IMPACT: International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Literature (IMPACT: IJRHAL)
ISSN (P): 2347–4564; ISSN (E): 2321–8878
Vol. 7, Issue 8, Aug 2019, 1–14

PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION: A MEDIUM OF EMPOWERMENT IN RDPS

Violina Gogoi

Research Scholar, Department of Political Science, Kaliabor College, Assam, India

Received: 04 Aug 2019 **Accepted: 09 Aug 2019** **Published: 23 Aug 2019**

ABSTRACT

For the success of any development programmes, people's participation is a must. This paper deals with people's participation and their awareness concerning two selected rural development Programmes (RDPs) mainly Swarnajayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY) and Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) respectively. Government of India has introduced several RDPs since independence of India. It basically focusses now on inclusive growth and hence inclusiveness of rural people as Majority 68.84% of total population of India belongs to rural population (Census 2011). RDPs have installed a remarkable process for the empowerment of the economically deprived people from rural area. The prime objective of this study is to analyse to what extent rural people are conscious about various RDPs and how energetically they participate in rural developmental activities. This paper has tried to interpret the data and statement of approved primary i.e. field study and secondary sources. A sample survey of 240 respondents was conducted in four villages under two districts namely Dibrugarh and Sivasagar of Assam State in India. The results have major implications that rural people are mostly notconscious about the benefits of RDPs.

***KEYWORDS**: People's Participation, Awareness, Rural Development, SGSY, MGNREGA, Inclusive*

INTRODUCTION

People generally mean a body of citizens of a state or country. In Social Science, people denote a group of humans, living in the same country under one national government; a nationality and who used to share a common religion, culture, language, or inherited condition of life.

Participation is the key to inclusion of human resources in development efforts; earlier, development planners have ignored the contributions that people could make and the skills that they could bring to the development projects. Therefore, if one could incorporate the human element in such projects convince people to participate in them, and then there would be stronger change that these projects would be successful. Participation in this sense is a vital component of human development. It generally refers to people's involvement in specific projects or programmes. But today participation means acomplete development policyaiming on the central role that people should play in all spheres of life. Human progresscomprisesof broadening their choice and superior participation that permits people to gain for themselves which allows them to enter a much broader range of opportunities. People can participate individually or in groups.

Cohen and Uphoff observed participation with respect to development projects as "people's involvement in decision making processes, in implementing program, their sharing in the benefits of development programs" and their contribution in efforts to evaluate such program.[i]

People's participation has been commonly used in the speech of development for last few decades and it has become a worldwide phenomenon without which it is impossible for the administration to function efficiently. Absence of people's participation is also a cause of failure of past development efforts.

Rural development programme is a people's programme; therefore, it is necessary that people should involve in rural development activities. The term participation is frequently used to cover all the forms of action by which citizens take part in the operation of the administration.

People's active participation in rural development activities has gained much popularity and interest to the researcher of social sciences. They came to the hypothesis that people should take part vigorously in rural development activities. Other objectives of the new development strategy likely to be fulfilled when people start to participate in all aspects of the development process, mainly decision making, implementation, observing and assessment along with benefit sharing. As, for example, people's participation in the planning and execution of development programmes and projects lead to the selection of the types of projects which are a direct benefit to them and will also generate more gainful employment (Yadav R.R., 2006).

The word People's participation is used mostly to denote the part of members of the general public as distinguished from that of appointed officials, including civil servants, influencing the activities of government or in providing directly for community needs.

The BalwantRai Mehta Committee set up in 1957 observed that the rural development can be possible only with the people's participation.[ii]Concerning rural development, the Government of India haslaunched so far, several rural development programmes from in which they play the role of a proposer, pioneer and promoter. But after fifty years of their inauguration, it has become evident that numerous rural development programmes like Community Development Programme, the National Extension Service, and the Integrated Rural Development Programme etc. have been partially successful in their allowed mission. The reasons for failure in effectively implementing these were the inadequate participation of the rural people and absence of their representative in the planning and execution stage (Dhillon and Hansara, 1995).

