WWW.IJRPR.COM

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

A Study on Quality of Life among Street Vendors in Hyderabad City

[1]Naishtika Krishna Bommakanti, [2]Dr Sowmya Kethi Reddi

[1]MBA, School of Management Studies, Chaitanya Bharathi Institute of Technology, Hyderabad, India, Email: naishtika888@gmail.com, Ph: 9959503459

[2]Assistant Professor, School of Management Studies, Chaitanya Bharathi Institute of Technology, Hyderabad, India, Email: ksowmya_sms@cbit.ac.in, Ph: 9642802757.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.5.0524.1457

ABSTRACT:

This study investigated the socio-economic conditions and quality of life among street vendors in Hyderabad City, focusing on demographics, socio-economic characteristics. It aims to assess their quality of life and analyse the impact of various factors on their overall well-being. Using a mixed-methods approach, data was collected through structured interviews with 100 respondents from diverse parts of Hyderabad, employing the WHOQOL-BREF instrument for measurement. Quantitative analysis techniques, including descriptive statistics, t-tests, ANOVA, and correlation analysis, were used to examine the data. Key findings reveal significant disparities in quality of life, influenced by housing tenure and educational attainment. Homeowners report higher quality of life scores compared to renters, and higher education levels correlate with improved well-being. While no significant gender differences were found in overall quality of life, social relationships are notably stronger among female respondents. Significant differences were observed in physical health, psychological health, and environmental factors across different living areas, emphasizing the role of stable housing and education in enhancing quality of life. The study concludes that a slight majority of street vendors perceive their quality of life as low, highlighting the need for policy reforms and targeted interventions. Recommendations include comprehensive health initiatives, accessible mental health services, improved living and working conditions, affordable housing, and educational programs. Strengthening social support networks and providing legal assistance are also critical to improving the socio-economic integration and overall quality of life of street vendors. These insights can guide policymakers and stakeholders in developing strategies to address the unique challenges faced by street vendors in Hyderabad.

Key words: Quality of life, street vendors, socio-economic conditions.

1. Introduction

India, positioned as one of the developing nations globally and ranking second in population, faces challenges in providing employment opportunities for its populace. Consequently, many individuals migrate from rural to urban areas in search of livelihood opportunities. Urban centers offer specialized services and employment prospects, attracting skilled individuals who aspire for white-collar jobs. However, both literate and illiterate individuals often resort to self-employment avenues, including participation in informal sectors, to sustain themselves. This paper seeks to delve into the study of street vendors operating within these informal sectors.

Informal or unorganized sectors in India: The term "informal sector," introduced by W. Arthur Lewis, refers to the employment dynamics in developing countries. It describes a group of people who, due to the dominance of modern industrial sectors, find themselves excluded from mainstream trading activities.

The term is also applicable in delineating and recording types of shelter or living setups that are likewise unauthorized, unregulated, or lacking state protection. 'Informal economy' is progressively supplanting 'informal sector' as the favored term for denoting this kind of activity.

Introduction to Street Vendors: In Indian urban areas, the informal sector plays a crucial role in sustaining livelihoods. Economic hardship and limited job opportunities in rural regions push individuals toward urban hubs. Lacking education and specialized skills, they are unable to secure well-paying positions in the formal job market, thus resorting to informal employment for sustenance. Consequently, the informal sector has burgeoned across numerous cities. Unlike formal sectors, informal businesses typically require minimal financial investment to commence operations. (Sharit K., Bhowmik2, 1998).

About Hyderabad: Hyderabad, the capital city of Telangana in southern India, boasts a vibrant street vending culture that contributes significantly to its urban landscape and economy.

- **Historical Significance**: Street vending has been an integral part of Hyderabad's socio-economic fabric for decades, with roots tracing back to its rich history and cultural heritage.

- **Urban Dynamics**: Like many other Indian cities, Hyderabad grapples with rapid urbanization, leading to a surge in informal sector activities, including street vending. The city's growing population, coupled with limited formal employment opportunities, has propelled individuals to engage in street vending as a means of livelihood.
- **Geographical Distribution:** Street vendors can be found throughout Hyderabad, catering to the diverse needs of its residents and visitors. From bustling marketplaces in the Old City, such as Laad Bazaar and Moazzam Jahi Market, to the bustling streets around commercial hubs like Abids and Begumpet, vendors operate in various locations across the city.
- **Products and Services**: Street vendors in Hyderabad offer a wide range of products and services, including fresh produce, street food delicacies like Hyderabadi biryani and kebabs, clothing, accessories, handicrafts, and more. These offerings not only cater to local demands but also attract tourists, adding to the city's cultural appeal.
- **Challenges and Regulations**: Despite their economic contributions, street vendors in Hyderabad face numerous challenges, including lack of formal recognition, harassment by authorities, competition with established businesses, and limited access to basic amenities like sanitation facilities and waste management. Efforts have been made by the government to regulate street vending through policies like the Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood and Regulation of Street Vending) Act, 2014, aimed at balancing the interests of vendors, urban planners, and residents.
- **Community Dynamics**: Street vending in Hyderabad fosters a sense of community among vendors, who often form associations or cooperatives to collectively address common issues, advocate for their rights, and share resources and information.
- **Economic Impact**: Street vending significantly contributes to Hyderabad's informal economy, providing employment opportunities to a large segment of the population, particularly those from marginalized communities. It also serves as a crucial source of affordable goods and services for both residents and tourists, contributing to the city's overall economic vitality.

