



ISSN 2278 – 0211 (Online)

## The Role of Education, Income and Occupation on Food Choice: A Comparative Study of Rural and Urban in Tamil Nadu, South India

**T. Thegaleesan**

Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Annamalai University, Tamil Nadu, India

**Dr. R. Renganathan**

Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Annamalai University, Tamil Nadu, India

### **Abstract:**

A Portuguese study reveals that the low and high-income groups are feed to be similar in regard to several food groups consumption and access to education/information appears to be the key element to a better food pattern consumption. While seeing these views, this research has been made an attempt to find out the influence of three economic determinants such as Income, occupation, and education on food choice in Indian context in Rural and Urban areas in villupuram District of Tamilnadu.

*Methodology:-* The data is random (N=300) out of which 150 from rural and 150 from the urban area. The period of study is midyear of 2016. The Statistical tools of Regression, ANOVA, 't' Test have been used to analyze

*Results:-* The co-efficient of variables shows the controversy result in rural area. In rural area, the formal occupation has influenced food choice where as in urban area it is insignificant, in Urban area, the coefficient for formal informal occupation shows that there is no impact on food choice.

*Conclusion:-* The inference is none of the income level and educational level influence the food choice; only the nature of occupation of the respondents influences the food choice

**Keywords:** Food choice, income, education, formal occupation, informal occupation, rural and urban area, labor migration, urbanization, the nature of the work

### **1. Introduction**

The key driver for eating food is hungry. However, what we choose to eat is not solely determined by physiological or nutritional needs. Some of the other factors that influence the food choice are biological, economical, physical, social, and psychological. Biological determinants are those hungry, appetites, and taste Economic determinants are cost, income and availability Physical determinants such as access, education, skills (e.g. cooking) and time Social determinants such as culture, family, and meal patterns and the Psychological determinants such as mood, stress, beliefs and knowledge. Thus, there is complexity of food choice is obvious, and the food selection factors also vary according to life style and its encompassed determinants will vary from one person to another. Thus, in economic aspect the cost of food is a primary determinant of food choice whether the cost is prohibitive depends fundamentally on a person's income and socio-economic status. The low-income groups whose are in very difficult situation to get a balanced healthy diet (nutrition), and this is termed as food poverty or otherwise called food insecurity. The reasons for this kind of poverty are cost, accessibility and the knowledge. Taking of energy rich and nutrient-poor food is the cause of lack of money to buy good or nutrient rich food, and the price of the healthy foods appears to be costly in low-income groups.

### **2. Background of the Study**

According to United Nations high commissioner for human rights (1998) report shows that hunger has long been a concern of world leaders, as evidenced by the 1948 universal declaration of human rights, stating everyone has a right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family including food'. At the 1996 world food summit in Rome studies alone indicate that household's economic, social and cultural situation are important factors on household's food securing status and it is also essential to consider that. The relationships between low socio-economic status and poor health status are complicated and influence by sex, age group, cultural, environment, social, community individual life style and health behavior Acheson D (1998).

Thus, low-income groups consume unbalanced diets particularly low in taking of fruit and vegetables (De Irala-Estevéz et al. 2000). Thus, the problem and perspective of food choice in any region are unique to its physical, economical, psychological, and social environment. Prior information regarding economic conditions of the people helps this present research to understanding the nature and problems of people in the study area such studies are: Matthieu Maillot et al. 2007, Abusaleh and Ananta E. Malick, 1999. France

Bellisle, 2005 and many studies focused that economic factors such as income, sources of income, savings, investment asset etc. are the important determinants of food choice. De Irala – Estevez J, et.al (2000) study reveals that many of population studies show that there are clear differences in social classes with regard to food and nutrient intakes. Low-income groups in particular, have a greater tendency to consume unbalanced diet and have low intakes of fruit and vegetables. Dibsall L.A et.al (2003) study shows that there are many aspects to food poverty but three of the main barriers to eating a balanced healthy diet include cost, accessibility and knowledge. In general, less educated and lower income groups appear to consume a less healthy diet (Shima kawa et. al (1994). Heidi M Blanck et.al (2007) study findings exhibit that 45% of workers reported to always or often choose healthy foods for lunch. Women were more likely than man to always or often choose healthy foods; younger adults and modestly educated (high school or less) were less likely than their comparison groups to always or often choose these foods. The following studies shows that age and education are those found by Morris et.al (1992), Stewart & Tinsky (1995) Kearney et.al (2000) indicates that the level of education can influence dietary behaviour during the adulthood. A large number of previous studies like Kobe (2004) Bertail and Caillavet (2008) Han and Wahi (1998) Vlismas et al. (2009) have explored the vegetable expenditure is affected by the gender, income, education, employment status and household size.

