

A STUDY ON CONSTRAINTS IN CONSUMPTION OF ORGANIC PRODUCTS AND GREEN MARKETING IN VARANASI DISTRICT OF UTTAR PRADESH, INDIA

ABSTRACT

Any factor or factors inhibiting or limiting individuals or groups from adopting any intervention or achieving a goal can be defined as constraint. It can be external factor as well as internal factors. This study looked at the limitations of green marketing and the consumption of organic products in Varanasi district, Uttar Pradesh. A total of 332 people took part in the study from four blocks of Varanasi district in Uttar Pradesh. The study looked at different types of limitations that can be put into four main groups: consumption, psychological, institutional, and social. It also examined the smaller components within each of these groups. Garret methods were employed to figure out the limitation. A major obstacle to buying organic products was the higher price compared to regular products. In the study area, social constraints were mainly due to strict food habits, and psychological constraints were mainly due to a lack of interest in consuming organic products.

KEYWORDS: Constraints, Consumption pattern, Garret Techniques, Green Marketing, Organic Products.

INTRODUCTION

Green marketing is all about advertising and offering products that were considered beneficial for the natural world [1]. It means making products better, changing how they were made or packaged, and advertising them. Green marketing means that a company and its customers join forces to tackle social and environmental problems. Green marketing is not the same as regular marketing. Regular marketing is when companies use techniques to encourage people to buy their products or services.[2] Green marketing is a type of marketing that focuses on getting people interested in buying environmentally friendly products and services. In marketing, the

words "ecofriendly" or "green" were now popular and trendy. Eco-friendly products were things that don't harm the environment when they were created, used, or thrown away. In easier words, these things help nature by making less dirty air and water. These days, all companies were trying to be environmentally friendly and save money, but still make good products. [3] Right now, professional groups understand that just barely meeting the minimum standards is not sufficient. They had to create a unique advantage for themselves in the market to stay alive in the future. Customers were now more aware of society, and it is crucial for companies to fulfill all the wants and needs of people and offer the best service they can to their customers. Any factor or factors inhibiting or limiting individuals or groups from adopting any intervention or achieving a goal can be defined as constraint. It can be external factor as well as internal factors. According to Merriam Webster Dictionary, constraint can be defined as the repression of one's own feelings, or behavior, or actions. In this objective four major constraint were identified which were Means of Consumption, Institutional Constraint, Social constraint and lastly the psychological constraint in green marketing process and marketing of organic products [4] So the objective of the research was to study the constraint in consumption of Organic Products and Green marketing in the study area.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

In order to determine the methodical enquiry for objective elucidation, a research design is very essential. Thus an attempt had been framed which might include various types of sampling procedure, nature and resources of data and its collection and analytical tools that might be employed to accomplish the objective of the study [5]. The subjoined headings were added to fulfill the purpose to clarify and accomplish objective of the study.

- Sampling structure
- Data sources and nature of the relevant data

Sampling structure/Design: -

The total number of existing farmers were anticipated from the purposively selected blocks of Varanasi district which is also purposively selected for research purposes and 10 percent from them were selected randomly [10]. Similarly, primary data on use of organic fertilizer were estimated from local farmers (sample size might be 5 percent of the existing total farmers)

randomly selected from the lists which exist with gram Pradhan from arbitrarily preferred villages.

Table 1 Sampling structure/design: -

1 st stage	Selection of district	Purposively
2 nd stage	Selection of blocks	Purposively
3 rd stage	Selection of village	Randomly selected
4 th stage	Selection of farmers	Stratified random sampling
5 th stage	Selection of organic farmers	Snowball sampling
6 th stage	Selection of various organic product distributor from the study area	Randomly selected

Study Area

Studies were conducted conveniently in Varanasi district

Duration of Study: 2021-2022

Ist Stage - Selection of the District

Varanasi District were divided into 3 tehsils (Tehsil sadar, Tehsil Pindra and Tehsil Rajatalab) and 8 blocks. The reason for selection district were following

1. The researcher himself is familiar with the area.
2. The researcher is conversant with the local language, geography, agricultural situation and other aspects of the area.
3. The knowledge of tract was also helpful for collecting reliable information's.

IInd Stage - Selection of the Block

Varanasi district comprises of eight development blocks viz., Arajiline, Baragaon, Chiraigaon, Cholapur, Harhua, Kashi Vidhya Peeth, Pindara, Sewapuri. Out of these 8 blocks, 50 percent blocks namely Kashi Vidhyapeeth, Baragaon, Harhua and Pindara were selected purposively for the present study [11].

