

## Article

# Psychological Factors Influencing Willingness to Purchase Wild-Edible Plants and Food Products from Wild-Edible Plants

Ana Težak Damijanić <sup>1</sup>, Ana Čehić Marić <sup>2,\*</sup> and Milan Oplanić <sup>2</sup><sup>1</sup> Department of Tourism, Institute of Agriculture and Tourism, Karla Huguesa 8, 52440 Poreč, Croatia; tezak@iptpo.hr<sup>2</sup> Department of Economics and Agricultural Development, Institute of Agriculture and Tourism, Karla Huguesa 8, 52440 Poreč, Croatia; milan@iptpo.hr

\* Correspondence: acehic@iptpo.hr; Tel.: +385-052/408-328

**Abstract:** Modern agriculture faces many challenges. At the same time, it is necessary to provide healthy and sustainable food for humanity in growing conditions that are facing numerous problems, including climate change. Different strategies can be applied to deal with climate change, such as using different crop technologies. In this context, the application of wild-edible plants as a source of biodiversity, vitamins, and minerals for the human diet is interesting. Consumers' behaviour toward wild-edible plants is a relatively new topic in marketing research, so this paper investigated the impact of certain psychological factors on consumers' willingness to purchase wild-edible plants and food products. The study was performed on a sample of consumers of produce from farmers' markets in Istria County, Croatia, and the data were collected via a questionnaire. The univariate and multivariate analyses provided evidence that consumers' purchase intentions are determined mainly by their positive attitudes regarding trying new and unfamiliar foods. Furthermore, customers' intentions to purchase food products containing wild-edible plants were determined by their attitudes regarding wild-edible plants and their subjective knowledge.

**Keywords:** climate changes; wild-edible plants; WEP; consumers; psychological factors; purchase intention



**Citation:** Težak Damijanić, A.; Čehić Marić, A.; Oplanić, M. Psychological Factors Influencing Willingness to Purchase Wild-Edible Plants and Food Products from Wild-Edible Plants. *Agriculture* **2024**, *14*, 1856. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture14111856>

Academic Editor: Maria Pergola

Received: 6 September 2024

Revised: 10 October 2024

Accepted: 16 October 2024

Published: 22 October 2024



**Copyright:** © 2024 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

The future of agriculture faces many challenges such as climate change, which increasingly impacts agricultural production planning due to frequent extremes like droughts, floods, and storms [1]. It is necessary to ensure regular and stable yields for a growing population and to produce the high-quality foods that consumers are accustomed to, and it is predicted that the impact of climate change will take an even greater toll in the future [2,3]. Strategies have been developed to mitigate the effects of climate change in relation to agriculture, like adaptation and mitigation through improved technologies, crop/cropping system-based technologies, and resource-conservation-based technologies, etc. [4]. However, a pressing issue is how consumers will react to products that are produced using new technologies and/or to products originating from new cultivation systems. It is especially fundamental to understand how consumers will react to new products derived from new food sources, like insects [3], microalgae [5], cultured meat [6,7], and wild-edible plants (WEPs) [8,9]. Although WEPs are part of our cultural heritage [10–12], their consumption decreased due to changes in food systems and modern way of life, resulting in the loss of traditional knowledge about WEPs [11,13,14].

This research focused on crop/cropping system-based technologies that promote the cultivation of crops and varieties that fit into new farming systems, i.e., those that have an increased resistance to high and low temperatures, droughts, floods, etc. Besides creating new varieties, an important element of this strategy involves using wild relatives as a source of specific resistance genes. Additionally, the use of WEPs as a new food source for humans presents an interesting alternative for cultivating resilient species to ensure a quality source

of nutrients for both humans and animals, whose availability varies depending on the season [15,16]. Although there is a positive impact of introducing WEPs into human diets as it increases the nutrient content [17], WEPs have mainly been collected in the wild without standardized procedures [18], which brings certain risks.

In many European countries, the supply of fresh WEPs is characterized as seasonal [19,20]. Furthermore, fresh WEPs are nutrient-dense foods, are considered relevant nutrition and health sources, and are also signs of the cultural identity of particular regions [19,20]. In non-European countries, like Brazil, Palestine, Patagonia, China, etc., WEPs are regarded as a traditional part of the human diet, especially in rural areas [21–24]. On the other hand, countries located in the Mediterranean basin have various WEPs that are commonly used in traditional medicine or for traditional food recipes [25]. However, consumers are generally not familiar with their characteristics [13,14,26].

To begin the potential cultivation of WEPs, it is important to investigate consumers' willingness to purchase WEPs as a significant factor in evaluating the market value of cultivating WEPs by farmers [27]. The consumption of WEPs contributes to a range of positive outcomes, from increasing the nutrient content in human diets to having a positive environmental impact, but some consumers may be reluctant to eat WEPs [28]. Nonetheless, today's consumers are willing to try new local foods that often contain ingredients that positively affect the environment and ensure ecological sustainability [29]. Carvalho et al. 2016 [30] identified that WEPs are gaining importance in modern cuisine, but there is a lack of research regarding the consumers of WEPs, especially of research focusing on the psychological factors that may influence purchasing decisions. Therefore, this paper investigated the impact of certain psychological factors on consumers' willingness to purchase WEPs and food products from WEPs.

