

International Journal of Agriculture Extension and Social Development

Volume 7; Issue 4; April 2024; Page No. 600-603

Received: 06-01-2024
Accepted: 10-02-2024

Indexed Journal
Peer Reviewed Journal

Perception of Rural Women towards RKVY Trainings on post-harvest interventions and value addition

¹Bharti, ²Dr. Vandana Verma, ³Dr. Rajesh Dahiya and ⁴Neha Yadav

¹Ph.D. Student, Department of Extension Education and Communication Management, I.C. College of Community Science, CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar, Haryana, India

^{2,2}Assistant Professor, Department of Extension Education and Communication Management, I.C. College of Community Science, CCS Haryana Agricultural University.

⁴M.Sc. Student, Department of Extension Education and Communication Management, I.C. College of Community Science, CCS Haryana Agricultural University.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33545/26180723.2024.v7.i4h.577>

Corresponding Author: Bharti

Abstract

Agriculture is the backbone of the Indian economy which plays the most significant role in the socio-economic development of the country. In India, agriculture contributes about 17-18 percent of the GDP (Economic survey 2017-18) and 10 percent of total exports. Indian Agriculture, a mixture of agro ecological conditions interspersed with equally diverse levels of land holding has got all the elements of the successful enterprise. The present study was conducted in Hisar and Fatehabad districts of Haryana under RKVY project. Five days training along intervention was provided in four villages namely Kharad Alipur and Gawar (Hisar) Dharania and Aherwan (Fatehabad) to 120 rural women by selecting 30 from each village and each training. Trainings were imparted on four aspects on post-harvest intervention & value-addition. Utility and coverage of training was assessed in terms of training effectiveness index which was found highest for post-harvest intervention & value-addition in vegetables 82.11%, fruits 79.44%, wheat 79.03% and pulses 76.73 percent respectively. Utility scores were found highest for methods of value-addition and post-harvest interventions in vegetables WMS 2.53, mixed vegetable pickle WMS 2.5 and garlic & ginger pickle WMS 2.49 respectively.

Keywords: Post-harvest interventions, value addition, perception, food processing, entrepreneur

Introduction

Agriculture is the leading sector of Indian economy because more than half of the workforce in the country is involved in agriculture. Agricultural growth plays a significant role in attaining certain national goals such as reducing rural poverty, providing food security, supplying raw materials to major food industries and wide variety of crops for food market.

A strong and dynamic food processing sector plays an important role in the overall economic growth of a country. Post-harvest intervention is necessary to protect the food from spoilage. Post-harvest interventions include different techniques at every stage of food processing like harvesting, cleaning, drying, handling, storage, packaging, transportation, pre-cooling, cooling all these stages need different techniques to reduce losses. Techniques are used as per the product, environment, socio-economic factors and availability of resources. A wide range of technologies were developed for the small farmers and large producers so, that quality food can be provided in all over the world. Post-harvests intervention can give great extend to the entrepreneurs started by women in rural areas. By using low cost food processing technologies availability of food products can be increased by farm women. At every stage of

food processing value addition is done in food products. Value addition and post-harvest interventions provides a great chance to the rural women for their self-employment and entrepreneurs. Empowerment of women can be done by making them self-employed through the training on value addition in food products and recognize the losses during food processing. Training is the most important method for empowering rural women. Different value-added products and food processing practices can be demonstrated to the rural women in training period. Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana was initiated in 2007 as an umbrella scheme for ensuring holistic development of agriculture and allied sectors by allowing states to choose their own agriculture and allied sector development activities as per the district/state agriculture plan. Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana aims at attaining 4 percent annual growth in agriculture sector during XI Plan period by ensuring a holistic development of agriculture and allied sector. Training on post-harvest intervention and value addition conducted under RKVY project helps in women empowerment because both have significant role in economic growth in agricultural field. Training and intervention are not sufficient to bring desirable changes for human development if proper feedback is not achieved. Thus, an effort has been

made to study the impact of training on rural women under RKVY project.

