

# Assessment of training for creating awareness on certification mark among rural people

■ SERENE SHEKHAR, SHRIDHAR D. JOSHI AND M.K. CHAUDHARY

Received: 12.04.2017; Revised: 30.09.2017; Accepted: 16.10.2017

■ **ABSTRACT** : The study was undertaken in Banaskantha district, under AGRESCO Project, Sardarkrushinagar Dantiwada Agricultural University of Gujarat state; to assess and compare training outcomes on enhancing awareness among respondents regarding certification marks. Randomly selected 160 respondents were considered as sample for the study. Half of the respondents were beneficiary of the training programme and the other half was control group. A pre-structured interview scheduled was used to measure independent variables and dependent variables. Frequency, percentage, range and chi-square test were used to tabulate the data. The findings revealed that cent per cent of the training beneficiary were able to identify ISI mark, toxicity mark and vegetarian mark. When compared between training beneficiary and non-beneficiary the result was found to be highly significant ( $z=30.0986^{**}$ ). The findings also revealed that cent per cent of the beneficiary were able to associate product with vegetarian mark and toxicity mark, followed by 90 per cent were able to associate BIS Hallmark, 87.5 per cent were able to associate ISI mark with the product. When compared between beneficiary and non-beneficiary, the result was found to be highly significant ( $z=24.9128^{**}$ ). It can be concluded from the study that awareness generating programme on certification mark could be beneficial for the rural people.

■ **KEY WORDS**: Certification marks, Awareness, Training, Rural

■ **HOW TO CITE THIS PAPER** : Shekhar, Serene, Joshi, Shridhar D. and Chaudhary, M.K. (2017). Assessment of training for creating awareness on certification mark among rural people. *Asian J. Home Sci.*, 12 (2) : 408-414, DOI: 10.15740/HAS/AJHS/12.2/408-414.

See end of the paper for authors' affiliations

**SERENE SHEKHAR**  
Department of Extension and  
Communication Management,  
Sardarkrushinagar Dantiwada  
Agricultural University, S.K. NAGAR  
(GUJARAT) INDIA  
Email : shekhar.sdau@gmail.com

The world is moving towards fair trade and we are still in phase where we are striving hard to create awareness among people for certification marks provided by Government of India. As per the estimation by Amine and Raizada (2015) at McKinsey Global Institute, India will triple its average household income and become the fifth largest consumer economy in the world by 2025. According to Department of consumer affairs, the third party certification scheme helps common

consumers to identify products conforming to standards. Presence of certification mark on a product implies that the product has been produced according to a specific standard and that its production has been carried out under a well-defined system. It also indicates that it has been appropriately inspected and tested according to the agreed standard. Hence, products certified by well-defined certification schemes assure product quality and thereby enable consumers to identify products of daily

use that conform to standards.

Several researches show that there is lack of awareness among people regarding certification marks. Relhan (2012) conducted detailed consumer surveys and reported that there was lack of awareness amongst the general public about product quality standardization. A survey conducted by CUTs (2012) in 19 states showed that 40% respondents were ignorant of any safety or quality certifications such as ISI, ISO and Agmark.

There is need to promote awareness among rural people regarding certification marks so as to stop mal practices and the consumers could make right decision about right product. Thus the present study is conducted with following objectives:

- To study the selected personal profile of the respondents.
- To assess and compare training outcomes on enhancing awareness among respondents regarding certification marks.
- To find association between personal profile of respondents with level of certification marks awareness.

## ■ RESEARCH METHODS

The study was undertaken in two randomly selected talukas of Banaskantha district of Gujarat State during April 2016 to February 2017.

Sr. No.	Respondents (160)	Deesa Taluka	Dantiwada Taluka
1.	Training Beneficiary (n=80)	Kanjara	Sikariya
2.	Non-Beneficiary (n=80)	Sadarpur	Dantiwada

One village from each Taluka was the training beneficiary for certification mark awareness programme and second village was non-beneficiary/ control.