Thereafter it was well realized that people's participation is highly important in effective implementation of such programmes, particularly in achieving objectives in a more efficient and logical manner such as assessment of ongoing programme, suggesting measures for further development, preparation of plan priorities, decision making at grassroots level and the activeness of different groups in implementation. The People's Participation in rural development, therefore, ensures participation at all stages of the programme viz. Plan formulation, implementation, decision making, sharing of benefits of development, monitoring and evaluation (Hedayat and Maroof, 2009).

The majority participation in a democracy can be assured only when people at large have a voice in the management of public affairs (Robyn, 2010; Dutta, 2012).

People's participation infers the active environment in development of the rural people, particularly deprived groups from the mass of the rural population and has earlier been debarred from the development mechanism.

Active people's participation quickens the development procedure of the government. The understanding and co-operation between the rural development officials and people is very much important for the practical implementation of

the programme. If people get the opportunity to take part in the decision making process as well as implementation, they would perpetually be in a better position to draw out the ways and means of development in conformity with the environment of their locality that might enhance the pace of development up to the expected level. If not, it is impossible to discover and transfer the local assetswithout involvement of the local groups in the execution of rural development programmes. People's active participation makes officials alertto the problem of the public and provideseffective and smooth implementation of various schemes for the development of localities. As the rural development programmes are introduced for the development of rural people, so it should certainly be the people's oriented programme. But without active people's participation, it will not be practicable to make rural development a people's oriented programme.

For the development designers and administrators, it is significant to seek the participation of diverse groups of rural people, to create the plans participatory (Gangopadhyay et al. 2008).

The effective execution of the several rural development programmes not only concerns the activeness of the administrative agencies viz DRDA, Blocks and Village level functionaries, but also concerns the effective people's participation.

Thus, we can say that participation is a procedure through which people, with a sense of dignity and self-respect, can determine to participate in development process as per their own aspects.

In order to provide self-employment, the Government of India introduced an innovative scheme on 1st April 1, 1999 which is popularly known as Swarrnajayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY).[iii]SGSY is a comprehensive self-employment programme for the rural poor and considered as a holistic scheme of micro enterprises covering various aspects of self-employment, viz., organisation of the rural poor into Self Help Groups (SHGs), capacity building, training, planning of activities, clusters, and infrastructure build up, technology, credit and marketing.[iv]It targetsis toform a large number of micro enterprises in the rural regions, constructing on the basis of prospective of the rural people. The prime object of SGSY is to rise the assisted poor householdfrom their poverty line in three years by providing them revenue generating assets over a combination of government subsidy and bank credit. Since June 2011 SGSY has been restructured as National Rural Livelihoods Mission (NRLM) and being carried out across the country. It targets at generatingeffectual and active institutional podiumsfor rural peopleempowering them to escalate household income through sustainable livelihood improvements and advance access to financial services.

To achieve the objectives of rural development and mostly inclusive rural development, Government of India has hosted National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) on September 7, 2005. A new scheme named National Rural Employment Guarantee scheme (NREGS) has been launched in 200 districts on February 2, 2006. The Act was later extended to another 130 districts during 2007-08. The rest of the districts covered under MNREGA since April 1, 2008.[v]On 2nd October, 2009 it has been renamed as Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) (Chaarlas and Velmurugan, 2012). This Act provides a legal guarantee (Ahuja et al, 2011; Chopra, 95; 2011**)** for 100 days of employment to adult fellows of any rural family to do public work related untrained physical work at the statutory minimum wage in every financial year. The main aim of this scheme is to provide employment to the rural poor in the days of agricultural holiday and to develop fundamental economic and congregational resources. The Act involves with rights based processes that challenge the existing systems and relationships. Transparency and public accountability are integral to it, expressed through social audits, proactive disclosures and records that are freely accessible to all.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The basic objectives of the present study is,

- To examine awareness and peoples participation in rural development programmes and how far they are empowered by these programmes.
- To find out the problems and constraints of respondents regarding rural development.

