

Chapter VI

Empowerment of Backward Class Women Representatives – An Empirical Analysis

Chapter VI Empowerment of Backward Class Women Representatives – An Empirical Analysis

The Constitution (Seventy-third amendment) Act, 1993 has been considered as a Magana Karta in the history of Panchayati Raj system in India. It paved the way for the new pattern of leadership at the grass roots level. The future of PR system depends upon the quality of its elected representatives. Therefore, the welfare of society requires efficient leadership within the local community and PR institutions can utilize such leadership. The role and performance of the leadership is very to produce and promote significant for mobilizing the rural masses for co-operation and involvement in the implementation of rural development schemes. The status of PR leaders can be utilized to find out their position in the hierarchy of rural society. The understanding of socio-economic and political background of a person is essential for the proper understanding of his behavioural pattern.

The present study was conducted after 73rd constitutional amendment act, 1993 and more appropriately after the enactment and implementation of A.P. Panchayathi Raj act 1994. The main feature of the act is the provision of reservation of one-third seats for women and the reservation for SCs/STs as per their percentage in the total population.

As a result the women representatives occupy about one-third seats in PR institutions and SCs about one-fifth seats, which is the significant representation of these highlight the basic variables constituting the socio-economic background of PR representatives such as age, caste, sex, family composition, occupation, marital status, educational level, income and land holdings. The major variables constituting the socio-economic background of the elected representatives of PR institutions are being examined here in this part.

Socio-Economic Background of the Respondents

In order to analyse the socio-economic background of the respondents the age, religion, marital status, educational level, sub-caste, housing conditions, landholdings, annual income, ration cards possessed, type of family, etc were taken as parameters.

Present Political Position of Sample Respondents

Prior to going in to the demographic details of the respondents, the total respondents with their Political Position are shown in the following tables. The Present Political Position of the sample respondents are presented in Table 6.1(a) and Table 6.1(b)

Table 6.1.1(a) Present Political Position of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	ZPTC	7	2.0	2.0	2.0
	MPTC	60	17.3	17.3	19.4
	Ward Member	279	80.6	80.6	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.1.1(b) Present Political Position of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	MPP	11	15.5	15.5	15.5
	Sarpanch	60	84.5	84.5	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.1.1(a) and Table 6.1.1(b) indicates the sample respondents with the reference to General Members & Heads of PRIs respectively. General Members total sample is 346 comprising ZPTC (07), MPTC (60), Ward Members (279) and Heads of PRIs total sample is 71 comprising MPP (11) and Sarpanch (60). Thus total sample comprising both General Members & Heads of PRIs is 417.

Backward Class Community Category of sample Respondents

Categorization of the sample Respondents in to Backward Class Community Classification are shown in the following tables. Categorization reveals which category people are more represented.

Table 6.1.2(a) Backward Community Category of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	A	3	.9	.9	.9
	B	50	14.5	14.5	15.3
	C	7	2.0	2.0	17.3
	D	206	59.5	59.5	76.9
	E	80	23.1	23.1	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.1.2(b) Backward Community Category of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	A	21	29.6	29.6	29.6
	B	41	57.7	57.7	87.3
	D	2	2.8	2.8	90.1
	E	7	9.9	9.9	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

From Table 6.1.2(a) and Table 6.1.2b Community to which the respondents will belong is observed. Among the 346 General Members 60 % are from BC-D, 23% are BC-E, 14.5% are BC-B, 2% from BC-C and 0.9% are BC-A. Among 71 Heads of PRIs selected 57.7 % belongs to BC-B followed by 29.6% in BC-A, 9.9% in BC-E and 2.8% BC-D.

Religion Status of sample Respondents

In Indian society religion is one of the main social considerations of an individual. The religious particulars of the sample respondents are given as bellow.

Table 6.1.3(a) Religion Status of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Hindu	259	74.9	74.9	74.9
	Muslim	80	23.1	23.1	98.0
	Christian	7	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.1.3(b) Religion Status of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Hindu	64	90.1	90.1	90.1
	Muslim	7	9.9	9.9	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Tables 6.1.3 (a) and 6.1.3 (b) indicates religion of the General Members & Heads of PRIs respectively. In General Members 74.9% belongs to Hindu, followed by 23.1% in Muslim and 2% in Christian. Among Heads of PRIs 90.1% belong to Hindu and 9.9% belongs to Muslim. Most of the respondents belongs to Hindu community.

Age of the Respondents

The age of an individual is an important factor which decides the economic activities to be performed by him /her. The age particulars of the respondents are shown in the following tables.

Table 6.1.4(a) Age of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 25	67	19.4	19.4	19.4
	26 – 35	67	19.4	19.4	38.7
	36 – 45	104	30.1	30.1	68.8
	46 and above	108	31.2	31.2	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.1.4(b) Age of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	26 – 35	58	81.7	81.7	81.7
	36 – 45	13	18.3	18.3	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.1.4(a) and Table 6.1.4(b) shows Age of the respondents in General Members 31.2% belongs to 46 and above age group followed by 30.1% in 36-45 age group and 19.4% both in 26-35 and < 25 age group. In Heads of PRIs 81.7% belongs to 26-35 age group 18.3% in 36-45 age group. Thus, in case of General Members most of the respondents are middle age groups. In case of Heads of PRIs most of the respondents are young.

Marital Status

In the Indian society the marital status of the person decides their social and economic role in the society. The family obligation drives the people to search for higher incomes or supplementary incomes. The following tables showing the marital status of the respondents

Table 6.1.5(a) Marital Status of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Married	346	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 6.1.5(b) Marital Status of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Married	71	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Field Data

Table 6.1.5(a) and Table 6.1.5(b) shows marital status of General Members & Heads of PRIs selected for the study and all sample respondents are married.

Educational Status

The active participation of women in public life largely depends on their educational background. Following tables shows the educational details. Educational level of General Members & Heads of PRIs are shown in Tables 6.1.6(a) and 6.1.6(b) Among the General Members 35.5% have the primary level of education followed by 28.9% illiterate, 23.7% respondents with secondary level, 10.1% respondents with Intermediate level of education and 1.7% respondents with Graduates level. Among Heads of PRIs 46.5% have primary level of education, followed by 18.3% respondents with Intermediate level, 15.5% both in secondary and Graduation level education and only 4.2% respondents with illiteracy.

Table 6.1.6(a) Education Level of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Illiterate	100	28.9	28.9	28.9
	Primary	123	35.5	35.5	64.5
	Secondary	82	23.7	23.7	88.2
	Intermediate	35	10.1	10.1	98.3
	Degree	6	1.7	1.7	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.1.6(b) Education Level of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Illiterate	3	4.2	4.2	4.2
	Primary	33	46.5	46.5	50.7
	Secondary	11	15.5	15.5	66.2
	Intermediate	13	18.3	18.3	84.5
	Degree	11	15.5	15.5	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Primary Occupation of the Respondents

Primary Occupation of the Respondents informs the researcher that how the respondents were occupied in their livelihood earnings before taking the political career. The following tables shows occupation details.

Table 6.1.7(a) Occupation of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agl. Labour	298	86.1	86.1	86.1
	Former	3	.9	.9	87.0
	Others	45	13.0	13.0	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.1.7(b) Occupation of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agl Labour	2	2.8	2.8	2.8
	Former	13	18.3	18.3	21.1
	Others	56	78.9	78.9	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Tables 6.1.7(a) and 6.1.7(b) indicates occupation of the General Members & Heads of PRIs respectively. In General Members 86.1% are with agricultural labour occupation, 13% are with others(which includes house wife's, private jobs and business)and 0.9% are farmers. In Heads of PRIs 78.9% are with occupation as others (same as above represented in the braces), 18.3% are farmers, 2.8% are agricultural labour.

Annual Income

The following tables shows the annual income of the sample respondents.

Table 6.1.8(a) Annual Income of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 lakh	345	99.7	99.7	99.7
	1 - 2 lakh	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.1.8(b) Annual Income of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	less than 1 lakh	40	56.3	56.3	56.3
	1 - 2 lakh	31	43.7	43.7	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.1.8(a) and Table 6.1.8(b) shows annual income of General Members & Heads of PRIs. In General members 99.7% are with less than 1 lakh income and 0.3% are with 1 to 2 lakhs. Among Heads of PRIs 56.3% are with <1 lakhs income and 43.7% are with 1 to 2 lakhs in income.

