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CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

India’s public distribution system (PDS) is the largest food security program in the world, which covers nearly 60% of the population and costs Rs 1.45 trillion—close to 1.4% of the national income. PDS has often been criticized for its structure, incessant corruption and leakages, and inclusion and exclusion errors in identifying the beneficiaries. The rolling out of the National Food Security Act (NFSA), 2013, and the overhauling of PDS in some states has created an aspiration that the system can be made effectual in making the households not only food secure, but also nutrition secure.

Consumer satisfaction is a person’s feeling of pleasure or disappointment resulting from comparing a product’s perceived performance or outcome in relation to his or her expectation. As this definition makes clear, satisfaction in a function on perceived performance and expectations. If the performance falls short of expectations, the consumer is satisfied or delighted. If the performance exceeds the expectation, the consumer is highly satisfied or delighted, high satisfaction or delight creates an emotional bond with the brand, not just a rational performance. The result is high consumer loyalty. They analyzed the results to develop seven dimensions of customer satisfaction for product. They are Capability, Usability, Performance, Reliability, Install-ability, Maintainability and Documentation.

Public Distribution System is among the most expansive policy initiatives of the Government of India. It began...
as a measure to ensure self-sufficiency at the national level and went on to become a major food safety net for the poor. However, it was soon marred by various inefficiencies and malpractices, which led to severe critic of the scheme. Several studies began questioning the feasibility of PDS in terms of its budgetary incidence, its market distorting nature and if free markets can play the role that is currently played by PDS. However, it is to be noted that various inefficiencies, which are condemned by the opponents of PDS, are not a result of faulty economic policy per se, but the unintended consequences arising from the implementation of the policy. Implementation of PDS is under the purview of the state governments. State governments vary widely in their performance with regard to PDS.

1.2 SCOPE OF THE STUDY
This study aims to investigate and analyze consumer satisfaction with the Public Distribution System (PDS) in Coimbatore. Focusing on the accessibility, quality, and efficiency of the PDS, the research will examine consumer perceptions and experiences. By employing surveys, interviews, and data analysis, the study seeks to identify key factors influencing satisfaction levels. The findings will provide valuable insights for policymakers, government authorities, and stakeholders involved in the PDS, contributing to the enhancement of the system's effectiveness and responsiveness to consumer needs in Coimbatore.

1.3 STATEMENT OF PROBLEM
PDS is a poverty alleviation programme and contributes towards the social welfare of the people. It is a primary social welfare and anti-poverty programme of the Government of India especially for the weaker sections of the population who survive with low-standard living and cannot afford the prevailing market prices for the essential commodities. Some eligible individuals may face challenges in proving their identity or providing the required documentation, leading to exclusion from the PDS or delays in receiving benefits. The study made an inquiry to understand the ability of the respondents to open and read messages and operation of the internet. The perception of the satisfaction households relating to the problem of inaccurate weight of commodities are supplied.

1.4 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY
- To analyze the socio-economic factors of consumers.
- To know the perception of consumers towards public distribution system.
- To assess the level of satisfaction of family card holders towards the PDS in North Coimbatore
- To study the operational problems of PDS in North Coimbatore
- To outline Findings and suggestions.
1.5 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Methodology is a way to systematically solve a research problem. It explains the various steps that are generally adopted by a researcher to solve a research problem.

Data collection

Data was collected through both primary and secondary data sources.

Primary data

The primary data has been collected through questionnaires filled by 115 respondents who are all using PDS.

Secondary data

The secondary data has been sourced from various journals and websites.

Sampling area and sampling technique

All the respondents have been chosen from the North Coimbatore city based on convenient random sampling.

TOOLS USED

- Simple Percentage Analysis
- Ranking Analysis

1.6 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

- This study is restricted to North Coimbatore only due to cost and time constraints.
- The samples for their research, such small quantity of respondents cannot represent the characteristics of Public distribution system (PDS) as in North Coimbatore.
- The observation may not be applicable to the areas other than the field where the survey was made.
1.7 CHAPTER SCHEME

CHAPTER I
The present chapter gives the “Introduction and Scope of the study, Statement of the problem, Objectives of the study, Research methodology Limitation of the study.

CHAPTER II
This chapter includes contains the review of the literature from magazines, articles, etc.

CHAPTER III
This section encompasses the significance and role, as well as the growth and motivation factors, encouraging people to embark on entrepreneurial endeavors within the context of the Public Distribution System.

CHAPTER IV
This chapter deals with analysis and interpretations of data; the analysis consists of percentage analysis and ranking method.

CHAPTER V
This chapter presents the findings, suggestions and conclusions.
CHAPTER II REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 INTRODUCTION
A Literature review is a scholarly paper that presents the current knowledge including substantive findings as well as theoretical and methodological contributions to the particular topic. It is a review on related literature of the study that the researcher has undertaken which in turn provide deep knowledge about the subject under the study. The review of literature gives the reader an outlook about the background and the situation under which study has been conducted and its help to formulate the research problem. The following are reviews that have been taken in support to the study.

