



ISSN: 2395-7476
IJHS 2016; 2(2): 359-362
© 2016 IJHS
www.homesciencejournal.com
Received: 26-03-2016
Accepted: 27-04-2016

Anshu
PG Student (EECM),
Department of Extension
Education and Communication
Management
CCS Haryana Agricultural
University, Hisar-125004,
Haryana, India.

Dr. Varma SK
Professor (EECM)
Department of Extension
Education and Communication
Management
CCS Haryana Agricultural
University, Hisar-125004,
Haryana, India.

Correspondence
Anshu
PG Student (EECM),
Department of Extension
Education and Communication
Management
CCS Haryana Agricultural
University, Hisar-125004,
Haryana, India.

Decision making pattern in household

Anshu and Dr. Varma SK

Abstract

The study was conducted in Kurukshetra district of Haryana state with the objective of analysing the decision making pattern in the household. Two blocks from Kurukshetra district were randomly selected i.e. Thanesar and Ladwa block. Two villages from each block were selected randomly. From Kurukshetra district 30 households from each village were selected randomly, thus making a total sample of 120 households from different socio-economic categories. The study revealed that on average men take decision related to farm and money. Decision related to home management and religious rituals were taken by both men and women.

Keywords: Women, man, involvement, decision

1. Introduction

Women also have always emerged as the pillars of the rural economy due to their total involvement with agriculture, forest protection, cattle care and dairying. The male members of the family usually migrate to towns to earn a living for their families. Thus, women in villages become the heads of the family. Even where the men continue to reside in the villages, it is the women and girls who look after the agriculture and cattle.

Despite their importance to agricultural production, women face severe handicaps. They are in fact, the largest group of landless labourers with little real security in case of the break-up of the family owing to death or divorce; inheritance laws and customs discriminate against them, land reform and settlement programmes usually give sole title and hence the security needed for obtaining production credits to the husband.

Women play an important role in animal husbandry activities as manager, decision makers and skilled workers. The real issue therefore, is more serious despite their involvement in agriculture work and in household work in such a long magnitude that they have not been actively involved in the mainstream of development and there is hardly any appreciation and recognition of their extensive contribution. By and large, they have remained as invisible workers. The prosperity and growth of a nation depend on the status and development of its women.

2. Methodology

The study was conducted in Kurukshetra district of Haryana state with the objective of analysing the decision making pattern in the household. From Kurukshetra district 30 households from each village were selected randomly, thus making a total sample of 120 households from different socio-economic categories. A well-structured interview schedule was constructed for data collection. Data were collected personally by the researcher by paying repeated visits to the area.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Socio-economic profile of respondents

More than half of the respondent (60.8%) were of middle age group, illiterate (66.7%), belonged to lower caste (40.8%), having low family education status (76.7%) and with negligible social participation. Most of the respondents (72.5%) had joint family, medium family size (40.0%), owned a mixed type house (66.7%), cultivator (41.7%) as their main occupation. Less than half of the respondents (40.0%) were landless, having 1-2 milch animals (36.7%) with medium material possession (68.3%).

3.2 Decision making pattern of farm families

For the purpose of studying the decision- making pattern in farm families in four distinct areas of decision related to farm, home, socio-religious and financial activities were identified. Information from each of the respondents’ family in the specific item was taken either by the husband, wife or jointly which has been presented in ensuing Tables 1- 4

It is clear from Table 1 that decisions related to farm activities viz., varieties to be grown, the number of channels in the

fields, installation of tube wells and pumps were taken cent percent by husband only. Whereas, decision related to land use pattern, seed selection, fertilizer application, irrigation, plant protection measures, sale and purchase of land were predominantly taken by husband only in high socio- economic status, whereas in case of medium and low socio-economic status, all the decisions related to farm were taken by husband (100.0%) only. It is further clear from Table 1 that in the majority of the cases

