



CONSUMER DYNAMICS FOR AGRI-FOOD BRANDS IN AGILE-EMERGING ECONOMIES

BISWAJIT PATTAJOSHI*, DEBADUTTA DAS
and SANGEETA MOHANTY

Research Scholar
Department of Business Management
Fakir Mohan University
Balasore, Odisha, India

Assistant Professor
Department of Business Management
Fakir Mohan University
Balasore, Odisha, India

Principal
Academy of Business Administration
Balasore, Odisha, India

Abstract

The outcome of this is to create a marketing program for a contemporary food/grocery store on the basis of buyer choice, liking, selection and decision making. An aggregate of 251 respondents obtaining adequate buying potential and well educated were in person studied with an organised question sheet. Uncomplicated statistical study such as descriptive statistical analysis, frequency distribution, cross tabulation, analysis of variance, and factor analysis were performed to evaluate the buyers liking for food and grocery goods and market characteristic were carried out. Buyers are playing critical role in decision making and co-creating products. With web as the new market dimension, the brick market is fading, so minutely understand the consequence of competition and contingency, where IT, is becoming a stronger grip for myriad of products, assortments, arrays and portfolios, in short gestation time and innovation cycle, coping and adjusting to strategy and external business environment, where the hidden footholds recogniser is portraying and mirroring what, when, why, how and where of consumer buying science nitty gritty to focus on real, proven branding ideas to open up a response and make a deal closer, and further usage and post purchase perception and construct management by aid of IT, reinforced with brand management strategy.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 91C05, 91C20, 91C99, 91E10, 91E30, 91E99, 91F99.

Keywords: consumer behavior, attributes, retail formats, developing nations, brand image.

*Corresponding author; E-mail: bjpjoshi3001@gmail.com

Received September 12, 2021; Accepted January 5, 2022

Introduction

The marketer's prime goal is to approach her focused segment and obtain more than a single selling. Nevertheless, buyers, nearly every time reach the market space with a firmly-established 3 group of things of flavour and liking, selection and choice (Hoyer and Brown,). This forms it hard for new goods to place in the middle of the time, outpouring market demands. This hiccup is accelerated by conventional marketing communication programs such as ads and sales communication, which are faced with the tests of approach progressively falling apart buyer markets and sharply moving through the clutter of message conveying focused at buyers, which produces means of mass communication bestrewing (Meenaghan). "Marketers have been expending more and more to set to get their message conveyed out, only to find their modulation submerged out in an ocean of disturbance produced by infinite other marketers setting to do the identical rational" (Freedman,). Patronage funding signifies as a process of avoiding keeping away from this noise by backing patrons to recognise and focus clearly-defined listeners in objects of population and particular groups and way of living (Fan and Pfitzenmaier, McDaniel, Meenaghan, Roy and Cornwell, Smith) [1].

Theoretical Foundations

In organization for the consequence of patronage to be made as large as, Keller focusses that it is significant to choice the accurate form of episodes or patron to equal the brand. Investigation advices that patronage justifies like famous person patronage advertising (Gwinner, McDaniel, Smith). Firms engage popular person in hopes that likingness of that particular person will also obtain 'likingness' of their products or services. According to McCracken patronage can garner their self-popularity to produce constructive associations for brands in the minds of consumers. Brand builders are anticipating to move this production of associations to their own brands. When a brand is recognised as associated to a patron or episode, buyers may conclude that some of the specific associations or feelings that feature the famous personality or episode may also distinguish the brand (Keller,). Investigation of Becker-Olsen and Simmons focussed that increasingly-congruent patronage can enhance brand worth/significance and value, whereas poor-congruency (sponsor partner is perceived as incongruent with

sponsored event) can weaken brand worth significance and value.