## 2. The Literature Review

Throughout human history, WEPs have been a food source during extreme conditions such as droughts, floods, famines, and other risks related to the food supply [31]. In the early development of humanity, they were a crucial part of the human diet, whereas nowadays, the consumption of WEPs is mostly associated with rural areas where local populations collect WEPs in the wild and consume them according to traditional recipes [32,33].

Although WEPs have been considered less attractive for modern human diets, this situation is changing because they represent a potentially important source of nutrients to supplement basic diets [15]. The increase in WEP consumption brings a range of positive effects, including the increased levels of nutrients and food security, medicinal value, availability, and economic significance for rural areas [32]. Therefore, there is growing research interest in WEPs [32], with several studies having been conducted to systematize WEP species and document the traditional knowledge of local populations about WEPs [34–37]. Even though WEPs have such potential, it is important to highlight certain challenges in bringing WEPs to the market, such as difficulties in harvesting and collecting; the perishability of the plants; consumer perceptions of WEPs, which are often associated with the idea that WEPs are an alternative to more familiar foods; and the lack of awareness that they are nutritionally superior [38]. Another possible limitation is the availability of the abundance of WEPs to be commercialized [39,40]. The availability of some WEPs is difficult to predict, especially because they grow during specific seasons [41]. Potential solutions to this challenge can be found in niche markets [42].

Furthermore, consumer psychological factors may impact the consumption and purchase of WEPs, so researching the impact of psychological variables is important to identify the factors that influence consumer intentions [43]. This study focussed on the following psychological variables: consumers' knowledge, attitudes, food neophobia, environmental and climate change concern, and their relationship to purchase intention.

Knowledge is often included in studies of factors influencing purchase decisions and is viewed through two concepts: subjective and objective knowledge. Subjective knowledge refers to an individual's self-assessment of their knowledge about a product,

while objective knowledge is stored in the consumer's long-term memory [44]. Subjective knowledge is described as an individual's perception of how much they know about a topic and is more based on product-related experience [45]. It is self-assessed and supports the consumer decision-making process [46]; however, it is a perception of one's knowledge [47]. Subjective knowledge is closely related to attitude [48] and is a more reliable predictor of behaviour than objective knowledge. The greater subjective knowledge consumers have, the less likely they will feel confused and uncertain about their purchase decisions [49]. Regarding WEPs, knowledge mainly refers to the traditional knowledge available in rural areas that have been using WEPs for centuries [50,51].

The relationship between attitude and behaviour has long been the focus of marketing research, with the positive impact of attitude on consumer behaviour confirmed in several studies focused on food [52–54]. According to Han et al. 2017 [55], if the perceived value of a product meets consumer expectations, they will have a more positive attitude towards the product and then decide to purchase it. Consumer attitudes towards food are important, especially today when the awareness of sustainable development and healthy food is growing [56]. Consumer attitudes towards WEPs are still relatively unknown [57], but WEPs are generally regarded as safe, healthy foods that are part of the traditional diet [57]. Schunko and Vogl [58] reported that organic food consumers have a positive attitude towards WEPs and consider their quality and responsible harvesting to be important.

Food neophobia is described as a fear or aversion to trying new foods [59], which potentially leads to avoiding unfamiliar foods [60]. This perception is shaped by various factors, including personal experience, genetic predisposition, media influence, environment, marketing, education, culture, and tradition [60]. The level of food neophobia also depends on the individual's exposure to other cultures, so people who frequently encounter new cultures have a lower level of food neophobia [61–65]. Knowledge and personal experiences also influence the willingness to try new foods [64]. Generally, people with lower levels of food neophobia are more willing to try unfamiliar foods [65], so food neophobia is often used as a variable in market research that is focused on consumers' acceptance of new food [66]. It has also been used to research consumers' willingness to try insect-based food as a specific nutrient source that is not often consumed in Western diets [67].

Concern for the environment is becoming an important factor in the consumer decision-making process [68]. Environmental concern is defined as a strong attitude towards protecting the environment [69] and is the foundation of environmental research [70]. The term environmental concern can be extended to climate change concern, where the consumers are concerned and involved in a problem, such as global climate change [71]. Consumers with a higher level of environmental concern are more likely to engage in eco-friendly purchasing behaviour [72]. Typically, the term environmental concern in the literature is associated with the green movement, eco-friendly behaviour, a green purchase intention, and similar terms related to green, sustainable behaviour. WEPs can also be considered a consumer response to green behaviour, as they have a range of positive attributes for human health and the environment.

Purchase intention is defined as a consumer's potential behaviour and the likelihood of purchase after evaluating a product [73]. Purchase intention is the probability that a consumer will buy a certain product in the future in response to the need for the product, knowledge about the product, opinions about the product, and brand [74]. Regarding WEPs, there is a lack of available data considering the consumer purchase process of WEPs [58].

