

# A Study on Change in Consumer Buying Behavior of Organic Food Products Post Covid 19 Pandemic

**Dr. R. Chitra, Assistant Professor (Sl.Gr), PSG Institute of Management Studies, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India. chitrarajesh19@gmail.com**

**B. Subadra devi, Research Scholar, Sri Ramakrishna College of Arts & Science, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India. subhadevi6@gmail.com**

**Abstract - People want food, which is free from chemicals and toxins the food which can increase their vulnerability system, which is natural and has better quality. The Indian organic food is a new paradigm in 2019 after COVID-19. People now understand the value of nutritional food, which can increase their vulnerable system, can help from nimbus contagion so there's a huge occasion in the Indian request to motivate the consumer to buy further and further organic food it's time to shift from conventional food to organic food. This paper focuses on changes in food consumption that passed during the COVID-19 epidemic. It's ideal is to collude changes in individual consumer positions and identify the influence of different factors related to the COVID 19 epidemic on changes in individual food consumption. The epidemic caused by COVID-19 has changed the mindset of numerous consumers. They are decreasingly apprehensive of the pitfalls of not minding for the earth. Before the epidemic, there was a perceived increase in collaborative environmental concern and sustainability, but COVID-19 has further accelerated this process and motivated further people to assume this responsibility. Therefore, the health extremity could spark the consumption of organic foods, which are foods produced through environmentally friendly and that haven't been instinctively altered. It's essential for retailers to know how these consumers of organic foods bear in order to try to modify their strategies. In this environment, the idea of this exploration is to dissect the relationship between, satisfaction, trust, purchase, and word-of-mouth intentions towards organic products.**

**Keywords: Organic food, Buying behavior, Covid 19, Pandemic, Health and Environment.**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Organic Agriculture is a creation framework that supports the strength of soils, environments, and individuals. It depends on natural procedures, biodiversity and cycles adjusted to nearby conditions, as opposed to the utilization of contributions with unfavorable impacts. Purchasers are on edge about food quality, creation methods and provenance and trust natural nourishments. The food related dynamic procedures is intricate and is affected by numerous determinants.

The COVID-19 pandemic has led to surging demand for organic food products. This has resulted in surge in interest of products that benefit from a "Health Halo" including functional foods and fruits and vegetables. Corona virus is raising purchaser familiarity with the connection among nourishment and wellbeing. The COVID-19 pandemic and its tremendous effect on regular daily existences had sensational ramifications for the natural area in 2020. Now

customers look for sound and clean food to take care of their families, natural food is their choice of decision for home.

Organic food is created by strategies that follow the principles of natural cultivating. Standards vary across worldwide, but organic farming, in general, features practices that cycle resources, promote ecological balance, and conserve biodiversity. Associations managing natural items might limit the utilization of specific pesticides and manures in the cultivating techniques used to create such items. In general, organic foods are also usually not processed using irradiation, industrial solvents, or synthetic food additives

Demand for organic food products and awareness level is expanding rapidly around the developed countries. Nevertheless, the market advancement in the Asian nations is in a beginning stage. Meager data is available for Indian natural food grandstand and the shopper direct towards these items.

The expanding interest for organic food items in different regions of the planet from mid 2000s is driven by the rising customers' awareness about quality and security of food (Vindigni et al., 2002). The reality shows that natural food utilization is still low in extent, contrasted with non-natural food (Gupta and Ogden, 2009). Such a circumstance shows the significance of study on customers' conduct, especially the shoppers' demeanor towards purchasing organic food. Likewise, the review on the mentality and goal model in organic food utilization has not shown reliable outcomes (Chen, 2009).

The review on the lead of the purchasers towards the natural item is one of the basic plots for separating the future interest of the organic agribusiness. From the publicizing perspective, it is basic to comprehend human origination of purchaser choice creation regarding naturally delivered food and how the utilization can be progressed. Mindfulness and information level of purchasers about naturally delivered food sources are likewise essential.

As per Michaelidou (2008), the organic food is seen by its arrangement (no destructive and adjusted fixings are utilized), technique for creation (food is developed uniquely under regular conditions with insignificant effect on the climate), addressed qualities (protected and solid) and surprisingly friendly class (upper and medium). Mohammed et al. (2012) have differentiated the antecedent of exertion of natural elements in Egypt. As indicated by the outcomes, the determinants of utilization of natural food are positioned as follows: medical conditions, wellbeing of natural food varieties and the conviction that natural food varieties add to the environmental framework.

