

Research Paper :

Access to and control over productive resources of members of dairy cooperatives

PUNAM K. YADAV AND INDU GROVER

Accepted : October, 2009

See end of the article for authors' affiliations

Correspondence to:

PUNAM K. YADAV

Department of Home Science,
Extension Education, C.C.S.
Haryana Agricultural
University, HISAR
(HARYANA) INDIA

ABSTRACT

The study was conducted in Haryana State, India on a sample of 200 members of dairy cooperative, comprising of 100 men and 100 women drawn from 10 villages of two districts, Hisar and Mahendergarh. Gender profile revealed that majority of both the men and women were in middle age groups, men were matriculates and women were illiterate, both were having medium size of family and farming was the main occupation. It was found that men had more access to and control over land, capital, farm income, animal related, household related, extension services and trainings and institutions and markets.

Key words : Productive resources, Dairy cooperatives, Gender analysis

The access and control profile of resources and benefits profile is a tool to help identify gender-based patterns of power and decision-making. The ability and opportunity to acquire resources by men and women does not necessarily imply that they will have the power to command or control the benefits that are derived from these activities. It is generally seen that though women have access to productive resources *viz.* land, animals, house, property, gadgets, media, credit, technology etc. but as they lack control of these resources they are away from commanding, participation and decision making regarding their use, sale and purchase.

Gender analysis undertaken in several studies in different parts of the world for different contexts reveal that men and women do not have the same access or control over productive resources and benefits accruing from them. This gender-based inequality has implications on personality, capacity, behaviour, authority, development, participation and empowerment. Sethi (1991) stated that lack of land rights are major reason for women's lack of authority and power in the decision making process. Nath (1992) revealed that rural women earnings are only 10 per cent of that of their male counterparts. Quist (1995) stated that despite equal right of women to own property there is a tendency that land and property are more often owned by men.

In India, livestock development is emerging as a major rural development activity and more so as an activity which is likely to benefit women directly (Ramkumar *et al.* 2004; Chaudhary, 2005). Rural farmers in the state of Haryana are engaged in agro-based activities especially

as land is a limiting factor. Dairying is emerging as the best suitable alternative in this situation for ensuring regular marketing of their produce, timely payment and other benefits (Grover and Sethi, 2005; Birthal and Taneja, 2006). Although, the involvement of women in livestock production is a long-standing tradition all over the world, but livestock patterns differ widely among ecological zones, and socio-political systems (Niamir, 1990). The present study has been undertaken to investigate access to and control over productive resources of members of dairy cooperatives in Haryana state through gender analysis.

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in Haryana state, India on a sample of 200 members of dairy cooperatives, comprising of 100 men and 100 women drawn from 10 villages of two districts, Hisar and Mahendergarh. Five dairy cooperatives from each selected district, which is total of ten dairy cooperatives, were selected purposively. The selected dairy cooperative societies were Baropati, Talwandi Rana, Arya Nagar, Ladwa and Dhaima from Hisar district and Balaha Kalan, Raghunathpura, Bachhod, Silarpur and Ratta Kalan from Mahendergarh district.

The relevant variables for the present study were selected on the basis of extensive review of literature, consultation with experts and a pilot study conducted in the area of investigation. An interview schedule was prepared and used for primary data collection from the field. The responses for these productive resources were collected for various aspects under category of access

to and control over by men, women or both. Gender wise access to and control over productive resources *viz.* agricultural related, animal related, household related, transport, extension service and training, institute and market were analyzed using appropriate statistical tools to draw the inferences.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The results obtained from the present investigation are presented below:

Personal and socio-economic profile of the respondents :

The personal profile of the respondents as presented in Table 1 revealed that 55 per cent of men and 70 per cent of women were in middle age group, all were married, 60 per cent men and 55 per cent women had nuclear families and remaining had joint family. As far as family education status was concerned it was found that 60 per cent men had medium family education status whereas 35 per cent of women each had low and medium family education status. Majority of men and women were involved in agriculture and total annual income in both the cases was reported to be in middle range. More than half of both men and women (50 % and 63%) had low material possession.

Gender wise access to and control over productive resources :

The data regarding gender wise access to and control over productive resources are presented in Table 2.

