

A Study on Personal Profile and Adoption Level of Food Technology Trainees in Relation to Self Employment in Food Processing Enterprises

Dr. Manju Yadav

State Consultant

National Food Security Mission

Department of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare

Panchkula, Haryana

Email: manurao2005@gmail.com

Dr. Monika Yadav

Assistant Professor

Department of Home Science

OM Sterling Global University

Hisar, Haryana

Email: yadavmonika692@gmail.com

Abstract

The survey was conducted on sixty respondents with a view to ascertain the personal profile of respondents and the adoption level of food-related enterprises by trainees under the Food Technology program implemented in the Department of Horticulture at K.A.P.G. College, Allahabad from 2017-to 18.

The Study inferred that majority of the respondents were in the middle age group, School level educated, and middle-income group with high mass media exposure. The component of Food Processing Enterprises (FPE). such as Fruit Based Enterprise, Vegetable Based enterprise, Shop Own opening, Marketing, Raw material Supplier, NGOs for cooperatives and Govt. Service was found to be adopted by the majority of the respondents. However, the components such as marketing, own shop opening and raw material supplier were poorly adopted by them and need intensive training in order to develop the skill among the participants.

Keywords

Adoption, Enterprise, Trainees and Personal Profile.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows:

**Dr. Manju Yadav,
Dr. Monika Yadav**

A Study on Personal Profile and Adoption Level of Food Technology Trainees in Relation to Self Employment in Food Processing Enterprises
Vol. XIII, No.1
Article No.01,
pp. 001-007

Similarity Check: 14%

<https://anubooks.com/jgv-vol-xiii-no-1-jan.-june-2022/>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31995/jgv.2022.v13i01.001>

Introduction

Scientific development makes things easy to practice and enhances efficiency in terms of time and capital investment. This ultimately improves income generation, hence happiness. Diversification of agro-based products, agriculture enterprises, innovations, Indigenous Technological Knowledge (ITKs), and crucial inputs has become imperative in limited units of limited resources for not only quality produce and profit optimization but also for employment, sustainability, eco-friendly and holistic development. To achieve such a pilot goal the policymakers, administrators, scientists and even farmers have realized for agriculture produces diversification. In his regard, training is a very potent tool to conceptualize and impart knowledge and transfer the skill to the trainees.

Indiscriminate use of chemicals caused alarming situations in the field of health, food, cloth and the biosphere. We have a rich wealth of I.T.Ks. for quality and yield improvement without any kind of deterioration. Rishi-Krishi, Homa-Farming, Biodynamic and Organic Farming are a few examples of such types of I.T.Ks.

Ascertaining Profiles is an important approach to drawing definite conclusions about the participants. Characters like, cost, education, income, mode of income, social participation, and mass media exposure are critical predictors influencing the skill development and technology adoption. Adoption of FPE. at gross level is a very complex phenomenon which governs by several obvious and hidden factors. Despite similar training package adoption variabilities are observed in a practical situation.

In view of the above facts, it was felt imperative to examine the adoption level of Food Technology trainees in relation to Self Employment in Food Processing enterprises.

Methodology

Respondents were selected purposively because of their potential keenness in the field of food processing. Investigation had covered the eighty respondents from various districts which were actively engaged in Food Processing Program.

For the selection of the respondent, a list of keen respondents from the video area was made. A total of eighty respondents were trained on a specialized subject. For the analysis of personal profiles, the data were collected through the personal interview method. The data relating to the adoption of FPE. were collected with the help of an interview schedule. The collected data were analyzed with the use of simple statistical tools and conclusions were drawn.

Results and discussion

Personal Profile of the Respondents:

Table 1: Personal profile of FPE trainees

Cost Structure	Frequency	Percentage
(a) General	15	18.75
(b) OBCs	55	68.75
(c) SCs & STs	10	12.50
Total	80	100
Educational Qualification		
(a) Illiterate	8	10.00
(b) Primary to middle	15	18.75
(c) School level	42	52.50
(d) Graduate and above	15	18.75
Total	80	100
Annual Income in Rupees		
(a) Low (up to Rs. 30,000)	21	26.25
(b) Medium (more than Rs. 30,000 and up to Rs. 60,000)	40	50.00
(c) High (more than Rs. 60,000)	19	23.75
Total	80	100
Mode of income		
(a) Service	40	50.00
(b) Business	24	30.00
(c) Farming	16	20.00
Total	80	100
Social Participation		
(a) No membership	32	40.00
(b) Member of one organization	23	28.75
(c) Member of More than one organization	14	17.50
(d) office-bearer	11	13.75
Total	80	100
Mass Media Exposure		
(a) Low (up to 25)	25	31.25
(b) Medium (> 25 to 50)	33	41.25
(c) High (> 50)	22	27.50
Total	80	100

Personal Profile included as Cost, Education, Income, Mode of income, Social Participation and Mass Media Exposure in the study.