2.2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Dr. B. K. Gairola (2023)\(^1\) Public Distribution System in the country facilitates the supply of food grains to the poor at a subsidized price. Essential items such as Selected cereals, sugar and kerosene at subsidized prices to holders of ration cards is the objective of efficient Public Distribution System. The PDS also helps to modulate open - market prices for commodities that is distributed through the system. Government accords great Importance to the objective of measuring outcomes of PDS so as to Ensure that equal distribution system serves up the purpose for which it was set up.

Somesh Srivastava (2022)\(^2\) The Government of India is making frantic efforts to tackle the food security issue. The country has more than 300 million hungry and malnourished people. On the other hand, thousands of tons of food grain is rotting in Government granaries. There is certainly a management problem. There is requisite policy deficit also. The Government is trying hard to address both. Scholars and social activists are suggesting universal public distribution system.

Manahan, (2021)\(^3\) has observed that the central government takes measures to uplift the poorest people through this effective welfare schemes. Most of the below poverty line and under nutritious people are provided food grains through Public Distribution System at free of cost. Most backward districts and trial belts are benefited by this scheme and food security is also provided by the central government with the cooperation of State Government.

Mahadavappa Eraiah, (2020)\(^4\) He explained about the purpose of Public Distribution System was to act as price supporting programmes for the consumers during the periods of food shortage of the 2020. On the other it acted as an instrument of price stabilization and
become a countervailing force against private traders who were trying to exploit the situation of security of food. The basic aim was to provide essential commodities like rice, wheat, sugar, and edible oil and kerosene at subsidized prices. However, the supply of food under the Public Distribution System made a clear demarcation between urban and rural consumers.

Jos Mooij (2019) According to him, the network of Public Distribution System dealers was quite reasonable. There was one PDS dealer allocated for every 1,630 people. He stated that only a part of the Public Distribution System food grain reached the cardholders, many poor people had no red cards. Food grains were often not reaching the PDS shops in the villages. He concluded that, there was a large-scale misappropriation of food grains at all levels.

The distribution of cards to BPL families was unsatisfactory.

Thanga Pandian (2019) He stated that the essential commodities would be supplied on all the days of a month at the convenience of the public instead of supplying them on certain specific days. He has offered employees of Fair Price Shop some suggestions like attend their work in time and distribute the commodities with correct weight without making them stand in long queues.

Subramanian (2018) examined the relative significance of various factors accounting for poverty in rural Tamil Nadu. The study showed that the level of poverty was positively associated with inequality in consumption and negatively associated with real wage rate and net domestic product in agriculture per head of rural population. If ameliorative measures are to be thought of top priority should be given to the reduction in inequality of consumption compared to raising real wage rate and net domestic product in agriculture per head of rural population.

Ahmed Tritah (2017) Using propensity score matching methods, I found that while the PDS has a poor record on reaching the poor, conditional on having access to PDS, the subsidy is entirely consumed. Moreover, I found that food subsidies going through the PDS exert a multiplier effect on quantity consumed. This finding points to a revaluation of the impact of PDS with respect to its main objective which is food Security. I propose a new poverty measure, integrating the food content of poverty lines and shows that relative to this poverty line PDS has benefited the poor.

Amit Kumar Gupta, and Dr. Anupama Saxena (2016) Food insecurity is very challenging problem in the entire world, nearly 870 million people are suffering from undernourishment globally (or one in eight of the people in the world did not consume enough food to cover their minimum dietary energy requirements). Particularly in India 217 million people are undernourished, which constitutes 17.5 percent of national population in 2015-16.
K.S Chandresekar (2015) analyzed the working of the public distribution system in Thirunelveli district such as allotment, liftment and off take of essential commodities in the district. He highlighted the problems of public distribution system in Thirunelveli district such as poor quality of essential commodities supplied, non-display of information on the notice boards regarding the availability of commodities and business hours not convenient to cardholders.

Fathima P. Jacob (2014) Public Distribution System in India is a consumer side intervention in the food market. There are two basic aspects of evaluating the effects of policy intervention in Public Distribution System. One is to analyze the overall per capita availability of cereals and other is per capita consumption and it’s the government policy to ensure whether the objectives of the Public Distribution System has been achieved.

Madhura Swaminathan (2013) Evidence on calorie intake and nutritional outcomes establishes that chronic hunger and food insecurity persist today on a mass scale in India. The liberalization-induced policy of narrow targeting of the Public Distribution System (PDS), a programme of food security that provides a minimum quantity of cereals at subsidized prices, has resulted in worsening food insecurity. Recent evidence from the 61st round of the National Sample Survey in 2012-2013 establishes that targeting has led to high rates of exclusion of needy households from the system and a clear deterioration of coverage in States like Coimbatore where the universal PDS was most effective.