It was found that in case of land resources though 75 per cent of the men and women had access to cultivation on land by virtue of being landowners yet for ownership, buying and selling majority of men respondents (77.5% in each case) had access to as compared to women (2.5% for each case). Regarding control, 80 per cent men alone had control over land resources in terms of buying, selling, ownership and cultivation by virtue of being landowners while rest of the men did not possess land. Eighty per cent women had no control over ownership, buying, selling and cultivation of land while remaining did not have land. Agarwal (2001) stated that most of the land is owned and controlled by men, thus depriving women of a critical means of enhancing not only their economic well-being but also of empowering them. Puri (2002) found that in majority of families male members had direct access over property *viz.*, house (100%), agriculture land (70%), cash (75%), and plots (40%) and only 1% women had plot in their name. In none of the families, under study, agriculture land or house

Table 1 : Personal and socio-economic variable of members of dairy cooperative societies (DCS)

Sr. No.	Variables and categories	Men		Women	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
1.	Age				
	Young	45	45.00	30	30.00
	Middle	55	55.00	70	70.00
	Old	00	00.00	00	00.00
2.	Type of family				
	Nuclear	60	60.00	55	55.00
	Joint	40	40.00	45	45.00
3.	Size of family				
	Small	40	40.00	50	50.00
	Medium	40	40.00	25	25.00
	Large	20	20.00	25	25.00
4.	Family education status				
	Low	30	30.00	35	35.00
	Medium	60	60.00	35	35.00
	High	10	10.00	30	30.00
5.	Caste				
	Scheduled	05	05.00	10	10.00
	Backward	82	82.00	70	70.00
	Upper	13	13.00	20	20.00
6.	Total annual income from dairy				
	Low (up to Rs. 18,000)	30	30.00	37	37.00
	Middle (Rs.18,000-36,000)	63	63.00	58	58.00
	High (above Rs.36,000)	07	07.00	05	05.00
7.	Total annual income from other sources				
	Low (up to Rs. 1,00,000)	40	40.00	35	35.00
	Middle (Rs. 1 lakh to 3 lakh)	50	50.00	45	45.00
	High (above Rs. 3 lakhs)	10	10.00	20	20.00
8.	Land holding				
	Landless	20	20.00	20	20.00
	Marginal	10	10.00	20	20.00
	Small	30	30.00	00	00.00
	Medium	30	30.00	40	40.00
	Large	10	10.00	20	20.00
9.	Material possession				
	Low	30	30.00	15	15.00
	Medium	50	50.00	63	63.00
	High	20	20.00	22	22.00

Table 2 : Gender wise access to and control over resources of members of dairy cooperative societies

