

## Original Research Article

### **Value added Products of Pearl millet Foods: Adoption and Acceptability by Rural Women**

#### **Abstract**

Investigations were carried out to assess the sensory evaluation (organoleptic tests) and adoption feasibility of different pearl millet products among rural women. Study was conducted in Tonk district of Rajasthan state. Total 25 rural women of Sangrampura, Khandawa, Harbhamata, Palai and Damodarpura villages were selected for this study. Results indicate that on the basis of comparative sensory evaluation and rank wise preferential choice of pearl millet products, majority of women accepted *ladoo* (mean score 2.68) and *shakarapare* (mean score 2.50) which got rank I and II and salty products ranked III and IV. Overall adoption feasibility of these products was 79 per cent which means high level of adoption of these products.

**Key words:** Value addition, Pearl millet, Organoleptic tests, Adoption feasibility

#### **Introduction**

Pearl millet provides staple food for millions under the most vulnerable farming system in dry and semi-arid regions of Asia and Africa. Pearl millet is well adapted to drought prone areas, low soil fertility and high temperature situations. In India, it is the fourth most important cereal crop after rice, wheat and sorghum. In Rajasthan its average area of production is 3.47 million hectare, productivity 1436 kg per ha in 2021-22. It is nutritionally superior to major cereals with respect to protein, energy, vitamins and minerals (Singh 2003). Besides, millets are also rich source of dietary fibre, phytochemicals, micronutrients and nutriceals. In view of health and nutritional benefits and to sustain the production of bajra, it becomes necessary to promote these nutria-cereals among masses. Though, pearl millet is good as far as nutritive value is concerned, but still there are some major constraints that obstacle its diversified utilization. One of the major constraints with the utilization of pearl millet is the property of the flour to acquire a rancid odour within few days of milling. Various processing techniques like malting, blanching, sprouting, dry heat treatment, fermentation and soaking can be used to overcome these constraints.

The processing technique not only helps in improving the availability of nutrients but also enhance the shelf life of pearl millet flour. Pearl millet grains are very high in calories and that's why they do wonders for growing children and pregnant women. To overcome the problems of under-nutrition and over-nutrition there is need to develop value added fibre rich

Comment [U1]: Reference may be given

Comment [U2]: Ref.

Comment [U3]: ref

products from cereals and nutritional evaluation of new crop varieties and preparation of value added products.

### Research Methodology

The present study was conducted in Tonk district of Rajasthan state during 2021 and 2022. Five villages namely, Sangrampura, Khandawa, Harbhamata, Palai and Damodarpura were selected randomly. A total of 25 rural women respondents were selected purposively from these villages who had interest in getting new skills for making value added products of pearl millet. A well designed intervention programme comprised of motivational lectures, demonstrations, training programme and literature was provided to rural women. During training programme value added products of pearl millet namely, *ladoo*, *matar*, *sev* and *shakarpare* were prepared in front of them and given them to taste these. Results are presented in terms of organoleptic (sensory) evaluation of each products, comparative and rank wise preferential choice of each product and adoption feasibility of pearl millet products.

### Results and Discussion

Sensory evaluation means to explore the possibility of acceptance of pearl millet products on the basis of five parameters viz., colour, texture, taste, flavours and appearance. The data in Table 1 indicate that taste of pearl millet *ladoo* by rural women respondents were preferred to appreciate extent (mean score 2.80) and got rank I followed by flavor (mean score 2.76), colour (mean score 2.68) and got rank II and III respectively. Sensory evaluation score assigned to pearl millet *matar* depicted that taste of *matar* was appreciated by majority of the rural women and got rank I (mean score 2.64) followed by flavor (mean score 2.48) and appearance (mean score 2.34) having rank II and III respectively. Whereas, sensory evaluation score of *sev* and *shakarpare* in terms of various parameters were comparatively the same as in the other products and also appreciated by majority of respondents in respect of their taste, flavor and texture.

Data presented in Table 2 on overall acceptability or acceptance of different pearl millet product, clearly show that sweet pearl millet products i.e. *ladoo* and *shakarpare* were preferred to maximum extent of appreciable (mean score 2.68 and 2.50, respectively) and got rank I and II, whereas salty products got rank III and IV having mean score 2.39 and 2.20, respectively.

Table 3 shows the data regarding perceived feasibility of pearl millet products, overall adoption feasibility index was found 79 per cent which means of high percentage of adoption feasibility. However, highest score was obtained on practicability attributes i.e. 96.8 per cent. This might be due to the facts that rural women respondents found these products were easily

Comment [U4]: procedure and composition an scientific base

Comment [U5]: Ref. and scale to be given clearly

demonstrable and triable. This trend was followed by simplicity (81.3 %), relative advantage (77.6%) and compatibility (61.3%). These results are in consonance with Sain (2003) and Malik and Verma (2014). This might be due to the fact that rural women found these products having low initial costs, physically, culturability and socially compatible and easy to demonstrable to other fellow or rural women.

