

Gendered Agricultural Production in Hidabu Abote Woreda, North Shoa, Oromia Regional State, Ethiopia

Feleke Yehuwalashet Motuma (Principal investigator)¹ Dr. Natarajan Kolandavel (Co-researcher)²
Professor Devarajan Sundara Rajan (Advice-giver)²

1. Department of Geography and Environmental Studies, Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia, PObox138

2. Department of Rural Developments and Agricultural Extension, Wolaita Sodo University, PObox138

Abstract

This study aims to assess Gendered Agricultural Production in Hidabu Abote Woreda, Ethiopia. The study used questionnaire, Focus Group discussion, and key informants to gather relevant information. The data collected from the respondents using questionnaires were organized, tallied, tabulated and the analysis was made using tables to compare, contrast and explain gendered agricultural condition of the households through percentage, mean and frequency count. The information obtained by open and close ended questions, from key informants, and Focus Group discussion were considered in the analysis and interpretation part of this study. The result shows both men and women participated in agricultural activities but women worked more days in the field than men. Community socialized in such a way that girls are held inferior to boys. These socially induced differences between males and females result in discriminatory rewards, statuses, opportunities and roles in crop production. In the process of upbringing, boys are expected to learn and become self-reliant, major bread winners, and responsible in different activities while girls are brought up to conform, be obedient and dependent, and specialize in indoor activities like cooking, washing clothes, fetching water, and caring for children. Intervention should target at empowering women in terms of education/capacity building to reduce gender inequality in agricultural activities.

Keywords: Gender, Agriculture, production, indoor activities, Ethiopia

1. Introduction and Problem Justification

Agriculture is an integral part of household income in Ethiopia; nearly 80 percent of employed individuals work in the agriculture sector. However, there is gender gap in productivity that limits the sectors full potential (CSA, 2012).

Different socio-economic activities performed by people are characterized by a certain kind of division of labor, among which the gender dimension is more apparent. In the process of social and economic development, people specialize in particular tasks and hence it is socially accepted that there are men's tasks and women's tasks (Yaekob, 1999). Although societies divide these activities to sexes differ from one culture to another and from time to time, a gender division of labor exists in all societies (Melese, 1994). Such division of labor is perceived to be 'natural' because it has not shown any change for generations (Boserup, 1970).

Agriculture is best economic activities in Ethiopia. Sensibly, the agricultural sector creates 85% of job opportunity. And also agriculture contribute about 41 % of GDP, and 90% of exports (2009/10) (MoA, 2010). In targeting women, World Bank (2007) report indicated that agriculture is a key pathway out of poverty for women, and that women's prospects for taking this path improve when they have better access to resources. But this report confirms that their limited access to essential production resources (land, labor, and inputs) is often restricted gender issue to generate income.

Historically, the backbone of Ethiopia's economy like many other developing countries is the agricultural sector, which absorbs significant labor force out of which women make almost half. It is documented in many literatures that, Ethiopian rural women play a significant role in crop and livestock production in addition to their reproductive and community roles. However their relative access to and control over resources is limited vis-à-vis men. This is believed to contribute its part to the sector's low performance (Yaekob, 1999).

In recognition to the above fact, gender issues, especially the case of gender and agricultural production, have drawn the attention of a good deal of academicians, development planners and practitioners. As a result, there is an increasing interest to assess and investigate women's place in society with the aim of devising a sound solution to the problems they encounter. This study, therefore seeks to assess the contributions of women in agricultural production, gender differences in access to and control over resources, and the concept influencing the gender division of labor and gender differential in access to and control over resources in Hidabu Abote Woreda.

1.1. The specific objectives of the study

The specific objectives of the study were:

- To identify Gender division of farm activities in the study area
- To assess Gendered agricultural service in the study area
- To assess societal insight of Gender arrangement for agricultural activities in the study area

2. Literature

2.1. Trends of Gender and Agriculture

Gender role among agriculturalists has its own long history. Scholars indicated that women were originally in charge of gathering food and since they spent much of their time at home, they came to know means of planting their own food. Though women were considered to have started cultivation, through time, the situation has been changed and it became the duty of men. According to Martin and Voorhies (1975) in Kottak (2002) 'As horticulture developed into agriculture, women lost their role as primary cultivators. As to them certain agricultural techniques such as ploughing were assigned to men because of their greater average body size and strength. In addition, there were other suggestions about why women were cut off from agricultural production. Kottak (2002) assumes the reason to be the need of women to stay closer to home to care the large number of children that typify agriculture, compared to less labor intensive economies.

