DOI : 10.18843/ijms/v6i1(3)/06
DOI URL :http://dx.doi.org/10.18843/ijms/v6i1(3)/06

# Assessment of Consumer Perception in Regard to Organic Products in Punjab Region

***Ms. Shaveta,***
PhD Research Scholar,
I.K. Gujral Punjab Technical University,
Jalandhar, India.

***Dr. Manoj Kumar Kulshreshtha,***
PhD Research Supervisor,
I.K. Gujral Punjab Technical University,
Jalandhar, India.

**ABSTRACT**

*Worldwide, the demand for organic food and products has expanded in recent years because of the strong perception of consumers that organic products are safe and clean. Even it measures that there is a positive relationship between organic food and good health. Another reason for this perception is the great coverage and publication on the matters related to contaminated food or illness related to unnatural growth and development of food products especially related to fruits and vegetables. Another strong point for organics is the perceived environmental benefit and finally the availability and variety of organic products in the market. Even in the Indian market due to great awareness of consumer regarding good, healthy, safe and natural diet and health concern, the concept of organic food and products at the potential for organic market is increasing rapidly. The present paper includes descriptive and empirical study. Our physical and physiological well being is strongly associated with food preference and choice. Even various health problems are increasing due to adulteration and nutritional deficiencies in food. The aim of this paper is to identify the perceptions and choice of organic foods and measurement of indicators for these foods. Organic foods are perceived as being healthier and resistance free than the conventional foods. This research will provide valuable insights as to what extent these three different sections comprising of independent variables and dependent variables (perception of organic product) in Punjab. The scope of present paper is restricted to organic products in Punjab region.*

**Keywords**: Consumer Perception, Good Health, Organic Food, Punjab Region

## INTRODUCTION:

Although there is no official definition of organic, however the products and other ingredients which are grown without any use of chemicals, artificial, synthetic, or average fertilizer or genetically modified organism (GMO) or ionized radiation are called organic products. Even the original products like meat, poultry or dairy products which do not use any antibiotic or growth hormones are considered organic in nature.On an average India produced around 1.35 million MT (2015-16) of certified organic products which includes variety of food products like sugarcane, oilseeds, dry fruits, vegetables, coffee, tea etc. Madhya Pradesh has covered largest area under organic certification followed by Himachal Pradesh and Rajasthan. 263687 MT volume of organic product was exported during 2015-16. Oilseeds takes a lead among the products exported followed by processed food products. With high rising concern of health issues and food safety lead to consumer to turn to organic products. The increased consumer interest in organic food has been attributed to the growing demand for food free from pesticides and chemical residues. Perception level is increasing for nutritional diet for good health. As consumers believed that food grown by pesticides are high in saturated fats, sugar, chemicals that lead to various problems like cancer, high blood pressure and heart diseases. Organic food production is environment friendly. Its production helps in reducing global warming and preventing flora and fauna and provides natural habitat to wild life.

## LITERATURE REVIEW:

Kumar et al. (2014) suggested that retailers can develop effective marketing programme and strategies to influence consumers positively. Results show that health consciousness, time is the major factors that affect the consumers' attitude towards buying organic food online. Paul et al. (2015) defined that organic products are made entirely from natural substances, grown without the use of chemicals, inorganic fertilizers and pesticides. It is well defined as the products which do not carry any pollutant or impurities to degrade the environment, human or the natural resources and which can be recycled. Banupriya (2015) stated that majority consumers were aware of organic food, its benefits and problems associated with conventional food. However, this awareness was relatively more among educated respondents. However still majority buy conventional food and not organic regularly due to some prominent reasons like high price of goods, lack of information related from where to buy, lack of easy as well as regular availability and risk of getting cheated. Vukasovic (2015) explained that definition of ″organic fruits and vegetables″ is not yet clearly installed in the food market and in consumers' perception. 35% of respondents clearly installed the definition of organic fruits and vegetables. This means that there is a need to continuously inform more the consumer about the meaning of the organic products and the meaning of the labeling put on products. Both health care institutions and other institutions of public importance, and manufacturers as well, should take this obligation. The market for fruits and vegetables is seen as being the most valuable category of organic products in the future. Results show that consumers perceive organic fruits and vegetables as very healthy, tasty, and of good quality. Among the purchase motives quality, freshness, nutritional value, organically grown and safety products were indicated as the most important reasons of purchasing organic fruits and vegetables in EU member state. Maheshwari and Sekar (2015) found that those organic products have a paradigm in its awareness and accessibility. Thus, Consumers are increasingly aware but they are reluctant in cost and availability about the range of products. The study revealed the positive impact of purchasing organic food products in market. There are also several other factors that drives consumer purchase of organic food products in the market. So, the literature reviewed produces mixed results as regards the attitudinal and perceptions of consumers towards organic food products. Ramesh and Divya (2015) stated that organic food consumption is increasing because of concerns over environmental and health issues associated with food production. The increase in consumers' interest in organic food products has been attributed among other issues to the growing demand for food free from pesticides and chemical residues. With the present study an attempt is made to describe the existing situation regarding the main motives to purchase organic food products are health and environmental benefits, plus support for local or small farmers. Kumar and Chandrashekar (2015) revealed that a lot of problems are faced by respondents while purchasing the organic products in the market. Irregular availability of organic product in shop. Because fruits and vegetables is supplied weekly once in shop. There is no good packaging system of products. More number of farmer are not growing the organic commodities so organic product is not available throughout the week. Lots of problem is there while preserving or storing organic product. Because chemicals pesticides are not used while growing and storing. So it is highly perishable in the nature. Cost of the organic product is very high so it is all so affected to consumer to buy the commodity. Because Price of the product should not meet the normal people. There is a lack of awareness about organic products to consumers. The organic products shops are limited in the city. Arunkumar and Elangovan (2016) conducted a study that the majority (71.5%) of the consumers agree and strongly agree that organic food have high nutritional value. Most (70%) of the consumers agree and strongly agree that the organic food have good value for their money. Maximum (71%) of the consumers agree and strongly agree that the organic food are good for themselves and their family's health. Varma (2016) described the existing situation regarding Indian consumers' perceptions about organic foods. The main motives to purchase organic food products are health and environmental benefits, plus support for local or small farmers. In addition, an important factor that was revealed as a barrier to the development of organic foods is consumer information. Increased consumer awareness of organic labeling and their trust in organic labels as well as increasing the availability and range of organic food products. Oroian et al. (2017) explained that organic farming practices are becoming popular among producers and are considered an alternative for small farms. Consumers are aware of the implications the consumption of organic products has for the sustainable development of agriculture. The results of the study showed that consumers of organic products are educated people over 35 years old who are aware of the effect of their diet on their health.

## OBJECTIVE OF THIS PAPER:

The objective of this paper was to analyze and compare consumer perception among different regions in Punjab.

## METHODOLOGY:

Research Methodology is a way to systematically solve the research problem. The research design adopted in this paper was descriptive and empirical and the population covers the customers of organic food in Punjab region. Both primary and secondary sources were used to collect data. ANOVA test was used to analysis the data.

### Independent Variables would be:

- ✓ Understanding the concept of organic
- ✓ Knowledge of the organic products
- ✓ Environmental Awareness
- ✓ Product Availability
- ✓ Healthy Lifestyle
- ✓ Product Information

### Dependent variable would be:

- ✓ Perceptions about the organic products

**Hypothesis $H_1$:** There is significant difference in the perception of consumers region wise.

## ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS:

As per the table 5.1 (attached in appendices) Fourteen statements were designed i.e Organic food is beneficial to environment, Organic food is essential for consumption, Organic food is healthy ,Organic food is a safe option, Organic food consumption provides satisfaction, Organic food is tasty, Organic food is beneficial for animals ,Organic food is expensive, Organic food should be promoted by Government, Organic food is beneficial for farmers, Organic food is easily available, Organic food is more hygienic, Organic food causes less allergies and Organic food has a higher nutritive value on likert scale on the basis of agreement (strongly disagree:1,disagree:2,undecided:3,agree:4 and strongly agree:5).

