

Chi-Square Analysis of the Preference of Packaged Food on The Basis of Household Income of the Respondents

Deepti Ahuja¹ Dr. Sudhir Lamba²

¹Assistant Professor, Govt. Girls College, Mahendergarh, Haryana

²Research Scholar, Singhania University, Pachheri Bari, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan

INTRODUCTION

Retail Marketing defined as “individuals or groups, acquiring, using and disposing of products, services, ideas or experiences” (Arnould, Price & Zinkha, 2004). There are numbers of different theories explaining Retail Marketing (Statt, 1997; Blackwell, Minrard, and Engel, 2006; Chaudhuri, 2006) and a huge amount of literature currently exists (Grunert 2002; Botonaki, Ploymeros, Tsakorodou, & Mattas, 2006; Friese, Wanke, and Plessner, 2006). There are different number of characteristics, which can impact on Retail Marketing Majority of the respondents in the middle-income segments are in both the categories who do packaged food and who do not do. However in the upper income segment, the preference for doing packaged food is more skewed in comparison to their counterparts. The application of chi-square highlights significant association between the variables

MATERIAL AND METHOD

Chi-square analysis of the preference of packaged food on the basis of household income of the respondents

Income	Do packaged food		Total
	Yes	No	
2-4 lac per annum	45 (8.1)	64 (17.3)	109 (11.8)
4.1-6 lac per annum	150 (27.0)	91 (24.7)	241 (26.1)
6.1-8 lac per annum	158 (28.4)	90 (24.4)	248 (26.8)
8.1-10 lac per annum	78 (14.0)	71 (19.2)	149 (16.1)
Above 10 lac per annum	125 (22.5)	53 (14.4)	178 (19.2)
Total	556 (100.0)	389(100.0)	925(100.0)

Source: Primary Data

Figures in parenthesis show percentages

$\chi^2 = 29.244^{**}$; $p \leq 0.05^{*}$; $p \leq 0.01^{**}$

Table .3 depicts that the majority of the respondents in the middle-income segments are in both the categories who do packaged food and who do not do. However in the upper income segment, the preference for doing packaged food is more skewed in comparison to their counterparts. The application of chi-square highlights significant association between the variables at 1 percent level of confidence.

Table 4: Chi-square analysis of the preference of packaged food on the basis of current dwelling place

Current living place	Do packaged food		Total
	Yes	No	
Gurgaon	200 (36.0)	130 (35.2)	330 (35.7)
Delhi	215 (38.7)	123 (33.3)	338 (36.5)
Noida	38 (6.8)	65 (17.6)	103 (11.1)
Faridabad	103 (18.5)	51 (13.8)	154 (16.6)
Total	556 (100.0)	389(100.0)	925(100.0)

Source: Primary Data

Figures in parenthesis show percentages

$\chi^2 = 27.860^{**}$; $p \leq 0.05^{*}$; $p \leq 0.01^{**}$

Tablet 4.3.4 describes that majority of respondents who live in Delhi and Gurgaon have more preference of packaged food whereas Faridabad and Noida respondents have lesser preference of packaged food. It may be the organized food retailing in Delhi, Gurgaon is very rapid, and all modern food retailers are easily available in these cities in comparison to other cities. The application of chi-square shows significant association between the variables at 1

percent level of confidence.

Table 5: Chi-square analysis of the preference of packaged food on the basis of the origin of the respondents

Family originally hail from	Do packaged food		Total
	Yes	No	
Gurgaon	138 (24.8)	83 (22.5)	221 (23.9)
Delhi	129 (23.2)	85 (23.0)	214 (23.1)
Noida	30 (5.4)	45 (12.2)	75 (8.1)
Faridabad	88 (15.8)	48 (13.0)	136 (14.7)
Any other	171 (30.8)	108 (29.3)	279 (30.2)
Total	556 (100.0)	389(100.0)	925(100.0)

Source: Primary Data

Figures in parenthesis show percentages

$$\chi^2 = 14.514^{**}; p \leq 0.05^*; p \leq 0.01^{**};$$

Table .5 shows a significant relationship in between the choice of packaged food and the place where the respondents originally comes from. The chi-square value is 14.514 and is significant at 1 percent level. The table shows that 29.3 percent of the respondents' families do not originally hail from NCR (i.e. Gurgaon, Delhi, Noida and Faridabad). Further it is interesting to notice that out of 8.1 percent of the respondents from Noida, more than half (12.2 percent) of the respondents do not like to purchase packaged food.