METHODOLOGY AND DATA

The study was conducted in 2015–2016 and refers to the period 2014–2015. A multistage random sampling and purposive sampling has been used to select the study area and households. In selecting the study area, we have used a multi stage random sampling method. For this study, 240 respondents who availed benefits of MGNREGA have been selected from four villages under two different development blocks namely Barbaruah Development Block (BDB) and Gaurisagar Development Block (GDB) Dainijan and Japara villages from BDB, Dibrugarh district and another two villages namely Lahingia and Mothadang from GDB, Sivasagar district to examine the actual implementation of MGNREGA. It is to be stated that total 240 respondents are categorised according to their age, gender, education, caste, income and occupation, as discussed below. They are selected on the basis of the simple random sampling method from the list of beneficiaries maintained in the respective block offices. The study is based on primary data. Primary data has been collected from selected households with the help of well-structured and pre tested questionnaire. The respondents were made aware of the purpose of the interview and every care is taken to draw out accurate information from them. The questions were asked in their understandable language in order to comfort them to answer the questions. Since the data has been collected with the personal contact method, the respondents were interviewed at their houses. Efforts were made to interview the respondent alone without any interference from other family members. After collecting the data it is carefully edited and then tables are created with the help of excel sheet and SPSS-20 software. Various Tables are used to analyses the data. Finally, we have calculated numbers; percentage, mean, average and also we used Logistic regression to enrich our analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

To observe the extent of people's awareness and participation in two selected rural development programmes SGSY and MGNREGA in the (selected) study area, the selected respondents have been probed on the following issues and problems with regards to the implementation of the programmes. The replies/responses are discussed below.

Awareness of the Respondents about the Features of SGSY and MGNREGA

The success of any rural development programmes depends on the awareness of the rural people. In order to know the awareness of the people regarding SGSY and MGNREGA a question was asked to them with "Yes", "No" and "Not Sure" as options. The question put to them was "Do you know the basic features of SGSY and MGNREGA?". The response is shown in the table 1

The table 1 shows that out of the total 240 respondents under the Swarnajayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY)

52.08% respondents were aware about the features of a scheme, like SGSY has been planned to cover all aspects of self-employment such as organisation of the poor into Self Help Groups, training, credit, technology, infrastructure and marketing. While 34.58% respondents admitted that they have not heard about the scheme and 13.34% were not sure about the scheme in the four selected villages under Barbaruah and Gaurisagar Development Block.

Table 1: Awareness of the Respondents

	Awareness on SGSY				Awareness on MGNREGA			
Respondents Villages	**Yes**	**No**	**Not Sure**	**Total**	**Yes**	**No**	**Not sure**	**Total**
Dainijan(BDB)	32 (53.33)	18 (30.0)	10 (16.67)	60 (100)	29 (48.33)	22 (36.67)	9 (15.0)	60 (100)
Japara(BDB)	34 (56.67)	20 (33.33)	6 (10.0)	60 (100)	32 (53.33)	24 (40.0)	4 (6.67)	60 (100)
Lahingia(GDB)	29 (48.33)	24 (40.0)	7 (11.67)	60 (100)	31 (51.67)	26 (43.33)	3 (5.0)	60 (100)
Mothadang (GDB)	30 (50.0)	21 (35.0)	9 (15.0)	60 (100)	29 (48.33)	22 (36.67)	9 (15.0)	60 (100)
Total	**125 (52.08)**	**83 (34.58)**	**32 (13.34)**	**240 (100)**	**121 (50.41)**	**94 (39.17)**	**25 (10.42)**	**240 (100)**

Source: Field Study (Percentages are in Parentheses)

In case of Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) 121 out of 240 respondents below were found aware in the four selected villages about the scheme that at least 100 days employment in the form of manual work shall be provided to every rural household, whereas 94 i.e. 39.17% have not heard about the scheme and 25 (10.42%) were not sure about the same under Barbaruah Development Block and Gaurisagar Development Block.

Thus the above table 1 reveals that in the case of SGSY, 52.08% respondents are aware and in case of MGNREGA, 50.41% out of total respondents were aware about the important provision of both the programmes.

The above table reveals that Japara village of Barbaruah Block topped in largest awareness which is 56.67% in SGSY and 53.33% in MGNREGA as this village is directly connected to NH37 and also near to district H.Q. The respondents get information quickly.