Analysis of variance was the technique used to determine all perception statements across the cities. Even the proportion was determined by frequency with respective percentages. Amongst the cities the population is more concentrated towards agreements in relation to perception of organic food. All the statements linked to Organic foods attained an average value 3.30-4.90 meet the agreement of this statement. But this statement differs across the cities. Maximum proportion from Amritsar and Jalandhar followed by Bathinda agreed towards the impact on environment factors. The variance ratio was calculated which showed significant differences amongst cities with F-value 7.62 and p-value less than 0.001.

Further statement showed high F-value and even the significant value across the cities. As per the statement organic food is beneficial to the environment. Organic food is essential for consumption [mean = 3.55, F-Value 4.19 and P-value less than 0.001]. Even it was found that organic food is healthy [mean = 4.16, F-Value 6.35 and P-value less than 0.001]. The Statement organic food is a safe option with mean = 3.90, F-Value 3.41 and P-value is 0.005. The statement organic food consumption provides satisfaction is significant with mean 3.67, F- Value 9.03 and P- Value less than 0.001.

As per table 5.2 (attached in appendices): The perception across the cities is statistically significant. This has been resolved by Post Hoc analysis by observing intra difference by Tukey HSD (Honestly significant difference) and explained as follows:

- **Organic food is beneficial for environment:** For the first statement all the cities were compared by Post Hoc analysis. Amritsar first was compared by another it was observed that perception of Bathinda, Jalandhar, Pathankot and Patiala was similar while Amritsar showed significant result over Kapurthala towards first statement. Bathinda showed significant better than Kapurthala (P-Value 0.001). Jalandhar showed significant better than Kapurthala (P-value 0.001). Jalandhar showed significant better than Patiala (P-value 0.028). Bathinda and Jalandhar are significant better than Patiala overall Bathinda and Jalandhar really believed that food is beneficial for environment.
- **Organic food is essential for consumption:** Bathinda is significant better than Amritsar. Rest all are performing equally. Bathinda is significantly better than Jalandhar and Pathankot. Bathinda is even better than Patiala. So overall consumers in Bathinda felt organic food consumption is essential than consumers in Amritsar, Jalandhar, Kapurthala, Pathankot and Patiala.

- **Organic food is healthy:** By Tukey test it was observed Amritsar has higher positive feedback then Kapurthala (P-Value 0.014). Bathinda is better than Kapurthala (P-Value 0.005). Jalandhar is better than Kapurthala (P-Value 0.010). Patiala is better than Kapurthala (P-Value 0.001). So overall Bathinda and Amritsar are higher positive in average.
- **Organic food is safe option:** Inter cities comparison was examined where Bathinda proved statistically significant better than all. Kapurthala is better than Amritsar and further Patiala is better than Amritsar. So in all Bathinda, Kapurthala and Patiala believe that organic food is a safe option.
- **Organic food consumption provides satisfaction:** Tukey HSD for post Hoc analysis evaluated. Bathinda and Kapurthala are responding satisfactory for organic food consumption. Rest others showed less satisfaction.
- **Organic food is tasty:** As per the evaluation by Turkey HSD test Bathinda and Kapurthala are significantly better then Amritsar (P-value 0.001). Bathinda is better than Pathankot and Patiala (P-value 0.001). Kapurthala is better than Jalandhar, Pathankot and Patiala (P-value 0.001). So overall consumers from Bathinda and Kapurthala are quiet convinced about organic food taste.
- **Organic food is beneficial for animals:** This analysis examined that Bathinda and Kapurthala showed higher significant averages than Amritsar (P-value 0.001). Bathinda is better than Amritsar, Jalandhar, Pathankot and Patiala. So consumers from Bathinda followed by Kapurthala believed that organic food is beneficial for animals.
- **Organic food is expensive:** Consumer from Amritsar felt that organic food is more expensive than Bathinda consumer. Pathankot and Patiala consumers experience that organic food is more expensive than Bathinda. Consumers from Pathankot felt that organic food is more expensive than consumers from Jalandhar. Kapurthala and Bathinda observed to consume more as well as they felt they are less expensive. Rest of all cities believes that they have to pay more for organic food.
- **Organic food should be promoted by government:** Bathinda, Kapurthala and Patiala evaluated that they should be promoted more than Amritsar consumers. Bathinda is observed to be better than Amritsar and Jalandhar. Kapurthala is better than Amritsar. Patiala is better than Amritsar, Jalandhar and Pathankot. So overall Patiala, Kapurthala and Bathinda are responding very positively words promotions and policies.
- **Organic food is beneficial to farmers:** Bathinda consumers felt that organic farming improves soil fertility then Amritsar and Pathankot. Kapurthala is better than Pathankot. So overall Bathinda followed by Kapurthala have proved to better then all cities in perception.
- **Organic food is easily available:** Bathinda is better in availability of organic food products then Amritsar. But Amritsar is better than Patiala in availability of products in outlets. Bathinda is better than Pathankot and Patiala. Jalandhar is better than Pathankot and Patiala. So overall Bathinda and Patiala followed by Jalandhar are best in availability of products.
- **Organic food is more hygienic:** It was concluded that Bathinda and Jalandhar contrived that organic food is more hygienic. Rest all cities are responding equally but less than these cities in perception at 5 percent level of significance.
- **Organic food causes less allergies:** Bathinda and Kapurthala believe that these organic food causes less allergies then Amritsar. Bathinda is better than Jalandhar, Pathankot and Patiala. Hence Bathinda and Kapurthala have less allergies than perception of other cities at 5 percent level of significance.
- **Organic food has higher nutritional value:** Bathinda is significantly better than Amritsar, Pathankot and Patiala. So overall Bathinda consumers believed higher nutritive value in organic foods then other cities.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

As the perception level is increasing for nutritional diets, so organic food is also making their remarkable penetration. The present paper tried to explore the perception factors towards organic products in Indian context. The primary objective of this paper was to analyze and compare consumer perception among different regions in Punjab. Amongst the cities the population is more concentrated towards agreements in relation to perception of organic food. Organic food is beneficial to environment attained an average value 3.92 meet the agreement of this statement. But this statement differs across the cities. Maximum proportion from Amritsar and Jalandhar followed by Bathinda agreed towards the impact on environment factors. Organic food is essential for consumption and even it was found that organic food is healthy. All the statements linked to organic food were towards agreement with average value 3.30-4.90. After all this the perception across the cities is statistically significant. This has been resolved by post Hoc analysis by observing intra difference by Tukey HSD (Honestly significant difference). For the first statement i.e. organic food is beneficial for environmental all the cities were compared by Post Hoc analysis. It was observed that perception of Bathinda, Jalandhar, Pathankot and Patiala

was similar while Amritsar showed significant result over Kapurthala towards first statement. Bathinda and Jalandhar are significant better than Patiala as they believed that food is beneficial for environment. Bathinda and Kapurthala are responding satisfactory for organic food consumption. Rest others showed less satisfaction. So overall consumers from Bathinda and Kapurthala are quiet convinced about organic food taste. Bathinda consumers felt that organic farming improves soil fertility than Amritsar and Pathankot. So overall Bathinda followed by Kapurthala have proved to better then all cities in perception. Overall significant differences are observed amongst regions of Punjab. So it can be a recommendation for policy makers and marketers to improve the gaps in perception of consumers associated with the organic food industry.

**REFERENCES:**

Arun, B. and Elangovan, D. (2016). Consumer Attitude and Preference for Organic Food Products in Coimbatore City. *Asia Pacific Journal of Research,* I(XL), 233-242.

Bashaa, M., (2015). Consumers Attitude towards Organic Food. *ELSEVIER*, 31(4), 444 – 452.

Bhama, T. and Vedha Balaji (2012). Consumer Perception towards Organic Food Products in India. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Business Management & Information Systems.*

Boutsouki, C. et al. (2008). Attiudes and behaviour towards organic products: an exploratory study. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management,* 36 (2), 158-175.

Camelia et al. (2017). Consumers' Attitudes towards Organic Products and Sustainable Development: A Case Study of Romania. *Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute Journal,* 6(9), 59-69.

