Available online @ www.iaraindia.com
SELP Journal of Social Science - A Blind Review & Refereed Quarterly Journal
ISSN: 0975-9999 (P) 2349-1655 (O) Impact Factor: 5.650 (I2OR), 4.111 (COSMOS), 2.5 (JIF), 2.77 (NAAS)
Volume XVII, Issue 67, October – December 2026
Formally UGC Approved Journal (46622), © Author

A CONCEPTUAL STUDY ON THE CARBON-BASED FORTIFYING PURCHASING BEHAVIOUR

Dr. T. MARISELVAM
Assistant Professor
PG and Research Department of Commerce
St.Thomas College of Arts and Science, Koyambedu, Chennai, Tamilnadu

ABSTRACT

Consumers purchase fortifying food because they believe in its superior quality and are willing to pay a premium for the perceived benefits associated with organic products and their production processes. Furthermore, the European Union's regulatory framework for organic farming and food production identifies the production of high-quality products as one of its key objectives (EC Regulation No. 834/2007). However, some recent studies comparing organically and conventionally produced foods have not consistently confirmed the expected superiority of organic products in terms of various nutritional components. This paper adopts a conceptual approach based on a review of existing literature. The emerging themes identified through the review will help guide future research and highlight key variables and factors that warrant further investigation by identifying gaps in the existing literature. Additionally, the findings may provide a foundation for longitudinal research and phenomenological studies to gain deeper insights into consumer perceptions, experiences, and attitudes toward natural food.

KEYWORDS: Fortifying, Customers, Purchase, audit based, Behaviour.

INTRODUCTION

Customers purchase fortifying food since they have faith in the high caliber of the item. They are eager to pay for a normal 'in addition to' in fortifying item and procedure quality. Moreover, the EU lawful administrative structure for fortifying food and farming characterizes excellent items as a significant objective of production (EC Regulation 834/2007). In any case, a portion of the ongoing exploration discoveries looking at distinctively developed food don't affirm this 'extra' for fortifying items in a scope of food constituents. However, these outcomes are not without debate and are dependent upon talk. The majority of the looked into papers report noteworthy contrasts with respect to dry issue, absolute sugars, nutrient C and polyphenolic substances among fortifying ally and traditionally created vegetables and natural products. In any case, most creators concur that the effect of these distinctions on human wellbeing is as yet obscure. Different examinations, concentrating more on undesired mixes in food, for example, buildups, found critical differences.9,10 The inquiry is whether fortifying food quality ought to be characterized distinctly as per single food constituents or whether these mixes can be viewed as pointers for a portion of the item situated quality criteria of fortifying food. For quite a long while, FQH (Fortifying Food Quality and Health Association, http://www.fortifyingfqhresearch.org) individuals, who are specialists from various controls, have been taking a shot at these fortifying food quality criteria issues. A noteworthy test is the need to characterize food quality ideas and strategies for deciding quality.

This is audit based theoretical paper. The Pattern rising up out of audit will establish the course of future inquiries about and furthermore would investigate the parameters or factors for further investigation by discovering exploration holes. The investigation can likewise prompt

longitudinal examinations and phenomenological thinks about with suggestions in Fortifying Food.

MEANING OF FORTIFYING

Padiya J. (2012), informed that the expression "fortifying" alludes to the manner in which farming items are developed and prepared. While The guidelines fluctuate from nation to nation, in the U.S., fortifying yields must be developed Without the utilization of manufactured pesticides, bioengineered qualities (GMOs), oil-based Fertilizers and sewage sludge based composts. Raghavan (2013), saw that Fortifying domesticated animals raised for meat, eggs, and dairy items must approach the Outdoors and be given fortifying feed. They may not be given anti-toxins, development hormones, or any creature side-effects.

IMPORTANCE OF FORTIFYING

Balaji and Bhama (2012), closes when all is said in done, an individual's personality, in connection to their decision of eating regimen, can be viewed as being subject to early encounters of food, as far as directions, for example, determined musings, sentiments, systems, and activities, Therefore, picking a way of life dependent on an fortifying eating routine could recommend a chance to build up a feeling of dependability for the youthful grown-up, regarding character and having a place.

