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Rezumat

The purpose of this paper was to identify several of consumers’ perceptions, beliefs and actions related to organic food and also possible differences between groups of consumers. The studied variables were: interest or indifference in eating organic vs conventional food, food label information reading behaviour, perceived healthiness degree of organic food, perceived seriousness of the preference for organic food. The study revealed: an average concern for the food type (organic vs conventional: 57% of the sample declare they care what kind of food they eat); a high interest in label information (76% declared they read the food label in at least 26% of the cases when they buy food); dominant perception of organic food as a healthier option than conventional food (by 95% of the tested consumers) and as opposite to a fad (by 62% of the subjects); a statistically significant difference between men and women in terms of their appreciations (perceptions) of organic food as being healthier than conventional food (p=.036); a statistically significant difference between people who cared if they ate organic vs conventional food and those who didn’t care in the levels of label reading frequency (p=.000).
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INTRODUCTION

In developed countries food has long passed the stage of being just a means for survival or pleasure and consumers tend to adopt complex behaviours related to food, where safety, health, economic and environmental concerns are present (Loizou, Michailidis&Chatzitheodoridis, 2013, pp. 918, 928). Food production, also, raises problems beyond mere production, and started to raise questions and impose solutions in relation to environmental, social and ethical aspects (Givens et al, Eds, 2008, passim). The understanding of consumer behavior related to organic food brings benefits for all three components of sustainable development: social, economic, environmental. So far, on present day market, conventional food is more convenient than ecological food for at least four reasons: conventional food products are more available (easier to be found), cheaper, already known and used (so the functional perceived risk is smaller), more
attractive because they display more numerous varieties and are more widely and intensively promoted than ecological food products. There are only a few reasons left that are usually not found in conventional food and can push consumers towards organic food: concern for health, for the environment and animal welfare, for the conservation of traditional activities and products, interest in projecting a certain image. Studies have found that some of the most powerful reasons to buy organic food are health and environment concerns (de Magistris, Gracia, 2008, p. 942; Paul, Rana, 2012, p. 419; Pearson, Henryks, Jones, 2011, p.175; Petrescu et al (b), 2013, p. 8), but they can differ according to the type of product (Padel, Foster, 2005, p. 623-624). Of course, common food motivation forces also have impact on the purchase of organic food, such as price, availability, taste, packaging, freedom of choice, etc. (Zanoli, Naspetti, 2002, p. 652; Ward et al. 2012, p. 466-467); another influencing factor is the stage in the family life cycle, as families with small children and those whose children have moved out spend more on organic food than families with older children (Riefer, Hamm, 2011, p. 797).

MATERIAL AND METHOD
The paper presents partial results from an extensive study on consumer perception, knowledge and behavior related to organic food. The results presented in this paper were obtained through a random survey run on persons over 18 years old from Cluj-Napoca (NW Romania), consumers of organic food. They are real or self-assumed consumers of organic food, as the first filter question asked if they have consumed organic food during the past twelve months. This means that they believe they eat organic products, but it doesn’t necessarily mean this food is organic, because they might not know the real meaning of organic and because the food provider might mislead them. The sample size was 76 persons. The method used for the data collection was a face-to-face interview, the instrument was a structured questionnaire, with closed-ended and open-ended questions. The objective of the study presented here was to determine consumers’ perceptions of organic food and their interest in the characteristics of the food they eat. The terms organic, ecological (eco) and bio in relation to food are used here as synonyms. The statistical analysis was carried out using the software SPSS version 21. For comparison of differences regarding an ordinal variable, between two groups, we used the Mann-Whitney U test. The level of statistical significance was set at p<0.05.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS
The purpose of this paper was to understand several of consumers’ perceptions, beliefs and actions related to organic food and to identify possible differences between groups of consumers according to these variables. The studied variables were: interest or indifference in eating organic vs conventional food, food label information reading behaviour, perceived healthiness degree of organic food, perceived seriousness of the preference for organic food. The research questions for this study were: (1) How much do consumers care if the food they eat is organic or conventional?, (2) How often do consumers read the label/information on the package of the food they buy?, (3) What is consumers’ perception regarding the quality of being healthier of organic food compared to conventional food?, (4) What is consumers’ perception regarding the characteristic of organic food of being just another fad?, (4) Is there a difference according to gender
regarding the four previously mentioned variables on one hand and also between combinations of two of these variables on the other hand?

The sample was roughly divided in half by gender (using question/request no. 1: “Indicate your gender: a) M, b) F”), as showed in Figure no. 1.

Figure no. 1. Sample structure by gender (%)  
Source: authors’ elaboration based on survey data

We wanted to know how much consumers care if the food they eat is organic or conventional and therefore introduced question no. 2: “How much do you care if the food you eat is organic or conventional? (conventional food = food that contains preservatives, colouring, flavouring chemicals, food additives, pesticides, chemical fertilizers etc.): a) not at all/very little b) a little c) average concern d) much e) very much” (Figure no. 2).