Chakrabarti, S. (2010). Factors influencing organic food- purchase in India-expert survey insights. *British Food Journal,* 112 (8), 902-15.

Dipeolu, A. et al. (2009). Consumer awareness and willingness to pay for organic vegetables in S. W. Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Food and Agro-Industry,* S57-S65.

Hammit, J. (1990). Risk perception and food choice: an exploratory analysis of organic versus conventional produce buyers. *Risk Analysis,* 10(3), 3767-3774.

Kumar et al. (2014). Feasibility of online selling of organic Produce. *International Journal of Business Analytics and Intelligence,* 2(2), 24-36.

Kumar, S. and Chandrashekar, H. (2015). A Study on Consumers Behavior towards Organic Food Products in Mysore City. *International Journal of Management Research & Review,* 5(11), 1082-1091.

Maheshwari, U. and Chandrasekar, (2015). A Study on Consumer Perception and Attitude Towards Organic Products With Reference to Western Districts of TamilNadu. *Indian Journal of Applied Research,* 5(4), 383-387.

Muhammad et al. (2016). The Significance of Consumer's Awareness about Organic Food Products in the United Arab Emirates. *Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute Journal,* 8(9), 1-12.

Paul et al. (2016). Predicting Green Product Consumption using Theory of Planned Behavior and Reasoned Action. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Sevices,* 29(6), 123-134.

Paul, J. and Rana, J. (2012). Consumer Behavior and Purchase intention for Organic food. *Journal of Consumer Marketing,* 29/6 (2012), 412-422.

Ramesh, S. and Divya, M., (2015). A study on Consumers' Awareness Attitude and Satisfaction towards select Organic Food Products with reference to Coimbatore. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Studies,* 2(4), 81-84.

Smed, S. and Andersen, L. (2012). Information or Prices, Which Is Most Powerful in Increasing Consumer Demand for Organic Vegetables? *International Business Research,* 5(12).

Varma, N. (2016). Consumption of Organic Food and Consumers Awareness. *International Journal of Science Technology and Management,* 5(5), 130-135.

Voon, P. et al. (2011). Determinants of Willingness to purchase organic food: an exploratory study using structural equation modeling. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review,* 14(2), pp.103-120.

Yiridoe, E. et al. (2005). Comparison of consumer perceptions and preferences toward organic versus conventionally produced foods: a review and update of the literature. *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems,* 20(4), 193-205.

Zanoli, R., and Naspetti, S. (2002). Consumer motivations in the purchase of organic food. *British Food Journal,* 104(8), 643-653.

## APPENDICES

**Table 5.1: Perceptions of Consumers region wise distribution of Punjab for Organic Foods**

| Question | Options | Score | | | | | F | P - value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree | | |
| Perception Scale [Organic food is beneficial to environment](3.92) | Amritsar | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 14 (2.3%) | 74 (12.3%) | 12 (2.0%) | 7.62 | **<0.001** |
| | Bathinda | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 10 (1.7%) | 67 (11.2%) | 22 (3.7%) | | |
| | Jalandhar | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 10 (1.7%) | 74 (12.3%) | 16 (2.7%) | | |
| | Kapurthala | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 38 (6.3%) | 56 (9.3%) | 6 (1.0%) | | |
| | Pathankot | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 26 (4.3%) | 61 (10.2%) | 13 (2.2%) | | |
| | Patiala | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 32 (5.3%) | 55 (9.2%) | 13 (2.2%) | | |
| Perception Scale [Organic food is essential for consumption] (3.55) | Amritsar | 0 (0.0%) | 10 (1.7%) | 35 (5.8%) | 50 (8.3%) | 5 (0.8%) | 4.19 | **<0.001** |
| | Bathinda | 0 (0.0%) | 7 (1.2%) | 9 (1.5%) | 76 (12.7%) | 7 (1.2%) | | |
| | Jalandhar | 0 (0.0%) | 11 (1.8%) | 39 (6.5%) | 39 (6.5%) | 11 (1.8%) | | |
| | Kapurthala | 0 (0.0%) | 9 (1.5%) | 29 (4.8%) | 55 (9.2%) | 7 (1.2%) | | |
| | Pathankot | 0 (0.0%) | 25 (4.2%) | 23 (3.8%) | 42 (7.0%) | 10 (1.7%) | | |
| | Patiala | 0 (0.0%) | 15 (2.5%) | 27 (4.5%) | 56 (9.3%) | 2 (0.3%) | | |
| Perception Scale [Organic food is healthy] (4.16) | Amritsar | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 12 (2.0%) | 56 (9.3%) | 31 (5.2%) | 6.35 | **<0.001** |
| | Bathinda | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 14 (2.3%) | 49 (8.2%) | 36 (6.0%) | | |
| | Jalandhar | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 10 (1.7%) | 62 (10.3%) | 28 (4.7%) | | |
| | Kapurthala | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 27 (4.5%) | 60 (10.0%) | 13 (2.2%) | | |
| | Pathankot | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 22 (3.7%) | 35 (5.8%) | 43 (7.2%) | | |
| | Patiala | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 8 (1.3%) | 46 (7.7%) | 46 (7.7%) | | |
| Perception Scale [Organic food is a safe option] (3.90) | Amritsar | 0 (0.0%) | 4 (0.7%) | 30 (5.0%) | 58 (9.7%) | 8 (1.3%) | 3.41 | **0.005** |
| | Bathinda | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 17 (2.8%) | 69 (11.5%) | 14 (2.3%) | | |
| | Jalandhar | 0 (0.0%) | 2 (0.3%) | 23 (3.8%) | 55 (9.2%) | 20 (3.3%) | | |
| | Kapurthala | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 15 (2.5%) | 73 (12.2%) | 12 (2.0%) | | |
| | Pathankot | 0 (0.0%) | 3 (0.5%) | 31 (5.2%) | 46 (7.7%) | 20 (3.3%) | | |
| | Patiala | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 19 (3.2%) | 55 (9.2%) | 25 (4.2%) | | |
| Perception Scale [Organic food consumption provides satisfaction] (3.67) | Amritsar | 0 (0.0%) | 2 (0.3%) | 37 (6.2%) | 57 (9.5%) | 4 (0.7%) | 9.03 | **<0.001** |
| | Bathinda | 1 (0.2%) | 0 (0.0%) | 18 (3.0%) | 74 (12.4%) | 6 (1.0%) | | |
| | Jalandhar | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 36 (6.0%) | 61 (10.2%) | 2 (0.3%) | | |
| | Kapurthala | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 21 (3.5%) | 67 (11.2%) | 12 (2.0%) | | |
| | Pathankot | 0 (0.0%) | 6 (1.0%) | 37 (6.2%) | 53 (8.8%) | 4 (0.7%) | | |
| | Patiala | 0 (0.0%) | 3 (0.5%) | 49 (8.2%) | 48 (8.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | | |
| Perception Scale [Organic food is tasty] (3.42) | Amritsar | 0 (0.0%) | 25 (4.2%) | 32 (5.3%) | 43 (7.2%) | 0 (0.0%) | 18.33 | **<0.001** |
| | Bathinda | 1 (0.2%) | 5 (0.8%) | 20 (3.3%) | 64 (10.7%) | 10 (1.7%) | | |
| | Jalandhar | 0 (0.0%) | 8 (1.3%) | 48 (8.0%) | 44 (7.3%) | 0 (0.0%) | | |
| | Kapurthala | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 20 (3.3%) | 71 (11.8%) | 8 (1.3%) | | |
| | Pathankot | 0 (0.0%) | 31 (5.2%) | 24 (4.0%) | 41 (6.8%) | 4 (0.7%) | | |
| | Patiala | 0 (0.0%) | 18 (3.0%) | 47 (7.8%) | 35 (5.8%) | 0 (0.0%) | | |
| Perception Scale [Organic food is | Amritsar | 0 (0.0%) | 5 (0.8%) | 72 (12.2%) | 21 (3.6%) | 0 (0.0%) | 14.91 | **<0.001** |
| | Bathinda | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 38 (6.4%) | 55 (9.3%) | 5 (0.8%) | | |
| | Jalandhar | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 68 (11.5%) | 26 (4.4%) | 0 (0.0%) | | |

