Chapter 5
Measuring Women’s Empowerment

5.1 Introduction

Chapter 5 would focus on measurement of women’s empowerment by measuring the autonomy of women (social, economic and household) to find out the impact of gender centric activities undertaken by GRC.

5.2 Research Objective 2: To Measure Women’s Empowerment by adopting Indicators of the Autonomy of Women

The analysis of the women’s autonomy helps investigate the impact of GRC programs on women’s empowerment by looking at women’s diverse and varied experiences in decision making in different domains of life. The gender perspective provides an insight to understand social relations of gender. By incorporating bargaining approaches, gendered analysis of household decision-making and determination of allocation of resources and responsibilities is revealed. Ashwini Deshpande (2002) explained that the relative deprivation of women is compounded by their low levels of autonomy and their greater vulnerability to domestic violence (Deshpande, 2002).

In order to save the household from chronic poverty, reducing the risk of health shock by improving access to resources and reducing health disparities are very important. WHO (World Health Organization, 2008) recommends equal distribution of power and assets for gender equity belonging to grass root for poverty reduction. The study would be limited to measuring variables pertaining to micro level which indicate gender equity significant in ameliorating poverty. Therefore, their participation in significant decision making relating to self and children on various dimensions of distribution of resources and responsibilities would be analyzed. A comparative study with GRC group and Non-GRC groups would be made, and Chi-square would be used to find the difference between the behavior of respondents of both the groups in different categories of indicators of autonomy.

Impact on autonomy of women would be examined in three dimensions which are as follows:

- Social Empowerment
- Economic Empowerment
- Household Empowerment
5.2.1 What Is The Impact of GRC Activities on Social Empowerment?

The indicators used to measure social empowerment have already been discussed in chapter 3 which have been adopted for the present analysis. The social empowerment may be measured by following indicators mentioned in figure 5.1: 

Figure 5.1. Social Empowerment

The findings in each category given in five tables, would be discussed and later aggregate empowerment would be computed.

5.2.1.1. Autonomy of Respondents on the Visits to Family and Friends (GRC and Non-GRC Groups)

This indicator has been widely used in surveys like National Family and Health Survey, DHS, which measures physical freedom. Jejeebhoy et al (2001) recognized the importance of women’s physical freedom not only in accomplishing the responsibilities but also in many other dimensions related to education and health of children.

Table 5.8.1 : Autonomy of Respondents on the Visits to Family and Friends (GRC and Non-GRC Groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who Takes the Decision?</th>
<th>GRC N = 165</th>
<th>Non-GRC N = 55</th>
<th>Total N = 220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>99 (60.0)%</td>
<td>30 (54.5)%</td>
<td>129 (58.6)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>29 (17.6)%</td>
<td>5 (11.1)%</td>
<td>34 (15.5)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>37 (22.4)%</td>
<td>20 (36.4)%</td>
<td>57 (25.9)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square  D.F.  Significance  Min E.F.  Cells with E.F. < 5
5.224442  .0734  8.500 (before Yates corrections)
The calculated value of the Chi-square is not significant at .05 level. From the data, it is evident that 22.4 percent of households under GRC groups and 36.4% of households under Non-GRC group can visit their near and dear ones with their husbands only (this restriction on women further restricts physical mobility).

A larger percentage of women i.e. 17.6 percent from GRC groups and only 11.1 percent women from Non-GRC groups are empowered and need not seek permission for visiting their relatives. It gives them ample opportunities for developing relations.

The survey also shows that 82.4 percent from GRC group and 89 percent from Non-GRC group have to seek permission regarding physical mobility. Women use coping strategies of preventing conflicts in the family by going with their husbands, while for many other respondents, going with their husbands is an instrument to earn esteem in the community.

There is certainly a need to change the male ideology. Gender relations of dominance and subordination derive their legitimacy from traditions and culture that maintain and perpetuate subordination of women (Barbara & Chowdry, 1997).

5.2.1.2. Area of Independent Decision Making for the Number of Children (GRC and Non-GRC Groups)

The study by Baulch, B. et al (1998) finds that the large size of the household increases the chances of entering into poverty (Baulch & Macculloch, Being Poor and Becoming Poor: Poverty Status and Poverty Transitions in Rural Pakistan, 1998). Therefore, in the following Table 5.8.2, the autonomy of respondents in deciding the number of children in the household would be examined.

Table 5.8.2: Area of Independent Decision Making for the Number of Children (GRC and Non-GRC Groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Required</th>
<th>GRC N = 165</th>
<th>Non-GRC N = 55</th>
<th>Total N = 220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Empowered)</td>
<td>56 (33.9)%</td>
<td>14 (25.5)%</td>
<td>70 (31.8)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (Not Empowered)</td>
<td>67 (40.6)%</td>
<td>28 (50.9)%</td>
<td>95 (43.2)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both(Partially Empowered)</td>
<td>42 (25.5)%</td>
<td>13 (23.6)%</td>
<td>55 (25.0)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square D. F. Significance Min E.F. Cells with E.F. < 5
2.001912 .3675 13.750
In table 5.8.2, the Chi-square is not significant at .05 degrees of significance showing no difference in autonomy of respondents of both groups.

Here 40.6% respondents from GRC group and 51% of the respondents from Non-GRC group confirmed that taking decision independently on the size of the family, was faced with various detrimental factors viz. religious and spiritual, societal and familial. Approximately 25% respondents from both the groups are shown as partially empowered and their decisions are determined by the preferences of their husbands and elders in the household. They do not seem to have control on their own body.

Though GRCs have not been very effective yet the performance of GRC group in this area is marginally better than that of the other groups, therefore, more efforts need to be put in so as to empower women achieve autonomy with regard to their fertility to size up their family (as the large size of the family becomes conducive for chronic poverty).

5.2.1.3. Use of the Condom

Autonomy of women in this arena (to ask their husband to have safe sex) is very crucial in delaying pregnancy and in reducing the spread of HIV. It is taken as a proxy indicator in tracking progress towards health, gender equality and poverty goals of the MDGs (Indicators For Monitoring the Millennium Development Goals, 2003). Small family diminishes the vulnerabilities and more resources are available for investing in human capital in children in addition to reducing probability of adopting coping strategies as discussed in chapter 2 on chronic poverty apart from reducing health shocks by discouraging high-risk behavior.

Table 5.8.3.: Use of the Condom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of the condom</th>
<th>GRC N=165</th>
<th>Non-GRC N=55</th>
<th>Total N=220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not empowered</td>
<td>75 (45.5)</td>
<td>31 (56.4)</td>
<td>106 (48.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial empowerment</td>
<td>20 (12.1)</td>
<td>11 (20.0)</td>
<td>31 (14.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>70 (42.4)</td>
<td>13 (23.6)</td>
<td>83 (37.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi- square     DF     Significance  
6.69551         2     .0352

The findings presented above in Table 5.8.3. exhibit the Chi-square significant at .05 degrees indicating significant difference in behavior of both the groups regarding use of condom as a means to regulate and plan the size of family and prevent the spread of HIV also. Large number of respondents from GRC group i.e. 42 percent, as against only 24 percent from Non-GRC groups, are empowered.
However, more percentage of respondents from Non-GRC groups are partially empowered as the use of condoms remains at the discretion of the male partner. Further, in qualitative investigation respondents confided that asking husbands to use condom is not considered as an acceptable reproductive behavior and results either in humiliation or domestic violence.

