

# BMJ Open Consumers' consciousness of health-friendly products and services and its association with sociodemographic characteristics and health status: a cross-sectional survey of the South Korean population

Young Ho Yun <sup>1</sup>, Jin Ah Sim,<sup>1</sup> Yaeji Kim,<sup>2</sup> Sujee Lee,<sup>3</sup> Kyoung-Nam Kim<sup>4</sup>

**To cite:** Yun YH, Sim JA, Kim Y, *et al.* Consumers' consciousness of health-friendly products and services and its association with sociodemographic characteristics and health status: a cross-sectional survey of the South Korean population. *BMJ Open* 2020;**10**:e035591. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-035591

► Prepublication history for this paper is available online. To view these files, please visit the journal online (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-035591>).

Received 07 November 2019  
Revised 07 May 2020  
Accepted 07 May 2020



© Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2020. Re-use permitted under CC BY-NC. No commercial re-use. See rights and permissions. Published by BMJ.

For numbered affiliations see end of article.

**Correspondence to**  
Professor Young Ho Yun;  
[lawyun08@gmail.com](mailto:lawyun08@gmail.com)

## ABSTRACT

**Objectives** To identify consumers' consciousness of health-friendly products and services (consumer reaction, purchase intention and willingness to pay more) and its association with sociodemographic characteristics and multidimensional health status.

**Methods** From March to May 2018, we administered questionnaires to 1200 individuals from the general Korean population asking about their perception of health-friendly labels, and if they would purchase such labelled products (foods, pharmaceuticals, etc) and services (purifying water, preventing air pollution, etc) at extra cost.

**Results** The participants placed a high value on the importance of mental, social, spiritual and physical health factors in terms of the company's products and services with a score of about 8 out of 10 (range, 7.74–8.33). Most respondents (72.4%) said that they were interested in adopting health-friendly labels. When a health-friendly label is introduced (such as one by the Business for Social Responsiveness), 65.1% of the respondents said that they intended to purchase the product or service, while 6.8% said that they did not and 75.0% said that they were willing to pay extra for the health-friendly product or service. Multivariate logistic regression models showed urban residence, high education level and good social health to be significantly associated with positive attitudes towards health-friendly labels. People with high income, no religion or normal weight were more likely to say that they intend to purchase products and services with health-friendly labels. They also had a more positive attitude towards paying more for such products and services, as did people with good spiritual health.

**Conclusion** This study provides data that illustrate the importance of health-friendly products and services to the general population and companies.

## INTRODUCTION


In 1948, the WHO Constitution defined health as 'a state of complete physical, social, and mental well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity'. In recent

## Strengths and limitations of this study

- Consumers nowadays are interested in whether a company cares about consumers' health and wellness. Given such an increasing consensus, we proposed the concept of health-friendly management, and thereby aimed to better understand consumers' perception of health-friendly labels and their purchase behaviour of health-friendly labelled products and services.
- We propose here the concept of 'health-friendly management', which refers to the promotion of various healthful components, or the avoidance of harmful components, whether they affect the physical, mental, social or spiritual aspects of health.
- However, since the current study is based on cross-sectional data, we could not conclude the causality between one's attitude towards health-friendly labels and the intent to purchase health-friendly products or services.

years, health has been viewed as having four aspects—body, mind, social and spiritual.<sup>1</sup> Health is determined somewhat by genetics and medical care, but mostly by behaviour and social conditions. Healthcare policy, however, does not accommodate that observation.<sup>2</sup> In the USA, for example, approximately 95% of the health budget goes to medical care services, while only 5% is allocated to population-based approaches for health improvement.<sup>3</sup>

There is an increasing awareness of the importance of social and environmental factors on health and that health is the responsibility of both the government and the private sector.<sup>4</sup> Although current health policy focuses mainly on the role of the government, companies can play an



**Figure 1** The conceptual model for how demographic and health behaviours and health status are related to consciousness of health-friendly products and services.

important role in building a framework of health ecosystems.<sup>4</sup> Just as companies can influence the health of employees and customers, they can also address corporate social responsibility (CSR). Usually, however, CSR efforts focus on philanthropy and are undertaken largely to meet legal requirements or avoid penalties.<sup>5</sup> But CSR can have a more strategic role by using the company's core systems to create business and express social value by addressing the issue of population health.<sup>4,6</sup> According to Porter and Kramer, 'The concept of shared values can be defined as policies and operating practices that enhance the competitiveness of a company while simultaneously advancing the economic and social conditions of the communities in which it operates'.<sup>6,7</sup> Some companies, such as PepsiCo,<sup>8</sup> Qualcomm Incorporated,<sup>9</sup> Walmart<sup>10</sup> and General Electric,<sup>6</sup> found new business opportunities that could prevent or solve specific health challenges.<sup>4</sup> Overall, a few companies outside the food, beverage and agriculture industries are trying to improve customers' health and wellness.<sup>4</sup> Many sustainability and corporate responsibility programmes are 'less bad' rather than 'good'.<sup>5</sup>


