



International Journal of Home Science

ISSN: 2395-7476
IJHS 2019; 5(1): 213-215
© 2019 IJHS
www.homesciencejournal.com
Received: 23-11-2018
Accepted: 26-12-2018

Shital M Rathod
Assistant Prof. – Smt. Vatsalabai
Naik Mahila Mahavidyalaya,
Pusad, Maharashtra, India

Dr. Jyoti Solunke
Head, Dept. of Home Science
Sant Tukaram College of Arts
and Science Parbhani,
Maharashtra, India

Comparison of working and non-working women about their participation in home activities

Shital M Rathod and Dr. Jyoti Solunke

Abstract

To know the Comparison of working and non working women about their Participation in Home activities, two districts were selected i.e. Yeotmal & Parbhani under this Gunj & Bori from pusad and Daithana & Pokharni from Parbhani villages were selected. The total respondents included in the study were 600. It consists of working (300) and non working (300) women sample. Personal Interview method was used for data collection. Statistical techniques viz., X² Test was used for analyzing the data. The findings revealed It can be expressed from the table that that majority 46.83 percent of the women were from the age category 31-45 years, It was seen that less than half 39.83 percent of the women were educated up to school level The major occupation of the selected women was found to be household (50.00%). The working women were engaged in service i. e. Teacher, Lecturer, Professor, Doctor, Anganwadi workers, ASHA workers, Supervisor, Sarpanch, etc were less than one third (16.33%) As far as family type was concerned, joint type of families were seen to be predominant 53.5 percent, The trend of medium sized (5-8 members) families was found to be in less than half 49.00 percent of the selected families It was observed that half 50.83 percent of them had their annual income up to above Rs. 1,00,000/- most of the respondents 93.83 percent had no membership it was noted that majority of the families 91.33 percent were having land line/mobile phones that a huge majority 86.16 percent of the women had no contacts with any extension agent. It is reviewed from the table shows that there was significant association between working and non working women in the food preparation in the areas like Chapati/ bhakari making and serving food. Table 2 shows that there was significant association between working and non working women in the sending to school and helping/ supervising children in study. For the child care and getting them ready for school there was no significant association between working and non working women and table 3 revealed that there was significant association between working and non working women in the ornament purchasing only and all are the non significant.

Keywords: Participation, working women, non working women, home activity

Introduction

Homemaking is multisided art and science with involves Variety of responsibility, various duties, and task and it is said to be a full time job. From the time immemorial homemaking is recognized to be the responsibility of the homemaker. Though the job of homemaking encompasses a core of the activities essential to our existence the study of homemaking work is almost an entirely neglected area of study.

Women play a vital role as housewives & copartners in farming profession. As cultural & social endowment, they have the responsibility for all domestic tasks including cooking, fetching of water, washing, care of children & livestock. In addition, they toil in the fields engaging various pre & post harvest operations. A majority of women work in marginal occupations to supplement family income by collection of fuel wood , fodder , fishes , practicing small animal husbandry & marketing of many rural & forest produce. (Srivastava, 1988)^[3]

In day to day life women in society is professionally performing several activities equal to men folk both in high & low socio- economic rang. The high society women plays professional's roles such as teacher, lecturer, doctor, lawyer etc. the low society or illiterate women performs various activities such as tailor, construction worker, scavenger, sweeper, vender & maid servant etc. These activities are performed in addition to her regular household activities.

According to Lemlem *et al.* (2002)^[4], In rural Ethiopid, women play key role in both livestock management and household activities besides farming activities.

Correspondence
Shital M Rathod
Assistant Prof. – Smt. Vatsalabai
Naik Mahila Mahavidyalaya,
Pusad, Maharashtra, India

They are the household managers but their work is considered as non-productive, unorganized and undocumented.

