



33 The drudgery prone activities were identified in the food processing enterprises  
34 and tools were developed/ modified to replace the strenuous manual task either by  
35 mechanising it or fitting the tool to the worker. For feasibility testing of the developed  
36 tools, 15 physically fit **respondents** were selected purposively who were actively involved  
37 in the selected activities. They were allowed to work with and without the tool and their  
38 responses were recorded. Responses of the respondents were recorded using interview  
39 schedule which comprised of different statements categorized under six main headings i.e.  
40 musculoskeletal factors, grip fatigue, physical stress factors, work output factors, tool factors  
41 and acceptability factors. The responses were recorded on 5 point scale. The qualitative score  
42 was quantified by assessing scores i.e. strongly agree – 5, agree – 4, undecided – 3, disagree –  
43 2 and strongly disagree – 1. This scoring was done for positive statements. For negative  
44 comments, the scoring was as follows. Strongly agree – 1, agree – 2, undecided – 3, disagree  
45 – 4 and strongly disagree – 5. The mean scores were calculated for each category of  
46 statements and attained scores were calculated by summation of the mean scores of different  
47 statements under each heading. The percentage of the gained score was calculated by using  
48 the following formula:

49

$$\text{Gained score} = \frac{\text{Attained score}}{\text{Maximum attained score}} \times 100$$

50  
51

52 The overall scores were then classified as below:

- < 40 Not acceptable
- 40-60 Needs modification
- 60-80 Acceptable
- 80-100 Highly acceptable

## 53 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

54 **The tools developed under the present study are presented below:**

### 55 1. Pulp extractor



**Fig. 1: Side and front view of Pulp extractor**

58 The pulp extractor (Fig 1) can be used to scoop out the pulp of fruits like wood apple,  
 59 watermelon and muskmelon. In micro and small-scale enterprises, respondents were  
 60 extracting the pulp of wood apple for making *juice*. There were no tools available to extract  
 61 the pulp. Respondents used the spatula or spoon to extract the pulp which did not have any  
 62 handle (Fig 2). Many times, their spoons broke during removing the pulp which leads to cuts  
 63 in their palms. Therefore, there was a need to modify the tool used by them. The pulp  
 64 extractor has a moderately sharp edge which assists in scooping the pulp without putting  
 65 extra pressure on palm and fingers. The sharp edge is at the exterior side of the scooper so  
 66 that the workers can easily clean the scooper without any injury. It has a wooden handle  
 67 wrapped with a slip-proof material which provides proper grip while scooping (Fig 3). The  
 68 feasibility testing of pulp extractor was done on 15 respondents whose results are shown in  
 69 Table 1. The modified tool was highly acceptable by the respondents on all six factors i.e.  
 70 musculoskeletal stress, grip fatigue, physical stress, work output, tool factor and  
 71 acceptability.

72 **Table 1: Feasibility testing of Pulp extractor**

n=15

Factors assessed	Maximum attainable score	Attained score (mean)	% Score gained	Remarks
Musculoskeletal stress factor	50	47	94	Highly acceptable
Grip Fatigue	25	24.2	96.8	Highly acceptable
Physical stress factor	15	13.9	92.66	Highly acceptable
Work output	15	14.1	94	Highly acceptable
Tool factor	40	38.1	95.25	Highly acceptable
Acceptability	15	14.8	98.6	Highly acceptable

74



75  
 76  
 77  
 78  
 79  
 80  
 81  
 82

83

84 Fig 2: Extracting pulp traditionally

Fig 3: Worker using Pulp extractor

85

86 2. Veg-multi-slicer



87

88 Fig 4: Diagonal view of Veg-multi-slicer

89 The Veg-multi-slicer can be used to cut vegetables in several pieces in one effort (Fig  
90 4). Seven to eight strand of vegetables like baby corn, carrot, radish can be placed and cut in  
91 a fixed size in one go (Fig 5). It is a useful tool for the workers engaged in micro, small and  
92 medium scale enterprises as they were cutting a number of vegetables either by holding  
93 several pieces in hand (Fig 6 ) or on traditional chopping board (Fig 7) which required more  
94 effort. In the newly developed Veg-slicer, the force got evenly distributed on all the pieces  
95 with less effort. The feasibility testing of Veg-multi-slicer was done on 15 respondents and its  
96 results are displayed in Table 2. Results reveal that it was found to be highly acceptable on  
97 musculoskeletal stress factor, grip fatigue, physical stress, work output and acceptability  
98 whereas was acceptable on the cool factor.

