Chapter 8

SUPERVISORS' ASSESSMENT OF THE ANGANWADI PERFORMANCE
SOME SIGNIFICANT PREDICTORS

As reported in Chapter 7, the Supervisors occupied an important administrative as well as professional role in the ICDS programme. She was directly involved not only in supervising and reviewing functioning of the various AWCs under her charge but also in providing guidance and mid-course corrections for achieving better results in the programme. Her assessment of the functioning of anganwadies was therefore very important for understanding the programme as well as in identifying various areas of improvement for further success. It was, therefore, decided to pursue the supervisors' assessment more thoroughly with the help of multiple regression analysis.

Supervisors' assessment was available for a large number of anganwadies included in the sample along with the other data such as AWWs' background information, their expectations and aspirations, their self-concepts as well as their perceptions and self-assessment of the programme. These variables included 10 background variables such as age, education, training, seniority, income, additional employment etc.; AWWs perceptions and self-assessment of the functioning of eight aspects and components of the ICDS programme, such as supplementary nutrition service, pre-school education activity, and their perception of the prevailing service and
working conditions, etc.; nine self-concepts such as sense of self-abilities, self-confidence, self-worthiness, sense of responsibility, self-acceptance, emotional maturity, etc.; and their perception and feelings about their quality of life now, as it was five years ago and the level expected to be five years later. These 30 variables were used as independent variables to predict the variance in supervisors' assessment of the anganwadi work and the AWWs.

The results of the multiple regression analysis are summarised in Table 8.1. The above 30 independent variables together explained 60% of the variance in the dependent variable \( R = .60, F = .56, \) not significant. The explained variance, though substantial, failed to reach statistical level of significance. As could be expected, there were other factors, unknown and not included here, which also accounted for variance in the supervisors' assessment of the anganwadi programme. The analyses, however, revealed valuable information about some individual significant factors, as shown by their beta values i.e., standard partial regression coefficient (Kerlinger and Pedhazur, 1973:164-165). The partial correlation coefficients and the coefficient of partial determination indicated "the relative importance of the different independent variables in a problem in explaining variations in the dependent variable" (Croxton et al, 1971:458). The significant predictors thus identified their relative importance in explaining variations in supervisors' assessment of the AWWs' performance.
Significant Correlates of Supervisors' Assessment
Organisational and Personal Factors

The analyses identified 15 significant correlates of the supervisors' assessment of the AWWs' work. Of these, one third were organisational and personal background factors. As discussed below, three of the five emerged as positive and two negative predictors of such assessment.

Older AWWs Do Better: The Age Factor

The age of AWWs emerged as a significant positive correlate of the supervisors' assessment of their performance (Beta = .35, \( P < .01 \)). As reported in the earlier chapters, typically, AWWs belonged to the age group of 25-35 years. Their age showed significant positive correlations with marital status, length of service with anganwadi, training in anganwadi, duration of such training, additional training, income and additional employment. Their age was negative with education suggesting that the younger AWWs were more educated. Similarly, the younger AWWs also showed greater aspiration for future quality of life.

AWWs' age, however, showed no relationship with self-concepts. Performance-wise, the youthful AWWs were observed to have better interaction with children and mothers. When all such variables were controlled and other things being equal, age accounted for 4% variance in supervisors' assessment of AWWs. It was not only statistically significant but it also emerged as behaviourally and
educationally very important. The youthful AWWs were perceived less positively and their performance rated low by their supervisors. They were probably more comfortable with older AWWs who were married and more trained. On the other hand, the supervisors seemed to be less in tune with youthful and aspiring AWWs, although more educated, were probably less trained and experienced. With other things being equal, age by itself became an important correlate of supervisors' assessment of their AWWs. It may have implications for recruitment and training policy of the anganwadi programme.

Higher Education Helps

AWWs' education emerged as another positive correlate of supervisors' assessment (Beta = .25, P < .05). As reported in Chapter 2, there was not much variation in the level of education among the AWWs as most of them were educated up to secondary level. However, youthful AWWs were more educated, as mentioned above. When such correlations were controlled, education by itself came out as a significant positive factor. Education, therefore, seemed to have helped the field functionaries in doing a better job. More educated they were, more positive was their assessment by their supervisors. It accounted for 3% variation in their performance.