Size of the Family

In rural areas the economic and political position of a family depends on the size of the family. As such the family size of the sample women representatives are shown in the following tables.

Table 6.1.9(a) Size of the Family Members of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	2	.6	.6	.6
	3	103	29.8	29.8	30.3
	4	133	38.4	38.4	68.8
	5	84	24.3	24.3	93.1
	6 and above	24	6.9	6.9	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.1.9(b) Size of the family members of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4	13	18.3	18.3	18.3
	6 and above	58	81.7	81.7	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Tables 6.1.9(a) and 9(b) reveals size of the family members of General Members & Heads of PRIs. In General members 38.4% respondents have a size of 4 member family, 29.8% have a family of 3 members, 24.3% with a family of 5 persons and 6.9% have 6 and above family size and 0.6% with a family size of 2 persons. In Heads of PRIs 81.7% have a family size of 6 and above persons and 18.3% have a family size of 4 persons.

Type of the family

The type of the family, in which the individual living is also an important parameter to measure the socio, economic and political status. The following tables shows the details of the type of the family.

Table 6.1.10(a) Type of the family of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Nuclear	293	84.7	84.7	84.7
	Joint	53	15.3	15.3	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.1.10(b) Type of the family of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Nuclear	13	18.3	18.3	18.3
	Joint	58	81.7	81.7	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.1.10(a) and Table 6.1.10(b) shows type of family of General Members & Heads of PRIs respectively. In General Members 84.7% sample respondents are of nuclear family type and 15.3% are of joint family type. In Heads of PRIs 81.7% respondents are of joint family and 18.3% are of nuclear family.

No. of Members of the family in Govt. Service

The following tables show the details number of members of the family in government service.

Table 6.1.11(a) No. of Employees in the family of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	.6	.6	.6
	0	344	99.4	99.4	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.1.11(b) No. of Employees in the family of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	71	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Field Data

Tables 6.1.11(a) and 6.1.11(b) reveal the no. of employees in the family of the General Members & Heads of PRIs. Among the General Members 0.6% respondents have some members of their family are in Govt. services and rest of respondents have no family members are in Govt. service. In Heads of PRIs none of the respondents have their family members are in Govt. services.

No. of Dependents

The economic well being of a family largely depends upon the number of dependents in the household. The dependents include children, senior citizens, physically and mentally challenged persons. The following tables shows the details of the number of the dependents.

Tables 6.1.12(a) and 6.1.12(b) reveals no. of dependents of respondents of General Members & Heads of PRIs respectively. Among the General Members 38.2% have 2 persons as dependents, 29.8% have 1 member as dependents and 24.9% have 3 dependents, 6.6% have 4 dependents and 0.6% have 0 dependents. Among Heads of PRIs, 33.8% have 2 members, 32.4% have 3 members, 31% have 4 members and 2.8% have 1 person as dependents.

Table 6.1.12(a) No. of Dependents of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	2	.6	.6	.6
	1	103	29.8	29.8	30.3
	2	132	38.2	38.2	68.5
	3	86	24.9	24.9	93.4
	4	23	6.6	6.6	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.1.12(b) No. of Dependents of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	2.8	2.8	2.8
	2	24	33.8	33.8	36.6
	3	23	32.4	32.4	69.0
	4	22	31.0	31.0	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Status of the house of Respondents

The following tables show the status of the house of the respondents.

Table 6.1.13(a) Status of the house of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Own	346	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 6.1.13(b) Status of the house of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Own	71	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Field Data

Table 6.1.13(a) and 13(b) reveals Status of House of General Members and Heads of PRIs respectively. All the respondents have own house.

Possession of type of Ration Card by Respondents

The ration cards issued by State Government to rural households also indicates the economic status of a household. The following tables shows the ration card details of the sample respondents.

Table 6.1.14(a)Type of Ration Card of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	White	329	95.1	95.1	95.1
	Pink	17	4.9	4.9	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.1.14(b)Type of Ration Card of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	White	49	69.0	69.0	69.0
	Pink	22	31.0	31.0	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Tables 6.1.14(a) and 6.1.14(b) provides type of type of Ration Card possessed by the General Members & Heads of PRIs. Among the General Members 95.1% have White and 4.9% have Pink Ration Cards. Where as in Heads of PRIs 69% have White and 31% have Pink Ration Cards.

Electricity Facility

The following tables gives the details of the electricity facility of the households of the respondents.

Table 6.1.15(a) Electricity Connection to the house of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	346	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 6.1.15(b) Electricity Connection to the house of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	71	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Field Data

Tables 6.1.15(a) and 6.1.15(b) illustrates Electricity Connection to the house of House of General Members and Heads of PRIs. All respondents houses are connected with electricity service.

Toilet Facility

To improve the hygienic conditions of rural areas government providing incentives for the construction of individual toilets. But, such incentives didn't yield fruitful results as most of the sample households don't have individual toilets. Tables 6.1.16(a) & 6.1.16(b) shows similar to the electricity connection that all the respondents (General Members and Heads of PRIs) have individual Toilet facilities in their houses.

Table 6.1.16(a) Individual Toilet Facility of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	346	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 6.1.16(b) Individual Toilet Facility of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	71	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Field Data

Source of Drinking Water

The following tables shows the details of the major sources of drinking water for the sample households.

Table 6.1.17(a) Major source of Drinking water of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Public tap	242	69.9	69.6	69.9
	Public Bore Well	12	3.5	3.5	73.4
	Own tap	92	26.6	26.6	
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	100

Table 6.1.17(b) Major source of drinking water of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Public tap	2	2.8	2.8	2.8
	Own tap	69	97.2	97.2	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Tables 6.1.17(a) and 6.1.17(b) furnishes details on drinking water sources for the General Members and Heads of PRIs families. Among General Members 69.9% have public tap, 26.6% have own tap and 3.5% have public bore well as their source of drinking water. Among Heads of PRIs 97.2% have own tap and 2.8% have public tap as their source of drinking water.

Land holdings of Respondents

In rural India agriculture and allied activities are the major occupation of respondents. The economic status of a household largely depends on the possession of land by the family. The following tables show the landholding particulars of the sample respondents.

Table 6.1.18(a) Landed Property of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Landless	87	25.1	25.1	25.1
	1 acre	130	37.6	37.6	62.7
	2 - 5 acre	105	30.3	30.3	93.1
	6 and above	24	6.9	6.9	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.1.18(b) Landed Property of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Landless	13	18.3	18.3	18.3
	2 - 5 acre	36	50.7	50.7	69.0
	6 and above	22	31.0	31.0	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.1.18(a) and Table 6.1.18(b) list landed property of General Members and Heads of PRIs. Among General Members 37.6% have 1 acre, 30.3% have 2 to 5 acre, 25.1% have no land (land less) 6.9% have 6 and above acre as landed property. On the other side in the Heads of PRIs 50.7% have 2 to 5 acre, 31% have 6 and above acre, 18.3% have no land as their landed property.

Agents of Motivation to participate in Politics

Generally women enter in to politics by their own choice or motivated by some persons or incidents. For this reason researcher asked the respondents what has motivated respondent to enter in to politics. The generally influenced agents such as Influenced by Local Leaders, Family members, National Leaders, Voluntary and Due to reservation policy were asked to respondents and their replies were recorded and are shown in the following tables.

Table 6.2.1(a) Influence to join the politics of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Family Members	27	7.8	7.8	7.8
	Due to reservation policy	319	92.2	92.2	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.2.1(b) Influence to join the politics of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Family Members	14	19.7	19.7	19.7
	Due to reservation policy	57	80.3	80.3	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.2.1(a) and Table 6.2.1(b) furnishes factor influencing to join in politics by the respondents among General Members & Heads of PRIs respectively. It is observed that 92.9% of General Members and 80.3% of Heads of PRIs are influenced to join in politics because of reservation policy. On the other side 7.8% of General Members and 19.7% of Heads of PRIs are influenced to join in politics because of family members, none of the respondents are influenced by National Leaders, Local Leaders or on their voluntary basis.

Respondents awareness on PRI Provisions

The functional levels of any representative largely depend on their awareness levels in which institution or body they are functioning. As such during field survey the awareness of the sample respondents is examined on such areas like awareness on three tiers of PRIs, knowledge of

minimum age of 18 years to cast vote in elections, knowledge of minimum age of 21 years to contest in elections, awareness on the percentage of reservations in PRIs, XI Schedule on Indian Constitution, major functional areas of PRIs, Two Child Norm etc. The following 6.2.2(a) and (b) to 6.2.7(a) and (b) tables shows Awareness of respondents on PRI provisions.