IIIrd Stage – Selection of the Villages

There were 1360 villages in Varanasi district. A complete list of villages was obtained from the respective selected block development offices. The villages were arranged in ascending order on the basis of their size of land holding in the block [6]. Then 10% villages from each block were selected randomly i.e. 63 villages. The round off villages from the Kashi Vidhyapeeth block was 13, Baragaon was 14, Harhua was 17 and 19 from pindara.

IVth and Vth stage

Farmers were distributed based on the landholding from Kashi vidhyapeeth block four were marginal, ten from small categories, thirty-two from Semi medium group, twenty-six from Medium group and four were large farmers. In Baragaon block ten respondent belong to marginal category, sixteen from small group, twenty-eight from Semi medium group, twenty-two from medium categories and six from large group. In Harahua block eight were marginal farmers, ten were small farmers, twenty-four from both Semi medium and medium group, and four from large group. From Pindara block twelve were from marginal group, Sixteen from small group, thirty-eight from Semi medium group, twenty-eight from medium group and ten from large group [12]

Statistical Tools

Frequency:

This measure was used to know the distribution pattern of respondent's variable wise and to categorize the problems perceived by respondents in order of importance.

Percentage Analysis Method: -

Formula: -

$$P = \frac{X}{N} * 100$$

Where;

P= Percentage

X= Frequencies

N= Total number of respondent

Likert Scale for consumer behaviour

“A Likert scale assumes that the strength/intensity of an attitude is linear, i.e., on a continuum from strongly agree to strongly disagree, and makes the assumption that attitudes can be measured. Likert Scales had the advantage that they do not expect a simple yes / no answer from the respondent but rather allow for degrees of opinion and even no opinion at all”. [7].

Garett's Ranking Techniques

“Garrett's Ranking Technique was applied to study the preference, change of orders of constraints and advantages into numerical scores. The prime advantage of this technique over simple frequency distribution is that the constraints were arranged based on their severity from the point of view of respondents” [9]. As per this method, respondents had been asked to assign the rank for all factors and the outcomes of such ranking had been converted into score value with the help of the following formula [9]:

$$\text{Percent position} = \frac{100 (R_{ij} - 0.5)}{N_j}$$

Where,

- R_{ij} = Rank given for the i th variable by j th respondents
- N_j = Number of variable ranked by j th respondents

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The Means of Consumption constraint was broadly based on Price of the product and its availability a total of 5 sub factor was identified, the Institutional Constraint were broadly based upon the awareness and efforts done by the institution there were 4 sub major constraint identified in institutional constraint, the social constraint was based on norms of the society and peer influence the last constraint was psychological constraint which was based on the attitude and behavior. The following information were obtained based on the study

Table 2 Ranking preference of respondent for Consumption

S.No	Constraint related to Consumption	Sample Size 332					Total
		RANKING PREFERNCE					
		I	II	III	IV	V	
1.	Lack of availability of certified organic products	56	60	71	70	75	332
2.	Organic products are not easily available	71	53	74	72	62	332
3.	Organic products are not timely available	51	73	51	71	86	332
4.	Less accessibility of organic products	63	61	66	70	72	332
5.	Price of organic products are much more than conventional product	91	85	70	49	37	332

Table 3: Estimation of Garret Value for each Percent Position value

Rank	Percent position for Garret value $=100(R_{ij}-0.5)/N_j$	GarretPercentage	Garret Value
I	$100(1-0.5)/5$	10	75
II	$100(2-0.5)/5$	30	60
III	$100(3-0.5)/5$	50	50
IV	$100(4-0.5)/5$	70	40
V	$100(5-0.5)/5$	90	24

Percent position value were calculated by considering the formula i.e., $100(R_{ij}-0.5)/N_j$; in order to evaluate the Garrett value, percent position value is essential to rank the exact causes for a particular phenomenon or problem.

This Table 3 described the percent position value of the total sample respondents. For each percent position value, Garrett value has been estimated by considering Garrett Ranking Conversion Table. Here, the 10 per cent position value the Garrett value has been nearest integer of the Garrett Ranking Conversion Table i.e., 75 and so on. This is because, Garrett value is essential for calculating the total score of the respondents by ranking on different factors of the phenomenon.

