Himachal Journal of Agricultural Research Vol. 32(1) : 151-153, 2006

Short Note

A study on satisfaction level derived from the performance of selected equipment

Jatinder Kishtwaria, Aruna Rana and Shivani Vyas
Department of Family Resource Management,
College of Home Science
CSK Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalya, Palampur- 176 062.

With the opening of global market, numbers of equipment are launched in Indian market. All these tools and appliances are not suitable for Indian workers since they are designed according to foreign specifications and standards which have variations in physical dimensions, socio-economic status of the Indian users. Therefore, all these equipment are not able to satisfy the consumers. Sangwan and Kiran (1987) studied the rank order of usage of household gadgets in the kitchen and listed the rank order as mixie, gas, lighter, oven, heater, toaster, immersion rod, table-fan, hot plate, refrigerator etc. It was found that these appliances were generally used to save time and energy as well as drudgery.

The main goal of research related to equipment is to identify the most commonly used equipment (tools, utensils and appliances) by urban and rural families and satisfaction derived from all these equipment. The study has been framed to study the satisfaction level of respondents from all types of selected kitchen equipment by urban and rural families.

Multiple random sampling technique was used for selection of respondents. A complete list of municipal wards in the Palampur municipal council was obtained from which three wards were chosen randomly. A separate list of villages around Palampur town in a periphery of 3-5 kms was prepared, from which villages were selected at random. In the selected wards and villages, list of households was prepared from which a random sample of 80 households (40 from municipal council's area and 40 from periphery villages) were chosen through proportional allocation method. The satisfaction level was sought in terms of 'excellent', 'good', 'satisfactory' and 'poor' which were scored as '4', '3', '2' and '1', respectively.

The results revealed that majority of the respondents belonged to the age group of 20-35 years, both in case of rural (70 %) and urban (65 %) households. Majority of respondents in urban (67.5%) and rural area (45 %) were graduates. Similar results were given by Kalra (2000) and Mathur (2001). Majority in urban (22.5 %) and in rural area (15 %) had an income range of Rs. 10,001 to 15,000 per month. Majority belonged to nuclear families both in urban (80 %) as well as in rural (55 %) area. Out of total sample, 70 per cent from urban area had a family size upto four members whereas, in rural families majority (55 %) belonged to family size between 5-9 members.

Possession of different types of kitchen equipment: The common equipment possessed by the sampled households (both in case of urban and rural) included skillet, vessel , pressure cooker, sauce pan, frying pan, griddle, knife, vegetable peeler, lemon squeezer, sand-wich maker and mixer-cum-grinder. All above-mentioned equipment were selected on the basis of selection criteria i.e. equipment at least used by 50 per cent respondents both in case of urban and rural families. These results were supported by Dhablania (1992) who revealed that urban families were possessing and using more, time and energy saving devices than their rural counterparts.

Satisfaction derived from all types of selected kitchen equipment Urban households: Majority of respondents were satisfied with the performance of knife and lemon squeezer and least were satisfied while using frying pan. The respondents were moderately satisfied by the use of remaining equipment namely skillet, pressure cooker, vessel, griddle, mixer-cum-grinder, sauce pan, sand-wich maker and vegetable peeler (Table 1).

Majority of respondents in rural areas were

satisfied with the performance of mixer-cum-grinder and vessel and were least satisfied with the performance of skillet. The respondents were moderately satisfied by the use of remaining equipment under study namely lemon squeezer, sand-wich maker, sauce pan, pressure cooker, vegetable peeler, knife, griddle and frying pan (Table 2). Similarly Kaur (2001) reported that most of respondents in rural area i.e. 68 per cent were satisfied with the performance of knife

Table 1. Distribution of respondents according to the satisfaction derived from performance of all type of selected equipment by urban families

Sr. No.	Equipment	Estimated scores in descending order	Group
1.	Knife	145	High
2.	Lemon squeezer	138	
3.	Skillet	118	
4.	Pressure cooker	116	
5.	Vessel	116	
6.	Griddle	107	Medium
7.	Mixer-cum-grinder	106	
8.	Sauce pan	105	
9.	Sand-wich maker	104	
10.	Vegetable peeler	99	
11.	Frying pan	91	Low

Mean (X) = 113.8; Standard error (S.E.) = 16.1; Sample size (n) = 40, Possible score value = 40-160.

Table 2. Distribution of respondents according to the satisfaction derived from all type of selected equipment by rural families

Sr. No.	Equipment	Estimated scores in descending order	Group
1.	Mixer-cum-grinder	152	High
2.	Vessel	134	
3.	Lemon squeezer	133	
4.	Sand-wich maker	130	
5.	Sauce pan	128	
6.	Pressure cooker	126	
7.	Vegetable peeler	118	Medium
8.	Knife	110	
9.	Griddle	106	
10.	Frying pan	96	
11.	Skillet	79	Low

Mean (X) = 111.3; Standard error (S.E.) = 22.0; Sample size (n) = 40, Possible score value = 40-160.

Lastly it can be concluded that most commonly selected equipment by urban and rural families were skillet, vessel, pressure cooker, frying pan, sauce pan, griddle, knife, vegetable peeler, lemon squeezer, sand-wich maker and mixer-cum-grinder. Women respondents were satisfied with the equipment on the basis of their performance of work, but were not aware regarding good features of equipment. Urban families were satisfied with the performance of knife and rural families were satisfied with the performance of mixer-cum-grinder, whereas, urban families were least satisfied with the performance of frying pan and rural families were not satisfied with the performance of skillet.

Mass media needs to play an effective role in awakening and imparting information regarding sound equipment, therefore consumers can get more satisfaction from use of all these frequently used equipment. Consumer education can play an important role in creating awareness, interest and desire for the purchase of equipment having good features.

References

Dhablania, P. 1992. Trends in the possession and use of time and energy conservation devices by rural and urban families. *M.Sc. Thesis*, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana.

Kalra, P. 2000. Economic contribution of child labour towards family income. *M.Sc. Thesis*, CSK Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya, Palampur.

Kaur, H. 2001. A study on ergonomic evaluation of selected kitchen equipments. *M.Sc. Thesis*, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana.

Mathur, P. 2001. Assessment of kitchen work surface and storage spaces. *M.Sc. Thesis*, CSK Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya, Palampur.

Sangwan, M. and Kiran. 1987. Performance testing of sauce pans and sauce pots. *Journal of Research Punjab Agricultural University* 25 (1): 144-48.

VIR SOFTECH