Income: A Positive Factor

AWWs' salary/honorarium/income emerged as another important positive correlate of supervisors' assessment of their performance (Beta = .71, P < .001). On an average, she
probably earned Rs. 300 per month. As reported in Chapter 2, income was positively correlated with age, marital status, locality of residence, education, length of service, training, duration of training and additional employment. It was identified as one of the most important organisational variable. Older, married, senior and more trained AWWs, some of whom were also engaged in some additional employment, earned more. Such AWWs also appeared to be more satisfied with their present quality of life. They also seemed to be satisfied with the functioning of nutrition, immunisation, and public cooperation but not so satisfied with health service and the record keeping function. They were low on personal efficacy and self-esteem. They were also observed as not particularly active at their respective anganwadies. However with other things being equal, the factor of AWWs' income emerged as a very powerful positive correlate of their performance. It accounted for 5% variance in supervisors' assessment.

Going by this assessment, such AWWs were much more involved in the programme. They were probably more punctual and regular in attending to their tasks, they were also good in maintaining records and in implementing other required activities. Interestingly, such AWWs also felt more satisfied with their current quality of life which might have motivated and activated them for the programme. Organisationally, it was therefore an important feedback from the present research to the ICDS organisation that
salary/income of the field functionaries by itself, irrespective of other factors, was a very significant correlate of their motivation, involvement and performance.

Senior AWWs Assessed Negatively

As discussed in previous chapters, length of service with anganwadi was an important organisational variable which showed positive correlations with age, marital status, training, duration of training, additional training, income and supplementary employment. It also showed positive correlation with the self-concept of self-abilities. Such 'senior' AWWs tended to view themselves as not very attractive and successful, although they showed high sense of self-abilities. They were also observed to be less active at their respective AWCs. They were also weak in establishing communication with the beneficiaries. The overall environment at their centres was also observed to be less attractive. Irrespective of such inter-correlations, with other things being equal and controlled, seniority, as indicated by length of service with anganwadies, emerged as a very important negative correlate of their performance. They seemed to be less involved with the programme and less motivated to make their contributions. (Beta = -.82, p<.001). It accounted for 4% of the variance in supervisors' assessment.

Organisationally, it was a very important finding. Senior functionaries were more experienced and therefore
could be valuable for the organisation and the programme. They were perceived as low performers and less involved by the supervisors. It was certainly not because of their age which, in any case was controlled here, and which was by itself, a significant positive correlate of performance as reported above. More years they put in with anganwadies, the less effective and useful they were for the programme. At least, their supervisors definitely perceived them as such as compared to their junior and fresher colleagues. This was somewhat puzzling as to why should the more experienced AWWs be less active and less involved in the programme? So much so, that, such 'seniority' became a significant negative predictor of performance.

Did the results indicate a role-conflict between the senior AWWs and the supervisors? These were two closest roles in the programme, as reported in Chapter 1. This was possible in view of the fact that the immediate supervisors might not be very different from some of the senior AWWs who were also probably eligible for promotion to this next post in the organisation. This could therefore create interpersonal as well as inter-role conflicts in the Programme. Such conflicts might have influenced the supervisors' assessment of the senior AWWs' work with serious implications for functioning of the programme. One possible source of such conflicts could have arisen from the personnel policy itself. The 'senior' AWWs, like other AWWs, were only 'honorary' workers drawing a small honorarium without any
secured status in the organisation. The supervisors - the immediate higher level above the AWWs, on the other hand - were not only regular employees with status but were also drawing a handsome salary - at least as compared to the AWWs' honorarium. Such comparisons would have aggravated the feelings of deprivation among the senior AWWs, enhanced their sense of insecurity and contributed to conflicts and discontent with adverse effects on the programme. Negative perception of the supervisors could further aggravate such conflicts.

Additional Employment Inhibits the ICDS Programme

Additional employment undertaken by some AWWs emerged as another significant negative correlate of supervisors' assessment of their work (Beta = -.43, P < .001). This factor accounted for about 5% variance in such assessment. As reported earlier, comparatively speaking, older AWWs, more educated and more trained, were more inclined to undertake additional employment, i.e., other income generating activities in addition to their work asaganwadi workers. These AWWs, i.e., those employed in additional work, showed significantly lower sense of self-worthiness, lower self-confidence and lower emotional maturity.

