TECHMIND RESEARCH
ISSN: 2291-2118
International Journal of Research in Business and Technology
Volume 12 No.2 April 2021

Perceived Risks and Consumer Buying Behavior on Street Food around Negros Oriental State University, Dumaguete City

Ryan Tayco[1*], Glennen Y. Zamora[2] & Millard Vaughn Tubog[3]
Negros Oriental State University[1,2&3]
tycs.ryn415@gmail.com[1]
glennenyzamora@gmail.com[2]
baki13lardims@gmail.com[3]
*Corresponding author

Abstract - *Street food or ready-to-eat food is the easiest and cheapest foods that are mostly available to students around Schools or University. Since eating right is a fundamental human right, including and most notably of the students, the constitutional privilege should not take for granted by food providers. This descriptive research used a survey questionnaire to gathered data from the students of Negros Oriental State University, Dumaguete City. 1, 382 respondents answered the survey questionnaire from the eight (8) different colleges in NORSU. They were chosen as respondents through systematic random sampling. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the basic features of the data in a study. Weighted mean and standard deviation was also used to simple summaries about the sample and the measures. Regression analysis was used to conduct the multivariate analysis to test the conceptual framework of the study. The result shows that the respondents neither agree nor disagree on perceived risk on street food and consumer buying behavior. This study also shows the relationship between street food's perceived risk and consumer buying behavior is significant. It means that there is a significant relationship that exists between street foods' perceived risk and consumer buying behavior. The results of the regression analysis between predictors of consumers' buying behavior show that food handling practices such as personal hygiene, food preparation, and food storage shows significant effects of perceived risk on consumers' buying behavior.*

Keywords: *perceived risks; consumer buying behavior; street food; descriptive study; regression analysis; NORSU; Dumaguete City*

1. INTRODUCTION

Food is among the basic needs of every individual. Every human, regardless of age, occupation, and social status, consumes food to survive. However, to sustain a physical life, the drive to eat does not spring from physiological life alone. But, it triggers by the fact that it is a source of emotional satisfaction and an avenue for expressing the social need for sharing and trading, contributing to the relationship of individuals, groups, and societies. Eating, therefore, transpires everywhere, may it be at home, at work, or an academic institution such as the University. The need for eating, consumers also seek convenience, so street food is the best answer for consumers in many countries (Choi, Lee & Ok, 2013)[8]. Since eating right is a fundamental human right, including and most notably of the students, the constitutional privilege should not take for granted by food providers.

Street foods represent traditional local cultures with various types of authentic cuisines (Winarno & Allain, 1991)[31]. Street food vendors and the diverse foods they offer have become cultural icons and tourist attractions (Bhowmik, 2005[5]; Henderson, 2000[15]; Kim, Kim, & Lim, 2007)[17]. Street food vending is a significant income-generating activity for a vast number of people, which contributes to economic self-reliance (Matthews-Njoku, Asiabaka, & Adesope, 2006)[20]. However, street-vended foods may pose significant public health problems, which should be adequately addressed by various regulating agencies (Mankee, et al. 2003). Street food vending is prevalent in urban areas of developing countries (Solomons & Gross, 1995)[24], including the Philippines (Castillo, 1994)[7]. Street foods provide an economical source of nourishment, especially for the low-income workers of the urban poor populations (Abdussalam & Kaferstein, 1993[1]; Freese *et al.*, 1998)[12]. In the Philippines, patronage of street-vended foods seems to cut through the cross-section of the socio-economic profile of the population ranging from the more affluent sector at one end of the spectrum to the disadvantaged at the other end. This street food patronage is also commonly reflected in the campus situation in Dumaguete City.

Consumer buyer behavior is considered to be an integral part of marketing. Kotler and Keller (2011)[19] stated that consumer buying behavior is a study of the ways of buying. It is also the disposing of goods, services, ideas, or experiences by individuals, groups, and organizations to satisfy their needs and wants. Enis (1974) [11]defined buyer behavior has as a process, which, through inputs and their use through process and actions, leads to the

satisfaction of needs and wants. Consumer buying behavior has numerous factors as a part of it, which are believed to have some level of effect on the purchasing decisions of the customers. From marketers' point of view issues, specific aspects of consumer behavior that need to be studied include the reasons behind consumers making purchases, particular factors influencing the patterns of consumer purchases, analysis of changing elements within the society, and others. In this study, the five factors that influence consumer buying behaviors are personal, social, cultural, psychological, and economic considerations.

