

Awareness Level of Farm Women About Stress Reducing Improved Farm Tools

Deepali Chauhan¹

ABSTRACT

Two categories of farm women living nearby and far away from Kanpur city, (U.P.) were selected. Further, these two categories were studied under two sub-categories *i.e.* resource rich and resource poor farm women. The farm tools namely hand ridger, naven dibbler, seed treatment drum, PAU seed drill and CIAE seed drill, four row and two row rice transplanter, fertilizer broad caster, twin wheel hoe, paddy dapoli naven, wheat dev agro, soy bean dev agro, Ouat paddy thresher, crri rice winnower, hanging type grain cleaner, standing type ground nut decorticator, octagonal tubular maize sheller and rotary maize sheller were listed out for assessing awareness level of farm women. Awareness level of improved farm tools was found to be higher among resource rich farm women of nearby city as compared to resource rich farm women of faraway from city. Further, resource poor farm women of nearby city were found to be more aware about farm tools as compared to resource poor farm women of faraway from city. Moreover, awareness level was found higher among resource rich farm women as compared to resource poor farm women. Paddy Dapoli Naven was used by all farm women contrary to hanging type grain cleaner to which all farm women were found unaware.

Keywords: Stress reducing improved farm tools, awareness level, farm women

INTRODUCTION

In developing countries, both female and male farm workers are at risk because of inadequate farm tools and techniques, education, training and safety or protective mechanism.

Moreover, women have anatomical and physiological differences with men and may place them at risk for work related injuries (Engberg, 1993). On an average, upper body strength is 40.75 per cent less in females than in males, while lower body strength is 5.30 per cent less in females (Falkel *et al.*, 1986). Females internal organs are more vulnerable to infections, external trauma and environmental irritants (Abbot, 2003). Whole body vibration affects women more than men because of anatomical and physiological characteristics.

In India, there is apparent gap between development of improved farm tools by engineers and adoption of these tools by farm women. Transfer of technology generally aims at speedy diffusion of novel agricultural information from the place of invention (lab) to the place of adoption (land).

Keeping in view the above facts, the present study was designed to investigate the awareness level of farm women regarding stress reducing improved farm tools.

METHODOLOGY

Purposive cum random sampling design was used to select the study area and respondents. District Kanpur (U.P.) was selected purposively for the present study with the assumption that the farm women of district were intensively engaged in different farming activities. District Kanpur Nagar comprises of ten blocks, out of which two blocks namely, Kalyanpur and Sarsaul were randomly (Chit system) selected for the purpose of drawing samples. Two villages for each block were randomly selected.

From each selected village, 15 resource rich farm women and 15 resource poor farm women of each selected block were selected randomly. In this way, 30 resource rich farm women of near by city, 30 resource rich farm women of faraway from city and 30 resource poor farm women of near by city and 30 resource poor farm women of far away city were selected. Thus, the sample size for the study comprised of 120 farm women on the basis of purposive cum random sample.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data of Table 1 showed that most of the resource rich farm women of nearby city were found using hand ridger (60.00%) and Naven dibbler (70.00%) whereas most of the resource poor farm women of nearby city were only heard about the Hand ridger (33.33%) and only seen the Naven dibbler (40.00%) Further more. It was found that

most of resource rich (40.00% and 50.00%) and resource poor farm women (76.67% and 83.33%) of far away city

were unaware about both improved tools *i.e.* hand ridger and Naveen dibbler used for land preparation.

Table 1: Distribution of farm women on the basis of their awareness level about stress reducing improved farm tools. n = 120

