

Addis Ababa University
School Of Graduate Studies
Institute of Gender Studies

**Gender Division of Labor among Wives and Husbands
in Agro-Pastoral Society: The case of Fafen, Somali
Region**

By: LIMAT TAMIR

May 2010

Addis Ababa University

Addis Ababa

Addis Ababa University
School Of Graduate Studies
Institute of Gender Studies

**Gender Division of Labor among Wives and Husbands
in Agro-Pastoral Society: The case of Fafen, Somali
Region**

By: Limat Tamir

**A Thesis Submitted to the Institute of Gender Studies In
partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Gender Studies**

May 2010

Addis Ababa University

Addis Ababa

Addis Ababa University
School Of Graduate Studies
Institute of Gender Studies

**Gender Division of Labor among Wives and
Husbands in Agro-pastoral Society: The case of
Fafen, Somali Region**

Name of Student: _____

Signature _____

Approved by Board of Examiners

_____	_____	_____
Chairperson	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Advisor	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Internal Examiner	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
External Examiner	Signature	Date

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my acclamation and genuine appreciation to my advisor, Dr. Mulumebet Zenebe for spending her precious time on deep evaluation of the title, proposal, tool preparation and overall work done and for her constructive comments and honest sharing of her knowledge.

Similarly, my earnest gratitude as well goes to Fafen kebele administrator and individuals who work for the Somali Pastoral and Agro-pastoral Research Institute for their unreserved cooperation during the data collection process.

My sincere gratitude goes to all data collectors and study participants whose contribution was vital for the success of the study.

Special thank as well goes to Ato Muhammed Ibrahim and Ato muhammed Muhimed, without their assistance the feasibility of the data collection would have been possible.

I wish to thank Ato Mebratie Belachew for his technical assistance in the quantitative data analysis.

I also would like to thank my sisters; Yekeba Tamir, Yezewdwork Djenie, Nesanet Admasu and Aberu Tekle for their unreserved support throughout the two year study period.

Finally, I would like to articulate my genuine appreciation to Ato Yigzaw Haile, my husband for his constructive comments and suggestions in any aspect of the study as well as edition apart from his encouragement towards the completion of the study.

Table of Contents

Content

	Page
Acknowledgments.....	I
Table of contents.....	II
List of Tables	IV
List of Figures.....	V
Glossary	VI
Abstract.....	VII

I. Introduction

1.1. Background.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.3. Objectives	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.4. Operational Definitions.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.5. Significance.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.6. Delimitation	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.7. Limitation.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

II. Review of Related Literature

2.1. Conceptual Framework.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2. The Meaning and the Nature of Gender Division of Labor	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2.1. The Nature of Gender Division of Labor in Agro-pastoral Society	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.3. Gender Division of Labor or Tasks	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.3.1. Household Chores.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.3.2. Agriculture	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.4. Factors Affecting Gender Division of Labor.....	19
2.4.1. Factors Affecting Gender Division Labor in Agro-pastoral Areas.	Error! Bookmark not defined.

III. Methodology

3.1. Research Design.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.2. Study Area	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.3. Sources of Data	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.4. Participants.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.5. Sampling Technique	Error! Bookmark not defined.

3.6. Instruments (Data collection tools).....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.7. Procedures.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.7.1. Preparation of Data Collection Tool.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.7.2. Data Administration.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.7.3. Analysis.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.8. Ethical Considerations	Error! Bookmark not defined.

IV. Findings

4.1. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.2. Division of Labor among Couples.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.2.1. Household Chores.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.2.1.1. Factors Affecting Gender Division of Labor in Household Chores.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.2.2. Crop Production	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.2.2.1. Factors Affecting Gender Division of Labor in Crop Production.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.2.3. Vegetable and Fruit.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.2.3.1. Factor Affecting Division of Labor in the Production of Vegetables and Fruits.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.2.4. Livestock Production	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.2.4.1. Factors Affecting Gender Division of Labor in Livestock Production.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.2.5. Marketing (Selling Agricultural Products)	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.2.5.1. Factors Affecting Gender Division of Labor in Marketing (Selling).....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.3. The Role of Couples for Saving and Managing the Household Income.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

V. Discussion

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 Conclusions.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.2 Recommendations.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Reference

APPENDICES

- Appendix A: Questionnaires for couples in Somali Language
- Appendix B: Interview Guides for couples in Somali Language
- Appendix C: Questionnaires for Couples in English
- Appendix D: Interview Guides for Couples in English

Appendix E: Interview Guides for key informants in English

Appendix F: Demographic Characteristics of Interview Respondents

List of Tables

Table one: Background characteristics of Respondents.....

Table two: Household tasks.....

Table Three: Influencing Factors for active Participation of Wives in domestic chores...

Table Four: Influencing Factors for less participation of husbands in household chores...

Table Five: Tasks in crop production.....

Table Six: Tasks in ‘Chatt’ production.....

Table Seven: Influencing Factors for active participation of husbands in farm tasks.....

Table Eight: Influencing Factors for less participation of wives in farm tasks.....

Table Nine: Tasks in vegetable and fruit production
.....

Table Ten: Tasks in livestock production.....

Table Eleven: Tasks in marketing (selling the agricultural products.....

List of Figures

Figure One: A tent built by a woman-----

Figure Two: Men chewing Khat in a Group-----

Figure Three: A woman going to sell Fire Wood-----

Glossary

“Khat” (Amharic) is a perennial shrub or plant and people chew its leaves for stimulation (Mirkana).

Jebena(Amharic): A cultural term used to denote the ceremony and duration of chewing chatt.

Ara-as: A village found in Fafen kebele

Golmorodi: A village found in Fafen kebele

Abstract

Gender division of labor is a Scio-cultural construction and assignment of tasks for males and females. The very nature of gender division of labor is its variation across cultures. Therefore, it needs specific attention in particular place to have a specific data about who does what in that area. This study was conducted at Fafen (Golmorodi and Ara-as), a kebelie from Gorsum woreda in Jigjiga zone (Somali Region). It was designed to investigate what wives and husbands do in domestic chores; crop, vegetable and fruit, as well as livestock productions; and selling of agricultural products. Besides, the study was designed to see the influencing factors for the division of tasks among couples and the role of wives and husbands for saving and managing the household income. Both quantitative and qualitative research designs were used. Hundred respondents (fifty wives and fifty husbands) were taken as a sample from the total population of one thousand. Ten couples (five wives and five husbands) were taken for in-depth interview from those who responded to the questionnaires. The selection of the respondents has been done using simple random sampling technique. Besides, three key informants were taken for in depth interview through purposive sampling technique. Structured interview was employed for collecting the data from questionnaire respondents. The finding indicated that wives perform all tasks in household chores, selling of agricultural products and saving and managing the income of the household. They also perform most of the tasks in livestock production; whereas, the participation of husbands in livestock production is less. On the contrary, husbands accomplish most of the tasks in crop production, however, wives also accomplish tasks alone and together with their husbands in this production; and both wives and husbands carry out tasks in vegetable and fruit productions. The finding depicted the variation of the participation of couples across crops, vegetables, fruits and tasks in these items and wives of the study area were overburdened with multiple tasks. Factors that sway the division of tasks among couples were interrelated and mainly emanate from the culture of the study area. Hence, there is a need to ease the burden of the wives in the study area through creating awareness for society in general and husbands in particular to share the above mentioned tasks.

I. Introduction

1.1. Background

The notion of gender in general and gender division of labor in particular has got due attention by many scholar since 1970's. The famous scholar who should be noted in laying down the foundation for the concern of women in relation gender division of labor is Boserup (1970). This famous scholar has tried to study the role women play in agriculture. The notion of gender division of labor existed in all societal stages of development, in every society as well as in all age group of human being. It predates in the primitive societal stages of development where women were assigned a task of gathering and men hunting. Beginning from that time onwards, women and men had assigned tasks based on their sex and expected roles. In other words, women's and men's tasks were determined based on their biological or physiological make up (Elizabeth, 2005). For instance, women had been assigned a task of child caring and rearing based on their biological reproductive role of pregnancy and breast feeding (Diana, 1991).

Gender division of labor is a socio-cultural assignment of tasks for individuals based on their gender. This definition can speak for nature of gender division of labor. It is susceptible to variation both in terms time of and place (Lindsey, 2004). Researches done on gender division of labor portrayed that the variation of gender division of labor is due to certain contributing factors (Caroline and Carolyn, 2005; Elizabeth, 2005; Diana, 1991; Lourdes, 1982; John, 1987; Nune and Maria, 1983; Janeth and Vivlan, 1998; Linda and Rosemary, 1994). Some of the factors are: socio-cultural, economical, marriage practice, religion, marital status, residence, methods of agricultural production, the introduction of new crops and technology, forms of property as well as the political make up of an area. There are researches conducted on the issue of gender division of labor in different aspects. Some of these aspects are gender division of labor in paid labor (John, 1987); the effect of gender division of labor on the socio-economic as well as other social statuses of women (Lourdes, 1982; Eyuel, 2007); gender division of labor in agriculture

(Elizabeth,2003; Lourdes,1982;Sintayehu, 2002; Dejene,1995); women and domestic chores (Stevl and Sue ,2002; Suzan,1998; Lourdes,1982; Janeth and Vivlan,1998). Besides, According to Richard (1997), there are researches that portrayed the nature of gender division of labor in agro-pastoral society is somewhat different from those who are mainly depend on agriculture. According to her, women and men were engaged in productive tasks and were egalitarian partners for the contribution of household income in agro-pastoral areas. She noted that the sources of living and household income for these societies were animal and crop production in which women of these area played great role.

There are few studies conducted on the issue of division of labor in agro-pastoral society of Ethiopia (Kechero, 2005; Dejene, 2009; Kedija, Azage, Mohammed and Berhanu, 2005). However, these researches didn't investigate what the current researcher designed to explore. For instance, Kedija, Azage, Mohammed and Berhanu,(2005) investigated the issue of traditional cow and camel production and marketing in Mieso District, oromia Regional state. This study is limited only on the issue of cow and camel milking. Besides, Hence, the researcher was interested to conduct a study on the tasks performed by the couples in household; agriculture which includes crop, vegetable, fruit and livestock production and selling of agricultural products in detail at the area selected for this study. Besides, the contributing factors for the division of tasks among husband and wife and the role of couples for managing and saving the income of the household were the focus of this study. The researcher believed that since gender is a relational concept, its other terminologies constructed based on it as that of gender division of labor are also relational. To put in other terms, dealing with a certain issue about women in relation to gender without addressing the same issue of men by comparing with women doesn't give full information. Furthermore, when we try to know what women accomplish in any sphere of activities, we have to know the men's since they share tasks based on their gender thereby have their own parts to perform. Hence, it makes sense when we see women and men specifically wife and husband in a relational way instead of taking them separately while dealing with a certain issue which is relational. Therefore, it is interesting and useful making the roles and tasks of wives visible by comparing both genders in a given situation. This can be done by taking both genders i.e. wife and husband as respondents to the study. One thing which should be noted here is that taking both sexes as a participant of the study has great feminist epistemological concern i.e. uncovering the limitation of previous researches which took male as

the sole participant to their study while dealing with women's problems and concerns (Diana, 1991).

1.2. Statement of the Problem

As indicated in the background part, gender division of labor had been blamed for the low socio-economic status and subordination of women. However, there are studies which portrayed that the tasks assigned to genders, their economic contribution and status varied greatly on the socio-cultural, economical, religious and political set up of an area under consideration (Suzanne, 1998; Stevl and Sue, 2002; Caroline and Carolyn, 2005; Elizabeth, 2005; Lourdes, 1982; Janeth and Vivlan, 1998; Linda and Rosemary, 1994). These studies had revealed the cross-cultural variation of the assignment of tasks for men and women in general and wife and husband in particular thereby the variation of the status of women across cultures. As a worldwide phenomenon, gender division of labor among men and women in general and among wife and husband in particular at the labor market had been studied extensively (John, 1987). In relation to this, the issue of domestic or reproductive role of women and its effect on the Scio-economic and other status of them had also received due attention by many scholars and researchers (Lourdes, 1982; Stevl and Sue, 2002; Suzan, 1998; Janeth and Vivlan, 1998). These studies had tried to look at the tasks carried out by men and women and its effects on the socio-economic status and subordination of women.

The same holds true for studies conducted on the issue under discussion in Ethiopia. In fact there are researches done on gender division of labor in Ethiopia. Some of these are; (Sintayehu, 2002; Dejene, 1995; Daniel, 2008; Eyuel, 2007; Wossen, 2008; Yohannes, 1997). However, the focus of these studies was not on the issue that has been analyzed by the researcher. The spotlight of some of these researchers for instance, Eyuel (2007) was to show the effect of gender division of labor on working urban women in the area of health, education, economic and other social statuses. This work didn't look at the effect of gender division of labor on rural women of Ethiopia in general and women of agro-pastoral society as that of Fafen in particular though the effect of gender division of labor on women under study was not the concern of the researcher for the current study. In addition, even though the work of Dejenie (1995) and Wossen (2008) tried to analyze gender division of labor in agriculture, their focus was only on crop production without examining the division of tasks in each crop separately and time allocation among

people in farm tasks. They didn't demonstrate what do wife and husband perform in agro-pastoral society in general and in the selected area in particular which allows to portray the set of condition of division of labor in the household as a unit. This can allow for uncovering the contribution of wives and husbands for household income since we can make evident the tasks and economic contribution of the couples through intensive scrutiny of what they accomplish separately. Moreover, since household through its individual members is the base for the national development of the society as well as the country, it has to be studied in asymmetric way in order to see the individual contributions by putting the lens on individual members of the household among which wife and husband are the most important once. Moreover, previous researchers had taken tasks in agricultural production only in the context of the division of tasks in crop production; they didn't focus on the division of tasks in livestock production, vegetable and fruit production as well as selling of agricultural products as part of tasks in agriculture. That means, the involvement of wives and husbands in the task of animal production which is very crucial source of income mainly for subsistence in agro-pastoral society was overlooked. Lastly, the above noted researches didn't have a detailed look at the contributing factors for the division of tasks among wife and husband and their role for managing and saving the income of the household in the selected area.

Thus, the researcher was interested to see the set of condition of division of tasks among wives and husbands and contributing factors for the division in Fafen in accordance with the research questions and objectives listed below.

1. What tasks do wives and husbands carry out in the selected area?
2. What are the factors that contribute for the division of tasks among wives and husbands?
3. What is the role of wives and husbands in managing and saving the income of the household?

1.3. Objectives

The general objective of the research was to identify what tasks wives and husbands carryout in the area under study and what factors do sway the division of tasks among couples.

The specific objectives of the research were:

- ❖ To identify the tasks performed by wives and husbands in domestic chores, agriculture as well as marketing (selling). Agriculture includes crop, vegetable, fruit and livestock productions.
- ❖ To identify contributing factors for the division of tasks among wives and husbands.
- ❖ To see the role of wives and husbands in managing and saving the income of the household.

1.4. Operational Definitions

Gender Division of labor: - is defined as the division of tasks among husbands and wives in domestic chores and agricultural production as well as selling of agricultural products. Agricultural production included crop, vegetable, fruit as well as animal production.

Household Income: - Refers to the income generated by both wife and husband that is measured in terms of money and it might be invested for consumption and saving.

Crop Production: - Refers to the production cereal crops including maize, sorghum and Khat.

Vegetable and Fruit Production: - Refers to the production of tomato, salad, green paper; and mango and papaya respectively.

Livestock Production: - Refers to the production of livestock including camels.

Marketing: - Refers to the selling of agricultural products including milk and butter.

Household Chores: -Refers to performing child caring, cooking, cleaning, fetching water, collecting fire wood, caring the sick and old members of the household, washing clothes, house building and other similar tasks.

1.5. Significance

The research report is expected to stimulate further researches to be undertaken on the issues raised and other related issues. Besides, the research will have significance in showing the task of wives and husbands and the contributing factors for the division of the tasks among them as well as the role couples have in managing and saving their income in agro-pastoral area - Fafen.

1.6. Delimitation

The scope of the research was on division of tasks among wife and husband in the selected area on household chores; crop; vegetable and fruit and livestock production; as well as selling of

agricultural products including milk and butter. Besides, the study has tried to see the contributing factors for the division tasks among wife and husband. Moreover, the research also tried to cover the role of wives and husbands for managing and saving the money of the household. The study didn't cover the division of tasks in paid employment and selling of animal meat, beef and skin products.

Most importantly, the research has included only wives and husbands who live in the area selected for this purpose. To put in other terms, the participants for this research were only rural married couples who live under a roof. That means, urban wife and husband were not part of this research.

1.7. Limitation

The main noted limitation of this study was language. The very effect of language was observed during conducting in-depth interview. That is, since the interview was conducted on Somali speaking people, it was very difficult to get the direct word of the interviewee as it has been stated by them though there had been translators.

II. Review of Related Literature

2.1. Conceptual Framework

The researcher had taken the theory of Gendered cultural relativism and gender role socialization in order to conceptualize the issues that were addressed. Gendered cultural relativism is a perspective that puts women at the center of knowledge but contextualizes their experiences to their culture. It holds the notion that since women and men have different cultural backgrounds, the role and the status they have in a society varies across cultures depending on the culture of the particular area. This theory is directly related to the nature of gender division of labor that emanates from its construction. That means, since gender is constructed by a particular society so gender division of labor. It is constructed by a particular society so as to assign specific tasks to each sexes based on their gender. Hence, the tasks each sex responsible to accomplish depend on the culture of a specific area. In every culture, women and men in general and husbands and wives in particular are related to each other in culturally specified ways. It is culture that allocates and perpetuates specific tasks and roles to women and men on the bases of their gender; it defines how females and males become women and men (Lois, 2002). Thus, it is possible to argue that culture is the base for the variation of division of tasks among couples across cultures and also a factor for sharing tasks among the same since it is their culture that assigns tasks that are deemed appropriate to them.

In relation to the above concept, we can see gender role socialization in line with the notion of gender division of labor. Gender role socialization is the concept that has direct relation with culture in respect of the issue of gender division of tasks among the sexes. It is the tool to learn how to be a man and a woman through various socializing agents. Moreover, it is a process through which individuals acquired the roles and responsibilities for which they are responsible to accomplish. In spite of its variation across cultures and time to time, gender role socialization which is accomplished by various socialization agents like family, school, media and e.t.c.;

teaches and perpetuates tasks for both sexes that are assumed to be appropriate in the eyes of the particular culture and society. Hence, sexes are culturally obliged to do culturally given tasks that are presumed to be appropriate for them at that point and place in time. This dictation or socialization compels genders (men and women) to perform tasks that the culture of their area assumes appropriate for each (Ralston, 2008). From this, it is possible to say that gender role socialization is one of the factors that sway the couples to accomplish tasks that are assumed to be appropriate for them in the eyes of their culture and society.

Culture and gender role socialization together influence both genders to accomplish tasks in a particular area in household chores, agricultural production, livestock production and selling of agricultural products. Therefore, when we see these concepts in relation to the issue under investigation, husbands and wives of Fafen might have their own culturally given tasks in the aforesaid chores and productions that are considered to be appropriate for the sexes in the eyes of this culture and society. Therefore, the culture of this area might have an effect on the division of tasks among the couples in each variables in the noted particular area.

