

Consumer satisfaction towards organic vegetables in Kerala

Dr. Divya Vijayan^{1*}, Dr. Ushadevi. K.N²

¹Assistant Professor (Contract), Department of Rural Marketing Management, Co-operation, Banking and Management, Kerala Agricultural University, Vellanikkara, Thrissur 680 656, India

²Professor & Head, Department of Rural Marketing Management, Co-operation, Banking and Management, Kerala Agricultural University, Vellanikkara, Thrissur 680 656, India

ABSTRACT

Consumers, nowadays are more aware of the necessity of organic vegetables in take rather than highly chemical vegetables which will cause health hazards to human beings and its cultivation hurts the environment. The purpose of the study was to analyze the level of consumer satisfaction with organic vegetables. The study was conducted in the central zone of Kerala. A sample of 60 consumers using vegetables was selected and primary data were collected by using a structured questionnaire. The level of consumer satisfaction towards organic vegetables revealed that they are moderately satisfied with the taste, nutrient value, freshness, eco-friendliness, shelf life, value for money, and source of information. However, they are moderately dissatisfied with price, availability, and marketing channels. ANOVA shows a significant difference in the level of satisfaction in the three districts. Based on Kruskal Wallis, the differences are mainly in price, quality, availability, marketing channels, source of information, and authenticity of organic nature.

Keywords; Consumer, organic vegetables, attitude, satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

Organic farming as an approach to sustainable agriculture tries to decrease environmental problems and possible health hazards caused by the residues from pesticides Organic agriculture is the most dynamic and rapidly growing sector of the global food industry (Ellis, Panyakul, Vildozo, & Kasterine, 2006). The term consumer behaviour can be defined as the behaviour that consumers display in searching for purchasing, using, evaluating and disposing of product and services that they expect will satisfy their needs. One of the objectives of the present study is to examine the consumer behaviour towards organic vegetables. As vegetables constitute a major portion of food consumption of people, changes has undergone in the nature, type and quality of vegetables consumed by them. Now a day's vegetables are used not only to add their food habit but to provide nutrient and prevent nutritious related diseases and improves physical and mental well being of consumers. In the context of changing behaviour of consumers towards vegetables, study on consumer behaviour towards organic vegetables which is very important.

Objectives of the study

- To understand the consumer attitude towards organic vegetables
- To analyse the level of consumer's satisfaction towards organic vegetables.

METHODOLOGY

The study was confined to three districts viz, Thrissur, Palakkad and Ernakulum representing central Kerala. The districts were selected based on the prominence of vegetable cultivation and on the expert opinion the three blocks viz, Pazhayannur, Elavanchery and Muvattupuzha were selected from Thrissur, Palakkad and Ernakulum districts respectively. Twenty vegetable consumers from each selected blocks like Pazhayanoor, Elavenchery and Muvattupuzha of Thrissur, Palakkad and Ernakulum districts respectively were selected based on the snow ball sampling method. Thus the total samples of consumers were 60. Primary data were collected through pre-tested structured interview schedule from the consumers.



Statistical tools used for the study:

Following statistical tools were employed to analyse the data collected based on the objectives of the study. The variables of farmer behaviour towards organic vegetables were analysed with the help of statistical tools like Percentage analysis, Index method, Kruskal Wallis and One way ANOVA. The barriers were measured using Percentage analysis. Consumer behaviour towards organic vegetables is measured using the Percentage analysis, Index method, Kruskal Wallis, Kendall's coefficient and One way ANOVA. The details of the tools used were given below.

Index method

Indices were calculated based on Likert Scale of summated rating.

$$Index = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{q} S_{ij \times 100}}{\sum maxS_{j}}$$

i= Respondents

j=Factors

Sj=Score of the jth factor

Sij=Total score for the jth factor of the ith respondent

Maxsj=Maximum score for the jth factor

Based on the obtained index, the range was worked out using logical interpretation.