Table 6: Chi-square analysis of the preference of packaged food on the basis of both husband/wife working

Both spouse working	Do packaged food		Total
	Yes	No	
Yes	275 (49.5)	153 (41.5)	428 (46.3)
No	174 (31.3)	142 (38.5)	316 (34.2)
Unmarried	107 (19.2)	74 (20.1)	181 (19.6)
Total	556 (100.0)	389(100.0)	925(100.0)

Source: Primary Data

Figures in parenthesis show percentage

$$\chi^2 = 6.494^*; p \leq 0.05^*; p \leq 0.01^{**}$$

The table 6 depicts that the majority of respondents are both spouse-working couples in both the categories of packaged food doers and non-packaged food doers. Further, the table shows that the majority of both spouse-working couples prefer to do packaged food and it may be shortage of time to prepare meals, convenience and more disposable income at their end. Whereas the respondents where both spouse are not working and those are unmarried, have lesser preference of packaged food. The application of chi-square highlights a significant association between the variables at 5 percent level of confidence.

Table .7: Chi-square analysis of the preference of packaged food on the basis of preferred time for food shopping

Preferred time for food shopping	Do packaged food		Total
	Yes	No	
Morning	80 (14.4)	44 (11.9)	124 (13.4)
Afternoon	14 (2.5)	22 (6.0)	36 (3.9)
Evening	446 (80.2)	297 (80.5)	743 (80.3)
Night	16 (2.9)	06 (1.6)	22 (2.4)
Total	556 (100.0)	389(100.0)	925(100.0)

Source: Primary Data

Figures in parenthesis show percentage

$$\chi^2 = 9.228^*; p \leq 0.05^*; p \leq 0.01^{**}$$

Table.7 compares the shopping time preference of the respondents with their food doing habits. It is gauged from the table that the majority of the respondents are in both the categories prefer to purchase food items in evening who do packaged food and who do not do. However a lesser percentage of respondents (14.4%) who do packaged food also prefer to do food products in morning time and similarly a small percentage of non-packaged food doers (11.9%) also like to do food items at morning time. A meagre percentage of both the categories respondents show their preference for food shopping at afternoon and at night time. The application of chi-square highlights a significant association between the variables at 5 percent level of confidence.

Table.8: Chi-square analysis of the preference of packaged food on the basis of frequency of food shopping

Frequency of food shopping	Do packaged food		Total
	Yes	No	
Daily	139 (25.0)	103 (27.9)	242 (26.2)
Once in a week	218 (39.2)	172 (46.6)	390 (42.2)
Twice in a week	199 (35.8)	94 (25.0)	293 (31.7)
Total	556 (100.0)	389(100.0)	925(100.0)

Source: Primary Data

Figures in parenthesis show percentage

$$\chi^2 = 11.057^{**}; p \leq 0.05^{*}; p \leq 0.01^{**}$$

Table 8 exhibits that the majority of packaged food doers like to do food shopping once and twice in a week. Similarly, the majority of non-packaged food doers like to do food shopping once in a week. And almost similar percentage of respondents from both the categories of doers who do packaged food and non-packaged food doers like to do food shopping on daily basis. It seems packaged food doers purchase these food products quite often because they do not like food storage and they do it as their convenience and need base. The chi-square value has shown the association between the variables at 1 percent level of significance.

Table .9: Chi-square analysis of the preference of packaged food on the basis of money spend on food shopping per month

Monthly food shopping expenditure	Do packaged food		Total
	Yes	No	
Less than 2000	1 (0.2)	11 (3.0)	12 (1.3)
2001-4000	117 (21.0)	145 (39.3)	262 (28.3)
4001-6000	190 (34.2)	135 (36.6)	325 (35.1)
6001-8000	127 (22.8)	29 (7.9)	156 (16.9)
8001-10000	87 (15.6)	35 (9.5)	122 (13.2)
Above 10000	34 (6.1)	14 (3.8)	48 (5.2)
Total	556 (100.0)	389(100.0)	925(100.0)

Source: Primary Data

Figures in parenthesis show percentage

$$\chi^2 = 78.082^{**}; p \leq 0.05^{*}; p \leq 0.01^{**};$$

Table 4.3.9 compares the respondents' monthly food shopping expenditures with their food doing habits. It is observed from the table that the majority of packaged food doers spend money on food shopping in the range of rupees 2001-8000 per month. Whereas non-packaged food doers spend money on monthly food interaction in the range of rupees 2001-6000. In the higher range expenditure, the preference of the respondents is skewed towards doing packaged food in comparison to those who do not do. The chi-square values highlight a significant association between the variables at 1 percent level of confidence.