Training Beneficiary means respondents who under went certification mark awareness. Non-beneficiary means respondents who were control group and were not given benefit of awareness programme.

Three stages random sampling procedure was followed to collect the data. A representative sample of 160 respondents was selected for the study.

Personal characters such as: age, caste, education and level of media exposure were taken as independent variables.

Certification marks awareness was measured as independent variable, taking into consideration two

		Village name	Male	Female
<b>Beneficiary</b>				
Deesa Taluka	Kanjara		20	20
Dantiwada Taluka	Sikariya		20	20
<b>Non-Beneficiary</b>				
Deesa Taluka	Sadarpur		20	20
Dantiwada Taluka	Dantiwada		20	20
		Total	80	80

aspects *i.e.* Identification of marks, association of certified mark with the product.

The study included: ISI, FPO, AGMARK, BIS, Organic Mark, Ecomark, non-polluting vehicle mark, silk mark, vegetarian/ non-vegetarian mark.

A pre-structured interview schedule was developed for collection of data on personal profile and certification marks awareness. To measure certification marks awareness, two point scale was developed *i.e.* Aware, and Not Aware which was coded as 2 and 1, respectively. Data was collected by personal interview technique. For beneficiaries, data was collected after training programme. One day training programme was organized in one villages of each taluka. The training included power point presentation, charts and posters. Actual household / farm products with certification marks were shown and displayed. Statistical analysis was done by using frequencies, percentages and chi-square test.

## ■ RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

After analyzing the data related to personal profile of the respondents, the following results were obtained.

It can be revealed from Table 1 that equal per cent (47.5 %) of the overall respondents were falling in 20-40 years of age and SC category, forty per cent of the overall respondents were educated upto Primary level and 57.5 per cent of the respondents were having medium media exposure. Further, it was found that, there was no significant difference in age, caste, education and level of media exposure of training beneficiary and non-beneficiary.

### **Assessment and comparison of training outcomes on creating awareness among respondents regarding certification marks :**

It can be revealed from the Table 2 that cent per cent of the training beneficiary were able to identify ISI

**Table 1 : Distribution of the respondents according to personal profile**

Personal profile	Training beneficiary (n <sub>1</sub> =80)	Non-beneficiary (n <sub>2</sub> =80)	Overall (n=160)	Z value (Mean and SD)
	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)	
<b>Age (years)</b>				
12-20	17 (21.25)	18 (22.5)	35 (21.875)	Z= 0.3112 <sup>NS</sup> (Mean=33.65; SD=12.144)
21-40	40 (50)	36 (45)	76 (47.5)	
41-60	23 (28.75)	26 (32.5)	49 (30.625)	
<b>Caste</b>				
General	12 (15)	20 (25)	32 (20)	Z= 0.5 <sup>NS</sup> (Mean=1.725 SD=0.776624)
SEBC	34 (42.5)	18 (22.5)	52 (32.5)	
SC	34 (42.5)	42 (52.5)	76 (47.5)	
<b>Education</b>				
Secondary	36 (45)	27 (33.75)	63 (39.375)	Z=0.1046 <sup>NS</sup> (Mean=2.187 SD=0.75392)
Primary	29 (36.25)	35 (43.75)	64 (40)	
Illiterate	15 (18.75)	18 (22.5)	33 (20.625)	
<b>Level of media exposure</b>				
Low (<10.36)	8 (10)	12 (15)	20 (12.5)	Z= 0.1058 <sup>NS</sup> (Mean=11.625 SD=1.2627)
Medium (10.37-12.87)	45 (56.25)	47 (58.75)	92 (57.5)	
High (>12.88)	27 (33.75)	21 (26.25)	48 (30)	

And \*\* indicate significance of values at P=0.05 and 0.01, respectively

NS=Non-significant

mark, toxicity mark and vegetarian mark after they were made aware of the various certification marks. It was also noted that only fifty per cent of the training beneficiary were able to arrange the toxic labels correctly according to toxicity.