Figure no. 2. Concern for food type – organic vs conventional (%)  
Source: authors’ elaboration based on survey data

The interest consumers assign to type of food they eat is mainly influenced by two variables: the perceived differences between the food options and the impact that food has on issues of their concern (health, budget, image, environment etc.). Consumers’
perception of the differences between organic and convention (for healthiness characteristic) was tested by question/request no. 4 (Figure no. 6). About half of consumers (57% of the total sample) declare they care if the food is organic or conventional. This percentage should increase if we consider this aspect a key variable for changing consumption behaviour towards preference for eco food and if we see ecological food (and organic agriculture) as an important contributor to sustainable development. Moreover, the answers came only from that segment of the population that assumed they used organic food, which means that within the general population the percentage is even smaller.

We can observe also an average interest level of the whole sample by calculating a score like this: we assign a score to each level of interest (from 0 to 4), multiply it by the number of customers that had a specific level of interest and sum them up \((0*3+1*4+2*26+3*32+ 4*11=196)\) and we obtained a score of 196 points out of 304 possible, which represents 65% of the maximum (ideal) score (Figure no. 3).

![Figure no. 3. Score of sample for the interest in consuming organic or conventional food](image)

Source: authors’ elaboration based on survey data

We investigated (using Mann Whitney U test) if men and women differ in terms of their concern for the consumed food type – organic vs conventional; we obtained \(p=0.144\), which means the probability value \((p)\) is greater than .05, so the result is not significant. There is no statistically significant difference in the levels of concern for the food type (organic vs conventional) of men and women.

A concerned consumer (about the food he/she eats) should want to know more about the nature of the food he/she consumes. The easiest ways to find out more information is to read the label and ask the seller. Question no. 3 tested the label reading frequency (regardless of the type – organic/conventional): “How often do you read the label/information on the package of the food you buy: a) never b) in 1-25% of cases c) in 26-75% of cases d) in 76-100% of cases” (Figure no. 4).
Figure no.4 Frequency of reading label information according to consumers' perception (%)

Source: authors’ elaboration based on survey data

Most of the tested consumers (76% of the total sample) declare they read the food label in at least 26% of cases when buying food. This behaviour confirms the interest in food characteristics implied by the answers to the previous question. Consumers should care about the characteristics of the food they eat and use their power on the market by making informed buying decisions, by rewarding the producers who offer what they need through their acquisitions and sanctioning those who fail to fulfill their requests by not purchasing from them. The habit of reading food labels will further influence the reading of eco-labels. According to studies, paying attention to and understanding a new label (which can be an eco one) depends on both consumer motivation and issue-relevant knowledge (Thøgersen, Haugaard, Olesen, 2010, p. 1802). Further analysis can reveal the type of information that is most useful to, most read by, most interesting to a specific group of consumers. For instance, a study on college and master students (from Cluj-Napoca, NW Romania) showed that the items that were read “Very often/Always” by the highest percentages of the consumers tested were expiration date, brand, quantity, price (Petrescu et al (a), 2014, p. 68).

In order to see the position of the average perception of the total sample between two extreme situations (when nobody ever reads the label information and when everybody frequently reads it) we assigned a score to each reading frequency, multiplied by the number of customers that had a specific reading frequency and summed them up (0*0 + 1*18+2*33+3*25=159) and we obtained a score of 159 points out of 228 possible, which represents 70% of the maximum (ideal) score (Figure no. 5).
We investigated (using Mann Whitney U test) if men and women differ in terms of their label reading frequency levels; we obtained $p=0.373$, which means the probability value ($p$) is more than .05, so the result is not significant. There is no statistically significant difference in the levels of label reading frequency of men and women.

We investigated (using Mann Whitney U test) if people who cared if they ate organic vs conventional food (those who answered “much” and “very much”) and those who didn’t care (those who answered “not at all/very little”, “a little”, “average concern”) differ in terms of their label reading frequency levels; we obtained $p=0.000$, which means the probability value ($p$) is less than .05, so the result is significant. There is a statistically significant difference in the levels of label reading frequency of people who cared if they ate organic vs conventional food and those who didn’t.

In order to determine consumers’ perception of the healthiness of organic food compared to conventional food we used question/request no. 4: “State your agreement/disagreement with the following statement: Organic food is healthier than conventional food (answer options: strongly disagree, somewhat disagree, undecided, somewhat agree, strongly agree)” (Figure no. 6).

---

**Figure no. 5.** Score of sample for label information reading frequency
Source: authors’ elaboration based on survey data

**Figure no. 6.** Consumers’ perception of the healthiness of organic food compared to conventional food (%)
Source: authors’ elaboration based on survey data
Most of the subjects believe that organic food is healthier than conventional food: 95% of them agree with this idea. Healthiness favours acquisition and consumption (besides price, availability, taste etc.). Consequently, the existence of such a belief is a good basis for increasing organic food consumption.

An average position of the total sample between two extreme situations (when everybody disagrees and when everybody agrees that organic food is healthier than conventional food) can be calculated following the same algorithm presented before (for Figure no. 3). The sample score is 277 and represents 91% of maximum score (Figure no. 7). If we calculate a similar score by gender, we obtain 211 for men (representing 71% of a maximum of 42x5=210 points) and 129 for women (representing 76% of a maximum of 34x5=170 points). Percentage of men and women of gender samples giving a certain evaluation is represented in Figure no. 8.