According to Business for Social Responsibility, consumers nowadays are interested in whether a company cares about their health and wellness, health-friendly product and service.<sup>4</sup> For example, consumers can easily accept to buy innovative functional foods with health effects and increasing interest in health might drive a growth in demand for functional health foods with radical innovations.<sup>11</sup> A famous example is the announcement Walmart made at the White House together with then-First Lady Michelle Obama. Walmart company would open 300 stores to serve the U.S. Department of Agriculture's designated food desert areas to provide easy access to fresh, affordable and nutritious food to foster healthier communities.<sup>10</sup> There is a significant stream

of research covering health labelling and its impact on consumer choice.<sup>12-14</sup> For example, frequent users of nutrition labels were less likely to consume unhealthy indicator foods<sup>13</sup>

Some studies of consumer purchase decision models indicate that consumer purchase intentions greatly depend on health and price consciousness and on a health label and they are uneven across different market segments and cultures.<sup>15-18</sup> Although some studies have investigated the perception and purchase of organic products and eco-labels, few have investigated the same concept on health.<sup>17,19-21</sup> Earlier studies have shown that consumer's sociodemographic characteristics,<sup>20,22</sup> such as age, sex, education and income, and their health status influenced their attitude towards health-friendly products and services (consumer reaction, purchase intention and willingness to pay more).<sup>17,18,20-27</sup> Thus, in this study, we aimed to understand consumer perception of health-friendly labels and their purchasing behaviour of health-friendly labelled products and services, and to identify associated factors.

We propose here the concept of 'health-friendly management', which refers to the promotion of various healthful components, or the avoidance of harmful components, whether they affect the physical, mental, social or spiritual aspects of health.

To eliminate factors that may impair health, it is necessary for health-friendly products and services to meet safety regulations through quality control of raw materials, minimisation of harmful elements or the improvement of mental, social and spiritual health. Health-friendly management, thus, deals with health-friendly products and services as a corporate responsibility. From our literature review, we hypothesised that consumer's demographic characteristics such as education and income and their health status might influence their attitude towards health-friendly products



**Figure 2** Proportions about participants' idea about health-friendly labelled products or services. (A) Consumer reaction about health-friendly labelled products or services. (B) Purchase intention for health-friendly labelled products or services. (C) Willing to pay more for the health-friendly labelled products or services.

and services (consumer reaction, purchase intention and willingness to pay more) [figure 1](#).<sup>17 18 20–27</sup>

## METHODS

### Patient and public involvement

Data were collected from a broader general Korean population targeted in the survey. First, the survey was conducted with the general population aged 20–70 years and residing across 17 major cities and local districts from March to May 2018. In each major city and local district, all participants were recruited taking the age and sex strata by region into account and applying probability proportion-to-size sampling in accordance with the 2016 Korean census. We used a probability-proportional-to-size technique for sample selection to select a representative national sample, particularly when the sample groups differ in size.<sup>28</sup> Among 4000 eligible persons, 1200 people (30% response rate) of them responded to the self-reported questionnaire in the presence of the interviewer who could provide further explanation on the study. This method is widely used by trained research assistants who

administered a semistructured, self-reported questionnaire. The World Research Co. (Seoul, Korea) conducted the survey. All recruiters provided informed consent.

### Measurement

The survey items were formulated on the basis of published studies.<sup>29–32</sup> Accordingly, these three items were generated: (1) How would you feel about companies when you see their health-friendly labelled products or services?<sup>28</sup> The participants could respond with one of the following: 'They are trustworthy', 'They care about consumers' health', 'The cost is high' or 'No special feeling'. (2) Would you prefer the health-friendly labelled products or services to others not so labelled?<sup>28 31</sup> (5-point Likert scale with 1, not at all; 2, a little; 3, moderate; 4, quite a bit and 5, very much) (3) Would you be willing to pay more for the health-friendly labelled product or service? If so, how much more compared with the label-free product price?<sup>29–31</sup> (1, no more; 2, <5%; 3, 5%–10%; 4, 11%–15%; 5, 16%–20% and 6, >21%) ([figure 2](#)). To measure the impact of different aspects of health status on health-friendly consciousness, we assessed the

**Table 1** Sociodemographic characteristics of participants

Variable		Study participants *		Korea population
		N=1200	%	%
Sex	Male	592	49.3	49.9
	Female	608	50.7	50.1
Age, years	20–29	194	16.2	15.9
	30–39	212	17.7	16.4
	40–49	249	20.8	19.6
	50–59	239	19.9	20.2
	≥60	306	25.5	27.9
Religion	Protestantism	213	17.8	19.7
	Buddhism	178	14.8	15.5
	Catholic	98	8.2	7.9
	No religion	709	59.1	56.1
	Other	2	0.2	0.8
Marriage	Married	884	73.7	55.8
	Widowed	34	2.8	3.5
	Divorced/separated	17	1.4	1.9
	Single	265	22.1	38.6
Education	Non-schooled	5	0.4	12.0
	Elementary school graduate	27	2.3	
	Middle school graduate	92	7.7	
	High school graduate	537	44.8	39.0
	College degree or higher	539	44.9	48.0
	Metropolitan	543	45.3	91.8
Residence	Urban	592	49.3	
	Rural	65	5.4	8.2
	≤1 000 000	30	2.5	6.2
Monthly income, KRW (1000 KRW=US\$0.9)	1 000 000–1 999 999	89	7.4	15.2
	2 000 000–2 999 999	188	15.6	18.9
	3 000 000–3 999 999	344	28.7	17.7
	≥4 999 999	543	45.3	42.2
	Own business	291	24.3	21.0
Job status	Employed	549	45.8	39.7
	Unemployed	342	28.5	39.3
	Retired	18	1.5	
	<18.5	41	3.4	3.6
BMI	18.5–23.49	686	57.4	58.1
	23.5–24.99	245	20.5	
	≥25	224	18.7	38.3

