



# Measure Constraints Faced by Farm Women Using ICT Tools by Garrett Ranking Method

**Shivani Jha <sup>a+++\*</sup> and S. K. Kashyap <sup>b#</sup>**

<sup>a</sup> Department of Extension Education, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, Punjab. India.

<sup>b</sup> College of Agriculture, G.B.P.U.A.T., Pantnagar, Uttarakhand. India.

## **Authors' contributions**

*This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.*

## **Article Information**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.9734/air/2024/v25i41101>

## **Open Peer Review History:**

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/119043>

**Original Research Article**

**Received: 24/04/2024**

**Accepted: 29/06/2024**

**Published: 01/07/2024**

## **ABSTRACT**

Traditionally the extension services have focused on male farmers. In the last few decades the concern regarding farm women have been raised globally. There is immediate need to equip these farm women with relevant knowledge and skill. It is only possible if appropriate and relevant information communication technology (ICT) tools are made available to farm women to get information related to agriculture. The present study was conducted in the Udham Singh Nagar district of Uttarakhand state to identify the constraints faced by farm women while using ICT tools. Garrett ranking was used. For this study, respondents were selected by using a Probability proportional to size (PPS) sampling method. To derive the inferences of the study, two blocks were selected for the present study. The study covered four villages & it covered 120 farm women in the

<sup>++</sup> Ph.D. Scholar;

<sup>#</sup> Dean;

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: E-mail: [jha.shivani123@gmail.com](mailto:jha.shivani123@gmail.com);

selected villages. Data for the study was collected during 2019-20. Primary data was collected from farm women through personal interview method with the help of a pretested schedule. The main personal constraints noticed were lack of preference in using Information communication technology (ICT), lack of training, lack of confidence, lack of motivation and lack of time to utilize Information communication technology (ICT). The main technological constraints were language problem to use Information communication technology (ICT), complex nature of Information communication technology (ICT) restricted availability and restricted accessibility to Information communication technology (ICT) tools. The main cultural constraints were lack of faith in Information communication technology (ICT) tools, traditional belief in the existing system, discouragement from the family and society. The main infrastructural barriers were poor electricity services and poor network connectivity.

*Keywords: Constraints, farm women; Information Communication Technology (ICT); lack of training and poor network.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Agriculture is the base of Indian economy. About 70 percent population live in village out of which primarily 47 percent workforce is in agriculture [1]. Mishra and Sundaram [2] said that agriculture is the largest livelihood provider in community life and occupationally it is highly dependent on various cropping system, animal husbandry and allied sectors. Lele et al. [3] reported that agriculture in India is facing severe challenges like limited land and water availability, which is further exacerbated by degradation of natural resources, climate change, changes in demand and consumption patterns, moving toward high value agriculture, increasing population pressure and liberalization of trade. The agriculture sector in several developing countries is underperforming, partially as a result of lack of accessibility of proper resources to farm women [4-8]. They are considered as less productive; and the reason of less productivity of women farmers is often attributed to lack of access to resources as well as land, finance and technology. They represent a vital resource in agriculture through their multiple roles as farmers, labourers and entrepreneur. Farm women perform several activities like producing agricultural crops, tending animals, cooking food, working for wages in agricultural or different rural enterprises, collection of fuel and water, selling agriculture produce and caring for members of the family and maintaining their homes.

ICT tools aims to improve the lives of farm household especially in the rural areas by providing them the appropriate and relevant information. Traditionally the extension services have focused on male farmers. In the last few decades the concern regarding farm women

have been raised globally. There is immediate need to equip these farm women with relevant knowledge and skill. It is only possible if appropriate and relevant ICT tools are made available to farm women to get information related to agriculture. Information and Communication Technology (ICT) is for everyone and women have to be an equal beneficiary to the advantages offered by the technology, and the products and processes, which emerge from its use. The benefits of the information provided by ICT tools, need not be restricted to the upper class of the society but have to freely flow to all segments of the society. ICT tools have the potential to reach those women who have not been reached by any other media, thereby empowering them to participate in economic and social progress, and make informed decision. It's necessary to begin utilization of ICT tools in dissemination of information to distantly situated farm women.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The current study is based on an examination of primary data collected in Udham Singh Nagar District in Uttarakhand. For this investigation, the two blocks were chosen. In the selected communities, the study covered 4 villages and 120 farm women. Data for the study was gathered for the years 2019-20. Primary data was gathered from farm women using a personal interview method and pre-tested interview schedule. The obtained data was compiled, collated, and analysed to achieve the aim of the study. A schedule was created in accordance with the existing literature in order to analyse the limits. As a result, restrictions were discovered and subdivided into personal, technological, infrastructure and cultural constraints, following which the sample farm womens' responses were