Sr. No.	Aspects	Access to resources			Control over resources		
		Frequency/ Percentage			Frequency/ Percentage		
		Men	Women	Both	Men	Women	Both
1.	Agriculture related/ land						
	No land	20(10.0)	20(10.0)	00(0.0)	20(10.0)	20(10.0)	00(0.0)
	Buying	155(77.5)	05(2.5)	00(0.0)	160(80.0)	00(0.0)	00(0.0)
	Selling	155(77.5)	05(2.5)	00(0.0)	160(80.0)	00(0.0)	00(0.0)
	Ownership	155(77.5)	05(2.5)	00(0.0)	160(80.0)	00(0.0)	00(0.0)
	Cultivation	10(5.0)	00(0.0)	150(75.0)	160(80.0)	00(0.0)	00(0.0)
2.	Animal related						
	Purchase	169(84.5)	03(1.5)	28(14.0)	193(96.5)	00(0.0)	07(3.5)
	Sale	167(83.5)	02(1.0)	31(15.5)	190(95.0)	00(0.0)	10(5.0)
	Utilization of income	163(81.5)	13(6.5)	24(12.0)	176(88.0)	03(1.5)	21(10.5)
3.	Household related						
	Family income	153(76.5)	02(1.0)	45(22.5)	187(93.5)	00(0.0)	13(6.5)
	Credits	168(84.0)	10(5.0)	22(11.0)	198(99.0)	00(0.0)	02(1.0)
	Savings	172(86.0)	03(1.5)	25(12.5)	192(96.0)	02(1.0)	06(3.0)
	Repayment of loan	180(90.0)	00(0.0)	20(10.0)	200(100.0)	00(0.0)	00(0.0)
	Ownership of house	200(100.0)	00(0.0)	00(0.0)	200(100.0)	00(0.0)	00(0.0)
4.	Farm income						
	Income from crops	150(75.0)	02(1.0)	48(24.0)	192(96.0)	00(0.0)	08(4.0)
	Income from animals	144(72.0)	03(1.5)	53(26.5)	189(94.5)	02(1.0)	09(4.5)
5.	Extension services and trainings						
	Availing extension service	20(10.0)	02(1.0)	00(0.0)	20(10.0)	00(0.0)	00(0.0)
	Attending training	85(42.5)	12(6.0)	00(0.0)	85(42.5)	00(0.0)	00(0.0)
	Meeting ext. personnel	30(15.0)	00(0.)	00(0.0)	30(15.0)	00(0.0)	00(0.0)
	Extension visits	37(18.5)	00(0.0)	00(0.0)	37(18.5)	00(0.0)	00(0.0)
6.	Institutions and market						
	Account in DCS	100(50.0)	100(50.0)	00(0.0)	180(90.0)	20(10.0)	00(0.0)
	Bank account	78(39.0)	40(20.0)	15(7.5)	88(44.0)	40(20.0)	05(2.5)
	Account in post office	02(1.0)	06(3.0)	00(0.0)	02(1.0)	06(3.0)	00(0.0)
	Visit to market	00(0.0)	00(0.)	200(100.0)	155(77.5)	45(22.5)	00(0.0)
	Money keeping	80(40.0)	50(25.0)	70(35.0)	170(85.0)	30(15.0)	00(0.0)
	Money withdrawal	78(39.0)	40(20.0)	15(7.5)	88(44.0)	40(20.0)	05(2.5)
	Social participation	65(32.5)	07(3.5)	128(64.0)	180(90.0)	05(2.5)	15(7.5)

*Figures in parentheses indicate percentages.

was in name of female members.

Bansal (2004) analyzed that though rural women were actively engaged in agricultural operations but most of the decisions regarding such operations were made by males thereby denying females of their independent share in decision making. Arora (2006) reported that the controlling power was in the hand of male (84.5%) only and females had low controlling power.

In case of animal related resources regarding purchase, majority (84.5%) of men respondents had access as compared to 1.5 per cent women while 14 per cent had joint access. Regarding control over these resources, 96.5 per-cent male respondents had complete control and 3.5 per cent had joint control. Regarding sale

of animals majority of men (83.5%) had access as compared to only 1.0 per cent women though 15.5 per cent respondents had joint access. Control over this resource was 95.00 per cent for men and 5.0 per cent joint. As far as utilization of income from animal husbandry is concerned, majority (81.5%) of men had access as compared to 6.5 per cent women and 12 per cent had joint access. Regarding control of this resource, 88 per cent was in the hands of men as compared to 1.5 per cent women though 10.5 per cent had joint access. Rangnekar (1992) reported that in livestock rearing activity, disposal of milk and milk products and feeding of animals are decided by women. Cherian *et al.* (1999) reported that in animal husbandry related matters decisions

were mainly taken by males only. Sheokand *et al.* (1999) analyzed that in Haryana state the decision taken on sale and purchase of animals showed significant association with districts and that in all the districts most of the decisions were taken by husband alone. Singh and Verma (2002) pointed out that women have no share in taking decision independently with regards to care of animals while joint decision was taken by 50 per cent for buying of animals.

In case of household related resources regarding family income, majority of men (76.5%) had access as compared with 22.5 per cent who had joint access and 1.0 per cent women had direct access. Majority (93.5%) men had control over family income and only 6.5 per cent had joint control. Regarding credit majority (84%) men had access as compared to 5.0 per cent women and 11 per cent had joint access. Regarding control majority of men (99%) had control and only 1.0 per cent had joint control. Regarding savings majority (86%) men had access as compared to 1.5 per cent women and 12.5 per cent had joint access. Control was 96 per cent in hands of men as compared to 1.0 per cent women and 3.0 per cent of respondents had joint control over savings. As regards to repayment of loan, 90 per cent access was of men and only 10 per cent had joint access. Cent per cent of the control was with men. Regarding ownership of the house cent per cent access and control was with men. Kaushik and Tripta (2001) concluded that regarding the use of earned income, 16.6 per cent beneficiaries kept the earned income with them and majority gave it to husband. Puri (2002) reported that male members had direct access over property while majority of women (85%) had direct control on jewellery and some had cash in hand (16%). Sabharwal (2006) concluded that there were apparent differences among male and female regarding resource distribution and males were better off with regards to possession of all most all resources, be it bank deposits (42.0%), house (90.5%), farm power (33.5%), training (3.0%), credit (6.0%) and material possession (33.5%).

