Study on Ownership and Control Pattern over Resources and Accessibility to Various Services in Gender Perspectives

Neeraj K. Sharma[1], H.R. Meena[2], Mahesh Chander[3], Hari R.[4] and Sharad Avhad[5]

1. Asstt. Prof., CVAS, RAJUVAS Bikaner (Rajasthan), 2 Sr. Scientist (Dairy Extension), NDRI, Karnal;
3. Principal Scientist (Ext. Edu.), 4&5 Ph.D. Scholar, Ext. Edu., IVRI, Izatnagar, Bareilly, U.P.

Corresponding author e-mail: neerajvet03@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted in Alwar and Bikaner district of Rajasthan. The sample was collected from 12 villages of 6 blocks of both the districts. The sample size was 240 respondents The information was collected by conducting personal interviews of the respondents with the help of semi structured interview schedule. The overall figures indicated that large ruminants were mainly owned by male respondents (44.17%) followed by joint ownership (35.00%). Only 20.83 percent female respondents owned large ruminants. Results revealed that in 44.17 per cent households control over large ruminants was in the hands of male respondents while control by female respondents was in 30.00 per cent households followed by joint control (25.83%). The results revealed that 27.50 per cent male respondents had accessibility to extension services as compared to only 13.33 per cent female respondent and only 29.17 per cent female respondents had accessibility to public animal health services whereas 42.50 per cent males had accessibility to public animal health services. About 30.83 per cent of female respondents had accessibility to market for selling its produce as compared to 67.50 per cent male respondents.

Key words: *Ownership; Control; Accessibility; Public animal health services;*

There are 75 million women engaged in dairying compared to 15 million men, and 20 million women in animal husbandry as against 1.5 million men (*Srinath, 2012*).They constitute about 55 per cent to the total agricultural labor and 60 per cent of the labor engaged in livestock (*Brij Bala et al., 2006*). They share responsibility with men and children for the care of animals and particular species and types of activities are more associated with women than men.

The role of women in livestock is well documented by *FAO (2002)* and her role and responsibility increases, when she has headship of the house. Identifying and supporting the roles and capabilities of women as livestock owners, processors and users of livestock products are key aspects to promote women's economic and social empowerment and consequently a rural women's ability to break the cycle of poverty. Moreover, access, control and management of resources such as grazing areas and feed resource, provide assets that improve women's equality and empowerment with an overall positive impact on the welfare of the household (*IFAD, 2009*). Ownership of livestock is particularly attractive to women in societies where access to land is restricted to men (*Bravo- Baumann, 2000*). Dairying provides women with a regular daily income, vital to household food security and family well being. Women are not only centrally involved in milk production, but also in collection, processing and marketing of dairy products, roles which were often overlooked by development programmes. In the past, projects and programmes were directed towards men with the view that these changes will be percolated to the entire family. But this transfer has not been successful, resulting in little empowerment of women. A prime reason for this male oriented focus is that the control of assets and resources are primarily with the men, with women having little role in it. This has important implications for the engagement of women in the livestock sector because they are the prime workers in the dairy sector in the country. Any strategy without ownership and control of resources will be futile in emancipating women. So an analysis of the control and access of various

resources by women dairy farmers is inevitable to identify the weakness in this sector.

METHODOLOGY

The current study was done in Rajasthan state. The state is purposefully selected because the state has one of the most pathetic conditions with respect to Gender development indicators. The state has the lowest literacy of women in entire India and has a much skewed female to male ratio (*GoI, 2011*).The state is the second highest milk producer in India. But despite this higher participation of women in Rajasthan in dairy sector the ownership and control and access of various resources pertaining to dairy sector has never been analyzed.