2.2. Gender Role and Agriculture in Africa

According to Boserup (1970) gender role in agriculture, can be classified it into two bases, the level of population density and the level of agricultural technology. On the basis of these variables, the gender role in agricultural production varies from place to place. According to her, female role in agricultural production is dominant in African because the continent is sparsely populated and the agricultural technology is based on simple hand tools that are hoes, sickle, axe and iron tipped digging stick. As to Boserup, women, in Africa, carry out nearly all farming activities except tree felling. This is illustrated in her own words as follow: - "Africa is the region of female farming par-excellence. In many African tribes, nearly all the tasks connected with food production continue to be left to women. Tree felling is always done by men, most often by young boys of 15 to 18 year" (1970:16). In the places where plough cultivation prevails, men plough the land by using draught animals and women are expected to do the work by using their hands. According to Boserup, the plough cultivation system exempts women from the work of agriculture and enables them to concentrate on the domestic duties.

2.3. Gender Role and Agriculture in Ethiopia

Research findings show the active participation of women in agricultural production. According to Frank (1999) women do almost half of the labor required for agricultural production in Ethiopia. In Ethiopia, in spite of some variations, it is common to see women assist their husbands in various agricultural activities as soil preparation, manuring, weeding and harvesting. When men spend their time in the farm, women engage on the breeding of livestock. According to Hanna (1990), women in Ethiopia participate in all aspects of agricultural production except ploughing. Despite their active role in agricultural production, they get little value due to their lower position in the society. Hence, it is the men that the society considers as producers.

3. Sampling design and procedures

Hidabu Abote woreda is one of the 14 Woreda of North Shoa zone. The researchers focused on this woreda because, most farmers in the Woreda are engaging on all type of the agricultural activities that helps the researchers to see gender issue in different angle. These kinds of area are help full to analyses gender issue against all type of agricultural activities. Purposive sampling method was employed to select rural kebele of Hidabu Abote Woreda as agricultural activities are no such concern of remaining other urban kebeles. Yet again, as agricultural activities and households' condition suitable for this study are limited to some rural area of Hidabu Abote Woreda, purposive sampling techniques was used. Thus, to satisfy the objective understudy, Inclusion criteria of the kebeles to sample were 1st the kebeles' households should be engaging on cash crop production, livestock rearing, poultry production and 2nd the kebeles' households should be participating on marketing the product. Based on these criteria Habado Kebele and Hariro Kebele were selected. Once again, to see very nature of this gender issue against agricultural production and other related concept, the condition of household members should satisfy prime objective. Because, selected households must be representative in terms of gender concept adequately. With this concept, purposive sampling technique was used to decide sample size for the study based on 1st Household having husband and wife that stay together permanently, 2nd household having at least teenager of daughter and sons and 3rd household having farm land. At this stage, the DAs were consulted to identify the location of each household within each kebeles. Fortunately, 35 household from Hariro kebele and 55 household from Habado kebele totally 90 household were selected.

3.1. Data type and sources

In this study, the researcher was used both primary and secondary data for the investigation of the problem. This was to make the study all rounded and efficient. In addition, these data was expected to cover the entire problem that was assessed. The primary data was collected from the agrarian households, DA, and key person from Woreda agricultural bureau. The secondary data was collected /gathered from websites, central statistical agency document, and previous study in which both qualitative and quantitative data was collected to represent different variables of

the problem.

3.2. Data Collection Procedures and tools

I. Questionnaire/scheduled interview/

According to Kothari (2008) information obtained by means of questionnaires is free from bias as the person conducting the research cannot influence the respondents hence accurate and valid data can be obtained. They are also cheaper, easier to administer and convenient as the respondents are given time to fill in the questionnaires.