Empowerment in this domain is a key interrupter, as small family reduces vulnerabilities and improves the economic conditions of the family. Therefore, more resources are available for investing in human capital besides reducing probability of adopting coping strategies as discussed in chapter 2 on chronic poverty, besides reducing health shocks.

5.2.1.4. Experience of Respondents Regarding Domestic Violence

Households are supposed to provide security to its members from the act of violence outside. But the simple question is, is she safe within the household? The structural violence which is the foundation of the bourgeois patriarchal households, has become a barrier in the path of women’s freedom. The experience of violence in any form anywhere, restricts women’s mobility which is crucial for carrying out everyday jobs of household. Sexual assault can result in humiliation, low esteem, unwanted pregnancies and the large size of the family. Despite humiliation and brutality, women maintain normalcy and continue to suffer because they find no realistic alternative choices. They do not even admit being oppressed but either blame themselves or blame their bad luck (Bowles and Klein, 1983).

Empowerment for dignified, educated and aware existence is necessary to fight against the atrocities, violence, discrimination and other crimes against women, hence legal awareness programs for women’s rights and welfare and basic laws safeguarding their rights are key elements of their empowerment. The following table 5.8.4. compares the incidence of domestic violence experienced by both the groups.

Table 5.8.4.: Comparison of Experience of Respondents of Both the Groups Regarding Domestic Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of violence</th>
<th>GRC N=165</th>
<th>Non-GRC N=55</th>
<th>Total N=220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (continuing)</td>
<td>100 (60.6)</td>
<td>38 (69.1)</td>
<td>138 (62.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not presently</td>
<td>34 (20.6)</td>
<td>8 (14.5)</td>
<td>42 (19.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>31 (18.8)</td>
<td>9 (16.4)</td>
<td>40 (18.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square       DF       Significance
1.40041          2        .4965
Respondents of both the groups reported being physically assaulted by their husbands. However, many women did not include occasional one or two slaps, scolding and humiliation in the definition of domestic violence, although one case of ‘attempt to murder’ was also brought to notice during the survey. The women’s acceptance of ‘domination of masculinity’ and men in the role of ‘bread earners’ and ‘security providers from outside’ gives them sufficient ground to accept oppression and does not allow the victim to strategize her move to break free from the trap of oppression.

The Chi- square is not significant at .05 degrees, revealing no significant difference between the two groups as far as experience of domestic violence is concerned. A large number of respondents i.e. 61 percent from GRC and 69 percent from Non-GRC groups face domestic violence of different types.

An interesting point worth mentioning is that the women who challenge stereotype roles were at the risk of domestic violence. Violence against wife is also observed in the event of non-compliance of the orders of the husbands. But practically, men find one or the other excuse to assault women. Further, the incidence of the act of violence could be higher because the respondents tend to give socially acceptable and ideal answers, when asked during face-to-face interviews.

But the interesting point is that 21 percent respondents from GRC group got freedom from domestic violence through GRC intervention. GRCs with the help of Delhi Legal Services Authority (DLSA) and their counselors effectively help the aggrieved parties in sorting out the conflicts through conflict resolution. Conflict resolution is a process involved in facilitating the peaceful ending of a conflict and retribution. In general, it is known as reconciliation. It is thought to encompass the use of non-violent measures by two parties in an attempt to promote effective resolution. The success rate as reported by GRC staff is around 30-35 percent. They also adopt follow-up measures which has been confirmed by the beneficiaries as well.

5.2.1.5. Reaction of Respondents on Domestic Violence

Bowles and Klein (1983) argue that in the absence of any realistic alternatives, no amount of persuasion would convince the victimized women that they were oppressed. Women who find themselves at the bottom of the power hierarchy in the household, feel powerless in conveying their voice to the players seated at the top of the patriarchal hierarchy. Schuler et al (1996) have shown relationship between active participation of beneficiaries from micro credit program and freedom from domestic violence (Schuler, Hashemi, & Riley, 1997).

Resistance may have been termed as ‘indirect agency’ by several authors cited by Raju (Raju, 2009). In spite of knowing the serious implications, some respondents deviate from the custom of remaining ‘voiceless’ by informing the police or contacting GRC or protesting by any means such as legal action or reacting in the same manner against any act of domestic violence. This fostering of new practice of resistance (which is unheard of) reflect success of GRCs.
Table 5.8.5: Reaction of Respondents on Domestic Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empowered /Not Empowered</th>
<th>GRC N=165</th>
<th>Non-GRC N=55</th>
<th>Total N=220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not empowered</td>
<td>111 (67.3)</td>
<td>43 (78.2)</td>
<td>154 (70.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowered</td>
<td>54 (32.7)</td>
<td>12 (21.8)</td>
<td>66 (30.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square DF Significance
2.33766 1 .1263

Though the Chi-square is not significant at .05 degrees, revealing no significant difference between both the groups as far as reaction of respondents to domestic violence is concerned, yet, table 5.8.5 shows GRC beneficiaries (32.7 percent) to be more empowered in comparison to the group of Non-GRCs (21.8).

Almost every woman faces violence in her life in one form or the other. A slap occasionally from husband (also called ‘bread earner’) has been recognized as an acceptable norm by many respondents from both the groups. These women admitted that they do not feel embarrassed. However, if we leave this group from the ambit of victims of domestic violence, even then those who feel themselves as the victims of domestic violence and also feel embarrassed are not ready to raise their voice against this cruel and humiliating behavior within the household. Qualitative examination explored that “EK CHUP TE SO SUKH” (voicelessness) as stated by many respondents of both the groups have been used as coping strategy fearing extreme adverse outcomes in the absence of fallback options. The women mentioned the cost they might have to pay by losing their family, shelter, honour of the family, financial support, children and face the suspicions of society, therefore they prefer to remain silent rather than inform the police. Cursing their destiny and informing parents is the common behavior, practiced by women.

In the event of domestic violence only 33 percent respondents from GRC and 22 percent respondents from Non-GRCs have been recognized being empowered who have shown indomitable spirit in taking recourse to extreme action by the respondents. It is often said that God helps those who help themselves. The awareness created among women about their rights, and legal support given by GRCs has diminished their voicelessness to some extent, therefore, demand for action from GRCs in terms of police action and justice seems to have emerged. The presence of GRC has raised the level of confidence amongst lower sections of the society to raise their voice and seek help from GRC to get freedom from violence.
Further, it is of prime importance to explain to women that violence is not a normal behavior. It is neither due to their destiny nor due to their fault, therefore, it has to be fought with by instilling ‘power within’. Empowerment in each category is analyzed separately before aggregate social empowerment is obtained in order to distinguish the domain where autonomy is visible from where it is not. The impact indicators showing social empowerment do not reckon significant difference between both the groups regarding physical freedom to visit family and relatives, autonomy over number of children, domestic violence and reaction to violence. Regarding autonomy over the use of condom, GRC respondents are significantly better off, therefore, they can regulate and plan their family in a better direction.