Objective/hypothesis of the study

- To analyze the effectiveness of trainings under RKVY project
- To Assess the impact of trainings on rural women

The study is also an attempt in the direction of highlighting the existing knowledge, attitude and skill acquisition of beneficiaries towards trainings on post-harvest intervention & value addition in fruits, vegetables, wheat and pulses. The information made through this research will be of great use to planners and policy makers involved in promotion of post-harvest intervention & value addition for diversification in agriculture and economic upliftment in rural areas.

Materials and Methods

The present studies were conducted during the year 2013-15 in Hisar and Fatehabad districts of Haryana state, under National Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana Project "Empowerment of rural women through value addition and post-harvest interventions" founded by Government of India.

Participants: 120 rural women of 4 villages/4 trainings i.e. 30 each on the aspects of post-harvest intervention & Value addition in fruits, vegetables, wheat & pulses were selected randomly.

Instruments: Interview schedule, booklet, lectures, demonstration, posters & charts.

Statistical analysis: Frequency, percentage, mean score, weighted mean score, indices & rank. Perception of respondents about training effectiveness index was calculated in terms of utility and coverage of training by the formula given below:

$$TEI = \frac{\text{Obtained utility score} + \text{Obtained coverage score}}{\text{Total obtainable score}} \times 100$$

Procedure

- Random selection of respondents.
- Motivation lectures & group discussion for involvement.
- Demonstration & skill-based approach for KAP.
- Reinforcement through literature & post training visits.

Results and Discussion

Utility & coverage of training on post-harvest intervention & value-addition in fruits

The training effectiveness index presented in table 1 indicated the perception of respondents towards usefulness & coverage of subject matter. Overall TEI was found 79.44% for all aspects covered under training on post-harvest intervention & value-addition in fruits. However, highest TEI was found in methods of value-addition and

post-harvest interventions in fruits 82.78% followed by syrup/squashes 80.74%, jam 78.89%, soup 77.96% & ketchup 76.85% respectively. Whereas, maximum utility score was found in syrup/squashes (2.42 WMS) & highest coverage score was found in methods of value-addition and post-harvest interventions in fruits (2.56 WMS). Similar trends were observed in the results of Dahiya *et al.* (2015)^[2] and Anju (2020)^[1].

Utility & coverage of training on post-harvest intervention & value-addition in vegetables:

The results in table 2 revealed that overall TEI was found 82.11 percent for all aspects of training on post-harvest intervention & value-addition in vegetables. However, highest TEI was found in garlic & ginger pickle 84.62% followed by mixed vegetable pickle 83.37%, methods of value-addition and post-harvest interventions in vegetables 83.33%, chutney 80.92% & potato chips 78.0% respectively. Methods of value-addition and post-harvest interventions in vegetables were given first rank in utility with (2.53 WMS) & garlic & ginger pickle was given 1st rank in coverage of subject matter with (2.57 WMS). Majority of the respondents found that training on post-harvest intervention & value-addition in vegetables was very much useful and well covered. The results are in consonance with the findings of Nisha (2017)^[9] and Anju (2020)^[1]

Utility & coverage of training on post-harvest intervention & value-addition in wheat

The data in table 3 depicted that overall training effectiveness index of the respondents regarding post-harvest intervention & value-addition in wheat was found 79.03 percent. It is also clear from table that highest TEI was found in methods of value-addition and post-harvest interventions in wheat 81.67% followed by nutritional burfi 79.25%, nutritional Ladoo 78.89%, Namakpara 78.70% & Shakarpara 76.67% respectively. First rank was given to nutritional Ladoo with (2.37 WMS) in utility & methods of value-addition and post-harvest interventions in wheat were given 1st rank in coverage with (2.53 WMS) as compared to other aspects. Similar trends were observed in the findings of Kiran (2016)^[7] and Dahiya *et al.* (2018)^[3]

Utility & coverage of training on post-harvest intervention & value-addition in pulses

