

Gender-based Practices in Everyday Life of the People in Pokhara, Nepal

GYANU CHHETRI (BISTA)[†]

*Department of Sociology, Patan Multiple Campus, Tribhuvan University,
Kathmandu, Nepal*

E-mail: gyanu35@gmail.com

KEY WORDS: Gender practices. Gender relation. Decision making. Household work. Earnings. Pokhara valley. Nepal.

ABSTRACT: Household is the primary site of gender construction. The way gender is practiced in the households tends to be reflected in how gender is perceived by individuals in households / families and the society. I argue that gender perceptions are built on what is practiced in daily life. Gender relationship prevails at the level of societal norms and values which shape gender-based practices and these in turn may re-shape gender-related norms and values of society. One's position and power in the household normally depends upon the individual's gender and kinship relation. This paper explores gender-based practices on division of work, decision-making and control of resources by focusing on practices in the 205 households in Pokhara valley, Nepal.

INTRODUCTION

We talk about gender as a social cultural construct – gender construction in society. As a micro unit of society, household is the primary site of gender construction. Household as the first school, children learn about gender role in the household. The way gender is practiced in the households tends to be reflected in how gender is perceived by individuals in households/families and the society. Thus people act and do what they believe; what they believe is what they learn; what they learn is what they have been socialized into; and what they socialize into is what they see and learn from the family. Perceptions are built on what is practiced and practice is guided by people's perceptions. The relationship is two way and it begins in the household.

I argue that gender perceptions are built on what is practiced in daily life. This relationship prevails at the level of societal norms and values which shape

gender-based practices and these in turn may re-shape gender-related norms and values of society.

In the household, who does what, who has what, who controls, who decides, etc. normally depends upon how the individual in question is perceived on the basis of gender. How work is divided among the family members, how and who makes decisions in the family, how resources are controlled and by whom depends on how people in the household are perceived by the society and what place they have in their culture.

This paper explores gender-based perceptions and practices on division of work, decision-making and control of resources within households on the basis of a research among the Brahman, Chhetri, Gaine (singers) and Kumal (potters) of Western Nepal. Data used in this paper was collected in Pokhara valley, in Western Nepal during my Ph.D. field research in 2002. Batulechaur of Pokhara and Rithepani of Lekhnath were selected for the study. The biggest Gaine settlement in Pokhara valley lies

[†]Associate Professor

in Batulechaur while that of Kumal's lies in Rithepani of Lekhnath Municipality. At the closest proximity were the Chhetris with the Gains in Batulechaur and Brahmans with the Kumals in Rithepani, Lekhnath. In a study by Gurung (2002:72) the ethnic/caste distribution showed that Batulechaur had dominance of Chhetris. Adhikari and Seddon (2002) showed that Lekhnath had dominance of Brahmans and Kumals. I examined gender issues as perceived and practiced by the so-called high caste Brahman and Chhetri, low caste Dalit Gains and the ethnic community Kumals of Pokhara valley in my thesis.

METHODOLOGY

Primary data for the study was collected from the selected respondents, knowledgeable persons and local elites through survey, interview and group discussions. Public life, daily activities of people, gender segregation and their mobility were carefully observed and recorded.

In the beginning of the field work, household census was undertaken for obtaining information from Brahmans and Kumals in Rithepani and Chhetris and Gains in Batulechaur. Information regarding population composition by age, sex, educational level, marital status, age at marriage and occupation of the family members as well as primary and secondary occupation of the household was obtained from the household census.

From among the 423 household and 2046 population identified by the household census, 205 respondents were selected for the survey with specific purpose.

A study by Holey ('90) has revealed that though household heads are mostly male members of the house they are not necessarily knowledgeable on all aspects of household matters. According to her household member's knowledge on specific areas relating to household matters depended on their gender.

Members within the household were selected for survey on the basis of their age, sex and education purposively. Thus priority was placed on the most elderly females and males, most educated females and young adult males with no education. Household survey was used for obtaining background

information, extensive socio-economic profile, division of labour in household work, economic activities and community activities. Information such as household resources and its ownership, access to and control over resources and decision-making in the household were also collected by this method. Though checklists of open-ended questions were prepared in advance specific questions were brought up during the interview. This 'probing' technique facilitated the process of obtaining information in depth which would not otherwise have been possible in structured interviews (Malla, '92; Campbell *et al.*, '79). Semi-structured interviews were held with local people for understanding peoples' attitudes, opinions, perceptions on gender issues.