CONCLUSION

Individual factors are characteristics of the individual. Interests and needs are the primary individual characteristics that influence attention. Interest is a reflection of overall lifestyle as well as result of long-term goals and plans and short-term needs, short-term goals and plans, of course, heavily influenced by the situation. In addition, individuals differ in their ability to attend the information (Maheswaran et al., 1990). This section explains the mean differences of the respondents on their different interest dimensions (table 1 –6) viz. educational information on various topics, source of educational information, respondents' lifestyle and habits, individual interest and food habits, food choice and preference for packaged food, purchase frequency of packaged food categories.

Table 1: Analysis of the respondents on the basis of educational information on various topics related to food habits

Interests in educational information on topics related to :	Do packaged food (556)		Do not do packaged food(369)		t-value	Sig.
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Lawn, gardening, landscaping	2.11	0.673	2.13	0.691	-0.541	0.588
Personal health & fitness	2.61	0.566	2.55	0.610	1.610	0.107
Food topic e.g. nutrition, safe food handling, etc.	2.56	0.557	2.70	0.542	-3.869**	0.000
Parenting, child & youth development	2.35	0.662	2.54	0.654	-4.292**	0.000
Farming, Agri. Business	1.65	0.705	1.65	0.720	-0.061	0.951
Environment topics-soil quality	1.85	0.718	1.80	0.760	0.983	0.325
Household budgeting, finance	2.29	0.698	2.34	0.699	-1.087	0.277
Aging, retirement, elder care	2.16	0.739	2.24	0.715	-1.740	0.082

*Significant at 1% level ; ** Significant at 5% level; ; 1=not interested, 2=somewhat interested, 3=very interested

Source: Primary Data

The table 4.4.1 reveals that on majority of the dimensions, there is no significant difference in the opinion of the respondents of both the categories. However, on the issues such as nutrition, safe food handling, parenting, and youth development, the respondents who do not do packaged food have more stronger views in favour of these items than their counterparts.

Table.2: Analysis of the respondents on the basis of lifestyle and food preference

Lifestyle and food preference:	Do packaged food (556)		Do not do packaged food (369)		t-value	Sig.
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Eat out with family	2.15	0.638	1.94	0.681	4.761**	0.000
Eat fast food	2.00	0.701	1.75	0.717	5.444**	0.000
Invite people over lunch/dinner or get invited	2.00	0.638	1.86	0.652	3.236**	0.001
Do nutrition food	2.38	0.739	2.42	0.729	-0.787	0.431
Do organic food	1.74	0.708	1.73	0.707	0.138	0.889

Table 2 exhibits the mean difference on the basis of respondents' lifestyle and food preference for both the categories of respondents who do packaged food and non-packaged food doers. The packaged food doers ($\bar{X}=2.15$) are frequent to go out with families for having food at various food joints in the society whereas the non-packaged food doers ($\bar{X}=1.94$) are relatively lesser on this front. Moreover, the packaged food doers ($\bar{X}=2.00$) occasionally prefer to eat fast food whereas non-packaged food doers ($\bar{X}=1.75$) show lesser preference on the same. Further the Retail Marketing of packaged food doers ($\bar{X}=2.00$) is stronger as they prefer to invite people over lunch/dinner or get invited by the people, on the other hand, non-packaged food doers ($\bar{X}=1.86$) lack on this dimension than their counterparts. Both the categories of respondents show almost equal preference for doing nutrition and organic food.

Table3: Analysis of the respondents on the basis of Individual interest and food habits

Individual interest and food habits:	Do packaged food (556)		Do not do packaged food (369)		t-value	Sig.
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Family members go for gym	1.51	0.500	1.59	0.491	-2.424*	0.015
Subscribe/follow any cooking magazine/book	1.76	0.421	1.76	0.421	0.004	0.996
Enjoy cooking	1.28	0.453	1.26	0.439	0.918	0.358
Locally grown foods available at the normal shopping places	1.23	0.421	1.29	0.456	-2.227*	0.026
My family and I like to eat different cuisine	1.19	0.400	1.33	0.471	-4.538**	0.000
Believe that as a percent of my income, food costs me less than it did for my grand parents	1.47	0.499	1.58	0.493	-3.337**	0.000
Own current residence	1.18	0.385	1.30	0.460	-4.350**	0.000