**Table 1. Percentage positions and their corresponding garett table values**

Rank	Percentage position		Garett table
1	100(1-0.5)/120	2.272727	88
2	100(2-0.5)/120	6.818182	79
3	100(3-0.5)/120	11.36364	74
4	100(4-0.5)/120	15.90909	70
5	100(5-0.5)/120	20.45455	66
6	100(6-0.5)/120	25	63
7	100(7-0.5)/120	29.54545	60
8	100(8-0.5)/120	34.09091	58
9	100(9-0.5)/120	38.63636	56
10	100(10-0.5)/120	43.18182	53
11	100(11-0.5)/120	47.72727	51
12	100(12-0.5)/120	52.27273	49
13	100(13-0.5)/120	56.81818	47
14	100(14-0.5)/120	61.36364	44
15	100(15-0.5)/120	65.90909	42
16	100(16-0.5)/120	70.45455	39
17	100(17-0.5)/120	75	36
18	100(18-0.5)/120	79.54545	34
19	100(19-0.5)/120	84.09091	30
20	100(20-0.5)/120	88.63636	26
21	100(21-0.5)/120	93.18182	20
22	100(22-0.5)/120	97.72727	13

recorded. Simple statistical tools like Garrett's Ranking Technique were used to analyse the data.

**3. GARETT RANKING TECHNIQUE**

Constraints were identified by studying previous research studies. Garrett's Ranking Technique provides the change of orders of constraints into numerical scores. The prime advantage of this technique over simple frequency distribution is that the constraints are arranged based on their severity from the point of view of respondents. Hence, the same number of respondents on two or more constraints may have been given different rank.

Garrett's formula for converting ranks into percent is:

$$\text{Percent position} = 100 * (R_{ij}-0.5)/N_j$$

Where

R<sub>ij</sub> = rank given for ith constraint by jth individual;

N<sub>j</sub>= number of constraint ranked by jth individual.

The per cent position of each rank will be converted into scores referring to the table given by Garrett and Woodworth [9].

The respondents were asked to rank the 22 constraints identified for the purpose of this studies as 1, 2, 3, 4 and up to 22 in order to know their preference in the selection of constraint. The calculated percentage position for the rank 1, 2, 3, 4 and up to 22 and their correspondent Garrett table as show in Table, For factors, the total score is calculated by multiplying the number of respondents ranking that factor as 1, 2, 3 and up to 22. For each factors, the scores of individual respondents were added together and divided by the total number of the respondents for whom scores were added. Average score/Mean score was calculated by dividing total score by number of respondents. These mean scores for all the constraints were arranged in descending order; the constraints were accordingly ranked.

**4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

According to Table 2 Different constraints are ranked by respondents on the basis of their severity of influencing by using Garrett Ranking Technique. The results revealed that that Technology barrier-Complex nature of ICT with

mean score 62.25 is ranked 1, Technology barrier-Fast updating/upgrading of technology with mean score 58.7 is ranked 2, Personal barrier-Lack of preference in using ICT with mean score 58.25 is ranked 3, Personal barrier-Lack of expertise to use ICT with mean score 57.98333 is ranked 4, Personal barrier-Lack of time to utilize the ICT with mean score 57.8 is ranked 5, Personal barrier-Lack of motivation to use ICT with mean score 56.53333 is ranked 6, Personal barrier-Lack of confidence in using ICT with mean score 56.35 is ranked 7, Personal barrier-Lack of training about how to use ICT with mean score 54.73333 is ranked 8, Personal barrier -Fear of technology with mean score 55.71667 is ranked 9, Personal barrier- 4 with mean score 55.5 is ranked 10, Personal barrier-Age factor with mean score 50 is ranked 11. The study is also in line with the findings of Agwu et al. [10]. Chilimo [11] Reddi and Sinha [12] and Shankariah and Swamy [4]. Technology barrier-Restricted accessibility to ICT tools with mean score 49.85 is ranked 12, Technology

barrier-Restricted availability to ICT tools with mean score 49.2 is ranked 13, Personal barrier-Inability to update the ICT expertise regularly with mean score 46.99167 is ranked 14, Cultural barrier-Discouragement from the family to use ICT with mean score 43.95 is ranked 15, Cultural barrier- Lack of faith in ICT tools with mean score 43.9 is ranked 16, Cultural barrier- Traditional belief in the existing system with mean score 43.4 is ranked 17, Institutional barrier- Poor electricity services with mean score 43.4 is ranked 18, Technology barrier- Irrelevancy of the content with individual need with mean score 41.6 is ranked 19, Institutional barrier- Language problem to use ICT with mean score 39.375 is ranked 20, Cultural barrier – Discouragement from the society to use ICT with mean score 38.75 is ranked 21 and Institutional barrier- Poor network connectivity in rural areas with mean score 37.85 is ranked 22. Poor mobile/internet connectivity in rural areas (66.00%) the above findings was in line with Rebekka and Sravanan [13], Jamdhade ([14] and Mittal and Mehar [15].