Objectives

1. To study the comparison of working and non working women in various Home activities.

Methodology

The study was carried out in two Regions of Maharashtra State were selected for the study. This research consist sample of six hundred working and non working women from rural and urban areas. The districts from these regions were purposively selected. These were Parbhani under this villages were Daithana & Pokharni from Marathvada region and Yeotmal the villages were selected Gunj & Bori from Vidarbha region. In the present study the total sample consisted of six hundred working and non working women out of these Three hundred rural women and Three hundred urban women will be selected. Out of Three hundred one hundred and fifty samples for rural area will be selected as working status of women like list of female workers working in different government organizations, non-governmental organizations, private organizations, Insurance Corporation, hospital, agriculture department, horticulture department, education department, zilla panchayat, revenue department, Anganwadi workers, farm labour, Farmer, dairy management, goat rearing, shop keeper, tailoring those who are earn etc. and non working will be housewife. Out of three hundred one hundred and fifty samples (urban) will be selected as working status of women like teachers, lectures, labour, entrepreneur, etc. and non working will be housewife. Out of three hundred one hundred and fifty samples (urban) will be selected as working status of women like teachers, lectures, labour, entrepreneur, etc. and non working will be housewife. Thus the sample comprised of total six hundred women. The respondents were personally interviewed with the help of pre - structured interview schedule.

Result and discussion

1. Comparison between type of participation of working and non working women in the home activities

Performance of household activities depends on time availability of the homemakers. The employed homemakers tend to have time pressure owing to their dual role. To compare household workload of the full-time and employed homemakers, X^2 test was carried out and the results are given in Table 1. An examination of Table 1 reflects the information about area wise difference in terms of type of participation of the working and non working women in the food preparation. Majority of the women in both category i.e working and non working were participating 56.67 and 68.67 percent independently followed by joint with female and no participation in cleaning and cutting vegetables but very negligible 12.33 and 2.67 percent of the male were participating in the above activity. Regarding Actual preparation of curry, 60 percent of the working women and 58 percent of the non working women were participating independently followed by the joint with female and no participation in this activity. Very less 7.66 and 1.67 percent of the male were participating in the same activity. It was noted that almost same percentages for Chapati/ bhakari making i.e. 60.67 and 61.67 percent of the working and non working women were participating independently, in this activity participation of the both category women was

dominant and among these women's participation was more. In this activity, joint with female and no participation of women from both categories was less but among these, working women's participation was slightly more. Involvement of male for this activity was very less 4 and 0.67 percent from both categories.

A perusal of data furnished in table indicates that serving food was the activity in which working and non working women involvement of major 45.67 and 53 percent women was found independent whereas less than one third 29 same percent of both categories women were not involved in this activity. Joint with male participation of women from both categories was observed very less as 6.33 and 0.67 percent of same activity respectively.

Information from the table 1 shows that there was significant association between working and non working women in the food preparation in the areas like Chapati/ bhakari making and serving food.

It can be expressed that in the table 2 for children affairs, child care was the activity. It was noticed that majority of the working and non working women were not participating in this activity with 43.00 and 39.00 percent respectively but among these, non working women's independent participation 38.33 percent was slightly more than the working women 31 percent. In which activity involvement of the joint with female participation from the non working women was more 19.67 percent than the female participation 15.33 percent from working women category. Male involved in this activity were very negligible 3.00 percent but male participation from working women category was 10.67 percent slightly more. While investigating, respondents replied that they working women are busy in their service, business or outside of the home. Hence they did not spend time or involved totally for in this activity.

Majority of the women in both category were not involved in the getting them ready for school, sending to school and helping/ supervising children in study followed by joint with female and independent for this activity where as very less percentage of male was involved in above activities from both category.

Table 2 shows that there was significant association between working and non working women in the sending to school and helping/ supervising children in study. For the child care and getting them ready for school there was no significant association between working and non working women.

A glance at the table 3 elucidates that in the activity vegetable purchasing more than one third 39.33 percent of the working women was involved in this activity. Majority of the working and non working women were not involved in the Vegetable Purchasing, Grocery Purchasing, Medicine Purchasing, Utensil purchasing. It was noted that in the Ornaments Purchasing less than fifty 46.00 and 38.00 percent of the male from the both category was involved but male from working women was slightly more than non working women category. It can be expressed that in the cloth purchasing from both category participation of male was 37.67 and 41.00 percent here is male from non working women was slightly more than male from working women category. Joint female involvements for the purchasing activities were very negligible.

Table 3 revealed that there was significant association between working and non working women in the ornament purchasing only and all are the non significant.