### 3. Materials and Methods

The target population were consumers at farmers' markets, because it was part of a more extensive research project linking healthy lifestyles and the consumption of WEPs in the climate change context. The research included four populations: consumers at farmers' markets, sellers at farmers' markets, tourists, and policymakers. This research centred on consumers at farmers' markets because they are more prone to purchase local

and seasonal food products [75–77]. The survey was conducted from March through June 2022 in four local farmer markets in Istria County, Croatia. A research agency was hired to collect the data, and it was agreed that their research staff would be stationary while the responders were mobile [78]. The consumers were approached by the researcher and asked to participate in the survey. After they expressed a willingness to participate in the survey, the researcher explained the purpose, stated that it was anonymous, and handed out a leaflet containing a QR code to the questionnaire. The data were collected through a self-completed questionnaire comprising 66 questions divided into six sections: WEP consumption; subjective knowledge; objective knowledge regarding five specific WEPs that were characteristic of the Mediterranean and sub-Mediterranean regions: wild asparagus (*Asparagus acutifolius* L.), wild fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare* Mill.), wild garlic (*Allium ursinum* L.), purslane (*Portulaca oleracea* L.), and sea fennel (*Crithmum maritimum* L.); food neophobia; climate change; wellness-related lifestyle; and the respondents' characteristics. A minimal number of 150 responders was required, considering that consumers buying at farmers' markets represent only a small proportion of the local consumers in general, and to satisfy the requirement for the data analysis [79]. For this research, a quantitative approach was adopted for two main reasons: to test consumers' knowledge about WEPs and to explore potential issues regarding food neophobia.

The data were processed using descriptive and multivariate statistics. Descriptive statistics were used to provide a general description of the sample, with multivariate statistics employed to determine the factors underlying the psychological factors and consumers' intention to buy WEPs and associated products. An exploratory factor analysis was performed using a Principal Axis Factoring analysis and Promax rotation, and an eigenvalue of 1.00 or more was used to identify potential factors. The Principal Axis Factoring analysis was chosen because it yields similar results to a principal component analysis, and it is appropriate for simple pattern estimation [80,81], while the Promax rotation was selected because it allows correlations among factors and offers a more replicable solution [82]. Internal reliability was determined by computing Cronbach's alpha. Factors were calculated as a mean value for each respondent [83]. A regression analysis was applied to test the relationship between customer purchase intentions and customer psychological factors. The independent variables were subjective knowledge, attitude related to nature preservation, attitude related to WEPs, food neophobia, and concern about climate change, while the dependent variables were customers' intention to purchase WEPs and customers' intention to purchase food products from WEPs. Appropriate regression diagnostics were performed [82–84].

A five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (totally not agree) to 5 (totally agree) was used to measure the subjective knowledge, attitude related to nature preservation, attitude related to WEPs, food neophobia, and customers' purchase intentions (Appendix A). The items measuring subjective knowledge were adopted from Flynn & Goldsmith, [85] and included six items. The attitudes related to WEPs consisted of five items adopted from Schunko & Vogl [58], while the attitudes related to nature preservation consisted of five items adopted from Yadav & Pathak [86]. The food neophobia construct was made up of six items adopted from Piha et al. [87]. Customers' purchase intentions consisted of three items measuring customers' intentions to buy fresh WEPs and three items measuring their intention to buy food products from WEPs. The purchase intention items were adopted from Yadav & Pathak [70,86], Piha et al. [87] and Liu, Liu, & Mo [88]. Concern about climate change was measured as a one-item measure on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (totally not agree) to 5 (totally agree).

#### 4. Results and Discussion

In all, there were 166 respondents (Table 1), and there were more females than males. Most of the respondents were aged between 36 and 54 (48%) and had obtained a higher education degree (55%). In general, the responders were employed (57%); 25% were self-employed and approximately 8% were retired. The most frequent monthly net income was between €800 and

€1070 (32%). About 56% of the respondents lived in a household with three or four members. More than three-quarters of the respondents showed concern about climate change.

**Table 1.** Sample characteristics.

Characteristics		Percent (%)
Gender	Male	24.1
	Female	75.9
Age	18–25	7.8
	26–35	20.5
	36–45	28.3
	46–55	21.7
	56+	21.7
Education	Basic education	3.6
	Secondary education	41.0
	Higher education (College, University, Masters, Ph.D.)	55.4
Profession	Self-employed/freelance	25.3
	Manager	2.5
	Employee	57.2
	Retired	8.4
	Other	6.6
Personal net monthly income	Up to €530	10.5
	€531–€796	23.4
	€797–€1060	31.4
	€1061–€1327	20.2
	More than €1327	14.5
Household members	1	12.7
	2	21.7
	3	27.7
	4	28.3
	5+	9.6
Concern about climate change	Totally not concerned	5.4
	Not concerned	3.6
	Neutral	12.0
	Concerned	39.8
	Totally concerned	39.2

Source: Data processed by authors.

The exploratory factor analysis was performed to identify constructs measuring subjective knowledge, attitudes related to nature preservation, attitudes related to WEPs, food neophobia, and customers' purchase intentions. Items with a loading of below 0.4 and cross-loadings were deleted, resulting in the retention of four items measuring attitudes related to nature preservation, four items measuring attitudes related to WEPs, and four items measuring food neophobia (Table 2) [89]. The exploratory factor analysis also confirmed the six-item structure measuring subjective knowledge, the three-item structure measuring customers' purchase intentions to buy fresh WEPs, and the three-item structure measuring their intention to buy food products from WEPs. All six factors accounted for 79.21% of the accumulated variance, and all the factor loadings were greater than 0.60. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients were between 0.861 and 0.974.