*Significant at 1% level ; ** Significant at 5% level; 1=yes, 2=no

Source: Primary Data

Table 3 delineates that on majority of the dimensions, there is significant difference in the opinion of the respondents of both the categories. The table shows that the packaged food doing ($\bar{X}=1.51$) families are more health conscious and visit gymnasium whereas non-packaged food doers (1.59) have lesser interest in this area. As far as concern about the food likings, packaged food doers ($\bar{X}=1.19$) prefer to eat different cuisine with their families and non-packaged food doers ($\bar{X}=1.33$) are comparatively have less interest in this aspect. A majority of packaged food doers admit that locally grown food is available at the normal shopping place in comparison to their counterparts. Further the packaged food doers ($\bar{X}=1.47$) perceived that their current income level have been increased in comparison to cost of food items in the society, on the other hand, non-packaged food doers ($\bar{X}=1.58$) show their strongly disagreement on this aspect. It shows ownership of current residence also plays a significant role in the individual interest and food habits, as the respondents who do packaged food have their own current residents whereas the non-packaged food doers ($\bar{X}=1.30$) reside in rented accommodations. Both the categories of the respondents enjoy cooking and subscribe cooking magazine/book at almost same level.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Agreement on Agriculture, World Trade Organization: The legal Texts, The Results of the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations, Cambridge University Press.
2. Agreement on Government Procurement, World Trade Organization: The legal Texts, The Results
3. Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures, World Trade Organization: The Legal Texts-The Results of the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations, Cambridge University Press.
4. Agreement on Trade- Related Measures, World Trade Organization: The Results of the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations, Cambridge University Press.
5. Agricultural Statistics At A Glance 2005, Directorate of Economics & Statistics (Agricultural Statistics Division) Department of Agriculture & Cooperation, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India.
6. Agriculture Statistics at a Glance, 2002-03: Directorate of Economics & Statistics, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India.
7. Annual Report 2004-05, Government of India, Ministry of Chemical & Fertilizers, Department of Fertilizers, Delhi.
8. Annual Report 2006-07, Government of India, Ministry of Chemical & Fertilizers, Department of Fertilizers, Delhi.
9. Appellate Body Report on Canada-Measures Affecting the Export of Civilian Aircraft, WT/DS70/AB/R 2 August 1999. www.wto.org, accessed on 5-8-2004.
10. Appellate Body Report on Brazil - Export Financing Programme for Aircraft (WT/DS46/AB/R) 2 August 1999, Dispute Settlement Commentary (DSC), WorldTradeLaw.net LLC, accessed on 14.12.2004.
11. Appellate Body Report, United States - Final Countervailing Duty Determination With Respect To Certain Softwood Lumber From Canada,(WT/DS257/AB/R), Dispute Settlement Commentary (DSC), WorldTradeLaw.net LLC, accessed on 15.1.2005.
12. Appellate Body Report on India-Quantitative Restrictions On Imports Of Agricultural, Textile and Industrial Products, WT/DS90/AB/R 23 August 1999, www.wto.org, accessed on 12.7.2004.
13. Appellate Body Report on Canada-Certain Measures Affecting the Automotive Industry,

of the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations, Cambridge University Press.