The overall TEI in pulses training was 76.73 percent in terms of utility & coverage of training. Whereas in comparison to all aspects highest TEI was observed in moongdal ladoo 78.14% followed by methods of value-addition and post-harvest interventions in pulses 77.22%, sprouts salad 77.03%, sprouts 76.11% & sprout chat 75.18% respectively. Maximum utility score was found in methods of value-addition and post-harvest interventions in pulses (2.3 WMS) & highest coverage score was found in moongdal ladoo (2.42 WMS). Most of the respondents found that all trainings were very much useful & well covered. These results were also supported by the studies of Sachan (2016)^[10] and Dahiya *et al.* (2018)^[4]

Table 1: Perception of respondents about utility and coverage of subject matter on post-harvest intervention & value-addition in fruits

Sr. No.	Aspects	Utility					Coverage					TEI
		VU	U	NU	WMS	Rank	WC	MC	NC	WMS	Rank	
1.	Methods of value-addition and post-harvest interventions in fruits	15(50.00)	12(40.00)	03(10.00)	2.4	II	18(60.00)	11(36.67)	01(3.33)	2.56	I	82.78
2.	Syrup/ squashes	15(50.00)	13(43.33)	02(6.67)	2.42	I	16(53.33)	12(40.00)	02(6.67)	2.43	III	80.74
	▪ Ingredients	16(53.33)	12(40.00)	02(6.67)			14(46.67)	12(40.00)	04(13.33)			
	▪ Method	12(40.00)	17(56.67)	01(3.33)			17(56.67)	10(33.33)	03(10.00)			
	▪ Precautions											
3.	Jam	14(46.67)	14(46.67)	02(6.67)	2.27	IV	14(46.67)	15(50.00)	01(3.33)	2.46	II	78.89
	▪ Ingredients	11(36.67)	16(53.33)	03(10.00)			15(50.00)	12(40.00)	03(10.00)			
	▪ Method	9(30.00)	17(56.67)	04(13.33)			16(53.33)	14(46.67)	-			
	▪ Precautions											
4.	Soup	17(56.67)	12(40.00)	01(3.33)	2.29	III	13(43.33)	16(53.33)	01(3.33)	2.3	V	77.96
	▪ Ingredients	15(50.00)	14(46.67)	01(3.33)			12(40.00)	15(50.00)	03(10.00)			
	▪ Method	10(33.33)	14(46.67)	06(20.00)			10(33.33)	16(53.33)	04(13.33)			
	▪ Precautions											
5.	Ketchup	13(43.33)	14(46.67)	03(10.00)	2.26	V	15(50.00)	15(50.00)	-	2.35	IV	76.85
	▪ Ingredients	11(36.67)	18(60.00)	01(3.33)			12(40.00)	16(53.33)	02(6.67)			
	▪ Method	08(26.67)	19(63.33)	03(10.00)			10(33.33)	17(56.67)	03(10.00)			
	▪ Precautions											

Overall TEI= 79.44, VU= very useful U= useful NU= not useful, WC= well covered MC= medium covered NC= not covered

Table 2: Perception of respondents about utility and coverage of subject matter on post-harvest intervention & value-addition in vegetables

