

About the University

The Tamil Nadu Dr.Ambedkar Law University is a premier institution for legal education, established in the year 1997 in pursuance of the Tamil Nadu Act No.43 of 1997. As a sui generis model, the University is the first of its kind in the country offering legal education both on its campus and through the affiliated law colleges in the State of Tamil Nadu. All the seven Government Law Colleges stand affiliated to the Tamil Nadu Dr.Ambedkar Law University. The University has established the School of Excellence in Law in the University campus.

About the Chair of Excellence on Consumer Law and Jurisprudence

The Chair of Excellence on Consumer Law and Jurisprudence named after late Shri.A.K.Venkata Subramaniam, a former Secretary, Government of India and a Consumer Activist has been functioning since 01-07-2014. The objectives of the Chair, among others are: (i) to provide for the advancement and dissemination of knowledge of law and their role in the development of better education; (ii) to promote legal education and well being of the community generally and (iii) to provide access to legal education of large segments of the population and in particular to the disadvantaged groups.

About the Survey

A Survey on awareness about Food Safety was conducted by the A.K.Venkata Subramaniam Chair of Excellence on Consumer Law and Jurisprudence, Tamil Nadu Dr.Ambedkar Law University, Chennai during the period May – October, 2016. The objective of the survey was to ascertain to what extent the above stakeholders are aware of the various laws relating to food safety and how they view the impact of these laws in their lives. The Survey was divided into three parts: (i) awareness among the Public (ii) awareness among the Traders and (iii) awareness among Officials, Lawyers and Analysts. The second volume of the report covers the survey conducted among the Traders.



SURVEY REPORT ON FOOD SAFETY IN TAMIL NADU

SURVEY REPORT ON FOOD SAFETY IN TAMIL NADU VOLUME - II



VOLUME - II



Food safety is everyone's responsibility



Avoid illness and other costs of mistakes



A trustworthy product & brand



Safe behaviour makes safe food

PUBLISHED BY

Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution (Department of Consumer Affairs), Govt of India,
Shri.A.K.Venkata Subramaniam Chair of Excellence on Consumer Law and Jurisprudence(CECLJ),
The Tamil Nadu Dr.Ambedkar Law University,
Chennai.



सत्यमेव जयते

SURVEY REPORT ON FOOD SAFETY IN TAMIL NADU

VOLUME - II

PUBLISHED BY

**MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION
(DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS), GOVERNMENT OF INDIA &
SHRI A.K.VENKATA SUBRAMANIAM CHAIR OF EXCELLENCE ON
CONSUMER LAW AND JURISPRUDENCE,
THE TAMIL NADU DR.AMBEDKAR LAW UNIVERSITY,
CHENNAI
SEPTEMBER - 2017**

CONTENTS

S. No.	Particulars	Pg. No.
1.	Summary of Survey Findings	i - xxix
2.	Questionnaire in English & Tamil – Annexure-I	xxx - xxxiv
3.	Details of Target Group – Annexure-II	xxxv
4.	Instructions to Field Workers – Annexure-III	xxxvi - xxxvii
5.	Analysis of Data – Annexure-IV	1 - 170

Awareness about Food Safety

(II - Traders)

Summary of Survey Findings

A Survey on awareness about Food Safety was conducted by the A.K.VenkataSubramaniam Chair of Excellence on Consumer Law and Jurisprudence, Tamil Nadu Dr.Ambedkar Law University, Chennai during the period May – October, 2016. The Survey was divided into three parts: (i) Awareness among the Public (ii) Awareness among the Traders and (iii) Awareness among Officials, Lawyers and Analysts. The student volunteers, 10 each from the eight affiliated law colleges of the university were deployed to undertake the survey under the supervision of the Project Co-ordinators. A total of 3500 persons, comprising 1750 among General Public, 1050 among Traders and 700 among Officials, Lawyers and Analysts were interviewed by the students. The first volume of the report covered the survey conducted among the General Public. This volume covers the survey conducted among the Traders. A copy of the questionnaire given to the participant traders in the survey is enclosed as Annexure-I. Details regarding the number of participants' region wise, gender wise, age group wise, the type of business – hoesale/retail, the number of years in trade or business etc., are given in Annexure-II. A copy of the guidelines given to the project coordinators and instructions given to the student volunteers is enclosed as Annexure-III. Random sampling method was followed while undertaking the survey. The classification of raw data obtained in the survey is given as Annexure-IV.

Tamil Nadu has been divided into four regions and the Districts comprising the regions are given below:

Northern Region: Chennai, Kancheepuram, Tirvallur, Cuddalore, Villupuram, Vellore, Tiruvannamalai. [7 Districts]

Southern Region: Madurai, Dindigul, Theni, Ramanathapuram, Sivaganga, Virudhunagar, Tirunelveli, Thoothukkudi, Kanniyakumari. [9 Districts]

Western Region: The Nilgiris, Coimbatore, Tiruppur, Erode, Salem, Krishnagiri, Dharmapuri. [7 Districts]

Central Region: Thanjavur, Tiruvarur, Nagapattinam, Pudukkottai, Trichy, Karur, Perambalur, Ariyalur. [8 Districts]

A detailed analysis of the data is given in the following paragraphs.

I. Number of years in Trade or Business

- (i) (a) 39.9% of the respondents have been in business for more than ten years. 19.6% have been in business for periods ranging from 5 to 10 years, while 27.8% are in the range from 1 to 5 years. 12.7% of the respondents are recent entrants (less than one year) to the trade/business. [Page 14–15 of Annexure-IV]



- (b) There is no significant difference in the percentage of respondents vis-à-vis the number of years they have been in business in the different regions. [Page 14–15 of Annexure-IV]
- (ii)(a) Of the 1050 respondents, 230 or 21.9% are doing the wholesale business while the remaining 820 or 78.1% are doing retail business. [Page 108 of Annexure-IV]




- (b) Among the traders doing wholesale business, the percentage of traders who are in the business for more than ten years is higher (43.5%) compared to those in the 5–10 years category (25.7%), 1–5 years (24.3%) and less than one year (6.5%). [Page 108 of Annexure-IV]


- (c) Among the traders doing retail business, the percentage of those who are in business for more than ten years is 38.9% while the percentage in respect of other groups is: 5-10 years: 17.9%, 1-5 years: 28.8% and below one year: 14.4%. [Page 108 of Annexure-IV]

II. License / Registration to run business


- (i) (a) Respondents were asked to state whether they are running the business after obtaining a proper license or registration. 60.6% of the respondents replied in the affirmative while 25.8% of the respondents stated that they are running the business without license or registration. 13.6% of the respondents chose not to give any specific reply. [Page 16 of Annexure-IV]



- (b) The percentage of respondents who have obtained a license or registration is highest in the western region (70.6%) followed by the northern region (60.3%), southern region (59.8%) and central region (56%). [Page 16 of Annexure-IV]
- (c) The percentage of respondents who have not obtained a license or registration is highest in the southern region (32.9%) followed by northern (22.8%), central (22.7%) and western (20.2%) regions. [Page 16 of Annexure-IV]



- (ii) Among the wholesalers, 78.7% have taken license or registration while 13.9% have not done so. Among the retailers, the correspondent percentages are 55.5% and 29.1% respectively. 7.4% of the wholesalers and 15.4% of the retailers did not give any reply. [Page 109-110 of Annexure-IV]




- (iii)(a) Among the 636 respondents (60.6%) who have taken a license or registration, 271 respondents (42.6%) have been in the business for more than 10 years, 130 respondents (20.4%) have been in business for five to ten years, 185 respondents (29.1%) for one to five years and 50 respondents (7.9%) for less than one year. [Page 139 of Annexure-IV]

- (b) Among the 271 respondents (25.8%) who have not taken a license or registration as many as 108 (39.9%) have been in business for more than ten years. 50 respondents (18.5%) have been doing business for periods ranging from five to ten years while 58 respondents (21.4%) are in business for one to five years and 55 respondents (20.3%) are in business for less than one year. [Page 139 of Annexure-IV]

III. Category of License / Registration

- (i) (a) Among the 636 respondents who have taken a license/registration, 313 respondents (49.2%) have taken the license under the Shops and Establishments Act while 121 respondents (19%) have taken license under the Food Safety and Standards Act. 48 respondents (7.5%) have taken a license under Dangerous and Offensive Trade Act, 26 respondents (4.1%) under Legal Metrology Act and 128 respondents (20.1%) under other Acts. [Page 17 of Annexure-IV]



- (b) The percentage of respondents who have taken license under the Food Safety and Standards Act is highest (27%) in northern region followed by 15.5% in central region, 13% in western region and 12.2% in southern region. [Page 17 of Annexure-IV]
- (ii)(a) Among the wholesalers, 46.4% have taken license under the Shops and Establishments Act followed by 19.9% under Food Safety and Standards Act, 6.6% under Legal Metrology Act and 5% under Dangerous and Offensive Trade Act. The remaining 22.1% have taken licenses/registration under other Acts. [Page 111 of Annexure-IV]
- (b) Among the retailers also, the percentage of respondents who have taken license under the Shops and Establishments Act is highest at 50.3% followed by 18.7% under Food Safety and Standards Act, 8.6% under Dangerous and Offensive Trade Act and 3.1% under Legal Metrology Act. The remaining 19.3% have taken license/registration under other Acts. [Page 111 of Annexure-IV]
- (iii)(a) Among those who have taken license under the Shops and Establishments Act, 44.4% of respondents have been in the business for more than 10 years, 19.8% for periods ranging from 5 to 10 years, 29.1% for 1–5 years and 6.7% for less than one year. [Page 141 of Annexure-IV]
- (b) Among those who have taken license under the Food Safety and Standards Act, 39.7% of respondents have been in the business for more than 10 years. 16.5% of the respondents have been in business for periods ranging from 5 to 10 years, 34.7% for periods ranging from 1 to 5 years and 9.1% for less than one year. [Page 141 of Annexure-IV]

IV. Difficulty in getting the License / Registration

- (i) (a) While 30.3% of the respondents stated in that they had difficulty in getting licenses/registration, the remaining 69.7% did not find any difficulty in the getting the same. [Page 18-19 of Annexure-IV]
- (b) The percentage of respondents who had difficulty in getting licenses was highest in southern region (35.9%) followed by 31.3% in central, 30.1% in northern and 11.9% in western region respectively. [Page 18 of Annexure-IV]
- (c) Correspondingly the percentage of respondents who did not have difficulty in getting licenses was highest in western region (88.1%) followed by northern (69.9%) central 68.7% and southern region (64.1%) respectively. [Page 19 of Annexure-IV]
- (ii) Among the respondents doing wholesale business, 31.7% had difficulty in getting licenses while 68.3% did not have any difficulty. Among those doing retail business 29.9% had difficulty in getting licenses while 70.1% did not have any difficulty. [Page 112 of Annexure-IV]
- (iii)(a) Classification of data among respondents who have been doing trade/business for varying number of years shows that persons who have entered business in recent years had less difficulty compared to those who have been in business for more years. In other words the ease of doing business has improved over the years. The percentage of respondents who had difficulty in getting licenses among those who have been in business for more than 10 years is 34.1% followed by 28.6% for those in business for 5-10 years, 27.7% for those in business for 1-5 years and 26.3% for those below 1 year. [Page 142 of Annexure-IV]
- (b) Correspondingly the percentage of respondents who had no difficulty in getting license/registration was 73.7% in respect of those doing business for less than 1 year, 72.3% for those in business for 1-5 years, 71.4% for those in business for 5-10 years and 65.9% for those in business for more than 10 years. [Page 143 of Annexure-IV]

V. Registration under Food Safety and Standards Act, 2006 (FSSA)


- (i) (a) Among the 1050 respondents, 364 or 34.7% of the respondents have obtained license under Food Safety and Standards Act, 2006 while 686 or 65.3% of the respondents have not done so. [Page 20-21 of Annexure-IV]
- (b) The percentage of respondents who have registered under FSSA is highest under in the central region (43.3%) followed by western

region (43.1%), northern region (41.5%) and southern region (19.2%). [Page 20 of Annexure-IV]

- (ii)(a) Among the 364 respondents who have registered under the FSSA, 100 or 27.5% are wholesalers and 72.5% are retailers. [Page 113 of Annexure-IV]
- (b) 130 respondents (19%) among the 686 respondents who have not registered under FSSA are wholesalers while 556 (81%) are retailers. [Page 114 of Annexure-IV]
- (c) Among the 230 wholesalers 43.5% have obtained FSSA registration while 56.5% have not done so. Among the 820 retailers, 32.2% have obtained FSSA registration while 67.8% have not done so. [Page 114 of Annexure-IV]
- (iii) Classification of data in terms of years in the trade or business does not show any trend. Among the respondents who have been in business for less than 1 year, 33.8% have obtained registration under FSSA while 66.2% have not done so. The corresponding percentages for the other groups are: (i) 1-5 years: 42.1% and 57.9% (ii) 5-10 years: 38.8% and 61.2% and (iii) above 10 years: 27.7% and 72.3%. [Page 144 of Annexure-IV]

VI. Gathering knowledge of Rules and Regulations regarding business

- (i) (a) Among the 1050 respondents, 154 or 14.7% have gathered knowledge of Rules and Regulations regarding business from family members, while 20.7% have got it from friends, 47.4% from traders and the remaining 17.2% from Government officials. [Page 21-22 of Annexure-IV]



- (b) No particular trend is visible in the data between regions. However, the percentage of respondents who have gathered knowledge of Rules and Regulations is highest in western region 32.1% followed by 20.7% in southern region, 14.5% in northern region and 6.7% in central region. [Page 22 of Annexure-IV]
- (ii)(a) Among the wholesalers a large percentage of respondents (53.9%) have gathered knowledge of Rules and Regulations from co-traders, followed by family members (16.5%), Government officials (15.2%) and friends (14.3%). [Page 115-116 of Annexure-IV]
- (b) Among the retailers also 45.6% of the respondents have come to know about Rules and Regulations from co-traders followed by 22.4% from friends, 17.8% from Government officials and 14.1% from family members. [Page 115-116 of Annexure-IV]
- (iii)(a) Classification of data among respondents in terms of their number of years in trade or business vis-à-vis source of knowledge of Rules and Regulations does not reveal any trend with regard to family members, friends or co-traders.
- (b) However, the percentage of respondents who have gathered knowledge of Rules and Regulations from Government officials increases as the years in the business increases as can be seen from the following data: (i) below 1 year: 7.5% (ii) 1-5 years: 11.6% (iii) 5-10 years: 16% and (iv) above 10 years: 24.8%. [Page 146 of Annexure-IV]

VII. Awareness about Food Department officials


- (i) (a) The respondents were asked whether they know the name, designation, official address, phone number etc., of the Food Department officials in the area. While 23.9% of the respondents stated that they know the details, 55.4% did not know the details, the remaining 20.7% of the respondents did not give any opinion. [Page 23 of Annexure-IV]
- (b) The percentage of the respondents who know the names and other details of the officials was higher in western region (43.1%) followed by 21.9% in northern region, 21.6% in southern region and 21.3% in central region. [Page 23 of Annexure-IV]
- (ii)(a) Among the wholesalers 36.5% of the respondents know the name, designation etc., of the officials while 46.5% do not know the details. 17% of the respondents did not give any reply. [Page 117-118 of Annexure-IV]
- (b) Among the retailers only 20.4% of the respondents replied in the affirmative to the question while 57.9% of the respondents replied

in the negative. 21.7% of the respondents did not give any reply. [Page 117-118 of Annexure-IV]

- (iii) Classification of data with regard number of years in the business does not reveal any trend as can be seen from the following: (a) below 1 year: 21.1% (b) 1-5 years: 22.6% (c) 5-10 years: 28.2% and (d) above 10 years: 23.6%. [Page 147 of Annexure-IV]

VIII. Knowledge of Act / Rules that govern the Trade

- (i) (a) Respondents were asked to state whether they know the name of the Act/Rules/Regulations that govern their trade. While 29.6% replied in the affirmative, 48% stated that they do not know the name of the Act/Rules etc. The remaining 22.4% did not give any opinion. [Page 24-25 of Annexure-IV]



- (b) Among the respondents who know the names of Act, Rules etc., the percentage is the highest in the western region at 35.8% followed by 29.5% in the northern region, 28.7% in the central region and 28.3% in the southern region. [Page 24 of Annexure-IV]
- (c) Among the respondents who do not know the names of the Act, Rules etc., the percentage is the highest in the southern region (51.6%), closely followed by central region (51.3%), northern region (45.5%) and western region (42.2%). [Page 25 of Annexure-IV]
- (ii)(a) Among the wholesalers 50% of the respondents know the names of the Act, Rules etc., while 37% do not know the same. The remaining 13% of the respondents did not give any opinion. [Page 119 of Annexure-IV]
- (b) Among the retailers only 23.9% of the respondents know the names of the Act, Rules etc., while 51.1% do not know the same.


The remaining 25% did not give any opinion. [Page 119 of Annexure-IV]

(iii)(a) Classification of data according to the number of years in trade/business does not reveal any trend. The percentage of respondents who know the Act, Rules etc., among those who are in business for varying periods is as follows: (a) below 1 year: 27.1% (b) 1-5 years: 24.3% (c) 5-10 years: 34% (d) above 10 years: 32%. [Page 149 of Annexure-IV]


(b) The percentage of respondents who do not know the Act, Rules etc., among those who are in business for varying periods is as follows: (a) below 1 year: 53.4% (b) 1-5 years: 46.2% (c) 5-10 years: 41.3% (d) above 10 years: 50.8%. [Page 149 of Annexure-IV]

IX. Opinion about FSS Act, 2006

(i) (a) 58% of the respondents across the State are of the opinion that FSSA is essential while 21.6% are of the view that it does not serve any purpose. The remaining 20.4% stated that it does not help trade. [Page 26 of Annexure-IV]



(b) Traders in the western region seem to be more convinced about the essentiality of FSSA. 78.9% of the respondents in the western region stated that FSSA is essential while 64.1% of the respondents in the northern region, 53.9% of the respondents in the southern region and 34% of the respondents in the central region share the same view. [Page 26 of Annexure-IV]



- (c) The percentage of the respondents who have a negative perception about FSSA is highest in the central region. While 26.7% of the respondents in that region stated that the Act serves no purpose, 39.3% stated that it does not help trade. A fairly significant percentage of respondents in the southern region also feel that the Act does not serve any purpose (24.2%) or does not help trade (21.9%). The corresponding percentages in the northern region are 19.4% and 16.5% respectively. The negative perception of the Act is minimum in the western region where only 15.6% of the respondents feel that it serves no purpose while 5.5% feel that it does not help trade. [Page 26 of Annexure-IV]
- (ii)(a) Among the respondents who are doing wholesale business, 64.8% are of the view the Act is essential while 17.8% feel that it serves no purpose and another 17.4% feel that it does not help trade. [Page 120 of Annexure-IV]
- (b) Among the retailers, 56.1% are of the view that the Act is essential while 22.7% feel that it serves no purpose and the remaining 21.2% are of the view that it does not help trade. [Page 120 of Annexure-IV]
- (iii)(a) There is no particular trend among traders doing business for varying years with regard to their opinion about the essentiality of FSSA. The percentage of respondents who feel that the Act is essential, among those who are in business, is as follows: (a) below 1 year: 57.9% (b) 1-5 years: 62.3% (c) 5-10 years: 51.5% (d) above 10 years: 58.2%. [Page 150 of Annexure-IV]
- (b) The percentage of respondents who are in business for varying periods and who are of the view that the Act serves no purpose, is as follows: (a) below 1 year: 30.8% (b) 1-5 years: 20.5% (c) 5-10 years: 22.8% (d) above 10 years: 18.9%. [Page 150 of Annexure-IV]

- (c) The percentage of respondents who are in business for varying periods and who are of the view that the Act does not help trade, is as follows: (a) below 1 year: 11.3% (b) 1-5 years: 17.1% (c) 5-10 years: 25.7% (d) above 10 years: 22.9%. [Page 151 of Annexure-IV]

X. Ensuring Food Safety in the absence of such Acts

- (i) (a) Respondents were asked to state how food safety could be ensured to the public in the absence of Acts like FSS Act. 19.5% of the respondents across the State stated that it could be ensured through self-discipline by traders, 23.2% stated that it could be ensured by following trade ethics, 20.4% stated that it could be done by rejection of unsafe foods, 18.7% stated that it could be ensured by creating public awareness while the remaining 18.2% stated that it could be ensured through other means (Page 27–28 of Annexure-IV)




- (b) 34.9% of the trader - respondents in the western region stated that self-discipline among them could ensure food safety among the public in the absence of Acts like FSSA while the percentage of traders who held similar view was much less in the other regions: 21.2% in the northern region, 15.5% in the southern region and 12.7% in the central region [Page 27 of Annexure-IV]
- (c) The percentage of respondents who were of the view that by following trade ethics food safety could be ensured does not show any major difference among regions: 21.7% in the northern region, 25.4% in the southern region, 22% in the western region and 24% in the central region. [Page 27 of Annexure-IV]
- (d) Rejection of unsafe food is cited as a method for ensuring food safety by 34% of the respondents in the central region, 24.8% in western region, 22.4% in southern region and 13.2% in northern region. [Page 27 of Annexure-IV]