\*Data for the Korean population (2013–2019) were obtained from Statistics Korea.  
BMI, body mass index.

respondents' health on the basis of a holistic point of view.<sup>1</sup> The items measuring physical, mental, social and spiritual health status were applied as follows (0=not at all helpful, 10=very helpful): 'Physical health is the state of having normal physical strength, without diseases and

injuries. What do you think about your physical health status?' 'Mental health is the state of being mentally stable, being able to overcome stress. What do you think about your mental health status?' 'Social health is the state of having good social relationships, carrying out one's work properly. What do you think about your social health status?' 'Spiritual health is the state of adding meaning to life through volunteering, religious experiences and meditation. What do you think about your spiritual health status?' In addition, we measured general health status with the following question: 'Considering your physical, mental, social, and spiritual health status, what do you think about your health status in general?' All the items used a 5-point Likert scale with 'excellent', 'very good', 'good', 'poor' and 'bad'.

In addition, the respondents were asked which subscales of each health aspect they considered important for the pursuit of a company's health-friendly products or services. They were given the subscales of four health aspects (five subscales each) and asked to rate the importance of each on a scale of 0–10. The respondents' sociodemographic and health information we collected included age, sex, residence, religion, marital status, education, monthly income, job status, body mass index (BMI), comorbidities and smoking experience.

### Statistical analysis

Using descriptive statistics for the sociodemographic variables, we calculated the mean±SD scores of the importance of the impact of the four health factors (physical, mental, social and spiritual) for corporations that made health-friendly products or services. To test the reliability of the variables of health-friendly activities, we estimated Cronbach's  $\alpha$ , which is a measure of internal consistency of patient responses. Then we performed univariate analyses to measure sociodemographic correlates for each aspect of health consciousness (consumer reaction, purchase intention and willingness to pay more). For the sociodemographic factors significantly associated with univariate analysis, we performed multiple regression analyses to examine the independent association with more positive health consciousness. The sociodemographic variables were included in univariate analyses based on the literature reviews<sup>17 18 20–27</sup> and screening potentially element associated with the health consciousness. We also compared the proportions of health consciousness using a  $\chi^2$  test to evaluate the impact of five categories of health status (physical, mental, social, spiritual and general health). In all analyses, we determined two-sided p values and considered a p value <0.05 to be significant. In final model, we used the factors that were determined to be significant in univariate analyses to examine the association between the sociodemographic variables, health status and those of more positive health consciousness. We conducted three multiple regression analyses using the hierarchical/stepwise method for factors significantly associated with univariate analysis to identify the independent and best predicted variables for participants' consciousness of health-friendly product/services.

**Table 2** Mean and SD of the company's health-friendly activities that have a significant impact on consumers' health (0=not at all helpful, 10=very helpful)

Item	Mean	SD
Company's health-friendly activities that have an important impact on consumers' physical health (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.89$ )		
Reflecting physical health status during product/service development/improvement	7.71	1.33
Reflecting the enhancement of physical health activities when developing/improving products/services	7.76	1.35
Quality control for raw materials	8.02	1.43
Minimisation of harmful elements of production/service process	8.03	1.39
Active compensation for health-related accidents	7.95	1.37
Company's health-friendly activities that have an important impact on consumers' mental health (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.90$ )		
Reflecting mental health status during product/service development/improvement	7.78	1.29
Reflecting the promotion of mental health activities when developing/improving products/services	7.80	1.33
Customer-friendly service	7.94	1.34
Actively coping with customer complaints	8.02	1.27
Building confidence in corporation-made products/services	8.06	1.25
Company's health-friendly activities that have an important impact on consumers' social health (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.91$ )		
Reflecting social health status during product/service development/improvement	7.74	1.20
Reflecting on social health activities promotion when developing/improving products/services	7.75	1.34
Building constant relationship with customers	7.83	1.39
Respecting customers without discrimination	7.95	1.31
Contribution to improvement of family/relationship with others	7.83	1.21
Company's health-friendly activities that have an important impact on consumers' spiritual health (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.91$ )		
Reflecting spiritual health status during product/service development/improvement	7.61	1.36
Reflecting on spiritual health activities promotion when developing/improving products/services	7.66	1.37
Whether products/services respect person as a human being	7.83	1.39
Whether products/services make person feel worthy and valuable	7.84	1.34
Whether products/services help improve life satisfaction	7.80	1.29

We used this analytical approach because of concerns of multicollinearity. We conducted a univariate analysis with the aim of screening potentially existing elements to learn from existing data and draw implications. Therefore, univariate analysis was not a meaningful thing in itself, but a step to build a model for the final multivariate analysis. As a result, the final multivariate analysis results were meaningful and the researchers evaluated it. We also performed a sensitivity analysis by further calibrating the age-square along with the age variable in the multivariate analysis, confirming that most results were maintained. In the case of income variables, obtained and analysed in a categorical manner without logarithmic conversion of income variables, there are no problems caused by extreme values. We considered  $p < 0.05$  as statistically significant and reported results as the OR with a 95% CI. We used SAS V.9.3 software (SAS Institute) for all analyses.