99

Table 2: Feasibility testing of Veg-multi-slicer

n=15

100

Factors assessed	Maximum attainable score	Attained score (mean)	% Score gained	Remarks
Musculoskeletal stress factor	60	56.5	94.1	Highly acceptable
Grip fatigue	20	19.3	96.5	Highly acceptable
Physical stress factor	15	14.5	96.6	Highly acceptable
Work output	15	14.6	97.3	Highly acceptable
Tool factor	55	37.9	68.9	Acceptable
Acceptability	15	14.6	97.3	Highly acceptable

101



**Fig 5: Cutting multiple baby corns with veg-multi-slicer**



**Fig 6: Cutting multiple baby corns at a time by holding in hand**



**Fig 7: Cutting multiple baby corns at a time on chopping board**

### 3. Shell cracker



**Fig 8: Diagonal view of Shell cracker**

Shell cracker helps in breaking the hard outer cover of fruits like wood apple (Fig 8). Cracking the shell of fruits like wood apple or coconut was a tedious job in the microscale food processing enterprises. Workers used to break each fruit by hitting it on the ground multiple times. They used to hit each fruit for nearly eight to ten times on the ground to break its shell (Fig 9). Therefore, for processing of hundred of fruits they hit for around eight hundred to one thousand times with high intensity which put stress on their shoulders, hands, palms and upper back. To reduce this drudgery, a tool was developed which would break the shells by making simple hand movements (Fig 10). A jack was fitted in the base which was operated with the help of a handle which breaks the shell in three to four hand movements with less force. The fruits break into pieces with very less force (Fig 12) which previously required a high intensity of force on fingers (Fig 11). The results of feasibility testing done on

122 15 respondents are portrayed in Table 3. The tool was found to be highly acceptable by the  
 123 respondents on all six factors.

124 **Table 3: Feasibility testing of Shell-cracker**

125 n=15

Factors assessed	Maximum attainable score	Attained score (mean)	% Score gained	Remarks
Musculoskeletal stress factor	60	58	96.6	Highly acceptable
Grip fatigue	20	19.5	97.5	Highly acceptable
Physical stress factor	15	14.5	96.6	Highly acceptable
Work output	15	12.5	83.3	Highly acceptable
Tool factor	60	56.7	94.5	Highly acceptable
Acceptability	15	13.9	92.6	Highly acceptable

126



**Fig 9: Breaking the shell of wood apples by hitting on ground**



**Fig 10: Worker using shell cracker**



**Fig 11: Separating shells after cracking traditionally**



**Fig 12: Separating shells after cracking the shells with Shell cracker**

127

128 **4. Shifting trolley**





**Fig 13: Diagonal view of shifting trolley**

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

Shifting trolley helps in moving the materials from one place to another (Fig 13). In micro and small-scale food processing enterprises workers generally preferred to work in either shed or open area due to which they had to shift all the materials (Fig 14) from room to the place of work which required several trips and awkward postures while lifting and carrying the materials. For this purpose, a trolley had been developed which can accommodate all the materials required by them and can easily be moved by maintaining an appropriate body posture. The trolley was equipped with hanging hooks and hanging bars which to hang cutting/peeling tools and mats/sacks respectively. The feasibility testing of Shifting trolley was done on 15 respondents whose results are presented in Table 4. The Shifting trolley was highly acceptable on musculoskeletal stress factor, grip fatigue, physical stress factor, work output and tool factor whereas, was acceptable on acceptability factor.

142

**Table 4 : Feasibility testing of Shifting trolley**

<b>Factors assessed</b>	<b>Maximum attainable score</b>	<b>Attained score</b>	<b>% Score gained</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
Musculoskeletal stress factor	60	52.6	87.6	Highly acceptable
Grip fatigue	20	18.2	91.0	Highly acceptable
Physical stress factor	15	14.7	98.0	Highly acceptable
Work output	15	14.8	98.6	Highly acceptable
Tool factor	50	41.1	82.2	Highly acceptable
Acceptability	15	9.1	60.6	Acceptable

143

144



(a) *Patila*      (b) Plastic crates      (c) Sac for keeping wastes      (d) Knife

145

146

**Fig 14: Materials used by the workers in processing work**

147 **CONCLUSION**

148 Workers in food processing enterprises faced several problems due to the unavailability of  
 149 tools. Maximum discomforts were faced in pulp extraction, cutting vegetables, shell cracking  
 150 and shifting of materials. Four tools were developed to reduce the discomforts of respondents  
 151 engaged in food processing enterprises. The results of feasibility testing show that all the  
 152 tools were acceptable by the **respondents**.

153 **Ethical Approval:**

154 As per international standard or university standard written ethical approval has been  
 155 collected and preserved by the author(s).

156 **Consent:**

157 As per international standard or university standard, respondent's written consent has been  
 158 collected and preserved by the author(s).

159 **REFERENCE**

160 Mali S C and Vyavahare R T (2015) An ergonomic evaluation of an industrial workstation: A  
 161 review. *Inter J Current Engg and Tech-5*: 1820-26  
 162 Patel V S and Ingle S T (2007) Occupational noise exposure and hearing loss among pulse  
 163 processing workers. *Environmentalist 28*: 358-65.  
 164 Ramsey J, Dang B and Habes D (2008) Ergonomic evaluation of workers at a cabinet mill  
 165 and assembly plant. Health Hazard Evaluation Report. Department of Health and  
 166 Human Services. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Institute for  
 167 Occupational Safety and Health, Pennsylvania.  
 168 Smith T A (2004) Incidence of occupational skin conditions in a food manufacturing  
 169 company: Results of a health surveillance programme. *Occupational Medicine 54*:  
 170 227-30.