- WT/DS139/AB/R & WT/DS142/AB/R 31 May 2000, www.wto.org, accessed on 10.7.2004.
14. Appellate Body Report on United States-Imposition of Countervailing Duties On Certain Hot-Rolled Lead and Bismuth Carbon Steel Products Originating In The United Kingdom, WT/DS138/AB/R 10 May 2000, www.wto.org, accessed on 1.7.2004.
15. Appellate Body Report on Canada-Measures Affecting the Importation Of milk and The Exportation Of The Dairy Products –Recourse To Article 21.5 of The DSU by new Zealand and United States, WT/DS103/AB/RW & WT/DS113/AB/RW 3 December 2001, www.wto.org, accessed on 2.7.2004.
16. Appellate Body Report on United States-tax Treatment for “ Foreign Sales Corporations” WT/DS108/AB/RW, 24 February 2000, www.wto.org accessed on 1.7.2004.
17. Appellate Body Report on United States-tax Treatment for “ Foreign Sales Corporations” Recourse To Article 21.5 Of The DSU By The European Communities, WT/DS108/AB/RW, 14 January 2002, www.wto.org accessed on 1.7.2004.
18. Appellate Body Report on United States-Countervailing Duties On certain Corrosion-Resistant Steel Flat Products From Germany, WT/DS213/AB/R 28 November 2002, www.wto.org, accessed on 12.12.2004.
19. Appellate Body Report of EC-banana III. WTO analytical index: SUBSIDIES & COUNTERVAILING MEASURES, Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures, www.wto.org, accessed on 15.1.2005.
20. Appellate Body Report of Indonesia – Autos. WTO analytical index: SUBSIDIES & COUNTERVAILING MEASURES, Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures, www.wto.org, accessed on 15.1.2005.
21. Appellate Body Report, United States - Final Countervailing Duty Determination With Respect To Certain Softwood Lumber From Canada,(WT/DS257/AB/R), Dispute Settlement Commentary (DSC), WorldTradeLaw.net LLC, accessed on 15.1.2005.
22. Awasthi U.S.: Impact Of The Policy On The Health Of Urea Industry, ‘Fertilizers And Agriculture’ F.A.I. Seminar December 2002, New Delhi.
23. Banga M.G, “Assessment of Subsidy Loss”, Joint Commissioner, Department of Fertilizers, Ministry of Chemical & Fertilizers, Government of India, 2004.
24. Bhatt, D.K. Impact of New Policy Regime Especially Movement Decontrol On Fertilizer Marketing, presented in FAI Seminar, 4-6 December, 2003, New Delhi.
25. Carney D, Editor, ODI Series, ‘Fertilizer Supply’, Department for International Development, Rural Livelihoods Department, November 1997.
26. Chandhoke N. Priyadarshi P, “Electoral Politics in Post-Conflict Societies: Case of Haryana”, Economic and Political Weekly, March 4-10, 2006.
27. Chand R, “Emerging Crisis in Haryana Agriculture: Severity and Options for Future”, Economic and Political Weekly, Special Issue on Agriculture, March 27, 1999.
28. Chandra S, “Fertilizer Demand –Supply Management- A Holistic View”, Fertilizer News, July 2002, Vol.46 (7).
29. Chandra S, “Dynamics of New Pricing Policy for Urea in WTO perspective”, Fertilizer Marketing News, June 2003, No.6.
30. Chandra S, “Reforming the Land Reform” Business Standrad, Kolcatta, 25th March 2005.
31. Chandra S. & Sinha N, “Fertilizer Subsidy-A WTO Compatible Approach” Indian fertilizer Journal, July 2007, FAI, New Delhi.
32. ‘Concession Scheme’ for extending financial supports to decontrolled fertilizers P&K on sale w.e.f. 1.10.2000. -Annual Report 2003-04, GOI, DOF, Ministry of Chemical and Fertilizers.
33. Cuppett B. S, Case Study on WTO Dispute Settlement: European Communities-Hormones, Complaint by the United States, 2001.
34. Desai B. H, Theoretical And Policy Making Contributions of Research on Agricultural Economics: A Success or Failure or Neither? Indian Economy in the New Millennium, Himalayan Publishing House, Mumbai, 1999.
35. DOF Circular No. 12012/3/2006-FPP (II-8th March

