GENDER INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION MAKING ABOUT ANIMAL HUSBANDRY PRACTICES

Anupam Kumari[1], Prakash Singh[2] & B. Mishra[3]

Women play a significant and crucial role in agricultural development and allied fields including in the main crop production livestock production, horticulture, post harvest operations, agro/social forestry, fisheries, etc. The nature and extent of women's involvement in animal husbandry, vary greatly from region to region. Even within a region, their involvement vary widely among different ecological sub-zones farming system's caste, classes and socio-economic status of families etc. (Swaminathan, 1985).

With so much of contribution by women to animal husbandry it is unfortunate thatagrarian Indian society relegated women to the exclusive role of doing work rather than active decision maker. Power, authority and decision making regarding animal husbandry issues seem to rest exclusively with the males and eventually women acquired a role apace which lost its dignity, respect and values. Therefore, the present investigation was designed with the following specific objectives :

1. To study the gender involvement in decision making.
2. To study the relationship of characteristics of males and females with decisionmaking.

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in C.D. Block Milkipur of Faizabad district, Uttar Pradesh. Five Villages were selected randomly from the list of all the villages in the block. A separate list of livestock owners in each selected villages was prepared and from them, 100 respondents were selected throguh propertionate random sampling techniques, of the total, 50 were males and 50 females. The data were collected with the help of pretested semi structured schedule by personal interview method.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Extent of involvement in decision making– The table 1 clearly indicates that the higher number of wives (72·00%) were observed in the medium category of decision making, while 13·00 and 12·00 per cent wives found in the categories of low and high decision making respectively. A meagre number of wives (3·00%) was observed such who did not take part in decision making about animal husbandry practices.

In case of husbands, almost three fourth (76·00%) were observed in the category of high decision making followed by 16·00 per cent belonged to the medium category. Only 3·00% husbands were observed in low category of decision making. A meagre number of husbands (5·00%) was observed who had not taken part in decision making process related to animal husbandry practices.

In the context of distribution of family members involved in decision making, maximum number of family members (30·00%) were observed in the medium category of decision making followed by 18·00 and 14·00 percent belonged to the categories of low and high decision making respectively. More than one third of family members (38·00%) were observed such who did not involve in decision making.

So far as involvement of neighbour and friends and 'others' was concerned, the higher number of neighbours and friends (76·00%) and 'others' (87·00%) were reported theirinvolvement as nil. Nearly one fourth of the neighbours and friends (24·00%) and 'others' (13·00%) belonged to the

1. P.G. Student, 2. Asstt. Prof. & 3. Assoc. Prof. & Head, Deptt. of Ext. Edu., N.D. Uni. of Agri. & Tech., Faizabad

category of low decision making. None of the neighbours and friends and 'others' were observed in the medium and high category of decision making.

Table 1. Distribution of different persons according to involvement in decision making relating to animal husbandry practices.

Category of involvement	Wives		Husbands		Family members		Neighbours and friends		Others	
	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage	No.	Per-centage
No involvement	3	3·00	5	5·00	38	38·00	76	76·00	87	87·00
Low (up to 13·00)	13	13·00	3	3·00	18	18·00	24	24·00	13	13·00
Medium (13·00 to 46·00)	72	72·00	16	16·00	30	30·00	–	0·00	–	0·00
High (above 46·00)	12	12·00	76	76·00	14	14·00	–	0·00	–	0·00
Total	**100**	**100·00**	**100**	**100·00**	**100**	**100·00**	**100**	**100·00**	**100**	**100·00**

Mean = 29·41, Range-Min. = 0, Max. = 96·92

Thus, it can be said that a maximum number of the wives and family mambers was observed in the category of medium involvement while husbands were observed in the category of high involvement of decision making.

2. Practice wise involvement of different persons in decision making–During the course of survery, informations on practicewise extent of involvement of different persons in decision making about animal husbandry practices were collected. The data pertaining to this observation have been presented in Table 2 which illustrate that the highest percentage of involvement of wives in decision making about responsibility for cleaning of animals shed was observed 58·80 per cent which was more than rest of the persons. The reason of takingmaximum decision by the wives in respect to cleaning of animals shed is that because it hasconsidered as routine activity so that is performed by them.

The involvement of husbands was more than wives and other persons in all the animal husbandry practices except the practice like responsibility for cleaning of animals shed which can be seen 23·60 per cent. The dominant involvement (70·65%) of husbands was seen in the practice like livestock to be raised. They were also found involved in the practices like size and location of housing (18·55%) equipment needed (18·35%) and livestock to be raised (17·70%). The involvement of family members were greater than the wives but less than husbands.

The involvement of neighbours and friends and 'other' in decision making regarding animal husbandry practices was observed zero in almost all the practices (Table 2) except some of the practices. Their percentage was below 2·00 while in case of disease treatment and preventive measures to protact livestock, the percentage was 1·45 and 1·30 respectively.

The Table further shows that involvement of neighbour and friends and 'other' could be seen only in the practices in which decisions were taken about out-door activities and health care practices like disposal of excess and non productive animals, feed arrangement,preventive measures to protect livestock, type of disease treatment and weaning and care of young ones.

The overall extent of involvement of the wives, husband, family members, neighbours and friends and 'other' were also calculated. Therefore, it is obvious from the Table that by and large, the extent of involvement of husbands was more (51·58%) in comparison to others like wives (29·41%) and family members (18·66%). It is also apparent from the table that the involvement of neighbour and friends and 'others' in decision making was observed verymeagre i.e. 0·20 and 0·15 per cent respectively.

