# DECISION MAKING PATTERN OF RURAL WOMEN RELATING TO ADOPTION OF RICE PRODUCTION TECHNOLOGY

Sarita Vaish<sup>1</sup>, Prakash Singh<sup>2</sup> & B. Mishra<sup>3</sup>

In Indian economy, farm business have been family enterprises in which both husband and wife participate evenly. Wives and daughters, of the farm men share both work and wages. Their roles are generally complimentry, not only in physical participation at farm and home related activities, but also in respect of decision making process, concerning such activities. Men's role is dominent and authoritative while that of women is subtile and pursuasive. Outwardly decision making is the prerogative of the male head of the farm family but any such decision taken is strongly influenced by the attitude and openion of the female partner. A proper standing of the complexity of the decision making process in rural families and ascertaining the role of farm women in it will help in toning up agriculture modernization in the country as well as transformation of family life in rural society. There is now growing realization that we can not go on ignoring the contribution of nearly half of our population as female constitute 48·1 per cent of the country's population (Census 1991). Keeping these facts into consideration, the present study was conducted with following objectives:

- To study the profile of the respondents.
- To know the decision making pattern of rural women relating to rice production technology

### METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted in community development block-Milkipur, district Faizabad of Uttar Pradesh because of having major area under rice cultivation. A separate complete list of all the

rice grower in each selected village was prepared. From these lists, a total number of 100 rice growing farmers were selected through proportionate random sampling techniques Data were collected from the wives of head of the family on 22 major rice production practices through personal interview method with the help of pretested interview schedule.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Profile of the respondents-A maximum number of the respondents (57%) were found in middle age group i.e. 30 to 53 years. Literacy level of the respondents was very poor i.e. 22.00 percent. Majority of the respondents (44%) were seen in the schedule caste category. The nuclear families were counted 61.00 percent and 59.00 percent respondents wereobserved such who had 6 to 9 members in their family. Majority i.e. 73.00 percent respondents, families were reported agriculture as their main occupation. Maximum (77%) were marginal farmers (up to 2.5 acre) with an average land holding of 1.95 acres. An over whelming majority of the was those whose annual income was observed up to Rs. 35,000. The maximum respondents (64%) were reported having communication media. Social participation was observed to be very less. Majority of the respondents (84%) were observed in medium category of socio-economic status. The economic motivation and value-orientations of the respondents were observed of medium level each with an average mean of scores 23.46 and 30.72 respectively.

P.G. Student, 2. Asstt. Prof. & 3. Assoc. Prof. & Head, Deptt. of Ext. Edu. N.D.

