

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMPUTER APPLICATION & MANAGEMENT

I
J
R
C
M



A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed (Refereed/Juried) Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

Indexed & Listed at:

Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, ProQuest, U.S.A., EBSCO Publishing, U.S.A., Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A., Google Scholar,

Indian Citation Index (ICI), J-Gate, India [link of the same is duly available at Inlibnet of University Grants Commission (U.G.C)].

Index Copernicus Publishers Panel, Poland with IC Value of 5.09 (2012) & number of libraries all around the world.

Circulated all over the world & Google has verified that scholars of more than 6303 Cities in 196 countries/territories are visiting our journal on regular basis.

Ground Floor, Building No. 1041-C-1, Devi Bhawan Bazar, JAGADHRI – 135 003, Yamunanagar, Haryana, INDIA

<http://ijrcm.org.in/>

CONTENTS

Sr. No.	TITLE & NAME OF THE AUTHOR (S)	Page No.
1.	A STUDY ON SERVICE QUALITY OF INDIAN TELECOMMUNICATION COMPANIES <i>KUSAM LATA & Dr. S. S. NARTA</i>	1
2.	MEASURING GENDER AND INCOME IMPACT ON PERCEPTION OF ORGANIC FOOD: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY ON GERMAN YOUTH <i>SAJEEB SAHA, BISAKHA DEWAN, FATEMA SARKER & SAUDA AFRIN ANNY</i>	6
3.	APPLICATION OF GOAL PROGRAMMING TO COMPARE PERFORMANCE IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SECTOR: A CASE STUDY FOR SPECIAL ECONOMIC ZONES <i>Dr. BITHIKA BISHESH</i>	14
4.	A STUDY ON THE LENDING PATTERNS OF THE PAWN BROKERS WITH RESPECT TO GOLD LOANS – BANGALORE CITY <i>GISA GEORGE</i>	21
5.	CHALLENGES RELATED TO KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IN THE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SECTOR (A STUDY WITH REFERENCE TO SELECT (IT) INDUSTRY IN DELHI/NCR) <i>SHALU SOLANKI</i>	25
	REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK & DISCLAIMER	29

FOUNDER PATRON**Late Sh. RAM BHAJAN AGGARWAL**

Former State Minister for Home & Tourism, Government of Haryana
 Former Vice-President, Dadri Education Society, Charkhi Dadri
 Former President, Chinar Syntex Ltd. (Textile Mills), Bhiwani

CO-ORDINATOR**Dr. BHAVET**

Former Faculty, Shree Ram Institute of Engineering & Technology, Urjani

ADVISOR**Prof. S. L. MAHANDRU**

Principal (Retd.), Maharaja Agrasen College, Jagadhri

EDITOR**Dr. PARVEEN KUMAR**

Professor, Department of Computer Science, NIMS University, Jaipur

CO-EDITOR**Dr. A. SASI KUMAR**

Professor, Vels Institute of Science, Technology & Advanced Studies (Deemed to be University), Pallavaram

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD**Dr. CHRISTIAN EHIUBUCHE**

Professor of Global Business/Management, Larry L Luing School of Business, Berkeley College, USA

Dr. SIKANDER KUMAR

Vice Chancellor, Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh

Dr. JOSÉ G. VARGAS-HERNÁNDEZ

Research Professor, University Center for Economic & Managerial Sciences, University of Guadalajara, Guadalajara, Mexico

Dr. RAJENDER GUPTA

Convener, Board of Studies in Economics, University of Jammu, Jammu

Dr. D. S. CHAUBEY

Professor & Dean (Research & Studies), Uttaranchal University, Dehradun

Dr. TEGUH WIDODO

Dean, Faculty of Applied Science, Telkom University, Bandung Technoplex, Jl. Telekomunikasi, Indonesia

Dr. S. P. TIWARI

Head, Department of Economics & Rural Development, Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Avadh University, Faizabad

Dr. BOYINA RUPINI

Director, School of ITS, Indira Gandhi National Open University, New Delhi

Dr. KAUP MOHAMED

Dean & Managing Director, London American City College/ICBEST, United Arab Emirates

Dr. MIKE AMUHAYA IRAVO

Principal, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture & Tech., Westlands Campus, Nairobi-Kenya

Dr. M. S. SENAM RAJU

Professor, School of Management Studies, I.G.N.O.U., New Delhi

Dr. NEPOMUCENO TIU

Chief Librarian & Professor, Lyceum of the Philippines University, Laguna, Philippines

Dr. A SAJEEVAN RAO

Professor & Director, Accurate Institute of Advanced Management, Greater Noida

Dr. H. R. SHARMA

Director, Chhatrapati Shivaji Institute of Technology, Durg, C.G.

Dr. CLIFFORD OBIYO OFURUM

Professor of Accounting & Finance, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria

Dr. SHIB SHANKAR ROY

Professor, Department of Marketing, University of Rajshahi, Rajshahi, Bangladesh

Dr. MANOHAR LAL

Director & Chairman, School of Information & Computer Sciences, I.G.N.O.U., New Delhi

Dr. SRINIVAS MADISHETTI

Professor, School of Business, Mzumbe University, Tanzania

Dr. VIRENDRA KUMAR SHRIVASTAVA

Director, Asia Pacific Institute of Information Technology, Panipat

Dr. VIJAYPAL SINGH DHAKA

Professor & Head, Department of Computer & Communication Engineering, Manipal University, Jaipur

Dr. NAWAB ALI KHAN

Professor & Dean, Faculty of Commerce, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, U.P.

Dr. EGWAKHE A. JOHNSON

Professor & Director, Babcock Centre for Executive Development, Babcock University, Nigeria

Dr. ASHWANI KUSH

Head, Computer Science, University College, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

Dr. ABHAY BANSAL

Head, Department of Information Technology, Amity School of Engg. & Tech., Amity University, Noida

Dr. BHARAT BHUSHAN

Head, Department of Computer Science & Applications, Guru Nanak Khalsa College, Yamunanagar

MUDENDA COLLINS

Head, Operations & Supply Chain, School of Business, The Copperbelt University, Zambia

Dr. JAYASHREE SHANTARAM PATIL (DAKE)

Faculty in Economics, KPB Hinduja College of Commerce, Mumbai

Dr. MURAT DARÇIN

Associate Dean, Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy, Ankara, Turkey

Dr. YOUNOS VAKIL ALROAIA

Head of International Center, DOS in Management, Semnan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Semnan, Iran

P. SARVAHARANA

Asst. Registrar, Indian Institute of Technology (IIT), Madras

SHASHI KHURANA

Associate Professor, S. M. S. Khalsa Lubana Girls College, Barara, Ambala

Dr. SEOW TA WEEA

Associate Professor, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Parit Raja, Malaysia

Dr. OKAN VELI ŞAFAKLI

Professor & Dean, European University of Lefke, Lefke, Cyprus

Dr. MOHINDER CHAND

Associate Professor, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

Dr. BORIS MILOVIC

Associate Professor, Faculty of Sport, Union Nikola Tesla University, Belgrade, Serbia