Hasalika and Ashalatha (1998) revealed on awareness of homemakers about Indian Standard Mark on consumer goods in Dharwad city. Results showed that maximum number of employed homemakers were aware of the ISI mark (71.00%) and Agmark (30.00%). Gambhir (2002) revealed that 54.00 per cent of the respondents were aware of the ISI mark and 46.00 per

cent of the respondents were not aware of it.

Karki and Mehrotra (2008) indicated that majority of the respondents (89.17%) were aware of the ISI mark followed by awareness regarding Agmark (84.17%) where as comparatively less percentage of respondents (42.50) were aware of FPO mark.

Khapre *et al.* (2011) emphasized that 40% Of respondents know about Agmark, FPO, and ISI as quality marked product but only 23.9% are able to recognize symbol on food label which is similar to other study carried in slum area of Hyderabad.

Kumar and Sakthiventhan (2012) showed that 78.4

**Table 2 : Identification of certification marks by the respondents****(n=160)**

Sr. No.	Certification marks	Training Beneficiary (n <sub>1</sub> =80)	Non-beneficiary (n <sub>2</sub> =80)
		Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)
1.	Agmark	59 (73.75)	10(12.50)
2.	BIS Hallmark	72(90.00)	03(3.75)
3.	Eco mark	64(80.00)	02(2.50)
4.	FPO	67(83.75)	01(1.25)
5.	Indian organic certification mark	68 (85.00)	04(5.00)
6.	ISI	80(100)	67(83.75)
7.	Non- polluting vehicle mark	61(76.25)	15(18.75)
8.	Silk mark	70(87.50)	18(22.50)
9.	Toxicity marks	80(100)	55(68.75)
10.	Sequence of toxicity mark	40(50.00)	12(15.00)
11.	Non-vegetarian mark	72(90.00)	26(32.50)
12.	Vegetarian	80(100)	33(41.25)

per cent of the respondents aware of 916 KD terminology and 56 per cent of them aware of carat (CT) terminology. 52.8 per cent and 45.6 per cent of respondents are aware of Agmark and ISI terminology. But, very few of them only aware of sanforized, mercerized FPO, BIS and star terminology. It is found that the rural respondents are somewhat aware of the popular terminology likes 916KDM, CT, Agmark and ISI. But, the other terminology sanforized, mercerized, BIS and star. It is understand that the rural consumers are having some level of awareness when they purchase gold and food. Hence, they have awareness of gold item terminology and food item terminology. But, they are not having awareness on steel related terminology, electrical goods terminology.

Arora *et al.* (2014) found that majority of respondents were aware of AGMARK, ISI mark, HALLMARK and GREENMARK and the majority of

respondents were not aware of FPOMARK, WOOLMARK, ECOMARK and BROWMARK.

When compared between Training beneficiary and non-beneficiary, the result was found to be highly significant ( $z=30.0986^{**}$ ). Thus it can be stated that the certification mark awareness programme can definitely help in improving the awareness level of the rural people (Table 3).












It can be revealed from the Table 4 that cent per cent of the beneficiary were able to associate product with vegetarian mark and toxicity mark, followed by 90 per cent were able to associate BIS Hallmark, 87.5 per cent were able to associate ISI mark with the product. In contrary to the findings, a study by Amine and Raizada (2015) on awareness on the mark were tested in Dharwad city of Karnataka State and results showed that the ISI mark was well known to seventy one per cent of the respondents and a few was aware of Agmark.