In addition, the researcher also used multicultural feminists thought for the analyses of the topic at hand. According to Tong (1998), the main theme of multicultural feminists is rooted in multicultural thought, an ideology that has built its epistemology on the support of diversity. Hence, by applying the multicultural celebration of diversity, these feminists had tried to uncover the differential background of women in order to see their condition of oppression and subordination. They underlined on the point that the subordination and or operation of women is greatly affected by their varying backgrounds as that of religion, place of location or culture, marital status, class and the like. When we relate this thought to the topic under consideration i.e. gender division of labor among wives and husbands in Fafen, there might be different culture, ethnicity, religion and socio-economical set up in this area. Hence, it is an expected event that the condition of gender division of labor in this area might have its own nature which resulted in different subordination of women in general and wives of the selected area in particular. The main emphasis of the researcher is on the point that the multi cultural celebration of diversity across cultures. That means the impossibility of universalizing about the women and men of the world. They should be seen in their context. Their view is generated in order to oppose the mainstream thought of other feminists such as liberal and existentialist who have a view of

taking women and men across the world as if they are the same, have the same experiences and background. These mainstream feminists had tried to stipulate that the reproductive tasks or roles are performed by women and productive tasks by men across the world.

However, this universalization is criticized by multicultural feminists. It is because so long as gender is a socio-cultural constructed phenomenon, so gender division of labor which is constructed based on the notion of gender. This in turn resulted in the variation of the nature and type of tasks carried out by the couples across cultures. In this case, there might be a possibility for women or wives in engaging in the so called productive roles in a certain country and in particular place in a region.

2.2. The Meaning and the Nature of Gender Division of Labor

Gender which is the stepping stone for the construction of gender division of labor refers to the social organization of the relationship between sexes (Whittler, Tyler and Reger cited in Suzanne, 1998, P.343). Gender division of labor is the societal construction of tasks assigned to women and men based on their sex in a given society (Caroline and Carolyn, 2005; Steyl and Sue, 2002). The nature of gender division of labor therefore emanates from its construction. Hence, since this concept is constructed by the particular society; its nature depends mainly on the context where it is constructed (Suzanne, 1998; Steyl and Sue, 2002).

Researches conducted on the issue of gender division of labor portrayed that the nature of gender division of labor varies greatly across cultures depending on the socio-cultural and economic set up of the society at hand (Suzanne, 1998; Caroline and Carolyn, 2005). There are arguments about the nature of gender division of labor in respect to public-private domain. On one side, there are researches for instance, (Michele cited in Caroline and Carolyn, 2005, P.95) that stick to show the universal nature of women's domestic role that is private and men's productive role that is supposed to be public. On the other side, there are also other scholars who strived to show the difficulty of universalizing the private and public spheres since this through a light on the universality of male domination (Suzanne, 1998; Caroline and Carolyn, 2005). The persuasive justification for these scholars is the varying nature of the concept of private and public spheres across cultures. They argued that gender division of labor should be viewed in the context that

we try to investigate. Their finding demonstrated the fact that women are engaged in productive role that is considered to be public.

Moreover, Lynne and Sylvia (1989), presented different arguments forwarded by researchers towards the concept of reproduction (private) and production (public) activities carried out by women and men. According to them, reproduction has a wide variety of connotations, ranging from the process of biological reproduction at one end of spectrum to the process of social reproduction at the other. Biological reproduction comprises child birth and lactation; where as physical reproduction involves the daily regeneration of the labor forces through cooking, cleaning, washing and so on. Social reproduction also denotes to the maintenance of ideological conditions which reproduce class relations and uphold the social and economic statuesque. According to these writers, in most societies, reproductive activities tend to fall up on the shoulder of women, and a factor for them to remain outside the domain of public life and politics.

Lynne and Sylvia also show that production has different meanings in urban and rural areas; but they defined it as all activities which directly generating income. However, these scholars forwarded the unsatisfactory result of the classification of private-public and reproduction-production by referring to the stand of Marxist feminists who argues that both reproduction and production create value, and are therefore potentially income generating. According to these researchers, these feminists point out that the connotation of productive activities as direct income generating shed a light on the economic value of reproductive activities. They stated that merely because domestic tasks such as house work and child care unwaged in virtually in all societies doesn't mean that these activities are unproductive and still less that they do not constitute a category of work. They noted that several domestic-based activities contribute income to the household unit in the form of saving, budgeting or provision of unpaid services.

The most noted argument of Lynne and Sylvia is the problem of defining the boundary between productive and reproductive tasks in rural environments as they are complicated by the existence of an intermediate category of activity, subsistence farming. They stated that subsistence farming essential for use and in this sense akin to reproductions, yet in content it displays similarities to income generating rural activities, and in times of surplus may itself become production for exchange. In view of this, they pointed out that we might well ask whether drawing a rather

arbitrary divide between productive and reproductive labor valid, let alone necessary. Again we argue its worth in analytical terms. In most parts of the world, involvement in production or recognizable income -generating activities (the creation of exchange values) is accorded greater value than involvement in the subsistence or reproductive sphere (the creation of use values) in which the former is usually dominated by men and the later tends to be the domain of women. They mainly strived to show that rural production contains a detailed examination of women's roles in various types of rural production, as well as reminding us of the problem of separating production from reproduction in rural areas.

In relation to this, according to Diana (1991), many findings portrayed that women are in a position to engage in productive tasks that are directly contributing to the household income and both men and women are in a position to engage in productive tasks thereby contributing to the household income. However, as noted above, this doesn't mean that women's reproductive roles have no economic importance. The intention here is to show the cross-cultural variation of the engagement of women and men in reproductive as well as productive roles. Thus, gender division of labor is not a static rather dynamic concept which varies across cultures and within cultures. As a result, the participation of women and men in the so called reproductive and productive activities also varies across culture and place of location (rural and urban). From these findings, we can fairly argue that the societal assignment of domestic chores or reproductive roles for women and other productive tasks for men depends on the culture and socio-economical set up of an area.

2.2.1. The Nature of Gender Division of Labor in Agro-pastoral Society

According to Richard (1997), Agro-pastoralists are people who derive less than 50 per cent of their incomes from livestock and livestock products, and most of the remaining income from cultivation or subsistence farming. According to this researcher, the types of livestock kept by agro-pastoralists vary according to climate, environment, water and other natural resources, as well as geographical area. The livestock kept in these areas include; camels, goats, sheep, livestock, yaks, horses, llamas, alpacas, reindeer and vicunas.

When we come to the nature of gender division of labor in these areas, there are arguments which have direct relationship with the division of tasks among wife and husband in these areas.

For instance, there are researchers who offered the variations of some previous interpretation of gender division of labor in agro-pastoral and pastoral nomadic societies (Martin and Vocher cited in Caroline and Carolyn, 2005, P.102). According these researchers, it is difficult to point to any single pattern of economic adaptation or social structure of the sexes among agro-pastoralist across the world. Based on their ethnological, cross-cultural and historical secondary data, these authors made several tentative generalizations. They noted that the sexual division of labor in pastoral and agro-pastoral areas seems to be related to the degree and nature of mobility necessary for the booming implementation of subsistence activities that includes crop production and animal herding.

According to Caroline and Carolyn (2005), many authors agree that, however the form it takes place, the division of labor in agro-pastoral areas does not create a sharp dichotomy between domestic and public spheres. According to them, women's tasks are more likely take place in camp than men's tasks, but they do not detach women in the household. Many women work is done in cooperation with other women. Both men and women participate in collective work patterns with other member of the same gender. Camps are typically divided in to women's space and men's space, but almost all activities are carried out in open, avoiding development of private -domestic sphere for women versus public sphere for men (Kelly and Carney cited in Caroline and Carolyn, 2005, P.138). According to them, women's work may be household work, but public household work. They put a point therefore that public- domestic domain thus appears as too rigid and bound to western cultures. They concluded that the nature of gender division of labor in agro-pastoral society is complex, and challenge superficial generalization.

In indicating the implication of the transition of the production systems of pastoralism to agro-pastoralism that has direct effect on the nature of gender division of labor in agro-pastoral areas, Elizabeth (2003) forwarded that pastoral production system all over the world is characterized by exogenously driven change and can be described as systems in transition. That is, crop- livestock integration is reported to occur more in lands historically used for pastoralist that has direct effect on the assignment of tasks for sexes. This scholar pointed out that the trend towards crop-livestock integration is associated with new activities and a reorganization of gender and age specific roles. Her finding indicated that there is a general change in gender roles in livestock production system in Africa, Latin America and Asia. As a result, the changing pastoral

production to agro-pastoral system in Africa results in increasing workloads for women in livestock production. Hence, Elizabeth noted that emerging gender divisions of labor are a direct consequence of struggles of men and women since they strive to support their families.

Elizabeth further indicated that pastoral people of Massai have changed to agro-pastoral way of life. She noted that People of Massai agro-pastoral has spent more time on livestock related duties than they do on crop related duties. Moreover, according to this researcher, the historical division of labor that placed the responsibility of livestock production in the hands of the male members of the community has changed in this area. As a result, in all agro-zones that this researcher has conducted her study, the wives are spending more labor time on livestock production than their husbands.

2.3. Gender Division of Labor or Tasks

2.3.1. Household Chores

Most women of the world share one fact in common i.e. accomplishing domestic chores. They are responsible for performing domestic chores though the degree of their participation and the manner of performing household chores varies across cultures and countries depending on the context of the specific area (Lourdes, 1982). According to Lourdes, women are usually responsible for the work of household tasks due to the very reason that they are responsible for child bearing and rearing. The findings in relation to division of labor in household tasks portrayed that women are the dominant once in carrying out household chores (Suzan, 1998; Stuel and Sue, 2002; Caroline and Carolyn, 2005; Janet and Vivian, 1993; Martha, 1987). According to these researchers, gender role differences in household tasks revealed a greater multiplicity of women's tasks than of men's.

When we come to Ethiopia, the same finding is evident as that of the above. There are researches conducted in Ethiopia that revealed women are exclusively responsible for accomplishing domestic chores such as food processing, preparation and preservation; fetching water; spinning and traditional sewing; collecting fire wood; child care and so forth (Yohhannes, 1997; Wossen, 2008; Sintayehu 2002). Moreover, Habtamu, Hirut, Yusuf and Konjit (2004) found out that women in rural areas of Ethiopia were involved in rearing children, building hut(house), grinding

grain, fetching, collecting fire wood, and cleaning the house even though the study didn't separately deal with each tasks in household chores, crop and animal production and see the role men play in these productions comparatively. However, Dejene (2009) indicated that husbands take part in the task of fetching water in agro-pastoral area of Guji.

2.3.2. Agriculture

Before giving some insight as to the division of labor in agricultural production, it is better to see what constitute this scenario (agricultural production). According to Lourdes (1982), the participation of couples in agricultural production is traditionally conceptualized in terms of performance of tasks associated with agricultural field work. She further noted that although her analysis of the sexual division of labor also focused on this more restricted definition of what constitutes agricultural work, it is important to give due attention to various activities encompassed in a broader conceptualization of agricultural production. According to her, a broader definition must include all of the activities connected with both crop and animal production, irrespective of whether the final products constitute use value for the family's consumption or exchange value. The current researcher therefore took this view for the analysis of gender division of labor among couples in agricultural production since the importance of taking in to account this broader definition of activities encompassed with in agricultural production among the agro-pastoral society results from the fact that the sexual division of labor may vary among the component tasks that in turn help to have a detailed analyses of what the couples carry out in those tasks.

Crop Production

According to Suzan (1998), there are tasks that are associated with the production of crop. Some of the activities included the production of the means of production such as making or repairing tools, and infrastructure improvements on the land, as well as the collection of inputs, such as fertilizer; tasks associated with field work; personal services associated to field work, such as cooking for field hands; the tasks involved in transporting, storing, and marketing the harvest; and the numerous of tasks associated with organizing agricultural work.

In order to show the importance of scrutinizing the specific tasks carried out by couples, Lynne and Sylvia (1989) noted that the most accurate measure of the sexual division of labor is the

sexual composition of the labor force in an activity. In relation to this, the finding of Lourdes, 1982; Elizabeth, 2003; Carolyn and Caroline, 2005; and Kara, 2008; portrayed that the participation of women in crop production varies in both types of an activity, types of crop, and place of location. For instance, the finding of Lourdes (1982) portrayed that peasantry women were found to be frequently carried out marketing of agricultural products and agricultural field work was the most infrequent activities for these women. Not only this, but the finding of this researcher also made evident that the participation of women in the noted agricultural tasks vary from one place to another in which she took two areas for her study.

Besides, the finding of John (1987) revealed that the division of labor by sex in crop production varies according to the specific agricultural tasks and household's class position. It demonstrates that women and men have participated in agricultural activities with varying degree and women despite their low participation rates performed a wide range of agriculture tasks. This researcher noted that although women traditionally formed a relatively small fraction of agricultural labor force, and although there was a fairly rigid sexual division of labor in field work, they performed quite a variety of tasks.

Most importantly, Lourdes (1982), pointed out the need to see qualitative aspect of gender division of labor i.e. the tasks carried out by the couples. She justified her point by stating that attention to the labor process within agricultural field work suggests that the sexual division of labor in many activities is a technical division of labor, taking place within the labor process itself. She took Cajamarca, for example, and noted that in this place during field preparation and planting, both men and women may participate in the same activity, but each usually performs separate tasks. Men always lead the team of oxen plowing in the field, while women follow behind and shake the soil to free it from the roots of weeds that are turned over. During planting, men lead the oxen making the furrow while women place the seed. She noted that in the Garcia Roviara, during tobacco planting, both men and women may participate, but here again there is a technical division of labor. Men make the hoe in the ground for the tobacco seedling with an iron cane, and the women put the plant in place. This complementarity in the labor process is also true in harvesting activities. In the corn harvest in Cajamarca, women generally plant with the corncobs while men follow behind, cutting the corn plant with sickle. In the grain harvest men wiled the sickle, cutting the wheat or barley stalk, while men or women gather the crop. Only

men however, load the burros and transport crop to the threshing ground. In the threshing operation men manage the horses and thresh the grain, while the women sweep up the threshed grain with the help of the children.

According to Lourdes (1982), labor allocation between husbands and their wives for different cropping strategies, tasks and crops differs. For instance, activities such as field preparation, irrigation and supervising are mostly done by men while harvesting, planting and threshing are mostly done by women. However, there are crops in which there is equal allocation of labor between husband and wife.

Researches conducted in the area of gender division of labor in crop production in Ethiopia revealed that both sexes have tasks to accomplish in this production. These researches also demonstrate that the tasks women and men are responsible for varies from one place to another. Furthermore, the finding of these researches indicated that there are tasks that are performed by both sexes together, exclusively carried out by women as well as exclusively accomplished by men. For instance, Dejenie (1989) in his finding revealed that in his study area Legambo, there are tasks that are exclusively accomplished by women like tasks in the production of pumpkin and selling the same taking it in to the market. However, this researcher came up with this finding while investigating time allocation of men and women in agricultural production. To put in other terms, the objective of this researcher was to investigate the time allocation of the sexes in agricultural production; he didn't focus on who does what particularly husband and wife in each task in the production of crop in detail which helps to clearly see the contribution of the couples in this production.

The finding of Wossen (2008), in its part portrayed that women in general are the dominant participants in food crops and men in the production of cash crops in Mjinger community in south western Ethiopia. However, his study was considering agriculture only in the sense of crop production. It didn't see tasks in livestock production in the umbrella of agriculture. It also failed to see gender division of labor in vegetable and fruit production while examining tasks in the production of crops. This researcher also didn't investigate the contributing factors for the division of tasks in the production of these productions in the study area.

Besides the above studies, women play a dominant role in crop production in Dorze (Gamo) highlands (Getaneh, 2004), Tsamako people (Melese, 1994), Chenchaworeda in North Omo zone (Birhanu, 1999), in Jimma Rare district (Ameyu,2003), Sendafa in the area of North Shewa (Kasahun, 1996), and Delanta woreda in Wollo (Nahusenay,2004) . On the contrary, both sexes found to have equal share in contributing to crop production. For instance, the finding of Yilma (2002) among the Konso people of Tokatulega district in south western Ethiopia indicated that almost all agricultural tasks except few ones were performed by both sexes. This finding also revealed that there is no sharp gender based division of labor as a general rule. But, he has also mentioned the existence of tasks that are carried out mainly by a particular gender. Moreover, carrying maize from the field to the storage facility and preparing threshing ground is women's exclusive work, whereas threshing is the task of men in Guji agro-pastoral area (Dejenei, 2009). Most importantly, men of Sidama were dominant in agricultural tasks Sintayehu (2002).

However, the above studies didn't portray the possible contributing factors for women's' being dominant participant, men's active engagement and sharing of tasks equally among the sexes in the above mentioned areas in crop production.

Vegetable and Fruit Production

Vegetable and fruit production has emerged as a significant activity for marginal farm households and their production is found to be the main source of income for rural households in general and poor rural households in particular (Elizabeth, 2003). This researcher pointed out that poor rural households of Nepal have been benefited out of vegetable cultivation. Vegetables in this area have served not only for regular source of income for poor households but also as nutritional supplements. However, despite showing the vegetable cultivation's becoming significant and have become the main source of income mainly for rural households, this researcher didn't see the division of tasks among wives and husbands who are probably responsible for the survival of their household. It is because recognizing the significant contribution of vegetable and fruit production for the survival of poor rural households without recognizing and knowing who does what in this production transmits partial information. Most importantly, these kinds of data might hide the contribution of couples for their household survival.

Livestock Production

Traditional livestock systems based on local resources and animal breeds are the major source of livelihoods for rural families, and provide food and income for rural poor (Richard, 1997). This researcher noted that livestock production is cited as the main source of livelihood in rural areas in general and agro-pastoral areas in particular. Ethiopia is known for its large number of livestock. Livestock is the major capital asset of pastoral and agro-pastoral area of our country and the contribution of livestock and livestock products to the household's of these areas' income is significant (Kejela and Emanu, 2005). According to Elizabeth (2003), there are tasks to be carried out in this systems of production which includes feeding and grazing, attention to health care, looking after the young and sick animals and sweeping the animal sheds, transformation activities (skinning the hides, cleaning wool, butchering, and marketing). According to this noted scholar, the division of tasks among men and women in livestock production varies from place to place and season to season. Hence, the participation of women and the burden they have in this activity varies accordingly.

However, the finding of Elizabeth portrayed that despite the variety, males and females of all ages participate in livestock production; and men usually own and manage large animals, such as cattle and buffalo, while women are almost always responsible for poultry and small ruminants, such as goats. She stated however that gender roles change. To this effect, a study in Tanzania conducted by Elizabeth found that women do perform "men's tasks" during labor shortages. Moreover, Caroline and Carolyn (2005) indicated that care and management of livestock are generally in the hands of men in agro-pastoral areas and women give assistance in the care of animals and make major contribution to their families. Lourdes (1982), further asserted that women do participate in livestock production. However, these findings lack specificity as to in which tasks and livestock they or women are accomplishing tasks in livestock production.

In addition, women of Ethiopia found to be involving in looking after animals (Habtamu, Hirut, Yusuf and Konjit (2004). Moreover, milking of cows and collecting food for young animals is the responsibility of wives in the district of Mieso in Oromo region (Kedija, Azage, Mohammed and Berhanu, 2005) though their study focused on the role of genders in milking and didn't see

other specific tasks in livestock productions. However, Kechero (2007), who studied the division of labor in agro-pastoral area of Jimma, indicated that men are largely the decision makers for livestock production and are in charge of general herd management. On the contrary, women generally contribute more labor inputs in areas of feeding; manage vulnerable animals (calves, small ruminants, and sick, injured and pregnant animals), cleaning of barns, dairy-related activities (milking, butter and cheese making), transportation of farm manure and sale of milk and its products than men and children. According to him, both men and women take part in the harvesting and transportation of feed, feeding of animals, cleaning of sheds and sale of milk, cheese and butter, whereas, processing of milk is done solely by women. According to Dejene (2009), milking cows was the task of women in Guji agro-pastoral area. Similarly, the finding of Sintayehu (2002) showed that men of Sidama were the primary responsibility takers in livestock production particularly in herding and managing.