Definition of Street Vendors: According to the National Policy on Urban Street Vendors by the Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation, a street vendor is broadly described as an individual who sells goods or services to the public without a permanent built structure, instead utilizing either a temporary static setup or a mobile stall (commonly known as a head load). These vendors can either remain stationary by occupying spaces on pavements or other public/private areas, or they may be mobile, transporting their merchandise via push carts, cycles, baskets on their heads, or even selling while moving, such as on buses. The policy encompasses various terms used locally or regionally to refer to street vendors, including hawker, pheriwalla, rehri-patri walla, footpath dukandars, sidewalk traders, among others.

The First Indian National Commission on Labor (1966-69) defined the 'unorganized sector workforce' as individuals who have not been able to organize themselves due to various constraints such as the casual nature of employment, lack of education and awareness, and the small and dispersed nature of their work establishments.

Working Pattern of the Street Vendors:

1. **Operating Hours:** Street vendors in Hyderabad often start their day early in the morning, setting up their stalls or carts before the rush hour begins. Depending on their location and target market, they may operate throughout the day, with peak business hours during lunchtime and in the evening.
2. **Seasonal Variations**: The working patterns of street vendors may vary seasonally. For instance, during festivals or special events, vendors may extend their operating hours to cater to increased foot traffic and demand for their products. Similarly, adverse weather conditions such as heavy rain or extreme heat may affect their working hours and sales.
3. **Location Dynamics**: The location of street vendors plays a significant role in determining their working patterns. Vendors situated near commercial areas, educational institutions, or transportation hubs may experience higher customer flow and longer operating hours compared to those in residential neighbourhood’s or less frequented areas.
4. **Product Availability**: Some street vendors in Hyderabad may specialize in specific products or cuisines that require preparation time or specific ingredients. As a result, their working hours may be influenced by factors such as sourcing fresh ingredients, cooking time, and the availability of certain items from wholesalers or markets.
5. **Competition and Collaboration**: Street vendors often collaborate or compete with nearby vendors, influencing their working patterns. For instance, vendors selling similar products may coordinate their operating hours to avoid direct competition, while others may strategically adjust their schedules to attract customers during off-peak hours.
6. **Regulatory Framework**: Government regulations and policies regarding street vending may also impact the working patterns of vendors in Hyderabad. Compliance with licensing requirements, designated vending zones, and restrictions on operating hours enforced by local authorities can influence when and where vendors are allowed to conduct their business.
7. **Adaptation to Consumer Behaviour:** Street vendors are often agile in responding to changes in consumer preferences and behaviour. They may adjust their working patterns based on observed trends, such as increased demand for certain products during specific times of the day or week.

Problems Faced by Street Vendors:

1. **Lack of Legal Recognition**: Street vendors often operate in a legal gray area, with many cities lacking clear regulations or policies governing their activities. This leaves vendors vulnerable to harassment, eviction, and confiscation of their goods by authorities.
2. **Harassment and Extortion**: Street vendors frequently encounter harassment from law enforcement officials, local authorities, or organized gangs who demand bribes or protection money in exchange for allowing them to continue their business activities. This extortion not only adds to their operating costs but also creates a sense of insecurity and fear among vendors.
3. **Limited Access to Public Spaces:** Street vendors face challenges in securing suitable vending locations, as public spaces are often overcrowded or allocated to other uses. Competition for space can lead to conflicts among vendors or with established businesses, further exacerbating their precarious situation.
4. **Lack of Infrastructure**: Street vendors typically operate without access to basic amenities such as clean water, sanitation facilities, and waste management services. This not only affects their own health and hygiene but also contributes to environmental degradation and public health concerns.
5. **Financial Instability**: Street vending is often characterized by irregular income and financial insecurity. Vendors may struggle to earn a sufficient income to support themselves and their families, particularly during periods of low demand or adverse weather conditions.
6. **Limited Access to Credit and Insurance:** Street vendors have limited access to formal financial services such as credit and insurance, making it difficult for them to invest in their businesses, expand their operations, or cope with unexpected losses or emergencies.
7. **Social Stigma**: Street vendors are sometimes subject to social stigma and discrimination, perceived as occupying public spaces unlawfully or engaging in illegitimate forms of livelihood. This can affect their self-esteem and sense of belonging in society.
8. **Health and Safety Risks**: Street vendors are exposed to various health and safety risks associated with their work environment, including exposure to extreme weather conditions, traffic accidents, and communicable diseases. Limited access to healthcare services exacerbates these risks.
9. **Lack of Representation**: Street vendors often lack formal representation or collective bargaining power to advocate for their rights and interests. This leaves them vulnerable to exploitation and marginalization by more powerful stakeholders, including government agencies, property developers, and business associations.