Consumers, in pursuit of various benefits, face some degree of risk in every purchase decision (Kim, Ferrin, & Rao, 2008)[16]. Thus, the perception of risk and interest has been a useful framework for explaining a consumer's choice of a product/service. Food consumption also involves both positive and negative aspects (Ashwell, 1991)[3]. As an everyday experience, food is necessary for physical wellbeing and is a purveyor of not only pleasure but also worry and stress (Rozin et. al.1999)[22]. Food consumption rests on the degree of perceived risk and benefits that are affected by the outrage related to the hazard and by the euphoria related to the gain (Ashwell, 1991).

Bauer (1960)[4] first introduced the concept of perceived risk in analyzing consumer behavior. Perceived risk is the combined effects of probabilities, the uncertainty involved in a purchase decision, and the consequences of taking an undesirable action (Cunningham, 1967[10]; Gronhaug, 1975[14]; Ulleberg & Rundmo, 2003)[29]. Public concern about food consumption has been affected by a large number of problems (Adam, 1999[2]; Miles & Frewer, 2001)[21], ranging from pesticide residues in foods (Williams & Hammit, 2001)[30] to genetically modified foods (Townsend, 2006[26]; Townsend & Campbell, 2004)[27]. The way these risks are perceived is reasonably critical to understanding how people react to the possible hazards associated with their choices (Brunsø, Fjord, & Grunert, 2002[6]; Stefani, Cavicchi, Romano, & Lobb, 2008)[25]. Street food is no exception. Therefore, the risk perception of this study is the likelihood of negative, unfavorable, and harmful consequences to consumers themselves and society caused by the purchase and consumption of street food. In this study, the perceived risks related to food consumption of street food are a hygienic risk, environmental risk, health risk, and food handling practices.

The Dumaguete City is convergent with different kinds of inhabitants, be it businessmen, professionals, tourists, but the most prominent chunk were the students. In this scenario, the food industry is now booming in the serving tasty, wholesome, and safe food to eat for the consumers were the main concerns of any foodservice section. The Philippines agreed on the growth of awareness of food safety. Because of the following factors: First, a good percentage of the food establishments are on the small and medium scale, where strict operation- regulations for the safety of the food are wanting. Second, scarcity remains the foremost issue of injury. Thus, it results in an in-depth knowledge of food safety, especially in the countryside.

This study is significant to the Norsunians who are studying at Negros Oriental State University, Main Campus I Dumaguete City, and this is to help educate the street foods' patrons, especially the students on how to guarantee their welfare and their wellbeing too. Yet, World Health Organization cares that, in the outlook of their standing in the diets of urban populations, mainly the socially disadvantaged and strength should be prepared to reserve the benefits provided by diverse, low-priced, and often healthy street food. Hence, authorities worried the street food-management have to sense of balance efforts meant at reducing the negative aspects of the environment with the benefits of street food and its essential role in the community. Health authorities charged with the obligation for food safety control should match risk management action to the level of evaluated risk, WHO (1996). The main objective of the study was to determine the perceived risk and consumer buying behavior on the street food around Negros Oriental State University, Dumaguete City.

2. PROCEDURE/METHODOLOGY

This study utilized the descriptive method of research to elicit information from the students at NORSU Main Campus I, Dumaguete City.

The survey instrument asked socio-demographic questions such as age, sex, course, and year level of the respondents. The food safety perceives risk was assess adapted from Choi, Lee, & Ok (2013)[8], and consumers' food-buying behavior was determine changed from Kotler & Armstrong (2013) on factors affecting consumer behavior. Slight modifications were made to reflect the exact situation of the study. All items in the instrument asked the respondents to indicate their level of agreement by choosing from a 5-point Likert scale. A stratified random sampling procedure was used to arrive at the number of respondents. A population frame of all possible respondents was created before the conduct of the sampling.

A panel of two experts in the field of Hospitality Management examined the survey questionnaire to establish validity. Reliability analysis was conducted on all items using Cronbach's α coefficient. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the basic features of the data in a study. Weighted mean and standard deviation was used to simple summaries about the sample and the measures. Regression analysis was used to conduct the multivariate analysis to test the conceptual framework of the study. It was used to examine the relationships between student's food buying decisions and street food perceived risk.

