

Original Research Article

Personal Characteristics of ICDS Beneficiaries

D.N. Sawandkar^{1*}, A.D. Koregaonkar² and S.S. Mane³

¹VNMKV, Parbhani, Maharashtra, India

²Community Medicine, Maharashtra, India

³Department of Extension Education, VNMKV Parabhani, Maharashtra, India

**Corresponding author*

ABSTRACT

The study was conducted in Parbhani district of Marathwada region. The result made it clear that the study revealed that higher proportion of the ICDS beneficiaries were middle age between 23 and 39, educated up to primary and secondary school level, majority of them had annual income up to 58 to 320 thousand, majority of beneficiaries had medium size family, use of medium source of information. Majority of them were from joint family having semi-medium size of land holding, most of them had house plus agricultural occupation, low social participation and medium use of source of information.

Keywords

ICDS, Impact, Child development

Introduction

Children are the future of a nation. Recognizing the importance of children as a vital human resource, the constitution of India, Directive Principles of State Policy and the national policy for children have addressed the need for ensuring holistic development of the child. Government of India proclaimed a national policy on children in August 1974 declaring children as, "Supremely Important Asset". The policy provided the required framework for assigning priority to different needs of the child. The programme of the Integrated Child Development Services (ICDS) was launched in 2nd October 1975 in 33 community development blocks seeking to provide an integrated package of services in a convergent manner on an experimental

basis to commemorate the 106th birth anniversary of the father of the nation Mahatma Gandhi seeking to provide an integrated package of services in a convergent manner for the holistic development of the child. So, this paper examines personal characteristics of ICDS beneficiaries.

Materials and Methods

Present study was conducted in Parbhani district of Marathwada region of Maharashtra State. Total sample of 120 beneficiaries are examine for study. The data were collected with the help of structured schedule. The respondents were contacted personally at their home. Keeping

in view the objectives of the study an interview schedule was prepared which includes relevant questions for seeking reliable information in respect of variables. Efforts were made to formulate a schedule with clear and easy questions.

The categories on the beneficiaries were done on basis of Mean + Standard Deviation. Mean of sample was calculated by summing all the individual score and dividing it by number of cases.

Standard deviation

Standard Deviation is a measure of variability calculated around mean.

It was denoted by Greek letter 'δ' (sigma) and calculated with the following formula.

$$\delta = (\text{S.D.}) = \sqrt{\frac{N\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2}{N}}$$

Whereas,

δ = (S.D.) = Standard deviation
∑X² = Sum of square of 'X' series
(∑X)² = Square of summation 'X' series
N = Number of ICDS beneficiaries

Research finding

Age

It is revealed from table 1 that majority of the ICDS beneficiaries (75.00 %) were from middle age group, 19.17 per cent beneficiaries were from young age group and 05.83 per cent of the beneficiaries were from old age group. Age of the beneficiaries is an important factor in deciding impact of ICDS beneficiaries. Younger women beneficiaries are more energetic, dynamic having more risk bearing capacity.

Education

The data from table 2 clearly shows that 40.83 per cent of the ICDS beneficiaries were educated up to secondary school level, 26.67 per cent of them were having primary school level, 15.83 per cent of them were having higher secondary school level while, 10.00 per cent of them were illiterate, while 5.00 per cent were can read and write only, 1.67 per cent of the ICDS beneficiaries were graduate, whereas not a single ICDS beneficiaries was from post graduate. Generally, the villages are having the educational facility up to primary and secondary school level and for getting higher studies one has to go cities which gives rise to different problems.

This clearly indicates that large proportion of the ICDS beneficiaries had education up to primary and secondary school level category.

Family size

The data from table 3 showed that about 45.00 per cent of the ICDS beneficiaries were from medium size family.

While 29.17 per cent of them were from small size and 25.83 per cent were belonging to large family. In rural area most of the family type is joint that's have medium number of person.

Family type

The data from table 4 showed that about 65.83 per cent of ICDS beneficiaries were from joint family, while 34.17 per cent were from nuclear family.

In our country, rural peoples were live together; hence most of the ICDS beneficiaries were from joint family

Table.1 Distribution of the ICDS beneficiaries according to their age

Category	Frequency	Percentage
1.Young	23	19.17
2. Middle	90	75.00
3.Old	7	05.83
Total	120	100.00

Table.2 Distribution of ICDS beneficiaries according to their education

Education level	Frequency	Percentage
1. Illiterate	12	10.00
2. Can Read and Wright only	06	05.00
3. Primary school (up to IV th)	32	26.67
4. Secondary school (V th to X th)	49	40.83
5. Higher secondary school (XI th to XII th)	19	15.83
6. Graduate (Above XII th)	02	01.67
Total	120	100.00

Table.3 Distribution of ICDS beneficiaries according to their family type

Category	Frequency	Percentage
1.Small	35	29.17
2. Medium	54	45.00
3. Large	31	25.83
Total	120	100.00