Dr. IQBAL THONSE HAWALDAR

Associate Professor, College of Business Administration, Kingdom University, Bahrain

Dr. MOHENDER KUMAR GUPTA

Associate Professor, Government College, Hodal

Dr. ALEXANDER MOSESOV

Associate Professor, Kazakh-British Technical University (KBTU), Almaty, Kazakhstan

Dr. MOHAMMAD TALHA

Associate Professor, Department of Accounting & MIS, College of Industrial Management, King Fahd University of Petroleum & Minerals, Dhahran, Saudi Arabia

Dr. ASHOK KUMAR CHAUHAN

Reader, Department of Economics, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

Dr. RAJESH MODI

Faculty, Yanbu Industrial College, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

WILLIAM NKOMO

Asst. Head of the Department, Faculty of Computing, Botho University, Francistown, Botswana

YU-BING WANG

Faculty, department of Marketing, Feng Chia University, Taichung, Taiwan

Dr. SHIVAKUMAR DEENE

Faculty, Dept. of Commerce, School of Business Studies, Central University of Karnataka, Gulbarga

Dr. TITUS AMODU UMORU

Professor, Kwara State University, Kwara State, Nigeria

Dr. BHAVET

Faculty, Shree Ram Institute of Engineering & Technology, Urjani

Dr. THAMPOE MANAGALESWARAN

Faculty, Vavuniya Campus, University of Jaffna, Sri Lanka

Dr. ASHISH CHOPRA

Faculty, Department of Computer Applications, National Institute of Technology, Kurukshetra

SURAJ GAUDEL

BBA Program Coordinator, LA GRANDEE International College, Simalchaur - 8, Pokhara, Nepal

Dr. SAMBHAVNA

Faculty, I.I.T.M., Delhi

Dr. LALIT KUMAR

Course Director, Faculty of Financial Management, Haryana Institute of Public Administration, Gurugram

FORMER TECHNICAL ADVISOR

AMITA

FINANCIAL ADVISORS

DICKEN GOYAL

Advocate & Tax Adviser, Panchkula

NEENA

Investment Consultant, Chambaghat, Solan, Himachal Pradesh

LEGAL ADVISORS

JITENDER S. CHAHAL

Advocate, Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh U.T.

CHANDER BHUSHAN SHARMA

Advocate & Consultant, District Courts, Yamunanagar at Jagadhri

SUPERINTENDENT

SURENDER KUMAR POONIA

CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

We invite unpublished novel, original, empirical and high quality research work pertaining to the recent developments & practices in the areas of Computer Science & Applications; Commerce; Business; Finance; Marketing; Human Resource Management; General Management; Banking; Economics; Tourism Administration & Management; Education; Law; Library & Information Science; Defence & Strategic Studies; Electronic Science; Corporate Governance; Industrial Relations; and emerging paradigms in allied subjects like Accounting; Accounting Information Systems; Accounting Theory & Practice; Auditing; Behavioral Accounting; Behavioral Economics; Corporate Finance; Cost Accounting; Econometrics; Economic Development; Economic History; Financial Institutions & Markets; Financial Services; Fiscal Policy; Government & Non Profit Accounting; Industrial Organization; International Economics & Trade; International Finance; Macro Economics; Micro Economics; Rural Economics; Co-operation; Demography; Development Planning; Development Studies; Applied Economics; Development Economics; Business Economics; Monetary Policy; Public Policy Economics; Real Estate; Regional Economics; Political Science; Continuing Education; Labour Welfare; Philosophy; Psychology; Sociology; Tax Accounting; Advertising & Promotion Management; Management Information Systems (MIS); Business Law; Public Responsibility & Ethics; Communication; Direct Marketing; E-Commerce; Global Business; Health Care Administration; Labour Relations & Human Resource Management; Marketing Research; Marketing Theory & Applications; Non-Profit Organizations; Office Administration/Management; Operations Research/Statistics; Organizational Behavior & Theory; Organizational Development; Production/Operations; International Relations; Human Rights & Duties; Public Administration; Population Studies; Purchasing/Materials Management; Retailing; Sales/Selling; Services; Small Business Entrepreneurship; Strategic Management Policy; Technology/Innovation; Tourism & Hospitality; Transportation Distribution; Algorithms; Artificial Intelligence; Compilers & Translation; Computer Aided Design (CAD); Computer Aided Manufacturing; Computer Graphics; Computer Organization & Architecture; Database Structures & Systems; Discrete Structures; Internet; Management Information Systems; Modeling & Simulation; Neural Systems/Neural Networks; Numerical Analysis/Scientific Computing; Object Oriented Programming; Operating Systems; Programming Languages; Robotics; Symbolic & Formal Logic; Web Design and emerging paradigms in allied subjects.

Anybody can submit the **soft copy** of unpublished novel; original; empirical and high quality **research work/manuscript** **anytime** in **M.S. Word format** after preparing the same as per our **GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION**; at our email address i.e. infoijrcm@gmail.com or online by clicking the link **online submission** as given on our website ([FOR ONLINE SUBMISSION, CLICK HERE](#)).

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT

1. **COVERING LETTER FOR SUBMISSION:**

DATED: _____

THE EDITOR

IJRCM

Subject: SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT IN THE AREA OF _____.

(e.g. Finance/Mkt./HRM/General Mgt./Engineering/Economics/Computer/IT/ Education/Psychology/Law/Math/other, **please specify**)

DEAR SIR/MADAM

Please find my submission of manuscript titled ' _____ ' for likely publication in one of your journals.

I hereby affirm that the contents of this manuscript are original. Furthermore, it has neither been published anywhere in any language fully or partly, nor it is under review for publication elsewhere.

I affirm that all the co-authors of this manuscript have seen the submitted version of the manuscript and have agreed to inclusion of their names as co-authors.

Also, if my/our manuscript is accepted, I agree to comply with the formalities as given on the website of the journal. The Journal has discretion to publish our contribution in any of its journals.