- (e) 23.3% of respondents in the central region feel that food safety can be ensured by creating public awareness. This view is shared 19% of the respondents in northern and southern and 10.1% of the respondents in western region. [Page 28 of Annexure-IV]
- (ii)(a) Among the 230 wholesalers who were asked the question how food safety can be ensured in the absence of Acts like FSSA, 22.2% stated that it can be done by self-discipline by traders, 20% stated that it can be done by following trade ethics, 20% by rejection of unsafe food, 21.7% by creating public awareness and 16.1% stated that it can be done by other means. [Page 121-122 of Annexure-IV]
- (b) Among the 820 retailers, the percentage of respondents who favoured different methods for ensuring food safety in the absence of Acts like FSSA is as follows: (a) self-discipline by traders: 18.8% (b) following trade ethics: 24.1% (c) rejection of unsafe food: 20.5% (d) creating public awareness: 17.8% (e) other means: 18.8%. [Page 121-122 of Annexure-IV]
- (iii)(a) The classification of data according to the number of years the respondents have been in trade/business does not show any trend vis-à-vis their opinion on which is the best method to ensure food safety in the absence of Acts like FSSA. Self-discipline by traders was preferred by 17.7% of respondents in the group doing business for more than 10 years and 23.3% of the respondents in the group doing business for less than one year. [Page 152 of Annexure-IV]
- (b) The percentage of respondents who preferred following trade ethics ranged from 20.9% in the group doing business for 1–5 age years to 27.1% in the group doing business for less than one year. [Page 152 of Annexure-IV]
- (c) Rejection of unsafe food was preferred by 25.3% of the respondents in 1–5 years group and 16.2% in the above 10 years group while the other groups came in between. [Page 152 of Annexure-IV]
- (d) The percentage of respondents who preferred creating public awareness as a method for ensuring food safety among the different traders is as follows: (i) below 1 year: 18% (ii) 1–5 year: 18.2% (iii) 5–10 years: 16.5% (iv) above 10 years: 20.3%. [Page 152 of Annexure-IV]

XI. Reasons for opposing government actions under FSS Act

- (i) (a) The participants were asked to state whether they oppose the actions of the government under FSS Act and if so the main reason for opposing the same. 477 of the 1050 respondents (45.4%) stated

that they do not oppose government actions. Among the others 10.2% stated that the government actions affect freedom, 19.3% stated that they bring in unnecessary control 14.6% were of the view that they do not serve any purpose and the remaining 10.5% stated that they breed corruption. [Page 29–30 of Annexure-IV]




- (b) The percentage of respondents who do not oppose government controls and actions is highest in western region (73.4%) followed by 49.6% in northern region, 41.1% in southern region and 22.7% in central region. [Page 29–30 of Annexure-IV]
- (c) 28.7% of the respondents in the central region, 24.2% in southern region, 16.3% in northern region and 3.7 in western region feel that the government controls and actions bring in unnecessary control. [Page 29–30 of Annexure-IV]
- (d) The percentage of respondents who feel that government actions breed corruption is highest in central region (16%) followed by 14.1% in northern region, 5.8% in southern region and 2.8% in western region. [Page 29–30 of Annexure-IV]
- (ii)(a) Among the wholesalers 44.3% do not oppose government actions while 10.4% are of the view that they affect freedom, 15.7% feel that they bring in unnecessary control, 18.3% feel that they do not serve any purpose and the remaining 11.3% feel that they breed corruption. [Page 123-124 of Annexure-IV]
- (b) Among the retailers 45.7% do not oppose government actions. 10.1% are of the view that they affect freedom, 20.4% feel that they bring in unnecessary control, 13.5% feel that they do not serve any purpose and the remaining 10.2% feel that they breed corruption. [Page 123-124 of Annexure-IV]

- (iii)(a) Classification of data pertaining to the above question among respondents who have been in business for varying years does not show any trend. This can be seen from the fact that the percentage of people who do not oppose government actions in the different categories is as follows: (i) below 1 year: 47.4% (ii) 1–5 year: 45.5% (iii) 5–10 years: 41.3% (iv) above 10 years: 46.8%. [Page 154 of Annexure-IV]
- (b) Similarly, the percentage of persons, among different categories, who are of the view that government actions will bring in unnecessary control is as follows: (i) below 1 year: 23.3% (ii) 1–5 year: 17.8% (iii) 5–10 years: 17% (iv) above 10 years: 20.3%. [Page 154 of Annexure-IV]

XII. Kind of guidance expected from government officials

- (i) (a) The traders/respondents were asked to state the kind of help/guidance required from government officials. 29.3% of the respondents stated that they would like to be apprised of government rules and regulations; 18.9% would welcome guidance to develop label; 21.7% would like assistance in getting license/registration; 18.8% would like officials to visit them periodically and guide them while 11.3% would like to be helped with the provision of infrastructural facilities. [Page 31 of Annexure-IV]



- (b) Among the respondents who wanted help in understanding government rules and regulations, the percentage was highest in the northern region (40%) followed by 27.7% in the southern region, 11% in western region and 14.7% in central region.

- (c) More percentage of respondents in central region (26.7%) expect guidance to develop label compared to traders in other regions.
 - (d) The percentage of respondents who would appreciate assistance to get license/registration is highest in southern region (32.9%).
 - (e) A high percentage of traders in the western region (35.8%) would like periodical visits by government officials to guide traders.
 - (f) The percentage of respondents who would require help in having infrastructural facilities is higher in western (21.1%) and central (20.7%) regions compared to northern (9.6%) and southern (6.4%) regions. [Page 31 of Annexure-IV]
- (ii)(a) Among the 230 wholesalers, 25.2% want assistance in understanding rules and regulations, 23.9% want guidance to develop label, 18.3% want assistance to get license/registration, 23.9% welcome periodical visits by government officials to help them and the remaining 8.7% would welcome assistance in putting up infrastructural facilities.
 - (b) Among the 820 retailers, the response to the above question was as follows: (i) knowledge of rules and regulations: 30.5% (ii) guidance to develop label: 17.4% (iii) assistance to get license/registration: 22.7% (iv) periodical visit to guide traders: 17.3% and (v) infrastructural facilities: 12.1%. [Page 125-126 of Annexure-IV]
- (iii)(a) Among the respondents who have been in business for varying periods, it is surprising to note that a high percentage of respondents in the 'above 10 years' category (36.3%) want help in acquiring knowledge of rules and regulations compared to those who are in business for 5–10 years (28.2%), 1-5 years (21.9%) and below one year 25.6%.
 - (b) Expectedly, more respondents who are in business for less than a year(29.3%) require guidance to develop label compared to those in business for 1-5 years (19.5%), 5-10 years (17.5%) and above 10 years (15.8%).
 - (c) The replies of respondents who have been in business for varying periods does not show any trend with regard to the help they require (i) to get license/registration (ii) to get infrastructural facilities and (iii) to get guidance from government officials through periodical visits. [Page 155–156 of Annexure-IV]

XIII. Visit of Food Safety Officers

- (i) (a) The respondents were asked how often the Food Safety Officer (FSO) visits their shop for guidance. 48.9% of the respondents stated that FSO never visits the shop, 14.4% stated that he visits once in three months, 13.6% stated that he visits once in six months and the remaining 23.1% stated that he visits once in a year. [Page 32-33 of Annexure-IV]




- (b) The percentage of respondents who stated that the FSO never visits their shop is highest in the southern region (64.7%) as compared to 47.3% in the central region, 44% in the northern region and 21.1% in the western region.
- (c) 39.4% of the respondents in the western region stated that the FSO visits the shop at least once in three months compared to 18% in central region, 12.5% in the northern region and 7.3% in the southern region.
- (d) A fairly high percentage of respondents in the northern region (30.6%) stated that FSO visits the shop once a year. The same reply was given by 22% of the respondents in the western region, 20% in the central region and 15.2% in the southern region. [Page 32-33 of Annexure-IV]
- (ii)(a) 41.7% of the 230 wholesalers stated that the FSO never visits their premises while 11.7% stated that he visits once in three months, 19.1% stated that he visits once in six months and 27.4% stated that he visits once a year.
- (b) Among the retailers, the percentage of respondents who stated that FSO never visits their premises is higher at 50.9%, while the percentage of respondents who stated that the FSO's visit is once

in three months, once in six months and once in a year were 15.1%, 12.1% and 22% respectively. [Page 127 of Annexure-IV]

- (iii)(a) 62.4% of the respondents who have in business for less than a year stated that the FSO never visits them for guidance while the same view is expressed by 46.6% of the respondents in the 1-5 year category, 47.1% in the 5-10 years category and 47% in the above 10 years category.
- (b) There is no marked difference in the percentage of respondents who stated that the FSO visits once in three months as can be seen from the following data: (i) below one year: 13.5% (ii) 1-5 years: 14.4% (iii) 5-10 years: 13.1% and (iv) above 10 years: 14.8%.
- (c) Similarly, no particular trend is noticed in the reply given by the respondents of various categories that the FSO visits their premises once in six months as can be seen from the following data: (i) below one year: 9.8% (ii) 1-5 years: 13.4% (iii) 5-10 years: 15.5% and (iv) above 10 years: 14.1%. [Page 157 of Annexure-IV]

XIV. Type of complaints made by the Public

- (i) (a) The trader-participants were asked to indicate the type of complaint that public make. 55.2% of the complaints are about costs, 19.5% are about hygiene, 16.4% are about taste and 8.9% are about environment. [Page 34 of Annexure-IV]




- (b) According to the respondents, the public in the southern region complain more about cost (60.6%) followed by people in the western region (59.6%), central region (52%) and northern region (51.1%).
- (c) 30% of the respondents from the central region state that the public complain about hygiene. The same complaint is made by the public in the northern region (22.5%), southern region (13.4%) and western region (11.9%).

- (d) 15.8% of the respondents in the northern region state that public complain about taste while 18.1%, 22% and 10% of the respondents in the southern, western and central regions respectively are of the view that the public from their regions complain about taste.
- (e) 10.5% of the respondents in the northern region state that the public complain about the environment. The corresponding percentage in other regions is 8% or below. [Page 34 of Annexure-IV]
- (ii)(a) Among the wholesalers, 52.2% state that the public complain about cost while 21.3% state that they complain about hygiene, 16.1% about taste and 10.4% about environment.
 - (b) Among the retailers also, a similar trend is noticed. 56.1% state that the public complain about cost followed by 19% about hygiene, 16.5% about taste and 8.4% about environment. [Page 128 of Annexure-IV]
- (iii)(a) Data relating to the number of years in the trade or business of the respondents shows that 64.7% of the respondents in the 'above 10 years' category state that the public complain about cost. Similar view was expressed by 52.4% of the respondents in the '5-10 years' category, 47.9% in the 1-5 years category and 45.9% in the less than one year category.
 - (b) Percentage of respondents in the different categories of years in business who are of the view that the public complain about hygiene is as follows: (i) below one year: 27.1% (ii) 1-5 years: 16.4% (iii) 5-10 years: 20.4% and (iv) above 10 years: 18.9%.
 - (c) The percentage of respondents who state that the major complaint of the public is about taste is as follows: (i) below one year: 22.6% (ii) 1-5 years: 20.2% (iii) 5-10 years: 16.5% and (iv) above 10 years: 11.7%. [Page 159 of Annexure-IV]

XV. Training on Food Safety

- (i) (a) More than 2/3rd of the respondents or 68.3% of the 1050 trader/respondents to be precise, have not undergone any training in food safety. Only 17.8% of the respondents have undergone training on hygiene/food safety while the remaining 13.9% of the respondents did not give any opinion [Page 35-36 of Annexure-IV]



- (b) The percentage of respondents who have undergone training in hygiene/food safety is highest in the central region (38%) followed by western (15.6%) southern (14.3%) and northern (14.3%) regions respectively.
- (c) The percentage of respondents who have not undergone training in hygiene/food safety is highest in the southern region (77.6%) followed by western (77.1%) northern (67.4%) and central (43.3%) regions respectively. [Page 35 of Annexure-IV]
- (ii)(a) Of the 230 wholesalers, only 71 or 30.9% have undergone training in food safety while 53% of the wholesalers have not undergone training in hygiene or food safety. The remaining 16.1% of the wholesalers did not give any opinion.
- (b) The percentage of retailers who have undergone training is much less at 14.1%. Only 116 of 820 retailers who were interviewed stated that they have undergone training in hygiene or food safety. 72.6% of the retailers have not undergone any training while 13.3% did not give any opinion. [Page 129–130 of Annexure-IV]
- (iii)(a) The percentage of respondents according to the years of experience in the trade or business who have undergone training in food safety is as follows: (i) below one year: 20.3% (ii) 1–5 years: 17.1% (iii) 5-10 years: 21.4% and (iv) above 10 years: 15.8%. [Page 160 of Annexure-IV]
- (b) Corresponding percentage of respondents who have not undergone training is as follows: (i) below one year: 60.9% (ii) 1–5 years: 62.7% (iii) 5-10 years: 63.6% and (iv) above 10 years: 76.8%. It is to be noted that a large percentage of respondents in the above 10 year category have not undergone any training in hygiene or food safety. [Page 160 of Annexure-IV]

XVI. Period of training attended

- (i) (a) Of the 187 respondents who have undergone some training in hygiene or food safety, 36.9% have undergone training up to three days, 20.9% between 4 and 7 days, 15% between 8 and 15 days and 27.3% above 15 days.
- (b) The percentage of respondents who have undergone training above 15 days is highest in the southern region (49%) followed by western region (41.2%) northern region (26.6%) and central region (5.3%).
- (c) The percentage of respondents who have undergone training for 3 days or below is highest in the central region (49.1%) followed by northern region (34.4%), western region (29.4%) and southern region (28.6%). [Page 37 of Annexure-IV]
- (ii)(a) Among the 71 wholesalers who have undergone training, the period wise break-up is as follows: (i) up to three days: 35.2% (ii) 4-7 days: 19.7% (iii) 8-15 days: 14.1% and (iv) above 15 days: 31%.
- (b) Among the 116 retailers who have undergone training, the period wise break-up is as follows: (i) up to three days-37.9% (ii) 4-7 days: 21.6% (iii) 8-15 days: 15.5% and (iv) above 15 days: 25%. [Page 131 of Annexure-IV]
- (iii)(a) Classification of data according to the experience in the trade or business shows that the following percentages of respondents have undergone training for more than 15 days. (i) below one year: 15.7% (ii) 1-5 years: 21.6% (iii) 5-10 years: 21.6% and (iv) above 10 years: 41.2%.
- (b) Percentage of respondents who have undergone training for three days or below is as follows: (i) below one year: 18.8% (ii) 1-5 years: 30.4% (iii) 5-10 years: 20.3% and (iv) above 10 years: 30.4%. [Page 161-162 of Annexure-IV]

XVII. Necessity for Training

- (i) (a) 48.9% of the respondents stated that such type of training is necessary while 51.1% of the respondents state that it is not necessary.
- (b) The percentage of respondents who feel that training is necessary is highest in the central region (67.7%) followed by western (57.6%), northern (45.8%) and southern (44.2%) regions respectively. [Page 38 of Annexure-IV]


- (ii)(a) Among the wholesalers 56% of the respondents stated that training is necessary while 44% did not think so.
- (b) Among the retailers the percentage of respondents who think that training is necessary is less at 47.3% compared to 52.7% who do not think that such training necessary. [Page 132-133 of Annexure-IV]
- (iii)(a) Classification of data according to experience in the trade or business shows that the percentage of respondents who think that training is necessary is as follows: (i) below one year: 44.3% (ii) 1-5 years: 57% (iii) 5-10 years: 51.9% and (iv) above 10 years: 43.3%. [Page 163 of Annexure-IV]
- (b) The percentage of respondents who do not think that training is necessary is as follows: (i) below one year: 55.7% (ii) 1-5 years: 43% (iii) 5-10 years: 48.1% and (iv) above 10 years: 56.7%. [Page 163 of Annexure-IV]

XVIII. Interest in Training

- (i) (a) Of the 1050 respondents, 560 or 53.3% state that they are interested in such type of training while the remaining 46.7% are not interested.
- (b) The percentage of interested respondents is highest in central region (64.7%) followed by northern (54.5%), western (48.6%) and southern (48.4%) regions respectively. [Page 39 of Annexure-IV]
- (ii)(a) Among wholesalers 58.7% are interested in training while 41.3% are not interested.
- (b) Among the retailers 51.8% are interested in undergoing training while 48.2% are not interested. [Page 134 of Annexure-IV]
- (iii)(a) Classification of data in terms of number of years in trade/business shows that the percentage of respondents interested in training does not reveal any trend as can be seen from the following: (i) below one year: 49.6% (ii) 1-5 years: 62.7% (iii) 5-10 years: 55.8% and (iv) above 10 years: 46.8%. [Page 164 of Annexure IV]
- (b) The percentage of respondents who are not interested in training is as follows: (i) below one year: 50.4% (ii) 1-5 years: 37.3% (iii) 5-10 years: 44.2% and (iv) above 10 years: 53.2%. [Page 165 of Annexure-IV]

XIX. Responsibility for Unsafe Food

- (i) (a) The respondents were asked to choose one among the following factors responsible for unsafe food: unsafe water, unsafe environment, careless trade, unhygienic practices. 20.1% of the respondents cited unsafe water, 24.5% cited unsafe environment, 36.6% mentioned careless trade and 18.9% pointed out that unhygienic practices are responsible for unsafe food. [Page 40-41 of Annexure-IV]



- (b) While 25.2% of the respondents in the northern region and 20.7% in the southern region mentioned unsafe water as the reason for unsafe food, the same view is shared by 10.1% of the respondents in the western region and 10.7% in the central region.
- (c) Unsafe environment is cited as a reason by 29.7% of the respondents in the northern region, 19% in the southern region, 17.4% in the western region and 26.7% in the central region.
- (d) Surprisingly careless trade is cited as a major reason in all the regions. 33.5% in the northern region, 36.7% in the southern region, 42.2% in the western region and 41.3% in the central region have cited this reason.
- (e) 11.6% in the northern region, 23.6% in the southern region, 30.3% in the western region and 21.3% in the central region have mentioned unhygienic practices as the main reason responsible for unsafe food. [Page 40-41 of Annexure-IV]
- (ii)(a) Among the wholesalers 33% mentioned “careless trade” as the reason responsible for unsafe food while 23% mentioned “unsafe environment”, 22.2% mentioned “unsafe water” and 21.7% mentioned “unhygienic practices” as the reason.

- (b) Among the retailers also a similar trend is noticed. While 37.6% mentioned “careless trade” as the reason responsible for unsafe food, 24.9% mentioned “unsafe environment”, 19.5% mentioned “unsafe water” and 18.0% mentioned “unhygienic practices” as the reason. [Page 135 of Annexure-IV]
- (iii)(a) Classification of data in terms of years of experience in trade or business shows no significant trend as can be seen from the following data regarding their opinion that careless trade is the main reason responsible for unsafe food: (i) below one year: 39.1% (ii) 1–5 years: 30.5% (iii) 5-10 years: 37.4% and (iv) above 10 years: 39.6%. [Page 166 of Annexure-IV]
- (b) The percentage of respondents who consider unsafe environment as the main reason responsible for unsafe food is as follows: (i) below one year: 23.3% (ii) 1–5 years: 28.1% (iii) 5-10 years: 18.4% and (iv) above 10 years: 25.3%.
- (c) The percentage of respondents who consider unsafe water as the main reason responsible for unsafe food is as follows: (i) below one year: 21.8% (ii) 1–5 years: 21.6% (iii) 5-10 years: 21.8% and (iv) above 10 years: 17.7%.
- (d) With regard to unhygienic practices being held as the main reason for unsafe food, the percentage among different categories is as follows: (i) below one year: 15.8% (ii) 1–5 years: 19.9% (iii) 5-10 years: 22.3% and (iv) above 10 years: 17.4%. [Page 166 of Annexure-IV]


XX. Seeking the help of Trade Associations

- (i) (a) When asked whether they will seek the help/services of trade associations to solve their problems, 53.1% of the respondents replied in the affirmative while 32.4% stated that they will not seek the services of trade associations. The remaining 14.5% did not offer any opinion. [Page 42 of Annexure-IV]
- (b) The respondents in the central and southern regions are more inclined to seek the help of trade associations. While 62.7% of the respondents in the central region and 59.2% in the southern region seek the help of associations, the percentage of respondents who do likewise is 47.1% in the northern region and 45.9% in the western region.
- (c) The percentage of respondents who do not want to seek the services of trade associations in the different regions is as follows: northern–31.3%, southern–32.9%, western–43.1% and central–26.7%. [Page 42 of Annexure-IV]

- (ii)(a) The percentage of wholesalers who seek the help/services of trade associations is fairly high at 64.8% while only 20.9% do not want to seek the help of trade associations. The remaining 14.3% did not give any opinion.
- (b) Among the retailers while 49.9% of the respondents would like to take the help/services of trade associations, 35.6% do not want to do so. Here again, 14.5% of the respondents did not give any opinion. [Page 136–137 of Annexure-IV]
- (iii)(a) There is no appreciable difference in the percentage of respondents who have varying years of experience in their trade or business with regard to their inclination or otherwise to take the help/services of trade associations.
- (b) The percentage of respondents, in terms of their experience in the trade or business, who would like take the help of trade associations is as follows: (i) below one year: 54.1% (ii) 1–5 years: 50.3% (iii) 5-10 years: 51.9% and (iv) above 10 years: 55.4%.
- (c) The percentage of respondents, who would not like take the help/services of trade associations is as follows: (i) below one year: 34.6% (ii) 1–5 years: 31.5% (iii) 5-10 years: 30.1% and (iv) above 10 years: 33.4%. [Page 167 of Annexure-IV]

XXI. Type of help required from trade associations

- (i) (a) The participants who had expressed the view that they would seek the help of trade associations were asked to state what kind of help they would need. 30.3% of the respondents stated that they would need guidance, 27.6% would need their support to show their unity/strength, 24.5% would need their help to fight in order to safeguard their interest and the remaining 17.6% would need the associations to provide information. [Page 43 of Annexure-IV]



- (b) A higher percentage of respondents in the northern region (31.8%) would like their associations to provide information compared to 18% in central region, 6% in the western region and 5.4% in southern region.
 - (c) There is considerable difference in the percentage of respondents who need guidance from the association. While it is 45.3% in the southern region, the percentage is relatively less at 24.5% in central region, 21.8% in northern region and 16% in southern region.
 - (d) 40% of respondents in western region and 39.4% in central region would like to take the help of the associations in order to show their unity or strength while the percentage is less at 23.7% and 23.2% in northern and southern regions respectively.
 - (e) A higher percentage of respondents in the western region (38%) want to take the help of the associations in their fight to safeguard their interests compared to 26.1% in the southern region, 22.7% in northern region and 18.1% in the central region. [Page 43 of Annexure-IV]
- (ii)(a) Among the 149 wholesalers who take the help of trade associations, 36.9% do so to fight in order to safeguard their interests, 27.5% to show their unity and strength, 22.1% for guidance and 13.4% for providing information.
 - (b) Among the 409 retailers who seek the help of trade associations, 33.3% do so for guidance, 27.6% to show their unity and strength, 20% to help in their fight to safeguard their interests and 19.1% for providing information. [Page 138 of Annexure-IV]
- (iii)(a) Classification of data in terms of the respondents' years of experience in the trade or business does not show any trend.
 - (b) The percentage of respondents in terms of their years of experience in the trade or business who would seek the help of associations to provide information is as follows: (i) below one year: 31.9% (ii) 1-5 years: 25.2% (iii) 5-10 years: 9.3% and (iv) above 10 years: 12.1%. [Page 169 of Annexure-IV]
 - (c) The percentage of respondents who would like guidance from the trade associations is as follows: (i) below one year: 29.2% (ii) 1-5 years: 19% (iii) 5-10 years: 29% and (iv) above 10 years: 38.4%.
 - (d) The percentage of respondents who would take help from the trade associations to show their unity/strength is as follows: (i) below one year: 18.1% (ii) 1-5 years: 32% (iii) 5-10 years: 31.8% and (iv) above 10 years: 25.9%.