In relation to the tasks in selling of agricultural products, it has been found out that the most common activities for women are marketing of agricultural products (Lourdes, 1982). However, Sintayehu (2002) indicated that both men and women accomplished a task of selling agricultural products though items for which women are responsible to sell were less in amount and less valued. By the same note, men of Jimma agro-pastoral zone took part in selling of milk together with their wives (Kechero, 2007).

Regarding the role in saving and managing the income of the household, Janet and Vivian (1993) revealed that rural Srilanka women handle income and manage expenditure of the household. On the contrary, according to Dejene (2009), women have little control over agricultural products and the expansion of agriculture increased women's work burden and reduced their control over resources in Guji agro-pastoral area.

2.4. Factors Affecting Gender Division of Labor

There are researches conducted on the factors that affect gender division of labor (Diana, 1991; Caroline and Carolyn, 2005; Suzan, 1998; Elizabeth, 2003; Lourdes, 1982; John, 1987; Nune and Maria, 1983; Janeth and Vivian, 1998; Linda and Rosemary, 1994; Lourdes, 1982). The objective of these researches was to scrutinize the contributing factors for the variation of gender division of labor in a particular area. The overall conclusion of these studies portrayed that there is a need

to put a lens on the particular area to know the various factors that affect the prevailing gender division of labor among women and men in that area. According to these scholars, with varying degree and nature there are factors that influence either negatively or positively the participation of women and men in any task. These are; social, cultural, economical, religious, marital status, marriage practice, age, ethnicity, kinship, race, social status, modes of subsistence, survival strategies of the households in specific relation to land; leadership role in the family, inheritance of property, control of distribution and exchange of valued goods and other similar factors.

According to Lourdes (1982), the conditions and types of the tasks undertaken by the couples are dependent on the survival strategies of households in specific relation to land. Besides, changes in land holding patterns and in methods of agricultural production differently affects different rural households and the work that couples from these households carry out. Sue further noted that a change in the distribution of land and other means of production has also an effect on a task carried out by the couples in agricultural production. According to Lourdes, the change in the social and technical relations of production also alters the gender based division of labor. In addition, the economic pressure of the involvement commodity of production for sale and interdiction on women's participation in work outside the home are also other factors that affect the division of labor among couples.

When we see the participation of women in agricultural work, the above noted research portrayed that there is a cross-cultural variation. According to this finding, women's participation in agricultural work in Haryan is usually considered as rigged where women traditionally have done little field work. Where as in the shoddier and hillier districts of the old stats of Punjab, women have typically been known to do more agricultural work, even plowing in some areas where the men were away, working as migrant laborers

The finding of Elizabeth (2003) also reveals the domination of crop production by husbands in irrigation systems of farming is related to the perceived difficulty of the tasks involved in irrigated farming. These are tasks such as construction of irrigation structures during field preparation, irrigation and maintenance. Besides, the domination of crop production by husbands is also linked to how long a family has been farming. Elizabeth stated that People that have taken up farming recently said that farming activities hard for women and that is why they are

predominantly done by men. But, people who had been farming for longer periods said that as farm related activities multiply and their urgency increases with increasing crop production, men find that they cannot perform all activities without the help of their wives, and the gender role become blurred in this area.

Linda and Rosemary (1994), on their part found out that women's roles are critical in agricultural production. However, the value of such roles has been largely diminished, and women have had less access than men to the development process and the resulting benefits. Norms of hierarchy and cultural notions of female and male roles govern the specific ways in which work is shared are influencing factors for the less participation of women and dominant participation of men. They further stated that the prevailing gender division of labor makes men responsible for plowing while women are held responsible for the ensuing tasks. As a result, regardless of the crop that is being cultivated, labor inputs for planting, composting, applying manure, transplanting, weeding, and postharvest activities including seed selection and storing are mainly provided by women. Men generally control the marketing of agricultural surpluses, and the income from the sale of crops remains with them. Women are able to sell or barter a small amount of grains to meet some of their household needs.

Factors affecting gender division of labor in various aspects including agriculture, household and marketing has get less attention in Ethiopia. As a result, it has not been studied in full-fledged manner and detail. However, Dejenie (1989) and Wossen(2008) generally found out that the most likely factors that affect gender division of labor in crop production were cultural background, cropping patterns, types of farm technology and the perceived difficulty of some of agricultural tasks.

2.4.1. Factors Affecting Gender Division Labor in Agro-pastoral Areas.

The variation among gender division of labor in agro-pastoral societies is influenced by the interaction of animal herding and cultivation; cultural history of the society, economic independence and agricultural back ground (Martin and Voorhees cited in Caroline and Carolyn, 2005, P.239). However, they argued that it is difficult to determine and put common factor like culture and social influences for all agro-pastoral societies. They also stated that gender division of labor with in many agro-pastoral societies is inclined towards male dominance of economic

productive tasks. These authors see this dominance is emanated due to the perceived assumption of the strength required to handle large animals. But, according to them, females may however herd animals and serve as dairy maids for large animals and small species. They also contribute by gathering food, carrying water, and processing by products such as milk, hide, and dung. But, the lack of firm differentiation between domestic and public spheres encounters gender egalitarianism, where women have some economic contribution and control.

Besides, other scholars also argued that women participate more fully in the total life of these societies than they do in settled agricultural communities (Bouldig cited in Caroline and Carolyn, 2005, P.367). On the contrary, other researchers argued that male dominance of economic production gives rise to their superiority over their wives (Martine and Voorhees cited in Caroline and Carolyn, 2005, P.378). From these, we can fairly hold an assumption that there might not common factor for the variation of division of tasks among wife and husband in agro-pastoral society across the world. These suggest an importance of examining local cultures and histories to have a specific factor for the division of tasks among husband and wife in that area. It is because the context of a particular area is the base for any claim we strive to hold about that area.

Moreover, according to Elizabeth (2003), the influencing factors for the division of tasks in agricultural production in agro-pastoral areas are the change of system of production i.e. crop-livestock integration that is occurred in lands historically used for pastoralism. In this, she noted that the trend towards crop—livestock integration is associated with new tasks and a reorganization of gender and age specific roles. She further stated that there is a general change in gender roles in livestock production system in Africa, Latin America and Asia. As a result, the changing pastoral production system in Africa results in increasing workloads for women in livestock production.

III. Methodology

The methodology part of the study included the research design, study area, participants, sources of data, sampling technique, data collection tools, data collection procedures, methods of data analyses and ethical considerations.

3.1. Research Design

The researcher used mixed methods research designs i.e. quantitative and qualitative. The rationale for combining quantitative and qualitative methods was for better addressing research questions by triangulating and substantiating the result both from quantitative research and the detail of qualitative research; to explore participants' views and to obtain statistical, quantitative results from a sample and allow a few individuals to probe or explore those results in more depth (Creswell, 2003, Sarantakos, 2005). Most importantly, the justification for using qualitative research design apart from quantitative one since it employs flexible methods of data collection tool as that of in-depth interview thereby allow the researcher to gather depth information that might not be revealed in quantitative data. It also offered the researcher to create subjective knowledge by making the participants the source of knowledge. Moreover, this approach is the best way to access the respondents' ideas, memories and thoughts in their own words rather than the words of the researcher that is what feminist research insists (Reinherz, 1992). The specific design was cross-sectional one since the data was collected once from study participants.

3.2. Study Area

The study area was Fafen, a kebele from Gursum woreda in Jigjiga (Somali region). There are two villages in Fafen termed as Golmorodi and Ara-as. Fafen is located 35 Kilo meters from Jigjiga (the capital town of Somali region) and 593 kilo meters from Addis Ababa, the capital city of Ethiopia. The study area is found between the town of Hadow (the way to Jigjiga) and Mombas

(the capital town of Gursum and the way to Harer). Somali region is located in the South East part of Ethiopia. The selected area is agro-pastoral. The sources of living and income for this area includes: the production of crop including khat, vegetable and fruit, livestock including camel production. The dominant ethnic group and religion are Somali and Muslim respectively. The area was selected due to the following reasons.

- ❖ The area is least researched with respect to the topic at hand.
- ❖ The potential availability of the intended variables in the area i.e. the above listed agricultural activities are carried out in this area. The area is rich in water resource that helps the people to carryout agricultural activities.

3.3. Sources of Data

The researcher used both primary and secondary data .The primary data has been gathered from wives and husbands as well as key informants in the selected area. The secondary data was collected from books, internet sources, essays and thesis.

3.4. Participants

The population of the study was married couples of the area which included both wives and husbands. The total population of the study area was 1000 (married once) in which 576 were from Golmorodi and 424 were from Ara-as .The researcher therefore took 60 respondents from the former area and 40 from the later employing simple random sampling technique since the total population of the former area is greater than the later. Hence, the total number of participants for both conducting structured interview (questionnaires) and in-depth interview was 100. Among these, 50 (50%) were wives and the other half i.e. 50(%) were husbands who live in the selected area. The sample size was determined with estimation considering the cost, feasibility and accessibility of respondents (Russell, 2001). The purpose of taking wives and husbands was to identify the tasks carried out by them, the possible contributing factors for the division of the tasks as well as the role they play for saving and managing their household income. The researcher took twelve respondents i.e. five wives and five husbands who responded to the questionnaires and three key informants through simple random and purposive sampling technique respectively in order to conduct in depth interview.

The reason for taking equal number of participants from both sexes for both questionnaire and in depth interview was to get equally representative response for both sexes.

3.5. Sampling Technique

The researcher employed simple random sampling technique to select respondents for both questionnaires and in-depth interview. The above participants to the research were chosen with the framework of simple random sampling technique. First, the researcher took a sample frame of married couples who live in the selected kebele. After that, the respondents were selected with the framework of simple random sampling technique. They were selected randomly from those married couples for administering the questionnaires. It is because they had zero probability to be selected from the population i.e. married couples. That means, the sample participants had equal chance of being selected from the couples. Zero probability doesn't mean zero chance. After the questionnaires had been administered, respondents for conducting in-depth interview were selected randomly from those who responded to the questionnaires. In addition, the key informants were selected through purposive sampling technique since the researcher believed they do have and give information about the required data.

3.6. Instruments (Data collection tools)

The tools which were employed for this study were closed ended questionnaires and semi-structured in-depth interview guides. The purpose of the questionnaires was to get statistical based information as to the tasks carried out by the couples and the contributing factors for the division of tasks among the same. The content covered in the questionnaires were the tasks performed by the couples in the household chores; crop, vegetable, fruit and animal production; marketing and contributing factors for the division of tasks among wife and husband in household chores and farm tasks.

In depth interview as a data collection tool was selected because according to Debbus (1995), interview is a face to face communication between interviewee and interviewer on certain area of inquiry, and thereby allows the interviewee to speak up freely and more trustful data might be directly obtained. As a result, this scenario could help the researcher to explore in vast and in detail about the issue at hand. Moreover, it allows the researcher to have free interaction with the interviewee there by giving the opportunity for clarification and discussion. It also helps the

researcher to generate theory based on the people's view of reality. Most importantly, it produces non standardized information that allows the researcher to make full use of difference among people and allowing women to speak as they were ignored for centuries (Reinharz, 1992). The last but not least purpose of using in depth interview was to substantiate or strengthen the data that was gathered from questionnaires.

3.7. Procedures

3.7.1. Preparation of Data Collection Tool

The Questionnaires and interview items were prepared by the researcher through thorough reading of background, research questions, operational definitions and literature reviews. The researcher has carefully organized and read the items. The psychometric characteristics of the questionnaires items (reliability, clarity, readability, answerability and validity) were tested during the pilot study. This test had helped the researcher to modify, see the consistency and the representativeness of the items and; whether they measure what is intended to measure. For instance, in the items of household chores, the task of building tent was first put as building house .However, during the pilot test; it is found that building house and building tent are different. As result, the researcher has replaced building house by building tent since the intention was to know who does the task of building tent.

Besides, the task storing was included in Khat production. During the pilot test, it has been found that Khatt is not stored; hence, the researcher has detached this task from the list and included the task of cutting the tips of khat to produce more branches “megerez” since this task is very vital to measure the variable. When we come to items measuring livestock production, the task of milking was first prepared as general and was put in one space without indicating which livestock separately. However, during the pilot test, the respondents asked the question which livestock. Hence, the researcher has arranged this problem and put the task of milking as cow milking, goat milking and camel milking.

Concerning validity, it was seen as it had been a measure of what the study intended to investigate. In fact, validity determination theoretically is difficult. But, the validity of the measures was decided based on the content of the items whether they stand to measure or goes with indicators through giving to experts for the purpose of comments and evaluations. By doing

so, the validity of the indicators was addressed. With respect to reliability, as far as the validity of the items has been checked, it is obvious that it is reliable though the reliability of items was not checked with the help of formulas. With regard to clarity, answerability, and readability, different persons have seen the relevance and helpfulness of the items to the investigation. The same holds true for in-depth interview item measures. During the preparation of interview guide items, varieties of suggestions, comments and arrangements were collected from experts.

7.2. Data Administration

The data was administered at Fafen, the place located in Somali region. To administer and collect data from participants, there were serious of procedures and activities that have been under taken by the researcher. The researcher had discussed with the selected Kebele leader (chairman) and head of the Office for research on livestock in Somali Pastoral and Agro-pastoral Research Institute, Fafen branch in order to get cooperation and aware the overall purpose of the study. After we made interesting discussion about the issues that required to be addressed in the study and the very aim of the study, the aforementioned individuals were very co-operative to made arrangements for data collection. Besides, we have discussed about how to collect the data. As a result, we have agreed that the data have to be collected through assistant data collectors who can speak and read as well as write somali language since the respondents of the study had spoken this language. To this effect, both the questionnaires and in-depth interview guides were first prepared in English and later translated to Somali by Somali speaking individual as well as expert in translation.

The researcher has collected the data with the help of two individuals who are experts particularly working for the above explained research institute. For that matter, it is the head of the Office for research on livestock in Somali pastoral and agro-pastoral research institute who arranged these individuals to administer the questionnaires. The researcher had trained these individuals how to administer the questionnaires and collect the same since it was administered through structured interview. These data collectors were informed about that before starting and administrating questionnaires through structured interview, they have to introduce themselves and request the willingness of the respondents. After obtaining the willingness of the participants, they have to give orientation for the participants on the issues like how they proceed during the course of interview, the purpose of the research, the confidentiality of the information

that will be obtained from them, the sponsor of the research (the organization from which the researcher came from) and other related issues.

They were also told that after having informed the aforementioned issues, they can administer structured and closed ended questionnaires through the structured interview data collection method. The reason of preferring this kind of data collection method was with the belief that most of the sample respondents were illiterate. Therefore, it was more convincing to read them the items and fill their response in order to make the research feasible. Moreover, the data collectors administered the questionnaires by going to the respondents' house.

The next task was making arrangement for conducting in-depth interview. The researcher waited for the completion of the tasks of filling questionnaire since respondents for in-depth interview were taken from those who responded to the questionnaires in order to substantiate the data collected from questionnaires. Hence, the researcher took five couples i.e. five husband and five wives. After fixing the number of interview respondents and selecting them with the framework of simple random sampling technique, the next agenda was deciding the time, date and days of conducting the interview. Based on the appointment made, the respondents showed up at the place where they have agreed (at their home or respective place of living) and then the interview was conducted. But, as that of administering the questionnaires, accomplishing in depth interview was done with the assistance of language translators. These individuals were those who administered the questionnaires. Before conducting the interview, the researcher introduced herself to the respondents and informed the ethical related issues mentioned above. Tape recorder was used after obtaining the willingness of the respondents to catch any information from the mouth of the respondents and the translation of the same which helped the researcher to gather intense data. Besides the above procedures, the following tasks have been undertaken during the course of interview. These were:

- ❖ The researcher had tried to minimize the power that she has being educated over the respondents who were mostly illiterate which helped to accomplish the interview smoothly.
- ❖ Wives and husbands were interviewed separately in order to get free and honest response.
- ❖ The respondents' freedom of interrupting the course of interview was ensured.

- ❖ Probe questions were used in order to elicit more data that helped to address the research questions.
- ❖ Field notes were taken thereby starting to identify interesting words and explanations for data analysis

The above all procedures including identification of agro-pastoral area, arranging the mechanism and time of administering questionnaire and in-depth interview, administering questionnaires and conducting in-depth interview took one month and fifteen days.

3.7.3. Analysis

The researcher undertaken the following activities so as to analyze the data gathered from the questionnaires and interview. The data gathered from questionnaires was analyzed with the help of a statistical package for social science (SPSS) version 15. Before the analyses started, some of relevant data analysis techniques were considered. After the data was entered to the computer and coded using SPSS, statistical analyses were carried out for to summarize the raw data of demographic characteristics of respondents and to compute the percentage that the couples carried out in each variable. The interview data had been analyzed by identifying themes for which the responses belong and convey similar message and putting quotes for each theme. The researcher considered research ethical issues while analyzing the data. Moreover, the data obtained from interview had been analyzed under each theme of questionnaire results.

3.8. Ethical Considerations

Prior to administering questionnaires and initiating the interview, the first task of the researcher was obtaining the consent of the respondents through informing the purpose of the study and the sponsor of the research. In addition, interviewees were informed about the possible outcome of the study and its benefit to them. Participants were also informed that any data they provide would be kept confidential as the analyses is made without mentioning names. Moreover, the researcher gave an opportunity to ask questions and their right to interrupt and or drop out of the interview at any time if they feel uncomfortable or have other priorities to be carried out. Lastly, they were informed the expected duration of participation in the interview before hand.

IV. Findings

This part deals with the demographic characteristics of respondents; division of tasks in household chores; crop, vegetable and fruit, as well as livestock productions; and selling of agricultural products. Besides, it also includes the influencing factors for the division of tasks among couples in the aforesaid variables and the role of couples for managing and saving the income of the household.

4.1. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Table one below presents the sex, age and educational background characteristics of respondents. According to the table, the male and female proportion is 50% and 50% respectively. With regard to age, the majority of respondents fall on the category of 41-60(36%) followed by 31-40(31%), 26-30(21%), 60-70(6%) and 12-25(6%). As can be seen from the table, majority (69%) of the respondents were illiterate.

Table One: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Variables	Category	Respondents' Response
Sex	Male	50(50%)
	Female	50(50%)
	Total	100%
Age	12-25	6(6%)
	26-30	21(21%)
	31-40	31(31%)
	41-60	36(36%)
	60-70	6(6%)
	Total	100(100%)

Educational Status	Illiterate	69(69%)
	Read and Write	22(22%)
	Grade 1- 4	9(9%)
	Total	100%

4.2. Division of Labor among Couples

4.2.1. Household Chores

Tasks of Wife

Table two below presents the division of tasks among couples in the household chores. As can be seen from this table, it is wives who are responsible to carry out all household chores listed under the table. Among the tasks the wives alone carries out were: fetching water, cooking food, serving food and drink, washing food utensils, house cleaning, processing or preparing drinks and grinding in which all (100%) of the participants responded that the aforementioned tasks were solely carried out by wives. Besides, the majority of the respondents in the remaining tasks such as collecting fire wood, 96%; caring for children 89%; caring for sick and old family member,65%, cleaning the compound, 98%; buying materials for household consumption, 84%; and building tent (93%) (See Figure 1), affirmed that these tasks were performed by wives alone. This result indicated that it is wives who alone accomplished the above mentioned household chores.