NAME OF CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Designation/Post* :

Institution/College/University with full address & Pin Code :

Residential address with Pin Code :

Mobile Number (s) with country ISD code :

Is WhatsApp or Viber active on your above noted Mobile Number (Yes/No) :

Landline Number (s) with country ISD code :

E-mail Address :

Alternate E-mail Address :

Nationality :

* i.e. Alumnus (Male Alumni), Alumna (Female Alumni), Student, Research Scholar (M. Phil), Research Scholar (Ph. D.), JRF, Research Assistant, Assistant Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Junior Assistant Professor, Assistant Professor, Senior Assistant Professor, Co-ordinator, Reader, Associate Professor, Professor, Head, Vice-Principal, Dy. Director, Principal, Director, Dean, President, Vice Chancellor, Industry Designation etc. **The qualification of author is not acceptable for the purpose.**

NOTES:

- a) The whole manuscript has to be in **ONE MS WORD FILE** only, which will start from the covering letter, inside the manuscript. **pdf. version is liable to be rejected without any consideration.**
 - b) The sender is required to mention the following in the **SUBJECT COLUMN of the mail:**
New Manuscript for Review in the area of (e.g. Finance/Marketing/HRM/General Mgt./Engineering/Economics/Computer/IT/ Education/Psychology/Law/Math/other, please specify)
 - c) There is no need to give any text in the body of the mail, except the cases where the author wishes to give any **specific message** w.r.t. to the manuscript.
 - d) The total size of the file containing the manuscript is expected to be below **1000 KB.**
 - e) Only the **Abstract will not be considered for review** and the author is required to submit the **complete manuscript** in the first instance.
 - f) **The journal gives acknowledgement w.r.t. the receipt of every email within twenty-four hours** and in case of non-receipt of acknowledgment from the journal, w.r.t. the submission of the manuscript, within two days of its submission, the corresponding author is required to demand for the same by sending a separate mail to the journal.
 - g) The author (s) name or details should not appear anywhere on the body of the manuscript, except on the covering letter and the cover page of the manuscript, in the manner as mentioned in the guidelines.
2. **MANUSCRIPT TITLE:** The title of the paper should be typed in **bold letters, centered and fully capitalised.**
 3. **AUTHOR NAME (S) & AFFILIATIONS:** Author (s) **name, designation, affiliation (s), address, mobile/landline number (s), and email/alternate email address** should be given underneath the title.
 4. **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:** Acknowledgements can be given to reviewers, guides, funding institutions, etc., if any.
 5. **ABSTRACT:** Abstract should be in **fully italic printing**, ranging between **150 to 300 words**. The abstract must be informative and elucidating the background, aims, methods, results & conclusion in a **SINGLE PARA. Abbreviations must be mentioned in full.**
 6. **KEYWORDS:** Abstract must be followed by a list of keywords, subject to the maximum of **five**. These should be arranged in alphabetic order separated by commas and full stop at the end. All words of the keywords, including the first one should be in small letters, except special words e.g. name of the Countries, abbreviations etc.
 7. **JEL CODE:** Provide the appropriate Journal of Economic Literature Classification System code (s). JEL codes are available at www.aea-web.org/econlit/jelCodes.php. However, mentioning of JEL Code is not mandatory.
 8. **MANUSCRIPT:** Manuscript must be in **BRITISH ENGLISH** prepared on a standard A4 size **PORTRAIT SETTING PAPER. It should be free from any errors i.e. grammatical, spelling or punctuation. It must be thoroughly edited at your end.**
 9. **HEADINGS:** All the headings must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised. Leave a blank line before each heading.
 10. **SUB-HEADINGS:** All the sub-headings must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised.
 11. **MAIN TEXT:**

THE MAIN TEXT SHOULD FOLLOW THE FOLLOWING SEQUENCE:**INTRODUCTION****REVIEW OF LITERATURE****NEED/IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY****STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM****OBJECTIVES****HYPOTHESIS (ES)****RESEARCH METHODOLOGY****RESULTS & DISCUSSION****FINDINGS****RECOMMENDATIONS/SUGGESTIONS****CONCLUSIONS****LIMITATIONS****SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH****REFERENCES****APPENDIX/ANNEXURE****The manuscript should preferably be in 2000 to 5000 WORDS, But the limits can vary depending on the nature of the manuscript.**

12. **FIGURES & TABLES:** These should be simple, crystal **CLEAR, centered, separately numbered** & self-explained, and the **titles must be above the table/figure. Sources of data should be mentioned below the table/figure. It should be ensured that the tables/figures are referred to from the main text.**
13. **EQUATIONS/FORMULAE:** These should be consecutively numbered in parenthesis, left aligned with equation/formulae number placed at the right. The equation editor provided with standard versions of Microsoft Word may be utilised. If any other equation editor is utilised, author must confirm that these equations may be viewed and edited in versions of Microsoft Office that does not have the editor.
14. **ACRONYMS:** These should not be used in the abstract. The use of acronyms is elsewhere is acceptable. Acronyms should be defined on its first use in each section e.g. Reserve Bank of India (RBI). Acronyms should be redefined on first use in subsequent sections.
15. **REFERENCES:** The list of all references should be alphabetically arranged. **The author (s) should mention only the actually utilised references in the preparation of manuscript** and they may follow Harvard Style of Referencing. **Also check to ensure that everything that you are including in the reference section is duly cited in the paper.** The author (s) are supposed to follow the references as per the following:
- All works cited in the text (including sources for tables and figures) should be listed alphabetically.
 - Use (ed.) for one editor, and (ed.s) for multiple editors.
 - When listing two or more works by one author, use --- (20xx), such as after Kohl (1997), use --- (2001), etc., in chronologically ascending order.
 - Indicate (opening and closing) page numbers for articles in journals and for chapters in books.
 - The title of books and journals should be in italic printing. Double quotation marks are used for titles of journal articles, book chapters, dissertations, reports, working papers, unpublished material, etc.
 - For titles in a language other than English, provide an English translation in parenthesis.
 - **Headers, footers, endnotes and footnotes should not be used in the document.** However, **you can mention short notes to elucidate some specific point**, which may be placed in number orders before the references.

PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING FOR STYLE AND PUNCTUATION IN REFERENCES:

BOOKS

- Bowersox, Donald J., Closs, David J., (1996), "Logistical Management." Tata McGraw, Hill, New Delhi.
- Hunker, H.L. and A.J. Wright (1963), "Factors of Industrial Location in Ohio" Ohio State University, Nigeria.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO BOOKS

- Sharma T., Kwatra, G. (2008) Effectiveness of Social Advertising: A Study of Selected Campaigns, Corporate Social Responsibility, Edited by David Crowther & Nicholas Capaldi, Ashgate Research Companion to Corporate Social Responsibility, Chapter 15, pp 287-303.

JOURNAL AND OTHER ARTICLES

- Schemenner, R.W., Huber, J.C. and Cook, R.L. (1987), "Geographic Differences and the Location of New Manufacturing Facilities," Journal of Urban Economics, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 83-104.

CONFERENCE PAPERS

- Garg, Sambhav (2011): "Business Ethics" Paper presented at the Annual International Conference for the All India Management Association, New Delhi, India, 19–23

UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS

- Kumar S. (2011): "Customer Value: A Comparative Study of Rural and Urban Customers," Thesis, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.

ONLINE RESOURCES

- Always indicate the date that the source was accessed, as online resources are frequently updated or removed.

