CHAPTER V

TESTING OF HYPOTHESES

Five hypotheses were framed for the study as mentioned under:

1. The improved household technologies have improved the quality of the management practices of homemakers.

2. The attitude of working women towards possession and use of improved technologies is more positive than that of non-working women.

3. The extent of use of improved household technologies is greater among working than in non-working women.

4. The problems of working women for the purchase and use of new household technologies are less than that of non-working women.

5. The effect of different factors for possession of new household technologies do not vary for working and non-working women.

The above mentioned hypotheses were tested by analyzing the collected data and the results of the same are given as under.

Hypothesis no. 1

Statement : The improved household technologies have improved the quality of management practices of homemakers.

Test : The hypothesis No. 1 was accepted as per the results of present study. The improved household technologies have improved the quality of management practices of homemaker. These technologies helped the homemaker in saving of energy and time, improved their standard of living, reduced their tiresome labour, enabled them to take better care of family members, achieved higher level of efficiency, work became more interesting, less fatiguing and less dependence on domestic help, enabled them to
help the children in their academic pursuits, etc. Thus hypothesis No. 1 was accepted by the present study.

**Hypothesis no. 2**

**Statement**: The attitude of working women towards possession and use of improved technologies is more positive than that of non-working women.

**Test**: The hypothesis No. 2 was partially accepted by the study. The attitude of working as well as non-working women towards use of 31 out of 39 improved household technologies was similar. These technologies included food processor, mixer and grinder, electric kettle, coffee maker, electric chapati maker, poori presser, electric tandoor, electric juicer, rice cooker, chopper, microwave, ice-cream maker, food warmer, cooking range, refrigerator, dish washer, water purifier, geyser, electric chimney, washing machine, electric iron, vacuum cleaner, TV with cable connection, VCR/CD/DVD player, music system, mobile phone, cooler, inverter, generator, room heater and exhaust fan etc. There were eight technologies where the hypothesis No. 2 was accepted. These technologies included stick blender, toaster, patty maker, electric egg beater, oven toaster and grinder, PC with internet, air conditioner and heat convector where the attitude of working women towards the use of these household technologies was significantly higher than that of non-working women (Table 4.6). Thus, hypothesis No. 2 is mildly accepted by the present study.

**Hypothesis no. 3**

**Statement**: The extent of use of improved household technologies is greater among working women than in non-working women.

**Test**: The hypothesis No. 3 was rejected on the basis of results of present study. The data was analysed in two forms, i.e. working out of mean frequency of use and average time of use of modern household technologies for working and non-working women. It was found that either there was no difference in the frequency of use and average time of use of these technologies by working and non-working women or in some cases the extent of use of these technologies was found to be significantly higher.
among non-working women than the working ones. Out of 39 technologies, the frequency of use for 31 technologies was at par among working as well as non-working women while the frequency of use of 6 items by non-working women was significantly higher. There were only two items where frequency of use of working women was significantly higher (Table 4.3.1).

As far as average time of use of household technologies is concerned, it was similar for 22 technologies while the average time of use of 13 technologies was significantly higher in case of non-working women. There were only four technologies where average time of use was significantly higher in case of working women as compared to the non-working ones (Table 4.3.2).

Thus, hypothesis No. 3 is grossly rejected by the study.

Hypothesis no. 4

Statement: The problems of working women for the purchase and use of modern household technologies are less than that of non-working women.

Test: The hypothesis No. 4 is accepted by the study. The proportions of non-working women reporting different problems faced by them for purchase of different types of modern household technologies were found to be higher than the working women except non-availability of preferred brand in case of kitchen related technologies and washing, cleaning and ironing technologies where the extent of problem was similar while in case of comfort technologies, problem of the non-availability of preferred brand was higher among working as compared to non-working women. All other problems such as resistance of family members, financial constraints, the decision maker of the family reluctant to feel the need, unsuitable financing options and non-availability of space were higher among non-working as compared to working women. As far as use of technologies is concerned, the extent of problems is by and large, higher among non-working women as compared to the working ones, except non-adaptive attitude of family members in case of kitchen related technologies, limited suitability of the available gadgets in case of washing, ironing and cleaning
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technologies, increased pressure of chores on homemaker in case of information and communication technologies and reluctance of the Indian husband to share domestic duties in case of washing, ironing and cleaning technologies where extent of problem is higher among working as compared to non-working. Majority of the problems in case of use of modern technologies are higher among non-working women. Therefore, the extent of problems for purchase and use of these technologies is less in case of working women as compared to the non-working women (Table 4.8.1, 4.8.2). Thus hypothesis No. 4 is accepted by the study.

Hypothesis no. 5

Statement: The effect of different factors for possession of new household technologies do not vary for working and non-working women.

Test: The hypothesis No. 5 is accepted by the study. The pattern of ranking of different factors affecting the purchase of new household technologies was found to be statistically the same in case of highly significant values of coefficients of correlation between the ranking pattern among working and non-working women.

Therefore, the effect of different factors for possession of new household technologies do not vary for working and non-working women (Table 4.7). Thus, hypothesis No. 5 is strongly accepted by the study.