**Table 3 : Comparison between training beneficiary and non-beneficiary regarding certification mark awareness (n=160)**

Sr. No.	Respondents	Mean	z-value
1.	Training beneficiary (n <sub>1</sub> =80)	22.16 ± 1.107	30.0986**
2.	Non-beneficiary (n <sub>2</sub> =80)	15.08 ± 1.792	

\*\* indicates significance of value at P=0.01

**Table 4 : Identification of certification marks with associated product by the respondents (n=160)**

Sr. No.	Certification marks	Symbols	Frequency (%)	
			Training beneficiary (n <sub>1</sub> =80)	Non-beneficiary (n <sub>2</sub> =80)
1.	Agmark		33 (41.25)	04 (5.00)
2.	BIS Hallmark		72 (90.00)	03 (3.75)
3.	Eco mark		47 (58.75)	02 (2.5)
4.	FPO		53 (66.25)	01 (1.25)
5.	Indian organic certification mark		64 (80.00)	02 (2.50)
6.	ISI		70 (87.50)	47 (58.75)
7.	Non- polluting vehicle mark		56 (70.00)	19 (23.75)
8.	Silk mark		60 (75.00)	15 (18.75)
9.	Toxicity marks		80 (100)	43 (53.75)
10.	Non-vegetarian mark		69 (86.25)	26 (32.50)
11.	Vegetarian		80 (100)	33 (41.25)

**Table 5 : Comparison between training beneficiary and non-beneficiary regarding association of certification mark with appropriate product (n=160)**

Respondents	Mean	z-value
Training beneficiary (n <sub>1</sub> =80)	20.86 ± 1.32	24.9128**
Non-beneficiary (n <sub>2</sub> =80)	14.54 ± 1.85	

\*\* indicates significance of value at P=0.01

**Table 6: Certification marks and impact of demographic variables**

Certification marks	Sex			Age			Education			Media Exposure			Caste		
	Chi square	df	Sig	Chi square	df	Sig	Chi square	df	Sig	Chi square	df	Sig	Chi square	df	Sig
Agmark	.065 <sup>a</sup>	1	.799	2.341 <sup>a</sup>	2	.310	3.646 <sup>a</sup>	2	.162	3.400 <sup>a</sup>	3	.334	5.076 <sup>a</sup>	2	.079
BIS Hallmark	.556 <sup>a</sup>	1	.456	.102 <sup>a</sup>	2	.950	1.439 <sup>a</sup>	2	.487	3.379 <sup>a</sup>	3	.337	1.514 <sup>a</sup>	2	.469
Eco mark	1.250 <sup>a</sup>	1	.264	.102 <sup>a</sup>	2	.950	.560 <sup>a</sup>	2	.756	8.322 <sup>a</sup>	3	.040*	1.293 <sup>a</sup>	2	.524
FPO	.092 <sup>a</sup>	1	.762	.092 <sup>a</sup>	2	.955	1.168 <sup>a</sup>	2	.558	1.307 <sup>a</sup>	3	.728	1.226 <sup>a</sup>	2	.542
Indian organic certification mark	.392 <sup>a</sup>	1	.531	1.235 <sup>a</sup>	2	.539	.865 <sup>a</sup>	2	.649	1.639 <sup>a</sup>	3	.651	2.145 <sup>a</sup>	2	.342
Non- polluting vehicle mark	.069 <sup>a</sup>	1	.793	1.726 <sup>a</sup>	2	.422	1.335 <sup>a</sup>	2	.513	3.898 <sup>a</sup>	3	.273	2.178 <sup>a</sup>	2	.337
Silk mark	4.114 <sup>a</sup>	1	.043*	16.236 <sup>a</sup>	2	.000**	1.177 <sup>a</sup>	2	.555	3.599 <sup>a</sup>	3	.308	3.227 <sup>a</sup>	2	.199
Sequence of toxicity mark	.000 <sup>a</sup>	1	1.000	18.412 <sup>a</sup>	2	.000**	8.129 <sup>a</sup>	2	.017*	2.565 <sup>a</sup>	3	.464	3.765 <sup>a</sup>	2	.152
Non-vegetarian mark	.000 <sup>a</sup>	1	1.000	.102 <sup>a</sup>	2	.950	3.346 <sup>a</sup>	2	.188	.156 <sup>a</sup>	3	.984	3.693 <sup>a</sup>	2	.158

When compared between beneficiary and non-beneficiary, the result was found to be highly significant ( $z=24.9128^{**}$ ). Thus it can be stated that the certification mark awareness programme can help the rural people in associating the certification mark with the product. Maheswari *et al.* (2014) showed that intervention programme influenced knowledge and awareness of the respondents regarding consumerism (Table 5).