The extent of student's food buying decision and street food perceived risk interpreted as follows:

5 Strongly Agree (SA)
4 Agree (A)
3 Neither Agree/Disagree (NA/ND)
2 Disagree (D)

1 Strongly Disagree (SD)

Upon retrieval of the questionnaires from the respective respondents, the results were tabulated, and the appropriate statistical tools were applied. The data were then presented using tables and graphs. The main instrument for data gathering was a survey questionnaire. Part I provides background information through the students' profiles. Part II focuses on the extent of student's food buying decisions specifically on personal, cultural, social, psychological, and economic factors and street food perceived risk such as hygienic risk, environmental risk, health risk, and food handling practices.

Data in Table 1 present the profile of the respondents of this study. The standard deviation of 2.84 indicates that the ages of the respondents are homogenous. Most of the participants are ages 20 years old, and most are female The biggest respondents are from the College of Business Administration since this is the biggest college in NORSU, and most of the respondents are 1st year students.

Table 1. Socio-demographic profile of the respondents

Variables	N	Mean/%	SD	Min-Max
Age	1,382	20.48	2.84	16-37
Sex				
Male	548	39.65%		
Female	820	59.34%		
Not Indicated	14	1.01%		
College				
CBA	412	29.81%		
CAS	279	20.19%		
CIT	205	14.83%		
CED	142	10.27%		
CCJE	131	9.48%		
CEA	118	8.54%		
CNPAHS	89	6.44%		
CAF	4	0.29%		
Not Indicated	2	0.15%		
Year Level				
I	527	38.13%		
II	385	27.86%		
III	227	16.43%		
IV	225	16.28%		
V	12	0.87%		
Not Indicated	6	0.43%		

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data gathered from the study are presented, analyzed, and interpreted in this section.

3.1 The Extent of Respondents Perceived Risk

Table 2 shows the respondents perceived risk on street food around Negros Oriental State University, Dumaguete City. The respondents of the study neither agree nor disagree on the overall perceived risk in terms of hygienic, environmental, health, and food handling risk. Food handling practices have the highest weighted mean of 3.69. It implies that most of the respondents agree that food handling practices are essential to decrease the perceived risk of street foods. Specifically, they agree on the items: personal hygiene, food preparation, and food storage. It means that food handling practices are the perceived risk recognized most by the respondents. According to the study of Trafialek et al. (2018)[28], in their research on street food vendors' hygienic practices in some Asian and EU countries, many were found non-compliance in the sanitary practices among street food vendors. Hygiene of food equipment and food preparation in EU countries showed higher conformity than in Asian countries. Chukuezi's (2010)[9] study also showed that health hazards from street food vending might be minimized by avoiding poor handling and awareness of the need for personal hygiene and care in preparation, storage, and dispensing of street foods.

Table 2. The extent of Respondents Perceived Risk

Perceived Risk	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Hygienic Risk	**3.20**	**Neither Agree or Disagree**
1. Ingredients not fresh	3.10	Neither Agree or Disagree
2. Improper food storage	3.23	Neither Agree or Disagree
3. Insufficient water supply	3.20	Neither Agree or Disagree
4. Unsanitary conditions	3.28	Neither Agree or Disagree
Environmental Risk	**3.27**	**Neither Agree or Disagree**
1. Excessive use of disposables	3.51	Agree
2. Food waste contamination	3.32	Neither Agree or Disagree
3. Water/sewage contamination	3.29	Neither Agree or Disagree
Health Risk	**2.99**	**Neither Agree or Disagree**
1. Unbalanced nutrition	3.37	Neither Agree or Disagree
2. Food poisoning	2.60	Disagree
3. Being obese	3.00	Neither Agree or Disagree
Food Handling Practices	**3.69**	**Agree**
1. Personal hygiene	3.70	Agree
2. Food preparation	3.72	Agree
3. Food storage	3.66	Agree
Grand $\overline{WX}$	**3.31**	**Neither Agree or Disagree**

Legend:	
Weighted Means	*Verbal Descriptions*
1.00-1.79	*Strongly Disagree*
1.80-2.59	*Disagree*
2.60-3.39	*Neither Agree/Disagree*
3.40-4.19	*Agree*
4.20-5.00	*Strongly Agree*