These studies advice that the interconnectedness in middle of brand and episode impact the transmission of image trust, and that the feeling of fitting sponsorship is the outcome of an patronage means in which buyer strengthen, or not, brand image credence of a brand of specific focus in this investigation is the impact of brand liking, choice and selection. Will brand image transmission still happen even though the buyer has firmly-established brand flavour and liking, choice and selection? One element that can impact this reaction is sorting out facility. Van Rompay, De Vries and Van Venrooij stated out that the smoothness of sorting out facts and figures is more in fitting interconnectedness, encompassing more comprehension, which in approach results to increasingly advantageous and beneficial reactions. Another element that may influence the image transmission is the buyers' product framework. Studies of Batra and Homer stated that brand image faith will have an increasing influence on brand choice/selection and liking when buyer's previously formed associations fit the associations obtained from the 4 product type. This study will created from these suppositions and forecasts that brand selection/choice and liking can have a prime impact on brand image transmission when acknowledging these two factors. Past studies on marketing and patronage has declared that the congruence between brand and episode can be of significance on brand image faith. Brand image trust encompasses all the interconnections that buyers attach with the brand (Batra and Homer). As stated by Aaker, most of the brand interconnections that make brands distinguished and robust are of not in working order of phenomena; they move across the felt guarantee and purity of the brand on functionality product and service parameter and focus as an alternative with 'experiential and feelings and emotions' properties of the brand (e.g. Coca-Cola is "All American" Mercedes is "prestigious", etc). These brand interconnectedness are produced or created from brand and product category experiential and feelings, fixing in mind promotional communication, or who or what type of person, might use that product (Gwinner and Eaton; Keller). McCracken posited that brands benefit from interconnectedness with patrons, because patrons obtain or control a range of constructive definitions (e.g. Pepsi is more appealing to gen X when sponsored by Madonna, since of her against-establishment perceptual

construct). In his studies, he proposes that the interconnectedness (meaning) transmission from the popular patrons to the brand when both patrons and brands are created/fixed in the mind altogether in an ad. The higher the perceptual congruence of brand interconnections in between the patron and the brand, the most likelihood brand perceptual construct transmission will occur (Smith). But why is this congruence a need to transmit perceptual construct web interconnections? McCracken questioned out to the patronage procedure in which the buyer necessitates to obtain the crucial fit in between patron and brand (e.g. apt tone, pace, etc.), in focus to fix the patron associations (e.g. biology, way of living, division of a society based on social and economic status, persona or character).

Strengthening from McCracken, patronage investigation has also affirmed the significance of fit or instability on the equation between brand and episode, exemplary by brand perceptual construct faith (Crimmins and Horn, Gwinner and Eaton, Speed and Thomson). For quick information, buyers had a more constructive perceptual construct of the patron if they felt the patron's perceptual construct and the perceptual construct of the episode patroned as stable (Close et al.). Meenaghan described that experience and feelings of fit project the spread to which the patron party is seen as foreseeable. These investigations suppose that fit in between the brand and episode can be constructively of impact on buyer reaction.

The way buyers' feel and operate ads declaration is significant, because it impacts their frame of mind toward the advertisement, or toward the patronage. Buyers can comfortably operate fit interpretations and are so positive likelihood to have advantageous and beneficial reaction, resulting to more constructive frame of mind, as against to un-fit communication conveyance (Van Rompay et al.). Van Rompay et al. studied fit and inapt word-illustration advertisements in 5 web, and described that buyers can best describe the facts and figures obtained in a fit perspective, because it took fewer ability for consumers to produce a mind illustration reflection, than in inapt or un-fit perspective. Investigation in the mental regions assure these studies. Reber, Winkielman and Schwarz used distinction between illustration and ontogeny, and presentation span as coherent improvisations and stated that consumers hierarchy or position inducement which were easiness to operate as highly 'beautiful' and less 'unattractive' or as highly

‘appealing’ and less ‘unappealing. Reinforcing from Reber et al., investigation of Winkielman and Cacioppo also back this relation in middle of more coherency of operating and constructive mental cognitive response. These investigations advice that the easiness of filtering and operating can be of important impact on consumer reaction.

Reinforcement, this investigation has zeroed on the spread of brand perceptual construct transfer rather than constructive or pessimistic cognitive reaction.

Customers approaching the market of huge product orders many times have popular likings and selection. Such likings are obtained by evocation memory anticipation of functionality which were imbibed by brands, patrons, and brand types (Misra and Beatty, McDaniel). Specific brand types can impact these customer product attributes; So the brand type alone can be a prime origin of explanation, (Levy,). Product attributes support customers assess new brands that fit into the same product type. An example of this was put forth by Fiske’s consumer perceptual construct.