## RESULTS

### Sociodemographic characteristics of the participants

Table 1 shows sociodemographic characteristics of the 1200 survey participants. The mean age $\pm$ SD of the study participants was 46.97 $\pm$ 14.18 years.

### Factors that are important for the health-friendly activities of companies to affect consumers' four aspects of health

The respondents evaluated the mental, social, spiritual and physical health factors incorporated into products or services highly. Table 2 shows the scores for the various aspects of the four factors. All values of the variables of the health-friendly activities showed high reliability, with good internal consistency (Cronbach's  $\alpha$  range, 0.89–0.91).

### Acceptance of health-friendly label and intent to purchase its products or services

Most respondents (72.4%) said that they were interested in adopting the health-friendly label, evaluating the companies' health-friendly activities in various areas. In detail, 36.5% of the respondents believed that the companies thought about consumers' health, and 35.9% felt that they could believe the label claims and purchase the products or services. When a health-friendly label is introduced by a company, 65.1% of the respondents said that they intended to purchase the product/service, 6.8% said that they did not and 75.1% said that they were willing to pay more for it (figure 2).

**Table 3** Univariate analysis of correlation of participants' consciousness of company's health-friendly activities with demographic and health behaviours

Predictors	n (%)	Consumer reaction			Purchase intention			Additional payment intention		
		Negative response	Positive response	P value	Negative response	Positive response	P value	Negative response	Positive response	P value
Age, years										
20–59	894 (74.5)	<b>231 (25.8)</b>	<b>663 (74.2)</b>	<b>0.006*</b>	<b>292 (32.7)</b>	<b>602 (67.3)</b>	<b>0.004*</b>	<b>198 (22.1)</b>	<b>696 (77.9)</b>	<b>&lt;0.001*</b>
≥60	306 (25.5)	<b>104 (34.0)</b>	<b>202 (66.0)</b>		<b>128 (41.8)</b>	<b>176 (58.2)</b>		<b>101 (33.0)</b>	<b>205 (67.0)</b>	
Sex										
Male	592 (49.3)	159 (26.9)	433 (73.1)	0.42	212 (35.8)	380 (64.2)	0.561	146 (24.7)	446 (75.3)	0.841
Female	608 (50.7)	176 (28.9)	432 (71.1)		208 (34.2)	400 (65.8)		153 (25.2)	455 (74.8)	
Residence										
Rural/suburban	657 (54.8)	<b>209 (31.8)</b>	<b>448 (68.2)</b>	<b>0.001*</b>	228 (34.7)	429 (65.3)	0.813	177 (26.9)	480 (73.1)	0.075
Urban	543 (45.3)	<b>126 (23.2)</b>	<b>417 (76.8)</b>		192 (35.4)	351 (64.6)		122 (22.5)	421 (77.5)	
Religion										
None	711 (59.3)	<b>182 (25.6)</b>	<b>529 (74.4)</b>	<b>0.031*</b>	<b>218 (30.7)</b>	<b>493 (69.3)</b>	<b>&lt;0.001*</b>	175 (24.6)	536 (75.4)	0.769
Yes	489 (40.8)	<b>153 (31.35)</b>	<b>336 (68.7)</b>		<b>202 (41.3)</b>	<b>287 (58.7)</b>		124 (25.4)	365 (74.6)	
Marriage										
Not married	316 (26.3)	87 (27.5)	229 (72.5)	0.859	117 (37.0)	199 (63.0)	0.379	78 (24.7)	239 (75.3)	0.911
Married	884 (73.7)	248 (28.1)	636 (71.9)		303 (34.3)	581 (65.7)		221 (25.0)	663 (75.0)	
Education										
≤High school graduate	<b>661 (55.1)</b>	<b>204 (30.9)</b>	<b>457 (69.1)</b>	<b>0.012*</b>	<b>259 (39.2)</b>	<b>402 (60.8)</b>	<b>0.001*</b>	<b>193 (29.2)</b>	<b>468 (70.8)</b>	<b>&lt;0.001*</b>
College graduate	<b>539 (44.9)</b>	<b>131 (24.3)</b>	<b>408 (75.7)</b>		<b>161 (29.9)</b>	<b>378 (70.1)</b>		<b>106 (19.7)</b>	<b>433 (80.3)</b>	
Monthly income, KRW (1000 KRW=US\$0.9)										
<3000	307 (25.6)	97 (31.6)	210 (68.4)	0.096	<b>136 (44.3)</b>	<b>171 (55.7)</b>	<b>&lt;0.001*</b>	<b>101 (32.9)</b>	<b>206 (67.1)</b>	<b>&lt;0.001*</b>
≥3000	893 (74.4)	238 (26.7)	655 (73.3)		<b>284 (31.8)</b>	<b>609 (68.2)</b>		<b>198 (22.2)</b>	<b>695 (77.8)</b>	
Employed										
Yes	840 (70.0)	235 (28.0)	605 (72.0)	0.944	292 (34.8)	548 (65.2)	0.792	205 (24.4)	635 (75.6)	0.531
No	360 (30.0)	100 (27.8)	260 (72.2)		128 (35.6)	232 (64.4)		94 (26.1)	266 (73.9)	
Overweight (BMI)										
<23.5	727 (60.6)	<b>188 (25.9)</b>	<b>539 (74.1)</b>	<b>0.049*</b>	<b>230 (31.6)</b>	<b>497 (68.4)</b>	<b>0.002*</b>	<b>154 (21.2)</b>	<b>573 (78.8)</b>	<b>&lt;0.001*</b>
≥23.5	473 (39.4)	<b>147 (31.1)</b>	<b>326 (68.9)</b>		<b>190 (40.2)</b>	<b>283 (59.8)</b>		<b>145 (30.7)</b>	<b>328 (69.3)</b>	