WEBSITES

- Garg, Bhavet (2011): Towards a New Gas Policy, Political Weekly, Viewed on January 01, 2012 <http://epw.in/user/viewabstract.jsp>

MEASURING GENDER AND INCOME IMPACT ON PERCEPTION OF ORGANIC FOOD: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY ON GERMAN YOUTH

SAJEEB SAHA

ASST. PROFESSOR

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRIBUSINESS AND MARKETING
SHER-E-BANGLA AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY
DHAKA**

BISAKHA DEWAN

ASST. PROFESSOR

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRIBUSINESS AND MARKETING
SHER-E- BANGLA AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY
DHAKA**

FATEMA SARKER

ASST. PROFESSOR

**DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT AND POVERTY STUDIES
SHER-E- BANGLA AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY
DHAKA**

SAUDA AFRIN ANNY

ASST. PROFESSOR

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRIBUSINESS AND MARKETING
SHER-E- BANGLA AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY
DHAKA**

ABSTRACT

In order to know how organic food is perceived by young generation of Germany, study was conducted upon 100 GYOC¹ with average age of 26.81 years. Male and females are in equal numbers. 65% of respondents are student, 87% of them are single and 98% is having university level of education. This study reveals that almost 60% of GYOC purchase organic products at least once in a week. Statistical techniques naming Descriptive statistics and ANOVA are used to analyze data and test significance. Findings show that organic foods are perceived mostly as eco-friendly, healthy and expensive. Both males and females have same perception of organic food with the exception of taste, nutritious value and credibility. Organic food is perceived less nutritious, tasty and credible to male than female. GYOC with higher income perceive organic food as healthier, safer and less expensive than that of lower income group.

KEYWORDS

organic food, german young organic consumers, healthy, eco-friendliness.

JEL CODES

P46, M31.

INTRODUCTION

Because of high education and standard of living, developed country like Germany is showing more interest on organic products. People are more concerned not only for their personal health but also for generation next and environment. They expect to have foods with higher nutritious value, no additives & preservatives that come from organic farming. Germany is the second largest organic food market in the world after USA. Sales of organic foods have increased in recent years, peaking in 2012 at over €7 billion. That's nearly a third of the total organic food sales in the European Union and about 4% of the total food sales in Germany (GAIN Report, 2014). Germany is the country of more than 82.5 million people. Even though median age of German population is 45.9 years (Worldometers, 2014), young generation (20 to 39 years old) consists of 23.6% of the population (Population Pyramid, 2015). Future market of any industry in Germany depends on this group of population. In this study, author wants to analyze the perception of this group of people towards organic food. Studies conducted on organic food earlier have shown the direction of this study and help to find the necessary variables to be analyzed. For example, previous studies (Eco Mercados, 2005; Cene and Karaman, 2015; Fotopoulos and Krystallis, 2002) show education, income, age, gender, children affect organic food purchase decisions. Moreover, plenty of studies (Mohsen and Decko, 2013; Wilson, Evans, Leppard, & Syrette, 2004; Cabuk et al., 2014; Rehbar and Turhan, 2002) show health, environment, nutritious value, taste, animal welfare, food safety and knowledge play very important roles for making purchase decision of organic product.

LITERATURE REVIEW

All customers associate organic products with health at different level of abstraction and want good tasty and nourishing products, because pleasure and wellbeing are their most important values (Zanoli and Naspetti, 2002). Concern for ecology drives consumer to buy organic. In Germany, ecological reason is the 2nd best motivating factor after health (Alvensleben, 1997). Environmental friendly production method attracts younger people towards organic food (Wier and Calverly, 2002). Likewise, high product quality also drives people to consume organic food. For Croatians, high quality is the second best factors after health for buying organic food (Radman, 2005). Most consumers perceive organic food as higher quality products, based upon which they show an acceptance of a price premium for organic food. Consumers rely on organic agriculture as a possible strategy to cope with food safety problems (Bruschi et al., 2015). Michaelidou and Hassan, 2008 say food safety is the most important predictor of attitude while health consciousness appears to be the least important motive. Nutrition (Mukul et al.,

¹ German Young Organic Consumer

2013), animal welfare (Mutlu, 2007) and supporting small organic farmers (Zanoli, 2004) are also significant in taking decision of buying organic. Animal welfare is one of the important factors for organic consumers when they buy dairy products. In most of the western European countries, animal welfare is considered to be the second most important concern after health (Mutlu, 2007). Buying from the region is closely related with supporting small organic farmers and standing against international big food producers (Zanoli, 2004). Finally, consumers consider availability of locally grown products, reliable information and easy comparison with non-organic products too when they take the decision to buy organic food. (Gottschalk and Leistner, 2013).

For special way of production and quality, organic food is more expensive than conventional food. So, for people with low income, organic food is not the matter of interest (Hill and Lynchehaun, 2002). The appearance of organic foods is not as attractive as conventional foods. People do not get interest in having products specially foods that have bad appearance. Poor appearance and look compared to conventional food can be one of the reasons for not buying organic food (Mutlu, 2007). Despite controversies and debates about relative characteristics and real value of organic food, both individual consumers and consumer groups are prompted to pursue and react to market opportunities for safer food with high levels of enthusiasm (Wilson, Evans, Leppard, & Syrette, 2004).

The attitude and the intention to buy are affected by health consciousness, environmental concern and food safety concern. The attitude plays a fundamental role both in terms of the direct impact on the intention to buy and the indirect effect as a mediator on how the health consciousness, environmental concern and food safety concern affect the intention to buy (Cabuk et al., 2014). The previous studies as factors such as health, environmental factors, food availability, product price, consumers' income and trust to organization are found to influence consumers effectively (Cene and Karaman, 2015). Egoistic (e.g. personal health) and altruistic (e.g. environmental) considerations simultaneously play an important role on consumer attitude and intention. Societal considerations are more important while people take decision on organic or green products (Kareklas, 2014). Consumer awareness, health and environment sensitive actions are some highlights in developed countries that create market demand (Rehbar and Turhan, 2002). Young families and older consumers, who are concentrated in urban area, are highly educated and fall in high income bracket; are the organic food consumers. Health and safety issues are keys to them. On the other hand, high switching cost to organic food is one of the main reasons for not consuming organic food (Eco Mercados, 2005).

Prior product knowledge is proposed in consumer research as one of the cognitive traits existing at the background of consumer perceptions, influencing valuation of a product's perceived benefits, costs, and value (Lai, 1995). In organic food research, perceived prior knowledge exemplifies an important factor in the acceptance of organic food and may, therefore, determine the specific benefits consumers perceive and look for in it (Hill & Lynchehaun, 2002; Zanoli & Naspetti, 2002). Consumers with higher level of involvement, more perceived prior knowledge of organic food, and a higher level of usage are likely to be prominently motivated and driven by pursuit of its future-based benefits in its purchase and consumption (Mohsen and Decko, 2013).

Organic food can be marketed globally based on a universal set of key value propositions. The same could be true for other global products sharing similar types of certifiable value propositions (Thogersen et al., 2015). A cross-cultural study by Mutlu, 2007, shows that health and supporting organic movement are similarly standing on the top three places in motivation list for Turkey and Germany, on the other hand, high price and lack of availability reported as ruling barriers but with different degree of importance.