With regards to farm income related resources, majority of men (75%) had access to income from crops as compared to 1.0 per cent women and 24 per cent of respondents had joint access. As far as control is concerned 96 per cent was of men alone and only 4.0 per cent had joint control. Regarding income from animals, majority (72%) men had access as compared to 1.5 per cent women and 26.5 per cent had joint access. Control was in hands of 94.5 per cent men and as compared to 1.0 per cent women and 4.50 per cent of respondents had joint control. Similar results were found by Sabharwal

(2006). World Bank (2001) reported that in Asia region inequity exists in access to resources and the reasons may be the traditional perceptions and attitudes that perpetuate gender biases.

In case of extension services and trainings regarding availing extension services even men had poor access (10%) as compared to very poor access by women (1.0%). Ten per cent control was of men. Regarding attending trainings, 42.5 per cent men had access as compared to 6.0 per cent women but the women had no control over attending of trainings though the men had. As regards to meeting extension personnel, both the access and control of this resource was with men (15%). Similarly, access and control regarding extension visits was with men alone (18.5%). Sharma (2002) found that women farmers usually have been neglected in extension efforts and gender inequality had so far not been challenged by the agricultural extension system. Jones and Goldey (2000) concluded that women farmers had significantly less access to extension services than men, particularly with regards to their awareness and participation in extension activities organized by agents largely due to problems of communication, heavy farm and domestic work and gender division of labour. Sharma (2002) found that women farmers usually have been neglected in extension efforts. Grover and Sethi (2005) reported that in case of technology, access to training, information and extension services this was cent per cent for male respondents in comparison to 10 per cent females who had access to training and 2.5 per cent in extension services.

In case of institutions and market, regarding accounts in dairy cooperative societies (DCS) cent per cent men and women had access but the control was 90 per cent in hands of men and only 10 per cent women had control on account in DCS. Regarding bank accounts 39 per cent men as compared to 20 per cent women and 7.5 per cent had joint access. Control was 44 per cent in hands of men as compared to 20 per cent women and 2.5 per cent had joint control. Regarding account in post office, access and control was 1.0 per cent with men and 3.0 per cent with women. Regarding visits to market, cent per cent of the men and women had access but the control was mainly with men (77.5%) and only 22.5 per cent women had control. Regarding money keeping 40 per cent of men and 25 per cent women and 35 per cent had joint access to money keeping but the control was mainly of men (85%) as compared to women (15%). Regarding money withdrawal, 39 per cent of men had access as compared to 20 per cent women and 7.5 per cent of both had access to money withdrawal. Control of money withdrawal was

44 per cent was in hands of men as compared to 20 per cent women and 2.5 per cent had joint control. Regarding social participation majority (64%) of the respondents had joint access as compared to men (32.5%) and women (3.5%) whereas the control was mainly of men (90%) followed by joint control (7.5%) and women alone had little (2.5%) control over social participation. Similar findings were reported by Kumari (1998) who concluded that all the major decisions in the household viz., keeping money (64.18%), buying/selling of land (50.88%), buying farm inputs (65.85%), buying household items (42.23%), decisions of taking loans (70.25%), were being taken by men.

Conclusion:

It can be concluded that in case of land resources, ownership, buying, selling and cultivation, majority of men respondents had access as compared to women whereas the cent per cent control over land resources was of men alone. In case of animal related resources regarding purchase, majority of men respondents had access followed by joint access. As far as utilization of income is concerned majority of men had access as compared to few women and some cases of joint access. In case of household related resources, regarding family income, majority of men alone had access women alone while 22.5 per cent had joint access. With regards to farm income related resources majority men had access to income from crops followed by joint access. As far as control of these resources is concerned, more than 90 per cent control was in hands of men. In case of extension services and trainings regarding availing extension services, few men had access to and control as compared to very few women. Regarding money keeping, 40 per cent of men followed by 35 per cent with joint access and 25 per cent women had access to money keeping but the control was mainly of men (85%) as compared to women (15%). This gender scenario reflects traditional paternistic values.