The study also finds that both BDB and GDB have organised awareness camps on health and agriculture, which may exterminate poverty and ill health of the rural poor. The study discloses that awareness camps on Health and Agriculture are organized by the blocks for the upliftment of rural people. In case of awareness and the basic features of the selected schemes the present study finds lack of awareness among the respondents. Ignorance, unfamiliarity and illiteracy, impractical attitude towards life were the causes for not attending awareness camps organised by the blocks.

Attendance of Rural Poor in the Awareness Camps

In order to make the rural poor of the study area aware of the Swarnajayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY) and Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA), awareness camps have been organized by the Blocks at Gaon Panchayats (GPs) during the period 2014-2015 respectively. The main objective of organising awareness camps under SGSY is to acquaint the guidelines of the scheme with the individual and groups (SHGs) Swarozgaris. Some

camps have been organized to make them aware about the progress of the economic activities. So far as MGNREGA is concerned, the awareness camps have been organized to make the rural poor aware of the provisions of the Act and guidelines of the scheme. Therefore, a question was put to them with Yes/No Options

"Do the Blocks organise any awareness camp among the people?" (Yes/No). The table 2 shows the attendance of the respondents' in awareness camps.

Table 2: Attendance of Rural Poor in the Awareness Camps

	SGSY			MGNREGA		
Respondents Villages	**Yes**	**No**	**Total**	**Yes**	**No**	**Total**
Dainijan(BDB)	34 (56.67)	26 43.33%	60 (100)	32 (53.33)	28 (46.67)	60 (100)
Japara (BDB)	36 (60.0)	24 40.0%	60 (100)	35 (58.33)	25 (41.67)	60 (100)
Lahingia (GDB)	36 (60.0)	24 40.0%	60 (100)	31 (51.67)	29 (48.33)	60 (100)
Mothadang (GDB)	33 (55.0)	27 45.0%	60 (100)	29 (48.33)	31 (51.67)	60 (100)
Total	**139 (57.92)**	**101 (42.08)**	**240 (100)**	**127 (52.92)**	**113 (47.08)**	**240 (100)**

Source: Field Study (Percentages are in Parentheses**)**

From the above table 2 it is evident that 139 i.e. 57.92% in SGSY programme out of 240 respondents attended awareness camps and 42.08% have not attended any awareness camps organised by BDB and GDB.

In case with MGNREGA, it is seen that 52.92% of total respondents attended awareness camps and 47.08% did not attend any awareness camps organised by rural development authorities in Barbaruah development block and Gaurisagar development block.

The study reveals that Japara village under BDB had highest respondents in SGSY with 60.0% and 58.333% in MGNREGA who were found aware about basic features of both the programmes.

In the study, the researcher finds that majority of respondents have not participated in the decision making process. Poverty, Illiteracy, apathetic mind, lack of proper knowledge and awareness for rural development programmes or no scope specified by the authorities may be the cause for the same. Attendance in SGSY awareness camps is higher than in MGNREGA.

Attending the Gram Sabha Meeting by the Respondents

Gram Sabha is the cornerstone of the entire scheme of democratic decentralization. All the adult members of Gram Panchayat should attend Gram Sabha meeting in order to make it more efficient and functional. Therefore, a question was asked to the respondents to enquire about their involvement in Gram Sabha. The question put to them was "Do you attend Gram Sabha Meeting?". The response is shown in the table 3.

Table 3: Attendance of Respondents in Gram Sabha Meeting

Respondents Villages	Yes	No	Total
Dainijan (BDB)	21 (35.0)	39 (65.0)	60 (100)
Japara(BDB)	25 (41.67)	35 (58.33)	60 (100)
Lahingia(GDB)	24 (40.0)	36 (60.0)	60 (100)
Mothadang(GDB)	23 (38.33)	37 (61.67)	60 (100)
Total	**93 (38.75)**	**147 (61.25)**	**240 (100)**

Source: Field Study (Percentages are in Parentheses)

Table 3 reveals that out of 240 respondents 147 (61.25%) respondents replied in negative that they did not attend Gram Sabha meeting, while 93 (48.75%) responded in positive that they attended Gram Sabha meeting.