Table 1: Type of participation of working and non working women in the food preparation

Home Activities	Working women				Non working women				X ² value
	Independent	Joint with female	Joint with male	No participation	Independent	Joint with female	Joint with male	No participation	
Cleaning & cutting vegetables	170 (56.67%)	63 (21%)	37 (12.33%)	30 (10.00%)	206 (68.67%)	65 (21.67%)	8 (2.67%)	21 (7%)	23.72
Actual preparation of curry	180 (60%)	66 (22%)	23 (7.66%)	31 (10.33%)	174 (58%)	61 (20.33%)	5 (1.67%)	60 (20%)	21.08
Chapati/ bhakri making	182 (60.67%)	72 (24%)	12 (4%)	34 (11.33%)	185 (61.67%)	55 (18.33%)	2 (0.67%)	58 (19.33%)	15.54**
Serving food	137 (45.67%)	57 (19%)	19 (6.33%)	87 (29%)	159 (53%)	52 (17.33%)	2 (0.67%)	87 (29%)	15.44**

** indicate significance of value at P = 0.001 and NS - Non significant

Table 2: Type of participation of working and non working women in children affairs

Home Activities	Working women				Non working women				X ² value
	Independent	Joint with female	Joint with male	No participation	Independent	Joint with female	Joint with male	No participation	
Child care	93 (31%)	46 (15.33%)	32 (10.67%)	129 (43%)	115 (38.33%)	59 (19.67%)	9 (3%)	117 (39%)	17.4
Getting them ready for school	68 (22.67%)	20 (6.67%)	18 (6.33%)	193 (64.33%)	73 (24.33%)	20 (6.67%)	3 (1%)	204 (68%)	12.08
Sending to school	23 (7.67%)	13 (4.33%)	13 (4.13%)	251 (83.67%)	28 (9.33%)	10 (3.33%)	3 (1%)	259 (86.33%)	7.06**
Helping/Supervising children in study	56 (18.67%)	4 (1.33%)	13 (4.13%)	227 (75.67%)	52 (17.33%)	10 (3.33%)	4 (1.33%)	234 (78%)	7.56**

** indicate significance of value at P = 0.01 and NS - Non significant

Table 3: Type of participation of working and non working women in Purchasing

Home Activities	Working women				Non working women				X ² value
	Independent	Joint with female	Joint with male	No participation	Independent	Joint with female	Joint with male	No participation	
Vegetable purchasing	118 (39.33%)	41 (13.67%)	28 (9.33%)	113 (37.67%)	86 (28.67%)	29 (9.67%)	19 (6.33%)	166 (55.33%)	18.82
Grocery purchasing	60 (20%)	12 (4%)	80 (26.67%)	148 (49.33%)	32 (10.67%)	11 (3.67%)	55 (18.33%)	202 (67.33%)	21.50
Medicine purchasing	45 (15%)	2 (0.67%)	72 (24%)	181 (60.33%)	35 (11.67%)	7 (2.33%)	37 (12.33%)	221 (73.67%)	19.21
Ornaments purchasing	38 (12.67%)	1 (0.33%)	123 (41%)	138 (46%)	29 (9.67%)	10 (3.33%)	114 (38%)	147 (49%)	9.18**
Cloth purchasing	55 (18.33%)	1 (0.33%)	131 (43.67%)	113 (37.67%)	31 (10.33%)	10 (3.33%)	123 (41%)	136 (45.33%)	16.22
Utensil purchasing	79 (26.33%)	2 (0.67%)	32 (10.67%)	187 (62.33%)	46 (15.33%)	10 (3.33%)	25 (8.33%)	219 (73%)	17

** indicate significance of value at P = 0.01 and NS - Non significant

References

1. Kulkarni, M.S. and Murali, D. Time spending pattern of rural homemakers. Maha. Journal of Extn. Edn. 1991; X(2):145-148.
2. Manju Suman. Involvement of women in agricultural activities. Maharashtra Journal of Extension Education, 2002; XXI(1):105-106.
3. Srivastava JC. Development of farm women: Interministerial efforts & linkages with research system paper published in international conference in appropriate agriculture technologies for farm women. ICAR Delhi, 1998, 1.
4. Lemlem A, Bishop – Sambrook C, Puskur R, E Ephrem T. Opportunities for promoting gender equality in rural Ethiopia through the commercialization of agricultural IPMS (Improving productivity & market success) of Ethiopian farmers project working paper 18. ILRI

(International livestock research institute), Nairobi, Kenya, 2002, 84.