A Mahendran (2013) Find out still rural people and tribal people are depending on affordable PDS food grains. Targeted PDS is by far the largest food entitlement programme in India. It is accessed by more than a third of the total population of India and families living BPL remain the single most important constituency that the PDS.

Ravindra Kumar Verma (2012) The Public Distribution System (PDS) was introduced in virtually all the states of India, but Coimbatore’s PDS was the one which evolved as the most efficient and effective measure of food security. The salient features of the model were its universal coverage, high levels of utilisation, physical access made possible through a vast network of retail outlets, rural bias and progressive utilisation of the system.

Subba Rao (2011) has attempted to estimate food requirement for the State of Andhra Pradesh under certain assumptions. While working out these estimates he has assumed a supply level of 12 ozs. (340 grams) per consumption unit. He concluded that ultimately the benefit of public distribution is zero or negligible.
P.S. George (2010) has attempted to analyze public distribution of food grains and their income distribution effects in Coimbatore. He has tried to estimate the possible impact of rationing on incomes of the consumers using the relationship. The results for Coimbatore suggest that the system is economically viable. Further, ration rice, according to this study, accounted for a major share of rice consumption of consumers belonging to low income groups. Gupta basing on certain assumption has projected food grains requirements for PDS up to 1980. Sujata (2010) in study titled, ‘Management of public distribution system in India with special reference to Haryana’ focused to examine the level of benefits that the rural and urban dwellers are able to get from the system of public distribution.

Amit Kumar Gupta, and Dr. Anupama Saxena (2014) Food insecurity is very challenging problem in the entire world, nearly 870 million people are suffering from undernourishment globally (or one in eight of the people in the world did not consume enough food to cover their minimum dietary energy requirements). Particularly in India 217 million people are undernourished, which constitutes 17.5 percent of national population in 2013-14.
CHAPTER III

3.1 INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDY

In the intricate tapestry of organizational structures, the production department stands as a cornerstone, orchestrating the transformation of raw materials into finished goods. Embedded within the core of manufacturing enterprises, the production department system embodies a nexus of processes, technologies, and human expertise aimed at optimizing efficiency, quality, and output. As a pivotal hub, it navigates the delicate balance between resource allocation, scheduling, and performance monitoring to ensure the seamless flow of production activities. This introduction delves into the multifaceted dimensions of the production department system, exploring its significance, challenges, and evolving paradigms in the contemporary industrial landscape.

3.2 OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

The study on consumer satisfaction with the Public Distribution System (PDS) constitutes a comprehensive investigation into the intricacies of a vital social welfare program that plays a pivotal role in ensuring food security for economically vulnerable segments of the population. The Public Distribution System, a key component of governmental initiatives, involves the distribution of essential commodities, primarily food grains, at subsidized rates to specified beneficiaries. This study aims to provide a holistic understanding of consumer satisfaction within the framework of the PDS, unraveling the diverse factors that shape the experiences and perceptions of individuals who depend on this crucial public service.

The research adopts a robust mixed-methods approach, integrating both quantitative and qualitative methodologies to capture the depth and nuances of consumer satisfaction. Quantitative data will be garnered through surveys distributed among a diverse sample of PDS beneficiaries, offering insights into their satisfaction levels regarding the accessibility, affordability, and quality of the distributed food items. In tandem, qualitative data will be extracted through in-depth interviews and focus group discussions, allowing for a more nuanced exploration of the underlying factors influencing consumer satisfaction. Accessibility is a primary focus of this research, aiming to scrutinize the ease with which beneficiaries can avail themselves of PDS provisions. This encompasses an examination of the proximity of distribution centers, waiting times, and any logistical challenges faced by consumers. The goal is to identify barriers or inefficiencies that may hinder the seamless access to PDS benefits,
Affordability, another crucial dimension, will be assessed to understand the economic impact on beneficiaries. The study seeks to determine whether the subsidized rates effectively alleviate financial strain and contribute to enhanced food security. By examining the economic implications on consumers, the research aims to provide insights into the real-world impact of the PDS on the financial well-being of its beneficiaries, thus contributing to a more holistic evaluation of the program's effectiveness.

The quality of commodities distributed through the PDS will be a central focus of the study, delving into consumer perceptions regarding nutritional value, freshness, and overall satisfaction with the provided items. Understanding the subjective experiences of consumers in relation to the quality of the distributed goods is vital for assessing the program's effectiveness in meeting nutritional needs and ensuring consumer satisfaction. This dimension will shed light on the holistic impact of the PDS on the dietary well-being of its beneficiaries.