**Table 2.** Descriptive statistics and results of explanatory factor analysis.

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
Subjective knowledge								
sub_know_5	3.25	1.125	0.932					
sub_know_3	3.01	1.050	0.929					
sub_know_6	3.02	1.101	0.925					
sub_know_4	2.81	1.179	0.895					
sub_know_1	3.18	1.052	0.871					
sub_know_2	3.27	1.041	0.828					
Attitudes related to nature preservation								
att_np_3	4.17	0.717		0.967				
att_np_4	4.35	0.757		0.883				
att_np_2	4.04	0.810		0.828				
att_np_1	3.91	0.832		0.735				
Customers' purchase intention to buy food products from WEPs								
buy_int_fpweb_2	3.45	1.018			0.988			
buy_int_fpweb_2	3.40	1.061			0.947			
buy_int_fpweb_3	3.41	1.027			0.945			
Attitudes related to WEPs								
att_wep_2	4.11	0.849				0.953		
att_wep_3	4.05	0.862				0.953		
att_wep_5	3.98	0.894				0.660		
att_wep_4	3.57	1.064				0.621		
Food neophobia								
food_fobia_3	3.58	1.040					0.911	
food_fobia_6	3.80	1.006					0.837	
food_fobia_5	3.65	0.990					0.835	
food_fobia_1	3.31	1.095					0.679	
Customers' purchase intentions to buy fresh WEPs								
buy_int_fweb_1	3.57	1.005						0.980
buy_int_fweb_2	3.61	0.996						0.940
buy_int_fweb_3	3.62	0.951						0.867
Eigenvalues			6.381	5.934	2.238	2.005	1.398	1.056
% variance			26.586	24.727	9.326	8.356	5.823	4.398
% cumulative variance			26.586	51.313	60.639	68.995	74.818	79.217
Cronbach's $\alpha$			0.955	0.914	0.974	0.863	0.881	0.956

Source: Data processed by author.

The consumers generally slightly agreed with the statements measuring their subjective knowledge regarding WEPs, suggesting that they were not very familiar with WEPs. They expressed a slight intention to buy food products from WEPs and fresh WEPs, showing a certain level of trust in farmers selling this type of product. Regarding food neophobia, the consumers were rather willing to try new foods when it was presented in relation to WEPs. Consumers' attitudes regarding WEPs were high, but their attitudes about nature preservation were slightly higher.

The relationships between consumers' psychological factors and intention to purchase fresh WEPs and foods from WEPs were assessed using a regression analysis (Table 3). The two models that were analysed had significant F-tests, suggesting that consumers' psychological factors were significant in predicting their intention to purchase fresh WEPs and foods from WEPs [89]. However, the low R-squared and adjusted R-squared values indicated a low representativeness of the independent variables. Namely, the proportion of variance in intention to purchase fresh WEPs and foods from WEPs explained by the analysed psychological factors was relatively low, almost 22% for the first model and almost

30% for the second one. Furthermore, an adjusted R-square value reduced these amounts by 3%. Since there were significant variables in both of the models, there were no grounds to reject either model [90]. Multicollinearity varied from 1.054 to 1.335, indicating some correlation, but it was not large enough to be overly concerned about multicollinearity [91]. The Breusch–Pagan test was significant for both of the models, so they were corrected using robust standard errors [82]. The Ramsey RESET test was significant for the second model, suggesting that certain important variables had been omitted supporting the rather low R-squared and adjusted R-squared values.

**Table 3.** Results of regression analysis.

Variables	Purchase Intention—Fresh WEPs		Purchase Intention—Foods from WEPs	
	Original	Corrected	Original	Corrected
Constant	1.473 **	1.473 **	1.266 *	1.266
Subjective knowledge	−0.052	−0.052	−0.188 *	−0.188 *
Attitudes related to nature preservation	0.039	0.039	0.085	0.085
Attitudes related to WEPs	0.067	0.067	0.141	0.141 *
Food neophobia	0.421 ***	0.421 ***	0.474 ***	0.474 ***
Concern about climate change	0.071	0.071	−0.091	−0.091
F statistics	8.079 ***	9.46 ***	12.308 ***	11.36 ***
R <sup>2</sup>	0.216		0.295	
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.189		0.271	
RESET test	2.64		4.79 *	
Breusch–Pagan test	10.17 **		4.34 *	

Note: \* significant at  $\alpha = 0.05$ . \*\* significant at  $\alpha = 0.01$ . \*\*\* significant at  $\alpha = 0.001$ . Source: Data processed by authors.

The first regression revealed that only one variable, food neophobia, was significant in predicting customers' intention to buy fresh WEPs. All of the variables had positive signs, except subjective knowledge. The second regression considered the relationship between the consumers' factors and their intention to buy foods made with WEPs, indicating that subjective knowledge, attitudes regarding WEPs, and food neophobia were statistically significant. Attitudes related to nature preservation, attitudes related to WEPs, and food neophobia had positive signs, while subjective knowledge and concern about climate change had negative signs.

Subjective knowledge significantly predicted customer purchase intention for food from WEPs, highlighting its importance in this relationship. However, this factor negatively impacted purchase intention, contrary to the findings of Liang et al., Peschel et al., and Moorman et al. [92–94]. This suggests that customers were likely to buy WEPs and products made from WEPs if they were less familiar with those plants. This may be because of the farmers' market characteristics. Namely, the farmers' market is a direct distribution channel, i.e., customers achieve direct contact with producers (sellers), and, in this process, they often exchange information [76,77]. Consequently, producers have an opportunity to present their products, detailing the benefits of WEPs, as well as how to prepare fresh WEPs or use food products from WEPs. Also, customers with low subjective knowledge are more likely to ask for information and advice from sellers [47]. Furthermore, this may be related to the sensory characteristics of WEPs and foods from WEPs, namely those consumers with previous experience might choose to opt out [33].