As shown in Table 3, the respondents neither agree nor disagree on consumer buying behavior. They relayed that psychological factor such as appearance, aroma, food volume, variations of food items and beliefs, and attitude is the respondent's typical buying behavior. Singh et al. (2016)[23] explained that people demand good taste and quantity but very few demand for hygienic and sanitary food handling. The consumer of the street food demands less for hygiene and safe handling, which may be one of the causes for street food vendors not to maintain a standard of hygiene practices. As described by Furaiji, Łatuszyńska, & Wawrzyniak (2012)[13], that consumer behavior involves the psychological processes that consumers go through in recognizing their needs, finding ways to solve these needs, making purchase decisions, interpret information, make plans, and implement these plans

Table 3. Consumer Buying Behavior

Consumer Buying Behavior	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Personal Factor	**3.20**	**Neither Agree or Disagree**
1. Nutritional Content	3.10	Neither Agree or Disagree
2. Taste	3.23	Neither Agree or Disagree
3. Shelf life of food item	3.20	Neither Agree or Disagree
4. Personality	3.28	Neither Agree or Disagree
Cultural Factor	**3.27**	**Neither Agree or Disagree**
1. Familiarity with the food	3.51	Agree
2. Food preference	3.32	Neither Agree or Disagree
3. Food acceptance	3.29	Neither Agree or Disagree

Consumer Buying Behavior	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Social Factor	**2.99**	**Neither Agree or Disagree**
1. Peers' influence	3.37	Neither Agree or Disagree
2. Current trends	2.60	Disagree
3. The popularity of the food	3.00	Neither Agree or Disagree
Psychological Factor	**3.69**	**Agree**
1. Appearance	3.70	Agree
2. Aroma	3.72	Agree
3. Food volume	3.66	Agree
4. Variation of food items	3.72	Agree
5. Beliefs and attitude	3.66	Agree
Economic Factor	**2.99**	**Neither Agree or Disagree**
1. Spending capacity	3.37	Neither Agree or Disagree
2. Price	2.60	Disagree
3. Lifestyle	3.00	Neither Agree or Disagree
Grand WX	**3.31**	**Neither Agree or Disagree**

Table 4 reveals that the relationship between street food's perceived risk and consumer buying behavior is significant. It means that there is a significant relationship that exists between street foods' perceived risk and consumer buying behavior. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. The results imply that street food perceived risk has a relationship with the consumer's food buying behaviors. The data indicate that street food perceived risk affects consumer's food buying behaviors. Choi, Lee, & Ok (2013)[8], found out that perceived risks negatively affected consumer attitudes toward street food. In turn, risk perception adversely affected behavioral intention and attitude toward street food mediated the relationship between risk perception and behavioral intention. The way these risks are perceived is relatively critical to understand how people react to the possible hazards associated with their choices (Brunsø, Cavicchi, Romano, & Lobb, 2008).

Table 5. Correlation between street foods perceived risk and consumer buying behavior

Correlation Coefficient Matrix	**Hygienic Risk**	**Environmental Risk**	**Health Risk**	**Food Handling Practices**	**Consumers' Buying Behavior**
Hygienic Risk	1.00				
Environmental Risk	.637**	1.00			
Health Risk	.596**	.559**	1.00		
Food Handling Practices	.174**	.205**	.153**	1.00	
Consumers' Buying Behaviors	.142**	.173**	.129**	.436**	1.00

p<0.05, **p<0.01

Table 5 presents the regression analysis between predictors of consumers' buying behavior. Model 1 was built to predict socio-demographic profile with consumers' buying behaviors, Model 2 to predict hygienic risk, Model 3 to predict environmental risk, Model 4 to predict health risk, and Model 5 the predictors with consumers' buying behaviors. As seen, in Model 5, food handling practices such as personal hygiene, food preparation, and food storage shows significant effects of perceived risk on consumers' buying behavior. Personal hygiene and food preparation are vital at 0.05 and food storage at 0.001. This supports the findings of Trafialek et al. (2018)[28], in their study on street food vendors' hygienic practices in some Asian and EU countries that many were found non-compliance in the sanitary practices among street food vendors. Perceived risks like food handling practices negatively affected consumer attitudes toward street food (Choi, Lee, & Ok, 2013)[8]. These perceived risks from street food vending may be minimized by avoiding poor handling and awareness of the need for personal hygiene and care in the preparation, storage, and dispensing of street foods (Chukuezi, 2010)[9].