Rajasthan is divided into ten agro-climatic zones, each one having special characteristics of its own. Out of theses 10 agro climatic zones, 2 zones namely IC-Hyper Arid Partially Irrigated and IIIB-Flood Prone Eastern Plain have been selected purposively due to variation in climatic conditions and prevailing agriculture and animal husbandry practices, from IC- Hyper Arid Partially Irrigated zone Bikaner district and from IIIB-Flood Prone Eastern Plain Alwar district were selected purposively on the basis of highest livestock population in the zones. Three blocks selected from each district and two villages selected from each block randomly, thus total 12 villages selected from 6 blocks. From these 12 identified villages 120 households (120 male respondents and 120 female respondents) were purposively selected on the basis of having at least two tropical livestock unit. The semi structured interview schedule for respondents had used for collection of data for the present study. The data collected from sample respondents had coded, tabulated, analysed and presented in the form of tables. The suitable statistical tools viz. Chi-square, frequency and percentage had used in analysis of data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results revealed that majority of male respondents owned large ruminants in both the districts (41.67 per cent in Alwar & 46.67 per cent in Bikaner). Only 15.00 per cent households had small ruminants. Among them 11.67 per cent female respondents owned small ruminants and 3.33 male respondents owned small ruminants. The overall figures indicated that large ruminants were mainly owned by male respondents (44.17 per cent) followed by joint ownership (35.00 per cent) and female respondents (20.83 per cent). About fifty six per cent of male respondents had single ownership of land followed by joint (9.17 per cent) and female respondents (7.50 per cent). It may be observed that in 44.17 per cent households control of large ruminants were in the hands of male respondents while only 30.00 percent female respondents had control over animals. A total of 25.83 percent households had joint control over large ruminants. Among 82.35 per cent households control over small ruminants was by female respondents while control by male respondents was only in 17.65 per cent households. Among majority of households control over land, financial resources and management of labour was by male respondents while control by female respondents was very less. Similar results were obtained from other developing countries in Africa. *Oluka et al. (2003)* reported that women own fewer cattle but relatively more small stock than men. Regarding control men have a disproportionate control over access to livestock resources and benefits. The results depicted the downtrodden nature of women in developing countries. A perusal of Table 3 showed that only13.33 per cent female respondents had accessibility to extension services and 9.17 per cent to training as compared to male respondents wherein 27.50 per cent were accessible to extension services and 17.50 per cent to trainings related to livestock farming. The Results indicated the gender bias of the extension services. Though this topic has been debated in the last few years, no strategies were developed to tide over this situation as indicated by the study. The results revealed that only 29.17 per cent female respondents had accessibility to public animal health services whereas 42.50 per cent males had accessibility to public animal health services. About 86 per cent male respondents had accessibility to private animal health services as compared 52.50 per cent female respondents. About 30.83 per cent of female respondents had accessibility to market for selling its produce as compared to 67.50 per cent male respondents. Regarding access to credit, the study revealed that 33.34 per cent females had access to non institutional sources of credit as compared to 69.50 per cent male respondents. Male respondents (19.17 per cent) had

Table 1: Distribution of households according to ownership over resources

Resources	Alwar (n=60)				Bikaner (n=60)				Total (N=120)			
	M (%)	F (%)	J (%)	N (%)	M (%)	F (%)	J (%)	No (%)	M (%)	F (%)	J (%)	N (%)
Cattle/ buffalo	41.67	26.67	31.67	0.00	46.67	15.00	38.33	0.00	44.17	20.83	35.00	0.00
Sheep/Goat	6.67	13.33	0.00	80.00	0.00	10.00	0.00	90.00	3.33	11.67	0.00	85.00
Land	56.67	5.00	13.33	25.00	55.00	10.00	5.00	30.00	55.83	7.50	9.17	27.50

M= Male, F= Female, J= Joint and N= Not

Table 2: Distribution of households according to control over resources

Resources	Alwar (n=60)			Bikaner (n=60)			Pooled (N=120)		
	M (%)	F (%)	J (%)	M (%)	F (%)	J (%)	M (%)	F (%)	J (%)
Cattle/ buffalo	43.33	36.67	20.00	45.00	23.33	31.67	44.17	30.00	25.83
Sheep/Goat	27.27	72.73	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	17.65	82.35	0.00
Land	84.44	6.67	8.89	92.86	0.00	7.14	88.50	3.50	8.05
Financial	81.67	18.33	0.00	80.00	15.00	5.00	80.83	15.00	2.50
Labour	50.00	25.00	25.00	65.00	15.00	20.00	57.50	20.00	22.50

Table 3: Distribution of respondents according to accessibility to various services