Kruskal - Wallis test

The Kruskal – Wallis one way analysis of variance by ranks is an extremely useful test for deciding whether the independent samples are from different populations. It will explain whether the differences amongst samples signify genuine population differences or whether they represent merely random samples from the same population. The Kruskal – Wallis test statistic H was computed using the formula:

$$H = \frac{12}{N(N+1)} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{R_j^2}{n_j} - 3(N+1)$$
 Where,
$$K = Number of samples \\ n_j = Number of observations in jth sample \\ N = \sum_{j=1}^{k} n_j, \text{ the number of cases in all samples combined } R_j = Sum of ranks in jth samples$$

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS

Socio-Economic profile of consumers

Socio economic status is the measure of economic and social prospects of the individuals. It indicates the social position of an individual with respect education, income and occupation. In order to examine the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents, seven indicators, viz., sex, age, education, occupation, family type and monthly family income are considered and they are given in Table 5.1

Table 1 Socio-economic profile of sample consumers

| Sl. No | Characteristics | Thrissur | Palakkad | Ernakulu | Total (n=60) |
|---------|-------------------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|
| 51. 110 | Characteristics | | | m | |
| 1 | Gender | | | | |
| 1.1 | Male | 12 | 10 | 14 | 36 |
| 1.1 | Wate | (60) | (50) | (70) | (60) |
| 1.2 | Female | 8 | 10 | 6 | 24 |
| 1.2 | remaie | (40) | (50) | (30) | (40) |
| 2 | Age level (Years) | | | | |
| 2.1 | Below 30 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| 2.1 | below 30 | (5) | (10) | (15) | (10) |
| 2.2 | 30-40 | | 4 | 6 | 10 |
| 2.2 | 30-40 | - | (20) | (30) | (16.67) |
| 2.3 | 40-50 | 6 | 7 | | 13 |
| 2.3 | 40-30 | (30) | (35) | _ | (21.67) |
| 2.4 | 50-60 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 17 |



| | | (30) | (30) | (25) | (28.33) |
|-----|---------------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------|
| 2.5 | Above 60 | 7 (35) | (5) | 6 (30) | 14 (23.33) |
| 3 | Educational level | (33) | (3) | (30) | (23.33) |
| 3.1 | Below high school | 4 (20) | 2 (10) | 8 (40) | 14 (23.3) |
| 3.2 | Up to 12 th standard | 8 (40) | 10 (50) | 7 (35) | 25 (41.67) |
| 3.3 | Graduation | 7 (35) | 7 (35) | 5 (25) | 19 (31.67) |
| 3.4 | Post Graduation | 1 (5) | 1 (5) | _ | 2 (3.3) |
| 4 | Family size | | | | |
| 4.1 | Joint family | | 2 (10) | | (3.3) |
| 4.2 | Nuclear family | 20 (100) | 18 (90) | 20 (100) | 58 (96.67) |
| 5 | Occupation | | | | |
| 5.1 | Agriculturist | 1 (5) | (10) | 7 (35) | 10 (16.67) |
| 5.2 | Private employee | 12 (60) | 10 (50) | 6 (30) | 28 (46.67) |
| 5.3 | Govt.employee | 6 (30) | 7 (35) | 5 (25) | 18 (30) |
| 5.4 | Student | 1 (5) | 1 (5) | 2 (10) | 4 (6.67) |
| 6 | Average monthly income(In Rs) | | | | |
| 6.1 | 10000-20000 | 7 (35) | (20) | 0 | 10 (16.67) |
| 6.2 | 20000-30000 | 13 (65) | 11 (55) | 19 (95) | 43 (71.67) |
| 6.3 | 30000-40000 | 0 | 5 (25) | 1 (5) | 6 (10) |
| 6.4 | Above 40000 | 0 | 1 (5) | 0 | 1 (1.67) |

Source: Primary data

Note: Figures in Parenthesis represents percentage to total

Table 1 reveals that majority of the respondents (60 percent) were male. 28.33 percent of respondents were in the age group of 50-60 years. Regarding the educational level of respondents, 41.67 percent of the respondents were qualified up to 12th standard. 96.67 percent respondents belongs nuclear family. Regarding occupation of respondents, (46.67) were private employees. Most of the respondents (71.67 percent) were having income of ₹ 20000-30000 monthly.

Average monthly expenditure for vegetables

Monthly expenditure incurred for vegetables is different for consumers. Spending nature of consumers for vegetables is given in Table 2.