Customers with positive attitudes toward WEPs were more likely to purchase products from WEPs, confirming that attitude was a significant predictor of consumers' behaviour intention [95]. Furthermore, food neophobia, although usually defined as consumers' fear of trying new or unfamiliar foods, positively impacted consumers' intentions to purchase WEPs and WEP products. In other words, consumers who were interested in trying new and unfamiliar foods were more likely to purchase WEPs and WEP products. Since food

neophobia was a significant predictor in both models, this confirms the importance of food neophobia on consumer behaviour [59].

Attitudes regarding nature preservation and concern about climate change were not significant predictors of purchase intentions, regardless of buying fresh WEPs or WEP products, suggesting that these factors do not significantly influence consumers' decision-making process.

## 5. Conclusions

This paper explored the relationship between consumers' psychological factors and their intention to buy WEPs and WEP products, which present an excellent opportunity to deal with the issue of potential food shortages caused by climate change. Although different issues related to climate change are becoming more evident and the cultivation of WEPs offers a crop/cropping system-based technology strategy to promote the cultivation of crops and varieties that fit into new farming systems, namely a system with increased resistance to weather extremes, the main question is how will the consumers accept such products. WEPs are not an entirely new type of food source, but the traditional knowledge about them is forgotten to a certain extent [11,13,14].

This study makes several contributions to the extant literature. First, the subjective knowledge scale suggested by Flynn and Goldsmith [87] was modified to measure subjective knowledge related to WEPs. Secondly, the food neophobia scale [89], which is usually applied to measure the fear of trying new foods that can result in the avoidance of unfamiliar foods [67,68,75], was used to assess the intention to purchase fresh WEPs and WEPs food products. Thirdly, this research examined the consumer attitude scale related to WEPs that was proposed by Schunko and Vogl [58] and the customer attitude scale regarding nature preservation [88] and purchase intention [95] on customers that frequent farmers' markets. Finally, the influence of subjective knowledge, attitudes related to nature preservation and WEPs, food neophobia, customers' purchase intentions, and concern about climate change on customers' intentions to purchase fresh WEPs and WEP food products were evaluated. WEPs and WEP food products have long been used as a food source; however, modern consumers are more accustomed to different food products that do not contain WEPs. The findings suggested that a positive attitude regarding food neophobia impacts consumers' intentions to purchase both fresh plants and processed products.

The findings have certain practical implications. The idea of promoting WEPs as a way to combat climate change is not likely to impact consumer behaviour; therefore, policymakers should focus on different consumer-related factors. Customers' interest in trying new foods is a positive factor that supports the promotion of fresh WEPs and WEP food products. Although WEPs are part of the human diet, due to various factors, consumers are generally not familiar with them, and this can be a potential issue for marketers. Furthermore, previous experience with WEP consumption, either fresh or processed, could pose an issue because of their potentially unacceptable sensory characteristics. This research could help with the development of strategies regarding consumers' WEP knowledge, for example, increasing their subjective knowledge by promoting the benefits and positive impacts of WEPs on human health and the environment, accompanied by possible usage tips, especially those centred on unusual WEP tastes. Lastly, this research could encourage consumers to try different WEPs, consequently boosting farmers to substitute or introduce WEPs in crop/cropping system-based technologies strategies. Despite WEPs' potential, current challenges in their introduction to the market include their seasonality, so potential strategies should include guidance regarding their commercial production.

There are certain limitations of this study. Only customers frequenting local farmers' markets were involved in this study, so future research could test this relationship with consumers in general. Consumers' psychological factors included subjective knowledge, food neophobia, attitudes related to WEPs and nature presentation, and concern about climate change; further research could focus on measuring other psychological factors like lifestyle, health, etc., as well as sociodemographic characteristics, the influence of media



and word-of-mouth, health benefits, food safety issues, etc. Furthermore, consumers' knowledge can be measured as an individual's self-assessment of how much they know about a product and the knowledge stored in the consumer's long-term memory [44]. This research centred on subjective knowledge, so future studies could examine objective knowledge, as well as consumers with certain medical conditions. Since the study results were based on quantitative data, future research could benefit by applying qualitative research methods to provide a deeper understanding of consumers' attitudes towards and perceptions of WEPs.

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, A.T.D. and A.Č.M.; methodology, A.T.D.; software, A.T.D.; validation, A.T.D., A.Č.M. and M.O.; formal analysis, A.T.D.; investigation, A.T.D., A.Č.M. and M.O.; resources, A.T.D.; data curation, A.T.D. and A.Č.M. writing—original draft preparation, A.T.D., A.Č.M. and M.O.; writing—review and editing, A.T.D. and A.Č.M.; visualization, M.O.; supervision, A.T.D.; project administration, A.T.D. and M.O.; funding acquisition, A.T.D. and M.O. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** This research was co-funded by project KK.05.1.1.02.0030 WildBioAdapt—Wild plant species, in the function of the adaption of agriculture and tourism to climate change, supported by the Operational Program Competitiveness and Cohesion 2014–2020 and the European regional fund under the specific scheme “Scheme to strengthening applied research in proposing actions for climate change adaptation”. This research was co-funded by the project Sustainable Tourism Strategies to Conserve and Valorize the Mediterranean Coastal and Maritime Natural Heritage (INHERIT), co-financed by the Interreg Mediterranean program.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** This study did not require ethical approval.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Informed consent was obtained from all the subjects involved in the study.