- (e) The percentage of respondents who would like to take the help or services of trade associations in their fight to safeguard their interest does not show any appreciable difference between the various categories as can be seen from the following data: (i) below one year: 20.8% (ii) 1–5 years: 23.8% (iii) 5-10 years: 29.9% and (iv) above 10 years: 23.7%. [Page 169 of Annexure-IV]

XXII. Conclusions

- (i) It is shocking to note that less than two-third of the respondents are running their business with a valid license or registration. While 25.8% of the respondents have admitted that they are running the business without any license or registration, 13.6% chose not to give a reply. It can be taken that most respondents in this category also do not have a license or registration.
- (ii) Nearly 40% of those who have not taken a license/registration have been in business for more than ten years.
- (iii) About 30% of the respondents seem to have had difficulty in getting license/registration, more so in the southern region.
- (iv) Knowledge of rules and regulations regarding business have been gathered mostly from sources other than government like fellow traders, friends and family members. Less than 15% of the respondents have gained knowledge of rules relating to their business from government officials.
- (v) Awareness about food department officials i.e. their names, designation, address, phone numbers etc is very low among traders.
- (vi) Less than 30% of the traders know the name of the Act/Rules/Regulations that govern the trade.
- (vii) A majority of the traders, more among wholesalers than retailers, are of the opinion that FSS Act is essential. 21.6% of the traders are of the view that it does not serve any purpose while 20.4% feel that it does not help trade.
- (viii) The negative perception about FSS Act is highest in the central region and lowest in the western region.
- (ix) There is mixed response among traders as to how food safety can be ensured in the absence of Acts like FSS Act. 19.5% of the respondents cited self-discipline, 23% cited trade ethics, 20.4% mentioned rejection of unsafe foods, 18.7% stated that it could be ensured by creating awareness while the remaining 18.2% stated that it could be done through other means.

- (x) While 45.4% of the traders do not oppose government actions under the FSS Act, others oppose them for different reasons: affects freedom (10.2%), brings in unnecessary control (19.3%), breeds corruption (10.5%), does not serve any purpose (14.6%).
- (xi) Traders expect different kinds of guidance from government officials: to be apprised of government rules and regulations, guidance to develop label, assistance in getting license/registration, provision of infrastructural facilities and periodic visits to guide them.
- (xii) While more traders in the northern region want help in understanding government rules and regulations, those in the central region expect guidance to develop label, those in the southern region would appreciate assistance to get license/registration, those in the western region want help in having infrastructural facilities and periodical visits by government officials to guide them.
- (xiii) Food Safety officers do not seem visits the traders as often as they should. Nearly 50% of the traders state that the FSO never visits the shop while another 23% state that he visits once a year.
- (xiv) Public complaints to traders pertain mostly to costs (55.2%) followed by hygiene (19.5%), taste (16.4%) and environment (8.9%).
- (xv) Training on food safety to traders does not appear to have been taken up seriously. More than two-third of the respondents in the survey have not undergone any training in food safety. The percentage of respondents who have undergone training in food safety among retailers is less than half of those among wholesalers. Overall, just about 5% of the respondents have undergone training in food safety for more than 15 days.
- (xvi) Opinion about necessity for training is more or less evenly divided, 48.9% stating that it is necessary and the remaining 51.9% saying it is not necessary. But more than 53% of the respondents seem to be interested in undergoing training, more among wholesalers than among retailers.
- (xvii) Unsafe water, unsafe environment, careless trade and unhygienic practices are cited as the main reasons for unsafe food by the traders.
- (xviii) Though a majority of the traders (53.1%) like to seek the help/services of the traders' associations, quite a substantial percentage of traders (32.4%) do not need the services. The rest are non-committal.

- (xix) The percentage of traders who need the help of associations is higher among wholesalers than among retailers.
- (xx) The type of assistance that the traders need from associations is as follows:- general guidance: 30.3%, to show unity and strength: 27.6%, to fight to safeguard their interests: 24.5%, to provide information: 17.6%.

XXIII. Recommendations

- (i) **Licensing/Registration:** Immediate action should be taken to see that all the traders who do their business without a license/registration, in spite of the law requiring him to take one, are made to take a license/registration within a specified period. The procedures for taking license/registration should be simplified.
- (ii) **Interaction between traders and government officials:** Traders should be made aware of the rules and regulations that govern their trade. It should be made mandatory for government officials to visit the business premises of traders at least once a quarter so that they can guide the traders on complying with the rules and regulations.
- (iii) **Training of Traders:** Periodic training programmes should be organized both for wholesalers and retailers so that there is better appreciation among traders about the need for various Acts and Rules and of government's intention in bringing forward such legislation.
- (iv) **Traders' Associations:** By encouraging the formation of traders' associations and having frequent dialogue with them, many of the misconceptions about government actions can be removed. The associations can also act as a bridge between government and traders and facilitate early redressal of their grievances.

ANNEXURE - I

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TRADERS

1. **Name** :
2. **District** :
3. **Age** :
4. **Sex** : (a) Male (b) Female (c) Others
5. **Type of Business:** (a) Wholesale (b) Retail
6. **Mobile No:**
7. **How long are you doing this trade/business?**
(a) Below one year (b) 1-5 years (c) 5-10 years
(d) 10 years above
8. **Do you have a licence/Registration to do this business?**
(a) Yes (b) No (c) No opinion
9. **If yes, which of the following license do you have?**
(a) Shop & Establishment License
(b) Dangerous and offensive trade license
(c) Legal Metrology license
(d) Food Safety Standards Act license
(e) Any other license
10. **Did you have any difficulty in getting the above Licenses?**
(a) Yes (b) No
11. **Have you registered your business under the Food Safety and Standards (FSS) Act, 2006?**
(a) Yes (b) No
12. **Where did you gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding your Business?**
(a) Family members (b) Friends (c) Co-Traders
(d) Government officials
13. **Do you know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in your area?**
(a) Yes (b) No (c) No opinion
14. **Do you know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs your trade?**
(a) Yes (b) No (c) No opinion
15. **What is your opinion about the FSS Act, 2006?**
(a) It is essential (b) It serves no purpose
(c) It does not help trade

- 16. In the absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public?**
- (a) Self discipline by traders (b) Following trade ethics
(c) Rejection of unsafe foods (d) Public awareness
(e) Others
- 17. Why do you oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act?**
- (a) It affects our freedom
(b) It brings in unnecessary control
(c) Act does not serve any purpose
(d) It breeds corruption
(e) We don't oppose.
- 18. What kind of help/guidance/suggestions do you expect from government officials?**
- (a) Knowledge of rules/Regulations
(b) Guidance to develop label
(c) Assistance to get License/registration
(d) Periodical visit to guide traders
(e) Infrastructure facilities
- 19. How often does the FSO visit your shop and guide you?**
- (a) Never visits (b) Once in 3 months (c) once in 6 months
(d) Once in a Year
- 20. What type of complaints do public make?**
- (a) About taste (b) About hygiene (c) About cost
(d) About environment
- 21. Have you undergone any training on food hygiene/safety?**
- (a) Yes (b) No (c) No opinion
- 22. If yes, how many days?**
- (a) Less than 3 days (b) 4–7 days (c) 8-15 days
(d) Above 15 days
- 23. If “No” do you think that such type of training is necessary?**
- (a) Yes (b) No
- 24. Are you interested in such type of training?**
- (a) Yes (b) No
- 25. Which of the following may be held as more responsible for unsafe food?**
- (a) Unsafe water (b) Unsafe environment (c) Careless trade
(d) Unhygienic practices
- 26. Do you seek the help/services of trade associations?**
- (a) Yes (b) No (c) No opinion
- 27. If yes, what type of help?**
- (a) Providing information (b) Guidance (c) Unity/Strength
(d) to fight to safeguard our interests.

வியாபாரிகளுக்கான வினாப்பட்டியல்

- 1) வியாபாரியின் பெயர் :
- 2) மாவட்டம் :
- 3) வயது :
- 4) பாலினம் : (அ) ஆண் (ஆ) பெண் (இ) மற்றவர்
- 5) எந்த வகையான வியாபாரம் :
(அ) மொத்த விற்பனை (ஆ) சில்லறை விற்பனை
- 6) தொலைபேசி எண் :
- 7) எவ்வளவு காலமாக இந்த வியாபாரத்தை நடத்துகிறீர்கள்?
(அ) ஓராண்டுக்கு கீழ் (ஆ) 1 – 5 வருடங்கள்
(இ) 5 – 10 வருடங்கள் (ஈ) 10 வருடங்களுக்கு மேலாக
- 8) முறையான அனுமதி பெற்று அல்லது பதிவு செய்து இந்த வியாபாரத்தை நடத்துகிறீர்களா?
(அ) ஆம் (ஆ) இல்லை (இ) கருத்து இல்லை
- 9) மேற்கண்டவற்றை கேள்விக்கு பதில் ஆம் எனில், கீழ்க்கண்டவற்றில் எம்மாதிரியான அனுமதியை நீங்கள் பெற்றுள்ளீர்கள்?
(அ) கடை மற்றும் நிறுவன அனுமதி
(Shop and Establishment License)
(ஆ) ஆபத்தான மற்றும் தாக்குதல் வர்த்தக உரிமம்
(Dangerous and offensive Trade License)
(இ) சட்ட அளவியல் உரிமம்
(Legal Metrology License)
(ஈ) உணவு பாதுகாப்பு தர நிலைகள் சட்ட உரிமம்
(Food Safety Standards Act License)
(உ) இதர வகை உரிமம்/பதிவு
(Any other form of License or Registration)
- 10) மேற்கண்ட அனுமதியை பெறுவதில் ஏதாவது இடையூறு இருந்ததா?
(அ) ஆம் (ஆ) இல்லை
- 11) உணவு பாதுகாப்பு மற்றும் தர நிர்ணய சட்டத்தின் கீழ் (FSSAI) அனுமதி பெற்றுள்ளீர்களா?
(அ) ஆம் (ஆ) இல்லை
- 12) உங்களது தொழில் சம்பந்தமான அரசு சட்டங்கள் மற்றும் விதிமுறைகள் உங்களுக்கு எப்படி தெரிய வந்தது?
(அ) குடும்ப உறுப்பினர் மூலமாக (ஆ) நண்பர்கள் மூலமாக
(இ) சக வியாபாரிகள் மூலமாக (ஈ) அரசு அலுவலர்கள் மூலமாக

- 13) உங்கள் பகுதிக்கான உணவுத்துறை அலுவலர்கள் பெயர் மற்றும் அலுவலர்கள் முகவரி பற்றி நீங்கள் அறிவீர்களா?
(அ) ஆம் (ஆ) இல்லை (இ) கருத்து இல்லை
- 14) உங்களது தொழில்/ வியாபாரம் எந்த சட்டம் மற்றும் விதிமுறையின் கீழ் அடங்கியுள்ளது என்பது உங்களுக்கு தெரியுமா?
(அ) ஆம் (ஆ) இல்லை (இ) கருத்து இல்லை
- 15) உணவு பாதுகாப்பு மற்றும் தர நிர்ணய சட்டம், 2006 பற்றி உங்களது கருத்து என்ன?
(அ) அவசியமானது (ஆ) பயனற்றது
(இ) வியாபாரிகளுக்கு இடையூறு அளிப்பது
- 16) அம்மாதிரி சட்டங்கள் இல்லையெனில் பொதுமக்களுக்கு உணவு பாதுகாப்பினை எந்த வகையில் உறுதி செய்ய முடியும்?
(அ) வியாபாரிகளின் சுய கட்டுப்பாடு
(ஆ) வியாபார நெறிமுறைகளை பின்பற்றுதல்
(இ) பாதுகாப்பற்ற உணவு வகைகளை நிராகரித்தல்
(ஈ) பொதுமக்களிடையே விழிப்புணர்வை ஏற்படுத்துதல்
(உ) மற்றவை
- 17) உணவு பாதுகாப்பு மற்றும் தர நிர்ணய சட்டத்தில் வரையறுக்கப்பட்டுள்ள கட்டுப்பாடுகளையும் அரசு நடவடிக்கைகளையும் ஏன் எதிர்க்கிறீர்கள்?
(அ) அது எங்களது சுதந்திரத்தை பாதிக்கிறது
(ஆ) சட்டத்தில் குறிப்பிடப்பட்ட கட்டுப்பாடுகள் தேவையற்றவை
(இ) சட்டத்தினால் எந்தவித பயனும் இல்லை
(ஈ) அது ஊழலுக்கு வழி வகுக்கிறது
(உ) நாங்கள் எதிர்க்கவில்லை
- 18) அரசு அலுவலர்களிடமிருந்து நீங்கள் எம்மாதிரியான உதவி/ வழிகாட்டுதல்/ஆலோசனைகளை எதிர்பார்க்கிறீர்கள்?
(அ) விதிகள் மற்றும் நெறிமுறைகளைப் பற்றிய விளக்கங்கள்
(ஆ) அட்டையில் (Label) குறிப்பிடவேண்டிய வாசகம் குறித்து வழிகாட்டுதல்
(இ) உரிமம் பெறுதல் மற்றும் பதிவு செய்வதற்கான உதவி
(ஈ) அவ்வப்போது பார்வையிட்டு ஆலோசனை வழங்குதல்
(உ) கட்டுமான வசதிகள் ஏற்படுத்தி தருதல்
- 19) உணவு பாதுகாப்பு அலுவலர் எவ்வளவு நாட்களுக்கு ஒருமுறை தங்களது கடைக்கு வந்து ஆலோசனைகள் வழங்குகிறார்?
(அ) வருவதே இல்லை (ஆ) மூன்று மாதங்களுக்கு ஒருமுறை
(இ) ஆறு மாதங்களுக்கு ஒருமுறை (ஈ) ஆண்டுக்கு ஒருமுறை
- 20) பொதுமக்கள் எம்மாதிரியான புகார்களை தெரிவிக்கிறார்கள்?
(அ) உணவில் ருசி (ஆ) சுத்தம் மற்றும் சுகாதாரம்
(இ) விலை (ஈ) சுற்றுப்புறச் சூழல்

- 21) உணவு பாதுகாப்பு மற்றும் சுத்தமான உணவு பற்றிய பயிற்சியில் நீங்கள் கலந்து கொண்டதுண்டா?
 (அ) ஆம் (ஆ) இல்லை (இ) கருத்து இல்லை
- 22) ஆம் எனில் எவ்வளவு நாட்கள்?
 (அ) 3 நாட்களுக்கு குறைவாக (ஆ) 4 முதல் 7 நாட்கள்
 (இ) 8 முதல் 15 நாட்கள் (ஈ) 15 நாட்களுக்கு மேலாக
- 23) பயிற்சியில் கலந்து கொண்டதில்லையெனில் அம்மாதிரி பயிற்சி அவசியம் என்று கருதுகிறீர்கள்?
 (அ) ஆம் (ஆ) இல்லை
- 24) அம்மாதிரி பயிற்சியில் கலந்துகொள்ள உங்களுக்கு விருப்பம் உண்டா?
 (அ) ஆம் (ஆ) இல்லை
- 25) உணவு பாதுகாப்பின்மைக்கு கீழ்க்கண்டவற்றில் முக்கியமான காரணம் எது?
 (அ) பாதுகாப்பற்ற குடிநீர்
 (ஆ) பாதுகாப்பற்ற சுற்றுப்புறச் சூழல்
 (இ) வியாபாரிகளின் கவனக்குறைவு
 (ஈ) சுகாதாரமற்ற பழக்க வழக்கங்கள்
- 26) வியாபாரிகள் சங்கங்களின் உதவியை நீங்கள் விரும்புகிறீர்களா?
 (அ) ஆம் (ஆ) இல்லை (இ) கருத்து இல்லை
- 27) மேற்கூறிய கேள்விக்கு விடை 'ஆம்' எனில் எம்மாதிரியான உதவி?
 (அ) தகவல் அளித்தல்
 (ஆ) வழி காட்டுதல்
 (இ) ஒற்றுமை மற்றும் வலிமையை நிலைநாட்டுதல்
 (ஈ) எங்களது நலனை பாதுகாக்க போராடுதல்

கள ஆய்வாளர்/மாணவர்
 (பெயர் மற்றும் கையொப்பம்)

ஒருங்கிணைப்பாளர்/மேற்பார்வையாளர்
 (பெயர் மற்றும் கையொப்பம்)

ANNEXURE – II

Details of Target Group (Traders)

Number of Students involved in the Survey (8x10)			80
Region wise distribution of the target group			
	Northern	448	
	Southern	343	
	Western	109	
	Central	150	
	Total		1050
Gender wise distribution of target group			
	Men	833	
	Women	217	
	Total		1050
Age wise distribution of the target group			
	Below 30 years	192	
	31-40 years	323	
	41-50 years	298	
	Above 50 years	237	
	Total		1050
Type of business done by the target group			
	Wholesale	230	
	Retail	820	
	Total		1050
Number of years in business by the target group			
	Below 1 year	133	
	1-5 years	292	
	5-10 years	206	
	Above 10 years	419	
	Total		1050

ANNEXURE – III

Instructions to Project Co-ordinators

1. Each student volunteer will be asked to interview 50 persons (in one of the three categories viz. (i) Public (ii) Traders and (iii) Government Officials, Lawyers and Analysts). For example, a student will be given 50 copies of the questionnaire for either public or traders or officials, lawyers and analysts.
2. Five students in each affiliated college will be given the questionnaire for public, three students will be given the questionnaire for traders and two students will be given the questionnaire for officials, lawyers and analysts.
3. The students who are given the questionnaires for officials, lawyers and analysts will have to contact at least 10 officials, 10 lawyers and 5 analysts out of the total 50.
4. The Survey should be conducted between 1st May and 15th May 2016.
5. Needless to say, care should be taken while conducting interviews to ensure that the Survey truly reflects the opinion of the persons interviewed.
6. The completed forms should be sent to the Consumer Chair so as to reach the Chair on or before 20th May.
7. The student volunteer should affix his signature at the bottom of every form as indicated. The questionnaire form should also be attested by the project co-ordinator.
8. Project co-ordinator should ensure that blank forms are not signed by the student volunteer or the co-ordinator.

Instructions to Field Workers

1. Collect the Voter's List in your City
2. Follow the Random Sampling method.
3. From the Voter's List, select twenty respondents (target group), through the above method, ten from the Urban area and ten from the rural area of the district. For example, persons with serials

numbers 15, 25, 35, 45, 55 etc. may be selected or persons with serial numbers 11, 31, 51, 71, 91 etc may be selected. If a particular respondent, say Serial No.71 in your list is not available, then you may go to S.No.72.

4. If any Respondent doesn't fill the personal details, don't force him/her to do so.
5. Choose the Respondents who are willing to answer the questionnaire. Don't choose the Respondents who are uninterested or unwilling.
6. Approach the Respondents when they are free and give them sufficient time to fill the questionnaire.
7. If they are not able to understand the question, please explain it to them and answer the queries which they ask.
8. If the respondent is illiterate/semi-literate, you should explain all the questions patiently and get the answers.
9. If any one of the Respondents does not return the questionnaire within a reasonable time, then go to the next Respondent.
10. Under no circumstances should you answer the questionnaire yourself for the sake of completing the survey.
11. Please remember that authenticity of the data collected and integrity of the persons interviewing/interviewed are very important for the success of the survey.