The study finds that respondents were not interested to attend Gram Sabha meeting due to ignorance and illiteracy. Most of the Gram Sabha meetings were basically held on Republic day, Independence Day and on Gandhi Jayanti. Therefore, they found it annoying to attend meeting on holidays.

Lack of concern, lack of knowledge regarding the benefits of RDPs are the causes behind their absence in Gram Sabha meeting. They also believe that they can not avail the profits of rural development programme by attending meetings. The study finds that People's participation is very pitiable in RDPs.

Training Camps Organized in the Study Area

It is to be noted that there is no provision of maximum and minimum numbers of training camps to be held per block in every year under the schemes SGSY and MGNREGA. An enquiry was made by putting a question. "Have you attended any training camps under SGSY and MGNREGA?" (Yes/No). Respondents' opinion on attending the training camps is shown in the table 4 given below

Table 4: Respondents' Opinion Regarding Attendance in Training Camps

	SGSY			MGNREGA		
Respondents Villages	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
Dainijan (BDB)	31 (51.67)	29 (48.33)	60 (100)	29 (48.33)	31 (51.67)	60 (100)
Japara(BDB)	35 (58.33)	25 (41.67)	60 (100)	30 (50.0)	30 (50.0)	60 (100)
Lahingia(GDB)	34 (53.33)	26 (46.67)	60 (100)	31 (51.67)	29 (48.33)	60 (100)
Mothadang(GDB)	33 (55.0)	27 (45.0)	60 (100)	32 (53.33)	28 (46.67)	60 (100)
Total	**133 (55.42)**	**107 (44.58)**	**240 (100)**	**122 (50.83)**	**118 (49.17)**	**240 (100)**

Source: Field Study (Percentages are in parentheses)

The above table 4 reveals that under SGSY i.e. 55.42% out of 240 respondents have participated and 44.58% have not participated in the training camps organised by the blocks. In terms of MGNREGA, it is seen that 122 respondents i.e. 50.83% of 240 participated in and118 i.e. 49.17% respondents have not taken training under MGNREGA.

The study respondents have shown interest in further training for improving their productivity and quality of the products. When respondents were further asked to name any institute and the kind of training imparted to them. Some mentioned the name of State Institute of Rural Development (SIRD), Dibrugarh and Sivasagar district which provides training for rural financing, entrepreneurship, social audit, gender budgeting etc.

In the field study, the researcher had seen a training centre in BDB which was in worst condition to use. The training centre was fully neglected by the block.

The present study, therefore finds that more training camps need to be organised to train up the rural poor to fight for the alleviation of poverty, inequality and assertion of right and freedom. Under SGSY, the training is imparted on how to establish and run the Self-Help Groups (SHGs) effectively and successfully, how to generate good results under cluster projects of the block and more importantly how to produce goods with limited resources to become self-reliable and improve their economic conditions.

The study finds that Self-Help Groups (SHGs) under SGSY have shown interest in further training to explore more on various handmade productivity and to make quality oriented products to increase and spread their number of sales. Blocks should take initiative to bring leaders of successful SHGs to exchange ideas between the beneficiaries and leaders of SHGs so that they can feel the positive impact of RDPs.

The study also finds that beneficiaries are not trained people. Although, training camps have been held on rural financing, entrepreneurship, social audit etc. But the number of training camps has been very few. More training camps need to be organised to train up the rural poor to fight for the alleviation of poverty, inequality and assertion of right and freedom. Respondents reported that training camps were held on Pickle making and natural colour dye at the panchayats. Under the MGNREGA, the course content of the training is to acquaint with the provisions of National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005 enacted to protect the unskilled labourers and how this helps to protect their rights.

Basic Problems

In the study a question was asked to the respondents to know the basic problems of the people are in study area Roads and Communication / Agriculture Unemployment/ Others (education, water supply, public health, electricity, and flood). The table 5 given below shows the basic problem of the locality.