Purchaser conduct incorporates a bewildered mental interaction and furthermore actual improvement (purchase decision). Purchaser lead is a decision method and actual improvement individuals participate in while reviewing, getting, using or designing of items and endeavors. Shopper Behavior might be portrayed as "the exchange of abilities that takes put amidst a usage method, inside a buyers' self and his condition. - this cooperation takes put between three parts viz. learning, impact and conduct; - it continues through pre-purchase advancement to the post purchase understanding; - it fuses the periods of assessing, getting, using and disposing of product and adventures". The "purchaser" fuses both individual buyers and business/current/legitimate shoppers. Shopper coordinate explains the reasons and reasoning that underlie getting decisions and use plans; it explains the methods through which buyers pick.

### Objectives of the Study

1. To study the demographic profile of respondents consuming organic food products.
2. To find out the association between demographic factors and consumer buying behavior.

3. To test the difference among demographic factors and overall satisfaction
4. To find out the preference factors of consumers while buying organic food products after covid 19.

### Scope of the Study

Organic food products promotes a balance of human, other living organisms and the nature. It additionally advances no counterfeit additives and best keep up with the innovation of food. This forestalls overabundance utilization of unsafe fixings and subsequently guarantees wellbeing. The study attempted to gain knowledge about Consumers' buying behaviour towards organic food products and to see whether there is any potential that might change their behaviour.

## II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Haomom Ramananda Singh (2002) dissected client market and customer purchasing conduct towards solid and non-strong merchandise. Shoppers have high brand mindfulness. Larger piece of the shoppers are brand steadfast. Buyers show complex purchasing conduct.

(Srithamma, Vithayarungruang Sri and Posayanonda, 2005) It is an overall peculiarity that individuals have become increasingly more isolated from the starting points of their food. Stressed over their wellbeing, buyers search out affirmed items to shield themselves from poisons and cancer-causing agents.

As per Cottigham (2012), the more conspicuous quantities of normal food are bought in the general stores, latest two years saw a rising in direct selling of organic food items. Regardless of the way that the improvement has been smaller over the latest two years, and stay the most critical wellspring of natural nourishment for clients.

**B.Krishnakumare and S.Niranjan (2017)**, The principle subject of the review is to distinguishes the which element impact the buyers to purchase the items and to be aware of buyers level of awareness and knowledge towards the purchasing of products. Finally the concluded that, the consumers psychological factors plays an individual to buy the products.

**Vishal Kumar Laheri and Purushottam Kumar Arya (2018)** in their review, underscores on the choice of buyers towards their consuming propensities. The study reveals that there is a need for organizing many awareness programs by the government & at the same time safe for the environment.

**Nayana Sharma And Dr. Ritu Singhvi (2019)** in their review ('Consumer discernment and conduct towards natural food. The main objective of the study is to provide an current practices of market exposure towards consumers and organic foods. Through the study finally they

concluded that purchasing behaviours can be influenced by consumers psychological factors.

Maggie McNeil(2020) analyzed that the unprecedented COVID 19 pandemic and its enormous impact on our daily lives-has already had dramatic consequences for the organic sector in 2020.Prior to 2020,the organic sector has been growing steadily year by year.

A recent report by the Organic Product Network and Category Partners, organic product sales were up 22%.

**Table –1 Socio –Economic Factors of the respondents**

S.No.	Demographics	Respondents	Percentage (100%)
<b>I</b>	<b>Gender</b>		
	Male	34	28.3
	Female	86	71.7
<b>II</b>	<b>Age</b>		
	Below 18 years	1	.8
	18-22 years	90	75.0
	23-27 years	21	17.5
	28-34 years	8	6.7
	Above 35 years	0	0
<b>III</b>	<b>Education</b>		
	School level	5	4.2
	UG	81	67.5
	PG	34	28.3
<b>IV</b>	<b>Occupation</b>		
	Student	76	63.3
	Self employed	4	3.3
	Profession	18	15.0
	Business	7	5.8
	Others	15	12.5
<b>V</b>	<b>Family Monthly Income</b>		
	Below 25000	38	31.7
	25000-40000	43	35.8
	41000-60000	23	19.2
	Above 60000	16	13.3
<b>VI</b>	<b>Type of family</b>		
	Nuclear	89	74.2
	Joint	31	25.8
<b>VII</b>	<b>Marital Status</b>		
	Married	10	8.3
	Unmarried	110	91.7

Source: Computed from Primary

data

**INFERENCE**

The Hence, majority (71.7 percent) of the respondents are Female, majority (75 percent) of the respondents are 18-22 years. It is concluded that most of the sample respondents (67.5 percent) of the respondents are belonging to UG level, most of the sample respondents (63.3 percent) of the respondents are belonging to student., most of the sample respondents (35.8 percent) of the respondents are belonging to 25000-40000 income group, most of the sample respondents (74.2 percent) of the respondents are belonging to nuclear family type and It is concluded that, most of the sample respondents (91.7 percent) of the respondents are belonging to unmarried.