Farm Operation	Improved Farm tools	Nearby City								Faraway from City							
		Resource rich farm women n=30				Resource poor farm women n=30				Resource rich farm women n=30				Resource poor farm women n=30			
		Only seen	Only hear	Used	Not aware	Only seen	Only hear	Used	Not aware	Only seen	Only hear	Used	Not aware	Only seen	Only hear	Used	Not aware
F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	
Land preparation	• Hand ridger	10 (33.33)	2 (6.67)	18 (60.00)	- (-)	8 (26.67)	10 (33.33)	6 (20.00)	6 (20.00)	5 (16.67)	5 (16.67)	8 (26.67)	12 (40.00)	2 (6.67)	5 (16.67)	- (-)	23 (76.67)
	• Naveen Dibbler	2 (6.67)	7 (23.33)	21 (70.00)	- (-)	12 (40.00)	7 (23.33)	3 (10.00)	8 (26.67)	5 (16.67)	5 (16.67)	5 (16.67)	15 (50.00)	- (-)	5 (16.67)	- (-)	25 (83.33)
Seed treatment	• Seed treatment drum	5 (16.67)	3 (10.00)	22 (73.33)	- (-)	9 (30.00)	2 (6.67)	7 (23.33)	12 (40.00)	8 (26.67)	2 (6.67)	12 (40.00)	8 (26.67)	- (-)	8 (26.67)	- (-)	22 (73.33)
Sowing	• CIAE Seed drill	8 (26.67)	4 (13.33)	6 (20.00)	12 (40.00)	12 (40.00)	4 (13.33)	- (-)	12 (40.00)	3 (10.00)	10 (33.33)	2 (6.67)	15 (50.00)	- (-)	5 (16.67)	- (-)	28 (93.33)
	• PAU seed drill	8 (26.67)	6 (20.00)	3 (10.00)	13 (43.33)	12 (40.00)	3 (10.00)	- (-)	15 (50.00)	2 (6.67)	8 (26.67)	2 (6.67)	18 (60.00)	- (-)	2 (6.67)	- (-)	28 (93.33)
Transplanting	• Four row rice transplanter	10 (33.33)	6 (20.00)	12 (40.00)	2 (6.67)	15 (50.00)	9 (30.00)	- (-)	6 (20.00)	12 (40.00)	5 (16.67)	5 (16.67)	8 (26.67)	2 (6.67)	14 (46.67)	2 (6.67)	12 (40.00)
	• Two row rice transplanter	10 (33.33)	4 (13.33)	14 (46.67)	2 (6.67)	17 (56.67)	6 (20.00)	4 (13.33)	3 (10.00)	12 (40.00)	7 (23.33)	6 (20.00)	5 (16.67)	5 (16.67)	12 (40.00)	3 (10.00)	10 (33.33)
Use of chemical fertilizer and manure	• Fertilizer broad caster	6 (20.00)	2 (6.67)	22 (73.33)	- (-)	15 (50.00)	3 (10.00)	10 (33.33)	2 (6.67)	12 (40.00)	8 (26.67)	5 (16.67)	5 (16.67)	12 (40.00)	14 (46.67)	- (-)	4 (13.33)
Weeding	• Twin wheel hoe	3 (10.00)	2 (6.67)	25 (83.33)	- (-)	10 (33.33)	5 (16.67)	15 (50.00)	- (-)	6 (20.00)	4 (13.33)	20 (66.67)	- (-)	12 (40.00)	8 (26.67)	10 (33.33)	- (-)
Harvesting	• Paddy dapoli naveen	- (-)	- (-)	30 (100.00)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	30 (100.00)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	30 (100.00)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	30 (100.00)	- (-)
	• Wheat dev agro	3 (10.00)	- (-)	27 (90.00)	- (-)	8 (26.67)	- (-)	22 (73.33)	- (-)	3 (10.00)	- (-)	27 (90.00)	- (-)	10 (33.33)	- (-)	20 (66.67)	- (-)
	• Soy bean Dev Agro	6 (20.00)	2 (6.67)	22 (73.33)	- (-)	7 (23.33)	- (-)	23 (76.67)	- (-)	3 (10.00)	- (-)	27 (90.00)	- (-)	10 (33.33)	- (-)	20 (66.67)	- (-)
Threshing	• OUAT paddy thresher	20 (66.67)	- (-)	10 (33.33)	- (-)	20 (66.67)	5 (16.67)	- (-)	- (-)	7 (23.33)	15 (50.00)	8 (26.67)	- (-)	14 (46.67)	18 (60.00)	- (-)	- (-)

Winn owing	• CRR I Ric	5 (16.67)	- (-)	25 (83.33)	- (-)	20 (66.67)	5 (16.67)	5 (16.67)	- (-)	5 (16.67)	2 (6.67)	18 (60.00)	5 (16.67)	5 (16.67)	15 (50.00)	- (-)	10 (33.33)
	• Hang ing type grain clea ner	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	30 (100.00)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	30 (100.00)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	30 (100.00)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	30 (100.00)
	• Stand ing type grou nd nut decor ticator	5 (16.67)	3 (10.00)	7 (23.33)	15 (50.00)	2 (6.67)	4 (13.33)	4 (13.33)	20 (66.67)	2 (6.67)	5 (16.67)	3 (10.00)	20 (66.67)	- (-)	2 (6.67)	- (-)	28 (93.33)
	• Octa gonal tubelar maize Sheller	4 (13.33)	4 (13.33)	22 (73.33)	- (-)	11 (36.67)	4 (13.33)	12 (40.00)	3 (10.00)	7 (23.33)	4 (13.33)	15 (50.00)	3 (10.00)	8 (26.67)	12 (40.00)	- (-)	10 (33.33)
	• Rotary maize Sheller	5 (16.67)	20 (66.67)	- (-)	5 (16.67)	2 (6.67)	18 (60.00)	- (-)	10 (33.33)	- (-)	5 (16.67)	- (-)	25 (83.33)	- (-)	- (-)	- (-)	30 (100.00)