Table 6.2.2(a) Awareness on Three Tier PRIs of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	7	2.0	2.0	2.0
	NO	339	98.0	98.0	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.2.2(b) Awareness on Three Tier PRIs of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	22	31.0	31.0	31.0
	NO	49	69.0	69.0	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.2.2(a) and Table 6.2.2(b) show awareness of the General Members & Heads of PRIs on three tier structure of PRIs. Only 2% of General Members & 31% of Heads of PRIs are aware of the three tier structure of PRIs.

Table 6.2.3(a) Awareness on the percentage of Reservation in PRI Elections of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	119	34.4	34.4	34.4
	NO	227	65.6	65.6	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.2.3(b) Awareness on the percentage of Reservation in PRI Elections of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	44	62.0	62.0	62.0
	NO	27	38.0	38.0	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.2.3(a) and Table 6.2.3(b) reveal percentage of reservation in PRI elections. The awareness on the reservation policy among General Members and Heads of PRIs is in the following percentages. 34.4% of General Members 62% of Heads of PRIs are aware of reservation policy.

Table 6.2.4(a) Awareness on the XI Schedule of Indian Constitution of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	6	1.7	1.7	1.7
	NO	340	98.3	98.3	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.2.4(b) Awareness on the XI Schedule of Indian Constitution of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	11	15.5	15.5	15.5
	NO	60	84.5	84.5	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.2.4(a) and Table 6.2.4(b) represents awareness on XIth schedule of Indian Constitution. 1.7% of General Members & 15.5% of Heads of PRIs are aware of XIth schedule.

Table 6.2.5(a) Awareness on Functions of PRIs of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	8	2.3	2.3	2.3
	NO	338	97.7	97.7	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.2.5(b) Awareness on Functions of PRIs of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	58	81.7	81.7	81.7
	NO	13	18.3	18.3	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.2.5(a) and Table 6.2.5(b) indicates awareness on functions of PRIs. 2.3% of General Members & 81.7% of Heads of PRIs are aware of functions of PRIs.

Table 6.2.6(a) Awareness on Two Child Norm for Contesting in Elections of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	305	88.2	88.2	88.2
	NO	41	11.8	11.8	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.2.6(b) Awareness on Two Child Norm for Contesting in Elections of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	71	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Field Data

Table 6.2.6(a) and Table 6.2.6(b) reveal awareness on two child norm for contesting in elections. 88.2% of General Members & 100% of Heads of PRIs are aware of two child norm for contesting in elections.

Table 6.2.7(a) Awareness on minimum age for voting right 18 or 21 of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18	241	69.7	69.7	69.7
	21	105	30.3	30.3	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.2.7(b) Awareness on minimum age for voting right 18 or 21 of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18	71	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Field Data

Table 6.2.7(a) and Table 6.2.7(b) shows awareness on minimum age for voting right. 69.7% of General Members & 100% of Heads of PRIs are aware of minimum age for voting right. In General Members 30.3% were of the opinion of 21 years as minimum age for voting . After questioning, the investigator has educated these people that the minimum age is 18 years and these people have acknowledged these factors.

Previous Political Experience and Exposure

Most of the women representatives came to politics particular in time of Panchayat Election, 2014. The following tables show the previous political experience and exposure of the respondents.

Table 6.3.1(a) Do you have any previous political experience and exposure?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	25	7.2	7.2	7.2
	NO	321	92.8	92.8	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.3.1(b) Do you have any previous political experience and exposure?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	24	33.8	33.8	33.8
	NO	47	66.2	66.2	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.3.1(a) and Table 6.3.1(b) reveal the previous political experience and exposure among the respondents. 7.2% of General Members & 33.8% of Heads of PRIs have previous political experience.

Length of Political Experience

The respondents with previous political experience were further asked (0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years) to give the details of their Length of Political Experience and the same is shown in the following tables.

Table 6.3.2.(a) If yes, mention the length of the political experience					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 - 5 Years	322	93.1	93.1	93.1
	6 - 10 Years	24	6.9	6.9	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.3.2.(b) If yes, mention the length of the political experience					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 - 5 Years	60	84.5	84.5	84.5
	6 - 10 Years	11	15.5	15.5	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.3.2(a) and Table 6.3.2(b) reveals length of political experience among the respondents. Among the General Members 6.9% & among Heads of PRIs 15.5% have 6 -10 years previous political experience. Whereas the rest of the respondents belong to 0-5 years. Note (Here the respondents who responded with YES & NO in 6.2.8a & 8b are included as the group categorized is starting with 0-5 years).

Honour or Recognition

To assess the level of exposure got by the female members the researcher asked the sample representatives whether they are honoured enough by the villagers or not. The following tables show their responses.

Table 6.3.3(a) Do you receive honour and recognition from the villagers?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	346	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 6.3.3(b) Do you receive honour and recognition from the villagers?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	71	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Field Data

Table 6.3.3(a) and Table 6.3.3(b) reveal Honour & Recognition arising by virtue of being General Members & Heads of PRIs. All the respondents are agreed that they are receiving Honour & Recognition from the villagers.

Political Party Membership

The political mileage of an individual, especially women largely depends on their association with a particular political party. The membership of a political party is quite essential for the members who are contesting for a position at intermediate level and district level, for which elections are held on party basis. The following tables shows the details of membership of political parties that the sample women is having in one party or other.

Table 6.3.4(a) Do you have any Political Party Membership?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	346	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 6.3.4(b) Do you have any Political Party Membership?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	71	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Field Data

Table 6.3.4(a) and Table 6.3.4(b) shows Political Party Membership. All the respondents from General Members & Heads of PRIs agreed that they have political party membership.

Family support

The reflections of family support (Full support, Husband dominates, Husband helps without interference, No support from family) towards the sample women representatives shown in the following tables.

Table 6.3.5(a) Are you receiving the support of your family members?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Full Support	111	32.1	32.1	32.1
	Husband dominates	67	19.4	19.4	51.4
	Husband Helps without interference	168	48.6	48.6	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.3.5(b) Are you receiving the support of your family members?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Full Support	71	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Field Data

Table 6.3.5(a) and Table 6.3.5(b) reveal support of family members. Among the General Members 48.6% receive husbands help without interference, 32.1% receive full support from all family members and 19.4% has husband support but husbands dominates. Among Heads of PRIs all respondents receive full support from all family members.

Works Undertaken for Women

The sample women members were asked “Which one of the following works have you undertaken specially for the women?” (Nothing, JSY, NOAPS, Immunization, MGNREGS, SHG, Dr. NTR Vaidya Seva, Sanitation and IAY). The responses of the respondents shown in the following tables.

Table 6.3.6(a) Which one of the following works have you undertaken for women?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Nothing	300	86.7	86.7	86.7
	NOAPS	1	.3	.3	87.0
	MGNREGS	44	12.7	12.7	99.7
	SHG	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.3.6(b) Which one of the following works have you undertaken for women?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Nothing	36	50.7	50.7	50.7
	MGNREGS	13	18.3	18.3	69.0
	Sanitation	22	31.0	31.0	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.3.6(a) and Table 6.3.6(b) indicates works undertaken by the respondents for women. Among the General Members 86.7% have undertaking nothing, 12.7% have undertaken MGNRES, 0.3% have taken NOPES as well as SHGs for women. Among Heads of PRIs 50.7% have undertaken nothing, 31% have undertaken Sanitation work and 18.3% undertaken MGNRES for women.

Work done beyond Schemes

The sample women representatives were further asked “ Which works you have undertaken for the benefit of women beyond schemes.” Answer of this question has been reflected in the following tables.

Table 6.3.7(a) Which works you have undertaken for the benefit of women beyond schemes					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Nil	322	93.1	93.1	93.1
	Work done	24	6.9	6.9	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.3.7(b) Which works you have undertaken for the benefit of women beyond schemes					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Nil	48	67.6	67.6	67.6
	Work done	23	32.4	32.4	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.3.7(a) and Table 6.3.7(b) reveal works undertaken by the respondents for women beyond the schemes. 93.1% of General Members & 67.6% of Heads of PRIs have undertaken Nothing (Nil) and rest have done some works.

Use of Power

Perceptions of the women representatives about her “Role” are judged putting one probing question that, “how do you want to use your power”? Answer to this question has been presented through the following tables.