| Question | Options | Score | | | | | F | P - value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree | | |
| beneficial for animals] (3.30) | Kapurthala | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 47 (8.0%) | 53 (9.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | | |
| | Pathankot | 0 (0.0%) | 16 (2.7%) | 56 (9.5%) | 24 (4.1%) | 4 (0.7%) | | |
| | Patiala | 0 (0.0%) | 21 (3.6%) | 59 (10.0%) | 14 (2.4%) | 6 (1.0%) | | |
| Perception Scale [Organic food is expensive] (4.93) | Amritsar | 0 (0.0%) | 4 (0.7%) | 9 (1.5%) | 27 (4.5%) | 60 (10.0%) | 11.60 | **<0.001** |
| | Bathinda | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 18 (3.0%) | 65 (10.8%) | 16 (2.7%) | | |
| | Jalandhar | 0 (0.0%) | 3 (0.5%) | 18 (3.0%) | 39 (6.5%) | 40 (6.7%) | | |
| | Kapurthala | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 8 (1.3%) | 66 (11.0%) | 26 (4.3%) | | |
| | Pathankot | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 7 (1.2%) | 41 (6.8%) | 52 (8.7%) | | |
| | Patiala | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 4 (0.7%) | 34 (5.7%) | 62 (10.3%) | | |
| Perception Scale [Organic food should be promoted by Government](3.89) | Amritsar | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 45 (7.5%) | 44 (7.3%) | 11 (1.8%) | 10.24 | **<0.001** |
| | Bathinda | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 10 (1.7%) | 75 (12.5%) | 13 (2.2%) | | |
| | Jalandhar | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 40 (6.7%) | 55 (9.2%) | 5 (0.8%) | | |
| | Kapurthala | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 10 (1.7%) | 68 (11.4%) | 22 (3.7%) | | |
| | Pathankot | 0 (0.0%) | 4 (0.7%) | 33 (5.5%) | 40 (6.7%) | 23 (3.8%) | | |
| | Patiala | 0 (0.0%) | 3 (0.5%) | 18 (3.0%) | 44 (7.3%) | 35 (5.8%) | | |
| Perception Scale [Organic food is beneficial for farmers] (3.41) | Amritsar | 0 (0.0%) | 16 (2.7%) | 38 (6.3%) | 46 (7.7%) | 0 (0.0%) | 3.86 | **0.002** |
| | Bathinda | 0 (0.0%) | 2 (0.3%) | 34 (5.7%) | 63 (10.5%) | 0 (0.0%) | | |
| | Jalandhar | 0 (0.0%) | 11 (1.8%) | 42 (7.0%) | 44 (7.3%) | 3 (0.5%) | | |
| | Kapurthala | 0 (0.0%) | 9 (1.5%) | 31 (5.2%) | 55 (9.2%) | 5 (0.8%) | | |
| | Pathankot | 0 (0.0%) | 18 (3.0%) | 44 (7.3%) | 33 (5.5%) | 5 (0.8%) | | |
| | Patiala | 0 (0.0%) | 14 (2.3%) | 40 (6.7%) | 39 (6.5%) | 7 (1.2%) | | |
| Perception Scale [Organic food is easily available] (3.35) | Amritsar | 4 (0.7%) | 15 (2.5%) | 17 (2.8%) | 63 (10.5%) | 1 (0.2%) | 13.41 | **<0.001** |
| | Bathinda | 2 (0.3%) | 2 (0.3%) | 11 (1.8%) | 74 (12.3%) | 11 (1.8%) | | |
| | Jalandhar | 6 (1.0%) | 9 (1.5%) | 14 (2.3%) | 65 (10.8%) | 6 (1.0%) | | |
| | Kapurthala | 10 (1.7%) | 20 (3.3%) | 4 (0.7%) | 59 (9.8%) | 7 (1.2%) | | |
| | Pathankot | 6 (1.0%) | 31 (5.2%) | 16 (2.7%) | 40 (6.7%) | 7 (1.2%) | | |
| | Patiala | 11 (1.8%) | 36 (6.0%) | 16 (2.7%) | 33 (5.5%) | 4 (0.7%) | | |
| Perception Scale [Organic food is more hygienic] (4.34) | Amritsar | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 23 (3.8%) | 28 (4.7%) | 49 (8.2%) | 7.43 | **<0.001** |
| | Bathinda | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 14 (2.3%) | 8 (1.3%) | 77 (12.8%) | | |
| | Jalandhar | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 14 (2.3%) | 19 (3.2%) | 67 (11.2%) | | |
| | Kapurthala | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 12 (2.0%) | 40 (6.7%) | 48 (8.0%) | | |
| | Pathankot | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 21 (3.5%) | 44 (7.3%) | 35 (5.8%) | | |
| | Patiala | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 12 (2.0%) | 62 (10.3%) | 26 (4.3%) | | |
| Perception Scale [Organic food causes less allergies] (4.06) | Amritsar | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 53 (8.8%) | 11 (1.8%) | 35 (5.8%) | 13.94 | **<0.001** |
| | Bathinda | 1 (0.2%) | 1 (0.2%) | 14 (2.3%) | 7 (1.2%) | 77 (12.8%) | | |
| | Jalandhar | 0 (0.0%) | 3 (0.5%) | 37 (6.2%) | 20 (3.3%) | 40 (6.7%) | | |
| | Kapurthala | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 19 (3.2%) | 28 (4.7%) | 53 (8.8%) | | |
| | Pathankot | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 40 (6.7%) | 23 (3.8%) | 37 (6.2%) | | |
| | Patiala | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 52 (8.7%) | 22 (3.7%) | 26 (4.3%) | | |
| Perception | Amritsar | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 25 (4.2%) | 19 (3.2%) | 56 (9.3%) | 4.62 | **<0.001** |

| Question | Options | Score | | | | | F | P - value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree | | |
| Scale [Organic food has a higher nutritive value] (4.35) | Bathinda | 0 (0.0%) | 1 (0.2%) | 13 (2.2%) | 8 (1.3%) | 78 (13.0%) | | |
| | Jalandhar | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 22 (3.7%) | 18 (3.0%) | 60 (10.0%) | | |
| | Kapurthala | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 6 (1.0%) | 44 (7.3%) | 50 (8.3%) | | |
| | Pathankot | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 33 (5.5%) | 16 (2.7%) | 51 (8.5%) | | |
| | Patiala | 0 (0.0%) | 0 (0.0%) | 21 (3.5%) | 39 (6.5%) | 40 (6.7%) | | |

**(Figures in brackets are the averages of all perception statements.)**

**Table 5.2: Post Hoc Test for Inter Comparisons among the Cities**

| Dependent Variable | | (I) City/ Town | (J) City/ Town | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Perception Scale [Organic food is beneficial to environment] | Tukey HSD | Amritsar | Bathinda | -0.12 | 0.08 | 0.686 | -0.35 | 0.11 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.08 | 0.08 | 0.925 | -0.31 | 0.15 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.3 | 0.08 | **0.004** | 0.07 | 0.53 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.11 | 0.08 | 0.76 | -0.12 | 0.34 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.17 | 0.08 | 0.301 | -0.06 | 0.4 |
| | | Bathinda | Amritsar | 0.12 | 0.08 | 0.686 | -0.11 | 0.35 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.04 | 0.08 | 0.997 | -0.19 | 0.27 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.42 | 0.08 | **<0.001** | 0.19 | 0.65 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.23 | 0.08 | 0.057 | 0 | 0.46 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.29 | 0.08 | **0.006** | 0.06 | 0.52 |
| | | Jalandhar | Amritsar | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.925 | -0.15 | 0.31 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.04 | 0.08 | 0.997 | -0.27 | 0.19 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.38 | 0.08 | **<0.001** | 0.15 | 0.61 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.19 | 0.08 | 0.187 | -0.04 | 0.42 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.25 | 0.08 | **0.028** | 0.02 | 0.48 |
| | | Kapurthala | Amritsar | -0.3 | 0.08 | **0.004** | -0.53 | -0.07 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.42 | 0.08 | **<0.001** | -0.65 | -0.19 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.38 | 0.08 | **<0.001** | -0.61 | -0.15 |
| | | | Pathankot | -0.19 | 0.08 | 0.187 | -0.42 | 0.04 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.13 | 0.08 | 0.607 | -0.36 | 0.1 |
| | | Pathankot | Amritsar | -0.11 | 0.08 | 0.76 | -0.34 | 0.12 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.23 | 0.08 | 0.057 | -0.46 | 0 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.19 | 0.08 | 0.187 | -0.42 | 0.04 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.19 | 0.08 | 0.187 | -0.04 | 0.42 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.978 | -0.17 | 0.29 |
| | | Patiala | Amritsar | -0.17 | 0.08 | 0.301 | -0.4 | 0.06 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.29 | 0.08 | **0.006** | -0.52 | -0.06 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.25 | 0.08 | **0.028** | -0.48 | -0.02 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.13 | 0.08 | 0.607 | -0.1 | 0.36 |

