

Understanding Communication Needs of Organic Food Consumers in India: A Grounded Theory Approach

Evelina Sahay

Assistant Professor, Marketing Department, ITM Business School, Kharghar, Navi Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Email: evelinasahay@gmail.com

Dr. Somnath Mukherjee

Assistant Professor, Management Department, Birla Institute of Technology, City Centre Ranchi, Jharkhand, India

Email: smukherjeebit@gmail.com

Abstract

In urban and sub-urban India, the moderate but growing demand for the organic market is attributable to diverse key drivers regarding organic product intake. This study is envisaged to investigate information concerning motivation and barriers beneath Indian consumers' awareness and intention towards buying trends of organic food products in order to identify the related cues/factors required for designing accurate communication nudges. To gain detailed insight grounded theory approach was used and 47 respondents i.e., users/non-users from major urban and suburbs of North and South India were interviewed based on a questionnaire survey, followed by the theoretical sampling method. Outcomes of this study show respondents from urban and sub-urban India are equally concerned about their health, ethical, and social values. While on the other side respondents residing in Urban parts of India either users or non-users were comparatively more aware of the barriers affecting organic market practices. The results recommend marketers and promoters of the organic market to take the core role played by communication and consumer sovereignty into consideration and design effective communications based on the cues derived within this study.

Keywords: *Green consumption, Organic Ignorance, Communication to consumers in India, Consumer sovereignty, Grounded Theory*

Introduction

In accordance with the 20th edition of The World of Organic Agriculture, published by the FiBL (Research Institute of Organic Agriculture) and IFOAM–Organics International, India tops the table in the world when it comes to the production of organic products (Willer & Lernoud, 2019). Moreover, it has been estimated that by 2020, India bagged an exponential increase, of around INR 100,000–120,000 million, in the organic market that is steadily increasing with a CAGR of 25% (ASSOCHAM-NEC study, 2018). The key drivers of this current rise in purchasing pattern of the organic market likely include rising concern towards better health, proliferated consumption-related ailments, strengthened standard of living and household income, awareness regarding environmental benefits, and likewise (Barański et al., 2017; Eynade et al., 2021; Magnusson et al., 2003; Rizzo et al., 2020a). In several ways, these factors have very well challenged the sustainability of the organic product market in both urban and sub-urban parts of India. Besides, has motivated the producers to intensively expand the production of natural based products. This expansion has largely influenced urban purchasing patterns (Osswald & Dittrich, 2012). While reachability to several suburb parts of India is still a major problem.

The growing popularity of organic products has led to an increase in so-called "eco-friendly" conscious consumers that has, in a way, boosted their consumption irrespective of place. Despite being the largest organic producer in the world, India's domestic market is still at an early stage. The country is increasingly gaining over

the global market, specifically in Europe, but suffers an extremely slow domestic market growth (Willer & Lernoud, 2019). Hitherto there is still a wide gap among peers as well as producers of organic products (Kushwah et al., 2019). Hence, making it essential to look up for associated motivators and challenges in India to design an effective and proper communication.

In a similar context, most of the accessible literature is mainly dedicated to the urban cities of India (Dangi et al., 2020; Nagaraj, 2021; Panduranga Rao, 2020). As the urban market is thought to be a potential market by most producers. In this present work, the authors present insights into the current consumption practices as well as intention to purchase organic products concerning urban and sub-urban India. The study documents the diversity in consumption practices with the place of residence and identifies challenges in the organic product market. This paper is aimed at assisting policymakers, marketers, and producers to identify the important cues around which the communication nudges can be developed for the promotion of organic food and marketing.

Literature review

A brief perusal of the literature indicating grounded theory approach and relevant factors broadly affecting an understanding of consumption practices among consumers in the context of Urban and sub-urban India is discussed in the following section.

Grounded theory approach

Due to the magnitude of information that one can seek and engaging outcomes, grounded theory is one of the extensively used approaches. Taking this into consideration, researchers have successfully identified motivators and major barriers in the purchase and consumption of organic food (Yadav et al., 2019). In another study, researchers have utilized grounded theory to explore prime vitals concerning consumer decision-making in online promotion (Sharma et al., 2020).

Factors affecting consumption practices

Demographic segmentation based on age, income, gender, and education stands out as a core in identifying consumption practices of organic products (Mehra & Ratna, 2014; Nandi et al., 2016; Nasution et al., 2010; Promotosh et al., 2011). Researchers have extensively explored that organic buyers are, in general, educated and aged, and the cost of the product is a major hurdle (Ramesh & Divya, 2015). On the flip side, there is a considerable population residing in urban parts of India (Chattopadhyay & Khanzode, 2019; Nandi et al., 2016; Rao et al., 2020) than sub-urban India (Kumar & Ali, 2011) who are genuinely concerned about the health of their families, environment, animal welfare and amalgamation of all factors. Whereas price is one of the main hurdles in organic market growth. Also, price in conjugation with the unavailability of the product has barred consumers from buying organic products (Nandi et al., 2016). Researchers have vividly explored the mediating role of attitude and perceived behavioral control to mitigate consumerism (Boobalan & Nachimuthu, 2020; Kataria et al., 2019). Whereas Chakrabarti has specifically emphasized characteristic features such as the reputation of purchase store, certification process-related information, word of mouth, and likewise. In his study, he has marked these features as top-rated when it comes to organic product consumption (Chakrabarti, 2010).

A perusal of literature makes it clear that the grounded theory approach has not been utilized for the understanding of motivators and barriers concerning the organic market in Urban and Sub-urban parts of India in a simultaneous manner. It should also be noted that limited work has been done to gain an insight into what exactly should be conveyed to the organic producers. The reported literature evidently shows that there is still much scope for studying consumers purchase intention for the organic product in Urban and Sub-Urban India. There is a need to explore vital information from consumers of Urban and Sub-Urban India in terms of their organic product consumption and utility. The lack of literature clearly reveals diverse missing dimensions concerning consumer's purchase intention in the context of Urban and Sub-urban India that are required to be investigated.