**Data Availability Statement:** The data presented in this study are available on request from the first author due to contractual obligations.

**Acknowledgments:** The authors would like to thank the research agency in their assistance with data gathering.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of the data; in the writing of the manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results.

## Appendix A

**Table A1.** List of Items Measuring Subjective Knowledge, Attitudes Related to Wild-Edible Plants, Customers' Purchase Intentions, Food Neophobia, and Attitudes Related to Nature Preservation.

Subjective knowledge	
sub_know_1	I know pretty much about wild-edible plants
sub_know_2	I know how to judge the quality of wild-edible plants
sub_know_3	I feel very knowledgeable about wild-edible plants
sub_know_4	Among my circle of friends, I'm one of the “experts” on wild-edible plants
sub_know_5	Compared to most other people, I know more about wild-edible plants
sub_know_6	When it comes to wild-edible plants, I know a lot
Attitudes related to wild-edible plants	
att_wep_1	Wild-edible plants gathering does not reduce the natural availability of the wild plant species
att_wep_2	Wild-edible plants are healthier than cultivated ones
att_wep_3	Wild-edible plants taste better than cultivated ones
att_wep_4	Wild-edible plants are indispensable for my nutrition
att_wep_5	Wild-edible plants are important supplements for healthy lifestyles
Customers' purchase intentions to buy fresh wild-edible plants	
buy_int_fweb_1	I will buy fresh wild-edible plants in the near future
buy_int_fweb_2	I am willing to buy fresh wild-edible plants in the near future
buy_int_fweb_3	I will make an effort to buy fresh wild-edible plants in the near future

Table A1. Cont.

Customers' purchase intention to buy food products made from wild-edible plants	
buy_int_fpweb_1	I am willing to buy food products made from wild-edible plants in the near future
buy_int_fpweb_2	I will buy food products made from wild-edible plants in the near future
buy_int_fpweb_3	I will make an effort to buy food products made from wild-edible plants in the near future
Food neophobia	
food_neophobia_1	I am constantly trying new and different foods
food_neophobia_2	I don't trust new foods
food_neophobia_3	I will try food from different countries
food_neophobia_4	Ethnic/regional food looks too weird to eat
food_neophobia_5	At dinner parties, I will try new food
food_neophobia_6	I will try new food in new regional/ethnic restaurants
Attitudes related to nature preservation	
att_np_1	The balance of nature is very delicate and can be easily upset
att_np_2	When humans interfere with nature, it often produces disastrous consequences
att_np_3	Humans must live in harmony with nature in order to survive
att_np_4	Mankind is severely abusing the environment
att_np_5	Mankind was created to rule over the rest of nature

## References

- Yanagi, M. Climate change impacts on wheat production: Reviewing challenges and adaptation strategies. *Adv. Resour. Res.* **2024**, *4*, 89–107. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Malhi, G.S.; Kaur, M.; Kaushik, P. Impact of Climate Change on Agriculture and Its Mitigation Strategies: A Review. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 1318. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Dalal, N.; Phogat, N.; Bisht, V. Insects: A New Food Source. *Int. J. Agric. Sci.* **2019**, *11*, 9345–9349.
- Venkateswarlu, B.; Shanker, A.K. Climate change and agriculture: Adaptation and mitigation strategies. *Indian J. Agron.* **2009**, *54*, 226–230. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- van der Spiegel, M.; Noordam, M.Y.; van der Fels-Klerx, H.J. Safety of novel protein sources (insects, microalgae, seaweed, duckweed, and rapeseed) and legislative aspects for their application in food and feed production. *Compr. Rev. Food Sci. Food Saf.* **2013**, *12*, 662–678. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Siddiqui, S.A.; Zannou, O.; Karim, I.; Kasmia; Awad, N.M.H.; Gołaszewski, J.; Heinz, V.; Smetana, S. Avoiding Food Neophobia and Increasing Consumer Acceptance of New Food Trends—A Decade of Research. *Sustainability* **2022**, *14*, 10391. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Treich, N. Cultured Meat: Promises and Challenges. *Environ. Resour. Econ.* **2021**, *79*, 33–61. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Carrell. Wild Harvest Reaps Big Rewards in Foraging Rush. *Guardian* 2009. Severin Carrell, Scotland Correspondent, Mon 27 Apr 2009 01.01 CEST. Available online: <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2009/apr/27/wild-food-foraging-reforesting-scotland> (accessed on 2 September 2024).
- Colombo, M.L.; Perego, S.; Vender, C.; Davanzo, F. Ethnobotany and foraging behaviour: A new approach for an emerging problem. *Lact. Alp.* **2010**, *10*, 159.
- Author, I.; Pieroni, A. Gathered Wild Food Plants in the Upper Valley of the Serchio River (Garfagnana), Central Italy. *Econ. Bot.* **1999**, *53*, 327–341.
- Aswani, S.; Lemahieu, A.; Sauer, W.H.H. Global trends of local ecological knowledge and future implications. *PLoS ONE* **2018**, *13*, e0195440. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Pardo, M.; Santayana, D.E.; Pellón, E.G. Etnobotánica: Aprovechamiento Tradicional de Plantas y Patrimonio Cultural. *An. Jard. Bot. Madr.* **2022**, *60*, 171–182.
- Cruz, M.P.; Medeiros, P.M.; Combariza, I.S.; Peroni, N.; Albuquerque, U.P. 'I eat the manofê so it is not forgotten': Local perceptions and consumption of native wild edible plants from seasonal dry forests in Brazil. *J. Ethnobiol. Ethnomed.* **2014**, *10*, 45. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Salvi, J.; Ss, K. Impact Factor: RJIF 5.12. 2016, Volume 1. Available online: [www.botanyjournals.com](http://www.botanyjournals.com) (accessed on 2 September 2024).
- Feyssa, D.H.; Njoka, J.T.; Asfaw, Z.; Nyangito, M.M. Seasonal availability and consumption of wild edible plants in semiarid Ethiopia: Implications to food security and climate change adaptation. *J. Hortic. For.* **2011**, *3*, 138–149.
- Asfaw, Z. The Future of Wild Food Plants in Southern Ethiopia: Ecosystem Conservation Coupled with Enhancement of the Roles of Key Social Groups. *Acta Hortic.* **2009**, *806*, 701–708. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Powell, B.; Thilsted, S.H.; Ickowitz, A.; Termote, C.; Sunderland, T.; Herforth, A. Improving diets with wild and cultivated biodiversity from across the landscape. *Food Secur.* **2015**, *7*, 535–554. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Ceccanti, C.; Landi, M.; Benvenuti, S.; Pardossi, A.; Guidi, L. Mediterranean Wild Edible Plants: Weeds or 'New Functional Crops'? *Molecules* **2018**, *23*, 2299. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