Table 4 : Overall Garret score

S. No	Constraint related to Consumption	Garret Score					Total
1.	Lack of availability of certified organic products	4200	3600	3550	2800	1800	15950
2.	Organic products are not easily available	5325	3180	3700	2880	1488	16573
3.	Organic products are not timely available	3825	4380	2550	2840	2064	15659
4.	Less accessibility of organic products	4725	3660	3300	2800	1728	16213
5.	Price of organic products are much more than conventional product	6825	5100	3500	1960	888	18273

The total score of each factor ranks have been estimated by multiplying Garrett value with the respective given value. Hence, the total score is essential to calculate the average score given by the total respondents under different factors of a particular phenomenon.

Table 4 described the calculation procedures of total Score of the sample respondents. The total score calculated by multiplying Garret Value with the respective rank given by the respondents on each factor of the sample. Hence, on the first rank the Garrett value is 75 and the number respondents given Rank 1 is 56. So, by multiplying this two, it is getting the total score i.e., 4200. Hence, all the estimation process going on the same direction on each and every factors with their respective rank given by the number of respondents.

Under Garrett value ranking techniques, average score has been calculated by dividing the total score with the total respondents of the selected sample. The highest percentage average score indicates the 1st rank whereas the lowest percentage average score indicates the last rank of the total estimated factors rank.

Table 5 Constraint related to Consumption

S.No	Means to consumption	Calculated value	Total Garret score	Garret score percentage	Rank
1.	Price of organic products are much more than conventional product	10	18273	55.03916	I

2.	Organic products are not easily available	30	16573	49.91867	II
3.	Less accessibility of organic products	50	16213	48.83434	III
4.	Lack of availability of certified organic products	70	15950	48.04217	IV
5.	Organic products are not timely available	90	15659	47.16566	V

The table 5 revealed the constraint in means of consumption, the “Price of organic products was much more than conventional product” was became a dominant constraint which rank I based on Garret score. The rank II was given to constraint “Organic products are not easily available” in the study area based on the Garret score, The IIIrd rank was given to “Less accessibility of organic products” in the study area based on the garret score. “Lack of availability of certified organic products was rank IV based on the garret score, the least constraint was “Organic products are not timely available” in the means of the consumption pattern. The results of this study was in concordance with the study of Chandrasekhar et.al. (2015) who explained that “consumers perceived that irregular availability higher price are main limiting factors in consuming organic products”. The results of this study was in concordance with the study of Chandrasekhar et.al. (2015) who explained that consumers perceived that irregular availability, higher price are main limiting factors in consuming organic products.

Table 6 Ranking preference of respondent for Institutional constraint

S.No	Constraints Related to Institution	Sample Size 332				Total
		RANKING PREFERNCE				
		I	II	III	IV	
1	Lack of govt. subsidies on organic products	78	79	95	80	332
2	Lack of national level standardization	83	73	87	89	332
3	Advisory information services is inadequate	77	90	86	79	332

	and inappropriate					
4	Lack of awareness regarding organic product and its importance	94	90	64	84	332

Table 7 Estimation of Garret Value for each Percent Position value

Rank	Percent position for Garret value $=100(R_{ij}-0.5)/N_j$	Garret Percentage	Garret Value
I	$100(1-0.5)/4$	12.5	73
II	$100(2-0.5)/4$	37.5	56
III	$100(3-0.5)/4$	62.5	44
IV	$100(4-0.5)/4$	87.5	27

Percent position value were calculated by considering the formula i.e., $100(R_{ij}-0.5)/N_j$ in order to evaluate the Garrett value, percent position value is essential to rank the exact causes for a particular phenomenon or problem.

This Table 7 described the percent position value of the total sample respondents. For each percent position value, Garrett value has been estimated by considering Garrett Ranking Conversion Table. Here, the 12.5 per cent position value the Garrett value has been nearest integer of the Garrett Ranking Conversion Table i.e., 73 and so on. This is because, Garrett value is essential for calculating the total score of the respondents by ranking on different factors of the phenomenon.

Table 8: Overall Garret score

S. No	Constraints Related to Institution	Garret Score				Total
1	Lack of govt. subsidies on organic products	5694	4424	4180	2160	16458
2	Lack of national level standardization	6059	4088	3828	2403	16378
3	Advisory information services is inadequate and inappropriate	5621	5040	3784	2133	16578
4	Lack of awareness regarding organic product	6862	5040	2816	2268	16986

	and its importance					
--	--------------------	--	--	--	--	--

The total score of each factor ranks have been estimated by multiplying Garrett value with the respective given value. Hence, the total score is essential to calculate the average score given by the total respondents under different factors of a particular phenomenon.