- 2007), Department of Fertilizers, Ministry of Chemical & Fertilizers, Government of India, New Delhi.
36. Dubey M, "An Unequal Treaty: World Trading Order After GATT" New Age International Limited Publishers, New Delhi, 1999.
37. Erdogan G. F. U., "Turkish Membership in the European Union: Challenges and opportunities for the Agriculture Sector", International Trade and Finance Association 15th International Conference, Ankara University, School of Agriculture, Department of Agricultural Economics, 18 May 2005, (<http://services.bepress.com/itfa/15th/art11>), accessed 1.7.2006.
38. Essential commodities Act, 1955, The Fertilizer Association of India, New Delhi.
39. Fertilizer (Control) order 1985, Gazette Notification orders No. GSR 758 (E) dated 25th September 1985. The Fertilizer Association of India, New Delhi.
40. Fertilizer (Movement control) order, 1973 Gazette Notification No. SRO 249(E) dated 25th April 1973, The Fertilizer Association of India, New Delhi.
7. Gazettes Notification No. S.O.642 (E) dated 25.08.1992 regarding decontrol of potassic and phosphoric fertilizers, issued by the Department of Agriculture & Co-operation, Government of India.
8. General Agreement on Tariff and Trade 1994, The World Trade organization. The legal Texts, The Results of the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations. Cambridge University press.
9. Ghuman, "Implications of WTO regime: Challenges before Haryana Agriculture", The Tribune, Chandigarh, June 19, 2000.
10. Goyal A. & Mohd. N, -WTO in the new Millennium, 5th Edition: September 2001, Academy of Business Studies, Sheeltara House, New Delhi.
11. Government of India, Ministry of Chemical & Fertilizers, Department of Fertilizers, letter No.12019/5/98-FPP dated January 30, 2003.
12. Gupta U, "Fertilizer Subsidy: The Inevitable Monster: Concept Agrotech Consultants Limited, New Delhi publication.1999.
13. Hardter R.K, Salz G.G. and Kali K. International Potash Institute (IPI), Basel, Switzerland, "BALACNCED FERTILIZATION AND CROP QUALITY", IFA Agricultural Conference On Managing Plant Nutrient, 29 June-2 July 1999, Barcelona, Spain.
14. Hussain A, "Poverty, Growth and Governance in South Asia", published as a Chapter in the book: V.A. Panandiker (ed.): Problems of Governance in South Asia, Konark, New Delhi, 2000.
15. Hussain A, Agriculture Growth and Employment in Pakistan's Rural Sector: Policies for Institutional Change: ILO, Mimeo, March 1999.
16. Landes M, Govindan A, "Indian Agriculture: Status and Reform Potential" approved by Chad R. Russell, U. S. Embassy, New Delhi, a voluntary Report-public distribution, dated 8/19/2004.GAIN Report Number: IN4089.
17. Letter No. 4-20/78-FDO-1 dated 1.1.1979-E.equated Freight, Department Of Agriculture and Cooperation, Government Of India.
18. Koul. A.K. - The Legal Regime of Subsidies and Countervailing Measures in World Trade Organization (WTO)- Delhi Law Review-Volume XXI: 1999.

REFERENCES

1. Fertilizer (Movement control) order, 1973 Gazette Notification No. SRO 249(E) dated 25th April 1973, The Fertilizer Association of India, New Delhi.
2. Fertilizer Statistics 2005-06, Fertilizer Association Of India (FAI), New Delhi.
3. Fertilizers Situation- 'India-Policy Changes In the Hydrocarbon Sector', Fertilizers News December 2001, F.A.I., New Delhi.
4. FICC/CE/72-2003/164 dated 28-5-2003. Notification issued by the FICC, Department of Fertilizers, GOI, New Delhi.
5. Final Act Embodying The Result Of The Uruguay Round Of Multilateral Trade Negotiations, The legal Texts, The Results of the Uruguay Round Of Multilateral Trade Negotiations, Cambridge University press.
6. Gazette Notification No. S.O. 477 (E), Ministry of Industry, Department of Industrial Development dated 24th July 1991.
7. Gazettes Notification No. S.O.642 (E) dated 25.08.1992 regarding decontrol of potassic and phosphoric fertilizers, issued by the Department of Agriculture & Co-operation, Government of India.
8. General Agreement on Tariff and Trade 1994, The World Trade organization. The legal Texts, The Results of the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations. Cambridge University press.
9. Ghuman, "Implications of WTO regime: Challenges before Haryana Agriculture", The Tribune, Chandigarh, June 19, 2000.
10. Goyal A. & Mohd. N, -WTO in the new Millennium, 5th Edition: September 2001, Academy of Business Studies, Sheeltara House, New Delhi.
11. Government of India, Ministry of Chemical & Fertilizers, Department of Fertilizers, letter No.12019/5/98-FPP dated January 30, 2003.
12. Gupta U, "Fertilizer Subsidy: The Inevitable Monster: Concept Agrotech Consultants Limited, New Delhi publication.1999.
13. Hardter R.K, Salz G.G. and Kali K. International Potash Institute (IPI), Basel, Switzerland, "BALACNCED FERTILIZATION AND CROP QUALITY", IFA Agricultural Conference On Managing Plant Nutrient, 29 June-2 July 1999, Barcelona, Spain.
14. Hussain A, "Poverty, Growth and Governance in South Asia", published as a Chapter in the book: V.A. Panandiker (ed.): Problems of Governance in South Asia, Konark, New Delhi, 2000.
15. Hussain A, Agriculture Growth and Employment in Pakistan's Rural Sector: Policies for Institutional Change: ILO, Mimeo, March 1999.
16. Landes M, Govindan A, "Indian Agriculture: Status and Reform Potential" approved by Chad R. Russell, U. S. Embassy, New Delhi, a voluntary Report-public distribution, dated 8/19/2004.GAIN Report Number: IN4089.
17. Letter No. 4-20/78-FDO-1 dated 1.1.1979-E.equated Freight, Department Of Agriculture and Cooperation, Government Of India.
18. Koul. A.K. - The Legal Regime of Subsidies and Countervailing Measures in World Trade Organization (WTO)- Delhi Law Review-Volume XXI: 1999.