As revealed in the Table 1, the majority of the trainees (68.75%) were of the OBCs group followed by General (18.75%) and 12.50% SCs & STs. From an

education point of view 52.50 % had school level, 18.75 % each primary and graduate level and only 10.00% were found to be illiterate. The majority of trainees were of medium-income (50%) group followed by 26.25 % low and 23.75% higher income group. Fifty percent were found to belong Service group followed by Business, (30%) and Farming (20 %). Very poor social participation was observed and 40 % were found to that no any membership whereas 28.75% were having one organization membership and 17.50 % with more than two organization membership but only 13.75 % were found to be an office-bearers. In relation to mass media exposure, 41.25 % were medium level followed by low 31.25 % and 27.50% high. The findings are in the conformity with the findings of Patel & Thakkar (1991), Kokate (1980), Mishra (1994) and Rathour (2000).

Adoption of FPE

The analyzed data are given in Table-2

It is evident from the Table-2 that the majority of the trainees (78.10%) who adopted the Food Processing Enterprises were of the OBCs group followed by General (44.30%), SCs & STs group (37.80%); an average of 69.28%, adopted one or more Enterprises and rest (30%), were not found to be adopters of any Enterprise. In education, overwhelming majority of trainees 79.51% adopted is of school level, followed by graduation and above (57.10%), primary to the middle (54.20%) and only 33.33% illiterate. The adoption percentage of 83.80 was greater in the medium income group followed by the higher income group (71.43%) and least (31.25%) in the low-income group. Trainees in the Service group have had higher adoption (75.23%), followed by Business(68.89%), and Farming (51.91%). The role of social participation in adoption was found to be ineffective and 78.81% of adopters had no social linkage while 73.81% of adopters were found to be office bearers and 61.11% were associated with one organization and 54.00% had linkage with more than one organization. Mass media exposure yielded greater adaptability and 70.59%, of adopters, were of high exposure to mass media followed by medium (69.57%) and 67.85% low.

These findings are supported by the findings of Choudhary et. al. (1988) Singh & Singh (1990), Reddy et. al. (1982) and Kokate (1980).

Summary

The majority of trainees were in the middle age group (75.00%) with medium income group (50.00%) and school-level education (61.67%). The Service category (50.00%), with poor social participation (45.00%) and having medium mass media exposure (38.33%). Illiterate (5.00%) and old age (8.33%) participant number was

the least, which indicates that our respondent community structure had changed as compared to those in the early days. Socio-economic status was also found to be medium in nature which is somewhat static in position as compared to the past one. A personal profile such as age, education, income, source of income and mass media exposure had influenced the level of adoption of food processing enterprises significantly.

Conclusion

It can be concluded that this study on the personal profile and adoption level of Food Technology trainees in relation to Self Employment in Food Processing enterprises was found to be significantly effective and the personal profiles of the participants too had affected the adoption of FPE significantly.

References

1. Choudhary, S.D., Sharma, S.S., Gour R.A. (1988). Adoption behavior of trained farmers. *Maharashtra Journal of Extension Education. Vol. VII. Pg. 197-199.*
2. Kokate, K.D. (1980). A stud on training needs as perceived by the farmers of KVK villages (Karnal). Unpublished M.Sc, thesis, Kurukshetra University: NDRI Karnal (Haryana).
3. Mishra, M.K. (1994). Impact of training program of KVK-R.K. Mission divayan in the tribal area of Ranchi district, Bihar. Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, NDRI: Karnal (Haryana).
4. Patel, G.J., Thakkar, K.A. (1991). Training needs of trained and untrained rural women in relation to animal husbandry practices. Paper presented in seminar on “*Training for rural development: prospects and Retrospects*” held at Directorate & Extension Education. Kokan Krishi Vidyapeeth: Dapoi. Nov. 22-23. Pg. 111.
5. Rathore, Rajendra. (2000). A study on information needs and utilization patterns of the farm publications. Published by the Rajasthan Agricultural University, Ph. D Thesis: GBPUA & T., Pantnagar.
6. Reddy, M.V., Reddy, B.L., Rao, V.M., Murthy C.R. (1982). Relationship between farmer’s background and knowledge acquired through farmers training program – An experimental evidence. *Andhra Agricultural Journal. Vol. 29(1). Pg. 75-77.*
7. Singh, M., Singh, M.P. (1990). Training affecting symbolic adoption: A multivariate approach. *Indian Journal of Extension Education Vol. XXVI (1&2) Pg. 61-66.*