Past research on the attribute propoundation has projected the effect of brand attribute on customer reaction. Batra and Homer have put forth in their studies that brand image trust have a huge influence on brand likings when the customer product attribute has congruency with the product type. They used in their studies two patrons as sponsors to evaluate their influence on image trusts, and obtained that the impact of image beliefs on brand likings were projected in the buying expectations, but only when the image trusts were salient and illustratively congruent with the product type. This states that grouping of information supports comprehension of stimuli awakened by the endorsing. Sujan, Bettman, and Sujanuse this to project that beforehand brand trusts and anticipations saliently impact selling ends. Sujan, when a consumer faces a stimulus, their product attribute forces to reinforce the stimulus with groups of information (brand attributes) in evocation memory. Smith, customers use this attribute to evaluate if the image trusts, shifted from an episode in a patron funding fits with the brand and their anticipation of the product category. Goodstein focussed that these product attributes can impact buyers frame-of-mind and buying anticipation toward advertisement promotion of brands and their 4P’s communications.

These studies focus that brand likings are interlinked to customer product attribute, which is obtained by associations of the product type. It can be assumed that when these attributes are clear, customer are less likely to acknowledge the shifted trusts if it is not stable with their product attributes. 6 There constructive effect of a fit atmosphere on image shift in patronage-funding. The increasing congruency between brand and episode, the more potentially image shift will be steeply raised. That brand inclination, liking and selection will impact the reciprocation of image shift in a fit context [2].

Review of Literature

Food buying intentions of customers in most agile economies such as India has saliently modified with raises in the per capita disposable income, international interaction, ICT, urbanisation, educational hub and health awareness, movement of family holders towards higher income groups, changes in way of life and family tree hierarchy (Rao, Shetty, Deshingkar et al. Vepa, KPMG, Kaushik, Kaur and Singh, Pingali). Customer purchase behaviour for food and grocery brands has always been impacted by a number of economic, cultural, emotional, frame-of -mind and way of life factors (Shaw et al. Brokaw and Lakshman, Asp, Roux et al. Roslow et al. Roininen, Choo et al. Ling et al. Ahlgren et al. Goyal and Singh, Nagla,). Sustained economic growth and staggering urbanisation are propelling a radical growth in the order for high significance food products like fruits, vegetables, milk, meat, eggs and fish (Bhalla and Hazell, Kumar, Bhalla et al. Kumar et al. Landes et al. Pingali and Khwaja, Rao et al.) [3].

A customer liking for buying comfort is backing the rise of contemporary retail store in India, which in return orders for higher effectuality, performance and protection standards in the food value chain (Chengappa et al. 2005, Mukherjee and Patel, 2005, Umali-Deininger and Sur,). Customers have now become more distinctive in their food product likings, inclination and preferences and have started focusing more on comfort, pleasant quality and performance of the products (Quagraine et al. Acebrón et al.). With the evolving of the supermarket and hypermarket culture, customer liking for packaged food products has been rising saliently in the recent years (Stewart-Knox and Mitchell, Silayoi and Speece, Wells et al.). The expectation for comfort and an increase in the number of engaged working women are some of the crucial factors propelling a strong growth of packaged food products

(Goyal and Singh). Customers have now beginning to prefer quality food and are getting more conscious in objective of nutritional diet, healthiness and food safety challenges (Ruth and Yeung, Rimal et al.). Food buying trends in developing economies like India are proven for daily or frequent buying from near marketplaces called “mom and pop stores” (Veeck and Veeck, Sabnavis). Factors such as sex, age group, educational type and remuneration play a significant role in assessing the food usage pattern around the globe (Roux et al. Roslow et al. Turrell et al. Choo et al. Rao et al. Krystallis and Chrysohoidis, Batte et al. Goyal and Singh, Bukenya and Wright). Several other analysis also show that retail store choice is judged as a thinking flowchart which is highly impacted by customers social population elements (Arnold et al. Arnold and Luthra, Sinha and Banerjee, Fox et al. van Waterschoot et al.) [4].