\*Significant correlation results ( $p < 0.05$ ) were highlighted in bold. BMI, body mass index.

**Table 4** Univariate analysis of correlation of participants' consciousness of health-friendly product/services with health status

Predictors	n (%)	Consumer reaction			Purchase intention			Additional payment intention		
		Negative response	Positive response	P value	Negative response	Positive response	P value	Negative response	Positive response	P value
Physical health status										
Poor	221 (18.4)	66 (29.9)	155 (70.1)	0.475	78 (35.3)	143 (64.7)	0.919	67 (30.3)	154 (69.7)	0.04*
≥good	979 (81.6)	269 (27.5)	710 (72.5)		342 (34.9)	637 (65.1)		232 (23.7)	747 (76.3)	
Mental health status										
Poor	121 (10.1)	44 (36.4)	77 (63.6)	0.029*	46 (38.0)	75 (62.0)	0.463	40 (33.1)	81 (66.9)	0.029*
≥good	1079 (89.9)	291 (27.0)	788 (73.0)		374 (34.7)	705 (65.3)		259 (24.0)	820 (76.0)	
Social health status										
Poor	83 (6.9)	35 (42.2)	48 (57.8)	0.003*	40 (48.2)	43 (51.8)	0.009*	27 (32.5)	56 (67.5)	0.096
≥good	1117 (93.1)	300 (26.9)	817 (73.1)		380 (34.0)	737 (66.0)		272 (24.4)	845 (76.5)	
Spiritual health status										
Poor	112 (9.3)	38 (33.9)	74 (66.1)	0.136	46 (41.1)	66 (58.9)	0.157	45 (40.2)	67 (59.8)	<0.001*
≥good	1088 (90.7)	297 (27.3)	791 (72.7)		374 (34.4)	714 (65.6)		254 (23.3)	834 (76.7)	
General health status										
Poor	90 (7.5)	32 (35.6)	58 (64.4)	0.093	34 (37.8)	56 (62.2)	0.566	36 (40.0)	54 (60.0)	0.001*
≥good	1110 (92.5)	303 (27.3)	807 (72.7)		386 (34.8)	724 (65.2)		263 (23.7)	847 (76.3)	

\*Significant correlation results (p<0.05) were highlighted in bold.

**Table 5** Multivariate analyses\* of participants' consciousness of health-friendly products/services with sociodemographic variables and health status

Predictor	n (%)	Positive consumer reaction	Positive purchase intention	Positive additional payment intention
		aOR* (95% CI)	aOR* (95% CI)	aOR* (95% CI)
<b>Age (years)</b>				
≥60	894 (74.5)			
20–59	306 (25.5)	NS	NS	NS
<b>Residence</b>				
Rural/suburban	657 (54.8)	1		
Urban	543 (45.3)	1.54 (1.19 to 2.00)	–	–
<b>Religion</b>				
None	711 (59.3)		1	
Yes	489 (40.8)	NS	0.66 (0.51 to 0.84)	–
<b>Education</b>				
≤High school graduate	661 (55.1)	1		1
College graduate	539 (44.9)	1.30 (1.00 to 1.69)	NS	1.41 (1.06 to 1.87)
<b>Monthly income, KRW (1000 KRW=US\$0.9)</b>				
<3000	345 (28.7)		1	1
≥3000	855 (71.3)	–	1.46 (1.11 to 1.93)	1.42 (1.05 to 1.92)
<b>BMI</b>				
≥23.5	966 (76.6)		1	1
<23.5	281 (23.4)	NS	1.34 (1.04 to 1.72)	1.42 (1.08 to 1.86)
<b>Physical health status</b>				
Poor	221 (18.4)			
≥good	979 (81.6)	–	–	NS
<b>Mental health status</b>				
Poor	121 (10.1)			
≥good	1079 (89.9)	NS	–	NS
<b>Social health status</b>				
Poor	83 (6.9)	1		
≥good	1117 (93.1)	1.79 (1.13 to 2.85)	NS	–
<b>Spiritual health status</b>				
Poor	112 (9.3)			1
≥good	1088 (90.7)	–	–	1.90 (1.26 to 2.86)
<b>General health status</b>				
Poor	90 (7.5)			
≥good	1110 (92.5)	–	–	NS

\*Multiple logistic regression analysis including variables identified as independent predictors that showed statistical significance in univariate analysis of correlates of needs for tailored health management programme. aOR, adjusted OR.