### 3. Objectives

Pedro A. Moreira and Patricia D. Padrao (2004) Study A cross-sectional study reveals that, the low and high income groups are feed to be similar in regard to several food groups consumption and access to education/information appears to be the key element to a better food pattern as indicated by higher frequency of milk, vegetable soup, vegetables, fruits and fish consumption. While seeing this Portuguese study, this research has taken the same economic determinants such as different Income groups, educational role and types occupation in influencing food choice and how these variables play their roles in Indian context in Rural and Urban areas particularly in Villupuram district of Tamilnadu

### 4. Methodology

Data for this study were drawn from Villupuram District. The nature of data is random (N=300 out of which 150 from rural and 150 from the urban area) For urban area, the Villupuram town and for rural area, Vanur village have been taken. For this study, the primary data have been collected and processed. The face-to-face data have collected by the researcher both in Rural and Urban area. The cross-section data has been collected in the year 2016. The Types of food or food Choice is taken as dependent variable and the Education status, Income level, Formal and Informal occupation are taken as independent variables (predictors)

This classification has been done based on the tables (see in the appendix Table-1, Table-2, table-3) which is related to food choice, education, income and formal and informal occupations.

Educational category classified as:

Illiterate	-	No Education
Primary	-	Up 6th standard
Secondary	-	6th to 10 standard
Higher secondary	-	10th to 12 standard
Degree	-	Under Graduation + above

Occupational category classified as:

No occupation	-	Dependent, student, or aged one (Excluded in analysis)
Formal	-	Top level – 1
	-	Middle level – 2
	-	Low level – 3
Informal	-	Coolie – 1
	-	Business – 2
	-	Agriculture – 3

Income Category has classified as

Up to 10,000	1
10,001 to 20,000	2
20,001 to 30,000	3
30,001 & above	4

Types of food choice classified as:

Type –1	Vegetable (T1)
Type – 2	T1 + green + pulses (T2)
Type – 3	T2+ fruits (T3)
Type – 4	T3 eggs + chicken (T4)
Type – 5	T4+ mutton (T5)

Type – 6T5+sea food and all (T6)

## 5. Results and Discussion

The statistical tool Regression analysis has been used to find out result

$$Y = a + bx$$

$$\text{Food Choice} = a + \beta_1x_1 + \beta_2x_2 + \beta_3x_3 + \beta_4x_4$$

$$Y = a + \beta_1x_1 + \beta_2x_2 + \beta_3x_3 + \beta_4x_4$$

Y = Food Choice

a = intercept

$x_1$  = Education

$x_2$  = Income

$x_3$  = Formal Occupation

$x_4$  = Informal Occupation

$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4$  are co-efficient for the independent variable  $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4$  respectively.