Accessibility to various services	Alwar		Bikaner		Polled		χ^2 value	P-value
	M (%)	F (%)	M (%)	F (%)	M (%)	F (%)		
Extension services	25.00	11.67	30.00	15.00	27.50	13.33	7.41	.006
Trainings	13.33	6.67	21.67	11.67	17.50	9.17	3.60	.05
Private animal health services	86.67	68.33	85.00	36.67	85.83	52.50	17.30	<0.001
Public animal health services	50.00	30.00	35.00	28.33	42.50	29.17	4.63	0.03
Market facilities	70.00	31.67	65.00	30.00	67.50	30.83	31.26	<0.001
Institutional credit facilities	16.67	9.17	21.67	9.17	19.17	9.17	2.588	0.108
Non-Institutional credit facilities	64.00	21.67	75.00	45.00	69.50	33.34	18.30	<0.001

also better accessibility to institutional credit sources as compared to female respondents (9.17 per cent). Poor credit accessibility of the women is due to the fact that public credit programmes depends heavily on physical collateral and so are heavily biased towards male headed households which can satisfy this criteria, Women due to lack of collateral security have always been ignored and have received very little credit from the banks, a situation which has had a negative impact on women's productivity (*FAO, 1996*). Various legal restrictions, the need for a male's signature, customary rules, lack of credit schemes catering to the specific needs of for rural women and lack of collateral such as a title to land have added impetus to this problem (*Fletschner, 2006*). Poor marketing skills, low levels of literacy and customary practices are factors that prevent women from freely leaving the house premises. As a consequence, there is frequently a marked imbalance between women and men in the benefits accrued from livestock-related income (*USAID, 2005*).

CONCLUSION

The study has revealed that the scenario of ownership & control over resources and accessibility to various services of women in Rajasthan is still poignant. More legal and social policies need to be developed to augment women resource ownership and control of resources.

Proper credit flow also needs to be ensured for this weaker section of the society. For this gender fair and gender specific polices needed to be developed immediately. This could only be realized with the cooperative effort of various basic institutions and organizations.

Paper received on : September 22, 2014

Accepted on : October 12, 2014

REFERENCES

Bala, B., Sharma, S.D. and Sharma, R.K. (2006). Knowledge and adoption level of improved technology among rural women owing to extension programmes. *Agricultural Economics Research Review,* **19**: 301-310.

Bravo-Baumann, H. (2000). Gender and livestock: Capitalisation of experiences on livestock project and gender. Working document, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, Bern. Source: http://www.fao.org/wairdocs/LEAD/X6106E/X6106e00.HTM.

Clones, P.J. (1992). The Link between Gender Issues and the Fragile Environments of Sub-Saharan Africa. Women in Development Unit. Poverty and Social Policy Division. Technical Department. Africa region. The World Bank. pp 19.

FAO, (1996). Food Grains Marketing Improvement in Tanzania. Report of Technical Cooperation Among Developing Countries (TCDC), Experts on Grain Marketing Visit in Tanzania, 20th September to 6th October. pp 21.

FAO (2002). World Agriculture: Towards 2015/2030. FAO, Rome.

FAO (2011). The State of Food and Agriculture 2010-11: Women in Agriculture: Closing the gender gap. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy.

Fletschner, D. **(**2006). Women's access to credit: does it matter for household efficiency? http://economics.ucr.edu/winter10/Fletschner%20paper%204%20of%204%20for%20Jan%2015%20sem.pdf (accessed on: 14/4/2013)

IFAD (2009). Rota, A. and Sperandini, S. Gender and Livestock: tools for design in Livestock Thematic Papers: Tools for project design. Rome: International Fund for Agricultural Development.

Oluka, J., Owoyesigire, B., Esenu, B., Sssewannyana, E. (2003). Small stock and women in livestock production in the Teso farming fystem region of Uganda African Women Policy Network, Serere. Agricultural and Animal Production Research Institute, P. O. Soroti, Uganda.

Srinath, K. (2012). Enabling inclusive growth in agriculture: Role of farm women. *Indian Farming,* **61** (12): 9.

USAID **(**2005). Enhancing women's access to markets: an overview of donor programs and best practices http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADH668.pdf