II. Focus group discussion

The number of focus group discussions was determined by saturation of ideas (until a point where no more new idea emerged). Accordingly, Two FGDs on each of the selected rural kebeles were selected. The FGD was conducted separately among men and women as suggested by few women who mentioned that they could openly discuss the absence of men. A total of 4 FGDs was conducted. The size of the group was from 7 to 11. The purpose of the gathering was explained briefly, and a semi-structured discussion lasting 2 to 3 hours followed. The groups discussed on the gender roles on the choice of crops, fertilizer application, different agricultural activities such as land preparation, weeding, plantation, harvesting. Each group also discussed on the involvement of men and women in the local institutions such as a user group.

III. Key Informant Interviews

The selection of key informants was undertaken by using purposive sampling procedure. Total of 8 key informants interviews were undertaken. Therefore, the key informant interview was conducted with elders (4), DA (2), administrator of kebele (1) and head of agricultural office (1) to get real information about the problem. Hence, inhabitants' experiences, opinions, needs, and constraints was collected and discussed with individual and group of interviewee. To make the communication easy and understandable, checklist prepared by English language was translated to Afan Oromo language as all interviewee have the same mother-tongue language (Afan Oromo) with some of the researchers.

3.3 Data analysis

After the necessary data were collected from primary and secondary sources both qualitative and quantitative analytical methods were used. The data collected from the respondents using questionnaires were organized, tallied, tabulated and the analysis was made using tables which used to compare, contrast and explain gendered agricultural condition of the households by using percentage, mean and frequency count. The information or data which were obtained from open and close ended questions, interview, and observation were considered in the analysis and interpretation part of this study. Finally conclusion and recommendation was formulated based on findings.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Gender Division of farm activities

4.1.1. Gender and farm production

Table 1: Summary of workshare among household members in farm production Activities (n= 90 households)

Types of Production	Husband	Wife	Children		Total Share
			Daughter	Sons	
Cereal Production	71.1	15.3	1.2	12.4	100.0
Cash Crop Production	7.2	69.5	18.5	4.8	100.0
Livestock Production	16.7	58.7	4.6	20	100.0
Poultry Production		73.5	26.5		100.0
<i>Overall Average</i>	<i>37.5</i>	<i>46.05</i>	<i>7.7</i>	<i>8.75</i>	<i>100.0</i>

Source: own survey, 2016

Cereal production and livestock production were cultivated mainly for food consumption. Cash crop production was cultivated mainly for market. Poultry production was for both purposes. Table 1 shows the working share of men and women to the production of these crops. Accordingly, 71.1%, 7.2%, and 16.7% of husbands were participating on the cereal production, cash crop production, and livestock production respectively. In case of housewives, the working share of the farm production is 15.3%, 69.5%, 58.7%, and 73.5% in cereal production, cash crop production, livestock production and poultry production respectively. And also, working share of daughter is cereal production (1.2. %), cash crop production (18.5%), livestock production (4.6%) and poultry production (26.5%) . The above table also depicted that 12.4% 4.8%, and 20% of sons of households respondents are participating on cereal production, cash crop production, and livestock production respectively. As already discussed above poultry production is left for women in the study area. In average, 46.05(housewives), 37.5(husbands), 8.75(sons) and 7.7(daughters) were engaging in farm production activities.

This all indicate that the working share of women (daughter and housewife) are high in farm production.

4.1.2. Gender and farm Land ownership

Goldstein and Udry (2008) show that in Ghana, people with less social and political power in the community notably women face more risk that their land will be expropriated and thus are more reluctant to leave their agricultural plots fallow. This constraint depresses soil fertility and agricultural output on women's land. Accordingly focus group discussion revealed that *“Traditionally, in study area, names and property pass to the next generation through male descendants”*. From this the researcher understand as this system puts male on an upper basis than female in having farm land.

4.1.3. Gender and Cereal production

Table 2: Work share among household members in Cereal Crop Production Activities (n=90 households)

Activity (Cereal Crops)	Husband	Wife	Children		Total Share
			Daughters	Sons	
Ploughing	91.8			8.2	100.0
Sowing	96.6			3.4	100.0
Weeding	44.9	21.8		33.3	100.0
Harvesting	96.6	1.7		1.7	100.0
Threshing	79.9			20.1	100.0
Storing	88.4			11.6	100.0
Transporting		83.3	8.5	8.2	100.0
<i>Overall Average</i>	<i>71.1</i>	<i>15.3</i>	<i>1.2</i>	<i>12.4</i>	<i>100.0</i>

