## Obstacles of Sustainability of Women Farmer Groupsin Utilizing House Yard through Sustainably Food House Program

Saleh<sup>1</sup>, Halil<sup>2</sup>, Suadnya<sup>3</sup>

 <sup>1</sup>Student at Agribusiness Department of Master Program of Dry Land Management, Post Graduate Program, Mataram University, Mataram, Indonesia.
 <sup>2</sup>Lecturer of Economics at Agribusiness Department of Master Program of Dry Land Management, Post Graduate Program, Mataram University, Mataram, Indonesia.
 <sup>3</sup>Lecturer of Sociology atAgribusiness Department of Master Program of Dry Land Management, Post Graduate Program, Mataram University, Mataram, Indonesia.
 <sup>3</sup>Lecturer of Sociology atAgribusiness Department of Master Program of Dry Land Management, Post Graduate Program, Mataram University, Mataram, Indonesia.
 <sup>3</sup>Corresponding Author: Saleh

Abstract: Food is a basic need of society to support the quality of health, social and political stability in a state. The food needed is in ready-to-eat and non-processed food. To provide ready-to-eat food, it is required production process of non agricultural or agricultural raw materials in a broad sense (crops and horticulture, plantation, forestry, fishery and livestock). The cultivation of crops is currently done by housewife farmer groups in their house yards. Therefore, the aim of this study was to analyze the factors which influence the sustainability of the group in the utilization of yard through the program of Sustainably Food House. The research method used was descriptive quantitative method. Data were obtained from 64 respondents through questionnaire. The respondents were from sustainable groups and unsustainable groups. The data were analyzed using logistic regression analysis. According to the analysis result, it can be concluded that in simultaneous test, all independent variables significantly affect the sustainability of the housewife farmer groups. Table "Omnibus Tests of Model Coeficients" shows result of simultaneous test on all coefficient variables in logistic regression. Significant value generated is 0,000 (Sig 0,000  $\leq \alpha = 0.05$ ). It can also be seen on Chi-square model value of 63.386, with df 17, it is generated Chi-square table 27.59, so Chi-square model value greater than Chi-square table. This means that all the 17 independent variables affect one's decisions in continuing the group activity. On partial test by using wald test, variables influencing sustainability of the cultivation are Family member (X10) with significance value of 0.048, Motivation (X12) with significance value of 0.016, and Revenue (X16) with significance value of 0.029.

Keywords: Challenge, housewife farmer groups, sustainable, yard

Date of Submission: 28-09-2017	Date of acceptance: 23-10-2017

#### I. Introduction

Food is a basic human need to support the quality of health, social and political stability in a State. The food needed is in ready-to-eat and non-processed food. To provide ready-to-eat food, it is required production process of non agricultural or agricultural raw materials in a broad sense (crops and horticulture, plantation, forestry, fishery and livestock).

Fulfillment of food need means adequate food availability, both in quantity, quality, safety, diversity, nutritional content, affordability for all society, not contrary to the religion, beliefs and culture of society. This condition is called food security (Law Number 18 of 2012).

Moreover, the World Bank (2009) stated that food security is not only in food availability but includes food access and food utilization by everyone, both men and women, peasant societies of all ages, ethnicities, religions, and socioeconomic levels. Furthermore, Rossi P (2010) stated that to ensure food supply is in adequate condition(so that people can obtain sufficient quantity, quality and sustainability at an affordable price), food security must include availability, distribution, and consumption factors in terms of quantity, quality, diversity and safety.

Lack of food diversification in West Nusa Tenggarais caused by most agricultural land is planted with rice(rice is the main food that must be met), the area of agriculture is continuously decreased and there is no basic price for food other than rice. The issue is a shared responsibility between the government and the community (Mawardi, 2010 in Fauziah, 2015).

One of the alternatives to overcome the scarcity of agricultural land is to utilize house yard (Suwono, 2012 in Sudrajat, 2016). Utilization of house yard would realize food independent in the household, in an effort to increase the availability of local food and family economy in the future (Hariyadi, 2013 in Sudrajat, 2016).

The yard is a plot of land on which a residential were built, has certain limits and has functional relationships, both economic, biophysical and sociocultural with its inhabitants (Rahayu, M et al, 2005).