	Table 1. Socio-econ		Table 1. Socio-economic profile of the respondents N = 100											
	Characteristics	Respondents No. percentage		Mean	S.D.	Min. (5)	11111111111	Max (6)						
_		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(3)	(0)	_						
1.	Age Young age (up to 29 Years)	2.1	21.00	41.24	12.03	20	63	3						
	Middile age (30 to 53 years)	2 I 5 7	21·00 57·00	41.74	12 03	-	-							
	Old age (above 53 years)	22	22.00	_	192	_	·   -							
	Education	22	22.00		1.000									
	Illiterate	78	78.00	_	-	6	-	•8						
	Can read and write	1	1.00	_	-	-	-	-						
	Primary	12	12.00	_	3 <b>—</b>	-	-	-						
	Middle	5	5.00		-	-	-   -	-						
	High School	3	3.00	-	. –	-		_						
	Intermediate	1	1.00	-	-	-		-						
	Caste	m - =												
	General caste	22	22.00	-	-	_		_						
	Backward caste	34	34.00	-	_	-		<del>_</del> 0						
	Scheduled caste	44	44.00	-	_	-		_						
	Type of Family	2 6 552					- 1							
	Joint Joint	39	39.00	-	-	-								
	Nuclear	61	61.00	-	-	_   _	-	_						
				**************************************			.	14						
	Size of Family Up to 5 members	29	29.00	7.11	2.3	1 4	•	-						
	6 to 9 members	59	59.00	-	-	-	-							
	Above 9 members	12	12.00	-	-	1 .	-							
					1			-						
	Family Occupation	73	73.00	-	-		-							
	Agriculture	13	13.00	-	-		_ , ,	-						
	Service	1	1.00	-	-	1	_	_						
- 1	Business	3	3.00	-	-		-							
(	Caste occupation	10	10.00	-	_		-	-						
-	Agricultural labour	6	= = ==				2.2	15						
7. 5	Size of Land Holding:	77	77.00	1.9	-		2.2	13						
	Marginal (up to 2.5 acres)	17	17.00	-	-		-							
•	Small (2.6 to 5 acres)	4	4.00	-	-		-	-						
1	Medium (5·1 to 10 acres)	2	2.00	-	-		-	-						
r	Rig (above 10 acres)		9		1									
Ī	Family Annual Income	90	90.00	27,79	0 -	.   9	000,	2,50,0						
T	In to Re 35:00	5	5.00	_	_	- 4	- 1	_						
Ċ	Rs. 35,000 to Rs. 70,000	5,000	5.00	_	-	-	-	_						
	D - 70 000	5	3 00			1 1	9 9 9 1							
	Communication Media Possession:		64.00	_		-	-	_						
. •	laving communication media.		36.00	_	1 .	_	-	1						
ŀ	aving no communication media	36	30.00		13	1								
h	aving no communication means	,	07.00			_	-	-						
0. S	ocial Participation	97	97.00			_	_	-						
	La Participation	3	3.00	-		_	-	_						
N	Member of one organization	0	0.00	-		_	_	\ -						
A	Aember of two organizations	0	0.00	_	8									
	dambar of more than two	-												
-	reconizations officer bearer	× .	, ,			1.45	20	13						
1 0	ocio-economic status	4	4.00	4	5   2	4.45	20	1						
1. 5	(up to 21)	2.60	84.00	-	- 1	-								
L	ow (up to 21)	84	12.00	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	-	-	-	-1 "						
E	dedium (22 to 69)	12	12 00	nn fell	1	19	Olger State	1.						
	itab (above 69)		27.00	23	46	2.28	18	1:						
) F	conomic motivation	27	27.00	23		-	-	e.,						
1	ow (up to 21)	60	60.00	30 F K		_	-	-						
, L	Medium (22 to 26)	13	13.00		-			1						
N	dedium (22 26)	1 15	1 1 2 2		EV -		27							
Н	ligh (above 26)	21	21.00	30	.72	2.66	1 21							
1 V	value Orientations	21	56.00		_	_	_	- , ,						
1	ow (up to 23)	56	1 22 120			-	-							
N	Medium (24 to 29)	23	23.00											
14	ligh (above 29)													

2. Decision making pattern—Extent of involvement of the respondents was measured on 22 major rice production practices. The data furnished in Table 2 indicates that percentage of involvement of respondents (self) in decision making about area to be sown, labourmanagement, grain storage and marketing were 36·26, 36·94, 39·96 and 34·39 respectively which were more than rest of the persons involved in the process. It shows that women were playing dominent role in these areas. The percentage of involvement of

respondents in decision making about use of chemical/method for rat control (13·71) and use of chemical for disease control (6·81) was less than rest of the respondents. It was observed that women had very little or noknowledge about plant protection practices, but they were consulted because their positive opinion gave strength to the male farmer's decision regarding the adoption of these rice production practices which proved the supportive role of women in decision making.

Table 2. Practice-wise extent of involement of different persons in decision making about rice production technology adoption

