

Impact of Training and Development of Farm Women Groups in Tamil Nadu

K. Uma^{1*} and T. Nivetha²

¹Professor, ²Ph.D Scholar, Department of Agricultural and Rural Management,
Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore – 641003

*Corresponding Author E-mail: umatnau@gmail.com

Received: 9.07.2020 | Revised: 11.08.2020 | Accepted: 16.08.2020

ABSTRACT

In agricultural-dependent countries, extension programmes have been the main conduit for disseminating information on farm technologies and assist farmers in developing their farm technical and managerial skills. Farmers already have a lot of knowledge about their environment and their farming system extension can bring them other knowledge and information which they do not have. Major international agencies such as the UN and the World Bank have realized that these technologies have to address to the needs of not only the male farmer in perspective but also incorporate the requirements and adaptability of women in the farm sector. This study focus on impact of farm women groups by doing extension services. The sampling design followed was simple random sampling. Totally a sample of 240 Farm women were to be interviewed, 180 from member of Farm Women Group (FWG) and 60 from Non-member Farm Women. The result showed that certain characteristics such as personal characters of farmers, influential characters of trainers and other socio-cultural factors also playing a greater role in influencing technology adoption by farmers were analysed. About 60-80 % each of the women farmers identifies technical skill, attitude towards change, attitude towards taking risk, farmers exposure were important influential factor than educational level, income and years of farming experience. Moreover, government policy and weather condition respectively as factors influencing adoption of improved farm practices among women farmers.

Keywords: Farm women groups, Training, Impact on farm practices.

INTRODUCTION

Extension is a primary tool for making agriculture, its related activities as well as other economic activities more effective and efficient to meet the needs of the people. Agricultural extension is aimed primarily at improving the knowledge of farmers for rural

development; as such, it has been recognized as a critical component for technology transfer (Bonye et al., 2012). Gender has proven to be an essential variable for analysing the roles, responsibilities, constraints, opportunities, incentives, costs, and benefits in agriculture.

Cite this article: Uma, K., & Nivetha, T. (2020). Impact of Training and Development of Farm Women Groups in Tamil Nadu, *Ind. J. Pure App. Biosci.* 8(6), 181-189. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18782/2582-2845.8304>

Extension education adopts in formal ways of empowering the rural farmers to enable them identify their problems and solve the problems in their own way, using their local resources with slight scientific modifications (Abu-Mus'ab, 2009). Extension increases farm yields and improve the standard of living of farmers (Hemu, 2010). Agriculture is the single largest production endeavor in India which is increasingly becoming a Female Activity that contributes about 18 per cent of GDP. Agriculture sector employs 4/5th of all economically active women in the country where 48 per cent of India's self-employed farmers are women. There are 75 million women engaged in dairying as against 15 million men and 20 million in animal husbandry as compared to 1.5 million men.

Trained women farmers were encouraged to establish women's groups in their villages to share their knowledge and experiences with others to address the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of farm women group. Share of farm women in agricultural operations like land preparation is 32%, seed cleaning and sowing (80%), inter cultivation activities 86 % and harvesting-reaping, winnowing, drying, cleaning and storage (84%) (FAO). It is realized that, in order to raise the agricultural output and productivity on a sustainable basis in the developing countries, large scale

adoption of new technologies is very essential. Women are involved in all aspects of agriculture, from crop selection to land preparation, sowing, planting, weeding, pest control, harvesting, crop storage, handling, marketing, and processing (Fabiya et al., 2007).

From 1998 onwards, the most important innovation had been the formation of Farm Women Groups (FWGs), a total of around 1500 groups, generally consisting of 15 to 20 farm women, some trained, some not. These groups had gradually evolved into Self-Help Groups (SHGs). They were given one day's training in group formation as well as specialised training in both agriculture and other income-generating activities. In this context, the objective is to assess the level of agricultural training and extension activities targeted at women for promoting adoption of technologies and to test its cost efficiency and sustainability.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The sampling design followed was simple random sampling. From each selected district, taluk and revenue villages a list of farm women group details had been prepared after consulting agricultural officials, panchayat authorities, peoples' representatives. In the first stage, based on cropping intensity, the districts shown in Table 1 were selected.