Annexure – IV - Results for Trader data

District

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Tiruchi	74	7.0	7.0	7.0
	Ramanathapuram	2	.2	.2	7.2
	Toothukudi	10	1.0	1.0	8.2
	Kanyakumari	2	.2	.2	8.4
	Tirunelveli	127	12.1	12.1	20.5
	Virudunagar	9	.9	.9	21.3
	Madurai	96	9.1	9.1	30.5
	Theni	55	5.2	5.2	35.7
	Dindigul	42	4.0	4.0	39.7
	Coimbatore	63	6.0	6.0	45.7
	Tiruppur	1	.1	.1	45.8
	Erode	45	4.3	4.3	50.1
	Karur	76	7.2	7.2	57.3
	Tiruvannamalai	7	.7	.7	58.0
	Vellore	149	14.2	14.2	72.2
	Kancheepuram	152	14.5	14.5	86.7
	Tiruvallur	2	.2	.2	86.9
	Chennai	138	13.1	13.1	100.0
	Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

Name of Region

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Northern	448	42.7	42.7	42.7
	Southern	343	32.7	32.7	75.3
	Western	109	10.4	10.4	85.7
	Central	150	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

Age Group in years

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below 30	192	18.3	18.3	18.3
	31-40	323	30.8	30.8	49.0
	41-50	298	28.4	28.4	77.4
	Above 50	237	22.6	22.6	100.0
	Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	833	79.3	79.3	79.3
	Female	217	20.7	20.7	100.0
	Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

Type of Business

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Wholesale	230	21.9	21.9	21.9
	Retail	820	78.1	78.1	100.0
	Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

Number of years in Trade/Business

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below 1	133	12.7	12.7	12.7
	1-5	292	27.8	27.8	40.5
	5-10	206	19.6	19.6	60.1
	Above 10	419	39.9	39.9	100.0
	Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

Licence/Registration to business

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	636	60.6	60.6	60.6
	No	271	25.8	25.8	86.4
	No Opinion	143	13.6	13.6	100.0
	Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

If yes, category of license to business

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	--	-----------	---------	---------------	--------------------

Valid	Shop and Establishment	313	29.8	49.2	49.2
	Dangerous and offensive trade	48	4.6	7.5	56.8
	Legal Metrology	26	2.5	4.1	60.8
	Food Safety Standards Act	121	11.5	19.0	79.9
	Others	128	12.2	20.1	100.0
	Total	636	60.6	100.0	
Missing	System	414	39.4		
Total		1050	100.0		

Difficulty in getting the above Licenses

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	318	30.3	30.3	30.3
No	732	69.7	69.7	100.0
Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Yes	364	34.7	34.7	34.7
No	686	65.3	65.3	100.0
Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Family members	154	14.7	14.7	14.7
	Friends	217	20.7	20.7	35.3
	Co-Traders	498	47.4	47.4	82.8
	Government officials	181	17.2	17.2	100.0
	Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	251	23.9	23.9	23.9
	No	582	55.4	55.4	79.3
	No Opinion	217	20.7	20.7	100.0
	Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	311	29.6	29.6	29.6
	No	504	48.0	48.0	77.6
	No Opinion	235	22.4	22.4	100.0
	Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Essential	609	58.0	58.0	58.0
	Serves no purpose	227	21.6	21.6	79.6
	Not help trade	214	20.4	20.4	100.0
	Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Self discipline by traders	205	19.5	19.5	19.5
	Following trade ethics	244	23.2	23.2	42.8
	Rejection of unsafe foods	214	20.4	20.4	63.1
	Public awareness	196	18.7	18.7	81.8
	Others	191	18.2	18.2	100.0
	Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Affects freedom	107	10.2	10.2	10.2
	Brings in unnecessary control	203	19.3	19.3	29.5
	Not serve any purpose	153	14.6	14.6	44.1

Breeds corruption	110	10.5	10.5	54.6
Not oppose	477	45.4	45.4	100.0
Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Knowledge of rules/ Regulations	308	29.3	29.3	29.3
Guidance to develop label	198	18.9	18.9	48.2
Assistance to get License/registration	228	21.7	21.7	69.9
Periodical visit to guide traders	197	18.8	18.8	88.7
Infrastructure facilities	119	11.3	11.3	100.0
Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

Often the FSO visit your shop and guide

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never visits	513	48.9	48.9	48.9
Once in 3 months	151	14.4	14.4	63.2
Once in 6 months	143	13.6	13.6	76.9

Once in a year	243	23.1	23.1	100.0
Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

Type of complaints to public make

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	About taste	172	16.4	16.4	16.4
	About hygiene	205	19.5	19.5	35.9
	About cost	580	55.2	55.2	91.1
	About environment	93	8.9	8.9	100.0
	Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

Undergone training on food hygiene/safety

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	187	17.8	17.8	17.8
	No	717	68.3	68.3	86.1
	No Opinion	146	13.9	13.9	100.0
	Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Upto 3	69	6.6	36.9	36.9
	4-7	39	3.7	20.9	57.8

	8-15	28	2.7	15.0	72.7
	Above 15	51	4.9	27.3	100.0
	Total	187	17.8	100.0	
Missing	System	863	82.2		
Total		1050	100.0		

If no, think that such type of training is necessary

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	422	40.2	48.9	48.9
	No	441	42.0	51.1	100.0
	Total	863	82.2	100.0	
Missing	System	187	17.8		
Total		1050	100.0		

Interested in such type of training

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	560	53.3	53.3	53.3
	No	490	46.7	46.7	100.0
	Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

Responsible for unsafe food

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Unsafe water	211	20.1	20.1	20.1
	Unsafe environment	257	24.5	24.5	44.6

Careless trade	384	36.6	36.6	81.1
Unhygienic practices	198	18.9	18.9	100.0
Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

Seek the help / services of trade associations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	558	53.1	53.1	53.1
	No	340	32.4	32.4	85.5
	No Opinion	152	14.5	14.5	100.0
	Total	1050	100.0	100.0	

If yes, type of help of trade association

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Providing information	98	9.3	17.6	17.6
	Guidance	169	16.1	30.3	47.8
	Unity / Strength	154	14.7	27.6	75.4
	Fight to safeguard our interests.	137	13.0	24.6	100.0
	Total	558	53.1	100.0	
Missing	System	492	46.9		
Total		1050	100.0		

Crosstabs

Gender * Name of Region

Crosstab

			Name of Region				Total
			Northern	Southern	Western	Central	
Gender	Male	Count	350	298	82	103	833
		% within Gender	42.0%	35.8%	9.8%	12.4%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	78.1%	86.9%	75.2%	68.7%	79.3%
	Female	Count	98	45	27	47	217
		% within Gender	45.2%	20.7%	12.4%	21.7%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	21.9%	13.1%	24.8%	31.3%	20.7%
Total		Count	448	343	109	150	1050
		% within Gender	42.7%	32.7%	10.4%	14.3%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.844(a)	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	24.101	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.087	1	.024
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.53.

Age Group in years * Name of Region

Crosstab

			Name of Region				Total
			Northern	Southern	Western	Central	
Age Group in years	Below 30	Count	90	54	25	23	192
		% within Age Group in years	46.9%	28.1%	13.0%	12.0%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	20.1%	15.7%	22.9%	15.3%	18.3%
	31-40	Count	154	91	32	46	323
		% within Age Group in years	47.7%	28.2%	9.9%	14.2%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	34.4%	26.5%	29.4%	30.7%	30.8%
	41-50	Count	111	111	32	44	298
		% within Age Group in years	37.2%	37.2%	10.7%	14.8%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	24.8%	32.4%	29.4%	29.3%	28.4%
	Above 50	Count	93	87	20	37	237
		% within Age Group in years	39.2%	36.7%	8.4%	15.6%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	20.8%	25.4%	18.3%	24.7%	22.6%
Total	Count	448	343	109	150	1050	
	% within Age Group in years	42.7%	32.7%	10.4%	14.3%	100.0%	
	% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.021(a)	9	.090
Likelihood Ratio	15.062	9	.089
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.158	1	.142
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.93.

Type of Business * Name of Region

Crosstab

			Name of Region				Total
			Northern	Southern	Western	Central	
Type of Business	Wholesale	Count	103	79	27	21	230
		% within Type of Business	44.8%	34.3%	11.7%	9.1%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	23.0%	23.0%	24.8%	14.0%	21.9%
	Retail	Count	345	264	82	129	820
		% within Type of Business	42.1%	32.2%	10.0%	15.7%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	77.0%	77.0%	75.2%	86.0%	78.1%
Total	Count	448	343	109	150	1050	
	% within Type of Business	42.7%	32.7%	10.4%	14.3%	100.0%	
	% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.566(a)	3	.087
Likelihood Ratio	7.140	3	.068
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.275	1	.070
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 23.88.

Number of years in Trade/Business * Name of Region

Crosstab

		Name of Region					
			Northern	Southern	Western	Central	Total
Number of years in Trade/Business	Below 1	Count	64	32	15	22	133
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	48.1%	24.1%	11.3%	16.5%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	14.3%	9.3%	13.8%	14.7%	12.7%
	1-5	Count	135	77	33	47	292
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	46.2%	26.4%	11.3%	16.1%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	30.1%	22.4%	30.3%	31.3%	27.8%
	5-10	Count	76	78	17	35	206
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	36.9%	37.9%	8.3%	17.0%	100.0%
		% within Name of	17.0%	22.7%	15.6%	23.3%	19.6%

Total	Above 10	Region Count	173	156	44	46	419
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	41.3%	37.2%	10.5%	11.0%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	38.6%	45.5%	40.4%	30.7%	39.9%
		Count	448	343	109	150	1050
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	42.7%	32.7%	10.4%	14.3%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.182(a)	9	.012
Likelihood Ratio	21.790	9	.010
Linear-by-Linear Association	.433	1	.511
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.81.

Licence/Registration to business * Name of Region

Crosstab

			Name of Region				Total
			Northern	Southern	Western	Central	
Licence/Registration	Yes	Count	270	205	77	84	636

to business	No	% within Licence/Registration to business	42.5%	32.2%	12.1%	13.2%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	60.3%	59.8%	70.6%	56.0%	60.6%
		Count	102	113	22	34	271
No Opinion	No Opinion	% within Licence/Registration to business	37.6%	41.7%	8.1%	12.5%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	22.8%	32.9%	20.2%	22.7%	25.8%
		Count	76	25	10	32	143
Total	Total	% within Licence/Registration to business	53.1%	17.5%	7.0%	22.4%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	17.0%	7.3%	9.2%	21.3%	13.6%
		Count	448	343	109	150	1050
		% within Licence/Registration to business	42.7%	32.7%	10.4%	14.3%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.578(a)	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	35.190	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.036	1	.849
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.84.

If yes, category of license to business * Name of Region

Crosstab

		Name of Region				Total	
		Northern	Southern	Western	Central		
If yes, category of license to business	Shop and Establishment	Count	106	118	47	42	313
		% within If yes, category of license to business	33.9%	37.7%	15.0%	13.4%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	39.3%	57.6%	61.0%	50.0%	49.2%
	Dangerous and offensive trade	Count	32	7	0	9	48
		% within If yes, category of license to business	66.7%	14.6%	.0%	18.8%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	11.9%	3.4%	.0%	10.7%	7.5%
	Legal Metrology	Count	13	8	3	2	26
		% within If yes, category of license to business	50.0%	30.8%	11.5%	7.7%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	4.8%	3.9%	3.9%	2.4%	4.1%
	Food Safety Standards Act	Count	73	25	10	13	121
		% within If yes, category of license to business	60.3%	20.7%	8.3%	10.7%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	27.0%	12.2%	13.0%	15.5%	19.0%
	Others	Count	46	47	17	18	128
		% within If yes, category of license to business	35.9%	36.7%	13.3%	14.1%	100.0%

Total	% within Name of Region	17.0%	22.9%	22.1%	21.4%	20.1%
	Count	270	205	77	84	636
	% within If yes, category of license to business	42.5%	32.2%	12.1%	13.2%	100.0%
	% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	48.168(a)	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	54.182	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.592	1	.107
N of Valid Cases	636		

a 2 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.15.

Difficulty in getting the above Licenses * Name of Region

Crosstab

			Name of Region				Total
			Northern	Southern	Western	Central	
Difficulty in getting the above Licenses	Yes	Count	135	123	13	47	318
		% within Difficulty in getting the above Licenses	42.5%	38.7%	4.1%	14.8%	100.0%
	No	% within Name of Region	30.1%	35.9%	11.9%	31.3%	30.3%
Count		313	220	96	103	732	

Total	% within Difficulty in getting the above Licenses	42.8%	30.1%	13.1%	14.1%	100.0%
	% within Name of Region	69.9%	64.1%	88.1%	68.7%	69.7%
	Count	448	343	109	150	1050
	% within Difficulty in getting the above Licenses	42.7%	32.7%	10.4%	14.3%	100.0%
	% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.532(a)	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	25.628	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.073	1	.300
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 33.01.

Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006 * Name of Region

Crosstab

		Count	Name of Region				Total
			Northern	Southern	Western	Central	
Registered business	Yes		186	66	47	65	364

under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006	No	% within Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006	51.1%	18.1%	12.9%	17.9%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	41.5%	19.2%	43.1%	43.3%	34.7%
		Count	262	277	62	85	686
Total		% within Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006	38.2%	40.4%	9.0%	12.4%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	58.5%	80.8%	56.9%	56.7%	65.3%
		Count	448	343	109	150	1050
		% within Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006	42.7%	32.7%	10.4%	14.3%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	53.729(a)	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	56.901	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.078	1	.780

N of Valid Cases | 1050

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 37.79.

Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business * Name of Region

Crosstab

		Name of Region					
		Northern	Southern	Western	Central	Total	
Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	Family members	Count	72	31	11	40	154
		% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	46.8%	20.1%	7.1%	26.0%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	16.1%	9.0%	10.1%	26.7%	14.7%
	Friends	Count	91	51	21	54	217
		% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	41.9%	23.5%	9.7%	24.9%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	20.3%	14.9%	19.3%	36.0%	20.7%
	Co-Traders	Count	220	190	42	46	498
		% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	44.2%	38.2%	8.4%	9.2%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	49.1%	55.4%	38.5%	30.7%	47.4%
	Government officials	Count	65	71	35	10	181

Total	% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	35.9%	39.2%	19.3%	5.5%	100.0%
	% within Name of Region	14.5%	20.7%	32.1%	6.7%	17.2%
	Count	448	343	109	150	1050
	% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	42.7%	32.7%	10.4%	14.3%	100.0%
	% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	90.658(a)	9	.000
Likelihood Ratio	87.868	9	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.827	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.99.

Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area * Name of Region

Crosstab

		Name of Region				Total
		Northern	Southern	Western	Central	

Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	Yes	Count	98	74	47	32	251
		% within Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	39.0%	29.5%	18.7%	12.7%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	21.9%	21.6%	43.1%	21.3%	23.9%
		Count	227	216	48	91	582
		% within Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	39.0%	37.1%	8.2%	15.6%	100.0%
	No	% within Name of Region	50.7%	63.0%	44.0%	60.7%	55.4%
		Count	123	53	14	27	217
		% within Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	56.7%	24.4%	6.5%	12.4%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	27.5%	15.5%	12.8%	18.0%	20.7%
		Count	448	343	109	150	1050
Total	No Opinion	% within Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials	42.7%	32.7%	10.4%	14.3%	100.0%

in area					
% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	45.696(a)	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	42.591	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.327	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.53.

Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade * Name of Region

Crosstab

		Name of Region				Total	
		Northern	Southern	Western	Central		
Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	Yes	Count	132	97	39	43	311
		% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	42.4%	31.2%	12.5%	13.8%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	29.5%	28.3%	35.8%	28.7%	29.6%

Total	No	Count	204	177	46	77	504	
		% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	40.5%	35.1%	9.1%	15.3%	100.0%	
	No Opinion	% within Name of Region	45.5%	51.6%	42.2%	51.3%	48.0%	
		Count	112	69	24	30	235	
	Total	No	% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	47.7%	29.4%	10.2%	12.8%	100.0%
			% within Name of Region	25.0%	20.1%	22.0%	20.0%	22.4%
		No Opinion	Count	448	343	109	150	1050
			% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	42.7%	32.7%	10.4%	14.3%	100.0%
		Total	% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.805(a)	6	.339
Likelihood Ratio	6.724	6	.347
Linear-by-Linear Association	.953	1	.329
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 24.40.

Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006 * Name of Region

Crosstab

		Name of Region				Total	
		Northern	Southern	Western	Central		
Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	Essential	Count	287	185	86	51	609
		% within Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	47.1%	30.4%	14.1%	8.4%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	64.1%	53.9%	78.9%	34.0%	58.0%
	Serves no purpose	Count	87	83	17	40	227
		% within Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	38.3%	36.6%	7.5%	17.6%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	19.4%	24.2%	15.6%	26.7%	21.6%
	Not help trade	Count	74	75	6	59	214
		% within Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	34.6%	35.0%	2.8%	27.6%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	16.5%	21.9%	5.5%	39.3%	20.4%
Total	Count	448	343	109	150	1050	
	% within Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	42.7%	32.7%	10.4%	14.3%	100.0%	
	% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)

Pearson Chi-Square	74.498(a)	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	75.682	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	24.289	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.22.

Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public * Name of Region

Crosstab

			Name of Region				Total
			Northern	Southern	Western	Central	
Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	Self discipline by traders	Count	95	53	38	19	205
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	46.3%	25.9%	18.5%	9.3%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	21.2%	15.5%	34.9%	12.7%	19.5%
	Following trade ethics	Count	97	87	24	36	244
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	39.8%	35.7%	9.8%	14.8%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	21.7%	25.4%	22.0%	24.0%	23.2%
	Rejection of unsafe foods	Count	59	77	27	51	214
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	27.6%	36.0%	12.6%	23.8%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	13.2%	22.4%	24.8%	34.0%	20.4%

Total	Public awareness	Count	85	65	11	35	196
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	43.4%	33.2%	5.6%	17.9%	100.0%
	Others	% within Name of Region	19.0%	19.0%	10.1%	23.3%	18.7%
		Count	112	61	9	9	191
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	58.6%	31.9%	4.7%	4.7%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	25.0%	17.8%	8.3%	6.0%	18.2%
		Count	448	343	109	150	1050
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	42.7%	32.7%	10.4%	14.3%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	84.100(a)	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	86.975	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.543	1	.003
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.83.

Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act * Name of Region

Crosstab

		Name of Region				Total	
		Northern	Southern	Western	Central		
Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	Affects freedom	Count	43	27	14	23	107
		% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	40.2%	25.2%	13.1%	21.5%	100.0%
	Brings in unnecessary control	% within Name of Region	9.6%	7.9%	12.8%	15.3%	10.2%
		Count	73	83	4	43	203
	Not serve any purpose	% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	36.0%	40.9%	2.0%	21.2%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	16.3%	24.2%	3.7%	28.7%	19.3%
	Breeds corruption	Count	47	72	8	26	153
		% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	30.7%	47.1%	5.2%	17.0%	100.0%
	Not oppose	% within Name of Region	10.5%	21.0%	7.3%	17.3%	14.6%
		Count	63	20	3	24	110
		% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	57.3%	18.2%	2.7%	21.8%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	14.1%	5.8%	2.8%	16.0%	10.5%
Not oppose		Count	222	141	80	34	477

Total	% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	46.5%	29.6%	16.8%	7.1%	100.0%
	% within Name of Region	49.6%	41.1%	73.4%	22.7%	45.4%
	Count	448	343	109	150	1050
	% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	42.7%	32.7%	10.4%	14.3%	100.0%
	% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	115.159(a)	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	124.643	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.102	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.11.

Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials * Name of Region

Crosstab

Kind of help/guidance/	Knowledge of rules/	Count	Name of Region				Total
			Northern	Southern	Western	Central	
			179	95	12	22	308

suggestions expect from government officials	Regulations	% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	58.1%	30.8%	3.9%	7.1%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	40.0%	27.7%	11.0%	14.7%	29.3%
Guidance to develop label	Count		80	61	17	40	198
		% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	40.4%	30.8%	8.6%	20.2%	100.0%
Assistance to get License/registration		% within Name of Region	17.9%	17.8%	15.6%	26.7%	18.9%
	Count		65	113	18	32	228
Periodical visit to guide traders		% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	28.5%	49.6%	7.9%	14.0%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	14.5%	32.9%	16.5%	21.3%	21.7%
Infrastructure facilities	Count		81	52	39	25	197
		% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	41.1%	26.4%	19.8%	12.7%	100.0%
Total		% within Name of Region	18.1%	15.2%	35.8%	16.7%	18.8%
	Count		43	22	23	31	119
		% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	36.1%	18.5%	19.3%	26.1%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	9.6%	6.4%	21.1%	20.7%	11.3%
	Count		448	343	109	150	1050

	% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	42.7%	32.7%	10.4%	14.3%	100.0%
	% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	127.814(a)	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	124.689	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	43.493	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.35.

Often the FSO visit your shop and guide * Name of Region

Crosstab

		Name of Region				Total	
		Northern	Southern	Western	Central		
Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	Never visits	Count	197	222	23	71	513
		% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	38.4%	43.3%	4.5%	13.8%	100.0%
	Once in 3 months	% within Name of Region	44.0%	64.7%	21.1%	47.3%	48.9%
		Count	56	25	43	27	151
		% within Often the FSO visit your shop	37.1%	16.6%	28.5%	17.9%	100.0%

		and guide					
		% within Name of Region	12.5%	7.3%	39.4%	18.0%	14.4%
	Once in 6 months	Count	58	44	19	22	143
		% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	40.6%	30.8%	13.3%	15.4%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	12.9%	12.8%	17.4%	14.7%	13.6%
	Once in a year	Count	137	52	24	30	243
		% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	56.4%	21.4%	9.9%	12.3%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	30.6%	15.2%	22.0%	20.0%	23.1%
Total		Count	448	343	109	150	1050
		% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	42.7%	32.7%	10.4%	14.3%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	121.659(a)	9	.000
Likelihood Ratio	112.183	9	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.352	1	.125
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.84.

Type of complaints to public make * Name of Region

Crosstab

		Name of Region				Total	
		Northern	Southern	Western	Central		
Type of complaints to public make	About taste	Count	71	62	24	15	172
		% within Type of complaints to public make	41.3%	36.0%	14.0%	8.7%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	15.8%	18.1%	22.0%	10.0%	16.4%
	About hygiene	Count	101	46	13	45	205
		% within Type of complaints to public make	49.3%	22.4%	6.3%	22.0%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	22.5%	13.4%	11.9%	30.0%	19.5%
	About cost	Count	229	208	65	78	580
		% within Type of complaints to public make	39.5%	35.9%	11.2%	13.4%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	51.1%	60.6%	59.6%	52.0%	55.2%
	About environment	Count	47	27	7	12	93
		% within Type of complaints to public make	50.5%	29.0%	7.5%	12.9%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	10.5%	7.9%	6.4%	8.0%	8.9%
Total	Count	448	343	109	150	1050	
	% within Type of complaints to public make	42.7%	32.7%	10.4%	14.3%	100.0%	
	% within Name of	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Region					
--------	--	--	--	--	--

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	33.272(a)	9	.000
Likelihood Ratio	33.693	9	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.001	1	.975
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.65.