Methodology

Data collection

To gain in-depth information concerning motivations and barriers beneath buying trends of organic products among urban and sub-urban residents, structured research methodology i.e. grounded theory technique (Mackenzie, 2006) was brought into effective action. The grounded studies are generally composed of a number of sampling techniques, followed by data collection and analysis via diverse stages of coding adjoined with comparative analysis, theoretical sampling approach, and memoing. These methods and processes create an unfolding, iterative system of actions and interactions inherent in grounded theory (Birks & Jane, 2015). In general, these methods are both iterative and dynamic and are not one-directional.

The whole framework was designed on semi-structured interviews substantially based on organic product buying trends among urban and sub-urban consumers of North and South India. Overall, interviews were organized and recorded with 47 Indian consumers from both urban and sub-urban parts of India (Table 1). The proposed work has been worked out by keeping in view that almost 65.53 % of the total Indian population resides in sub-urban cities (*India Rural Population 1960-2021 | MacroTrends*, 2021). In order to reach a large number of respondents, at the initial level Assisted Crowd Sourcing, an online social media-based method was used. From there, some potential respondents were picked and contacted for further interviews. During screening at the primary level, only those respondents were included those who were interested in participating. After seeking permission from them and giving consent of confidentiality of the information provided by them, they were contacted in their free time and asked questions concerning relevance to our investigation.

For initial exploration, the questionnaire was prepared in compliance with the Straussian approach. However, with the interview, questions were added to the initially designed questionnaire in an iterative approach, and respondents were consulted using the theoretical sampling method. And, after 47 interviews, the researcher agreed on data saturation, as no new insight was generated from the new respondents. The average duration of an interview ranged between 15-20 minutes that were recorded for further analysis. After self-introductory questions, in the beginning, each respondent was asked whether they purchase organic products or not. Further, on receiving a positive response, a set of questions circumventing the qualifying questions were asked. Whereas on negative response, another set of questions were asked.

Table1: Demographic profiles of sample

| Sample attributes | Descriptive statistics | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|--------|
| Urban population | 23 | |
| Sub-Urban population | 24 | |
| | (Female) | (Male) |
| Gender | 59.57% | 40.43% |
| Average age (In years) | 43.5 | 48 |
| Average number of kids | 1 | 2 |
| Educational Qualification | | |
| Intermediate | - | - |
| Graduate | 21.43% | 68.42% |
| Post-Graduate | 50.00% | 31.58% |
| PhD | 28.57% | - |
| Household Income | | |

| | | |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Below 5 lakh per annum | 14.29% | 5.27% |
| 5-10 lakh per annum | 57.14% | 36.84% |
| Above 10 lakh per annum | 28.57% | 57.89% |
| Organic product users | 57.14% | 36.84% |

Quality assessment of methodology

In order to reduce the risk of bias during data collection, data analysis, critical thinking, and theory development, the quality assessment was conducted in two phases (Yadav et al., 2019). In the first phase, the data extracted from the recorded tape of the respondents were coded independently by two researchers by the virtue of memo writing (Birks & Jane, 2015). While in the second phase, randomly picked respondents were contacted again to cross-check the interpretations done by the individual researcher, before including the same into the analysis.

Findings

Data analysis

Preliminary, the collected information was segregated into groups and was facilitated with open and axial coding procedure appertaining to grounded theory strategy (Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Glaser, 1978; Teppo, 2015). Essentially, each line, sentence, and paragraph were scrutinized to identify, categorize, and describe the potential phenomena found in the text. Consequently, the deciphered concepts were cross verified with the already detailed concepts in the literature. Besides, an amalgamation of inductive and deductive thinking was also put forward.

Broadly, studies were assessed in two phases. In the first phase, the raw data was arranged in a systematic manner with reference to the open coding process. In the present study, 19 codes were identified based on the response pattern of the respondents. Out of which, 10 codes were classified as motivators, whereas the remaining 9 codes were deemed as barriers to the purchase of organic products. Further, in the second phase, the defined open codes were categorized in adherence to the core theme for the purpose of the axial coding. Overall, four axial codes concerning motivators and four axial codes concerning barriers in what should be conveyed to organic product consumers were categorized. Table 2 briefly enlists all the recognized open and axial codes.