Type of Food		Rural					Urban						
		Educational Qualification						Illiterate	Primary	Secondary	Higher Secondary	Degree & Above	Total
		Illiterate	Primary	Secondary	Higher Secondary	Degree & Above	Total						
T1	A	1	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	2
	B	33.3%	.0%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	100.0%
	C	6.2%	.0%	3.6%	3.2%	.0%	2.0%	.0%	.0%	5.9%	5.6%	.0%	1.3%
	D	.7%	.0%	.7%	.7%	.0%	2.0%	.0%	.0%	.7%	.7%	.0%	1.3%
T2	A	1	1	0	1	0	3	0	7	0	0	0	7
	B	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	C	6.2%	5.0%	.0%	3.2%	.0%	2.0%	.0%	31.8%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.7%
	D	.7%	.7%	.0%	.7%	.0%	2.0%	.0%	4.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.7%
T3	A	0	0	4	8	17	29	0	0	5	1	32	38
	B	.0%	.0%	13.8%	27.6%	58.6%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	13.2%	2.6%	84.2%	100.0%
	C	.0%	.0%	14.3%	25.8%	30.9%	19.3%	.0%	.0%	29.4%	5.6%	42.1%	25.3%
	D	.0%	.0%	2.7%	5.3%	11.3%	19.3%	.0%	.0%	3.3%	.7%	21.3%	25.3%
T4	A	6	6	6	6	6	30	10	6	0	0	5	21
	B	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	100.0%	47.6%	28.6%	.0%	.0%	23.8%	100.0%
	C	37.5%	30.0%	21.4%	19.4%	10.9%	20.0%	58.8%	27.3%	.0%	.0%	6.6%	14.0%
	D	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%	20.0%	6.7%	4.0%	.0%	.0%	3.3%	14.0%
T5	A	7	11	12	11	29	70	6	9	10	15	36	76
	B	10.0%	15.7%	17.1%	15.7%	41.4%	100.0%	7.9%	11.8%	13.2%	19.7%	47.4%	100.0%
	C	43.8%	55.0%	42.9%	35.5%	52.7%	46.7%	35.3%	40.9%	58.8%	83.3%	47.4%	50.7%
	D	4.7%	7.3%	8.0%	7.3%	19.3%	46.7%	4.0%	6.0%	6.7%	10.0%	24.0%	50.7%
T6	A	1	2	5	4	3	15	1	0	1	1	3	6
	B	6.7%	13.3%	33.3%	26.7%	20.0%	100.0%	16.7%	.0%	16.7%	16.7%	50.0%	100.0%
	C	6.2%	10.0%	17.9%	12.9%	5.5%	10.0%	5.9%	.0%	5.9%	5.6%	3.9%	4.0%
	D	.7%	1.3%	3.3%	2.7%	2.0%	10.0%	.7%	.0%	.7%	.7%	2.0%	4.0%
Total	A	16	20	28	31	55	150	17	22	17	18	76	150
	B	10.7%	13.3%	18.7%	20.7%	36.7%	100.0%	11.3%	14.7%	11.3%	12.0%	50.7%	100.0%
	C	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	D	10.7%	13.3%	18.7%	20.7%	36.7%	100.0%	11.3%	14.7%	11.3%	12.0%	50.7%	100.0%

A Count; B. Percentage within Education C. Percentage within Food choice D. Percentage of Total

Table 1

Type of Food		Rural					Urban				
		Income of the Respondents									
		Upto Rs.0 to 10000	Rs.10001 – Rs.20000	Rs.20001- Rs.30000	Above Rs.30000	Total	Upto Rs.0 to 10000	Rs.10001 – Rs.20000	Rs.20001- Rs.30000	Above Rs.30000	Total
T1	A	2	1	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	2
	B	66.7%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	C	1.8%	3.6%	.0%	.0%	2.0%	.9%	3.8%	.0%	.0%	1.3%
	D	1.3%	.7%	0%	.0%	2.0%	.7%	.7%	.0%	.0%	1.3%
T2	A	3	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	7
	B	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	C	2.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.0%	6.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.7%
	D	2.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.0%	4.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.7%
T3	A	21	5	2	1	29	34	0	0	4	38
	B	72.4%	17.2%	6.9%	3.4%	100.0%	89.5%	.0%	.0%	10.5%	100.0%
	C	18.6%	17.9%	50.0%	20.0%	19.3%	29.1%	.0%	.0%	80.0%	25.3%
	D	14.0%	3.3%	1.3%	.7%	19.3%	22.7%	.0%	.0%	2.7%	25.3%
T4	A	22	5	1	2	30	13	7	1	0	21
	B	73.3%	16.7%	3.3%	6.7%	100.0%	61.9%	33.3%	4.8%	.0%	100.0%
	C	19.5%	17.9%	25.0%	40.0%	20.0%	11.1%	26.9%	50.0%	.0%	14.0%
	D	14.7%	3.3%	.7%	1.3%	20.0%	8.7%	4.7%	.7%	.0%	14.0%
T5	A	54	14	1	1	70	60	15	1	0	76
	B	77.1%	20.0%	1.4%	1.4%	100.0%	78.9%	19.7%	1.3%	.0%	100.0%
	C	47.8%	50.0%	25.0%	20.0%	46.7%	51.3%	57.7%	50.0%	.0%	50.7%
	D	36.0%	9.3%	.7%	.7%	46.7%	40.0%	10.0%	.7%	.0%	50.7%
T6	A	11	3	0	1	15	2	3	0	1	6
	B	73.3%	20.0%	.0%	6.7%	100.0%	33.3%	50.0%	.0%	16.7%	100.0%
	C	9.7%	10.7%	.0%	20.0%	10.0%	1.7%	11.5%	.0%	20.0%	4.0%
	D	7.3%	2.0%	.0%	.7%	10.0%	1.3%	2.0%	.0%	.7%	4.0%
Total	A	113	28	4	5	150	117	26	2	5	150
	B	75.3%	18.7%	2.7%	3.3%	100.0%	78.0%	17.3%	1.3%	3.3%	100.0%
	C	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	D	75.3%	18.7%	2.7%	3.3%	100.0%	78.0%	17.3%	1.3%	3.3%	100.0%

A Count; B. Percentage within Education C. Percentage within Food choice D. Percentage of Total

Table 2

Type of Food		Rural				Urban			
		OCCUPATION							
		No Occupation	Formal	Informal	Total	No Occupation	Formal	Informal	Total
T1	A	1	1	1	3	0	1	1	2
	B	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	C	2.9%	2.4%	1.4%	2.0%	.0%	2.2%	2.4%	1.3%
	D	.7%	.7%	.7%	2.0%	.0%	.7%	.7%	1.3%
T2	A	1	2	0	3	7	0	0	7
	B	33.3%	66.7%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	C	2.9%	4.9%	.0%	2.0%	10.9%	.0%	.0%	4.7%
	D	.7%	1.3%	.0%	2.0%	4.7%	.0%	.0%	4.7%
T3	A	6	12	11	29	11	15	12	38
	B	20.7%	41.4%	37.9%	100.0%	28.9%	39.5%	31.6%	100.0%
	C	17.1%	29.3%	14.9%	19.3%	17.2%	33.3%	29.3%	25.3%
	D	4.0%	8.0%	7.3%	19.3%	7.3%	10.0%	8.0%	25.3%
T4	A	4	7	19	30	9	3	9	21
	B	13.3%	23.3%	63.3%	100.0%	42.9%	14.3%	42.9%	100.0%
	C	11.4%	17.1%	25.7%	20.0%	14.1%	6.7%	22.0%	14.0%
	D	2.7%	4.7%	12.7%	20.0%	6.0%	2.0%	6.0%	14.0%
T5	A	22	17	31	70	37	24	15	76
	B	31.4%	24.3%	44.3%	100.0%	48.7%	31.6%	19.7%	100.0%
	C	62.9%	41.5%	41.9%	46.7%	57.8%	53.3%	36.6%	50.7%
	D	14.7%	11.3%	20.7%	46.7%	24.7%	16.0%	10.0%	50.7%
T6	A	1	2	12	15	0	2	4	6
	B	6.7%	13.3%	80.0%	100.0%	.0%	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	C	2.9%	4.9%	16.2%	10.0%	.0%	4.4%	9.8%	4.0%
	D	.7%	1.3%	8.0%	10.0%	.0%	1.3%	2.7%	4.0%
Total	A	35	41	74	150	64	45	41	150
	B	23.3%	27.3%	49.3%	100.0%	42.7%	30.0%	27.3%	100.0%
	C	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	D	23.3%	27.3%	49.3%	100.0%	42.7%	30.0%	27.3%	100.0%

Table 3

### 5.1. Regression Analysis for Food Choice in Rural Area

In this model, the food choice is taken as dependent variable and the predictors are taken as independent variables such as the formal and informal occupation, income and educational status of the respondents are taken in the study area. In this model  $R=.189$  which shows that there is a positive relation between the whole models with the 19% reliability.

#### 5.1.1. Anova

Model	F	Sig.
Regression	1.348	.255 <sup>a</sup>

Table 4

Source: Computed

This analysis of variance for regression model in rural area shows that there is strong relation between the food choice and the predictors with the 'F' value 1.34 with 5% significant level, which implies that there is a positive relation between food choice and independent variables in the study area. It means the individuals selected in sample are significantly influenced by the variables such as income, formal and informal occupation and educational status.

#### 5.1.2. Co-Efficient

Variables	T	Sig.
Educational Qualification	.118	.906
Income	-.236	.814
Formal occupation	1.759	.081
Informal occupation	-1.729	.086

Table 5

Source: Computed

The co-efficient for predictor education shows that there is no much positive impact by education on food choice. Although the 't' value is .118 and positive it is insignificant. It implies the educational status of the respondents has no way to influence in selection of food choice.

The co-efficient for income shows that there is inverse relation between food choice and income level. The t-value account for -.236 and insignificant level shows that there is negative impact by income on food choice which implies the sample selected in the population has no impact of income on food choice in the selected area.

The predictor for formal occupation shows that there is significant positive impact by formal occupation on food choice in rural area the t-value which account for 1.759 with 5% level significant shows that there is perfect representation by the sample on total population.

The predictor for informal occupation shows that there is negative relationship between informal occupation and food choice. And the t-value which account for -1.729 which is insignificant

### 5.2. Regression Analysis for Food Choice in Urban Area

In this model, the food choice is taken as dependent variable and the predictors are taken as independent variables such as the formal and informal occupation, income and educational status of the respondents are taken in the study area. In this model  $R=.019$  which shows that the whole model has less reliability.

#### 5.2.1. Anova

Model	F	Sig.
Regression	.013	1.000 <sup>a</sup>

Table 6

This Analysis of variance for regression model in urban area shows that there is no relation between the food choice and the predictors which shows that the 'F' value is 0.013 which is insignificant.

#### 5.2.2. Co-Efficient

Variables	t	Sig.
Educational Qualification	.017	.986
Income	.211	.833
Formal occupation	-.033	.974
Informal occupation	-.099	.921

Table 7

The co-efficient for predictor for education in urban area shows that there is no positive impact by education on food choice in urban area. The 't' value accounted for 0.017 which is insignificant show that there no influence by the independent variables on total population of urban area.

The co-efficient for income in urban area shows that there is no positive impact by income on food choice in urban area. The 't' value accounted for 0.211 which is insignificant show that there is no impact by the independent variable on total population of urban area.

The co-efficient for occupation in formal sector shows that in urban area with the 't'-value of -0.033 is insignificant and it is inversely related to the predictant (food Choice) in urban area.

The co-efficient for occupation in informal sector shows that in urban area with the 't'-value of -0.099 is insignificant and it is inversely related to the predictant in urban area.

## 6. Discussion

### 6.1. Education

The main finding of the present study is that the predictors such as educational, income, and informal occupation has not at all relation with food Choices in the study area both Rural and Urban except formal occupation. The formal occupation in rural area has much strong relation with types of food with enough significant. There is general opinion among the researchers that education and income are conceptually distinct, and that they are likely to make separate and unique contributions to health-related outcomes Pedro A. Moreira and Patricia D. Padrao (2004) but in this study it is actually different. Our interest in education, income and both formal and informal occupation in rural and urban people relate to the types of food choice in the selected population to comparing with European standards, India is a relatively poor country, exhibiting the highest level of social inequalities. Nevertheless, India had significantly and positive changes in several domains such as the economy and culture in last few decades, except literacy rate. In 2015, UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) report said in the absolute numbers, India with 28.7 crore illiterates and was the country with the largest number of adults without basic literacy skills in 2010-11 compared to 2000-01 when it had 30.4 crore illiterates. The Tamilnadu is one of the south states in south India having the overall illiteracy rate is 19.9 per cent with male 13.2 % and female 26.6%. Out of which, the villupuram districts comprises the recent combined illiteracy rate is 27.92% in which, female literacy is 36.49% and male literacy is 19.42. whereas in 2001 it was 51.6% in combined in which, 64.6% for female literacy rate and 39.1% for male literacy rate. Despite the improvements and changes in the education of adults, this is a reality that classifies Tamilnadu as the state with the higher percentage of individuals with low level of education on selection of food choice. Based on the data the matter of literacy and illiteracy has no way influenced in selection food choice. In this study, the most educated persons consumed all types of food choice both in rural and urban areas. None of education level in rural area has shown the rationale types of food choice like the counterpart from urban areas. The table.1 (see in appendix) shows that, in the higher education, (degree & above) out of 70 respondents, 46% are in rural and out of 76 respondents, 50.6% are in urban areas and all are in T5 choice whereas, the illiterates in T5 choices are just 10.7% in rural and 11.3% urban areas, and the next category is T4 and T3 choices are placed which is nothing but the T3 is vegetarian choice which implies whatever the educational level those choices are only in these three types. It does not reveal the influence of education on food choice since there could be the reason of customs, palatability, and cooking. Many studies still having attempted to identify the influence of socioeconomic factors on individual's food choice

### 6.2. Income

Several studies have concluded that a strong relationship exists between countries' per capita incomes and Food choice. The economic issue is of considerable significance, and it suggests that this is probably the key variable of all in influencing food choice. The individual income is expected to influence food choices, especially for relatively high-priced food items such as fish, fruits and vegetables. Nevertheless, this is not seems to be the case when we compare different income levels as determinants of food choice of both rural and urban people in the study area. Our data shows, in both rural and urban area, there is no significant positive trend in the consumption of vegetables, fruits, mutton and fish and all, with higher levels of income, which did not get any relation with the income with the exception of formal occupation income in rural area. In table-2 (see in appendix) in rural area out of 150 respondents, 75.3% are in 10000 income category in which 47.8% respondents are in T5 choice likewise in urban area out of 150 respondents, 78% are in 10000 income category in which 51.3% respondents are in T5 choice whereas, the high income for T5 choice are very meager. Thus, there is no association between income and food choice and this result is ascertained by another one study done by Ramesh Chand and Jaya Jumrani (2013) and commented as the factor related to nutritional deprivation in India is that income poverty and prevalence of under nutrition are not moving in the same direction. It is somewhat puzzling as to why despite a substantial increase in per capita food production and significant decline in poverty in India continues to face high incidence of under nutrition and malnutrition. India's progress in improving nutrition has been excessively slow regardless of the growth in income over the past two decades. It is therefore becomes important to distinguish between those who are under-nourished because of poverty and those who are not poor but are still under-nourished

### 6.3. Formal and Informal Occupation

The formal and informal occupation can be termed as those who are working in organized sector and unorganized sector. Such formal sector's occupation includes factories, enterprises, industries, schools, hospitals and some units, which are registered with the government including shops, clinics and offices that possess a formal license. On the other hand, in unorganized sector, construction

workers, domestic workers, workers working on the streets, people working in small workshops not affiliated with the government. There is low unemployment in organized sector as compared to the unorganized sector. In the Table.3 about occupational status, (see in appendix) the food choice T5 influences more followed by T4 food choice. In rural area, out of 150, 46.7% of the respondents are in T5 choice in which 24.3% are formal occupants whereas 44.3% are informal occupants. In Urban area, out of 150, 50.7% of the respondents are in T5 choice in which 31.6% are formal occupants whereas 19.7% are informal occupants. According to development and transition theories, workers in the informal sector typically earn less income, have unstable income, and do not have access to basic protections and services. Originally, the term referred to self-employed small enterprises like street vending, sewing, artisans and small farming. It now also includes wage-earning jobs like crop harvesting, cleaning and many other unprotected occupations. The informal economy is also much larger than most people realize, with women playing a huge role. The working poor, particularly women, are concentrated in the informal economy, and most low-income households rely on the sector to provide for them. However, informal businesses can also lack the potential for growth, trapping employees in menial jobs indefinitely. However, according to the nature of job, time, hardships the people in informal occupation are highly prone to irrational consumption of food whatever available in and around of working spot and thus their food choice which implies the result. And for the sake of getting regular employment, income and to eradication of their poverty they are bound to be out of their food choice. On the other hand, the informal sector can allow a large proportion of the population to escape extreme poverty and earn an income that is satisfactory for survival. In developed countries, some people who are formally employed may choose to perform part of their work outside of the formal economy, exactly because it gives them more advantages in monetary aspect.

#### 6.4. Conclusion

In the context of food choice, each country has different types results and in Indian context, the regular income and severity of poverty plays significant role in informal occupation sector. Whereas those in formal occupation selecting their food choice in rationale in rural area only. Whereas in urban, they are unable to be in rationale although they have regular employment and income opportunities because of migration of labours to urban areas called as urbanization thereby causes to rise in price of the food stuffs and scarcity of food. It rides out the urban people to out of food choice. they are consuming whatever available at a time. Thus, for informal occupation the employment and income directly hinder their food choice in both rural and urban areas and for formal occupation the labour migration, urbanization, rise in price and time-being availability of food hinder only urban area rather than in rural. In rural the formal occupations are comfortable in food choice. Therefore, it is inferred that none of the income level and educational level influence the food choice; only the nature of occupation of the respondents influences the food choice

#### 7. References

- i. De Irala-Estevez J, Groth M, Johansson L, Oltersdorf U, Prattala R & Martinez-Gonzalez MA (2000) A systematic review of socioeconomic differences in food habits in Europe: consumption of fruit and vegetables. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 54: 706-714.
- ii. Dibsdall LA, Lambert N, Bobbin RF, Frewer LJ (2003) Low-income consumers' attitudes and behaviour towards access, availability and motivation to eat fruit and vegetables. *Public Health Nutrition* 6(2):159-68.
- iii. Dr.FranceBellisle, (2005) EUFIC (European Food Information Council) The Determinants of Food Choice, Review 04/2005
- iv. Hampl JS, Heaton CL, Taylor CA (2003) Snacking patterns influence energy and nutrient intakes but not body mass index. *Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics* 16(1):3-11
- v. [http://jpma.org.pk/full\\_article\\_text.php?article\\_id=3529](http://jpma.org.pk/full_article_text.php?article_id=3529)
- vi. <http://keydifferences.com/difference-between-organised-and-unorganised-sector>
- vii. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Informal\\_sector](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Informal_sector)
- viii. Kearney M, Jearney JM, Dunne A&Gibney MJ (2000) Socio-demographic determinants of perceived influences on food choice in a nationally representative sample of Irish adults. *Public Health Nutrition* 3(2): 219-226.
- ix. Pedro A Moreira and Patricia D. Padrao, 'Educational and Economic determinants of food intake in Portuguese adults: a cross-sectional survey' December, 2004, *BMC public Health* pp 1-11.
- x. The Census of India, 2011
- xi. [www.businessdictionary.com](http://www.businessdictionary.com)
- xii. WWW.REFERENCE.COM
- xiii. United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, All human rights for all: 15<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the universal declaration of Human rights, Geneva, Switzerland, 1998.
- xiv. Vlismas, K, Stavrinou, V, and P.B. Panagiotakos 'Socio-Economic status, Dietary Habits and Health related outcomes in various parts of world: A review, *Central European journal of Public Health* 17(2):55-63.
- xv. Shimakawa T. et.,al: Dietary patterns and socio- demographic factors in the Atherosclerosis' Risk in study. *Prev. Med* 23, 769-780, 1994
- xvi. Kobe, 'Fruit and Vegetable for Health' report of a joint FAO/WHO workshop, May 17, 2012.
- xvii. Bertail. P and F. Caillavet, "Fruit and Vegetable consumption Patterns: A Segmentation Approach, *Amer J. Agri. Economics* 90(3) 827-842, 2008.
- xviii. Heidi m blanck, Amy l. yarocw, audie a. atienza , sarah l y,ms, jiaou zhang and louibe c. masse, factors influencing lunchtime food choice among working Americans.' *Health educ. Behave online*, june, 2007.
- xix. Morris, D.H, Sorensen g. Stoddard a.m, and fitzgerald g. 'comparison between food choice of working adults and dietary pattern recommended by the national cancer institute *journal of American dietetic association*, 92.1272-74,1992
- xx. Ramesh Chand and Jaya Jumrani, 'Food Security and Undernourishment in India: Assessment of Alternative Norms and the Income Effect' *Ind. Jn. of Agri. Econ*, Vol.68, No.1, Jan.-March 2013