Table Two: Household Tasks

Items	Options				
	Only husband	Only wife	Mainly husband	Mainly wife	Both
Fetching water		100(100%)			
Collecting fire wood		96(96%)		4(4%)	
Cooking food		100(100%)			
Caring for children		89(89%)		9(9%)	2(2%)
Caring for old and sick family member	1(1%)	65(65%)	3(3%)	21(21%)	10(10%)
Serving food and drink		99(99%)			1(1%)
Washing clothes		80(80%)		8(8%)	12(12%)
Washing food utensils		100(100%)			

House cleaning		100(100%)			
Cleaning the compound		98(98%)		2(2%)	
Processing or preparing drinks		100(100%)			
Grinding		100(100%)			
Buying materials for household consumption		84(84%)		13(13%)	3(3%)
Building tent		93(93%)		4(4%)	3(3%)

Figure 1: A Tent Built by a Woman



The same holds true for the interview result regarding the tasks carried out by couples in household chores. The result gathered from both interviewee couples and key informant respondents portrayed that wives are the sole responsible persons to perform all household chores including building tents and buying materials for household consumption. According to all interviewee respondents, husbands do not perform any household chore. However, one of the interviewee husband (husband one) disclosed that he shares with his wife a responsibility of taking care of the sick and old family members among all household chores.

4.2.1.1. Factors Affecting Gender Division of Labor in Household Chores

The interview result revealed the reasons for the division of tasks among couples in the household chores. The reasons for each couple are explained independently below.

Factors for Wives Exclusive Participation in Household Chores

The table three below contains reasons for active engagement of wives in household tasks. As this table revealed, among the nine, seven were factors that influenced wives to have active participation in household chores. These were: Staying at home (98%), fit to the task(78%), culture (68%),Lack of husband’s willingness to perform household chores (82%), husband’s being not available most of the times(82%), husband’s being busy of productive tasks(92%) and husband’s being afraid of societal stereotypes(74%). Whereas, the reasons such as husbands’ being busy of chewing chatt (60%), and religion (66%) were not the factors that affect the participation of wives to accomplish domestic chores.

Table Three: Influencing Factors for the Active Participation of Wives in Household Tasks.

Reasons	Options	
	Yes	No
I stay at home	49(98%)	1(2%)
My husband is busy of chewing chat.	20(40%)	30(60%)
I fit to domestic chores.	39(78%)	11(22%)
The culture assigned household chores to me.	34(68%)	16(32%)
My religion obliges me to perform household chores	17(34%)	33(66%)
My husband is not willing to accomplish household chores.	34(68%)	16(32%)
My husband is not available most of the times	41(82%)	9(18%)
My husband is busy of productive tasks.	46(92%)	4(8%)
My husband is afraid of society’s stereotypes	37(74%)	13(26%)

There were also factors that influenced the active engagement of wives in performing household chores fully or alone in accordance with the interview results. According to interviewees, the reasons influencing wives to exclusively perform household tasks were: taking this task as naturally given phenomenon or God’s gift and as granted culturally; the belief that they fit to the task; the belief that if they fail to do the task, no one will carry it out; considering male as having high status than female by the very reason that they are males naturally; therefore, they(males) are over qualified to carry out household chores or the belief that males are not females and have low status to carry out household chores and the belief that the status of female is low since she is female hence, she has to accomplish household chores that requires no cleanness. Respondents i.e. wives, husbands and key informants revealed that wives of the study area exclusively accomplished domestic chores due to the reason that they themselves accepted performing this

task as appropriate and natural and granted culturally. Here is the response of one of the interviewee wives.

It is because males are males. Their status is different. It is the work of God. Since he is male you have to wash his cloth and keep him clean and he therefore will wear and looks neat. You have to keep his protocol. You have to arrange his cloth always. He is not female. In addition, he performs other agricultural tasks and he may take livestock to the grassland. There is division of labor. It is due to these reasons that I am responsible to carryout domestic chores. If he has extra time, he spends that time to visit relatives and play with his friends. I carryout household chores while my husband does visiting relatives and play with his friends chewing chatt. I only take rest if I hire maid or my children help me out in performing domestic chores” (Forty years old woman (wife three), Golmorodi, Fafen).

The response of this interviewee holds more than two reasons for her to perform the task of household chores alone. These are: First; she considers the task as God given (natural or mandatory gift from God). Second; she also considers herself as the one who fits to the task of performing household chores since she is female and she understands being female as having lower status than males. Third; she deems that since males have higher status than females naturally they (males) are over qualified to perform household chores. Fourth; she supposes again that males have to be clean and wear clean cloth whereas; females have lower status therefore, carryout household chores. This interviewee has strong belief that is “males are males, they are not females”. It is this belief that serves her as a base for her reasons that compel her to carryout household chores alone without murmuring against anybody including her husband.

Moreover, Third key informant, a thirty five year old woman and an expert of Harmful Traditional Practices and Gender based Violence in Somali Region Women Affairs Office in indicating the reason for wives exclusive engagement in performing household chores stated that “It is culture that makes men to be such and women themselves take this as granted”. The response of this key informant tells us that women or wives themselves take performing household chores as culturally granted and therefore accomplish household tasks exclusively.

Moreover, according to interviewees, wives consider performing domestic chores as their part to carry out since they think these tasks are women’s tasks. In relation to this, performing

household chores by husbands is considered as a taboo as per the culture of the study area. As, a result, wives don't allow their husbands to do these tasks. Besides, wives also accomplish domestic chores alone thinking that males have other tasks to perform as that of farm tasks. Most importantly, husbands' lack of willingness to accomplish household chores was also reported as a reason for active engagement of wives in performing domestic tasks. One of the interviewee women stated the following in indicating reasons that influenced her to exclusively accomplish household chores.

No one has ever seen this as a problem. Performing domestic chores is seen as female's tasks. No male has tried to carryout domestic chores. Performing domestic chores like cooking and washing clothes by male is considered as a taboo. There is no male who carries out this task if his wife is available (Thirty eight years old woman (wife four), Ara-as, Fafen).

The response of the above wife also explicated that performing domestic chores is seen as female's task and it is considered as a taboo for husbands to carry out these tasks. It is for this reason that she alone performs household chores. Another participant also indicated the following as a reason for wives dominant engagement in performing household chores.

In this area as far as I live and observe, it is woman who performs most of the tasks. Male just sleep. It is a woman who is responsible to carryout domestic chores. Her husband sleeps while she is carryings out these tasks. He slept now. It is the way he brought up .It is the culture. Male in this area is like the boss of the bee. He just sits and orders his wife and eats whatever he wants” (Thirty years old man (second key informant) an Expert of Animal Food in Somali Pastoral and Agro-pastoral Research Institute Fafen Branch, Fafen).

The above response of the key informant also tells us that it is the culture that makes males to refrain from performing household tasks and females to accomplish the task alone. The interviewee below has a different reason form other ones in one point keeping the other things same.

In our area, it is a taboo to perform domestic chores for the husband even male doesn't boil tea. I wash the cloth and cook food for the family. I perform all domestic chores though I am an old women; my husband is not willing to help me in case of the

need to seek others assistance due to the multiple tasks .Amazingly, if I ask his assistance, we might quarreler. You can do if there is peace .But, how could you do in the presence of attack and degrading. If somebody shows you long face, your blood snows. This is usual. But, you accomplish irrespective of long face. It is mandatory. My husband sits and plays with his friends but I cook and serve him. I do weeping even the floor of the shop. It is my responsibility; no body or my husband doesn't touch it. Males do not give us a place. Stop it there are many problems of my husband (Fifty years old woman (Wife one), Ara-as, Fafen)

Incredibly, the above interviewee wife has different reason that is even though she believes that this task is a woman's task, she asks her husband to help her out in case she needs assistance. But, her husband is not willing to assist her. Hence, it is due to this reason that she is obliged to accomplish the task alone.

Factors for Husbands Zero or Less Engagement in Household Tasks

Table four below contains influencing factors for husband's less engagement in performing household chores. The table portrayed that among the nine reasons, six of them were factors for husbands' less or zero participation in performing domestic chores. These were: the belief that domestic tasks are women's tasks (94%), being preoccupied with farm tasks (94%); culture (54%), lack of willingness to accomplish domestic chores (84%), afraid of societal stereotypes (74%), and being uncomfortable to carry out household tasks (82%). On the other side, the reasons such as : no need of involvement(64%), religion (96%),and being busy of visiting wives (68%) were not the factors for less or zero engagement of husbands performing household tasks.

Table Four: Influencing Factors for the Less Engagement of Husbands in Household tasks.

Reasons	Options	
	Yes	No
Domestic tasks are women's tasks	47(94%)	3(6%)
I am preoccupied with productive tasks	47(94%)	3(6%)
I am culturally prohibited from performing domestic tasks	27(54%)	23(46%)
There is no need for my involvement	18(36%)	32(64%)
My religion doesn't allow me to accomplish domestic tasks and	2(4%)	48(96%)
I am not willing to carry out domestic tasks	42(84%)	8(16%)
I am afraid of societal stereotypes.	37(74%)	13(26%)
I am not comfortable to carry out domestic chores.	41(82%)	9(18%)

I am busy of visiting my wives.	16(32%)	34(68%)
---------------------------------	---------	---------

The same as that of wives, the interview result also demonstrated factors for husbands to abstain from performing household chores. Some of the major factors were: Considering performing this task as a taboo and afraid of societal stereotypes as per the culture of the study area. Respondents particularly husbands indicated that even though they want to accomplish household chores they hesitate from accomplishing the same since they are afraid of society's labeling and discrimination. In relation to this, one of the interviewee husbands stated the following.

The reason for my less or no engagement in performing domestic chores except in her absence emanates from culture. I want to mean as the will of the Bible and Kuran, it says perform tasks and help each other. It says the wife is your queen so perform household chores willingly before she performs it since she is expected to be at the backroom "goada". It also says serve her she wants, I mean food and drink. It obliges me to serve up the food and drink after I prepare. But, the surrounding environment and our culture consider performing domestic chores by husbands as a taboo. Getting in to the kitchen and cooking food by males or husbands are considered as a taboo in our area. The society may label husbands as female if they perform these chores. They might say "he accomplish a task of cooking as female" if he does domestic chores. It is this labeling which hinders me to carry out these tasks .But, if I perform domestic chores, it has no disadvantage rather societal stereotypes are setbacks for me. It may seem disadvantage in our surrounding and for these people" (Fifty five years old (Husband one), Ara-as, Fafen).

The response of the above interviewee marked that it is culture; societal stereotypes i.e. the labeling that "he is female if a husband carries out household chores" and the surrounding environment that prohibits him from performing household chores though he is willing to accomplish the tasks. The other factors that influenced husbands less participation in performing domestic chores were considering domestic task as females' and having other tasks to carry out as that of farm tasks in their agricultural field or the belief that their part is only carrying out farm tasks culturally. A fifty three years old man in indicating his reasons for refraining from performing household chores pointed out "I can't perform two tasks. So,

she has to perform tasks in livestock and domestic chores since I accomplish agricultural tasks”. This husband believes that household chore is the task of his wife and her share to carry out since his part is performing farm tasks.

Besides, lack of know-how to do domestic and or the perceived difficulty of the tasks for husbands was also raised by the respondents as a setback for actively engage in performing household tasks even though husbands were willing to accomplish these chores. The interviewee below demonstrated his reason for his zero engagement in accomplishing domestic chores as follows.

I do agricultural task and I bring raw materials. Hence, it is her responsibility to cook and serve the family the same. The tasks of male and female are divided in to two culturally in Somali. So, I fail to do due to this culture. It is not due to religion but culture. If I compelled to do domestic chores, it will be new for me. So, it is difficult for me to accomplish these tasks” (Fifty years old man (Husband two), Golmorodi, Fafen).

This interviewee pointed out that he believes domestic task as his wife’s part and it is culture which assigns the tasks for them as a reason for his less participation in performing the tasks. Most importantly, he marked that the perceived difficulty of caring out household chores as factors that influenced him to actively engage in accomplishing household tasks though he is willing to accomplish in case of compelling circumstance to do so.

In addition, the other interviewee husbands also demonstrated that they feel discomfort if they accomplish domestic tasks. It is for this reason that they refrain from performing these chores. One of the respondents explained his reason regarding this issue as “I don’t perform it since I am not comfortable. If I try to perform domestic chores, I do not know how to accomplish. For instance, if one of my children excretes, I do not know how to clean it up” (Forty six years old man (Husband three), Golmorodi, Fafen). This interviewee husband has two reasons for his less participation in performing domestic tasks. These are: feeling of discomfort in carrying out this task and lack of know-how to perform the same.

The last but not least factor indicated by the participants that affects husbands in accomplishing household chores was the belief that since wives give birth to a child and stay at home, they have to perform tasks associated with the household. Here is the direct word of one of the respondents.

There is no problem with performing domestic chores, but it is difficult for me to do these tasks while my wife is available to do it. It is due to culture. It is the culture that makes us like this. It is the culture that hinders us to do so. Culturally, we (females and males) has different tasks each. The turn of male is performing agricultural tasks and it is the turn of females to carryout household chores. The reason for this is that since females give birth to a child and stay at home they take the responsibility of performing domestic chores. Therefore, it is this fact that makes us divides the tasks for females and males. If she says let me go to the farm land, who is going to breast feed the child? Males can't do it. So, since she is nearby to the child, she can give breast to the child. However, the main steppingstone source of the income is found in the household. Running together is good, not bad. To clarify, the agricultural products (crops, vegetables, chatt and fruits) are taken to home as well as children and livestock are found in home. So, if we leave the home, the children will play with the grain and if I fail to get crop today I can eat the grain that I previously collected. Thus, female is the first storing (ከሌላ) of the household since she does all these things.”(Forty five years old man (Husband four) Ara-as, Fafen)

The response of the above interviewee transmits a message that is the base for the division of tasks among couples. He puts that since females give birth to a child and breast feed them, they have to carry out tasks around the home since they stay at home to accomplish reproductive roles. He also forwarded that he believes this task as his wife's part and difficult to carry out by him. He lastly puts culture as a set back to him to perform these tasks. Moreover, this interviewee noted that he has no problem with performing the task but it is lack of know-how and the belief that since his wife stays at home she has to carry out the task which compels him from performing the tasks. Most importantly, he also tried to acknowledge the role his wife plays while staying at home.

4.2.2. Crop Production

The variable crop production included division of tasks in maize, sorghum and khat(jaad) productions. The reason for presenting the division of tasks in these productions separately was

for identifying tasks accomplished by the couples in each production since there was variation with regard to the tasks performed by the couples across these crops. According to the data, there were tasks accomplished by husbands, both couples and wives which are presented below separately. Moreover, the divisions of tasks in sorghum and maize productions were analyzed by categorizing the tasks in these productions in to three stages. These were: tasks before sowing, tasks before harvesting and harvesting and post harvesting tasks.

Tasks of Husbands

Table five A below presents division of tasks before the task of sowing in maize and sorghum crops. According to this table, all the tasks except one before the task of sowing in the mentioned productions of maize and sorghum were accomplished by husbands alone. However, the task of clearing (66%) was carried out by both couples in the production of maize. The majority of the participants in most tasks in each aforementioned crop above disclosed that it is only husbands who are responsible to perform these tasks. The tasks for which the husbands are responsible to carry out alone before the task of sowing in the aforesaid productions were: Plowing (100%, 100%), land preparation (99%,98%), making farm implements (99%,87%), shake the soil to make it clear from the roots of weeds that are turned over (69%, 62%), making the furrow(94%,89%), seed selection(81%,71%), construction of irrigation structure(96%,95%), irrigation and maintenance(99%,95%),and clearing in the production of sorghum (67%).

Tasks Measuring the Production of maize and sorghum

Table Five A: Tasks Before Sowing

Item	Crop	Options				
		Only husband	Only wife	Mainly husband	Mainly wife	Both
Plowing	Maize	100(100%)				
	Sorghum	100(100%)				
Land preparation	Maize	99(99%)		1(1%)		
	Sorghum	98(98%)		1(1%)		1(1%)
Making farm implements or tools	Maize	99(99%)		1(1%)		
	Sorghum	87(87%)		7(7%)		6(6%)
Shake the soil to free it from the roots of weeds that are turned over	Maize	69(69%)		13(13%)		18(18%)
	Sorghum	62(62%)	1(1)	21(21%)	1(1%)	15(15%)
Making the furrow	Maize	94(94%)		3(3%)		3(3%)
	Sorghum	89(89%)		7(7%)		4(4%)
Seed selection	Maize	81(81%)		5(5%)		14(14%)
	Sorghum	71(51%)		12(12%)	10(10%)	10(10%)

Construction of irrigation structure	Maize	96(96%)		3(3%)		1(1%)
	Sorghum	95(95%)		2(2%)		3(3%)
Irrigation and maintenance	Maize	99(99%)		1(1%)		
	Sorghum	95(95%)		4(4%)		1(1)
Clearing	Maize	22(22 %)		12(12%)		66(66%)
	Sorghum	67(67%)		13(13%)		20(20%)

Table five B below presents the division of tasks before the task of harvesting in sorghum and maize productions. As per the table, the tasks for which the husbands were responsible to perform alone in the production of maize were: in irrigation watering (83%), managing works (60%), applying pesticides (96%), hoeing (67%) and scaring away animals from damaging the maize crop and plant (75%). This table further revealed the tasks accomplished by husbands alone in the production of sorghum. These were: in irrigation watering (89%), managing works (54%), placing the seed (66%) and applying pesticides (92%). Moreover, the tasks which were performed by both couples in both crops as per the same table were: sowing(69%, 73%), applying fertilizer(60%,70%), weeding(61%, 63%), collection of fertilizer(70%, 62%), placing the seed of maize(69%), applying manure(72%, 75%), hoeing in sorghum production(67%) and scaring away animals from damaging sorghum crops(80%). The mentioned table indicated some variation of the participation of husbands and wives in maize and sorghum productions. For instance, husbands are the sole responsible persons to scare animals from damaging the maize crop and placing the seed of sorghum. But, the task of scaring away animals from damaging the sorghum crop and placing the seed of sorghum were performed by both couples. That means, in the later case, husbands accomplished the tasks together with their wives. By the same token, the participation of wives varies across these productions. For instance, they perform tasks such as hoeing in maize production together with their husbands but not in sorghum. They also accomplish the task of scaring away animals from damaging the sorghum plant again together with their husbands but not in maize. The reason for this will be dealt in topic of influencing factors for less participation of wives in crop production.