**Chi-square**

**H1: There is a significant association between Gender and Often purchase .**

**Gender \* Often purchase Crosstabulation**

Count

		Often purchase				Total
		1	2	3	4	
Gender	1	12	16	3	3	34
	2	23	31	21	11	86
Total		35	47	24	14	120

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.657 <sup>a</sup>	3	.199

a. 1 cells (12.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.97.

Hence the significant value is 0.199 is higher than 0.05. So null hypothesis is accepted. Hence there is a significant association between Gender and Often purchase .

**H2: There is significant association between Education and Reasons for purchasing.**

**Education \* Resons for purchasing Crosstabulation**

Count

		Resons for purchasing				Total
		1	2	3	6	
Education	1	4	1	0	0	5
	2	72	4	1	4	81
	3	25	5	2	2	34
Total		101	10	3	6	120

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.779 <sup>a</sup>	6	.342

a. 9 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .13.

Hence the significant value is 0.342 is higher than 0.05. So null hypothesis is accepted. Hence there is a significant association between Education and Reasons for purchasing.

**H3: There is a significant association between Family monthly income and Type of food products.**

**Family monthly income \* Type of food product Crosstabulation**

Count

		Type of food product							Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Family monthly	1	33	3	0	0	0	1	1	38
	2	25	7	5	1	4	1	0	43

income	3	20	1	0	0	0	2	0	23
	4	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	16
Total		92	12	5	1	5	4	1	120

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.861 <sup>a</sup>	18	.082

a. 24 cells (85.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .13.

Hence the significant value is 0.082 is higher than 0.05. So null hypothesis is accepted. Hence there is a significant association between Family monthly income and Type of food products.

**H4: There is a significant association between Type of family and Type of food product.**

**Type of family \* Type of food product Crosstabulation**

Count		Type of food product							Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Type of 1	70	6	3	1	4	4	1	89	
family 2	22	6	2	0	1	0	0	31	
Total	92	12	5	1	5	4	1	120	

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.537 <sup>a</sup>	6	.366

a. 11 cells (78.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .26.

Hence the significant value is 0.366 is higher than 0.05. So null hypothesis is accepted. Hence there is a significant association between Type of family and Type of food product.

**H5: There is a significant association between Marital status and often purchase.**

**Marital status \* Often purchase Crosstabulation**

Count		Often purchase				Total
		1	2	3	4	
Marital 1	3	3	4	0	10	
status 2	32	44	20	14	110	
Total	35	47	24	14	120	

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.691 <sup>a</sup>	3	.297

a. 4 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.17.

Hence the significant value is 0.297 is higher than 0.05. So null hypothesis is accepted. Hence there is a significant association between Marital status and often purchase.

**H6: There is a significant association between Education and Percentage to pay more.**

**Education \* Percentage to pay more Crosstabulation**

Count		Percentage to pay more				Total
		1	2	3	4	
Education 1	1	2	0	2	5	
2	16	36	17	12	81	
3	3	14	10	7	34	
Total	20	52	27	21	120	

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.718 <sup>a</sup>	6	.455

a. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .83.

Hence the significant value is 0.455 is higher than 0.05. So null hypothesis is accepted. Hence there is a significant association between Education and Percentage to pay more.