Table 5. A hierarchical regression analysis between predictors of Consumers' Buying Behavior

Independent Variables(Standardized Beta Coefficients)					
Control Variables	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Final Model**
Age	.019				-.002
Sex	-.010				.012

Year Level	.005				.038
Hygienic Risk					
• Ingredients not fresh		.006			.020
• Improper food storage		.058			-.014
• Insufficient water supply		.028			-.005
• Unsanitary conditions		.034			-.008
Environmental Risk					
• Excessive use of disposables			.036		.044
• Food waste contamination			.077		.034
• Water/sewage contamination			.017		-.025
Health Risk					
• Unbalanced nutrition				.037	.040
• Food poisoning				.056	.025
• Being obese				-.002	-.033
Food Handling Practices					
• Personal hygiene					.126*
• Food preparation					.141*
• Food storage					.206**
R squared (R^2)	.001	.013	.021	.025	.198

*p<0.05, **p<0.01

4. CONCLUSION

The respondents neither agree nor disagree on the perceived risk on street food around Negros Oriental State University, Dumaguete City. It implies that most of the respondents agree that food handling practices are important to decrease the perceived risk of street foods. It was also observed that the respondents neither agree nor disagree on consumer buying behavior. They relayed that psychological factor such as appearance, aroma, food volume, variations of food items and beliefs, and attitude is the respondent's standard buying behavior.

This study also shows the relationship between street food's perceived risk and consumer buying behavior is significant. It means that there is a significant relationship that exists between street foods' perceived risk and consumer buying behavior. The results imply that street food perceived risk has a relationship with the consumer's food buying behaviors. The data indicate that street food perceived risk affects consumer's food buying behaviors. The study also presents evidence on the relationship between the individual demographic profile of the consumers and street food perceived risk related to consumer buying behavior. The results of the regression analysis between predictors of consumers' buying behavior show that food handling practices such as personal hygiene, food preparation, and food storage shows significant effects of perceived risk on consumers' buying behavior.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

Since the location of the street food is near the Provincial Government of Negros Oriental, it is recommended by the researchers that there is continuous monitoring by the health department of the Province from time to time. The street food vendors should follow consistent proper procedures. Cover waste bins (*with lids)* should be visible and available for the customers.

The researchers also recommend that hygienic practices informative checklists should be available in every station of the street food area. This checklist will evaluate the food safety practices of street food vendors to emphasize the implementation of excellent hygiene standards. It could also help the health department of the Province to map out a program for food safety.

The Hospitality Management Department of Negros Oriental State University may conduct training on food handling practices such as personal hygiene, food preparation, and food storage since this is found to be the perceived risks by the respondents of the study. Training in handling customers and foodborne illnesses may also provide for street food vendors. As for further research, researchers may conduct similar research in a different setting to further confirm the results of this study.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank the Research, Innovation, Development, and Extension Office of Negros Oriental State University for the financial help to finish this study.