Undergone training on food hygiene/safety * Name of Region

Crosstab

			Name of Region				
			Northern	Southern	Western	Central	Total
Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	Yes	Count	64	49	17	57	187
		% within Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	34.2%	26.2%	9.1%	30.5%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	14.3%	14.3%	15.6%	38.0%	17.8%
	No	Count	302	266	84	65	717
		% within Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	42.1%	37.1%	11.7%	9.1%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	67.4%	77.6%	77.1%	43.3%	68.3%
	No Opinion	Count	82	28	8	28	146

Total	% within Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	56.2%	19.2%	5.5%	19.2%	100.0%
	% within Name of Region	18.3%	8.2%	7.3%	18.7%	13.9%
	Count	448	343	109	150	1050
	% within Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	42.7%	32.7%	10.4%	14.3%	100.0%
	% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	79.610(a)	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	74.675	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	20.507	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.16.

If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety * Name of Region

Crosstab

			Name of Region				Total
			Northern	Southern	Western	Central	
If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	Upto 3	Count	22	14	5	28	69
		% within If yes, number of days attended training on	31.9%	20.3%	7.2%	40.6%	100.0%

	food hygiene/safety					
	% within Name of Region	34.4%	28.6%	29.4%	49.1%	36.9%
4-7	Count	17	7	5	10	39
	% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	43.6%	17.9%	12.8%	25.6%	100.0%
	% within Name of Region	26.6%	14.3%	29.4%	17.5%	20.9%
8-15	Count	8	4	0	16	28
	% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	28.6%	14.3%	.0%	57.1%	100.0%
	% within Name of Region	12.5%	8.2%	.0%	28.1%	15.0%
Above 15	Count	17	24	7	3	51
	% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	33.3%	47.1%	13.7%	5.9%	100.0%
	% within Name of Region	26.6%	49.0%	41.2%	5.3%	27.3%
Total	Count	64	49	17	57	187
	% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	34.2%	26.2%	9.1%	30.5%	100.0%
	% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	37.169(a)	9	.000
Likelihood Ratio	41.858	9	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.671	1	.031
N of Valid Cases	187		

a 3 cells (18.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.55.

If no, think that such type of training is necessary * Name of Region

Crosstab

			Name of Region				Total
			Northern	Southern	Western	Central	
If no, think that such type of training is necessary	Yes	Count	176	130	53	63	422
		% within If no, think that such type of training is necessary	41.7%	30.8%	12.6%	14.9%	100.0%
	No	% within Name of Region	45.8%	44.2%	57.6%	67.7%	48.9%
		Count	208	164	39	30	441
Total		% within If no, think that such type of training is necessary	47.2%	37.2%	8.8%	6.8%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	54.2%	55.8%	42.4%	32.3%	51.1%
		Count	384	294	92	93	863
		% within If no, think that such type of training is necessary	44.5%	34.1%	10.7%	10.8%	100.0%

% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
-------------------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.030(a)	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	20.300	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.394	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	863		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 44.99.

Interested in such type of training * Name of Region

Crosstab

		Name of Region				Total	
		Northern	Southern	Western	Central		
Interested in such type of training	Yes	Count	244	166	53	97	560
		% within Interested in such type of training	43.6%	29.6%	9.5%	17.3%	100.0%
	No	% within Name of Region	54.5%	48.4%	48.6%	64.7%	53.3%
		Count	204	177	56	53	490
Total		% within Interested in such type of training	41.6%	36.1%	11.4%	10.8%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	45.5%	51.6%	51.4%	35.3%	46.7%
		Count	448	343	109	150	1050

% within Interested in such type of training	42.7%	32.7%	10.4%	14.3%	100.0%
% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.301(a)	3	.006
Likelihood Ratio	12.440	3	.006
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.968	1	.161
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 50.87.

Responsible for unsafe food * Name of Region

Crosstab

		Name of Region				Total	
		Northern	Southern	Western	Central		
Responsible for unsafe food	Unsafe water	Count	113	71	11	16	211
		% within Responsible for unsafe food	53.6%	33.6%	5.2%	7.6%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	25.2%	20.7%	10.1%	10.7%	20.1%
	Unsafe environment	Count	133	65	19	40	257
		% within Responsible for unsafe food	51.8%	25.3%	7.4%	15.6%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	29.7%	19.0%	17.4%	26.7%	24.5%

Total	Careless trade	Count	150	126	46	62	384
		% within Responsible for unsafe food	39.1%	32.8%	12.0%	16.1%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	33.5%	36.7%	42.2%	41.3%	36.6%
	Unhygienic practices	Count	52	81	33	32	198
		% within Responsible for unsafe food	26.3%	40.9%	16.7%	16.2%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	11.6%	23.6%	30.3%	21.3%	18.9%
	Total	Count	448	343	109	150	1050
		% within Responsible for unsafe food	42.7%	32.7%	10.4%	14.3%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	57.418(a)	9	.000
Likelihood Ratio	60.316	9	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	34.047	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 20.55.

Seek the help / services of trade associations * Name of Region

Crosstab

		Name of Region				Total
		Northern	Southern	Western	Central	

Seek the help / services of trade associations	Yes	Count	211	203	50	94	558
		% within Seek the help / services of trade associations	37.8%	36.4%	9.0%	16.8%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	47.1%	59.2%	45.9%	62.7%	53.1%
	No	Count	140	113	47	40	340
		% within Seek the help / services of trade associations	41.2%	33.2%	13.8%	11.8%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	31.3%	32.9%	43.1%	26.7%	32.4%
	No Opinion	Count	97	27	12	16	152
		% within Seek the help / services of trade associations	63.8%	17.8%	7.9%	10.5%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	21.7%	7.9%	11.0%	10.7%	14.5%
Total	Count	448	343	109	150	1050	
	% within Seek the help / services of trade associations	42.7%	32.7%	10.4%	14.3%	100.0%	
	% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	43.363(a)	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	43.227	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.840	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.78.

If yes, type of help of trade association * Name of Region

Crosstab

			Name of Region				Total
			Northern	Southern	Western	Central	
If yes, type of help of trade association	Providing information	Count	67	11	3	17	98
		% within If yes, type of help of trade association	68.4%	11.2%	3.1%	17.3%	100.0%
	Guidance	% within Name of Region	31.8%	5.4%	6.0%	18.1%	17.6%
		Count	46	92	8	23	169
	Unity / Strength	% within If yes, type of help of trade association	27.2%	54.4%	4.7%	13.6%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	21.8%	45.3%	16.0%	24.5%	30.3%
	Fight to safeguard our interests.	Count	50	47	20	37	154
		% within If yes, type of help of trade association	32.5%	30.5%	13.0%	24.0%	100.0%
	Total	% within Name of Region	23.7%	23.2%	40.0%	39.4%	27.6%
		Count	48	53	19	17	137
	Total	% within If yes, type of help of trade association	35.0%	38.7%	13.9%	12.4%	100.0%
		% within Name of Region	22.7%	26.1%	38.0%	18.1%	24.6%
Total	Count	211	203	50	94	558	
	% within If yes, type of help of trade association	37.8%	36.4%	9.0%	16.8%	100.0%	

association					
% within Name of Region	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	85.527(a)	9	.000
Likelihood Ratio	86.690	9	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.705	1	.010
N of Valid Cases	558		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.78.

Crosstabs

Age Group in years * Gender

Crosstab

		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
Age Group in years	Below 30	Count 148	44	192
		% within Age Group in years 77.1%	22.9%	100.0%
		% within Gender 17.8%	20.3%	18.3%
	31-40	Count 234	89	323
		% within Age Group in 72.4%	27.6%	100.0%

		years			
		% within Gender	28.1%	41.0%	30.8%
	41-50	Count	245	53	298
		% within Age Group in years	82.2%	17.8%	100.0%
		% within Gender	29.4%	24.4%	28.4%
	Above 50	Count	206	31	237
		% within Age Group in years	86.9%	13.1%	100.0%
		% within Gender	24.7%	14.3%	22.6%
Total		Count	833	217	1050
		% within Age Group in years	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.767(a)	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	20.105	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.019	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 39.68.

Type of Business * Gender

Crosstab

		Gender			Total
		Male	Female		
Type of Business	Wholesale	Count	196	34	230
		% within Type of Business	85.2%	14.8%	100.0%
		% within Gender	23.5%	15.7%	21.9%
	Retail	Count	637	183	820
		% within Type of Business	77.7%	22.3%	100.0%
		% within Gender	76.5%	84.3%	78.1%
Total	Count	833	217	1050	
	% within Type of Business	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.219(b)	1	.013		
Continuity Correction(a)	5.768	1	.016		
Likelihood Ratio	6.598	1	.010		
Fisher's Exact Test				.013	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.213	1	.013		

N of Valid Cases	1050			
------------------	------	--	--	--

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 47.53.

Number of years in Trade/Business * Gender

Crosstab

		Gender		Total	
		Male	Female		
Number of years in Trade/Business	Below 1	Count	106	27	133
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	79.7%	20.3%	100.0%
		% within Gender	12.7%	12.4%	12.7%
1-5		Count	222	70	292
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	76.0%	24.0%	100.0%
		% within Gender	26.7%	32.3%	27.8%
5-10		Count	170	36	206
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	82.5%	17.5%	100.0%
		% within Gender	20.4%	16.6%	19.6%
Above 10		Count	335	84	419
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
		% within Gender	40.2%	38.7%	39.9%
Total		Count	833	217	1050
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%

% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
-----------------	--------	--------	--------

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.335(a)	3	.343
Likelihood Ratio	3.318	3	.345
Linear-by-Linear Association	.632	1	.426
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 27.49.

Licence/Registration to business * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Licence/Registration to business	Yes	Count	530	106	636
		% within Licence/Registration to business	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
		% within Gender	63.6%	48.8%	60.6%
No	No	Count	199	72	271
		% within Licence/Registration to business	73.4%	26.6%	100.0%
		% within Gender	23.9%	33.2%	25.8%
No Opinion	No Opinion	Count	104	39	143

Total	% within Licence/Registration to business	72.7%	27.3%	100.0%
	% within Gender	12.5%	18.0%	13.6%
	Count	833	217	1050
	% within Licence/Registration to business	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.770(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	15.494	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.545	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 29.55.

If yes, category of license to business * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
If yes, category of license to business	Shop and Establishment	Count	262	51	313
		% within If yes, category of license to business	83.7%	16.3%	100.0%
		% within Gender	49.4%	48.1%	49.2%

Total	Dangerous and offensive trade	Count	40	8	48
		% within If yes, category of license to business	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%
		% within Gender	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%
	Legal Metrology	Count	22	4	26
		% within If yes, category of license to business	84.6%	15.4%	100.0%
		% within Gender	4.2%	3.8%	4.1%
	Food Safety Standards Act	Count	96	25	121
		% within If yes, category of license to business	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%
		% within Gender	18.1%	23.6%	19.0%
	Others	Count	110	18	128
		% within If yes, category of license to business	85.9%	14.1%	100.0%
		% within Gender	20.8%	17.0%	20.1%
Total	Count	530	106	636	
	% within If yes, category of license to business	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.077(a)	4	.722
Likelihood Ratio	2.027	4	.731
Linear-by-Linear Association	.001	1	.975

N of Valid Cases	636		
------------------	-----	--	--

a 1 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.33.

Difficulty in getting the above Licenses * Gender

Crosstab

		Gender			
		Male	Female	Total	
Difficulty in getting the above Licenses	Yes	Count	245	73	318
		% within Difficulty in getting the above Licenses	77.0%	23.0%	100.0%
	No	% within Gender	29.4%	33.6%	30.3%
		Count	588	144	732
Total		% within Difficulty in getting the above Licenses	80.3%	19.7%	100.0%
		% within Gender	70.6%	66.4%	69.7%
		Count	833	217	1050
		% within Difficulty in getting the above Licenses	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)

Pearson Chi-Square	1.458(b)	1	.227		
Continuity Correction(a)	1.265	1	.261		
Likelihood Ratio	1.437	1	.231		
Fisher's Exact Test				.246	.131
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.457	1	.227		
N of Valid Cases	1050				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 65.72.

Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006 * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006	Yes	Count	281	83	364
		% within Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006	77.2%	22.8%	100.0%
	No	% within Gender	33.7%	38.2%	34.7%
		Count	552	134	686
		% within Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006	80.5%	19.5%	100.0%

Total	% within Gender	66.3%	61.8%	65.3%
	Count	833	217	1050
	% within Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.550(b)	1	.213		
Continuity Correction(a)	1.357	1	.244		
Likelihood Ratio	1.533	1	.216		
Fisher's Exact Test				.230	.122
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.548	1	.213		
N of Valid Cases	1050				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 75.23.

Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Gather the knowledge	Family members	Count	103	51	154

of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business		% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	66.9%	33.1%	100.0%
	Friends	% within Gender	12.4%	23.5%	14.7%
		Count	181	36	217
		% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	83.4%	16.6%	100.0%
	Co-Traders	% within Gender	21.7%	16.6%	20.7%
		Count	404	94	498
		% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	81.1%	18.9%	100.0%
	Government officials	% within Gender	48.5%	43.3%	47.4%
		Count	145	36	181
		% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	80.1%	19.9%	100.0%
	Total	% within Gender	17.4%	16.6%	17.2%
		Count	833	217	1050
		% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.800(a)	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	16.312	3	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.458	1	.011
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 31.83.

Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	Yes	Count	211	40	251
		% within Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	84.1%	15.9%	100.0%
	No	% within Gender	25.3%	18.4%	23.9%
		Count	456	126	582
		% within Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	78.4%	21.6%	100.0%

Total	No Opinion	% within Gender	54.7%	58.1%	55.4%	
		Count	166	51	217	
	Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	% within Gender	76.5%	23.5%	100.0%	
		Count	19.9%	23.5%	20.7%	
	Total	No Opinion	% within Gender	19.9%	23.5%	20.7%
			Count	833	217	1050
Total	Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	% within Gender	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%	
		Count	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.833(a)	2	.089
Likelihood Ratio	5.017	2	.081
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.241	1	.039
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 44.85.

Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	Yes	Count	255	56	311
		% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	82.0%	18.0%	100.0%
		% within Gender	30.6%	25.8%	29.6%
	No	Count	400	104	504
		% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	79.4%	20.6%	100.0%
		% within Gender	48.0%	47.9%	48.0%
	No Opinion	Count	178	57	235
		% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	75.7%	24.3%	100.0%
		% within Gender	21.4%	26.3%	22.4%
Total	Count	833	217	1050	
	% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.189(a)	2	.203

Likelihood Ratio	3.162	2	.206
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.147	1	.076
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 48.57.

Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006 * Gender

Crosstab

		Gender			
			Male	Female	Total
Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	Essential	Count	481	128	609
		% within Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	79.0%	21.0%	100.0%
		% within Gender	57.7%	59.0%	58.0%
	Serves no purpose	Count	185	42	227
		% within Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	81.5%	18.5%	100.0%
		% within Gender	22.2%	19.4%	21.6%
	Not help trade	Count	167	47	214
		% within Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	78.0%	22.0%	100.0%
		% within Gender	20.0%	21.7%	20.4%
Total	Count	833	217	1050	
	% within Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.914(a)	2	.633
Likelihood Ratio	.928	2	.629
Linear-by-Linear Association	.004	1	.952
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 44.23.

Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public * Gender

Crosstab

		Gender		Total	
		Male	Female		
Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	Self discipline by traders	Count	174	31	205
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	84.9%	15.1%	100.0%
	Following trade ethics	% within Gender	20.9%	14.3%	19.5%
		Count	207	37	244
	Rejection of unsafe foods	% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	84.8%	15.2%	100.0%
		% within Gender	24.8%	17.1%	23.2%
		Count	161	53	214
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	75.2%	24.8%	100.0%

Total	Public awareness	% within Gender	19.3%	24.4%	20.4%	
		Count	151	45	196	
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	77.0%	23.0%	100.0%	
	Others	% within Gender	18.1%	20.7%	18.7%	
		Count	140	51	191	
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	73.3%	26.7%	100.0%	
	Total	% within Gender	16.8%	23.5%	18.2%	
		Count	833	217	1050	
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%	
			% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.415(a)	4	.004
Likelihood Ratio	15.684	4	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.252	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 39.47.

Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act * Gender

Crosstab

		Gender		Total	
		Male	Female		
Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	Affects freedom	Count	93	14	107
		% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	86.9%	13.1%	100.0%
	Brings in unnecessary control	% within Gender	11.2%	6.5%	10.2%
		Count	164	39	203
	Not serve any purpose	% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	80.8%	19.2%	100.0%
		% within Gender	19.7%	18.0%	19.3%
	Breeds corruption	Count	128	25	153
		% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	83.7%	16.3%	100.0%
	Not oppose	% within Gender	15.4%	11.5%	14.6%
		Count	94	16	110
	Total	% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	85.5%	14.5%	100.0%
		% within Gender	11.3%	7.4%	10.5%
	Total	Count	354	123	477
		% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	74.2%	25.8%	100.0%
Total	% within Gender	42.5%	56.7%	45.4%	
	Count	833	217	1050	

	% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.900(a)	4	.003
Likelihood Ratio	16.243	4	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.171	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.11.

Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials * Gender

Crosstab

		Gender		Total	
		Male	Female		
Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	Knowledge of rules/ Regulations	Count	235	73	308
		% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	76.3%	23.7%	100.0%
		% within Gender	28.2%	33.6%	29.3%
	Guidance to develop	Count	154	44	198

	label	% within Kind of help/guidance/suggestions expect from government officials	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%
		% within Gender	18.5%	20.3%	18.9%
	Assistance to get License/registration	Count	175	53	228
		% within Kind of help/guidance/suggestions expect from government officials	76.8%	23.2%	100.0%
		% within Gender	21.0%	24.4%	21.7%
	Periodical visit to guide traders	Count	164	33	197
		% within Kind of help/guidance/suggestions expect from government officials	83.2%	16.8%	100.0%
		% within Gender	19.7%	15.2%	18.8%
	Infrastructure facilities	Count	105	14	119
		% within Kind of help/guidance/suggestions expect from government officials	88.2%	11.8%	100.0%
		% within Gender	12.6%	6.5%	11.3%
Total		Count	833	217	1050
		% within Kind of help/guidance/suggestions expect from government officials	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)

Pearson Chi-Square	10.541(a)	4	.032
Likelihood Ratio	11.353	4	.023
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.958	1	.005
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 24.59.

Often the FSO visit your shop and guide * Gender

Crosstab

		Gender		Total	
		Male	Female		
Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	Never visits	Count	401	112	513
		% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	78.2%	21.8%	100.0%
	Once in 3 months	% within Gender	48.1%	51.6%	48.9%
		Count	124	27	151
	Once in 6 months	% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	82.1%	17.9%	100.0%
		% within Gender	14.9%	12.4%	14.4%
	Once in a year	Count	121	22	143
		% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	84.6%	15.4%	100.0%
		% within Gender	14.5%	10.1%	13.6%
		Count	187	56	243
		% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	77.0%	23.0%	100.0%
		% within Gender	22.4%	25.8%	23.1%

Total	Count	833	217	1050
	% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.412(a)	3	.220
Likelihood Ratio	4.588	3	.205
Linear-by-Linear Association	.015	1	.904
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 29.55.

Type of complaints to public make * Gender

Crosstab

		Gender			
		Male	Female	Total	
Type of complaints to public make	About taste	Count	136	36	172
		% within Type of complaints to public make	79.1%	20.9%	100.0%
		% within Gender	16.3%	16.6%	16.4%
	About hygiene	Count	153	52	205
		% within Type of complaints to public make	74.6%	25.4%	100.0%

	About cost	% within Gender	18.4%	24.0%	19.5%
		Count	470	110	580
	About environment	% within Type of complaints to public make	81.0%	19.0%	100.0%
		Count	74	19	93
Total		% within Gender	8.9%	8.8%	8.9%
		Count	833	217	1050
		% within Type of complaints to public make	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.795(a)	3	.284
Likelihood Ratio	3.679	3	.298
Linear-by-Linear Association	.895	1	.344
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.22.

Undergone training on food hygiene/safety * Gender

Crosstab

		Gender	Total

			Male	Female	
Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	Yes	Count	151	36	187
		% within			
		Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	80.7%	19.3%	100.0%
	No	% within Gender	18.1%	16.6%	17.8%
		Count	573	144	717
		% within			
	No Opinion	Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	79.9%	20.1%	100.0%
		% within Gender	68.8%	66.4%	68.3%
		Count	109	37	146
Total	% within				
	Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	74.7%	25.3%	100.0%	
	% within Gender	13.1%	17.1%	13.9%	
		Count	833	217	1050
		% within			
		Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.324(a)	2	.313
Likelihood Ratio	2.232	2	.328
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.650	1	.199

N of Valid Cases	1050
------------------	------

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 30.17.

If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety * Gender

Crosstab

		Gender		Total	
		Male	Female		
If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	Upto 3	Count	61	8	69
		% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	88.4%	11.6%	100.0%
		% within Gender	40.4%	22.2%	36.9%
	4-7	Count	32	7	39
		% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	82.1%	17.9%	100.0%
		% within Gender	21.2%	19.4%	20.9%
	8-15	Count	17	11	28
		% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	60.7%	39.3%	100.0%
		% within Gender	11.3%	30.6%	15.0%
	Above 15	Count	41	10	51
		% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	80.4%	19.6%	100.0%
		% within Gender	27.2%	27.8%	27.3%
Total	Count	151	36	187	

	% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	80.7%	19.3%	100.0%
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.879(a)	3	.020
Likelihood Ratio	8.984	3	.030
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.884	1	.089
N of Valid Cases	187		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.39.