Table Five B: Tasks before Harvesting

Item	Crop	Options				
		Only husband	Only wife	Mainly husband	Mainly wife	Both
Sowing	Maize	19(19%)		12(12%)		69(69%)
	Sorghum	16(16%)		11(11%)		73(73%)
Applying fertilizer	Maize	25(25%)		15(15%)		60(60%)
	Sorghum	20(20%)		10(10%)		70(70%)
Weeding	Maize	8(8%)	1(1%)	30(30%)		61(61%)
	Sorghum	12(12%)		25(25%)		63(63%)
In irrigation –watering	Maize	83(83%)		11(11%)		6(6%)
	Sorghum	89(89%)		5(5%)		6(6%)
Collection of fertilizer	Maize	10(10%)		11(11%)	9(9%)	70(70%)
	Sorghum	12(12%)		19(19%)	7(7%)	62(62%)
Managing works	Maize	81(81%)		9(9%)		10(10%)
	Sorghum	70(70%)		21(21%)		9(9%)
Placing the seed	Maize	13(13%)		18(18%)		69(69%)
	Sorghum	66(66%)		15(15%)		19(19%)
Applying pesticides	Maize	96(96%)		2(2%)		2(2%)
	Sorghum	92(92%)		5(5%)		3(3%)
Applying manure	Maize	24(24%)		4(4%)		72(72%)
	Sorghum	21(21%)		3(3%)	1(1%)	75(75%)
Hoeing	Maize	67(67%)		8(8%)		25(25%)
	Sorghum	13(13%)		15(15%)	5(5%)	67(67%)
Scaring away animals from damaging the crops	Maize	75(75%)		9(9%)	1(1%)	16(16%)
	Sorghum	10(10%)		5(5%)	5(5%)	80(80%)

Table five C below shows the division of tasks in harvesting and post harvesting activities in the production of maize and sorghum. According to the table, more than half of the tasks were accomplished by husbands alone and there is no variation of the participation of couples in both productions. They engaged in similar tasks in maize and sorghum productions. The tasks which were carried out by husbands alone in both productions were: Cutting the corn from the plant(75%, 84%), collecting the harvest from the farm land(84%,85%),preparing the threshing ground (86%,70%), threshing(91%,81%), cutting the plant(90%,85%), gathering the

crop(79%,57%), and Managing in threshing the grain(66%,64%).However, tasks such as transporting the harvest to the threshing ground(66%,74%),storing(68%,64%),and Sweeping up the threshed grain(71%,64%) were performed by both couples together. Moreover, the task of transporting the crop to the home (75%, 71%) was accomplished mainly by wives.

Table Five C: Harvesting and Post Harvesting Tasks

Item	Crop	Options				
		Only husband	Only wife	Mainly husband	Mainly wife	Both
Cutting the corn from the plant	Maize	75(75%)		20(22%)		5(5%)
	Sorghum	84(84%)		11(11%)		5(10%)
Collecting the harvest from the farm land	Maize	85(85%)		11(11%)		4(4%)
	Sorghum	70(70%)		20(20%)		10(10%)
Preparing the threshing ground	Maize	86(86%)		13(13%)		1(1%)
	Sorghum	70(70%)		20(20%)		10(10%)
Threshing	Maize	91(91%)		7(7%)		2(2%)
	Sorghum	81(81%)		17(17%)		2(2%)
Transporting the harvest to the threshing ground	Maize	16(16%)		15(15%)	3(3%)	66(66%)
	Sorghum	14(14%)		12(12%)		74(74%)
Storing	Maize	11(11%)		17(17%)	6(6%)	68(68%)
	Sorghum	17(17%)	2(2%)	13(13%)	4(4%)	64(64%)
Cutting the plant	Maize	90(90%)		3(3%)		7(7%)
	Sorghum	85(85%)		7(7%)		8(8%)
Gathering the crop	Maize	79(79%)		15(15%)		6(6%)
	Sorghum	57(57%)		23(23%)		20(20%)
Transporting the crop to the home	Maize	10(10%)		10(10%)	75 (75%)	5(5%)
	Sorghum	10(10%)	2(2%)	4(4%)	71(71%)	13(13%)
Managing in threshing the grain	Maize	66(66%)		21(21%)		13(13%)
	Sorghum	64(64%)	2(2%)	20(20%)		14(14%)
Sweeping up the threshed grain	Total	10(10%)		16(16%).	3(3%)	71(71%)
	Sorghum	17(17%)	2(2%)	13(13%)	4(4%)	64(64%)

Tasks of Husbands in the Production of khat

Table six below demonstrated the division of tasks in khat production. This table revealed that the majority of the tasks in khat production were accomplished by husbands alone. These were: plowing(100%),land preparation(71%), applying fertilizer(60%), cutting the tips of khat plant to produce many branches(74%), watering(94%), planting(96%), making farm

implements(82%),collection of fertilizer(69%),organizing works (65%), shaking the soil to free it from the roots of weeds that are turned over(90%),making the furrow(89%), applying pesticides(88%),transplanting(82%),construction of irrigation structure(96%), irrigation and maintenance(85%)and clearing(64%).

Tasks of Both Couples

According to the table, tasks such as weeding (79%), harvesting (76%), gathering (49%), applying manure (56%), and hoeing (62%) were performed by both couples.

Tasks of Wife

The tasks for which the wives alone carry out in the production of khat were transporting the harvest (61%) and scaring away animals from damaging the khat plant (69%).

Table Six: Tasks in the Production of khat (jaad)

Item	Options				
	Only husband	Only wife	Mainly husband	Mainly wife	Both
Plowing	100(100%)				
Land preparation	71(71%)	5(5%)	9(9%)	7(7%)	8(8%)
Applying fertilizer	60(60%)		16(16%)		24(24%)
Weeding	11(11%)		10(10%)		79(79%)
Cutting the tips of the khat plant to produce many branches	74(74%)		10(10%)		16(16%)
Harvesting	10(10%)	2(2%)	11(11%)	1(1%)	76(76%)
Transporting the harvest	10(10%)	61(61%)	10(10%)	6(6%)	13(13%)
Watering	94(94%)	1(1%)	3(3%)		2(2%)
Planting	96(96%)		3(3%)		1(1%)
Making farm implements or tools	82(82%)		8(8%)	1(1%)	9(9%)
Collection of fertilizer	69(69%)	1(1%)	18(18%)	7(7%)	15(15%)
Organizing work in khat	65(65%)		13(13%)		22(22%)
Shake the soil free from the roots of weeds turned over furrow	90(90%)		4(4%)		6(6%)
Making the furrow	89(89%)		5(5%)		6(6%)
Gathering khat	27(27%)	6(6%)	14(14%)	4(4%)	49(49%)
Applying pesticides	88(88%)		7(7%)		4(4%)
Applying manure	28(28%)		15(15%)	1(2%)	56(56%)
Transplanting	82(82%)		12(12%)		6(6%)

Construction of irrigation structure	96(96%)		3(3%)		1(2%)
Irrigation and maintenance	85(85%)		9(9%)		6(6%)
Hoeing	21(21%)	1(2.0%)	15(15%)	1(1%)	62(62%)
scaring away animals from damaging the khat plant	6(6%)	69(69%)	3(3%)	2(2%)	20(20%)
Clearing	64(64%)			4(4%)	

The interview result regarding division of tasks in crop production depicted that most of the tasks in the farm land were performed by husbands alone. However, there were also tasks accomplished together with their wives. Tasks categorized in the former one were: plowing, harvesting, watering, scaring away animals from damaging the maize crop, threshing and digging the ground for storing the grain. Among the tasks in the later one were weeding, sowing, transporting the harvest to the threshing ground, storing the crop, hoeing, scaring away animals and birds from eating the crop, e.t.c. To this effect, a fifty five years old man stated the following.

I perform tasks in these productions. First I plough the land and when the rain rains I sow the seed of maize, sorghum and other similar crops. I accomplish tasks like harvesting, but if it is beyond my capacity I ask the assistance of technical advice from agriculture professionals. I carry out all agricultural tasks starting from plowing till harvesting. I accomplish tasks in khat production. khat is not sowed rather it is to be transplanted .Hence, I transplant the stem or branches of khat. In the production of khat, my wife has tasks to carry out like taking care of the khat plants, selling it in the market and managing in the khat work. Tasks like digging ‘መኮራኮራ’ and weeding are carried out by me and other hired individuals (Fifty five years old man (Husband one), Ara-as, Fafen).

Another participant also explained that: I carry out the task of plowing, sowing, digging and other agricultural tasks. It is male who perform agricultural tasks most of the times. The tasks of wives is feeding those who carryout agricultural tasks in the field. They cook food and boil tea and then they take it to those in the field. Not only this but also they take khat to the field hands (Interview, fifty years old man (Husband two), Golmorodi, Fafen).

Here is also the word of one of the key informants.

Males in this area accomplish difficult tasks in the farm. For instance, in plantation, wedding, and after the crops grow, females or children may scare away birds from damaging the crop. After maturation or the crops reach for harvesting, it is males who carry out the task of harvesting since it is a difficult task for females. But, it is the task of females for collecting seeds from the farm, for instance, the seed of the sorghum and maize. Females perform any task after harvesting including taking the grain to the market. They also accomplish a task of separating the seed from dust and other unnecessary particles like sand and stone(Thirty two years old woman(Key informant one) Head for Office of Livestock in Somali Pastoral and Aroi-pastoral Reaserch Institute Fafen Branch, Fafen).

The above quotes tell us that the husband performs many tasks in the farm land .They accomplish tasks such as: plowing, sowing, harvesting, hoeing, weeding and other tasks in the farm that are perceived to be difficult for wives to perform.

As that of husbands, wives had tasks in crop production they accomplish alone according to the data gathered from interviewee respondents. Most importantly, the interview result made evident tasks accomplished by wives alone that the questionnaire didn't cover. According to the interviewees, the tasks of fencing the farm land, making furrows to protect the crop from being damaged by erosion, collecting the seed from the farm land, isolating the seed from the dust, and isolating the soil from the roots of weeds that are turned over after the farm land is plowed by their husbands were performed by wives alone in crop production. In addition, the wives also accomplished tasks such as: carrying the seed that were going to be sowed by their husbands and follow their husbands carrying the same while their husbands do sowing, scaring away animals and birds from damaging the sorghum plant and grain, and harvestings for temporary consumption either to sell the fresh maize and sorghum to the market or serve for the family.

Moreover, tasks such as: transporting the threshed grain putting it in to sack and using donkey for transport after their husband tied up the donkey, placing seed to the prepared ground for the sake of storing, cooking food and preparing drink including tea and take it to the farm hands together with khat were other tasks for which the wives are responsible to accomplish in the aforesaid productions. Furthermore, wives also performed the tasks of taking care of the khat

plant, collecting the head of maize and sorghum after their husband cut it off from the plant, pulling oxen while their husbands do plowing and give moral support to those who carry out tasks in the farmland. The woman below stated the tasks performed by her in crop production as follows.

I carry out tasks like cooking food, prepare drink and take it to those who carry out agricultural tasks in the field. I also take khat to them. Furthermore, I do fencing of the farm land in order to protect it from being damaged by animals. I perform weeding, collecting the weeds done by my husband and scaring away animals from damaging the crops. But, it is male who accomplishes agricultural tasks most of the times (Forty five years old woman (wife two), Golmorodi, Fafen).

Another interviewee also explained that:

I perform the task of weeding, fencing the farmland and making furrows through digging in order to protect the farmland from erosions and looking after them from being damaged by animals. I also do harvesting. I do most of the times miniature tasks in agricultural production. It is my husband who does other difficult tasks in this production (Forty years old woman (wife three), Golmorodi, Fafen).

Forty two old woman stated the tasks accomplished by her in crop production as follows:

I carry out agricultural tasks and in the production of livestock. I perform the task of weeding, digging and collecting the threshed grain after threshed by males. I help my husband in sowing that means even though I do not plow, I do participate in sowing. (Forty two years old woman (wife five, Golmorodi, Fafen)

Another woman also stated the following.

I couldn't perform the task of plowing. I can't do it since I do not have know - how. I do only weeding and looking after (scaring away animals from damaging the crops) as well as collecting the harvest while my husband harvest them out. I also do a task of scaring away birds from eating the crops and I do collecting the head of the maize and sorghum after my husband cut it off from the plant. I do a task of collecting and putting it in the 'ozh' the threshed grain (Thirty eight years old (wife four), Ara-as, Fafen).

Key informant two explained the tasks accomplished by wives in the following way.

The first task plowing is the task of males; but, isolating the soil from the roots of weeds is carried out by females. During sowing, females carry the seed that is going to be sowed by their husbands and males perform sowing. That means, females follow their husbands caring the seed while their husbands do sowing. Scaring away animals from damaging the maize plant is carried out by males. Females often carry out this task. The task of harvesting is male's task, but it can be carried out by females for temporary consumption or for using the crop being fresh and sell it being the same. It is different in looking after sorghum plant keeping the similarity of the tasks to be carried out by the couples like in the maize production. It is females who carry out this task most of the times since this plant is damaged or can be eaten during day time and her husband is busy of chewing khat. Hence, the wife is responsible to carry out scaring away animals and birds from damaging and eating the sorghum plant. But, in the normal course of things, it is a task of children. But if there are no children, both would take this responsibility. Harvesting is a task of males. The task of females in this regard is bringing food and drinks especially tea for the farm hands. But, even though she is not joining the group physically she gives moral support for those who carry out the task of harvesting. The task of threshing is carried out by males since it requires labor. Threshing in this area is done using stick and kicking the grain. Most labor intensive tasks are carried out by males since females give birth to many children, performing difficult tasks might bring problems to wives. Taking away the threshed grain is done using sack and this task is carried by female. And, they also take the threshed grain to home through donkey after their husband tied the donkey up. That means, transporting the threshed grain is carried out by females. Storing is carried out through putting it into the ground depending on the amount of the grain. If this is the case, digging or preparing ground for storing is carried out by males and females assist in placing the grain in the area” (Thirty years old man(second key informant)an Expert of Animal Food in Somali Pastoral and Agro-Pastoral Research Institute, Fafen Branch,Fafen).

4.2.2.1. Factors Affecting Gender Division of Labor in Crop Production

Based on both questionnaire and interview results, there were factors that affect the division of tasks in crop production. Moreover, these factors differently influenced the couples in

accomplishing tasks in these productions. Therefore, the factors for each couple will be discussed below separately.

Factors for Husbands Active Participation in Crop Production

Table seven below demonstrated that all six reasons were factors for husbands to participate actively in performing farm tasks. These were: culture (56%), feeling comfortable in accomplishing farm tasks (70%), and farm implements being comfortable (68%), physically fit to farm tasks (70%), wives being preoccupied with household chores (98%) and farm implements being uncomfortable for wives (70%).

Table Seven: Influencing Factors for active Participation of Husbands in Farm Tasks.

Reasons	Options	
	Yes	No
Farm tasks are culturally assigned for me.	28(56%)	22(44%)
I feel comfortable when I carry out farm tasks.	35(70%)	15(30%)
The implements for farm tasks are comfortable for me	68(68%)	16(32%)
I am physically fit to farm tasks.	35(70%)	15(30%)
My wife is pre-occupied with domestic chores	49(98%)	1(2%)
The implements for farm tasks are not comfortable for my wife	35(70%)	15(30%)

The data gathered from interviewee respondents also depicted the factors for the active engagement of husbands in most tasks in crop production. The major ones were: first; husbands’ belief that they are physically capable to carry out tasks in crop production in general and the perceived difficulty of the tasks as that of plowing in particular, second; taking this task as granted or considering it as naturally given to males, third; feeling sympathy for their wives i.e. since wives give birth to a child and get tired, they should not perform tasks in the farmland. In addition, taking farm tasks as male’s tasks culturally, thinking that their wives have other tasks to perform as that of household chores and tasks in livestock production, and the belief that their wives spent their time on performing household chores and reproductive roles as that of pregnancy and breast feeding, therefore have no extra time to perform tasks in the farmland were also noted as factors that influenced husbands to accomplish farm tasks actively.

One of the interviewee husbands in indicating his reason for engaging actively in farm tasks stated that “my wife has other tasks to carry out. Females have their own given tasks to perform. They perform domestic chores as well as task in livestock production”. This interviewee husband believes that his wife has other tasks to perform like domestic chores and

tasks in livestock production. Hence, it is this belief which influences him to accomplish tasks mostly in the farm land. Another respondent, forty six years old man also explained the reason for his active engagement in farm tasks. He affirmed that " since these tasks are males tasks I have to perform. There are females and males tasks .It the responsibility of males to carry out these tasks. Females have other tasks to carry out. My wife told you what female's tasks are" .This interviewee believes performing tasks in the farm land is the task of males; therefore he has to carry out this task. Besides these two respondents, one of the key informants below also indicated the reason for husbands' dominant participation in farm tasks as follows.

A factor for absolute engagement of husbands in difficult agricultural tasks as that of plowing is due to physical capacity. For instance, the oxen might jump while plowing. So, it is difficult for her to manage in that case. She can't even carry out this task if she is allowed to do so since she has responsibilities to carry out domestic chores. Oh, they better finish their domestic chores first. Here, there are many problems for females" (Thirty years old man(second key informant), an Expert of Animal Food in Somali Pastoral and Agro-Pastoral Research Institute, Fafen Branch,Fafen)).

The response of the key informant above tells us that it is the perceived difficulty of plowing and the belief that males are physically strong and females are weak that influences husbands to perform farm tasks alone. Besides, wives' being preoccupied with household chores is also another factor for husbands to actively engage in farm tasks. Here is the direct word of one of the interviewees who stated his reason for carrying out farm tasks alone.

Females spend their time on pregnancy, breast feeding and performing domestic chores. Hence, they can't perform agricultural tasks since reproductive tasks consume their time. They don't have extra time to carryout agricultural tasks. Therefore, it is my responsibility to carryout tasks in the farm land. (Forty five years old man (Husband four), Ara-as, Fafen)

This interviewee believes that since wives spend their time on pregnancy, breast feeding and performing domestic chores which consume their time, it is mandatory for him to accomplish tasks in the farmland.

Factors for Wives less Participation in Crop Production

Table eight below demonstrated among the six reasons of farm tasks, three of them were factors for the wives for their less participation in performing farm tasks in the agricultural field. These were: the belief that females are physically weak (70%), culture (65%) and being preoccupied with household chores and child rearing (60%). On the other side, the reasons such as: no need of involvement in farm tasks (60%), shortage of farm land and farm implements(58%), farm implements being uncomfortable for wives(58%) were not the factors for less engagement of wives in farm tasks.

Table Eight: Influencing Factors for less engagement of Wives in Farm Tasks.

Reasons	Options	
	Yes	No
I am physically weak	35(70%)	15(30%)
Farm tasks are males' tasks culturally.	15(30%)	35(70%)
There is no need for my involvement.	30(60%)	20(40%)
I am preoccupied with household chores and child caring.	30(60%)	20(40%)
There is shortage of farmland and farm implements.	21(42%)	29(58%)
The implements are not comfortable for me.	21(42%)	29(58%)

The interview result also portrayed factors for less engagement of wives in crop production. Wife respondents explicated the major factors that influenced them in accomplishing farm tasks .According to them, it their belief that they don't fit or physically incompetent to carry out farm tasks and males are strong to perform the same which hindered them from performing a task of plowing and to other similar tasks (tasks that are perceived to be difficult).However, their husbands lack of willingness to participate them in the task, preoccupied with other task as that of household chores and livestock production, considering the tasks as male's tasks culturally and naturally, and lack of know-how to do some tasks as that of plowing were also indicted as factors that affect wives active participation in farm tasks.

A forty two years old woman from Golmorodi explained the reason for her less participation in performing farm tasks. She noted that "It is our culture that gave us our tasks (males and females); it is the work of God. It is because it is difficult for female to plow. God creates difference among sexes. He assigns them tasks that are females and males. But, they can accomplish pulling oxen while their husband performs plowing. Nevertheless, by nature males are strong. That is why they carry out plowing". This interviewee believes that since God created males being strong and females being weak, it is easy for males to plow whereas difficult for

females to perform the same. It is this perception that influenced her in performing the task of plowing in addition to the culture of the area. Moreover, she mixes-up culture and nature in understanding the source of the division of labor among sexes in the study area. She takes the tasks culturally assigned to them as granted naturally.