Table 5: Basic Problems of the Respondents

Respondents Villages	Roads and Communication	Agriculture	Unemployment	Others	Total
Dainijan (BDB)	17 (28.33)	18 (30.0)	16 (26.67)	9 (15.0)	60 (100)
Japara(BDB)	16 (26.67)	14 (23.33)	20 (33.33)	10 (16.67)	60 (100)
Lahingia(GDB)	18 (30.0)	14 (23.33)	20 (33.34)	8 (13.33)	60 (100)
Mothadang(GDB)	19	18	17	6	60

	(31.67)	(30.0)	(28.33)	(10.0)	(100)
Total	**70 (29.17)**	**64 (26.67)**	**73 (30.41)**	**33 (13.75)**	**240 (100)**

Source: Field Study (Percentages are in Parentheses)

In response to the question the table 5 shows that, out of total respondents, 30.41% which is the largest in percentage stated unemployment as their major basic problem, 29.17% respondents stated roads and communications as their basic problem, while 26.67% mentioned agriculture as one of the basic problem and rest of the 33 which constitutes 13.75% mentioned others (education, water supply, public health, electricity, and flood) as their basic problem under Barbaruah development block and Gaurisagar development block.

Village wise Dainijan Village 28.33% mentioned Roads and Communication as basic problem, 30.0% faced agricultural problem, 26.67% faced unemployment 15.0% mentioned others as basic problem whereas in Japara Village 26.67% faced Roads and Communication as basic problem,23.33% faced agricultural problem 33.33% faced 16.67% stated others as their basic problem. While in Mothadang village 31.67% mentioned roads and communication as their basic problem, 30.0% stated about agricultural problem, 28.33% mentioned unemployment, 10.0% stated others as their basic problem and in Lahingia village 30.0% stated roads and communication as a problem and 23.33% about agricultural problem, 33.34 mentioned faced unemployment and 13.3% stated others (education, water supply, public health, electricity, and flood) problem.

Government and machineries of local self-government must show the interest to solve the problems faced by the rural people which are hampering in the way of inclusive development.

Responsibility in Solving Rural Problems

Another important question was asked to the respondents to know whether they feel that they have the responsibility in solving the problems or not.

Table 6 given below shows the number and percentage of respondents who comment regarding their responsibility in solving rural problems

Table 6: Respondents' Responsibility in Solving the Problems

Respondents Villages	High	Medium	Low	Total
Dainijan (BDB)	29 (48.33)	7 (11.67)	24 (40.0)	60 (100)
Japara(BDB)	32 (53.33)	10 (16.67)	18 (30.0)	60 (100)
Lahingia(GDB)	31 (51.67)	12 (20.0)	17 (28.33)	60 (100)
Mothadang(GDB)	30 (50.0)	11 (18.33)	19 (31.67)	60 (100)
Total	**122 (50.83)**	**40 (16.67)**	**78 (32.5)**	**240 (100)**

Source: Field Study (Percentages are in Parentheses)

The above table 6 shows that, out of total respondents 240 respondents 122 which constitute 50.83% under BDB and GDB shown genuine interest in solving rural problems, where 16.67% respondents response was medium in solving

rural problems and 32.5% respondents responds their responsibility in solving rural problems shown low.

The study reveals that half of the total respondents shown interest in solving the rural problems.They are also interested to take active part in rural development activities. It may help the rural development authorities to implement different rural development programmes in the district and they can get support from the beneficiaries. Any problems of human mankind cannot be solved if they are not motivated to solve. So people's participation in resolving rural problems is necessary for growth and development of any rural area.

Lack of awareness and interest regarding the schemes, illiteracy, and poverty may be the causes for their low responsibility in solving rural problems. Sometimes the benefits of RDPs are enjoyed by fake beneficiaries or beneficiaries closed to officials which hesitates the real beneficiaries to participate in solving rural problems. Dainijan village shown low interest with highest percentage 40.0% in solving rural problems as it is entirely a ST dominated village which are officially regarded as disadvantaged people in India.

Views Regarding Monitoring and Evaluation

SGSY scheme is monitored from central to grass root level. MGNREGA also provides for monitoring of the programmes being implemented under the Act. Accordingly vigilance transparency and people's participation have been strongly emphasised on the Act. One provision accepted for that purpose in the Act is the formation of Monitoring and Vigilance committee.

