The Pharma Innovation

Daneshwari Onkari
Research Scholar, Department of
Human Development and
Family Studies, College of
Community Science, UAS,
Dharwad, Karnataka, India

Sunanda Itagi
Professor, Department of
Human Development and
Family Studies, College of
Community Science, UAS,
Dharwad, Karnataka, India

Resilience among rural orphans

Daneshwari Onkari and Sunanda Itagi

Abstract
The study on resilience among rural orphans was conducted in the year 2016-2018 in Dharwad taluka with objective to know the resilience among rural orphans. About 124 orphans were randomly selected in the age range of 6 to 18 years to know their resilience. Resilience scale developed by Embury (2007), socio-economic status scale by Agarwal *et al.*, 2005 and self-structured questionnaire were used to collect auxiliary information. Results revealed that 55.6 per cent were females, 43.5 per cent of them were in the age range of 10-15 years 49 per cent were paternal orphans, 59.7 per cent of them had less than 4 years of orphan hood experience and 49.2 per cent were living with mother. With regard to resilience, majority (61.3 %) of the children were in the low level of resilience while 12.9 per cent each of them were in below average as well as average level of resilience. With regard to vulnerability, 55.6 per cent of the children were in high category of vulnerability followed by 16.9 per cent of them were in average category of vulnerability. Negative and significant relation found between resilience and vulnerability. Vulnerability and birth order of children predicted 80.2 per cent of variation in the resilience among orphans.

Keywords: Orphans, children, resilience, vulnerability

Introduction
Orphan is a child who is below 18 years of age and who has lost one or both parents (George, 2011) [4]. Maternal orphan is referred to a child who has lost their mother and paternal orphan is referred to a child who has lost their father. Double orphans are those who lost their both parents. Social orphans are children who are living without parents because of abandonment or because their parents gave them up as a result of poverty, alcoholism or imprisonment, etc (Dillon, 2008) [2].

The number of orphans in India stands at approximately 55 million children of age 0 to 12 years, which is about 47% of the overall population of 150 million orphans in the world (GCM India; UNICEF, 2005) [7]. India is the world's largest democracy with a population of over a billion people, of which 400 million are children. Approximately 18 million of this number of children live or work on the streets of India, and majority of them are involved in crime, prostitution, gang related violence and drug trafficking; however, a large number of these children are orphans (Shrivastava, 2007) [5]. The children who have lost their parents are most vulnerable, because they do not have the emotional and physical maturity to address their psychological trauma associated with parental loss. In the society, orphan children can be considered to be at more risk than average children (Subbarao and Coury, 2004) [6]. Loss of parents introduces a major change in the life of an orphan. These changes can easily affect not only the physical, but also the psychological and mental well-being of children.

These children need emotional psychological support like care, love, affection, protection, attention, security, attachment and they want to be praised and rewarded. They do have stressful events or trauma in their lives like parental loss, abuse, negligence and poverty. This makes them emotionally suppressed and makes them withdraw from the social activities. They may develop scholastic backwardness and behaviour problems. Emotional disturbance and behavioural problems affect children in all life situations. Hence the resilience i.e. bouncing back capacity of the children plays a major role in the life of an orphan to face the adversity. Resilience/Resilient is the capacity of a system, community or society potentially exposed to hazards to adapt, by resisting or changing in order to reach and maintain an acceptable level of functioning and structure. This is determined by the degree to which the social system is capable of organizing itself to increase its capacity for learning from past disasters for better future protection and to improve risk reduction measures (UNISDR, 2004) [8].

People who are resilient can effectively cope with, or adapt to, stress and challenging life situations.

Correspondence
Daneshwari Onkari
Research Scholar, Department of
Human Development and
Family Studies, College of
Community Science, UAS,
Dharwad, Karnataka, India

They learn from the experience of being able to effectively manage in one situation, making them better able to cope with stresses and challenges in future situations.

Vulnerability is the inability to resist a hazard or to respond when a disaster has occurred (Pagina, 2008). Vulnerability is the conditions determined by physical, social, economic and environmental factors or processes, which increase the susceptibility of a community to the impact of hazards (UNISDR, 2004) [8]. Hence the present study aims to study the resilience among orphans and to know the influence of selected demographic variables on resilience.

Methodology

Study was conducted in the year 2016-2018 in Dharwad taluka, Dharwad district of Karnataka state. A correlation research design was used to know the relationship between individual, ecological factors with resilience of orphans. Prevalence of orphans was assessed by selecting 5% villages of Dharwad taluka. From the prevalence, 25-30 per cent of the population *i.e* 124 orphans were randomly selected to know the resilience. Self structured questionnaire was used to collect personal information like age, gender, education of children, type of orphan, number of siblings, period of orphanhood, family type, family size and caste. The socio-economic status scale developed by Aggarwal *et al.* 2005 [1] was used to assess SES. It consisted of 23 statements which assess caste, education, occupation and monthly per capita income from all sources, type of house and location, family possessions and possessions of earning members in the family, number of children and possessions of agriculture and non-agricultural land along with animals and social status of the family. The scores were given for different dimensions and added to obtain total score. The socio economic status has been classified as upper high, high, upper middle, lower middle, poor middle and very poor.