Thakur *et al.* (2009) depicted that only 23% of the subjects were aware of the various standard marks like ISI, FPO, Agmark. Significant gain in knowledge of the subjects was observed during post test.

Borin *et al.* (2011) also insisted for more consumer awareness to safeguard themselves from scrupulous manufacturers and service providers.

Siwach and Dahiya (2009) emphasized that regarding the checking of ISI mark and AGMARK. Approximately 55.0 to 70.0% of the rural respondents never bothered themselves to check these marks on the products. As far as checking of ISI mark on household goods is concerned only 5.0% of rural respondents always checked it, followed by 27.50% who seldom checked it and 67.5% never made an insight into it. Similarly, the rural respondents never checked AGMARK (55.0 to 57.5 %) of AGMARK symbols.

### Impact of demographic variables on certification marks awareness :

It can be revealed from the Table 6 that media exposure showed significant and positive association with eco mark. It may be because of the reason that people who were more exposed to media are aware of ill effect of pollution thus when they were made aware of eco mark they learned and understood more better.

Further, sex and age both affected the awareness level regarding silk mark. The reason could be that grown up females may likely to buy silk product for wedding purpose thus they were able to recall and retain the silk mark.

Age and education was found to be highly significant with recalling the sequence of toxicity mark. The reason could be that grown up were engaged in spraying pesticide and insecticide in their fields thus were able to retain the information for their future use.

Sundaram and Sriram (2015) found that there was significant association between demographic profile and certification marks such as age and occupation. While educational qualification and income showed no significant association with ISI. Age and education showed positive association with identification of BIS Hallmark. Income showed positive association with

Agmark.

Singh and Sharma (2013) found significant difference between the customers awareness toward the marks of quality assurance on the products on the basis of various level of the educational qualification. They also suggested that levels of awareness among respondents varied according to their occupation.

Arora *et al.* (2014) reported that there was no significant difference between the male and female teenagers regarding awareness of different quality assurance marks.

Karki and Mehrotra (2008) indicated that relationship between education and the awareness of marks of the respondents was significant.

### Conclusion :

The assessments of training on awareness of certification marks, among the rural respondents, were found to be highly significant thus It can be concluded from the study that awareness generating programme on certification mark could be beneficial for the rural people.

### Implication of the study :

Enlightening the rural consumers with certification marks will not only protect them from exploitation but will also introduce efficiency, transparency and accountability in the entire manufacturing and service sector. Thus, effort should be made by educational institutes, consumer forum for massive awareness programmes.

Authors' affiliations:

**SHRIDHAR D. JOSHI**, Department of Home Science, Municipal Arts and U.B. Science College, MEHSANA (GUJARAT) INDIA

**M.K. CHAUDHARY**, Department of Statistics, Sardarkrushinagar Dantiwada Agricultural University, S.K. NAGAR (GUJARAT) INDIA (Email : mkdaval@yahoo.co.in)

### ■ REFERENCES

- Amine, Lyn S. and Raizada, Deepa (2015).** Market entry into the newly opened Indian Market: Recent Experiences of US Companies in the Soft drinks Industry." In *Proceedings of the 1995 Academy of Marketing Science (AMS) Annual Conference*, pp. 287-292. Springer International Publishing.
- Arora, Reeta, Chawla, Asha and Sachdeva, Vandana (2014).** An analytical study of consumer awareness among teenagers. *Internat. J. Adv. Res. Management & Soc. Sci.*, **3**(8):137-154.

Available on: <http://www.garph.co.uk/IJARMSS/Aug2014/13.pdf>.