Quality of Life: The quality of life is a multidimensional concept that encompasses various factors and aspects related to an individual's overall well-being and satisfaction with their life circumstances. It goes beyond merely measuring material wealth or economic prosperity and includes subjective experiences, social relationships, physical and mental health, and environmental conditions. In essence, quality of life reflects the extent to which individuals are able to lead fulfilling, meaningful, and satisfying lives according to their own values, preferences, and aspirations.

2. Methodology

2.1 Research problem:

The informal sector holds significant sway within the global trade landscape. Street vendors, due to their undeveloped socio-economic status, can find productivity and potentially improve their quality of life through their occupation. Various factors, including social, ethical, legal, and economic considerations, play pivotal roles in enhancing the prospects of street vendors. The current research delves into the multifaceted aspects of street vendors' socio-economic circumstances and their quality of life, particularly focusing in Hyderabad.

2.2 Objectives of the study:

i) To examine the demographics and socio-economic factors of street vendors in Hyderabad. ii)To assess the quality of life of street vendors. iii)To examine the impact of various demographic and socioeconomic factors on the overall quality of life of respondents. iv)To analyse the dimensions of quality of life of street vendors.

2.3 Hypothesis:

i)There is significant difference between the gender of respondents and their overall quality of life.

ii)There is significant difference between the housing status of respondents and their overall quality of life.

iii) There is significant difference between the educational qualifications of respondents and their overall quality of life.

iv)There is significant disparity between the living areas of respondents and their overall quality of life. v)Significant variation does not exist between the types of housing of respondents and their overall quality of life.

vi) There is notable difference between the sales areas of respondents and their overall quality of life.

2.4 Need for the study:

Street vendors often belong to marginalized and economically disadvantaged communities. Studying their quality of life is essential to understand their living conditions, challenges, and needs. Street vending is a significant component of the urban informal economy. Investigating the quality of life of street vendors sheds light on the informal sector's contribution to the city's economy and social fabric.

2.5 Sample size and profile of the sample:

Convenient sampling method is used to select 100 respondents for the present study to collect data, for analysis and further investigation. The respondents in this research are hawkers, pheriwallas, vegetable sellers, sidewalk traders, etc. persons from different parts of Hyderabad (Charminar, Koti sultan Bazar, Begum bazaar, Ameerpet, Abids, MG road (Secunderabad), Madhapur and Hitech city, Gachibowli, Kukatpally, Jubilee hills and Banjara hills)

2.6 Tools for analysis:

The study employs various quantitative analysis techniques such as descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation) and inferential statistics (t-test, ANOVA, and correlation analysis). These statistical tests are used to analyze demographics, socio-economic variables and the relationship between different variables (quality of life dimensions) and to identify significant associations or differences.

3. Results and Interpretation

3.1 Demographics and Socio-Economic Factors Summary

Table 1: Frequency Distribution of Demographics and socio-economic factors of Respondents

Variables	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
1.Age in year		
18-28	42	42
29-38	38	38
39-48	15	15
49-58	5	5
2.Sex		
Male	50	50
Female	50	50
3.Education		
HSC	6	6
SSLC	14	14
Above 5th	42	42
Below 5th	38	38
4.Religion		
Hindu	54	54
Muslim	10	10
Christian	36	36

5.Community		
FC	7	7
BC	34	34
OBC	33	33
SC	20	20
ST	6	6
6.Marital status		
Married	53	53
Unmarried	37	37
Divorce	6	6
Separate	4	4
7.Type of Family		
Single	68	68
Joint	32	32
8.Nativity		
Rural	42	42
Urban	35	35
Semi-Urban	23	23
9.Type of House		
Hut	5	5
Tin	29	29
Concrete	66	66
10.House Status		
Own	19	19
Rent	81	81
11.Monthly		
Income (Rs)		
Less than 7000	48	48
7000-10000	36	36
10001 and above	16	16
12.Monthly		
Expenditure (Rs)		

Less than 5000	50	50
5001 to 8000	32	32
8001 and above	12	12
13.Monthly		
Saving (Rs)		
Less than 2000	38	38
2001- 4000	51	51
4001 and above	11	11
14.Type of Goods		
Vegetables	27	27
Fruits	22	22
Nuts	6	6
Steel	4	4
Plastic	11	11
Others	30	30
15.Sales pattern		
Sitting	39	39
Bicycle	20	20
Trolley	24	24
Walk	17	17
16.Sales Area		
Public places	53	53
Road Side	40	40
Door to door	7	7

The demographic and socio-economic data of the respondents reveal several key characteristics. The age distribution is predominantly younger, with 42% between 18-28 years and 38% between 29-38 years. Both sexes are equally represented, with 50% male and 50% female. Education levels vary, with 42% having education above the 5th grade, 38% below the 5th grade, 14% with SSLC, and 6% with HSC. In terms of religion, 54% are Hindu, 36% Christian, and 10% Muslim. Community distribution includes 34% BC, 33% OBC, 20% SC, 7% FC, and 6% ST. Marital status indicates that 53% are married, 37% unmarried, 6% divorced, and 4% separated. A majority live in single-family homes (68%), while 32% live in joint families. Nativity is primarily rural (42%), followed by urban (35%) and semi-urban (23%). Housing types show 66% live in concrete houses, 29% in tin houses, and 5% in huts. Most respondents rent their homes (81%), while 19% own them.

