



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695

ISSN (P): 2349-8242

NAAS Rating: 5.03

TPI 2020; 9(11): 209-212

© 2020 TPI

www.thepharmajournal.com

Received: 08-07-2020

Accepted: 15-08-2020

Kanchan Pant

Ph.D., Scholar, Department of Family Resource Management, GBPUA&T Pantnagar University, College of Home Science, Pantnagar, Uttarakhand, India

Dr. Jitendra Kwatra

Professor and Programme Co-ordinator, KVK, Kashipur Under GBPUA&T Pantnagar University, Pantnagar, Uttarakhand, India

Dr. Seema Kwatra

Professor, Department of Family Resource Management, GBPUA&T Pantnagar University, College of Home Science, Pantnagar, Uttarakhand, India

Corresponding Author:

Kanchan Pant

Ph.D., Scholar, Department of Family Resource Management, GBPUA&T Pantnagar University, College of Home Science, Pantnagar, Uttarakhand, India

Acceptability of woman friendly drudgery reducing technologies in selected village of hills of Uttarakhand

Kanchan Pant, Dr. Jitendra Kwatra and Dr. Seema Kwatra

Abstract

Women in agriculture mainly use old and traditional tools and implements. These tools are not gendered friendly also has less efficiency. farm women are either unaware or have little knowledge about technology advancement. This paper main objective is to search out Acceptability of woman-friendly drudgery reducing technologies in the hill as well as Tarai region in Uttarakhand. And this information will be helpful in making future intervention for women. This study was carried out in two districts of Uttarakhand and a total sample size of 120 was taken for descriptive data using purposive and random sampling. The results revealed that the acceptability of women-friendly reducing technologies are very low because they are not aware of these techniques and tools. But this situation is now changing by the effort of state govt as well as ICAR.

Keywords: Acceptability, woman friendly, reducing, technologies

Introduction

Women who performed farm activities and work in commercial areas, they generally face the problem of drudgery. They are always engaged in repetitive, monotonous, harmful activities, harmful postures and handling toxic materials. In household activities like cooking, women who use chulha or work in smoky fuels environment with poor ventilation have problem of cough, dyspnoea and lung problems. Women who work in this environment from childhood they are prone to disorder like congestive heart, severe cardiac enlargements and cor - pulmonate.

In agriculture area mostly task performed by the women are generally repetitive, monotonous and arduous. Agriculture activities like sowing, transplanting, irrigation, weeding, fertilizer application, plant protection and harvesting have immense drudgery impact on farm women.

For farm activities like threshing, winnowing and milling now machines are available but in some areas mainly in hilly areas these activities is carried out manually by the farm women. So these activities are also reason for drudgery.

Women face many health hazards while performing the farm activities. During transplanting activity, the health hazards risk is reported to be about 50 percent, during harvesting 26.5 percent and post harvesting activities like threshing activity about 50 percent, during drying activity about 33 percent and during parboiling activity about 67 percent. Some livestock management activities like shed cleaning reported health hazards risk about 47 percent and during fodder collection 23 percent.

In India where women participation in agriculture is very high, there are limited resources available to them. There are limited tools and resources available to them because of their low level of socio economic condition.

Women in agriculture mainly use the old and traditional tools and implements. These tools are not gender friendly also has less efficiency. Most of the work performed by these tools are tedious and time consuming. Many operations are done in varying posture. Thus use of these tools for long time causes the body pain and inconvenience.

In India most of the farm women are either unaware or have little knowledge about the technology advancement. The information is not available to them. Gender friendly tools are available in different areas like agriculture, horticulture and animal husbandry. Main motive of using gender friendly or women friendly tools is to reduce the drudgery, save time, increase the productivity, improve the work efficiency or farm women can get leisure time, conserving energy, can improve quality of work.

Methodology

Selection of locale- The present study was conducted in hill and tarai areas of Uttarakhand. In hill area, Nainital block was selected and three villages Mallachopra, Jadapani, Quidal were purposively selected from the operational villages of KVK, Jeolikote. Purposive sampling procedure was used to select the area and simple random sampling was used to select the sample. A sample size of one twenty was selected for the collection of descriptive data. An interview schedule was used to gather information related to research from the respondents. The collected data was tabulated and analyzed with the help of descriptive (frequency, percentage and mean) and rational statistics (co-relation coefficient).

Result and Discussion

Now development of improved tools for farm women is a core area. Many scientists working with equipment developers to change the age old situation of drudgery faced by farm women. Developed drudgery reducing farm tools are suitable for farm women. Bhusan *et al.* (2016) [1] conducted a study to know the awareness of the respondents about improved tool and found that respondents had heard about few tools such as paady drum seeder, groundnut stripper, cook stoves, vegetable transplanter, wheel barrow, paddy winnower and tubular maize sheller.