A thirty years old man (second key informant), an Expert of Animal Food in Somali Pastoral and Agro-Pastoral Research Institute, Fafen Branch also forwarded the factor for wives' less participation in the task of scaring away animals and birds from damaging the maize crop. He pointed out that "the factor for less engagement of wives in the tasks of looking after the maize crop is that looking after this plant is carried out during night since it is being damaged during this time. So, this time is not comfortable for females". The response of this key informant indicated the fact that since maize crop is being damaged during the night, it influenced wives to accomplish the task of scaring away animals from damaging the maize crop. It is because this time might be exposed females to problems that are particular to their gender.

On the other note, fifty five years old man from Ara-as indicated that his wife accomplishes a task of managing work in khat production. The reason for the engagement of his wife in this task is related to the susceptibility of the khat plant to be chewed by those who accomplish tasks in the khat field. He depicted that "it is because if my wife doesn't engage in managing and taking care of the khat plants, the individuals hired for taking care of this plant will finish it out which means they chew the khat without limitation in that case we will be the losers". This interviewee marked that if his wife fails to do controlling and managing works in khat, it will be finished by those who perform tasks in the field since no one is there to limit them from chewing the khat. It is for this reason that his wife actively participated in the noted task.

4.2.3. Vegetable and Fruit

Table nine below revealed the division of tasks among couples in the production of vegetable and fruits. The table presents the tasks in five vegetables and fruits such as tomato, green paper, salad, mango and papaya. The reason of presenting each task in each item separately was to show the tasks the couples carry out in these items since the task carried out by the couples varied across vegetable, fruit and tasks. Moreover, the analysis was accomplished by categorizing the tasks in to two i.e. tasks before planting and tasks till harvesting.

Tasks of Husbands

It is palpable from table nine A that there are tasks utterly carried out by husbands alone in vegetable and fruit production. These were: preparing the seedling of tomato (50%), green paper (72%), mango (98%), and papaya (89%), collecting the seedling of mango (98%) as well as hoeing in tomato (67%), green paper (72%), salad (66%), mango (80%) and papaya (82%).

Tasks of Wife

The table mentioned above indicated tasks in vegetable and fruits that there were totally and mainly carried out by wives. The task of preparing the seedling of salad 53% and collecting the seedling of salad 65% were accomplished mainly by wives. Whereas, arranging the land for tomato (64%), green paper (63%), salad (70%), mango (68%) and papaya (72%) was performed by wife alone.

Tasks of Both Couples

The task of collecting the seedling of tomato (63%), green paper (62%) and papaya (70%) were performed by both couples according to the data presented by the noted table before the task of planting vegetable and fruits.

The table made evident that husbands perform a task of preparing the seedling of vegetable and fruit and hoeing in each items; and they perform tasks mainly on mango and papaya, whereas, wives perform mostly a task of arranging land and mainly on salad which means there is some variation of the participation of couples across tasks and vegetable and fruits.

Tasks measuring vegetable and fruit production

Table nine A: Tasks before planting

Tasks	Items	Options				
		Only a husband	Only a wife	Mainly a husband	Mainly a wife	Both
Preparing Seedling	Tomato	50(50%)	2(2%)	10(10%)	21(21%)	17(17%)
	Green paper	72(72%)		11(11%)	17(17%)	10(10%)
	Salad	16(16%)	23(23%)		53(53%)	8(8%)
	Mango	98(98%)		2(2%)		
	Papaya	89(89%)	1(1%)	9(18%)		1(1%)
Collecting the seedling from the farm land	Tomato	9(9%)	9(9%)	8(8%)	11(11%)	63(63%)
	Green paper	8(8%)	11(11%)	4(4%)	15(15%)	62(62%)
	Salad	1(1%)	14(14%)	10(10%)	65(65%)	10(10%)
	Mango	32(32%)	10(10%)	24(24%)	7(7%)	27(27%)
	Papaya	7(7%)	10(10%)	7(7%)	6(6%)	70(70%)
Hoeing	Tomato	67(67%)	4(4%)	11(11%)	9(9%)	9(9%)
	Green paper	72(72%)	11(11%)	9(9%)	5(5%)	3(3%)

	Salad	66(66%)	6(6%)	20(20%)	5(5%)	3(3%)
	Mango	80(80%)	4(4%)	8(8%)	7(1%)	1(1%)
	Papaya	82(82%)	2(2%)	9(9%)	3(3%)	4(4%)
Arranging the land	Tomato	7(7%)	64(64%)	11(11%)	9(9%)	9(9%)
	Green paper	9(9%)	63(63%)	6(6%)	16(16%)	6(6%)
	Salad	3(3%)	70(70%)	11(11%)	7(7%)	9(9%)
	Mango	7(7%)	68(68%)	8(8%)	5(5%)	12(12%)
	Papaya	6(6%)	72(72%)	7(7%)	8(8%)	7(7%)

Table nine B below portrays the division of tasks till harvesting vegetable and fruits. As it could be seen from the table, there were tasks accomplished by husbands alone, together with their wives and wives alone and mainly. The tasks of husband in this regard were planting the mango and papaya seedlings (78% and 76%), watering green paper (77%), mango (72%) and papaya (69%) and harvesting the fruit of papaya (80%). On the other side, planting the seedling of tomato (64%) and the task of harvesting salad (80%) were performed by the wife alone, whereas the task of watering salad (68%) was accomplished mainly by wife. Moreover, planting the seedling of green paper (58%) and salad(60%); watering tomato (87%); weeding tomato(66%), green paper(52%), salad(71%), mango (66%) and papaya(78%); harvesting tomato(65%), green paper (78%)and mango (73%) were performed by both couples. According to the table, most of the tasks in vegetable and fruit production were accomplished by both couples. And, husbands performed mostly in the task of planting and watering and on the fruit of papaya where as wives performed tasks in salad. This finding indicated the variation of the participation of couples across vegetable, fruit and tasks.

Table nine B: Tasks till harvesting

Tasks	Items	Options				
		Only a husband	Only a wife	Mainly a husband	Mainly a wife	Both
Planting	Tomato	7(7%)	64(64%)	11(11%)	9(9%)	9(9%)
	Green paper	10(10%)	9(9%)	15(15%)	8(8%)	58(58%)
	Salad	10(10%)	7(7%)	4(4%)	19(19%)	60(60%)
	Mango	78(78%)	5(5%)	11(11%)	3(3%)	3(3%)
	Papaya	76(76%)		9(9%)	2(2%)	13(13%)
Watering	Tomato	4(4%)	5(5%)	3(3%)	1(1%)	87(87%)
	Green paper	77(77%)	8(8%)	11(14%)	3(3%)	5 (5%)
	Salad	3(3%)	15(15%)	5(5%)	68(68%)	9(9%)
	Mango	72(72%)	4(4%)	18(18%)	4(4%)	2(2%)

	Papaya	69(69%)	2(2%)	17(17%)	4(4%)	8(8%)
Weeding	Tomato	4(4%)	3(3%)	15(15%)	12(12%)	66(66%)
	Green paper	10(10%)	11(11%)	14(14%)	13(13%)	52(52%)
	Salad	8(8%)	4(4%)	10(10%)	7(7%)	71(71%)
	Mango	18(18%)	4(4%)	6(6%)	2(2%)	66(66%)
	Papaya	8(8%)	3(3%)	6(6%)	6(6%)	78(75%)
Harvesting	Tomato	3(3%)	10(10%)	8(8%)	14(14%)	65(36%)
	Green paper	8(8%)	4(4%)	3(3%)	7(7%)	78(78%)
	Salad	8(8%)	80(80%)	1(1%)	3(3%)	8(8%)
	Mango	10(10%)	10(10%)	6(6%)	1(1%)	73(73%)
	Papaya	80(80%)	7(7%)	1(1%)	9(9%)	3(3%)

According to the interview result, the participation of couples in the production of vegetable and fruit depends mainly on the place where these things are planted. That is, if the fruits and vegetables are planted near the home, both couple carryout tasks in these productions; but if the items are planted far from the home, the participation of wives decreases and the participation of husbands in the aforementioned productions increases. Here is the direct word of one of the key informants which affirmed this scenario.

. ...the participation of couples in vegetable and fruit is mostly determined by the area where these items are planted. If the fruit and vegetable are planted near the home, wives perform any task in these production i.e. they accomplish planting, weeding, harvesting, watering and other similar things. But, if they (fruits and vegetables) are planted far from their home, it is males who are responsible to carry out the tasks in these productions. But, if the things are planted around their home, both couples carryout tasks in the production of fruits and vegetables” (Thirty five years old woman (key informant three), an Expert of Harmful Traditional Practices and Gender Based violence in Somali Women’s Affairs Office, Jigjiga).

This key informant underlined on the point that the participation of couples in the work of vegetable and fruit greatly depend on the place where these things are planted. According to her, if these items are planted around the home, both couples can carry out tasks in these productions. But, if these items are planted far from the home, the participation of wives in these productions is negatively influenced since they have tasks to perform that are attached to the household.

Tasks of Wives

According to the data gathered from both interviewee couples and key informants, wives accomplished tasks in the production of vegetables and fruits. They fore instance accomplished tasks such as: harvesting vegetables and fruits, planting, weeding, watering and other similar tasks. One of the interviewee who explained the tasks carried out by wives in vegetable and fruit production stated that “when we come to vegetable and fruit production, females can participate. For instance, it is easy for female to plant vegetable and fruit while I dig the hoe for this purpose”. In addition, key informant three (thirty five years old woman, an Expert of Harmful Traditional Practices and Gender Based violence in Somali Women’s Affairs Office, Jigjiga, also forwarded the tasks performed by wives. She stated that “. . . women carry out tasks like harvesting vegetable and fruits for the sake of selling in to the market, planting, weeding, watering and other similar things. . .”

Tasks of Husbands

The interview result also demonstrated that husbands performed different tasks in vegetables and fruits production which included arranging field land, hoeing for planting, fencing, taking care, managing and supervising hired workers to carryout tasks in the production of vegetable and fruit and other tasks in aforesaid productions. One of the participants explained the following in indicating the tasks performed by him.

Yes I do tasks in the production of tomato, green paper, mango, papaya and other similar items. It is me who is responsible to carryout tasks in these productions. But, if I am not available in the area, my wife is responsible to accomplish these tasks. My task in these productions is digging or taking care of vegetables and fruits and I hired individuals and order them to perform every tasks in these production together with my children. That means, I manage in the tasks of taking care of these vegetables and fruits while being carried out by hired individuals and my children. But, if there are no hired workers it is me who is responsible to do so. Tasks in vegetable and fruits are not the responsibilities of my wife in the normal course of things though she accomplishes all these tasks in my absence. But, if I am available, it is my responsibility to carry out all the tasks. However, since we have large agricultural production, my wife has great role to play. We have two agricultural lands. So, if I do

tasks in one of our farmland, she does tasks in another. As you can see she came from another area after performing the tasks there” (Fifty five years old man (husband one), Ara-as, Fafen).

The response of this interviewee marked that he carries out any task in vegetable and fruit including digging hoe for planting the items, taking care of vegetable and fruits and managing and supervising the hired workers for accomplishing tasks in vegetable and fruits. But, if he is not available to accomplish all the stated tasks, his wife takes these responsibilities and accomplishes the same.

4.2.3.1. Factor Affecting Division of Labor in the Production of Vegetables and Fruits

As is plain from the response of the interviewees, there were factors for both couples either to do or refrain from carrying out tasks in the above productions.

Factors for Wives Active as well as less Participation in Vegetables and fruits production

According to the interview data, the major factors for the wife to accomplish tasks in the production of vegetables and fruits were: First: the items being planted near the home. That is, if the vegetables and fruits are planted near the home, wives can carry out tasks in these items. It is because since wives are responsible to perform domestic chores, they can participate in the tasks of vegetable and fruit production since it is favorable situation for them to actively engage in accomplishing tasks in these productions. Second: the fact that this items are directly related to the income of the household for which the wives are responsible to sell and fulfill the need of the household with the money they get from the items. Regarding this, respondents indicated that the wife of Fafen is solely responsible to manage the income of the household as per the culture of this area. And, vegetables and fruits are one of the sources of income for the household of Fafen. It is for this reason that wives were actively participating in the production of vegetable and fruits.

On the contrary, there were factors that influence wives for their less participation in the aforesaid productions based on the data gathered from interviewees. The major once were: first; the items being planted far from the home. That means, if vegetables and fruits are planted far from the home, wives can't perform tasks in these productions since they are responsible to carry

out household chores staying around the home. Second; the culture of the study that assigns the tasks for each i.e. carrying out household chores for wives and tasks that are being carried out in the farm land for husbands. Wives are culturally obliged to carry out reproductive roles that can consume their time and be a setback to perform tasks in vegetables and fruits. To put in other terms, being preoccupied with household chores was the main factor for wives' less participation in the production of vegetables and fruits. The third and last factor was the perceived difficulty of some of the tasks like hoeing for females. Almost all interviewee couples and key informants, especially husbands, stated that they don't want to give tasks such as digging hoe for planting vegetables and fruits for their wives since they believe this task is difficult for them to perform as it requires more labor. They further strengthen their justification by taking the reproductive role of their wives i.e. pregnancy, giving birth to a child and breast feeding which consumes and weakens the labor of women. The interviewee below elaborated this scenario as follows.

... it is easy for female to plant vegetable and fruit while I dig the hoe for this purpose. But, she can't dig the hoe since it is a difficult task and not her part to carry out. The reason is the difficulty of the task. She might plow if I am not capable to do so since we have to eat. But, females by nature are diamonds. So, we have to take care of them instead of letting them work outside the home. It is our responsibility to treat them, not forcing them to work tasks outside (Forty five years old man (husband four), Ara-as, Fafen).

This interviewee noted the fact that his wife doesn't accomplish a task of digging for making hoe for planting vegetable and fruits since he perceived this task as difficult for her. Hence, it is this perceived difficulty of the task of digging that influences his wife from accomplishing the same.

Factors for Husbands active engagement in vegetable and fruit production

The interview result also demonstrated factors for husband's active participation in the production of vegetable and fruit. First: husbands were responsible to be in the field culturally and have time to do tasks in the field. According to the interview respondents, the culture of the study area assigned husbands tasks relating to the field. As a result, they had more time than their wives to accomplish tasks in the production of vegetables and fruits since they had no responsibility in the household. Hence, it is for these reasons that husbands were active participants in performing tasks in the aforementioned productions. In relation to division of

tasks among the wives and husbands of the study area, there was also another reason for the active participation of husbands in aforesaid productions. This is related to the distance of the area where vegetables and fruits were produced. That means, if these items are planted far from the home, husbands alone carry out tasks in these productions since wives do not have time to do the tasks.

4.2.4. Livestock Production

Table Ten below demonstrates the division of tasks among couples in livestock production. This table portrayed that more than half of the tasks in the variable were carried out by the wives alone.

Tasks of Wife

The tasks which were performed by wife alone in the production of livestock were: supplying water (94%), barn cleaning (97%), goat milking (100%), milk processing (96%), sweeping up the animal sheds (93%), attention to the health of animals (62%) and looking after young animals (90%) ; Similarly, cow milking (58%) and scaring away animals from eating the food of the livestock (64%) were performed mainly by wives.

Tasks of Husband

The tasks of camel milking (100%) and looking after large animals (70%) were carried out by husbands alone.

Tasks of Both Couples

Tasks such as: Taking care of sick animals (62%), feeding (59%) and collecting food (71%) were carried out by both couples. The above all result of the table made evident that the wife accomplished majority of the tasks in the production of livestock.

Table Ten: Tasks measuring in Livestock Production

Tasks	Options				
	Only Husband	Only Wife	Mainly husband	Mainly Wife	Both
Supplying water	1(1%)	94(94%)		5(5%)	
Barn Cleaning		97(97%)		3(3%)	
Camel Milking	100(100%)				
Goat milking		100(100%)			
Cow milking		10(10%)	3(3%)	58(58%)	29(29%)
Milk processing	1(1%)	96(96%)		3(3%)	
Taking care of sick animals	3(3%)	2(2%)	7(7%)	26(26%)	62(62%)

Feeding	4(4%)	22(22%)	13(13%)	2(2%)	59(59%)
Looking after large animals	70(70%)	3(3%)	11(11%)	2(2%)	14(14%)
Attention to the health of animals	6(6%)	62(62%)	6(6%)	8(8%)	18(18%)
Collecting food	6(6%)	3(3%)	13(13%)	7(7%)	71(71%)
Scaring away animals of others from eating the food of livestock	2(2%)	23(23%)	3(3%)	64(64%)	8(8%)
Sweeping the animal sheds	1(1%)	93(93%)	3(3%)		3(3%)
Looking after young animals	1(10%)	90(90%)		5(5%)	4(4%)

The interview result also affirmed that wives in the area of Fafen perform of the tasks in livestock production. According to the response of the majority interview respondents, most of the tasks in livestock production were accomplished by wives. They performed tasks such as feeding, watering, milking (cow and goat), looking after, collecting food, barn cleaning, cleaning milking utensil and utensil for taking the milk to the market, tie up the livestock, shake the milk to come up with butter, taking care of sick animals including giving medicine to sick animals; they carry out all the tasks in the production of livestock except in the production of camel. On the other side, husbands do have less participation in the production of livestock. They only perform milking (camel and cow), binding up livestock, taking care of the health of animals and looking after camels. They mostly accomplish tasks in the production of camels.

To this effect, a fifty years old man (Husband two), from Golmorodi indicated many tasks accomplished by his wife in the production of livestock. He stated that “my wife accomplishes the task of looking after livestock, feeding them, serving them water taking them to the nearby river, keeping them in their house, feeding them the steam and lives of plants available in the area, and other tasks in livestock production”. Moreover, a forty five years old man in relation to the tasks accomplished by him and his wife in livestock production stated the following.

My wife has lots of responsibilities to carry out tasks in the production of livestock. She perform milking, cleaning the waste of livestock, preparing the utensil for taking the milk to the market. If I fail purposely controlling her from doing these tasks, she accomplishes many tasks in this regard. I only do milking, and taking care of the health of animals (Forty five years old man (husband four), Ara-as, Fafen).

Besides, a fifty three years old man (husband five), from Golmorodi forwarded that his wife takes major responsibility in tasks of livestock production and he has no role in this regard. He explained that “my wife performs tasks such as: looking after livestock, milking, giving food and water, taking care of the sick animals. But, I do not accomplish any task in the production of livestock. I perform tasks in the farm land”.

A forty two years old wife interviewee also stated the tasks carried out by her in the following way.

I do the task of milking, looking after livestock; giving food and water, giving medicine for sick animals and binding them up. I also perform looking after both small and large livestock. It is woman who is responsible for looking after livestock most of the time”(Forty two years old woman (wife five), Golmorodi, Fafen.).

Another husband interviewee again stated that:

Most tasks in livestock production are carried out by females. If we say male are carrying out tasks in livestock production, they do in the production of camels. But, in the production of cows, oxen, sheep, goats and calves, females carry out all the tasks (Fifty years old man (husband two), Ara-as, Fafen).

The above quotes revealed that the wife perform many tasks in livestock production. She carries out milking, looking after livestock, giving food and water, taking care of sick animals, binding them up, cleaning the waste of livestock, preparing the utensil for taking the milk to the market .On the contrary, a husband accomplishes only milking and taking care of the health of animals and they may not engage in any of the tasks in these production at all. However, husbands mostly engage in the tasks in camel production as that of milking camels.