Table 1: Farm related decision- making pattern in farm families

S. No.	Decisions related to farm	Socio-Economic Status											
		High (n=30)			Medium (n=38)			Low (n=52)			Total (n=120)		
		Husband	Wife	Joint	Husband	Wife	Joint	Husband	Wife	Joint	Husband	Wife	Joint
1.	Land use pattern	27 (90.0)	-	3 (10.0)	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	117 (97.5)	-	3 (2.5)
2.	Verities to be grown	30 (100.0)	-	-	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	120 (100.0)	-	-
3.	Seed selection	28 (93.3)	-	2 (6.7)	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	118 (98.3)	-	2 (1.7)
4.	Fertilizers application	28 (93.3)	-	2 (6.7)	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	118 (98.3)	-	2 (1.7)
5.	Irrigation	29 (96.7)	-	1 (3.3)	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	119 (99.2)	-	1 (0.8)
6.	Number of channels in fields	30 (100.0)	-	-	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	120 (100.0)	-	-
7.	Installation of tube wells or pump	30 (100.0)	-	-	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	120 (100.0)	-	-
8.	Plant protection measure	27 (90.0)	-	3 (10.0)	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	117 (97.5)	-	3 (2.5)
9.	Sale and purchase of land	27 (90.0)	-	3 (10.0)	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	117 (97.5)	-	3 (2.5)
	Overall involvement	28 (93.4)	-	2 (6.6)	38 (100)	-	-	52 (100)	-	-	118 (98.3)	-	2 (1.7)

Table 2: Home management related decision making pattern in farm families

S. No	Decisions related to home management	Socio-Economic Status											
		High (n=30)			Medium (n=38)			Low (n=52)			Total (n=120)		
		Husband	Wife	Joint	Husband	Wife	Joint	Husband	Wife	Joint	Husband	Wife	Joint
1.	Construction of a new house	8 (26.7)	-	22 (73.3)	15 (39.5)	1 (2.7)	22 (57.8)	17 (32.7)	-	35 (67.3)	40 (33.3)	1 (0.8)	79 (65.9)
2.	Construction of moveable parts like racks, chakki, chullah, hara	-	8 (26.7)	22 (73.3)	9 (23.7)	5 (13.1)	24 (63.2)	5 (9.6)	3 (5.7)	44 (84.7)	14 (11.7)	16 (13.3)	90 (75.0)
3.	Getting the house white washed	-	-	30 (100.0)	9 (23.7)	5 (13.1)	24 (63.2)	5 (9.6)	3 (5.7)	44 (84.7)	14 (11.7)	8 (6.7)	98 (81.6)
4.	Decorating the house	5 (16.7)	12 (40.0)	13 (43.3)	7 (18.4)	13 (34.2)	18 (47.4)	13 (25.0)	22 (42.3)	17 (32.7)	25 (20.8)	47 (39.2)	48 (40.0)
5.	Preparing fancy articles like dolls, baskets, Embroidery etc.	-	30 (100.0)	-	-	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	120 (100.0)	-
	Overall involvement	3 (10.0)	10 (33.3)	17 (56.7)	8 (21.1)	12 (31.6)	18 (47.3)	8 (15.4)	16 (30.8)	28 (53.8)	19 (15.8)	38 (31.7)	63 (52.5)

Table 3: Religious rituals related decision-making pattern in farm families

S. No.	Decisions related to religious rituals	Socio-Economic Status											
		High (n=30)			Medium (n=38)			Low (n=52)			Total (n=120)		
		Husband	Wife	Joint	Husband	Wife	Joint	Husband	Wife	Joint	Husband	Wife	Joint
1.	When to call and send back daughters to Their in- laws place	-	-	30 (100.0)	-	-	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	120 (100.0)
2.	Attending marriage, birth and death ceremonies	-	-	30 (100.0)	-	-	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	120 (100.0)
3.	Going to school gathering	-	-	30 (100.0)	-	-	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	120 (100.0)
4.	Going to mahila mandal	5 (16.7)	16 (53.3)	9 (30.0)	11 (28.9)	9 (23.7)	18 (47.4)	18 (34.6)	12 (23.1)	22 (42.3)	34 (28.3)	37 (30.8)	49 (40.9)
5.	Kind and amount of charity to be given	5 (16.7)	-	25 (83.3)	21 (55.3)	-	17 (44.7)	23 (44.2)	-	29 (55.8)	49 (40.8)	-	71 (59.2)
6.	When and whom to worship	5 (16.7)	-	25 (83.3)	-	-	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	5 (4.2)	-	115 (95.8)
	Overall involvement	3 (10.0)	2 (6.7)	25 (83.3)	5 (13.2)	2 (5.3)	31 (81.5)	7 (13.5)	2 (3.8)	43 (82.7)	15 (12.5)	6 (5.0)	99 (82.5)