Source: own survey, 2016

Cereal Crop Production activities which were considered in this study include: ploughing, sawing, weeding, and harvesting, threshing, storing and transporting (table 2). The household respondents also revealed that Cereal crop production related field works are performed by husband. In comparing with housewife and children, 91.8%,96.6%,44.6,96.6%,79.9%,88.4% of husband have engaging on ploughing, sawing , weeding, and harvesting, threshing and storing respectively. In another wise, 83.3% of housewife was engaging on transporting cereal than other household members. Besides their schooling, the children are also participating in all type of activities, especially, sons are having lion role in participating in all activity of cereal production. In average, 71.1 of husband, 15.3 of housewife, 12.4 of sons and 1.2 of daughter are performing the above listed activity relatively.

Participants of FGD and key informants also indicated that Men are typically responsible for the heavier manual tasks but Women are often involved with activities that require dexterity and attention to detail, such as raising seedlings in nurseries, transplanting and weeding, transporting the crops, household responsibilities, such as storage, processing and adding value, Role may varies based on type of farm activities.

Through all above information, the researchers reached on the following concept. Lion share goes to men Cereal Crop Production activities except transporting Cereal product which is exclusively female (housewife and daughters) and rarely sons' job.

4.1.3.1 Gender and crop choice

Key informant Farmers reported that their choice of crops depends on their profitability and their use as food. Some farmers cited good soil as a reason to grow certain crops. Wheat, bean, barley, teff and sorghum crops were grown for food and also because they were profitable.

These key informants also explain that *“the standard explanation for this division of crops by gender is that women’s preferences for crop varieties differ from that of men. Women opt to produce varieties of crops which are mainly used for domestic consumption, whereas men prefer crop varieties which have high market demand and fetch high prices.”*

key informant indicate that *“women in study area accessed to garden farm like Gesho (Rhamnus prinoides), cucumber and cabbage which is suitable for home consumption and can fetch low income while men prefer to produce high product varieties of garlic, chills, Wheat, bean, barley, Teff and sorghum which is suitable to generate high income”*. Likely the above the finding is coincides with finding of the Badstue etal (2007) indicating that in many places local varieties are considered *“women’s “crops, and high-yielding varieties are considered “men’s “crops.*

4.1.4. Gender and Cash crop production

Table 3: Work share among household members in cash crop production activities (n= 90 households)

Activity (Cash Crop)	Husband	Wife	Children		Total Share
			Daughters	Sons	
Land Preparation	50.0	16.7	0.0	33.3	100.0
Manuring		83.3	16.7		100.0
Watering		83.3	0.0	16.7	100.0
Weeding		60.0	40.0		100.0
Harvesting		86.7	13.3		100.0
Processing		73.5	26.5		100.0
<i>Overall Average</i>	<i>7.2</i>	<i>69.5</i>	<i>18.5</i>	<i>4.8</i>	<i>100.0</i>

Source: own survey, 2016

As depicted on the above table, except land preparation in which 50% of husband and 33.3 % of sons totally 83.3 % participating, all cash crop production activities are the daily job of housewife and children (mainly daughter) in the study area. Accordingly, 83.3%, 83.3%, 60% 86.7%, 73.5% of housewives are participating on field activities like manuring, watering, weeding, harvesting, and processing respectively. In average 69.5 of the job is exercised by housewife. In addition to schooling, the daughters are also having lion share in participating on cash crop production activities. When we compare household members in average, 69.5, 18.5, 7.2 and 4.8 of cash crop production activities are performed by housewives, daughters, husband and sons respectively.

Example, in study area, chilli is a cash crop. Key informant said *“The seedlings are first raised near water sources and, after two months, are transplanted in land close to the home, in the backyard or in a main field nearby. Most of the main farm operations are undertaken by women, including seed selection, fertilizing, harvesting, processing, storing and day-to-day management. Men assist with nursery and planting; they have sole responsibility only for tillage. Unlike other field crops, chill production needs special care and is very labour intensive. The crop must be free from weeds and requires hoeing at least two or three times to remove any weeds and to loosen the soil; this work is done by women. The chills are harvested as they near to mature; there are at least three rounds of picking to finish the entire harvest. But marketing case is totally processed by male and women obtain some share through bagging their husband.”* This indicate that Wives are an important part of the labour force but the decision when to sell and gain cash income from chill is fully controlled by their husbands.