Table 8 described the calculation procedures of total Score of the sample respondents. The total score calculated by multiplying Garret Value with the respective rank given by the respondents on each factor of the sample. Hence, on the first rank the Garrett value is 73 and the number respondents given Rank 1 is 78. So, by multiplying this two, it is getting the total score i.e., 5694. Hence, all the estimation process going on the same direction on each and every factors with their respective rank given by the number of respondents.

Under Garrett value ranking techniques, average score has been calculated by dividing the total score with the total respondents of the selected sample. The highest percentage average score indicates the 1st rank whereas the lowest percentage average score indicates the last rank of the total estimated factors rank.

Table 9 Constraints Related to Institution

S.No	Institutional constraints	Calculated value	Garret score	Garret score percentage	Rank
1	Lack of awareness regarding organic product green marketing and its importance	12.5	16986	51.16265	I
2	Advisory information services is inadequate and inappropriate	37.5	16578	49.93373	II
3	Lack of govt. subsidies on organic products	62.5	16458	49.57229	III
4	Lack of national level standardization for the products	87.5	16378	49.33133	IV

Table 9 mention Institutional constraints related to green marketing and organic product consumption. Under this four constraint items were listed. The Rank I was given by respondent to the statement “Lack of awareness regarding organic product, green marketing and its importance” based on the garret score followed by “Advisory information services is inadequate and inappropriate in the study area” was rank II based on the garret score. The III rank was given to the statement “Lack of government subsidies on organic products in the study area”, “Lack of national level standardization for the organic products” were the last constraint in the category of Institutional constraint.

Table 10 Ranking preference of respondent for Social constraint

S.No	Social Constraint	Sample Size 332		Total
		RANKING PREFERENCE		
		I	II	
1	Rigid norms of social system regarding food habits	189	143	332
2	Peer groups are not supportive in nature	143	189	332

Table 11: Estimation of Garret Value for each Percent Position value

Rank	Percent position for Garret value $=100(R_{ij}-0.5)/N_j$	Garret percentage	Garret Value
I	$100(1-0.5)/2$	25	63
II	$100(2-0.5)/2$	75	37

Percent position value were calculated by considering the formula i.e., $100(R_{ij}-0.5)/N_j$ in order to evaluate the Garret value, percent position value is essential to rank the exact causes for a particular phenomenon or problem.

This Table 11 described the percent position value of the total sample respondents. For each percent position value, Garret value has been estimated by considering Garret Ranking Conversion Table. Here, the 25 per cent position value the Garret value has been nearest integer of the Garret Ranking Conversion Table i.e., 63 and so on. This is because, Garret value is

essential for calculating the total score of the respondents by ranking on different factors of the phenomenon.

Table 12: Overall Garret score

S.No	Social Constraint	Garret Score		Total
1.	Rigid norms of social system regarding food habits	11907	5291	17198
2.	Peer groups are not supportive in nature	9009	6993	16002

The total score of each factor ranks have been estimated by multiplying Garrett value with the respective given value. Hence, the total score is essential to calculate the average score given by the total respondents under different factors of a particular phenomenon.

Table 12 described the calculation procedures of total Score of the sample respondents. The total score calculated by multiplying Garret Value with the respective rank given by the respondents on each factor of the sample. Hence, on the first rank the Garrett value is 63 and the number respondents given Rank 1 is 189. So, by multiplying this two, it is getting the total score i.e., 11907. Hence, all the estimation process going on the same direction on each and every factors with their respective rank given by the number of respondents.

Under Garrett value ranking techniques, average score has been calculated by dividing the total score with the total respondents of the selected sample. The highest percentage average score indicates the 1st rank whereas the lowest percentage average score indicates the last rank of the total estimated factors rank.

Table 13 Social Constraint in the study Area

S.No	Social constraints	Calculated value	Total Garret score	Garret score percentage	Rank
1	Rigid norms of social system regarding food habits	25	17198	51.8012	I
2	Peer groups are not	75	16002	48.1988	II

	supportive in nature				
--	----------------------	--	--	--	--

Table 13 mentioned the social constraint in the study area the major constraint was rigid norms regarding the food habit which was rank I based on garret score by the respondent the rank II was given to the statement “Peer groups are not supportive in nature” This study revealed the fact that people in the study area are still believe that conventional products are better than organic product and they do not want to modify prevailing track.