Table 4: Finance related decision-making pattern in farm families

S. No.	Decisions	Socio-Economic Status											
		High (n=30)			Medium (n=38)			Low (n=52)			Total (n=120)		
		Husband	Wife	Joint	Husband	Wife	Joint	Husband	Wife	Joint	Husband	Wife	Joint
1.	How much money should spend on different items?	15 (50.0)	2 (6.7)	13 (43.3)	18 (47.4)	12 (31.6)	8 (21.0)	19 (36.6)	6 (11.5)	27 (51.9)	52 (43.3)	20 (16.7)	48 (40.0)
2.	Buying and selling of different articles	8 (26.6)	5 (16.7)	17 (56.7)	11 (28.9)	9 (23.7)	18 (47.4)	7 (13.5)	4 (7.7)	41 (78.8)	26 (21.7)	18 (15.0)	76 (63.3)
3.	Buying farm inputs	30 (100.0)	-	-	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	120 (100.0)	-	-
4.	Buying farm machinery	30 (100.0)	-	-	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	120 (100.0)	-	-
5.	Buying daily necessities like clothes etc	5 (16.7)	8 (26.6)	17 (56.7)	9 (23.7)	15 (39.5)	14 (36.8)	16 (30.8)	9 (17.3)	27 (51.9)	30 (25.0)	32 (26.7)	58 (48.3)
6.	Buying costly items like fan, cooler, TV etc	2 (6.7)	7 (23.3)	21 (70.0)	1 (2.6)	19 (50.0)	18 (47.4)	9 (17.3)	1 (1.9)	42 (80.8)	12 (10.0)	27 (22.5)	81 (67.5)
7.	Selling of farm produce	30 (100.0)	-	-	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	120 (100.0)	-	-
8.	Selling of home produce	8 (26.7)	12 (40.0)	10 (33.3)	4 (10.5)	19 (50.0)	15 (39.5)	9 (17.3)	20 (38.5)	23 (44.2)	21 (17.5)	51 (42.5)	48 (40.0)
9.	Taking and giving loans	27 (90.0)	-	3 (10.0)	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	117 (97.5)	-	3 (2.5)
10.	Deciding manner of savings	27 (90.0)	-	3 (10.0)	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	117 (97.5)	-	3 (2.5)
11.	Insurance of family members	26 (86.7)	-	4 (13.3)	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	116 (96.7)	-	4 (3.3)
12.	Insurance of crops	30 (100.0)	-	-	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	120 (100.0)	-	-
13.	Insurance of animals	9 (30.0)	4 (13.3)	17 (56.7)	9 (23.7)	7 (18.4)	22 (57.9)	10 (19.2)	-	42 (80.8)	28 (23.3)	11 (9.2)	81 (67.5)
14.	Buying and selling of animals	10 (33.3)	3 (10.0)	17 (56.7)	10 (26.3)	7 (18.4)	21 (55.3)	10 (19.2)	-	42 (80.8)	30 (25.0)	10 (8.3)	80 (66.7)
15.	Selling of extra lands	30 (100.0)	-	-	38 (100.0)	-	-	52 (100.0)	-	-	120 (100.0)	-	-
	Overall involvement	19 (63.3)	3 (10.0)	8 (26.7)	24 (63.1)	6 (15.8)	8 (21.1)	33 (63.5)	3 (5.8)	16 (30.7)	76 (63.3)	12 (10.0)	32 (26.7)

decisions related to farm i.e. land use pattern, varieties to be grown and seed related decision etc. were taken by husbands only (98.3%) and only 1.7 percent of decisions were taken jointly by both husband and wife in case of the total sample.