Furthermore, the yard is defined as an area that requires special care, provide a security and comfort around the residence, in which a small-scale cultivation and livestock can be done, so that yield of farm can be consumed by household members (Galhena et al in Metalisa, 2014)

The yard has multipurpose functions. This limited land can produce foodstuffs such as tubers, vegetables, fruits; spices and medicinal materials, handicraft materials; as well as animal food derived from poultry, small livestock or fish. Benefits to be gained from the management of the yard include: meeting the needs of family consumption and nutrition, saving expenses, providing additional income for the family, and facilitating public access to daily consumption needs without having to go to markets far enough from where they live in (Putra et al., 2013). The development of the yard cannot be separated from theagricultural land problem; the availability of agricultural land is more and more imited from year to year due to increase of land conversion from agriculture to non-agricultural sectors (Sudrajat, 2013).

The city of Mataram is formed based on Law Number 4 of 1993, and has area of  $61.30 \text{ km}^2$  (6,130 Ha) divided into 6 (six) sub-district and 50 urban villages.Mataram City has the smallest area in West Nusa Tenggara Province, but is inhabited by large population. The total population of Mataram city, according to BPS data of Mataram City in 2014, is 441.664 and in 2015, increased to 450.226 with growth rate of 2.08%, population density of 7345 inhabitants/ km<sup>2</sup> (BPS Kota Mataram, 2015). Nasoetion(2008) in Rossi. P (2010) stated that food demand will increase along with the increase of population in the world. To be an independent nation infood fulfillment, the nation of Indonesia has its own obstacles and threats due to reduced agricultural land that has been converted into residential and industrial land.

Local Government of Mataram has implemented the Program for the Acceleration of Food Diversification through Sustainable Food House to overcome the lack of quality of food in Mataram. This condition could be seen through the indicator of the achievement of expectedfood Pattern score (PPH) in Mataram City of 82 (less than the standard score of 100). This means that the communities of Mataram still consume less animal source food, vegetable and fruit (Food Security of Mataram, 2015).

The acceleration program of food diversification is applied through the farming activities of the yard that empowers housewives grouped into organizations called farmer group. This was aimed to facilitate the guidance in leadingsociety's mindset to utilize the yard as food source and family income by planting various types of vegetables in accordance with the needs of families (BKP Kementan RI, 2013).

Ministry of Agriculture initiates the optimization of the use of the yard through theSustainably Food HouseProgram, which is an intensive trial to sustainably produce quality food around the yard (Research Agency, 2012). Utilization of the yard through the program is one of the women's efforts to increase their role in agricultural development. The role of women in using the yard to be planted with various vegetable crops, medicinal plants and fruits is to increase food and family nutrition (Mayanasari D et al, 2015).

Based on the data of the Food Resilience of Mataram, the optimization of the yard utilization of through the program in 2013 is set by 8 (eight) groups of women farmers from 6 (six) sub-districts namely Sekarbela, Ampenan, Mataram, Sandubaya, Selaparang and Cakranegara. Of the 8 (eight) women farmer groups that have been designated as participants of optimizing the utilization of yard, only 3 (three) groups are still continuing the program; SopokAngen, Sejahtera Asri and Handayani.

The successful implementation of acceleration of the food diversification movement depends on the synergy of cooperation among local government, various related agencies, extension counselors and beneficiaries. In order for the activities to be carried out with the right target, it must be correctly identified the root of the problems in the field and conduct a comprehensive approach to the community by involving the deep-rooted groups in the community. In total, this activity is directed to be the needs of the group/society, so that its existence and development would be sustainable and not to be a mere project (BKP Kementan RI, 2015).

#### **II. Research Methods**

#### **Research methods**

The research method used in this study is descriptive, which aimed to solve existing problem at the moment by collecting data, arrange, and draw conclusion.

#### **Unit of Analysis**

The unit of analysis in this study is groups of women farmers in Mataram, West Nusa Tenggara Province as the beneficiary of acceleration of food diversificationthrough Sustainably Food House Program. **Determination of Sample Areas and Number of Respondents** 

Determination of sample area in this study was done by purposive sampling method. This research was conducted in Mataram, consisting of 5 (five) sub-districts as sample, Fromwhich was determined 64 respondents.

#### Data Type

The type of data in this study is qualitative and quantitative data.Qualitative data are data obtained not in the form of numbers, in opposite,Quantitative data are data in the form of numbers.