**Table 2. Constraints perceived by farm women in utilization of ICTs**

S.No	Constraints	Total score	Mean score	Rank
<b>Personal barrier</b>				
1	Lack of confidence in using ICT	6762	56.35	7
2	Fear of technology	6686	55.71667	9
3	Lack of training about how to use ICT	6568	54.73333	8
4	Age factor	6660	55.5	10
5	Financial problem	6000	50	11
6	Inability to update the ICT expertise regularly	5639	46.99167	14
7	Lack of preference in using ICT	6990	58.25	3
8	Lack of motivation to use ICT	6784	56.53333	6
9	Lack of time to utilize the ICT	6936	57.8	5
10	Lack of expertise to use ICT	6958	57.98333	4
<b>Technological Barrier</b>				
11	Restricted availability to ICT tools	5904	49.2	13
12	Restricted accessibility to ICT tools	5982	49.85	12
13	Irrelevancy of the content with individual need	4992	41.6	19
14	Language problem to use ICT	4725	39.375	20
15	Complex nature of ICT	7470	62.25	1
16	Fast updating/upgrading of technology	7044	58.7	2
<b>Cultural Barriers</b>				
17	Lack of faith in ICT tools	5268	43.9	16
18	Traditional belief in the existing system	5208	43.4	17
19	Discouragement from the family to use ICT	5274	43.95	15
20	Discouragement from the society to use ICT	4650	38.75	21
<b>Infrastructural barriers</b>				
21	Poor electricity services	5208	43.4	18
22	Poor network connectivity in rural areas	4542	37.85	22

The reason for such findings could be that the respondents may not aware about the use of ICT tools and further language was a big barrier. Further use of ICT requires special skills and respondents may not be having required skills to use ICTs tools that's why respondents have no confidence in operating ICTs, and also respondents might be busy in agriculture and animal husbandry activities so have little or no time to use ICTs.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The major problems faced by most of the farm women were- Complex nature of ICT, lack of motivation to use ICT, lack of technical knowledge to operate ICTs, inadequate literacy skills to use ICTs, lack of confidence, lack of own ICTs, financial problem, problem in understanding language, lack of electricity and others. Respondents may not aware about the use of ICT tools and further language was a big barrier.

## CONFERENCE DISCLAIMER

Some part of this manuscript was previously presented and published in the conference: IEEC-2023 at RARI (SKNAU, Jobner), Jaipur, Rajasthan organised by Society of Extension Education, Agra, India. Web Link of the proceeding:

<https://seea.org.in/compendia/measure-constraints-faced-by-farm-women-using-ict-tools-by-garett-ranking-method>

## DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

1. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), The state of food and agriculture 2010–2011. Rome: FAO; 2011. Accessed on: 15<sup>th</sup> April 2020.
2. Mishra RP, Sundaram KV. Rural Area Development Perspective and Approaches, Sterling Publication. 1970;1. Accessed on: 12<sup>th</sup> April 2020.
3. Lele S, Wilshusen P, Brockington D, Seidler R, Bawa K. Beyond exclusion: Alternative approaches to biodiversity conservation in the developing tropics. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*. 2010;2(2):94-100.
4. Shankaraiah N, Swamy BKN. Mobile communication as a viable tool for agriculture and rural development. proceedings of mobiles for development held on 2012. Department of agricultural extension, university of agricultural sciences, Bangalore; 2012.
5. Jena, Ankit Kumar, Anshuman Jena, Sweta Sahoo, Smaranika Mohanty, and Gayatri Sahoo. Commercial vegetable growers' socio-economic status on usage of social media in Odisha, India". *Journal of Experimental Agriculture International*. 2024;46(2):99-107. Available:<https://doi.org/10.9734/jeai/2024/v46i22312>.
6. Bansal, Vishakha, Lipi Das, Vandana Joshi, Subhash Chandra Meena. Farmer's awareness and use of different ICT tools. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology*. 2022;40(10):156-65. Available:<https://doi.org/10.9734/ajaees/2022/v40i1031055>.
7. Hilbert M. Digital gender divide or technologically empowered women in developing countries? A typical case of lies, damned lies, and statistics. In *Women's studies international forum*. Pergamon. 2011 34(6):479-489.
8. Rao NH. A framework for implementing information and communication technologies in agricultural development in India. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*. 2007;74(4):491-518.
9. Garret HE, Woodworth RS. Statistics in psychology and education. Vakils, Feffer and Simons Pvt. Ltd., Bombay. 1969;329.
10. Agwu AE, Uche-Mba UC, Akinngbe OM. Use of information and communication technologies among researchers, extension workers and farmers in Abia and Enugu states: Implications for a national agricultural extension policy on ICTs. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*. 2008;12(1):37-48.
11. Chilimo WL. Information and communication technologies and sustainable livelihoods: A Case of selected

- rural areas of Tanzania. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Kwazulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa; 2008.
12. Reddi UV, Sinha V. ICT use in Education: National policies, strategies and programmes. UNESCO Meta-survey on the use of technologies in Education; 2009.
  13. Rebekka S, Saravanan R. Access and usage of ICTs for agriculture and rural development by the tribal farmers in Meghalaya state of North-East India. Journal of Agric. Informatics. Nigeria. Agric. Inf. Worldw. 2015;6(1):18.
  14. Jamdhade SS. Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Tools Used by Orange Growers (Master's Thesis). Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola; c2015.
  15. Mittal S, Mehar M. Socio economic factors affecting adoption of modern ICT by farmers in India the Journal of agricultural education and extension. 2016;22(2):199-212.

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). This publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Peer-review history:*  
*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:*  
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/119043>