According to the report of MARKETLINE, 2015, German organic food market grew by 4.8% in 2014 to reach a value of \$10,500.9 million. The market forecast indicates that in 2019, this market will have a value of \$14,429 million, an increase of 37.4% since 2014. Fruit & vegetables is the largest segment of the organic food market in Germany, accounting for 28.8% of the market's total value. Germany accounts for 30.2% of the European organic food market value. Rivalry in the organic foods market is heightened by the lack of product differentiation, and negligible switching costs for buyers. Strong market growth serves to counteract this somewhat.

OBJECTIVES

1. Analyze the impact of gender on perception of young organic consumer of Germany towards organic food.
2. Analyze the impact of income on perception of young organic consumer of Germany towards organic food.

HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

There are twenty-four hypotheses to be tested in this study. They are as follows:

- H1:** There is a difference in perception by gender toward healthiness of organic food.
H2: There is a difference in perception by gender toward eco-friendliness of organic food.
H3: There is a difference in perception by gender toward taste of organic food.
H4: There is a difference in perception by gender toward nutritious value of organic food.
H5: There is a difference in perception by gender toward organic food regarding free of pesticides.
H6: There is a difference in perception by gender toward organic food regarding free of chemical.
H7: There is a difference in perception by gender toward organic food regarding free of preservatives.
H8: There is a difference in perception by gender toward organic food regarding free of GMO.
H9: There is a difference in perception by gender toward organic food regarding certification and credibility.
H10: There is a difference in perception by gender toward organic food regarding animal welfare.
H11: There is a difference in perception by gender toward food safety of organic food.
H12: There is a difference in perception by gender toward organic food regarding expensiveness.
H13: There is a difference in perception by different income group toward healthiness of organic food.
H14: There is a difference in perception by different income group toward eco-friendliness of organic food.
H15: There is a difference in perception by different income group toward taste of organic food.
H16: There is a difference in perception by different income group toward nutritious value of organic food.
H17: There is a difference in perception by different income group toward organic food regarding free of pesticides.
H18: There is a difference in perception by different income group toward organic food regarding free of chemical.
H19: There is a difference in perception by different income group toward organic food regarding free of preservatives.
H20: There is a difference in perception by different income group toward organic food regarding free of GMO.
H21: There is a difference in perception by different income group toward organic food regarding certification and credibility.
H22: There is a difference in perception by different income group toward organic food regarding animal welfare.
H23: There is a difference in perception by different income group toward food safety of organic food.
H24: There is a difference in perception by different income group toward organic food regarding expensiveness.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Author needs to know perception of German young generation towards organic food and impact of gender and income on perception. So, this study is basically a descriptive kind of study that is a part of conclusive research whose major objective is the description of something, usually market characteristics or functions (Malhotra and Birks, 2006) and also causal research as it is needed to show some relationships among different variables. A causal research is a type of conclusive research where the major objective is to obtain evidence regarding cause-and-effect (causal) relationships (Malhotra and Birks, 2006). Both secondary and primary data are necessary for research purpose. To understand German organic market and find important factors regarding perception on organic food, it is needed to explore different previous studies and reports. On the other hand, to analyze the perception of young generation of Germany regarding organic food, first hand data were needed from them. A 5-point Likert scale is used with assigning value from 1 for extreme disagreement to 5 for extreme agreement. Judgmental sampling technique is used for serving the research purpose. Judgmental sampling belonging to non-probability is the form of convenience sampling in which the population elements are purposely selected based on the judgment of the researcher (Malhotra and Birks, 2006). Total sample size is 100 whose age is between

20 years old and 39 years old. Sample must consume organic products and must be having German nationality. Basically, statistical analysis like Descriptive statistics and ANOVA (analysis of variance) are used for study purpose. ANOVA is used to show the impact of gender and income on perception on organic food where the natures of independent variables (gender, income) are categorical and natures of dependent variables (healthy, eco-friendly, expensive etc.) are metric. Results are generated with the help of SPSS software.

FINDINGS

Reliability analysis of scale: Cronbach's α is calculated to test the reliability of the Likert scale. The internal reliability of the scale items is satisfactory as value of α is 0.7508 in our case. The reliability exceeds 0.70 is typically considered as acceptable (Nunnally, 1983).

Demographic profile of samples: The demographic distributions of GYOC shows that age group of 24 to 25 are dominating with 41% of young organic consumers. Minimum age of respondents is 23 years and maximum is 35 years. Average age of the samples of this study is 26.81. Gender is distributed equally (50% is male and 50% is female). 65% respondents are students, 27 are having full time job and only 8 are having part time employment. There are five different levels of income have been chosen for the study. 34% lies in the group who has income of less than €1000 per month and 39% belongs to the group that has income of €1000 to less than €2000 per month. Similarly, 22 % of respondents earn €2000 to less than €3000 per month. Likewise, 2% and 3% of samples have income of €3000 to less than €4000 and €4000 and above per month respectively. Regarding the marital status, 87% are single, 6% are married with no child, 6% are married with children and only 1% is single parent with no child. 56% of the GYOC purchases organic products at least once in a week and 29% purchases 2 to 4 times in a week. On the other hand, 12% and 3% of samples purchases once in a month and less than once in a month respectively.

Perception towards organic food: Mean score of any particular variable higher than 3 indicates a positive association between organic food and that particular variable whereas, mean score less than 3 shows a negative association, as point 3 is the neutral point above which is agreement and below is disagreement. Considering this fact, we can articulate that according to GYOC, organic food is strongly associated with eco-friendliness, healthiness and expensiveness. They also believe that organic food is free from pesticides, chemical, preservatives and GMO (genetically modified organisms). They moderately agree that it is safe and it cares animal welfare and it is credible. But they have doubt on its taste and nutritious value to some extent (Table 1).

Impact of gender on perception: To know the impact of gender on perception of organic food and compare the means of male and female, one-way ANOVA is conducted as nature of independent variable (sex) is categorical and nature of dependent variables (healthy, eco-friendly, tasty etc.) are metric. Results (Table 3) show that there is no significant difference on perception between male and female except the case of taste, nutritious value and certified or credibility. Only these three variables have calculated F value greater than the critical value which is significant at 5%. The critical value of F is somewhere between 3.92 and 4.00 at 1 and 98 degrees of freedom. But calculated values of F of all these three variables (7.467, 8.973 and 5.271) are higher than the critical value. Moreover, we can see a big difference of sample means of these variables in Table 2: for example, sample means with values of 2.84 (male) and 3.32 (female) for variable "tasty" are quite different. Interestingly, females have higher mean score than males in these three variables: taste, nutritious value and certified or credibility. So, we can conclude that we could reject the null hypothesis relating to these three variables. Organic food is perceived more nutritious, tasty and credible to female than male. To summarize,

TABLE A

Hypothesis	Test
H3. There is a difference in perception by gender toward taste of organic food.	Accepted
H4. There is a difference in perception by gender toward nutritious value of organic food.	Accepted
H9. There is a difference in perception by gender toward organic food regarding certification and credibility.	Accepted