**Borin, Norm, Douglas C. Cerf and Krishnan, R. (2011).** Consumer effects of environmental impact in product labeling. *J. Consumer Mktg.*, **28**(1): 76-86.

CUTs (2012) Awareness Generation Programme on BIS Standards of Products. Available on: [http://cuts-international.org/crc/pdf/CUTS-BIS\\_Report\\_Assam.pdf](http://cuts-international.org/crc/pdf/CUTS-BIS_Report_Assam.pdf). Retrieved on: 7-4-2017

**Gambhir, C. (2002).** Consumer protection: Law and practice. *Indian J. Marketing*, **32**: 17-20.

**Hasaliker, Suma and Ashalatha, K.V. (2011).** Awareness of home-makers about Indian Standard Marks on consumer goods. *Karnataka J. Agric. Sci.*, **11**(4).

**Karki, Indu and Mehrotra, Neelam (2008).** Awareness of Standard Marks, consumer rights and act. *J. Dairying, Food Home Sci.*, **27**(3/4): 221-225.

**Khapre, M.P., Chaudhary, Sonali, Wagh. V and Dawale, Ajay (2011).** Buying practices and prevalence of adulteration in selected food items in rural area of Wardha district. *J. Health & Allied Sci.*, **10**(3):1-4.

**Kumar, Krishna B. and Sakthiventhan, S. (2012).** A study on consumer protection awareness among rural consumer in Caddalore. *Internat. J. Engg. Management Res.*, **2**(6):2249-2254.

**Lavanya, S.M., Ajjan, N. and Mahendran (2012).** Consumers' awareness and preference towards quality certified products. *Internat. J. Res. IT & Mgmt.*, **2**(5): 65-74

**Maheswari, J.S., Patel, Hemlatta J. and Pandit, Shobhna K. (2014).** A study of women's consumer rights and awareness regarding household goods and services. A research project Submitted to University Grant Commission. Retrieved from: [http://www.tcas.ac.in/pdf/Web\\_Summery\\_Sashi\\_Maheshwari.pdf](http://www.tcas.ac.in/pdf/Web_Summery_Sashi_Maheshwari.pdf).

**Ramalingam, L.P. (2013).** Factors influencing rural consumers towards ISI Marked White Goods. *Internat. J.*, **1**(6): 7-13.

**Relhan, Vibhir (2012).** How effective is the current procedure of Product Quality Standardization in the Indian market? A Case Study on Bureau of Indian Standards (BIS) - National Standards Body. CCS Working Paper No. 281 Summer Research Internship Programme 2012 Centre for Civil Society. Available on: [https://ccs.in/internship\\_papers/2012/281\\_how-effective-is-current-procedure-of-product-quality-standardization\\_vibhor-relhan.pdf](https://ccs.in/internship_papers/2012/281_how-effective-is-current-procedure-of-product-quality-standardization_vibhor-relhan.pdf) Retrieved on: 7-4-2017.

**Singh, Hawa and Sharma, Hemlata (2013).** Consumer perception towards the quality marks of products. *Internat. J. Management & Soc. Sci. Res.*, **2**(9): 50-53. Available on: <https://>

/pdfs.semanticscholar.org/7929/bd78a90842f4dce0878dd55a4b9c6b38a08b.pdf

**Siwach, Meena and Dahiya (2009).** Knowledge and utilization of consumer education by rural and urban women. *J. Human Ecol.*, **25** (1): 41-44

**Sundaram, N. and Sriram, M. (2015).** Safety, standards and certification marks on consumables – An investigation on

Awareness with Reference to Rural Consumers of Vellore district, Tamil Nadu, India. *Internat. J. Engg., Business & Enterprise Applications*, **12**(1): 17-20.

**Thakur, Manjula, Walia, Indarjit and Singh, Amarjit (2009).** Impact of health education package on knowledge and practices of women regarding food adulteration. *Nursing & Midwifery Res. J.*, **5** (1):1-9.

12<sup>th</sup>  
Year  
★★★★★ of Excellence ★★★★★