



DECISION MAKING PATTERN OF MALE AND FEMALE FARMERS IN HORTICULTURAL FARMING

¹Bharath Kumar T.P., ²Govinda Gowda V., & ³Nita Khandekar

¹ Assistant Professor, Dept. of Agricultural Extension, College of Agriculture, Hassan, UAS-B

² Assistant Professor, Dept. of Agricultural Extension, College of Agriculture, University of Agricultural Sciences, GKVK, Bangalore, India

³ Senior Scientist, Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Hessaraghatta, Bangalore India

ABSTRACT

The research was carried out in Kolar district of Karnataka state, which is located in the eastern dry zone of the state. Kolar district occupies a prominent place in the horticulture map of Karnataka and plays a vital role in the economy of the district. The diverse agro-climatic features favour the district to grow a wide variety of tropical and subtropical plantation and horticulture crops. Majority of the respondents (70.00%) had a medium level of participation in decision making followed by 17.50 per cent and 12.50 per cent having a low and high level of participation in decision making.

Keywords

INTRODUCTION

India has borne and nurtured great women like Rani Lakshmi Bai, Sarojini Naidu, Indira Gandhi and many other dignitaries in her womb. She has on the other hand suffered and endured the pain and humiliation of heinous practices like sati, purdah, female infanticide and other social stigma which have been a challenge to the very existence of women in India. Women in India, today stand poised between a collapsing past and an uncertain future seeing the quantitative and qualitative changes, Quantitative, in terms of economic growth and technological changes; and qualitative, in terms of a new paradigm of a society governed by an all together different set of values and ethos.

“Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru said “to awake people it is the women who must be awakened. Once she is on the move, the family moves, the village moves and the nation moves”.

Women are involved where physical labour is more, men participate in agriculture activities with lesser physical labour, but, they are involved in all important aspects related to agriculture decision making, finance and marketing. Women get limited opportunities in modern occupations as they do not have access to the training required for new technologies. It has often been said that a women is physically fragile and unfit to do strenuous jobs involving hard labour. But, it is not the physical incapacity, which has kept her in background; it is illiteracy, social restriction, her low self esteem and lack of facilities for technical training. In India, women’s contribution to the farm sector is largely ignored and inadequately understood. Very few scientific

and empirical attempts have been made to examine the actual participation of women in decision making and other supportive activities at farm level, especially so in horticulture. Thus, in order to have a better understanding of women’s role in horticulture, which is an important means of improving the economic condition of the family, it is important to know the participation of women in various decision making activities of horticulture enterprise. Therefore, the study was formulated with the objective of examining the decision making pattern of both men and women in horticulture farming.

METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in Kolar district of Karnataka state, which is located in the eastern dry zone of the state. Kolar district occupies a prominent place in the horticulture map of Karnataka and plays a vital role in the economy of the district. Kolar district consist of five taluks viz., Bangarpet, Kolar, Malur, Mulbagal and Srinivasapura. Out of which two taluks Malur and Srinivasapura were purposively selected for the study which are predominantly horticulture areas and for the convenience in commuting. Two villages were selected randomly from each of the selected taluks of Kolar district. Thus, a total of 4 villages were selected for the study. Initially, an exhaustive list of horticultural farmers was prepared from the selected villages, where horticulture farming is being practiced. Then from each village 15 horticulture farmers were selected on the basis of random sampling. Data were collected from both the head and his spouse. Thus, the final sample

Decision Making Pattern of Male And Female Farmers In Horticultural Farming

comprised of 4 villages and 120 respondents. Structured interview schedule was used to elicit the required information from the respondents. The data collection was done by personal interview with the farmers.

Decision making refers to extent of participation of respondents in decision making in horticulture activities. Decision making was measured using the scale developed by Puri (1972). The respondents were given scores of 4, 3, 2, 1, and 0 for wife alone, husband and wife jointly, all family members collectively, husband alone and no decision, respectively. The frequency of responses in each activity was calculated to enumerate the decision making pattern.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

It is evident from **Table 1** that majority of the respondents (60.83%) had a medium level of participation in decision making followed by 21.67 per cent and 17.50 per cent having a low and high level of participation in decision making.