5.2.1.6. Comparison of Overall Social Empowerment Between GRC and Non-GRC Respondents

The aggregate social empowerment in five domains of two groups are estimated and shown in table 5.8.6 below. It reveals significant difference between the respondents belonging to GRC and Non-GRC, though it fails to demonstrate the difference in empowerment individually.

### Table 5.8.6.: Comparison of Overall Social Empowerment between GRC and Non-GRC Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>t. Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>5.77*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-GRC</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at .01 level (T. Tail significant)

Ho- There is no significant difference between GRC and Non-GRC respondents so far as aggregate social empowerment is concerned.

The hypothesis is found not true as the above mentioned table of social empowerment indicates that there is an important difference between the respondents belonging to GRC and Non-GRC so far as the social empowerment is concerned (t =5. 77, significant at .01 degrees ). The mean values of social empowerment indicate that it is more in the case of GRC (mean = 5. 23) as compared to Non-GRC (mean = 3. 29). This means that respondents of GRC are more empowered as compared to the impact of training programs conducted by GRC.

5.2.2. Impact of GRC activities on Economic Empowerment

Economic empowerment, without which empowerment in other domains are incomplete (Approach Paper to the tenth Five Year Plan (2002-2007)) , refers to how resources are generated, controlled and
consumed. Increase in control of economic resources as a result of participation in GRC promoted activities and Self Help Group may have positive impact on choices of women, previously denied.

First, the study would focus on empowerment in each indicator separately and later aggregate empowerment would be obtained. Nine indicators have been used to measure economic empowerment by making comparisons between GRC and Non-GRC respondents. They are as follows:

Figure 5.2 : Indicators of Economic Empowerment

![Indicators of Economic Empowerment](image)

The findings in each indicator are as follows:

5.2.2.1. Autonomy of Respondents on Keeping Money For the Self (GRC and Non-GRC Groups)

Sue Ellen M. Charlton focused on the understanding of who controls the disposition of cash, as it is crucial not only for the measurement of economic empowerment but also for the understanding of asymmetries in the allocation of resources (Charlton, 1984).

Table 5.9.1 : Comparison of Autonomy of Respondents on Keeping Money for the Self of GRC and Non-GRC Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision taken by</th>
<th>GRC N = 165</th>
<th>Non-GRC N = 55</th>
<th>Total N = 220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband (wife not being empowered)</td>
<td>80 (48.5)%</td>
<td>28 (50.9)%</td>
<td>108 (49.1)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife (Empowered)</td>
<td>61 (37.0)%</td>
<td>13 (23.6)%</td>
<td>74 (33.6)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Empowered</td>
<td>24 (14.5)%</td>
<td>14 (25.5)%</td>
<td>38 (17.3)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square D.F. Significance Min E.F. Cells with E.F. < 5
5.071672 .0792 9.500 (before Yates corrections)
Keeping money for the self without seeking consent from any one, not only boosts their self esteem but also enhances their welfare.

It is evident from the above mentioned table 5.9.1 that the Chi-square is not significant at .05 level. It does not show significant difference between respondents of GRC and Non-GRC, regarding seeking/not seeking ‘permission from any member of the household for keeping money for self consumption’.

Approximately 37 percent women from GRC group do not seek consent for holding money for self consumption which is 13.4 percent higher than the Non-GRC group reflecting empowerment in this area. As far as partial empowerment is concerned, 14.5 percent from GRC respondents as against 25.5 per cent respondents from Non-GRCs fall in this category.

While digging deep it was documented that many women who do keep money for self-use without consent feel guilty, and many others, who are employed keep money to pay for travelling expenses only. Many others end up giving doles to husbands for meeting their personal requirements (legitimate or illegitimate).

5.2.2.2. Comparison of GRC and Non-GRC Groups regarding their Participation in Availing Credit

Loan taken for unproductive purpose would entrap the household in debt trap making their exit from poverty difficult. Therefore, it is important to understand women’s participation for taking loan. Table 5.9.2. mentioned below indicates this aspect.

Table 5.9.2 : Comparison of GRC and Non-GRC Groups Regarding Their Participation in Availing Credit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Required (Decisions taken jointly)</th>
<th>GRC N = 165</th>
<th>Non-GRC N = 55</th>
<th>Total N = 220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>106 (64.2)%</td>
<td>32 (58.2)%</td>
<td>138 (62.7)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>59 (35.8)%</td>
<td>23 (41.8)%</td>
<td>82 (37.3)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square D.F. Significance Min E.F. Cells with E.F. < 5

.64805 1 .4208 (before Yates corrections)
Table 5.9.2 shows values of the Chi-square which is not significant at .05 level of significance.

Table 5.2.2. reveals no major difference between both the groups regarding their participation in availing loan.

Roughly 64 percent of the households under GRC group and 58 percent of the household under Non-GRC confirmed their participation in decision making for availing loans jointly.

Detailed investigations revealed that GRCs had a greater role in building and creating awareness about doing things jointly. Respondents revealed that men remain secretive to reduce accountability when it comes to availing loans.

5.2.2.3. Respondents’ Participation Required for Purchase of Assets (GRC and Non-GRC)

Women’s participation in the purchase of assets is considered as a key constituent of empowerment and has been used in National Family and Health Survey-3 (NFHS-III, 2005-06).

Table 5.9.3.:Comparison of Respondents’ Participation Required for Purchase of Assets of GRC and Non- GRC Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Required</th>
<th>GRC N = 165</th>
<th>Non-GRC N = 55</th>
<th>Total N = 220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99 (60.0)%</td>
<td>17 (30.9)%</td>
<td>116 (52.7)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66 (40.0)%</td>
<td>38 (69.1)%</td>
<td>104 (47.3)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square  D. F.  Significance  Min E.F.  Cells with E.F. < 5
14.00531  1  .0002 (before Yates corrections)

Table 5.9.3 reveals the Chi-square at .01 level of significance indicating significant difference in both the groups on the issue of their involvement in the purchase of assets.

Here 60 percent women from GRC group admitted their participation in decision making regarding the purchase of assets, out of which 47 percent were members of SHG. While 69 percent women from Non-GRC group admitted that they did not have any say in decision making regarding the purchase of assets. The difference in the preferences on the purchase of assets results in conflicts.

This leads to the conclusion that GRC has played an important role in women empowered through their participation on the subject of purchase of assets though it is to be further investigated whether her participation can change the decision or not.
5.2.2.4. Respondents’ Participation for the Sale of Assets of GRC and Non-GRC Groups

Participation of women not only in acquisition but also in disposition of assets has been considered as an indicative component of women’s empowerment in contemporary surveys for its measurement. The present study also uses this indicator in the table 5.9.4, given below.

Table 5.9.4: Comparison of Respondents’ Participation for the Sale of Assets of GRC and Non-GRC Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Required</th>
<th>GRC N = 165</th>
<th>Non-GRC N = 55</th>
<th>Total N = 220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92 (55.8)%</td>
<td>23 (41.8)%</td>
<td>115 (52.3)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>73 (44.2)%</td>
<td>32 (58.2)%</td>
<td>105 (47.7)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square D.F. Significance Min E.F. Cells with E.F. < 5
3.212701 .0731 (before Yates corrections)

In table 5.9.4, the Chi-square is not significant at 0.05 level of significance showing not much difference regarding participation in decision of respondents of both groups on the issue of the sale of assets.