| Dependent Variable | | (I) City/ Town | (J) City/ Town | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| | | | Pathankot | -0.06 | 0.08 | 0.978 | -0.29 | 0.17 |
| Perception Scale [Organic food is essential for consumption] | Tukey HSD | Amritsar | Bathinda | -0.34 | 0.11 | **0.033** | -0.66 | -0.02 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0 | 0.11 | 1 | -0.32 | 0.32 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.1 | 0.11 | 0.949 | -0.42 | 0.22 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.13 | 0.11 | 0.856 | -0.19 | 0.45 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.05 | 0.11 | 0.998 | -0.27 | 0.37 |
| | | Bathinda | Amritsar | 0.34 | 0.11 | **0.033** | 0.02 | 0.66 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.34 | 0.11 | **0.033** | 0.02 | 0.66 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.24 | 0.11 | 0.279 | -0.08 | 0.56 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.47 | 0.11 | **0.001** | 0.15 | 0.79 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.38 | 0.11 | **0.008** | 0.07 | 0.71 |
| | | Jalandhar | Amritsar | 0 | 0.11 | 1 | -0.32 | 0.32 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.34 | 0.11 | **0.033** | -0.66 | -0.02 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.1 | 0.11 | 0.949 | -0.42 | 0.22 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.13 | 0.11 | 0.856 | -0.19 | 0.45 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.05 | 0.11 | 0.998 | -0.27 | 0.37 |
| | | Kapurthala | Amritsar | 0.1 | 0.11 | 0.949 | -0.22 | 0.42 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.24 | 0.11 | 0.279 | -0.56 | 0.08 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.1 | 0.11 | 0.949 | -0.22 | 0.42 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.23 | 0.11 | 0.316 | -0.09 | 0.55 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.15 | 0.11 | 0.765 | -0.17 | 0.47 |
| | | Pathankot | Amritsar | -0.13 | 0.11 | 0.856 | -0.45 | 0.19 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.47 | 0.11 | **0.001** | -0.79 | -0.15 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.13 | 0.11 | 0.856 | -0.45 | 0.19 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.23 | 0.11 | 0.316 | -0.55 | 0.09 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.08 | 0.11 | 0.98 | -0.4 | 0.24 |
| | | Patiala | Amritsar | -0.05 | 0.11 | 0.998 | -0.37 | 0.27 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.38 | 0.11 | **0.008** | -0.71 | -0.07 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.05 | 0.11 | 0.998 | -0.37 | 0.27 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.15 | 0.11 | 0.765 | -0.47 | 0.17 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.08 | 0.11 | 0.98 | -0.24 | 0.4 |
| Perception Scale [Organic food is healthy] | Tukey HSD | Amritsar | Bathinda | -0.03 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.3 | 0.24 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.01 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.28 | 0.26 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.31 | 0.1 | **0.014** | 0.04 | 0.58 |
| | | | Pathankot | -0.04 | 0.1 | 0.998 | -0.31 | 0.23 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.21 | 0.1 | 0.232 | -0.48 | 0.06 |
| | | Bathinda | Amritsar | 0.03 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.24 | 0.3 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.02 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.25 | 0.29 |

| Dependent Variable | | (I) City/ Town | (J) City/ Town | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| | | Jalandhar | Kapurthala | 0.34 | 0.1 | **0.005** | 0.07 | 0.61 |
| | | | Pathankot | -0.01 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.28 | 0.26 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.18 | 0.1 | 0.404 | -0.45 | 0.09 |
| | | Kapurthala | Amritsar | 0.01 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.26 | 0.28 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.02 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.29 | 0.25 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.32 | 0.1 | **0.01** | 0.05 | 0.59 |
| | | | Pathankot | -0.03 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.3 | 0.24 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.2 | 0.1 | 0.284 | -0.47 | 0.07 |
| | | Pathankot | Amritsar | -0.31 | 0.1 | **0.014** | -0.58 | -0.04 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.34 | 0.1 | **0.005** | -0.61 | -0.07 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.32 | 0.1 | **0.01** | -0.59 | -0.05 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.35 | 0.1 | **0.003** | 0.08 | 0.62 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.17 | 0.1 | 0.471 | -0.44 | 0.1 |
| | | Patiala | Amritsar | 0.21 | 0.1 | 0.232 | -0.06 | 0.48 |
| | | | Bathinda | 0.18 | 0.1 | 0.404 | -0.09 | 0.45 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.284 | -0.07 | 0.47 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.52 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | 0.25 | 0.79 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.17 | 0.1 | 0.471 | -0.1 | 0.44 |
| Perception Scale [Organic food is a safe option] | Tukey HSD | Amritsar | Bathinda | -0.27 | 0.09 | **0.047** | -0.54 | 0 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.23 | 0.09 | 0.14 | -0.5 | 0.04 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.27 | 0.09 | **0.047** | -0.54 | 0 |
| | | | Pathankot | -0.13 | 0.09 | 0.736 | -0.4 | 0.14 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.34 | 0.09 | **0.004** | -0.61 | -0.07 |
| | | Bathinda | Amritsar | 0.27 | 0.09 | **0.047** | 0 | 0.54 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.04 | 0.09 | 0.998 | -0.23 | 0.31 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0 | 0.09 | 1 | -0.27 | 0.27 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.14 | 0.09 | 0.669 | -0.13 | 0.41 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.07 | 0.09 | 0.976 | -0.34 | 0.2 |
| | | Jalandhar | Amritsar | 0.23 | 0.09 | 0.14 | -0.04 | 0.5 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.04 | 0.09 | 0.998 | -0.31 | 0.23 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.04 | 0.09 | 0.998 | -0.31 | 0.23 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.1 | 0.09 | 0.895 | -0.17 | 0.37 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.11 | 0.09 | 0.85 | -0.38 | 0.16 |

| Dependent Variable | | (I) City/ Town | (J) City/ Town | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| | | Kapurthala | Amritsar | 0.27 | 0.09 | **0.047** | 0 | 0.54 |
| | | | Bathinda | 0 | 0.09 | 1 | -0.27 | 0.27 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.04 | 0.09 | 0.998 | -0.23 | 0.31 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.14 | 0.09 | 0.669 | -0.13 | 0.41 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.07 | 0.09 | 0.976 | -0.34 | 0.2 |
| | | Pathankot | Amritsar | 0.13 | 0.09 | 0.736 | -0.14 | 0.4 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.14 | 0.09 | 0.669 | -0.41 | 0.13 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.1 | 0.09 | 0.895 | -0.37 | 0.17 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.14 | 0.09 | 0.669 | -0.41 | 0.13 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.21 | 0.09 | 0.222 | -0.48 | 0.06 |
| | | Patiala | Amritsar | 0.34 | 0.09 | **0.004** | 0.07 | 0.61 |
| | | | Bathinda | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.976 | -0.2 | 0.34 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.85 | -0.16 | 0.38 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.976 | -0.2 | 0.34 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.21 | 0.09 | 0.222 | -0.06 | 0.48 |
| Perception Scale [Organic food consumption provides satisfaction] | Tukey HSD | Amritsar | Bathinda | -0.22 | 0.08 | 0.09 | -0.46 | 0.02 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.01 | 0.08 | 1 | -0.25 | 0.23 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.28 | 0.08 | **0.01** | -0.52 | -0.04 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.928 | -0.16 | 0.32 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.18 | 0.08 | 0.25 | -0.06 | 0.42 |
| | | Bathinda | Amritsar | 0.22 | 0.08 | 0.09 | -0.02 | 0.46 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.21 | 0.08 | 0.121 | -0.03 | 0.45 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.06 | 0.08 | 0.977 | -0.3 | 0.18 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.3 | 0.08 | **0.005** | 0.06 | 0.54 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.4 | 0.08 | **<0.001** | 0.16 | 0.64 |
| | | Jalandhar | Amritsar | 0.01 | 0.08 | 1 | -0.23 | 0.25 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.21 | 0.08 | 0.121 | -0.45 | 0.03 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.27 | 0.08 | **0.015** | -0.51 | -0.03 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.886 | -0.15 | 0.33 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.19 | 0.08 | 0.197 | -0.05 | 0.43 |
| | | Kapurthala | Amritsar | 0.28 | 0.08 | **0.01** | 0.04 | 0.52 |
| | | | Bathinda | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.977 | -0.18 | 0.3 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.27 | 0.08 | **0.015** | 0.03 | 0.51 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.36 | 0.08 | **<0.001** | 0.12 | 0.6 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.46 | 0.08 | **<0.001** | 0.22 | 0.7 |
| | | Pathankot | Amritsar | -0.08 | 0.08 | 0.928 | -0.32 | 0.16 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.3 | 0.08 | **0.005** | -0.54 | -0.06 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.09 | 0.08 | 0.886 | -0.33 | 0.15 |

| Dependent Variable | | (I) City/ Town | (J) City/ Town | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.36 | 0.08 | **<0.001** | -0.6 | -0.12 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.1 | 0.08 | 0.832 | -0.14 | 0.34 |
| | | Patiala | Amritsar | -0.18 | 0.08 | 0.25 | -0.42 | 0.06 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.4 | 0.08 | **<0.001** | -0.64 | -0.16 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.19 | 0.08 | 0.197 | -0.43 | 0.05 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.46 | 0.08 | **<0.001** | -0.7 | -0.22 |
| | | | Pathankot | -0.1 | 0.08 | 0.832 | -0.34 | 0.14 |
| Perception Scale [Organic food is tasty] | Tukey HSD | Amritsar | Bathinda | -0.59 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | -0.89 | -0.29 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.18 | 0.1 | 0.514 | -0.48 | 0.12 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.68 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | -0.98 | -0.38 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.3 | 0.3 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.01 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.29 | 0.31 |
| | | Bathinda | Amritsar | 0.59 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | 0.29 | 0.89 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.41 | 0.1 | **0.001** | 0.11 | 0.71 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.09 | 0.1 | 0.955 | -0.39 | 0.21 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.59 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | 0.29 | 0.89 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.6 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | 0.3 | 0.9 |
| | | Jalandhar | Amritsar | 0.18 | 0.1 | 0.514 | -0.12 | 0.48 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.41 | 0.1 | **0.001** | -0.71 | -0.11 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.5 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | -0.8 | -0.2 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.18 | 0.1 | 0.514 | -0.12 | 0.48 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.19 | 0.1 | 0.451 | -0.11 | 0.49 |
| | | Kapurthala | Amritsar | 0.68 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | 0.38 | 0.98 |
| | | | Bathinda | 0.09 | 0.1 | 0.955 | -0.21 | 0.39 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.5 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | 0.2 | 0.8 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.68 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | 0.38 | 0.98 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.69 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | 0.39 | 0.99 |
| | | Pathankot | Amritsar | 0 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.3 | 0.3 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.59 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | -0.89 | -0.29 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.18 | 0.1 | 0.514 | -0.48 | 0.12 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.68 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | -0.98 | -0.38 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.01 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.29 | 0.31 |
| | | Patiala | Amritsar | -0.01 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.31 | 0.29 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.6 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | -0.9 | -0.3 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.19 | 0.1 | 0.451 | -0.49 | 0.11 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.69 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | -0.99 | -0.39 |
| | | | Pathankot | -0.01 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.31 | 0.29 |
| Perception | Tukey | Amritsar | Bathinda | -0.48 | 0.09 | **<0.001** | -0.73 | -0.24 |

| Dependent Variable | | (I) City/ Town | (J) City/ Town | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Scale [Organic food is beneficial for animals] | HSD | | Jalandhar | -0.11 | 0.09 | 0.786 | -0.36 | 0.14 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.37 | 0.09 | **<0.001** | -0.61 | -0.12 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0 | 0.09 | 1 | -0.24 | 0.25 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.775 | -0.13 | 0.36 |
| | | Bathinda | Amritsar | 0.48 | 0.09 | **<0.001** | 0.24 | 0.73 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.37 | 0.09 | **<0.001** | 0.12 | 0.62 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.752 | -0.13 | 0.36 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.49 | 0.09 | **<0.001** | 0.24 | 0.73 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.6 | 0.09 | **<0.001** | 0.35 | 0.84 |
| | | Jalandhar | Amritsar | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.786 | -0.14 | 0.36 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.37 | 0.09 | **<0.001** | -0.62 | -0.12 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.25 | 0.09 | **0.042** | -0.5 | -0.01 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.761 | -0.13 | 0.36 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.23 | 0.09 | 0.097 | -0.02 | 0.47 |
| | | Kapurthala | Amritsar | 0.37 | 0.09 | **<0.001** | 0.12 | 0.61 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.12 | 0.09 | 0.752 | -0.36 | 0.13 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.25 | 0.09 | **0.042** | 0.01 | 0.5 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.37 | 0.09 | **<0.001** | 0.13 | 0.61 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.48 | 0.09 | **<0.001** | 0.24 | 0.72 |
| | | Pathankot | Amritsar | 0 | 0.09 | 1 | -0.25 | 0.24 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.49 | 0.09 | **<0.001** | -0.73 | -0.24 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.12 | 0.09 | 0.761 | -0.36 | 0.13 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.37 | 0.09 | **<0.001** | -0.61 | -0.13 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.793 | -0.13 | 0.35 |
| | | Patiala | Amritsar | -0.11 | 0.09 | 0.775 | -0.36 | 0.13 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.6 | 0.09 | **<0.001** | -0.84 | -0.35 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.23 | 0.09 | 0.097 | -0.47 | 0.02 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.48 | 0.09 | **<0.001** | -0.72 | -0.24 |
| | | | Pathankot | -0.11 | 0.09 | 0.793 | -0.35 | 0.13 |
| Perception Scale [Organic food is expensive] | Tukey HSD | Amritsar | Bathinda | 0.47 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | 0.2 | 0.74 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.27 | 0.1 | 0.057 | 0 | 0.54 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.25 | 0.1 | 0.098 | -0.02 | 0.52 |
| | | | Pathankot | -0.02 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.29 | 0.25 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.15 | 0.1 | 0.624 | -0.42 | 0.12 |
| | | Bathinda | Amritsar | -0.47 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | -0.74 | -0.2 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.2 | 0.1 | 0.297 | -0.47 | 0.07 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.22 | 0.1 | 0.199 | -0.49 | 0.05 |
| | | | Pathankot | -0.49 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | -0.76 | -0.22 |