19. Mankiw N.G, "Principles of Economics, Second Edition, Thomson South –Western.2000.
20. Markesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade organization. The legal Texts, The Results of the Uruguay Round Of Multilateral Trade Negotiations, Cambridge University press.
21. Murshid K.A.S, Research Director, BIDS, "Implication of Agricultural policy Reforms on Rural Food Security and Poverty". 2004.
22. Alawi, h. (1986). Saudi Arabia: making sense of self-service. *International Society Review*, 3(1), 21-38.
23. Anderson Jr., T.W., & Golden, L.L. (1984). Lifestyle and psychographics: a critical review and recommendation. *Advances in Social Research*, 11, 405-11.
24. Ares, G., & Gambaro, A. (2007). Influence of gender, age and motives underlying food choice on perceived healthiness and willingness to try functional foods. *Appetite*, 49, 148-58.
25. Asp, E.H. (1999). Factors affecting food decisions made by individual Human. *Food Policy*, 24, 287-94.
26. Auh, S., & Johnson, M.D. (2005). Compatibility effects in evaluations of satisfaction and loyalty. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 26, 25-57.
27. Aylott, R. and Mitchell, V. (1999). An exploratory study of grocery shopping stressors. *British Food Journal*, 101(9), 683-700.
28. Bagozzi, R.P, Gopinath, M., & Prashant, U.N. (1999). The role of emotions in society. *Journal of the Academy of Society*, 27(2), 184-206.
29. Balabanis, G., & Diamantopoulos, A. (2004). Domestic country bias, country-of-origin effects, and Social ethnocentrism: a multidimensional unfolding approach. *Journal of Academy of Society Science*, 32(1), 80-95.
30. Balabanis, G., Muller, R., & Melewar, T.C. (2000). The human values' lenses of country of origin images. *International Society Review*, 19(6), 582-610.
31. Ball, D., Coelho, P.S., & Machas, A. (2004). The role of communication and trust in explaining customer loyalty: an extension to the ECSI model. *European Journal of Society*, 38(9/10), 1272-93.
32. Baltas, G. and Papastathopoulou, P. (2003). Shopper characteristics, product and store choice criteria: a survey in the Greek grocery sector. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 31(10), 498-507.
33. Barker, M.E., Tandy, M., & Stookey, J.D. (1999). How are Human of low-fat and high-fat diets perceived by those with lower and higher fat intake? *Appetite*, 33(3), 309-317.
34. Barnett, M., and Breakwell, G.M. (2001). Risk perceptions and experience: Hazard personality profiles and individual differences. *Risk Analysis*, 21(1), 171-177.
35. Bawa, K. and Ghosh, A. (1999). A model of household grocery shopping behaviour. *Society Letters*, 10(2), 149-60.
36. Bennett, R., & Rundle-Thiele, S. (2004). Customer satisfaction should not be the only goal. *Journal of Service Society*, 18(6/7), 514-23.
37. Bergadaa. M.M. (1990). The role of time in the action of the Social. *Journal of Social Research*, 17, 289-301.
38. Berry, L. (1979). The time doing Social. *Journal of Retailing*, 55(4), 58-69.,
39. Bhaskaran, S., & Hardley, F. (2002). Doers beliefs, attitude and behaviour: foods with therapeutic claims. *The Journal of Social Society*, 19, 591-606.
40. Bilkey, W.J. & Nes, E. (1982). Country-of-origin effects on products evaluations. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 13, 88-99.
41. Bloch, P.H. (1981). An exploratio into the scaling of Human, involvement with a product class. *Advances in Social Research*, 8, 61-65.
42. Bogue, J., Delahunty, C., & Kelleher, C. (1999). Society-oriented new product development: Social's perceptions of diet and health and their consumption of reduced-fat and reduced-calorie foods. *Agribusiness Discussion Paper 24*, National University of Ireland.
43. Botonaki, A., Polymeros, K., Tsakiridou, E. and Mattas, k. (2006). The role of food quality certification on Human' food choices. *British Food Journal*, 108(2), 77.