#### Data source

Data used in this research are primary data and secondary data. Primary data are data obtained directly from the respondents and collected by direct interview, referencing to list of questions that have been set. Secondary data are data obtained from offices/agencies associated with this research, namely the Food Security of Mataram and other relevant agencies. Besides, the data were also collected from various sources of research results, scientific journals, papers and textbooks as well as the results of reports from agencies related that support the source of this review, including publications through the internet.

Data analysis

Referring to the research objectives to be achieved, the aspects analyzed are the factors that affect the sustainability of Women Farmer Groups in utilizing the yard through Sustainably Food House Program. The data was analyzed by using logistic regression analysis inSPSS with the following model:

Logit (Y) =  $\beta 0 + \beta 1X1 + \beta 2X2 + \beta 3X3 + \beta 4X4 + \beta 5X5 + \beta 6X6 + \beta 7X7 + \beta 8X8 + \beta 9X9 + \beta 10X10 + \beta 11X11 + \beta 12X12 + \beta 13X13 + \beta 14X14 ... . . \beta 17X17$ 

where:

 $\beta 0 = Constants$  $\beta i = Regression coefficient$ Y = Sustainability of the women farmer group. X1 = Leadership.X2 = Group Structure X3 = CompactnessX4 = Intensity of meeting (times / month) X5 = Formal support.X6 = Informal Support.X7 = Extensionist role.X8 = Age (Year)X9 = Formal Education Level. X10 = Family member (person) X11 = Experience Farming Yard (Year) X12 = Motivation.X13 = Time Curve (Hours / Day)X14 =Area of the Yard (m<sup>2</sup>) X15 = Number of plants. X16 = Revenue (Rp.)X17 = Access to Food market.

#### **III. Discussion**

#### Factors Affecting the Sustainability of Women Farmer Groups

Table "Omnibus Tests of Model Coeficients" shows result of simultaneous test on all coefficient variables in logistic regression. Significant value generated is 0,000 (Sig  $0,000 < \alpha = 0.05$ ). It can also be seen on Chi-square model value of 63.386, with df 17, it is generated Chi-square table 27.59, so Chi-square model value greater than Chi-square table. This means that all the 17 independent variables affect one's decisions in continuing the group activity.

Table 1. The simultaneous test results of factors affecting the sustainability of women farmer groups in the

utilization of yard through the Sustainably Food House Program.

**Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients** 

		Chi-square	Df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	63.386	17	.000
	Block	63.386	17	.000
	Model	63.386	17	.000

Simultaneously, the variables affect the sustainability of a group of women farmers who utilize the yard through the sustainably Food House Program.

#### 1. Leadership

62 respondents (98.45%) argue that the leadership of women farmer groups is almost entirely applying a democratic leadership style, which means the group leader grants wide authority to group members. In every problem solved, it always involves group members as a whole team. In a democratic leadership style, the leader provides much information about the duties and responsibilities of its members. Rika M. (2014) stated that the higher level of leadership support for the group will have an impact on the level of farmers' participation in developing their farming groups and stimulated their members to be engaged in empowerment activities as liaison between groups and outsiders, and as a bridge for the entry of important information. If the group leader involves the members actively in the farmer group activities, including in the decision-making process, the group's objectives will be more easily realized as it will result in members' commitment to contribute in achieving the group's goals. Lippit and White (1939) stated that democratic leadership is the most effective leadership style to make group members more skilled and more energetic that impact on higher productivity.

#### 2. Group Structure

57 respondents (89.06%) stated that there was clear division of tasks. This means that in the group structure shows that the division of task have been done proportionally in accordance with the main tasks in the organizational structure within the group. The division good task is the key to the implementation of an activity, especially in providing assurance of the stability, fluency and efficiency of the organization or group to achieve goals. Benefit of division of tasks is that the work is well organized according to plan and can be clearly known the purpose of an organization (Wibowo, 2007). The lack of clarity about the group structure will affect the ambiguity of the position, role, rights, obligations and power of each member, so that the implementation of the activities may not take place effectively and efficiently to achieve group goals (SitiAndarwati, 2012).

