IJBPAS, January, Special Issue, 2022, 11(1): 509-522

ISSN: 2277–4998

International Journal of Biology, Pharmacy and Allied Sciences (IJBPAS)

'A Bridge Between Laboratory and Reader'

www.ijbpas.com

PREDICTING CONSUMER INTENTION AND BEHAVIOUR TOWARDS ORGANIC FOOD PRODUCTS-A CONSUMER STYLE INVENTORY (CSI) APPROACH

G.ANITHA RATHNA[1*] AND M. SUMATHY[2]

1: Research Scholar, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu 641046

2: Professor & Head, School of Commerce, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu 641046

[*]**Corresponding Author: G.Anitha Rathna: E Mail: anitharathna29@gmail.com**

Received 10th June 2021; Revised 11th July 2021; Accepted 20th Aug. 2021; Available online 15th Jan. 2022

https://doi.org/10.31032/IJBPAS/2022/11.1.1065

ABSTRACT

Consumers approach the market with certain basic decision-making approaches. Consumer Styles Inventory can be used to assess these various decision-making styles (CSI). Researchers find out the purchase of organic food based on Sproles and Kendall's (1986) model to find out a consumer intention. This decision-making approach can be used for a variety of commodities and situations (Walsh, Hennig-Thurau, Wayne-Mitchell &Wiedmann, 2001a) based on that model researchers can predict consumers' intention towards organic foods. In this existing style like consumer decision-making style might be Characteristics of eight by Sproles and Kendall.This section has known the existing holes in the organic food literature and practice as an important step in moderating the worthwhileness of the current study. It emphasized that the issues at hand have not been researched sufficiently. In this model, proposed additional models have been added within the existing model. In addition, four factors are used to determine a buying behaviour that induces a consumer's intention to purchase organic food: environmental awareness, health concerns, the longevity of life, and high nutritional value. The sampling design shows that the study participants were drawn from Coimbatore district consumers who shop at selected stores. Coimbatore is primarily an agrarian base of the district common man's interest for organic food products are well

established and functioning of more than 70 organic retail stores across cities. These factors motivated the researcher to select this region for the field research. The empirical study is primarily focused on consumers' inhabitants in Coimbatore city. The sample size of 534 respondents was determined using a non-probability convenience sampling technique.The result of the structural equation model confirmed that Health consciousness, Environmental consciousness declared that there existsa close association between the Customer Style Inventory(CSI) and the food purchase intention towards organic food.

Keywords: Organic Food, Consumer intention, Health consciousness, Environmental concern

Review of Literature:

Due to its focus on customers' mental orientation, the consumer attributes method has been considered more effective and descriptive than consumer typology and psychographic approaches (Lysonski*et al.,* 1996). Sproles and Kendall (1986) constructed the forty-item instrument inventory by combining decision-making characteristics (CSI). Consumers are assumed to approach the market in one of eight primary decision-making styles, according to the CSI concept: "Perfectionism, high-quality consciousnesses", "Novelty-fashionconsciousness", "Brand consciousness", "Price consciousness", "Recreational, hedonisticshopping consciousness", "Confusion by over choice", "Impulsiveness", "Habitual, brand-loyal purchasing orientation" (Akturan*et al.,* 2011).Jain R& Sharma, A. (2013) this study focused on Sproles & Kendall's Consumer Style Inventory (CSI) for Analyzing Decision Making Styles of Consumers. The purpose of this paper is to review the various studies conducted from 1986 and 2010 to provide some direction for future research and to contribute significantly to academia and marketers. Consumers who are concerned with high-quality, brand-conscious price equals quality, recreational/hedonistic consumers, price-conscious value for money shoppers, and consumers who are perplexed by too many options. As a result, it was determined that Sproles and Kendall's inventory can be used as a good starting point.

STRUCTURE EQUATION MODEL - IMPACT OF CUSTOMER STYLE INVENTORY (CSI) TOWARDS ORGANIC FOOD:

Sproles and Kendall's original eight characteristics (1986). The following hypotheses have been developed based on these eight characteristics:

HYPOTHESIS FRAMED:

$H_0$6: There is no significant relationship between Consumer Style Inventory (CSI)

significantly influencing the consumers' purchase intention towards organic food products.