Table 1: Selection of Sample Respondents

| S.No | District | Member of Farm Women Group | Farm Women | Total |
|------|--------------------|----------------------------|------------|------------|
| 1 | Coimbatore | 30 | 10 | 40 |
| 2 | Erode | 30 | 10 | 40 |
| 3 | Thanjavur | 30 | 10 | 40 |
| 4 | Ramanathapuram | 30 | 10 | 40 |
| 5 | Thiruvannamalai | 30 | 10 | 40 |
| | Villupuram | 30 | 10 | 40 |
| | Grand Total | 180 | 60 | 240 |

From each district, 30 members of farm women group and 10 non members of farm women group were selected randomly to assess the technology adoption and the productivity changes. Totally a sample of 240 Farm women were to be interviewed, 180 from member of Farm Women Group (FWG) and

60 from Non-member Farm Women. The study had been completed during 2015. Primary data has been collected using structured questionnaire through interview schedule method. Secondary data details have been collected from Agriculture Department, Commissioner of Agriculture, Tamil Nadu and

Joint Director of Agriculture, Coimbatore,
Tamil Nadu.

1) Demographic details of the sample respondents.

The demographic details of the sample respondents are shown below:

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 2: General Profile of Sample Farmers

| S.No | Category | FWG | | FW | |
|----------|---|--------|------------|--------|------------|
| | | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage |
| 1 | Age Distribution (years) | | | | |
| | < 35 | 47 | 26.11 | 10 | 16.67 |
| | 35-45 | 110 | 61.11 | 38 | 63.33 |
| | 46-60 | 21 | 11.67 | 12 | 20.00 |
| | >60 | 2 | 1.11 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 2 | Educational Status | | | | |
| | Illiterate | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 1.67 |
| | Primary | 23 | 12.78 | 17 | 28.33 |
| | High school | 62 | 34.44 | 15 | 25.00 |
| | Secondary | 66 | 36.67 | 17 | 28.33 |
| | Degree | 29 | 16.11 | 10 | 16.67 |
| 3 | Family Size (no) | | | | |
| a. | Up to 3 | 34 | 18.89 | 6 | 10.00 |
| b. | 4 – 6 | 134 | 74.44 | 49 | 81.67 |
| c. | >6 | 12 | 6.67 | 5 | 8.33 |
| | Family type | | | | |
| a. | Nuclear | 125 | 69.44 | 35 | 58.33 |
| b. | Joint | 55 | 30.56 | 25 | 41.67 |
| 4 | Farming Experience (years) | | | | |
| a. | <10 | 106 | 58.89 | 31 | 51.67 |
| b. | 11 to 25 | 60 | 33.33 | 27 | 45.00 |
| c. | >25 | 14 | 7.78 | 2 | 3.33 |
| | Occupational Status (in numbers) | | | | |
| a. | Agriculture as primary occupation | 150 | 83.33 | 49 | 81.67 |
| b. | Agriculture as secondary occupation | 30 | 16.67 | 11 | 18.33 |

*Figures in parenthesis indicate per cent to the total

It could be inferred from the Table 2, that one-fourth of sample women respondents were aged less than 35 years in the category FWG and the corresponding figure is 17 percent in FW. Two-third of them was in more than thirty five years i.e. economically active population. In both the groups, the 35-45 age group was highest. Education status shows that all are literates irrespective of the Farm

Group category and Non-Group category. Farming Experience 50 % was having less than 10 years. Remaining 33- 45 percent of them were having less than 25 years. Almost 80 percent of women's main occupation is agriculture only.

2) Farm Size of the sample respondents

The farm size sample farms are reported in Table 3.