Here 55.8 percent of women from GRC group and 41.8 percent of women from Non-GRC group participated and could prevent the sale of assets.

Only 58.2 percent of women from Non-GRC and 44.2 percent from GRC group confirmed that the assets are sold by their husbands without any intimation to them and women come to be aware of it when an urgent need for money arises in the household. Since women do not possess any assets, neither their permission is sought to sell any assets nor are entitled to the proceeds from the sale of any assets.

To conclude, GRCs could not play a major role in empowering women in the process of decision making regarding the sale of assets and further studies need to be conducted in this regard.

5.2.2.5. Personal Expenditures of Children of Respondents of GRC and Non-GRC Groups

For the benefit of children, expenditure on health and education is very important and several studies reveal that women tend to spend more on the well being of children than do men (Mayra Buvenic, 2007) as they manage to reallocate family resources to sustain necessary expenditure on the education.
of children (Charolnet and Munoz, 2004). This component of empowerment is revealed in table 5.9.5.

**Table 5.9.5: Comparison of Personal Expenditures on Children of Respondents of GRC and Non-GRC Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Expenditure of children (In Rs.)</th>
<th>GRC N = 165</th>
<th>Non-GRC N = 55</th>
<th>Total N = 220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (No Money)</td>
<td>44 (26.7)%</td>
<td>24 (43.6)%</td>
<td>68 (30.9)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 300</td>
<td>50 (30.6)%</td>
<td>21 (38.3)%</td>
<td>71 (32.3)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 and above</td>
<td>71 (43.0)%</td>
<td>10 (18.2)%</td>
<td>81 (36.8)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square 11.55, significant at level .0031 (.01 level)

The findings of table 5.9.5. establish a strong relationship between GRC respondents and personal expenditure of their children in comparison to Non-GRC group as the Chi-square remains significant at .01 level.

The analysis of this table demonstrates that women of the GRC group are more empowered and aware of the welfare of their children. Therefore, 73 percent of households keep money aside for meeting the demands of their children whereas only 56 percent of the households under Non-GRC group spend money on the welfare of their children in terms of their well being.

In the range of Rs.50 to 300 the percentage of households in GRC group are 30.3 percent whereas it is 38.3 percent in Non-GRC group.

In the range of Rs.301 and above 43 percent of the households from GRC group keep money for the benefit of the children, whereas only 18.2 percent of the households of Non-GRC group fall into this category, which is a clear indicator of the impact of GRC over Non-GRC in this range.

It is a clear achievement in terms of women’s empowerment of GRC beneficiaries if they have impacted in enabling women to decide that some money must be kept aside for meeting current personal needs of the children for their ‘well-being’ and ‘well-becoming’. Expenditure meant for children reveals that roughly 49 percent of respondents from Non-GRC respondents and only 35.7 percent of GRC group make an expenditure up to Rs. 150 only. Approximately 11 percent of GRC respondents are making expenditure in the range of above Rs. 450, whereas none from Non-GRC falls in this category. This clearly indicates the impact of GRC in terms of prioritizing welfare of children through empowerment of women.
5.2.2.6. Autonomy of Respondents in Minor Purchases of GRC and Non-GRC Groups

This indicator is used by DHS and NFHS-3 to measure empowerment. Even a working woman is unable to decide confidently and independently on small purchases as resources are controlled by either husbands or elders and she is powerless. This indicator has been applied in several studies of empowerment. For evaluation of GRC, women’s empowerment is also analyzed knowing its impact on the outcome of child in terms of health and education. It would analyze autonomy of respondents in minor purchases in the table 5.9.6. mentioned below.

Table 5.9.6: Comparison of Autonomy of Respondents in Minor Purchases of GRC and Non-GRC Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision taken by</th>
<th>GRC N = 165</th>
<th>Non-GRC N = 55</th>
<th>Total N = 220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 (24.8)%</td>
<td>17 (30.9)%</td>
<td>58 (26.4)%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105 (63.6)%</td>
<td>29 (52.7)%</td>
<td>134 (60.9)%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 (11.5)%</td>
<td>9 (16.4)%</td>
<td>28 (12.7)%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square D.F. Significance Min E.F. Cells with E.F. < 5
2.142592 .3426 7.000 (before Yates corrections)

The calculated data finds no significant difference between the two groups regarding minor purchases because the Chi-square is not significant at .05 level.

National Family Health Survey 3, has also used this indicator for measuring women’s empowerment. Table 5.9.6 shows that more than 63% of women from the GRC group and 52.7% from Non-GRC have been identified as empowered in taking decision independently on the study of minor purchases. For 36% in the GRC groups and 47% in the Non-GRC groups, decisions are taken by the husband directly or indirectly (partially).

The findings indicate the effectiveness of programs undertaken by GRC on the beneficiaries. After detailed discussions it emerged that the purchases of minor items is the fixed responsibility of the women, immaterial of the fact whether they are employed or not and whether they have freedom of mobility not.
5.2.2.7. Personal Expenditures of Respondents of GRC and Non-GRC Groups

Women as compared to men spend less money on their personal use, which reflects the gender bias in the household. To understand household resource allocation, an analysis of this component is required, which is shown in table 5.9.7 given below.

Table 5.9.7 : Comparison of Personal Expenditures of Respondents of GRC and Non-GRC Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Expenditure of self (In Rs.)</th>
<th>GRC N = 165</th>
<th>Non-GRC N = 55</th>
<th>Total N = 220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (No Money)</td>
<td>55 (33.3)%</td>
<td>29 (52.7)%</td>
<td>84 (38.2)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 250</td>
<td>64 (38.8)%</td>
<td>20 (36.4)%</td>
<td>84 (38.2)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 and above</td>
<td>46 (27.9)%</td>
<td>6 (10.9)%</td>
<td>52 (23.6)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square 9.152, significant at level .0103 (. 01 level)

Table 5.9.7 expresses a strong relationship between the association of GRC and personal expenditure of self (woman) in comparison to the Non-GRC group as the Chi-square is significant at .01 level of significance.

It is evident from the above table that 33.3% women from GRC group and 52.7 percent from Non-GRC group do not spend a single penny on themselves and remain deprived of the resources which provide power.

Here GRC group reflects empowerment in terms of keeping money for self for meeting personal requirements as 38.8 percent of households spend in the range of Rs.50 to 250 which is around 2.4 percent higher than that of the Non-GRC group.

Approximately 28 percent of women in the GRC group keep money in the range of Rs.251 and above for self consumption whereas only 11.1 percent of women in Non-GRC group keep money for self consumption in the same category. Women as compared to men spend less money on their personal use which reflects the household allocation in favor of men as they are the ‘bread earner’.

