



# **iJRASET**

International Journal For Research in  
Applied Science and Engineering Technology



---

# **INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH**

IN APPLIED SCIENCE & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

---

**Volume: 8**

**Issue: IV**

**Month of publication: April 2020**

**DOI:**

**[www.ijraset.com](http://www.ijraset.com)**

**Call:  08813907089**

**E-mail ID: [ijraset@gmail.com](mailto:ijraset@gmail.com)**

# A Study on the Socio-Economic Background of Street Vendors with Special Reference to Pazhayannur Block Panchayath

Deepak. K. S

Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce

**Abstract:** Street vending is not a recent phenomenon. Centuries ago people started shopping from streets and traders started street vending. They used to line up near Railway stations, Bus stands, busy shopping streets, housing complexes to sell various goods and services. They used ordinary carts, wheeled push carts, semi fixed stalls and even Kiosks. Some vendors sold their products in fixed places while others used to operate in a much wider geographical area. Uneducated poor people started street vending for their daily bread. They are not organised but their contribution to the economy and nation is immense. They directly or indirectly participate in national and economic development. In this scenario it is quite needed to study the socio- economic background of street vendors.

**Keywords:** Street vendors, Kiosk, Carts, Financial inclusion, Thrift

## I. INTRODUCTION

Trade can be the sole of any economy irrespective of the form of the same. From big shopping malls to the street vendors are actively participating in trade. Many people likes to shop from streets for various reasons. But the street vendors are not earning much from their trade. Their profit margin is not as big as for other forms of business. The concept of bargaining is largely affecting street vendors and many of them are just earning for their daily bread. According to the Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, there are more than 10 million street vendors in India. Delhi consists of more than 450,000 street vendors while in Mumbai and Kolkata there are 250,000 and 450,000 street vendors. With a view to protect the street vendors in India, an act passed in the Parliament in 2012 and came into force in the year 2014 called Street Vendors Act 2014. The bill aimed at providing social security and protecting various rights of the street vendors. But the street vendors consist of the informal sector. They are still suffering much. It is highly relevant to analyse their socio-economic background.

## II. OBJECTIVES

- A. To analyze the socio-economic background of the street vendors
- B. To assess the quality of life of the selected street vendors
- C. To evaluate the problems confronted by selected group of street vendors

## III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A descriptive and analytical research design has been followed for the present study. Both primary and secondary data are employed here. A convenient sampling technique is used here. A sample size of 40 street vendors from the pazhayannur Block Panchayath is selected for the study.

## IV. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Owen N and Hussain N (1984) studied on food vendors and identified the role of vendors in economic activity. The study states that food selling is the only source of income for the majority of the vendors. It further suggests that providing lands or making appropriate locations available to the vendors by the local authority can be a motivation to the vendors. Helen R. Serkar (2004) analysed the working conditions and other characteristics of street vendors. The study suggests that the vendors must respect customers and should be patient with them for better sales. The study advises and highlights the needs and wants of vendors especially women and child vendors. Sharit Bhowmik (2005) revealed the magnitude of street vending in different Asian countries. The study points out the fact that magnitude of street vending in different Asian countries are increasing. The reason for this increase is because of the shrinking of jobs in formal sector. Most of the street vendors in Asia are not unionized.

Narumol Nirathorn (2006) revealed that about 88% of the vendors were migrants. Majority of these vendors was previously engaged in farming and other agricultural activities. Ray and Assem Mishra (2011) identified those street vendors facing problems like harassment by authorities, problem of eviction and problem of conflict with pedestrians. Vendors are not ready to relocate to other places. Other major conclusion is that vendors borrowed money from money lenders on high interest rates. Balasubramanian, Srinivasan and Vidyasubrahmaniam (2012) stated that majority of Women street vendors work for more than 8 hours, prefer fixed places for selling products, suffered from hard weather conditions.