There is no significant relationship between

$H_0$6a: Perfectionism, high-quality consciousness (PHQC) significantly influences the consumers' purchase intention towards organic food products.

$H_0$6b: Brand consciousness (BC) significantly influences the consumers' purchase intention

towards organic food products.

$H_0$6c: Novelty consciousness (NC) significantly influences the consumers' purchase intention towards organic food products.

$H_0$6d: Recreational, hedonistic shopping consciousness (RHC) influences the consumers' purchase intention towards organic food products.

$H_0$6e: Price consciousness (PC) influences the consumers' purchase intention towards organic food products.

$H_0$6f: Impulsiveness (IMC) influences the consumers' purchase intention towards organic food products.

$H_0$6g: Confusion by overchoice (CBO) influences the consumers' purchase intention towards organic food products.

$H_0$6h: Habitual/brand loyal(HBLC) influences the consumers' purchase intention towards organic food products.

SUPPORT FOR INCLUDING ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCTS IN THE CONTEXT OF ORGANIC FOOD PURCHASE INTENTION:

$H_0$6i: Environmental awareness (EA) significantly influences the consumer's intention to purchase organic food.

$H_0$6j: Health concern (HC) significantly influences the consumer's intention to purchase organic food

$H_0$6k: Green consumption consumer (GCC) significantly influences the consumer's intention to purchase organic food

$H_0$6l: Longevity of life (LOL) significantly influences the consumer's intention to purchase organic food

The theoretical framework was analysed with the help of SPSS and AMOS version 20. A two-stage Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) approach was used, as suggested by Anderson and Gerbing (1988). A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used in the first step to evaluate the measurement model's reliability and validity. The whole structural model was computed in the second stage to assess overall model fit and postulated associations using standardised regression coefficients (β) and p-values.

'Exploratory factor analysis'(EFA) was used to confirm that the items were

appropriately loaded into their respective factors. To do this, EFA used principal component analysis and a direct oblique rotation (Hair *et al*., 2008). Factor loading of the 60 items was checked.

Table 1: Coefficients Measuring The Relationship Between Consumer Style Inventory