5.2.2.8. Savings by Respondents of GRC and Non-GRC Groups

Savings provide future capability to the household in finding an exit route from chronic poverty and provide them the required cushion against negative shocks. For the evaluation of GRC, this component would be interpreted in the following table 5.9.8 in three ranges.
Table 5.9.8: Comparison of Savings by Respondents of GRC and Non-GRC Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Savings of Households (In Rs.)</th>
<th>GRC N = 165</th>
<th>Non-GRC N = 55</th>
<th>Total N = 220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (No saving)</td>
<td>19 (11.5)%</td>
<td>29 (52.7)%</td>
<td>48 (21.8)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 500</td>
<td>79 (47.9)%</td>
<td>16 (29.1)%</td>
<td>95 (43.2)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 – 1000</td>
<td>33 (20.0)%</td>
<td>6 (10.9)%</td>
<td>39 (17.7)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 and above</td>
<td>34 (20.6)%</td>
<td>4 (7.3)%</td>
<td>38 (17.3)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi- square D. F. Significance Min E.F. Cells with E.F. < 5
41.65173 3 .0000=0.1 9.500

The analysis of table 5.9.8 shows the Chi-square significant at .01 level and indicates a relationship between households of GRC group and savings in comparison to Non-GRC group.

In this table it has come to the notice that 52.7 percent of the households under Non-GRC group do not save at all, whereas only 11.5 percent of the households under the GRC group fall in this category.

In all other categories viz. Rs. 50 to Rs. 500 and Rs. 501 to Rs. 1000 and above the GRC group out passes the percentage of households under Non-GRC group which amply proves that economic impact is favorable on savings in the GRC beneficiaries.

GRCs promote formation of SHGs for fighting poverty. Such groups motivate the households to continue to have small savings irrespective of the difficult situations which in turn improves the standard of living of such households. But many respondents are not allowed by their families to become members of SHGs and save.

“Savings” are defined as excess of income over consumption and they provide capability to the individual household in finding an exit route from chronic poverty and providing them the required cushion against negative shocks (Radhakrishna et al 2006).

5.2.2.9. Women’s Labor Participation of Respondents of GRC and Non-GRC Groups

Charlton (1984) describes that all the indicators for women’s status in terms of health, sex ratio, maternal mortality rate and literacy rate indicate marginalization of women. N. Andal highlights the burden and consequences of low status of women by describing that her best and maximum time is
spent in performing socially and culturally constructed sex appropriate stereotype roles, such as fetching fuel and water, cooking and cleaning, bearing and rearing (Andal, 2002).

Pamela Creedon (1998) shows that discrimination against women prevents them from participating in labor market. N. Andal explains that poverty pushes women into workforce but compartmentalization of activities as a result of discrimination pushes them into informal sectors. In the same line of thinking, Pamela Creedon reports that women are disproportionately found in least skilled, lower paid jobs, having no social security (Andal, 2002).

Table 5.9.9: Comparison of Women’s Labor Participation between GRC and Non-GRC Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employed/Unemployed</th>
<th>GRC N=165</th>
<th>Non-GRC N=55</th>
<th>Total N=220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>100 (60.6)</td>
<td>41 (74.5)</td>
<td>141 64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>65 (39.4)</td>
<td>14 (25.5)</td>
<td>79 35.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Chi-square DF Significance

48266 1 .0620

The Chi-square obtained is not significant at .05 level depicting not much difference in the employment participation of women between both the groups.

A plurality of respondents i.e. 75 percent from Non-GRC in comparison to only 61 percent GRC respondents are engaged in paid employment. Primarily women from both the groups find their livelihood as wage earners as a domestic help, rag pickers, unskilled construction worker (precarious jobs).

Many women have been seen as running a small business (grocery shops, selling goods such as paan and cigarette etc. on the pavements.), besides fulfilling household responsibilities. Patterns of workforce participation, workplace conditions, waged and under-waged work are to be investigated in order to understand gender prejudices resulting in low status and increased likelihood of persistent poverty, Sheila Bhalla et al (2004) revealed that on an average, women in casual employment are more impoverished than men (Bhalla, Karan, & Shobha, 2004).

The common factors identified and reported by respondents in informal qualitative discussion for their being unemployed have been arranged in the descending order: ‘no freedom to work’, ‘illiteracy’, ‘lack of suitable jobs’, ‘lack of confidence’ and ‘lack of time for a job’, and ‘No ambition’.

The field study revealed that 40 percent of respondents from both the groups are engaged in the informal sector (casual, domestic help, construction site) whereas 25 percent have engaged themselves in self employment in order to get time for meeting responsibilities of a mother and wife.
However, 7 percent women helping their husbands, do not receive any income or acknowledgement for their contribution and remain invisible therefore they are regarded as unemployed and the figure comes to be approximately 36 percent.

5.2.3. Comparison of Overall Economic Empowerment between GRC And Non-GRC Respondents

The above listed nine tables measuring different fragmented components of economic empowerment reveal that respondents of GRC groups are significantly different in savings, and expenditures incurred by them on themselves and children in comparison to Non-GRCs revealing a new emerging trend.

Table 5.9.10: Comparison of Overall Economic Empowerment between GRC and Non-GRC Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t. level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.278**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-GRC</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .05 level

Ho-There is no significant difference between GRC and Non-GRC respondents so far as the economic empowerment is concerned.

The hypothesis is found not true as table 5.9.10 tends to analyze overall economic empowerment from nine components, revealing a significant difference between the respondents of GRC and Non-GRC, regarding economic empowerment (t=2.27, significant at .05 degrees). The calculated mean values of economic empowerment show that GRC groups are more empowered (with mean =11.09) in comparison to Non-GRC group (with mean =9.94). This may be due to the impact of training and awareness programs undertaken by GRC.

5.2.4. What is the impact of GRC activities on Household Empowerment?

Longwe (1991) includes the control of an individual on personal decisions while Rowland (1997) includes household decision making in the purchase of health and education of their children for measuring autonomy.

Blumberg (1991), Mayra Buvenic (2007), Mason (1986) documented that where women play a pivotal role in decision making regarding expenditure on food, nutrition, and medical care of children, better health outcomes of children are evident. Schultz associates a positive relationship between internalization of utility functions of family members by a household manager and high concern for their well-being and level of information (Kabeer, Reversed Realities, Gender Hierarchies in
Develoment Thought, 1994). Adopting good practices by care giver can act as an interrupter to chronic poverty. Women’s ability to participate in the decision, to take independent decisions and to attain physical freedom is important for a child’s improved health outcomes in three ways (based on Sonalde Desai paper):

i. **Health enhancing practices in routine**

Many practices followed by a care giver in maintaining hygiene in storing and cooking food, nutritional and safe method of cooking, breast feeding, inculcating good habits in children regarding personal hygiene, timely vaccination, significance of safe drinking water, knowing methods of making water safe, notably bring better health outcomes for children.

ii. **Intra-household resource allocation**

How resources (money, time, food, and health services) are consumed or distributed among members would determine a child’s long term health status. Mayra Buvenic documented that better outcomes of child can be expected in a household where women control more resources in comparison to men (Buvinic & King, Smart Economics, 2007). The analyses of resource allocation among family members identifies inequalities and disadvantages to different members of a household. The allocations are based on negotiations taking place within the household that can be characterized by ‘cooperative conflict ’ (Sen A., Economics and the Family, 1983)

iii. **Access to emergency medical care**

Besides physical freedom, women’s ability to take independent decisions is critical in taking decision regarding timely hospitalization and appropriate treatment of their ailing children. Any delay on account of obtaining permission either from husband or from elders may increase probability of morbidity and mortality to the child.