Table 6.3.8(a) Have you undertaken any other women welfare programmes besides the governmental programmes?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	65	18.8	18.8	18.8
	NO	281	81.2	81.2	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.3.8(b) Have you undertaken any other women welfare programmes besides the governmental programmes?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	26	36.6	36.6	36.6
	NO	45	63.4	63.4	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.3.8(a) and Table 6.3.8(b) reveal welfare programmes for women along with governmental programmes by the respondents. 18.8% General Members & 36.6% of Heads of PRIs have taken welfare programmes besides governmental programmes.

Table 6.3.9(a) If yes, specify the name of the programme					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Development Work	281	81.2	81.2	81.2
	Social Development	43	12.4	12.4	93.6
	Women Development	22	6.4	6.4	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.3.9(b) If yes, specify the name of the programme					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Development Work	34	47.9	47.9	47.9
	Social Development	24	33.8	33.8	81.7
	Women Development	13	18.3	18.3	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

If the respondents replied YES for the above they were again asked regarding type of the work undertaken by them such as 1.Development work 2.Social Development 3.Women Development 4.Supply basic needs 5.Economic Development 6.Others.

Table 6.3.9(a) and Table 6.3.9(b) reveal names of the programmes undertaken by the respondents. Among the General Members 81.2% have taken developmental works, 12.4% undertaken Social development and 6.4% have undertaken women development programmes. Among Heads of PRIs 47.9% have taken developmental works, 38.3% Social development works and 18.3% have undertaken women development programmes.

Awareness on Programmes of Women and Child Development

To judge their sense of responsibility women representatives are also asked “ Do you know the programmes regarding women and Child development?”. Answer to this question is shown in the following tables.

Table 6.3.10(a) General Members of PRIs awareness on the Women and Child development programmes of the government					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	47	13.6	13.6	13.6
	NO	299	86.4	86.4	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.3.10(b) Heads of PRIs awareness on the Women and Child development programmes of the government					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	47	66.2	66.2	66.2
	NO	24	33.8	33.8	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.3.10(a) and Table 6.3.10(b) reveal respondents awareness on women & child development programmes of the government. 13.6% of General Members & 62.2% of Heads of PRIs are aware of the women & child development programmes of the government.

Communication by Respondents with Public

The sample women representatives were further asked that “ How do you communicate with public in your locality?.” Their answers have been reflected in the following table.

Table 6.3.11(a) How frequently you communicate with the public					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Weekly	3	.9	.9	.9
	Monthly	2	.6	.6	1.4
	Quarterly	62	17.9	17.9	19.4
	Village Meetings	279	80.6	80.6	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.3.11(b) How frequently you communicate with the public					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Weekly	22	31.0	31.0	31.0
	Monthly	35	49.3	49.3	80.3
	Quarterly	14	19.7	19.7	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.3.11(a) and Table 6.3.11(b) indicates frequency of communication by the respondents with the public. Among the General Members 80.6% communicate through village meetings, 17.9% communicate in Quarterly meetings and only 0.9% & 0.6% communicates weekly & Monthly with the public respectively. Among Heads of PRIs 19.7% communicate quarterly meetings, 49.3% communicates on monthly and 31% communicates on weekly basis with public.

Nature of communication

The following tables show the sample representatives nature of communication with the public.

Table 6.3.12(a) and Table 6.3.12(b) brought out the frequency of communication between respondents and public. In case of General Members 80.6% communicate with the public through Gram sabha. 19.1% communicate through PRI general body meetings. Only 1% respondents communicates with public notifications and announcements. In case of Heads of PRIs 81.7% communicates through PRI general body meetings and rest through Gram sabha.

Table 6.3.12(a) General Members of PRIs views on nature of communication with the public.					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Through Public notification/Announcements	1	.3	.3	.3
	Gram Sabha	279	80.6	80.6	80.9
	PRI General body meetings	66	19.1	19.1	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.3.12(b) Heads of the PRIS views on nature of communication with the public.					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Gram Sabha	13	18.3	18.3	18.3
	PRI General body meetings	58	81.7	81.7	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Participation in Meetings

The women members will become enlightens about the activities of Panchayat Raj Institutions, only when they attend the meetings regularly. As such during field survey the women representatives were asked about their regularity of attending the meetings and the same was shown in the following tables.

Table 6.3.13(a) General Members of PRIs views on regular attends of PRI meetings.					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Regular	346	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 6.3.13(b) Heads of the PRIS views on regular attends of PRI meetings.					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Regular	71	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Field Data

Table 6.3.13(a) and Table 6.3.13(b) These two tables indicates regularity of the General Members and Heads of PRIs on attending the PRI meetings. All the respondents are regular to PRI meetings.

Support Systems

The sample respondents were asked “Which one of the following support systems i.e Training by Govt., Training by NGO, Training by Party, Guidance by Ex-Member, Reading Materials, Field Visit, Guidance by Husband/Family, Support by Secretary, Support from Villagers, Support by Cast leader to perform the work and Support from Officers) you have received after being elected?.The answer for this question has been reflected in the following tables.

Table 6.3.14(a) General Members of PRIs views on support systems received.					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Training by govt.	64	18.5	18.5	18.5
	Guidance by Ex-member	12	3.5	3.5	22.0
	Guidance by Husband/Family	2	.6	.6	22.5
	Support by Secretary	1	.3	.3	22.8
	Support from Villagers	223	64.5	64.5	87.3
	Support from Officers	44	12.7	12.7	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.3.14(a) and Table 6.3.14(b) reveal the support system on which the respondents are depending to perform their activities. Among the General Members 64.5% respondents has support from the villagers, 18.5% have support from government training programmes. 12.7% says they have support from officers, 3.5% are supported from the guidance by Ex. members and only 0.6% are having support from husband and family and 0.3% from secretaries. On the other side among the Heads of PRIs 46.5% have the support from family, 18.3% helped by secretaries ,16.9% through field visits, 15.5% by party training and 2.8% were supported from training by government.

Table 6.3.14(b) Heads of the PRIS views on support systems received.					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Training by govt.	2	2.8	2.8	2.8
	Training by Party	11	15.5	15.5	18.3
	Field visit	12	16.9	16.9	35.2
	Guidance by Husband/Family	33	46.5	46.5	81.7
	Support by Secretary	13	18.3	18.3	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Structural Constraints

The structural constraints (Age, Gender, Caste, Land Holdings, Occupation) faced by sample women representatives are shown in the following tables

Table 6.3.15 (a) Type of constraints faced. Views of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Gender	321	92.8	92.8	92.8
	Caste	25	7.2	7.2	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.3.15(b) Type of constraints faced. Views of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Gender	71	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Field Data

6.3.15(a) and 6.3.15(b), These tables indicates constrains faced by the respondents in performing the duties. Among the general members of PRIs 92.8% expressed that gender is the constraint and 7.2% felt that cast is a constrain where as in case of Heads of PRIs all the respondents felt that gender is the constrain.

Other Constraints

The question, “What are the other constraints faced by you in performing your work?” was put to the sample women representatives to know their feelings towards important hindrances i.e Distant Location and lack of communication, Low level of education, Male intervention, Party intervention, No monitoring & Supervision, Inadequate financial allocation and Party conflict. The following tables describe their responses.

Table 6.3.16(a) Do you have any other constraints in performing your duties?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low level of education	281	81.2	81.2	81.2
	Male intervention	22	6.4	6.4	87.6
	Party Intervention	43	12.4	12.4	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	
Table 6.3.16(b) Do you have any other constraints in performing your duties?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male intervention	69	97.2	97.2	97.2
	Party Conflict	2	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

6.3.16(a) and 6.3.16(b), tables indicates other constrains apart from general constrains faced by the General Members and Heads of PRIs in performing their duties. In General Members 81.2% expressed that low level of education is the constrain, 12.4% felt party intervention as a

constrain, 6.4% are of the opinion that male intervention is a constrain. Among the Heads of PRIs 97.2% revealed that male intervention is a constrain. 2.8% considered party conflict a constraint.

Wishes on continuity as PRI Members

The attitude of sample women to continue as PRI members is shown in the following tables.