Table 2 Average monthly expenditure incurred for vegetables by consumers

| Sl.No | Average monthly expenditure for vegetables | Thrissur | Palakkad | Ernakulum | Total (n=60) |
|-------|--|-----------|----------|------------|---------------|
| 1. | Below 500 | 5 (25) | 6 (30) | 3 (15) | 14 (23.33) |
| 2. | 500-1000 | 12 (60) | 11 (55) | 15 (75) | 38 (63.33) |



| 3. | 1000 and above | 3 (15) | 3 (15) | 2 (10) | 8 (13.33) |
|----|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| | Total | 20(100) | 20(100) | 20(100) | 60(100) |

Source: Primary data

Note: Figures in Parenthesis represents percentage to total

From table 5.2 it could be understand that majority of the respondents (63.33 percent) were spending about ₹500 to 1000 per month for purchasing vegetables.

Periodicity of purchasing vegetables

Frequency of purchasing vegetables can be considered as an indication towards preference for fresh vegetables and importance they assigned in their day to day life.

Table 3 Frequency of purchasing vegetables by consumers

| Periodicity of purchasing | Thrissur | Palakkad | Ernakulum | Total (n=60) |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| Daily | 12 | 15 | 17 | 44 |
| | (60) | (75) | (85) | (73.33) |
| Twice in a week | 8 | 5 | 3 | 16 |
| | (40) | (5) | (15) | (26.67) |
| Weekly | - | - | - | = |
| Total | 20 | 20 | 20 | 60 |
| | (100) | (100) | (100) | (100) |

Source: Primary data

Note: Figures in Parenthesis represents percentage to total

Table 3 revealed that 73.33 percent respondents were daily purchasing the vegetables. It might be an indication of consumer preference towards fresh vegetables.

Source of purchase of vegetables

The information regarding preferred source of produce of farmers will help the producers to stream line their distribution channel. Consumers were depending more than one source for purchase of vegetables. Table 5.4 shows the different sources of purchase preferred by sample consumers.

Table 4 Source of purchase of vegetables by consumers

| Source of purchase | Thrissur | Palakkad | Ernakulum | Total (n=60) |
|--------------------|----------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| Own farm | 10 | 13 | 8 | 31 |
| production | (50) | (65) | (40) | (51.67) |
| Direct from | 14 | 9 | 12 | 35 |
| neighbor farms | (70) | (45) | (60) | (58.33) |
| Wholesale market | 6 | 2 | 4 | 12 |
| | (30) | (10) | (20) | (20) |
| | | | | |
| Retail market | 14 | 18 | 20 | 52 |
| | (70) | (90) | (100) | (86.67) |

Source: Primary data

Note: Figures in Parenthesis represents percentage to total

It could be observed that majority of the respondents (86.67 percent) are depending on retail markets. They opined that convenience, proximity and availability were the major reason for same preferred. It can also be noticed that 51.67 percent depend on own farm production and 58.33 percent purchased vegetables from neighbor farms. This result indicates the consumer preference towards own farm products either from their own farms or direct from neighbor farms.

Attributes that influence the purchase of vegetables

The important attributes which are influencing the consumers for the purchase of vegetables are given in table 5.5.



Table 5 Attributes that influence the purchase of vegetables by consumers

| Attributes | Thrissur | Palakkad | Ernakulum | Total (n=60) |
|-------------------------|----------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| Price | 20(100) | 20(100) | 20(100) | 60(100) |
| Freshness | 18(90) | 19(95) | 16(80) | 53(88.33) |
| Nutrient value | 17(85) | 17(85) | 18(90) | 52(86.67) |
| Hygiene | 20(100) | 20(100) | 20(100) | 60(100) |
| Taste | 4(20) | 5(25) | 7(35) | 16(26.67) |
| Chemical Pesticide free | 15(75) | 17(85) | 18(90) | 50(83.33) |
| Organic nature | 7(35) | 6(30) | 16(80) | 29(48.33) |
| Quality Certification | 4(20) | 3(15) | 6(30) | 13(21.67) |
| Packaging | 5(25) | 6(30) | 9(45) | 20(33.33) |

Source: Primary data

Note: Figures in Parenthesis represents percentage to total

Among the attributes listed in table 5.5 all the respondents irrespective of regions were opinioned that price and hygiene (100 percent) are the important attributes which they looked for while purchasing the vegetables. This shows that consumers are both price and health conscious.