| Dependent Variable | | (I) City/ Town | (J) City/ Town | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| | | | Patiala | -0.62 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | -0.89 | -0.35 |
| | | Jalandhar | Amritsar | -0.27 | 0.1 | 0.057 | -0.54 | 0 |
| | | | Bathinda | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.297 | -0.07 | 0.47 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.02 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.29 | 0.25 |
| | | | Pathankot | -0.29 | 0.1 | **0.031** | -0.56 | -0.02 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.42 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | -0.69 | -0.15 |
| | | Kapurthala | Amritsar | -0.25 | 0.1 | 0.098 | -0.52 | 0.02 |
| | | | Bathinda | 0.22 | 0.1 | 0.199 | -0.05 | 0.49 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.02 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.25 | 0.29 |
| | | | Pathankot | -0.27 | 0.1 | 0.057 | -0.54 | 0 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.4 | 0.1 | **0.001** | -0.67 | -0.13 |
| | | Pathankot | Amritsar | 0.02 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.25 | 0.29 |
| | | | Bathinda | 0.49 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | 0.22 | 0.76 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.29 | 0.1 | **0.031** | 0.02 | 0.56 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.27 | 0.1 | 0.057 | 0 | 0.54 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.13 | 0.1 | 0.754 | -0.4 | 0.14 |
| | | Patiala | Amritsar | 0.15 | 0.1 | 0.624 | -0.12 | 0.42 |
| | | | Bathinda | 0.62 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | 0.35 | 0.89 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.42 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | 0.15 | 0.69 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.4 | 0.1 | **0.001** | 0.13 | 0.67 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.13 | 0.1 | 0.754 | -0.14 | 0.4 |
| Perception Scale [Organic food should be promoted by Government] | Tukey HSD | Amritsar | Bathinda | -0.35 | 0.1 | **0.003** | -0.62 | -0.08 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.01 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.26 | 0.28 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.46 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | -0.73 | -0.19 |
| | | | Pathankot | -0.16 | 0.1 | 0.542 | -0.43 | 0.11 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.45 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | -0.72 | -0.18 |
| | | Bathinda | Amritsar | 0.35 | 0.1 | **0.003** | 0.08 | 0.62 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.36 | 0.1 | **0.002** | 0.09 | 0.63 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.11 | 0.1 | 0.858 | -0.38 | 0.16 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.19 | 0.1 | 0.345 | -0.08 | 0.46 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.1 | 0.1 | 0.901 | -0.37 | 0.17 |
| | | Jalandhar | Amritsar | -0.01 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.28 | 0.26 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.36 | 0.1 | **0.002** | -0.63 | -0.09 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.47 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | -0.74 | -0.2 |
| | | | Pathankot | -0.17 | 0.1 | 0.473 | -0.44 | 0.1 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.46 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | -0.73 | -0.19 |
| | | Kapurthala | Amritsar | 0.46 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | 0.19 | 0.73 |
| | | | Bathinda | 0.11 | 0.1 | 0.858 | -0.16 | 0.38 |

| Dependent Variable | | (I) City/ Town | (J) City/ Town | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.47 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | 0.2 | 0.74 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.3 | 0.1 | **0.021** | 0.03 | 0.57 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.01 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.26 | 0.28 |
| | | Pathankot | Amritsar | 0.16 | 0.1 | 0.542 | -0.11 | 0.43 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.19 | 0.1 | 0.345 | -0.46 | 0.08 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.17 | 0.1 | 0.473 | -0.1 | 0.44 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.3 | 0.1 | **0.021** | -0.57 | -0.03 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.29 | 0.1 | **0.028** | -0.56 | -0.02 |
| | | Patiala | Amritsar | 0.45 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | 0.18 | 0.72 |
| | | | Bathinda | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.901 | -0.17 | 0.37 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.46 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | 0.19 | 0.73 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.01 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.28 | 0.26 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.29 | 0.1 | **0.028** | 0.02 | 0.56 |
| Perception Scale [Organic food is beneficial for farmers] | Tukey HSD | Amritsar | Bathinda | -0.32 | 0.1 | **0.028** | -0.61 | -0.02 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.09 | 0.1 | 0.953 | -0.38 | 0.2 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.26 | 0.1 | 0.12 | -0.55 | 0.03 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.05 | 0.1 | 0.997 | -0.24 | 0.34 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.09 | 0.1 | 0.953 | -0.38 | 0.2 |
| | | Bathinda | Amritsar | 0.32 | 0.1 | **0.028** | 0.02 | 0.61 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.23 | 0.1 | 0.245 | -0.07 | 0.52 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.06 | 0.1 | 0.994 | -0.24 | 0.35 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.37 | 0.1 | **0.006** | 0.07 | 0.66 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.23 | 0.1 | 0.245 | -0.07 | 0.52 |
| | | Jalandhar | Amritsar | 0.09 | 0.1 | 0.953 | -0.2 | 0.38 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.23 | 0.1 | 0.245 | -0.52 | 0.07 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.17 | 0.1 | 0.567 | -0.46 | 0.12 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.14 | 0.1 | 0.752 | -0.15 | 0.43 |
| | | | Patiala | 0 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.29 | 0.29 |
| | | Kapurthala | Amritsar | 0.26 | 0.1 | 0.12 | -0.03 | 0.55 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.06 | 0.1 | 0.994 | -0.35 | 0.24 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.17 | 0.1 | 0.567 | -0.12 | 0.46 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.31 | 0.1 | **0.033** | 0.02 | 0.6 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.17 | 0.1 | 0.567 | -0.12 | 0.46 |
| | | Pathankot | Amritsar | -0.05 | 0.1 | 0.997 | -0.34 | 0.24 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.37 | 0.1 | **0.006** | -0.66 | -0.07 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.14 | 0.1 | 0.752 | -0.43 | 0.15 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.31 | 0.1 | **0.033** | -0.6 | -0.02 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.14 | 0.1 | 0.752 | -0.43 | 0.15 |

| Dependent Variable | | (I) City/ Town | (J) City/ Town | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| | | Patiala | Amritsar | 0.09 | 0.1 | 0.953 | -0.2 | 0.38 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.23 | 0.1 | 0.245 | -0.52 | 0.07 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.29 | 0.29 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.17 | 0.1 | 0.567 | -0.46 | 0.12 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.14 | 0.1 | 0.752 | -0.15 | 0.43 |
| Perception Scale [Organic food is easily available] | Tukey HSD | Amritsar | Bathinda | -0.48 | 0.14 | **0.01** | -0.89 | -0.07 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.14 | 0.14 | 0.923 | -0.55 | 0.27 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.09 | 0.14 | 0.989 | -0.32 | 0.5 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.31 | 0.14 | 0.25 | -0.1 | 0.72 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.59 | 0.14 | **0.001** | 0.18 | 1 |
| | | Bathinda | Amritsar | 0.48 | 0.14 | **0.01** | 0.07 | 0.89 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.34 | 0.14 | 0.162 | -0.07 | 0.75 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.57 | 0.14 | **0.001** | 0.16 | 0.98 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.79 | 0.14 | **<0.001** | 0.38 | 1.2 |
| | | | Patiala | 1 | 0.14 | **<0.001** | 0.66 | 1.48 |
| | | Jalandhar | Amritsar | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.923 | -0.27 | 0.55 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.34 | 0.14 | 0.162 | -0.75 | 0.07 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.23 | 0.14 | 0.589 | -0.18 | 0.64 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.45 | 0.14 | **0.02** | 0.04 | 0.86 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.73 | 0.14 | **<0.001** | 0.32 | 1.14 |
| | | Kapurthala | Amritsar | -0.09 | 0.14 | 0.989 | -0.5 | 0.32 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.57 | 0.14 | **0.001** | -0.98 | -0.16 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.23 | 0.14 | 0.589 | -0.64 | 0.18 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.22 | 0.14 | 0.635 | -0.19 | 0.63 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.5 | 0.14 | **0.006** | 0.09 | 0.91 |
| | | Pathankot | Amritsar | -0.31 | 0.14 | 0.25 | -0.72 | 0.1 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.79 | 0.14 | **<0.001** | -1.2 | -0.38 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.45 | 0.14 | **0.02** | -0.86 | -0.04 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.22 | 0.14 | 0.635 | -0.63 | 0.19 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.28 | 0.14 | 0.363 | -0.13 | 0.69 |
| | | Patiala | Amritsar | -0.59 | 0.14 | **0.001** | -1 | -0.18 |
| | | | Bathinda | -1 | 0.14 | **<0.001** | -1.48 | -0.66 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.73 | 0.14 | **<0.001** | -1.14 | -0.32 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.5 | 0.14 | **0.006** | -0.91 | -0.09 |
| | | | Pathankot | -0.28 | 0.14 | 0.363 | -0.69 | 0.13 |
| Perception Scale [Organic | Tukey HSD | Amritsar | Bathinda | -0.35 | 0.1 | **0.009** | -0.64 | -0.06 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.27 | 0.1 | 0.092 | -0.56 | 0.02 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.1 | 0.1 | 0.926 | -0.39 | 0.19 |