Product characteristic, as experienced by customers, are critical elements in the food likings, selection, preference flow chart and are acknowledged to be a critical predictor for the victory of many product marketing tactics (Batra and Sinha, Kupiec and Revell). Customers liking on multitude food product characteristic is a well investigated area and analysis project that buyers use various assessment parameters while choosing the apt brands to fulfill their usage necessities (Ness and Gerhardy, Cardello, van der Pol and Ryan, Ahlgren et al., Chung et al.). The study on consumer behavior reflects that the customer experiences a product as a bundle of characteristics like comfort, heterogeneity and liking, product pricing, off-season availability, package, hygiene and pleasant quality. The purchase decision or choices between the products largely rely on an amalgamation of these characteristic (Juric and Worsley, Silayoi and Speece).

In the contemporary retail and store environment, fit between consumer experientiality on retail outlet characteristic and the aim of market positioning tactics outcomes in customer faithfulness towards an outlet (Uusitalo, Devlin et al. Morschett et al.). A customer's liking of a retail outlet leverages on amalgamation of performance and frame-of-mind attributes (Devlin et al. Zhuang et al.). Stochastic researches on store food market characteristic in both developed and developing nations show that buyers now prefer one roof solution for all their household requirements to save their time dimensions and effort (Burt and Gabbott, Goldman et al.) [5].

Methodology

The particular hypotheses tested in this investigation are as follows:

H1. While buying grocery, fruits and vegetables, customers give identical salience to varied buying intentions such as rate of purchase, thirty days expedition, inclination on marketplace, space between the marketplace and home, and food packaging.

H2. Customers focus similar identical salience on varied food product characteristics (pleasant quality and hygiene, product pricings, performance and taste, variety, packaging, comfort and non-seasonal availability) while buying food products.

H3. Customers obtain identical salience to varied market characteristic (related to products, market infrastructure, additional services, etc.) while choosing a marketplace for food buying.

Data Collection

The knowledge required to work out the analytical study was collected from the Bhubaneswar, g local market space, the Indian city through interaction and by review question-form managing. In order to keep away from differentiation with respect to the demographics we carried out a 8 respective classification in terms of age and gender. A total of 2, 259 personal responses were carried, which obtained 2200 valid studies and 2, 726 brand determination (each respondent was sought to assess four brands of the given set considered in the study) [6].

Data Analysis

The usual literature of focus is the F -ratio for column the treatment comparison. It is typically of little interest to know whether the within-subjects or rows F -ratio is significant. This test is telling us what we already know-that different individuals have different attitudes towards statistics. For our purpose it is more interesting to note the mean attitude towards statistics increased after the class and are still higher rise months later. Analysis of variance between food purchase behavior and demographics characteristics with noting significant level. What we know people have different buying attitudes but mean attitude for utilization /welfare increased after introducing neo-branding approaches indicated variability with

purchase behavior and demographics. Higher significance indicated high strength of synergism. With radical modification in the likings of the customer towards comfortable purchasing, the supermarket tradition is emerging up very fast. These supermarkets stores obtain conveniently packaged food items with choice and pick amenities. About 10 per cent of the customers prefer supermarkets for grocery food buying. Food buying is distance responsive and most of the customers desire for 24 hours accessibility of food products within one kilometer radius. Therefore, H1, which supposes that the customers buying decisions are similar for grocery, fruits and vegetables, is declined [7].

$F=191.9837605, p\text{-value}=3.9E-188, F=31.9377744, p\text{-Value}=1.25E36, F=751.0119953, p\text{Value}=0$). The middle determinant of the customers reaction on varied product attributes determine that cleanliness is the most crucial characteristic for the customers coming in order by price, performance and guarantee, heterogeneity, package, comfort and off-season obtainment. About 80 per cent of the customers experience that product characteristics such as pleasant quality, price, guarantee and performance and distinctiveness are critical, very critical or most critical for them. Package and comfort are crucial for approximately 70 per cent customers. off-season presence is crucial for 65 per cent customers. Mode determinants of reaction determine that assertiveness of the customers on these product characteristics is not very high. Thus, customers opine different viewpoints on dissimilar product characteristics and therefore, H2, which supposes that customers lay identical efforts on various product characteristic, is declined [8].