Now, household empowerment based on following indicators would be analyzed separately:

**Figure 5.3 Indicators of Houseold Empowerment**

- 1) Independent Decision in the Area of What to Cook
- 2) Who Eats First?
- 3) Autonomy in the Area of Education of Sons
- 4) Autonomy in the Area of Education of Daughters
- 5) Autonomy in the Area of Medical Care and hospitalization
- 6) Activities Performed by the Husbands of the respondents
- 7) Habit of Consuming alcohol
5.2.4.1. Independent Decision Making in the Area of What to Cook (GRC and Non-GRC Groups)

Health outcomes of children depend on the care giver as the kind of food cooked would determine the nutritional aspect. Table 5.10.1 given below deals with this aspect:

Table 5.10.1 : Comparison of Area of Independent Decision Making in the Area of What to Cook (GRC and Non-GRC Groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Required</th>
<th>GRC N = 165</th>
<th>Non-GRC N = 55</th>
<th>Total N = 220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85 (51.5)%</td>
<td>33 (60.0)%</td>
<td>118 (53.6)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57 (34.5)%</td>
<td>15 (27.3)%</td>
<td>72 (32.7)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>23 (13.9)%</td>
<td>7 (12.7)%</td>
<td>30 (13.6)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square D. F. Significance Min E.F. Cells with E.F. < 5
1.264782 .5313 7.500

In table 5.10.1, the Chi-square is not significant at .05 level. Roughly 35 percent GRC beneficiaries as against 27.3 percent women amongst Non-GRC beneficiaries confirmed having ‘no say’ in cooking matters. Generally, it depends on what is available at home or what has been brought by the husband or keeping husband’s preference in mind rather than the nutritional requirements of the children. These facts were explained by respondents of both the groups. Most of the women consider themselves as kitchen queens, however, they are victims of feudal system where women provide only their services sans any authority.

However, 51.5 percent respondents from GRC group and 60 percent from Non-GRC group seem to be fully empowered in this subject.

Qualitative discussions with GRC respondents brought forth the negative implications of their being members of SHGs. Many respondents cook, not according to what has been taught to them but what is desired by their husbands. Otherwise their husbands would blame it on their being member of SHGs. In fact, certain interventions enhance agency, but if it is not embedded in the social-structural realities, these may end up reinforcing the already existing oppressive structures.

Here GRC remained effective, nevertheless there are gray areas and more needs to be done if better outcomes for the children are to be achieved so that child poverty can be escaped.
5.2.4.2. Who Eats First?

Gender inequity in intra household, access to food, cultural patterns of distribution and nutritional taboos may affect women’s and children’s nutrition (Indicators For Monitoring the Millennium Development Goals, 2003). Several studies have focused on ‘who eats first’ to have an insight into intra household resource allocation. The gender dynamics within the household is reflected in the answer to the question ‘who eats first’. Through this mechanism, operates gender bias. The present study attempts to analyze this aspect in table 5.10.2 to find the difference in the occurrence of poverty in both the groups

Table 5.10.2 : Comparison of Respondents of GRC with Non-GRC Groups in the Area of Who Eats First

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empowered/not empowered</th>
<th>GRC N=165</th>
<th>Non-GRC N=55</th>
<th>Total N=220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not empowered</td>
<td>108 (65.5)</td>
<td>48 (87.3)</td>
<td>156 (70.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowered</td>
<td>57 (34.5)</td>
<td>7 (12.7)</td>
<td>64 (29.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square  Df  Significance
9.51923  1  .0020

The experience of poverty is significantly different for males and females which can be better understood by asking specifically “who eats first”, on the bases of existing literature which appears to believe that the one who eats last, becomes the victim of inadequacy of food. This system operates through gender discrimination, resulting in malnutrition among women and children, (Haddad L. J., 1999), (Haddad, Pena, Nishida, Quissumbing, & Slack, 1996).

Several eating patterns visible in the households regarding “who eats first” , were clubbed into two categories indicating ‘empowered respondents’ or ‘not empowered respondents’.

The findings provided in table 5.10.2 indicate a higher percentage of the GRC respondents as being empowered in comparison to Non-GRC respondents. Not only wide literature but the present study also suggests that in many households, either husband or elders are considered as preferable member of the family, thus they eat first of all. The tradition of a couple eating together also has a catch because it does not allow women to eat before husband though how late her husband might come home. In Muslim households, the food is not considered fit to be consumed by male counterpart, if a woman eats before her husband. Most of the times daughters act as pseudo mothers, by discharging mother’s responsibilities and also by eating last with their mothers.
The Chi-square remains significant at .01 level, displaying GRC respondents as better off in comparison to Non-GRC respondents in terms of food allocations. The findings display 34.5 percent of GRC respondents being empowered as against only 13 percent from Non-GRC respondents in terms of food allocation as they can eat first.

The data also indicate the strong existence of a gendered pattern of household resource allocation as there is a custom where husband being the ‘bread earner’ gets the privilege of eating first, which has a strong acceptance in the home and society.

Therefore, despite of association with GRC through capacity building, 66 percent respondents from GRC against 87 percent from Non-GRC, still face discrimination regarding the distribution of life sustaining resources.

But a new trend of eating in household i.e. ‘whosoever is hungry’ would eat first, is also visible and is seen as a positive change in GRC group.

5.2.4.3. The Autonomy of Respondents in the Area of Education of Sons (GRC and Non-GRC Groups)

The literature confirms the fact that access to education acts as an interrupter to chronic poverty. At the same time wide literature on inter generational transmission of poverty also indicates that coping strategies result in the high dropout rate from school for sons as they are expected to contribute to family income (it also determines the preference for sons). From the perspective of chronic poverty, the analysis of this indicator is crucial.

### Table 5.10.3 : Comparison of the Autonomy of Respondents in the Area of Education of the Sons (GRC and Non-GRC Groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who takes the decision?</th>
<th>GRC N = 165</th>
<th>Non-GRC N = 55</th>
<th>Total N = 220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>43 (26.1)%</td>
<td>19 (34.5)%</td>
<td>62 (28.2)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>61 (37.0)%</td>
<td>9 (16.4)%</td>
<td>70 (31.8)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>61 (37.0)%</td>
<td>27 (49.1)%</td>
<td>88 (40.0)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square D. F. Significance Min E.F. Cells with E.F. < 5
8.073682 .0177 15.500 (before Yates corrections)
Table 5.10.3 shows the Chi-square significant at.05 level of significance and shows a strong relationship between autonomy of women in education of son and its association with GRC as compared to Non-GRC respondents.

This table indicates a remarkable level of empowerment as 37 percent respondents from the GRC group are capable of deciding independently regarding the education of their son, while only 16.4 percent of Non-GRC group take decisions independently. The tremendous increase in self confidence and their ability to formulate their opinion in household decision with regard to education can be regarded as a major accomplishment. However, it is debatable, and more probe is required to ascertain the reason whether is it due to the value attached to education as a result of awareness created by GRCs or due to improved income status of respondents as a result of skill development through GRCs.

In 63 percent of the households from GRC as against 84 percent from Non-GRC, husbands directly or indirectly hold the decision.

Regarding education of sons, women from the GRC groups have a greater role in decision making as compared to Non-GRC group. However, economic crisis results in the prevalence of the issue of the drop out from school, and child labor amongst boys. Adoption of this coping strategy is due to more physical freedom to the boys than the girls. That is the one of the reasons for the preference for sons.