Coefficients[a]							
Variable	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	2.482	.105		23.735	.000		
PERFECTIONISM, HIGH-QUALITY CONSCIOUSNESS							
Good Quality	.106	.018	.231	5.871	.000	.874	1.144
Perfect Choice	.014	.026	.026	.538	.591	.566	1.766
Overall Best Quality	.164	.028	.291	5.812	.000	.540	1.850
Exact Organic Product	.030	.026	.058	1.125	.261	.513	1.947
Not Much Belief	-.080	.026	-.149	-3.056	.002	.567	1.764
Standards And Expectations	.082	.026	.155	3.101	.002	.540	1.853
Buying The Primary Product	.008	.023	.015	.359	.720	.733	1.364
Simplest To Satisfy Me	.051	.023	.096	2.172	.030	.697	1.434
BRAND CONSCIOUSNESS							
(Constant)	2.920	.110		26.505	.000		
Preferred national brands	.005	.030	.010	.172	.863	.446	2.240
Expensive brands are usually my choice	.101	.032	.196	3.148	.002	.365	2.742
Merchandise value and its higher quality	.255	.030	.434	8.591	.000	.552	1.813
Higher price with better quality.	-.013	.028	-.023	-.443	.658	.527	1.897
Pleasant department and specialty stores offer me the best products	-.010	.031	-.017	-.309	.758	.484	2.065
I prefer to purchase the most popular brands.	.055	.028	.100	1.975	.049	.544	1.839
The most well-known brands are frequently excellent choices.	-.135	.028	-.232	-4.803	.000	.603	1.659
NOVELTY CONSCIOUSNESS							
(Constant)	2.841	.125		22.659	.000		
I usually buy newest available organic products	.235	.035	.330	6.704	.000	.671	1.491
I keep organic food products in my kitchen up to date.	.027	.036	.048	.743	.458	.388	2.580
I go to a variety of stores to buy a wide range of things.	-.036	.031	-.064	-1.179	.239	.558	1.791
It's great to purchase something new and exciting.	.045	.029	.079	1.583	.114	.659	1.517
RECREATIONAL, HEDONISTIC CONSUMER							
(Constant)	3.586	.127		28.232	.000		
For me, shopping is not a pleasurable experience.	.096	.037	.136	2.595	.010	.685	1.459
Enjoyable activities of my life are going shopping	.027	.029	.050	.920	.358	.639	1.564
Shopping at various stores is a waste of time for me.	-.033	.033	-.059	-.989	.323	.529	1.891
I enjoy shopping just for the fun of it	-.014	.029	-.027	-.487	.627	.624	1.602
My shopping outings are short.	-.021	.027	-.038	-.792	.429	.805	1.243
PRICE CONSCIOUSNESS							
(Constant)	2.979	.160		18.616	.000		
Buying organic foods at sales price.	.007	.040	.008	.181	.857	.737	1.357
I normally choose for products that are less expensive.	-.148	.038	-.189	-3.850	.000	.645	1.551
Buying organic food at best value-for-money.	.344	.033	.483	10.461	.000	.730	1.370
IMPULSIVE , CARELESS CONSUMERS							
(Constant)	2.701	.107		25.200	.000		
More causious about shopping plan.	.187	.035	.353	5.303	.000	.320	3.121
I am impulsive while purchasing organic products	.036	.035	.069	1.028	.304	.318	3.145
I frequently make rash purchases that I subsequently regret.	-.069	.023	-.124	-2.954	.003	.803	1.245