Table 6.3.17(a) Would you like to continue as PRI member. Views of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	309	89.3	89.3	89.3
	NO	37	10.7	10.7	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.3.17(b) Would you like to continue as PRI member. Views of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	69	97.2	97.2	97.2
	NO	2	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.3.17(a) and Table 6.3.17(b) shows interests of the General Members of PRIs to continue. In case of General Members 89.3% are willing to continue to contest in the next election and 10.7% are not willing to continue. In case of Heads of PRIs 97.2% are willing to continue and 2.8% are not willing to continue. If YES to continue as PRI member, the following options put to the respondents. (If party wants, If my family permits, If my husband agrees, Of course)

Table 6.3.18(a) If yes to continue as PRI member					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	If my family permits	303	87.6	98.1	98.1
	If my husband agrees	6	1.7	1.9	100.0
	Total	309	89.3	100.0	
Missing	System	37	10.7		
Total		346	100.0		

Table 6.3.18(b) If yes to continue as PRI member					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	If party wants	11	15.5	15.9	15.9
	If my family permits	34	47.9	49.3	65.2
	If my husband agrees	13	18.3	18.8	84.1
	Of course	11	15.5	15.9	100.0
	Total	69	97.2	100.0	
Missing	System	2	2.8		
Total		71	100.0		

Source: Field Data

Tables 6.3.18(a) and 6.3.18(b) shows of willingness of candidates to continue as PRI members/Heads provided following factors are permitting them. Among the General Members of PRIs 87.6% responded that if their family permits they will continue, 1.7% says that if their husband agrees they will continue, remaining 10.7% are not willing to continue. On the other side Heads of PRIs 47.9% expressed that if their family permits they will continue, 18.3% opined that if their husband agrees, 15.5% revealed that if party wants and 15.5% are expressed “of course” as their opinion to continue, which means they are interested to continue and 2.8% are not willing.

If NO to continue as PRI member, the following options put to the respondents. (Due to my family problem, As I don't have sufficient education, As my children suffer, Due to my health, and Due to political confrontation)

Table 6.3.19(a) If no to continue as PRI member					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	As I do not have sufficient education	19	5.5	51.4	51.4
	Due to political confrontation	18	5.2	48.6	100.0
	Total	37	10.7	100.0	
Missing	System	309	89.3		
Total		346	100.0		

Table 6.3.19(b) If no to continue as PRI member					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Due to political confrontation	2	2.8	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	69	97.2		
Total		71	100.0		

Source: Field Data

Tables 6.3.19(a) and 6.3.19(b) shows the opinion from the respondents who are not interested to continue. From the 10.7% of General Members who are not interested to continue. 5.5% pointed the problem as they do not have sufficient education and 5.2% expressed political confrontation as a hindering factor. Among the 2.8% Heads of PRs who are not willing to continue expressed political confrontation is the limiting factor.

Availing the opportunities to develop knowledge and skills

The sample women respondents were asked “Whether you avail the opportunities to develop knowledge and skills for more empowerment levels in future?.” The responses to this question are recorded and shown in the following tables.

Table 6.3.20(a) Avail the opportunities to develop the knowledge and skills for better levels of empowerment.					
Views of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Fully Utilized	3	.9	.9	.9
	Moderately utilized	25	7.2	7.2	8.1
	Partially utilized	299	86.4	86.4	94.5
	Never Utilized	19	5.5	5.5	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.3.20(b) Avail the opportunities to develop the knowledge and skills for better levels of empowerment.					
Views of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Fully Utilized	11	15.5	15.5	15.5
	Moderately utilized	2	2.8	2.8	18.3
	Partially utilized	58	81.7	81.7	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Tables 6.3.20(a) and 6.3.20(b) reveals how far the opportunities available to develop knowledge and skills for better empowerment levels. In case of General Members of PRIs 86.4% felt that they partially utilized the opportunities, 7.2% are of the opinion that they moderately utilized, 5.5% are agreed that they have never utilized and only 0.9% expressed that they fully utilized the opportunities for their empowerment. Among the Heads of PRIs 81.7% are partially utilized, 15.5% are fully utilized and 2.8% are moderately utilized opportunities for their better levels of empowerment.

Influence of PRI membership on Women Empowerment

Regarding the influence of the PRI membership on women empowerment, in this present study attempt is made to assess the empowerment impact from PRI membership by studying the Motivation, Social status, Economic independence, Possession of material status, Decision making at domestic activities, cope with the familial challenges, Economic security, Ability to spend for various purposes, Taking societal political and domestic aggression, on political and legal awareness, Expressing descent and creating public awareness and control over resources. On these parameters respondents opinions are recorded as significantly increased, marginally increased, no change, can't say. For the above parameters ANOVA with respect to Age and Political position of the respondents is carried out to obtain the interference on how different subgroups vary on the above parameters.

Motivation levels

The PRI membership exposes women to face various issues which they tackle on the basis of their knowledge and wisdom. This in turn reposes motivation among women. The influence of PRI membership on motivation levels of sample women are shown in the following tables.

Table 6.4.1(a) Influence on Motivation levels of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Significantly increased	4	1.2	1.2	1.2
	Marginally increased	178	51.4	51.4	52.6
	Can not say / Do not know	164	47.4	47.4	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.4.1(b) Influence on Motivation levels of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Significantly increased	58	81.7	81.7	81.7
	Marginally increased	13	18.3	18.3	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Tables 6.4.1(a) and 6.4.1(b) shows motivation levels. Among General Members 51.4% respondents are marginally increased their motivation, followed by 47.4% who cannot recognize any change and 1.2% have significantly increased motivation. Among Heads 81.7% significantly increased and 18.3% marginally increased their motivation levels.

Influence on Social Status

The details of the influence of PRI membership on social status of sample women representatives are shown in the following tables. Tables 6.4.2(a) and 6.4.2(b) indicates PRI membership influence on social status of the respondents towards their empowerment. 48.6% expressed that they cannot say, 32.1% says no change, 18.5% expressed marginally increased only 0.9% expressed a significant increased in social status. Among Heads of PRIs all have expressed that their social status increased marginally.

Table 6.4.2(a) Influence on Social Status of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Significantly increased	3	.9	.9	.9
	Marginally increased	64	18.5	18.5	19.4
	No Change	111	32.1	32.1	51.4
	Can not say / Do not know	168	48.6	48.6	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.4.2(b) Influence on Social Status of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Marginally increased	71	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Field Data

Influence on Economic Independence

The following tables shows the details of respondents responses on economic independence due to PRI membership.

Table 6.4.3(a) Influence on Economic Independence of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Significantly increased	4	1.2	1.2	1.2
	Marginally increased	25	7.2	7.2	8.4
	No Change	149	43.1	43.1	51.4
	Can not say / Do not know	168	48.6	48.6	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.4.3(b) Influence on Economic Independence of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Marginally increased	36	50.7	50.7	50.7
	No Change	35	49.3	49.3	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.4.3(a) and Table 6.4. 3(b) shows economic independence happening because of PRI membership. Among General Members of PRIs 48.6% cannot say, 43.1% have observed no

change and 7.2% opined marginal increased and 1.2% have significant increase on economic independence. Among Heads of PRIs 50.7% have recognized marginal increased and 49.3% observed no change on economic independence.

Influence on Possession of Material Status

The additional adding to income of the family in the form given to women representatives, makes the family on Possession of Material Status. The details of the influence of the PRI membership on material status are shown in the following tables.

Table 6.4.4(a) and Table 6.4.4(b) reveal influence of PRI membership on material status. Among General Members of PRIs 48.6% cannot say, 43.4% no change, 7.5% recognized marginal increased and 0.6% recognized marginal increase on material status. Among Heads of PRIs 35.2% no change, 33.8% recognized marginal increase and 31% cannot say on material status.

Table 6.4.4(a) Influence on Possession of Material Status of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Significantly increased	2	.6	.6	.6
	Marginally increased	26	7.5	7.5	8.1
	No Change	150	43.4	43.4	51.4
	Can not say / Do not know	168	48.6	48.6	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.4.4(b) Influence on Possession of Material Status of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Marginally increased	24	33.8	33.8	33.8
	No Change	25	35.2	35.2	69.0
	Can not say / Do not know	22	31.0	31.0	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Role in decision making at domestic level

The particulars of the influence of PRI membership on decision making at domestic level with regard to family matters is shown in the following tables.

Table 6.4.5(a) Role in decision making at domestic level of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Marginally increased	27	7.8	7.8	7.8
	No Change	149	43.1	43.1	50.9
	Can not say / Do not know	170	49.1	49.1	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.4.5(b) Role in decision making at domestic level of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Marginally increased	44	62.0	62.0	62.0
	No Change	27	38.0	38.0	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.4.5(a) and Table 6.4.5(b) shows PRI membership influence on decision making at domestic level. Among General Members of PRIs 49.1% cannot say, 43.1% have no change and 7.8% observed marginal increase in decision making. Among Heads of PRIs 62% observed marginal increase and 38% have observed no change in decision making at domestic level

Potential to cope with familial challenges

The influence of PRI membership on sample women representatives in Potential to cope with familial challenges is shown in the following tables.