It is clear from Table 2 that decision related to home management viz., preparing fancy articles like dolls, baskets, embroidery etc. were taken by wife only (100.0%) irrespective of socio-economic status. In case of getting the house white washed and construction of moveable parts like racks, *chakki*, *chullah* and *hara*, construction of a new house and decorating the house, it varies between 40-81.6 per cent was taken jointly by both husband and wife irrespective of socio-economic status. Table 2 further reveals that the overall involvement of respondents in decisions related to home were taken jointly by both husband and wife (52.5%) followed by a decision taken by the wife (31.7%) only.

It is clear from Table 3 that decisions related religious to rituals viz., when to call and send back daughters to their in-laws place, attending marriage, birth and death ceremonies and going to school gathering were taken jointly by husband and wife (100.0%) irrespective of socio-economic status. The majority of decisions related to the kind and amount of charity to be given when and whom to worship (83.3%) and going to Mahila Mandal (30.0%) was taken jointly by both husband and wife in high socio-economic status and a similar trend was observed in case of medium and low socio-economic status respondents. It is clear from Table 3 that the majority (82.5%) of decision related to religious ritual were taken jointly.

Table 4 further reveals that decisions related to finance viz., buying farm inputs, buying farm machinery, selling of farm produce, insurance of crops and selling extra land were taken by husband (100.0%) irrespective of socio-economic status. The majority of the decisions related to buying costly items like fan, cooler, T.V. etc. and insurance of animals (67.5%) buying and selling of different articles (63.3%) were taken jointly both by husband and wife. Table 4 further reveals that decisions related to finance viz., buying farm inputs, buying farm machinery, selling of farm produce, insurance of crops and selling extra land were taken by husband (100.0%) irrespective of socio-economic status.

The majority of the decisions related to buying costly items like fan, cooler, T.V. etc. and insurance of animals (67.5%) buying and selling of different articles (63.3%) were taken jointly both by husband and wife. Whereas, decisions related to taking and giving loans, deciding manner of savings, insurance of family members and how much money should spend on different items were taken predominantly by husband only which varies between 43.3 per cent to 97.5 per cent, other remaining decision selling of home produce was taken by wife only (42.5%). It is clear from Table that in the majority of the cases, decisions related to finance were taken by husband only (63.3%) followed by a decision taken by husband and wife jointly (26.7%) only and 10.0 per cent taken by wife only in the total sample.

The findings of the study revealed that the majority of the decisions related to farm were taken by husbands only Umar *et*

al. (2011) [27] also support the finding. Their farming decisions were dominated by men., Funding of the study reveal that decisions related to home were taken jointly by both husband and wife, the majority of the decision related to religious ritual were taken jointly by both husband and wife and majority of the decisions related to finance were taken by husband only. Jeyaruba *et al.* (2013) and Baliyan (2014) [7, 8] supported this study.

4. Conclusion

The majority of the decisions related to farm i.e. land use pattern, varieties to be grown and seed related decision etc. Were taken by husband (98.3%) and only 1.7 per cent of decision were taken jointly by both husband and wife in case of the total sample. The majority of the decision related to home were taken jointly by both husband and wife (52.5%) followed by a decision taken by the wife (31.7%) Majority of the decision related to religious ritual were taken jointly by both husband and wife (82.5%) followed by a decision taken by husband (12.5%) in overall decision making. The majority of the decisions related to finance were taken by husband only (63.3%) followed by a decision taken by husband and wife jointly (26.7%) only and 10.0 per cent taken by wife only in the total sample.