I take time to shop carefully for the most effective buys	**.106**	**.024**	**.194**	**4.437**	**.000**	**.739**	**1.353**
More caution about spending on organic food.	**.056**	**.021**	**.115**	**2.714**	**.007**	**.794**	**1.260**
CONFUSED BY OVER- CHOICE CONSUMERS							
(Constant)	**2.927**	**.108**		**27.069**	**.000**		
There are so many brands to pick from that I frequently become confused..	**-.051**	**.027**	**-.088**	**-1.871**	**.062**	**.716**	**1.397**
It can be difficult to decide which stores to visit.	**.123**	**.034**	**.219**	**3.617**	**.000**	**.430**	**2.324**
The more I learn about organic food items, the harder it seems to choose the best.]	**.169**	**.037**	**.261**	**4.603**	**.000**	**.490**	**2.042**
HABITUAL, BRAND- LOYAL CONSUMERS							
(Constant)	**2.516**	**.105**		**24.018**	**.000**		
I have a few favourite brands that I buy on a regular basis.	**-.003**	**.033**	**-.004**	**-.082**	**.934**	**.513**	**1.948**
I stick with a one brand.	**.193**	**.035**	**.304**	**5.522**	**.000**	**.466**	**2.144**
Every time I go shopping for organic foods, I go to the same store.	**.106**	**.032**	**.170**	**3.277**	**.001**	**.527**	**1.899**
I switch brands of organic products on a regular basis.	**.077**	**.028**	**.133**	**2.758**	**.006**	**.607**	**1.647**
HEALTH CONCERN							
(Constant)	**2.465**	**.097**		**25.371**	**.000**		
To ensure overall health, I carefully selected foods.	**.163**	**.022**	**.300**	**7.400**	**.000**	**.831**	**1.204**
I think of myself as a health-conscious consumer.	**.132**	**.022**	**.255**	**6.059**	**.000**	**.775**	**1.291**
I often examine health-related issues.	**.072**	**.022**	**.136**	**3.269**	**.001**	**.791**	**1.265**
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSCIOUSNESS							
(Constant)	**2.887**	**.104**		**27.669**	**.000**		
The balance of nature is very delicate and can be easily upset	**-.026**	**.029**	**-.046**	**-.894**	**.371**	**.611**	**1.638**
Switching over to organic food for ecological reason.	**.087**	**.034**	**.143**	**2.517**	**.012**	**.496**	**2.018**
Choose an product based on less harmful to people & the environment.	**.185**	**.032**	**.323**	**5.693**	**.000**	**.499**	**2.004**
FOOD PURCHASE INTENTION							
(Constant)	**2.919**	**.120**		**24.298**	**.000**		
While shopping, I am willing to purchase organic foods.	**.073**	**.035**	**.120**	**2.099**	**.036**	**.528**	**1.894**
In the near future, I will make an attempt to purchase organic food.	**.027**	**.035**	**.047**	**.769**	**.442**	**.464**	**2.157**
I intend to buy organic products because they are more environmentally friendly	**.121**	**.035**	**.192**	**3.455**	**.001**	**.557**	**1.797**
GREEN CONSUMPTION CONSUMER							
(Constant)	**2.261**	**.088**		**25.553**	**.000**		
Produced in an ethically responsible manner	**-.031**	**.020**	**-.059**	**-1.543**	**.123**	**.714**	**1.400**
Buy products that are recyclable	**.005**	**.022**	**.010**	**.222**	**.825**	**.526**	**1.903**
Environmental conservation awareness	**.069**	**.024**	**.140**	**2.915**	**.004**	**.462**	**2.165**
Products that are certified to be environmentally-friendly	**.081**	**.019**	**.178**	**4.299**	**.000**	**.618**	**1.618**
Products that are biodegradable	**.015**	**.021**	**.031**	**.701**	**.484**	**.550**	**1.818**
Products that adhere to fair trade principles.	**.036**	**.022**	**.068**	**1.631**	**.103**	**.610**	**1.638**
Products that are free of toxins	**.036**	**.024**	**.071**	**1.514**	**.131**	**.478**	**2.092**
Products that are reducible	**.235**	**.025**	**.423**	**9.427**	**.000**	**.527**	**1.896**
Products that are good for the planet.	**.025**	**.022**	**.050**	**1.129**	**.259**	**.542**	**1.845**
LONGEVITY OF LIFE							
(Constant)	**2.556**	**.102**		**25.097**	**.000**		
No synthetic toxins	**.078**	**.023**	**.143**	**3.357**	**.001**	**.788**	**1.269**
Man-made Fertilizers	**.016**	**.025**	**.029**	**.653**	**.514**	**.734**	**1.362**
Free from Genetically modified organisms (GMO)	**.256**	**.029**	**.414**	**8.815**	**.000**	**.647**	**1.546**

Level of Significance: 5 per cent

Using the various dimensions of the CSI model and the information provided above the co-efficient table, determine if one or more of the independent variables are significant with the predictors and analyse whether there is an association

between consumers' purchase intention towards consumer style inventory. Out of 60 parameters statements considered only 34 were statistically significant.

The size of the tolerance and the VIF (Variance Inflated Factor) are used to determine multi-collinearity. If the tolerance value is greater than 0.2, there is no problem with multicollinearity. The VIF is the converse (opposite) of tolerance, in which large values are sought. Multicollinearity is considered a concern if the tolerance value is less than 0.2. Multi-collinearity is also a problem if the VIF is 5 or greater. Since the tolerance value is much above .20 and the VIF factor must be less than 5.0 it is inferred that multicollinearity among the independent variable is statistically significant.

To assess the Eigenvalues are closed to Zero then the variable is highly correlated. To check an Eigenvalue it must not be closed with zero. It closely with zero means it's highly correlated. Eigenvalue indicates how many distinct dimensions there are among the independent variable.