Table.4 Distribution of ICDS beneficiaries according to their family type

Category	Frequency	Percentage
1.Nuclear	41	34.17
2.Joint	79	65.83
Total	120	100.00

Table.5 Distribution of ICDS beneficiaries according to their annual income

Category	Frequency	Percentage
1. Low	17	14.17
2. Medium	81	67.50
3. High	22	18.33
Total	120	100.00

Table.6 Distribution of ICDS beneficiaries according to their land holding

Category	Frequency	Percentage
1.Marginal holding	31	25.83
2.Small holding	34	28.34
3. Semi-medium holding	33	27.50
4. Medium holding	21	17.50
5. Big holding	01	0.80
Total	120	100.00

Table.7 Distribution of ICDS beneficiaries according to their occupation

Category	Frequency	Percentage
1.House work	05	04.17
2.House work + labour	11	09.17
3. House work + Agriculture	61	50.83
4.House work + Agriculture+ labour	04	03.33
5.House work +Agriculture + business	33	27.50
6.House work + service	06	05.00
1. Total	120	100.00

Table.8 Distribution of ICDS beneficiaries according to their level of social participation

Category	Frequency	Percentage
1. Low	80	66.67
2. Medium	23	19.16
3. High	17	14.17
Total	120	100.00

Table.9 Distribution of ICDS beneficiaries according to their use of sources of information

Category	Frequency	Percentage
1. Low	31	25.83
2. Medium	77	64.17
3. High	12	10.00
Total	120	100.00

Annual income

It is observed that from table 5 that 67.50 per cent of ICDS beneficiaries had medium annual income followed by 18.34 and 14.17 per cent had high and low annual income, respectively. Such findings are due to the majority of the ICDS beneficiaries were belonging to medium and small land holding category. Naturally,

the ICDS beneficiaries also came from same category of economic condition in large number.

Land holding

As regards with the land holding, it is evident from the table 6 that higher percentage 28.34 per cent of ICDS beneficiaries were found in

small land holding category, 27.50 per cent were from semi-medium land holding category, 17.50 per cent were from medium land holding 25.83 per cent of them from marginal land holding and only 0.80 per cent of the ICDS beneficiaries were found in big land holding category. The reduction in land holding is due to the continuous fragmentation might be happened that maximum ICDS beneficiaries were from small land holding category.

Occupation

Most of the ICDS beneficiaries 50.83 per cent were house work and agriculture, 27.5 per cent were engaged in house work and agriculture and business, 09.17 per cent in house work and labour, 04.17 per cent in house work. 03.33 per cent in house work and agriculture and labour, whereas 05.00 per cent performing only house work and service Most of the ICDS beneficiaries engaged in house work and agricultural activities (Table 7).

Social participation

It is elucidated from table 8 that majority (66.67 %) of the ICDS beneficiaries had low level of social participation while, 19.16 per cent were medium social participation and only 14.17 per cent of ICDS beneficiaries were having high level of social participation.

ICDS beneficiaries were busy in their home management, child, and farming opportunities. They got little leisure time to participate in different social organizations. They participate only when it is an important on the basis of their interest. Therefore, most of the ICDS beneficiaries were noticed from low social participation category

Use of sources of information

It is revealed from table 9 that nearly two third (64.17 %) of the ICDS beneficiaries were used medium sources of information while, 25.83

per cent and 10.00 per cent of them were in low and high use of sources of information respectively. The different information sources led through understanding of new information and thereby motivate the ICDS beneficiaries for full impact of ICDS.

References

- Achla Gakkhar, Indu Bansal and Kalla. 2003. Impact of ICDS programme on knowledge gain in beneficiary women of TONK district of Rajasthan *Raj.J.Edu.* XI: 131-136
- Agarwal, K. N., Agarwal, D.K., Agarwal, A., Rai, S., Prasad, R., Agarwal, Singh, T.B. 2000. Impact of the integrated child development services (ICDS) on maternal nutrition and birth weight in rural Varanasi. *Indian Pediatrics*; 37(12): 1321-1327
- Aggarwal, Arun Kumar and Rajesh Kumar. 2005. Long term effects of ICDS services on behaviour and academic achievements of children. Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research, Dept. of Community Medicine. 6 p, Chandigarh
- Bhasin, Sanjiv K. 2001. Long term effects of ICDS. *Ind. J. of pediatrics*, 68(3): 211-216.
- Chopdar, A. 1979. Impact of health component of ICDS on the beneficiaries. *Ind. J. of pediatrics*, 46: 53-57.
- Mehendale, S.N., Karandikar, V. N. and Nath, M. H. 1985. Some aspects of evaluation of Pune urban ICDS project. *Medical J. of western India*, 13:1-7.
- Patel, R. B. and Udani, R. H. 1985. Impact of ICDS of pre-school of urban sloms. *Ind. J. of pediatrics* 49:215-218.
- Thombre, B.M. 1993. A critical analysis of Integrated Child Development Services for the welfare of mother and child in Marathwada. Ph.D. Thesis, Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, Parbhani. (M.S.)