Table2: Open and Axial coding in compliance with grounded theory approach

| Open Code | Excerpts from interview (Sub-Urban Resident) | Excerpts from interview (Urban Resident) | Axial Code |
|---|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Motivators: Organic market practices | | | |
| Health concern | I have been day and night working just with the motive to give a healthy life to my kids and family. In this current situation, taking good care of my family's health is my only goal. | By using organic products, we can avoid dangers to our health which ultimately causes different types of diseases and long-term harmful effects to our body. | Health consciousness |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|---|
| | I prefer organic products for my little one as they are grown with natural minerals that are good for health. | They say, organic products reduce the chances of health hazards due to absence of harmful chemicals. (Non-user) | |
| No side effects | I buy organic products as they have no side effects, allergies, or induced diseases. | Basically, organic products are said to have no side effects in long run. (Non-user) | Product-specific attitude |
| Connect with nature | In general, in day-to-day life, I purchase organics because they only contain natural things & can be easily digestible through our body. | Whenever I enter a shopping complex, my eyes always look for something made from pure and natural sources | |
| Nutritional concern | Basically, I buy organic products for my kid as they provide direct nutrition to our body and have a direct response to the physiological action of the body with minimal adverse effects. | Supplementing my family with nutrition is my utmost priority. | |
| | They contain antioxidants and also promote better hormonal functions in the body, so I preferably head towards buying organic products. | - | |
| Food safety | I personally prefer buying organic products because of no chemical presence or no fertilizers presence in the particular product. | Giving the best to my family is my utmost duty, so products with no artificial chemicals and fewer pesticides are my first pick. | |
| | I always put forward to feed my kid with chemical-free and preservative-free food, but I am not completely assured about the quality of Organic food that's available. (Non-user) | Whenever I go shopping, I make sure to buy fruits and vegetables with no pesticides and meat with no antibiotics. | |
| | In today's scenario, when one gets the least chance to eat organics, I always try my best to give those products to my kids and family that contain no harmful ingredient or raw material. | I always take care of the fact to have better food and without pesticide but the reason why I don't buy Organics is because this whole idea of organic produce is not very clear to me. (Non-user) | |
| Societal | I buy organics because they are good for health, the environment, and the ecosystem. | I focus to go for eco-friendly products only, as it is our duty to look for our mother earth. | Ethical consideration/ Environmental concern |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Organic farming | Organic farming is one that is very much required in today's scenario. And, to do my bit I always support them by buying organics. | - | |
| Improve soil fertility | In general, organic products keep the nutrients in the soil remains intact. | - | |
| Soil erosion and pollution | - | They reduce soil erosion and pollution. | |
| Word of mouth | I always give it a try when my best friend recommends any specific organic product to me. | I am an inquisitive person, and preferably follow my relative's choice while shopping. | Subjective norms |
| Barriers: Organic market practices | | | |
| Product guarantees | - | I always doubt about how reliable these organic products are and am I really going to get the best even after paying such a high cost? (Non-user) | Consumer Ignorance/Organic Ignorance |
| | - | I have not brought organic products as I have doubt of authenticity. (Non-User) | |
| | | I produce organic products on my farm for my consumption. (Non-User) | |
| Missing Product Labels and vital information/ proper labelling | Before buying any product, out of habit I usually check for the product ingredients and tests it has passed. And, surprisingly many times these basic things are unavailable on the label so that automatically bars my mind to buy that product. (Non-user) | There is no transparency of how products were formed or produced and what tests were done. (Non-user) | |
| | Organic products lack information concerning health and other benefits for end-users. | Organic products also lack a list of ingredients on their package as well as the making process. | |
| Lack of promotion | I want to see more of digital marketing. | Mainly I have observed that sellers use the middleman concept in the case of organic products, which I don't like at a personal level. | Role of communication |
| | I have very limited knowledge about any organic brand. Brands should communicate more. | We want to see the actual farm pictures where they grow the vegetables. (Non-user) | |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| Trust in the certification | I have seen that organic products lack the different types of seals provided to them by statutory bodies. | I take note of products that are certified by a trusted government body like ISI mark for safety. (Non-user) | |
| | I always search for the FSSAI mark in organic products meant for food consumption. And, only go for those products. (Non-user) | The complete details of the product including source and use of proper certification should be available for consumers | |
| Consumer assumptions | I would be satisfied with general description of how the product is made and how it is different from other products. | Their brand value makes one trust and that is the only parameter for a regular buyer. | Consumer sovereignty |
| | Certain laboratory tests may infer the absence of harmful chemicals. | By providing analysis report from reputed food testing laboratory. (Non-user) | |
| Uncertainty about product quality | I have encountered some dishonest suppliers and they themselves are not sure about the quality of product. | I have seen that second time purchase of products is not that effective as the first one. | |
| Participation of government | | I feel there is a lack of timely monitoring for compliance with quality standards. | |
| Money issues | Being a housewife, I have to keep a check on monthly expenses without keeping my family's health at stake. So, I preferably go for necessary organic products only. | There is no assurance that they are indeed organic besides being costlier. (Non-user) | Behavioral control factors |
| | - | I am not able to justify the high prices of organic products. (Non-user) | |
| Low availability of the product | - | Many a time I have seen this trend that particular organic products always stay out of stock. So, I have to timely shift my choice to permanently available products. | |

Motivators affecting organic market practices

Health consciousness: Health consciousness is basically a positive attitude corresponding to awareness about health and actively looking up for one's health as well as his or her family and accordingly adhering to the same (Espinosa & Kadić-Maglajlić, 2018; Michaelidou & Hassan, 2008). Taking the organic market into consideration, this constraint directly correlates with the positive consumption attitude (Hsu et al., 2016).

Overall, the basic ideation of health is significantly dependent on two aspects i.e., characteristics of the product and personal concern (Ditlevsen et al., 2019). The excerpts mentioned in Table 2 draws insight pointing towards the holistic perception of people towards health. Organic product users stated, "I want to give healthy life to my family"; "They are good for health, contains antioxidants and less chemicals". Similar concern for health was found in excerpts recorded from non-users, on being asked, what do they understand by organic products "I think, they can keep our kids healthy". The non-users always had a hint of doubt regarding organic products, thus emphasizing an immediate need for effective communication that can resolve their doubts and encourage organic consumption.

Product-specific attitude: It is identified as one of the vital motivators of the organic market. The product specific attitude of organic product consumption broadly circumvents around functional values in terms of the nutritional and chemical composition of the organic product (Escobar-López et al., 2017; Rahnama & Rajabpour, 2017). This can be further regarded as quality, safety, naturalness, chemical free ingredients, nutritional content, and zero adverse effects (Hoek et al., 2004; Janssen, 2018). Some organic products users stated, "I go for them as they are grown with natural minerals that are good for health"; "Organic products are free of chemicals"; "Organic products are free from chemicals (used at any stage of production or management)". Similar views were stated by non-users when inquired concerning their understanding towards organic products, though they did not have a firm belief in the stated functional values, "Organic products are said to be mainly obtained from plant origin without harmful chemicals"; " May be food and vegetables that are grown and processed without using fertilizers and not with harmful chemicals and pesticides."; " Probably to avoid ingesting unnecessary chemicals."; "They say there are no side effects of such products".

Ethical consideration/Environmental concern: An individual's awareness concerning the environment and contribution towards society are deemed to be as the social value-related motives (Nandi et al., 2016). The ethical consideration, in a way, is proportionally correlated with an individual's portrait as well as his attitude towards green consumption (Sweeney & Soutar, 2001; Yoo et al., 2013). The concern was noticeably seen in the excerpts from respondents "Organic farming is one that is very much required in today's scenario. And, to do my bit I always support them by buying organics"; "In general, organic products keep the nutrients in the soil remains intact". During probe even non-users expressed environmental concern "It is high time that we take care of the environment, but I am not sure how it can be achieved through organic farming and organic consumption." Such statements from users as well as non-users call for a clear and directional communication from the organic product marketers.