Public Distribution System (PDS) as the fundamental food security instrument of the Coimbatore plays a vital role in the eradication of poverty and curbing the soaring price rise of essential commodities. To ensure the upliftment of rural poor, the National Food Security Act (NFSA) plays a significant role and gives top priority for rural areas. As a part of the National Food Security Act, the Government of Coimbatore operates the PDS through a network of (492) outlets known as Ration shops and it serves 48,260,619 beneficiary households. An effective distribution mechanism is essential for the attainment of the affirmed objectives of PDS and NFSA. This chapter gives an overview of the distributive mechanism of the PDS in rural Coimbatore. It includes a brief description of the profile of sample households and the analytical results of the effectiveness of the distributive mechanism of the PDS in rural Coimbatore by using a set of relevant variables.

Commodities issued by the Central Government are distributed through the PDS under various schemes. The commodities available and quantity entitled are different for different schemes. Now the commodities are distributed as per the schemes specified in the National Food Security (NFSA) Act 2013. The NFSA beneficiary households are divided into four categories - AAY, Priority, Non-Priority Subsidized (NPS) and Non-Priority Non-Subsidized (NPNS).
3.3 TPDS to reflect on the following issues

- Efficacy of the delivery mechanism in improving access to PDS for the poor;
- Off-take by the poor and its determinants;
- Viability of Fair Price Shops (FPSs) & its implications;
- Types and magnitudes of targeting errors and their implications on welfare and budgetary consumersubsidy;
- Extent of leakages and diversions of subsidized food grains;
- Delivery cost across the States; and
- Overall performance of TPDS.

3.4 GOALS OF PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

The goal of PDS does not restrict itself with the distribution of rationed articles. Making available adequate quantities of essential articles at all times, in places accessible to all, at prices affordable to all and protection of the weaker section of the population from the vicious spiral of rising prices is the broad spectrum of PDS. More specifically, the goals of PDS are:

- Make goods available to consumers, especially the disadvantaged /vulnerable sections of society all at fair prices.
- Rectify the existing imbalances between the supply and demand for consumer goods; Check and prevent hoarding and black marketing in essential commodities.
- Ensure social justice in distribution of basic necessities of life.
- Even out fluctuations in prices and availability of mass consumption goods.
### 3.5 PROFILE OF THE SCHEME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Public Distribution System (PDS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
<td>Ensure affordable food access for economically weaker sections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiation Year</strong></td>
<td>Varies by country; implemented in India since the 1940s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Commodities</strong></td>
<td>Rice, wheat, sugar, kerosene, pulses, and other essentials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution Network</strong></td>
<td>Fair Price Shops (FPS) spread across urban and rural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subsidy Mechanism</strong></td>
<td>Government provides subsidies to keep essential items affordable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identification of Beneficiaries</strong></td>
<td>Through Below Poverty Line (BPL) and Antyodaya Anna Yojana (AAY) cards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Beneficiaries</strong></td>
<td>Economically disadvantaged populations, especially BPL families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mode of Distribution</strong></td>
<td>Coupons, smart cards, or direct distribution through FPS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Price Regulation</strong></td>
<td>Commodities sold at prices lower than the market rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenges</strong></td>
<td>Leakages, pilferage, corruption, and identification errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring and Technology</strong></td>
<td>Use of technology (e.g., biometrics, electronic weighing) for transparent distribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reforms and Innovations</strong></td>
<td>Introductions of e-PDS, Aadhaar integration, and GPS tracking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td>Enhances food security, alleviates poverty, and addresses malnutrition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Variations</strong></td>
<td>Similar systems exist in various countries with varying structures and names.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Success Indicators</strong></td>
<td>Reduction in hunger, improved nutritional outcomes, and effective subsidy targeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

SIMPLE PERCENTAGE ANALYSIS

The Percentage analysis is used for comparing certain features. The collected data represented in the form or table and graphs in order to due effective population comparisons made.

Simple percentage = \( \frac{\text{Number of responses replied}}{\text{Total number of responses}} \times 100 \)

RANKING ANALYSIS

Under these methods the respondents are asked to rank the choices. This method is easier and faster. Here in this study the respondents are asked to rank various factor based on their satisfaction over PDS.
# TABLE NO 4.1.1

**THE TABLE SHOWING THE GENDER OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERPRETATION**

From the above table we found that 76% of the respondents were Male and 24% of the respondents were Female.

**INFEERENCE**

Majority 76% of the respondents were Male.
CHART NO 4.1.1
THE CHART SHOWING THE GENDER OF THE RESPONDENTS

GENDER OF RESPONDENTS

- Male: 76%
- Female: 24%
### TABLE NO 4.1.2
THE TABLE SHOWING THE AGE OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18-30 Years</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31-50 Years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50-60 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Above 60 Years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERPRETATION**

From the above table we found that 68% of the respondents age is 18-30 years, 20% of the respondents age is 31-50 years and 4% of the respondents age is 50-60 years, 9% of the respondents age is 60 above.