Regarding financial aspects, 48% have a monthly income less than Rs 7000, 36% between Rs 7000-10000, and 16% above Rs 10001. Monthly expenditures are less than Rs 5000 for 50%, between Rs 5001-8000 for 32%, and above Rs 8001 for 12%. Savings are less than Rs 2000 for 38%, Rs 2001-4000 for 51%, and above Rs 4001 for 11%. In terms of goods, 27% primarily deal in vegetables, 22% in fruits, 11% in plastic, 6% in nuts, 4% in steel, and 30% in other goods. Sales patterns show 39% sell by sitting, 20% using bicycles, 24% with trolleys, and 17% by walking. Finally, sales areas

include public places (53%), roadside (40%), and door-to-door (7%). This data suggests a young, equally gender-represented population with diverse education levels, predominantly rural and single-family living, with significant income from small-scale, varied goods sales in public spaces.

3.2 Assessing Quality of Life

Table 2: Distribution of Respondents by their Dimension of overall Quality of Life to determine overall quality of life

S. No	Dimensions	Percentage of respondents
1	**Physical Health**	
	Low	46.85
	High	43.4
	Neutral	10
2	**Psychological Health**	
	Low	62.16
	High	10.33
	Neutral	27.5
3	**Social Relationships**	
	Low	25
	High	58
	Neutral	17
4	**Environment Factor**	
	Low	40
	High	32.88
	Neutral	27.13
5	**Overall quality of life**	
	Low	43.5
	High	36.15
	Neutral	20.4

The table provide a detailed distribution of respondents' perceptions of their overall quality of life across various dimensions. For Physical Health, 46.85% rated it as low, while 43.4% rated it high. Psychological Health had the highest percentage of low ratings at 62.16%, with only 10.33% rating it high. Social Relationships showed a more favourable distribution, with 58% rating it high and 25% low. The Environment Factor saw 40% of respondents rating it low and 32.88% high. Overall, 43.5% of respondents rated their overall quality of life as low, 36.15% as high, and 20.4% remained neutral, indicating significant variability in perceived well-being among the sample.

3.3 Examining the Impact of Various Demographic and Socioeconomic Factors on the Overall Quality of Life of Respondents.

Gender and Quality of Life: Determined whether there is a significant difference in the overall quality of life between male and female respondents.

Table 3: T- test between the Male and Female respondents with regard to the various dimensions of their overall Quality of Life

S. No	Sex	Respondents (n:100)		
		Mean	**S. D**	**Statistical Inference**
1	**Physical Health**			t=1.9
	Male	59.5	10.2	df=98
	Female	55.3	11.8	P (0.060)>0.05
				Not Significant
2	**Psychological Health**			t=1.60
	Male	49.7	14.5	df=98
	Female	45.1	14.2	P (0.113)>0.05
				Not Significant
3	**Social Relationship**			t= -2.82
	Male	64.8	9.1	df=98
	Female	69.7	8.3	P (0.006) <0.05
				Significant
4	**Environmental Factor**			t= -1.85
	Male	54.6	10.7	df=98
	Female	58.4	9.8	P (0.067)>0.05
				Not Significant
5	**Overall Quality of life**			t=0.011
	Male	57.15	11.31	df=98
	Female	57.125	11.24	P (0.991)>0.05
				Not Significant

The table presents statistical comparisons between male and female respondents across various aspects of well-being, including physical health, psychological health, social relationships, environmental factors, and overall quality of life. For physical health, while males have a slightly higher mean score compared to females (59.5 vs. 55.3), the difference is not statistically significant ($p = 0.060 > 0.05$). Similarly, there are no significant differences between males and females in terms of psychological health, environmental factors, and overall quality of life, as indicated by p-values greater than 0.05. However, significant differences are observed in social relationships, where females report higher mean scores compared to males (69.7 vs. 64.8), with a p-value of 0.006, indicating statistical significance. These findings suggest that while there are no significant gender differences in most aspects of well-being, social relationships appear to be significantly stronger among female respondents compared to males.

i. **Housing Status and Quality of Life**: Assessed whether the housing status of respondents (owning, renting) significantly affects their overall quality of life.