Consumers are looking into the freshness (88.33 percent) and nutrient value of vegetables. Chemical and pesticide free vegetables are also an attribute of consumers looking for. It can infer from the above analysis that there is enough market potential for organically cultivated vegetables.

Awareness about Organic vegetable

The awareness level of selected consumers about organic vegetables is depicted in table 5.6.

Table 6 Awareness of consumers about Organic vegetables

| Aware or not | Thrissur | Palakkad | Ernakulum | Total (n=60) |
|--------------|----------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| Yes | 20 | 20 | 20 | 60 |
| | (100) | (100) | (100) | (100) |
| No | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 20 | 20 | 20 | 60 |
| | (100) | (100) | (100) | (100) |

Source: Primary data

Note: Figures in Parenthesis represents percentage to total

Table 6 shows that all the consumers were aware about the organic vegetables. Organic vegetable is not a new concept for the people. It may be due to the increased awareness programme conducted by government and other organizations.

Consumer attitude towards organic vegetables

Consumer attitude is a composite of a consumer's beliefs, feelings and behavioural intentions towards some object. Understanding consumer attitude towards organic vegetable can help the producers to take decisions on organic vegetable farming and even organic farmer can determine the market potential of their vegetables. For this purpose different statements related to organic vegetables were selected and data collected on 5 point scale of Likert summated rating. An attitude index was constructed by giving weightages of 5 points from 5 to 1 (highly favourable and highly unfavourable). For the purpose of interpretation index score was rated as follows.

Less than 30- Highly unfavourable (HUF)

30-50 - Moderately Unfavourable (MUF)

50-70 -Indifferent (I)

70-90 - Moderately Favourable (MF) 90 and above- Highly favourable (HF)

Table 7 Consumer attitude towards organic vegetables

| Statements | Thrissur | | Palakkad | | Ernakulum | | Total (n=60) | | Rating | Kruskall wallis | |
|------------|----------|-------|----------|-------|-----------|-------|--------------|-------|--------|-----------------|-----------|
| | Score | Index | Score | Index | Score | Index | Score | Index | of | Н | Asymp.sig |



| | | | | | | | | | index | | |
|---|-----|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-------|-------|----------|-------|
| Organic vegetables are less perishable than inorganic vegetables | 73 | 73 | 92 | 92 | 88 | 88 | 253 | 84 | MF | 13.902** | 0.001 |
| Organic vegetables are more cheaper than inorganic vegetables | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 60 | 20 | HUF | | |
| Organic vegetables are good quality vegetables | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 300 | 100 | HF | | |
| Organic vegetables are affordable for common men | 45 | 45 | 53 | 53 | 58 | 58 | 156 | 52 | Ι | | |
| Availability of organic vegetables are proper | 58 | 58 | 48 | 48 | 52 | 52 | 158 | 52 | Ι | | |
| Organic vegetables are more nutritious than conventionally produced vegetables | 80 | 80 | 95 | 95 | 92 | 92 | 267 | 89 | MF | 25.030** | 0.000 |
| Organic farming conserves soil and less negative impact on environment | 80 | 80 | 92 | 92 | 90 | 90 | 262 | 87 | MF | 17.502** | 0.000 |
| Organic vegetables contains less pesticide residue than inorganic vegetables | 80 | 80 | 90 | 90 | 85 | 85 | 255 | 85 | MF | 13.111** | 0.001 |
| Source of information on organic vegetables are adequate | 48 | 48 | 49 | 49 | 45 | 45 | 142 | 47 | MUF | | |
| Composite index | 584 | 64.89 | 639 | 71 | 630 | 70 | 1853 | 68.63 | I | | |

Source: Primary data

(HF-Highly Favourable, MF- Moderately Favourable, I-Indifferent, MUF-Moderately Unfavourable, HF- Highly Unfavourable

All the respondents highly favoured that organic vegetables are good quality vegetables. They opined that it is more nutritious and chemical free. Consumers have moderately favourable attitude towards shelf life of organic vegetables, nutrient value, environmental friendliness and chemical free nature of the organic vegetables. However, they were having an indifferent attitude for affordability and availability of organic vegetables. They were moderately unfavoured towards the source of information of organic vegetables. They opined that information regarding organic vegetable is not adequate. Consumers showed highly unfavourable attitude towards the price of organic vegetables. They opined that price of organic vegetables are more than inorganic vegetables and it is not affordable for common men.