#### 3. Group cohesiveness

63 respondents (98.435%) expressed a compact opinion in the group. It can be concluded that almost all respondents stated "compact", meaning the relationship between members is well established, both in the activities and outside activities related to the utilization of yard land. Based on the results of interviews of compact relationships established in various community activities such as mutual cooperation, and religious activities. According to Slamet (2002) states that the cohesiveness of the group is the feeling of interest of members towards the group or sense of belonging to the group. Groups that are compact members will increase the passion of work so that members are more active and motivated to stay in touch with each other

#### 4. The formal support

49 respondents (76.56%) stated that there is a good formal support, meaning that the local government (headman and his staff) always have time to motivate, facilitate and mediate group activities and assist in solving problems faced by groups related to activity optimization of the Program. Rukminto (2008) claimed that one of the roles of the authority (apparatus) is to provide and develop support for citizens who are willing to be engaged in the structure and activities of the community. The support is not only in the term of material, but also praise, awards in words, or attitudes and behaviors that show the appreciation to the changes done by the citizens, and providing time for citizens to talk and discuss about the problems they face.

### 5. The informal support

Informal leaders are community leaders and religious leaders as a liaison in communicating various government development programs and conveying information to the public. 61 people (95,31%) stated informal support is in good category, meaning community leaders and religious figures participate directly in giving positive spirit and information to the community that lead to good optimization activities of yard utilization. The role of informal leaders is in term of suggestions, prohibitions and support to the wider community to move or do something. Informal leaders are used as a liaison in communicating various government development programs so that members of the community can get any information (Liow, 2015). 6. Extensionist's role

41 respondents (64.06%) stated that the role of extensionists in the very good category, meaning that the material and information presented by extension workers in giving counseling to the group members is very complete, easy to understand and increase knowledge and skill of farmer group in the utilization of their yard. Counseling is a non-formal education for women farmer groups that goes through the learning process. The counselor is an educator and motivator in improving the knowledge and skills of the group members. Yuliatin (2002) stated that the rapidity of an agricultural innovation is determined by the activeness of a counselor in conveying information and the accuracy of the methods and techniques used, so that extension activities are factors that can affect the dynamic farmers.

#### 7. Age of Respondents

Respondents who carried out optimizing the use of the yard through sustainablyFood HouseProgramare dominated by the member with age of 15 - 64 years; 64 people (100%). Overall age of respondents who carried out the program isat a productive age. At a person's productive age, it is still possible to

change the mindset and new ideas for the development of his business. Simanjuntak (1985) stated that the productive age ranges from 15 to 64 years and is considered to be able to work. This opinion is reinforced by Gulam (2011). He stated that productive age usually has high curiosity about the objects around the environment that can be observed. This makes they try to actively seek information, implement adoption of innovation. Furthermore, Cepriadi (2012) stated that age is a factor influencing in absorption and decision-making in applying new technology and new innovations. The more old of people is usually more difficult to change his mindset and increasingly difficult to accept new ideas (Mubyarto, 1989).

#### 8. Education Level

All 64 (100%) of the respondents went through formal education, but only 14 respondents (21,88%) have low education level (Elementary School), while the respondents withhigher education (High School, Bachelor and Magister) are 50 respondents (78.12%). Simanjuntak (1985) stated that the lower level of education causes a person less rational in thinking, adopting technology and management skills in any business. In opposite, the higher education levelmakes respondents to be more rational in the mindset, to have the power of reason, especially in making decisions to carry out the program and tohave very big role in the application or adoption of a new technology. This is reinforced by Soekartawi (1987), claiming that person with the higher the level of educationwill generally be more rational to think and quickly accept or implement a new technology.

#### 9. Access to Food

59 respondents (92.18%) stated that it is easy to get food. It can be concluded that to get food or a kind of cultivated plants in the yard is relatively easy. Based on the results of interviews with respondents, most respondents live not far from the market. Indeed, it is easy to get food in the market, but the quality and health level of crops cultivated are better and saferto consume.

#### **Obstacles of Sustainability of Women Farmer Group**

The Obstaclesof sustainability of women farmer groups in utilizing their house yard through The Sustainably Food House Program are as follows:

#### 1. Intensity of Meeting

The overall intensity of the meetings was conducted in moderate category. 59 respondents (92.18%) stated that the meeting was held about 2 to 3 times per month. This means that the meeting has not been done intensively. To further intensify the intensity of the meeting should be done at the right time, given the group members have a very crowded time and busyness. Therefore, the meeting time should be adjusted, for example the meeting can be done at night a day where all group members can have time to attend. In addition, according to interview result, the meeting was held along with an *arisan* or religious event. This is to stimulate member groups in attending the meeting, so that through this meeting, group members are able to share experiences in solving various problems.