Key informant interviews were carried out with knowledgeable and elderly females and males for obtaining information regarding history and development in the area, people's perception on gender discrimination and equality, and on traditional occupation of Kumals and Gains in the area. It is often said that "village tea-shops" and "*chautara*" (resting place under a tree) were the ideal places for group discussion (Malla, '92; *cf.* Chhetri, 2001). But those are only suitable places for male researcher and male respondents. Female members in rural Nepal are not expected to gather in a tea-shop and participate in the discussion with outsiders especially with male strangers. I had conducted group discussions at their courtyard, at ritual ceremony sites and work places separately for females and males.

Study Population

Brahmans and Chhetris are the major caste groups in Nepal by their number. Census of Nepal 2011 has listed 125 caste/ethnic groups in Nepal. It placed Chhetris at the top with highest population (16.6%) followed by the Hill-Brahmans (12.2%). In the traditional Hindu caste hierarchy based on pollution and purity, Brahman and Chhetri were classified under the *cord wearing* category, Kumal under the *enslavable* category and Gaine were categorized under the *untouchable* category (see Holfer, 2004). According to Sharma (2004) efforts were made by the Hindu rulers of Nepal at times to maintain social order in their state. Occupational caste hierarchy was also reinforced during Shah period, by Ram Shah,

the King of Gorkha (r.1606-1636 B.S.) who is also known for his social reform in the history of Nepal. After the unification of modern Nepal, King Prithvi Narayan Shah also declared Nepal the garden of four *Jat* and thirty six *Varna*. In the Nepali social context, *Jat* commonly means caste in the hierarchical, stratified sense of the Hindu caste system. "One can not choose one's *jati*; it is defined by birth" (Quigley, '95).

Gaines is a group of people of Nepal whose traditional occupation is singing and fishing. They are known for singing on *Sarangi*, to make their living. They have been defined as "a particular caste of begging singers" (Turner, '31:138), "a caste group who make their earning by singing on *Sarangi* and begging from place to place" (Gyawali, 2040 B.S.:199) (Bikram Sambat—Nepali Year which corresponds to 1984 A.D.). Gaines prefer to call themselves as "Gayak", "Gandharva" or "Gandhar" (see Chhetri, 2013). In the traditional Hindu caste hierarchy based on pollution and purity Gaines were placed under Shudra *Varna* and at the bottom of the hierarchy-untouchable castes category (see Holfer, 2004).

In the total population of Nepal, the Gaine constituted 0.03 % in 2001. The 2001 Census of Nepal has identified 5887 Gaines living in Nepal. Whereas, in Kaski district, 608 Gaines (283 males and 325 females) were identified in 2011 census. In the total population of Kaski district they constituted 0.123% in 2011 census. Their biggest and oldest settlement lies in Batulechaur of Pokhara (HMG, 2031).

Prior to the arrival of newspapers, radios and magazines to tell about events, Gaines travelled from place to place singing songs about battles and acts of bravery. "Almost every culture has had these singing newscasters from earliest times until the newspapers and radio slowly replaced them" (Mierow, '97: 80). Gaines composed songs instantly on any events (see Chhetri, '89).

Kumals are a group of people in Nepal whose traditional occupation is clay-pot making. Kumal constituted less than 1 % in the total population of Nepal in the Census of 2001. Kumal population in Kaski district according to 2011 census is 2530 (1258 males and 1272 females) They comprise 0.55% of the District total. Among the occupational caste that

originated in the hill, Kumal constituted 3.88 % (CBS '95: 321, Table 10). The two occupational castes people Kumal and Gaine combined together, constitute 4.11% of the hill occupational caste. According to an elderly Gurung male who was also the VDC Chair at the time of field work told me that though the Kumals were the early settlers of Ritthevani, they were dominated by Brahmans in the area. Studies have shown that Kumals were found abandoning their traditional occupation of making clay pots in past few years (Pathak, 2003; Kattel, 2001). Reasons provided for the abandonment were problems relating to firewood, colour, market, lack of interest of the young generation, and sustenance of the family expenditure.

Status of Women

In the context of Nepali society and culture, opportunities and constraints for women and men are based on their location in the social structure (caste status, economic status) and position in the family (household head, daughter, son, daughter-in-law, son-in-law). Thus women have differential control over productive resources such as land ownership, ownership of enterprises, control over loan/credit, control over income, control over information, control over family purse, etc.

Female ownership of family resources is negligible (CBS, 2003). Women ownership of house, land and livestock is 0.77%, 5.25% and 5.42 % respectively. According to 2001 census literacy rate for female is lower (42.5%). Female population (10+ year) involved in usual major activity shows 43 % in study, 95 % in household chores, and 48 % in agriculture in own farm. This shows that male percentage is higher in studies and female percentage is higher in household chores. Workload is heavier for females (Chhetri, 2001). In a year, women work 177 days while men work 159 days (Acharya and Bennett, '81). While in a day women work 10.8 hours and men work 7.8 hours (Shtri Shakti, '95).

Females are less visible as economically active. In economically active population (10 years and over) female percentage is 55.3 whereas male percentage is 71.7. Reason for usually economically not active, is being busy in study (67% for males and 34% for females) and in household chores (9% for males and

49% for females). Thus reason for economically not active is, study for males and household chores for females (CBS, 2003).

In Nepali society, each and every individual has different sets of roles to perform on the basis of their age, sex, position within the family and status as well as the caste/ethnic group they belong to in some cases. Traditional high-caste Hindu ideals have dictated women's manners and behaviours (see Bennett, '83; Gray, '90; Kondos, '90). Men are accorded higher status and importance in the society (Shrestha, '99). As such high-caste Hindu women are put under constant control of their men in different forms at different stages of life. Age and status in the family also determines the nature and degree of women's involvement in household work and decision-making (Shrestha, '99; Bhatt *et al.*, '97). Women are believed to have their primary responsibilities in domestic chores, farm activities, collection and utilization of forest products, rearing and taking care of children, as well as looking after the livestock (see Thacker, '93; Gurung and Banskota, '93; Pandey, '90, Bhatt *et al.*, '97).

Female headed household increased from 9 % in 1991 to 15% in 2001. Out migration of males for employment and death of males due to Maoist insurgency increased *de facto* female household heads that means more work for women. Women's decision-making power also depends on her position in the family as mother-in-law, daughter and daughter-in-law (Shrestha, '99).

Situations of Nepali women in the 1990s as Upadhyaya ('96) reviewed the status of women in Nepal and pointed, a "gradual changes in women's conditions as a result of both development interventions and broader processes of urbanization" although women benefited less than men.

Involvement in Household Work

In 'women in development' and 'gender and development' (WID/GAD) literature women's work is divided into three categories namely productive, reproductive and community works. Some works performed by women such as motivating and helping school going children to do their homework, care of the sick, and *pahunako satkar* i.e. taking care of the guests do not fit in those three categories. Besides,

there is overlapping of women's work (also see March 2003). They have been doing multiple jobs simultaneously. A local newspaper of Kathmandu (*Kantipur Daily*, June 10, 2014, p. 20) had published photo of a woman doing two works at the same time. She is shown carrying a load on her back while she is spinning wool into thread with her hands. Studies without considering their overlapping of work have revealed that village women have heavier workload than their men (Acharya and Bennett, '81; Pandey, '90; Gurung and Banskota, '93; Chhetri and Rana, '94; Stri Shakti, '95; Bhadra, '97). Nepali women's workload is not only reported to be heavier as compared to their men but also much higher than the global average for women (NESAC, '98). Women have been found also working during their leisure time and also while talking to the visitors (see Chhetri and Rana, '94). Making leaf plates, weaving *gundri*, (straw mats), *dhakki* (baskets), *namlo* (headband used in carrying loads), *batti katne* (making cotton lights for worshipping) and making ropes etc. are such activities that are performed in the leisure time. And these works of women are generally not listed under any of the three categories of work mentioned above.

Work in the family is divided among family members according to their age, sex and relation to the household head. Unless we know the amount of work one does, we can not tell who is performing more or less work in the household. Thus frequency of work was divided into three categories marked as 'Always', 'Mostly' and 'Sometimes'. The survey data (205 households) are presented in Table 1.

Looking at the involvement of females and males in the household work the data revealed that women always did cooking, dish washing, sweeping, washing clothes and food processing. Number of female was higher in all three categories of work frequency — 'Always' 'Mostly' and 'Sometimes'. Men also did those works but 'Sometimes' only. Lesser men were found doing household work in 'Mostly' category. They were also doing cooking but sometimes only when women were away from home, sick or menstruating. In taking care of the children, sick persons and livestock some men were also involved in the 'Always' category along with females. Household work was considered women's domain. Men were only helping women members of the family.

TABLE 1
Distribution of household work by gender

Household works	Number of household with frequency of work done by male and female					
	Always		Mostly		Sometimes	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Cooking	112	–	106	4	106	61
Dish washing	106	–	108	3	94	42
Sweeping	109	–	105	5	96	40
Washing clothes	101	1	107	4	86	39
Food processing	115	–	102	4	90	28
Child care	85	10	97	10	64	55
Care of the sick	59	35	78	45	67	53
Animal care	47	21	69	15	54	41

Source: Field Survey, 2002. *Note:* Due to multiple responses table total exceeded the number of respondents, 205.

Men did not consider themselves responsible for household work as long as women were around. However, the practice of men's involvement in household work will re-shape gender-based norms and values relating to household works.

Similar finding was noted by Regmi (2000:228) in his dissertation research that men collected water only when their women were sick, menstruating or were not at home. Though men did cooking and sweeping when women were considered polluted / untouchables during their menstruation periods, they did not take it as their regular job.

In a study among the Afghan Muslims, Najia Zewari ('99) found that men were reluctant to help their women in household work. According to her, "Most men do not help their women with household activities. Men consider it shameful to do women's work (Zewari, '99: 392). Such research based findings suggest that perceiving household chores as women's work is a phenomena that spreads across different societies.

A study conducted by International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD) in eight countries in the Hindu Kush-Himalayas had also revealed that household works were carried out by women in all the villages of the study (Gurung, '99). Though studies have shown that women's work domain is not limited to within the four walls of the house, the farmlands and the forest (Goverman and Gurung 2001), the actual practice reveals that household work is often considered as women's responsibility by both men and women themselves.

Disaggregating household works for family members by their relationship to the household head, it becomes clear that household works was mostly done by wives followed by daughters-in-law. Wives of the household head were always and mostly involved in the entire category of works. Next to head's wives was daughters-in law in doing the household works. Daughters were performing relatively less amount of household works compared to daughters-in-law. Male head of the households also did child and animal care but sometimes only. Adult sons sometimes did cooking and dishwashing (see Table 2).

Children both boys and girls helped in the household work. Girls were reported helping in 148 households (72% of 205 respondent households) while boys were helping in 132 (64%) households. Gender disaggregation of the children helping in the household work (Table 2) shows that more girls were helping in the household. Girls' work was higher to boys' in number of household as well as in work type. Both father and mother received help from boys in their work whereas girls' help in father's work was not found. Due to the inside-outside dichotomist perception of women and men's work domain, girls were found helping in mothers' work while boys were found to be helping fathers in works outside the home. However, boys also cooked food when their mothers were not cooking during menstruation. Girls' contribution in work at home was highest in helping mother followed by cooking food, fetching water and sweeping. They also worked in other's farm/field in

exchange of labour. However, shopping and escorting outsiders to the house was done only by the boys. They were not found collecting firewood, doing childcare and going for Parma (labour exchange). They helped in work at home by cooking food and washing dishes and clothes. When fathers are doing household work boys learn too.

TABLE 2
Children's involvement in household work by type of work and gender

Type of works	Girls		Boys	
	No.	%	No.	%
Help mother	59	14.75	19	4.75
Help father	–	–	19	4.75
Cook food	71	17.75	13	3.25
Wash utensils	23	5.75	7	1.75
Wash clothes	23	5.75	3	0.75
Sweep	29	7.25	7	1.75
Fetch water	37	9.25	16	4
Collect firewood	2	0.5	–	–
Exchange labour	15	3.75	–	–
Care of cattle	3	0.75	20	5
Child care	1	0.25	–	–
Shopping	–	–	6	1.5
Escort outsiders	–	–	3	0.75
Household affairs	–	–	4	1
Total (N=380)	263	71.00	117	29.00

Source: Field Survey, 2002.

Note: The total in Table 2 is larger than the number of respondents (205) because of multiple responses given by many.

In the community activities males take part always and most of the times. Female participate sometimes when their males are not around or when they are asked specifically to participate. Community work in the area mostly included construction and repair of roads, drinking water activities, construction of *Pati/Pauwa* (rest house) and community management meetings. Participation in community meetings are reported to be dominated by men.

Decision-Making in the Households

I have divided household decisions into two as 'major decisions' and 'other decisions'. 'Major decisions' include major economic activities such as buying and selling of property, making investments, borrowing and lending money and work/labour of the family members. Similarly, 'other decisions', are related to health, education, food, and clothing. Major

decisions are made by males, while 'other decisions' are taken jointly by females and males (Table 3).

TABLE 3
Decision-makers in the household by gender

Decision making area	Female	Male	Both
<i>Major decisions:</i>			
Buy/Sell property	26	158	20
Investment	36	151	28
Job/labour	30	155	32
Borrow/lend	34	147	18
<i>Other decisions:</i>			
Medical treatment	38	135	14
Education	33	144	–
Food/grocery	153	35	20
Family clothing	50	127	25

Source: Field Survey, 2002.

Men and women in the family have varying role and power in decision-making in the family based on their kinship position in the household. Unless we look at their kinship position we can not tell which male member of the family makes major and most of the decisions. Similarly, we would not know which female in a household has more decision-making power among the female members unless we obtain information from individuals. Therefore, gender and kinship membership is disaggregated for the family members in order to understand more precisely about who decides on what in the household (see Table 3). Among the female decision-makers of the household most of them are head females and wives of the household heads. Among the male decision-makers it is the head males and adult sons.

Though discussions are held before reaching a decision on important matters in most of the households among its members, the actual decisions are not always made in the consensus of all the family members. At times members may not agree on each other's decision. Sometimes some members want to make one decision while another member wants another. Though there could be different opinions about certain matters there may be a particular person in the family whose opinion is respected willingly or unwillingly by all the family members. I have called these people as final decision-makers. Thus final decision-maker is the one whose decision is regarded as final by the family members. Looking at the final decision-making in the family the data show (see Table 4) that of the final decision-makers, the proportion of

TABLE 4
Final decision-makers by gender, and relation to the household head

Relation to Head	Female				Total	Male			Total	
	HF	Wi	Mo	SoWi		HM	So	SoSo		
Total	22	9	1	3	35 (17%)	156	13	1	170 (83%)	205 (100%)

Source: Field Survey, 2002.

Legend: HF= Head Female; Wi= Wife; Mo= Mother; SoWi= Son's Wife; HM= Head Male; So= Son; SOSO= Son's Son

males 83% is almost five times higher than the females 17%. Among them 91% are the heads of the households. Similarly, among female decision-makers, 62% are head females and their proportion is almost three times larger than the wives of the heads of the households.

Sometime the head of the household or the person who usually makes the decision could be away from home or unavailable. When final decision-makers are not available other family members who have a say in the family, make decisions. In those situations, other

persons make decisions. I have called these persons alternate decision-makers. Among the alternate decision-makers the proportion of females was found four times higher to that of males. Most of them (85%) were wives of the household heads (Table 4). When the household heads (especially husbands) were away from home their wives made decisions. But mothers of household heads (especially widows) did not have any say in the family decision-making. Thus women's power position is systematically tied with their husband (see Table 5).

TABLE 5
Alternate decision-makers by gender, and relation to the household head

Wife	Mother	Female		Son's Wife	Total	Male Son	Total Grand Total
		Daughter					
121 (68%)	5 (3%)	8 (5%)		9 (5%)	143 (81%)	34 (19%)	177 (100%)

Source: Field Survey, 2002.