MEASUREMENT MODEL: ANALYSIS OF RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY:

Reliability and validity are two crucial factors to consider when evaluating a measurement instrument. Validity is concerned with the extent to which an instrument measures what it is intended to measure, whereas reliability is concerned with the capacity of an instrument to consistently measure something (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). The validity of an instrument, in particular, is inextricably tied to its reliability. The reliability of a system is calculated using

- Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951)
- Composite Reliability (Fornell&Larcker, 1981)
- Average Variance Extracted (Fornll&Larcker, 1981)

In this scenario, use CFA to test the validity of the hypothesised assumptions in the conceptual model. Before testing the multi-item variable measures, composite reliability (CR), validity (Average Variance Extracted (AVE), and both convergent and discriminant validity were computed, as well as model fit. The following section explains how Cronbach's alpha (α)values were determined, then goes into depth about how CR values were measured, and then uses AVE values to check the tools' validity.

There are two main versions of α: normal and standardised. The focus of this research was on the normal value, which was used when items were limited to a single score on a scale (Cronbach 1951). According to previous research, all constructs must have adequate or

acceptable reliability measurement scores if the coefficient values are more than 0.60. (Kline, 2000.

On the other hand, some research suggests that Cronbach's alpha value should be greater than 0.70 to be statistically acceptable (Byrne, 2006). Nunnaly (1978) also stated that 0.7 is a well-known reliability coefficient. Hair *et al.* (2007), claimed that beginnings are frequently used in the literature and are hence appropriate. Briefly stated, according to Lance, Butts, and Michels (2006), as well as other important researchers, the widely used Cronbach alpha values, appear to be described as follows:

On the other hand, some research suggests that Cronbach's alpha value should be greater than 0.70 to be statistically acceptable (Byrne, 2006). Nunnaly (1978) also stated that 0.7 is a well-known reliability coefficient. Nunnaly (1978), like Hair *et al.,* (2007), claimed that beginnings are occasionally used in the literature and are hence appropriate. Briefly stated, according to Henson (2001), Lance, Butts, and Michels (2006), as well as other important researchers, the widely used Cronbach alpha values, appear to be described as follows:

$\alpha \geq 0.9$ Excellent, but not always desirable (Scores exceeding 0.9 may indicate redundancy in the scale questions (Tavakol Dennick, 2011) and a maximum α value of 0.9 has been suggested (Streiner, 2003).

- $0.7 \leq \alpha < 0.9$ = Good
- $0.6 \leq \alpha < 0.7$ = Acceptable
- $0.5 \leq \alpha < 0.6$ = Poor
- $\alpha < 0.5$ = Unacceptable

It should be noted that the acceptability of the Cronbach's alpha can also be determined by the type of research, for example, values are lower in social sciences compared to health sciences (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011).

COMPOSITE RELIABILITY:

Composite reliability indicates the shared variance among the observed variables of a latent construct. It is also called internal consistency reliability. CR is used to find the sum of true score variance concerning the total scale score variance, i.e., it reflects the amount of scale score variance (Bacon, Sauer & Young, 1995).

COMPOSITE RELIABILITY: A SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE TO CRONBACH'S α:

The benefit of using an SEM approach consists of "better" estimates of true reliability than those from coefficient α. Both CR and Cronbach's α is used to test the internal consistency of the variables in the component, but the Cronbach alpha test is used when Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and CR test is used when

Confirmatory Factor Analysis(CFA). Since the standardised regression weights or loadings might vary under SEM, but the correlation coefficients for coefficient must be the same (Peterson & Kim, 2012). As a result, SEM can experimentally analyse and overcome some of the restrictive coefficient assumptions (Raykov, 2001).

The standardized regression weights of the default model were used to determine the composite reliability values, through the application of the following formula, as suggested by Fornell and Larcker (1981):

$$\textbf{Composite Reliability} = \frac{\Sigma\,(\text{Standard Loading})^2}{\Sigma((\text{Standard Loading})^2 + \Sigma(\text{Measurement Error})}$$

$$\textbf{Measurement Error (ME)} = (1 - \text{Standardising Loading})^2$$

Composite reliability should be 0.7 or higher. If it is an exploratory study 0.6 or higher is acceptable. CR is used to measure the internal consistency reliability between the indicator variable. After evaluating EFA, it was found that some items showed a low loading (below 0.40). Therefore, these low-loaded items were eliminated for more accurate results (Hair *et al.,* 2008).

Table 2: Measurement Model- Reliability And Validity

Research Construct		C.R. Value	AVE Value	Factor Loading
Perfectionism, High-Quality Consciousness	PHQC1	0.930	0.629	0.550
	PHQC2			0.835
	PHQC3			0.826
	PHQC4			0.875
	PHQC5			0.729
	PHQC6			0.910
	PHQC7			0.784
	PHQC8			0.783
Brand Conscious, Price equal quality	BC1	0.881	0.541	0.761
	BC2			0.882
	BC3			0.841
	BC4			0.784
	BC5			0.724
	BC6			-0.139
	BC7			0.752
Novelty Consciousness	NC1	0.815	0.537	0.74
	NC2			0.975
	NC3			0.592
	NC4			0.547
Recreational, hedonistic Consumer	RHC1	0.904	0.549	0.77
	RHC2			0.448
	RHC3			0.803
	RHC4			0.871
	RHC5			0.513
Price conscious, value for money	PC1	0.616	0.350	0.709
	PC2			0.741
	PC3			0.591
Impulsive, Careless Consumer	ICC1	0.903	0.605	0.896
	IMC2			0.781
	IMC3			0.294
	IMC4			0.694
	IMC5			0.752
Confused by over choice	CBO1	0.864	0.512	0.605
	CBO2			0.875
	CBO3			0.929
Habitual, Brand-loyal consumer	HBLC1	0.833	0.499	0.79
	HBLC2			0.887
	HBLC3			0.888
	HBLC4			0.533
Health Concern	HC1	0.766	0.525	0.66
	HC2			0.665
	HC3			0.964
Environment Awareness	EA1	0.793	0.562	0.768
	EA2			0.933
	EA3			0.887
Food purchase intension	FPI1	0.843	0.641	0.923
	FPI2			0.908
	FPI3			0.942
Green consumption consumer	GCC1	0.956	0.710	0.700
	GCC2			0.867
	GCC3			0.944
	GCC4			0.79

	GCC5			0.884
	GCC6			0.741
	GCC7			0.907
	GCC8			0.874
	GCC9			0.845
Longevity of life	LOL1	0.786	0.552	0.905
	LOL2			0.762
	LOL3			0.898

***Scales –1-Strongly Disagree; 3 –Neutral; 5 –Strongly Agree**

There is a numeral of model fit indices existing to researchers and several fit indices are essential to be used to determine the overall model fit. However, there has been an unlimited difference in agreement based on the cut-off points for these different indices, exactly on which indices to report. This is likely to create distress for researchers due to the available inconsistent evidence. According to Hair *et al.,* (2006), the fit indices point toward the validity of the measurement model. Furthermore, at least one incremental fit index and one absolute fit index must be used in the study of these indices. To justify the effect of sample size, it is common to divide the X2 measure (CMIN) by degrees of freedom (DF). The value should be less than 3.0 to show an appropriate fit. The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) is an absolute fit index that increases as the estimation error increases (Hair *et al.,* 2006). The RMSEA should be less than 0.07. Model complexity is normally accounted for using the Comparative Fit Index (CFI). The recommended cutoff is > 0.9, with 1 denoting perfect fit (Hair *et al.,* 2006; Arbuckle & Wothke, 1999). The degree of model fit for each projected coefficient is represented by the parsimony fittest. It attempts to correct any model over-fitting and determine the model's parsimony concerning the Goodness of Fit Index (GFI). When all of these fit indices for overall-model valuation are considered, it can be concluded that the proposed model and sample data are reasonably accepted. All of the indices, including the so-called Goodness of Fit indices, exceeded the 0.90 minimum thresholds, suggesting a fit of the model that would be provisionally acceptable. Moreover, the results show that the model is parsimonious for the reason that the PRATIO value is not far off to 1 and x2/g.l and is integrated between the interval values recommended by Arbuckle and Wothke (2004).