Table 3: Farm Size details of the sample respondents

| S.No | Category | FWG | | | FW | | |
|------|------------------------|-------|------------|---------------|-------|-----------|---------------|
| | | Mean | Number | Percent | Mean | Number | Percent |
| 1 | < 2.5 acres (Marginal) | 1.2 | 71 | 39.44 | 2.21 | 29 | 48.33 |
| 2 | 2.51 to 5.00 (Small) | 2.91 | 80 | 44.44 | 4.52 | 24 | 40.00 |
| 3 | 5.01 to 10.00 (Medium) | 5.14 | 25 | 13.88 | 8.23 | 6 | 10.00 |
| 4 | > 10 acres (Big) | 10.32 | 4 | 2.22 | 15.25 | 1 | 1.67 |
| | Total | | 180 | 100.00 | | 60 | 100.00 |

It could be inferred from the Table 3, there is not much difference between study groups is noted in farm size excepting medium size holding.

3) Annual income of the sample respondents

Annual income was computed for the sample farms (Table 4) and it is found that after the training, income of member group increased significantly.

Table 4: Distribution of Farmers according to Income

| S.No | Family Income (Rs/Annum) | FWG | | FW |
|------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | Before | After | |
| 1 | < 60000 (Low Income) | 48 (26.67) | 25 (13.80) | 19 (31.67) |
| 2 | 60000-120000 (Middle Income) | 48 (26.67) | 49 (27.22) | 15 (25.00) |
| 3 | 120000-240000 (High Income) | 41 (22.78) | 53 (29.44) | 10 (16.67) |
| 4 | >240000 (Very High Income) | 43 (23.89) | 55 (30.55) | 16 (26.67) |
| | Total | 180 (100.00) | 180 (100.00) | 60 (100.00) |

*Figures in parenthesis indicate percent to the total

The percent of families with below Rs. 60,000 per annum was 27 percent before the training and it declined to 14 percent after the training. This is primarily due to adoption of improved technologies. In non-member category, below Rs. 60,000 families are 32 percent clearly showing the impact of technology adoption.

4) Source of information about farming practices.

The source of information on new farming practices for crop farmers are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Source of Information on New Farming Practices

| Particulars | FWG | FW |
|------------------------|------------|------------|
| TNAU | 23 (38.33) | 4 (46.67) |
| Agri. Department | 55 (91.67) | 5 (16.67) |
| Private company | 11 (18.33) | 10 (33.33) |
| Neighbour | 20 (33.33) | 13 (43.33) |
| Source of seeds | | |
| Self | 57 (95.00) | 28 (93.33) |
| Neighbour farmers | 3 (5.00) | 2 (6.6) |

(Figures in parentheses indicate the per cent to total)

In case of Member farmers, nearly 92 per cent of households reported that Agricultural Department was the major source of information on the new technologies followed by TNAU and neighbour farmers. However, in case of non-member farmers, Agricultural Department (46.67 per cent) and neighboring farmers (43.33 per cent) were the major sources of information on new farming practices. Regarding the source of seeds with respect to agricultural crops, majority of them

had their own seed production which ranged from 93 to 95 percent.

5) Impact of farm training among FWG members

Formation of SHGs of the trained women has resulted is inculcating the saving habit. They are able to mobilize funds to meet their requirements for agriculture and other needs without being dependent on the money lenders and others.

Table 6: Impact of Training in Farming and SHG Functions on Select Socio-economic Activities of FWG Members

