



STUDY ON PERSONAL EFFECTIVENESS OF AUXILLARY NURSE MIDWIVES



PRESENTED BY– TARUN SHARMA ROLL NO– 682

GUIDED BY - Dr. D.K MANGAL

INTRODUCTION

- Personal Effectiveness (PE) refers to beliefs in one’s capacities to derive motivation, cognitive resources and courses of action to meet given situational demands.
- Openness is critical for personal effectiveness. It has two aspects—self-disclosure (sharing with others what they do not seem to know about one- self) and use of feedback (being open to what others say on aspects which one may not be aware of. In addition, perceptiveness or sensitivity to others’ feelings and to non-verbal cues is also important.
- The Johari Window model developed by Luft and Ingham is helpful in understanding two main dimensions of self: those aspects of a person’s behavior and response type that are known to him/her (self) and those aspects of his/ her behavior that are known to those with whom she interacts (others).
- PE used to help people better understands their relationship with self and others, in the blind and the closed areas

OBJECTIVES

- To study personal effectiveness of ANMs;
- To compare Personal Effectiveness Score of ANMs working under Khushi Ba-by Programme and others; and
- To identify personal effectiveness dimension lacking among the ANMs.

METHODOLOGY/ APPROACH

Step 1: Listing out the Name of ANMs who are working with Khushi Baby and others in 4 Blocks of Udaipur namely Jhadol, Gogunda, Salumbar and Sarada.

Step 2: The PE Scale was translated in to Hindi.

Step 3: The data collection was done during May 22-June 1, 2018. PHC and CHC were visited for administering the PE scale which is developed by Prof Udai Pareek. A Total of 34 ANMs were administered PE Scale. First of all, the ANM was in-structed on how to fill the scale. Following instructions were given:

The Instrument is for your own use. So be frank in your responses. Read each state-ment given below and indicate against each item. Please use the following guide-lines:

Write 4	if it is most characteristic of yours, or if you always or most often behave or feel this way
Write 3	if it is fairly true of you, or you quite often behave or feel this way
Write 2	if it is somewhat true in your case
Write 1	if it is not true or if you only occasionally feel or behave this way
Write 0	if it is not at all a characteristic of yours, or you seldom feel or behave this way

Step 4: The incomplete PE Scales were not considered for analysis/ rejected. A total of 30 (15 KB ANMs and 15 others) completely filled in PE scales were analysed.

Step 5: Data was analysed on the basis of key provided by Prof Udai Pareek. First of all, the scores were reversed for the items numbers which were marked*, like 1,3,4,5,6,10,11,12 and 15.

The scores were transferred to the scoring sheet in MS Excel. The scores were to-talled for self disclosure (1,4,7,10,13), Openness to feedback (2,5,8,11,14) and Per-ceptiveness (3,6,9,12,15).

If the total score in each dimension was 11 or below it was considered Low.

Prof Pareek has categorised personal effectives in to eight categories:

Categories of Personal Effectiveness				
	Category	Self-disclosure	Openness to feed-back	Perceptiveness
1	Effective	High	High	High
2	Insensitive	High	High	Low
3	Egocentric	High	Low	Low
4	Dogmatic	High	Low	High
5	Secretive	Low	High	High
6	Task-obsessed	Low	High	Low
7	Lonely empathic	Low	Low	High
8	Ineffective	Low	Low	Low

FINDINGS

Distribution of the ANMs by their scores on three dimensions of personal effectiveness by KB and Others

		PE SCORES	
		KB ANMs	Other ANMs
		n=15	n=15
Self Disclosure	Average score	10	11
	Range (Min-Max)	4-16	6-14
Openness to Feed-back	Average	14.6	13
	Range	9-16	5-16
Perceptiveness	Average	12.9	14.5
	Range	4-19	7-20

Categories of Personal Effectiveness

TYPES OF PERSONAL EFFECTIVENESS		
	Khushi Baby ANMs	Other ANMs
	(n=15)	(n=15)
Effective	5 (33%)	4 (27%)
Insensitive	0	0
Egocentric	0	0
Dogmatic	1 (7%)	4 (27%)
Secretive	4 (27%)	5 (33%)
Task Obsessed	4 (27%)	1 (7%)
Lonely Emphatic	0	0
Ineffective	1 (7%)	1 (7%)

CONCLUSION

- There were no ANM who was insensitive, egocentric, and lonely empathic.
- There is no much difference between KB and other ANMs. However, More KB ANMs were Task Obsessed than Non-KB ANMs
- Only one KB ANMs was found “Dogmatic” as compared to 4 Non-KB ANMs
- There were only two ANMs who were ineffective.
- There was a scope for improving personal effectiveness as a maximum score can be achieved are 20 in all the three dimensions
- Understanding of PE can be better understood by the JOHARI WINDOW concept

Johari Window		
	Known to Self	Not known to Self
Known to Others	Arena	Blind
Not known to Others	Closed	Dark