The scale developed by Embury (2007) [3] was used to assess the resilience among children and adolescents. The scale consists of 64 items. It uses a five point likert style format in which the students were asked to rate 64 items as never (0), rarely (1), sometimes (2), often (3) and almost always (4). Resiliency scale assesses resiliency of an individual through its three sub scales namely, sense of mastery, sense of relatedness and emotional reactivity.

Resiliency is calculated by using formula:

$$\text{RES raw scores} = \frac{(\text{MAS T} + \text{REL T})}{2}$$

where in, MAS is sense of mastery, REL is sense of relatedness.

The score got after the calculation is converted to T score. The RES T score was calculated by using manual for respective raw scores. T score ranges and rankings were given as:

Ranking	T score ranges
High	60
Above average	56-59
Average	46-55
Below average	41-45
Low	40

Vulnerability

Vulnerability was calculated by using formula:

$$\text{VUL} = \text{REA T} - \text{RES T}$$

Where in, REA T is emotional reactivity T score and RES T is resiliency T score.

The each score obtained after the calculation was converted to T score. The VUL T score was calculated by using manual for respective raw scores. T score ranges and rankings were given as:

Ranking	T score ranges
High	60
Above average	56-59
Average	46-55
Below average	41-45
Low	40

A pilot study was conducted on 30 orphan children to know the reliability of resilience scale. The reliability was 0.605 (0.86 alpha) by using split half method.

Results and discussion

The personal characteristics of 124 selected rural orphans is presented in the Table 1. It is apparent from the table that, 55.6 per cent are girls and 44.4 per cent are boys. With regard to age, 43.5 per cent of orphan children are in the age range of 10-15 years followed by 16-17 years and 6-9 years (30.6 % and 25.8 % respectively). With respect to type of orphan, nearly half of them (49.2 %) are paternal orphans, 33.9 per cent are maternal orphan and only 16.9 per cent are double orphans. With respect to birth order, 44.4 per cent are last born, 37.9 per cent are first born and 17.7 per cent are middle born. In case of period of orphanhood, more than half (59.7 %) of children had 0 to 4 years of orphanhood experience, 29.8 per cent had 5 to 8 years and only 10.5 per cent had more than 9 years of orphanhood experience. About half of the children (49.2 %) are living with mother, 20.2 per cent, 18.5 per cent and 12.1 per cent are living with uncle/ aunt, grandparents and with father respectively at present. Regarding number of siblings, 46.0 per cent of orphan children have 2 to 3 siblings followed by one sibling (41.1 %) and 12.9 per cent have no siblings.

Familial characteristics of the sample are presented in the Table 2. With respect to family type, among paternal orphans 75.41 per cent of the children are residing with mothers, 14.7 percent are residing in joint family and only 9.8 per cent are residing in extended family. Among maternal orphans, 61.90 per cent of the children are residing with fathers, 23.8 per cent of them are residing in joint family and 14.2 per cent of them in extended family. Among double orphans, 38.1 per cent of them are residing in extended family and 38.1 per cent of them are residing in extended family.

With regard to family size, among paternal orphans, 57.4 per cent of the children belonged to small family size followed by medium and large size family (32.8 % and 9.8 % respectively). In case of maternal orphans, 45.2 per cent of the subjects belonged to medium family size followed by small and large size family (38.1 % and 16.7 % respectively). Among double orphans, 42.9 per cent of the subjects belonged to small family size followed by medium and large size family (38.1 % and 19.0 % respectively).

Majority of the paternal, maternal and double orphans belonged to other backward class followed by upper caste, scheduled tribe and scheduled caste. With regard to socio-economic status of the family, irrespective of type of orphans, majority of them were from lower middle SES followed by

upper middle category of SES and none of the sample belonged to upper high, high, poor middle and poor category of socio-economic status from paternal, maternal and double orphans.

Table 3 indicates the resilience and vulnerability among orphans. In case of resiliency, majority (61.3 %) of the children were in the low level of resilience while 12.9 per cent of the children were in below average as well as average level of resilience. Only 4.8 per cent and 8.1 per cent were in above average and high levels of resiliency respectively. With regard to vulnerability, 55.6 per cent of the children were in high category of vulnerability followed by 16.9 per cent, 10.5 per cent, 8.9 per cent and 8.1 per cent of the children were in average, above average, low and below average category of vulnerability respectively. As resilience is bouncing back capacity of an individual when faced with adverse condition. Those who are high in resilience, will be capable of handling the situation and coming out of the situation. Orphan children due to parental loss, orphanhood, lower economic status, etc made them less resilient. Vulnerability is the conditions determined by physical, social, economic and environmental factors or processes, which increase the susceptibility of children to the impact of hazards. Children with higher vulnerability will not be having capacity to handle or face situation associated with parental loss.