| Sl.No | Particulars | Socio economic activities | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| | | Increased | No Change | Decreased |
| I. On farm | | | | |
| 1 | Adoption of improved agricultural practices | 166 (92.22) | 14 (7.78) | 0 (0.00) |
| 2 | Purchase of additional land for cultivation | 13 (7.22) | 67 (37.22) | 100 (55.55) |
| 3 | Leased in lands for cultivation | 22 (12.22) | 158 (87.77) | 0 (0.00) |
| 4 | Leased out land for cultivation | 13 (7.22) | 67 (37.22) | 100 (55.55) |
| 5 | Purchase of new implements | 29 (16.11) | 151 (83.39) | 0 (0.00) |
| 6 | Purchase new tractor | 5 (22.78) | 175 (77.22) | 0 (0.00) |
| 7 | Purchase of livestock | 38 (21.11) | 142 (78.89) | 0 (0.00) |
| II. Material Changes | | | | |
| 1 | Purchase of new utensils | 26 (14.44) | 154 (85.56) | 0 (0.00) |
| 2 | Purchase of household appliances | 19 (10.56) | 161 (89.44) | 0 (0.00) |
| 3 | Purchase of new jewels | 32 (17.78) | 148 (82.22) | 0 (0.00) |
| 4 | Purchase of new vehicles | 24 (13.33) | 156 (86.67) | 0 (0.00) |
| 5 | Purchase of radio/T.V/Telephone | 23 (12.78) | 156 (86.67) | 0 (0.00) |
| III. Personnel Changes | | | | |
| 1 | Providing education to children | 22 (12.22) | 158 (87.78) | 0 (0.00) |
| 2 | Healthcare | 51 (28.33) | 129 (71.67) | 0 (0.00) |
| 3 | Nutritious food consumption | 44 (24.44) | 136 (75.56) | 0 (0.00) |
| 4 | Expenditure on religious ceremonies | 42 (23.33) | 138 (76.67) | 0 (0.00) |
| IV. Economic Changes | | | | |
| 1 | Repayment of old loans | 104 (57.78) | 76 (42.22) | |
| 2 | Savings /deposits | 139 (77.22) | 39 (21.67) | 2 (1.11) |
| 3 | Investment on other enterprises | 33 (18.33) | 146 (81.11) | 1 (0.56) |
| 4 | Income | 164 (91.11) | 16 (8.88) | 1 (0.56) |
| V. Home Changes | | | | |
| 1 | Purchase of new house | 6 (3.33) | 174 (96.6) | 0 (0.00) |
| 2 | Modification of existing house | 33 (18.33) | 147 (81.67) | 0 (0.00) |
| VI. Social Changes | | | | |
| 1 | Relationship developed with extension worker | 121 (67.22) | 59 (32.78) | 0 (0.00) |
| 2 | Organizational participation | 133 (73.89) | 33 (18.33) | 14 (7.78) |
| 3 | Consultant role for many farm women | 61 (33.89) | 110 (61.11) | 9 (5.00) |
| 4 | Emergence as local leader | 43 (23.88) | 137 (76.11) | 0 (0.00) |
| 5 | Increase of outside contact | 131 (72.78) | 49 (27.22) | 0 (0.00) |
| 6 | Change in mass media exposure (Radio/TV/Farm Publication) | 68 (37.77) | 112 (62.22) | 0 (0.00) |
| 7 | Development of 'We' Feeling | 143 (79.44) | 37 (20.56) | 0 (0.00) |
| 8 | Group cohesiveness | 98 (54.44) | 82 (45.56) | 0 (0.00) |
| 9 | Participation in decision making | 177 (98.33) | 3 (1.67) | 0 (0.00) |

As a group, they have got involved in several income generating activities, further improving their economic condition. This has enabled some of them to acquire farm assets to some extent. Group cohesiveness has

improved thus creating more of 'WE' feeling. Exposure to mass media was expressed by about 54 percent of members.

6) Sustainability of Farm Women Groups

Members of these groups started to grow new crops in more area compared to previous periods and also they were able to manage risks due to drought through technology they trained. Nearly 50 % of farm women groups reported positive changes in economic and social aspects while observing indicators. 70%

of women groups observed no changes in enrollment in education. But drugs and tobacco use almost stopped after joining groups. They started using the available time very effectively. General awareness about political, social aspects had been increased because of mobility and meeting other people.