By and by, directions and decision of eating routine can change during an individual's life expectancy, particularly in connection to emotional life occasions made by the interaction between connections, settings, and conditions; the point of this specific investigation was to further investigate youthful adults‟ encounters of a solid direction for living dependent on an fortifying eating routine so as to find general mental implications.

The type of agriculture that depends on methods, for example, crop revolution, green fertilizer, manure and natural nuisance control is known as 'Fortifying Farming'. Wendell Berry, the American author, artist, ecological lobbyist and rancher characterizes it as, "A fortifying homestead, appropriately, isn't one that uses certain strategies and substances and keeps away from others; it is a homestead whose structure is framed in impersonation of the structure of a characteristic framework that has the uprightness, the autonomy and the considerate reliance of a life form".

A report by Britain‟s Soil Association demonstrates that untamed life is generously more extravagant and more differed on fortifying than on traditional homesteads. A commonplace fortifying field has five-fold the number of wild plants, 57% more species, and 44% a greater number of flying creatures in developed regions than a standard homestead. Two 1996 investigations demonstrate that fortifying ranches have twice the same number of skylarks, and twice the same number of butterflies. Each time we eat an fortifying lettuce or tomato, we help reestablish natural life. With the fortifying ranches outflanking all others in supporting biodiversity, an ever-increasing number of nations are going towards rehearsing fortifying farming.

In an ongoing report, Scottish researchers found that fortifying vegetable soups contain right around six fold the amount of salicylic corrosive as non-fortifying vegetable soups. Eleven brands of fortifying soup had 117 monograms for every gram, versus only 20 monograms in 24 sorts of non-fortifying soup. Voon et. Al. (2011) summarized that Salicylic corrosive is the fundamental fixing in ibuprofen; it helps battle solidifying of the veins and inside malignancy, and is delivered normally in plants as a safeguard against pressure and infection. In the event that plants don’t need to oppose bugs as a result of pesticide use, they create less salicylic corrosive, and pass less on to us. Similar researchers found essentially higher groupings of salicylic corrosive in the blood of veggie lover Buddhist priests, contrasted and meat-eaters.

FORTIFYING FARMING AND FOOD

In dry season conditions in an audit of relative investigations of grain and soybean creation in the US Midwest, fortifying cultivators delivered higher yields in drier atmospheres and during dry seasons (and comparative yields in ordinary conditions). Similar outcomes were found in the

Rodale analyze. Fraz et.al. (2007) saw that the Fortifying issue makes the dirt not so much smaller but rather more dampness retentive, enabling the roots to enter all the more profoundly to discover water.

Ajzen.I (2002) disclosed to Fortifying farming creates more occupations, delivers more benefits, and doesn‟t contaminates groundwater with nitrogen run-off. It additionally maintains a strategic distance from every one of the dangers related with GM crops. Be that as it may, lets complete with the motivation behind why numerous individuals start eating fortifying food – on the grounds that they trust it is more secure. Ranchers in Canada, Kansas and Nebraska who utilize the pesticide 2,4-D endure a higher pace of non-Hodgkin‟s lymphoma (a malignant growth). The equivalent applies to hounds which play on yards that have been showered. In Sweden, introduction to phenoxy herbicides has been appeared to expand the danger of contracting lymphomas six-crease. In the US, the demise rates from myeloma (a malignant growth) are most elevated in provincial farming zones. Thus it goes on. Vagrant ranch laborers endure an anomalous high pace of numerous myeloma, stomach, prostate and testicular malignancy. Fotopoulos et.al. (2002) study demonstrates that Fortifying farming conveys none of these dangers. There is a solid relationship between bosom malignant growth and introduction to compound pesticides. Atrazine, a typical fixing in pesticides, causes bosom malignancy in rodents, chromosomal breakdown in the ovaries of hamsters, and rear appendage distortions in frogs.