The group meeting is a term of togetherness as a more focused counseling media for better farming activities. This will give impact on increasing farm productivity to increase farmer income, so that it will eventually support the creation of better welfare for farmers and their families (FitriM , 2012).

#### 2. Farming Experience

The experience of farming is included in the low category. The respondents with experience about 0-5 years are 58 people (90.62%). This means the expertise and ability of the respondents in managing farms in the yard and in determining the decisions are still relatively low, the more experience of farming is, the more expert and capable in managing the farming, and so does in contrary. This opinion was reinforced by Rika Mutmainah (2014), stating that the experience of farming affects the success of farming, because it is able to give lessons to farmers in facing risks and know how to overcome various problems.

Efforts to be taken to improve the competence of women farmer groups are training and conducting a comparative study. Training the farmers can improve farmers knowledge and skills and can improve skills of women farmer groups to apply their knowledge in farm management. Likewise, the comparative study activity can improve the farmer's insight the farmers can interact directly with the object of the study concerned about the potential and problems faced. Anwas (2012) claimed that training is an effort of one's improvement, both in aspects of knowledge, skills and abilities, so that their performance can improve as needed.

#### 3. Timeline

54 respondents (84.38%) provides time to utilize the yard most in the range of 1-3 hours. This is in moderate category. This means that time spent by the farmers has not been maximized or limited to the sideline only. Based on the results of the interview, the limited time of the respondent is caused by that they arebusy enough to take care of the household and even there are some respondents working as employees and Civil Servants. Rohmad (2012) stated that members of women farmer groups having a lot of spare time, interest and high awareness level will be able to treat the plants better and can plant in large quantities. In contrary, members of group who are busy enough, have low levels of awareness, and interestneed to be improve their level of participation.

#### 4. Area of yard

Most of the respondents (61 respondents; 95,3%) who conducted the program had less than 120 m<sup>2</sup>of yard land area. This means the member group's farm land is in narrow category. Based on the results of the field survey, most women farmers who participate in the program live in a dense residential area. The yard area will affect the type and kinds of farming that can be cultivated in the yard.Lestari (2012) stated that problem of land limitations isone of the major factorswhich has grown people's interest in utilizing vertikultur technology in the yard. Efforts making to overcome the limited land area is a system of agricultural cultivation using vertical technology or vertically tiered. The system is a very suitable greening system and is recommended for urban areas with limited or narrow yards. If the land area of 1 meter<sup>2</sup> is usually only able for 5 stems of plants, vertical systems using vertikultur technology can produce 24-27 crops depending on the type of plants and needs (Aaiman Ahmad, 2016).

#### 5. Number of Plants

Most of the respondents (37 Respondents; 57.81%) are have less than 20 plants. This means that the crops cultivating in the program is in a little in number. There are some respondents who have a relatively wide yard but not utilized. The number of cropscan affect the total production and income of farm yard. A variety of plants can be planted in the yard, such as fruit, vegetable crops, medicinal plants or pharmacies live, flowers, food and protective plants. Various types of plants are very useful for human life, and others can be used as a source of food, source of nutrition and to improve family income (Sunardi and Slamet, 2008).

In partial test, it was found the variables which significantly influence the sustainability of the program. The variables are a challenge of sustainability of women farmer groups in utilizing the yard through the program. The data were analyzed by using the Wald test. The result is shown in the following table:

			В	S.E.	Wald	Df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1 <sup>a</sup>	$X_1$	Leadership	-1.597	2.012	.630		.428	.203
	$X_2$	Group structure	-14.004	1.816E4	.000	.203	.999	.000
	$X_3$	Member compactness	26.816	4.410E4	.000	.000	1.000	4.428E11
	$X_4$	Meeting intensity	5.006	14.994	.111	4.428E11	.738	149.319
	$X_5$	Formal support	1.223	1.692	.523	149.319	.470	3.399
$X_6$	$X_6$	Informal support	10.097	2.327E4	.000	3.399	1.000	2.426E4
	$X_7$	Extensionist's role	3.679	2.125	2.997	2.426E4	.083	39.598
	$X_8$	Age	092	.056	2.727	39.598	.099	.912
	$X_9$	Education level	862	2.262	.145	.912	.703	.422
	$X_{10}$	Family member	1.023	.516	3.921	.422	.048	2.780
	$X_{11}$	Farming experience	.274	.295	.862	2.780	.353	1.316
	X <sub>12</sub>	Motivation	-6.572	2.737	5.765	1.316	.016	.001
	X <sub>13</sub>	Timeline	.099	.063	2.439	.001	.118	1.104
	$X_{14}$	Yard area (m <sup>2</sup> )	018	.019	.921	1.104	.337	.982
	X15	Number of crops	.189	.153	1.541	.982	.214	1.209
	X16	Income	.000	.000	4.773	1.209	.029	1.000
	X <sub>17</sub>	Food acces	022	1.599	.000	1.000	.989	.978
	Constant		-34.325	4.644E4	.000	Exp(B)	.999	.000