SI. No.	Practices	Extent of involvement in decision making of different persons (percentage)						
		Respon- Dents (self)	Husband	Family members	Neighbours and Friends	Others	Total	
	Area to be sown	36.26	36.05	27.69	0	0	100.00	
	Selection of variety	31.64	36.44	22.66	9.26	0	100.00	
3.	Land preparation	9.26	38.88	39.18	12.68	0	100.00	
4.	Selection of seed	23.39	37.81	32.90	5.90	0	100.00	
5.	Seed rate	27.88	36.89	28.63	6.60	0	100-00	
6.	Sowing time	23.21	34.00	30.46	12.33	0	100.00	
7.	Nursery area	19.91	35.93	34.06	10-10	0	100-00	
8.	Use of manure and fertilizers nursery and field crop	21.54	32.73	32.98	12.75	0	100.00	
9.	Transplanting	29.99	32.40	32.81	4.80	0	100.00	
10.	Intercultural operations	27.88	27.72	35.20	9.20	Ö	100.00	
11.	Time of top dressing	17.34	37.23	33.93	11.50	ŏ	100.00	
	Irrigation	17.49	37.87	34.93	9.71	Ö	100.00	
	Use of weedicides	7.31	37.79	31.36	18.71	4.83	100.00	
14.	Use of insecticides	11.03	39.18	29.08	14-23	6.48	100.00	
	Use of chemicals for disease control	6.81	30.49	25.31	21.61	15.78	100.00	
	Control of khaira	25.64	37.54	25.59	11.23	0	100.00	
17.	Use of chemical/method for rats control	1 13.71	33.89	23.91	10.28	18.21	100.00	
18.	8	30.21	32.66	26.95	10.18	100	100.00	
19.	Labour management	36.94	35.98	27.09	0	0	100.00	
20.	3	30.38	38.09	31.53	0	0	100.00	
21.	Grain storage	39.69	22.44	32.51	5.36	0		
22.	Marketing	34.39	34.16	31.45	0	0	100.00	
11	Average	23.72	34.83	30-47	8.93	2.05	100.00	

The involvement of husband of the respondents was more than respondents (self) and other persons in decision making for adoption of all rice production technology except area to be sown (36.05%) labour management (35.98%), grain storage (22.33%) and marketing (34.16%).

The involvement of the family members were observed with almost same extent as the husbands of the respondents were involved.

The percentage involvement of neighbours

and friends in decision making process were also observed up to a considerable degree in all the practices except the area to be sown, labour management seed storage and marketing which can be seen zero involvement.

The involvement of the 'others' in decision making was observed nil in almost all the practices except the practice like plant protection measures.

The overall extent of involvement of husband in decision making for the adoption of different

practices was maximum (34·83%) in comparison to others i.e. family members (30·47%), self (23·72%) and neighbours and friends (8·93%). The table also indicates that theinvolvement of 'others' in decision making was lowest (2·05%). It means that the husband were observed playing dominent role in taking decisions about rice production technology adoption. In case of involvement extent of respondents (self), the similar pattern was also observed by Nagre (1976).

### CONCLUSION

Overall extent of involvement of the respondents in decision making shows that the women are playing considerably active role in decision making which is just reverse of past

decades in which male heads of the family claimed the primary manager of agriculture and used to take all the decisions. But now, they acknowledge women's contribution in decision making in agriculture specially in rice production technology adoption. Hence, it can be concluded that the males are still dominent as for as decision taking process is concerned but, the role played directly or indirectly by the female in this regard can not be ignored. Inspite of growinginvolvement of female in decision making process, there is a need of giving them more opportunities for improving their involvement in this regard, so that the production and productivity of rice may increase up to some extent.

rd dorbe of 1982, a gran come 4 to FF by a 17 o

he vice display and sear it is a display to val.

NOME IN SECTION AND ASSESSED AND ASSESSED ASSESSED.

#### REFERENCES

- 1. Achanta, I.D. (1982). Role of women in Agriculture development. Kurukshetra, 31 (2): 15-17.
- Isely, B.J. (1991). Preception of knowledge, extension and gender roles in rainfed agriculture. Paper presented at the Training-workshop on Gender analysis and its application in farming system research on May 18-31, 1991, held at Bangladesh Rice Research Institute (BRRI), Joydebpur, Bangladesh.
- 3. Nagre, M.L. (1976). The role of family members in decision making as related to selected farm operations. M.Sc (Ag) Thesis Marathwada Agril. University Parbhani (M.P.)
- Rajkamal, P., Pandey, H. and Manoharan, M. (1991). Socio-economic study of farm women in rainfed agriculture and the role of KVK. Paper presented in 'International Conference on Extension Strategy for Minimizing Risk in Rainfed agriculture held on April, 6-9, 1991.



and the standard of the standa