### Association of demographic characteristics and health status with health-friendly label, intent to purchase its product/services and willing to pay extra price, univariate logistic analysis

Tables 3 and 4 show the association of demographic characteristics and health status with consciousness of health-friendly

products and services, intent to purchase the product or services and willingness to pay a higher price for them. As for the domain of consumer reaction, five demographic variables (young age, place of residence, religion, education and higher BMI) and two types of health status (good mental health and social health) were statistically significant.



Significantly related to the domain of purchase intention were social health status as well as the demographic factors of age, religion, education, monthly income and BMI. In addition, significantly associated with additional payment intention were the demographic factors of younger age, education, monthly income and BMI, as were physical, mental, spiritual and general health status.

#### Multivariate logistic regression models for factors associated with health-friendly labels, intent to purchase its product or services and willingness to pay for the higher price

Multivariate logistic regression models show that the consumers residing in urban areas, highly educated and having good social health status showed a more positive reaction to health-friendly labels. Respondents with a higher income level, normal BMI and no religion were more likely to express an intention to purchase products and services with a health-friendly label, whereas no health status was significantly associated with that intent. In addition, factors such as higher education, higher income level, normal BMI and good spiritual health were associated with having a more positive attitude towards paying extra for products and services with health-friendly labels (table 5). Significant correlations in some univariate analyses such as age, physical, mental and general health status have lost significance in multivariate analysis, which may be due to correlation and confounding between variables.

#### DISCUSSION

This study provides a better understanding of the importance to consumers of products or services that provide physical, mental, social and spiritual health. In addition, this study suggests the need for a health-friendly certification mark or label recognised by the general population. Our findings suggest that consumers are demanding health-friendly products and services and are willing to pay the extra cost involved.

Companies' marketing activities can play a significant role in raising the public awareness of health.<sup>4</sup> Business for social responsibility, a global non-profit organisation working to build 'a just and sustainable world', confirmed that member companies support the idea that they can strengthen the health and wellness of their customers and the public. About 90% of the companies agree that they can help strengthen the health of their consumers, while about 75% agree that they can help strengthen public health.<sup>4</sup> Shared value models may represent the next evolution of capitalism.<sup>7</sup> In the USA, for example, Kaiser Permanente partnered with Home Box Office, the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Institute of Medicine and the Michael & Susan Dell Foundation and launched public health campaigns addressing the obesity epidemic.<sup>33</sup> Moreover, companies can partner with local governments to encourage healthy lifestyles or habits. For the National Salt Reduction Initiative, for instance, more than 100 state and local health authorities and national health organisations partnered

with many companies to reduce the amount of sodium in packaged and restaurant foods (<https://www1.nyc.gov/site/doh/health/health-topics/national-salt-reduction-initiative.page#national-salt-reduction-initiative>).

Our findings showed that consumers with higher education or who lived in an urban area had a more favourable attitude towards health-friendly labels and that non-religious, high-income or normal-weight consumers had intentions to purchase products and services with health-friendly labels. This study showed that people with higher education, high income or normal weight had a positive attitude towards paying more for products and services with health-friendly labels. However, other studies had inconsistent findings between demographic characteristics and purchase intention towards green products.<sup>20 22</sup> Our finding that consumers with good health status would be cautious about products and services with a health-friendly label and expressed willingness to pay more for them are consistent with the finding that health consciousness is an important factor that influences the purchase of organic foods.<sup>17 18 23 24</sup> Our results seem to be consistent with the finding that eco-label and the value of green products had the strongest positive influence on green product purchase intention and were associated with the willingness to pay more for environmentally certified products, the eco-label or the energy label.<sup>21 22 25-27</sup>

These studies imply that most consumers perceive the health-friendly label as important when purchasing products or services. Emphasising the health-friendly label of products or services accredited by reputable organisations would help to build reliability and awareness among consumers, but the products and services would be more expensive than conventional products and services,<sup>21 22</sup> and that could negatively influence purchasing. Thus, managers are challenged with the need to produce high-quality products and services at affordable prices.<sup>21</sup>

To integrate health-friendliness into its value chain and culture, companies can start by meeting social needs through products or services that serve the unserved or underserved.<sup>6 7 16</sup> It can motivate employees to strengthen the health of their customers through daily actions and business decisions. Companies can use key performance indicators and report them in their sustainability report in a comprehensive and transparent way.<sup>4</sup>