Table 2: Adoption of FPE

Personal Profile	Fruit Based Enterprise		Vegetable Based Enterprise		Own Shop Opening		Marketing		Raw Material Supplier		NGOs for Cooperatives		Govt. Service		Total Mean		
	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	Fr., %	
Cost Structure																	
(a) General	15	8 (53.33)	7 (46.67)	4 (26.67)	4 (26.67)	7 (46.67)	4 (26.67)	4 (26.67)	7 (46.67)	5 (33.33)	4 (26.67)	5 (33.33)	4 (26.67)	4 (26.67)	5 (33.33)	4 (26.67)	5.57 (44.30)
(b) OBCs	5	40 (72.72)	38 (69.09)	43 (78.18)	3 (30.00)	43 (78.18)	27 (60.00)	30 (75.00)	40 (72.72)	30 (75.00)	43 (78.18)	30 (75.00)	43 (78.18)	43 (78.18)	30 (75.00)	43 (78.18)	37.28 (67.27)
(c) SCs & STs	10	5 (50.00)	2 (20.00)	3 (30.00)	3 (30.00)	3 (30.00)	3 (30.00)	3 (30.00)	2 (20.00)	3 (30.00)	2 (30.00)	3 (30.00)	2 (30.00)	2 (30.00)	3 (30.00)	2 (30.00)	2.86 (28.60)
Total	80	53 (66.25)	47 (58.75)	50 (62.50)	34 (42.50)	38 (63.33)	31 (38.75)	38 (63.33)	34 (42.50)	38 (63.33)	25 (31.25)	49 (61.25)	49 (61.25)	49 (61.25)	38 (63.33)	45.71 (56.25)	
Educational Qualification																	
(a) Illiterate	8	2 (25.00)	1 (12.50)	2 (25.00)	0 (00.00)	0 (00.00)	0 (00.00)	0 (00.00)	0 (00.00)	0 (00.00)	0 (00.00)	0 (00.00)	2 (25.00)	2 (25.00)	0 (00.00)	1.00 (12.50)	
(b) Primary to middle	15	8 (53.33)	5 (33.33)	7 (46.67)	4 (26.67)	7 (46.67)	4 (26.67)	4 (26.67)	4 (26.67)	4 (26.67)	3 (20.00)	3 (20.00)	8 (55.33)	8 (55.33)	3 (20.00)	5.55 (67.13)	
(c) School level	42	30 (71.42)	35 (83.33)	33 (78.57)	33 (78.57)	24 (57.14)	28 (66.67)	24 (57.14)	28 (66.67)	18 (42.76)	18 (42.76)	35 (83.33)	35 (83.33)	35 (83.33)	18 (42.76)	29.00 (69.04)	
(d) Graduate and above	15	8 (53.33)	7 (46.67)	5 (33.33)	5 (33.33)	3 (20.00)	4 (26.67)	3 (20.00)	4 (26.67)	4 (26.67)	4 (26.67)	7 (46.47)	7 (46.47)	7 (46.47)	4 (26.67)	4.14 (27.60)	
Total	80	48 (60.00)	48 (60.00)	47 (58.65)	31 (38.75)	36 (45.00)	31 (38.75)	38 (63.33)	36 (45.00)	25 (31.25)	52 (65.00)	52 (65.00)	52 (65.00)	52 (65.00)	25 (31.25)	39.69 (48.75)	
Annual Income in Rs.																	
(a) Low (up to Rs. 30,000)	21	7 (33.33)	7 (33.33)	14 (66.66)	3 (14.28)	6 (28.56)	3 (14.28)	3 (14.28)	6 (28.56)	2 (12.67)	2 (12.67)	12 (57.12)	12 (57.12)	12 (57.12)	2 (12.67)	7.28 (34.68)	
(b) Medium (more than Rs. 30,000 and up to Rs. 60,000)	40	28 (93.33)	26 (86.67)	30 (100)	30 (100)	22 (73.33)	21 (70.00)	22 (73.33)	22 (73.33)	21 (70.00)	28 (93.33)	28 (93.33)	28 (93.33)	28 (93.33)	21 (70.00)	25.14 (83.80)	