From all above information, the researchers understand that cash crop production activities are job of female.

4.1.5. Gender and livestock production

Table 4: work share among household members in livestock production activities (n= 90 households)

Activity (Livestock Production)	Husband	Wife	Children		Total Share
			Daughters	Sons	
Cleaning Barn		100.0			100.0
Milking		76.6	23.4		100.0
Taking animals to Grazing	16.7			83.3	100.0
Feeding Animal	66.6	16.7		16.7	100.0
Taking care of calves		100.0			100.0
<i>Overall Average</i>	<i>16.7</i>	<i>58.7</i>	<i>4.6</i>	<i>20.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>

Source: own survey, 2016

According to above table 4, clearing barn and taking care of calves (each 100%) is totally the work share of the housewives in livestock production activities in the study area. The above figure also displayed that taking animals to grazing (83.3%) is dominated by sons in comparing with other household members. The household respondents' also revealed that 76.6% and 16.7% of housewives are participating on milking and feeding animals respectively. Whereas, 66.6% and 16.7% of husbands have working share of livestock production activities in Feeding Animal and Taking animals to Grazing respectively. In Average, 58.7, 20, 16.7 and 4.6 of housewives, sons, husband and daughters are participating in livestock production activities.

From all above analysis, the researchers conclude that livestock production activities are the working share of housewives which followed by sons and husband.

4.1.6. Gender and poultry production

Table 5: Workshare among household members in poultry production activities (n= 90 households)

Activity (Poultry Production)	Husband	Wife	Children		Total Share
			Daughters	Sons	
Caring Chicks		78.0	22.0		100.0
Collecting eggs		72.0	28.0		100.0
Feeding chicks		68.0	32.0		100.0
<i>Overall Average</i>		<i>73.5</i>	<i>26.5</i>		<i>100.0</i>

Source: own survey, 2016

The above table 5 indicate that poultry production activities are left for female (housewives and daughter) in the study area. Likely, 78%, 72%, 68% of work shares in caring chicks, collecting eggs and feeding chicks are belongs to housewives respectively. While 32%, 28% and 22% of these feeding chicks, collecting eggs and caring chicks are duties of daughters. Null of husband and sons are participating in poultry production activities.

This above household respondents figures indicate that poultry production is fell on the shoulders of the female (housewives and daughters). So, poultry production is working share of women on the study area.

4.2. Gendered agricultural service

Table 6: Household decision making pattern among respondent members of the household (n=90 households)

Mainly by Female (wives)	20.0
Mainly by Male (Husbands)	77.5
Equally by Female and male (Both)	2.5

Source: own survey, 2016

According to above table 6, household decision pattern among the members of the households are vary. Likely, the table shows that 77.5% of household respondents believes that husband are responsible in decision making process while 20% of households respondents believe that wives are responsible to make decision on different issue. The decision power of the children (2.5%) is very low which followed by wives decision power.

Therefore, from the above figure, one can understand that the husband are playing great role in decisions making process. The views of the husbands are dominating others household members view including wives. Undoubtedly, women are highly marginalized from social decision making. Unluckily, girls and women are marginalized from elders rich experience sharing and information. As current status was assessed, the key informants from Hidabu Abote Children and Women Affairs office confirm this existing worst scenario.

4.2.1. Gender and marketing of farm product

Table 7: Workshare among household members in marketing of farm products (n= 90 household members)

Marketing of Products	Husband	Wife	Children		Total share
			Daughter	Sons	
Cattle/ Small Ruminant	80.0	20.0			100.0
Milk and milk Product		81.6	18.4		100.0
Chicken and Egg		76.8	23.2		100.0
Vegetables and fruits		60.0	40.0		100.0
Cereal crops and cash crop	96.9	3.1			100.0

Source: own survey, 2016

From the above table, it is seen that the marketing share of husbands in cereal crops (96.9%) and cattle (80%) in the study area. The marketing share of the housewives are 81.6% for milk and milk product, 76.8% for chicken and eggs, 60% vegetable and fruits, and 3.1% in cereal and cash crop. And also daughters marketing share is 18.4%, 23% and 40% in milk and milk product chicken and eggs, and vegetables and fruits in that order.