Table 7: Sustainability indicators after training

| Sl.No | Sustainability indicators | Increase | Decrease | No Change |
|------------|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| I | Economic Indicators | | | |
| 1 | Getting employment regularly | 82 (45.56) | 28 (15.56) | 70 (38.89) |
| 2 | Wages/day | 120 (66.67) | 9 (5.00) | 11 (6.11) |
| II | Social Indicators | | | |
| 1 | General awareness | 159 (88.33) | 12 (6.67) | 9 (5.00) |
| 2 | Enrollment in education | 46 (25.56) | 9 (5.00) | 125 (69.44) |
| 3 | Efficient utilization of available time | 123 (68.33) | 12 (6.67) | 45 (25.00) |
| 4 | Use of tobacco | 0 (0.00) | 166 (92.22) | 14 (7.78) |
| III | Environmental Indicators | | | |
| 1 | Capacity to withstand (to grow crop even when there is drought) | 87 (48.33) | 24 (13.33) | 69 (38.33) |
| 2 | Change in cropping area | 118 (65.56) | 21 (11.67) | 41 (22.78) |

7) Respondents Opinion on Trainings regarding Technology

Respondent's opinion about this kind of training on technology was collected and given in Table 8. Reason to go for this training is motivation given by TANWABE Agricultural officers and through department of agriculture only they came to know about that training. Duration of the training programme is

sufficient to learn the technology. Class room training combined with Field demonstration is much useful for them compared with other methods. Majority of women not prefer to going for adoption immediately. After training, they used to discuss informally with friends and relatives and disseminate the technology.

Table 8: Respondents opinion on Trainings

| Category | Number | Percentage |
|---|--------|------------|
| Motivation to join and attend training programme | | |
| Female extension officer | 154 | 85.56 |
| Husband | 24 | 13.33 |
| Other trained farm women | 2 | 1.11 |
| Duration of the training programme is sufficient to learn the technology | | |
| Sufficient | 134 | 74.44 |

| | | |
|---|------------|---------------|
| Too short | 41 | 22.78 |
| Too long | 5 | 2.78 |
| Extension method used in imparting training the technology | | |
| Class room training | 27 | 15.00 |
| Field demonstration | 12 | 6.67 |
| Class room and field demonstrations combined | 141 | 78.33 |
| Preferred time to adopt a new technology | | |
| Immediately after training | 37 | 20.56 |
| After seeing other farmers doing it successfully | 49 | 27.22 |
| I prefer to wait and take my own time until I convinced | 94 | 52.22 |
| Information regarding Training / Meeting | | |
| Print and Media | 3 | 1.67 |
| Agricultural Department | 168 | 93.33 |
| Other fellow farmers already trained | 9 | 5.00 |
| Person you disseminate the information regarding Training you know | | |
| Farmer friends | 64 | 35.56 |
| Family members working in my farms | 82 | 45.56 |
| Relatives | 19 | 10.56 |
| Neighboring farmers | 12 | 6.67 |
| To those who ask for it | 3 | 1.67 |
| Frequency of passing on the information regarding Training to others | | |
| Regularly | 118 | 65.56 |
| Rarely | 59 | 32.78 |
| Never | 3 | 1.67 |
| Mode of disseminate the information regarding Training to others | | |
| Personal contact | 27 | 15.00 |
| Group discussion | 59 | 32.78 |
| Phone | 94 | 52.22 |
| Meeting other people other than the field | | |
| Total | 180 | 100.00 |

It is interesting to note that 90% of the women reported that they had no prior knowledge of the methods taught during the programme. 74.4% of the women reported that the duration of the main training was sufficient. 73% of the women reported that they were consulted about what they wanted to learn. It is also interesting to note that 68% of the women reported that the adoption of the methods did not involve more work for them. 61% of the

women reported that they attended the training in their own village.

8) Impact of training on agricultural practices

Training about agricultural practices followed generally by respondents after training were given in Table 10. Several other changes were also reported in the cost of cultivation, use of chemical fertilizer, use of farm yard manure and use of labour.

