizens would get older at a later time. The researchers took the data from 2018 until 2021 from all 34 provinces in Indonesia based on the Central Bureau statistics. |
| The Roles of the Government | |
| The Government Expenditure on Health Sector (KES) | This expenditure is useful to realize the specific budget of the government for the health sector. The applied measurement unit is a thousand rupiah. The data were from the Central Bureau of Statistics, BPS, from 2018 to 2021, taken from 34 provinces in Indonesia. |
| The Government Expenditure on Education Sector (PEND) | This specific fund is useful for the educational sector. The applied measurement is a thousand rupiah. The data were from the Central Bureau of Statistics, BPS, from 2018 to 2021, taken from 34 provinces in Indonesia. |
| The Government Expenditure on Social Sector (SOS) | This specific expenditure is useful for the social welfare sector. The applied measurement is a thousand rupiah. The data were from the Central Bureau of Statistics, BPS, from 2018 to 2021, taken from 34 provinces in Indonesia. |

Source: Author's Calculation Results (2023).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section provides the panel data regression analysis to determine the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable. Table 2 shows the results of the influential factors of children's well-being in Indonesia.

Table 2. Panel Regression Statistics

| Variable | | CEM | FEM | REM |
|----------|-------------|----------|----------|----------|
| PPK | Coefficient | 4.342 | 11.637 | 4.858 |
| | Probability | 0,000. | 0,042** | 0,008* |
| DP | Coefficient | 10,840 | -101,456 | -37,253 |
| | Probability | 0,437 | 0,007* | 0,085** |
| HLS | Coefficient | 4,423 | 8,763 | 5,274 |
| | Probability | 0,000* | 0,028** | 0,000* |
| KES | Coefficient | 2,043 | 2,839 | 2,475 |
| | Probability | 0,000* | 0,000* | 0,000* |
| PEND | Coefficient | 1,212 | 0,662 | 0,998 |
| | Probability | 0,257 | 0,463 | 0,239 |
| SOS | Coefficient | -0,538 | 0,107 | -0,028 |
| | Probability | 0,617 | 0,893 | 0,971 |
| CONS | Coefficient | -122,196 | -238,035 | -140,070 |
| | Probability | 0,000* | 0,020** | 0,000* |
| R-square | | 0,432 | 0,306 | 0,389 |
| Prob.F | | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |



NOTE

CEM = *Common Effect Model*

FEM = *Fixed Effect Model*

REM = *Random Effect Model*

* = Significance 1% ; ** = Significance 5% ; *** = Significance 10%

Source: Author's Calculation Results From Stata (2023).

Table 2 shows the estimated influential factor analysis of Indonesian children's well-being. After the Chow and Hausman test, the obtained results showed the most appropriate model should not apply the Random Effect, Model, REM. Here is the equation

$$IKKA = -140.070 + 4.858*PPK - 37.253*DP + 5.274*HLS + 2.475*KES + 0.998*PEND - 0.028*SOS(2)$$

The per-capita income, PPK, positively influenced the children's well-being (IKKA). The coefficient is 4.858, indicating a per-capita income increment of Rp 100.000. This increment leads to improved children's well-being for 4.858. The PROB shows a value of 0.008. The value indicates the per-capita income, PPK, significantly influences the children's well-being, IKKA. The P-value of the income distribution, DP, is 0.085. The coefficient is -37.253. The value indicates for each 5% income distribution gap, a significant negative impact on the children's well-being is observable. This correlation lowers the indicators to 37.253. The expected school years, HLS, positively and significantly influenced the Indonesian children's well-being. If the parents kept their education for an added year, the index of child well-being increased by 5.274. The government expenditure on health, KES, positively influenced the children's well-being (IKKA). The obtained result is 2.745. The value indicates the government expenditure increment, for at least Rp 100,000, on the health sector, the children's incentive also improves for Rp. 2.475. The government expenditure for education, PEND, positively and insignificantly influenced the children's well-being (IKKA). This result is similar to the previous result. If the government expenditure increases for Rp 100,000 on the educational sector, the index of child well-being improves by 0.998. The government expenditure on social welfare, SOS, negatively influenced the children's well-being (IKKA). The evidence was observable on each increment of the social welfare field for Rp. 100.000, the children's well-being index got lower to 0.028.

The panel data regression test found a positive and significant influence. The result indicates the per-capita increment influenced the children's well-being in Indonesia. This matter goes along with the development of information and technology and the success of SDGs with a focus on future generation empowerment. This effort could improve the children's well-being in the future and eradicate poverty.

(Wagmiller et al., 2020) also found that per-capita income significantly influenced the children's well-being. (Purtell et al., 2012) also found that income was useful for children's wellbeing by encouraging education in developing countries. The studies show the differences between the urban and suburban areas. The observation found low income lowered the educational level of suburban areas.

The statistical test also found that income distribution negatively and significantly influenced the children's well-being in Indonesia. The result shows a 5% increment of income distribution gap negatively and significantly influences the children's well-being for 37.253. This matter decreases the children's well-being index.

(Dalirazar, 2003) found income distribution as the primary and influential factor in children's well-being. In this research, the income distribution negatively influenced the children's well-being. High-income distribution led to low children's welfare. On the other hand, low-income distribution led to high children's well-being.

(Latif, 2009) also found that in Pakistan education became the primary factor of basic education for individuals. The facts in the research found that parents without educational levels would have children without primary education.

Table 2 shows that government expenditure on the health sector positively and significantly influences children's well-being. The result indicates each government expenditure on the health sector influences the children's well-being. Well-being is an important matter for children's wellbeing. On the other hand, the government expenditure for health spending on healthy nutritional status was expected to prevent stunting and empower the future generation of health in Indonesia (Fu et al., 2020). These matters are achievable with the government expenditure on the health sector.

(Dalirazar, 2003) found that government expenditure on health positively influenced the children's wellbeing. In this review, the fiscal policy of the government on the health field could improve the social capital of humans within the economic development.



The findings showed that the government expenditure on the education sector positively influenced the children's wellbeing in Indonesia but it was not significant. Education is a long-term investment. The results of education are observable some years later after the individuals accomplish the education. This matter positively influences the children's well-being. However, the impacts were indirect and insignificant. Some reasons also show the reasons children do not directly experience educational fund distribution. The government spending distribution on education in 2018 was for the Indonesia Pintar program. This program targeted 19.6 million citizens. The other program was School Operational Cost Assistance, targeting 56 million individuals. The other programs were *Bidikmisi* with a target of 401.500 students, school and class building rehabilitation with a target of 61.200 schools, and teacher-professional grant. This grant targets both non-civil servant teachers (435.900) and civil servant teachers (257.200), and regional teachers with civil servant status (1.2 million teachers). The government expenditure on education did not have a specific allotment for children aged between 0 and 18 years old. This matter also caused the insignificant effect of government expenditure on the educational sector toward the children's well-being (Dettlaff et al., 2011).

The findings showed that the government expenditure on the education sector positively influenced the children's wellbeing in Indonesia but it was not significant. Education is a long-term investment. The results of education are observable some years later after the individuals accomplish the education. This matter positively influences the children's well-being. However, the impacts were indirect and insignificant. Some reasons also show the reasons children do not directly experience educational fund distribution. The government spending distribution on education in 2018 was for the Indonesia Pintar program. This program targeted 19.6 million citizens. The other program was School Operational Cost Assistance, targeting 56 million individuals. The other programs were *Bidikmisi* with a target of 401.500 students, school and class building rehabilitation with a target of 61.200 schools, and teacher-professional grant. This grant targets both non-civil servant teachers (435.900) and civil servant teachers (257.200), and regional teachers with civil servant status (1.2 million teachers). The government expenditure on education did not have a specific allotment for children aged between 0 and 18 years old. This matter also caused the insignificant effect of government expenditure on the educational sector toward the children's well-being.

(Dalirazar, 2003) found the positive effect of government expenditure on the children's wellbeing. The government expenditure on the educational sector was not correlated with the educational gap. However, low government expenditure reflected various factors. Education has a long-term investment feature. Thus, education requires adequate time to improve the children's quality. Therefore, children may not experience a well-being state at the moment. The other reason was - that the government expenditure focused on consumption instead of investment, such as actual spending on employee salaries and operational costs. This matter led to an unsuccessful training program as previously planned because the plan and the budget were not efficient and effective for the educational sector (Fingerman et al., 2020). The central and regional governments decided to improve the education quality system. This decision went along with the vast facility and infrastructure developments in various regions. Thus, the government allocated at least 20% of the planned budget to the state budget. Increased salaries for teachers must also encourage high productivity and children's wellbeing (Purtell et al., 2012).

On the other hand, state spending is emphasized to support the government policies of promoting various national priority programs. The programs are useful for improving maritime development, food self-sufficiency, national defense and security industry development, infrastructure and connectivity development, and economic autonomy improvement. Some other steps are important to consider for the educational field, such as the Indonesia Pintar Card (KIP) and the learning obligation scheme.

(Abington & Blankenau, 2013) contradictory found that DAK or specifically allocated funds did not influence the well-being as moderate by HDI. The government expenditure for education became part of DAK while the children's wellbeing was the part of Human Development Index. The changes of DAK or specifically allocated funds were based on the national development applied by the central government for the regional government.

The table shows that government expenditure for the social health sector negatively and insignificantly influences children's well-being in Indonesia. This matter occurs because the children indirectly experience the government expenditure in the regions (Luke Shaefer et al., 2018). However, the families of the children could experience government expenditure.

(Kazepov & Ranci, 2017) found the misappropriation of social welfare funds from the original government expenditure on the social welfare sector. The evidence included the increased corruption cases during the epidemic period. Thus, the community, especially children did not experience the benefits of the government expenditure on the social welfare sector. (Perry et al., 2021) found that



minor community expected social assistance. However, many communities misused the social assistance so that they had to receive the consequences.

CONCLUSION

This research shows the significant influence of the roles of parents and government with the proxy of per-capita income, income distribution, period of education, and government expenditure on cost. On the other hand, the government expenditure on health and social welfare did not significantly influence the children's well-being in Indonesia. This research found all dependent variable combinations had an effect of 0.389 or 38.9% on the children's well-being in Indonesia. On the other hand, the remaining percentage, 61.1%, indicates the effect of unobserved factors. Therefore, the increment or decrease in the children's well-being in Indonesia relied on the per-capita income, the expected schooling years, and the government expenditure on education and health. Future research should review the government expenditure on education and social welfare sectors.

The implication of the Child Right Fulfillment Index (IPHA) could explain the children's well-being in Indonesia based on Law Number 23 of the Year 2022 about the guarantee of children's rights. This law regulates the relationship between parents and children to meet the rights of children and the obligation of parents, government, and community to support the children's rights. This research becomes a literature review of the government expenditure on educational and social welfare sectors in Indonesia. Thus, these sectors could be optimal for encouraging and supporting children's well-being in Indonesia by guaranteeing a healthy life and improving the well-being of people of various ages. Future research could review and encourage the optimization of the government's actual spending on sectors that support children's wellbeing. Thus, Indonesia could smoothly encounter the golden age in 2045.

REFERENCES

1. Abington, C., & Blankenau, W. (2013). Government education expenditures in early and late childhood. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 37(4), 854–874. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jedc.2012.12.001>
2. Barnes, K., Mukherji, A., Mullen, P., & Sood, N. (2017). Financial risk protection from social health insurance. *Journal of Health Economics*, 55, 14–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2017.06.002>
3. Buehler, C. (2020a). Family Processes and Children's and Adolescents' Well-Being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 82(1), 145–174. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12637>
4. Buehler, C. (2020b). Family Processes and Children's and Adolescents' Well-Being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 82(1), 145–174. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12637>
5. Conica, M., Nixon, E., & Quigley, J. (2023). Talk outside the box: Parents' decontextualized language during preschool years relates to child numeracy and literacy skills in middle childhood. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2023.105746>
6. Dalirazar, N. (2002). An International Index of Child Welfare WORKINGPAPER SERIES An International Index of Child Welfare. <http://www.umass.edu/peri/>
7. Dalirazar, N. (2003). An Econometric Analysis of International Variations in Child Welfare WORKINGPAPER SERIES An Econometric Analysis of International Variations in Child Welfare. <http://www.umass.edu/peri/>
8. Dettlaff, A. J., Rivaux, S. L., Baumann, D. J., Fluke, J. D., Rycraft, J. R., & James, J. (2011). Disentangling substantiation: The influence of race, income, and risk on the substantiation decision in child welfare. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33(9), 1630–1637. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2011.04.005>
9. Fingerman, K. L., Huo, M., & Birditt, K. S. (2020). A Decade of Research on Intergenerational Ties: Technological, Economic, Political, and Demographic Changes. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 82(1), 383–403. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12604>
10. Fleurbaey, M., Hagueré, C., & Trannoy, A. (2014). Welfare comparisons of income distributions and family size: An individualistic approach. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 51(1), 12–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmateco.2014.02.006>
11. Fu, M., Gu, L., Zhen, Z., Sun, M., & Tian, L. (2020). Optimal carbon tax income distribution and health welfare spillover effect based on health factors. *Applied Energy*, 276. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2020.115475>
12. Gowdy, J. (2005). Toward a new welfare economics for sustainability. *Ecological Economics*, 53(2), 211–222. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2004.08.007>



13. Gunawardena, N., & Stich, C. (2021). Interventions for young people aging out of the child welfare system: A systematic literature review. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2021.106076>
14. Gunes, P. M., & Ural Marchand, B. (2020). Macroeconomic conditions and child schooling in Turkey. *Labour Economics*, 63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2020.101809>
15. Heymann, J., Sprague, A. R., Nandi, A., Earle, A., Batra, P., Schickedanz, A., Chung, P. J., & Raub, A. (2017). Paid parental leave and family wellbeing in the sustainable development era. In *Public Health Reviews* (Vol. 38, Issue 1). BioMed Central Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40985-017-0067-2>
16. Ishartono, Santoso, & Raharjo, T. (2016). SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS (SDGs) DAN PENGENTASAN KEMISKINAN. <http://www.bappenas.go.id/id/berita-dan-siaran>
17. Kazepov, Y., & Ranci, C. (2017). Is every country fit for social investment? Italy as an adverse case. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 27(1), 90–104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928716673314>
18. Kota, K. /. (n.d.). INDEKS KOMPOSIT KESEJAHTERAAN ANAK.
19. Latif, A. (2009). A Critical Analysis of School Enrollment and Literacy Rates of Girls and Women in Pakistan. *Educational Studies*, 45(5), 424–439. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131940903190477>
20. Luke Shaefer, H., Collyer, S., Duncan, G., Edin, K., Garfinkel, I., Harris, D., Smeeding, T. M., Waldfogel, J., Wimer, C., & Yoshikawa, H. (2018). A universal child allowance: A plan to reduce poverty and income instability among children in the United States. *RSF*, 4(2), 22–42. <https://doi.org/10.7758/rsf.2018.4.2.02>
21. Ma, S. O. N., McCallum, S. M., Pasalich, D., Batterham, P. J., & Cleave, A. L. (2023). Understanding parental knowledge, attitudes and self-efficacy in professional help-seeking for child anxiety. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 337, 112–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2023.05.079>
22. Main, G., & Bradshaw, J. (2012). A child material deprivation index. *Child Indicators Research*, 5(3), 503–521. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-012-9145-7>
23. Nomaguchi, K., & Milkie, M. A. (2020a). Parenthood and Well-Being: A Decade in Review. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 82(1), 198–223. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12646>
24. Nomaguchi, K., & Milkie, M. A. (2020b). Parenthood and Well-Being: A Decade in Review. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 82(1), 198–223. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12646>
25. Nordtveit, B. H. (2008). Poverty alleviation and integrated service delivery: Literacy, early child development and health. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 28(4), 405–418. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2007.10.004>
26. Perry, H. B., Chowdhury, M., Were, M., LeBan, K., Crigler, L., Lewin, S., Musoke, D., Kok, M., Scott, K., Ballard, M., & Hodgins, S. (2021). Community health workers at the dawn of a new era: 11. CHWs leading the way to “Health for All.” In *Health Research Policy and Systems* (Vol. 19). BioMed Central Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-021-00755-5>
27. Purtell, K. M., Gershoff, E. T., & Aber, J. L. (2012). Low income families’ utilization of the Federal “Safety Net”: Individual and state-level predictors of TANF and Food Stamp receipt. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 34(4), 713–724. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2011.12.016>
28. Sisha, T. A. (2020). Household level food insecurity assessment: Evidence from panel data, Ethiopia. *Scientific African*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sciaf.2019.e00262>
29. Skoufias, E., & Olivieri, S. (2013). Sources of spatial welfare disparities in Indonesia: Household endowments or returns? *Journal of Asian Economics*, 29, 62–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asieco.2013.08.004>
30. Thomson, E. (2014). Family Complexity in Europe. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 654(1), 245–258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716214531384>
31. Wagmiller, R. L., Lee, K. S., & Su, J. H. (2020). The role of welfare in family income inequality: 1968–2016. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105615>
32. Yue, A., Shi, Y., Luo, R., Chen, J., Garth, J., Zhang, J., Medina, A., Kotb, S., & Rozelle, S. (2017). China’s Invisible Crisis: Cognitive Delays among Rural Toddlers and the Absence of Modern Parenting. In *The China Journal*. <http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c>

Cite this Article: Nanda Restu Vebrianna, Lukman Hakim, Tetuko Rawidyo Putro (2024). Does the Index of Child Right Fulfillment Explain the Children’s Wellbeing in Indonesia?. International Journal of Current Science Research and Review, 7(1), 165-172