6. REFERENCES

[1] AbdussalamM & Kaferstein FK (1993): Safety of street foods. World Health Forum 14(2), 191–194.
[2] Adam, B. (1999). Industrial food for thought: Timescapes of risk. Environmental values, 8(2), 219-238.
[3] Ashwell, K. (1991). The distribution of microglia and cell death in the fetal rat forebrain. Developmental brain research, 58(1), 1-12.
[4] Bauer, R. A. (1960). Consumer behavior as risk taking. In Proceedings of the 43rd National Conference of the American Marketing Assocation, June 15, 16, 17, Chicago, Illinois, 1960. American Marketing Association.
[5] Bhowmik, S. K. (2005). Street vendors in Asia: a review. Economic and political weekly, 2256-2264.
[6] Brunsø, K., Fjord, T. A., & Grunert, K. G. (2002). Consumers' food choice and quality perception. The Aarhus School of Business Publ., Aarhus, Denmark
[7] Castillo, M. T. G. (1994). Knowledge, attitudes, and practices of street food consumers in Manila. Field Epidemiological Training Program, Department of Health, Manila, Philippines.
[8] Choi, J., Lee, A., & Ok, C. (2013). The effects of consumers' perceived risk and benefit on attitude and behavioral intention: A study of street food. Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 30(3), 222-237.
[9] Chukuezi, C. O. (2010). Food safety and hygienic practices of street food vendors in Owerri, Nigeria. Studies in the sociology of science, 1(1), 50.
[10] Cunningham, M. S. (1967). The major dimensions of perceived risk. Risk-taking and information handling in consumer behavior.
[11] Enis, B. M. (1974). Marketing Principles (Pacific Palisades, Calif.
[12] Freese, E., Romero-Abal, M. E., Solomons, N. W., & Gross, R. (1998). The microbiological safety of typical Guatemalan foods from street vendors, low-income homes, and hotels. International journal of food sciences and nutrition, 49(1), 27-38.
[13] Furaiji, F., Łatuszyńska, M., & Wawrzyniak, A. (2012). An empirical study of the factors influencing consumer behaviour in the electric appliances market. Contemporary Economics, 6(3), 76-86.
[14] Grønhaug, K. (1975). Autonomous vs. joint decisions in organizational buying. Industrial Marketing Management, 4(5), 265-271.
[15] Henderson, J. (2000). Food hawkers and tourism in Singapore. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 19(2), 109-117.
[16] Kim, D. J., Ferrin, D. L., & Rao, H. R. (2008). A trust-based consumer decision-making model in electronic commerce: The role of trust, perceived risk, and their antecedents. Decision support systems, 44(2), 544-564.
[17] Kim, H. Y., Lim, Y. I., & Kim, H. J. (2007). A study on the ready-to-eat street-foods usage of customers in a college- town in the northern part of Seoul. Journal of the Korean Society of Food Culture, 22(1), 43-57.
[18] Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2010). Principles of marketing. Pearson education.
[19] Kotler, P., & Keller, K. (2011). Marketing management 14th edition. Prentice-Hall. Mankee, A., Ali, S., Chin, A., Indalsingh, R., Khan, R., Mohammed, F., ... & Adesiyun,
[20] Matthews-Njoku, E. C., Asiabaka, C. C., & Adesope, O. M. (2006). ENTERPRISE CHARACTERISTICS AFFECTING RESOURCE POOR WOMEN FOOD VENDORS'INCOME GENERATION IN IMO STATE, NIGERIA. Global Approaches To Extension Practice (GAEP), 2(1).
[21] Miles, S., & Frewer, L. J. (2001). Investigating specific concerns about different food hazards. Food quality and preference, 12(1), 47-61
[22] Rozin, P., Fischler, C., Imada, S., Sarubin, A., & Wrzesniewski, A. (1999). Attitudes to food and the role of food in life in the USA, Japan, Flemish Belgium, and France: Possible implications for the diet–health debate. Appetite, 33(2), 163-180.
[23] Singh, A. K., Dudeja, P., Kaushal, N., & Mukherji, S. (2016). Impact of a health education intervention on food safety and hygiene of street vendors: A pilot study. medical journal armed forces India, 72(3), 265-269.
[24] Solomons, N. W., & Gross, R. (1995). Urban nutrition in developing countries. Nutrition reviews, 53(4), 90-95.
[25] Stefani, G., Cavicchi, A., Romano, D., & Lobb, A. E. (2008). Determinants of intention to purchase chicken in Italy: The role of consumer risk perception and trust in different information sources. Agribusiness: An International Journal, 24(4), 523-537.
[26] Townsend, E. (2006). Affective influences on risk perceptions of, and attitudes toward, genetically modified food. Journal of Risk Research, 9(2), 125–139.
[27] Townsend, E., & Campbell, S. (2004). Psychological determinants of willingness to taste and purchase genetically modified food. Risk Analysis, 24(5), 1385–1393.
[28] Trafialek, J., Drosinos, E. H., Laskowski, W., Jakubowska-Gawlik, K., Tzamalis, P., Leksawasdi, N., ... & Kolanowski, W. (2018). Street food vendors' hygienic practices in some Asian and EU countries–A survey. Food control, 85, 212-222.
[29] Ulleberg, P., & Rundmo, T. (2003). Personality, attitudes, and risk perception as predictors of risky driving behaviour among young drivers. Safety Science, 41(5), 427-443.
[30] Williams, P. R., & Hammitt, J. K. (2001). Perceived risks of conventional and organic produce: pesticides, pathogens, and natural toxins. Risk analysis, 21(2), 319-330.

[31] Winarno, F. G., & Allain, A. (1991). Street foods in developing countries: lessons from Asia. Alimentation, Nutrition et Agriculture (FAO); Alimentacion, Nutricion y Agricultura (FAO).
[32] WHO. 1996. Essential Safety Requirements for Street-vended Food. Unpublished Document.