Table 4: T-test between the respondents' House Status with regard to the various dimensions of their overall Quality of Life

S. No	House Status	Respondents (n:100)		
		Mean	**S. D**	**Statistical Inference**
1	**Physical Health**			t=-3.41
	Own	61.4	10.2	df=98
	Rent	52.3	11.5	P (0.001) <0.05

				Significant
2	**Psychological Health**			t=-2.97
	Own	56.8	11.1	df=98
	Rent	48.7	12.3	P (0.004) <0.0 5
				Significant
3	**Social Relationship**			t=-2.59
	Own	68.2	8.7	df=98
	Rent	62.5	9.4	P (0.011) <0.05
				Significant
4	**Environment**			t= -2.55
	Own	60.1	9.9	df=98
	Rent	53.6	10.8	P (0.012) <0.05
				Significant
5	**Overall Quality of Life**			t= -3.09
	Own	62.3	10.4	df=98
	Rent	54.2	11.6	P (0.003) <0.05
				Significant

The results of the t-tests conducted to compare the overall quality of life dimensions between respondents living in rented houses and those owning houses reveal statistically significant differences across all examined dimensions. For physical health, respondents owning houses had a higher mean (61.4) compared to those renting (52.3), with a t-value of -3.41 and a p-value of 0.001, indicating significant difference at the 0.05 level. Similarly, in psychological health, house owners had a mean of 56.8 versus 48.7 for renters, with a t-value of -2.97 and a p-value of 0.004, also showing significant differences. Social relationships were better among house owners (mean of 68.2) compared to renters (mean of 62.5), with a t-value of -2.59 and a p-value of 0.011. For the environment factor, the mean was 60.1 for house owners and 53.6 for renters, with a t-value of -2.55 and a p-value of 0.012. Lastly, the overall quality of life was higher for house owners (mean of 62.3) compared to renters (mean of 54.2), with a t-value of -3.09 and a p-value of 0.003. All these findings indicate that owning a house is associated with significantly higher quality of life scores across these dimensions, with all p-values being less than 0.05.

ii. **Educational Qualifications and Quality of Life:** Evaluated the impact of respondents' educational qualifications (HSC, SSLC, Above 5th, Below 5th) on their overall quality of life.

Table 5: One way analysis of variance among various Education qualifications of the respondents with regard to their overall Quality of Life

S. No	Source	Respondents =100				
		DF	**SS**	**MS**	**Mean of X**	**Statistical Inference**
1	**Physical Health**				G1=44.8	**F**=3.28
	Between Groups	3	200.75	66.92	G2=47.7	P (0.024) <0.05
	Within Groups	96	1959.25	20.41	G3=52.3	Significant
					G4=55.2	
2	**Psychological Health**				G1= 41.3	**F**=3.00
	Between Groups	3	450.3	150.10	G2=45.2	P (0.034) <0.05
	Within Groups	96	4800.70	50.01	G3=50.4	Significant
					G4=55.1	
3	**Social Relationship**				G1=42.1	**F**=3.34
	Between Groups	3	400.20	133.40	G2=46.5	P (0.022) <0.05
	Within Groups	96	3839.80	39.99	G3=52.2	Significant
					G4=57.1	
4	**Environment Factors**				G1=44.6	**F**=3.58
	Between Groups	3	250.50	83.5	G2=49.1	P (0.017) <0.05
	Within Groups	96	2240.00	23.33	G3=54.3	Significant
					G4=58.6	
5	**Overall Quality of Life**				G1=43.2	**F**=3.34
	Between Groups	3	300.60	100.20	G2=48.3	P (0.022) <0.05
	Within Groups	96	2879.40	29.99	G3=53.1	Significant
					G4=58.4	

G1=HSC, G2=SSLC, G3= Above 5th Standard, G4=Below 5th Standard: The table presents the results of a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted to assess the impact of various education qualifications on different dimensions of respondents' overall quality of life. Each dimension, including Physical Health, Psychological Health, Social Relationships, Environmental Factors, and Overall Quality of Life, was evaluated separately. Across all dimensions, there were significant differences observed among education qualification groups. For instance, in terms of Physical Health, there was a significant difference among the groups (F=3.28, p=0.024), indicating that individuals with different education levels had varying physical health scores. Similar findings were observed for Psychological Health (F=3.00, p=0.034), Social Relationships (F=3.34, p=0.022), Environmental Factors (F=3.58, p=0.017), and Overall Quality of Life (F=3.34, p=0.022). The statistical inferences suggest that education qualification plays a significant role in shaping various dimensions of respondents' quality of life, highlighting the importance of educational attainment in overall well-being.

iii. **Living Areas and Quality of Life:** Investigated whether there is a significant disparity in the overall quality of life among respondents living in different areas (urban, rural, semi-urban).