Table 1 shows that 65.84 percent respondents did not know about the revolving stool. About 17.5 percent respondents said they have heard, 9.17 percent respondents said they have seen and only 7.5 percent respondents know about this tool. In the context of tarai region, 56.67 percent respondents did not know about the revolving stool. About 20 percent respondents had heard about the revolving stool, 13.34 percent respondents had seen and only 10 percent respondents had the knowledge about the revolving stool. Whereas in the hill region, about 76.67 percent respondents did not know about the revolving stool. About 13.37 percent respondents had heard, 5 percent respondents had seen and 5 respondents had knowledge about the revolving stool.

Table 1 shows that 25 percent respondents know about the water bag. About 8.35 percent respondents had heard, 25 percent respondents had seen this bag. And 41.67 percent respondents did not know about this. In the context of tarai region, most of the respondents i.e. 83.34 percent respondents did not know about the water bag. 16.67 percent respondents had heard about the water bag. But none of them had seen and none of them had the knowledge about the water bag. Whereas in the hill region, half of the respondents know about the water bag. About 50 percent respondents have seen the water bag. But did not possess the same.

Table 1 visualizes that most of the respondents i.e. 85.84 percent did not know about the Naveen sickle tool. And none of them have seen this tool but 14.17 percent respondents have heard about this. In the context of tarai region, 81.67 percent respondents did not know about the Naveen sickle whereas 18.34 percent respondents have heard about the tool. And in context of hill area, 90 percent respondents did not know about the Naveen sickle. None of the respondents had seen and only 10 percent respondents heard about this tool.

Table 1 envisages that more than half of the respondents 67.5 percent did not know about the dung collector. But 22.5 percent respondents have heard about the dung collector and only 10 percent respondents said that they have seen this tool. But none of the respondents had the complete knowledge

about the dung collector. In the context of tarai region 58.34 percent respondents did not know about the dung collector. About 26.67 percent respondents have heard about the dung collector and only 15 percent respondents have seen this tool. But none of the respondents had the complete knowledge about this tool. Whereas in the hill region 76.67 percent respondents did not know about the dung collector. About 18.34 percent respondents have heard and only 5 percent respondents have seen this tool.

Table 1 clearly states that 92.5 percent did not know about the motorized paddy thresher. Whereas 5.84 percent respondents said they have heard about motorized paddy thresher. Only 1.67 percent respondents have seen this tool. But none of the respondents had the complete knowledge about this. In the context of tarai region, 88.34 percent respondents did not know about the motorized paddy thresher. About 8.34 percent respondents have heard and only 3.34 percent respondents have seen this tool. But none of the respondents had the complete knowledge about this tool. Whereas in the hill region mostly did not know about motorized paddy thresher i.e. 96.67 percent.

Table 1 shows that 89.17 percent respondents did not know about the rice trasplanter. Only about 10.84 percent respondents have heard about this. No respondents have seen this tool and nobody have knowledge about the rice tansplanter. In the tarai context, 41.67 percent respondents did not know about the rice transplanter. None of the respondents have seen this tool but 16.67 percent respondents have heard about this. In hill area 95 percent respondents did not know about this tool. Only 5 percent respondents have heard and none of respondents seen this tool.

Table 1 envisages that more than thee fourth of the total respondents, 92.5 percent did not know about the twin wheel hoe weeder. Five percent respondents have heard about the Twin wheel hoe weeder and only 2.5 percent respondents have seen this tool. But none of the respondents had the complete knowledge about the twin wheel hoe weeder. In the context of tarai region 90 percent respondents did not know about the twin wheel hoe weeder. About 6.67 percent respondents have heard about the twin wheel hoe weeder and only 3.34 percent respondents have seen this tool. But none of the respondents have the complete knowledge about this tool. Whereas in the hill region mostly did not know about the twin wheel hoe weeder i.e. 95 percent. About 3.34 percent respondents had heard and only 1.67 percent respondents had seen this tool.

Table 1 visualize that 98.34 percent respondents do not know about the sugarcane stripper. Only about 1.67 percent respondents have heard about it. No respondents have seen this tool and nobody had knowledge about the groundnut stripper. In the tarai context, 96.67 percent respondents did not know about the groundnut stripper. None of the respondents have seen this tool but 3.34 percent respondents have heard about this. But in hill area nobody knows about the sugarcane stripper.

Table 1 shows that 80 percent respondents did not know about the fruit harvester. Only about 13.34 percent respondents have heard and only 4.17 respondents have seen this tool. No respondents have knowledge about the fruit harvester. In the tarai context 91.67 percent respondents did not know about the fruit harvester. None of the respondents have seen this tool but 8.34 percent respondents have heard about this. In hill area 68.34 percent respondents did not know about this tool. About 18.34 percent respondents have heard and 8.34

respondents have seen this tool. And only 5 percent respondents had knowledge about this tool.