Impact of income on perception: For the same reason explained in the previous section, ANOVA technique is used here again. The study reveals that people with different levels of income have different perception toward organic food regarding healthiness, expensiveness and safety. Other perceptions are same irrespective to income. The critical value of F is somewhere between 2.45 and 2.53 at 4 and 95 degrees of freedom. F values for healthiness, food safety and expensiveness are 4.280, 2.833 and 12.655 which are higher than the critical value (Table 5). So, all of the null hypothesis associated with these three variables will be rejected. Moreover, we can see the big mean differences of various levels of income associated with these three variables (Table 4). For the other cases, differences are negligible. In a nutshell, after analyzing mean scores of each level associated with these three variables: healthiness, expensiveness and food safety, we can conclude that GYOC with higher income perceive organic food as healthier than that of lower income group. Organic food as safe food is perceived mostly by the highest income level group. Mean score for food safety is lower for group with lower level of income. People with higher income do not think organic food is expensive. On the other hand, the lowest income group strongly agree with the statement - "Organic food is expensive". To summarize,

TABLE B

Hypothesis	Test
H13. There is a difference in perception by different income group toward healthiness of organic food.	Accepted
H23. There is a difference in perception by different income group toward food safety of organic food.	Accepted
H24. There is a difference in perception by different income group toward organic food regarding expensiveness.	Accepted

CONCLUSION

This study started with twenty-four hypotheses out of which six have been accepted. The impact of gender and income on the perception of GYOC is clearly identified but it fails to show the impact of other important factors like marital status, occupation, education etc. because of age constraint set for this study. For example, due to age constraint of the samples of this study, 87% of samples are single; impact of different marital status will not be valid. Result should only be valid if there were sufficient numbers of respondent with different marital status could be found. However, result shows organic foods are perceived mostly as eco-friendly, healthy and expensive by GYOC. Perception of both males and females matches with some exceptions. Their perceptions differ in term of taste, nutritious value and credibility of organic food. Organic food is perceived more nutritious, tasty and credible to female than male. Result also reveals that GYOC with different income levels have almost same perception on organic food with the exception of healthiness, safety and expensiveness of this food. GYOC with higher income perceive organic food as healthier and safer and less expensive than that of lower income group.

REFERENCES

1. **Alvensleben, R.**, 1997. Ecological Aspect of Food Demand: The case of organic food in Germany. Health, ecological and safety aspect in food choice, 4(1), 68-79.
2. **Bruschi, V., Shershneva, K., Dolgoplova, I., Canavari, M., and Teuber, R.**, 2015. Consumer Perception of Organic Food in Emerging markets: Evidence from Saint Petersburg. Agribusiness, 31 (3), 414-432.
3. **Cabuk, S., Tanrikulu, C. and Gelibolu, L.**, 2014. Understanding organic food consumption: Attitude as a mediator. International Journal of Consumer Studies, 38(2014), 337-345.
4. **Cene, E. and Karaman, F.**, 2015. Analyzing Organic Food Buyers' Perceptions with Bayesian Networks: A case study in Turkey. Journal of Applied Statistics, 42(7), 1572-1590.
5. **Eco Mercados**, 2005. Enhancing Organic and fair trade, 2005. The European Market for Organic and Fair Trade Products- with a focus on potential products from Central America. ISBN-99924-0-456-6.
6. **Fotopoulos, C. and Krystallis, A.**, 2002. Purchasing motives and profile of the Greek organic consumer: A countrywide survey. British Food Journal, 104(9), 730-765.

7. **Gain Report, USDA**, 2014. Assessments of Commodity and Trade Issues, Report Number- GM 14006 [online]. Available: http://gain.fas.usda.gov/Recent%20GAIN%20Publications/Exporter%20Guide_Berlin_Germany_12-15-2014.pdf [accessed 5 November].
8. **Gottschalk, I and Leistner, T.**, 2013. Consumer Reaction to the Availability of Organic Food in Discount Supermarkets. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 37(2013), 136-142.
9. **Hill, H., & Lynchehaun, F.**, 2002. Organic milk: Attitudes and consumption patterns. *British Food Journal*, 104(7), 526–543. doi: 10.1108/00070700210434570.
10. **Kareklas, I., Jeffrey, R. Carlson, and Darrel, D. Muehling, Darrel D.**, 2014. I Eat Organic for My Benefit and Yours: Egoistic and Altruistic Considerations for Purchasing Organic Food and Their Implications for Advertising Strategists *Journal of advertising*, 43(1), 18-32.
11. **Lai, A. W.**, 1995. Consumer values, product benefits and customer value: A consumption behaviour approach. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 22(1), 381–388.
12. **Malhotra, N.K. and Birks, D. F.**, 2006. *Marketing Research- an applied approach*. 3rd edition. London. Prentice Hall.
13. **MARKETLINE**, 2015. MarketLine industry profile: Organic Food in Germany [online]. Available: <http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail/detail?vid=26&sid=799333ad-bc4f-456f-86c1-307acb3c1f9c%40sessionmgr113&hid=110&bdata=JmxhbmC9ZGUmc2l0ZT11aG9zdC1saXZl#AN=102131400&db=buh> [accessed 10 November 2015].
14. **Michaelidou, N. and Hassan, Louise 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.
15. **Mohsen, G. M. and Decko, S.**, 2013. An extension of the benefit segmentation base for the consumption of organic foods: A time perspective. *Journal of management*, 29 (15-16), 1701-1728.
16. **Mukul, A. Z. A., Afrin, S. and Hasan, M. M.**, 2013. Factors Affecting Consumers' Perceptions about Organic Food and Their Prevalence in Bangladeshi Organic Preference. *Journal of Business and Management Sciences*, 1(5), 112-118.
17. **Mutlu, N.**, 2007. *Consumer Attitude and Behavior towards organic food: Cross cultural study of Turkey and Germany*. Thesis (Masters). Hohenheim University.
18. **Nunnally, J.C.**, 1983. *Psychometric Theory*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
19. **Populationpyramid**, 2015. Population Pyramids of the world from 1950 to 2100 [online]. Available: <http://populationpyramid.net/germany/2015/> [accessed 2 December 2015].
20. **Radman, M.**, 2005. Consumer Consumption and Perception on Organic Products in Croatia. *British Food Journal* 107(4), 263-274.
21. **Rehbar, E. and Turhan, S.**, 2002. Prospects and challenges for developing countries in trade and production of organic food and fibres- The case of Turkey. *British Food Journal*, 104(3/4/5), 371-390.
22. **Smith, R.**, (2011). Social Media offers insights on Organic vs. Conventional farming, September 17, 2011 [online]. Available: <http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&sid=799333ad-bc4f-456f-86c1-307acb3c1f9c%40sessionmgr113&hid=110> [Accessed 11 November, 2015].
23. **Thogersen, J., de Bercellos, M.D., Perin, M.G. and Zhou, Y.**, 2015. Consumer buying motives and attitudes towards organic food in two emerging markets. *International Marketing Review*, 32(3/4), 389-413.
24. **Wilson, C., Evans, G., Leppard, P., and Syrette, J.**, 2004. Reactions to genetically modified food crops and how perception of risks and benefits influences consumers' information gathering. *Risk Analysis*, 24(5), 1311–1321. doi: 10.1111/j.0272-4332.2004.00528.x
25. **Worldometers**, 2015. Germany Population [online]. Available: <http://www.worldometers.info/world-population/germany-population/> [accessed 2 December 2015].
26. **Zanoli, R. and Naspetti, S.**, 2002. Consumer motivation in the purchase of organic food, A means-end approach. *British Food journal*, 104(8), 643-653.
27. **Zanoli, R., Baehr, M., Botschen, M., Laberenze, H., Naspetti, S., Tehlen, E.**, 2004. The European Consumer and Organic Food. *Organic Market Initiatives and Rural Development*, Vol 4, Aberystwyth, UK.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1: PERCEPTION OF GERMAN YOUNG GENERATION TOWARDS ORGANIC FOOD