Sr. No.	Aspects	Utility					Coverage					TEI
		VU	U	NU	WMS	Rank	WC	MC	NC	WMS	Rank	
1.	Methods of value-addition and post-harvest interventions in vegetables	16(53.33)	14(46.67)	-	2.53	I	16(53.33)	12(40.00)	02(6.67)	2.46	IV	83.33
2.	Mixed vegetable pickle	18(60.00)	11(36.67)	01(3.33)	2.5	II	19(63.33)	09(30.00)	02(6.67)	2.52	II	83.70
	▪ Ingredients	15(50.00)	13(43.33)	02(6.67)			17(56.67)	13(43.33)	-			
	▪ Method	15(50.00)	15(50.00)	-			14(46.67)	15(50.00)	01(3.33)			
	▪ Precautions											
3.	Chutney	16(53.33)	09(30.00)	05(16.67)	2.34	IV	18(60.00)	12(40.00)	-	2.51	III	80.92
	▪ Ingredients	13(43.33)	11(36.67)	06(20.00)			15(50.00)	12(40.00)	3(10.00)			
	▪ Method	15(50.00)	13(43.33)	02(6.67)			16(53.33)	14(46.67)	-			
	▪ Precautions											
4.	Potato chips	11(36.67)	15(50.00)	04(13.33)	2.25	V	15(50.00)	14(46.67)	01(3.33)	2.42	V	78.0
	▪ Ingredients	10(33.33)	14(46.67)	06(20.00)			12(40.00)	16(53.33)	02(6.67)			
	▪ Method	13(43.33)	16(53.33)	01(3.33)			14(46.67)	16(53.33)	-			
	▪ Precautions											
5.	Garlic & Ginger pickle	16(53.33)	14(46.67)	-	2.49	III	19(63.33)	08(26.67)	03(10.00)	2.57	I	84.62
	▪ Ingredients	12(40.00)	15(50.00)	03(10.00)			17(56.67)	11(36.67)	02(6.67)			
	▪ Method	20(66.67)	10(33.33)	-			21(70.00)	09(30.00)	-			
	▪ Precautions											

Overall TEI= 82.11

Table 3: Perception of respondents about utility and coverage of subject matter on post-harvest intervention & value-addition in wheat

Sr. No.	Aspects	Utility					Coverage					TEI
		VU	U	NU	WMS	Rank	WC	MC	NC	WMS	Rank	
1.	Methods of value-addition and post-harvest interventions in wheat	14(46.67)	13(43.33)	03(10.00)	2.36	II	17(56.67)	12(40.00)	01(3.33)	2.53	I	81.67
2.	Nutritional Burfi	12(40.00)	16(53.33)	02(6.67)	2.35	III	16(53.33)	11(36.67)	03(10.00)	2.4	II	79.25
	▪ Ingredients	15(50.00)	11(36.67)	04(13.33)			15(50.00)	12(40.00)	03(10.00)			
	▪ Method	13(43.33)	15(50.00)	02(6.67)			12(40.00)	17(56.67)	01(3.33)			
	▪ Precautions											
3.	Namakpara	11(36.67)	16(53.33)	03(10.00)	2.33	IV	14(46.67)	12(40.00)	04(13.33)	2.38	III	78.70
	▪ Ingredients	14(46.67)	15(50.00)	01(3.33)			15(50.00)	13(43.33)	02(6.67)			
	▪ Method	12(40.00)	15(50.00)	03(10.00)			14(46.67)	14(46.67)	02(6.67)			
	▪ Precautions											
4.	Shakarpara	09(30.00)	17(56.67)	04(13.33)	2.24	V	10(33.33)	18(60.00)	02(6.67)	2.35	V	76.67
	▪ Ingredients	11(36.67)	18(60.00)	01(3.33)			12(40.00)	16(53.33)	02(6.67)			
	▪ Method	12(40.00)	13(43.33)	05(16.67)			15(50.00)	14(46.67)	01(3.33)			
	▪ Precautions											

5.	Nutritional laddoo	13(43.33)	16(53.33)	01(3.33)	2.37	I	13(43.33)	15(50.00)	02(6.67)	2.36	IV	78.89
	▪ Ingredients	12(40.00)	14(46.67)	04(13.33)			14(46.67)	13(43.33)	03(10.00)			
	▪ Method	16(53.33)	11(36.67)	03(10.00)			15(50.00)	11(36.67)	04(13.33)			

Overall TEI= 79.0

Table 4: Perception of respondents about utility and coverage of subject matter on post-harvest intervention & value-addition in pulses