Many companies, however, would struggle when trying to integrate a health and wellness agenda into their value chain. Many CEOs cite a lack of recognition from the financial market as a barrier to achieving their sustainability goals.<sup>34</sup> But it is necessary to focus not only on preventive and holistic health, but also on return on investment. Stakeholders from managers, employees, investors, consumers, community organisations and government should form a consensus that companies should try to contribute to consumer and public health through a mission that goes beyond mere profit. 'The purpose of business is to serve society, through the provision of safe, high quality products and services that enhance our well-being, without eroding our ecological and community life-support systems



ultimately'.<sup>5</sup> The government should also consider ways to assist these companies through tax breaks or their health insurance premium cuts.<sup>4</sup>

Although the scope of this study is so broad that all products and services and health are also very broadly defined across four different domains, consumers think that corporate products or services have very important impact not only on their physical health, but also on mental, social and spiritual health and there was no difference in importance among the four different domains of health. It might be crucial to develop measure to evaluate the health-friendly activities of corporates across four different domains of health in an objective and reasonable manner and to apply 'health-friendly label' to the products and services of corporates.

This study had some limitations. The first is that it was conducted in Korea and the findings might not apply to other populations. Second, in the present study, we applied probability proportion-to-size sampling taking into account the age and sex strata with the 2016 Korean census. Although we could not perform inverse probability weighting techniques due to lack of information of non-responder and, therefore, a concern of selection bias remains, the sociodemographic characteristics of the study participants included in the present study (n=1200) were similar to those of the Korean population with regard to age (20–29 years: 16.2%, 30–39 years: 17.7%, 40–49 years: 20.8%, 50–59 years: 19.9%, ≥60 years: 25.5% in the present study; 20–29 years: 15.9%, 30–39 years: 16.4%, 40–49 years: 19.6%, 50–59 years: 20.2%, ≥60 years: 27.9% in the Korean population) and sex (men: 49.3%, women: 50.7% in the present study; men: 49.9%, women: 50.1% in the Korean population), suggesting low possibility of selection bias and confirming representative sampling. Third, the response rates of the subjects were low, so the results might not be generalisable. Fourth, since this is a cross-sectional study, we could not attribute causality between attitudes towards health-friendly labels and intent to purchase health-friendly products or services. Further studies are needed to examine the associations. Fifth, almost all respondents would automatically agree with the questions in our survey and we did not address the gap between attitudes and behaviour. Sixth, our hypothesis that consumer's demographic characteristics might influence their attitude towards health-friendly products and services have the limitation of study design. Especially educated people tend to give socially desired responses in surveys, that is to say that they would prefer health-friendly products and be willing to pay more for them. Therefore, discrete choice modelling (choice-based conjoint analysis) would be more suitable method to find out the preferences of features and products to simulate market and create optimal products.

Seventh, we did not treat the questions of trustworthiness and care about consumer health as separate questions. Therefore, it is hard to interpret how one feels about companies when seeing health-friendly products or services. Eight, we arbitrarily used the categories to assess willingness to pay more and did not test other categories.

It would be helpful to see how sensitive the results are to the use of other categories in further studies. Finally, it is also a limitation that the respondents' use of health-friendly products or knowledge of such products was not asked at all in the survey although these factors might explain the attitudes towards the products. Further studies are needed to examine the associations of the consumers' use of health-friendly products or knowledge of the products with attitude towards health-friendly products and services.

#### Author affiliations

<sup>1</sup>Seoul National University College of Medicine, Seoul, The Republic of Korea

<sup>2</sup>Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Erlangen, Bayern, Germany

<sup>3</sup>University of Wisconsin Madison, Madison, Wisconsin, USA

<sup>4</sup>Seoul National University Hospital, Jongno-gu, Seoul, The Republic of Korea

**Acknowledgements** The corresponding author YHY and co-author JAS thank BK21 plus program through the National Research Foundation (NRF) for financial support.

**Contributors** YHY participated in the design of the study, provided financial supports and study materials, collected and assembled the data, interpreted the analyses, participated in the sequence alignment and drafted the manuscript. JAS participated in its design and coordination, conducted data analyses, participated in the sequence alignment and drafted the manuscript. YK, SL and K-NK participated in the design of the study, performed the statistical analysis and helped to draft the manuscript.

**Funding** This work was supported by a Seoul National University Research Grant in 2016 (800-20170241).

**Competing interests** None declared.

**Patient and public involvement** Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of this research.

**Patient consent for publication** Not required.

**Ethics approval** The Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Seoul National University Hospital approved the study protocol, and all participants provided informed consent. All participants from each of the Seoul National University Hospital provided written informed consent.

**Provenance and peer review** Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

**Data availability statement** Data are available upon reasonable request.

**Open access** This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited, appropriate credit is given, any changes made indicated, and the use is non-commercial. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.

#### ORCID iD

Young Ho Yun <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2740-7279>

#### REFERENCES

- 1 Yun YH, Sim JA, Park E-G, *et al.* Employee health behaviors, self-reported health status, and association with absenteeism: comparison with the general population. *J Occup Environ Med* 2016;58:932–9.
- 2 McGinnis JM, Williams-Russo P, Knickman JR. The case for more active policy attention to health promotion. *Health Aff* 2002;21:78–93.
- 3 Centers for Disease Control (CDC). Estimated national spending on prevention--United States, 1988. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 1992;41:529–31.
- 4 BSR: a new Csr frontier: business and population health 2013.
- 5 Visser W. Csr 2.0 and the new DNA of business. *Journal of Business Systems, Governance and Ethics* 2010;5:7.
- 6 Kottke TE, Pronk N, Zinkel AR, *et al.* Philanthropy and beyond: creating shared value to promote well-being for individuals in their communities. *Perm J* 2017;21:16–188.