**INFERENCE**

Majority 68% of the respondents age is 18-30 years.
CHART NO 4.1.2
THE CHART SHOWING THE AGE OF RESPONDENTS

AGE OF RESPONDENTS

- 18-30 Years: 68%
- 31-50 Years: 20%
- 31-50 Years: 9%
- Above 60 Years: 3%
TABLE NO 4.1.3
THE TABLE SHOWING THE MARTIAL STATUS OF THE RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>No of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION
From the above table we found that 37% of the respondents were Married and 63% of the respondents were Unmarried.

INFERENC
Majority 63% of the respondents were Unmarried.
CHART NO 4.1.3

THE CHART SHOWING THE MARITAL STATUS OF THE RESPONDENTS

MARTIAL STATUS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Married  Unmarried

37%  63%
TABLE NO 4.1.4

THE TABLE SHOWING THE EDUCATION QUALIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>School level</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Under graduate</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Post graduate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION

From the above table we found that 17% of the respondents were qualified to school level, 56% of the respondents were qualified up to undergraduate, 10% of the respondents were qualified up to Postgraduate, 17% of the respondents have not studied.

INFERENCE

Majority 17% of the respondents were undergraduate qualified students.
CHART NO 4.1.4

THE CHART SHOWING THE EDUCATION QUALIFICATION OF THE RESPONDENTS

EDUCATION QUALIFICATION

- Under graduate: 56%
- School level: 17%
- Post graduate: 10%
- Illiterate: 17%

Legend:
- School level
- Under graduate
- Post graduate
- Illiterate
TABLE NO 4.1.5
THE TABLE SHOWING THE NO OF PEOPLE IN THE FAMILY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>No. Of People</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>More than 4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION
From the above table we found that 3% of the people are living in a separate home, 12% of the people are with two members, 30% of the people are living with 3 members, 55% of the people are in an joint family.

INFERRENCE
Majority 55% of the people are in joint family.
CHART NO 4.1.5
THE CHART SHOWING THE NO OF PEOPLE IN THE FAMILY

NO OF PEOPLE IN THE FAMILY

- 3% 1
- 12% 2
- 55% 3
- 30% More than 4
TABLE NO 4.1.6
THE TABLE SHOWING THE MONTHLY INCOME OF THE RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Monthly Income</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10000-20000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30000-40000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40000-50000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Above 50000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION
From the above table we found that 31% of the respondents’ monthly income is between Rs 10000-20000, 23% of the respondent’s monthly income is between Rs 30000-40000, 23% of the respondent’s monthly income is between Rs 40000-50000 and 23% of the respondent’s monthly income is above 50000.

INFERECE
Mostly 31% of the people income is between 10000-20000.
Chart No. 4.1.6

The chart showing the monthly income of the respondents

- Monthly income of the respondents:
  - 10000-20000: 23%
  - 30000-40000: 31%
  - 40000-50000: 23%
  - Above 50000: 23%
TABLE NO 4.1.7
THE TABLE SHOWING THE ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY PLAY IN MODERNIZATION OF PDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Role Of Technology</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Streaming distribution channels</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Monitoring stock levels and preventing leakage</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Providing nutritional education to beneficiaries</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION
From the above table we found that 20% respondents were preferred streaming distribution channels, 42% of respondents preferred monitoring stock levels and preventing leakage, 28% of respondents preferred providing nutritional education to beneficiaries, 10% of respondents preferred others.

INFERENCE
Mostly 42% of the people preferred Monitoring stock levels and preventing leakage.
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THE CHART SHOWING THE ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY PLAY IN MODERNIZATION OF PDS

ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY PLAY IN MODERNIZATION OF PDS

- Streaming distribution channels: 28%
- Monitoring stock levels and preventing leakage: 42%
- Providing nutritional education to beneficiaries: 20%
- Others: 10%
TABLE NO 4.1.8
THE TABLE SHOWING THE FREQUENTLY PEOPLE VISIT PDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION
From the above table we found that 6% of the respondents visit the PDS daily, 32% of the respondents visit weekly, 41% of the respondents visit monthly, 21% of the respondents visit rarely.

INFERENCEx
Mostly 41% of the respondents visit PDS monthly.
CHART NO 4.1.8
THE CHART SHOWS HOW FREQUENTLY PEOPLE VISIT PDS

FREQUENTLY PEOPLE VISIT PDS

- 6% Daily
- 21% Weekly
- 32% Monthly
- 41% Rarely
TABLE NO 4.1.9
THE TABLE SHOWS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF FOOD CORPORATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Responsibility Of Food Corporation</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agricultural research</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Food storage and distribution</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rural development</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Industrial production</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERPRETATION**
From the above table 26% of the respondents gives response to agricultural research, 43% of the respondents to food storage and distribution, 23% of the respondents to rural development, 8% of the respondents responds to industrial production.

