

RESEARCH PAPER

Decision making pattern of farm women in relation to selected different agriculture activities

R.H. GONDALIYA* AND J.K. PATEL

Department of Extension Education, B. A. College of Agriculture, Anand Agricultural University, ANAND (GUJARAT) INDIA

ABSTRACT

Decision making pattern refers to take decision regarding agriculture activities either solely or with husband or with family members or no decision at all. In case of all of major agriculture activities such as sowing practices, nutrient management, crop protection and harvesting and post harvest activities majority of the farm women had taken joint decision with family members or with husband. While, independent female decisions were negligible. Certain area such as crop protections and policy decision, where farm women had denied to take any independent decision in all aspects of these activities.

Key Words : Decision making pattern, Farm women, Agriculture activities

View point paper : Gondaliya, R.H. and Patel, J.K. (2012). Decision making pattern of farm women in relation to selected different agriculture activities. *Asian Sci.*, 7(1): 78-81.

Some historians believe that it was woman who first domesticated crop plants and thereby initiated the art and science of farming. Women contribute nearly equally along with men, in the economic development of our country and hence, the prosperity and growth of a nation depends on the status and development of women. Women are involved in pre-sowing, post-sowing, harvesting and post-harvesting operations as well as allied activities through physical contribution. There is negligible role of farm women in decision making in various activities either home or farm even though their significant contributions. They usually deny taking decision or participating in decision making process. Decision making refers to mode of decisions taken by farm women regarding various aspects of agriculture activities either solely or jointly with husband or with family members. So to know women contribution and pattern to take decision about agriculture activities present study was conducted with following objective:

– To study the decision making pattern of farm women in relation to selected different agriculture activities.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study was undertaken in Anand district of Gujarat. Anand, Borsad and Petlad talukas which have maximum numbers of small and marginal farmers were selected purposively. Accordingly, five villages from each talukas i.e. a total fifteen villages were selected purposively. List of farm women living in these villages which are working on their farm were obtained from VLW's of concerned village. Randomly eight farm women were selected for study, in all, 120 farm women were selected to serve as the respondents for the study. Keeping in view the objectives of the study, well structured pre tested Gujarati version interview schedule was developed. The data were collected by personally interviewing the respondent farm women in an informal atmosphere either at home or farm.

* Author for correspondence

J.K. Patel, Department of Extension Education, B.A. College of Agriculture, Anand Agricultural University, ANAND (GUJARAT) INDIA

RESEARCH AND REMONSTRATION FINDINGS

Date presented in Table 1, clearly indicate that a great majority (98.33 %) of the farm women had no decision regarding dose of bio-fertilizers for seed treatment, followed by majority (65.83 %) of the farm women had decision with family members about selection of crops for sowing. Slightly more than one-fifth (20.83 %) of the farm women had decision with husband related to sowing time and had self decision regarding transplanting time.

This clearly indicates that great majority of the farm women had not taken decision about dose of bio-fertilizers for seed treatment, selection of bio-fertilizer for seed treatment and selection of varieties and majority farm women had taken joint family decision about selection of crops and area of different crops to be sown. The poor technical know-how among the farm women about bio-fertilizers and varieties of different crops might be the cause of no decision making in those items and due to their active involvement in animal husbandry practices they might be consulted to their family member about area and selection of fodder crops to be grown for cattle feed.

Data in Table 2 revealed that a great majority (97.50 %) of the farm women had no decision related to dose of micro

nutrient, followed by nearly half (47.50 %) of the farm women had decision with family members about time of application of FYM. While, 38.33 and 05.00 per cent farm women had decision with husband about time for application of FYM and self decision regarding selection of FYM, respectively.