Subjective norms: The existence of subjective norms is totally determined on one's outlook for society. They are mainly elicited on the grounds of an individual's tendency to get influenced by the social environment (Hansmann et al., 2020; Levine, 2012; Paulus, 2015). This constraint specifically circumscribes around societal influence, store reputation, social approval, and self-social status (Puska et al., 2018; Shin et al., 2018). This can be evaluated from the participants respective statements stating, "I trust my best friend's choice, I know she will pick best of best from all products"; "In the current scenario, we are trapped in a social circle, so we have to either follow the trend or become a trendsetter". Considering the high social media engagement of consumers and their inclination and response to influencer marketing, Subjective norms can be effectively leveraged by marketers to impact the buying preferences of consumers.

Barriers affecting organic market practices

Consumer Ignorance/Organic Ignorance: Consumer considerations for the purchase of an organic product are based on a complex set of thoughts. Of which, perception may not be in compliance with the amount of individual awareness and understanding for organic consumption (Eyinade et al., 2021). The excerpts from Urban respondents beneath non-consumption of organic product comprise "I have doubt of authenticity regarding organic products"; "I personally produce organic products on my farm for my consumption"; "I have a feeling of doubt that procured sources of products are genuinely organic". In addition, asymmetrical knowledge among individuals presents a concern for the organic market. On being asked regarding why they buy an organic product, some of them stated "They are probably good for health"; "Because it has no artificial element into it"; "They don't affect our health"; "Actually, it is natural". Among non-users, organic ignorance

and doubt was a predominant phenomenon as many non-user respondents had only a vague idea about organic products and their functional attributes.

Role of communication: In accordance with convention theory, values are communicated through diverse channels that collectively employ social welfare, equity-like "fair price", solidarity, sub-urban development, urban sub-urban relation, familiarity, closeness, and trust relations. Suitably, one's perception of organic consumption depends largely on the awareness communicated. At a large scale, the transformation in ideation by different intermediaries and factual knowledge gaps like trust, transparency, or confidence has been identified to be credibly communicated at all (Furtschegger & Schermer, 2014). Similar views were extracted from some of the recordings on being asked what ideally brands or companies should do to give assurance to consumers. Some of the well-documented responses include "I want to see general description of how the product is made and how it is different from other products"; "Their brand value makes one trust and that is the only parameter for a regular buyer"; "By sharing complete details of the product including source and use of proper certification". While non-users responded, "Better quality control & good business ethics"; "They should be certified by a trusted government body like ISI mark for safety"; "Strict norms and regulations required along with certification"; "By providing analysis report from reputed food testing laboratory"; "Inform end-user about its health and other benefits".

Communication, at this stage in Indian markets is required not only to educate the consumers about the organic products, their attributes, and benefits but also to make consumers more aware ethically and environmentally, thereby affecting their purchase preferences.

Consumer sovereignty: In practice, consumer sovereignty manifests the role of consumers in influencing production decisions (Fellner & Spash, 2015; Gorshin, 1967; Knox, 1960; Persky, 1993; Timmermann et al., 2018). As a whole, directly or indirectly market framework largely relies upon consumer's behavior, knowledge, and their uncertainty about the attributes of commodities (Tisdell, 2017). The accessible literature clearly suggests declination of the market due to poor assessment of knowledge about products at both buyer and supplier end (Akerlof, 2017). The consumers behavioral influence on the organic market can be seen from the statements "I would be satisfied with general description of how the product is made and how it is different from other products"; "Their brand value makes one trust and that is the only parameter for a regular buyer"; "Certain laboratory tests may infer the absence of harmful chemicals". Additionally, due to lack of knowledge, many a time, consumers are supplied with adulterated and inferior quality products by the suppliers. Some respondents pointed out "I have seen that second time purchase of product is not that effective than the first one"; "I have encountered some dishonest suppliers and they themselves are not sure about the quality of product". On the other hand, consumers having good access to knowledge stated, "I feel there is lack of timely monitoring for compliance with quality standards".

Behavioral control factors: The inclination towards consumption of any product is directly correlated to the willingness to pay. Overall, it can be said that the disposition of a product totally relies on an individual's desire to acquire it (Gumber & Rana, 2017). Additionally, the price of a product is interlinked with various factors like the product's value for money, household income, and personal concern (Lusk & Hudson, 2004). Despite the growing organic market, unavailability of the organic product has turned into a major deterrent to organic consumption. Collectively these factors largely influence the growth in the organic market as stated by respondents "I doubt about organic product reliability and high cost"; "There is no assurance that they are indeed organic besides being costlier"; "I don't buy organic products because of higher costs and lesser availability in the market"; "Difficult to ascertain authenticity"; "I can ignore the cost, but I don't trust that it's really organic". These thoughts were expressed by both users and non-users.

Discussion and Conclusion

The present work envisaged to identify the motivators and barriers behind organic consumption and intention among Indian consumers residing in Urban and sub-urban India. The insight from the study is intended to provide an assess of the information to the organic marketers, producers, and policymakers concerning bridging the gap between them and consumers. The investigation identified several factors circumscribed on an

individual's attitude towards health, environmental, social, and ethical values as favors of organic purchase. Whereas preparedness to pay, communication gap and product unavailability were considered as prime factors affecting the growth of the organic market.

The statements revealed that the user, as well as non-user respondents from Urban and Sub-urban India, put forward consideration of health as their priority when it comes to their family and kids. Conclusively, the marketers and producers need to understand the consumer perception towards organic and conventional consumption (Shafie & Rennie, 2012; Srineng & Thapa, 2018). Likewise, research in a similar context has very well established a direct relationship between the organic market and an individual's concern for health and wellbeing (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2004; Hidalgo-Baz et al., 2017; Moisander, 2007; Pagiaslis & Krontalis, 2014). The accessible reports suggest how a small shift from conventional consumption to organic consumption can impact one's psychological well-being and health (Apaolaza et al., 2018; Goetzke et al., 2014; Rizzo et al., 2020b).