Authors' affiliations:

INDU GROVER, Department of Home Science Extension Education, C.C.S. Haryana Agricultural University, HISAR (HARYANA) INDIA

REFERENCES

Agarwal, B. (2001). Land rights and gender equality. *Yojana*, **45**: 35-42.

Arora, A. (2006). Intergender access to and control of productive resources among rural families in Faridabad district of Haryana. M.Sc. Thesis, CCSHAU, Hisar.

Bansal, S. (2004). Study of gender analysis of access to land and decision making pattern. M.Sc. Thesis, CCSHAU, Hisar.

Birthal, P. S. and Taneja, V. K. (2006). Livestock sector in India: Opportunities and challenges, presented at the ICAR-ILRI workshop on 'Smallholder livestock production in India' held during January 24-25, 2006 at NCAP, New Delhi.

Chaudhary, A.L. (2005). Dairy scenario in Haryana: Importance of dairy farming. *Dainik Bhasker*. Feb. 20, 2005.

Cherian, A., Dixit, C. and Vats, A. (1999). Decision making pattern and participants of rural women in farming, livestock management and home based activities of Udham Singh Nagar District of U.P. State. *Food Security and Resource Mgt. Gender Issues*, **19**: 225-233.

Grover, Indu and Sethi, N. (2005). Final Report, Networking Mode Project: Approaches to Engendering Agricultural Research and Extension. CCS HAU, Hisar.

Jones, G.E. and Goldey, P. (2000). The gender of the extension agent and farmers access to and participation in agricultural extension in Nigeria. *J. agric. Extn. Edu.*, **6**(4): 223-233.

Kaushik, S. and Tripta. (2001). Women empowerment through financial assistance schemes: Better access but lesser control. *J. Family Ecology*, **5**(2): 36-38.

Kumari, P. (1998). Women's role in economic decision making. *Maharashtra. J. Extn. Edu.*, **17**(3-4): 217-220.

Nath, M. (1992). Women's issue-From periphery to the center. *J. Rural Dev.*, **11**(5):34-39.

Niamir, M. (1990). Herder's decision-making in natural resource management in arid and semi-arid Africa. Community Forestry Note 4, FAO, Rome.

Puri, S. (2002). Analysis of gender perception and difference in Haryana. M.Sc. Thesis, CCSHAU, Hisar.

Quist, E. (1995). Sweedish housing policy and some statistics on women's registered ownership of real property. International workshop on women's access, control and tenure of land, property and settlement in Galve, Sweden.

Ramkumar, S. and Rao, S.V.N. and Waldie, K. (2004). Dairy cattle rearing by landless rural women in Pondicherry: A Path to Empowerment. *Indian J. Gender Studies*, **11**(2): 205-222.

Rangnekar, S.D. (1992). Women in livestock production in rural India. Proceedings of 6th AAAP Animal Science Congress held at Bangkok, Thailand pp. 271-285.

Sabharwal, K. (2006). Intergender participation and health problems in paddy cultivation. Ph.D. Thesis, CCSHAU, Hisar.

Sethi, R.M. (1991). *Women in Agriculture*. Rawal Publishers, Jaipur. pp512-530.

Sharma, S. (2002). Development and effectiveness of media on women operated farm machinery for cotton cultivation. M.Sc. Thesis, CCSHAU, Hisar.

Sheokand, R.S., Sheoran, O.P. and Pannu, R.S. 1999. Farm women and animal husbandry practices in paddy belt of Haryana. *J. Dairying, Foods & Home Sci.*, **18**(2): 85-91.

Singh, K. and Verma, T. (2002). Involvement of farm women in decision making in two blocks of north Bihar. *J. Family Ecol.*, **4** (1-2): 146-148.

World Bank. (2001). World Development Report 2000-01: Attacking Poverty. <http://worldbank.org>.