Thus, it can be concluded that in respect of

decisions relating to animal husbandry tasks, a considerable number of wives was perceived to be contributed in this respect. Almost similar observation were reported by Agrawal (1987).

Table 2. Practice-wise involvement of different persons in decision making about animal husbandry practices.

S. No.	Practices	Extent of involvement in decision making of different persons (Percentage)					
		Wife	Husband	Family members	Neighbours and friends	Others	Total
1.	Livestock to be raised	11·65	70·65	17·70	–	–	100·00
2.	Equipment needed	15·35	66·33	18·35	–	–	100·00
3.	Size and location of housing	13·55	67·00	18·55	–	–	100·00
4.	Fodder production	19·10	61·8	19·10	–	–	100·00
5.	Marketing/consumption of animals	37·10	45·55	17·35	–	–	100·00
6.	Disposal of excess and non productive animals	19·95	60·85	18·85	0·3	0·05	100·00
7.	Care and feeding of livestock	36·8	44·65	18·55	–	–	100·00
8.	Feed arrangement	35·65	45·05	19·15	0·10	0·50	100·00
9.	Preventive measures to protect livestock	30·20	49·65	18·30	1·30	0·55	100·00
10.	Type of disease treatment	29·45	49·55	18·95	1·45	0·60	100·00
11.	Weaning and care of young ones	35·60	43·40	20·90	0·05	0·05	100·00
12.	Responsibility for cleaning of animals shed	58·80	23·60	17·60	–	–	100·00
13.	Milking of animals	39·15	41·50	19·35	–	–	100·00
	Average	29·41	51·58	18·66	0·20	0·15	100·00

3. Relationship between different variables with decision making–The table 3. highlights the responses collected from male and female. In case of male respondents, thevariables namely involvement in actual doing (D.P.), Involvement in actual doing (O.P.) involvement in supervision (D.P.) involvement in supervision (O.P.) and land holding were observed to be positively and significantly correlated, concluding that these variables had direct influence on extent of involvement in decision making means that as the valuse of these variables are increased the involvement of the male respondents in decision making is also increased and vice versa. The variables i.e. type of family and size of family were found highly significant but negativelycorrelated with decision making which shows the negative influence.

In case of female respondents, the variables namely involvement in actual doing (D.P.),

involvement in actual doing (O.P.), involvement in supervision (D.P.) and involvement insupervision (O.P.) were observed positively and significantly correlated, concludes that these variables had direct influence on involvement in

Table 3. Correlation coefficient (*r*) between different variables and involvement of the respondents in decision making.

Sl. No.	Variables	Correlation coefficient	
		MR	FR
1.	Age	–0· 0622	0· 0840
2.	Education	0· 0677	–0· 5487**
3.	Caste	0· 2496*	–0· 4335**
4.	Occupation	–0· 1427	–0· 0153
5.	Land holding	0· 2517*	–0· 5710**
6.	Type of family	–0· 3744**	–0· 4911**
7.	Size of family	–0· 3062**	–0· 4350**
8.	Social participation	0· 0035	–0· 2183*
9.	Annual income	0· 0772	–0· 5760**
10.	Material possession	0· 0506	–0· 5821**
11.	Communication media possession	0· 0388	–0· 5176**
12.	Herd size	–0· 1555	–0· 1068
13.	Milk production	–0· 0944	–0· 2277*
14.	Socio-economic status	0· 0479	–0· 6360**
15.	Economic motivation	–0· 1223	–0· 5425**
16.	Involvement in actual doing (D.P.)	0· 2952**	0· 6861**
17.	Involvement in actual doing (O.P.)	0· 3337**	0· 6247**
18.	Involvement in supervision (D.P.)	0· 3610**	0· 7207**
19.	Involvement in supervision (O.P.)	0· 4755**	0· 6775**

* Significant at 0·05 probability level = 0·1946
** Significant at 0·01 probability level =0·2540
D.P.– Daily Practices.O.P.–Occasional Practices.

decision making means that as these variables are increased the involvement of the female respondents in decision making is also increased and Vice-versa.

The remaining variables were observed to be negatively but significantly associated with extent of involvement of the respondents in decision making means that these variables had negatively affected the involvement in decision making by the female. Age was found to be positive but insignificant correlationship. similar findings were also observed by Agrawal (1987) and Vaish (1999).

CONCLUSION

The data clearly indicate that the husbands play dominent role in decision making. But, the involvement of wives can not be overlooked. It was observed during survey in the study area that the involvement of wife was comparatively low due to negative attitude towards doing work at farm in one hand and social norms resist their involvement in out-door activities on the other. Further, due to poor knowledge about animal husbandry, the female could not contribute more in decisions making. The variables which were having positive and significant association with involvement in decison making need to be manipulated for better performance of females is the areas like animal husbandry.

REFERENCES

1. Agrawal H. (1987). A study on contribution of farm women in animal husbandry enterprise, M.Sc. Thesis (unpub.) IVRI, Izatnagar.
2. Swaminathan, M.S. (1985) Importing a rural women user perspective to agricultural research and development IRRI, Philippines Report.
3. Vaish, S. (1999). Involvement of rural women in decision making relating to rice production technology adoption in C.D. Block Milkipur, Faizabad (U.P.). M.Sc. Thesis (unpub.), NDUAT Faizabad.