Table 6.4.6(a) Potential to cope with familial challenges of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Marginally increased	25	7.2	7.2	7.2
	No Change	112	32.4	32.4	39.6
	Can not say / Do not know	209	60.4	60.4	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.4.6(b) Potential to cope with familial challenges of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Marginally increased	33	46.5	46.5	46.5
	No Change	11	15.5	15.5	62.0
	Can not say / Do not know	27	38.0	38.0	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.4.6(a) and Table 6.4.6(b) indicates that PRI membership influence to cooperate with familiar challenges. From General Members of PRIs 60.4% cannot say, 32.4% no change and 7.2% observed marginal increase to cooperate with familiar challenges. On the Heads of PRIs 46.5% observed marginal increase, 38% cannot say and 15.5% observed no change to cooperate with familiar challenges.

Influence on economic security

The details of the influence of the PRI membership on economic security of sample women representatives are shown in the following tables.

Table 6.4.7(a) Influence on economic security of General Members PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Significantly increased	1	.3	.3	.3
	Marginally increased	25	7.2	7.2	7.5
	No Change	95	27.5	27.5	35.0
	Can not say / Do not know	225	65.0	65.0	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.4.7(b)Influence on economic security of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Marginally increased	11	15.5	15.5	15.5
	No Change	60	84.5	84.5	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.3.7(a) and 7(b) shows PRI membership influence on economic security. Among the General Members of PRIs 65% cannot say, 27.5% have no change, 7.2% observed marginal increase and 0.3% observed significant increase on economic security. Among Heads of PRIs 84.5% have no change and 15.5% observed marginal increase on economic status.

Affordability to spend for various purposes

The influence of PRI membership on affordability to spend for various purposes by sample respondents is shown in the following tables.

Table 6.4.8(a)Affordability to spend for various purposes General Members PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Marginally increased	119	34.4	34.4	34.4
	No Change	52	15.0	15.0	49.4
	Can not say / Do not know	175	50.6	50.6	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.4.8(b)Affordability to spend for various purposes of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Marginally increased	22	31.0	31.0	31.0
	No Change	27	38.0	38.0	69.0
	Can not say / Do not know	22	31.0	31.0	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.4.8(a) and Table 6.4.8(b) shows PRI membership influence on affordability to spend for various purposes. From General Members of PRIs 50.6% cannot say, 34.4% observed marginal increase and 15% have no change on affordability where as among Heads of PRIs 38% have no change, 31% cannot say and 31% observed marginally increased on affordability to spend for various purposes.

Taking societal, political and domestic aggression

In rural India, women are subject to male domination and she is also subject to domestic and other violence. The following tables shows all such details.

Table 6.4.9(a)Taking societal, political and domestic aggression of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Marginally increased	28	8.1	8.1	8.1
	No Change	44	12.7	12.7	20.8
	Can not say / Do not know	274	79.2	79.2	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.4.9(b)Taking societal, political and domestic aggression of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Marginally increased	44	62.0	62.0	62.0
	No Change	25	35.2	35.2	97.2
	Can not say / Do not know	2	2.8	2.8	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.4.9 (a) and Table 6.4.9(b) shows influence of PRI membership on taking societal, political and domestic aggression. From General Members of PRIs 79.2% cannot say, 12.7% have no change and 8.1% observed marginal increase. Among Heads of PRIs 62% observed marginal increase, 35.2% have no change and 2.8% cannot say on taking societal, political and domestic aggression.

Influence on Political and Legal awareness

The details of the influence of the PRI membership on legal and political awareness are shown in the following tables.

Table 6.4.10(a) Influence on Political and Legal awareness of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Marginally increased	28	8.1	8.1	8.1
	No Change	130	37.6	37.6	45.7
	Can not say / Do not know	188	54.3	54.3	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.4.10(b) Influence on Political and Legal awareness of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Significantly increased	11	15.5	15.5	15.5
	Marginally increased	47	66.2	66.2	81.7
	Can not say / Do not know	13	18.3	18.3	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.4.10(a) and Table 6.4.10(b) shows influence of PRI membership on political and legal awareness. In case of General Members of PRIs 54.3% cannot say, 37.6% have no change and 8.1% observed marginal increase on political and legal awareness. Among Heads of PRIs 66.2% observed marginal increase, 18.3% cannot say and 15.5% observed significant increase on political and legal awareness.

Expressing descent and creating public awareness

The influence of the PRI membership on expressing descent and creating public awareness of sample respondents is shown in the following tables. Table 6.4.11(a) and Table 6.4.11(b) shows PRI membership influence on expressing de-sent and create political awareness. Among General Members of PRIs 54% cannot say, 5.5% have no choice and 40.5% observed marginal increase and 18.3% have no change on expressing de-sent and create political awareness.

Table 6.4.11(a) Expressing descent and creating public awareness of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Marginally increased	140	40.5	40.5	40.5
	No Change	19	5.5	5.5	46.0
	Can not say / Do not know	187	54.0	54.0	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.4.11(b) Expressing descent and creating public awareness of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Marginally increased	58	81.7	81.7	81.7
	No Change	13	18.3	18.3	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Influence on Control over resources

The access to resources will yield good results if the control on such resources is there and otherwise not. The control over resources in outside the family is essential for empowerment of women. The respondents views on their access to resource are given in the following tables.

Table 6.4.12(a) Influence on Control over resources of General Members of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Significantly increased	1	.3	.3	.3
	Marginally increased	24	6.9	6.9	7.2
	No Change	134	38.7	38.7	46.0
	Can not say / Do not know	187	54.0	54.0	100.0
	Total	346	100.0	100.0	

Table 6.4.12(b) Influence on Control over resources of Heads of PRIs					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Marginally increased	13	18.3	18.3	18.3
	No Change	45	63.4	63.4	81.7
	Can not say / Do not know	13	18.3	18.3	100.0
	Total	71	100.0	100.0	

Source: Field Data

Table 6.4.12(a) and Table 6.4.12(b) presents PRI membership influence on control over resources. Among General Members of PRIs 54% cannot say, 38.7% have no choice, 6.9% observed marginal increase and 0.3% observed significantly increased on control over resources. Among Heads of PRIs 63.4% have no choice, 18.3% cannot say and 18.3% observed marginal increase on control over resources.

ANOVA of Constraints and Empowerment Influencing factors on Age and Political Positions of Respondents

ANOVA

The one way ANOVA procedure produces a one way analysis of variance for a quantitative dependent variable(for example, '*Constraint*' or '*empowerment influencing factor*' variable) by a single factor (independent variable, for example '*Age*' of PRI members/Heads, or '*Present political position*' of PRI members/Heads).

Analysis of Variance is carried out on the constraints faced by respondents as dependent variable and considering variable '*Age*' of respondents as independent variable for both general members and heads of PRIs. Same procedure is repeated for independent variable '*Present Political Position*'. Further, Analysis of variance conducted on factors influencing the empowerment of women representatives considering as dependent variable and considering variable '*Age*' of respondents' independent variable for both general members and heads of PRIs. Same procedure is repeated for independent variable '*Present Political Position*'.

ANOVA - Constraints on Age or Present Political Position

Table 6.5.1.(a) ANOVA based on the Age of General Members of PRIs

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
What type of constraints you have faced?	Between Groups	3.116	3	1.039	17.695	.000
	Within Groups	20.077	342	.059		
	Total	23.194	345			
Do you have any other constraints in performing your duties?	Between Groups	15.678	3	5.226	12.360	.000
	Within Groups	144.611	342	.423		
	Total	160.289	345			

Table 6.5.1(b) ANOVA based on the Age of Heads of PRIs

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
What type of constraints you have faced?	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	69	.000		
	Total	.000	70			
Do you have any other constraints in performing your duties?	Between Groups	4.022	1	4.022	10.248	.002
	Within Groups	27.077	69	.392		
	Total	31.099	70			

Table 6.5.1(a) and Table 6.5.1(b) shows ANOVA for statements (dependent variables) “what type of constraints you have faced” and “Do you have any other constraints in performing your duties” with independent variable i.e., ‘Age’ of the General Members/Head of PRIs.