(c) High (more than 60,000)	19	12 (85.71)	12 (85.71)	10 (71.43)	10 (71.43)	7 (50.00)	7 (50.00)	7 (50.00)	12 (85.71)	5 (35.71)	5 (35.71)	12 (85.71)	12 (85.71)	12 (85.71)	5 (35.71)	10 (71.43)	
Total	80	48 (80.00)	44 (73.33)	50 (83.33)	31 (50.10)	38 (63.33)	31 (50.10)	38 (63.33)	38 (63.33)	28 (46.00)	28 (46.00)	52 (86.67)	52 (86.67)	52 (86.67)	28 (46.00)	41.57 (69.29)	
Mode of Income																	
(a) Service	27	27 (90.00)	24 (80.00)	28 (93.33)	17 (56.67)	20 (66.67)	17 (56.67)	17 (56.67)	20 (66.67)	14 (46.67)	14 (46.67)	28 (93.33)	28 (93.33)	28 (93.33)	14 (46.67)	25.57 (75.23)	
(b) Business	15	15 (78.95)	14 (73.68)	16 (84.21)	9 (47.37)	13 (68.42)	9 (47.37)	9 (47.37)	13 (68.42)	10 (52.63)	10 (52.63)	16 (84.21)	16 (84.21)	16 (84.21)	10 (52.63)	13.28 (68.89)	
(c) Farming	6	6 (54.55)	6 (54.55)	6 (54.55)	5 (45.45)	5 (45.45)	5 (45.45)	5 (45.45)	5 (45.45)	4 (36.36)	4 (36.36)	8 (84.2)	8 (84.2)	8 (84.2)	4 (36.36)	5.71 (51.91)	
Total	48 (80.00)	48 (80.00)	44 (73.33)	50 (83.33)	31 (50.10)	38 (63.33)	31 (50.10)	38 (63.33)	38 (63.33)	28 (46.00)	28 (46.00)	52 (86.67)	52 (86.67)	52 (86.67)	28 (46.00)	41.57 (69.29)	
Social Participation																	
(a) No membership	23	23 (85.19)	23 (85.19)	24 (88.89)	19 (70.37)	20 (74.07)	19 (70.37)	19 (70.37)	20 (74.07)	16 (59.26)	16 (59.26)	24 (88.89)	24 (88.89)	24 (88.89)	16 (59.26)	21.28 (78.81)	
(b) Up to one organization	12	12 (66.67)	11 (61.11)	11 (61.11)	7 (38.89)	10 (55.56)	7 (38.89)	7 (38.89)	10 (55.56)	8 (44.44)	8 (44.44)	50 (83.33)	50 (83.33)	50 (83.33)	8 (44.44)	11.00 (61.11)	
(c) Member of more than one organization	6	6 (66.67)	5 (55.56)	7 (77.78)	3 (33.33)	4 (44.44)	3 (33.33)	3 (33.33)	4 (44.44)	2 (22.22)	2 (22.22)	7 (77.78)	7 (77.78)	7 (77.78)	2 (22.22)	4.86 (54.00)	
(d) office bearer	6	6 (100.00)	5 (83.33)	5 (83.33)	3 (50.00)	4 (66.67)	3 (50.00)	3 (50.00)	4 (66.67)	2 (33.33)	2 (33.33)	6 (100.00)	6 (100.00)	6 (100.00)	2 (33.33)	4.43 (73.81)	
Total	48 (80.00)	48 (80.00)	44 (73.33)	50 (83.33)	31 (50.10)	38 (63.33)	31 (50.10)	38 (63.33)	38 (63.33)	28 (46.00)	28 (46.00)	52 (86.67)	52 (86.67)	52 (86.67)	28 (46.00)	41.57 (69.29)	

Mass Media Exposure										
(a) Low (up to 25)	17 (85.00)	15 (75.00)	16 (80.00)	9 (45.00)	12 (60.00)	9 (45.00)	17 (85.00)	13.57 (67.89)		
(b) Medium (> 25 to 50)	19 (82.61)	18 (78.26)	19 (82.61)	12 (52.17)	13 (56.52)	11 (47.83)	20 (86.96)	16.00 (69.57)		
(c) High (> 50)	12 (70.59)	11 (64.71)	15 (88.24)	10 (58.82)	13 (66.47)	8 (47.06)	15 (88.24)	12.0 (70.59)		
Total	48 (80.00)	44 (73.33)	50 (83.33)	31 (50.10)	38 (63.33)	28 (46.00)	52 (86.67)	41.57 (69.29)		