## V. FINDINGS SUGGESTION CONCLUSION

### A. Demographic Profile

- 1) The majority of sample consist of 55 Per cent were from the age group 40-60.
- 2) Gender wise classification of respondents consists of 75 Per cent from male.
- 3) Education wise classification of respondents consists of 62 Per cent below SSLC.
- 4) Marital wise classification of respondent consist of 50 Per cent were married.
- 5) Income wise classification of respondents consist of most of the respondents from the group income 5001-10000
- 6) Monthly expenditure wise classification of respondents shows that 75 Per cent belongs to monthly expenditure category of less than 3000
- 7) It can be found that majority of the respondents (63 Per cent) belongs to Food stall.
- 8) Experience of the street vendors majority of the respondents (45 Per cent) have above 15 years of experience in street vending.

### B. *Quality Of Life*

- 1) Majority of the respondents have (52 Per cent) owned house and minority (48 Per cent) have rental house.
- 2) The one way ANOVA for the variable "level of satisfaction on water gives F value of 4.432 which is significant at 5 Per cent level ( $P = 0.019 < 0.05$ ). Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that there is significant difference. It can be inferred that income class of less than 3000 and 5001-10000 have lower level of mean on water that means they are highly satisfied with water as a facility at home in case of Toilet, Drainage, and LPG based on monthly income of the respondent the corresponding F values is found to be not significant at 5 Per cent level ( $P = 0.326, .0258, 0.176 > 0.05$ ). Hence null hypothesis is not rejected this implies that there is no significant difference.
- 3) The one way ANOVA for the variable Housing, Education to children, Financial needs, Entertainment, Savings and Lack of other employment are based on nature of business gives F values 5.273, 79.375, 5.165, 54.435, 9.615, 31.810 respectively, which is significant level of 5 Per cent level ( $p = .004, .000, .005 < 0.05$ ) Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that there is a significant difference. It can be inferred that food stall have lower level of mean on housing, that means they are highly influenced. In the case of Education to children, the flower seller has lower level of mean that means they are highly influenced. It can be inferred that fruit sellers have lower level of mean on financial needs that means they are highly influenced. The next factor is entertainment, vegetable seller are highly influenced. It can be inferred that vegetable sellers are highly influenced on savings. In case of lack of other employment have lower level of mean on fruit seller that means they are highly influenced.
- 4) It can be found the respondents have some sort of entertainment
- 5) The television entertainment plays dominant role (43 Per cent) in the various kinds of entertainments
- 6) Most of the street vendors (60 Per cent) depending on wholesalers for purchasing goods.
- 7) The 17 Per cent of respondents have opined that normal about price of commodities.
- 8) The chi-square statistics provide a value 66.560 which is significant at 5 Per cent level of significance ( $0.000 < 0.05$ ). Therefore the null hypothesis of no difference in the sources of finance used by the street vendors is not at all significant therefore it must be rejected. So there is a difference in selecting obtaining finance from various sources. It can be inferred that majority of the respondents depend on money lenders.
- 9) One way ANOVA for the variables "Shelter, Shelter and Space based on nature of business of street vendors gives F values of 5.523 and 422.625 respectively. Which is significant at 5 Per cent level ( $p = 0.003, 0.000 < 0.05$ ). Hence null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that there is a significant difference in the mean scores obtained on the level of satisfaction on shelter facility on nature of business of the street vendors and found out that the fruit sellers and flower sellers are mostly satisfied in this facility. There is a significant difference in the level of satisfaction on fruit selling street vendor in terms of Shelter and Space offered by the panchayath and local bodies that is mostly satisfied with these facilities as the lower mean value.

### C. *Problems Faced By The Street Vendors*

- 1) Most depended means among the various problem faced by the street vendors is "competitors" having lower level of mean value so all hypothesis is rejected as their p values are 0.001, 0.000, 0.004, 0.000, 0.019 respectively i.e.  $p < 0.05$ ). It means that there is significant difference. In wider sense it can be inferred that the street vendors having a years of experience between 5-10 years facing more problems from the competitors. The street vendors having the years of experience between 10-15 facing more problems from police, competitors, local politicians. The street vendors having the years of experience above 15 more problems faced from the government officials and local peoples.
- 2) The one way ANOVA for the variables "Price determination, Credit facility, Storage, Quality and Regular supply based on nature of business of street vendors gives F values of 29.053, 12.224, 7.370, 4.639, 0.008, 0.000 respectively. Which is significant at 5 Per cent level ( $p = 0.000, 0.001, 0.008 < 0.05$ ). Hence null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that there is a significant difference. It implies that fruit sellers and flower sellers have lower level of mean on price determination that means they are highly affected that problem on street vending. In the case of fruit sellers and vegetable sellers are highly affecting credit facility factor. It can be inferred that fruit sellers have lower level of mean on storage that means they are influenced. In case of flower sellers, quality factors are highly influenced. In the case of fruit seller are highly influenced on regular supply.