Table 14 Ranking preference of respondent for Psychological constraint

S.No	Psychological Constraint	Sample Size 332				Total
		RANKING PREFERNCE				
		I	II	III	IV	
1	Mental barrier that malnutrition/health hazards are inevitable	72	75	93	92	332
2	Lack of good perception regarding benefits of organicproduct consumption	88	87	76	81	332
3	Negative attitude towards organic products	84	79	77	92	332
4	Lack of willingness to consume organic products	88	91	86	67	332

Table 15: Estimation of Garret Value for each Percent Position value

Rank	Percent position for Garret value $=100(R_{ij}-0.5)/N_j$	Garret percentage	Garret Value
I	$100(1-0.5)/4$	12.5	73
II	$100(2-0.5)/4$	37.5	56
III	$100(3-0.5)/4$	62.5	44

IV	$100(4-0.5)/4$	87.5	27
----	----------------	------	----

Percent position value were calculated by considering the formula i.e., $100(R_{ij}-0.5)/N_j$ in order to evaluate the Garrett value, percent position value is essential to rank the exact causes for a particular phenomenon or problem [8].

This Table 15 described the percent position value of the total sample respondents. For each percent position value, Garrett value has been estimated by considering Garrett Ranking Conversion Table. Here, the 12.5 per cent position value the Garrett value has been nearest integer of the Garrett Ranking Conversion Table i.e., 73 and so on. This is because, Garrett value is essential for calculating the total score of the respondents by ranking on different factors of the phenomenon.

Table 16: Overall Garret score

S.No	Psychological Constraint	Garret Score				Total
1.	Mental barrier that malnutrition/health hazards are inevitable	5256	4200	4092	2484	16032
2.	Lack of good perception regarding benefits of organic product consumption	6424	4872	3344	2187	16827
3.	Negative attitude towards organic products	6132	4424	3388	2484	16428
4.	Lack of willingness to consume organic products	6424	5096	3784	1809	17113

The total score of each factor ranks have been estimated by multiplying Garrett value with the respective given value. Hence, the total score is essential to calculate the average score given by the total respondents under different factors of a particular phenomenon.

Table 16 described the calculation procedures of total Score of the sample respondents. The total score calculated by multiplying Garret Value with the respective rank given by the respondents on each factor of the sample. Hence, on the first rank the Garrett value is 73 and the number respondents given Rank 1 is 72. So, by multiplying this two, it is getting the total score i.e., 5256. Hence, all the estimation process going on the same direction on each and every factors with their respective rank given by the number of respondents.

Under Garrett value ranking techniques, average score has been calculated by dividing the total score with the total respondents of the selected sample. The highest percentage average score

indicates the 1st rank whereas the lowest percentage average score indicates the last rank of the total estimated factors rank.

Table 17 Psychological Constraint in the study area

S.No	Psychological constraints	Calculated value	Total Garret score	Garret score percentage	Rank
1	Lack of willingness to consume organic products	12.5	17113	51.54518	I
2	Lack of good perception regarding benefits of organic product consumption	37.5	16827	50.68373	II
3	Negative attitude towards organic products	62.5	16428	49.48193	III
4	Mental barrier that malnutrition/health hazards are inevitable	87.5	16032	48.28916	IV

The table 17 mentioned the psychological constraint in the study area, “Lack of willingness to consume organic products” were given the top rank in the constraint based on Garret score, “Need of great recognition with respect to the benefits of organic product” were given rank II based on the garret score. The third rank was given to the statement “Negative attitude towards organic products” and the fourth rank was given to the statement “Psychological barrier that health hazards are inevitable” based on the Garret score. The result of this constraint were found similar with the findings of Uma. R. and V. Selvam (2016) in research work.

CONCLUSION

“Price of organic products was much more than conventional product” was became a dominant constraint which rank I based on Garret score. The rank II was given to constraint “Organic products were not easily available” in the study area based on the Garret score, The IIIrd rank was given to “Less accessibility of organic products” in the study area based on the garret score.

“Lack of availability of certified organic products was rank IV based on the garret score, the least constraint was “Organic products were not timely available” in the means of the consumption pattern. Institutional constraints related to green marketing and organic product consumption can be operationalized as the gap in the part of institutions in proper information and service delivery to the people related to organic products and green marketing. Under this broad heading, four constraint items were listed. The Rank I was given by respondent to the statement “Lack of awareness regarding organic product, green marketing and its importance” based on the garret score followed by “Advisory information services is inadequate and inappropriate in the study area” was rank II based on the garret score. The III rank was given to the statement “Lack of government subsidies on organic products in the study area”, “Lack of national level standardization for the organic products” were the last constraint in the category of Institutional constraint. Social constraint in the study area the major constraint was rigid norms regarding the food habit which was rank I based on garret score by the respondent the rank II was given to the statement “Peer groups were not supportive in nature” Psychological constraint in the study area, “Lack of willingness to consume organic products” were given the top rank in the constraint based on Garret score, “Lack of good perception regarding benefits of organic product consumption” were given rank II based on the garret score. The third rank was given to the statement “Negative attitude towards organic products” and the fourth rank was given to the statement “Mental barrier that malnutrition or health hazards were inevitable in nature” based on the Garret score.

REFERENCES

1. Dwivedi Sudhakar, Sharma Sabbey, Kachroo Jyoti and Isher Ashish Kumar (2020): A Comparative Study on Farmers Buying Pattern towards Chemical and Bio Fertilizers *Agro Economist - An International Journal Citation: AE: 7(2): 159-162, December 2020* DOI: 10.30954/2394-8159.02.2020.12
2. FuiYeng Wong & Yazdanifard Rashad (2015): Green Marketing: A Study of Consumers' Buying Behavior in Relation to Green Products *Global Journal of Management and Business Research: E Marketing* Volume 15 Issue 5 Version 1.0 Year 2015

3. Ghanghas,B(2019).ReasonsforDiscontinuationofPolyhouseCultivationbyFarmersin Haryana. *Journal of Community Mobilization and Sustainable Development*, 121-126.
4. Govender Jeevarathnam P.and Govender Tushya L. Govender (2016): The influence of green marketing on consumer purchase behavior *Environmental Economics*, Volume 7, Issue 2, 2016.
5. Hakim Iqbal Ahmed and Shafi Shabina (2019): Present Scenario of Green Marketing in India: A Review *BEST: International Journal of Management Information Technology and Engineering (BEST: IJMITE)* ISSN (P): 2348–0513, ISSN (E): 2454–471X Vol. 7, Issue 11, Nov 2019, 1–6
6. Hamid Naveed (2017): Assessment of Green Marketing Impact on Consumer Attitude and Buying Behaviour in Jammu *International Journal of Technical Research & Science* pg. 409 Paper Id: IJTRS-V2-I6-006 Volume 2 Issue VI, July 2017 @2017, IJTRS ISSN No.: 2454- 2024 (online)
7. Hussain Md. Alamgir, Hossain Md. Zahangir and Islam Md. Matiul (2017) Farmers' Perception Regarding Effect of Chemical Fertilizer Application on Soil Health Bangladesh *Journal of Soil Science*.39 (1): 35-41,2017
8. Ismail Albert Feisal, Leong Ong Chee, Fazli Mohd, Sam Mohd, Pei Cheng Si (2018) Investigating the impact of green marketing on consumer's purchasing behaviour towards ecofriendly Products *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, Volume 7, Number 1, 2018, 170- 178p.
9. Janjhua Yasmin, Chaudhary Rashmi, Mehta Piyush and Kumar Krishan (2019): Determinants of Farmer's Attitude toward Organic Agriculture and Barriers for Converting to Organic Farming Systems: *Research Insights, International Journal of Economic Plants* 2019, 6(2):097-103.
10. Iqbal A, Kazmi SQ, Anwar A, Ramish MS, Salam A. Impact of Green Marketing On Green Purchase Intention And Green Consumption Behavior: The Moderating Role Of Green Concern. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*. 2023 Feb 24:975-93.
11. Borah PS, Dogbe CS, Pomegbe WW, Bamfo BA, Hornuvo LK. Green market orientation, green innovation capability, green knowledge acquisition and green brand positioning as determinants of new product success. *European Journal of Innovation Management*. 2023 Mar 8;26(2):364-85.

12. Rahman SU, Nguyen- Viet B. Towards sustainable development: Coupling green marketing strategies and consumer perceptions in addressing greenwashing. *Business Strategy and the Environment*. 2023 May;32(4):2420-33.

UNDER PEER REVIEW