CONCLUSION

Fortifying food is identified with quality desires and guarantees. Quality can be characterized by procedure and product related angles which are depicted and evaluated through criteria, markers and parameters. In this paper these various issues were coordinated in a calculated system, which contains the basic standards and beginning definitions. Further work must be done on a point-by-point logical depiction of the markers, for various item gatherings. Moreover, parameters must be characterized for the assessment of these pointers. This must be proceeded in testing different techniques for their appropriateness (for example on tangible observation) as well as growing new strategies covering the particular assignment.

REFERENCE

1. Angkumchaliang, P. and Huang, W.C (2012), “ Consumer‟s Perceptions and Attitudes of Fortifying Food products in Northern Ireland”, International Food and Agribusiness Management Review, Vol.15 (1),pp. 87-102.
2. Arunkumar G (2018), Direct Benefit Transfer- An Innovative Approach to Financial Inclusion in India, JETIR, 5(12).
3. Attanasio Sonia, Carelli Angela, Cappelli Lucio and Papetti Patrizia (2013), “Fortifying Food: A Study On Demographic Characteristics And Factors Influencing Purchase Intentions Among Consumers In Pontina Province”, International Journal of Latest Research in Science and Technology ISSN (Online):2278-5299 Volume 2, Issue 6: Page No.128-132.
4. Balaji, V. and Bhama, T. (2012), “ Consumer perception toward fortifying food products in India”, Proceedings of the International Conference on Business Management and Information Systems 2012, pp. 303-307.
5. Basha Mohamed Bilal, Mason Cordelia, Shamsudin Mohd Farid, Iqbal Hussain1 Hafezali, Abdelnabi Salem1 Milad and Ali Azlan (2015), “ Consumer Acceptance Towards Fortifying Food”, Global Journal Of Interdisplinary social Science, G.J.I.S.S.,Vol.4(3):29-32 (May-June, 2015) ISSN: 2319-8834.
6. Mari Selvam, P. (2021). Role and Performance of MSME Sector in India. Research Explorer, 9(31), 31-35.
7. Padiya, J. and Vala, N. (2012),” Profiling of fortifying Food Buyers in Ahmedabad City: An Empirical Study.”, Pacific Business Review International, vol.5 (1), pp.19-26.
8. Paramasivan C (2011), Research Methodology for Commerce and Management, Regal Publications, ISBN: 9788184841183.

9. Paramasivan C, Anandaraman R (2012), Micro Finance by Banks in India, Research Explorer, 1(2), 16-19.
10. Paul,Justin and Rana Jyoti (2012), "Consumer behavior and purchase intention for fortifying food", Journal of Consumer Marketing, Vol. 29 Iss: 6 pp. 412 – 422.
11. Raghavan, N. and Mageh, R. (2013),” A Study On Consumer‟s Purchase Intension toward Fortifying products”, Indian Journal of research, Vol.2(1), pp.111-114.
12. Raza Ali (2014), “A Study on the Relationship between Consumer Attitude, Perceived Value and Green Products”, Iranian Journal of Management Studies (IJMS),Vol. 7, No. 2, pp: 329-342.
13. Rianto Heru (2015), “Consumers' Attitude and Intention Towards Fortifying FoodPurchase: An Extension of Theory of Planned Behavior in Gender Perspective”, International Journal of Management, Economics and Social Sciences, Vol. 4(1), pp.17-31.
14. Roussean Sandra and Vranken Liesbet (2011),”The Impact of Information on the Willingness-to-Pay for Labeled Fortifying Food Products”, LICOS Discussion Paper series, Discussion paper 284/2011
15. S.V.Ramesh and M.Divya . (2015), “A study on consumers‟ awareness attitude and satisfaction towards select fortifying food products with reference to Coimbatore”, International Journal of Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Studies (IJIMS), Vol 2, No.4, 81-84.
16. Sakthirama, V. and Venkataram, R. (2012), “ A Structural Analysis of Purchase Intension of Fortifying consumers”, International journal Of Management, Vol.3 (2), pp. 401-410.
17. Soni Priya and Jatana Renu (2015), “CONSUMER PERCEPTION TOWARDS FORTIFYING FOOD PRODUCTS (OFPS) IN INDIA: WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO UDAIPUR CITY”, international Journal Of Research In computer Application and Management, Volume NO. 5, Issue No. 01 (January) ISSN 2231-1009.