Though poverty induced, labour participation among girls has also been observed. This point would be discussed in the following table.

5.2.4.4. Comparison of the Autonomy of the Respondents in the Area of Education of the Daughters (GRC and Non-GRC Groups)

It becomes evident from the literature that an access to education is an effective interrupter to chronic poverty. At the same time extensive literature on inter generational transmission of poverty also indicates that coping strategies result in higher dropout rates from school for daughters due to gender discrimination and socialization of stereotype roles they are expected to perform by looking after the siblings and help mothers. From the perspective of chronic poverty, the analysis of this indicator is crucial.
Table 5.10.4: Comparison of the Autonomy of Respondents in the Area of Education of Daughters (GRC and Non-GRC Groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who takes the decision?</th>
<th>GRC N = 165</th>
<th>Non-GRC N = 55</th>
<th>Total N = 220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband (Wife not empowered)</td>
<td>49 (29.7)%</td>
<td>24 (43.6)%</td>
<td>73 (33.2)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife (Empowered)</td>
<td>59 (35.8)%</td>
<td>8 (14.5)%</td>
<td>67 (30.5)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both (Partially Empowered)</td>
<td>57 (34.5)%</td>
<td>23 (41.8)%</td>
<td>80 (30.4)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square D. F. Significance Min E.F. Cells with E.F. < 5
9.110052 .0105 16.750 (before Yates corrections)

In order to enhance women’s empowerment at the individual level, GRCs undertake various awareness programs viz. removal of gender discrimination, equal rights in poverty for both genders, educating both genders and the formation of SHGs.

On analyzing table 5.10.4 it is established that there is a significant improvement in the autonomy of women regarding the education of the girl child and the value of the Chi-square is significant at .05 level of significance.

It is interesting to note that a large percentage of women have been shown as empowered in the GRC group regarding the education of girl child and it is 21.3 percent higher than that of the Non-GRC group. But it is 1.2 percent less than the percentage of empowered women in GRC group regarding the education of the son.

There are many factors such as socioeconomic and cultural differences within the community and household which may hamper decision as regards the education of daughter rather than that of son as it is hard to bring about changes at macro and institutional level.

In table 29.7 percent of the households of GRC groups and 43.6 percent of Non-GRC groups, decisions regarding the education of daughter is taken by the husbands. It is quite high with regard to the percentage showing decision making power on the subject of education of the son.

It is also evident from this table that 34.5 percent of the households under GRC group and 41.8% of the households under Non-GRC take decision jointly (couple). This situation can be termed as partial empowerment.
Despite of acknowledging the necessity and significance of education by women, she is ineffective in changing the decision against her husband in favor of her daughter regarding access to education. But the extent to which this decision making process is influenced by women needs more investigation.

5.2.4.5. The Autonomy of Respondents in the Area of Medical Care and Hospitalization (GRC and Non-GRC Groups)

Provision of medical care and hospitalization to children of both the genders is a significant determinant of a child’s welfare, hence it is significant to measure women’s empowerment in this component. An empowered woman takes timely decisions regarding health care for self and her children, thus, preventing health shocks. Thus, it would act as an interrupter to chronic poverty.

Table 5.10.5: Comparison of the Autonomy of respondents in the Area of Medical Care and Hospitalization (GRC and Non- GRC Groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who takes the decision</th>
<th>GRC N = 165</th>
<th>Non-GRC N = 55</th>
<th>Total N = 220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>45 (27.3)%</td>
<td>22 (40.0)%</td>
<td>67 (30.5)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>79 (47.9)%</td>
<td>16 (29.1)%</td>
<td>95 (43.2)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>41 (24.8)%</td>
<td>17 (30.9)%</td>
<td>58 (26.4)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi- square D. F. Significance Min E.F. Cells with E.F. < 5
6.140672 .0464 14.500 (before Yates corrections)

Table 5.10.5 shows the Chi- square significant at .05 degrees of significance which reflects effectiveness of activities of GRCs in capacity building of women and autonomy over decision making in the domain of hospitalization of children.

The success of GRC lies in ensuring women’s empowerment. From GRC group 47.9 percent women decide treatment and hospitalization independently and 24.8 percent are found to be partially empowered whereas 29 percent Non-GRC respondents are fully empowered and 31 percent are partially empowered.

Still 27.3 percent of GRC beneficiaries and 40 percent of Non-GRC respondents are not empowered, can’t provide health care to their children without the permission of their husbands or elders which can be critical for the ailing child.

The informal discussions with respondents from both the groups revealed that even when the decision is taken jointly, her role is merely of a subordinate while the husbands have more decisive role to
play. Since domestication and lack of physical mobility is disempowering, it is of vital significance to find the difference in their subordinate position between both the groups to evaluate the effectiveness of GRC’s programs on inequality of power relations within the household.

5.2.4.6. Activities Performed by the Husbands of the Respondents (GRC and Non-GRC Groups)

‘Labor time’ has been recognized by the New House-hold Economics as a vital household resource which can be put to multiple uses. The relationship between gender roles and well-being of women is explained in HDR (2010), (UNDP-Report, 2010). The analysis of distribution of time would probably reveal greater gender disadvantages and intra-household welfare differentials. In practice ‘stickiness’ has been observed within the household division of labor (Kabeer, Reversed Realities, Gender Hierarchies in Development Thought, 1994). Therefore, women seem to have no concession from family and domestic responsibilities and women’s full-time employment is identified as the indicator of emancipation (Gal & Gail, 2000) to achieve what Engel proposed to achieve through socializing of all the reproductive duties (Engels, 1982). The invisibility of their work weakens their ability to bargain for cooperation (Kabeer, 1994). However, in the Indian context for the present study, empowerment of women may be indicated by the activities performed by husbands of respondents.

Table 5.10.6: Comparison of Activities performed by the Husbands of the Respondents (GRC and Non-GRC Groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often the activities are performed by a male counterpart?</th>
<th>Helping in H/Hold*</th>
<th>Nursing of Children**</th>
<th>Purchase of Daily Needs***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRC N = 165</td>
<td>Non-GRC N = 55</td>
<td>GRC N = 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>18 (10.9)%</td>
<td>9 (16.4)%</td>
<td>22 (13.3)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>51 (30.9)%</td>
<td>21 (38.2)%</td>
<td>50 (30.3)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>96 (58.2)%</td>
<td>25 (45.5)%</td>
<td>93 (56.4)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Chi- square Signi | **Chi- square Signi | ***Chi- square Signi |
2.88154 | .2367 | 2.71041 | .2579 | 3.90034 | .1423
The above mentioned combined table 5.10.6 throws light on how the division of responsibility regarding each activity for meeting the family needs is made. The unpaid family labour, consumes time and energy and reinforces her subordination. Moreover, as a result of poverty limited domestic infrastructure also compounds her subordination. (Stromquist N. P., 1999). Professor Ashwini Deshpande in her study gave importance to cooperation by husbands as a component of women’s empowerment. It could be seen through analyzing activities performed by husbands in the household because without husband’s cooperation she feels stranded and often gets cut off from opportunities. Placing enormous responsibilities on a woman’s back is unjust. An assessment of the division of responsibilities in the household reveals, how much labor input of man and woman goes into undertaking above mentioned activities.