**ANOVA**

**To test the difference among demographic factors and overall satisfaction**

**Hypothesis**

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no difference among demographic factors and overall satisfaction before covid 19 pandemic

H<sub>1</sub>: There is difference among demographic demographic factors and overall satisfaction before covid 19 pandemic

**ANOVA**

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Gender	Between Groups	.331	3	.110	.532	.661
	Within Groups	24.036	116	.207		
	Total	24.367	119			
Education	Between Groups	.193	3	.064	.234	.872
	Within Groups	31.799	116	.274		
	Total	31.992	119			
Age	Between Groups	1.437	3	.479	1.331	.268
	Within Groups	41.763	116	.360		
	Total	43.200	119			
Occupation	Between Groups	16.042	3	5.347	2.574	.057
	Within Groups	240.950	116	2.077		
	Total	256.992	119			



Family monthly income	Between Groups	1.634	3	.545	.522	.668
	Within Groups	120.958	116	1.043		
	Total	122.592	119			
Type of family	Between Groups	.967	3	.322	1.698	.171
	Within Groups	22.025	116	.190		
	Total	22.992	119			
Marital status	Between Groups	.249	3	.083	1.080	.361
	Within Groups	8.918	116	.077		
	Total	9.167	119			

**INFERENCE**

Gender, here, significance is 0.661. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, the difference in overall satisfaction between male and female is considered insignificant. Then education and overall satisfaction is interpreted from the values given before pandemic where significance is 0.872. Here the p-value is greater than 0.05; therefore, overall satisfaction and gender is insignificant. Age and overall satisfaction where significance is 0.268. Here the p-value is greater than 0.05; therefore, the overall satisfaction and age is insignificant. Occupation where significance is 0.057. Here the p-value is greater than 0.05; therefore, the overall satisfaction and occupation is insignificant. Family monthly income where significance is 0.668. Here the p-value is greater than 0.05; therefore, overall satisfaction and occupation is insignificant. Type of family where significance is 0.171. Here the p-value is greater than 0.05; therefore, overall satisfaction and occupation is insignificant. Marital status where significance is 0.361. Here the p-value is greater than 0.05; therefore, overall satisfaction and occupation is insignificant before covid 19 pandemic.

**Hypothesis**

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no difference among demographic factors and overall satisfaction after covid 19 pandemic.

H<sub>1</sub>: There is difference among demographic demographic factors and overall satisfaction after covid 19 pandemic.

**ANOVA**

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Gender	Between Groups	1.010	3	.337	1.673	.177
	Within Groups	23.356	116	.201		
	Total	24.367	119			
Education	Between Groups	.379	3	.126	.464	.708
	Within Groups	31.613	116	.273		
	Total	31.992	119			
Age	Between Groups	2.354	3	.785	2.228	.089
	Within Groups	40.846	116	.352		
	Total	43.200	119			

Occupation	Between Groups	8.922	3	2.974	1.391	.249
	Within Groups	248.069	116	2.139		
	Total	256.992	119			
Family monthly income	Between Groups	.842	3	.281	.267	.849
	Within Groups	121.750	116	1.050		
	Total	122.592	119			
Type of family	Between Groups	.233	3	.078	.396	.756
	Within Groups	22.759	116	.196		
	Total	22.992	119			
Marital status	Between Groups	.024	3	.008	.104	.958
	Within Groups	9.142	116	.079		
	Total	9.167	119			

**INFERENCE**

Gender, here, significance is 0.177. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, the difference in overall satisfaction between male and female is considered insignificant. Then education and overall satisfaction is interpreted from the values given after pandemic where significance is 0.708. Here the p-value is greater than 0.05; therefore, overall satisfaction and gender is insignificant. Age and overall satisfaction where significance is 0.089. Here the p-value is greater than 0.05; therefore, the overall satisfaction and age is insignificant. Occupation where significance is 0.249. Here the p-value is greater than 0.05; therefore, overall satisfaction and occupation is insignificant. Family monthly income where significance is 0.849. Here the p-value is greater than 0.05; therefore, the overall satisfaction and occupation is insignificant. Type of family where significance is 0.756. Here the p-value is greater than 0.05; therefore, the overall satisfaction and occupation is insignificant. Marital status where significance is 0.958. Here the p-value is greater than 0.05; therefore, overall satisfaction and occupation is insignificant after covid 19 and pandemic.

**Ranking**

To find out the preference factors of consumers while buying organic food products after covid 19.

**Frequencies - Factors influencing to buy**

Variables	first rank	second rank	third rank	fourth rank	fifth rank	Sixth rank	Total
Health	85	20	9	3	1	2	120
Tastegood	40	60	12	8	0	0	120
Highquality	36	20	24	14	23	3	120
Freshness	3	8	12	4	62	31	120
Highnutritionalvalue	19	10	4	80	6	1	120
Moreseasonalvalue	0	1	1	13	24	81	120

## INFERENCE

It is found from the study that consumers prefer first rank to Health, second rank to good taste, third rank to freshness, fourth rank to high quality, fifth rank to, fourth rank to high nutritional value and sixth rank to more seasonal value.