Evaluation is another important tool used in the process of management of rural development. It comes finally in the long process of rural development. Though it is regarded as the last managerial tool, but to some extent it is accustomed with implementation and monitoring.

At the local level, Monitoring and Vigilance Committee (MVC) should be assigned a definite service area. It should act as a forum for concurrent social audit. Its report should be placed in the next meeting of Gram Sabha in the Panchayat where work has been executed.[1]

An enquiry was made to know whether the people of the two selected development blocks are aware about Monitoring and Evaluation of SGSY and Vigilance and Monitoring of MGNREGA schemes. Here an effort has been made in order to know the view regarding the same.

The Table7 given below shows the responses of the respondents regarding Monitoring and Evaluation of SGSY and Vigilance Committee under MGNREGA.

Table 7: Respondents Views Regarding Monitoring and Evaluation and VC

	Views Regarding Monitoring and Evaluation (SGSY)				Views regarding Vigilance Committee (MGNREGA)			
Respondents Villages	**Yes**	**No**	**Don't Know**	**Total**	**Yes**	**No**	**Don't Know**	**Total**
Dainijan (BDB)	15 (25.0)	16 (26.67)	29 (48.33)	60 (100)	15 (25.0)	12 (20.0)	33 (55.0)	60 (100)
Japara(BDB)	18 (30.0)	12 (20.0)	30 (50.0)	60 (100)	16 (26.67)	16 (26.67)	28 (46.66)	60 (100)
Lahingia(GDB)	17	21	22	60	15	23	22	60

[1]Para 13.6.4, MGRREGA Operational Guidelines, 2013. p.118

	(28.33)	(35.0)	(38.33)	(100)	(25.0)	(38.33)	(36.67)	(100)
Mothadang(GDB)	19 (31.67)	23 (38.33)	18 (30.0)	60 (100)	18 (30.0)	14 (23.33)	28 (46.67)	60 (100)
Total	**69 (28.75)**	**72 (30.0)**	**99 (41.25)**	**240 (100)**	**64 (26.67)**	**65 (27.08)**	**111 (46.25)**	**240 (100)**

Source: Field Study (Percentages are in Parentheses)

The table 7 shows that, 28.75% responded in affirmative, while 30.0% responded in negative and 41.25% were not aware of Monitoring and Evaluation of SGSY scheme. Regarding the enquiry made to know the existence of Vigilance Committee (VC) under MGNREGA, 26.67% respondents stated positively, 27.08% replied in negative and 46.25% respondents were unaware of it.

Here, the study found majority 41.25% in case of SGSY and 46.25% in case of MGNREGA unaware of Monitoring and Evaluation and Vigilance Committee respectively.

The study also discloses the fact that implementing agencies do not visit the areas where these (SGSY and MGNREGA) rural development programmes were implemented. Only 28.75% of total respondents stated positively about Monitoring and Evaluation of SGSY and in MGNREGA, very few 26.67% admitted Vigilance Committees inspection. Hence, the study shows that Monitoring and Evaluation and Vigilance Committee are inactive in their work. Negligence and unconcerned attitude of the authorities may be the causes for it. Without proper monitoring and evaluation corruption may take place which will barred in the path of development.

Views Regarding the Initiatives taken by Rural Development Authorities to Increase the Interest in Rural Development Activities

Another important aspect of the people's participation is the participation in formulation of plans and programmes and above all in decision making process. Most of the citizens of the rural areas are primarily interested in services and amenities rather than general principles, legislation and planning. In this regard, another important question was asked to the respondents whetherrural development authorities take initiatives to increase the interest in rural development activities among the rural poor. The table8 given below shows the view with number and percentage of the respondents.

Table 8: Views of Respondents' Regarding Initiatives Taken by Concerned Authorities to Increase the Interest

Respondents Villages	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total
Dainijan (BDB)	22 (36.67)	18 (30.0)	20 (33.33)	60 (100)
Japara(BDB)	26 (43.33)	24 (40.0)	10 (16.67)	60 (100)
Lahingia(GDB)	27 (45.0)	26 (43.33)	7 (11.67)	60 (100)
Mothadang(GDB)	28 (46.67)	20 (33.33)	12 (20.0)	60 (100)
Total	**103 (42.92)**	**88 (36.67)**	**49 (20.41)**	**240 (100)**

Source: Field Study (Percentages are in Parentheses)

The above table 8 finds that responding the question, 42.92% i.e.103 of total respondents responded affirmatively

thatinitiatives taken by rural development authorities to increase the interest in rural development activities, while 36.67% stated negatively in taking initiatives and 20.41% are not aware regarding this.