Customer liking for varied ease and comfort and characteristic of the retail stores have been determined through this questionnaire form studies, outcomes of which find out that obtaining performance and guarantee and an aggregate of products at low prices are the most inclined 9 characteristics of a desirable marketplace. This determines that Indian customers are still price conservative and focus 'cheap and best' strategy while buying a performance and guarantee product. Customers have also begin to judge the cruciality in having various other services like facility of lavatory, parking space, banking amenities, telephone kiosk and medical shoppers, etc. at the marketplace. Like the studies on product attributes, the customers gave saliently different

responses on varied market attributes ($F=40.30677887, p\text{-value}=1.36E-24$). Therefore, H3 cannot be supported [9].

Figure 1. Frequency of Purchase.

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
GROCERY	251	686	2.733068	2.172462151
FRUITS	251	781	3.111554	1.883505976
VEGETABLES	251	643	2.561753	1.239171315
SPICES	251	803	3.19920	1.864159363
PACKAGED				
WATER	251	744	2.964143	1.594709163

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	70.20398	4	17.551	10.0245488	5.49E-08	
Within Groups	2188.502	1250	1.750802			2.379048278
Total	2258.706	1254				

Figure 2. Monthly Expenditure.

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
GROCERY	251	752	2.996016	2.003984064
FRUITS	251	725	2.888446	1.667505976
VEGETABLES	251	706	2.812749	2.072796813
SPICES	251	773	3.079681	1.993625498
PACKAGED	251	932	3.713147	1.085386454
WATER				

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	129.1203	4	32.28008	18.29252324	5.49E-14	
Within Groups	2205.825	1250	1.76466			2.379048278
Total	2334.945	1254				

Figure 3. Preferred Market Place.

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
GROCERY	251	639	2.545817	1.16089243
FRUITS	251	544	2.167331	1.123888446
VEGETABLES	251	594	2.366534	1.361115538
SPICES	251	687	2.737052	1.258581673
PACKAGED	251	580	2.310757	1.279043825
WATER				

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	48.9036	4	12.2259	9.885868109	7.09E-08	
Within Groups	1545.88	1250	1.236704			2.3790483
Total	1594.78	1254				

Figure 4. Preferred Market Distance.

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
GROCERY	251	455	1.812749	0.632796813
FRUITS	251	615	2.450199	1.88050996
VEGETABLES	251	491	1.956175	1.322071713
SPICES	251	406	1.61753	0.237131474
PACKAGED	251	602	2.398406	1.13663745
WATER				

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	133.94	4	33.48486	32.14044249	1.59E-25	
Within Groups	1302.3	1250	1.041829			2.379048278
Total	1436.2	1254				

Figure 5. Preference on Food Packaging.

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
GROCERY	251	524	2.087649	0.416286853

FRUITS	251	422	1.681275	0.858007968
VEGETABLES	251	457	1.820717	0.627729084
SPICES	251	517	2.059761	0.376414343
PACKAGED	251	633	2.521912	0.250517928
WATER				

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	103.3	4	25.82191	51.05251052	7.5E-40	2.379048278
Within Groups	632.2	1250	0.505791			
Total	735.5	1254				

Figure 6. Perception on Attributes of frozen fruits.

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Convenience	251	787	3.135458	2.093577689
Quality	251	829	3.302789	0.691952191
Variety and choice	251	969	3.860558	0.4164478088
Price	251	689	2.74502	3.2947251
Seasonality	249	815	3.273092	2.336410157
Packaging	251	992	3.952191	1.973705179
cleanliness	251	997	3.972112	1.491219124

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	336.5	6	56.08924	31.93777449	1.25E-36	2.103761242
Within Groups	3070	1748	1.756204			
Total	3406	1754				

Figure 7. Perception on Attributes of frozen vegetables.