However, there is only key informant, thirty five years old woman, an Expert of Harmful traditional practices and Gender Based Violence in Somali Women’s Affairs Office who disclosed the fact that both couples are responsible to carry out tasks in livestock production except milking of camels. According to this interviewee, milking of camels is being carried out by husbands alone; and milking of cows is carried out by wives most of the times. She explained that “. . . both wife and husband carry out herding and milking. But, it is women who accomplish milking than men most of the times. But, if it is camel, it is male who performs milking”. The

other interviewees also responded the same regarding the task of milking camels. They noted that milking camels is the exclusive task of husbands and on the contrary, milking goats was the exclusive task of wives as per the interviewee result obtained from interviewee respondents. The reason for this fact will be dealt in the next topic.

4.2.4.1. Factors Affecting Gender Division of Labor in Livestock Production

The interview result showed the factors for the division of tasks among couples in the production of livestock. According to this, the major factors for wives active and husbands less engagement in the production of livestock were the culture of the study area, chewing khat by husbands and husbands being busy of performing farm tasks (the belief of husbands that tasks in livestock production are the responsibility of wives). According to the interviewees, it is the wives who are responsible to carrying out tasks in livestock production most of the times as per the culture of the study area. The interviewees affirmed that in their culture it is appropriate for the wives to accomplish tasks in livestock production. The respondents also demonstrated that the very reason for the active engagement of wives in the production of livestock is the fact that husband's being busy of chewing khat. Chewing khat is the usual practice of men of the study area. It is mostly done in a group (see Figure 2) beginning from around 12 a.m and probably ending at 5p.m. Chewing khat by husbands has cultural value for that society. This duration or ceremony is culturally termed as (jebena). Therefore, one can imagine how much time husbands spent in chewing this plant which has direct influence on their participation in the mentioned task. The influence of chewing khat is its being time consuming there by becoming a setback for accomplishing tasks in livestock productions.

Figure 2: Men chewing khat in a Group



Most importantly, the factors for less participation of wives in the production of camel in general and milking camel in particular and more engagement of husbands in this task was the perceived difficulty of the task of milking camels and collecting food for this animals. It is because when one does milking camels he or she has to spent several minutes and sitting by bowing down his knee and putting the milking utensil on his knee. Hence, doing this task for wives is perceived to be difficult since it requires labor and physical strength due to the fact that camels give large amount of milk at one moment and milking camel is done sitting improperly that is not comfortable. And, both couples believe that collecting the food of camels requires going to long journey, it is risky for wives since they might be raped or abducted on their way. Besides, the factor for zero engagement of husbands in the task of goat milking is culture i.e. milking goat by husbands is considered as a taboo and the culture of the study area allows only the wife to do milking goats.

A forty years old woman (wife three), from Golmorodi explained the reason for her active engagement in livestock production. She marked that “it is due to khat. Males are busy of chewing khat. My husband says I will come after stimulate chewing khat (enie merkigne emetalehu anchi higi); you go and look after the livestock. But, later he might not come at all”. The response of this interviewee woman tells us that it is chewing khat by her husband that compels her to accomplish tasks in livestock production.

One of the interviewees noted that:

We can take two people who do shop business. In this case, they have their own responsibility that means if one brings items for sale; the other should do selling the items. Hence, our division of labor is like this. I do agricultural tasks and she does tasks in livestock production along with household chores (Forty five years old man (husband four), Ara-as, Fafen).

This interviewee believes that it is the responsibility of his wife to do tasks in livestock production since he believes his part is only accomplishing tasks in farm land.

Third key informant from Somali Women’s Affairs Office stated the factor for active engagement of husbands in milking camels as follows “it is with a belief that it is difficult for women. As a result, males bring the camels from their grazing area to home and do milking. Their milk is too much; in addition when you do milking camels, you have to put the milking utensil at your knee and sitting by placing your legs on your foot finger (kutit bilesh).So, milking camels is a difficult task for wives”.

4.2.5. Marketing (Selling Agricultural Products)

Table eleven presents the division of tasks among couples in the task of marketing. As can be noticed from this table, it is the wife who is responsible to sell agricultural products. Almost in all items, the percentage of the respondents who selected the option only wife was above 90%. The wife perform selling of milk and butter (99%), maize(66%), sorghum(70%), barley(77%), salad(92%), green paper(99%), tomato(99%), mango(99%), banana(99%), orange(99%), khat (67%), fire wood(88%), charcoal(93%), potato(98%), onion(98%), and cabbage((98%).That means, the wife is the only responsible person to sell agricultural items.

Table Eleven: Items Measuring Tasks in Marketing (Selling Agricultural Items)

Items	Options				
	Only husband	Only wife	Mainly Husband	Mainly wife	Both
Milk and butter		99(99%)		1(1%)	
Maize		66(66%)	1(1%)	25(25%)	8(8%)
Sorghum		70(70%)	2(2%)	20(20%)	8(8%)
Barley		77(77%)	1(1%)	17(17%)	5(5.0%)
Salad		92(92%)		6(6%)	2(2%)
Green paper		99(99%)		1(1%)	
Tomato		99(99%)		1(1%)	
Mango		99(99%)		1(1%)	
Banana		99(99%)			1(1%)
Orange		99(99%)		1(1%)	
Khat		67(67%)		30(30%)	3(3%)
Fire wood		88(88%)		9(9%)	3(3%)
Charcoal		93(93%)		4(4%)	3(3%)
Potato		98(98%)		2(2%)	
Onion		98(98%)		2(2%)	
Cabbage		98(98%)		1(1%)	1(1%)

The same holds true for the interview result as to the tasks in selling the agricultural products including milk and butter. All interview respondents including key informants asserted that it is the wife who is responsible to sell the agricultural products taking them in to the market. They do sell crops like maize, sorghum, khat, mango, papaya, onion, milk and butter, salad, green paper, tomato, potato, banana and other similar items. It is only one wife interviewee who disclosed that her husband does selling khat sometimes.

Figure 3: A woman going to sell firewood



4.2.5.1. Factors Affecting Gender Division of Labor in Marketing (Selling)

The data that was gathered from interview revealed the factors that affect the participation of couples in the task of selling agricultural products. The factors for the active participation of wives and the less engagement of husbands in the task of selling agricultural products were: considering the task as simple by husbands, culture-Stereotype, husband's being addicted to khat and cigarette, and the desire of them to eat quality hotel food, wives being wise for satisfying their household need selling the items and their being wise to sell the items with expensive price as well as their eagerness to sell the items going anywhere. Respondents portrayed that if it is the husbands who do the selling the items, they will spent the money on their own sake i.e. to satisfy their need like for buying khat which is expensive these days, and cigarette as well as and eat quality food together with their friends in the hotels that are difficult to afford their cost. According to the interviewees, as a result of this, the family will remain empty handed.

On the contrary, if it is the wives who do selling the items, they will definitely buy any material for household consumption and their children; and they would save the remaining money that will be spend on other costs including medication fee. The interviews (wife and husbands as well as key informants) also stated that selling the above listed items by husbands is given for the wife culturally; In relation to this, they also disclosed that if a husband does selling those items, he will be labeled as 'female or wife'. According to them, selling the aforementioned items by

husbands is considered as a taboo for Fafen society. The issue that should be noted here is that since husbands know that they are addicted to khat and cigarette which will affect the family living and income, they agreed with their wife to sell the items in order to ensure the needs of the household. Hence, it is possible to say that economy is one of the factors for the division of tasks among couples in the tasks of marketing in the study area. It is the usual for husbands to chew khat and smoke cigarette in the study area. Let's have the direct words of the respondents below.

Third key informant asserted that:

It is the wife who is responsible to carry out selling of agricultural products. It is because if the husband does selling, he uses it for satisfying his needs. He wants to eat quality food together with his friends in hotels that are expensive. He also wants to enjoy with his friends chewing khat as well as smoking cigarette. So, if this is the case, the wife and children will leave empty handed. The wife will not get what she deserves from her husband while he comes back home selling the agricultural products. This will result in exposing the survival of the household at stake. So, there must be a mechanism to arrange this extravagancy through giving this task for the wife. Today, the cost of khat is too high. You can imagine how much money is sufficient to cover the cost of khat that the husband uses to chew. The minimum cost of khat to chew for one (ጽባባ) is ninety (90). But, if it is the wife who is responsible to sell the agricultural products, she buys materials for household consumption and save the remaining money for other purposes like for medication expense. The husband doesn't bother for household expense rather he only wants to satisfy his need. Somali husbands in general are addicted to many things as that of khat, cigarette and eating quality food going to the nearby town. Even if they stay at home they perform farm tasks seasonally and they eat their breakfast and lunch as well as chew khat with their friends for about half a day that means starting from around twelve a.m till five p.m. They enjoy a lot in Somali. It is the wife who is responsible to feed the family (Fifty five years old woman (third key informant), an Expert of Harmful Traditional Practices and Gender based Violence in Somali Women's Affairs Office, jigjiga).

A thirty years old key informant, an expert of animal food in the Somali pastoral and agro-pastoral research institute; Fafen branch, also added the reason for the wives of

Fafen to carry out selling of agricultural products alone. He affirmed that “males are extravagant. They use the money for satisfying their addiction. They don’t bother for the expense of the household. But, females are good at saving the money and invest for the household and children need. Is there anyone who doesn’t chew khat in this place? Is there any Somali who doesn’t chew khat? So, if he sells the items, he will buy khat and come home with no money and material for household consumption”.

First key informant forwarded that:

It is our culture. It is due to culture only. For one thing it is shame for male to take milk to the market .It is a taboo. If he does it, he is labeled as he is womanish, the society or his friends will also say he does tasks for which he is not responsible to carry out and he does a task of females. So, if he meet with males, they say go and sell your milk like female and do a task of females(Thirty two years old man(first key informant) , a head of office for livestock in Somali Pastoral and Agro-pastoral Research Institute; Fafen branch, Fafen).

A forty six year old man also explained that:

If I do selling, I abuse the money that I get from selling the items .I am addicted to many things like cigarette and khat. So, if I go to the market and sell this items, I will use it for khat and cigarette and I return with no money and without buying materials for household consumption in that case my family are losers (Forty six years old man(husband three), Golmorodi , Fafen)

4.3. The Role of Couples for Saving and Managing the Household Income

The interview result portrayed that it is woman who plays great role in saving and managing the income of the household. All interview respondents including five wives, five husbands and three key informants uncover the fact that it is the wives who manage the money the household receives in return from the selling of agricultural products explained before. They perform this through buying the necessary materials for household consumption and save the remaining one for other purposes including medication fee. It is because husbands have problems in managing the money obtained from the selling of agricultural products since they need chewing khat and

smoking cigarette. Hence, they spend the money for this purpose instead of fulfilling the need of the family as well as the household. Thus, they agree to leave the task of managing the household for their wife since she is an expert for the household survival. Let's see some of the direct quotes from the interview respondents.

Fifty five years old man stated the following.

My wife has great role for this money and in saving it to be used in investing for household consumption and other needs as that of cost for medication for the family especially for our children (Fifty five years old man(husband one) Golmorodi, Fafen).

Key informant one who works in Somali Pastoral and Agro-pastoral Research Institute, Fafen branch forwarded the following in indicating the role wives play in managing and saving the income of the household.

It is females who play vital role for their household income. It is because they do marketing related activities like selling agricultural products and buying materials and goods for household consumption with the money they received or get from the sold items. If one offers a male to take items to the market and sell the same, he absolutely refuses to do so. Unfortunately, if he go to the market and sell the agricultural products, he will buy chatt, cigarette and other similar things for his sake instead of buying materials for household consumption. He doesn't want to think for his household. He doesn't care for the household. He doesn't know about saving and do not want to save money for the household. So, females are better for saving and investing money for household. They are better for the family. They think and bother for the children and the household survival. They sell items in the market and buy food, cloth and other necessary things for the family and children (Thirty two years old man (first key informant),head of Office for livestock in Somali Pastoral and agro-pastoral research institute, Fafen branch, Fafen).

Another respondent stated that:

It is females who play major role for household income. It is because the mouth of males is large. That means small or ruminant thing can't satisfy him. But, his

wife worries about and for their household survival. Males spend the money for his sake” (Fifty three old man (husbands five), Golmorodi, Fafen).

Key informant three who works in Somali Women Affairs Office stated the role wives play in managing and saving the income of the household as follows.

It is women who play great role for their household income. They do selling and saving and use it even for their children medication. If they wait for their husband, he will not give money; so, they do generating income even with petty trading for the sake of satisfying their household need. It is not usual for men to do generating household income, (Thirty five years old woman’ interview (third key informant), an Expert of Harmful Traditional practices and Gender based Violence in Somali Women Affairs Office, Jigjiga).

The above quotes bring to light the fact that the wives in the study area are the pillars in saving money for fulfilling and ensuring the demand and survival of household respectively. They accomplish this through selling the agricultural items that the household produced, saving the money that they got from the sold items and managing the same for necessary costs, whereas, the role of the husband in this regard is less marked.

V. Discussion

This part has tried to relate and see the current finding with the previous studies that had been carried out in the issued addressed in this study.

The finding depicted that wives accomplished all household chores. They carried out these tasks alone. These tasks were fetching water, cooking food, collecting fire wood, carrying for children, serving food and drink, washing clothes, house cleaning, cleaning the compound, processing drinks, grinding, buying materials for domestic consumption and building tent. This is supported by the finding of Suzan (1998); Stuel and Sue, (2002); Caroline and Carolyn (2005); Janet and Vivian (1993); and Martha (1987) which revealed that wives were found to be dominantly engaged in performing household chores though their study was not on agro-pastoral areas. The current finding is also similar with the finding of Sintayehu (2002), Yohhanes (1997), Wossen (2008) and Habtamu, Hirut, Yusuf and Konjit (2004) which also portrayed that wives of Ethiopia

were dominant in accomplishing household chores. The finding in respect of the task of fetching water is in consistent with the finding of Dejenie (2009) which depicted the fact that men of Guji (agro-pastoral) area in Ethiopia were found assisting their wives in the task of fetching water. However, other domestic chores were accomplished by wives of this area which is similar with the wives of Fafen.

The finding also revealed the influencing factors for couples in the task of accomplishing household chores. According the result, factors that influenced wives to accomplish household tasks exclusively were directly related to the culture of the study area: According to this culture, wives were assigned to perform household chores taking the task as granted. In relation to this, wives of the study area believed that they fit to the task since they are females. Moreover, they also took household task as natural for wives to perform as they believe that the status of males is higher than females naturally. Most importantly, husbands were not willing to support their wives afraid of societal stereotypes and taking domestic chores as women's task culturally and naturally.

The finding in respect of the division of tasks in crop production (maize, sorghum and khat) revealed that most tasks in the farm land were performed by husband alone which is supported by the finding of Lourdes (1982) Elizabeth (2003) and Sintayehu (2002) which indicated husbands did most of the tasks in crop production. On the contrary, the current finding is in consistent with the findings of Getaneh (2004), Melese (1994), Birhanu (1999), Ameyu (2003), Kasahun (1996), and Nahusenay (2004) which indicated that women play a dominant role in crop production in Dorze (Gamo) highlands, Tsamako people, Chenchaworeda in North Omo zone, in Jimma Rare district, Sendafa in the area of North Shewa, and Delanta woreda in Wollo respectively. Moreover, the current finding is also not similar with the finding of Yilma (2002) which indicated that both sexes were found to have equal share in contributing to crop production and almost all agricultural tasks except few ones were performed by both sexes among the Konso people of Tokatulega district in South western Ethiopia. His finding also indicated that there was no sharp gender based division of labor as a general rule in that area though he mentioned the existence of tasks that were carried out mainly by a particular gender.

According to the finding however, there were tasks accomplished by wives either alone or with their husbands which is supported by the finding of John (1987) and Dejenie (2009) which

revealed men and women participated in farm tasks with varying degree and deviating from the rigid gender division of labor in the field work, women despite their participation rates performed quite a variety of tasks.

The finding also indicated that the participation of wives and husbands in farm tasks varies from task to task and crop to crop which is similar with researches done before on this issue which pointed out that the participation of women and men in farm tasks vary in the types of tasks and crops (John, 1987). Husbands for instance did a task of scaring away animals in the maize alone but not the production sorghum. Wives of the same area did a task of scaring away animals in the production of sorghum but not in maize due to the perceived difficulty of the task. That means, the task of scaring away animals from damaging plant and crop is accomplished during night in the case of maize but not in the case of sorghum. But, this task is carried out all over the day in the case of sorghum in that case favorable for the wives since it is not dark and their husbands were busy of chewing chatt at that time.

Variation in respect of tasks, wives for instance didn't engage in the task of plowing, making farm implements, watering, and construction of irrigation structure in each crop. By the same token, the husbands also didn't engage in the task of transporting the threshed grain to the home, cleaning the grain from dust, cooking food, preparing drink and take it to the farm hands in addition to khat. This finding in respect of the variation of the participation of couples across crops and tasks in a crop is similar with the finding of (Lourdes, 1982; Elizabeth, 2003) which indicated that the tasks accomplished by the sexes vary across crops and tasks. Moreover, the finding is also similar with the finding of Wossen (2008) which portrayed women were the dominant participants in food crops and men in the production of cash crops in Mjinger community in south western Ethiopia that shows the variation of the participation of couples across types of crops.

The interview result depicted that wives do have tasks they accomplished exclusively in the production of crop. This finding is similar with the finding of Dejenie (1989) which portrayed that women of Legambo accomplished some task exclusively in crop production. The interview result also showed the technical division of labor performed by couples. That is, quantitative result indicated a certain task as exclusive tasks of husbands but the interview result revealed that one specific task was accomplished by the couples together taking different share at the same

time. For instance, a task of sowing is reported as the exclusive task of husbands in the questionnaire results; but, the interview result indicated that carrying the seed and following their husband while they did sowing was a task of wives. Plowing is also reported as an exclusive task of husbands; but, wives did a task of pulling the oxen while their husbands did plowing. This is supported by the finding Lourdes (1982), which pointed out the need to see qualitative aspect of gender division of labor i.e. the tasks carried out by the couples. Lourdes justified her point by stating that attention to the labor process within agricultural field work suggests that the sexual division of labor in many activities is a technical division of labor, taking place within the labor process itself. However, the finding of this researcher is different from the current finding in that threshing and sweep up the threshed grain were mostly done by women, but husbands of Fafen were exclusively performing these tasks.

Both interview and questionnaire results revealed that wives of the study area performed a task of transporting the threshed grain to the home which is similar with the finding of Dejenie (2009) that demonstrated that carrying maize from the field to the storage facility is women's exclusive work though the wives of Fafen did transporting through donkeys and the women of Guji did it through carrying the grain themselves. However, The current finding is not similar with the study of Sintayehu(2002) which indicated that transporting the threshed grain to home is the task of men among the Sidama of southwestern Ethiopia. Furthermore, preparing the threshing ground is the task of women among the Guji (Dejenie, 2009) but not the task of women in Fafen. The fact of variation of tasks undertaken by couples in crop production both in types of crop, task and place of location emanated from the nature of gender division of labor which is underlined by previous researches conducted to identify this issue (Kara,2008; Daina, 1991; Carolyn and Caroline, 2005; Suzan,1998; Elizabeth, 2003 and Lourdes, 1982).These researchers noted the need to examine the specific tasks accomplished by couples in each crops in a particular area since they come up with the noted variations across places, crops, and tasks.

In respect of the participation of couples in performing the tasks in crop production, the finding portrayed the factors that sway wives and husbands either to accomplish or refrain from doing farm tasks. The factors were related to the culture of the area in one way or another. Factors that affect wives active participation in crop production were: the belief that these tasks are male's culturally and naturally, the belief that they don't fit to the task, their husbands lack of

willingness to participate them in the task, preoccupied with other task as that of household chores and livestock production, lack of know-how to do some tasks .