**INFERENCE**
Mostly 43% of the people were given responds to Food storage and distribution.
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RESPONSIBILITY OF FOOD CORPORATION

- Agricultural research: 8%
- Industrial production: 26%
- Rural development: 23%
- Food storage and distribution: 43%
### TABLE NO 4.1.10
THE TABLE SHOWING THE ELIGIBILITY FOR RECEIVING UNDER ANNA YOJANA (AAY) WITHIN PDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Anna Yojana Beneficiaries</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marginalized and vulnerable families</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Only urban residents</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>All citizens</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERPRETATION**
From the above table we found that 17% of the respondents marginalized and vulnerable families, 24% of the respondents are only urban residents, 31% of respondents are farmers, 28% of the respondents are all citizens.

**INFERENCE**
Mostly 31% of the respondents are farmers.
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ELIGIBILITY FOR RECEIVING UNDER ANNA YOJANA (AAY)

- Marginalized and vulnerable families
- Only urban residents
- Farmers
- All citizens

28% 17% 24% 31%
**TABLE NO 4.1.11**

**THE TABLE SHOWING CHALLENGES FACED WHILE DISTRIBUTION OF PDS AT FPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Encounter While Managing Distribution Of Products</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Logistical issues</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Staffing issues</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Supply chain problems</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Knowledge of Benefits</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERPRETATION**

From the above table we found that 18% of the respondents face logistical issues, 36% of the respondents face staffing issue, 37% of the respondents face supply chain problems, 9% of the respondents face knowledge and benefits issue.

**INFERENCE**

Mostly 37% of the respondents face supply chain problem.
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CHALLENGES FACED WHILE DISTRIBUTION OF PDS AT FPS

- Logistical issues: 9%
- Staffing issues: 18%
- Supply chain problems: 37%
- Knowledge of Benefits: 36%
TABLE NO 4.1.12

THE TABLE SHOWING MAIN PURPOSE OF ISSUING RATION CARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Purpose Of Issuing Ration Card</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To provide identification for voters</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To avail subsidies on cooking gas</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To access food grains at subsidized rates</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To receive cash transfers from the government</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION

From the above table we found that 24% of the respondents were provided with ration card to provide identification for voters, 34% of the respondents were to avail subsidies on cooking gas, 31% of the respondents were to avail access to food grains at subsidized rates, 11% of the respondents were to receive cash from the government.

INFERENCE

Mostly 34% of the respondents received card for access food grain at subsidiary rate.
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MAIN PURPOSE OF ISSUING RATION CARD

- 11% To provide identification for voters
- 24% To avail subsidies on cooking gas
- 31% To access food grains at subsidized rates
- 34% To receive cash transfers from the government
TABLE NO 4.1.13
THE TABLE SHOWING THE CHALLENGES FACED IN (PDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Encounter While Managing Distribution Of Products</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Over-supply of food grains</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lack of infrastructure for storage and distribution</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High literacy rates among the population</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excessive government intervention</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERPRETATION**
From the above table we found that 14% of the respondents face over supply chain of food grains, 40% the respondents face lack of infrastructure for storage and distribution, 32% of the respondents face high literacy rates among the population, 14% of the respondents face excessive government intervention.

**INFERENCES**
Mostly 40% of the respondents were facing lack of infrastructure for storage and distribution problem.
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CHALLENGES FACED IN (PDS)

- Over-supply of food grains: 14%
- Lack of infrastructure for storage and distribution: 14%
- High literacy rates among the population: 32%
- Excessive government intervention: 40%
### TABLE NO 4.1.14
THE TABLE SHOWING FACTORS CONTRIBUTION TO LEAKAGE IN (PDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Factors Contribution To Leakage</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Weak infrastructure for storage and distribution</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lack of transparency in the allocation process</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corruption among officials responsible for implementing the PDS</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INTERPRETATION
From the above table we found that 23% of the respondents contributes to weak infrastructure for storage and distribution, 37% of the respondents contributes to lack of transparency in the allocation process, 24% of the respondents contributes to corruption among officials responsible for implementing the PDS, 16% of the respondents contributes to others.

### INFERENCE
Mostly 37% of the respondents contributes to lack of transparency in the allocation process.
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FACTORs CONTRIBUTION TO LEAKAGE IN (PDS)

Weak infrastructure for storage and distribution 16%
Lack of transparency in the allocation process 23%
Corruption among officials responsible for implementing the PDS 37%
Others 24%
### TABLE NO 4.1.15