The **Table 2** revealed that Decision in the activities like land preparation, removal of crop residues, ploughing and stubble collection were fully taken by husband (100.00%) alone. Since, most of these activities are carried out by the male members alone; therefore, the decisions are taken by male members only. In case of sowing of seeds for rootstocks, grafting, budding, lifting of plants, basin preparation, preparation of pesticide-insecticide, maintenance, insect-pest control by traditional methods, training of plants, pruning, collection of prune wood, transportation to shed and pre-harvest treatments are activities where no decisions were taken (0.00%). The reasons for this could be that these are considered as routine activities wherein the respondents were not taking any conscious decisions. And in activities like manure application (33.34%), fertilizer application (36.66%), running of water pump (35.84%), irrigation (34.17%), pesticide application (29.16%) and sorting (55.83%) decision were taken by husband and wife jointly and in remaining activities decisions were taken collectively with family members. The husband had given equal importance to the wife in taking decision in these areas and women have shown their active involvement. The findings clearly shows that the involvement in activities also influences the decision making to a large extent. Interestingly wife alone was not taking any decisions on horticultural activities. Seemingly, the activities where, there is a role of women too her opinion is also sought in decision making. Women's involvement in taking decision alone was not reported in this study in any of the horticultural related activities. The

reason for the poor representation of women in decision making might be due to the lack of knowledge about the latest farming practices.

CONCLUSION

The role of women is negligible with reference to decision making. Her contribution in the work may be more but majority of the decisions are taken by men alone. Moreover, she has no say in the financial aspects of the household though she is supposed to carry out the entire household as well as farm related work. . The findings of the study would help the concerned extension agency to approach the right clientele to get better results by communicating the right technology to the right person. The extension workers, development agencies and the other social workers should develop policies which will concentrate on the capacity building of the women or overall personality development of women. By giving training useful information as to educate towards development of women. Planners and executors of the developmental departments should plan a programme in a scientific line to see the successful women's in near future. The extension workers should impart such knowledge for women to actively participate in decision making which will increase the economy of the family which inturn increases the national economy.

REFERENCE

- [1] GANGWAR, M., 1998, Dairy co-operative and empowerment of rural women. *M.Sc.(Agri.) Thesis* (Unpublished), Indian Vet. Res. Inst., Izathnagar.
- [2] KAPUR, K., 1988, Women – The co-partner in agriculture production. *Maharashtra J. Extn. Educ.*, **8**: 178-185.
- [3] NAGABHUSHANAM, K., SRIDHAR, H. P. AND NAIKA, K. V., 1993, Participation of rural women in agriculture in Kundapur taluk of coastal Karnataka. *Indian J. Adult Edu.*, **54** (4): 41-48.
- [4] PURI, S, 1972, Work roles and decision making pattern of farm wives and husbands. *Ph.D Thesis* (Unpublished). Indian Instt. Agric. Res., New Delhi.
- [5] RAVI. R. K., 2004, Knowledge, adoption and participation of farm women in jasmine production: A study in Tumkur district, Karnataka. *M.Sc.(Agri.) Thesis* (Unpublished), Univ. Agric. Sci., Dharwad.

Table 1: Distribution of respondents according to level of time utilization and decision making in horticultural activities.

Decision making	Low <25.92	0 (00.00)	26 (43.33)	26 (21.67)
	Medium 25.92-54.43	40 (66.67)	33 (55.00)	73 (60.83)
	High >54.43	20 (33.33)	1 (1.67)	21 (17.50)
	Total	60 (100)	60 (100)	120 (100.00)