The nature of market engagement differs undoubtedly between women and men. Participants of FGD also revealed that “*women tend to accept prices at local markets which they can reach on foot. As a result of the dominance of men in marketing, women sometimes resort to selling small quantities of the produce in secret, which can result in market inefficiencies*”. Since the male member is almost responsible for the economic flow in the family, marketing of the huge and costly product is mostly done by the male members. These indicates that Women are more likely to fetch low price for product. Women generally have little control over the income benefits of production.

4.2.2. Gender-based access to inputs and services

Who is a Farmer? Perception

Much of the literature on gender and agricultural extension is embedded in a larger debate about the household unit and the definitions used to establish exactly who should be eligible to receive extension information. Social beliefs are instrumental in shaping the perceptions about who is “the farmer.” Doss (2002) provided several

ways to define farmers: as head of farming households, as the owner of land that is farmed, or as the individual who is entitled to the revenue earned from the sale of produce. Although there is increasing recognition that farming is a family business, in many societies the head of household, whether a man or a woman, is still defined as the primary farmer and is perceived as the only appropriate recipient of agricultural extension information. Though this is slowly changing, according to a report by the World Bank (2010), many institutions continue to operate under the perception that “women are not farmers”. As a result, women are underserved as clients of extension services in their own right, often seen to be only helping.

Likely in Hidabu Abote woredas, women are not entitled to participate in sharing of information about agriculture. Women are not exposed to social issues due to local perception. It is clear that the differences in the ways in which individuals are treated through the socialization process, due mainly to their sex status, leads to the development of real psychological and personality differences between males and females.

For instance, a female informant (elder) in study area stated that “*their agricultural activities as simply helping their husbands because man is born to direct and women are born to be directed*” and she also said that “*man is a big person who has higher social position and knowledge, who can govern others and think in wider perspectives; while a woman is a person who can serve a man, who is like the husband’s object transferred through marriage, and to whom he can do anything he wishes to do*”. In study area, society is socialized in such a way that girls are held inferior to boys. In the process of upbringing, boys are expected to learn and become self-reliant, major bread winners, and responsible in different activities, while girls are brought up to conform, be obedient and dependent, and specialize in indoor activities like cooking, washing clothes, fetching water, caring for children, and etc.

4.2.3. Access to Credit

In Hidabu Abote, it is found that women have very less access to credit than men, particularly women in the male headed households. For instance, FGD and key informants indicated that men clients for micro finance much greater than women in the study area. Only few women who are headed households have access to MFI. There is no trend of taking credit for productive inputs such as fertilizer and improved seeds both by men and women. But in some areas where their farm land is proximate to the river, the men form a group and come with their business plan and get access to the existing credit system of the government either from the government or non-government organization. Every credit scheme is channelled through microfinance. But the repayment performance of women is by far better than men and they said in case of women loan default is very rare, women are trustful in all credit schemes.

4.2.4. Gender accesses to sources of information

As participants of focus group discussion and different key informants revealed, “*The sources of agricultural information generally depend on the household wealth and on gender differences. Men depend mainly on formal information sources while women mostly exploit informal sources of information. Men farmers access formal sources to improve their skills and knowledge, even in areas where women do most of the activities. Men directly access knowledge from development agents, extension agents, farmers’ conferences, and kebele meetings. Men also exploit indigenous sources to advance their knowledge, such as elders’ meetings and councils, social networks (ekub, idir, debo, afosha), visits to distant localities, and socializing with colleagues and relatives, and from market places while, Women get information from neighbours while participating in indigenous self-help and social network associations, as well as through their husbands, school children and friends*”.

These indicate that, the sources are mostly informal, indirect and sometimes provide incomplete information. Women farmers rarely get extension support that would enable them to enhance their knowledge and skills, and thereby improve the performance of their agricultural activities. Hence, women farmers usually have limited access to improved agricultural technologies and packages promoted by the extension system. This constrains their access to various inputs and services including knowledge, and limits their participation in market-oriented agricultural activities.