**D. Financial Problem**

- 1) The result of One way ANOVA for the variable investment and infrastructure, Credit needs and High rate of interest based on educational qualification of street vendors give F values of 24.320, 4.011, 14.891 respectively, which are significant at 5 percent level ( $p = 0.000, 0.027, 0.000 < 0.05$ ). Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that the respondents with plus two level qualification are more influenced by investment and infrastructure and credit needs. Respondents with SSLC are mostly influenced by High rate of interest.

**E. Marketing Problem**

- 1) The result of one way ANOVA for the variable Competition From Street Vendors, Exploitation By Middlemen and Lack Of Innovation based on educational qualification of workers give F value of 1.354, 2.257, 1.341 which is not significant at 5 percent level ( $P = .271, .119, 0.274 > 0.05$ ). Hence null hypothesis is not rejected. This implies that there is no significant difference in the mean score obtained on level of influence on marketing problems based on educational qualification of respondents.

**F. Production Problems**

- 1) The result of One way ANOVA for the variable Lack of subsidies and High cost of Production based on educational qualification of street vendors give F value of 13.993, 16.483 which is significant at 5 percent level ( $p = .000, .000 < 0.05$ ). Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. This implies that there is significant difference. In broad sense respondents with Below SSLC level qualification are more influenced by Lack of subsidies and High cost of Production based. In case Scarcity Of Raw materials based on educational qualification of Street vendors give F value of .861 which is not significant at 5 percent level ( $P = .431 > 0.05$ ). Hence null hypothesis is not rejected. This implies that there is no significant.

**G. Suggestion**

- 1) **Quality of Work Life:** The study depicted that there is above average street vendors have owned house so the government should provide special consideration for homeless street vendors. The findings indicate that all the street vendors don't have same level of satisfaction on various facilities at home and the source of finance. So for improving the quality of work life of street vendors the government should provide adequate housing facilities and financial assistance to street vendors at lower rate of interest
- 2) **Problems Faced by Street Vendors:** The study shows that street vendors are facing various problems in case of marketing, production and finance. Government should provide special support for street vendors by way of subsidies for the welfare of street vendors. Also the government should provide for the mitigation of problems faced by the street vendors

**VI. CONCLUSION**

Street vendors are contributing to the national growth directly or indirectly. The analysis proving that the socio-economic background of street vendors is not sound. A strong empowerment must be there for the street vendors in economically, financially and socially. Financial inclusion must be implemented in among street vendors. With various saving plan the habit of thrift must be encouraged. Various needs of street vendors must be satisfied by formulating policies by the government. Acts like Street vendors Act 2014 must be implemented in right way to get maximum benefit and protection to them.

**REFERENCES**

- [1] Narumol Nirathron (2006), Fighting Poverty from the Street – A Survey on Street Food Vendors in Bangkok, <http://www.ilo.org>
- [2] .Owens, N. and Hussain, N. Street foods in Bangladesh: A study of roadside food vendors in Manikganj Town, (Washington, D.C., Equity Policy Center, 1984).
- [3] C. N. Ray Assem Mishra Vendors and Informal Sector A Case-Study of Street Vendors of Surat City November 2011
- [4] Sharit K Bhowmik Street Vendors in Asia: A Review Vol. 40, Issue No. 22-23, 28 May, 2005



10.22214/IJRASET



45.98



IMPACT FACTOR:  
7.129



IMPACT FACTOR:  
7.429



# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH

IN APPLIED SCIENCE & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Call : 08813907089  (24\*7 Support on Whatsapp)