Hypothesis of one way ANOVA

H₀: There is no significant difference in PRI General Members/Heads Age wise groups on their constraints.

H₁: There is significant difference in PRI General Members/Heads Age wise groups on their constraints.

From table 6.5.1(a), it is clear that variable “What type of constraints you have faced” (F 17.695) and variable “Do you have any other constraints in performing your duties”(F 12.360) of constraints of General Members of PRIs have significant variance at 0.01 level with respect to General Members of PRIs Age. Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. Therefore, there is significant difference in constraints of General Members of PRIs of different age groups.

From table 6.5.1(b), it is clear that variable “What type of constraints you have faced” (F: “ ”) and variable “Do you have any other constraints in performing your duties”(F 10.248) of constraints of Heads of PRIs have significant variance at 0.01 level with respect to Heads of PRIs Age. Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. Therefore, there is significant difference in constraints of Heads of PRIs of different age groups.

Table 6.5.2 (a) ANOVA based on Present Political Position of General Members of PRIs

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
What type of constraints you have faced?	Between Groups	7.582	2	3.791	83.287	.000
	Within Groups	15.612	343	.046		
	Total	23.194	345			
Do you have any other constraints in performing your duties?	Between Groups	144.832	2	72.416	1606.938	.000
	Within Groups	15.457	343	.045		
	Total	160.289	345			

Table 6.5.2 (b) ANOVA based on the Present Political Position of Heads of PRIs

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
What type of constraints you have faced?	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	69	.000		
	Total	.000	70			
Do you have any other constraints in performing your duties?	Between Groups	.165	1	.165	.369	.546
	Within Groups	30.933	69	.448		
	Total	31.099	70			

Table 6.5.2(a) and 6.5.2(b) shows ANOVA for statements (dependent variables) “what type of constraints you have faced” and “Do you have any other constraints in performing your duties” with independent variable i.e., ‘Present Political Position’ of the General Members/Head of PRIs. In above table for some variables “F value” is nil which means that there is no variance on the respondents opinion on variable irrespective of subgroups they belong.

Hypothesis of one way ANOVA

H_0 : There is no significant difference in PRI General Members/Heads Present Political Position wise groups on their constraints.

H_1 : There is significant difference in PRI General Members/Heads Present Political Position wise groups on their constraints.

From table 6.5.2(a), it is clear that the variable “What type of constraints you have faced” (F 83.287) and the variable “Do you have any other constraints in performing your duties” (F 1606.998) of constraints of General Members of PRIs have significant variance at 0.01 level with respect to General Members of PRIs Present Political Position. Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. Therefore, there is significant difference in constraints of General Members of PRIs of different Present Political Position groups.

From table 6.5.2(b), it is clear that the variable “What type of constraints you have faced” (F) and the variable “Do you have any other constraints in performing your duties” (F 0.369) of constraints of Heads of PRIs have no significant variance (p-value 0.546) with respect to Heads of PRIs Present Political Position. Hence H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected. Therefore, there is no significant difference in constraints of Heads of PRIs of different Present Political Position groups.

ANOVA – Factors influencing Empowerment on Age or Present Political Position

Table 6.5.3 (a) ANOVA on Influence of Empowerment based on Age of General Members of PRIs

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Influence on Motivation levels	Between Groups	198.141	3	66.047	142.548	.000
	Within Groups	158.460	342	.463		
	Total	356.601	345			
Influence on Social Status	Between Groups	53.187	3	17.729	37.186	.000
	Within Groups	163.056	342	.477		
	Total	216.243	345			
Influence on Economic Independence	Between Groups	43.018	3	14.339	43.280	.000
	Within Groups	113.309	342	.331		
	Total	156.327	345			
Influence on Possession of Material Status	Between Groups	41.979	3	13.993	45.586	.000
	Within Groups	104.980	342	.307		
	Total	146.960	345			
Role in decision making at domestic level	Between Groups	46.201	3	15.400	57.438	.000
	Within Groups	91.697	342	.268		
	Total	137.899	345			
Potential to cope with familial challenges	Between Groups	46.579	3	15.526	59.282	.000
	Within Groups	89.572	342	.262		
	Total	136.150	345			
Influence on economic security	Between Groups	4.030	3	1.343	3.361	.019
	Within Groups	136.664	342	.400		
	Total	140.694	345			
Affordability to spend for various purposes	Between Groups	180.035	3	60.012	195.650	.000
	Within Groups	104.901	342	.307		
	Total	284.936	345			
Taking societal, political and domestic aggression	Between Groups	11.905	3	3.968	11.782	.000
	Within Groups	115.193	342	.337		
	Total	127.098	345			
Influence on Political and Legal awareness	Between Groups	29.433	3	9.811	29.804	.000
	Within Groups	112.579	342	.329		
	Total	142.012	345			
Expressing descent and creating public awareness	Between Groups	172.275	3	57.425	132.394	.000
	Within Groups	148.340	342	.434		
	Total	320.616	345			
Influence on Control over resources	Between Groups	30.091	3	10.030	31.188	.000
	Within Groups	109.992	342	.322		
	Total	140.084	345			

Table 6.5.3(b) ANOVA on Influence of Empowerment on Age of Heads of PRIs

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Influence on Motivation levels	Between Groups	.534	1	.534	3.650	.060
	Within Groups	10.086	69	.146		
	Total	10.620	70			
Influence on Social Status	Between Groups	.000	1	.000		
	Within Groups	.000	69	.000		
	Total	.000	70			
Influence on Economic Independence	Between Groups	1.985	1	1.985	8.691	.004
	Within Groups	15.761	69	.228		
	Total	17.746	70			
Influence on Possession of Material Status	Between Groups	8.261	1	8.261	15.126	.000
	Within Groups	37.683	69	.546		
	Total	45.944	70			
Role in decision making at domestic level	Between Groups	.816	1	.816	3.537	.064
	Within Groups	15.916	69	.231		
	Total	16.732	70			
Potential to cope with familial challenges	Between Groups	.904	1	.904	1.065	.306
	Within Groups	58.589	69	.849		
	Total	59.493	70			
Influence on economic security	Between Groups	.382	1	.382	2.957	.090
	Within Groups	8.914	69	.129		
	Total	9.296	70			
Affordability to spend for various purposes	Between Groups	11.394	1	11.394	24.111	.000
	Within Groups	32.606	69	.473		
	Total	44.000	70			
Taking societal, political and domestic aggression	Between Groups	.162	1	.162	.531	.469
	Within Groups	20.993	69	.304		
	Total	21.155	70			
Influence on Political and Legal awareness	Between Groups	17.794	1	17.794	29.207	.000
	Within Groups	42.037	69	.609		
	Total	59.831	70			
Expressing descent and creating public awareness	Between Groups	.534	1	.534	3.650	.060
	Within Groups	10.086	69	.146		
	Total	10.620	70			
Influence on Control over resources	Between Groups	.377	1	.377	1.014	.317
	Within Groups	25.623	69	.371		
	Total	26.000	70			

Table 6.5.3(a) and Table 6.5.3(b) shows ANOVA for statements (dependent variables) on factors influencing level of empowerment with independent variable i.e., 'Age' of the General Members/Head of PRIs.

Hypothesis of one way ANOVA

H₀: There is no significant difference in PRI General Members/Heads Age wise groups on the factors influencing the empowerment.

H₁: There is significant difference in PRI General Members/Heads Age wise groups on the factors influencing the empowerment.

From table 6.5.3(a), it is clear that the variable "Influence on Motivation levels" (F 142.548), the variable "Influence on Social Status" (F 37.186), the variable "Influence on Economic Independence" (F 43.280), the variable "Influence on Possession of Material Status" (F 45.586), the variable "Role in decision making at domestic level" (F 57.438), the variable "Potential to cope with familial challenges" (F 59.282), the variable "Affordability to spend for various purposes" (F 195.650), the variable "Taking societal, political and domestic aggression" (F 11.782), the variable "Influence on Political and Legal awareness" (F 29.804), the variable "Expressing descent and creating public awareness" (F 132.394), the variable "Influence on Control over resources" (F 31.188) of factors influencing the empowerment of General Members of PRIs have significant variance at 0.01 level with respect to General Members of PRIs Age, except the variable "Influence on economic security" (F 3.361) which is with p-value (.019). Hence H₀ is rejected and H₁ is accepted. Therefore, there is significant difference in factors influencing the empowerment of General Members of PRIs of different Age groups.