Hence, comparing to respondents 42.92% who said initiatives taken by rural development authorities to increase the interest, it was found that rest of the respondents i.e. 36.67% and 20.41% stated that they have not seen and also not aware about rural development authorities' initiative to increase the interest in rural development activities is not a good sign for rural development.

Regarding whether the implementing agencies organized any programme or taking initiatives to increase the interest in rural development activities among the rural poor people, majority of the respondents said that implementing agencies are not so concern in creating interest and also not aware about initiatives taken by blocks to increase interest which is hindering the way of rural development. It may be happened due to the malpractices of implementing agencies, bureaucratic attitude, implementation done by overstressed and understaffed offices or inactive and invisible Vigilance and monitoring committee for rural development activities.

CONCLUSIONS

Rural development programme is a people's programme; people should take keen interest in rural development activities. Every programme which is funded by the government, invariably have a short life unless citizens participate in them actively and continuously.

From the above analysis regarding people's participation in rural development programmes it can be said that for better implementation of any rural development programmes people's participation and involvement is considered necessary. Especially in decision making, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and sharing the benefits of the development programmes people's participation is a must. Therefore, people should take active part in rural development programmes. If people's voices are heard and their opportunities of participation are upheld, democracy can be stronger.

REFERENCES

1. *Ahuja U.R. et. al. (2011). Impact of MGNREGA on Rural Employment and Migration. Agricultural Economics Research Review, Vol. 24, pp. 495–502.*
2. *Chaarlas, LJ and Velmurugan, JM, (2012). Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005 (MGNREGA): Issues and Challenges, International Journal of Physical and Social Sciences 2(6) 253–261.*
3. *Yadav R.R., article on People's Participation: Focus on the Mobilization of the rural poor, Local Level Planning and Rural Development: Alternative Strategies, United Nations Asian Pacific Development Institute, Bangkok, 2006. p. 87.*
4. *Dhillon D.S. and Hansara B.S. People's Participation in Rural Development Programmes, Kurukshetra, January, Vol-XI, III, No.4, 1995. pp. 10–13.*
5. *Hedayat Allah Nikkhah, Maroof Redzuan, (2009). Participation as a Medium of Empowerment in Community Development, European Journal of Social Sciences 11(1) 170–176. E. Desingu Setty, 1985 (People's Participation in Rural Development: A critical analysis. Indian Journal of Social Work, 46(1).*

6. *Robyn Eversole, (2010). Remaking participation: Challenges for Community Development Practice, Community Development Journal 47(1) (29–41).*
7. *Biraj Dutta, (2012). People's Participation in Rural Development: A case Study in Dibrugarh District of Assam, PRABANDHAN: INDIAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT, (vol.5 issue 7, July 2012).*
8. *D. Gangopadhyay, A.K. Mukhopadhyay and Pushpa Singh., 2008.Rural Development: A Strategy for Poverty Alleviation in India, S & T for Rural India and Inclusive Growth from CSIR-National Institute of Science, Technology and Development Studies: http.//www.nistads.res.in/indiasnt2008/t6rural/t6rur8.htm p.1.*

---

[i]Cohen J.M. and Uphoff N.T., *Participations Place in Rural Development: Seeking Clarity through Specification*, World Development. p.8

[ii]BalwantRai Mehta Committee Report, Government of India, Delhi-1957.

[iii]*Swarrnajayanti Gram-SwarozgarYojana (SGSY) Guidelines* (2000), Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India p.1

[iv] SinghKesar, *Rural Development –Problems, Prospects and Implementation Strategies*, p.58

[v]MNREGA OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES 2013, Ministry of Rural Development, Department of Rural Development, Government of India, New Delhi, p.3