The majority of resource rich farm women of nearby city (73.33%) and far away city (40%) were using the seed treatment drum along with majority of resource poor farm women of nearby (40%) and far away city (73.33%) were unaware about seed treatment drum. Majority of all the four groups of farm women i.e.40.00 per cent and 43.33 per cent resource rich farm women of nearby city and 46.67 per cent and 50.00 per cent of resource poor farm women of nearby city, 50.00 per cent and 60.00 per cent resource rich farm women of faraway from city along with 73.33 per cent resource poor farm women of faraway from city were found to be unaware about CIAE seed drill and PAU seed drill used for sowing purpose. The most of resource rich women of nearby city were found using four row rice transplanter (40.00%) , two row rice transplanter (46.67%) and fertilizer broad caster (73.33%), whereas majority of resource poor farm women of nearby city had only seen four row rice transplanter (50.00%) ,two row rice transplanter (56.67%) and fertilizer broad caster (50.00%) along with majority of resource rich women of faraway farm city (40.00%) for four row rice transplanter, 40.00 per cent for two row rice transplanter and fertilizer broad caster (40.00%). Moreover, majority of resource poor farm women of faraway farm city were had heard about four row rice transplanter (46.67%) , two row rice transplanter (40.00%) and fertilizer broad caster (46.67%).

Most of the resource rich farm women of nearby city (83.33%), resource poor farm women of nearby city (50.00%) and resource rich women of faraway of from city (66.67%) were found using Twin Wheel hoe except

majority of resource poor farm women of far away from city who had only seen twin wheel hoe.

Paddy dapoli naveen was used by cent per cent resource rich and resource poor farm women of both nearby and far away city. Wheat dev agro and soy bean dev agro were also used by majority of resource rich farm women of nearby city (90.00% and 73.33%) ,majority of resource poor farm women of nearby city (73.33% and 76.675%) ,majority of resource rich women of far away from the city (90.00% and 90.00%) and majority of resource poor farm women of faraway from city (66.67% and 66.67%).

Ouat paddy thresher was only seen by resource rich (66.67%) and resource poor (66.67%) farm women of near by city. Moreover, the tool was only heard by resource rich (50.00%) and resource poor (60.00%) farm women of far away from city.

Majority of resource rich farm women of both nearby (83.33%) and far away (60.00%) from city were found using CRR I rice winnower along with majority of resource poor farm women (66.67%) of nearby city who had only seen and majority of resource poor farm women(50.00%) of far away from city who only heard about CRR I rice winnower. Hanging type grain cleaner was not known by cent per cent resource rich and resource poor farm women of both nearby and far away from city. However, standing type ground nut decorticator was not known by 50.00 per cent resource rich farm women of nearby city, 66.67 per cent resource poor farm women of

nearby city, 66.67 per cent resource rich farm women of far away from city and 93.33 per cent resource poor farm women of far away city. On the other hand octagonal tubular maize sheller was used by 73.33 per cent resource rich farm women of nearby city, 40.00 per cent resource poor farm women of nearby city, 50.00 per cent resource rich farm women of far away from city and 50.00 per cent resource poor farm women of far away from city.

Majority of resource rich farm women (66.67%) and resource poor farm women (60.00%) living nearby city had only heard about rotary maize sheller along with 83.33 per cent resource rich farm women and cent per cent resource poor farm women of far away from city found to be unaware rotary maize sheller.

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that awareness level about improved farm tools was higher among resource rich farm women of nearby city as compared to resource rich farm women of far away from city. Further, resource poor farm women of nearby city were more aware as compared to resource poor farm women of far away from city. Moreover, awareness level was found higher among resource rich farm women as compared to resource poor farm women. Paddy dapoli naveen was used by cent per cent farm women contrary to hanging type grain Cleaner to which cent per cent farm women were unaware.

IMPLICATION

There is a need for developing imitable strategies for increasing awareness among resource rich and resource poor farm women of both nearby and faraway from city regarding use of improved farm tools. Further, there is a great need for communicating modern technologies and concept through various traditional media, specific to region which are appealing to farm women specifically to resource poor farm women far away to city by working with traditional artists for treatment of the knowledge base so as to unheroic the level of knowledge and adoption level of farm women for inspanned farm tools.

REFERENCES

- Abbot, N.C. 2003. Pain full experiences : Why do women feel pain differently? Health pain and gender. Pathways Novantis J., 44:37-41.
- Engberg L. 1993. Woman and agricultural work occupational medicine 8 : 869-883
- Falkel, J.E.; Sauka, M.N.; Levine, L. and Pandolk, K.B. 1986. Upper to lower body muscular strength and endurance ratios for women and men ergonomics, 28 :