| Dependent Variable | | (I) City/ Town | (J) City/ Town | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| food is more hygienic] | | | Pathankot | 0.12 | 0.1 | 0.852 | -0.17 | 0.41 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.12 | 0.1 | 0.852 | -0.17 | 0.41 |
| | | Bathinda | Amritsar | 0.35 | 0.1 | **0.009** | 0.06 | 0.64 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.08 | 0.1 | 0.971 | -0.21 | 0.37 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.25 | 0.1 | 0.146 | -0.04 | 0.54 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.47 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | 0.18 | 0.76 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.47 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | 0.18 | 0.76 |
| | | Jalandhar | Amritsar | 0.27 | 0.1 | 0.092 | -0.02 | 0.56 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.08 | 0.1 | 0.971 | -0.37 | 0.21 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.17 | 0.1 | 0.562 | -0.12 | 0.46 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.39 | 0.1 | **0.002** | 0.1 | 0.68 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.39 | 0.1 | **0.002** | 0.1 | 0.68 |
| | | Kapurthala | Amritsar | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.926 | -0.19 | 0.39 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.25 | 0.1 | 0.146 | -0.54 | 0.04 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.17 | 0.1 | 0.562 | -0.46 | 0.12 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.22 | 0.1 | 0.267 | -0.07 | 0.51 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.22 | 0.1 | 0.267 | -0.07 | 0.51 |
| | | Pathankot | Amritsar | -0.12 | 0.1 | 0.852 | -0.41 | 0.17 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.47 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | -0.76 | -0.18 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.39 | 0.1 | **0.002** | -0.68 | -0.1 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.22 | 0.1 | 0.267 | -0.51 | 0.07 |
| | | | Patiala | 0 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.29 | 0.29 |
| | | Patiala | Amritsar | -0.12 | 0.1 | 0.852 | -0.41 | 0.17 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.47 | 0.1 | **<0.001** | -0.76 | -0.18 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.39 | 0.1 | **0.002** | -0.68 | -0.1 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.22 | 0.1 | 0.267 | -0.51 | 0.07 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0 | 0.1 | 1 | -0.29 | 0.29 |
| Perception Scale [Organic food causes less allergies] | Tukey HSD | Amritsar | Bathinda | -0.78 | 0.12 | **<0.001** | -1.13 | -0.43 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.17 | 0.12 | 0.744 | -0.52 | 0.18 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.54 | 0.12 | **<0.001** | -0.89 | -0.19 |
| | | | Pathankot | -0.17 | 0.12 | 0.744 | -0.52 | 0.18 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.06 | 0.12 | 0.997 | -0.29 | 0.41 |
| | | Bathinda | Amritsar | 0.78 | 0.12 | **<0.001** | 0.43 | 1.13 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.61 | 0.12 | **<0.001** | 0.26 | 0.96 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.24 | 0.12 | 0.38 | -0.11 | 0.59 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.61 | 0.12 | **<0.001** | 0.26 | 0.96 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.84 | 0.12 | **<0.001** | 0.49 | 1.19 |
| | | Jalandhar | Amritsar | 0.17 | 0.12 | 0.744 | -0.18 | 0.52 |

| Dependent Variable | | (I) City/ Town | (J) City/ Town | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| | | Kapurthala | Bathinda | -0.61 | 0.12 | **<0.001** | -0.96 | -0.26 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.37 | 0.12 | **0.035** | -0.72 | -0.02 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0 | 0.12 | 1 | -0.35 | 0.35 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.23 | 0.12 | 0.43 | -0.12 | 0.58 |
| | | Pathankot | Amritsar | 0.54 | 0.12 | **<0.001** | 0.19 | 0.89 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.24 | 0.12 | 0.38 | -0.59 | 0.11 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.37 | 0.12 | **0.035** | 0.02 | 0.72 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.37 | 0.12 | **0.035** | 0.02 | 0.72 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.6 | 0.12 | **<0.001** | 0.25 | 0.95 |
| | | Patiala | Amritsar | 0.17 | 0.12 | 0.744 | -0.18 | 0.52 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.61 | 0.12 | **<0.001** | -0.96 | -0.26 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0 | 0.12 | 1 | -0.35 | 0.35 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.37 | 0.12 | **0.035** | -0.72 | -0.02 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.23 | 0.12 | 0.43 | -0.12 | 0.58 |
| | | Jalandhar | Amritsar | -0.06 | 0.12 | 0.997 | -0.41 | 0.29 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.84 | 0.12 | **<0.001** | -1.19 | -0.49 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.23 | 0.12 | 0.43 | -0.58 | 0.12 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.6 | 0.12 | **<0.001** | -0.95 | -0.25 |
| | | | Pathankot | -0.23 | 0.12 | 0.43 | -0.58 | 0.12 |
| Perception Scale [Organic food has a higher nutritive value] | Tukey HSD | Amritsar | Bathinda | -0.32 | 0.11 | **0.048** | -0.64 | 0 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.07 | 0.11 | 0.989 | -0.39 | 0.25 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.13 | 0.11 | 0.853 | -0.45 | 0.19 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.13 | 0.11 | 0.853 | -0.19 | 0.45 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.891 | -0.2 | 0.44 |
| | | Bathinda | Amritsar | 0.32 | 0.11 | **0.048** | 0 | 0.64 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.25 | 0.11 | 0.22 | -0.07 | 0.57 |
| | | | Kapurthala | 0.19 | 0.11 | 0.529 | -0.13 | 0.51 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.45 | 0.11 | **0.001** | 0.13 | 0.77 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.44 | 0.11 | **0.001** | 0.12 | 0.76 |
| | | Jalandhar | Amritsar | 0.07 | 0.11 | 0.989 | -0.25 | 0.39 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.25 | 0.11 | 0.22 | -0.57 | 0.07 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.06 | 0.11 | 0.995 | -0.38 | 0.26 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.2 | 0.11 | 0.47 | -0.12 | 0.52 |
| | | | Patiala | 0.19 | 0.11 | 0.529 | -0.13 | 0.51 |
| | | Kapurthala | Amritsar | 0.13 | 0.11 | 0.853 | -0.19 | 0.45 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.19 | 0.11 | 0.529 | -0.51 | 0.13 |
| | | | Jalandhar | 0.06 | 0.11 | 0.995 | -0.26 | 0.38 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.26 | 0.11 | 0.183 | -0.06 | 0.58 |

| Dependent Variable | | (I) City/ Town | (J) City/ Town | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| | | | Patiala | 0.25 | 0.11 | 0.22 | -0.07 | 0.57 |
| | | Pathankot | Amritsar | -0.13 | 0.11 | 0.853 | -0.45 | 0.19 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.45 | 0.11 | **0.001** | -0.77 | -0.13 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.2 | 0.11 | 0.47 | -0.52 | 0.12 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.26 | 0.11 | 0.183 | -0.58 | 0.06 |
| | | | Patiala | -0.01 | 0.11 | 1 | -0.33 | 0.31 |
| | | Patiala | Amritsar | -0.12 | 0.11 | 0.891 | -0.44 | 0.2 |
| | | | Bathinda | -0.44 | 0.11 | **0.001** | -0.76 | -0.12 |
| | | | Jalandhar | -0.19 | 0.11 | 0.529 | -0.51 | 0.13 |
| | | | Kapurthala | -0.25 | 0.11 | 0.22 | -0.57 | 0.07 |
| | | | Pathankot | 0.01 | 0.11 | 1 | -0.31 | 0.33 |

---