Concluding the findings it can be stated that vast majority of farm women had not participated in decision making process regarding dose of micro nutrient and chemical fertilizers as well as selection of chemical fertilizers and preparation of FYM on farm where as sizeable number of farm women had participated in decision making process with their family members with respect to time for application of FYM, time of application of chemical fertilizer, preparation of FYM on farm and selection of micro nutrient. Self decision by the farm women was almost negligible in all the items related to nutrient management. Comprehensive knowledge about nutrient management is complex in general and it is beyond their ability to understand such complex technologies resulted in to limited alternative option with them which is reflected in their poor participation in decision making process might be the possible explanation of this result.

Table 3 indicate that cent percent of farm women had no self decision about various crop protection practices. In case of dose of fungicide for disease control a great majority (97.50 %) of the farm women had no decision about it; followed by

Sr. No.	Items	Decision making pattern				Total
		Self decision	With husband	With family members	No decision	
1.	Sowing time	13 (10.84%)	25 (20.83%)	57 (47.50%)	25 (20.83%)	120 (100.00%)
2.	Selection of crops	1 (0.84%)	7 (5.83%)	79 (65.83%)	33 (27.50%)	120 (100.00%)
3.	Selection of varieties	0 (0.00%)	14 (11.67%)	16 (13.33%)	90 (75.00%)	120 (100.00%)
4.	Area under different crops to be sown	0 (0.00%)	8 (6.67%)	72 (60.00%)	40 (33.33%)	120 (100.00%)
5.	Selection of bio-fertilizer for seed treatment	0 (0.00%)	7 (5.83%)	10 (8.34%)	103 (85.83%)	120 (100.00%)
6.	Dose of bio-fertilizers for seed treatment	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	2 (1.67%)	118 (98.33%)	120 (100.00%)
7.	Transplanting time	25 (20.83%)	11 (9.17%)	53 (44.17%)	31 (25.83%)	120 (100.00%)

Sr. No.	Items	Decision making pattern				Total
		Self decision	With husband	With family members	No decision	
1.	Selection of FYM	6 (05.00%)	26 (21.67%)	38 (31.67%)	50 (41.66%)	120 (100.00%)
2.	Preparation of FYM on farm	2 (01.67%)	5 (4.17%)	42 (35.00%)	71 (59.16%)	120 (100.00%)
3.	Time of application of FYM	0 (0.00%)	46 (38.33%)	57 (47.50%)	17 (14.17%)	120 (100.00%)
4.	Selection of chemical fertilizers	1 (0.83%)	10 (8.33%)	11 (9.17%)	98 (81.67%)	120 (100.00%)
5.	Dose of chemical fertilizer	0 (0.00%)	5 (04.17%)	8 (6.66%)	107 (89.17%)	120 (100.00%)
6.	Time of chemical fertilizer application	1 (0.83%)	39 (32.50%)	54 (45.00%)	26 (21.67%)	120 (100.00%)
7.	Selection of micro nutrient	1 (0.83%)	36 (30.00%)	40 (33.33%)	43 (35.84%)	120 (100.00%)
8.	Dose of micro nutrient	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (2.50%)	117 (97.50%)	120 (100.00%)

Table 3: Decision making pattern of the farm women about crop protection (n=120)

Sr. No.	Items	Decision making pattern				Total
		Self decision	With husband	With family members	No decision	
1.	Selection of fungicide for seed treatment	0 (0.00%)	10 (8.33%)	44 (36.67%)	66 (55.00%)	120 (100.00%)
2.	Dose of fungicide for seed treatment	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.83%)	3 (2.50%)	116 (96.67%)	120 (100.00%)
3.	Selection of pesticide for pest control	0 (0.00%)	6 (5.00%)	26 (21.67%)	88 (73.33%)	120 (100.00%)
4.	Dose of pesticide	0 (0.00%)	4 (3.33%)	9 (7.50%)	107 (89.17%)	120 (100.00%)
5.	Time for application of pesticide	0 (0.00%)	49 (40.83%)	57 (47.50%)	14 (11.67%)	120 (100.00%)
6.	Selection of fungicide for disease control	0 (0.00%)	2 (1.67%)	10 (8.33%)	108 (90.00%)	120 (100.00%)
7.	Dose of fungicide for disease control	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	3 (2.50%)	117 (97.50%)	120 (100.00%)
8.	Time for application of fungicide	0 (0.00%)	43 (35.84%)	58 (48.33%)	19 (15.83%)	120 (100.00%)