POST HOC MODIFICATIONS OR MODEL TRIMMING:

Although the model demonstrated a suitable model fit, this was done after exploring what could have been a good model provided the data. To improve the overall

fitting and perhaps Establish a more parsimonious model, post hoc model modifications were made. Similarly, MacCallum (1986), MacCallum Roznowski and Necowitz (1992), and MacCallum Roznowski and Necowitz (1992) opined that recommendations based on adjustment indexes of not necessarily result in the "correct" model in certain realistic situations. Under no situations can one be “absolutely” sure that themodified model is closer to the original model (Lei & Wu, 2007). Since the original model failed to provide a good fit after being fitted, the researcher had to “modify” the original model by reducing the number of parameters. However, this was considered with caution so as not to disruptthe model's fit. The researcher chose not to add parameters (rather than reducing the number of parameters) because doing so would make the model more susceptible to sampling errors (Lei & Wu, 2007). Adding parameters to a model makes it more complex and difficult to read. In addition, the error terms in each build with the highest positive estimates have been associated. Another method for improving model fit yielded marginally acceptable results. Any items which correlation coefficients below the recommended threshold of 0.5 were removed due to model fit criteria and the need to obtain a provisionally suitable model fit. Out of 60 parameters statements considered only 34 were the ultimate test-fitting model. After adding such adjustment indices, the fit indices were considered to be generally better than slightly acceptable or formally acceptable. This may show or validate that, in the end; the hypothesised conceptual model fits the data reasonably accurately. Accordingly, the model was provisionally accepted. As soon as the reliability, validity, and model fit attained the acceptable and marginally acceptable, CFA was concluded and the next step was to test the structural paths of the theorized model.

Table 3: Model Fit Summary

Model Fit Indices	Acceptable Threshold	Default Model	Modified Model	Acceptable / Unacceptable
Chi-Square Value: $\chi 2/(df)$	<3	9.279	3.692	Acceptable
Comparative Fit Index (CFI)	> 0.900	.986	0.998	Acceptable
Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)	> 0.900	.974	0.995	Acceptable
Incremental Fit Index (IFI)	> 0.900	.987	0.998	Acceptable
Normed Fit Index (NFI)	> 0.900	.985	0.997	Acceptable

Tucker Lewis Index (TLI)	**> 0.900**	**.890**	**0.964**	**Acceptable**
Parsimony Fit (PRATIO)	**Close to 1**	**.124**	**0.057**	**Acceptable**
Random Measure of Standard Error Approximation (RMSEA)	**< 0.08**	**.125**	**0.071**	**Acceptable**

CONCLUSION:

In this present study, the CSI concept is based on organic food purchase behaviour for Indian consumers. The study has partially supported the applicability of consumer decision-making styles (CDMS) like quality, brand, loyalty, better experience while shopping, the longevity of life, and price influenced the consumers' intention to purchase organic food. Further, the researcher incorporating additional constructs; environmental consciousness, green consumption consumer, longevity, and health consciousness most significant predictors of organic food purchase intention. The study concluded that environmental consciousness and health concern is a most significant factor for the consumer to purchase organic products. The present study helps to understand the factors that encourage consumers to purchase organic food products.

This study helps to find out organic food intention by using some factors like brand consciousness, environment consciousness, price consciousness, and based on their green consumption behaviour. During analysis allowing each factor into a block to find the most significant factors that induce an organic food purchase intention. The findings of the study provide that price is the most significant for determining the organic food purchase intention. It may be useful for researchers and business managers regarding the management and development of organic food. Our findings, in particular, contribute to the field's understanding and assist business managers in developing and implementing plans for the Indians organic food market.

REFERENCES:

[1] Akturan, U., Tezcan, N., & Vignolles, A. (2011). Segmenting young adults through their consumption styles: a cross-cultural study. *Young Consumers*.

[2] Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological bulletin*, *103*(3), 411.

[3] Arbuckle, J. L., & Wothke, W. (1999). *Amos 4.0 user's guide*. Marketing Department, SPSS Incorporated.

[4] Bacon, D. R., Sauer, P. L., & Young, M. (1995). Composite reliability in structural equations modeling. *Educational and psychological measurement*, *55*(3), 394-406.

[5] Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *psychometrika*, *16*(3), 297-334.

[6] Fornell, C., &Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of marketing research*, *18*(1), 39-50.

[7] Hair, E., Halle, T., Terry-Humen, E., Lavelle, B., & Calkins, J. (2006). Children's school readiness in the ECLS-K: Predictions to academic, health, and social outcomes in first grade. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *21*(4), 431-454.

[8] Henson, R. K. (2001). Understanding internal consistency reliability estimates: A conceptual primer on coefficient alpha. *Measurement and evaluation in counseling and development*, *34*(3), 177-189.

[9] Idoko, E. C., & Nebo, G. N. (2017). Mall consumption Motivations in Nigeria: the mediating role of attitude among shoppers. *Journal of Business*, *1*(2), 13-41.

[10] Jain, R., & Sharma, A. (2013). A review on Sproles & Kendall's consumer style inventory (CSI) for analyzing decision making styles of consumers. *Indian Journal of Marketing*, *43*(3), 40-47.

[11] Jain, R., & Sharma, A. (2013). A review on Sproles & Kendall's consumer style inventory (CSI) for analyzing decision-making styles of consumers. *Indian Journal of Marketing*, *43*(3), 40-47.

[12] Lysonski, S., Durvasula, S., & Zotos, Y. (1996). Consumer decision-making styles: a multi-country investigation. *European journal of Marketing*.

[13] Nunnaly, J. C. (1978). PSychoneric Theory. *Second Edion, McGraw-Hil*.

[14] Peterson, R. A., & Kim, Y. (2013). On the relationship between coefficient alpha and composite reliability. *Journal of applied psychology*, *98*(1), 194.

[15] Raykov, T., &Marcoulides, G. A. (2004). Using the delta method for approximate interval estimation of parameter functions in SEM. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *11*(4), 621-637.

[16] Sprotles, G. B., & Kendall, E. L. (1986). A methodology for profiling consumers' decision-making styles. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, *20*(2), 267-279.

[17] Streiner, D. L. (2003). Being inconsistent about consistency: When coefficient alpha does and doesn't matter. *Journal of personality assessment*, *80*(3), 217-222.

[18] Sumathy, M., Rathna, G. A., & Ramya, B. (2021). The Moderating Role Of Environmental Concerns And Trust

Towards An Organic Product. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government*, *27*(2), 4651-4658.

[19] Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International journal of medical education*, *2*, 53.

[20] Wagner, D., Byrne, M., &Kolcaba, K. (2006). Effects of comfort warming on preoperative patients. *AORN journal*, *84*(3), 427-448.

[21] C.M. Thakar, S.S. Parkhe, A. Jain etal., 3d Printing: Basic principles and applications, Materials Today: Proceedings, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpr.2021.06.272

[22] Khan, R. M. I., Kumar, T., Supriyatno, T., &Nukapangu, V. (2021). The Phenomenon of Arabic-English Translation of Foreign Language Classes During The Pandemic. IjazArabi Journal of Arabic Learning, 4(3). https://doi.org/10.18860/ijazarabi.v4i3.13597

[23] Sajja, G., Mustafa, M., Phasinam, K.,Kaliyaperumal, K., Ventayen, R., & Kassanuk, T.

[24] (2021). Towards Application of Machine Learning in Classification and Prediction of Heart

[25] Disease. 2021 Second International Conference On Electronics And Sustainable Communication Systems (ICESC). https://doi.org/10.1109/icesc51422.2021.9532940

[26] Veluri, R., Patra, I., Naved, M., Prasad, V.,Arcinas, M., Beram, S., & Raghuvanshi, A. (2021). Learning analytics using deep learning techniques for efficiently managing educational institutes. Materials Today: Proceedings. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpr.2021.11.416

[27] Walsh, G., Hennig-Thurau, T., Wayne-Mitchell, V., & Wiedmann, K. P. (2001). Consumers' decision-making style as a basis for market segmentation. Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing, 10(2), 117-131.