If no, think that such type of training is necessary * Gender

Crosstab

		Gender		Total	
		Male	Female		
If no, think that such type of training is necessary	Yes	Count	336	86	422
		% within If no, think that such type of training is necessary	79.6%	20.4%	100.0%
	No	% within Gender	49.3%	47.5%	48.9%
		Count	346	95	441
		% within If no, think that such type of training is	78.5%	21.5%	100.0%

	necessary			
Total	% within Gender	50.7%	52.5%	51.1%
	Count	682	181	863
	% within If no, think that such type of training is necessary	79.0%	21.0%	100.0%
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.176(b)	1	.675		
Continuity Correction(a)	.113	1	.737		
Likelihood Ratio	.176	1	.675		
Fisher's Exact Test				.677	.369
Linear-by-Linear Association	.176	1	.675		
N of Valid Cases	863				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 88.51.

Interested in such type of training * Gender

Crosstab

		Count	Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Interested in	Yes		437	123	560

such type of training		% within Interested in such type of training	78.0%	22.0%	100.0%
	No	% within Gender	52.5%	56.7%	53.3%
		Count	396	94	490
		% within Interested in such type of training	80.8%	19.2%	100.0%
		% within Gender	47.5%	43.3%	46.7%
Total		Count	833	217	1050
		% within Interested in such type of training	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.232(b)	1	.267		
Continuity Correction(a)	1.069	1	.301		
Likelihood Ratio	1.236	1	.266		
Fisher's Exact Test				.285	.151
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.231	1	.267		
N of Valid Cases	1050				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 101.27.

Responsible for unsafe food * Gender

Crosstab

		Gender		Total	
		Male	Female		
Responsible for unsafe food	Unsafe water	Count	169	42	211
		% within Responsible for unsafe food	80.1%	19.9%	100.0%
		% within Gender	20.3%	19.4%	20.1%
	Unsafe environment	Count	202	55	257
		% within Responsible for unsafe food	78.6%	21.4%	100.0%
		% within Gender	24.2%	25.3%	24.5%
	Careless trade	Count	306	78	384
		% within Responsible for unsafe food	79.7%	20.3%	100.0%
		% within Gender	36.7%	35.9%	36.6%
	Unhygienic practices	Count	156	42	198
		% within Responsible for unsafe food	78.8%	21.2%	100.0%
		% within Gender	18.7%	19.4%	18.9%
Total	Count	833	217	1050	
	% within Responsible for unsafe food	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%	
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.224(a)	3	.974
Likelihood Ratio	.224	3	.974
Linear-by-Linear Association	.033	1	.856
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 40.92.

Seek the help / services of trade associations * Gender

Crosstab

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Seek the help / services of trade associations	Yes	Count	458	100	558
		% within Seek the help / services of trade associations	82.1%	17.9%	100.0%
		% within Gender	55.0%	46.1%	53.1%
	No	Count	255	85	340
		% within Seek the help / services of trade associations	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% within Gender	30.6%	39.2%	32.4%
No Opinion	Count	120	32	152	
	% within Seek the help / services of trade associations	78.9%	21.1%	100.0%	

Total	% within Gender	14.4%	14.7%	14.5%
	Count	833	217	1050
	% within Seek the help / services of trade associations	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.473(a)	2	.039
Likelihood Ratio	6.383	2	.041
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.788	1	.095
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 31.41.

If yes, type of help of trade association * Gender

Crosstab

		Gender		Total	
		Male	Female		
If yes, type of help of trade association	Providing information	Count	74	24	98
		% within If yes, type of help of trade association	75.5%	24.5%	100.0%
		% within Gender	16.2%	24.0%	17.6%
	Guidance	Count	143	26	169

		% within If yes, type of help of trade association	84.6%	15.4%	100.0%
	Unity / Strength	% within Gender	31.2%	26.0%	30.3%
		Count	120	34	154
		% within If yes, type of help of trade association	77.9%	22.1%	100.0%
	Fight to safeguard our interests.	% within Gender	26.2%	34.0%	27.6%
		Count	121	16	137
		% within If yes, type of help of trade association	88.3%	11.7%	100.0%
Total		% within Gender	26.4%	16.0%	24.6%
		Count	458	100	558
		% within If yes, type of help of trade association	82.1%	17.9%	100.0%
		% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.052(a)	3	.029
Likelihood Ratio	9.160	3	.027
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.296	1	.069
N of Valid Cases	558		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.56.

Descriptives

Crosstabs

Type of Business * Age Group in years

Crosstab

			Age Group in years				Total
			Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	
Type of Business	Wholesale	Count	27	59	78	66	230
		% within Type of Business	11.7%	25.7%	33.9%	28.7%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	14.1%	18.3%	26.2%	27.8%	21.9%
	Retail	Count	165	264	220	171	820
		% within Type of Business	20.1%	32.2%	26.8%	20.9%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	85.9%	81.7%	73.8%	72.2%	78.1%
Total		Count	192	323	298	237	1050
		% within Type of Business	18.3%	30.8%	28.4%	22.6%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.472(a)	3	.001
Likelihood Ratio	17.914	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.359	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 42.06.

Number of years in Trade/Business * Age Group in years

Crosstab

		Age Group in years				Total	
		Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50		
Number of years in Trade/Business	Below 1	Count	50	46	20	17	133
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	37.6%	34.6%	15.0%	12.8%	100.0%
	1-5	% within Age Group in years	26.0%	14.2%	6.7%	7.2%	12.7%
		Count	70	106	78	38	292
	5-10	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	24.0%	36.3%	26.7%	13.0%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	36.5%	32.8%	26.2%	16.0%	27.8%
	Above 10	Count	32	72	69	33	206
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	15.5%	35.0%	33.5%	16.0%	100.0%
	Total	% within Age Group in years	16.7%	22.3%	23.2%	13.9%	19.6%
		Count	40	99	131	149	419
	Total	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	9.5%	23.6%	31.3%	35.6%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	20.8%	30.7%	44.0%	62.9%	39.9%
Total		Count	192	323	298	237	1050
		% within Number of years in	18.3%	30.8%	28.4%	22.6%	100.0%

	Trade/Business					
	% within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	126.747(a)	9	.000
Likelihood Ratio	124.580	9	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	107.083	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 24.32.

Licence/Registration to business * Age Group in years

Crosstab

			Age Group in years				Total
			Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	
Licence/Registration to business	Yes	Count	103	191	175	167	636
		% within Licence/Registration to business	16.2%	30.0%	27.5%	26.3%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	53.6%	59.1%	58.7%	70.5%	60.6%
	No	Count	52	91	80	48	271
		% within Licence/Registration to business	19.2%	33.6%	29.5%	17.7%	100.0%

	No Opinion	% within Age Group in years	27.1%	28.2%	26.8%	20.3%	25.8%
		Count	37	41	43	22	143
		% within Licence/Registration to business	25.9%	28.7%	30.1%	15.4%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	19.3%	12.7%	14.4%	9.3%	13.6%
Total		Count	192	323	298	237	1050
		% within Licence/Registration to business	18.3%	30.8%	28.4%	22.6%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.529(a)	6	.008
Likelihood Ratio	17.504	6	.008
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.003	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.15.

If yes, category of license to business * Age Group in years

Crosstab

		Count	Age Group in years				Total
			Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	
If yes, category of	Shop and		52	88	82	91	313

license to business	Establishment	% within If yes, category of license to business	16.6%	28.1%	26.2%	29.1%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	50.5%	46.1%	46.9%	54.5%	49.2%
		Count	10	24	7	7	48
	Dangerous and offensive trade	% within If yes, category of license to business	20.8%	50.0%	14.6%	14.6%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	9.7%	12.6%	4.0%	4.2%	7.5%
		Count	3	6	11	6	26
	Legal Metrology	% within If yes, category of license to business	11.5%	23.1%	42.3%	23.1%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	2.9%	3.1%	6.3%	3.6%	4.1%
		Count	21	34	36	30	121
	Food Safety Standards Act	% within If yes, category of license to business	17.4%	28.1%	29.8%	24.8%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	20.4%	17.8%	20.6%	18.0%	19.0%
		Count	17	39	39	33	128
	Others	% within If yes, category of license to business	13.3%	30.5%	30.5%	25.8%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	16.5%	20.4%	22.3%	19.8%	20.1%
		Count	103	191	175	167	636
Total	% within If yes, category of license to business	16.2%	30.0%	27.5%	26.3%	100.0%	
	% within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.579(a)	12	.099
Likelihood Ratio	18.337	12	.106
Linear-by-Linear Association	.016	1	.899
N of Valid Cases	636		

a 1 cells (5.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.21.

Difficulty in getting the above Licenses * Age Group in years

Crosstab

			Age Group in years				
			Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	Total
Difficulty in getting the above Licenses	Yes	Count	61	97	94	66	318
		% within Difficulty in getting the above Licenses	19.2%	30.5%	29.6%	20.8%	100.0%
	No	% within Age Group in years	31.8%	30.0%	31.5%	27.8%	30.3%
		Count	131	226	204	171	732
Total		% within Difficulty in getting the above Licenses	17.9%	30.9%	27.9%	23.4%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	68.2%	70.0%	68.5%	72.2%	69.7%
		Count	192	323	298	237	1050

% within Difficulty in getting the above Licenses	18.3%	30.8%	28.4%	22.6%	100.0%
% within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.101(a)	3	.777
Likelihood Ratio	1.108	3	.775
Linear-by-Linear Association	.481	1	.488
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 58.15.

Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006 * Age Group in years

Crosstab

			Age Group in years				Total
			Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	
Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006	Yes	Count	78	109	98	79	364
		% within Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006	21.4%	29.9%	26.9%	21.7%	100.0%

Total	No	% within Age Group in years	40.6%	33.7%	32.9%	33.3%	34.7%
		Count	114	214	200	158	686
		% within Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006	16.6%	31.2%	29.2%	23.0%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	59.4%	66.3%	67.1%	66.7%	65.3%
		Count	192	323	298	237	1050
		% within Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006	18.3%	30.8%	28.4%	22.6%	100.0%
% within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.734(a)	3	.292
Likelihood Ratio	3.668	3	.300
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.100	1	.147
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 66.56.

Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business * Age Group in years

Crosstab

			Age Group in years				Total
			Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	
Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	Family members	Count	41	44	43	26	154
		% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	26.6%	28.6%	27.9%	16.9%	100.0%
	Friends	% within Age Group in years	21.4%	13.6%	14.4%	11.0%	14.7%
		Count	46	78	57	36	217
	Co-Traders	% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	21.2%	35.9%	26.3%	16.6%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	24.0%	24.1%	19.1%	15.2%	20.7%
	Government officials	Count	78	153	138	129	498
		% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	15.7%	30.7%	27.7%	25.9%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	40.6%	47.4%	46.3%	54.4%	47.4%
		Count	27	48	60	46	181

Total	% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	14.9%	26.5%	33.1%	25.4%	100.0%
	% within Age Group in years	14.1%	14.9%	20.1%	19.4%	17.2%
	Count	192	323	298	237	1050
	% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	18.3%	30.8%	28.4%	22.6%	100.0%
	% within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.680(a)	9	.005
Likelihood Ratio	23.395	9	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.017	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 28.16.

Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area * Age Group in years

Crosstab

		Age Group in years				Total
		Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	

Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	Yes	Count	46	70	78	57	251
		% within Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	18.3%	27.9%	31.1%	22.7%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	24.0%	21.7%	26.2%	24.1%	23.9%
		Count	114	181	162	125	582
		% within Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	19.6%	31.1%	27.8%	21.5%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	59.4%	56.0%	54.4%	52.7%	55.4%
	No Opinion	Count	32	72	58	55	217
		% within Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	14.7%	33.2%	26.7%	25.3%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	16.7%	22.3%	19.5%	23.2%	20.7%
		Count	192	323	298	237	1050
		% within Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department	18.3%	30.8%	28.4%	22.6%	100.0%
		Total					

officials in area					
% within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.097(a)	6	.531
Likelihood Ratio	5.164	6	.523
Linear-by-Linear Association	.155	1	.694
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 39.68.

Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade * Age Group in years

Crosstab

			Age Group in years				Total
			Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	
Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	Yes	Count	52	92	92	75	311
		% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	16.7%	29.6%	29.6%	24.1%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	27.1%	28.5%	30.9%	31.6%	29.6%

Total	No	Count	96	164	145	99	504
		% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade % within Age Group in years	19.0%	32.5%	28.8%	19.6%	100.0%
	No Opinion	Count	44	67	61	63	235
		% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade % within Age Group in years	18.7%	28.5%	26.0%	26.8%	100.0%
	Total	Count	192	323	298	237	1050
		% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade % within Age Group in years	18.3%	30.8%	28.4%	22.6%	100.0%
	Total	Count	192	323	298	237	1050
		% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade % within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.431(a)	6	.377
Likelihood Ratio	6.430	6	.377
Linear-by-Linear Association	.044	1	.834
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 42.97.

Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006 * Age Group in years

Crosstab

			Age Group in years				Total
			Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	
Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	Essential	Count	128	179	172	130	609
		% within Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	21.0%	29.4%	28.2%	21.3%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	66.7%	55.4%	57.7%	54.9%	58.0%
	Serves no purpose	Count	31	82	57	57	227
		% within Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	13.7%	36.1%	25.1%	25.1%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	16.1%	25.4%	19.1%	24.1%	21.6%
	Not help trade	Count	33	62	69	50	214
		% within Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	15.4%	29.0%	32.2%	23.4%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	17.2%	19.2%	23.2%	21.1%	20.4%
Total	Count	192	323	298	237	1050	
	% within Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	18.3%	30.8%	28.4%	22.6%	100.0%	
	% within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)

Pearson Chi-Square	11.920(a)	6	.064
Likelihood Ratio	11.985	6	.062
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.506	1	.061
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 39.13.

Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public * Age Group in years

Crosstab

			Age Group in years				Total
			Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	
Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	Self discipline by traders	Count	36	63	58	48	205
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	17.6%	30.7%	28.3%	23.4%	100.0%
	Following trade ethics	% within Age Group in years	18.8%	19.5%	19.5%	20.3%	19.5%
		Count	35	67	75	67	244
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	14.3%	27.5%	30.7%	27.5%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	18.2%	20.7%	25.2%	28.3%	23.2%
Rejection of unsafe foods	Count	37	59	66	52	214	
	% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	17.3%	27.6%	30.8%	24.3%	100.0%	
	% within Age Group in years	19.3%	18.3%	22.1%	21.9%	20.4%	

Total	Public awareness	Count	36	56	59	45	196
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	18.4%	28.6%	30.1%	23.0%	100.0%
	Others	% within Age Group in years	18.8%	17.3%	19.8%	19.0%	18.7%
		Count	48	78	40	25	191
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	25.1%	40.8%	20.9%	13.1%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	25.0%	24.1%	13.4%	10.5%	18.2%
		Count	192	323	298	237	1050
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	18.3%	30.8%	28.4%	22.6%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.741(a)	12	.002
Likelihood Ratio	31.405	12	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.600	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 34.93.

Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act * Age Group in years

Crosstab

			Age Group in years				Total
			Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	
Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	Affects freedom	Count	16	32	36	23	107
		% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	15.0%	29.9%	33.6%	21.5%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	8.3%	9.9%	12.1%	9.7%	10.2%
	Brings in unnecessary control	Count	30	65	54	54	203
		% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	14.8%	32.0%	26.6%	26.6%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	15.6%	20.1%	18.1%	22.8%	19.3%
	Not serve any purpose	Count	30	37	33	53	153
		% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	19.6%	24.2%	21.6%	34.6%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	15.6%	11.5%	11.1%	22.4%	14.6%
	Breeds corruption	Count	11	34	45	20	110
		% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	10.0%	30.9%	40.9%	18.2%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	5.7%	10.5%	15.1%	8.4%	10.5%
Not oppose	Count	105	155	130	87	477	

Total	% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	22.0%	32.5%	27.3%	18.2%	100.0%
	% within Age Group in years	54.7%	48.0%	43.6%	36.7%	45.4%
	Count	192	323	298	237	1050
	% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	18.3%	30.8%	28.4%	22.6%	100.0%
	% within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	39.028(a)	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	38.233	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.309	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.57.

Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials * Age Group in years

Crosstab

Kind of help/guidance/ Knowledge of rules/	Count	Age Group in years				Total
		Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	
		57	97	84	70	308

suggestions expect from government officials	Regulations	% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	18.5%	31.5%	27.3%	22.7%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	29.7%	30.0%	28.2%	29.5%	29.3%
Guidance to develop label	Count		44	63	51	40	198
		% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	22.2%	31.8%	25.8%	20.2%	100.0%
Assistance to get License/registration		% within Age Group in years	22.9%	19.5%	17.1%	16.9%	18.9%
	Count		39	74	68	47	228
Periodical visit to guide traders		% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	17.1%	32.5%	29.8%	20.6%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	20.3%	22.9%	22.8%	19.8%	21.7%
Infrastructure facilities	Count		36	55	60	46	197
		% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	18.3%	27.9%	30.5%	23.4%	100.0%
Total		% within Age Group in years	18.8%	17.0%	20.1%	19.4%	18.8%
	Count		16	34	35	34	119
		% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	13.4%	28.6%	29.4%	28.6%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	8.3%	10.5%	11.7%	14.3%	11.3%
	Count		192	323	298	237	1050

	% within Kind of help/guidance/suggestions expect from government officials	18.3%	30.8%	28.4%	22.6%	100.0%
	% within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.384(a)	12	.754
Likelihood Ratio	8.339	12	.758
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.931	1	.087
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.76.

Often the FSO visit your shop and guide * Age Group in years

Crosstab

		Age Group in years				Total	
		Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50		
Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	Never visits	Count	98	157	136	122	513
		% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	19.1%	30.6%	26.5%	23.8%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	51.0%	48.6%	45.6%	51.5%	48.9%
	Once in 3 months	Count	34	46	46	25	151
		% within Often the FSO visit your shop	22.5%	30.5%	30.5%	16.6%	100.0%

		and guide					
		% within Age Group in years	17.7%	14.2%	15.4%	10.5%	14.4%
	Once in 6 months	Count	17	43	46	37	143
		% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	11.9%	30.1%	32.2%	25.9%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	8.9%	13.3%	15.4%	15.6%	13.6%
	Once in a year	Count	43	77	70	53	243
		% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	17.7%	31.7%	28.8%	21.8%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	22.4%	23.8%	23.5%	22.4%	23.1%
Total		Count	192	323	298	237	1050
		% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	18.3%	30.8%	28.4%	22.6%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.119(a)	9	.341
Likelihood Ratio	10.662	9	.300
Linear-by-Linear Association	.305	1	.581
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.15.

Type of complaints to public make * Age Group in years

Crosstab

		Age Group in years				Total	
		Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50		
Type of complaints to public make	About taste	Count	34	51	44	43	172
		% within Type of complaints to public make	19.8%	29.7%	25.6%	25.0%	100.0%
	About hygiene	% within Age Group in years	17.7%	15.8%	14.8%	18.1%	16.4%
		Count	42	63	53	47	205
	About cost	% within Type of complaints to public make	20.5%	30.7%	25.9%	22.9%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	21.9%	19.5%	17.8%	19.8%	19.5%
	About environment	Count	98	175	175	132	580
		% within Type of complaints to public make	16.9%	30.2%	30.2%	22.8%	100.0%
	Total	% within Age Group in years	51.0%	54.2%	58.7%	55.7%	55.2%
		Count	18	34	26	15	93
	Total	% within Type of complaints to public make	19.4%	36.6%	28.0%	16.1%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	9.4%	10.5%	8.7%	6.3%	8.9%
Total	Count	192	323	298	237	1050	
	% within Type of complaints to public make	18.3%	30.8%	28.4%	22.6%	100.0%	

% within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
-----------------------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.349(a)	9	.705
Likelihood Ratio	6.474	9	.692
Linear-by-Linear Association	.060	1	.806
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.01.

Undergone training on food hygiene/safety * Age Group in years

Crosstab

			Age Group in years				
			Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	Total
Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	Yes	Count	33	51	63	40	187
		% within Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	17.6%	27.3%	33.7%	21.4%	100.0%
No		% within Age Group in years	17.2%	15.8%	21.1%	16.9%	17.8%
		Count	131	225	194	167	717
		% within Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	18.3%	31.4%	27.1%	23.3%	100.0%

	No Opinion	% within Age Group in years	68.2%	69.7%	65.1%	70.5%	68.3%
		Count	28	47	41	30	146
		% within Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	19.2%	32.2%	28.1%	20.5%	100.0%
Total		% within Age Group in years	14.6%	14.6%	13.8%	12.7%	13.9%
		Count	192	323	298	237	1050
		% within Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	18.3%	30.8%	28.4%	22.6%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.881(a)	6	.693
Likelihood Ratio	3.818	6	.701
Linear-by-Linear Association	.583	1	.445
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.70.

If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety * Age Group in years

Crosstab

		Age Group in years	Total
--	--	--------------------	-------

			Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	
If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	Upto 3	Count	11	16	26	16	69
		% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety % within Age Group in years	15.9%	23.2%	37.7%	23.2%	100.0%
	4-7	Count	10	10	12	7	39
		% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety % within Age Group in years	25.6%	25.6%	30.8%	17.9%	100.0%
	8-15	Count	5	8	8	7	28
		% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety % within Age Group in years	17.9%	28.6%	28.6%	25.0%	100.0%
	Above 15	Count	7	17	17	10	51
		% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety % within Age Group in years	15.2%	15.7%	12.7%	17.5%	15.0%
	Total	Count	33	51	63	40	187
		% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety % within Age Group in years	13.7%	33.3%	33.3%	19.6%	100.0%
	Total	Count	33	51	63	40	187
		% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety % within Age Group in years	21.2%	33.3%	27.0%	25.0%	27.3%
Total	Count	33	51	63	40	187	
	% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety % within Age Group in years	17.6%	27.3%	33.7%	21.4%	100.0%	
Total	Count	33	51	63	40	187	
	% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety % within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.347(a)	9	.887
Likelihood Ratio	4.196	9	.898
Linear-by-Linear Association	.120	1	.729
N of Valid Cases	187		

a 1 cells (6.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.94.