19. Morales, P.; Ferreira, I.C.F.R.; Carvalho, A.M.; Sánchez-Mata, M.C.; Cámara, M.; Fernández-Ruiz, V.; Pardo-de-Santayana, M.; Tardío, J. Mediterranean non-cultivated vegetables as dietary sources of compounds with antioxidant and biological activity. *LWT-Food Sci. Technol.* **2014**, *55*, 389–396. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
20. Vanzani, P.; Rossetto, M.; De Marco, V.; Sacchetti, L.E.; Paoletti, M.G.; Rigo, A. Wild Mediterranean Plants as Traditional Food: A Valuable Source of Antioxidants. *J. Food Sci.* **2011**, *76*, C46–C51. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
21. Bortolotto, I.M.; de Mello Amorozo, M.C.; Neto, G.G.; Oldeland, J.; Damasceno-Junior, G.A. Knowledge and use of wild edible plants in rural communities along Paraguay River, Pantanal, Brazil. *J. Ethnobiol. Ethnomed.* **2015**, *11*, 46. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
22. Ali-Shtayeh, M.S.; Jamous, R.M.; Al-Shafie, J.H.; Elgharabah, A.; Kherfan, F.A.; Qarariah, K.H.; Khdaif, S.; Soos, I.M.; Musleh, A.A.; Isa, B.A.; et al. Traditional knowledge of wild edible plants used in Palestine (Northern West Bank): A comparative study. *J. Ethnobiol. Ethnomed.* **2008**, *4*, 13. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
23. Ladio, A.H.; Lozada, M. Edible Wild Plant Use in a Mapuche Community of Northwestern Patagonia. *Hum. Ecol.* **2000**, *28*, 53–71. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
24. Sachula; Geilebagan; Zhang, Y.Y.; Zhao, H.; Khasbagan. Wild edible plants collected and consumed by the locals in Daqinggou, Inner Mongolia, China. *J. Ethnobiol. Ethnomed.* **2020**, *16*, 60. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
25. Chrysargyris, A.; Baldi, A.; Lenzi, A.; Bulgari, R. Wild Plant Species as Potential Horticultural Crops: An Opportunity for Farmers and Consumers. *Horticolturae* **2023**, *11*, 1193. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
26. Peduruhe, P.S.; Jayathunge, K.G.L.R.; Liyanage, R. Potential of Underutilized Wild Edible Plants as the Food for the Future—A Review. *J. Food Secur.* **2021**, *9*, 136–147. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
27. Torrico, D.D.; Nie, X.; Lukito, D.; Deb-Choudhury, S.; Hutchings, S.C.; Realini, C.E. Consumer Attitudes and Acceptability toward Edible New Zealand Native Plants. *Sustainability* **2023**, *15*, 11592. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
28. Guo, Q.; Fei, S.; Shen, Z.; Iannone, B.V.; Knott, J.; Chown, S.L. A global analysis of elevational distribution of non-native versus native plants. *J. Biogeogr.* **2018**, *45*, 793–803. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
29. Perito, M.A.; Coderoni, S.; Russo, C. Consumer Attitudes towards Local and Organic Food with Upcycled Ingredients: An Italian Case Study for Olive Leaves. *Foods* **2020**, *9*, 1325. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
30. Carvalho, A.M.; Barata, A.M. The Consumption of Wild Edible Plants. In *Wild Plants, Mushrooms and Nuts: Functional Food Properties and Applications*; John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2013.
31. Amdie, T.A. Wild Edible Trees and Shrubs in the Semi-Arid Lowland of Southern Ethiopia. 2016. Available online: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303667740> (accessed on 2 September 2024).
32. Das, M.; Sen, P.; Suriya, S.; Pahari, K.; De, M. Availability of Wild Edible Plants (WEPS) in Urban, Suburban and Rural Market Areas in Rainy Season. *NDC E-BIOS* **2023**, *3*, 21–28. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
33. Serrasolses, G.; Calvet-Mir, L.; Carrió, E.; D'Ambrosio, U.; Garnatje, T.; Parada, M.; Vallès, J. A Matter of Taste: Local Explanations for the Consumption of Wild Food Plants in the Catalan Pyrenees and the Balearic Islands1. *Econ. Bot.* **2016**, *70*, 176–189. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
34. Dogan, Y.; Durkan, N. *Metal Accumulation in Crops and Potential Health Risk View Project Litani River Basin Management Support*; USAID: Washington, DC, USA; International Resources Group: Washington, DC, USA, 2009. Available online: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286322823> (accessed on 1 September 2024).
35. Nebel, S.; Pieroni, A.; Heinrich, M. Ta chòrta: Wild edible greens used in the Graecanic area in Calabria, Southern Italy. *Appetite* **2006**, *47*, 333–342. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
36. Pieroni, A.; Nebel, S.; Santoro, R.F.; Heinrich, M. Food for two seasons: Culinary uses of non-cultivated local vegetables and mushrooms in a south Italian village. *Int. J. Food Sci. Nutr.* **2005**, *56*, 245–272. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
37. Tardío, J.; Pardo-De-Santayana, M.; Morales, R. Ethnobotanical review of wild edible plants in Spain. *Bot. J. Linn. Soc.* **2006**, *152*, 27–71. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
38. Duguma, H.T. Wild Edible Plant Nutritional Contribution and Consumer Perception in Ethiopia. *Int. J. Food Sci.* **2020**, *2020*, 2958623. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
39. Molina, M.; Tardío, J.; Aceituno-Mata, L.; Morales, R.; Reyes-García, V.; Pardo-de-Santayana, M. Weeds and Food Diversity: Natural Yield Assessment and Future Alternatives for Traditionally Consumed Wild Vegetables. *J. Ethnobiol.* **2014**, *34*, 44–67. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
40. Madej, T.; Piroz, E.; Dumanowski, J.; Łuczaj, Ł. Juniper Beer in Poland: The Story of the Revival of a Traditional Beverage. *J. Ethnobiol.* **2014**, *34*, 84–103. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
41. Schunko, C.; Lechthaler, S.; Vogl, C.R. Conceptualising the factors that influence the commercialisation of non-timber forest products: The case of wild plant gathering by organic herb farmers in South Tyrol (Italy). *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 2028. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
42. Pettenella, D.; Secco, L.; Maso, D. NWFP&S Marketing: Lessons Learned and New Development Paths from Case Studies in Some European Countries. *Small-Scale For.* **2007**, *6*, 373–390. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
43. Baldi, L.; Mancuso, T.; Peri, M.; Gasco, L.; Trentinaglia, M.T. Consumer attitude and acceptance toward fish fed with insects: A focus on the new generations. *J. Insects Food Feed* **2022**, *8*, 1249–1263. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
44. Park, C.W.; Mothersbaugh, D.L.; Feick, L. Consumer Knowledge Assessment. *J. Consum. Res.* **1994**, *21*, 71–82. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
45. Park, C.W.; Lessig, V.P. Familiarity and Its Impact on Consumer Decision Biases and Heuristics. *J. Consum. Res.* **1981**, *8*, 223–230. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