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Healthy	100	3	5	4.30	.560
Eco- friendly	100	3	5	4.37	.597
Tasty	100	1	5	3.08	.907
Nutritious	100	1	5	3.53	.937
Free of pesticides	100	3	5	4.22	.561
Free of Chemical	100	3	5	4.19	.615
Free of preservatives	100	3	5	4.06	.679
Free of GMO	100	3	5	4.00	.682
Certified	100	2	5	3.72	.712
Animal Welfare	100	2	5	3.79	.686
Food Safety	100	2	5	3.94	.664
High price	100	3	5	4.23	.664

TABLE 2: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON PERCEPTION AND GENDER

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Healthy	male	50	4.26	.565	.080	4.10	4.42	3	5
	female	50	4.34	.557	.079	4.18	4.50	3	5
	Total	100	4.30	.560	.056	4.19	4.41	3	5
Eco- friendly	male	50	4.40	.571	.081	4.24	4.56	3	5
	female	50	4.34	.626	.089	4.16	4.52	3	5
	Total	100	4.37	.597	.060	4.25	4.49	3	5
Tasty	male	50	2.84	.842	.119	2.60	3.08	1	5
	female	50	3.32	.913	.129	3.06	3.58	1	5
	Total	100	3.08	.907	.091	2.90	3.26	1	5
Nutritious	male	50	3.26	.876	.124	3.01	3.51	1	5
	female	50	3.80	.926	.131	3.54	4.06	1	5
	Total	100	3.53	.937	.094	3.34	3.72	1	5
Free of pesticides	male	50	4.26	.527	.075	4.11	4.41	3	5
	female	50	4.18	.596	.084	4.01	4.35	3	5
	Total	100	4.22	.561	.056	4.11	4.33	3	5
Free of Chemical	male	50	4.18	.661	.093	3.99	4.37	3	5
	female	50	4.20	.571	.081	4.04	4.36	3	5
	Total	100	4.19	.615	.061	4.07	4.31	3	5
Free of preservatives	male	50	4.00	.728	.103	3.79	4.21	3	5
	female	50	4.12	.627	.089	3.94	4.30	3	5
	Total	100	4.06	.679	.068	3.93	4.19	3	5
Free of GMO	male	50	3.92	.665	.094	3.73	4.11	3	5
	female	50	4.08	.695	.098	3.88	4.28	3	5
	Total	100	4.00	.682	.068	3.86	4.14	3	5
Certified	male	50	3.56	.705	.100	3.36	3.76	2	5
	female	50	3.88	.689	.097	3.68	4.08	3	5
	Total	100	3.72	.712	.071	3.58	3.86	2	5
Animal Welfare	male	50	3.82	.661	.093	3.63	4.01	2	5
	female	50	3.76	.716	.101	3.56	3.96	3	5
	Total	100	3.79	.686	.069	3.65	3.93	2	5
Food Safety	male	50	3.92	.665	.094	3.73	4.11	2	5
	female	50	3.96	.669	.095	3.77	4.15	3	5
	Total	100	3.94	.664	.066	3.81	4.07	2	5
High price	male	50	4.28	.671	.095	4.09	4.47	3	5
	female	50	4.18	.661	.093	3.99	4.37	3	5
	Total	100	4.23	.664	.066	4.10	4.36	3	5

TABLE 3: ANOVA TABLE ON PERCEPTION AND GENDER

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Healthy	Between Groups	.160	1	.160	.508	.478
	Within Groups	30.840	98	.315		
	Total	31.000	99			
Eco- friendly	Between Groups	.090	1	.090	.250	.618
	Within Groups	35.220	98	.359		
	Total	35.310	99			
Tasty	Between Groups	5.760	1	5.760	7.467	.007
	Within Groups	75.600	98	.771		
	Total	81.360	99			
Nutritious	Between Groups	7.290	1	7.290	8.973	.003
	Within Groups	79.620	98	.812		
	Total	86.910	99			
Free of pesticides	Between Groups	.160	1	.160	.506	.479
	Within Groups	31.000	98	.316		
	Total	31.160	99			
Free of Chemical	Between Groups	.010	1	.010	.026	.872
	Within Groups	37.380	98	.381		
	Total	37.390	99			
Free of Preservatives	Between Groups	.360	1	.360	.779	.380
	Within Groups	45.280	98	.462		
	Total	45.640	99			
Free of GMO	Between Groups	.640	1	.640	1.383	.242
	Within Groups	45.360	98	.463		
	Total	46.000	99			
Certified	Between Groups	2.560	1	2.560	5.271	.024
	Within Groups	47.600	98	.486		
	Total	50.160	99			
Animal Welfare	Between Groups	.090	1	.090	.190	.664
	Within Groups	46.500	98	.474		
	Total	46.590	99			
Food Safety	Between Groups	.040	1	.040	.090	.765
	Within Groups	43.600	98	.445		
	Total	43.640	99			
High price	Between Groups	.250	1	.250	.564	.455
	Within Groups	43.460	98	.443		
	Total	43.710	99			

TABLE 4: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON PERCEPTION AND INCOME