Similarly, feeling sympathy for their wives, thinking that their wives have other tasks to do as that of household chores and tasks in livestock production, feeling comfortable of carrying out farm tasks, thinking that they are physically capable to do farm tasks and the perceived difficulty of the task plowing for their wives were reason for active engagement of husbands in accomplishing tasks in crop production. This is supported by the finding of Daina (1991);Carolyn and Caroline(2005);Suzan, (1998);and Elizabeth(2003) which revealed that the culture and social statuses as the influencing factors for the division of tasks among couples in crop production. Moreover, Dejenie (1989) and Wossen(2008) also suggested that cultural background, cropping patterns, type of farm technology and the perceived difficulty of some of agricultural tasks as the most likely factors that affect gender division of labor in crop production which is similar with the current finding conducted at Fafen.

The finding also revealed what tasks wives and husbands accomplished in the production of vegetable and fruit. Based on the finding, the tasks that the husband and wife perform in vegetable and fruit depend on the type of fruit and vegetable, kind of task as well as the place where these items are planted. However, all with these situations, the couples perform tasks in the production of vegetable and fruit. The husband for instance accomplished the tasks of preparing seedling tomato, green paper, mango and papaya, collecting the seedling of mango, planting the mango and papaya seedlings, watering green paper, mango and papaya. The other tasks performed by husbands included harvesting the fruit of papaya, plant servicing in tomato, green paper, mango, and papaya, arranging field land, hoeing for planting, fencing, taking care, managing and supervising hired workers to carryout tasks in the production of vegetable and fruit.

As per the finding, the tasks which were accomplished by wife in the production of vegetable and fruit were: preparing the seedling of salad, collecting the seedling of salad and watering salad accomplished mainly by wife. On the other hand, arranging the land for tomato, green paper, salad, mango and papaya, planting the seedling of tomato, the task of harvesting salad, harvesting vegetables and fruits, planting, weeding, and watering were performed by the wife

alone. We can see the participation of the couples in this regarded. As can be seen from the finding, the tasks in which husbands mostly responsible in vegetable and fruit were preparing seedling and watering, where as wives mostly engaged in the task of arranging filed land. Similarly, the vegetables and fruits in which the husband mostly engaged were mango and papaya and wives mostly engaged in the tasks of salad.

The issue addressed in relation to who does what in the production of vegetables and fruits was what factor did influence couples in accomplishing the tasks in the explained productions. According to the finding, factors that affect the participation of couples in accomplishing the task of vegetable and fruit were: The place where the items are planted, the fact that this items are directly related to money in which the wife is the responsible fulfill the need of the household , the culture of the study that assigns the couples tasks for each i.e. carrying out household chores for wives and tasks that are being carried out in the farm land for husbands and the perceived difficulty of some of the tasks like hoeing for females.

The finding in relation to the division of task among couples in livestock production marked the point that it is wives who performed most of the tasks in this production. This finding is similar with the finding of Elizabeth (2003) which portrayed that wives do most of the tasks in livestock production and in consistent with the finding of Kechero (2007) which revealed men are largely the decision makers for livestock production and are in charge of general herd management; women generally contribute more labor inputs in areas of feeding; manage vulnerable animals (calves, small ruminants, and sick, injured and pregnant animals), cleaning of barns, dairy-related activities (milking, butter and cheese making) and both men and women took part in the harvesting and transportation of feed, feeding of animals, cleaning of sheds and sale of milk, cheese and butter in agro-pastoral area of Jimma. It is because the current finding indicated that wives are solely responsible to perform and manage tasks in livestock. But, in Jimma zone men took part in most of the task including barn cleaning and selling of milk which are accomplished only by wives in Fafen. However, the current finding is similar with this finding in the task of processing milk, taking care of sick animals and looking after young animals which are carried out by wives in both areas.

However, there were some tasks that wives accomplished together with their husbands. Among the tasks that the wives take major responsibilities to carry out were: supplying water, barn cleaning, cow milking, goat milking, milk processing sweeping up the animal sheds, attention to the health of livestock and looking after young animals, feeding, collecting food, barn cleaning, cleaning milking utensil and utensil for taking the milk to the market, tie up the livestock, shake the milk to come up with butter, and taking care of sick animals. On the other side, as demonstrated from the finding, husbands do have less participation in the production of livestock. They perform only milking (camel and cow), binding up livestock, taking care of the health of animals, looking after camels and large animals. This is inconsistent with the finding of Dejenie (2009) and which found out that woman of Guji and not dominant or exclusively responsible to carry out most tasks in livestock. The finding is also in consistent with the study of Sintayehu(2002) that demonstrated the domination of men in the tasks in livestock production among the Sidama of Southwestern Ethiopia. The current finding is also not similar with the finding of Caroline and Carolyn (2005) which depicted that care and management of livestock were generally in the hands of men in agro-pastoral areas and women give assistance in the care of animals and make major contributions to their families. It is because wives of Fafen were found to be responsible to accomplish caring and managing livestock and these tasks were in their hands. For instance, women of this area were actively engaged in milking, selling milk products and collecting the food for livestock, where as men were actively engaged in watering and herding livestock which is in consistent with the current finding where wives of Fafen were exclusively accomplished these tasks. According to the finding, husbands mainly perform tasks in camels which is supported by the finding of Elizabeth (2003) that indicated men usually manage and carry out tasks in large animals.

The finding again made evident factors that were attributed to the division of tasks in the above explained production. According to the finding, the major factors that influenced wives to actively engage in livestock production and less engagement of them in the production of camels were: Culture, chewing khat by husbands, husbands being busy of performing farm tasks and the perceived difficulty of milking camels (factor for less engagement of wives in the task of milking camels) by both couples. The above finding is similar with the finding of Elizabeth (2003) which made evident that wives performed most tasks in livestock production since their husbands have

other tasks to accomplish as that of farm tasks. Moreover, the current finding is also consistent with the finding of Dejenie (2009) which revealed that women of Guji were found to become actively engaged in that task of livestock production due to the fact that husbands were busy with tasks.

The finding in relation to the division of tasks in marketing revealed that the wife is the sole responsible body to accomplish selling of agricultural products taking them in to the market. This finding is unique since it is common for most of Ethiopian husbands to sell agricultural items and control the money they receive. Husbands of Fafen had agreed with their wives on the issue of who should perform selling of the agricultural products since they believe that their wives are wise in selling and managing as well as controlling the money the household received in return from the sold items. This is supported by the finding of Lourdes (1982) that indicated the peasantry women were found to be frequently carried out marketing products. And, the finding is not similar with the finding of Kechero (2007) which revealed that the task of selling milk is accomplished by both sexes or husbands take part in selling milk in Agro-pastoral area of Jimma. On the other side, the current finding is not similar with the finding of Sintayehu (2002) which revealed that both men and women accomplish a task of selling and woman's main marketing items were small in amount and less valued.

The factors for wives active and husbands less participation in the task of selling agricultural products that were portrayed by the finding included; Considering the task as simple, culture, stereotype, husband's need to chew khat, smoke cigarette, and eat hotel food, and wives being wise for satisfying their household need selling the items. This finding is supported by the researches done before on the same issue that come up with the factors that affect the participation of couples in the task of selling i.e. leadership role in the family, survival strategy of the household and culture that influenced wives to actively engage in selling agricultural items (Nune and Maria, 1983; Lourdes, 1982; Jhon, 1987).

The finding also uncovered the role the wives play for saving and managing the household income. As per the finding, the wives do have great role for saving and managing the household income. They do it through selling the agricultural items and buy the materials that the household needs and saving the remaining money for other purposes including medication fee. This finding

shows that the economic power of the household resides on wives. As a result, wives of this area don't bother about the household expenditure since the money is in their own hands; they spent it when they want to fulfill the demand of the family. But, if the money is in the hands of their husbands, they have to ask or sometimes beg them to get the money for the sake of fulfilling the need of the family. For that effect, wives of the study area gave money for their husbands to buy khat. This finding is similar with the finding of Janet and Vivian (1993) which indicated that rural Srilinka women handled income and managed the expenditure of the household. However, the current finding is in consistent with the finding of Dejenie (2009) which demonstrated that women of Guji (agro-pastoral area) had little control over agricultural products and men did saving and managing the income of the household in this area. By the same token, the current finding is also not similar with the finding of Linda and Rosmary (1994), which uncovered that men generally control the marketing of agricultural surpluses and the income from the sale of crops remains with them; and women are able to sell only a small amount of grains to meet some of their household needs.

The overall discussion affirmed what cultural relativist and multicultural feminists hold about the tasks assigned to genders and the status they have across and within culture as indicated in the conceptual frame work part of the paper. That is, the tasks accomplished by sexes and their status varies across and within cultures since men and women perform tasks assigned to them by the culture of the particular area and society which are deemed to be appropriate for sexes in the eyes of that area. To put in other terms, the burden of women and men in performing different tasks is relative depending on the culture of the area under consideration. In relation to this, gender role socialization is also another factor that influenced the couples to perform and refrain from accomplishing tasks in household chores; crop, vegetable and fruit as well as livestock production; selling of agricultural products and the task of saving and managing the income of the household.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 Conclusions

Based on the findings and discussion rendered in the previous chapter, the following conclusions were made.

Wives of the study area were overburdened with multiple roles including household chores; farm tasks; tasks in vegetable and fruit productions; tasks in livestock production; marketing; as well as saving and managing the income of the household. Apart from accomplishing domestic chores which are usual for women in the agricultural society of Ethiopia, wives of Fafen accomplished almost all tasks in livestock productions which were perceived to be male's tasks in agricultural community and even in other agro-pastoral areas. Moreover, unlike other areas, wives of Fafen

were the sole responsible person in selling the agricultural products as well as saving and managing the income of the household.

Fafen husbands were dominant only in farm tasks particularly in crop production. Their participation in performing household chores and marketing as well as saving and managing the household was zero. However, they almost equally participate in the tasks of vegetable and fruits. But, they had less participation in livestock production which included milking cows together with their wives and camels alone. The most contributing factor that the respondents attribute for less participation of husbands in the tasks of livestock; marketing; saving and managing the income of the household was chewing khat by husbands which consumes time as well as money.

The economic power of the household is vested up on wives of the study area. That is, in the first place, they sell the agricultural products of the household exclusively. Second, they hold and control as well as manage the money they received in return from the sold items. This is in contradiction with the usual role of husbands i.e. holding and managing the income of the household in most areas of Ethiopia including agro-pastoral societies.

The factors that affect the division of tasks among couples in household chores; crop, vegetable and fruit, and livestock productions; selling of agricultural products and saving and managing the income of the household were Socio-cultural, economical, the perceived difficulty of the tasks, the belief that division of labor is natural and wife's considered being wise in accomplishing the tasks. Besides, most of the factors are interrelated and mostly related to the culture of the area. Religion had no any influence on the division of tasks in the study area.

The overall finding together with the results obtained from other researchers affirmed what many researchers and scholars forwarded. That is, gender division of labor varies across cultures, with in cultures, crops and tasks in a crop. As we have seen in the discussion part of this paper, the couples accomplish tasks in the variables sometimes similar across different cultures, crops and tasks, but it also varies in these regards. Thus, gender division of labor in general and the tasks the couples responsible to accomplish in the noted variables is specific to the particular area and it also varies from task to task and crop to crop as well as vegetable to vegetable within that area. Moreover, the similarity of systems of production among places doesn't mean the roles and

responsibilities of the couples are similar in these areas. For instance, agro-pastoral areas of Ethiopia don't always allocate similar tasks for the couples. There is variation across different areas including Fafen. The most likely factor might be the specific culture of the areas. For instance, chewing khat by husbands is the common practice in Fafen and taken as the most influencing factor of the division of tasks among couples in livestock production, selling of agricultural products and the role of saving and managing the income of the household; but it might not be the case in other agro-pastoral area of Ethiopia.

6.2 Recommendations

Based on the major findings and discussion, the following recommendations were forwarded.

- ❖ Awareness campaign need to be done for concerned bodies as to the fact that wives have tasks and roles even in saving and managing the income of the household in the study area which is different from the perceived fact that the head of the household is the husband and does managing the same.
- ❖ It is necessary to create awareness in relation to gender and gender division of labor for the society of Fafen in order to aware them on the issue that gender division of labor is culturally and socially constructed which will help to do away the belief that the tasks

assigned to them are natural (God's gift). Moreover, creating awareness on this issue will also help to minimize or eliminate the influencing factors that mostly emanate from culture.

- ❖ There is a need to ease the burden wives of the study area through arranging awareness campaigns for the community of the study area in general and husbands of the same in particular since there is a need to share the tasks.
- ❖ It is important that concerned bodies (GOs and NGOs) have specific data about a particular area regarding gender division of labor and the burden women have in Ethiopia. It is because knowing the specific condition of the particular area will help them to address the issue or problem of the area that is particular to it. Moreover, holding general assumption and providing general solution will hide specific problem of specific area since that area might have a unique feature that make it different from other areas.
- ❖ Further research needs to be done on the issue of the role of wives in saving and managing the income of the household in the study area in the relation to husbands' economic power since the researcher believes that such studies will add more knowledge on this topic and will be vital for concerned bodies and policy makers.
- ❖ Further research also needs to be done on the contributing factors for couples to perform or refrain from accomplishing each task in the addressed variables since this research didn't examine the reason of the couples in each task in a full-fledged manner; for instance, the reason for transporting the threshed grain to home by wives.

References

- Ameyu Godesso(2003).*The Role of Women in Agricultural Activities among Jimma-Rare Oromo, South Eastern Wollega*.AAU: Unpublished Senior Essay .Addis Ababa.
- Birhanu Hailu(1999).*The Role and Status of ‘Gamo Womens’ in Agricultural Development. The case of Chenchaworeda in North Omo Zone*. AAU: unpublished Senior Essay. Addis Ababa.
- Boseup,E.(1970).*Woman’s Role in Economic Development*. New York: St.Martins Press.
- Caroline,B and Carolyn, F.(2005).*Gender in Cross-Cultural Perspectives(fourth edition)* New jersey: Upper Saddle River press.
- Creswell,J.(2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and mixed Methods Approaches* (2nd).New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Debbus, M. (1995).*Methodological Review: a Handbook for Excellence in Focus Group Research*. Washington: Porter Noxell.
- Dejene Debesu (2009) .*Gender and Culture in Southern Ethiopia: An Ethnographic analysis of Guji-Oromo Women’s Customary Rights*. Miami University. Retrieved January 4 2010 from <http://sambo.africa.kyoto-uac.ip/kirokulasm>
- Dejenie Aredo(1995).*The Gender Division of Labor in Ethiopia Agriculture :The Study of Time Allocation among People in Private and Cooperative Farms in two Villages* .Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa Printing Press.
- Desalegn Rahmato(1984). *Agrarian Reforms in Ethiopia Agriculture* .Trenton: The Red Sea Printing Press.
- Diana. (1991).*Sexual Divisions Revisited*. Hong Hong: University of London.
- Elizabeth,E.(2005).*The Political Economy of Gender, Women and the Sexual Division of Labor in Philippines’s*. New York: printing press.
- Habtamu Wondimu, Hirut,Terefe, Yusuf O.Abdi and Konjit Kefetew(2004). *Gender and Cross-Cultural Dynamics in Ethiopia-The case of Eleven Ethnic Groups*.Addis Ababa: AAU

- Jeneth, M and Vivlan, K. (1998). *Different Places, Different Voices : Gender and Development in Africa*. London: Pearson printing press
- John, H. (1987). *Gender and Work in the Third World: Sexual Division in Brazilian Industry*. USA: New York printing press.
- Kara, N. (2008). *Greater Access to Trade Expansion Project under the Women in Development*. Retrieved January 4 2010 from <http://www.zucidestafrica.org/publications/wanoii>.
- Kechero Yisehak (2005). *Gender Responsibility in Small holder mixed crop-livestock production systems of Jimma zone, South West Ethiopia*: Jimma University. Retrieved November 8 2009 from [http://www.imps-Ethiopia.org\(cont/files\)documents/](http://www.imps-Ethiopia.org(cont/files)documents/) publications (Msc thesis).
- Kedija Hussen, Azage Tegegne, Mohammed Yousuf and Berhanu Gebremedhin (2005). *Traditional Cow and Camel Milk Production and Marketing in Agro-pastoral and Mixed Crop-Livestock Systems: The case of Mieso District, Oromia Regional State, Ethiopia*. Retrieved November 2009 from <http://www.irrd.org/rrz20/i/yise>.
- Kejela Gemtessa and Emanu, B. (2005). *Livelihood Diversification in Borana Pastoral Communities of Ethiopia- Prospects and Challenges*. Retrieved January 20 2010 from http://www.ilri.org/Link/Publications/Publications/Theme%201/Pastoral%20conference/Briefs/Gemtessa_Livelihood%20Diversification%20in%20Borana_%20Brief_Final1.pdf
- Linda, D and Rosemary, P. (1994). *Defining Women, Social Institutions and Gender Divisions*. UK: Polity Press.
- Lindsey, L. (2004). *Gender roles: A Sociological Perspective (4th)*. New Jersey: Himilton Printing Press.
- Lois, A. (2002). *Feminist Nationalist Social Movements: Beyond Universalism and towards a Gendered Cultural Relativism*. New York. Retrieved October 30 2009 from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science>
- Lourdes, B. (1982). *Women and Development- the Sexual Division in Rural Societies*. New York: Praeger press.
- Lynne, B and Sylvia, C. (1989). *Women in Third World: Gender Issues in Rural and Urban Areas*. Britain: Biddles Printing Press.

- Martha, F. (1987). *Rural Women, Unequal Partners in Development*. Geneva: Publication of international labor force.
- Melese Getu(1995). *Tsamako Women's Role and Status in Agro-pastoral Production*. Social Anthropological Dissertation Series: No.3. Addis Ababa.
- Nahusenay Abate (2004). *The Role of Women in Rural Livelihood and Sustainable Food Security in Ethiopia; The case Study from Delanta Woreda, North Wollo Zone*. School of Graduate Studies, AAU, Unpublished MA Thesis, AddisAababa.
- Ralston, S. (2008). *Culture and Gender. Country Briefing Paper for Women in Tonga*. Retrieved May 4, 2010 from http://www.adb.org/Documents/Books/Country_Briefing_Papers/Women_in_Tonga
- Reinherz, S. (1992). *Feminist Methods in Social Research*. New York: Oxford University Press:
- Richard, H. (1997). *Pastoralists, Ethnicity and the State in Ethiopia*. London: Cromwell Press.
- Russell, L. (2001). *Some Practical Guidelines for Effective Sample-Size Determination* University of Iowa. Retrieved April 3 2010 from <http://www.stat.uiowa.edu/techrep/tr303.pdf>
- Sarantakos, S. (2005). *Social Research (Third edition)*. London: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd.
- Sintayehu Dejene (2002). *Gender Roles in Agricultural Production among the Southwestern Ethiopia*. Addis Ababa: AAU.
- Stevl, J and Sue, S. (2002) . *Gender a Sociological Reader*. London: Open University press.
- Suzanne, S. (1998). *Gender, Family and Social Movements*. New Delhi: Fine Forge Press.
- Tong, P. (1998). *Feminist Thought, a Mere Comprehensive Introduction (second edition)*. USA and UK: West View Press
- Yilma Sunta (2002). *The Status and Role of Women in Food System of the Konso, South West Ethiopia*. AAU: School of Graduate Studies, Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa.