CHAPTER - 4
AN APPRAISAL OF RURAL FOOD BASKET IN KERALA
4.1 Introduction

The chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of primary data collected from the sample households from rural areas in Kerala. Details regarding the availability, accessibility and affordability of food crops, land use pattern, cropping pattern, sources and purchase of food items, influential factors of the food articles etc. are described in the analysis. The study also examined to assess the food basket of rural households in Kerala and identify the determinants of rural food baskets.

For the purpose of primary data, three villages were selected Mulakuzha village from Alappuzha district, Mattathur village from Thrissur district and Alanallur – I village from Palakkad district. Out of these villages, 3 wards were selected from each village for the study in accordance with the size of rural household’s population. Ward-09, ward-04, and ward-07 were selected from Mulakuzha village. Ward-02, ward-18, and ward-22 were selected from Mattathur village. Ward-10, ward-07, and ward-08 were selected from Alanallur-I village. A field survey was carried out during the period from August 2016 – December 2016 based on personal interview by using a detailed pre-structured schedule. The schedule gives the detailed information in order to make the study more articulate and generous 509 sample households in the rural areas were surveyed, on the basis of 10 % of the rural population in the selected wards in each village. A brief profile of the sample districts are presented in the following (table 4.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Alappuzh</th>
<th>Kerala</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Area</td>
<td>186944</td>
<td>447584</td>
<td>461858</td>
<td>3886287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Taluks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Blocks</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Villages</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Panchayaths</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>759210</td>
<td>637220</td>
<td>535958</td>
<td>7853754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longitude</td>
<td>76.22</td>
<td>76.65</td>
<td>76.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Population</td>
<td>3121200</td>
<td>2809934</td>
<td>2127789</td>
<td>33406061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1480763</td>
<td>1359478</td>
<td>1011342</td>
<td>16027412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1640437</td>
<td>1450456</td>
<td>1114647</td>
<td>17378649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Growth</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Sq. Km</td>
<td>3027</td>
<td>4482</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>38852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density/km²</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Ratio (Per 1000)</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Literacy</td>
<td>95.08</td>
<td>95.72</td>
<td>89.31</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Literacy</td>
<td>96.78</td>
<td>93.10</td>
<td>97.36</td>
<td>96.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Literacy</td>
<td>93.56</td>
<td>85.79</td>
<td>94.24</td>
<td>92.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total workers</td>
<td>35.11</td>
<td>37.09</td>
<td>37.81</td>
<td>34.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main workers</td>
<td>29.78</td>
<td>31.16</td>
<td>28.03</td>
<td>80.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal workers</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>19.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivators</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Labourers</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>23.98</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>59.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers in household</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>8.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other workers</td>
<td>86.89</td>
<td>67.11</td>
<td>83.49</td>
<td>82.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>103619</td>
<td>136257</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1081509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net area sown</td>
<td>127185</td>
<td>196818</td>
<td>87445</td>
<td>2071507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area sown more than once</td>
<td>34031</td>
<td>106643</td>
<td>21044</td>
<td>575954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cropped area</td>
<td>161216</td>
<td>303461</td>
<td>108489</td>
<td>2647461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Major crops**
- Paddy, Tapioca, Coconut, Banana, Rubber, Areca nut, etc...
- Paddy, Tapioca, Coconut, Banana, Rubber, Areca nut, Vegetable etc...
- Paddy, Tapioca, Coconut, Banana, Rubber Cardamom, Areca nut, etc...

4.2 Profile of the region

4.2.1 Thrissur District

The central part of Kerala, the district of Thrissur was officially formed on July 1, 1949 with a total geographical area of 186944 hectare. It covers 4.8 percent of the total geographical area of the state. The district is the home to over 10 percent of the Kerala’s population. Sakthan Thampuran was famously known as the architect of Thrissur district. The boundary of the total geographical area of the district is covered by Malappuram and Palakkad districts in the north; Ernakulum and Idukki in the south; Arabian Sea in the west; and Palakkad and Coimbatore district of Tamil Nadu in the east. The headquarters of the district is Thrissur city. The city is located in and around Thekkinkadu Maidan created under the guidance of Sakthan Thampuran. The location profile of the district shows that north altitude is in between 10 degree 10' and 10 degree 46' and east longitude is in between 75 degree 57’ and 76 degree 54’. The district is popularly known as the cultural capital of Kerala and the land of poorams. The initial name of the district was 'Thrisivaperur' which means the holy land of lord Siva.
There are five taluks and 255 villages in the district. The five taluks are Thrissur, Kodungallur, Mukundapuram, Chavakkad, and Thalappilli. In the urban area of the district there are seven local bodies. They are Thrissur Corporation, Chalakkudy, Irinjalakuda, Kodungallur, Chavakkad, Guruvayur and Kunnampulam municipalities. In the rural areas there exist three tier panchayati raj systems consisting of 88 Grama panchayats at village level, 16 block Panchayath and 1 district Panchayath. A religion wise analysis of the district reveals that the population consists of Hindu, Christian and Muslim. As per 2011 census, Hindu consists of 59.24%, followed by Christians, 24.21% and remaining belongs to Muslim category.

Among the coastal districts, Thrissur district ranks the third in area and the district ranks 5th in area among the districts. In terms of population per sq.km, the district recorded 7th position (1031) as against state density (860). The district recorded 9th rank in total (35.1 per cent) and 10th position in female work participation rate (18.7 per cent) and 7th rank in male work participation rate (53.3 per cent). The marginal work participation rate of the district is 15.2 per cent. The district occupies 2nd rank in the percentage of main workers 84.8 per cent. With 95.08 per cent, the district occupies the 7th position in literacy rate. The district recorded 4th rank in sex-ratio (1108). In child sex-ratio (0-6 age-group), the district recorded the 14th position (950). With 10.67 per cent, Thrissur has the 4th position in the percentage of SC population and 12th position in the case of ST population (1.94 per cent). 6.7 per cent of workers are agricultural labours occupying 13th rank and the district occupies the11th Position in the percentage of cultivators (3.8 per cent). With a population of 3121200 persons, the district stands 4th place in the state. (District Census Hand Book, Thrissur, 2011).

The details of mountains in the district show that Machad hills belong to Thalappilli taluk, Paravattani hill in Thrissur taluk, Palappilly, Kodassery and Athirappilly hills at Mukundapuram taluk. The highest point in Thrissur district is Vilangan hills. The major rivers in this district are Bharathapuzha, Kecheripuzha, Karuvannurpuzha and Chalakkudypuzha. The longest river in the district is Chalakkudypuzha. Thrissur is not far away from the presence of lakes. The district
consists of major fresh water lakes such as Manakkody Lake in Thrissur taluk, Thanneer Kayal in Chavakkad taluk, Muriyad lake, Kattakampal and Mullur Kayal in Thalappilli taluk.

Thrissur is an agrarian district where the land is utilized for the cultivation of paddy, coconut, areca nut, pepper, banana, and vegetables. The climatic conditions are suitable for the production of these crops. The temperature between day and night are more or less same with minor differences. Every year the district gets rainfall on an average of 2500 mm. The summer season of the district is from March to May. From June to September there is south-west monsoon. October and November is characterized by post monsoon season and winter starts from December and ends at February. The major mineral of the district is granite and minor minerals are tile/brick clay and laterite. 34.21 percent of the total area of the district covers forest land and the district collects timber, teak poles, billets, firewood and bamboo.

4.2.2 Palakkad District

Palakkad, the "Rice bowl of Kerala" formed on January 1st 1957. It is an agrarian district with a total area of 4,480 km² (1,730 sq mi). The district occupies highest position in Kerala on the basis of total length. As a largest district it covers 11.5% of the state. The initial name of Palakkad was Palakkattussery and it is reformed in to ‘Palghat’ in the subsequent years. The district headquarter is Palakkad city. The district is the abundant source of Palms and Paddy. A part of the district belonged to Madras Presidency. The boundary particulars are, in the north west of the district, Malappuram district is situated and Thrissur district in the south west of the district. The east border of the district is shared by Coimbatore district of Tamil Nadu and the north east by the Nilgiris district. The latitude of the district is 10.7867 and longitude is 76.6548 respectively. The administrative set up of the district shows that there are two revenue divisions and five taluks in the district. There exist 156 villages, 13 blocks, 91 grama Panchayaths and 4 municipalities under the jurisdiction of the Palakkad district.
As per 2011 census, the total geographical area of the district is 447584 hectares. Among this area, forest covers 136257 hectare, non-agricultural use covers 41410 hectare, uncultivable land covers 2756 hectare, miscellaneous tree crops covers 1023 hectare, cultivable waste covers 24033, net sown area covers 196818, and total cropped area covers 303461 hectares. The majority of people belong to Hinduism and the second position is by Muslims. Christian religion get a third place in the district. There exist other minority religions also. The female population is higher than male population in rural and urban areas as well as among the SC, ST and total population of the district. The literacy rate of the district shows that male literacy is higher than the female literacy.

Even though it is a dry area as it name derives from the word Palanilam, it occupies a good status in the paddy cultivation of the state. The average temperature of the district is 27.8 °C annually. The main occupation of the people in the district is agriculture. The district has a long gap known as Palakkad gap of 32 to 40 km. The district is therefore prominently known as the Gateway of Kerala. The
The major crops under the area are paddy, Coconut, Rubber, Pulses, Areca nut, Tapioca, Ginger, Groundnut, Sugarcane, and Cotton etc. For the cultivation of these major crops the district gets on an average rainfall of 2135 mm. There are three types of soil in the district; i.e, black soil which is seen in the areas of Chittur and Attappady, laterite soil, which is seen in the areas of Alathur, Chittur and Ottapalam and virgin forest soil in Mannarkad area and the fertility of the soil in the district has maintained the name the district as the Granaries of Kerala. Palakkad is the only district in the state where Cotton and Groundnut are cultivated.

Among the districts, Palakkad District ranks 1st in area (4482 Sq.km). The district recorded 13th position in the literacy rate (89.31 per cent). In Density, the district occupies 11th position (627). The district has 5 Taluks, 4 Statutory Towns, 17 Census Towns, 13 Community Development Blocks and 91 Panchayaths. In the percentage of Scheduled Caste Population to total population (14.37per cent), the district ranks 1st in the state. In child sex ratio (0-6 age group) the district has recorded the 5th position in the State. The urban density of Palakkad (4692 sq.km) is lower than that of State urban Density (4900). Palakkad occupies the 3rd position among the districts in the share of agricultural labours. The district recorded the 7th rank in total, 5th female work participation rate (20.42 per cent) and 54.88 per cent in male work participation rate which denotes 4th position. In urban and rural work participation rate (34.79 per cent and 37.83 per cent), the district occupies the 7th place in rural and 5th place in urban. The district holds the 11th rank in work participation rate of marginal workers (16.00 per cent). Palakkad stands at the 4th position in the percentage of main workers (83.99 per cent). In sex-ratio, the district occupies the 10th position (1067). Palakkad district is called the ‘rice bowl’ of Kerala on account of its net sown area under paddy cultivation. Silent Valley national park in the district is a unique preserve of tropical rain forest with an almost unbroken ecological history (District Census Hand Book, Thrissur, 2011).

The tourism in the district attracts a large number of foreign as well as domestic tourists and contributed much more to the tourism revenue collections of the state. The major tourist places in the district are Palakkad Fort,
Malampuzha dam garden, Silent Valley National Park, Anjumoorthy temple, Parambikulam Wildlife Sanctuary, Killikkurussimangalam, Attappady, Nelliampathi, Sholayar, etc. The major rivers in the district are Bharathapuzha, Gayathripuzha, Kannadipuzha, Kalpathypuzha, Thoothapuzha, Bhavanipuzha and Kunthipuzha.

4.2.3 Alappuzha District

The smallest district in Kerala was established on 17th August 1957 with a total area of 1414 sq.kms, i.e., 3.64% of the total area of the state. The boundary details show that in the north of the district, Ernakulam district is located. Kollam district is in the south of the district. East is covered together by Kottayam and Pathanamthitta districts and in west the district has Arabian Sea. The district has north latitudes of 9.05' and 9.54'. The east longitude is 76.17'30" and 70.40'. According to 2011 census it is the densest district of Kerala with a density of 1504 per sq.km. It occupies third position in female literacy rate also. The district is famously known as ‘Venice of East’. The district is widely known for tourist destination and well known for coir factories. Most of the Kerala’s Coir industries are situated in and around Alappuzha.
The total number of wards under six municipalities of the district is 215 and other 1169 are under the jurisdiction of 73 Grama Panchayaths. Altogether there are 1384 wards operated in this district. The total number of block Panchayath is 12 and there exist a total of 91 local bodies in the district. There are 92 villages in the district. The revenue divisions are Alappuzha and Chengannur. The six taluks are Cherthala, Ambalappuzha, Kuttanad, Karthikappally, Mavelikkara and Chengannur. It is clear that majority of the people are Hindus (68.64%), followed by Christian (20.45%). Muslim is among the minority group of the district. There are 10.55% Muslims in the district. Other categories account for 0.36%.

Under the Local Self-Government System, the district is divided into 5 Statutory Towns, 12 Development Blocks and 73 Panchayaths. It may be noted that the jurisdiction of the Development Blocks includes the areas falling in Census Towns and Out-growth also. In terms of area, Alappuzha district is the smallest district in the State. The district has the fourth highest effective literacy rate (95.72 percent) and with regard to female literacy rate, it also stands the 4th in the State. Alappuzha is the second densest district (1504) in the state in terms of population per sq. km. The district has a higher sex ratio (1100) than the state (1084). Alappuzha is the only district in the state where there are no reserved forests. Kuttanad Taluk, known as the rice bowl of the state, has a predominant position in the production of rice. With 2127789 persons, Alappuzha district ranks 9th among the districts of the state in population. In work participation rate (37.81 per cent), the district has the 4th position among the districts. Alappuzha district ranks 3rd in female work participation rate (24.02 per cent). In child sex ratio, the district has 13th rank with 951 female children per 1000 male children. In the percentage of Scheduled Tribe population to total population, the district has the 13th rank (0.31 per cent) among the districts. It stands the 7th position in the percentage of Scheduled Caste population to total population (9.45 per cent). In the district 74.13 per cent of workers are main workers and 25.87 percent are marginal workers. The district stands the 2nd position in the percentage of workers in household industry (4.46 per cent) (District Census Hand Book, Thrissur, 2011).
The major rivers in the district are Pampa, Achankovil, and Manimala. The famous Vembanad and Kayamkulam Lakes are the sole assets of Alappuzha district. Another central feature of the district is it has no forest land under its jurisdiction. Alappuzha is prominently known as Alleppey. The tourism in the district attracts a large number of foreign as well as domestic tourists in the district. The Punnamada Lake of the district attracts tourists in the wake of the famous Nehru trophy boat race started in 1952 and the district is famous for its snake boat race.

Climatic conditions of the district show that in the coastal area there exists moist and hot climate whereas the interior of the district experiences cool and dry climate. The annual average rainfall is 2763 mm. The rain gauge stations in the district are Alappuzha, Ambalappuzha, Kayamkulam, Chengannur, Mavelikkara, Harippad, Cherthala and Arookutty. In between March to May there is hot climate. After that the south-west monsoon starts and continues up to September. October and November show north east monsoon and from December to February there is dry climate situation. The major minerals in the district are glass and foundry sand. Lime shell, China clay and ordinary clay are the other major minerals. The main crops of the district are Paddy, Coconut, Tapioca, Cashew, Pepper, Areca nut etc. In the past period of time, the major exportable items of the district were Coir and coir products, Coconut, Ginger, Pepper and Turmeric, etc.

4.3 Profile of the sample Panchayaths

This section deals with a brief profile of the sample Panchayaths for the study. The segment starts with the overview of the sample area and the socio-economic status of the sample households. Then it proceeds to discuss in depth the focus of concern; i.e; food security in the state. The study mainly focuses on the food basket of rural households in Kerala and identifies the determinants of rural food baskets in the state. The details as the availability, accessibility and affordability of food crops, land use pattern, cropping pattern, sources and purchase of food items, determining factors of the food articles etc. are described in this section.
We look into the brief idea about the sample Panchayaths from Thrissur, Palakkad and Alappuzha districts and it is presented in table 4.2

**Table 4.2**  
**A brief profile of sample areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Maattathur</th>
<th>Alanallur</th>
<th>Mulakuzha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>103 sq km</td>
<td>58.24 sq km</td>
<td>22.74 sq km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>45919</td>
<td>58000</td>
<td>28390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of males</td>
<td>22274</td>
<td>25225</td>
<td>13091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of females</td>
<td>23645</td>
<td>27329</td>
<td>15299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>446 sq km</td>
<td>808 sq km</td>
<td>705 sq km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Rate</td>
<td>92 %</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>94.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages included</td>
<td>Mattathoor</td>
<td>Alanallur 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Mulakuzha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vellikulangara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Half of Kodassery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Panchayath</td>
<td>Kodakara</td>
<td>Mannarkad</td>
<td>Chengannur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Panchayath</td>
<td>Thrissur</td>
<td>Palakkad</td>
<td>Alappuzha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taluk</td>
<td>Mukundapuram</td>
<td>Mannarkad</td>
<td>Chengannur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of Wards</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries</td>
<td>Palakkad district and Kodassery grama</td>
<td>Kottopadam grama Panchayath (East)</td>
<td>Aaranmula and Muzhuveli grama Panchayath (East)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kodakara and Panchayath (East)</td>
<td>Melattoor, Vettathoor grama Panchayath (West)</td>
<td>Venmani and Aala grama Panchayath (West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parapookkara grama Panchayath (West)</td>
<td>Thazhekkel grama Panchayath (North)</td>
<td>Kulanada and Venmani grama Panchayath (North)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kodassery grama Panchayath (North)</td>
<td>Karuvarakund and Edappatta grama Panchayath (South)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Varanatharappilly grama Panchayath (South)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Crops</td>
<td>Paddy, Coconut, Banana, Tapioca, Pepper Areca nut, Vegetables etc…</td>
<td>Paddy, Banana, Pepper, Cocoa, Coconut, Areca nut, Vegetables etc</td>
<td>Paddy, Ginger, Coconut, Banana, Pepper, Rubber, Vegetables etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Development Reports of Panchayaths (2011 Census)
4.4 Socio- Economic Profile of Sample Households

Here an attempt is made to describe the socio- economic characteristics of the sample households, namely total sample households, size of the family, gender, religion, education status etc. it is very useful for the justification of the objective of the study.

I. General Information

Economic Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAY</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>2 (1.19)</td>
<td>1 (0.55)</td>
<td>3 (0.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APL</td>
<td>121 (75.63)</td>
<td>128 (76.19)</td>
<td>134 (74.03)</td>
<td>383 (75.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPL</td>
<td>39 (24.38)</td>
<td>38 (22.62)</td>
<td>46 (25.41)</td>
<td>123 (24.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Table 4.3 represents the percent share of the sample households according to the economic category which they are belonging. It is clear from the table that the majority of the sample households (75.25 percent) belong in the category of APL. Across districts, BPL category constitutes 24.17 percent. AAY category has shown very lean across the districts. In the category of APL, Palakkad district (76.19 percent) occupies highest across districts.

Type of family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>5 (3.13)</td>
<td>14 (8.33)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>19 (3.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear family</td>
<td>155 (96.88)</td>
<td>152 (90.48)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>488 (95.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>2 (1.19)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>2 (0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages
The sample households were classified on their family size in different districts presented in table 4.4. The average number of family members belongs to nuclear family. On these, Thrissur (100 percent) occupies highest number in the case of nuclear family. Palakkad district (8.33 percent) occupies highest in the case of Joint Family.

### Table 4.5
**Period of stay at home**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>158 (98.75)</td>
<td>165 (98.21)</td>
<td>180 (99.45)</td>
<td>503 (98.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>1 (0.63)</td>
<td>2 (1.19)</td>
<td>1 (0.55)</td>
<td>4 (0.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>1 (0.63)</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Table 4.5 illustrates the members in the family who stay house always. In the study, there are three categories namely, daily, weekly and monthly. From these, the category named daily has attained highest (98.82 percent) across the districts. But in the case of monthly category, the same was only 0.3 percent of the total.

### Religion

### Table 4.6
**Religion wise classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>82 (51.3)</td>
<td>75 (44.6)</td>
<td>61 (33.7)</td>
<td>218 (42.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>61 (38.1)</td>
<td>77 (45.8)</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>139 (27.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>16 (10)</td>
<td>13 (7.7)</td>
<td>118 (65.2)</td>
<td>147 (28.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>3 (1.8)</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Religion wise distribution of the sample households is given in table 4.6. Most of the sample households in Thrissur district belong to Christian religion (65.2 percent). Hindu religion (51.3 percent) is highest percent in Alappuzha.
district. But almost 45.8 percent of the sample households in Palakkad district belong to Muslim religion. Hence there is a dominance of specific religion across the sample districts.

Social group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>40 (25)</td>
<td>34 (20.2)</td>
<td>121 (66.9)</td>
<td>195 (38.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>24 (15)</td>
<td>13 (7.7)</td>
<td>20 (11)</td>
<td>57 (11.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC</td>
<td>95 (59.4)</td>
<td>116 (69)</td>
<td>40 (22.1)</td>
<td>251 (49.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4 (2.4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Caste wise distribution of the sample households is given in table 4.7. Among the sample districts, majority of the sample households belongs to OBC category (49.3 percent). The percentage of ST population is negligible in Thrissur district. Where, the SC/ ST population is very low across the sample districts.

Occupational status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Labour</td>
<td>9 (5.6)</td>
<td>12 (7.1)</td>
<td>28 (15.5)</td>
<td>49 (9.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolie Worker</td>
<td>51 (31.9)</td>
<td>50 (29.8)</td>
<td>93 (51.4)</td>
<td>194 (38.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govt.</td>
<td>27 (16.9)</td>
<td>24 (14.3)</td>
<td>11 (6.1)</td>
<td>62 (12.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>6 (3.8)</td>
<td>10 (6)</td>
<td>7 (3.9)</td>
<td>23 (4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self employed</td>
<td>33 (20.6)</td>
<td>44 (26.2)</td>
<td>32 (17.7)</td>
<td>109 (21.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>33 (20.6)</td>
<td>27 (16.1)</td>
<td>9 (5)</td>
<td>69 (13.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Labour&amp; Coolie worker</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Labour&amp; Professional</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages
Table 4.8 illustrates the occupational status of the sample households across the districts. Occupational status is categorized into five. They are, Agricultural Labour, Coolie Worker, Government employees, Private employees, Professional employees, Self employees and others. From the survey, it is found that, most of the sample households belong to Coolie workers (38.1 percent). Among these, highest in this employment goes to Thrissur district (51.4 percent). Only 9.6 percent of sample households are engaged as agricultural labours.

**Source of Income**

The discussion on sources of income of the sample households is presented in table 4.9. The sources of income are categorized into 7; they are cultivation, farming, other agricultural activity, salary/wage, pension, remittances and others. Most of the sample households are included in salary/wage category (67.19 percent). The next is from other category (12.77 percent). A few is from a category of other than agricultural activity (1.18 percent).

**Table 4.9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Income</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivation</td>
<td>6 (3.75)</td>
<td>6 (3.57)</td>
<td>19 (10.5)</td>
<td>31 (6.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>2 (1.25)</td>
<td>5 (2.98)</td>
<td>7 (3.87)</td>
<td>14 (2.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agricultural Activity</td>
<td>1 (0.63)</td>
<td>2 (1.19)</td>
<td>3 (1.66)</td>
<td>6 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary/Wage</td>
<td>101 (63.13)</td>
<td>104 (61.9)</td>
<td>137 (75.69)</td>
<td>342 (67.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>9 (5.63)</td>
<td>3 (1.79)</td>
<td>3 (1.66)</td>
<td>15 (2.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remittances</td>
<td>5 (3.13)</td>
<td>14 (8.33)</td>
<td>3 (1.66)</td>
<td>22 (4.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivation &amp; Farming</td>
<td>1 (0.63)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1 (0.55)</td>
<td>2 (0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivation &amp; Salary/Wage</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming &amp; Salary/Wage</td>
<td>1 (0.63)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1 (0.55)</td>
<td>2 (0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agricultural Activity &amp; Salary/Wage</td>
<td>1 (0.63)</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>2 (0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary/Wage &amp; pension</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>2 (1.2)</td>
<td>2 (1.1)</td>
<td>4 (0.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension &amp; Others</td>
<td>1 (0.63)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.10 clearly depicts the structure of sample households. The type of structure is categorized into Katcha, Semi Pucca, and Pucca. Most of the sample households belong to the pucca structure across the sample districts (54.62 percent). Among these, Alappuzha holds the majority of these structures (60 percent). The next is from semi pucca (41.85 percent) across districts, and very small structure of kutcha has been seen across the sample districts.

### Table 4.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katcha</td>
<td>5 (3.13)</td>
<td>3 (1.79)</td>
<td>10 (5.52)</td>
<td>18 (3.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi Pucca</td>
<td>59 (36.88)</td>
<td>73 (43.45)</td>
<td>81 (44.75)</td>
<td>213 (41.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pucca</td>
<td>96 (60)</td>
<td>92 (54.76)</td>
<td>90 (49.72)</td>
<td>278 (54.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

II. Demographic Details

### Gender wise classification

Table 4.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>307 (46.73)</td>
<td>310 (46.41)</td>
<td>353 (47.32)</td>
<td>970 (46.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>350 (53.27)</td>
<td>358 (53.59)</td>
<td>393 (52.68)</td>
<td>1101 (53.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>657 (100)</td>
<td>668 (100)</td>
<td>746 (100)</td>
<td>2071 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages
Table 4.1 represents the percentage share of sample households according to gender. It is clear from the table that the majority of the sample households (53.16 percent) are males from each district. Across districts, large proportion of male households (53.59 percent) is composed in Palakkad. Among the 46.84 percent of the female population in sample households across the districts, Thrissur dominates 47.32 percent in the case of female category.

**Age wise classification**

Age wise classification is shown in table 4.12. Most of the sample households are in the category of age group of 16-30 categories (31.43 percent) across the districts and it has shown highest in Palakkad district (34.58 percent). Only 1.69 percent of the farmers were in the age group of above 75. 17.14 percent of the sample households belong to the category of below 15 age group. All the other sample households are in the age group between 31-75.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 15</td>
<td>88 (13.39)</td>
<td>116 (17.37)</td>
<td>151 (20.24)</td>
<td>355 (17.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>219 (33.33)</td>
<td>231 (34.58)</td>
<td>201 (26.94)</td>
<td>651 (31.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>146 (22.22)</td>
<td>171 (25.6)</td>
<td>200 (26.81)</td>
<td>517 (24.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-60</td>
<td>157 (23.9)</td>
<td>128 (19.16)</td>
<td>121 (16.22)</td>
<td>406 (19.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-75</td>
<td>34 (5.18)</td>
<td>19 (2.84)</td>
<td>54 (7.24)</td>
<td>107 (5.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 75</td>
<td>13 (1.98)</td>
<td>3 (0.45)</td>
<td>19 (2.55)</td>
<td>35 (1.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>657 (100)</td>
<td>668 (100)</td>
<td>746 (100)</td>
<td>2071 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages
Marital Status

Table 4.13

Marital Status of the members in the selected sample households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>367 (55.86)</td>
<td>371 (55.54)</td>
<td>405 (54.29)</td>
<td>1143 (55.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1 (0.15)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1 (0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>288 (43.84)</td>
<td>290 (43.41)</td>
<td>330 (44.24)</td>
<td>908 (43.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2 (0.3)</td>
<td>6 (0.9)</td>
<td>11 (1.47)</td>
<td>19 (0.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>657 (100)</td>
<td>668 (100)</td>
<td>746 (100)</td>
<td>2071 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Table 4.13 explains the marital status of the sample households across the districts. Most of the sample households are in the married category (55.19 percent) across districts. 0.92 percent of the sample households fall in the widowed category.

Education Status

Table 4.14

Education Status of the members in the selected sample households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>14 (2.13)</td>
<td>17 (2.54)</td>
<td>18 (2.41)</td>
<td>49 (2.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>155 (23.59)</td>
<td>169 (25.3)</td>
<td>332 (44.5)</td>
<td>656 (31.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>186 (28.31)</td>
<td>145 (21.71)</td>
<td>179 (23.99)</td>
<td>510 (24.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Secondary</td>
<td>121 (18.42)</td>
<td>129 (19.31)</td>
<td>89 (11.93)</td>
<td>339 (16.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>144 (21.92)</td>
<td>160 (23.95)</td>
<td>113 (15.15)</td>
<td>417 (20.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-Graduation &amp; above</td>
<td>37 (5.63)</td>
<td>48 (7.19)</td>
<td>15 (2.01)</td>
<td>100 (4.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>657 (100)</td>
<td>668 (100)</td>
<td>746 (100)</td>
<td>2071 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

The Education profile of the sample households across the districts is presented in table 4.14. Majority of the sample households were with
primary education across the districts (31.68 percent). Primary education is highest in Thrissur district (44.5 percent). Across the districts, the numbers of illiterate is high in Palakkad district (2.54 percent). 24.97 percent of the sample households belong to the category of graduation and post graduation across the districts.

**Family Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of households according to Family Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001-15000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15001-25000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25001-35000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35001-45000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45001-55000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55001-65000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above65000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Table 4.15 classifies based on the family income across the districts. There is an increase in the category of Rs.15001-25000 (53.05 percent), and also a decrease in the category of up to Rs. 5000 as 0.98 percent. From the study, it is found that, Thrissur has secured highest position in the classification of households according to family income across the districts.

**Pension**

Table 4.16 represents the classification according to the pension received among the sample households across the districts. Among the category, only 2 percent of the population received pension and majority of the persons are still employed in various sectors. Palakkad district holds the top position in the employment creation among various sectors (98.5 percent).
Table 4.16
Classification according to the pension received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>637 (96.96)</td>
<td>658 (98.5)</td>
<td>732 (98.12)</td>
<td>2027 (97.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1000</td>
<td>15 (2.28)</td>
<td>7 (1.05)</td>
<td>7 (0.94)</td>
<td>29 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001-2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.15)</td>
<td>2 (0.27)</td>
<td>3 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-3000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.15)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4001-5000</td>
<td>2 (0.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.13)</td>
<td>3 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 5000</td>
<td>3 (0.46)</td>
<td>1 (0.15)</td>
<td>4 (0.54)</td>
<td>8 (0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>657 (100)</td>
<td>668 (100)</td>
<td>746 (100)</td>
<td>2071 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

III. Availability Information

Table 4.17
Land owned in Cents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Owned</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>1 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 5</td>
<td>38 (23.75)</td>
<td>54 (32.14)</td>
<td>28 (15.47)</td>
<td>120 (23.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-20</td>
<td>77 (48.13)</td>
<td>78 (46.43)</td>
<td>103 (56.91)</td>
<td>258 (50.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40</td>
<td>31 (19.38)</td>
<td>18 (10.71)</td>
<td>34 (18.78)</td>
<td>83 (16.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>5 (3.13)</td>
<td>8 (4.76)</td>
<td>13 (7.18)</td>
<td>26 (5.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80</td>
<td>5 (3.13)</td>
<td>6 (3.57)</td>
<td>2 (1.1)</td>
<td>13 (2.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100</td>
<td>3 (1.88)</td>
<td>4 (2.38)</td>
<td>1 (0.55)</td>
<td>8 (1.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above 100</td>
<td>1 (0.63)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Land owned by the sample households is presented in table 4.17. Most of the sample households have their own land. Out of the 509 sample households, 490 households have their own land and very small percentage of people stayed in rented houses. Almost 96 percentage of people have their own land and
among these, Palakkad district households was higher the proportion in terms of own land. The highest land owned by the category of 6-20 cents (50.69 percent), and the least land owned by above 100 (0.2 percent). In this category, Thrissur has secured highest position in land owned classification.

Table 4.18
Households utilizing Land for Agricultural Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>89 (55.63)</td>
<td>122 (72.62)</td>
<td>117 (64.64)</td>
<td>328 (64.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71 (44.38)</td>
<td>46 (27.38)</td>
<td>64 (35.36)</td>
<td>181 (35.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Table 4.18 classifies the household utilizing land for agricultural purposes across the districts. Most of the sample households across the districts (64.44 percent) are not utilizing land for agricultural purposes. Land used for agricultural purposes has only 35.56 percent among the sample households. Of these, Alappuzha district (44.38 percent) occupies the highest utilization of the land for agricultural purposes.

Table 4.19
Utilization of Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Land</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultivation</td>
<td>16 (10)</td>
<td>2 (1.2)</td>
<td>7 (3.9)</td>
<td>25 (4.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>131 (81.9)</td>
<td>132 (78.6)</td>
<td>134 (74)</td>
<td>397 (78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>13 (8.1)</td>
<td>34 (20.2)</td>
<td>40 (22.1)</td>
<td>87 (17.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Land utilization in the sample households is presented in table 4.19. It reveals that, majority of the sample households are using their land for construction purposes. Majority of the households build their houses in their own
land, and there are no space and time for cultivation activities. While analyzing across the districts, the picture reveals that very negligible portion use their land for cultivation purposes; it is almost below 5 percent and some others use their land for both housing and cultivation. After their need as housing purposes, the remaining space is used for their daily needs. 17 percent of the households utilize their land in housing and cultivation purposes. Among the districts, the people in Alappuzha are using their land mostly in housing purposes (82 percent).

**Table 4.20**

**Obtain Essential Food Items Easily**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12 (7.5)</td>
<td>22 (13.1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>34 (6.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>148 (92.5)</td>
<td>146 (86.9)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>475 (93.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Majority of the sample households obtain their food items easily, as shown in table 4.20. The study among the sample households regarding the easily attainability of the food items reveals that, almost 93 percent of the people is having positive attitude regarding the matter. Among these, the people in Thrissur district obtain essential food items easily and they have simply accessible the essential food items. This reveals that, due to public intervention and other private outlets solved the difficulty in the obtainability of the food items.

**Table 4.21**

**Have Mortgage in Land**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>156 (97.5)</td>
<td>156 (92.86)</td>
<td>173 (95.58)</td>
<td>485 (95.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4 (2.5)</td>
<td>12 (7.14)</td>
<td>8 (4.42)</td>
<td>24 (4.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages
Table 4.21 represents that there is mortgage in land among the sample households. While analyzing the respective argument, it still reveals that majority of the sample households across the districts was not in any legal agreement in land by which a bank, building society, money lenders etc and only 5 percent of the sample population are involved in this practice.

**Table 4.22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>153 (95.63)</td>
<td>161 (95.83)</td>
<td>177 (97.79)</td>
<td>491 (96.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7 (4.38)</td>
<td>7 (4.17)</td>
<td>4 (2.21)</td>
<td>18 (3.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Table 4.22 represents that there is any lease in land among the sample households. While analyzing the respective argument, it still reveals that majority of the sample households across the districts was not at all legal agreement in land by which a bank, building society, money lenders etc and only 5 percent of the sample population are involved in this practice.

**Table 4.23**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9 (5.63)</td>
<td>16 (9.52)</td>
<td>4 (2.21)</td>
<td>29 (5.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>151 (94.38)</td>
<td>152 (90.48)</td>
<td>177 (97.79)</td>
<td>480 (94.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Table 4.23 explains the acquirement of enough quantity of food for all the time. Almost 94 percent of the population has the opinion that they have acquired enough quantity of food at all times and it is mostly seen in Thrissur district. Only very few percent of population is against this argument.
Among the sample households, majority of the people are able to deal with sufficient food for all the members in the family from family income. Only 7 percent of the people in the sample areas are not able to deal with sufficient food (Table 4.24).

Table 4.25
Source of purchase of food items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food items</th>
<th>Own production</th>
<th>Purchased by own money</th>
<th>Purchased on credit</th>
<th>Receiving food as part wage</th>
<th>PDS</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rice &amp; Rice Pdts</td>
<td>20 (2.74)</td>
<td>464 (63.65)</td>
<td>1 (0.14)</td>
<td>1 (0.14)</td>
<td>243 (33.33)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wheat &amp; Wheat Pdts</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>413 (66.51)</td>
<td>1 (0.16)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>207 (33.33)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses &amp; Pulse Pdts</td>
<td>8 (1.66)</td>
<td>468 (97.10)</td>
<td>5 (1.04)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (0.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt &amp; Spices</td>
<td>5 (1.09)</td>
<td>451 (98.69)</td>
<td>1 (0.22)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>475 (99.37)</td>
<td>3 (0.63)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereals</td>
<td>4 (1.6)</td>
<td>244 (97.6)</td>
<td>1 (0.4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk &amp; Milk Pdts</td>
<td>50 (11.9)</td>
<td>344 (81.9)</td>
<td>1 (0.24)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>25 (5.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edible Oil</td>
<td>44 (10.4)</td>
<td>378 (89.36)</td>
<td>1 (0.24)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapioca</td>
<td>78 (20.63)</td>
<td>297 (78.57)</td>
<td>3 (0.79)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits &amp; Nuts</td>
<td>34 (10.93)</td>
<td>266 (85.53)</td>
<td>2 (0.64)</td>
<td>9 (2.89)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat Egg Fish</td>
<td>12 (2.76)</td>
<td>420 (96.55)</td>
<td>1 (0.23)</td>
<td>1 (0.23)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (0.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>108 (21.34)</td>
<td>397 (78.46)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots &amp; Tubers</td>
<td>71 (38.59)</td>
<td>111 (60.33)</td>
<td>1 (0.54)</td>
<td>1 (0.54)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverages</td>
<td>2 (5.26)</td>
<td>33 (86.84)</td>
<td>2 (5.26)</td>
<td>1 (2.63)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Pdts</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>37 (94.87)</td>
<td>1 (2.56)</td>
<td>1 (2.56)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

The sources of purchase of food items are shown in table 4.25. The major sources are own production, purchased by own money, purchased on credit, receiving food as a part of wage, PDS and others. On these sources of food items, majority of the sample households purchased their requirements of food items from open market using their own money and also the households mostly depend on
Public Distribution system. Rice, wheat, sugar and kerosene are the main products distributed through the PDS in Kerala and in the majority of the people in the sample households are buy rice and wheat through PDS (almost 67 percent).

Table 4.26 illustrates the availability of food items in the market and it signifies as easy, tough, fairly and others. Most of the sample households in the state are of the opinion that majority of the food grains are easily available in the market and the households satisfy their daily needs very efficiently and only small part of the people in the sample households are not in favour of this view.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food items</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Tough</th>
<th>Fairly</th>
<th>Others (No Opinion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rice &amp; Rice Pdts</td>
<td>485 (95.3)</td>
<td>9 (1.8)</td>
<td>15 (2.9)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wheat &amp; Wheat Pdts</td>
<td>463 (91)</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td>17 (3.3)</td>
<td>24 (4.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses &amp; Pulse Pdts</td>
<td>463 (91)</td>
<td>42 (8.3)</td>
<td>11 (2.2)</td>
<td>23 (4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt &amp; Spices</td>
<td>454 (89.2)</td>
<td>6 (1.2)</td>
<td>4 (0.8)</td>
<td>48 (9.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>471 (92.5)</td>
<td>6 (1.2)</td>
<td>6 (1.2)</td>
<td>26 (5.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereals</td>
<td>241 (47.3)</td>
<td>13 (2.6)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
<td>254 (49.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk &amp; Milk Pdts</td>
<td>414 (81.3)</td>
<td>6 (1.2)</td>
<td>3 (0.6)</td>
<td>86 (16.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edible Oil</td>
<td>421 (82.7)</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
<td>82 (16.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapioca</td>
<td>359 (70.5)</td>
<td>7 (1.4)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
<td>142 (27.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits &amp; Nuts</td>
<td>289 (56.8)</td>
<td>6 (1.2)</td>
<td>3 (0.6)</td>
<td>211 (41.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat Egg Fish</td>
<td>404 (79.4)</td>
<td>11 (2.2)</td>
<td>13 (2.6)</td>
<td>81 (15.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>413 (81.1)</td>
<td>7 (1.4)</td>
<td>4 (0.8)</td>
<td>85 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots &amp; Tubers</td>
<td>151 (29.7)</td>
<td>8 (1.6)</td>
<td>4 (0.8)</td>
<td>346 (68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverages</td>
<td>28 (5.5)</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td>471 (92.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Pdts</td>
<td>32 (6.3)</td>
<td>6 (1.2)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
<td>470 (92.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages.

Table 4.27 explains the average quantity of each food item purchased and consumed per month and also percentage quantity consumed across the districts. Most of the food items are consumed by the households from the markets and consumed up to their requirements. In the case of some of the food items, the quantity purchased is less in quantity and quantity consumed is high in quantity and the gap between the quantity purchased and quantity consumed are adjusted by the households through their own production in their land areas. The consumption of vegetables is as more than hundred percentage; i.e, the quantity consumed is more than the quantity purchased.
Table 4.27
Average quantity of each food items purchased and consumed per month and also percentage quantity consumed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food items</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QP</td>
<td>QC</td>
<td>Consumption (%)</td>
<td>QP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice &amp; Rice Pdts</td>
<td>23.53</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>27.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wheat &amp; Wheat Pdts</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>92.02</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses &amp; Pulse Pdts</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>93.04</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt &amp; Spices</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>90.86</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>91.52</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereals</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk &amp; Milk Pdts</td>
<td>12.91</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>97.37</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edible Oil</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>65.27</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapioca</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits &amp; Nuts</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>96.49</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat Egg Fish</td>
<td>17.57</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>87.65</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>108.47</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots &amp; Tubers</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverages</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Pdts</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages; QP = Quantity purchased; QC= Quantity Consumed
Table 4.28

Number of respondents purchasing each food items from different sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Local Dealer</th>
<th>Nearby town</th>
<th>Maveli stores</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice &amp; Rice products</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wheat &amp; Wheat products</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses &amp; Pulse Pdts</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt &amp; Spices</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereals</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk &amp; Milk Pdts</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edible Oil</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapioca</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits &amp; Nuts</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat Egg Fish</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots &amp; Tubers</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Pdts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Table 4.28 explains the number of respondents purchasing each food item from different sources. The different sources which the respondents agrees that, they have purchased their needs from local dealers, nearby towns, Maveli stores and others. Most of the households in the sample area opined that the main sources of purchase of food items are from local dealers. The main food items like rice, wheat, pulses and cereals which are available in the majority of the market places and the supply of these food items are easily accessible to the people in the sample households. The majority of the population in the sample households are using the public distribution channels like PDS, Maveli stores etc for their daily needs.
Table 4.29
Control on Household Income and Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully</td>
<td>125 (78.13)</td>
<td>124 (73.81)</td>
<td>167 (92.27)</td>
<td>416 (81.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>32 (20)</td>
<td>38 (22.62)</td>
<td>10 (5.52)</td>
<td>80 (15.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3 (1.88)</td>
<td>6 (3.57)</td>
<td>4 (2.21)</td>
<td>13 (2.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Table 4.29 exhibits the control of households’ income and expenditure among sample households across the districts. Here, the categorization is divided into three: fully, partially and rarely; among these, most of the sample households are of the opinion that they were fully aware about the market rates and the present position of the economy. Almost 82 percent of the people in the sample households are in full control of their household income and expenditure. Among these, the people in Thrissur district have more control on household income and expenditure (92 percent). Only 16 percent of the population among the sample households partially opined that they have only little control on household’s income and expenditure.

Table 4.30
Able to give Food to family members according to age and condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully</td>
<td>122 (76.25)</td>
<td>125 (74.4)</td>
<td>176 (97.24)</td>
<td>423 (83.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>33 (20.63)</td>
<td>34 (20.24)</td>
<td>1 (0.55)</td>
<td>68 (13.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>5 (3.13)</td>
<td>9 (5.36)</td>
<td>4 (2.21)</td>
<td>18 (3.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages
The nutritional standard of the people mainly depends upon the food intake and their calorie contents and depend on the age and family conditions of the people in the economy. Here, the discussion is focusing on the ability to give food to family members according to age and condition. In Kerala, most of the people are conscious about the nutritional standards of the family members. Here, almost 83 percent of the people in the sample households are fully conscious about the food items to family members and they are capable to give food to family members according to age and requirement. Among these, the study across the districts shows that the people in Thrissur district are more able to give food to family members according to age compared to other districts. The remaining 17 percent of the population in the sample households are not much keen in this (table 4.30).

### Table 4.31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully</td>
<td>110 (68.75)</td>
<td>107 (63.69)</td>
<td>149 (82.32)</td>
<td>366 (71.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>47 (29.38)</td>
<td>49 (29.17)</td>
<td>29 (16.02)</td>
<td>125 (24.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3 (1.88)</td>
<td>12 (7.14)</td>
<td>3 (1.66)</td>
<td>18 (3.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

People in the sample households make obtainable pulses, fruits, milk, non-vegetables items, green vegetables etc in family food basket throughout the year. This is shown in table 4.31. Almost 72 percent of the population is fully conscious about the food availabilities and accessibilities and they are very intense to make obtainable all food items to the family members throughout the year. It is very ardent to see in the people of Thrissur district (82 percent). Very little the population is not seriously taken this matter and they have no worry about the accessibility of the food items to the family members throughout the year (table 4.31).
Table 4.32

Aware about the enough income is essential for household food security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully</td>
<td>120 (75)</td>
<td>122 (72.62)</td>
<td>170 (93.92)</td>
<td>412 (80.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>36 (22.5)</td>
<td>38 (22.62)</td>
<td>9 (4.97)</td>
<td>83 (16.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>4 (2.5)</td>
<td>8 (4.76)</td>
<td>2 (1.1)</td>
<td>14 (2.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Majority of the people in the sample households are more aware about the financial position of their families for acquiring their basic needs, especially the food needs and they are very much enthusiastic to maintain the food security in the households. Table 4.32 exhibits the awareness among the people in the sample households about whether enough income is essential for household food security. Table shows that almost 81 percent of the population is fully aware of their current financial position to feed their family members and there are some people (16 percent) who are not aware about this. With the available income, they try to maintain the food security of the family members among the sample households.

Table 4.33

Farming is essential for household food security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>66 (41.25)</td>
<td>45 (26.79)</td>
<td>50 (27.62)</td>
<td>161 (31.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>85 (53.13)</td>
<td>104 (61.9)</td>
<td>114 (62.98)</td>
<td>303 (59.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5 (3.13)</td>
<td>7 (4.17)</td>
<td>4 (2.21)</td>
<td>16 (3.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4 (2.5)</td>
<td>12 (7.14)</td>
<td>13 (7.18)</td>
<td>29 (5.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Table 4.33 explains the actions of the people in the sample households in farming activities to maintain the household food security. Farming is very essential for an economy for maintaining the food security for all
The discussions in the sample households tell us that, 91 percent of the population agrees with this, i.e; farming is necessary for household food security. As we know, in Kerala, the need of the people are increasing in the case of food items, but we are not ready to work in agriculture activities due to many constraints; i.e; non availability of labourer, high cost of raw materials, accessibility of fertile land etc. But, still our 15 percent of the needs are satisfied in production within the state and for remaining 85 percent we depend on other states. So the table clearly depicts the attitude of the people in the sample households. They are aware that farming is essential for household food security, but majority of the people are not ready to work in the farming activities. Only very small part of the population does not agree with the statement that farming is essential for household food security. Among this, people in Thrissur district severely believe that farming is inevitable for food security in the present and also in the future. In this view, people are ready to cultivate the necessary food items, such as vegetables, fruits etc in their courtyards.

Table 4.34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33 (20.63)</td>
<td>49 (29.17)</td>
<td>33 (18.23)</td>
<td>115 (22.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>127 (79.38)</td>
<td>119 (70.83)</td>
<td>148 (81.77)</td>
<td>394 (77.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Most of the households in the sample areas are of the opinion that, they have easily available to our food items. It is shown in table 4.34. It states that, 77 percent of the population is of the opinion that they get enough food articles very easily from different markets. The major food articles in the rural food basket include rice, wheat, cereals, pulses and tapioca. Due to the changes in the cropping pattern, the trends in the production have much transform and it effect the production of basic food items. Due to the imports from other states, the food articles are supplied properly and easily available in the households in the sample area.
Table 4.35

Money spend in one month for different items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking Oil</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>217.7</td>
<td>389.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firewood/ Cooking Fuel</td>
<td>576.4</td>
<td>216.8</td>
<td>584.5</td>
<td>313.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarette/Alcohol</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>104.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1822.2</td>
<td>5207.5</td>
<td>2469.4</td>
<td>12074.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>926.9</td>
<td>1499.5</td>
<td>965.8</td>
<td>1870.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>473.8</td>
<td>846.0</td>
<td>705.4</td>
<td>1390.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Repayment</td>
<td>15428.1</td>
<td>63593.7</td>
<td>8574.4</td>
<td>49067.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Maintenance</td>
<td>723.1</td>
<td>660.2</td>
<td>635.5</td>
<td>523.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>1425.0</td>
<td>15813.3</td>
<td>356.5</td>
<td>1000.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>501.3</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>285.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrations</td>
<td>238.1</td>
<td>1649.2</td>
<td>193.2</td>
<td>668.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foods &amp;Beverages</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>181.9</td>
<td>878.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>277.8</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>410.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>341.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey

Table 4.35 explains the money spends monthly for different items among the sample households across the districts. Majority of the households spend their income on education and debt repayment in one month. And next to that, almost half of the incomes they spend on the other activities like health issues and shopping purposes etc. only very small amount the households spend for food and beverages and other activities. In the case of food expenditure, compared that other districts, the people in Palakkad district spend more on food items.

Table 4.36

Maintains the Stocks of rice or other staple foods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>43 (26.88)</td>
<td>22 (13.1)</td>
<td>20 (11.05)</td>
<td>85 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>100 (62.5)</td>
<td>89 (52.98)</td>
<td>85 (46.96)</td>
<td>274 (53.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13 (8.13)</td>
<td>33 (19.64)</td>
<td>62 (34.25)</td>
<td>108 (21.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4 (2.5)</td>
<td>24 (14.29)</td>
<td>14 (7.73)</td>
<td>42 (8.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages
Table 4.36 illustrates how the people in sample households maintain the stocks of rice or other for their daily bread. Majority of the people agreed that they maintain the stock of rice or other staple foods for their daily needs. Among these the households in Alappuzha district holds the top most priority. Only 8 percent of the people strongly disagree that, they do not maintain the stocks of rice or other staple foods and they purchase the food items on daily basis.

Table 4.37

Activities sustaining (main Activity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Activity</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1 (0.55)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary/ Wage</td>
<td>129 (80.63)</td>
<td>162 (96.43)</td>
<td>143 (79.01)</td>
<td>434 (85.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Income</td>
<td>11 (6.88)</td>
<td>2 (1.19)</td>
<td>31 (17.13)</td>
<td>44 (8.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>9 (5.63)</td>
<td>2 (1.19)</td>
<td>3 (1.66)</td>
<td>14 (2.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>11 (6.88)</td>
<td>2 (1.19)</td>
<td>3 (1.66)</td>
<td>16 (3.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Table 4.37 illustrates that the most important activity sustaining the income in terms of money generated in the last one month. Majority of the people sustain their activities through salary/wage actions. Among these, the people in Palakkad district are more intense in the activities under the category of salary/wage for sustaining the income. Majority of the people in the sample households are dealing with the casual jobs for their daily breads and they earned in the form of wages for their daily works.

Table 4.38

Activities Sustaining (Second Activity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Activity</td>
<td>129 (80.63)</td>
<td>154 (91.67)</td>
<td>145 (80.11)</td>
<td>428 (84.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary/ Wage</td>
<td>4 (2.5)</td>
<td>2 (1.19)</td>
<td>4 (2.21)</td>
<td>10 (1.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension</td>
<td>4 (2.5)</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>4 (2.21)</td>
<td>9 (1.77)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.38 explains the second most important activity sustaining the income in terms of money generated in the last one month. Majority of the people sustain their activities through salary/wage actions as a major activity and there is no other activity for sustaining their income. 84 percent of the people do not possess any income other than the main activity. Some people have enjoyed the benefits from agricultural income and pensions for sustaining their requirements.

**Table 4.39**

Type of Breakfast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breakfast</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapatti</td>
<td>1 (0.63)</td>
<td>4 (2.38)</td>
<td>1 (0.55)</td>
<td>6 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td>13 (8.13)</td>
<td>66 (39.29)</td>
<td>26 (14.36)</td>
<td>105 (20.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals &amp; Chapatti</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals &amp; Eatables</td>
<td>1 (0.63)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eatables</td>
<td>145 (90.63)</td>
<td>97 (57.74)</td>
<td>154 (85.08)</td>
<td>396 (77.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.40**

Type of Lunch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>180 (99.45)</td>
<td>508 (99.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eatables</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1 (0.55)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.41

Type of Dinner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dinner</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chappathi</td>
<td>42 (26.25)</td>
<td>18 (10.71)</td>
<td>12 (6.63)</td>
<td>72 (14.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td>77 (48.13)</td>
<td>132 (78.57)</td>
<td>159 (87.85)</td>
<td>368 (72.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chappathi &amp; Meals</td>
<td>39 (24.38)</td>
<td>17 (10.12)</td>
<td>9 (40.97)</td>
<td>65 (12.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eatables</td>
<td>1 (0.63)</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>1 (0.55)</td>
<td>3 (0.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals &amp; Eatables</td>
<td>1 (0.63)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Tables 4.39, 4.40 and 4.41 explain the dietary habits of the sample households across the districts. The food items in different periods like breakfast, lunch and dinner and what they prefer more in these time periods. Majority of the households are preferring eatables like idli, dosa, etc. in the breakfast time and on lunch time, they more prefer on meals. In the time of dinner, they prefer both meals and chapattis.

IV. Accessibility and Affordability Information

Table 4.42

Transport Facility Available for Sale and Purchase of Food Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>39 (24.38)</td>
<td>22 (13.1)</td>
<td>11 (6.08)</td>
<td>72 (14.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>119 (74.38)</td>
<td>140 (83.33)</td>
<td>169 (93.37)</td>
<td>428 (84.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1 (0.63)</td>
<td>3 (1.79)</td>
<td>1 (0.55)</td>
<td>5 (0.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1 (0.63)</td>
<td>3 (1.79)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>4 (0.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Table 4.42 illustrates that the transport facility available for sale and purchase of food items. Almost 84 percent of the people enjoy the benefit of transportation facility for sale and purchase of their food items. Among
these, Thrissur district occupies highest rank in terms of transportation facility in the sample households across the districts and only very few of the population disagree with the facilities of transportation.

Table 4.43
There is Market for Sale and Purchase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>39 (24.38)</td>
<td>32 (19.05)</td>
<td>5 (2.76)</td>
<td>76 (14.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>119 (74.38)</td>
<td>127 (75.6)</td>
<td>175 (96.69)</td>
<td>421 (82.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2 (1.25)</td>
<td>3 (1.79)</td>
<td>1 (0.55)</td>
<td>6 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>6 (3.57)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>6 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

There is a platform available for sale and purchase of food items in the sample households across the districts. More than 83 percent of the population agrees that they have an opportunity and there is a market for sale and purchase of food items. Among these, Thrissur district surmounts that, they have sufficient market facilities for sale and purchase of food items and only a small part of the population strongly disagree with the facilities of market for sale and purchase of food items (table 4.43).

Table 4.44
Family is Able to afford all three meals a day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>79 (49.38)</td>
<td>59 (35.12)</td>
<td>60 (33.15)</td>
<td>198 (38.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>77 (48.13)</td>
<td>90 (53.57)</td>
<td>118 (65.19)</td>
<td>285 (55.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2 (1.25)</td>
<td>11 (6.55)</td>
<td>1 (0.55)</td>
<td>14 (2.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2 (1.25)</td>
<td>8 (4.76)</td>
<td>2 (1.1)</td>
<td>12 (2.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Among the sample households across the districts, 90 percent of the households are able to afford three meals per day for their family
members and only very few households are not in favour to this. Compared to other districts, the households in Thrissur district are very much able to afford their meals per day. Table 4.44 clearly depicts the capacities of the families in various districts among the sample households. As compared to other districts, the financial status of the people in sample households across districts is very high; so they are able to afford all the three meals a day.

Table 4.45

Proportion of Income Spent for buying food

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>21 (13.13)</td>
<td>27 (16.07)</td>
<td>7 (3.87)</td>
<td>55 (10.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One third or less</td>
<td>80 (50)</td>
<td>102 (60.71)</td>
<td>138 (76.24)</td>
<td>320 (62.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one third</td>
<td>59 (36.88)</td>
<td>39 (23.21)</td>
<td>36 (19.89)</td>
<td>134 (26.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Table explains the proportion of income spent for buying food. The study focuses on the status of the family members of the sample households towards the expenditure pattern among food items. Almost 63 percent of the people in the sample households spend only one third of the income they earn for food items and among these, the people in Thrissur district are very keen to spend their income on food items. There is no distinction of their income in the sample households in any of the food items has seen in a few of the households. What they earn, they spend; this policy was adopted by 10 percent of the households in the sample areas. So they are not aware about, how much income spends for buying food items. 26 percent of the people in the sample households spend more than one third of their income for buying food (table 4.45).

Table 4.46

Rise in price of food items affected families’ intake of food grain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>54 (33.75)</td>
<td>27 (16.07)</td>
<td>19 (10.5)</td>
<td>100 (19.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>97 (60.63)</td>
<td>125 (74.4)</td>
<td>158 (87.29)</td>
<td>380 (74.66)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the households in the sample districts have positive attitude towards the rise in price of food items affected families intake of food and only very small part of the sample households are not in favour of this argument. When there is a rise in the price of major food items, the people may shift to other substitute food items due to shortage of income. When the price of rice increase in the sample households, the people may shift to chapatti and other related wheat products. The people in Thrissur district sternly agree with the statement of rise in price of food items affected families intake of food (table 4.46).

| Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages |

Table 4.47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for worry to arrange money to purchase family’s next meal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No worry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising cost of food articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.47 shows the categorization of reasons for worry to arrange the money to purchase families next meal. The reasons are categorized into four: No worry, Low Income, rising cost of food articles and others. Most of the people in the sample households do not have any worry to arrange the next meal for their family members. Almost more than half of the people are efficient to feed the next meal to their family members. But, 38 percent of the people in the sample households face the problem of arranging the money to the next meal of their family members. The nature of employment is not so high and the status of the income of 37
percent of the people is very low as compared to other sample households and they can’t afford to buy food articles at the existing prices. So, the people very much worry about to the possibilities to feed their family members. There is a small percent of population who worry about their next meal due to the rising cost of food articles.

**Table 4.48**

**Family gets 100 days employment under MGNREG Act 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>22 (13.75)</td>
<td>28 (16.67)</td>
<td>65 (35.91)</td>
<td>115 (22.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23 (14.38)</td>
<td>17 (10.12)</td>
<td>10 (5.52)</td>
<td>50 (9.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13 (8.13)</td>
<td>39 (23.21)</td>
<td>51 (28.18)</td>
<td>103 (20.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>102 (63.75)</td>
<td>84 (50)</td>
<td>55 (30.39)</td>
<td>241 (47.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

The households in the sample area are not getting 100 days employment under MGNREG Act 2005. The family does not possess any benefits from this act. Almost half of the households were strongly disagreeing that, they do not have any employment opportunities under this act, especially in Alappuzha district. But the households from Thrissur district strongly agreed with the policy and they reap the benefits from this policy (table 4.48).

**Table 4.49**

**Feel that scarcity is a chronic problem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>29 (18.13)</td>
<td>41 (24.4)</td>
<td>28 (15.47)</td>
<td>98 (19.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>59 (36.88)</td>
<td>57 (33.93)</td>
<td>77 (42.54)</td>
<td>193 (37.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20 (12.5)</td>
<td>20 (11.9)</td>
<td>33 (18.23)</td>
<td>73 (14.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>52 (32.5)</td>
<td>50 (29.76)</td>
<td>43 (23.76)</td>
<td>145 (28.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages
In the sample households, scarcity feels as a main debatable issue. Almost 38 percent of the population agrees that they experienced the problem of scarcity. Among these, the households in Thrissur district mostly agreed with the problem of scarcity, while comparing with other districts. 19 percent of the households strongly agreed that, they feel scarcity as a chronic problem now a days and at the same time 28 percent of the people strongly disagree with the statement. (table 4.49).

Table 4.50
Aware About Market Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>68 (42.5)</td>
<td>65 (38.69)</td>
<td>66 (36.46)</td>
<td>199 (39.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>38 (23.75)</td>
<td>58 (34.52)</td>
<td>52 (28.73)</td>
<td>148 (29.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>54 (33.75)</td>
<td>45 (26.79)</td>
<td>63 (34.81)</td>
<td>162 (31.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Table 4.50 checks the awareness about the market rates among the sample households across the districts. Most of the households (39 percent) are always aware about the market rates of food items and behave like rational people. Among these, the people in Alappuzha very cleverly adjusted to their daily food habits according to the market rates compared to other districts. 29 percent of the people do not worry about the market rates; they are ready to buy the food items at any cost.

Table 4.51
Experienced any Food Shortage over the past 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>118 (73.75)</td>
<td>124 (73.81)</td>
<td>108 (59.67)</td>
<td>350 (68.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42 (26.25)</td>
<td>44 (26.19)</td>
<td>73 (40.33)</td>
<td>159 (31.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages
Most of the sample households have not experienced any food shortage over the past 12 months. For 69 percent of the households’ sufficient quantity of food grains is available and only 31 percent of the people face the problem of food shortage over last one year. 40 percent of the people in Thrissur district face the problem of shortage of food over the last one year (table 4.51).

**Table 4.52**

**Depend mostly to get the food you needed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha (n=160)</th>
<th>Palakkad (n=168)</th>
<th>Thrissur (n=181)</th>
<th>Grand Total (n=509)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional work to get money</td>
<td>113 (70.6)</td>
<td>137 (81.5)</td>
<td>153 (84.5)</td>
<td>403 (79.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowed money</td>
<td>125 (78.1)</td>
<td>110 (65.5)</td>
<td>147 (81.2)</td>
<td>382 (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting help from friends and relatives</td>
<td>65 (40.6)</td>
<td>49 (29.2)</td>
<td>41 (22.7)</td>
<td>155 (30.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling some assets or personal household goods</td>
<td>17 (10.6)</td>
<td>12 (7.1)</td>
<td>8 (4.4)</td>
<td>37 (7.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting charities</td>
<td>5 (3.1)</td>
<td>2 (1.2)</td>
<td>2 (1.1)</td>
<td>9 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could not do anything</td>
<td>2 (1.3)</td>
<td>2 (1.2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>2 (1.2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (0.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Table 4.52 explains the dependency mostly to get the food need among the sample households. When the family does not get enough food to eat, the ways the households depend mostly are explained in table. Among the seven options, the major share of opinion goes to the three categories, i.e; additional work to get money, borrowed money, and accepting help from friends and relatives. Among these three categories, the people in the sample households are more concentrated on the additional work to get money and the borrowed money; and the respondents in the Thrissur district are very familiar with this.
Table 4.53 explains the determining factors of the food articles in the sample households. The major determining factors are income, taste and preferences, interest of the family, availability, convenience, locally grown food, price and others. In accordance with the attitude of the sample households and its preference in, we may state that in the majority of the food items, income is the major determining factor of the food articles in the sample households and the second determining factor for the majority of the sample households is the tastes and preferences. The ranking given in each category depends upon the responses from the sample households. Among the food items, the majority of the people in the sample households rank their preferences through their demand in the food articles and it mainly depends upon the two determining factors, i.e., income, taste, and preferences. Price of the food items is the other main determining factor among the sample households for choosing the food articles in accordance with their needs.
### IV. Specific Information

#### Table 4.53
Determining factor of food articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors/Items</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Taste &amp; Preferences</th>
<th>Interest of the Family</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Convenience</th>
<th>Locally Grown Food</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rice and rice</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>416 (81.7)</td>
<td>354 (69.5)</td>
<td>185 (36.3)</td>
<td>44 (8.6)</td>
<td>17 (3.3)</td>
<td>10 (2)</td>
<td>310 (60.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>products</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wheat</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>331 (65)</td>
<td>350 (68.8)</td>
<td>207 (40.7)</td>
<td>30 (5.9)</td>
<td>9 (1.8)</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td>265 (52.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat products</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulses and</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>338 (66.4)</td>
<td>325 (63.9)</td>
<td>176 (34.6)</td>
<td>22 (4.3)</td>
<td>4 (0.8)</td>
<td>4 (0.8)</td>
<td>272 (53.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulse products</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt and</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>325 (63.9)</td>
<td>307 (60.3)</td>
<td>147 (28.9)</td>
<td>26 (5.1)</td>
<td>9 (1.8)</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td>249 (48.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spices</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>335 (65.8)</td>
<td>300 (58.9)</td>
<td>155 (30.5)</td>
<td>24 (4.7)</td>
<td>9 (1.8)</td>
<td>7 (1.4)</td>
<td>233 (45.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereals</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>164 (32.2)</td>
<td>148 (29.1)</td>
<td>68 (13.4)</td>
<td>11 (2.2)</td>
<td>7 (1.4)</td>
<td>4 (0.8)</td>
<td>121 (23.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk and Milk</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>219 (43)</td>
<td>227 (44.6)</td>
<td>105 (20.6)</td>
<td>45 (8.8)</td>
<td>7 (1.4)</td>
<td>7 (1.4)</td>
<td>156 (30.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edible oil</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>193 (37.9)</td>
<td>178 (35)</td>
<td>67 (13.2)</td>
<td>19 (3.7)</td>
<td>8 (1.6)</td>
<td>8 (1.6)</td>
<td>155 (30.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapioca</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>136 (26.7)</td>
<td>157 (30.8)</td>
<td>50 (9.8)</td>
<td>22 (4.3)</td>
<td>12 (2.4)</td>
<td>7 (1.4)</td>
<td>128 (25.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits and Nuts</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>130 (25.5)</td>
<td>169 (33.2)</td>
<td>63 (12.4)</td>
<td>13 (2.6)</td>
<td>3 (0.6)</td>
<td>8 (1.6)</td>
<td>134 (26.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meat Egg and Fish</strong></td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>247 (48.5)</td>
<td>251 (49.3)</td>
<td>132 (25.9)</td>
<td>19 (3.7)</td>
<td>2 (0.4)</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td>209 (41.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetables</strong></td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>194 (38.1)</td>
<td>181 (35.6)</td>
<td>90 (17.7)</td>
<td>48 (9.4)</td>
<td>3 (0.6)</td>
<td>23 (4.5)</td>
<td>150 (29.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roots and Tubers</strong></td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>24 (4.7)</td>
<td>29 (5.7)</td>
<td>17 (3.3)</td>
<td>22 (4.3)</td>
<td>8 (1.6)</td>
<td>9 (1.8)</td>
<td>19 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beverages</strong></td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td>11 (2.2)</td>
<td>14 (2.8)</td>
<td>4 (0.8)</td>
<td>2 (0.4)</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
<td>3 (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Products</strong></td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td>8 (1.6)</td>
<td>4 (0.8)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>9 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.54 explains the constraints experienced in household food security. The major constrained are high cost of food items, lack of storage facility, inadequate marketing facilities, inadequate food availability, poor quality of available food items, cultural inhibition in consumption of some food items, lack of knowledge regarding food security practices, lack of employment opportunities throughout the year and others. Among these, the high cost of food items holds the prime position in the constraints in the household food security (95 percent) and the lack of storage facility is the next constraint in the household food security. The people in the sample households buy their products in accordance with their daily needs and they have no proper facilities for storage of the food items.

### Table 4.54

**Constraints experienced in household food security**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha (n=160)</th>
<th>Palakkad (n=168)</th>
<th>Thrissur (n=181)</th>
<th>Grand Total (n=509)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High cost of food items</td>
<td>151 (94.38)</td>
<td>155 (92.26)</td>
<td>177 (97.79)</td>
<td>483 (94.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of storage facility</td>
<td>46 (28.75)</td>
<td>67 (39.88)</td>
<td>92 (50.83)</td>
<td>205 (40.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate marketing facilities</td>
<td>10 (6.25)</td>
<td>34 (20.24)</td>
<td>92 (50.83)</td>
<td>70 (13.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate food availability</td>
<td>17 (10.63)</td>
<td>15 (8.93)</td>
<td>92 (50.83)</td>
<td>37 (7.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor quality of available food items</td>
<td>33 (20.63)</td>
<td>21 (12.5)</td>
<td>3 (1.66)</td>
<td>57 (11.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural inhibition in consumption of some</td>
<td>10 (6.25)</td>
<td>6 (3.57)</td>
<td>1 (0.55)</td>
<td>17 (3.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge regarding food security</td>
<td>26 (16.25)</td>
<td>13 (7.74)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>39 (7.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of employment opportunities throughout the year</td>
<td>18 (11.25)</td>
<td>13 (7.74)</td>
<td>9 (4.97)</td>
<td>40 (7.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (1.19)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (0.39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages
Table 4.55
Type of Food Assistance getting from anganwadi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>145 (90.63)</td>
<td>134 (79.76)</td>
<td>155 (85.64)</td>
<td>434 (85.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Products</td>
<td>3 (1.88)</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>3 (1.66)</td>
<td>7 (1.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amritham Powder</td>
<td>12 (7.5)</td>
<td>27 (16.07)</td>
<td>24 (13.26)</td>
<td>63 (12.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>5 (2.98)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>5 (0.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Table 4.55 shows the type of food assistance from anganwadis. Almost 85 percent of the sample households do not possess any benefit from anganwadis. Almost 16 percent of the people in Palakkad district enjoy the benefit of anganwadis.

Table 4.56
Aware of the government programmes to enhance the food security of the rural poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>103 (64.38)</td>
<td>126 (75)</td>
<td>158 (87.29)</td>
<td>387 (76.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57 (35.63)</td>
<td>42 (25)</td>
<td>23 (12.71)</td>
<td>122 (23.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Awareness of the government programmes to enhance the food security of the rural households is exhibited in table 4.56. Unfortunately, majority of the sample households are not aware of the government programmes across the districts. More than $\frac{3}{4}$th of the population still have no idea about the policies and programmes of the government and it is very severe in Thrissur district (87.29 percent).
Table 4.57
Awareness about NFSB for enhancing the food security of the people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>125 (78.13)</td>
<td>134 (79.76)</td>
<td>163 (90.06)</td>
<td>422 (82.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35 (21.88)</td>
<td>34 (20.24)</td>
<td>18 (9.94)</td>
<td>87 (17.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>160 (100)</td>
<td>168 (100)</td>
<td>181 (100)</td>
<td>509 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Table 4.57 shows awareness about the National Food Security Bill for enhancing the food security of the sample households. Most of the people (82.91 percent) are not aware about the national food security schemes and policies and it is more serious in Thrissur district (90.06 percent).

Table 4.58
Preference of different public intervention based on easily availability of food items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public intervention</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDS/ Maveli stores/ Supplyco</td>
<td>119 (74.4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>147 (87.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICDS/ Anganwadi</td>
<td>14 (8.8)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid day meal scheme</td>
<td>10 (6.3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (1.2)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGNREA</td>
<td>19 (11.9)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 (3.6)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFSM</td>
<td>10 (6.3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (1.2)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudumbashree</td>
<td>8 (5)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9 (5.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2 (1.3)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Tables 4.58, 4.59, 4.60, 4.61 illustrate the impact/effectiveness of public intervention on food security. The major impacts are classified into four; easily accessible, affordable price, quick accessible and quality food items.
among the major public interventions like PDS/ Maveli stores/ Supplyco, ICDS/ Angnawadi, Mid day meal scheme, MGNREA, NFSM and Kudumbasree. On these preferences of different public interventions, majority of the sample households have the opinion that Public Distribution System is the most effective public intervention on food security across the districts.

Table 4.59

Preference of different public intervention based on affordability in price of food items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public intervention</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDS/ Maveli stores/ Supplyco</td>
<td>67 (41.9)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63 (37.5)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICDS/ Angnawadi</td>
<td>10 (6.3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 (2.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid day meal scheme</td>
<td>8 (5)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (1.2)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGNREA</td>
<td>12 (7.5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (1.2)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFSM</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudumbashree</td>
<td>9 (5.6)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (1.2)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Table 4.60

Preference of different public intervention based on quick accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public intervention</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDS/ Maveli stores/ Supplyco</td>
<td>70 (43.8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60 (35.7)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICDS/ Angnawadi</td>
<td>5 (3.1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (1.2)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid day meal scheme</td>
<td>6 (3.8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGNREA</td>
<td>6 (3.8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFSM</td>
<td>4 (2.5)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudumbashree</td>
<td>6 (3.8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5 (3.1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages
Table 4.61

Preference of different public intervention based on quality of food items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public intervention</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDS/ Maveli stores/ Supplyco</td>
<td>8 (5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 (7.1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICDS/ Angnawadi</td>
<td>3 (1.9)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 (1.8)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid day meal scheme</td>
<td>2 (1.3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (1.2)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGNREA</td>
<td>2 (1.3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFSM</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudumbashree</td>
<td>7 (4.4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6 (3.8)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages

Table 4.62 explains the suggestions in household food security among the sample households across the districts. Among the suggestions, most of the people opine that more emphasis on organic farming by minimizing use of chemicals and the effort for increasing farm production.

Table 4.62

Suggestions in household food security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alappuzha (n=160)</th>
<th>Palakkad (n=168)</th>
<th>Thrissur (n=181)</th>
<th>Grand Total (n=509)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on organic farming by minimizing use of chemicals</td>
<td>150 (93.8)</td>
<td>147 (87.5)</td>
<td>17 (94.5)</td>
<td>468 (91.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort for increasing farm production</td>
<td>54 (33.8)</td>
<td>43 (25.6)</td>
<td>46 (25.4)</td>
<td>143 (28.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring proper food storage facilities</td>
<td>20 (12.5)</td>
<td>31 (18.5)</td>
<td>30 (16.6)</td>
<td>81 (15.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of adequate marketing facilities</td>
<td>12 (7.5)</td>
<td>18 (10.7)</td>
<td>16 (8.8)</td>
<td>46 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring quality food supply at reasonable prices</td>
<td>28 (17.5)</td>
<td>20 (11.9)</td>
<td>15 (8.3)</td>
<td>63 (12.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness and training regarding food security management practices</td>
<td>15 (9.4)</td>
<td>13 (7.7)</td>
<td>3 (1.7)</td>
<td>31 (6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (1.2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, Note: Values in brackets are percentages
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat and wheat products</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1214.132</td>
<td>607.066</td>
<td>3.619*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>84872.607</td>
<td>167.732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>86086.739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt and spices</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.475</td>
<td>8.737</td>
<td>1.077**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>4105.224</td>
<td>8.113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>4122.699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulse and pulse products</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52.55</td>
<td>26.275</td>
<td>5.485*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>2424.098</td>
<td>4.791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>2476.648</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereals</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30.269</td>
<td>15.135</td>
<td>5.365*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>1427.377</td>
<td>2.821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>1457.646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk and Milk products</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4778.404</td>
<td>2389.2</td>
<td>4.291*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>281729.35</td>
<td>556.777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>286507.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edible oil</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.051</td>
<td>6.026</td>
<td>1.479**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>2061.811</td>
<td>4.075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>2073.862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapioca</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>699.04</td>
<td>349.52</td>
<td>44.286**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>3993.506</td>
<td>7.892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>4692.546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits nuts</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>3.743*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>2055.026</td>
<td>4.061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>2085.426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat, egg, fish</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>206.161</td>
<td>103.081</td>
<td>2.586**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>20169.081</td>
<td>39.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>20375.242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Between groups</th>
<th>Within groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.965</td>
<td>18729.243</td>
<td>18818.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.483</td>
<td>37.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root tubers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.765</td>
<td>1213.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.883</td>
<td>2.398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>18.571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>22.053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other foods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>100.369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey

** Significant at 1% level, * significant at 5% level, ns Non significant

Analysis of variance was done for comparing the purchase of each item in the three districts. Significant difference was found only in the case of rice and rice products, pulse and pulse products, sugar, cereals, milk products, tapioca, fruits-nuts, root tubers. In the case of all other items, F values were found to be in significant indicating that there is no significant difference in the purchase of that item among the three districts.
Table 4.64
Results of scaling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Alappuzha</th>
<th>Palakkad</th>
<th>Thrissur</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Farming is essential for household food security</td>
<td>63.75</td>
<td>48.51</td>
<td>50.83</td>
<td>54.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maintains the Stocks of rice or other staple foods</td>
<td>51.56</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>24.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transport Facility Available for Sale and Purchase of Food Items</td>
<td>60.63</td>
<td>52.08</td>
<td>52.49</td>
<td>54.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is Market for Sale and Purchase</td>
<td>60.94</td>
<td>52.38</td>
<td>50.83</td>
<td>54.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Family is Able to afford all three meals a day</td>
<td>71.56</td>
<td>53.87</td>
<td>64.36</td>
<td>63.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rise in price of food items affected families’ intake of food grain</td>
<td>60.63</td>
<td>44.94</td>
<td>52.76</td>
<td>52.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Family gets 100 days employment under MGNREG Act 2005</td>
<td>48.13</td>
<td>34.52</td>
<td>39.23</td>
<td>40.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Feel that scarcity is a chronic problem</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Survey, calculated from the primary data
Note: Grand total refers to the scaling of the corresponding summation of tables

Tables 4.33, 4.36, 4.42, 4.43, 4.44, 4.46, 4.48, 4.49 are summed up into the scaling analysis. Table 4.64 analyses the results of scaling based on the statements and they categorized into eight heads under three districts. The scaling are strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree. The codes are given as 2 for strongly agree, 1 for agree, -1 for disagree and -2 for strongly disagree. If the scaling is in between the range of 0 to 33.33, it is low rating, in between 33.33 to 66.66 it is medium rating and above 66.66 shows the high rating in the statement. As per the ratings among the statements, most of the statements belong to the medium rating. In the case of farming, the people in Alappuzha district are more favour in the view and it is considered as essential for household food security. In almost all the statements, the population in the sample households in Alappuzha district is more favour and response as compared to other districts.
On the appraisal of rural food basket in Kerala and their determinants, the majority of the population is follow the food culture of Kerala and still rice is considered as the main staple food in Kerala. Due to the changes in the cropping pattern, the production of staple food is reduced as compared to the present to the previous situation. But the needs and requirements are increasing with a raise in the population and we need to depend on other states for our daily requirements.

The major food items in the rural food basket include rice, wheat, pulses, cereals, vegetables etc. and there are mainly three determinant factors depends on the accessability of the food items. Income, taste and preferences and price are considered as the three factors for choosing the food articles and the food items can be accessable through the fair prices shops and various public distribution channels especially PDS. Majority of the people in the sample households are daily wage earners and they depend their needs of the food through the PDS and nearby shops. The food items are available in the market but still some of the people in the sample households face the problem of scarcity due to the lack of purchasing power or may be the poor performance of the distribution channels to the downtrodden sections of the society. This lead to the food insecurity in the state. So we need to strengthen the channels of food security and adopt the organic farming methods to increase the productivity and minimize the use of chemicals.