Table 2.Partial Test of Independent variables using the Wald of 5%.

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: X<sub>1</sub>, X<sub>2</sub>, X<sub>3</sub>, X<sub>4</sub>, X<sub>5</sub>, X<sub>6</sub>, X<sub>7</sub>, X<sub>8</sub>, X<sub>9</sub>, X<sub>10</sub>, X<sub>11</sub>, X<sub>12</sub>, X<sub>13</sub>, X<sub>14</sub>, X<sub>15</sub>, X<sub>16</sub>, X<sub>17</sub>.

Based on the above table, it can be seen that factors influencing the sustainability of Women Farmer Group in the utilization of yard through the program are Family member (X10) with significance level of 0.048, Motivation (X12) with significance level of 0.016 and Revenue (X16) with a significance level of 0.029. This means the variables significantly affect the decision of a women farmer to continue or not the utilization of their yard for the program.

#### **1. Number of Family Member**

The more dependents of the family is, the more heavy the burden felt by a householder. On the other hand family member is a source of labor. In the analysis, it is still considered to increase family income. Cepriadi (2012) stated that the number of family members who are in the productive age is a source of labor that will increase the income of faming, because it can be active on the farm, but a person is not productive age is

considered to be a burden for householder.Based on the interview result, the dependents of the family aremost of children and not a productive age, so that their existence cannot help in managing the yard. This will affect the sustainability of women farmers group in the management of the yard.

#### 2. Motivation

The motivation of most women farmer group is in low category, which is 35 respondents (54,68%). This means that the respondent was invited and interested to optimize the utilization of yard through the program(not on their own awareness). This can affect the sustainability of the group in the utilization of yard area. Hamzah B. Uno (2003) stated that someone's motivation level is determined by three components; expectations of success on a task, the instrumentalist, which is the assessment of what will happen if successful and valence form of response to feelings ofposistif, neutral, or negative. High level motivation happens when the effort produces something that exceeds expectations, while low level motivation happens when the business produces less than expected. In order for women farmer groups continue to utilize the yard, it needs efforts to raise public awareness of the consumption of agricultural products that are safe from pesticides, and chemicals, preserving the environment and adding aesthetics or the beauty of the house, so the community consciously do cultivation of plants in the environmentally friendly yard continuously.

One of the efforts done by the government is the mentoring by extension workers. As a driver, the extensionist must be creative, innovative, and communicative to motivate the women farmer and their families to participate actively in the activities of yard land use. Support of village officials should be improved to provide much time in facilitating group activities as well assisting in problem solving faced by groups. The support of community leaders in providing positive information to the community is a motivation for women farmer groups. One of the roles of the authority is to provide and develop support for citizens who are willing to be engaged in the structure and activities of the community. The support is not only in the term of material, but also praise, awards in words, or attitudes and behaviors that show the appreciation to the changes done by the citizens, and providing time for citizens to talk and discuss about the problems they face (Rukminto, 2008). **3. Income** 

The income average of most women farmer is less than Rp. 1.000.000 per month. This is in low category. Simanjuntak (1998) stated that income is required to meet the needs of life in the form of clothing, food, and boards. Someone who has a low income will not meet the needs of his life. While someone who has a lot of income can meet the needs of his life.

Efforts to be made by the government in increasing the income of women farmer is involving the the community and groups of women farmers themselves, either through ongoing assistance to improve the production of farmyard. Yield of the cultivation is not only for self-consumption, but also for sell in the form of processed products. Therefore, technological aid and processing tools is needed to increase the value of yield by turning the yields into distinctive and quality agricultural products. For example, fruits and vegetables will increase the selling price if processed into preparations such as juice, cakes, pickles, dodol, chips and other processed products withhigher selling price. The next strategy is to provide a market or cooperative as well as to assist the promotion of the results of these processed products. Thus the income of women farmer will increase to meet the needs of their life.