When all other related variables were controlled, additional employment emerged as very significant negative factor in supervisors' assessment of the AWWs' work. Although, this was a personal matter of the AWWs, it clearly had serious implications for the organisation. The AWWs
were free to take up any other additional employment for generating income for themselves. In fact, that they were getting only honorarium from the anganwadi work. Many times, because of meagre honorarium, the AWWs were forced to undertake other income generating activities. The analyses revealed that such additional work was a strong inhibiting factor in functioning of the ICDS programme. Although, the AWWs were free to undertake additional work, it was not liked by their supervisors. Obviously, they were not able to devote full time and attention to the anganwadi work which in any case, they were not required to do.

The supervisors, it seemed, could not reconcile with this fact, as they perceived them as probably less interested in the programme and, therefore, disfavoured their additional employment. These AWWs who were exclusively working only for the anganwadi programme were rated significantly more positively by the supervisors. They were perceived as much more involved in the Programme and more motivated to undertake the desired activities. In this sense, the factor of honorarium/salary, a significant positive correlate of performance, assumed further importance for the success of the programme. It suggested the need for payment of reasonable salary to the AWWs to enable them to pay full attention to the programme, as discussed in Chapter 7. The supervisors were likely to endorse this need, rather strongly, in interest of the programme.
Thus, Age, Education and Income emerged as important and positive correlates of supervisors' assessment of the programme and AWWs' performance. These background factors seemed to contribute to enhancing the efficacy and impact of the programme. In view of their supervisors, the older AWWs, more educated AWWs and those placed in higher income group, were doing a better job. On the contrary, 'seniority' and Additional Employment emerged as two important negative predictors of the programme functioning. Because of meagre honorarium, at least some of the AWWs were forced to take up other employment which, in view of the supervisors, resulted in lowering their performance as AWWs. Their 'seniority' also negatively contributed to the programme. These were important organisational variables which required urgent attention for improving the quality and functioning of the programme on the ground.

The importance of such organisational variables, as mentioned above, was also indicated by their relative importance among the 15 significant predictors of the supervisors' assessment of the AWWs' work. Honorarium/income emerged as comparatively a very important factor occupying 7th position in order of importance among the 15 factors. Among the background variables, it emerged on the top. This was followed by the factors of Additional Employment and Seniority which were 8th and 9th in order of importance. Age of the AWWs was 12th and Education 14th in order of importance among the 15 factors. The last two, though
significant correlates of performance, were comparatively less important than Income, Additional Employment and Seniority. As mentioned above, these factors were very important for efficient functioning of the programme and, therefore, required attention of the organisation.

II

AWWs' Perceptions, Aspirations and Performance

As reported above, AWWs had provided their perceptions and assessment of the functioning of some important components and aspects of the ICDS programme on the ground. Of such eight areas, only two emerged as significant correlates of supervisors' assessment of AWWs' work. Both these were negative predictors of performance. These were AWWs' perception of their working conditions and their perception of the functioning of the supplementary nutrition service.

Highly Positive View Inhibits Performance: The Case of Supplementary Nutrition

On the whole, AWWs tended to give positive assessment of the functioning of this component at their respective anganwadis. This was positively correlated with their perceptions of Immunisation and Health checkup. Income also showed positive correlation with this assessment. However, AWWs with higher sense of health and personality, higher sense of success in present and future and higher sense of responsibility, as indicated by their beliefs, tended to
assess the functioning of this component less positively. They tended to take negative view of the implementation of this component. Interestingly, those AWWs who thought very high of the functioning of supplementary nutrition were actually observed to show weak interactions with children and mothers, i.e., beneficiaries of this service.