Furthermore, the alleged pieces of evidence tabulated relatively present concern of respondents in the direction of linking functional values to health attributes. It can also be said, with reference to Ditlevsen et al. (2019), that understanding of health differs with the consumers. However, there is a huge scope giving rationale that subjective norms tend to change rapidly with the social status of the reference group (Al-Swidi et al., 2014; Bai et al., 2019; Choo et al., 2004; Scalco et al., 2017; Thøersen & Zhou, 2012). Besides, a meta-analysis significantly affirmed the role of subjective norms affecting the purchase intention and attitude of an individual (Scalco et al., 2017). Organic ignorance has identified a variable gap between the organic market and Sub-Urban consumption. This information has been well established by the available documents concerning moderate growth in the organic market due to organic ignorance.

Aside from health, environmental and ethical concerns, lack of communication vividly showed a gap regarding the purchase of organic products. The impact of effective communication on the organic market is largely unknown. However, with the advent of digitalization and the rise of social media, if taken care of, communication can do wonders with organic consumption (Aertsens et al., 2011; Bellows et al., 2008; Tarabella et al., 2019). It has also been recognized as an influential word of mouth based network (Melović et al., 2020; Yang, 2021; Zhou et al., 2020). Consumer's high Subjective Norms can be exploited effectively by marketers provided they are able to identify the suitable influencers and get them to communicate with the reference groups. This strategy can be subtly used for young adults as they are predominantly present on social media, have a zeal to follow the new consumption patterns and have good spending capacity.

Consideration of the ideal role of consumers' sovereignty on the efficiency of market growth has been playing a lead role in economic outcomes (Fellner & Spash, 2015; Persky, 1993; Tisdell, 2017). The growing complexity of the supply chain and hidden access to knowledge about the product has widely affected the market. Some researchers have vividly worked upon the facts stating the correlation between ultimate transfer of knowledge to consumer and competitive economy (Krozer, 2016; Kuenzler, 2017; Tisdell, 2017). Overall, this is because of the uncertainty of thought process, poor access to information, or no knowledge at consumer ends (Boettke, 2018). Some alike results pertaining to consumers' sovereignty have been raised in the present study. Thus, suggesting marketers, producers, and statutory bodies need to look upon the other side of the frame by adopting policies to enhance buyer's trust as well as their market. The role of effective communication will be most crucial in all this, and it is clear from the findings that there is a need to communicate with the market without delay.

In general, respondents have mainly raised concern regarding value for money as the largest hurdle when it comes to buying organic products. The present investigation also suggests only a few respondents were willing to purchase costly organic products. Interestingly, individuals from Sub-urban India were found to show negligible interest in repetitive buying of the product, as none of the user/non-user complained regarding the unavailability of the products. Likewise, the literature suggests that the consumer find price as a vital obstacle in organic product purchase (Marian et al., 2014; Melovic et al., 2020; Pawlewicz, 2020; Rana & Paul, 2017; Shafie & Rennie, 2012), while some individuals are willing to pay to some extent (Aguilar & Vlosky, 2007; Obayelu, 2014; Owusu & Anifori, 2013; Saphores et al., 2007). The low capital income is also one of the concerns suggesting consumers unwillingness to pay high prices for organic (Pacanoski, 2009).

Conclusively, the organic market growth likely relies on consumer's perception towards safety, health, and green consumption. While consumers have enlisted health and safety in first place pertaining to purchase of organic products (Ghorbani et al., 2007; Naspetti & Zanoli, 2009; Röhr et al., 2005; Sadek & Oktarani, 2009; Yiridoe, 2014), followed by social and ethical values including environmental concern and Subjective Norms, but contrasting views suggesting market growth gap between consumer and marketer are significantly visible. As consumers have raised concerns for lack of information and communication, value for money, combined with a doubtful mindset; it calls for marketers to deploy a well thought out communication addressing the issues and concerns of consumers.

Suggestions

In India, primarily food security is given priority, and due to lack of knowledge and communication gap food safety does not stand a place. The diversity in an individual's basic concepts regarding consumption of organic products has chiefly restricted the growth of the organic market. Concerning the same, additional studies bringing more insight to understand an individual's psychological biases and limitations towards the organic consumption are therefore essentially needed for quick proliferation of organic market in India. The cues drawn from this study through an in depth investigation of motivators as well as barriers of organic buying can subtly guide the marketing efforts for organic communication. Consumer expectations regarding more communication from the brands can be built around the major cues identified within this study.

References

1. Aertsens, J., Mondelaers, K., Verbeke, W., Buysse, J., & van Huylenbroeck, G. (2011). The influence of subjective and objective knowledge on attitude, motivations and consumption of organic food. In *British Food Journal* (Vol. 113, Issue 11, pp. 1353–1378). <https://doi.org/10.1108/00070701111179988>
2. Aguilar, F. X., & Vlosky, R. P. (2007). Consumer willingness to pay price premiums for environmentally certified wood products in the U.S. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 9(8), 1100–1112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2006.12.001>
3. Akerlof, G. A. (2017). The market for “lemons”: Quality uncertainty and the market mechanism. In *Decision Science* (Vol. 84, Issue 3, pp. 261–273). <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511609381.002>
4. Al-Swidi, A., Huque, S. M. R., Hafeez, M. H., & Shariff, M. N. M. (2014). The role of subjective norms in theory of planned behavior in the context of organic food consumption. *British Food Journal*, 116(10), 1561–1580. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-05-2013-0105>
5. Apaolaza, V., Hartmann, P., D'Souza, C., & López, C. M. (2018). Eat organic – Feel good? The relationship between organic food consumption, health concern and subjective wellbeing. *Food Quality and Preference*, 63, 51–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2017.07.011>
6. ASSOCHAM-NEC study. (2018). Assocham India. In *The Associated Chambers of Commerce & Industry of India*. <https://www.assochem.org/newsdetail.php?id=6835>
7. Bai, L., Wang, M., & Gong, S. (2019). Understanding the antecedents of organic food purchases: The important roles of beliefs, subjective norms, and identity expressiveness. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 11(11), 3045. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11113045>
8. Barański, M., Rempel, L., Iversen, P. O., & Leifert, C. (2017). Effects of organic food consumption on human health; the jury is still out! In *Food and Nutrition Research* (Vol. 61, Issue 1). Taylor and Francis Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16546628.2017.1287333>
9. Bellows, A. C., Onyango, B., Diamond, A., & Hallman, W. K. (2008). Understanding consumer interest in organics: Production values vs. purchasing behavior. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Industrial Organization*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.2202/1542-0485.1169>
10. Bhattacharya, C. B., & Sen, S. (2004). Doing better at doing good: When, why, and how consumers respond to corporate social initiatives. *California Management Review*, 47(1). <https://doi.org/10.2307/41166284>
11. Birks, M., & Jane, M. (2015). Grounded theory. In *SAGE*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406915618324>
12. Boettke, P. J. (2018). Hayek and Market Socialism. In *F. A. Hayek* (pp. 119–139). Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-41160-0_5