**THE TABLE SHOWING SATISFACTION OF (PDS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Highly satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Highly dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Price stability</td>
<td>67(5)</td>
<td>30(4)</td>
<td>16(3)</td>
<td>1(2)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>335</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Timely distribution</td>
<td>20(5)</td>
<td>52(4)</td>
<td>29(3)</td>
<td>9(2)</td>
<td>5(1)</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Government policy</td>
<td>25(5)</td>
<td>32(4)</td>
<td>42(3)</td>
<td>9(2)</td>
<td>7(1)</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Storage facilities</td>
<td>18(5)</td>
<td>37(4)</td>
<td>26(3)</td>
<td>29(2)</td>
<td>5(1)</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>15(5)</td>
<td>28(4)</td>
<td>33(3)</td>
<td>9(2)</td>
<td>30(1)</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERPRETATION

In the presented table, Price stability emerges as the top priority, securing its leading position with an impressive score of (526). This underscores the critical significance attached to maintaining consistent and predictable pricing within the assessed context. Following closely in second place is Timely distribution, boasting a commendable score of (418), indicative of the substantial emphasis placed on efficient and punctual delivery mechanisms. Government policy claims the third spot, garnering a score of (404), highlighting its pivotal role in shaping and influencing the overall landscape. Storage facilities secure the fourth position with a score of (379), underscoring the recognized need for robust and well-equipped storage solutions. Infrastructure, though ranking fifth with a score of (334), remains a crucial factor in the overarching considerations, affirming its role in supporting and enhancing the entire system.
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Satisfaction of PDS

- Price stability
- Timely distribution
- Government policy
- Storage facilities
- Infrastructure

- Highly satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neutral
- Highly dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
TABLE NO 4.1.16
THE TABLE SHOWING SATISFACTION OF (PDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low quantity products</td>
<td>33(5) 165</td>
<td>22(4)</td>
<td>23(3)</td>
<td>12(2)</td>
<td>25(1)</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Proper balance Amount</td>
<td>21(5) 105</td>
<td>43(4)</td>
<td>22(3)</td>
<td>14(2)</td>
<td>15(1)</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Improper quality</td>
<td>14(5) 70</td>
<td>26(4)</td>
<td>31(3)</td>
<td>18(2)</td>
<td>26(1)</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unavailability of products</td>
<td>14(5) 70</td>
<td>34(4)</td>
<td>32(3)</td>
<td>13(2)</td>
<td>22(1)</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Distributing of old Stock</td>
<td>19(5) 95</td>
<td>27(4)</td>
<td>32(3)</td>
<td>13(2)</td>
<td>24(1)</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 367 386 329 350 349
INTERPRETATION

In the presented table, low-quantity products emerge as the top priority, securing their leading position with an impressive score of (367). This underscores the critical significance attached to maintaining consistent and predictable pricing within the assessed context. Following closely in second place is the proper balance of the amount, boasting a commendable score of (386), indicative of the substantial emphasis placed on efficient and punctual delivery mechanisms. Improper quality claims the third spot, garnering a score of (329), highlighting its pivotal role in shaping and influencing the overall landscape. Unavailability of products secures the fourth position with a score of (350), underscoring the recognized need for robust and well-equipped storage solutions. Distributing old stock, fifth with a score of (349), remains a crucial factor in the overarching considerations, affirming its role in supporting and enhancing the entire system.
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**TABLE NO 4.1.17**

**THE TABLE SHOWING SATISFACTION OF (PDS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Rank 5</th>
<th>Rank 4</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>14(5)</td>
<td>3(4)</td>
<td>22(3)</td>
<td>32(2)</td>
<td>44(1)</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Invalidity of measuring device</td>
<td>15(5)</td>
<td>15(4)</td>
<td>37(3)</td>
<td>36(2)</td>
<td>12(1)</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Enough storage capacity in store</td>
<td>16(5)</td>
<td>10(4)</td>
<td>30(3)</td>
<td>31(2)</td>
<td>28(1)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Long waiting hours in queue</td>
<td>19(5)</td>
<td>22(4)</td>
<td>29(3)</td>
<td>29(2)</td>
<td>16(1)</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Low response from store in charge</td>
<td>32(5)</td>
<td>10(4)</td>
<td>24(3)</td>
<td>25(2)</td>
<td>24(1)</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERPRETATION

In the presented table Accessibility emerges as the top priority, securing its leading position with an impressive score of (256). This underscores the critical significance attached to maintaining consistent and predictable pricing within the assessed context. Following closely in second place is Invalidity of measuring device, boasting a commendable score of (330), indicative of the substantial emphasis placed on efficient and punctual delivery mechanisms. Enough storage capacity in store claims the third spot, garnering a score of (300), Long waiting hours in que secures highlighting its pivotal role in shaping and influencing the overall landscape. He fourth position with a score of (344), underscoring the recognized need for robust and well-equipped storage solutions. Low response from store in charge, though ranking fifth with a score of (346), remains a crucial factor in the overarching considerations, affirming its role in supporting and enhancing the entire system.
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Satisfaction of PDS

Accessibility
Invalidity of measuring device
Enough storage capacity in store
Long waiting hours in queue
Low response from store in charge