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Convenience	251	1131	4.505976	0.786964143
Quality	251	1004	4	0.8

Variety and choice	251	959	3.820717	1.067729084
Price	251	841	3.350598	0.428589641
Seasonality	249	543	2.163347	1.465211155
Packaging	251	705	2.808765	0.459282869
cleanliness	251	923	3.677291	0.603442231

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	923.37	6	153.8947	191.9837605	3.9E-188	2.103755334
Within Groups	1402.8	1750	0.801603			
Total	2326.2	1756				

Figure 8. Perception on Attributes of grocery.

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Convenience	250	1019	4.076	0.63275502
Quality	251	1077	4.290836653	0.207075697
Variety and choice	250	1092	4.368	0.345959839
Price	251	1013	4.035856574	0.730709163
Seasonality	251	292	1.163346614	0.409211155
Packaging	251	1005	4.003984064	0.795984064
cleanliness	251	1184	4.7171131474	0.203665339

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	2140.54235	6	356.7570582	751.0119953	0	2.103761242
Within Groups	830.361355	1748	0.4750351			
Total	2970.9037	1756				

Figure 9. Perception on Attributes of grocery.

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
--------	-------	-----	---------	----------

			4.03585	0.322709
Available at one place	251	1013	7	2
Provision of Additional			3.97211	0.739219
Services	251	997	2	1
			3.74103	0.640669
Attraction for children	251	939	6	3
Available of Basic			4.47410	0.634326
Amenities	251	1123	4	7

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	70.645	4	23.5484	40.30677	1.36E-24	2.163803
Within Groups	584.23	3	0.58423	9		6
	1	1000	1			
	654.87					
Total	6	1003				

Conclusion

Cruciality of product and brand characteristic focussed on customers' angle can be obtained by food processors and packagers for creating apt decisiveness in food product marketing. Neo branding approaches indicated variability with purchase behavior and demographics. Higher significance indicated high strength of synergism. Neo-branding approaches through frequent purchase loyalty programs, monthly expenditure best-buy and value for money and personal saving, preferred market place and modern day retail format, food packaging, shelf-life, freshness and convenience, parameters are becoming phenomenal success.

References

- [1] H. J. Choo, J-E. Chung and D. T. Pysarchik, Antecedents to new food product purchasing behavior among innovator groups in India, *European Journal of Marketing* 38 Nos 5/6 (2004), 608-25.
- [2] J-E. Chung, J. Yu and D. T. Pysarchik, Cue utilization to assess food product quality: a

- comparison of consumers and retailers in India, *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research* 16(2) (2006), 199-214.
- [3] P. Deshingkar, U. Kulkarni, L. Rao and S. Rao, Changing food systems in India response-sharing and marketing arrangements for vegetable production in Andhra Pradesh, *Development Policy Review* 21(5-6) (2003), 627-39.
- [4] D. Devlin, G. Birtwistle and N. Macedo, Food retail positioning strategy: a means-end chain analysis, *British Food Journal* 105(9) (2003), 653-70.
- [5] E. J. Fox, A. L. Montgomery and L. M. Lodish, Consumer shopping and spending across retail formats, *The Journal of Business* 77(S2) (2004), S26-S60.
- [6] A. Goldman, S. Ramaswami and R. E. Krider, Barriers to the advancement of modern food retail formats: theory and measurement, *Journal of Retailing* 78 (2002), 281-95.
- [7] A. Goyal and N. P. Singh, Consumer perception about fast food in India: an exploratory study, *British Food Journal* 109(2) (2007), 182-95.
- [8] B. Juric and A. Worsley, Consumers attitudes towards imported food products, *Food Quality and Preference* 9(6) (1998), 431-41.
- [9] P. Kaur and R. Singh, Uncovering retail shopping motives of Indian youth, *Young Consumers* 8(2) (2007), 128-38.
- [10] N. Kaushik, Retail: the next big thing, *The Hindu Business Line*, 13 October, available at: www.thehindubusinessline.com/catalyst/2005/10/13/stories/2005101300240400.htm 8b.KPMG (2005), *Consumer Markets in India: The Next Big Things*, Publication No. 213-405, KPMG International (2005).
- [11] A. Krystallis and G. Chryssohoidis, Consumers willingness to pay for organic food: factors that affect it and variation per organic product type, *British Food Journal* 107(5) (2005), 320-43.