Table 4 represents the relationship between resilience and vulnerability. There was negative ad significant relationship was found between resilience and vulnerability indicating higher the resilience and lower will be the vulnerability.

A predictor variable of resilience of rural orphan children is presented in Table 5. The selected demographic variables have been included in different models to know the impact of variables on resilience of orphan children. Personal and familial characteristics were put in different models to know the impact of independent variables on resilience. In that vulnerability and birth order were found to be the significant predictor of resilience and explained about 80.9 per cent of variation in the dependent variable. All other independent variables did not influence on the variation in the dependent variable (viz. resilience).

Table 1: Personal characteristics of rural orphans N=124

Variables		Frequency	Percentages
Gender	Male	55	44.4
	Female	69	55.6
Age (yrs)	6-9	32	25.8
	10-15	54	43.5
	16-17	38	30.6
Type of Orphan	Paternal orphan	61	49.2
	Maternal orphan	42	33.9
	Double orphan	21	16.9
Birth order	First	47	37.9
	Middle	22	17.7
	Last	55	44.4
Period of orphanhood (yrs)	0-4	74	59.7
	5-8	37	29.8
	>9	13	10.5
Present living status	Father	15	12.1
	Mother	61	49.2
	Grand parents	23	18.5
	Uncle/aunt	25	20.2
No. of siblings	None	16	12.9
	One	51	41.1
	2-3	57	46.0

Figures in parenthesis indicates percentages

Table 2: Familial characteristics of rural orphans N = 124

Variables			PO	MO	DO
Family type	Single parent family	Father only	0 (0.00)	26 (61.90)	0 (0.00)
		Mother only	46 (75.1)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
	Extended family	Joint	9 (14.7)	10 (23.8)	8 (38.1)
		Extended	6 (9.8)	6 (14.2)	13 (61.9)
Family size	Small (≤4)		35 (57.4)	16 (38.1)	9 (42.9)
	Medium (5-8)		20 (32.8)	19 (45.2)	8 (38.1)
	Large (≥9)		6 (9.8)	7 (16.7)	4 (19.0)
Caste	Upper caste		19 (31.1)	10 (23.8)	5 (23.8)
	OBC		32 (52.5)	20 (47.6)	15 (71.4)
	SC		6 (9.8)	5 (11.9)	0 (0.0)
	ST		4 (6.6)	7 (16.7)	1 (4.8)
Socio-economic status	Upper High		0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	High		0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	Upper Middle		2 (3.3)	13 (31.0)	3 (14.3)
	Lower Middle		59 (96.7)	29 (69.0)	18 (85.7)
	Poor Middle		0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	Poor		0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)

Figures in parenthesis indicates percentages

Table 3: Resilience and vulnerability among orphans N=124

Categories	Resilience	Vulnerability
High	10(8.1)	**69(55.6)**
Above average	6(4.8)	13(10.5)
Average	16(12.9)	21(16.)
Below average	16(12.9)	10(8.1)
Low	**76(61.3)**	11(8.9)

Figures in parenthesis indicates percentages

Table 4: Correlation between resilience and vulnerability

Variables	Vulnerability
Resilience	-0.891**

Table 5: Predictor variables of resilience of rural orphans

Coefficients[a]							
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	R	R^2
	B	Std. Error	Beta				
1 (Constant)	104.046	3.308		31.449	.000	.891[a]	.794
Vulnerability	-1.237	.057	-.891	-21.674	.000		
2 (Constant)	101.230	3.328		30.418	.000	.899[b]	.809
Vulnerability	-1.270	.056	-.915	-22.582	.000		
Birth order	2.566	.835	.125	3.074	.003		

a. Predictors: (Constant), vulnerability
b. Predictors: (Constant), vulnerability, birth order
c. Dependent Variable: resilience

References
1. Aggarwal OP, Bhasin SK, Sharma AKC, Aggarwal K, Rajoura OP. A new instrument (scale) for measuring the socio-economic status of a family: Preliminary study. Indian J Comm. Med. 2005; 34(4):111-114.
2. Dillon SA. The missing link: a social orphan protocol to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. Sited in Naqshbandi, M. M., Rashmi, S. and Fahim, H., 2012, Orphans in orphanages of Kashmir and their Psychological problems. Int. NGO J. 2008; 7(3):55-63.
3. Embury T. Resiliency scale for children and adolescents: A profile of personal strengths. San Antonio, TX: Harcourt assessment, INC, 2007.
4. George A. State of orphans in the earthly paradise. Econ. Polit. Weekly. 2011; 46(10):19.
5. Shrivastava D. Child trafficking–A human right abuse. Indian Police J. 2007, 65.
6. Subbarao K, Coury D. Reaching out to Africa's orphans: A framework for public action: World Bank Publications, 2004.
7. UNICEF. The state of the world's children 2006: excluded and invisible: United Nations Pubns, 2005.
8. UNISDR. Living with Risk, UNISDR (United Nations Secretariat for the International Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction), Geneva, Switzerland, 2004.