Sr. No.	Aspects	Utility					Coverage					TEI
		VU	U	NU	WMS	Rank	WC	MC	NC	WMS	Rank	
1.	Methods of value-addition and post-harvest interventions in pulses	12(40.00)	15(50.00)	03(10.00)	2.3	I	12(40.00)	16(53.33)	02(6.67)	2.4	I	77.22
2.	Sprouts	10(33.33)	17(56.67)	03(10.00)	2.24	IV	13(43.33)	14(46.67)	03(10.00)	2.32	V	76.11
	▪ Ingredients	09(30.00)	16(53.33)	05(16.67)			12(40.00)	17(56.67)	01(3.33)			
	▪ Method	13(43.33)	15(50.00)	02(6.67)			11(36.67)	16(53.33)	03(10.00)			
3.	Moongdal Laddoo	13(43.33)	12(40.00)	05(16.67)	2.26	III	14(46.67)	15(50.00)	01(3.33)	2.22	II	78.14
	• Ingredients	11(36.67)	13(43.33)	06(20.00)			15(50.00)	13(43.33)	02(6.67)			
	• Method	15(50.00)	11(36.67)	04(13.33)			14(46.67)	12(40.00)	04(13.33)			
4.	Sprout chat	8(26.67)	15(50.00)	7(23.33)	2.14	V	14(46.67)	13(43.33)	03(10.00)	2.36	IV	75.18
	▪ Ingredients	12(40.00)	14(46.67)	4(13.33)			16(53.33)	12(40.00)	02(6.67)			
	▪ Method	10(33.33)	14(46.67)	6(20.00)			12(40.00)	14(46.67)	04(13.33)			
5.	Sprouts salad	11(36.67)	15(50.00)	04(13.33)	2.27	II	15(50.00)	14(46.67)	01(3.33)	2.37	III	77.03
	▪ Ingredients	09(30.00)	18(60.00)	03(10.00)			10(33.33)	18(60.00)	02(6.67)			
	▪ Method	12(40.00)	16(53.33)	02(6.67)			13(43.33)	15(50.00)	02(6.67)			

Overall TEI= 76.7

Conclusion

It can be concluded from the studies of RKVY project that trainings on the aspects of post-harvest interventions & value addition in fruits, vegetables, wheat & pulses were perceived very useful by the respondents. They perceived the subject matter very useful and well covered by the experts and subject matter specialist which were covered during intervention provided to the respondents. They succeeded in acquiring need based skills for entrepreneurship developments through agriculture & allied sectors in rural areas.

References

- Anju. Impact assessment of RKVY project: Livelihood and food security of rural women through diversified agriculture activities [M.Sc. Thesis]. Hisar: CCS Haryana Agricultural University; c2020.
- Dahiya R, Dahiya S, Kawatra A, Sangwan V. Value added Pearl millet Products- A tool for nutrition enrichment. Int. J Fam Home Sci. 2015;11(3):299-305.
- Dahiya R, Mehta S. Empowerment of SHG's Through Dairying a Milk Processing. Anim. Agri. Bio Res. 2018;23(1):118-121.
- Dahiya R, Yadav S. Learning index of Trainees Regarding Apparel Designing and Construction. Indian J Soc. Res. 2018;59(5):657-670.
- Government of India (GOI). Economic survey, Ministry of Finance, Economic Division, New Delhi. <http://esaharyana.gov.in>. Published; c2014.
- Grewal RB. Grain processing: cereals, pulses and oil seeds. Paper presented at: Brain storming workshop on post-harvest technology and value addition in Haryana. Haryana Kisan Ayog; c2014.
- Kiran B. Impact assessment of cutting and tailoring

- trainings organized by KVK for scheduled caste women [M.Sc. Thesis]. Hisar: CCS Haryana Agricultural University; c2016.
- Krishna MM. Abstract: On-Farm Processing and Value Addition. Integrated farming systems for sustainable agriculture and enhancement of rural livelihood. Retired ICAR employee's association (RICAREA), Hyderabad 500030, Telangana, India; c2015.
- Nisha. Impact assessment of food processing trainings on scheduled caste women [M.Sc. Thesis]. Hisar: CCS Haryana Agricultural University; c2017.
- Sachan D. Impact assessment of garment construction trainings on scheduled caste women [M.Sc. Thesis]. Hisar: CCS Haryana Agricultural University; c2016.