The Chi- square remains not significant at .05 level in above mentioned three activities.

The findings presented in the combined table above depict that a higher percentage of husbands from Non-GRC respondents have been cooperating with their wives regularly in the household chores, nursing of children, and purchases of daily needs in comparison to GRC group.

The impact of GRCs regarding the ability of respondents in getting help or cooperation of husbands is not visible as they continue to perform socially constructed stereotype roles and bear the brunt of the entire household chores. A significant finding listed above reveals that in three categories of activities i.e. helping in the household, nursing of children, and purchases of daily needs, about 58.2, 56.4, and 43.6 percent husbands of GRCs never perform these activities respectively as against Non-GRCs, which are 45.5, 43.6, and 29.1 percent. It may be because more women from Non-GRCs (i.e. 75 percent) are working in comparison to 61 percent of GRC group.

Qualitative exploration showed women’s internalization of stereotype roles, and acceptance of unequal distribution of responsibilities in the garb of their ‘own choice’ which reinforces ‘stickiness’ of stereotyping and leaves no scope for ‘renegotiation’. Since men and women are positioned differently in relation to the division of resources and responsibilities within the household, overtly she conceals her displeasure. This is termed as ‘risk-mitigating mechanism’ (risk of security) by Kabeer (Kabeer, Reversed Realities, Gender Hierarchies in Development Thought, 1994).

5.2.4.7. Habit of Consuming Alcohol/Smoking of Husband (GRC and Non-GRC Groups)

It is evident from the review of literature that women’s empowerment in terms of a higher share of cash income of women in the household, is linked to more expenditure incurred on the well-being of children and reduced expenditure on alcohol and cigarettes incurred by husbands (Hoddinott & L, 1995). Because men tend to spend more on their personal needs even at the cost of the well-being of children, following table 5.10.7 shows difference in the spending habit of husbands of respondents of both the groups, on personal needs such as alcohol/cigarette.
Table 5.10.7: Determining the Difference in the Habit of Consuming Alcohol/Smoking of Husband (GRC and Non-GRC Groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drinking/Smoking Habit (How often)</th>
<th>GRC N = 165</th>
<th>Non-GRC N = 55</th>
<th>Total N = 220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>37 (22.4%)</td>
<td>17 (30.9%)</td>
<td>54 (24.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>39 (23.6%)</td>
<td>19 (34.5%)</td>
<td>58 (26.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>89 (53.9%)</td>
<td>19 (34.5%)</td>
<td>108 (49.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square  D. F.  Significance  Min E.F.  Cells with E.F. < 5

6.232442  .0443  13.500

Here the Chi-square is significant at .05 level, showing definite impact of association with GRC beneficiaries and drinking/smoking habits of their husbands (a masculine habit) in comparison to Non-GRC respondents.

It is seen that husbands of about 22.4 percent from the GRC respondents and 31% from the Non-GRC respondents indulge in consumption of alcohol/smoking regularly.

Roughly 54 percent husbands of GRC respondents and only 34% from Non-GRC never consume alcohol/smoking.

The percentage in the category of ‘Never Drinks/Smokes’ proves that there is an impact of GRC on its beneficiaries, as they can have more disposable income to be diverted from unproductive consumption on alcohol/cigarette to investment in children. Pitt and Khandekar (1998) assert that men tend to spend on personal consumption such as alcohol and smoking while women’s spending pattern is directed towards children’s welfare (Pitt & Khandeker, 1998).

5.2.4.8. Comparison of Overall Household Empowerment between GRC and Non-GRC Respondents

The foregoing seven tables measuring different fragmented components of ‘Household Empowerment’ reveal that respondents of GRC groups are significantly different so far as the autonomy of women on subjects such as husband’s habit of consuming alcohol, who eats first, education of sons and daughters, and hospitalization by them in comparison to respondents of Non-GRCs is concerned.
Table 5.10.8: Comparison of Overall Household Empowerment between GRC and Non-GRC Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t. Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRC</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>7.1152</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-GRC</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not significant at .01 level (.0161)

Ho- There is no difference between GRC and Non-GRC respondents so far as household empowerment is concerned.

The hypothesis is accepted in table 5.10.8 as the title ‘Household Empowerment’ reveals that there is no significant difference between the respondents of GRC and Non-GRC, so far as the household empowerment is concerned (t=1. 40, not significant at .01 level as it is .0161). So far as the mean value is concerned, it is marginally higher in the case of GRC (mean =7. 1152) in comparison to (mean =6. 47) of Non-GRC.

One may infer from the data that GRC respondents are marginally more empowered than Non-GRC, so the training and awareness programs have not demonstrated significant impact.

5.2.5. Relationships among three Empowerment Indicators

Various indicators used in the present study to measure empowerment in fragmented component do not capture the actual essence of empowerment in totality. Thus, a holistic approach is essential to identify fragmented empowerment in bringing changes and better outcomes and not just acquiring capabilities and having resources.

Economic--Household–Social empowerment influence one another in complex interactive ways and smoothen out the path of empowerment in synergistic ways by overcoming barriers and resistance. The significance of the understanding of the relationship between empowerment in three dimensions lies in the definition of women’s empowerment which considers women’s empowerment as a multidimensional dynamic process involving interrelated and overlapping dimensions.

It is essential to obtain a chain connection to discern whether economic empowerment (not just earning power) translates into household and social empowerment or not or other way round. However, the evidence furnished by the study of Bloomberg refers to the connection between interrelated components of economic, social and household empowerment by showcasing how “triple overlap” operates both within the home and in the society.
A study by Doss, Cheryl, demonstrates from a household survey conducted in Ghana that the percentage of assets owned by women has significant impact on household expenditure decisions and is viewed as an indicator of women’s bargaining power (Doss, 1999). A similar view is put forward by Smith et al who maintain that increase in women’s relative control over resources like time, information and health services tends to increase the nutritional and health care status of women resulting in better health outcomes of their children (Smith & Haddad).

Table 5.11.1: Relationships among Three Categories of Empowerment Indicators

N=220

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Social Empowerment</th>
<th>Household Empowerment</th>
<th>Economic Empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Social Empowerment</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Household Empowerment</td>
<td>.2648**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Economic Empowerment</td>
<td>.3149**</td>
<td>.3588</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation table 5.11.1 reveals that there is a significant positive relationship between social empowerment and household empowerment (r = .2648, significant at .01 degrees). This means the respondents who experience social empowerment also enjoy more household empowerment.

The above mentioned table reveals a strong and positive relationship between social empowerment and economic empowerment (r = .3149, significant at .01 degrees).

The investigation of the overlapping and complicated relationship between economic and household empowerment, depicts a positive and a stronger relationship (r= .3588, significant at .01 degrees), than the other two (1. relation between social and economic, 2. relation between social and household) relationships.

5.2.6. Conclusion

On the bases of indicators related to empowerment on three dimensions i.e. social, economic and household, this chapter concludes a positive impact of GRC’s activities on social and economic empowerment although there is no significant impact on household domain.
5.2.7. Notes

1. Culture: Social networks are closely associated to Culture which refers to “aspects of life that deal with relationships among individuals, within groups, among groups and between ideas and perspectives”.

170
5.2.8. References of chapter 5.