If no, think that such type of training is necessary * Age Group in years

Crosstab

			Age Group in years				Total
			Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	
If no, think that such type of training is necessary	Yes	Count	79	130	129	84	422
		% within If no, think that such type of training is necessary	18.7%	30.8%	30.6%	19.9%	100.0%
	No	% within Age Group in years	49.7%	47.8%	54.9%	42.6%	48.9%
		Count	80	142	106	113	441
Total		% within If no, think that such type of training is necessary	18.1%	32.2%	24.0%	25.6%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	50.3%	52.2%	45.1%	57.4%	51.1%
		Count	159	272	235	197	863

	% within If no, think that such type of training is necessary	18.4%	31.5%	27.2%	22.8%	100.0%
	% within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.641(a)	3	.084
Likelihood Ratio	6.657	3	.084
Linear-by-Linear Association	.604	1	.437
N of Valid Cases	863		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 77.75.

Interested in such type of training * Age Group in years

Crosstab

			Age Group in years				Total
			Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	
Interested in such type of training	Yes	Count	98	175	170	117	560
		% within Interested in such type of training	17.5%	31.3%	30.4%	20.9%	100.0%
	% within Age Group in years	51.0%	54.2%	57.0%	49.4%	53.3%	
	No	Count	94	148	128	120	490

Total	% within Interested in such type of training	19.2%	30.2%	26.1%	24.5%	100.0%
	% within Age Group in years	49.0%	45.8%	43.0%	50.6%	46.7%
	Count	192	323	298	237	1050
	% within Interested in such type of training	18.3%	30.8%	28.4%	22.6%	100.0%
	% within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.647(a)	3	.302
Likelihood Ratio	3.650	3	.302
Linear-by-Linear Association	.040	1	.842
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 89.60.

Responsible for unsafe food * Age Group in years

Crosstab

			Age Group in years				Total
			Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	
Responsible for	Unsafe water	Count	53	69	49	40	211

unsafe food		% within Responsible for unsafe food	25.1%	32.7%	23.2%	19.0%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	27.6%	21.4%	16.4%	16.9%	20.1%
Unsafe environment		Count	45	88	76	48	257
		% within Responsible for unsafe food	17.5%	34.2%	29.6%	18.7%	100.0%
Careless trade		% within Age Group in years	23.4%	27.2%	25.5%	20.3%	24.5%
		Count	57	114	118	95	384
Unhygienic practices		% within Responsible for unsafe food	14.8%	29.7%	30.7%	24.7%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	29.7%	35.3%	39.6%	40.1%	36.6%
Total		Count	37	52	55	54	198
		% within Responsible for unsafe food	18.7%	26.3%	27.8%	27.3%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	19.3%	16.1%	18.5%	22.8%	18.9%
		Count	192	323	298	237	1050
		% within Responsible for unsafe food	18.3%	30.8%	28.4%	22.6%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.258(a)	9	.023

Likelihood Ratio	19.037	9	.025
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.051	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 36.21.

Seek the help / services of trade associations * Age Group in years

Crosstab

		Age Group in years					
			Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	Total
Seek the help / services of trade associations	Yes	Count	98	157	162	141	558
		% within Seek the help / services of trade associations	17.6%	28.1%	29.0%	25.3%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	51.0%	48.6%	54.4%	59.5%	53.1%
	No	Count	59	111	97	73	340
		% within Seek the help / services of trade associations	17.4%	32.6%	28.5%	21.5%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	30.7%	34.4%	32.6%	30.8%	32.4%
	No Opinion	Count	35	55	39	23	152
		% within Seek the help / services of trade associations	23.0%	36.2%	25.7%	15.1%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	18.2%	17.0%	13.1%	9.7%	14.5%
Total		Count	192	323	298	237	1050

% within Seek the help / services of trade associations	18.3%	30.8%	28.4%	22.6%	100.0%
% within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.477(a)	6	.075
Likelihood Ratio	11.732	6	.068
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.733	1	.003
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 27.79.

If yes, type of help of trade association * Age Group in years

Crosstab

		Age Group in years				Total
		Below 30	31-40	41-50	Above 50	
If yes, type of help of trade association	Providing information	Count 22	35	23	18	98
		% within If yes, type of help of trade association 22.4%	35.7%	23.5%	18.4%	100.0%
	Guidance	Count 24	43	45	57	169
		% within If yes, type of help of trade 14.2%	25.4%	26.6%	33.7%	100.0%

		association					
		% within Age Group in years	24.5%	27.4%	27.8%	40.4%	30.3%
	Unity / Strength	Count	28	48	46	32	154
		% within If yes, type of help of trade association	18.2%	31.2%	29.9%	20.8%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	28.6%	30.6%	28.4%	22.7%	27.6%
	Fight to safeguard our interests.	Count	24	31	48	34	137
		% within If yes, type of help of trade association	17.5%	22.6%	35.0%	24.8%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	24.5%	19.7%	29.6%	24.1%	24.6%
Total		Count	98	157	162	141	558
		% within If yes, type of help of trade association	17.6%	28.1%	29.0%	25.3%	100.0%
		% within Age Group in years	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.862(a)	9	.037
Likelihood Ratio	17.569	9	.041
Linear-by-Linear Association	.898	1	.343
N of Valid Cases	558		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.21.

Crosstabs

Number of years in Trade/Business * Type of Business

Crosstab

			Type of Business		Total
			Wholesale	Retail	
Number of years in Trade/Business	Below 1	Count	15	118	133
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	11.3%	88.7%	100.0%
	1-5	% within Type of Business	6.5%	14.4%	12.7%
		Count	56	236	292
	5-10	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	19.2%	80.8%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	24.3%	28.8%	27.8%
	Above 10	Count	59	147	206
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	28.6%	71.4%	100.0%
	Total	% within Type of Business	25.7%	17.9%	19.6%
		Count	100	319	419
	Total	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	23.9%	76.1%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	43.5%	38.9%	39.9%
Total	Count	230	820	1050	
	% within Number of years in	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%	

	Trade/Business			
	% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.455(a)	3	.001
Likelihood Ratio	17.546	3	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.422	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 29.13.

Licence/Registration to business * Type of Business

Crosstab

			Type of Business		Total
			Wholesale	Retail	
Licence/Registration to business	Yes	Count	181	455	636
		% within Licence/Registration to business	28.5%	71.5%	100.0%
	No	% within Type of Business	78.7%	55.5%	60.6%
		Count	32	239	271
		% within Licence/Registration to business	11.8%	88.2%	100.0%

		% within Type of Business	13.9%	29.1%	25.8%
	No Opinion	Count	17	126	143
		% within Licence/Registration to business	11.9%	88.1%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	7.4%	15.4%	13.6%
Total		Count	230	820	1050
		% within Licence/Registration to business	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	40.509(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	43.191	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	33.461	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 31.32.

If yes, category of license to business * Type of Business

Crosstab

		Count	Type of Business		Total
			Wholesale	Retail	
If yes, category of	Shop and		84	229	313

license to business	Establishment	% within If yes, category of license to business	26.8%	73.2%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	46.4%	50.3%	49.2%
	Dangerous and offensive trade	Count	9	39	48
		% within If yes, category of license to business	18.8%	81.3%	100.0%
	Legal Metrology	% within Type of Business	5.0%	8.6%	7.5%
		Count	12	14	26
	Food Safety Standards Act	% within If yes, category of license to business	46.2%	53.8%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	6.6%	3.1%	4.1%
	Others	Count	36	85	121
		% within If yes, category of license to business	29.8%	70.2%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	19.9%	18.7%	19.0%
		Count	40	88	128
		% within If yes, category of license to business	31.3%	68.8%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	22.1%	19.3%	20.1%
Total		Count	181	455	636
		% within If yes, category of license to business	28.5%	71.5%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.214(a)	4	.125
Likelihood Ratio	7.052	4	.133
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.512	1	.219
N of Valid Cases	636		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.40.

Difficulty in getting the above Licenses * Type of Business

Crosstab

			Type of Business		Total
			Wholesale	Retail	
Difficulty in getting the above Licenses	Yes	Count	73	245	318
		% within Difficulty in getting the above Licenses	23.0%	77.0%	100.0%
	No	% within Type of Business	31.7%	29.9%	30.3%
		Count	157	575	732
Total		% within Difficulty in getting the above Licenses	21.4%	78.6%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	68.3%	70.1%	69.7%
		Count	230	820	1050

% within Difficulty in getting the above Licenses	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%
% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.295(b)	1	.587		
Continuity Correction(a)	.213	1	.644		
Likelihood Ratio	.293	1	.588		
Fisher's Exact Test				.626	.321
Linear-by-Linear Association	.294	1	.587		
N of Valid Cases	1050				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 69.66.

Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006 * Type of Business

Crosstab

			Type of Business		Total
			Wholesale	Retail	
Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006	Yes	Count	100	264	364
		% within Registered business under the Food Safety	27.5%	72.5%	100.0%

		and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006			
	No	% within Type of Business Count	43.5% 130	32.2% 556	34.7% 686
		% within Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006	19.0%	81.0%	100.0%
Total		% within Type of Business Count	56.5% 230	67.8% 820	65.3% 1050
		% within Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.096(b)	1	.001		
Continuity Correction(a)	9.604	1	.002		

Likelihood Ratio	9.866	1	.002		
Fisher's Exact Test				.002	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.087	1	.001		
N of Valid Cases	1050				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 79.73.

Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business * Type of Business

Crosstab

		Type of Business		Total	
		Wholesale	Retail		
Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	Family members	Count	38	116	154
		% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	24.7%	75.3%	100.0%
	Friends	% within Type of Business	16.5%	14.1%	14.7%
		Count	33	184	217
	Co-Traders	% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	15.2%	84.8%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	14.3%	22.4%	20.7%
	Count	124	374	498	

		% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	24.9%	75.1%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	53.9%	45.6%	47.4%
	Government officials	Count	35	146	181
		% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	19.3%	80.7%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	15.2%	17.8%	17.2%
Total		Count	230	820	1050
		% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.690(a)	3	.021
Likelihood Ratio	10.115	3	.018
Linear-by-Linear Association	.012	1	.913
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 33.73.

Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area * Type of Business

Crosstab

			Type of Business		Total
			Wholesale	Retail	
Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	Yes	Count	84	167	251
		% within Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	33.5%	66.5%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	36.5%	20.4%	23.9%
	No	Count	107	475	582
		% within Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	18.4%	81.6%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	46.5%	57.9%	55.4%
No Opinion	Count	39	178	217	
	% within Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	18.0%	82.0%	100.0%	

Total	% within Type of Business	17.0%	21.7%	20.7%
	Count	230	820	1050
	% within Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%
	% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.789(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	24.140	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	17.639	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 47.53.

Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade * Type of Business

Crosstab

			Type of Business		Total
			Wholesale	Retail	
Know the name of	Yes	Count	115	196	311

Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	No	% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	37.0%	63.0%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	50.0%	23.9%	29.6%
		Count	85	419	504
No Opinion		% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	16.9%	83.1%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	37.0%	51.1%	48.0%
		Count	30	205	235
Total		% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	12.8%	87.2%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	13.0%	25.0%	22.4%
		Count	230	820	1050
		% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	60.259(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	57.304	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear	50.482	1	.000

Association N of Valid Cases	1050
---------------------------------	------

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 51.48.

Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006 * Type of Business

Crosstab

			Type of Business		Total
			Wholesale	Retail	
Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	Essential	Count	149	460	609
		% within Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	24.5%	75.5%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	64.8%	56.1%	58.0%
	Serves no purpose	Count	41	186	227
		% within Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	18.1%	81.9%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	17.8%	22.7%	21.6%
	Not help trade	Count	40	174	214
		% within Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	18.7%	81.3%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	17.4%	21.2%	20.4%
Total	Count	230	820	1050	
	% within Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%	
	% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.587(a)	2	.061
Likelihood Ratio	5.667	2	.059
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.375	1	.036
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 46.88.

Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public * Type of Business

Crosstab

			Type of Business		Total
			Wholesale	Retail	
Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	Self discipline by traders	Count	51	154	205
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	24.9%	75.1%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	22.2%	18.8%	19.5%
	Following trade ethics	Count	46	198	244
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	18.9%	81.1%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	20.0%	24.1%	23.2%
Rejection of unsafe	Count	46	168	214	

Total	foods	% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	21.5%	78.5%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	20.0%	20.5%	20.4%
	Public awareness	Count	50	146	196
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	25.5%	74.5%	100.0%
	Others	% within Type of Business	21.7%	17.8%	18.7%
		Count	37	154	191
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	19.4%	80.6%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	16.1%	18.8%	18.2%
		Count	230	820	1050
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.615(a)	4	.329
Likelihood Ratio	4.599	4	.331
Linear-by-Linear	.156	1	.692

Association N of Valid Cases	1050
---------------------------------	------

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 41.84.

Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act * Type of Business

Crosstab

			Type of Business		Total
			Wholesale	Retail	
Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	Affects freedom	Count	24	83	107
		% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	22.4%	77.6%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	10.4%	10.1%	10.2%
	Brings in unnecessary control	Count	36	167	203
		% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	17.7%	82.3%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	15.7%	20.4%	19.3%
	Not serve any purpose	Count	42	111	153
		% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	27.5%	72.5%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	18.3%	13.5%	14.6%
Breeds corruption	Count	26	84	110	

		% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	23.6%	76.4%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	11.3%	10.2%	10.5%
	Not oppose	Count	102	375	477
		% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	21.4%	78.6%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	44.3%	45.7%	45.4%
Total		Count	230	820	1050
		% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.101(a)	4	.277
Likelihood Ratio	5.057	4	.281
Linear-by-Linear Association	.047	1	.828
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 23.44.

Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials * Type of Business

Crosstab

			Type of Business		
			Wholesale	Retail	Total
Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	Knowledge of rules/ Regulations	Count	58	250	308
		% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	18.8%	81.2%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	25.2%	30.5%	29.3%
	Guidance to develop label	Count	55	143	198
		% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	27.8%	72.2%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	23.9%	17.4%	18.9%
	Assistance to get License/registration	Count	42	186	228
		% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	18.4%	81.6%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	18.3%	22.7%	21.7%
	Periodical visit to guide traders	Count	55	142	197
		% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	27.9%	72.1%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	23.9%	17.3%	18.8%
Infrastructure facilities	Count	20	99	119	

Total	% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	16.8%	83.2%	100.0%
	% within Type of Business	8.7%	12.1%	11.3%
	Count	230	820	1050
	% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%
	% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.284(a)	4	.010
Likelihood Ratio	13.068	4	.011
Linear-by-Linear Association	.146	1	.702
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.07.

Often the FSO visit your shop and guide * Type of Business

Crosstab

			Type of Business		Total
			Wholesale	Retail	
Often the FSO visit	Never visits	Count	96	417	513

your shop and guide		% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	18.7%	81.3%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	41.7%	50.9%	48.9%
Once in 3 months		Count	27	124	151
		% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	17.9%	82.1%	100.0%
Once in 6 months		% within Type of Business	11.7%	15.1%	14.4%
		Count	44	99	143
Once in a year		% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	30.8%	69.2%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	19.1%	12.1%	13.6%
Total		Count	63	180	243
		% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	25.9%	74.1%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	27.4%	22.0%	23.1%
		Count	230	820	1050
		% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.349(a)	3	.004

Likelihood Ratio	12.923	3	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.537	1	.003
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 31.32.

Type of complaints to public make * Type of Business

Crosstab

			Type of Business		Total
			Wholesale	Retail	
Type of complaints to public make	About taste	Count	37	135	172
		% within Type of complaints to public make	21.5%	78.5%	100.0%
	About hygiene	% within Type of Business	16.1%	16.5%	16.4%
		Count	49	156	205
	About cost	% within Type of complaints to public make	23.9%	76.1%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	21.3%	19.0%	19.5%
	About environment	Count	120	460	580
		% within Type of complaints to public make	20.7%	79.3%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	52.2%	56.1%	55.2%
		Count	24	69	93
		% within Type of complaints to public make	25.8%	74.2%	100.0%

Total	% within Type of Business	10.4%	8.4%	8.9%
	Count	230	820	1050
	% within Type of complaints to public make	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%
	% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.822(a)	3	.610
Likelihood Ratio	1.787	3	.618
Linear-by-Linear Association	.006	1	.939
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 20.37.

Undergone training on food hygiene/safety * Type of Business

Crosstab

		Type of Business			
		Wholesale	Retail	Total	
Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	Yes	Count	71	116	187
		% within Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	38.0%	62.0%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	30.9%	14.1%	17.8%

Total	No	Count	122	595	717
		% within Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	17.0%	83.0%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	53.0%	72.6%	68.3%
	No Opinion	Count	37	109	146
		% within Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	25.3%	74.7%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	16.1%	13.3%	13.9%
	Total	Count	230	820	1050
		% within Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	39.235(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	36.288	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.031	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 31.98.

If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety * Type of Business

Crosstab

			Type of Business		Total
			Wholesale	Retail	
If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	Upto 3	Count	25	44	69
		% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	36.2%	63.8%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	35.2%	37.9%	36.9%
	4-7	Count	14	25	39
		% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	35.9%	64.1%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	19.7%	21.6%	20.9%
	8-15	Count	10	18	28
		% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	35.7%	64.3%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	14.1%	15.5%	15.0%
	Above 15	Count	22	29	51
		% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	43.1%	56.9%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	31.0%	25.0%	27.3%
Total		Count	71	116	187

	% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	38.0%	62.0%	100.0%
	% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.798(a)	3	.850
Likelihood Ratio	.791	3	.852
Linear-by-Linear Association	.512	1	.474
N of Valid Cases	187		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.63.

If no, think that such type of training is necessary * Type of Business

Crosstab

			Type of Business		Total
			Wholesale	Retail	
If no, think that such type of training is necessary	Yes	Count	89	333	422
		% within If no, think that such type of training is necessary	21.1%	78.9%	100.0%
	% within Type of Business	56.0%	47.3%	48.9%	
	No	Count	70	371	441

Total	% within If no, think that such type of training is necessary	15.9%	84.1%	100.0%
	% within Type of Business	44.0%	52.7%	51.1%
	Count	159	704	863
	% within If no, think that such type of training is necessary	18.4%	81.6%	100.0%
	% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.905(b)	1	.048		
Continuity Correction(a)	3.566	1	.059		
Likelihood Ratio	3.910	1	.048		
Fisher's Exact Test				.053	.029
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.901	1	.048		
N of Valid Cases	863				

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 77.75.

Interested in such type of training * Type of Business

Crosstab

		Type of Business	Total

			Wholesale	Retail	
Interested in such type of training	Yes	Count	135	425	560
		% within Interested in such type of training	24.1%	75.9%	100.0%
	No	% within Type of Business	58.7%	51.8%	53.3%
		Count	95	395	490
Total		% within Interested in such type of training	19.4%	80.6%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	41.3%	48.2%	46.7%
		Count	230	820	1050
		% within Interested in such type of training	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.403(b)	1	.065		
Continuity Correction(a)	3.132	1	.077		
Likelihood Ratio	3.420	1	.064		
Fisher's Exact Test				.073	.038
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.399	1	.065		

N of Valid Cases	1050			
------------------	------	--	--	--

a Computed only for a 2x2 table

b 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 107.33.

Responsible for unsafe food * Type of Business

Crosstab

			Type of Business		Total
			Wholesale	Retail	
Responsible for unsafe food	Unsafe water	Count	51	160	211
		% within Responsible for unsafe food	24.2%	75.8%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	22.2%	19.5%	20.1%
	Unsafe environment	Count	53	204	257
		% within Responsible for unsafe food	20.6%	79.4%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	23.0%	24.9%	24.5%
	Careless trade	Count	76	308	384
		% within Responsible for unsafe food	19.8%	80.2%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	33.0%	37.6%	36.6%
	Unhygienic practices	Count	50	148	198
		% within Responsible for unsafe food	25.3%	74.7%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	21.7%	18.0%	18.9%
Total	Count	230	820	1050	

	% within Responsible for unsafe food	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%
	% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.180(a)	3	.365
Likelihood Ratio	3.149	3	.369
Linear-by-Linear Association	.001	1	.979
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 43.37.

Seek the help / services of trade associations * Type of Business

Crosstab

		Type of Business		
		Wholesale	Retail	Total
Seek the help / services of trade associations	Yes	Count 149	Count 409	Count 558
		% within Seek the help / services of trade associations 26.7%	% within Seek the help / services of trade associations 73.3%	% within Seek the help / services of trade associations 100.0%
		% within Type of Business 64.8%	% within Type of Business 49.9%	% within Type of Business 53.1%
No	Count 48	Count 292	Count 340	

		% within Seek the help / services of trade associations	14.1%	85.9%	100.0%
	No Opinion	% within Type of Business	20.9%	35.6%	32.4%
		Count	33	119	152
		% within Seek the help / services of trade associations	21.7%	78.3%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	14.3%	14.5%	14.5%
Total		Count	230	820	1050
		% within Seek the help / services of trade associations	21.9%	78.1%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.564(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	20.498	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.737	1	.005
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 33.30.

If yes, type of help of trade association * Type of Business

Crosstab

		Type of Business		Total	
		Wholesale	Retail		
If yes, type of help of trade association	Providing information	Count	20	78	98
		% within If yes, type of help of trade association	20.4%	79.6%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	13.4%	19.1%	17.6%
	Guidance	Count	33	136	169
		% within If yes, type of help of trade association	19.5%	80.5%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	22.1%	33.3%	30.3%
	Unity / Strength	Count	41	113	154
		% within If yes, type of help of trade association	26.6%	73.4%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	27.5%	27.6%	27.6%
	Fight to safeguard our interests.	Count	55	82	137
		% within If yes, type of help of trade association	40.1%	59.9%	100.0%
		% within Type of Business	36.9%	20.0%	24.6%
Total	Count	149	409	558	
	% within If yes, type of help of trade association	26.7%	73.3%	100.0%	
	% within Type of Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	19.081(a)	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	18.473	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	15.505	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	558		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 26.17.