Rank 5
Rank 4
Rank 3
Rank 2
Rank 1
CHAPTER V
FINDINGS, SUGGESTION AND CONCLUSION FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

- Majority 76% of the respondents were Male.
- Majority 68% of the respondents age is 18-30 years.
- Majority 63% of the respondents were Unmarried.
- Majority 17% of the respondents were undergraduate qualified students.
- Majority 55% of the people are in joint family
- Mostly 31% of the people income is between 10000-20000.
- Mostly 42% of the people preferred Monitoring stock levels and preventing leakage.
- Mostly 41% of the respondents visit PDS monthly.
- Mostly 43% of the people were given responds to Food storage and distribution.
- Mostly 31% of the respondents are farmers.
- Mostly 37% of the respondents face supply chain problem
- Mostly 34% of the respondents received card for access food grain at subsidiary rate.
- Mostly 40% of the respondent’s were facing lack of infrastructure for storage and distribution problem
- Mostly 37% of the respondents contributes to lack of transparency in the allocation process.
5.2 SUGGESTIONS

The following suggestions were made for the consumer satisfaction towards public distribution system based on the findings of this study.

- The public distribution system department should take step to increase the performance of the public distribution system.
- The public distribution system department should allot separate date for separate wards.
- The public distribution system department should list out the price of all the product in public distribution system stores.
- The public distribution system department should periodically check the availability of the product in public distribution system stores.
- The quantity of the products distributed can be increased.
- The quality of the rice can be improved.
- The public distribution should provide good quality products to the consumers.
- The public distribution system should reduce the waiting hours of the consumers.
- The public distribution system should have an enough storage capacity.
5.3 CONCLUSION

Government has taken all efforts to make the system more effective and ensure the availability, affordability and accessibility of public distribution system articles to the poor. But the responses of sample respondents of this study showed different picture and unearthed that public distribution system is suffering from problems like leakages, poor quality and under-weighing, non-availability of controlled as well as non-controlled articles. As the main objective of public distribution system is to provide safety net to the poor against spiraling rise in price, the selling of non-controlled articles through FPS is not away from the scope of public distribution system (PDS).
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“A STUDY ON CONSUMER SATISFACTION TOWARDS PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM IN NORTH COIMBATORE”

INTERVIE SCHEDULE

1. Name _________________________________________________________

2. Gender  
   a. Male  
   b. Female  

3. Age  
   a. 18-30 Years  
   b. 31-50 Years  
   c. 50-60 Years  
   d. Above 60 Years  

4. Marital Status  
   a. Married  
   b. Unmarried  

5. Education Qualification  
   a. School level  
   b. Under graduate  
   c. Post graduation  
   d. Illiterate  

6. Number of people in your family  
   a. 1  
   b. 2  
   c. 3  
   d. 4 or more  

7. Family income monthly  
   a. Rs 10000-20000  
   b. Rs 30000-40000  
   c. Rs 40000-50000  
   d. Above Rs 50000
8. What role does technology play in the modernization of the PDS?
   a. Streamlining distribution channels
   b. Monitoring stock levels and preventing leakages
   c. Providing nutritional education to beneficiaries
   d. Others

9. How frequently do you visit a PDS shop in North Coimbatore?
   a. Daily
   b. Weekly
   c. Monthly
   d. Rarely

10. The Food Corporation of India (FCI) is responsible for:
    a. Agricultural research
    b. Food storage and distribution
    c. Rural development
    d. Industrial production

11. Who is eligible to receive benefits under the Antyodaya Anna Yojana (AAY) within the PDS?
    a. Marginalized and vulnerable families
    b. Only urban residents
    c. Farmers
    d. All citizens

12. What challenges, if any, do you encounter while managing the distribution of products at FPSs?
    a. Logistical issues
    b. Staffing issues
    c. Supply chain problems
    d. Knowledge of Benefits

13. What is the main purpose of issuing ration cards in the context of the PDS?
    a. To provide identification for voters
    b. To avail subsidies on cooking gas
    c. To access food grains at subsidized rates
    d. To receive cash transfers from the government
14. Which of the following is a major challenge faced by the PDS in India?
   a. Over-supply of food grains
   b. Lack of infrastructure for storage and distribution
   c. High literacy rates among the population
   d. Excessive government intervention

15. Which of the following factors contributes to leakages in the PDS?
   a. Weak infrastructure for storage and distribution
   b. Lack of transparency in the allocation process
   c. Corruption among officials responsible for implementing the PDS
   d. Others

16. Rank the factors satisfactions of PDS level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Highly satisfied</th>
<th>satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Highly dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price Stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Rank the factors satisfactions of PDS level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low quantity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unavailability of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributing of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old Stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Rank the problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Rank 5</th>
<th>Rank 4</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalidity of measuring device</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough storage capacity in store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long waiting hours in queue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low response from store in charge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Any Other Suggestions ____________________