Table 6: One way analysis of variance among various Living Areas of the respondents with regard to their overall Quality of Life

S. No	Living Area	Respondents =100				
		DF	SS	MS	Mean of X	Statistical Inference
1	**Physical Health**				H1=44.8	**F**=5.46
	Between Groups	2	15314.74	7657.37	H2=47.2	P (0.007) <0.05
	Within Groups	97	24785.22	255.77	H3=51.3	Significant
2	**Psychological Health**				H1=41.3	**F**=3.54
	Between Groups	2	3289.47	1644.74	H2=45.7	P (0.032) <0.05
	Within Groups	97	22581.22	232.68	H3=49.2	Significant
3	**Social Relationship**				H1=42.1	**F**=2.78
	Between Groups	2	1979.07	989.53	H2=46.5	P (0.067)>0.05
	Within Groups	97	18121.22	186.75	H3=51.9	Not Significant
4	**Environment Factors**				H1=44.6	**F**=3.71
	Between Groups	2	4426.68	2213.34	H2=49.1	P (0.028) <0.05
	Within Groups	97	27173.22	280.10	H3=53.8	Significant
5	**Overall Quality of Life**				H1=43.2	**F**=3.89

H1=Rural, H2=Urban, H3=Semi-Urban: The table presents the results of a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted among various living areas of respondents concerning their overall quality of life. The analysis encompassed five dimensions: Physical Health, Psychological Health, Social Relationship, Environment Factors, and Overall Quality of Life, each evaluated across three living areas - rural, urban, and semi-urban. The ANOVA results revealed statistically significant differences in Physical Health (F=5.46, p=0.007), Psychological Health (F=3.54, p=0.032), Environment Factors (F=3.71, p=0.028), and Overall Quality of Life (F=3.89, p=0.023) across the living areas. In these dimensions, the means of quality of life differed significantly among the different living areas. However, for Social Relationship (F=2.78, p=0.067), the analysis did not yield a statistically significant difference. This suggests that while there were variations in the quality of social relationships among the living areas, these differences were not significant enough to reject the null hypothesis. Overall, the findings highlight the importance of considering living area dynamics in understanding the quality of life perceptions among individuals, particularly in dimensions like physical and psychological health and the overall quality of life.

iv. Types of Housing and Quality of Life: Analysed whether different types of housing (hut, tin, concrete) lead to significant variations in the overall quality of life of respondents.

Table 7: One way analysis of variance among various House Statuses of the respondents with regard to their overall Quality of Life

S. No	House Status	Respondents =100				
		DF	SS	MS	Mean of X	Statistical Inference
1	**Physical Health**				R1=68.00	**F**=2.598
	Between Groups	2	1185.5	592.75	R2=81.45	P (0.080)>0.05
	Within Groups	97	22124.5	228.17	R3=77.78	not Significant
2	**Psychological Health**				R1=69.14	**F**=2.207
	Between Groups	2	1098.2	549.1	R2=69.64	P (0.114)>0.05
	Within Groups	97	24121.8	248.68	R3=67.11	not significant
3	**Social Relationship**				R1=28.57	**F**=1.911
	Between Groups	2	905.6	452.8	R2=30.91	P (0.152)>0.05
	Within Groups	97	22994.4	237.04	R3=30.22	not significant
4	**Environment Factors**				R1=82.86	**F**=2.141
	Between Groups	2	995.3	497.65	R2=86.55	P (0.122)>0.05
	Within Groups	97	22544.7	232.42	R3=83.70	not Significant
5	**Overall Quality of Life**				R1=68.29	**F**=2.929

	Between Groups	2	1298.6	649.3	R2=72.00	P (0.058)>0.05
	Within Groups	97	21501.4	221.67	R3=70.96	not Significant

R1= Hut, R2= Tin, R3= Concrete: The one-way ANOVA analysis in Table 7 investigates the impact of house status (Hut, Tin, Concrete) on various dimensions of quality of life among respondents. For physical health, the between-group variability (SS = 1185.5, MS = 592.75) compared to within-group variability (SS = 22124.5, MS = 228.17) results in an F-value of 2.598 with a p-value of 0.080, indicating no significant difference. Psychological health shows a similar trend with between-group SS of 1098.2 and within-group SS of 24121.8, yielding an F-value of 2.207 and a p-value of 0.114, again not significant. Social relationship dimension also exhibits non-significant differences with an F-value of 1.911 and a p-value of 0.152. Environment factors have between-group SS of 995.3 and within-group SS of 22544.7, resulting in an F-value of 2.141 and a p-value of 0.122, indicating no significant differences. Finally, the overall quality of life dimension shows an F-value of 2.929 and a p-value of 0.058, which is marginally non-significant. Overall, the ANOVA results suggest that house status does not significantly affect these dimensions of quality of life among the respondents.

v. **Sales Areas and Quality of Life:** Examined if the sales areas (road, open, door to door) of respondents have a notable impact on their overall quality of life.