## III. SUGGESTIONS

- Health awareness campaign can be made among common public
- Package of organic food products should be made better
- In order encourage more of organic food products; there can be more number of retailers.
- More promotional activities has to be initiated by the marketers
- Brand awareness has to be established.
- Marketers should take care about the availability of products on time.
- Price of organic food products can be reduced to increase more number of purchases
- Creation ought to be expanded by empowering the ranchers to go for natural cultivating

## IV. CONCLUSION

The study has revealed that consumers' buying behavior plays a major role in organic food products segment during COVID-19. The advertisers of natural food items should be creative and dynamic to meet the changing buy conduct for natural food items among the metropolitan inhabitants. The majority of organic food consuming respondents believed that organic food products contained no pesticides, while most of the non-organic food consuming respondents believed that organic food commodities were natural products. The fundamental purpose for purchasing a natural food item was wellbeing awareness. However the natural food item was respected solid, the absence of trust on the innovation of natural food item was one more justification behind not accepting the natural food item in the review region. Consequently, the firm delivering and selling natural food items should track down ways of making trust among the customers to further develop their buy expectation. It was also found that the organic food consumers had high influence of psychological factors such as perception, attitude and purchase intention towards buying organic food products. The customer confidence in natural food item was inconsequential among both natural and non-natural food buyers.

## REFERENCES

[1] Dahl D., Social influence and consumer behavior. *J. Consum. Res.*, 2013, 40, 2,

- [2] Galletto L., Situation and perspectives of organic meat in Italy. The experience of a small group of firms located in the Veneto Region. *Organic Food*, 2007, Part 2, pp. 47-63.
- [3] Ivanišová E., Tokár M., Mocko K., Bojňanská T., Mareček J., Mendelová A., Antioxidant activity of selected plant products. *J. Microbiol., Biotechnol. Food Sci.*, 2013, 2 (SI), 1692–1703.
- [4] Kozelová D., Vietoris V., Fikselová M., Quality and availability of organic foods by Slovak consumers. *Potravinárstvo*, 2013, 8, 1, 61–66,
- [5] Kucińska K., Pelc I., Artyszak A., Development of Organic Agriculture in Poland. Paper presented at Joint Organic Congress, Organic Farming and European Rural Development, Odense. 2006. May 30–31, 2006.
- [6] Pop N. Al., Dabija D.C., The Changing Business Landscape of Romania, Lessons for and from Transition Economies. 2013, Springer, New York, pp. 45–60.
- [7] R Development Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. 2011. Vienna, Austria. ISBN 3–900051–07–0, Available at: [<http://www.R-project.org>].
- [8] Roman G.V., ituația agriculturii ecologice in Romania. 2010. [Cit. 2014–08–15]
- [9] Rural Europe. 2009. Organics can boost rural economies, says research NGO. *Rural Europe*, 77, 8, Available at: [[www.agra-net.com](http://www.agra-net.com)].
- [10] Tranter R., Bennett R.M., Costa L., Cowan C., Holt G.C., Jones P.J., Miele M., Sottomayor M., Vestergaard J., Consumers' willingness-to-pay for organic conversion grade food: Evidence from five EU countries. *Food Policy*, 2009, 34, 3, 287–294.
- [11] Turgut C., Ornek H., Cutright T.J., Determination of pesticide residues in Turkey's table grapes: the effect of integrated pest management, organic farming, and conventional farming. *Env. Monitor. Assess.* 2011, 173, 1–4, 315–323.
- [12] "National Organic Program". Agricultural Marketing Service, US Department of Agriculture. 12 December 2018. Retrieved 2019-02-25.
- [13] "Organic certification". European Commission: Agriculture and Rural Development. 2014. Retrieved 2014-12-10.
- [14] Lowell, Vicki. "Organic FAQs". Organic Farming Research Foundation. Retrieved 2020-09-22.
- [15] Jump up to: a "Should you go organic?". Harvard Health Publishing, Harvard Medical School. 5 July 2017. Retrieved 2019-02-25.
- [16] Anghelcev, George; Sar, Sela; Martin, Justin; Moultrie, Jas (2020). "Marketing Processed Organic Foods: The Impact of Promotional Message Framing (Vice Vs. Virtue Advertising) on Perceptions of Healthfulness". *Journal of Food Products Marketing*.