Consumer satisfaction towards organic vegetables and inorganic vegetables

Here the consumer satisfaction measures how the organic vegetables can meet or surpass a consumer's expectation. Consumer satisfaction is important because it provides farmers with a measure that they can use to manage and improve their decisions on organic vegetable farming.

For this purpose different statements related to organic vegetables were selected and data collected on 5 point scale of Likert summated rating. A satisfaction index was constructed by giving weightages of 5 points from 5 to 1 (highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied). For the purpose of interpretation index score was rated as follows.



Less than 30- Highly Dissatisfied (HDS) 30-50 – Moderately Dissatisfied (MDS) 50-70- Resigned (R) 70-90 – Moderately Satisfied (MS) 90 and above- Highly Satisfied (HS)

Kruskal wallis and one way ANOVA was applied to test the hypothesis that the obtained ranks provided by the consumers in the three districts do not differ significantly.

Here the consumer satisfactions towards organic and inorganic vegetables are given in Table 5.8 and 5.9.

Table 8 Level of consumer satisfaction towards organic vegetables

| Statements | Thriss | ur | Palakkad | | | Ernakulum | | Total (n=60) | | Kruskal v | vallis |
|--------------------------------------|--------|-------|----------|-------|-------|-----------|-------|--------------|-----|-----------|-----------|
| | Score | Index | Score | Index | Score | Index | Score | Index | | Н | Asymp.sig |
| Price | 40 | 40 | 56 | 56 | 52 | 52 | 148 | 49.3 | DS | 9.528** | 0.009 |
| Taste | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 240 | 80 | MS | | |
| Nutrient value | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 240 | 80 | MS | | |
| Freshness | 70 | 70 | 80 | 80 | 66 | 66 | 216 | 72 | MS | 9.746** | 0.008 |
| Shelf life | 100 | 100 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 260 | 86.67 | MS | 59** | 0.00 |
| Availability of vegetables | 34 | 34 | 60 | 60 | 46 | 46 | 140 | 46.67 | MDS | 31.145** | 0.000 |
| Marketing channels | 40 | 40 | 56 | 56 | 40 | 40 | 136 | 45.33 | MDS | 42.909** | 0.000 |
| Eco- friendliness | 80 | 80 | 64 | 64 | 60 | 60 | 210 | 70 | MS | 29.893** | 0.000 |
| Hygiene | 80 | 80 | 74 | 74 | 48 | 48 | 202 | 67.33 | MS | 51.729** | 0.000 |
| Source of information | 76 | 76 | 66 | 66 | 68 | 68 | 210 | 70 | MS | 9.391** | 0.009 |
| Authenticity of organic nature | 44 | 44 | 56 | 56 | 58 | 58 | 158 | 52.67 | R | 24.278** | 0.000 |
| It gives value for money | 100 | 100 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 260 | 86.67 | MS | 59** | 0.000 |
| Composit index | 844 | 70.33 | 832 | 69.33 | 764 | 63.67 | 2440 | 67.78 | R | | |

Source: Primary data

(HS-Highly Satisfied, MS-Moderately Satisfied, R-Resigned, MDS-Moderately Dissatisfied, HDS-Highly Dissatisfied)

Table 8 reveals that consumers were not highly satisfied with any of the feature of the organic vegetables and they were moderately satisfied with taste, nutrient value, freshness, shelf life and that organic vegetable gives value for money. Organic vegetables are tasty vegetables and it contains nutrient value and it is fresh vegetable. Shelf life of the organic vegetables is more when compared to inorganic vegetables. Source of information and eco friendliness are also moderately satisfied by the consumers. Consumers are resigned to hygiene and authenticity of organic nature of vegetables. Consumers were moderately dissatisfied with price, availability and marketing channels of the vegetables.