#### **IV.** Conclusion

Based on the data analysis above, it can be concluded that simultaneously all independent variables significantly affect the level of sustainability of Women Farmer Group.Table "Omnibus Tests of Model Coeficients" shows result of simultaneous test on all coefficient variables in logistic regression. Significant value generated is 0,000 (Sig 0,000 < $\alpha$  = 0.05). It can also be seen on Chi-square model value of 63.386, with df 17, it is generated Chi-square table 27.59, so Chi-square model value greater than Chi-square table.This means that all the 17 independent variables affect one's decisions in continuing the group activity.

The challenge of sustainability of women farmer groups in utilizing yard area through lesatri food districts is the variables that simultaneously affect the sustainability of women farmer groups and the percentage is dominated.

The obstacles of sustainability of Women Farmer Groups in utilizing house yard through Sustainably Food House Program are non-intensive meetings, limited time for crops, limited area and the small number of crops cultivated.

In partial test, the variables which significantly influence the sustainability of the program are Family member (X10) with significance level of 0.048, Motivation (X12) with significance level of 0.016 and Revenue (X16) with a significance level of 0.029. This means the variables significantly affect the decision of a women farmer whether they continue or not the utilization of their yard for the program.

#### Reference

- [1] Aaiman Ahmad. 2016. BudidayaSayuranSistim Vertikultur.<u>http://tooreeman.blogspot.co.id/2016/02/budidaya-sayuran-sistim-vertikultur.html</u>
- [2] Anwas.2012.Pengaruh Pendidikan Formal, Pelatihan, danIntensitasPertemuanTerhadapKompetensiPenyuluhPertanian. PustekkomKemdikbud. Tangerang Selatan. Banten.
   [2] D. L. K. L. D. L. L.
- [3] BadanKetahanPanganKementerianPertanian, 2015. PedomanPelaksanaanGerakanPercepatanPenganekaragamanKonsumsiPangan (P2KP)Tahun 2015.
   [4] D. L. Licher, 2012. Description, 2012. Description, 2012. Description, 2013.
- [4] BadanLitbangPertanian. 2012. PengembanganKawasanRumahPangan Lestari. BadanPenelitiandanPengembanganPertanian. KementerianPertanian. Jakarta.
- [5] BPS Kota Mataram. 2015. Mataram Dalam Angka Tahun 2015.
- [6] Cepriadi, 2012. Persepsi Petani Terhadap Usahatani Lahan Pekarangan (Studi Kasus Usahatani Lahan Pekarangan Di Kecamatan Kerinci Kabupaten Pelalawan) Indonesian Journal Of Agricultural Economics (IJAE)
   [7] Mayanasariet al. 2015. PeranKelompokWanitaTaniDalamPemanfaatanPekarangan di Kota Palopo.
- [7] Mayanasariet al. 2015. PeranKelompokWanitaTaniDalamPemanfaatanPekarangan di Kota Palopo. BalaiPengkajianTeknologiPertanian (BPTP) Sulawesi Selatan.
   [8] Fauziah, B. 2015. Dampak Program PercepatanPenganekaragamanKonsumsiPangan (P2KP)
- terhadapEkonomiRumahTanggaKelompokWanitaTani (KWT) Di Kota Mataram.
- [9]
   Fitri,
   M.
   2012.
   PengaruhKeberadaanKelompokTaniTerhadapPendapatan
   Usaha