Table 9: Changes in agricultural practices after training (per cent)

| S.No | Parameter | Increased | Decreased | Same | No response | Total |
|------|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|------|-------------|-------|
| 1 | Change in cost of cultivation | 18 | 73 | 1 | 8 | 100 |
| 2 | Use of chemical fertilizer | 10 | 72 | 0 | 18 | 100 |
| 3 | Use of enriched farm yard manure | 84 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 100 |
| 4 | Use of implements and machinery | 28 | 0 | 62 | 10 | 100 |
| 5 | Informed marketing decisions | 65 | 0 | 21 | 14 | 100 |

Regarding the changes in the cost of cultivation after training more than 73% of the respondents have reported that the cost has come down while only 18% have reported the cost has gone up. Of those who reported that cost of cultivation has gone up, 48% have reported that it has gone up by 10%-25%, 37% by less than 10%. Similarly reduction of costs has been 10%-25% for 43%, less than 10% for 39%. Over 70 % of the women, after training, report that the use of chemical fertiliser has gone down. Correspondingly, over 80% of the women have reported that use of farm yard manure has gone up after the training. Another significant trend is that over 60% of the women have reported the use of labour has gone down. This is because less weeding requires to be done due to proper seed selection and seed treatment methods adopted. Labour being expensive, the saving in this aspect has reduced the cost of cultivation significantly.

CONCLUSION

Prior to training the women were just following the traditional methods practiced by the elders. They reported that the methods taught like seed selection, seed treatment, line sowing, compost making, preparation and use of organic pesticides were new to them and relevant as they were low cost or no cost. They were also perceived to be environment friendly, good for the land and for the health. Training in other agricultural related activities like horticulture, flower gardening, animal husbandry was perceived to be relevant. Training in other income generating activities like candle making, making detergents, phenyl, shampoo etc. were found to be useful and relevant for keeping them occupied in lean

agricultural periods. Besides the training on modern farming practices, training provided in the formation and running of SHGs was found to be inculcating the saving habit and making them economically independent.

REFERENCES

- Bala, N. (2010). "Selective discrimination against women in Indian Agriculture - A Review" *Agricultural Reviews*. 31(3), 224 – 228.
- Bonye, S. Z., Alfred, K. B., & Jasaw, G. S. (2012). Promoting community-based extension agents as an alternative approach to formal agricultural extension service delivery in Northern Ghana. *Asian Journal of Agricultural and Rural Development*. 2(1), 76–95.
- Damisa, R., Samndi, & Yohana, M. (2007). Women Participation in Agricultural Production- A probit Analysis, *Journal of Applied Sciences*. 7(3), 412-416.
- Danso-Abbeam, G., Ehiakpor, D. S., & Aidoo, R. (2018). Agricultural extension and its effects on farm productivity and income: insight from Northern Ghana. *Agriculture & Food Security* 7, 74.
- Fabiyi, E. F., Danladi, B. B., Akande, & Mahmood, Y. (2007). Role of Women in Agricultural Development and their Constraints: A Case Study of Biliri Local Government Area, Gombe State, Nigeria. *Pakistan Journal of Nutrition*, 6(6), 676 – 680.
- Farid, K. S., Mozumdar, L., Kabir, M. S., & Goswami, U. K. (2009). Nature and extent of rural women's participation in Agricultural and non-agricultural

- activities, *Agricultural Science Digest*. 29(4), 254-259.
- Gupta, R. (1987). Role of women in economic development. *Yojana*, 31(8), 28-32.
- Khan, M., Sajjad, M., Hameed, B., Khan, M., & Jan, A. (2012). Participation of women in agriculture activities in district Peshawar. *Sarhad Journal of Agriculture*. 28, 121–127.
- Mun, & Arindam, (2014). Analysis of Women Participation in Indian Agriculture, *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 19(5), 01-06.
- Santhi, S., Kalirajan, V., & Kanaga Sabapathi, K. (2018). Role of Farm Women in Paddy Cultivation Practices in Thanjavur District, India, *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*, 7(12), 47-50.
- Singh & Vinay (2013). Gender participation in Indian agriculture: An ergonomic evaluation of occupational hazard of farm and allied activities, *International Journal of Agriculture, Environment & Biotechnology*. 6(1), 157-168.
- Unnevehr, L., & Stanford, M. L. (1985). Technology and the demand for women's labor in Asian rice farming. In *Women in Rice Farming*; Gower Publishing Company Limited: Aldershot, UK, pp. 1–20.