13. Boobalan, K., & Nachimuthu, G. S. (2020). Organic consumerism: A comparison between India and the USA. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 53, 101988. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.101988>
14. Chakrabarti, S. (2010). Factors influencing organic food purchase in India - expert survey insights. *British Food Journal*, 112(8), 902–915. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00070701011067497>
15. Chattopadhyay, A., & Khanzode, P. (2019). AN EMPIRICAL STUDY ON AWARENESS AND CONSUMPTION PATTERN OF ORGANIC FOOD IN BENGALURU CITY, THE IT CAPITAL OF INDIA: AN ANALYSIS WITH RESPECT TO DIFFERENT DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS AND AVAILABILITY OF ORGANIC FOOD PRODUCTS IN BENGALURU. *International Journal of Research -GRANTHAALAYAH*, 7(1), 276–296. <https://doi.org/10.29121/granthaalayah.v7.i1.2019.1055>
16. Choo, H., Chung, J., & Thorndike Pysarchik, D. (2004). Antecedents to new food product purchasing behavior among innovator groups in India. *European Journal of Marketing*, 38(5/6), 608–625. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560410529240>
17. Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2015). Basics of Qualitative Research. In 4th ed.; Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/basics-of-qualitative-research/book235578>
18. Dangi, N., Narula, S. A., & Gupta, S. K. (2020). Influences on purchase intentions of organic food consumers in an emerging economy. *Journal of Asia Business Studies*, 14(5), 599–620. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JABS-12-2019-0364>
19. Ditlevsen, K., Sandøe, P., & Lassen, J. (2019). Healthy food is nutritious, but organic food is healthy because it is pure: The negotiation of healthy food choices by Danish consumers of organic food. *Food Quality and Preference*, 71, 46–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2018.06.001>
20. Escobar-López, S. Y., Espinoza-Ortega, A., Vizcarra-Bordi, I., & Thomé-Ortiz, H. (2017). The consumer of food products in organic markets of central Mexico. *British Food Journal*, 119(3), 558–574. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-07-2016-0321>
21. Espinosa, A., & Kadić-Maglajlić, S. (2018). The mediating role of health consciousness in the relation between emotional intelligence and health behaviors. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9(NOV), 2161. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02161>
22. Eyinade, G. A., Mushunje, A., & Yusuf, S. F. G. (2021). The willingness to consume organic food: A review. In *Food and Agricultural Immunology* (Vol. 32, Issue 1, pp. 78–104). Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540105.2021.1874885>
23. Fellner, W. J., & Spash, C. L. (2015). The role of consumer sovereignty in sustaining the market economy. In *Handbook of Research on Sustainable Consumption* (pp. 394–409). <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781783471270.00038>
24. Furtschegger, C., & Schermer, M. (2014). The perception of organic values and ways of communicating them in mid- scale values based food chains. *XIth IFSA-Conference European IFSA Symposium, April*, 1–4.
25. Ghorbani, M., Mahmoudi, H., & Liaghati, H. (2007). Consumers' Demands and Preferences for Organic foods: A Survey Study in Mashhad, Iran. *3rd QLIF Congress, Hohenheim, Germany*, 1–4. <https://orgprints.org/9831/>
26. Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity: advances in the methodology of grounded theory*. Mill Valley, CA Sociology Press. - References - Scientific Research Publishing. <https://books.google.com/books?id=73-2AAAAIAAJ&pgis=1>
27. Goetzke, B., Nitzko, S., & Spiller, A. (2014). Consumption of organic and functional food. A matter of well-being and health? *Appetite*, 77, 96–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2014.02.012>
28. Gorshin, S. I. (1967). On the principle of reduction. *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics*, 31(6), 1088–1091. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-8928\(67\)90215-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-8928(67)90215-8)
29. Gumber, G., & Rana, J. (2017). Factors Influencing Willingness to Pay Price Premium for Organic Food in India. *International Journal of Emerging Research in Management and Technology*, 6(2), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.23956/ijermt/v6n1/115>
30. Hansmann, R., Baur, I., & Binder, C. R. (2020). Increasing organic food consumption: An integrating model of drivers and barriers. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 275, 123058. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.123058>