4.3. Societal insight of gender arrangement for agricultural activities

4.3.1. Women are overburdened with domestic sphere

One elder informant said in thinking her childhood said “*During the agricultural production season, and often at other times, the working day for me was starting when the cock crows, which is about 3 a.m. I grind grain using a grinding stone until it gets light enough for me (about 5:30 am) to go to the river to fetch water. Then I return and continue to grind while cooking lunch, which takes one to two hours, depending on whether I am using the partially pre-cooked shiro, or some other ingredients then milking of cows, keeping children clean and etc. She said “now days some women are exempted from grinding due to grinding mills”*”.

These indicate how far women were busy with domestic unpaid activity than agricultural activity. According to participants of FGD, there are activities needed to maintain the family in which men are not involved, but which put a heavy burden on the women. These include food preparation, the fetching of fuel and water, and keeping the compound, house, and family clean. In the study area, up to half of the days in the month are religious

holidays or weekends and thus are relatively free of work. Even during these holidays, besides cooking, the woman cleans the grain/crop ready for grinding, washes clothes, and cleans the house and etc. On top of this women are involved in agricultural production. Clean fields of uprooted plants and other debris before they are sown; they also participate in weeding and carrying harvested produce for stocking to a threshing ground.

4.3.2. Religion and Gender

According directly coated Christian Bible verse, “*1 ፤ ሰው ሴትን ወሰዶ ቢያገባ፥ የእፍረት ነገር ስላገኘባት በእርሱ ዘንድ ሞገስ ቢታገኝ፥ የፍቅርን ጽሕፈት ጽፎ በእጅዋ ይሰጣት፥ ከቤቷም ይደርዳት።” (ኦሪት ዘጻግም 24:1 ፤)*”

“1, When man hath taken a wife, and married here and it come to pass that she find no favour in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in here: then let him write her a bill of divorcement and give it in her out of his house” (dueteronomy24:1)”

This hinder the women not to have fixed home and other asset as of men that pave the way for agricultural activity too.

4.3.3. Issue of Marriage

Ebenstein (2014) Indicate that many cultures (in sub-Saharan Africa) practice where by a married couple lives near or with the husband's parents. Likely key informants and focus group discussion indicate that *“when a woman gets married, she essentially ceases to be a member of her birth family and joins her husband's family. Under this system, parents potentially obtain more of the returns to investments in a son's health and education because he will remain a part of their family, whereas a daughter will physically and financially leave the household upon marriage”*.

These indicate socially induced differences between males and females result in discriminatory rewards, ranks, opportunities and roles in agricultural activities.

4.3.4. Dowry system

According to Boserup (1970), dowry systems emerged mainly in societies where women played a lesser role in agriculture. According to participants of FGD and key informants, *“the dowry system is the price of a groom given to family of females. Dowry is thus a financial cost to parents of having male. In many male having families, male have entailed with different asset for this purpose. This dowry system causing pro-male bias in having different asset. The responsibilities of the female parents are keeping the female health and beauty to have marriage rather than equipped her with asset”*.

This also blocks the women not to participate on agricultural activity as like that of male. As Das Gupta et al., (2003) indicated the above marriage scenarios in Habado Kebele is opposite in the India.

4.3.5. Muscle based crop production

As group of informants indicates, *“women have a comparative disadvantage in ploughing farm land with ‘biyye koticha’ (vertisols) and also with huge dispersed rock which need to be rolled out to till around, whereas men's physical strength give them an advantage in ploughing such farm land”*.

These informants also said that *“plough holding require muscle to stay share in the soil in case soil is dry and full of obstacle. Accordingly men have given sustainable opportunity to lead farming activities, because of their less physical strength women remain facilitator”*.

These informants also said *“their dressing culture is also not pay the way for such activity and so women themselves prefer to work on activity that do not want physical strength like domestic work”*. These indicate that physical strength and dressing style make comparative disadvantage in producing crop.

The finding of Boserup's (1970) also indicate that Men had a large advantage in using ploughs, which require great deal of upper body and grip strength to operate.

4.3.6. Being women

Through lough key informant said that *“it is our Culture, women with menstrual are not allowed to harvest some round or all year round giving yield like cucumbers, Gesho (Rhamnus prinoides) and chills. In case women with menstrual case harvest such farm, the root of these plants can be dried. Even they are not allowed to pass side of such farm areas”*. This is another reason the women lost equal opportunity to participate in agricultural activity.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

5.1 Conclusion

Based on the above all discussion the following conclusions was made.