Table 9 Level of consumer satisfaction towards inorganic vegetables

| Statements | Thriss | Thrissur | | Palakkad | | Ernakulum | | (n=60) | Level of SI |
|------------------|--------|----------|-------|----------|-------|-----------|-------|--------|-------------|
| | Score | Index | Score | Index | Score | Index | Score | Index | |
| Affordable Price | 68 | 68 | 64 | 64 | 56 | 56 | 188 | 62.67 | R |



| Taste | 60 | 60 | 72 | 72 | 74 | 74 | 206 | 68.67 | R |
|----------------------------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|------|-------|-----|
| Nutrient value | 54 | 54 | 36 | 36 | 34 | 34 | 124 | 41.33 | MDS |
| Freshness | 78 | 78 | 76 | 76 | 48 | 48 | 202 | 67.33 | R |
| Shelf life | 36 | 36 | 44 | 44 | 32 | 32 | 112 | 37.33 | MDS |
| Availability of vegetables | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 300 | 100 | HS |
| Marketing channels | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 300 | 100 | HS |
| Eco-friendliness | 34 | 34 | 38 | 38 | 30 | 30 | 102 | 34 | MDS |
| Hygiene | 54 | 54 | 52 | 52 | 32 | 32 | 138 | 46.00 | MDS |
| Source of information | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 300 | 100 | HS |
| It gives value for money | 88 | 88 | 94 | 94 | 76 | 76 | 258 | 86.00 | MS |
| Composite index | 772 | 70.18 | 776 | 70.55 | 682 | 62.00 | 2230 | 67.58 | R |

Source: Primary data

(HS-Highly Satisfied, MS-Moderately Satisfied, R-Resigned, MDS-Moderately Dissatisfied, HDS-Highly Dissatisfied)

Table 9 clearly depicts that availability of vegetables, marketing channels and source of information are highly satisfied by the consumers. Because inorganic vegetables are available in the nearest markets at any time. Information about inorganic vegetable is available from the various sources like neighbor farms, friends and relatives etc. Consumers were moderately satisfied that inorganic vegetables which gives value for money. They have resigned stage in respect to price, taste and freshness of the inorganic vegetables as it changes in every time. Consumers were moderately dissatisfied with nutrient value, shelf life, eco-friendliness and hygiene features of inorganic vegetables and authenticity of organic nature. Even though organic manures are used in conventional farming, high level usage of chemicals and pesticides made the vegetables as inorganic in nature.

The satisfaction of consumer gets from organic and inorganic vegetables significantly vary in the three districts. Consumers vary in their behaviour and their satisfaction level also different according to their socio- economic characteristics.

Based on the Kruskal Wallis, it can be inferred that difference in satisfaction is due to the difference in price, quality, availability, marketing channels, source of information and authenticity of organic nature.

CONCLUSIONS

This session could be concluded that consumer behaviour towards organic vegetables shows a preference for consuming organic vegetables. Consumers are aware about the advantages of organic vegetables and adverse effects of inorganic vegetables. They prefer organic vegetables as they are health conscious but the high price of organic vegetables is discouraging them from the purchase of organic vegetables. Attitude and satisfaction level of consumers towards organic vegetables shows significant difference among consumers. Strategies for marketing the organic vegetables have to be formulated with exclusive outlets for organically grown crops so as to increase their trust in the labeled organic vegetables.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Ahmad,S.N.2010. Influencing purchase intentions among consumers in Klang Valley, Malaysia. *Int.J. Business and Mgmt.* **5(2):** 105-118.
- [2]. APEDA [Agricultural and Processed Food Products Export Development Authority]. 2011.APEDA homepage [online]. Available: http://www.apeda.gov.in/ apeda website/ organic/Organic Products.htm. [30 Dec. 2014].
- [3]. Assis, K. and Ismail, H.A.M. 2011. Knowledge, attitude and practices of farmers towards organic farming. *Int. J. Eco. Res.* 2(3): 1-6.
- [4]. Balachandran, V. 2004. Future in the past: study on the status of organic farming in Kerala. Discussion paper.82, Kerala Research Programme on Local Level Development, Trivandrum. Available: www.cds.ac.in/krpcds/publication/downloads/82.pdf. [13 March 2014].
- [5]. Bharathi, B., Ananthnag. K., and Nagaraja, G.N. Buying behaviour of urban residents towards organically produced food products. *Int. J. Res. Appl.Nat. Social. Sci.* **2(2).** 33-38.