Table 8: One way analysis of variance among various Sales Areas of the respondents with regard to their overall Quality of Life

S. No	**House Status**	**Respondents = 100**				
		DF	**SS**	**MS**	**Mean of X**	**Statistical Inference**
1	**Physical Health**				M1=80.00	**F**=3.057
	Between Groups	2	1200.928	600.464	M2=75.48	P (0.054)>0.05
	Within Groups	97	19018.072	196.072	M3=70.00	not Significant
2	**Psychological Health**				M1=70.22	**F**=4.780
	Between Groups	2	1900.900	950.450	M2=60.65	P (0.011) <0.01
	Within Groups	97	19270.057	198.660	M3=55.73	significant
3	**Social Relationship**				M1=65.44	**F**=2.190
	Between Groups	2	900.573	450.286	M2=70.39	P (0.117)>0.05
	Within Groups	97	19977.856	205.957	M3=62.00	not significant
4	**Environment Factors**				M1=72.88	**F**=3.327
	Between Groups	2	1450.356	725.178	M2=66.77	P (0.040) <0.05
	Within Groups	97	21128.643	217.819	M3=62.43	Significant
5	**Overall Quality of Life**				M1=75.89	**F**=2.524
	Between Groups	2	990.099	495.050	M2=68.43	P (0.085)>0.05
	Within Groups	97	19038.830	196.272	M3=60.00	Not Significant

M1= Road, M2= Open, M3= Door to Door: The table presents the results of a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted among various sales areas with respect to respondents' overall quality of life across different dimensions: physical health, psychological health, social relationships, environmental factors, and overall quality of life. For physical health, there was no significant difference observed among sales areas ($F(2,97) = 3.057$, $p = 0.054 > 0.05$). However, significant differences were found in psychological health ($F(2,97) = 4.780$, $p = 0.011 < 0.01$) and environmental factors ($F(2,97) = 3.327$, $p = 0.040 < 0.05$) among the sales areas. Conversely, no significant differences were detected in social relationships ($F(2,97) = 2.190$, $p = 0.117 > 0.05$) and overall quality of life ($F(2,97) = 2.524$, $p = 0.085 > 0.05$). These findings suggest that while there are variations in the perceptions of psychological health and environmental factors across different sales areas, there is no discernible difference in overall quality of life and social relationships among the respondents from these areas.

3.4 Finding the Correlation among 4 Dimensions of Quality of Life of Street Vendors

Table 9: Results of Correlation analysis among the variables of Street Vendor's overall Quality of Life

Variables	**Physical Health**	**Psychological Health**	**Social Relationship**	**Environmental Factors**	**Overall Quality of Life**
Physical Health	1.000	0.63	0.52	0.47	0.68
Psychological Health	0.63	1.000	0.58	0.51	0.74
Social Relationship	0.52	0.58	1.000	0.49	0.66
Environmental Factors	0.47	0.51	0.49	1.000	0.59
Overall Quality of Life	0.68	0.74	0.66	0.59	1.000

Explanation:

Values range from -1 to 1. Positive values indicate a positive correlation, negative values indicate a negative correlation, and 0 indicates no correlation. Diagonal values are 1 because a variable is perfectly correlated with itself. Off-diagonal values represent the correlation between different variables.

Interpretation:

The correlations between various aspects of health and quality of life reveal several significant relationships. There is a strong positive correlation between physical health and psychological health (r = 0.63), and an even stronger positive correlation between physical health and overall quality of life (r = 0.68). Physical health also shows moderate positive correlations with social relationships (r = 0.52) and environmental factors (r = 0.47). Psychological health is strongly positively correlated with social relationships (r = 0.58) and overall quality of life (r = 0.74), indicating a very strong relationship. It also has a moderate positive correlation with environmental factors (r = 0.51). Additionally, social relationships have a moderate positive correlation with environmental factors (r = 0.49) and a strong positive correlation with overall quality of life (r = 0.66). Finally, there is a strong positive correlation between environmental factors and overall quality of life (r = 0.59). These correlations highlight the interconnectedness of physical health, psychological health, social relationships, environmental factors, and overall quality of life.

4. Findings

- The majority of respondents are young, evenly split between male and female, and mostly married, with significant portions having completed education above the 5th grade. The predominant religions are Hinduism, Islam, and Christianity, with most living in single-family structures, residing in concrete houses, and renting their accommodation. The primary goods sold are vegetables and fruits, mainly in public places and roadside areas, with nearly half earning less than 7000 Rs per month.
- Regarding Overall Quality of Life, a significant portion of respondents, 43.50%, rated it as low, highlighting potential areas where the overall well-being and satisfaction of the surveyed population could be enhanced.
- When considering the overall quality of life, a slight majority (43%) perceive it as low, while 36% perceive it as high.
- Findings suggest that while there are no significant gender differences in most aspects of well-being, social relationships appear to be significantly stronger among female respondents compared to males. Thus, null hypothesis is accepted. There is no significant difference between the gender of respondents and their overall quality of life.
- Findings indicate that owning a house is associated with significantly higher quality of life scores across these dimensions, with all p-values being less than 0.05. Thus, null hypothesis is rejected. There is significant difference between the housing status of respondents and their overall quality of life.
- The statistical inferences suggest that education qualification plays a significant role in shaping various dimensions of respondents' quality of life, highlighting the importance of educational attainment in overall well-being. So null hypothesis is rejected. There is significant difference between the educational qualifications of respondents and their overall quality of life.
- The analysis reveals significant differences in physical health, psychological health, environmental factors, and overall quality of life among rural, urban, and semi-urban areas. However, social relationships do not significantly vary across these living areas. This emphasizes that the type of

living area is an important factor in understanding quality of life, particularly in the physical, psychological, and environmental dimensions. On majority, null hypothesis is rejected. There is a significant disparity between the living areas of respondents and their overall quality of life.

- The ANOVA results suggest that house status does not significantly affect these dimensions of quality of life among the respondents A significant variation do not exist between the types of housing of respondents and their overall quality of life. Null hypothesis is accepted.
- These findings suggest that while there are variations in the perceptions of psychological health and environmental factors across different sales areas, there is no discernible difference in overall quality of life and social relationships among the respondents from these areas. Therefore, the null hypothesis (i.e., There is no notable difference between the sales areas of respondents and their overall quality of life) is rejected for psychological health and environmental factors but accepted for overall quality of life and social relationships.
- Findings indicate that all dimensions of quality of life are positively interrelated, with the strongest associations observed between psychological health and overall quality of life.

5. Conclusion

A slight majority (43%) of street vendors perceive their overall quality of life as low, indicating room for significant improvement in their living and working conditions. There are no significant gender differences in overall quality of life, though social relationships are notably stronger among female respondents. Owning a house significantly enhances quality of life, suggesting the importance of stable housing in improving well-being. Higher education levels are strongly associated with better quality of life, highlighting the role of education in socio-economic development. Significant differences in quality of life exist among rural, urban, and semi-urban areas, with physical, psychological, and environmental dimensions being particularly affected. Variations in psychological health and environmental factors are noted across different sales areas, though overall quality of life and social relationships remain consistent. All dimensions of quality of life are positively interrelated, with the strongest association between psychological health and overall quality of life. Despite other challenges, social relationships are relatively stable across different demographic segments, serving as a potential support mechanism. Street vendors in Hyderabad exhibit significant disparities in physical and psychological health, influenced by their sales areas and living conditions. Environmental factors significantly affect the quality of life, with vendors in different living areas experiencing varied environmental challenges. Psychological health is a critical dimension, showing significant variation across different sales areas, highlighting the need for mental health support. The majority of street vendors earn less than 7000 Rs per month, affecting their overall quality of life and ability to save.

These conclusions underscore the multifaceted nature of quality of life among street vendors, influenced by housing, education, and living environments, while also pointing to the critical need for targeted interventions to address these disparities.

6. Suggestions

Implement comprehensive health initiatives focusing on both physical and psychological well-being of street vendors. Provide accessible mental health services to address the significant variations in psychological health. Enhance living and working conditions by reducing pollution and improving infrastructure. Increase access to affordable housing to reduce the dependency on rented accommodations. Develop programs to increase income levels and provide financial stability to street vendors. Initiatives to strengthen social support networks are essential, given the strong correlation between social relationships and overall quality of life. Improve safety measures in sales areas, particularly for those working roadside and in public places. Offer educational programs to increase the educational attainment of street vendors, enhancing their overall quality of life. Provide legal assistance to street vendors to protect their rights and improve their working conditions. A comprehensive approach integrating physical health, psychological support, and environmental improvements is necessary to address the multifaceted challenges faced by street vendors in Hyderabad.

7. References

Research papers and articles:

- Afolabi, O. M., & Aladejebi, O. (2021). Exploring the reasons for street hawking, challenges, and quality of life of street vendors. Journal of Positive School Psychology, 5(2), 3967-3981.
- Bandusena, P. (2020). The Mobile Street Vendors' Contribution to The Urban Economy: The Case of Pettah, Sri Lanka.
- Begari, P. (2017). Education level of street vendors and its impact on performance of the activity: A case study of Hyderabad, Telangana. International Journal of Research in Economics and Social Sciences, 7(6), 124-135.
- Dhas, A. C. (2020). Socio-Economic Status of Urban Madurai Street Vendors: A Micro-Level Analysis. Munich Personal RePEc Archive.
- Imam, S. (2021). Socio-Economic Status of the Street Vendors: A Study with Reference to Bodh Gaya (Gaya District). International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR), 10(8), ISSN: 2319-7064.

- Kumari, S., & Tiwari, G. (2018). Working conditions and quality of life of street vendors in city of Ahmedabad. ResearchGate.
- Panwar, A. M., & Garg, V. (2015). Issues and Challenges Faced by Vendors on Urban Streets: A Case of Sonipat City, India. International Journal of Engineering Technology, Management and Applied Sciences, 3(2).
- Prakash, R. (2013). Quality of life among street vendors in Tiruchirappalli city, Tamil Nadu, India. International Research Journal of Social Sciences, 2(12), 18-28.
- Prakash, R. (2014). A study on socio-economic conditions and working patterns of street vendors in Tiruchirappalli city, Tamil Nadu, India. International Journal of Physical and Social Sciences, 4(9), 1-12.
- Raj, S., Patil, S., & Vatsala, S. (2022). Street vending and its impact on urban economy: A case study of Bengaluru. Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research, 9(4), 625-633.

Textbooks:

- Bhowmik, S. (Ed.). (2010). *Street vendors in the global urban economy*. New Delhi, India: Routledge

Websites: Google scholar, Research Gate, SSRN