- 7 Moore C. Corporate social responsibility and creating shared value. *Heiffer International* 2014;1-6.
- 8 Pepsico: PepsiCo global sustainable agriculture policy.
- 9 Qualcomm. *Qualcomm Life and WebMD Collaborate to Bring Integrated Digital Health Resources and Tools to Consumers, Qualcomm Life's 2net Ecosystem attracts new technology partners with release of 2net Hub API and SDK and launch of 2net Ecosystem Technology Certification Program at the 2013 HIMSS Conference*. New Orleans, LA, 2013.
- 10 Walmart. *Walmart to open up to 300 stores serving USDA food Deserts by 2016; more than 40,000 associates will work in these stores, about 500 new and existing locations will provide access to more than 700 USDA food deserts serving approximately 1.3 million people*. Washington, DC, 2016.
- 11 Puhakka R, Valve R, Sinkkonen A. Older consumers' perceptions of functional foods and non-edible health-enhancing innovations. *Int J Consum Stud* 2018;42:111-9.
- 12 Rimpeekool W, Kirk M, Yiengprugsawan V, et al. Nutrition label experience and consumption of transitional foods among a nationwide cohort of 42,750 Thai adults. *Br Food J* 2017;119:425-39.
- 13 Montandon AC, Colli C. Effective nutrition labels for fast food consumers. *Br Food J* 2016;118:2534-49.
- 14 Hassan LM. A systematic review of the efficacy of alcohol warning labels: insights from qualitative and quantitative research in the new millennium. *Journal of Social Marketing* 2018;8:333-52.
- 15 Peattie K, Ratnayaka M. Responding to the green movement. *Industrial Marketing Management* 1992;21:103-10.
- 16 Ottman J. Sometimes consumers will pay more to go green. *Marketing news* 1992;26:16.
- 17 Kabir MA. Factors of Consumers Perceptions & Purchase Intentions towards Green Products. *Journal of Business* 2014;35.
- 18 Yagmur O. OZBUK my: consumer clusters based on health and price consciousness.
- 19 The relationship of Thai consumers' health consciousness and perceived value. *Global Journal of Emerging Trends in e-Business, Marketing and Consumer Psychology* 2015;1:259-68.
- 20 Chowtanapanich S. Identifying factors influencing purchase intentions of Non-Blackmores users, International Conference on trends in economics, humanities and management (ICTEHM'14), Pattaya, Thailand 2014.
- 21 Kong W, Harun A, Sulong RS, et al. The influence of consumers' perception of green products on green purchase intention. *International Journal of Asian Social Science* 2014;4:924-39.
- 22 Singh S, Singh D. Consumer's attitude and purchase intention towards green products in the FMCG sector. *Pacific Business Review International* 2014;7:27-46.
- 23 Akhondan H, Johnson-Carroll K. Health consciousness and organic food consumption. *Journal of Family & Consumer Sciences* 2015;107:27-32.
- 24 Leong TP, Paim L. Mediating effects of intention on the factors affecting organic food products consumption among Chinese generation Y in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business Research and Management* 2015;6:1-19.
- 25 Vlosky RP, Ozanne LK, Fontenot RJ. A conceptual model of US consumer willingness-to-pay for environmentally certified wood products. *J Consum Mark* 1999;16:122-40.
- 26 D'Souza C. Bridging the communication gap: dolphin-safe "ecolabels". *Corporate Communications: An International Journal* 2000;5:185-90.
- 27 Sammer K, Wüstenhagen R. The influence of eco-labelling on consumer behaviour – results of a discrete choice analysis for washing machines. *Bus Strategy Environ* 2006;15:185-99.
- 28 Lemeshow S. *Sampling for health professionals*. Belmont, Ca: Lifetime Learning Publications, 1980.
- 29 Lea E, Worsley T. Australians' organic food beliefs, demographics and values. *Br Food J* 2005;107:855-69.
- 30 Lichtenstein DR, Ridgway NM, Netemeyer RG. Price perceptions and consumer Shopping behavior: a field study. *Journal of Marketing Research* 1993;30:234-45.
- 31 Michaelidou N, Hassan LM. The role of health consciousness, food safety concern and ethical identity on attitudes and intentions towards organic food. *Int J Consum Stud* 2008;32:163-70.
- 32 Schifferstein HNJ, Oude Ophuis PAM. Health-Related determinants of organic food consumption in the Netherlands. *Food Qual Prefer* 1998;9:119-33.
- 33 Permanente K. *Kaiser Permanente Joins HBO and Leading Health Organizations to Present The Weight of the Nation, Groundbreaking documentary series launches public health campaign to address America's obesity epidemic*. Oakland CA, 2012.
- 34 Lacy P, Cooper T, Hayward R, et al. A new era of sustainability: un global Compact-Accenture CEO study 2010;2010.