Table 1 envisages that more than three fourth of the total i.e. 86.67 percent did not know about the paddy winnower. But 11.67 percent respondents have heard about the paddy winnower and only 1.67 percent respondents have seen this tool. But none of the respondents had the complete knowledge about the paddy winnower. In the context of tarai region 80 percent respondents did not know about the paddy winnower. About 16.67 percent respondents have heard about the paddy winnower and only 3.34 percent respondents have seen this tool. But none of the respondents had the complete knowledge about this tool. Whereas in the hill region, mostly about 93.34 percent respondents did not know about the paddy winnower. About 6.67 percent respondents have heard and no respondents seen this tool.

Table 1 shows that 91.67 percent respondents did not know about the tubular maize sheller. Only about 8.34 percent

respondents have heard about this. No respondents have seen this tool and nobody had knowledge about tubular maize sheller. In the tarai context, 88.34 percent respondents did not know about the tubular maize sheller. None of the respondents had seen this tool but 11.67 percent respondents have heard about this. In hill area 95 percent respondents did not know about this tool. Only 5 percent respondents have heard and none of respondents seen this tool.

Table 1 shows that 88.34 percent respondents did not know about the vegetable transplanter. Only about 11.67 percent respondents have heard about this. No respondents have seen this tool and nobody had knowledge about Vegetable transplanter. In the tarai context 85 percent respondents did not know about the vegetable transplanter. None of the respondents have seen this tool but 15 percent respondents have heard about this. In hill area 91.67 percent respondents did not know about this tool. Only 8.34 percent respondents have heard and none of respondents have seen this tool.

Table 1: Awareness of farm women regarding selected drudgery reduction technologies n=120

Selected tools	Region	Percentage (%)			
		Heard	Seen	Know	Do not know
Revolving stool	Tarai region	12 (20)	8 (13.37)	6 (10)	34 (56.67)
	Hill region	8 (13.37)	3 (5)	3 (5)	46 (76.67)
	Total	21 (17.5)	11 (9.17)	9 (7.5)	79 (65.84)
Water bag	Tarai region	10 (16.67)	Nil	Nil	50 (83.34)
	Hill region	Nil	30 (50)	30 (50)	Nil
	Total	10 (8.34)	30 (25)	30 (25)	50 (41.67)
Naveen sickle	Tarai region	11 (18.34)	Nil	Nil	49 (81.67)
	Hill region	6 (10)	Nil	Nil	54 (90)
	Total	17 (14.17)	Nil	Nil	103 (85.84)
Dung collector	Tarai region	16 (26.67)	9 (15)	Nil	35 (58.34)
	Hill region	11 (18.34)	3 (5)	Nil	46 (76.67)
	Total	27 (22.5)	12 (10)	Nil	81 (67.5)
Motorized paddy thresher	Tarai region	5 (8.34)	2 (3.34)	Nil	53 (88.34)
	Hill region	2 (3.34)	Nil	Nil	58 (96.67)
	Total	7 (5.84)	2 (1.67)	Nil	111 (92.5)
Rice transplanter	Tarai region	10 (16.67)	Nil	Nil	50 (41.67)
	Hill region	3 (5)	Nil	Nil	57 (95)
	Total	13 (10.84)	Nil	Nil	107 (89.17)
Twin wheel hoe weeder	Tarai region	4 (6.67)	2 (3.34)	Nil	54 (90)
	Hill region	2 (3.34)	1 (1.67)	Nil	57 (95)
	Total	6 (5)	3 (2.5)	Nil	111 (92.5)
Sugarcane stripper	Tarai region	2 (3.34)	Nil	Nil	58 (96.67)
	Hill region	Nil	Nil	Nil	60 (100)
	Total	2 (1.67)	Nil	Nil	118 (98.34)
Fruit harvester	Tarai region	5 (8.34)	Nil	Nil	55 (91.67)
	Hill region	11 (18.34)	5 (8.34)	3 (5)	41 (68.34)
	Total	16 (13.34)	5 (4.17)	3 (2.5)	96 (80)
Paddy winnower	Tarai region	10 (16.67)	2 (3.34)	Nil	48 (80)
	Hill region	4 (6.67)	Nil	Nil	56 (93.34)
	Total	14 (11.67)	2 (1.67)	Nil	104 (86.67)
Tubular maize sheller	Tarai region	7 (11.67)	Nil	Nil	53 (88.34)
	Hill region	3 (5)	Nil	Nil	57 (95)
	Total	10 (8.34)	Nil	Nil	110 (91.67)
Vegetable transplanter	Tarai region	9 (15)	Nil	Nil	51 (85)
	Hill region	5 (8.34)	Nil	Nil	55 (91.67)
	Total	14 (11.67)	Nil	Nil	106 (88.34)
Chaff cutter	Tarai region	2 (3.34)	8 (13.34)	41 (68.34)	9 (15)
	Hill region	5 (8.34)	8 (13.34)	12 (20)	35 (58.34)
	Total	7 (5.84)	16 (13.34)	53 (44.17)	44 (73.34)
Wheel barrow	Tarai region	11 (18.34)	5 (8.34)	1 (1.67)	43 (88.34)
	Hill region	9 (15)	2 (3.34)	Nil	49 (71.67)
	Total	20 (16.67)	7 (5.84)	1 (1.67)	9 (26.67)
Shovel	Tarai region	14 (23.37)	9 (15)	21 (35)	16 (26.67)
	Hill region	8 (13.34)	5 (8.34)	25 (41.67)	22 (36.67)