**Table 1: Sensory evaluation of pearl millet products**

N=25

| Characters                | Response Categories |                      |                 | Total Score | Mean Score  | Rank |
|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|------|
|                           | Appreciable         | Somewhat Appreciable | Not Appreciable |             |             |      |
| <i>Ladoo</i>              |                     |                      |                 |             |             |      |
| Colour                    | 17 (51)             | 8 (16)               | 0 (0)           | 67          | 2.68        | III  |
| Texture                   | 16 (48)             | 8 (16)               | 1 (1)           | 65          | 2.60        | IV   |
| Taste                     | 20 (60)             | 5 (10)               | 0 (0)           | 70          | 2.80        | I    |
| Flavour                   | 19 (57)             | 6 (12)               | 0 (0)           | 69          | 2.76        | II   |
| Appearance                | 17 (51)             | 5 (10)               | 3(3)            | 64          | 2.56        | V    |
| <b>Overall Acceptance</b> |                     |                      |                 | <b>335</b>  | <b>2.68</b> |      |
| <i>Matar</i>              |                     |                      |                 |             |             |      |
| Colour                    | 11 (33)             | 7(14)                | 7 (7)           | 54          | 2.16        | V    |
| Texture                   | 12 (36)             | 8 (16)               | 5 (5)           | 57          | 2.28        | IV   |
| Taste                     | 16 (48)             | 9 (18)               | 0 (0)           | 66          | 2.64        | I    |
| Flavour                   | 15 (45)             | 7 (14)               | 3 (3)           | 62          | 2.48        | II   |
| Appearance                | 14 (42)             | 6 (12)               | 5 (5)           | 59          | 2.34        | III  |
| <b>Overall Acceptance</b> |                     |                      |                 | <b>298</b>  | <b>2.39</b> |      |
| <i>Sev</i>                |                     |                      |                 |             |             |      |
| Colour                    | 11 (33)             | 6 (12)               | 8 (8)           | 53          | 2.12        | IV   |
| Texture                   | 14 (42)             | 3 (6)                | 8 (8)           | 56          | 2.24        | II   |
| Taste                     | 13 (39)             | 8 (16)               | 4 (4)           | 59          | 2.36        | I    |
| Flavour                   | 12 (36)             | 6 (12)               | 7 (7)           | 55          | 2.20        | III  |
| Appearance                | 11 (33)             | 5 (10)               | 9 (9)           | 52          | 2.08        | V    |
| <b>Overall Acceptance</b> |                     |                      |                 | <b>275</b>  | <b>2.20</b> |      |
| <i>Shakarpore</i>         |                     |                      |                 |             |             |      |
| Colour                    | 15 (45)             | 6 (12)               | 4 (4)           | 61          | 2.44        | IV   |
| Texture                   | 13 (39)             | 9 (18)               | 3 (3)           | 60          | 2.40        | V    |
| Taste                     | 17 (51)             | 8 (16)               | 0 (0)           | 67          | 2.68        | I    |
| Flavour                   | 15 (45)             | 9 (18)               | 1 (1)           | 64          | 2.56        | II   |
| Appearance                | 15 (45)             | 8 (16)               | 2 (2)           | 63          | 2.52        | III  |
| <b>Overall Acceptance</b> |                     |                      |                 | <b>315</b>  | <b>2.50</b> |      |

Comment [U6]: waht is value in brace as N=25 waht is 51

**Table 2: Comparative sensory evaluation and rank wise preferential choice of pearl millet products**

N=25

| Characters                | Pearl millet Products |              |            |                   |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------|-------------------|
|                           | <i>Ladoo</i>          | <i>Matar</i> | <i>Sev</i> | <i>Shakarpare</i> |
| Colour                    | 2.68                  | 2.16         | 2.12       | 2.44              |
| Texture                   | 2.60                  | 2.28         | 2.24       | 2.40              |
| Taste                     | 2.80                  | 2.64         | 2.36       | 2.68              |
| Flavour                   | 2.76                  | 2.48         | 2.20       | 2.56              |
| Appearance                | 2.56                  | 2.40         | 2.08       | 2.52              |
| <b>Overall Acceptance</b> | 2.68                  | 2.39         | 2.20       | 2.50              |
| <b>Rank</b>               | <b>I</b>              | <b>III</b>   | <b>IV</b>  | <b>II</b>         |