5. References

1. Anonymous Self Help Development International, Country Programme Ethiopia Ref: ET009051 Annual Report, 2004.
2. Anonymous 2001. Published Progress Report New Delhi: ICAR, 1996-2001, 108-109.
<http://www.krepublishers.com/02-Journals/JAS/JAS-01-0-000-10-Web/JAS-01-1-000-10-Abst-PDF/JAS-01-1-049-10-015-Mrunalin-A-PR/JAS-01-1-049-10-015-Mrunalini-A-Tt.pdf>
3. Arshad S, Muhammad S, Ashraf I. Women's Participation in Livestock Farming Activities. *The Journal of Animal & Plant Sciences.* 2013; 23(1):304-308.
4. Arshad S, Muhammad S, Randhawa MA, Ashraf I, Choudhry KM. Rural Women's Involvement in Decision-Making Regarding Livestock Management. *Pakistan J Agri Sci.* 2010; 47(2):1-4.
5. Badiger C, Hasalkar S, Huilgol S. Drudgery of Farm Women in Agriculture and Animal Husbandry Operations. *Karnataka. J Agric Sci.* 2004; 17(4):787-790.
6. Bala N. Selective Discrimination against Women in Indian Agriculture- A Review. *Agric. Rev.* 2010; 31(3):224-228.
7. Baliyan K. Factors Affecting Participation of Woman in Household Decision Making: Implication for Family Welfare and Agriculture Development, 2014.
http://www.indiastat.com/SOCIO_PDF/103/fulltext.pdf
8. Baliyan K, Singh AK, Kumar S. Status and Decision Making Power of Agricultural Farm Women. A Case Study, 2014. www.academia.edu,
9. Census of India. Government of India, 2011.
10. Chauhan NM, Thakor R. Participation of the Tribal Farm Women in Decision Making. *Gujarat J Ext Edu.* 2006; 16(17):55-57.
11. Chitnis R. Women Farmers: The Invisible Face of Agriculture India, 2013.
<https://www.greengrants.org/2013/04/09/women-farmers-the-invisible-face-of-agriculture-in-india/>
12. Damisa MA, Yohanna M. Role of Rural Women in Farm Management Decision Making Process: Ordered Probit Analysis. *World Journal of Agricultural Sciences.* 2007; 3(4):543-546.
13. FAO Women and Food Security, 2002.
<http://www.Fao.org>.
14. FAO. Food and Population, 2004. [on line] [Accessed on 10.10.2010]. Available at www.fao.org
15. FAO. Statistical Database of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, 2010.
<http://faostat.fao.org/site/339/default.aspx?page567>
16. FAO (FAOSTAT) Food Balance Sheets > Commodity Balances > Crops Primary Equivalent, 2012. Retrieved August 17, 2012.
17. Goudappa SB, Surekha S, Reddy BS. Participation of Farm Women in Decision-Making Process on Agricultural Operations in Yadgir District of Karnataka. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education Special Issue.* 2012, I.
18. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/am307e/am307e00.pdf>
19. Kiani M. How Much are Women Involved in Decision Making in Family in Iran? *Sociology Study.* 2012; 2(6):417.
20. Mugadur NS, Hiremath RC. Socio-Economic Condition of Agriculture Women Labour: A Case Study. *Indian Journal of Research.* 2014; 3(12).
21. Mulugeta M, Amsalu T. Women's Role and Their Decision Making in Livestock and Household Management. *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development.* 2014; 6(11):347-353.
22. Nain MS, Kumar P. Study of Women Participation and Decision Making in Farm Management. *Journal of Community Mobilization and Sustainable Development.* 2010; 5(1):67-71.
23. Ogdand GG, Hembade AS, Studies on the Participation of Women in Decision Making about Dairy Occupation in Parbhani District of Maharashtra State. *International Journal of Current Research and Academic Review.* 2014; 2(8):367-372.
24. Sifferlin A. Women are Still Doing Most of the Housework, 2014. <http://time.com/2895235/men-housework-women/>
25. Thelma P, Singh A, Luis J, Hussain M. Labour out Migration, Livelihood of Rice Farming House Hold and Women Left Behind – A Case Study in Eastern Uttar Pradesh. *Economic and Political Weekly.* 2005; 11(25):2522-2529.
26. Tsegaye D, Dessalegn T, Yimam A, Kefale M. Extent of Rural Women Participation and Decision Making in Seed Production Activities. *Global Advanced Research Journal of Agricultural Science.* 2012; 1(7):86-190.
27. Umar HS, Anzaku TAK, Saingbe ND. Constraints to Women Involvement in Household Farming Decisions in North Central Nigeria: the Application of Factor Analysis Model. *Elixir International Journal.* 2011. www.elixirpublishers.com.