	Total	22 (18.34)	14 (11.67)	46 (38.34)	38 (31.67)
Rake	Tarai region	15 (25)	11 (18.34)	7 (11.67)	27 (45)
	Hill region	10 (16.67)	6 (10)	4 (6.67)	40 (66.67)
	Total	25 (20.84)	17 (14.17)	11 (9.17)	67 (55.84)

Note: Values in parenthesis indicates percentage.

Table 1 views that about 44.17 percent respondents had knowledge about the chaff cutter. About 5.84 percent respondents have heard and 13.34 percent respondents have seen this tool. But 36.67 percent respondents did not know about the tool. In the tarai context 68.34 respondents know about the tool. About 3.34 percent respondents have heard and 13.34 percent respondents have seen this tool. But 15 percent respondents did not know about the tool. In the hill context, 20 respondents know about the tool. About 8.34 percent respondents have heard and 13.34 percent respondents have seen this tool. But 20 percent respondents did not know about the tool.

Table 1 clearly states that only 1.67 percent respondents had knowledge about the wheel barrow. About 16.67 percent respondents have heard and 5.84 percent respondents seen this tool. But 26.67 percent respondents did not know about the tool. In the tarai context 88.34 respondents know about the tool. About 18.34 percent respondents have heard and 8.34 percent respondents have seen this tool. But 88.34 percent respondents did not know about the tool. In the hill context none of the respondents know about the wheel barrow tool. About 15 percent respondents have heard and 3.34 percent respondents have seen this tool. But 71.67 percent respondents did not know about the tool.

Table 1 views that about 6.67 percent respondents had knowledge about the shovel. About 18.34 percent respondents have heard and 38.34 percent respondents have seen this tool. But 31.67 percent respondents did not know about the tool. In the tarai context, 35 respondents know about the tool. About 23.37 percent respondents have heard and 15 percent respondents have seen this tool. But 26.67 percent respondents did not know about the tool. In the hill context 41.67 respondents know about the tool. About 13.34 percent respondents have heard and 8.34 percent respondents have seen this tool. But 36.67 percent respondents did not know about the tool.

Table 1 shows that about 9.17 percent respondents had knowledge about the rake. About 20.84 percent respondents have heard and 14.17 percent respondents have seen this tool. But 55.84 percent respondents did not know about the tool. In the tarai context, 11.67 respondents know about the tool. About 25 percent respondents have heard and 18.34 percent respondents have seen this tool. But 45 percent respondents did not know about the tool. In the hill context 6.67 respondents know about the tool. About 16.67 percent respondents have heard and 10 percent respondents have seen this tool. But 66.67 percent respondents did not know about the tool.

Conclusion

Although availability of drudgery reducing tools and technique is sufficient but acceptability and awareness is not up to the mark because of illiteracy, patriarchy system, unrecognized work of farm women etc. but still ICAR and State department introducing many extension programs to aware the farm women about technology advancement and drudgery reducing tools but for reducing this gap there is still much more needs to be done. To reduce gap between acceptability and availability this paper might play important

role.

References

1. Bhusan KB, Mishra KD, Tirkey UT, Jain G, Goswami AK. Awareness about drudgery reducing farm tools and implements by women farm workers in Gujarat, India. *Indian Res. J Ext. Edu.*, 2016, 16(3).
2. Sethi RC, Sharma RB. Frontier technologies for empowering farm women. *International journal of farm science*. 2011; 2(1):142-145.
3. Swamikannan D, Jeyalakshmi C. Women labour in agriculture in India: some facets. *International Journal of Business and Economics Research*. 2015; 1(1):22-28.
4. Tiwari N, Upadhyay R. Technological needs of rural women in selected drudgery reducing technologies related to animal husbandry. *Raj. J. Extn. Edu*. 2012; 20:10-14.
5. Temesgen D, Hinde U, Yusuf J. Determinants of farm women participation in agricultural extension training programs: A case from selected district of Oromia Region of Ethiopia. *International Journal of Agricultural Science Research*. 2015; 4(4):067-077.