**Table 3: Perceived adoption feasibility of pearl millet products**

N=25

| Attribute                    | Response Category |              |              | Total Score | Mean Score | Rank |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|------------|------|
|                              | Agree(3)          | Undecided(2) | Disagreed(1) |             |            |      |
| <b>Relative Advantage</b>    |                   |              |              |             |            |      |
| Low initial costs            | 12 (36)           | 13 (26)      | 0 (0)        | 62          | 2.48       | I    |
| Monetary benefits            | 11 (33)           | 9 (18)       | 5 (5)        | 56          | 2.24       | IV   |
| Consistency of use           | 10 (30)           | 13 (26)      | 2 (2)        | 58          | 2.32       | III  |
| Time saving                  | 9 (27)            | 12 (24)      | 4 (4)        | 55          | 2.20       | V    |
| Multiple use potential       | 12 (36)           | 11 (22)      | 2 (2)        | 60          | 2.40       | II   |
| <b>Total</b>                 |                   |              |              | <b>291</b>  |            |      |
| <b>AFI = 77.6%</b>           |                   |              |              |             |            |      |
| <b>Compatibility</b>         |                   |              |              |             |            |      |
| Cultural                     | 16 (48)           | 9 (18)       | 0 (0)        | 66          | 2.64       | I    |
| Physical                     | 15 (45)           | 10 (20)      | 0 (0)        | 65          | 2.60       | II   |
| Social                       | 12 (36)           | 7 (14)       | 6 (6)        | 56          | 2.24       | III  |
| Situational                  | 10 (30)           | 10 (20)      | 5 (5)        | 55          | 2.20       | IV   |
| Relational                   | 6 (18)            | 10 (20)      | 9 (9)        | 47          | 1.88       | V    |
| <b>Total</b>                 |                   |              |              | <b>289</b>  |            |      |
| <b>AFI = 77.2%</b>           |                   |              |              |             |            |      |
| <b>Simplicity/Complexity</b> |                   |              |              |             |            |      |
| Cognitive simplicity         | 19 (57)           | 6 (12)       | 0 (0)        | 69          | 2.76       | III  |
| Application simplicity       | 21 (63)           | 4 (8)        | 0 (0)        | 71          | 2.84       | II   |
| Resource Simplicity          | 0 (0)             | 11 (22)      | 14 (14)      | 36          | 1.44       | V    |
| Reversibility                | 25 (75)           | 0 (0)        | 0 (0)        | 75          | 3.00       | I    |
| Increase Efficiency          | 8 (24)            | 13 (26)      | 4 (4)        | 54          | 2.16       | IV   |
| <b>Total</b>                 |                   |              |              | <b>305</b>  |            |      |

| <b>AFI = 81.3%</b>         |         |         |       |            |      |     |
|----------------------------|---------|---------|-------|------------|------|-----|
| <b>Practicability</b>      |         |         |       |            |      |     |
| Communicability            | 15 (45) | 10 (20) | 0 (0) | 65         | 2.60 | III |
| Visibility of results      | 25 (75) | 0 (0)   | 0 (0) | 75         | 3.00 | I   |
| Demonstrability            | 23 (69) | 2 (2)   | 0 (0) | 73         | 2.92 | II  |
| Triability                 | 25 (75) | 0 (0)   | 0 (0) | 75         | 3.00 | I   |
| Provision of modification  | 25 (75) | 0 (0)   | 0 (0) | 75         | 3.00 | I   |
| <b>Total</b>               |         |         |       | <b>363</b> |      |     |
| <b>AFI = 96.8%</b>         |         |         |       |            |      |     |
| <b>Overall AFI = 79.0%</b> |         |         |       |            |      |     |

### **Conclusion**

Results indicated that there was high extent of appreciation of pearl millet products among rural women and they appreciated sweet products (*ladoo* and *shakarpare*) more in comparison to salty products. This means they appreciated these products irrespective of their taste, flavor, texture etc. However, overall adoption feasibility index of pearl millet products was 79 per cent which means high level of adoption.

### **REFERENCES**

- Malik, Preeti and Verma, Sashi Kanta, 2014. Capacity building of Haryana rural women through pearl millet products. In: National Seminar on “Life skills and youth developments : Challenges & Prospects”. Feb 12, 2014. Pp 137-140
- Sain, K. 2003. Acceptability of pearl millet products among rural women. M.Sc Thesis, CCS, HAU Hisar
- Singh, G. 2003. Development and nutritional evaluation of value added products from pearl millet. Ph.D Thesis, CCS HAU, Hisar