31. Hidalgo-Baz, M., Martos-Partal, M., & González-Benito, Ó. (2017). Attitudes vs. purchase behaviors as experienced dissonance: The roles of knowledge and consumer orientations in organic market. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8(FEB), 248. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00248>
32. Hoek, A. C., Luning, P. A., Stafleu, A., & De Graaf, C. (2004). Food-related lifestyle and health attitudes of Dutch vegetarians, non-vegetarian consumers of meat substitutes, and meat consumers. *Appetite*, 42(3), 265–272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2003.12.003>
33. Hsu, S. Y., Chang, C. C., & Lin, T. T. (2016). An analysis of purchase intentions toward organic food on health consciousness and food safety with/under structural equation modeling. *British Food Journal*, 118(1), 200–216. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-11-2014-0376>
34. *India Rural Population 1960-2021 | MacroTrends*. (2021). <https://www.macrotrends.net/countries/IND/india/rural-population>
35. Janssen, M. (2018). Determinants of organic food purchases: Evidence from household panel data. *Food Quality and Preference*, 68, 19–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2018.02.002>
36. Kataria, Y. S., Krishna, H. G., Tyagi, V. K., & Vashishat, T. (2019). Consumer Buying behavior of Organic food Products in India Through the Lens of Planned Behavior Theory. *Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 10(1), 60. <https://doi.org/10.5958/2321-5828.2019.00011.1>
37. Knox, F. (1960). The Doctrine of Consumers' Sovereignty. *Review of Social Economy*, 18(2), 138–149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00346766000000024>
38. Krozer, Y. (2016). Ethical Consumers and Producers. In *Theory and Practices on Innovating for Sustainable Development* (pp. 113–123). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-18636-8_9
39. Kuenzler, A. (2017). Restoring consumer sovereignty: How markets manipulate us and what the law can do about it. In *Restoring Consumer Sovereignty: How Markets Manipulate Us and What the Law Can Do About it*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190698577.001.0001>
40. Kumar, S., & Ali, J. (2011). Analyzing the Factors Affecting Consumer Awareness on Organic Foods in India. *21st Annual IFAMA World Forum and Symposium on the Road to 2050: Sustainability as a Business Opportunity, Frankfurt, Germany, February 2015*, 1–12. https://www.ifama.org/events/conferences/2011/cmsdocs/2011SymposiumDocs/282_SymposiumPaper.pdf
41. Kushwah, S., Dhir, A., Sagar, M., & Gupta, B. (2019). Determinants of organic food consumption. A systematic literature review on motives and barriers. In *Appetite* (Vol. 143). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2019.104402>
42. Levine, J. M. (2012). Group processes. In *Group Processes*. Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203869673>
43. Lusk, J. L., & Hudson, D. (2004). Willingness-to-pay estimates and their relevance to agribusiness decision making. In *Review of Agricultural Economics* (Vol. 26, Issue 2, pp. 152–169). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9353.2004.00168.x>
44. Mackenzie, N. (2006). Research dilemmas: Paradigms, methods and methodology. *Issues In Educational Research*, 16. <http://www.iier.org.au/iier16/mackenzie.html>
45. Magnusson, M. K., Arvola, A., Hursti, U. K. K., Åberg, L., & Sjöden, P. O. (2003). Choice of organic foods is related to perceived consequences for human health and to environmentally friendly behaviour. *Appetite*, 40(2), 109–117. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-6663\(03\)00002-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-6663(03)00002-3)
46. Marian, L., Chrysochou, P., Krystallis, A., & Thøgersen, J. (2014). The role of price as a product attribute in the organic food context: An exploration based on actual purchase data. *Food Quality and Preference*, 37, 52–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2014.05.001>
47. Mehra, S., & Ratna, P. A. (2014). Attitude and behaviour of consumers towards organic food: An exploratory study in India. *International Journal of Business Excellence*, 7(6), 677–700. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBEX.2014.065503>
48. Melovic, B., Cirovic, D., Dudic, B., Vulic, T. B., & Gregus, M. (2020). The analysis of marketing factors influencing consumers' preferences and acceptance of organic food products—recommendations for the optimization of the offer in a developing market. *Foods*, 9(3), 259. <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods9030259>

49. Melović, B., Jocović, M., Dabić, M., Vulić, T. B., & Dudic, B. (2020). The impact of digital transformation and digital marketing on the brand promotion, positioning and electronic business in Montenegro. *Technology in Society*, 63, 101425. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101425>
50. Michaelidou, N., & Hassan, L. M. (2008). The role of health consciousness, food safety concern and ethical identity on attitudes and intentions towards organic food. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 32(2), 163–170. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-6431.2007.00619.x>
51. Moisander, J. (2007). Motivational complexity of green consumerism. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 31(4), 404–409. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-6431.2007.00586.x>
52. Nagaraj, S. (2021). Role of consumer health consciousness, food safety & attitude on organic food purchase in emerging market: A serial mediation model. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 59, 102423. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2020.102423>
53. Nandi, R., Bokelmann, W., Gowdru, N. V., & Dias, G. (2016). Consumer motives and purchase preferences for organic food products: Empirical evidence from a consumer survey in Bangalore, South India. *Journal of International Food and Agribusiness Marketing*, 28(1), 74–99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08974438.2015.1035470>
54. Naspetti, S., & Zanoli, R. (2009). Organic food quality and safety perception throughout Europe. *Journal of Food Products Marketing*, 15(3), 249–266. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10454440902908019>
55. Nasution, R. A., Tarigan, M. M., & Dhewanto, W. (2010). Consumer attitude and intention to buy organic food as a result of brand extension: An experimental approach. *2010 International Conference on Management Science and Engineering, ICMSE 2010*, 3(1), 503–511. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICMSE.2010.5719850>
56. Obayelu, O. (2014). Consumers' Perception and Willingness to Pay for Organic Leafy Vegetables in Urban Oyo State, Nigeria. *European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety*, 4(2), 127–136. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ejnf/2014/6498>
57. Osswald, N., & Dittrich, C. (2012). *Sustainable food consumption and urban lifestyles: the case of Hyderabad/India*.
58. Owusu, V., & Anifori, M. O. (2013). Consumer willingness to pay a premium for organic fruit and vegetable in Ghana. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review*, 16(1), 67–86. <https://doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.144649>
59. Pacanoski, Z. (2009). The myth of organic agriculture. *Plant Protection Science*, 45(2), 39–48. <https://doi.org/10.17221/43/2008-pps>
60. Pagiaslis, A., & Krontalis, A. K. (2014). Green consumption behavior antecedents: Environmental concern, knowledge, and beliefs. *Psychology and Marketing*, 31(5), 335–348. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.20698>
61. Panduranga Rao, D. (2020). A Study on Consumer Preference Towards Organic Food Products in Tamilnadu. *Journal of Xidian University*, 14(5). <https://doi.org/10.37896/jxu14.5/139>
62. Paulus, P. B. (2015). Psychology of group influence: Second edition. In *Psychology of Group Influence: Second Edition*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315715544>
63. Pawlewicz, A. (2020). Change of price premiums trend for organic food products: The example of the Polish egg market. *Agriculture (Switzerland)*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture10020035>
64. Persky, J. (1993). Retrospectives: Consumer Sovereignty. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 7(1), 183–191. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.7.1.183>
65. Promotosh, B., Sajedul, I. M., & Vladimir, V. (2011). *Young Consumers' Purchase Intentions of Buying Green Products A study based on the Theory of Planned Behavior*. <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2:427264>
66. Puska, P., Kurki, S., Lähdesmäki, M., Siltaoja, M., & Luomala, H. (2018). Sweet taste of prosocial status signaling: When eating organic foods makes you happy and hopeful. *Appetite*, 121, 348–359. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2017.11.102>
67. Rahnema, H., & Rajabpour, S. (2017). Factors for consumer choice of dairy products in Iran. *Appetite*, 111, 46–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2016.12.004>
68. Ramesh, S. V., & Divya, M. (2015). A study on consumers' awareness attitude and satisfaction towards select organic food products with reference to Coimbatore. *Journal of Interdisciplinary and*

- Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(4), 81–84.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/298643931_A_study_on_consumers'_awareness_attitude_and_satisfaction_towards_select_organic_food_products_with_reference_to_Coimbatore
69. Rana, J., & Paul, J. (2017). Consumer behavior and purchase intention for organic food: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 38(6), 157–165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2017.06.004>
 70. Rao, D. P., Mogili, R., & Nagaraj, S. (2020). A Study on Consumer Preference Towards Organic Food Products in Tamilnadu. *Journal of Xidian University*, 14(5). <https://doi.org/10.37896/jxu14.5/139>
 71. Rizzo, G., Borrello, M., Guccione, G. D., Schifani, G., & Cembalo, L. (2020a). Organic food consumption: The relevance of the health attribute. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12020595>
 72. Rizzo, G., Borrello, M., Guccione, G. D., Schifani, G., & Cembalo, L. (2020b). Organic food consumption: The relevance of the health attribute. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(2), 595. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12020595>
 73. Röhr, A., Lüddecke, K., Drusch, S., Müller, M. J., & Alvensleben, R. V. (2005). Food quality and safety - Consumer perception and public health concern. *Food Control*, 16(8 SPEC. ISS.), 649–655. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2004.06.001>
 74. Sadek, N. F., & Oktarani, Y. P. (2009). Consumer Knowledge and Perception about Organic Food: A Challenge for Consumer Education on The Benefits of Going Organic. *Asian Journal of Food and Agro-Industry*, Special Issue, 363–367. <https://www.thaiscience.info/Journals/Article/AFAI/10850245.pdf>
 75. Saphores, J. D. M., Nixon, H., Ogunseitan, O. A., & Shapiro, A. A. (2007). California households' willingness to pay for “green” electronics. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 50(1), 113–133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09640560601048549>
 76. Scalco, A., Noventa, S., Sartori, R., & Ceschi, A. (2017). Predicting organic food consumption: A meta-analytic structural equation model based on the theory of planned behavior. In *Appetite* (Vol. 112, pp. 235–248). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2017.02.007>
 77. Shafie, F. A., & Rennie, D. (2012). Consumer Perceptions Towards Organic Food. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 49, 360–367. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.07.034>
 78. Sharma, A., Joshi, R. M., & Wali, O. P. (2020). Human Capital: A Key Driver of Consumer Decision-making in Online Promotion (An Application of Grounded Theory in Exploratory Research). *Asia-Pacific Journal of Management Research and Innovation*, 16(2), 132–145. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2319510x20931267>
 79. Shin, Y. H., Im, J., Jung, S. E., & Severt, K. (2018). The theory of planned behavior and the norm activation model approach to consumer behavior regarding organic menus. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 69, 21–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2017.10.011>
 80. Srinieang, S., & Thapa, G. B. (2018). Consumers' Perception of Environmental and Health Benefits, and Consumption of Organic Vegetables in Bangkok. *Agricultural and Food Economics*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40100-018-0100-x>
 81. Sweeney, J. C., & Soutar, G. N. (2001). Consumer perceived value: The development of a multiple item scale. *Journal of Retailing*, 77(2), 203–220. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359\(01\)00041-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359(01)00041-0)
 82. Tarabella, A., Masoni, A., & Tessitore, S. (2019). *Birth of Organic Agriculture and Development of an “Organic” Market* (pp. 41–57). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-23811-1_4
 83. Teppo, A. R. (2015). Grounded Theory Methods. In *Approaches to qualitative research in mathematics education: Examples of methodology and methods* (pp. 3–21). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9181-6_1
 84. Thøersen, J., & Zhou, Y. (2012). Chinese consumers' adoption of a “green” innovation - The case of organic food. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 28(3–4), 313–333. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2012.658834>
 85. Timmermann, C., Félix, G. F., & Tittonell, P. (2018). Food sovereignty and consumer sovereignty: Two antagonistic goals? *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems*, 42(3), 274–298. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21683565.2017.1359807>

86. Tisdell, C. (2017). Consumers' sovereignty – significant failures: why consumers' demands for environmental, human and animal protection are often unmet. In *Economics and Environmental Change* (pp. 94–119). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781782549635.00012>
87. Willer, H., & Lernoud, J. (2019). *The world of organic agriculture. Statistics and emerging trends 2019*. <https://orgprints.org/37018/>
88. Yadav, R., Singh, P. K., Srivastava, A., & Ahmad, A. (2019). Motivators and barriers to sustainable food consumption: Qualitative inquiry about organic food consumers in a developing nation. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 24(4), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.1650>
89. Yang, X. (2021). Determinants of consumers' continuance intention to use social recommender systems: A self-regulation perspective. *Technology in Society*, 64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101464>
90. Yiridoe, E. K. (2014). Organic and conventional food : A literature review of the economics of consumer perceptions and preferences Organic and Conventional Food : A Literature Review of the Economics of Consumer Perceptions and Preferences Final Report. *Citeseer*, April 2006. https://www.academia.edu/download/47915110/Organic_and_conventional_food_a_literature_review_.pdf
91. Yoo, J. J., Divita, L., & Kim, H. Y. (2013). Environmental awareness on bamboo product purchase intentions: Do consumption values impact green consumption? *International Journal of Fashion Design, Technology and Education*, 6(1), 27–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17543266.2012.758318>
92. Zhou, Q., Mei, Q., Liu, S., & Wang, Q. (2020). Dual-effects of core enterprise management and media attention on occupational health and safety of small and medium suppliers in China. *Technology in Society*, 63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101419>