44. Brokaw, S. & Lakshman, C. (1995). Cross-cultural Social research in India : a review and analysis. *Journal of International Social Society*, 7(3), 53-80.
45. Brown, S.L., & Eisenhardt, K.M. (1995). Product development: Past research, present findings, and future directions. *The Academy of Management review*, 20(2), 343-379.
46. Bruhn, M., & Grebitus, C. (2004). Food quality from a Social's perspective. Working Paper 06/WP423, University of Kiel.
47. Brunso, K., Fjord, T.A., & Grunert, K.G. (2002). Consumers' food choice and quality perception. Working Paper 77, Aarhus School of Business.
48. Brunso, K., & Grunert, K.G. (1995). Development and testing of a cross-culturally valid instrument: food-related life style. *Advances in Social Research*, 22(22), 475-480.
49. Brunso, K., Grunert, K.G., & Johansen, L.B. (1995). The comparison of food-related life-styles across countries, *Appetite*, 24, 286-87.
50. Brunso, K., Scholderer, J., & Grunert, K.G. (2004). Closing the gap between values and behaviour – a means-end theory of lifestyle. *Journal of Business Research*, 57, 665-670.
51. Business Credit (2006). India tops annual list of most attractive countries for international retail expansion. *Business Credit*, 107(7), 72.
52. Brunso, k., & Grunert, K.G. (2007). Social attitude measures and food product development. In H. MacFie (Ed.). *Social-led food product development*, Cambridge: Woodhead Publishing Lt., 197-222.
53. Candel, M.J.J.M. (2001). 'Human' convenience orientation towards meal preparatio: conceptualization and measurement. *Appetite*, 36(1), 15-28.
54. Carpenter, J.M. and Moore, M. (2006). Social demographics, store attributes, and retail format choice in the US grocery society. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 34(6), 434-52.
55. Census Report, 2001.
56. CII Report (2006). Retail Society Analysis, Confederatio of Indian Industry, N.Delhi, March, 30-45.
57. Connors, M., Bisogni, C.A., Sobal, J., & Devine, C.M. (2001). Managing values in personal food systems. *Appetite*, 36(3), 189-200.
58. Cooper, R.G., & Kleinschmidt, E.J. (1987). New products: What separates winners from losers? *The Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 4(3), 169-184.
59. Celsi, R.L., & Olson, J.C. (1988). The role of involvement in attention and comprehension processes. *Journal of Social Research*, 15(2), 210-224.
60. Chambers, S., Lobb, A., Butler, L.T., and Traill, W.B. (2008). The influence of age and gender on food choice: a focus group exploratio. *International Journal of Social Studies*, 32, 356.
61. Chandrashekar, R., & Grewal, D. (2003). Assimilation of advertised reference prices: the moderating role of involvement. *Journal of Retailing*, 79(1), 53-62.
62. Chengappa, P.G., Lalith, A., Prasanna, R.K.K., Vijayalakshmi, D., Reddy, B.M.R., & Joshi, P.K. (2005). Emergence of organized retail chains in India during post liberalization era, paper presented at the South Asia Regional Conference of International Association of Agricultural Economists, Globalization of Agriculture in South Asia, Hyderabad.
63. Chetthamrongchai, P. and Davies, G. (2000). Segmenting the society for food shoppers using attitudes to shopping and to time. *British Food Journal*, 102(2), 81-101.
64. Choo, H.J., Chung, J.E., & Pysarchik, D.T. (2004). Antecedents to new food product interaction behaviour among innovator groups in India. *European Journal of Society*, 38(5/6), 608-25.
65. Coulson, N.S. (2000). An application of the stages of change model to Social use of food labels. *British Food journal*, 102(9), 661-68.
66. Darian, J.C. and Cohen, J. (1995). Segmenting by Social time shortage. *Journal of Social Society*, 12(1), 32-44.
67. De Boer, M., McCarthy, M., Cowan, C., & Ryan, I. (2004). The influence of lifestyle characteristics and beliefs about convenience food on the demand

for convenience foods in Irish society. Food Quality and Preference, 15, 155-165.

68. De Carlos, P., Garcia, M., De Felipe, I., Briz, J., & Morais, F. (2005). Analysis of Social perceptions on quality and food safety in the Spanish beef society: a future application in new product development. Presented at the 11th Congress of the European Association of Agricultural Economists, Copenhagen, Denmark.