![Score of total sample perception of the healthiness degree of organic food compared to conventional food](image)

Figure no. 7. Score of total sample perception of the healthiness degree of organic food compared to conventional food

Source: authors’ elaboration based on survey data

![Man and women’ perception of the healthiness of organic food compared to conventional food by gender (% of specific gender group)](image)

Figure no. 8. Man and women’ perception of the healthiness of organic food compared to conventional food by gender (% of specific gender group)

Source: authors’ elaboration based on survey data

We investigated (using Mann Whitney U test) if men and women differ in terms of their appreciations (perceptions) of organic food as being healthier that conventional food; we obtained p=0.036, which means the probability value (p) is less than .05, so the result is significant. There is a statistically significant difference in the levels of
appreciations (perceptions) of men and women regarding organic food as being healthier than conventional food.

We investigated (using Mann Whitney U test) if people who cared if they ate organic or conventional food (those who answered “much” and “very much”) and those who didn’t care (those who answered “not at all/very little”, “a little”, “average concern”) differed in terms of their appreciations (perceptions) of organic food as being healthier than conventional food (question/request 2 and 4); we obtained $p=0.280$, which means the probability value ($p$) is higher than .05, so the result is not significant. There is no statistically significant difference in the levels of appreciations (perceptions) of organic food as being healthier than conventional food of people who cared if they ate organic vs conventional food and those who didn’t care.

We tested (using Mann Whitney U test) if people who read the label information rarely (in 0-25% of cases) and those who read it more often (at least in 26% of cases) differ in terms of their appreciations (perceptions) of organic food as being healthier than conventional food (question/request 2 and 4); we obtained $p=0.634$, which means the probability value ($p$) is higher than .05, so the result is not significant. There is no statistically significant difference in the levels of appreciations (perceptions) of organic food as being healthier than conventional food of people who read the label information rarely and those who read it more often.

We wanted to find out consumers’ perceptions of how durable and well-motivated (or transient and superficial) the consumption of organic food is and, therefore, we used question/request no. 5: “State your agreement/disagreement with the following statement: Organic food is just another fad (answer options: strongly disagree, somewhat disagree, undecided, somewhat agree, strongly agree)” (Figure no. 9).

Most of the tested consumers (62% of the total sample) do not agree with the idea that consumption of organic food is just a fad. In other words, consumption of organic food is seen as opposite to a fad: is durable (stable in time) and based on serious motivations. This situation strengthens the belief that organic food is a serious option to conventional food, even a better one, at least from the angle of health impact.
An average position of the total sample between two extreme situations (when everybody disagrees and when everybody agrees that organic food is a fad) can be calculated following the same algorithm presented before (for Figure no. 3). The sample score is 98 and represents 32% of maximum score (Figure no. 10).

![Figure no. 10. Score of total sample perception of organic food being a fad](image)

Source: authors’ elaboration based on survey data

We investigated (using Mann Whitney U test) if men and women differ in terms of their appreciations (perceptions) of organic food as being a fad; we obtained p=0.288, which means the probability value (p) is more than .05, so the result is not significant. There is no statistically significant difference in the levels of appreciations (perceptions) of organic food as being a fad of men and women.

We investigated (using Mann Whitney U test) if people who cared if they ate organic or conventional food (those who answered “much” and “very much”) and those who didn’t care (those who answered “not at all/very little”, “a little”, “average concern”) differ in terms of their appreciations (perceptions) of organic food as a fad; we obtained p=0.317, which means the probability value (p) is higher than .05, so the result is not significant. There is no statistically significant difference in the levels of appreciations (perceptions) of organic food as being a fad of people who cared if they ate organic vs conventional food and those who didn’t.

We tested (using Mann Whitney U test) if people who read the label information rarely (in 0-25% of cases) and those whose read it more often (at least in 26% of cases) differ in terms of their appreciations (perceptions) of organic food as a fad; we obtained p=0.713, which means the probability value (p) is higher than .05, so the result is not significant. There is no statistically significant difference in the levels of appreciations (perceptions) of organic food as being a fad between people who read the label information rarely and those who read it more often.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The study revealed that the most frequent type of consumer among those tested has an average to high concern for the type of food he/she eats, reads label information in more than a quarter of cases when buying food, believes that organic food is a healthier option than conventional food and that consumption of organic food is not a fad. The belief that organic food is a healthier option than conventional food is different according to gender (p=.036). Label reading frequency is different according to the concern about the nature
(organic vs conventional) of the consumed food products (p=.000). No other statistically significant differences were found between groups created based on tested variables.

Consumers’ perception of eco food being healthier is a strong point that can be used to increase preference for and acquisition of this kind of products. Organic food is perceived as opposite to a fad by the majority of consumers, which can mean that organic food is seen as an option that lasts in time and that there are strong motivations and good, wise reasons that make consumers prefer it over other alternatives. This perception strengthens the belief that organic food is a serious option to conventional food, probably even a better one if we take into consideration the impact on health.
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