Control of Kitchen

From division of household work in the respondents' households, it was revealed that cooking food was always done by females. Most of them were household head's wives followed by daughters-in-law and daughters. Males cooked only occasionally. Kitchen was primarily controlled by women in matters relating to what to cook, how much to cook and when to cook (see Table 6). Majority of them were wives (61%) of the household head followed by daughters-in-law (20%) and female household heads (10%).

Women have control over family kitchen. However, 25% of the women who cooked food had no freedom to feed themselves as they pleased before everybody else. Reasons provided by those who could not feed themselves before others was that they have to respect the elders thus wait till the elders eat.

Women who had an office job or employment were able to eat even before others because they had to be at work on time and so could not afford to wait till others were fed. Their reason was that when family members do not gather for food on time, the cook should be allowed to eat when they have to or if they were very hungry (Table 6).

With reference to a tradition we often hear from our mothers that daughters-in-law cook food and mothers-in-law control kitchen. But my study showed that among the respondent households only 61% wives of the heads and 20% of the daughters-in-law had control over kitchen. Given this, two points become evident. One is that mother of household heads had no control over kitchen. And the other is that daughters-in-law were taking paid jobs outside the house and thus were less engaged in cooking work.

TABLE 6
Power of kitchen controller to self-feed and perceived reason for it

Kitchen controller have power to feed themselves as they please	No. of households (N=205)
Yes	153 (75%)
No	52 (25%)
Reason for Yes:	
Others are younger than the controller	4
Members do not come home on time	76
Allowed to	40
Should self-feed when hungry	17
Have to go to work	16
Reason for No:	
Cannot eat before the elders, they should be respected	44
Do not feel like or they feel better after feeding the family	8

Source: Field Survey, 2002.

Control over Earning

Management of own earning among the family members was traditionally motivated. Though it was their own earning, of 205 households, 136 households (66%) reported that their earning members of the family did not keep the money with them while in 69 households (34%) individual members were reported to keep their earning themselves.

In 46% of the 136 respondent households, earning family members gave all of their earning to one of the elderly or trusted members in the household to keep. In 32% households, members gave three-fourths and in the rest of the households earning members were giving half to one-fourth of their income. A total of 41% respondents gave their income to their wives were 41% while 37% gave to the head-males and 10% to the head-females. Thus among those who were given to keep the money there were more women (60%) than men (40%).

Looking at this from the keeper's side about the control of keeper over the purse or money shows that 55 per cent of the keepers of the purse could spend the purse on their own. However, 45 per cent of the keepers who were mostly women (mothers and or wives) could not spend the money on their own. They needed to seek permission to spend it because it was not their earning but of those who gave them to keep. Besides they are required to ask the head of the

household before doing anything with the money collected in the household purse. This shows that keeping purse alone does not denote power to spend it or control over it.

Right of the person keeping the purse to spend the money and right of the person earning the money to spend all of it by herself / himself differed on the basis of the individual's position in the household. Thus the western concept as who keeps the family purse denoting control over the purse does not seem to be applicable to the context of this study. If the person who keeps the family purse does not have power to spend it then the person is merely guarding the purse.

Control over Household Resources

Household resources in the study area consisted of land, house and livestock. Among the 136 households having land 74% landholders were male household heads and 10% were other male members of the family. Only 15% female had ownership of land. Similarly, the family house was owned by 80% males and 20% females. Of these 70% male and 12% female was the head of the households. It means only 8% female other than the head of the household had house under their names. Cattle were owned by the household in 78% of the households and not by any individuals. Thus power of control over cattle also rested with the family rather than with the individual male or female member of the household. Only *Pewa* (women's personal property) is owned by particular females. Among the final decision makers in the family 83% were males and 17% were females. Decisions on buying and selling of property like land, house and livestock were made by one female in every 6 males. Among these females 73% were head of the household. The point here is that household resources were owned by males and final decision-makers in the family were also males. However, majority of the owners both males and females could not sell the property they owned on their own. Reasons provided for this were that it belonged to their children and to the household (72%) and the owner needed to ask other members of the family (28%) before reaching a decision to sell the property. Due to the inheritance of parental property by the children (by sons only not until long ago) parents needed consent of the adult

son to sell or transfer ownership of the immovable property. Besides, a wife needs consent of her husband and/or of son to sell the property under her name. In this context having access or even ownership of resources does not provide absolute control over them.

CONCLUSION

People's perceptions are built on what norms and values are internalized in course of socialization. And people's practices are directed by the perceptions built on them. Thus people think and act according to the norms and values of the society. People's decision-making power, control of resources and given household work, depends on the place they occupy in the family. For example, in the respondent households, husband and wife, son, daughter and daughter-in-law did not have same amount of power and control in the family. Household work was considered women's work domain men only help women or do the work when women are not around. Similarly, women take part in community activities only when they are asked specifically or when their men are not around. Male decision-makers were five times higher than the females and overwhelming majority of them were head of the households.

Keeping family purse or controlling kitchen does not denote power over it. For example, women in the respondent households were keeping money for their husbands and children but they were not left on their own in spending it. Similarly, kitchen was within women's domain but they were deprived of the power to feed themselves as they wished.

Gender-based practices discussed above were shaped by society and these in turn may re-shape gender-related norms and values of society. Thus Perceptions are built on what is practiced and practice is directed by people's perceptions. The relationship is two way and it begins in the household.

NOTE

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Silver Jubilee Conference held on 2-3 June 2012, organized by the Sociological/Anthropological Society of Nepal, Kathmandu, Nepal (SASON).

REFERENCES CITED

Acharya, Meena and Lynn Bennett 1981. *The Rural Women of Nepal: An Aggregate Analysis and Summary of 8 Village*

Studies, The Status of Women in Nepal. Vol. II, Part 9. Centre for Economic Development and Administration, Tribhuvan University: Kathmandu.

Adhikari J. and David Seddon 2002. *Pokhara: Biography of a Town*. Mandala Book Point: Kathmandu.

Bhadra, Chandra Kala 1997. Intra-Household Gender Analysis of Work Roles and Distribution of Resources: A Pilot Study in a Nepalese Village. *Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Oregon State University: Oregon*.

Bhatt, Nina, L. Shrestha, B. Thomas-Slayter and I. Koirala 1997. *Managing Resources in a Nepalese Village: Changing Dynamics of Gender, Caste and Ethnicity*. Institute for Integrated Development Studies: Kathmandu.

Bhurltel, Bidyanath 2000. Changing Livelihood Strategies of the Kumals Living in Pokhara Valley of Western Nepal. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Central Department of Sociology/Anthropology, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal.

Cameron, Mary M. 2002. Rural Dalit women and work: The impact of social and economic change. In: Prabodh Devkota (ed.), *Dalits of Nepal: Issues and Challenges*, pp. 173-180. Feminist Dalit Organization: Lalitpur.

Campbell, J. G., R. Shrestha and L. Stone 1979. *The Use and Misuse of Social Science Research in Nepal*. Research Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies, Tribhuvan University: Kathmandu.

CBS (Central Bureau of Statistics) 2003. *Population Monograph of Nepal*. Central Bureau of Statistics: Kathmandu.

Chhetri, Gyanu Bista 2013. Economic imperatives, socio-cultural prejudices and traditional occupations of Gandharvas of Nepal. In: Dilli Ram Dahal, Laya Prasad Upreti and Bipin Kumar Acharya (eds.), *SASON Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, IV: 50-67. Sociological/Anthropological Society of Nepal: Kathmandu.

Chhetri, Gyanu and Sita Rana 1994. A Gender Analysis of Women's Participation in Community Forestry. *Report submitted to Nepal-Australia Community Forestry Project: Kathmandu*.

Chhetri, Gyanu 1989. "Gaine ko Sarangi Eauta Magne Bhandu ki Nepali Sanskriti ko Anga? Ek Samaj Sastriya Dristikon" (Gaine's Sarangi whether a means for begging or an element of Nepali Culture? A Sociological Perspective). *Contributions to Nepalese Studies*, 16(1): 55-69.

Giddens, Anthony 1993. *Sociology*. Polity Press: UK.

Gray, John 1991. Marriage and the constitution of hierarchy and gender in Bahun-Chhetri households. *Contributions to Nepalese Studies*, 18(1):53-82. CNAS: Kathmandu.

Groverman, V. and J. D. Gurung 2001. *Gender and Organizational Change: Training Manual*. International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD): Kathmandu.

Gurung, Harka 2002. *Pokhara Valley: A Geographical Survey*. Nepal Geographical Society, Central Department of Geography, Tribhuvan University: Kathmandu.

- Gurung, J. D. 1999. Introduction. In: Gurung, Jeannette D. (ed.), *Searching for Women's Voices in the Hindu Kush-Himalayas*. International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD): Kathmandu.
- Gurung, S. M. and M. Baskota 1993. Women in Mountain Resource Management in Nepal. *MPE Discussion Series*, No. 3. ICIMOD: Kathmandu.
- Gyawali, Surya Bikram 2040. *Nepali Samchhipta Shabdakosh*. Royal Nepal Academy: Kathmandu.
- Hobley, Marry E. A. 1990. Social Reality, Social Forestry: The Case of Two Nepalese Panchayats. *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation*. Australian National University: Canberra.
- Höfer, Andras 2004. *The Caste Hierarchy and the State in Nepal: A Study of the Muluki Ain of 1854*. Himal Books: Kathmandu. (originally published in 1979 by Innsbruck: Universitätsverlag Wagner).
- Kondos, V. 1990. The triple goddess and the processual approach to the world: The Parbatya case. In: M. Allan and S.N. Mukherjee (ed.), *Women in India and Nepal*, Sterling Publishers: New Delhi.
- Kattel, Shambhu P. 2000. Development and Its Victims. From Pottery Makers to Porters: The Changing Lifeworld of the Kumals of the Arun Valley, Eastern Nepal. *Unpublished M. Phil Thesis*. University of Bergen.
- March, Kathryn S. 2002. *If Each Comes Half Way: Meeting Tamang Women in Nepal*. Cornell University Press: Ithaca.
- Mierow, Dorothy 1997. *Thirty Years in Pokhara: You must have seen a lot of changes*. Pilgrims Book House: Kathmandu.
- NESAC, 1998. *Nepal Human Development Report 1998*. Nepal South Asia Centre: Kathmandu.
- Pandey, Shanta 1990. Women in Hattisunde Forest Management in Dhading District, Nepal. *MPE Discussion Paper*, Series No. 9. ICIMOD: Kathmandu.
- Pathak, Kedar Raj 2003. Socio-Cultural and Economic Changes among the Kumals: A Study of the Kumal Community of Gadhawa VDC in Deukhuri Valley of Dang District. *Unpublished Masters Thesis*, Central Department of Sociology/Anthropology, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Quigley, Declan 1993. *The Interpretation of Caste*. Clarendon Press: Oxford.
- Regmi, Sibesh Chandra 2000. Gender Issues in the Management of Water Resources in Nepal. *Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis*, University of Southampton.
- Sharma, Prayag Raj 2004. *The State and Society in Nepal: Historical Foundations and Contemporary Trends*. Himal Books: Kathmandu.
- Shrestha, Ava Darshan 1999. Case study in Nuwakot, district, Nepal. In: J. Gurung (ed.), *Searching for Women's Voices in the Hindu-Kush Himalayas*, pp. 259-312. International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development: Kathmandu.
- Shtri Shakti 1995. *Women, Development, Democracy - A Study of the Socio-Economic Changes in the Status of Women in Nepal (1981-1993)*. Shtri Shakti: Kathmandu.
- Thacker, Prabha 1993. Technology: Women's Work and Status (The Case of the Carpet Industry in Nepal). *MPE Discussion Paper*, Series No. 21. ICIMOD: Kathmandu.
- Turner, R. L. 1931. *A Comparative and Etymological Dictionary of Nepali Language*. London
- Upadhya, Shizu 1996. The status of women in Nepal –15 years on. *Studies in Nepali History and Society*, 1(2): 423-453.
- Zewari, Najia 1999. Case studies in Istalif and Deh Sabz, Afghanistan. In: Jeannette D. Gurung (ed.), *Searching for Women's Voices in the Hindu Kush-Himalayas*, pp. 383-396. International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD): Kathmandu.