AWWs' perception of this service, i.e., supplementary nutrition, when other variables were controlled, emerged as a very significant negative correlate of supervisors' assessment of their work (Beta =-.36, P <.001). It accounted for 8% variance in such assessment. This finding was very interesting. The AWWs themselves thought that they were doing a very good job of delivering this service at their respective centres. Their supervisors, however, thought otherwise and in a different direction. They rated them, on the whole, as low performers. In this sense, greater the self-assessment of this service, lower was their performance rating by the supervisors, who probably thought that these AWWs were not actively involved in the programme. The AWWs self-respect and a sense of self-satisfaction in this regard could, in fact, indicate their sense of complacency in delivering this important service to the poor. Their weak interaction with the beneficiaries probably also indicated this tendency. Results, therefore, indicated that more realistic and somewhat critical AWWs probably felt more concerned for this component. They were involved more seriously in delivering the service and were assessed
positively by the supervisors. It also suggested that, the supervisors themselves did not think that the supplementary food and nutrition service was that effective and successful as some of the AWWs tended to report.

Another noteworthy fact here was that the AWWs' self-assessment, particularly of supplementary food and nutrition service, emerged as the fourth most important correlate of supervisors' assessment among the 15 significant factors. This finding suggested that, sense of self-satisfaction and complacency was a very powerful inhibiting factor in managing and reaching the programme on the ground.

Uncritical Sense of Self-Satisfaction Inhibits Performance: The Perception of Working Conditions

As reported above, the AWWs tended to give some kind of routine perception of their service and working conditions. They were neither clearly positive nor negative about these conditions. It was also not correlated with any other background variables. It was however positively correlated with sense of satisfaction with current quality of life. It was also significantly correlated with self-concepts of self-abilities, self-confidence, sense of success in present and future and sense of responsibility. Correlational analyses, therefore, indicated that more efficacious the AWWs were, more positive was their perception about the prevailing service and working conditions. With such correlations controlled and other things being equal, the AWWs' perception of working conditions, i.e., their sense of satisfaction with
their terms and conditions, emerged as a significant negative predictor of supervisors' assessment of their work (Beta = -.27, P < .01). It accounted for 4% variance in such assessment.

It was interesting, therefore, that those AWWs who were critical and apprehensive of their service and working conditions, felt more concerned and involved in implementing the programme. On the other hand, those who felt contented with their compensation and felt that, they got full training for their work; that their service was secured and that their service terms were satisfactory, were observed by the supervisors to be less punctual in opening their centres, less regular in maintaining records, and also less interested and involved in their various functions at the centre. As a result, their supervisors assessed them as less effective in producing the desired impact on the people.

This significant finding suggested that, mere verbal expression of satisfaction with service and working conditions and even sense of contentment in this regard, contributed little to the programme. On the contrary, it was a very significant inhibiting factor which retarded AWWs' active and real involvement in the programme. In other words, the discontented AWWs, who were unhappy and critical of their service and working conditions, felt more concerned and interested in various services being offered by the Scheme. In view of their supervisors, they were also better performers than those who showed uncritical satisfaction with
poor conditions of work. As critical AWWs were more interested in various activities, were able to create better impact on the beneficiaries. Thus, sense of critical discontent with the prevailing service and working condition seemed to emerge as an important positive factor in their performance.

Thus, the two perceptions - namely, Supplementary Nutrition service and Service and Working Conditions, emerged as very important indicators of ICDS performance. Those AWWs who were critically dissatisfied with functioning of the above as well as those were critically discontented with their conditions of service and work were more actively involved in implementing the programme and were rated as better performers. These two findings were conceptually consistent with a common factor namely, sense of critical discontent. The results indicated that sense of satisfaction may not always be a positive factor in performance. It may imply a sense of complacency, a tendency to justify poor performance and adjustment with poor quality of work and life. The fact that, self assessment of food and nutrition service and of the prevailing conditions of work emerged respectively as fourth and eleventh in order of importance among the fifteen significant correlates of supervisors' assessment of performance, further added urgency to their significance.
Quality of Life Promotes Performance

As mentioned in Chapter 5, on an average the AWWs' sense of satisfaction with their current quality of life was towards low side. It was correlated with their past life satisfaction as well as expected quality of life in future. Such satisfaction with current life was positively correlated with additional training, i.e., training in addition to anganwadi work and with income. Such AWWs were also positive in their perception of pre-school education, immunisation and programme management. They also showed greater sense of satisfaction with the prevailing working conditions. When all such related variables were controlled, satisfaction with present quality of life emerged as a very significant positive predictor of supervisors' assessment of their performance (Beta +.46, P<.001). It accounted for 9% variance in such assessment. It was the second most important predictor of performance among the 15 significant factors.

It was a very important finding from both, theoretical and practical points of view. Those among the AWWs, who did not feel insecure and discontented with their quality of life to be more involved in the ICDS programme. The supervisors perceived them as more punctual, regular, active and effective. They were able to produce good impact on the beneficiaries. Thus, in this sense, quality of life emerged as a powerful motivator for the programme. It, therefore suggested that, discontent with quality of life, was a powerful demotivator for the programme.
One noteworthy dimension of the present finding was that, in simple correlational analysis, satisfaction with working conditions and satisfaction with present quality of life were highly positively correlated, as reported in Chapter 5. However, in multiple regression analyses, these two factors showed opposite directions, both emerging as important significant predictors of performance on their own. However, those contented with the prevailing service and working conditions seemed to pay little attention to the programme. Whereas, those contented with their conditions of life appeared much more involved in implementing the programme.

Service and working conditions obtaining for AWWs were only of adhoc nature as they were not regular employees of the organisation. They also seemed to view such conditions in an adhoc manner. Those feeling adjusted with such conditions seemed to be neither serious about working conditions nor about the Programme. On the other hand, quality of life was a more serious matter. It depended partly on their work as AWWs and partly, may be more, on other factors. Those contented with quality of life, were probably satisfied persons. Such contentment worked as a motivator for their involvement in the programme. In this sense, quality of life and promotion of better living conditions for the field functionaries emerged as a very important agenda for effective programme implementation on the ground.
Expected Quality of Future Life Inhibits Performance

As reported in Chapter 5, on an average, the AWWs tended to expect better quality of life in future as compared to their present quality of life. Youthful AWWs showed higher expectation for their future life. Higher the age of AWWs, lower was their expectation of such quality of life in future. Expected quality of life in future showed significant negative correlations with self-concepts of health and personality and self-worthiness, and positive correlation with sense of emotional maturity. It was unrelated to the assessment of performance whether as observed or as rated by the beneficiaries. They were observed to be not particularly active at their AWCs. When all such variables were controlled, expected quality of life in future emerged as significant negative predictor of supervisors' assessment of performance (Beta = -.32, P < .05). It accounted for 3% variance in such assessment and was 13th in order of importance among the 15 significant predictors of performance.

The results, therefore, indicated that aspiring AWWs were probably not so actively involved in implementing the programme. It did not interest and motivate them. May be, they saw no future for themselves in the programme and did not think that, it would be able to satisfy their desire for better quality of life. They probably did not see any opportunity for personal and career development in the programme. Such perceived mismatch between aspirations and
the perceived nature of the programme probably created a sense of dissatisfaction in them, which in turn worked as an inhibiting factor in their performance. In this sense, satisfaction with present quality of life which emerged as very important positive predictor of their performance and sense of dissatisfaction on account of mismatch between the programme and their desire for better quality of life in future seemed to work, conceptually, in the same direction.

Service and working conditions, present quality of life and quality of life in future, had one common thing, i.e., sense of satisfaction/dissatisfaction about conditions obtaining in life and at work. Results indicated the importance of contentment due to quality of life and also the importance of aspiration in this regard. As discussed in Chapter 7, work organisations and programmes, which could provide worthwhile goals and scope for personal growth, where they could look forward to their future, were likely to secure higher involvement of their employees/functionaries. The results suggested that the AWWs did not perceive such goals and future in the anganwadi work. They looked forward to a better quality of life which they thought the anganwadi programme was not able to provide them. Such feelings were aroused more among those with greater desire for better quality of life. Hence, their involvement in the programme was weakened which inhibited their performance.

Thus, the AWWs' perceptions and aspirations seemed to
play an important role in promoting and/or inhibiting performance in the ICDS programme. Four such factors emerged as significant predictors of performance as rated by their supervisors. Of these four, sense of contentment with present quality of life emerged as the most important factor. Next in importance was their perception of the functioning of supplementary food and nutrition. Here, those who were critical and probably more realistic in their assessment of the functioning of this important service, and therefore were more concerned, performed better in the programme. The third important factor in this respect was AWWs' view of their service and working conditions. Here also, those who were reasonably critical and, probably, more serious seemed to be doing better in the programme. Lastly, the expected quality of future life emerged as another important factor in their performance. The aspiring AWWs were not satisfied with the programme and were probably involved much less in implementing the various activities. Thus, AWWs' perceptions of the programme and attitude to their quality of life emerged as very important factors in their involvement and performance in the ICDS programme.

III

AWWs' Self-Concepts and Performance

It was interesting that of the nine self-concepts, some of which were highly interrelated as reported in Chapter 4, as many as six emerged as significant correlates of supervisors' assessment of AWWs' performance, as seen in Table 8.1. Four
of these six self-concepts, namely, sense of emotional maturity, sense of self-worthiness, sense of self-confidence, and sense of responsibility emerged as significant negative correlates. The remaining two, i.e., sense of self-acceptance, sense of self-ability emerged as positive correlates of their performance. Let us first discuss the positive predictors of the programme.

Sense of Self-Ability: Motivator of Performance

As reported in Chapter 4, the AWWs tended to view their self-abilities rather on the high side. It was positively and very significantly correlated with all other self-concepts except self-acceptance with which it was unrelated. Thus, it was significantly associated with self confidence, self worthiness, sense of success in present and future, sense of responsibility, sense of shame and guilt and sense of emotional maturity. It also showed positive relationship with self-assessment of pre-school education, record keeping, public cooperation and working conditions. Interestingly, seniority, i.e., length of aganwadi service, showed significant positive and income significant negative correlations with sense of abilities. Such AWWs were observed to have weak rapport with their beneficiaries who perceived to have derived no or little benefit from the programme.

However, when all these correlated variables were controlled and with other things being equal, AWWs' sense of
self-abilities emerged as the most important, number one, positive predictor of performance (Beta=.60, P<.001). It accounted for as much as 14% variance in the supervisors' assessment of their work. Thus, task-oriented AWWs with higher sense of self abilities, i.e., those who did not leave their task for lack of adequate facilities, who tended to complete their task with speed and who felt, they were doing important and meaningful tasks, were rated much more positively by their supervisors. Such AWWs were much more involved in implementing the ICDS programme. Their self concept probably motivated them for implementing the required tasks. Such AWWs were found to have made greater impact in the programme.

The above finding was important for another reason as well. It was one of the four self-concepts forming sense of personal efficacy. Of the other three, two, namely self-confidence and sense of responsibility as discussed below, emerged as significant negative predictors of supervisors' assessment. The fourth one, i.e., sense of success in present and future was also negative but not significant. On the whole, sense of personal efficacy, therefore, seemed to work in the negative direction. Sense of self-abilities, not only dented this trend but, emerged as the number one positive predictor of performance. Was it because it included an element of task orientation? Those high on this self-concept tended to show high commitment to tasks and to perceive them as meaningful and important. Such an
orientation and commitment to tasks at hand probably worked as a source of strong motivation for them resulting in their active involvement and better performance.

Sense of Self-Acceptance as Motivator

The AWWs, as discussed in Chapter 4, tended to show high sense of self-acceptance. It was a unique self-concept in as much as it was unrelated to all other self-concepts. It was also unrelated to the AWWs' background, expectations, aspirations and their perceptions and self-assessment of the programme. Sense of self-acceptance showed no correlation with any of the variables in the study except one, i.e., supervisors' assessment. However, when all other variables were controlled, it emerged as not only significant but as the 6th most important positive correlate of performance (Beta = .36, P<.001). It accounted for 6% variance in supervisors' assessment of AWWs' work.

Thus, such AWWs, who were not harsh to anyone, gave no excuses and who did not indulge in self-praise, seemed to be liked by the supervisors - probably because of their non-defensive personal qualities. These enabled them to forge good inter-personal relations and to work without inhibition and resistance.

It was interesting that, these two self concepts - self abilities and self-acceptance emerged as very important positive motivators of AWWs performance. Together, they accounted for 20% of its variance. This was indeed an
important finding.

**Sense of Emotional Maturity retards Performance**

As mentioned above, of the six concepts which emerged as significant predictors of performance, four were negative. The most important of these four factors was the AWWs' sense of emotional maturity. As mentioned in Chapter 4, the AWWs tended to be on the low side on this self-concept. It was, however, positively correlated with self-abilities, self-confidence, sense of shame and guilt and negatively correlated with sense of success in present and future and sense of responsibility. It was also negatively correlated with the additional employment and positive correlated with locality of residence. It appeared that those AWWs' who felt they were emotionally mature, were also positive in evaluating their abilities, self-confidence as well as their low sense of shame and guilt. Mostly, they tended to reside near their respective aganwadies. They were not involved in any additional employment. They also expected better quality of life in future. However, when all such variables were controlled, sense of emotional maturity emerged as a very powerful negative predictor of performance (Beta = -.52, P<.001). It accounted for some 8% variance in such assessment and was third in order of importance among the 15 significant factors.

The beneficiaries also tended to perceive them positively although they were not observed to be particularly active at their respective centres. However,
they were assessed negatively by their supervisors. These were the persons, who did not easily feel sad, who were not that easily provoked and got emotionally involved in various situations, criticism generally did not bother them, in fact they were ready to accept such criticism and probably, most importantly, they tended to try and use new methods of work. They were inclined to take risk and try new ideas and activities.

The findings here indicated that probably such tendencies and qualities did not go well with the programme and the supervisors. Such AWWs were perceived to be less punctual in opening their centres, less regular in maintaining records, and less willing to implement various activities as desired, such as distribution of supplementary food and nutrition, distribution of toys and other materials to children for pre school education. They probably wanted to try new methods in doing such work. Apparently, this did not find encouragement from the supervisors. In their assessment this inhibited their performance and therefore they rated them low. It was therefore an interesting finding that emotionally mature and creative AWWs were not particularly liked by their supervisors and they ended as low performers in the programme. Probably, the ICDS programme was being implemented in a routine manner leaving little opportunity for persons with such qualities.
Sense of Self Worthiness also Inhibited Performance

The next important negative correlate in this respect was the AWWs' sense of self worthiness. As mentioned in Chapter 4, on the whole, the AWWs appeared to be on the high side on this self concept. It was negatively correlated with training, income and additional employment. Such persons were also not so much bothered about their future quality of life as with the present quality of life. However, when these variables were controlled, sense of worthiness, emerged as negative factor in their performance (Beta = -.44, P < .001). It accounted for about 8% variance in supervisors assessment and was placed fifth in order of importance among the 15 significant factors.

Persons with high sense of worthiness thought that they were competent persons. They did not brood much over insults and criticism and they thought, they were worthy of giving advice and guidance to others. Such persons thought very highly of their competence and skills. The programme was, however, not able to motivate such persons. They were much less involved in implementing various activities of the ICDS programme. They did not act in the expected manner and were therefore rated low by the supervisors. This was an important finding which suggested that the programme was unable to utilise resource of such persons who had the inner sense of worthiness and competence. On the contrary, the nature of the programme and the manner of its implementation seemed to have demotivated such persons.
Sense of Self-Confidence: A Negative Factor

As reported in Chapter 4, the AWWs seemed to be quite high in their assessment of self-confidence. It was positively correlated with self-concepts of health, abilities, worthiness, sense of success in present and future, sense of responsibility, low sense of shame and guilt, and emotional maturity. In fact it was positively correlated with all self-concepts except self-acceptance with which it was uncorrelated. It showed negative correlation with additional employment and income. It was also positive with health checkup service, pre-school education and service and working conditions. When all these correlations were controlled, it emerged as a significant negative predictor of supervisors' assessment of their performance (Beta=-.33, P<.01). It accounted for some 4% variance in such assessment and placed tenth in importance among the 15 significant factors.

The AWWs with high sense of self-confidence thought, given the opportunity, they could perform very high, felt capable of overcoming any hurdles and considered themselves as successful persons. It seemed, they were not so much liked by their supervisors, who perceived them as not active in the programme and rated them low in performance. Such persons were also not assessed positively by the beneficiaries. They were, probably, not so friendly with them. Results suggested that, persons with self-confidence were not so confident about the programme itself. They
tended to sit on the fence and did not get fully involved in the programme. As a result, their high sense of self-confidence became an inhibiting factor in their performance.

Sense of Responsibility also Lowered Performance

The AWWs also tended to be on the high side on this self-concept of beliefs and conviction, i.e., sense of responsibility. It was positively correlated with several other self-concepts as well as with present quality of life. They also viewed positively the functioning of immunisation, record keeping, public cooperation and service and working conditions. However, when such variables were controlled, sense of responsibility emerged as a significant negative correlate of their performance (Beta = -.21, P < .05). It accounted for some 3% variance and was placed lowest in the list of 15 significant factors.

The fact, that it emerged as a significant negative factor in AWWs' performance, was an important finding. Such persons tended to think that they were personally responsible for whatever they did, indicating that they probably showed low sense of dependency and high sense of initiative. This was an important element in their sense of personal efficacy. It was interesting that, this was not perceived and identified as a positive resource in the ICDS programme. It appeared that, the programme did not provide opportunity for initiative. The programme probably demanded high level of dependency on instructions, directives and guidance of
supervisors and others. Such persons were, therefore, not motivated by the programme and felt disinterested in its implementation.

Summary

Multiple regression analyses identified 15 significant correlates of AWWs' performance as assessed by their supervisors. These characteristics of AWWs are arranged below in order of their importance and contribution to explaining variation in performance.

1. Sense of self-abilities (positive)
2. Satisfaction with current living conditions (positive)
3. Sense of emotional maturity (negative)
4. AWWs' perception of supplementary food and nutrition (negative).
5. Sense of self-worthiness (negative)
6. Sense of self-acceptance (positive)
7. Honorarium/income (positive)
8. Additional employment (negative)
9. Seniority in terms of length of service (negative)
10. Sense of self confidence (negative)
11. Satisfaction with service and working conditions (negative)
12. Age (positive)
13. Expected quality of life in future (negative)
14. Education (positive)
15. Sense of responsibility (negative)
Several other factors which were supposed to be important for effective implementation of the programme did not emerge as significant. These included training, locality of residence, programme management and public cooperation. The fact that such factors, although otherwise important, did not make a difference in the supervisors' assessment of AWWs' performance, was itself significant, requiring further study and understanding.

Some of the significant correlates suggested serious implications for the nature and functioning of the ICDS programme. These included sense of emotional maturity and tendency to try out new methods and ideas; sense of self-worthiness including sense of competence; seniority of field functionaries some of whom might have been eligible for promotion to regular positions in the organisation; sense of self-confidence for success in overcoming hurdles; youthfulness of the functionaries as age emerged as a positive correlate of performance, aspiration of AWWs for better quality of life and sense of responsibility including readiness to take initiative and own responsibility for success and failure. Such motivational and behavioural qualities formed important human resource. The findings therefore raised some conceptual as well as practical questions/issues pertaining to the nature of work involved in the ICDS programme and the manner of its implementation on the ground.
Table 8.1

Multiple Regression Analysis of Variance in Supervise Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Predictors</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Partial $r^2$</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Partial $r^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Life</td>
<td>$-0.31$</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>Sense of Shame &amp; C</td>
<td>$-0.17$</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Emotional Maturity</td>
<td>$-0.52$</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Programme Implementation</td>
<td>$-0.03$</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Other Training</td>
<td>$-0.18$</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Present Life</td>
<td>$-0.46$</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>$-0.36$</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Training Duration</td>
<td>$-0.19$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Worthiness</td>
<td>$-0.44$</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Self-Confidence</td>
<td>$-0.33$</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>$-0.27$</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$-0.71$</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>Sense of Responsibility</td>
<td>$-0.21$</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>$-0.10$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Pre-School Education</td>
<td>$-0.20$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Keeping</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Public Cooperation</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Sense of Health &amp; Responsibility</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anganwadi Training</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Additional Employment</td>
<td>$-0.43$</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>$-0.11$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Sense of Success</td>
<td>$-0.20$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Service</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Past Life</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Abilities</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Immunisation</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Length of Service</td>
<td>$-0.82$</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R = 0.60, F = 0.56, NS; 1 = < 0.05, 2 = P < 0.01, 3 = P < 0.001$