Table 2: Involvement of male and female horticultural farmers in decision making

Sl. No	Activities	Husband No.	Wife No.	Jointly Husband & wife No.	Together with family members No.	No decision No.
1.	Land preparation	120 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
2.	Removal of crop residues	120 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
3.	Ploughing	120 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
4.	Stubble collection	120 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
5.	Clod breaking	78 (65.00)	0 (0.00)	26 (21.67)	16 (13.33)	0 (0.00)
6.	Leveling	74 (61.67)	0 (0.00)	30 (25.00)	16 (13.33)	0 (0.00)
7.	Use of tractor drawn implements	62 (51.67)	0 (0.00)	40 (33.33)	18 (15.00)	0 (0.00)
8.	Use of bullock drawn implements	83 (69.17)	0 (0.00)	21 (17.50)	16 (13.33)	0 (0.00)
9.	Use of tractor/power tiller	80 (66.67)	0 (0.00)	27 (22.50)	13 (10.83)	0 (0.00)
10.	Manure application	80 (66.67)	0 (0.00)	40 (33.34)	0 (00.00)	0 (0.00)
11.	Layout	62 (51.67)	0 (0.00)	31 (25.83)	27 (22.50)	0 (0.00)

Figure in parenthesis indicate percentage

Decision Making Pattern of Male And Female Farmers In Horticultural Farming

Sl. No	Activities	Husband No.	Wife No.	Jointly Husband & wife No.	Together with family members No.	No decision No.
12.	Pit preparation	65 (54.17)	0 (0.00)	29 (24.17)	26 (21.67)	0 (0.00)
13.	Fertilizer application	76 (63.33)	0 (0.00)	44 (36.66)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
14.	Filling of pits	82 (68.33)	0 (0.00)	22 (18.33)	16 (13.33)	0 (0.00)
15.	Sowing of seeds for rootstocks	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	120 (100.00)
16.	Rootstocks maintenance	67 (55.83)	0 (0.00)	27 (22.50)	26 (21.67)	0 (0.00)
17.	Grafting	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	120 (100.00)
18.	Budding	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	120 (100.00)
19.	Lifting of plants	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	120 (100.00)
20.	Selection of crops	58 (48.33)	0 (0.00)	33 (27.50)	29 (24.17)	0 (0.00)
21.	Procurement of plants	82 (68.33)	0 (0.00)	25 (20.83)	13 (10.83)	0 (0.00)
22.	Transportation to field	83 (69.17)	0 (0.00)	21 (17.50)	16 (13.33)	0 (0.00)
23.	Planting	57 (47.50)	0 (0.00)	35 (29.17)	28 (23.33)	0 (0.00)
24.	Pit preparation	65 (54.17)	0 (0.00)	29 (24.17)	26 (21.67)	0 (0.00)
25.	Fertilizer application	76 (63.33)	0 (0.00)	44 (36.66)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
26.	Filling of pits	82 (68.33)	0 (0.00)	22 (18.33)	16 (13.33)	0 (0.00)
27.	Sowing of seeds for rootstocks	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	120 (100.00)
28.	Rootstocks maintenance	67 (55.83)	0 (0.00)	27 (22.50)	26 (21.67)	0 (0.00)
29.	Grafting	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	120 (100.00)
30.	Budding	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	120 (100.00)

31.	Lifting of plants	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	120 (100.00)
32.	Selection of crops	58 (48.33)	0 (0.00)	33 (27.50)	29 (24.17)	0 (0.00)
33.	Procurement of plants	82 (68.33)	0 (0.00)	25 (20.83)	13 (10.83)	0 (0.00)
34.	Transportation to field	83 (69.17)	0 (0.00)	21 (17.50)	16 (13.33)	0 (0.00)
35.	Planting	57 (47.50)	0 (0.00)	35 (29.17)	28 (23.33)	0 (0.00)
36.	Pruning of plants	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	120 (100.00)
37.	Collection of prune wood	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	120 (100.00)
38.	Cultivation of intercrops	63 (52.50)	0 (0.00)	34 (28.33)	23 (19.17)	0 (0.00)
39.	Mulching	52 (43.33)	0 (0.00)	37 (30.83)	31 (25.83)	0 (0.00)
40.	Harvesting	59 (49.17)	0 (0.00)	33 (27.50)	28 (23.33)	0 (0.00)
41.	Sorting	53 (44.17)	0 (0.00)	67 (55.83)	0 (0.00))	0 (0.00)
42.	Transportation to shed	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	120 (100.00)
43.	Pre-harvest treatments	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	120 (100.00)
44.	Marketing of fresh produces	55 (45.83)	0 (0.00)	35 (29.17)	30 (25.00)	0 (0.00)

Figure in parenthesis indicate percentage