- Traditionally, in study area, names and property pass to the next generation through male descendants that puts male on an upper basis than female in having farm land. But the working shares of women are high in farm production.
- In study area, Women opt to produce varieties of crops which are mainly used for domestic consumption, whereas men prefer crop varieties which have high market demand and fetch high prices.
- In study area, livestock crop production and poultry production activities are the working share of housewives which followed by sons and husband but the husband are playing great role in decisions making process. The views of the husbands are dominating others household members view including

wives

- These socially induced differences between males and females result in discriminatory rewards, statuses, opportunities and roles in crop production
- Women farmers usually have limited access to improved agricultural technologies and packages promoted by the extension system and have little control over the income benefits of production.
- Religion and dowry system hinder the women not to have fixed home and other asset as of men which pave the way for pro-male bias in having different asset in the study area
- In the process of upbringing, boys are expected to learn and become self-reliant, major bread winners, and responsible in different activities
- While girls are brought up to conform, be obedient and dependent, and specialize in indoor activities like cooking, washing clothes, fetching water, caring for children, and etc.

5.2. Recommendation

Based on the above all discussion and conclusion made the following recommendation were made.

- Further interventions should be directed in construction of the women through policy to end up reinforcing existing stereotypes and gendered forms of discrimination.
- Awareness creation and sanction over damaging practices undermining women's should be exercised by nearby leadership
- Local NGO should gave due attention in giving training about their right and responsibilities for the women community of study area.

6. Reference

- Biseswar, I. (2008). A New Discourse on "Gender" in Ethiopia', *African Identities*, 6(4):405-429
- Boserup, E. (1970) Women's Role in Economic Development, London, Earthscan Publications Ltd.
- Buchy, M., and F. Basaznew. (2005). Gender-blind Organisations Deliver Gender-biased Services: The Case of Awasa Bureau of Agriculture in Southern Ethiopia. *Gender, Technology and Development* 9(2): 235–251.
- Central Statistical Agency. (2012). *Agricultural sample surveys*. Reports on area and production of major crops Meher season. Vol. 1 (2005/06 to 2011/12). Addis Ababa: CSA. Development Options, Londn, Zed Books.
- Frank, E. (1999) Gender, Agricultural Development and Food Security in Amhara, Ethiopia: The Contested
- Goldstein, M. and Udry, C. (2008). "The Profits of Power: Land Rights and Agricultural Investment in Ghana." *Journal of Political Economy* 116 (6):981–1022.
- Hanna, K. (1990), Gender Relations in Mobilizing Human Resources' in S. Pause wang et.al, Ethiopia: Rural
- Haregewoin C, Emebet M (2003). Towards Gender equality in Ethiopia. A Profile of Gender Relations.
- Hirut T (2004). Violence Against Women in Ethiopia: A Strong Case of Civil Society Concern. In: Chowdhury, S., Wais, A., and Kahsai Wolde Giorgis (Eds) Civil Society in Ethiopia: Reflections Identity of Women Farmers in Ethiopia, USAID/Ethiopia
- Jiggins, J., R.K. Samanta and J.E. Olawoye. (1998). Improving women farmers' access to extension services. In B. Swanson, R.P. Bentz, and A.J. Sofranko (eds.), *Improving Agricultural Extension: A Reference Manual*. Rome: FAO. Available at www.fao.org/docrep/W5830E/w5830e0b.htm.
- Kottak, C.P. (2002) *Cultural Anthropology*, 9th edition, McGraw-Hill, New York
- Lynda, (1991), Gender inequality onsite (kasente' cited in Tackle, 2008)
- Melese Getu (1994), "Tsemako Women's Role and Status in Agro-pastoral Production." (MA Unpublished Thesis). A.A.U.: Addis Ababa.on Realities and Perspectives of Hope. African – Asian Studies Promotion Association.
- Quisumbing, A., L. Brown., H. S. Feldstein, L. Haddad, and C. Pena. (1995). —Women: The Key to Food Security. *Report 21*, International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, DC. Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency.
- World Bank (2010). Gender and Governance in Rural Services: Insights from India, Ghana and Ethiopia. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- World Bank. (2007) *World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Yaekob Mentena (1999), "The Role of Women in Agriculture: A Case Study of Arba Minch Zuria woreda, Semen Omo Zone." (MA Unpublished Thesis). A.A.U