Table 4: Decision making pattern of the farm women about harvesting and post harvest activities (n=120)

Sr. No.	Items	Decision making pattern				Total
		Self decision	With husband	With family members	No decision	
1.	Harvesting	24 (20.00%)	52 (43.33%)	41 (34.17%)	3 (2.50%)	120 (100.00%)
2.	Collection of harvested crop	12 (10.00%)	21 (17.50%)	80 (66.67%)	7 (5.83%)	120 (100.00%)
3.	Threshing	1 (0.83%)	32 (26.67%)	40 (33.33%)	47 (39.17%)	120 (100.00%)
4.	Winnowing	64 (53.33%)	5 (4.17%)	46 (38.33%)	5 (4.17%)	120 (100.00%)
5.	Storage for seed purpose	10 (8.33%)	29 (24.17%)	50 (41.67%)	31 (25.83%)	120 (100.00%)
6.	Grading of product	6 (5.00%)	26 (21.67%)	49 (40.83%)	39 (32.50%)	120 (100.00%)

48.33 and 40.83 per cent farm women had decision with family members and with husband regarding time for application of fungicide and time for application of pesticide, respectively.

From the foregoing discussion it can be concluded that no self decision about plant protections had been taken by any farm women in all the item included in study and vast majority of the farm women had taken decision neither solely nor jointly in majority of the item related to plant protection measures. Selection and procurement of pesticides is male domain and predominantly male affair might be the possible cause of this results.

It is clear from the Table 4 that majority (66.67 %) of the farm women had decision with family members about collection of harvested crop, followed by more than half (53.33 %) of the farm women had self decision about winnowing. While, 43.33 and 39.17 per cent farm women had decision with husband regarding harvesting and no decision about threshing, respectively.

Above discussion leads to conclude that great majority farm women had participated jointly in decision making either with their husband or family members regarding, collection of harvested crop, harvesting and storage for seed purpose. Probable reason behind this result might be that majority farm women having marginal and small land holding which compel them to engage in this type of activities which ultimately increase their active participation in decision making process in consultation with their husband or other family members.

Similar investigatiuon was also carriedout by Bhaumik *et al.*, (1996) regarding participation of rural women in decision makings.

Conclusion:

From on going discussion it can said that even though women have major contribution in successfully carried out major on farm or off farm women activities, farm women were denied to take participation in decision making process which ultimately reflected in the poor participation in decision making process and negligible independent female decision. Here, areas such as crop protection and policy decision where women had denied to take any independent decision in all items of them. However, in majority practices majority farm women had taken decision either with family members or with husband.

REFERENCES

Bellurkar, C.M., Wakle, P.M. and Gholve, M.A. (2003). A study on decision making pattern and participation of rural women in animal husbandry and dairying enterprise. *Maharashtra J. Extn. Edu.*, **22**(2):81-85.

Bhaumik, U., Sen, M. and Chatterjee, J. G. (1996). Participation of rural women of in decision making. *Indian J. Extn. Edu.*, **32**(1&4): 24-29.

Cherian, A., Vats and Aditi (2001). Decision making pattern of rural women regarding farm, animal husbandry, home and family related decision of hill, bhabur and Tarai zone of U.P. State. *Rural India*, (November-December).
: **Wakle, P.K., Bellurakar, C.M. and Gholve, M.A.** (2003). A study on decision making pattern and participation of rural women in animal husbandry and dairying enterprise. *Maharashtra J. Extn. Edu.*, **22**(2):81-85.

Received : 18.04.2012; Revised : 01.05.2012; Accepted : 15.05.2012