Crosstabs

Licence/Registration to business * Number of years in Trade/Business

Crosstab

			Number of years in Trade/Business				Total
			Below 1	1-5	5-10	Above 10	
Licence/Registration to business	Yes	Count	50	185	130	271	636
		% within Licence/Registration to business	7.9%	29.1%	20.4%	42.6%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	37.6%	63.4%	63.1%	64.7%	60.6%
	No	Count	55	58	50	108	271
		% within Licence/Registration to business	20.3%	21.4%	18.5%	39.9%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	41.4%	19.9%	24.3%	25.8%	25.8%

Total	No Opinion	Count	28	49	26	40	143
		% within Licence/Registration to business	19.6%	34.3%	18.2%	28.0%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	21.1%	16.8%	12.6%	9.5%	13.6%
		Count	133	292	206	419	1050
		% within Licence/Registration to business	12.7%	27.8%	19.6%	39.9%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	42.785(a)	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	42.668	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	21.148	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.11.

If yes, category of license to business * Number of years in Trade/Business

Crosstab

		Count	Number of years in Trade/Business				Total
			Below 1	1-5	5-10	Above 10	
If yes, category of	Shop and		21	91	62	139	313

license to business	Establishment	% within If yes, category of license to business	6.7%	29.1%	19.8%	44.4%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business Count	42.0%	49.2%	47.7%	51.3%	49.2%
	Dangerous and offensive trade	Count	3	12	4	29	48
		% within If yes, category of license to business	6.3%	25.0%	8.3%	60.4%	100.0%
	Legal Metrology	% within Number of years in Trade/Business Count	6.0%	6.5%	3.1%	10.7%	7.5%
		Count	2	6	6	12	26
	Food Safety Standards Act	% within If yes, category of license to business	7.7%	23.1%	23.1%	46.2%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business Count	4.0%	3.2%	4.6%	4.4%	4.1%
	Others	Count	11	42	20	48	121
		% within If yes, category of license to business	9.1%	34.7%	16.5%	39.7%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business Count	22.0%	22.7%	15.4%	17.7%	19.0%
		Count	13	34	38	43	128
Total		% within If yes, category of license to business	10.2%	26.6%	29.7%	33.6%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business Count	26.0%	18.4%	29.2%	15.9%	20.1%
		Count	50	185	130	271	636
		% within If yes, category of license to	7.9%	29.1%	20.4%	42.6%	100.0%

business					
% within Number of years in Trade/Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.399(a)	12	.060
Likelihood Ratio	20.504	12	.058
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.414	1	.065
N of Valid Cases	636		

a 2 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.04.

Difficulty in getting the above Licenses * Number of years in Trade/Business

Crosstab

		Number of years in Trade/Business				Total	
		Below 1	1-5	5-10	Above 10		
Difficulty in getting the above Licenses	Yes	Count	35	81	59	143	318
		% within Difficulty in getting the above Licenses	11.0%	25.5%	18.6%	45.0%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	26.3%	27.7%	28.6%	34.1%	30.3%
No	Count	98	211	147	276	732	

Total	% within Difficulty in getting the above Licenses	13.4%	28.8%	20.1%	37.7%	100.0%
	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	73.7%	72.3%	71.4%	65.9%	69.7%
	Count	133	292	206	419	1050
	% within Difficulty in getting the above Licenses	12.7%	27.8%	19.6%	39.9%	100.0%
	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.084(a)	3	.166
Likelihood Ratio	5.065	3	.167
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.492	1	.034
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 40.28.

Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006 * Number of years in Trade/Business

Crosstab

		Number of years in Trade/Business				Total
		Below 1	1-5	5-10	Above 10	

Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006	Yes	Count	45	123	80	116	364
		% within Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006	12.4%	33.8%	22.0%	31.9%	100.0%
	No	% within Number of years in Trade/Business Count	33.8%	42.1%	38.8%	27.7%	34.7%
		Count	88	169	126	303	686
Total	Yes	% within Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006	12.8%	24.6%	18.4%	44.2%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business Count	66.2%	57.9%	61.2%	72.3%	65.3%
		Count	133	292	206	419	1050
	No	% within Registered business under the Food Safety and Standards(FSS) Act, 2006	12.7%	27.8%	19.6%	39.9%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business Count	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		Count					

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)

Pearson Chi-Square	17.807(a)	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	17.912	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.583	1	.003
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 46.11.

Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business * Number of years in Trade/Business

Crosstab

			Number of years in Trade/Business				Total
			Below 1	1-5	5-10	Above 10	
Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	Family members	Count	32	48	30	44	154
		% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	20.8%	31.2%	19.5%	28.6%	100.0%
	Friends	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	24.1%	16.4%	14.6%	10.5%	14.7%
		Count	29	91	50	47	217
	Co-Traders	% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	13.4%	41.9%	23.0%	21.7%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	21.8%	31.2%	24.3%	11.2%	20.7%
	Co-Traders	Count	62	119	93	224	498

		% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	12.4%	23.9%	18.7%	45.0%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	46.6%	40.8%	45.1%	53.5%	47.4%
	Government officials	Count	10	34	33	104	181
		% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	5.5%	18.8%	18.2%	57.5%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	7.5%	11.6%	16.0%	24.8%	17.2%
Total		Count	133	292	206	419	1050
		% within Gather the knowledge of Government Rules and Regulations regarding Business	12.7%	27.8%	19.6%	39.9%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	81.584(a)	9	.000
Likelihood Ratio	83.240	9	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	55.872	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.51.

Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area * Number of years in Trade/Business

Crosstab

			Number of years in Trade/Business				Total
			Below 1	1-5	5-10	Above 10	
Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	Yes	Count	28	66	58	99	251
		% within Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	11.2%	26.3%	23.1%	39.4%	100.0%
	No	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	21.1%	22.6%	28.2%	23.6%	23.9%
		Count	82	146	104	250	582
	No Opinion	% within Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	14.1%	25.1%	17.9%	43.0%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	61.7%	50.0%	50.5%	59.7%	55.4%
		Count	23	80	44	70	217
		% within Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food	10.6%	36.9%	20.3%	32.3%	100.0%

	Department officials in area					
Total	% within Number of years in Trade/Business Count	17.3%	27.4%	21.4%	16.7%	20.7%
		133	292	206	419	1050
	% within Know the Name, Designation, Official address, Phone Number etc. of the Food Department officials in area	12.7%	27.8%	19.6%	39.9%	100.0%
	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.338(a)	6	.008
Likelihood Ratio	16.960	6	.009
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.580	1	.108
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 27.49.

Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade * Number of years in Trade/Business

Crosstab

			Number of years in Trade/Business				Total
			Below 1	1-5	5-10	Above 10	
Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	Yes	Count	36	71	70	134	311
		% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	11.6%	22.8%	22.5%	43.1%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	27.1%	24.3%	34.0%	32.0%	29.6%
	No	Count	71	135	85	213	504
		% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	14.1%	26.8%	16.9%	42.3%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	53.4%	46.2%	41.3%	50.8%	48.0%
No Opinion	Count	26	86	51	72	235	
	% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	11.1%	36.6%	21.7%	30.6%	100.0%	
	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	19.5%	29.5%	24.8%	17.2%	22.4%	
Total	Count	133	292	206	419	1050	
	% within Know the name of Act/Rule/Regulations that governs trade	12.7%	27.8%	19.6%	39.9%	100.0%	
	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.398(a)	6	.002
Likelihood Ratio	21.419	6	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.127	1	.008
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 29.77.

Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006 * Number of years in Trade/Business

Crosstab

			Number of years in Trade/Business				Total
			Below 1	1-5	5-10	Above 10	
Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	Essential	Count	77	182	106	244	609
		% within Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	12.6%	29.9%	17.4%	40.1%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	57.9%	62.3%	51.5%	58.2%	58.0%
	Serves no purpose	Count	41	60	47	79	227
		% within Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	18.1%	26.4%	20.7%	34.8%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	30.8%	20.5%	22.8%	18.9%	21.6%
Not help trade	Count	15	50	53	96	214	

Total	% within Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	7.0%	23.4%	24.8%	44.9%	100.0%
	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	11.3%	17.1%	25.7%	22.9%	20.4%
	Count	133	292	206	419	1050
	% within Opinion about the FSS Act, 2006	12.7%	27.8%	19.6%	39.9%	100.0%
	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.592(a)	6	.002
Likelihood Ratio	20.950	6	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.942	1	.047
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 27.11.

Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public * Number of years in Trade/Business

Crosstab

		Count	Number of years in Trade/Business				Total
			Below 1	1-5	5-10	Above 10	
Absence of such Acts	Self discipline by		31	61	39	74	205

how could safety of Food be ensured to public	traders	% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	15.1%	29.8%	19.0%	36.1%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	23.3%	20.9%	18.9%	17.7%	19.5%
	Following trade ethics	Count	36	61	51	96	244
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	14.8%	25.0%	20.9%	39.3%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	27.1%	20.9%	24.8%	22.9%	23.2%
	Rejection of unsafe foods	Count	22	74	50	68	214
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	10.3%	34.6%	23.4%	31.8%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	16.5%	25.3%	24.3%	16.2%	20.4%
	Public awareness	Count	24	53	34	85	196
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	12.2%	27.0%	17.3%	43.4%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	18.0%	18.2%	16.5%	20.3%	18.7%
	Others	Count	20	43	32	96	191
		% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	10.5%	22.5%	16.8%	50.3%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	15.0%	14.7%	15.5%	22.9%	18.2%
Total		Count	133	292	206	419	1050

	% within Absence of such Acts how could safety of Food be ensured to public	12.7%	27.8%	19.6%	39.9%	100.0%
	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.116(a)	12	.027
Likelihood Ratio	22.881	12	.029
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.727	1	.005
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 24.19.

Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act * Number of years in Trade/Business

Crosstab

		Number of years in Trade/Business				Total	
		Below 1	1-5	5-10	Above 10		
Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	Affects freedom	Count	14	37	22	34	107
		% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	13.1%	34.6%	20.6%	31.8%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	10.5%	12.7%	10.7%	8.1%	10.2%
	Brings in unnecessary	Count	31	52	35	85	203

Total	control	% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	15.3%	25.6%	17.2%	41.9%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	23.3%	17.8%	17.0%	20.3%	19.3%
	Not serve any purpose	Count	16	34	41	62	153
		% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	10.5%	22.2%	26.8%	40.5%	100.0%
	Breeds corruption	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	12.0%	11.6%	19.9%	14.8%	14.6%
		Count	9	36	23	42	110
	Not oppose	% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	8.2%	32.7%	20.9%	38.2%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	6.8%	12.3%	11.2%	10.0%	10.5%
	Total	Count	63	133	85	196	477
		% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	13.2%	27.9%	17.8%	41.1%	100.0%
	Total	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	47.4%	45.5%	41.3%	46.8%	45.4%
		Count	133	292	206	419	1050
	Total	% within Reason to oppose Government actions and controls like FSS Act	12.7%	27.8%	19.6%	39.9%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.103(a)	12	.187
Likelihood Ratio	16.044	12	.189
Linear-by-Linear Association	.569	1	.451
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.55.

Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials * Number of years in Trade/Business

Crosstab

		Number of years in Trade/Business				Total	
		Below 1	1-5	5-10	Above 10		
Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	Knowledge of rules/ Regulations	Count	34	64	58	152	308
		% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	11.0%	20.8%	18.8%	49.4%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	25.6%	21.9%	28.2%	36.3%	29.3%
	Guidance to develop label	Count	39	57	36	66	198
		% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	19.7%	28.8%	18.2%	33.3%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	29.3%	19.5%	17.5%	15.8%	18.9%
	Assistance to get	Count	28	71	39	90	228

Total	License/registration	% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	12.3%	31.1%	17.1%	39.5%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	21.1%	24.3%	18.9%	21.5%	21.7%
	Periodical visit to guide traders	Count	17	65	44	71	197
		% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	8.6%	33.0%	22.3%	36.0%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	12.8%	22.3%	21.4%	16.9%	18.8%
	Infrastructure facilities	Count	15	35	29	40	119
		% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	12.6%	29.4%	24.4%	33.6%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	11.3%	12.0%	14.1%	9.5%	11.3%
		Count	133	292	206	419	1050
		% within Kind of help/guidance/ suggestions expect from government officials	12.7%	27.8%	19.6%	39.9%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	33.506(a)	12	.001
Likelihood Ratio	32.757	12	.001
Linear-by-Linear	4.285	1	.038

Association			
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.07.

Often the FSO visit your shop and guide * Number of years in Trade/Business

Crosstab

		Number of years in Trade/Business				Total	
		Below 1	1-5	5-10	Above 10		
Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	Never visits	Count	83	136	97	197	513
		% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	16.2%	26.5%	18.9%	38.4%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	62.4%	46.6%	47.1%	47.0%	48.9%
		Count	18	42	29	62	151
	Once in 3 months	% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	11.9%	27.8%	19.2%	41.1%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	13.5%	14.4%	14.1%	14.8%	14.4%
		Count	13	39	32	59	143
		% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	9.1%	27.3%	22.4%	41.3%	100.0%
	Once in 6 months	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	9.8%	13.4%	15.5%	14.1%	13.6%
		Count	19	75	48	101	243
		% within Often the FSO visit your shop	7.8%	30.9%	19.8%	41.6%	100.0%

	and guide					
Total	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	14.3%	25.7%	23.3%	24.1%	23.1%
	Count	133	292	206	419	1050
	% within Often the FSO visit your shop and guide	12.7%	27.8%	19.6%	39.9%	100.0%
	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.433(a)	9	.144
Likelihood Ratio	13.860	9	.127
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.330	1	.037
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.11.

Type of complaints to public make * Number of years in Trade/Business

Crosstab

		Count	Number of years in Trade/Business				Total
			Below 1	1-5	5-10	Above 10	
Type of complaints to	About taste		30	59	34	49	172

public make		% within Type of complaints to public make	17.4%	34.3%	19.8%	28.5%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	22.6%	20.2%	16.5%	11.7%	16.4%
About hygiene		Count	36	48	42	79	205
		% within Type of complaints to public make	17.6%	23.4%	20.5%	38.5%	100.0%
About cost		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	27.1%	16.4%	20.4%	18.9%	19.5%
		Count	61	140	108	271	580
About environment		% within Type of complaints to public make	10.5%	24.1%	18.6%	46.7%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	45.9%	47.9%	52.4%	64.7%	55.2%
Total		Count	6	45	22	20	93
		% within Type of complaints to public make	6.5%	48.4%	23.7%	21.5%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	4.5%	15.4%	10.7%	4.8%	8.9%
		Count	133	292	206	419	1050
		% within Type of complaints to public make	12.7%	27.8%	19.6%	39.9%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	54.439(a)	9	.000
Likelihood Ratio	53.728	9	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.604	1	.006
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.78.

Undergone training on food hygiene/safety * Number of years in Trade/Business

Crosstab

			Number of years in Trade/Business				Total
			Below 1	1-5	5-10	Above 10	
Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	Yes	Count	27	50	44	66	187
		% within Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	14.4%	26.7%	23.5%	35.3%	100.0%
	No	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	20.3%	17.1%	21.4%	15.8%	17.8%
		Count	81	183	131	322	717
No Opinion	No	% within Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	11.3%	25.5%	18.3%	44.9%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	60.9%	62.7%	63.6%	76.8%	68.3%
	No Opinion	Count	25	59	31	31	146
		% within Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	17.1%	40.4%	21.2%	21.2%	100.0%

Total	% within Number of years in Trade/Business Count	18.8%	20.2%	15.0%	7.4%	13.9%
		133	292	206	419	1050
	% within Undergone training on food hygiene/safety	12.7%	27.8%	19.6%	39.9%	100.0%
	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.144(a)	6	.000
Likelihood Ratio	35.375	6	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.334	1	.021
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.49.

If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety * Number of years in Trade/Business

Crosstab

			Number of years in Trade/Business				Total
			Below 1	1-5	5-10	Above 10	
If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	Upto 3	Count	13	21	14	21	69
		% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	18.8%	30.4%	20.3%	30.4%	100.0%

		% within Number of years in Trade/Business Count	48.1%	42.0%	31.8%	31.8%	36.9%
	4-7		3	13	12	11	39
		% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	7.7%	33.3%	30.8%	28.2%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business Count	11.1%	26.0%	27.3%	16.7%	20.9%
	8-15		3	5	7	13	28
		% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	10.7%	17.9%	25.0%	46.4%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business Count	11.1%	10.0%	15.9%	19.7%	15.0%
	Above 15		8	11	11	21	51
		% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	15.7%	21.6%	21.6%	41.2%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business Count	29.6%	22.0%	25.0%	31.8%	27.3%
Total			27	50	44	66	187
		% within If yes, number of days attended training on food hygiene/safety	14.4%	26.7%	23.5%	35.3%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.588(a)	9	.476
Likelihood Ratio	8.760	9	.460
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.467	1	.116
N of Valid Cases	187		

a 1 cells (6.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.04.

If no, think that such type of training is necessary * Number of years in Trade/Business

Crosstab

		Number of years in Trade/Business				Total	
		Below 1	1-5	5-10	Above 10		
If no, think that such type of training is necessary	Yes	Count	47	138	84	153	422
		% within If no, think that such type of training is necessary	11.1%	32.7%	19.9%	36.3%	100.0%
	No	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	44.3%	57.0%	51.9%	43.3%	48.9%
		Count	59	104	78	200	441
Total		% within If no, think that such type of training is necessary	13.4%	23.6%	17.7%	45.4%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	55.7%	43.0%	48.1%	56.7%	51.1%
Total		Count	106	242	162	353	863

% within If no, think that such type of training is necessary	12.3%	28.0%	18.8%	40.9%	100.0%
% within Number of years in Trade/Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.203(a)	3	.007
Likelihood Ratio	12.234	3	.007
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.480	1	.062
N of Valid Cases	863		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 51.83.

Interested in such type of training * Number of years in Trade/Business

Crosstab

			Number of years in Trade/Business				Total
			Below 1	1-5	5-10	Above 10	
Interested in such type of training	Yes	Count	66	183	115	196	560
		% within Interested in such type of training	11.8%	32.7%	20.5%	35.0%	100.0%
	No	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	49.6%	62.7%	55.8%	46.8%	53.3%
		Count	67	109	91	223	490

Total	% within Interested in such type of training	13.7%	22.2%	18.6%	45.5%	100.0%
	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	50.4%	37.3%	44.2%	53.2%	46.7%
	Count	133	292	206	419	1050
	% within Interested in such type of training	12.7%	27.8%	19.6%	39.9%	100.0%
	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.713(a)	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	18.840	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.598	1	.010
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 62.07.

Responsible for unsafe food * Number of years in Trade/Business

Crosstab

		Number of years in Trade/Business				Total	
		Below 1	1-5	5-10	Above 10		
Responsible for	Unsafe water	Count	29	63	45	74	211

unsafe food		% within Responsible for unsafe food	13.7%	29.9%	21.3%	35.1%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	21.8%	21.6%	21.8%	17.7%	20.1%
	Unsafe environment	Count	31	82	38	106	257
		% within Responsible for unsafe food	12.1%	31.9%	14.8%	41.2%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	23.3%	28.1%	18.4%	25.3%	24.5%
	Careless trade	Count	52	89	77	166	384
		% within Responsible for unsafe food	13.5%	23.2%	20.1%	43.2%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	39.1%	30.5%	37.4%	39.6%	36.6%
	Unhygienic practices	Count	21	58	46	73	198
		% within Responsible for unsafe food	10.6%	29.3%	23.2%	36.9%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	15.8%	19.9%	22.3%	17.4%	18.9%
Total		Count	133	292	206	419	1050
		% within Responsible for unsafe food	12.7%	27.8%	19.6%	39.9%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.753(a)	9	.131
Likelihood Ratio	14.121	9	.118
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.356	1	.244
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 25.08.

Seek the help / services of trade associations * Number of years in Trade/Business

Crosstab

			Number of years in Trade/Business				Total
			Below 1	1-5	5-10	Above 10	
Seek the help / services of trade associations	Yes	Count	72	147	107	232	558
		% within Seek the help / services of trade associations	12.9%	26.3%	19.2%	41.6%	100.0%
	No	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	54.1%	50.3%	51.9%	55.4%	53.1%
		Count	46	92	62	140	340
No Opinion	No	% within Seek the help / services of trade associations	13.5%	27.1%	18.2%	41.2%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	34.6%	31.5%	30.1%	33.4%	32.4%
	No Opinion	Count	15	53	37	47	152
		% within Seek the help / services of trade associations	9.9%	34.9%	24.3%	30.9%	100.0%

Total	% within Number of years in Trade/Business Count	11.3%	18.2%	18.0%	11.2%	14.5%
		133	292	206	419	1050
	% within Seek the help / services of trade associations	12.7%	27.8%	19.6%	39.9%	100.0%
	% within Number of years in Trade/Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.106(a)	6	.120
Likelihood Ratio	10.122	6	.120
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.464	1	.226
N of Valid Cases	1050		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.25.

If yes, type of help of trade association * Number of years in Trade/Business

Crosstab

			Number of years in Trade/Business				Total
			Below 1	1-5	5-10	Above 10	
If yes, type of help of trade association	Providing information	Count	23	37	10	28	98
		% within If yes, type of help of trade association	23.5%	37.8%	10.2%	28.6%	100.0%

		% within Number of years in Trade/Business Count	31.9%	25.2%	9.3%	12.1%	17.6%
	Guidance		21	28	31	89	169
		% within If yes, type of help of trade association	12.4%	16.6%	18.3%	52.7%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business Count	29.2%	19.0%	29.0%	38.4%	30.3%
	Unity / Strength		13	47	34	60	154
		% within If yes, type of help of trade association	8.4%	30.5%	22.1%	39.0%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business Count	18.1%	32.0%	31.8%	25.9%	27.6%
	Fight to safeguard our interests.		15	35	32	55	137
		% within If yes, type of help of trade association	10.9%	25.5%	23.4%	40.1%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business Count	20.8%	23.8%	29.9%	23.7%	24.6%
Total			72	147	107	232	558
		% within If yes, type of help of trade association	12.9%	26.3%	19.2%	41.6%	100.0%
		% within Number of years in Trade/Business	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	38.721(a)	9	.000
Likelihood Ratio	38.570	9	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.511	1	.034
N of Valid Cases	558		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.65.