		N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error
Healthy	less than 1000	34	3.94	.649	.111
	1000- less than 2000	39	4.28	.510	.082
	2000- less than3000	22	4.55	.596	.127
	3000- less than 4000	2	4.50	.707	.500
	4000 and above	3	4.67	.577	.333
	Total	100	4.24	.622	.062
Eco- friendly	less than 1000	34	4.53	.563	.097
	1000- less than 2000	39	4.21	.615	.098
	2000- less than3000	22	4.41	.503	.107
	3000- less than 4000	2	4.50	.707	.500
	4000 and above	3	4.33	1.155	.667
	Total	100	4.37	.597	.060
Tasty	less than 1000	34	3.15	.892	.153
	1000- less than 2000	39	3.15	.875	.140
	2000- less than3000	22	2.82	1.006	.215
	3000- less than 4000	2	2.50	.707	.500
	4000 and above	3	3.67	.577	.333
	Total	100	3.08	.907	.091
Nutritious	less than 1000	34	3.41	.925	.159
	1000- less than 2000	39	3.56	.821	.131
	2000- less than3000	22	3.59	1.141	.243
	3000- less than 4000	2	3.00	.000	.000
	4000 and above	3	4.33	1.155	.667
	Total	100	3.53	.937	.094
Free of pesticides	less than 1000	34	4.32	.589	.101
	1000- less than 2000	39	4.08	.580	.093
	2000- less than3000	22	4.36	.492	.105
	3000- less than 4000	2	4.00	.000	.000
	4000 and above	3	4.00	.000	.000
	Total	100	4.22	.561	.056
Free of Chemical	less than 1000	34	4.24	.654	.112
	1000- less than 2000	39	4.13	.615	.098
	2000- less than3000	22	4.27	.631	.135
	3000- less than 4000	2	4.00	.000	.000
	4000 and above	3	4.00	.000	.000
	Total	100	4.19	.615	.061
Free of preservative	less than 1000	34	4.09	.712	.122
	1000- less than 2000	39	4.05	.647	.104
	2000- less than3000	22	4.05	.785	.167
	3000- less than 4000	2	4.00	.000	.000
	4000 and above	3	4.00	.000	.000
	Total	100	4.06	.679	.068
Free of GMO	less than 1000	34	4.00	.739	.127
	1000- less than 2000	39	4.08	.623	.100
	2000- less than3000	22	3.86	.774	.165
	3000- less than 4000	2	4.00	.000	.000
	4000 and above	3	4.00	.000	.000
	Total	100	4.00	.682	.068
Certified	less than 1000	34	3.68	.684	.117
	1000- less than 2000	39	3.82	.721	.115
	2000- less than3000	22	3.59	.796	.170
	3000- less than 4000	2	3.50	.707	.500
	4000 and above	3	4.00	.000	.000
	Total	100	3.72	.712	.071
Animal Welfare	less than 1000	34	3.76	.741	.127
	1000- less than 2000	39	3.69	.694	.111
	2000- less than3000	22	3.95	.653	.139
	3000- less than 4000	2	4.00	.000	.000
	4000 and above	3	4.00	.000	.000
	Total	100	3.79	.686	.069
Food Safety	less than 1000	34	3.91	.712	.122
	1000- less than 2000	39	3.79	.695	.111
	2000- less than3000	22	4.27	.456	.097
	3000- less than 4000	2	4.00	.000	.000
	4000 and above	3	4.67	.577	.333
	Total	100	3.97	.674	.067
High price	less than 1000	34	4.44	.561	.096
	1000- less than 2000	39	4.13	.570	.091
	2000- less than3000	22	4.09	.811	.173
	3000- less than 4000	2	3.00	.000	.000
	4000 and above	3	2.00	.000	.000
	Total	100	4.14	.752	.075

TABLE 5: ANOVA TABLE ON PERCEPTION AND INCOME

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Healthy	Between Groups	5.839	4	1.460	4.280	.003
	Within Groups	32.401	95	.341		
	Total	38.240	99			
Eco- friendly	Between Groups	1.996	4	.499	1.423	.232
	Within Groups	33.314	95	.351		
	Total	35.310	99			
Tasty	Between Groups	3.579	4	.895	1.093	.365
	Within Groups	77.781	95	.819		
	Total	81.360	99			
Nutritious	Between Groups	3.100	4	.775	.879	.480
	Within Groups	83.810	95	.882		
	Total	86.910	99			
Free of pesticides	Between Groups	1.859	4	.465	1.507	.206
	Within Groups	29.301	95	.308		
	Total	31.160	99			
Free of Chemical	Between Groups	.550	4	.137	.354	.840
	Within Groups	36.840	95	.388		
	Total	37.390	99			
Free of preservatives	Between Groups	.053	4	.013	.027	.999
	Within Groups	45.587	95	.480		
	Total	45.640	99			
Free of GMO	Between Groups	.640	4	.160	.335	.854
	Within Groups	45.360	95	.477		
	Total	46.000	99			
Certified	Between Groups	1.157	4	.289	.561	.692
	Within Groups	49.003	95	.516		
	Total	50.160	99			
Animal Welfare	Between Groups	1.210	4	.303	.633	.640
	Within Groups	45.380	95	.478		
	Total	46.590	99			
Food Safety	Between Groups	4.785	4	1.196	2.833	.029
	Within Groups	40.125	95	.422		
	Total	44.910	99			
High price	Between Groups	19.480	4	4.870	12.655	.000
	Within Groups	36.560	95	.385		
	Total	56.040	99			

REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK

Dear Readers

At the very outset, International Journal of Research in Computer Application & Management (IJRCM) acknowledges & appreciates your efforts in showing interest in our present issue under your kind perusal.

I would like to request you to supply your critical comments and suggestions about the material published in this issue, as well as on the journal as a whole, on our e-mail infoijrcm@gmail.com for further improvements in the interest of research.

If you have any queries, please feel free to contact us on our e-mail infoijrcm@gmail.com.

I am sure that your feedback and deliberations would make future issues better – a result of our joint effort.

Looking forward to an appropriate consideration.

With sincere regards

Thanking you profoundly

Academically yours

Sd/-

Co-ordinator

DISCLAIMER

The information and opinions presented in the Journal reflect the views of the authors and not of the Journal or its Editorial Board or the Publishers/Editors. Publication does not constitute endorsement by the journal. Neither the Journal nor its publishers/Editors/Editorial Board nor anyone else involved in creating, producing or delivering the journal or the materials contained therein, assumes any liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information provided in the journal, nor shall they be liable for any direct, indirect, incidental, special, consequential or punitive damages arising out of the use of information/material contained in the journal. The journal, neither its publishers/Editors/ Editorial Board, nor any other party involved in the preparation of material contained in the journal represents or warrants that the information contained herein is in every respect accurate or complete, and they are not responsible for any errors or omissions or for the results obtained from the use of such material. Readers are encouraged to confirm the information contained herein with other sources. The responsibility of the contents and the opinions expressed in this journal are exclusively of the author (s) concerned.

ABOUT THE JOURNAL

In this age of Commerce, Economics, Computer, I.T. & Management and cut throat competition, a group of intellectuals felt the need to have some platform, where young and budding managers and academicians could express their views and discuss the problems among their peers. This journal was conceived with this noble intention in view. This journal has been introduced to give an opportunity for expressing refined and innovative ideas in this field. It is our humble endeavour to provide a springboard to the upcoming specialists and give a chance to know about the latest in the sphere of research and knowledge. We have taken a small step and we hope that with the active co-operation of like-minded scholars, we shall be able to serve the society with our humble efforts.

Our Other Journals