   TaniTembakau.FakultasPertanianUniversitasAbdurachmanSaleh.
   Situbondo.
   Usaha
- [10] Hamzah B. Uno.2003. Teorimotivasidanpengukurannya. BumiAksara. Jakarta
- [11] Gulam. PM. 2011. Faktor-Faktor yang BerhubungandenganPerilakuPemukim di Bantaran Sungai Ciliwung di DKI Jakarta. InstitutPertanian Bogor. Bogor.
- [12] Lestari. 2012. BalaiPengkajianTeknologiPertanian Jakarta
- [13] Liow, M. R. 2015. PerananPemimpin Informal dalamMeningkatkanPartisipasiMasyarakatdalam Pembangunan di DesaMalola. JAP NO.31 VOL III 2015
- [14] Lippit, R. And White, RK. 1939. Polaperilakuagresif di iklimsosialeksperimental. Social PsychologyJournal, Vol 10, 271-301
- [15] Mardikanto. 2009. SistemPenyuluhanPertanian. UniversitasSebelasMaret. Surakarta
- [16] Metalisa. 2014. PersepsiAnggotaTentangPeranKetuaKelompokWanitaTaniDalamPemanfaatanLahanPekaranganBerkelanjutan (Kasus di Kabupaten Bogor). SekolahPascasarjana. InstitutPertanian Bogor.
- [17] Putra et al. Nani. 2013. BalaiPengkajianTekonologiPertanian Nusa Tenggara Barat.
- [18]KantorKetahananPanganKotaMataram,2015.LaporanAkhirPelaksanaanKegiatanOptimalisasiPemanfaatanPekaranganMelaluiKonsep KRPL Tahun 2015.2015.
- [19] Mardikanto. 2009. SistemPenyuluhanPertanian. UniversitasSebelasMaret. Surakarta.

[20] Mubyarto. 1989. PengantarEkonomiPertanian. LembagaPenelitian, PendidikandanPeneranganEkonomidanSosial. Jakarta

- [21] Nazir. M. 2003. MetodePenelitianCetakan ke-5. Ghalia Indonesia. Jakarta.
- [22] Rika Mutmainah. 2014. PeranKepemimpinanKelompokTani Dan EfektivitasPemberdayaanPetani. DepartemenSainsKomunikasidanPengembanganMasyarakat, FakultasEkologiManusia. IPB
- [23] Rossi. P. 2010. Kebijakan Pemerintah Dalam Mewujudkan Ketahanan Pangan Di Indonesia.
- [24] Rahayu, M et al, 2005. KeanekaragamanTanamanPekarangandanPemanfaatannya di desaLampeapi, PulauWawoni, Sulawesi Selatan. JurnalTeknologiLingkungan P3TL-BPPT.
- [25] Resicha. 2016. PeranPenyuluhPertanianDalamPengembanganKelompokTani di Nagari Sungai PuaKecamatan Sungai PuaKabupatenAgam. FakultasPertanian. UniversitasAndalas.
- [26] RohmadBudiono. 2012. UpayaPemanfaatanPekaranganTerbatasDenganPengembangan Model KawasanRumahPangan Lestari (KRPL-Mandiri). Balitkabi Malang. Malang.
- [27] Rukminto, A.I. 2008. IntervensiKomunitasPengembanganMasyarakatSebagaiUpayaPemberdayaanMasyarakat. PT. Raja GrafindoPersada. Jakarta
- [28] Simanjuntak. 1985. EkonomiSumberDayaManusia. Jakarta. LPEE-UI.
- [29] SitiAndarwati. 2012. DinamikaKelompokPeternakSapiPotongBinaanUniversitasGadjahMada di PropinsiDaerahIstimewa Yogyakarta.
- [30] Soekartawi. 1987. PrinsipDasarEkonomiPertanian. Teori dan Aplikasi.RajaGrafindoPersada, Jakarta
- [31] Slamet, M. 2002, Teori Dan PraktekKepemimpinan, RinekaCipta.Jakarta
- [32] Sudrajat. 2013. PenguasaanLahanSawah dan KeragamanSumberPendapatanPetani di PinggiranKota Yogyakarta dalamJurnalPatrawidya.
- [33] Sudrajat. 2016. PeningkatanPartisipasi Dan PeranAktifMasyarakatDalamPengembanganUsahaTaniLahanPekarangan Di DesaMuntuk, KecamatanDlingo, KabupatenBantul, Yogyakarta.
- [34] Umar, H. 2000. Metode Penelitian Untuk Skripsi dan Tesis. Jakarta. Raja Grafindo Persada
- [35] Undang-UndangNomor 18 tahun 2012 tentangPangan.
- [36] World Bank. 2009. Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook. The World Bank, FAO, IFAD. Washington DC (US).
- [37] Yuliatin. 2002. Tingkat KedinamisanKelompokTaniLokaldanTransmigrandalamUpayaPengembanganKemandirianAnggota KelompokTani. InstitutPertanian Bogor. Bogor

# Saleh Obstacles of Sustainability of Women Farmer Groupsin Utilizing House Yard through Sustainably Food House Program." IOSR Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Science (IOSR-JAVS), vol. 10, no. 10, 2017, pp. 37-44.