From table 6.5.3(b), it is clear that the variable "Influence on Economic Independence" (F 8.691), with p-value (.004), the variable "Influence on Possession of Material Status" (F 15.126), with p-value (.000), the variable "Affordability to spend for various purposes" (F 24.111), with p-value (.000), the variable "Influence on Political and Legal awareness" (F 29.207), with p-value (.000). These factors influencing the empowerment of Heads of PRIs have significant variance at 0.01 level with respect to Heads of PRIs Age. The variable "Influence on Motivation levels" (F

3.650), with p-value (.060), the variable “Role in decision making at domestic level” (F 3.537) , with p-value (.064), the variable “Expressing descent and creating public awareness” (F 3.650) , with p-value (.060) and the variable “Influence on economic security” (F 2.957) with p-value (.090), factors influencing the empowerment of Heads of PRIs have significant variance at 0.10 level with respect to Heads of PRIs Age. Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted for these factors. Thus there is significant difference in factors influencing the empowerment of Heads of PRIs of different Age groups. Whereas, the variable “Influence on Social Status” (F), the variable “Potential to cope with familial challenges” (F 1.065) , with p-value (.306), the variable “Taking societal, political and domestic aggression” (F .531) , with p-value (.469), the variable “Influence on Control over resources” (F 1.014) with p-value (.317), factors influencing the empowerment of Heads of PRIs have no significant variance at 0.01 level with respect to Heads of PRIs Age. Hence H_0 is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference in these factors influencing the empowerment of Heads of PRIs of different Age groups. In above table for some variables “F value” is nil which means that there is no variance on the respondents’ opinion on variable irrespective of subgroups they belong.

Table 6.5.4(a) and Table 6.5.4(b) shows ANOVA for statements (dependent variables) on factors influencing level of empowerment with independent variable i.e., ‘Present Political Position’ of the General Members/Head of PRIs.

Hypothesis of one way ANOVA

H_0 : There is no significant difference in PRI General Members/Heads Present Political Position wise groups on the factors influencing the empowerment.

H_1 : There is significant difference in PRI General Members/Heads Present Political Position wise groups on the factors influencing the empowerment.

From table 6.5.4(a), it is clear that the variable “Influence on Motivation levels” (F 53.253), the variable “Influence on Social Status” (F 369.478), the variable “Influence on Economic Independence” (F 144.893) , the variable “Influence on Possession of Material Status” (F

124.936) , the variable “Role in decision making at domestic level” (F 102.063) , the variable “Potential to cope with familial challenges” (F 9.505) , the variable “Influence on economic security” (F 205.189), the variable “Taking societal,

Table 6.5.4 (a) ANOVA on Influence of Empowerment on Present Political Position of General Members of PRIs

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Influence on Motivation levels	Between Groups	84.493	2	42.246	53.253	.000
	Within Groups	272.109	343	.793		
	Total	356.601	345			
Influence on Social Status	Between Groups	147.690	2	73.845	369.478	.000
	Within Groups	68.553	343	.200		
	Total	216.243	345			
Influence on Economic Independence	Between Groups	71.590	2	35.795	144.893	.000
	Within Groups	84.736	343	.247		
	Total	156.327	345			
Influence on Possession of Material Status	Between Groups	61.937	2	30.969	124.936	.000
	Within Groups	85.022	343	.248		
	Total	146.960	345			
Role in decision making at domestic level	Between Groups	51.448	2	25.724	102.063	.000
	Within Groups	86.451	343	.252		
	Total	137.899	345			
Potential to cope with familial challenges	Between Groups	7.150	2	3.575	9.505	.000
	Within Groups	129.001	343	.376		
	Total	136.150	345			
Influence on economic security	Between Groups	76.638	2	38.319	205.189	.000
	Within Groups	64.055	343	.187		
	Total	140.694	345			
Affordability to spend for various purposes	Between Groups	4.690	2	2.345	2.870	.058
	Within Groups	280.246	343	.817		
	Total	284.936	345			
Taking societal, political and domestic aggression	Between Groups	27.590	2	13.795	47.550	.000
	Within Groups	99.509	343	.290		
	Total	127.098	345			
Influence on Political and Legal awareness	Between Groups	29.725	2	14.863	45.401	.000
	Within Groups	112.286	343	.327		
	Total	142.012	345			
Expressing descent and creating public awareness	Between Groups	10.670	2	5.335	5.904	.003
	Within Groups	309.945	343	.904		
	Total	320.616	345			
Influence on Control over resources	Between Groups	27.797	2	13.899	42.456	.000
	Within Groups	112.286	343	.327		
	Total	140.084	345			

Table 6.5.4 (b) ANOVA on Influence of Empowerment on Present Political Position of Heads of PRIs

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Influence on Motivation levels	Between Groups	.105	1	.105	.686	.410
	Within Groups	10.515	69	.152		
	Total	10.620	70			
Influence on Social Status	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.	.
	Within Groups	.000	69	.000		
	Total	.000	70			
Influence on Economic Independence	Between Groups	.268	1	.268	1.057	.308
	Within Groups	17.479	69	.253		
	Total	17.746	70			
Influence on Possession of Material Status	Between Groups	.574	1	.574	.873	.353
	Within Groups	45.370	69	.658		
	Total	45.944	70			
Role in decision making at domestic level	Between Groups	.072	1	.072	.297	.587
	Within Groups	16.661	69	.241		
	Total	16.732	70			
Potential to cope with familial challenges	Between Groups	.401	1	.401	.468	.496
	Within Groups	59.092	69	.856		
	Total	59.493	70			
Influence on economic security	Between Groups	.009	1	.009	.070	.792
	Within Groups	9.286	69	.135		
	Total	9.296	70			
Affordability to spend for various purposes	Between Groups	.430	1	.430	.681	.412
	Within Groups	43.570	69	.631		
	Total	44.000	70			
Taking societal, political and domestic aggression	Between Groups	.028	1	.028	.090	.765
	Within Groups	21.127	69	.306		
	Total	21.155	70			
Influence on Political and Legal awareness	Between Groups	.302	1	.302	.350	.556
	Within Groups	59.529	69	.863		
	Total	59.831	70			
Expressing descent and creating public awareness	Between Groups	.105	1	.105	.686	.410
	Within Groups	10.515	69	.152		
	Total	10.620	70			
Influence on Control over resources	Between Groups	.108	1	.108	.287	.594
	Within Groups	25.892	69	.375		
	Total	26.000	70			

political and domestic aggression” (F 47.550) , the variable “Influence on Political and Legal awareness” (F 45.401) , the variable “Expressing descent and creating public awareness” (F 5.904) , the variable “Influence on Control over resources” (F 42.456) of factors influencing the empowerment of General Members of PRIs have significant variance at 0.01 level with respect

to General Members of PRIs Present Political Position except the variable “Affordability to spend for various purposes” (F 2.870) , with p-value (.058) at 0.10 level. Hence H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. Therefore, there is significant difference in factors influencing the empowerment of General Members of PRIs of different Present Political Position groups.

From table 6.5.4(b), it is clear that the variable “Influence on Motivation levels” (F .686), with p-value (.410), the variable “Influence on Social Status” (F), the variable “Influence on Economic Independence” (F 1.057) , with p-value (.308), the variable “Influence on Possession of Material Status” (F .873) , with p-value (.353), the variable “Role in decision making at domestic level” (F .297) , with p-value (.587), the variable “Potential to cope with familial challenges” (F .468) , with p-value (.496), the variable “Influence on economic security” (F .070) with p-value (.792), the variable “Affordability to spend for various purposes” (F .681) , with p-value (.412), the variable “Taking societal, political and domestic aggression” (F .090) , with p-value (.765), the variable “Influence on Political and Legal awareness” (F .350), with p-value (.556), the variable “Expressing descent and creating public awareness” (F .686) , with p-value (.410), the variable “Influence on Control over resources” (F .287) of with p-value (.594), factors influencing the empowerment of Heads of PRIs have no significant variance at 0.01 level with respect to Heads of PRIs Present Political Position. Hence H_0 is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference in factors influencing the empowerment of Heads of PRIs of different Present Political Position groups. In above table for some variables “F value” is nil which means that there is no variance on the respondents’ opinion on variable irrespective of subgroups they belong.

For the easy understanding of the ANOVA results, on the same dependents and independent variables Cross Table is carried out and is shown in ANNEXURE-I