46. Hochstein, B.; Bolander, W.; Christenson, B.; Pratt, A.B.; Reynolds, K. An Investigation of Consumer Subjective Knowledge in Frontline Interactions. *J. Retail.* **2021**, *97*, 336–346. [CrossRef]
47. Hwang, H.; Nam, S.-J. The influence of consumers' knowledge on their responses to genetically modified foods. *GM Crops Food* **2021**, *12*, 146–157. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
48. Jin, H.J.; Han, D.H. Interaction between message framing and consumers' prior subjective knowledge regarding food safety issues. *Food Policy* **2014**, *44*, 95–102. [CrossRef]
49. Upreti, Y.; Poudel, R.C.; Shrestha, K.K.; Rajbhandary, S.; Tiwari, N.N.; Shrestha, U.B. Diversity of use and local knowledge of wild edible plant resources in Nepal. *J. Ethnobiol. Ethnomed.* **2012**, *8*, 16. [CrossRef]
50. Verbeke, W. Impact of communication on consumers' food choices. *Proc. Nutr. Soc.* **2008**, *67*, 281–288. [CrossRef]
51. Vermeir, I.; Verbeke, W. Sustainable food consumption: Exploring the consumer 'attitude—Behavioral intention' gap. *J. Agric. Environ. Ethics* **2006**, *19*, 169–194. [CrossRef]
52. Pieniak, Z.; Verbeke, W.; Brunsø, K.; Olsen, S.O. *Consumer Knowledge and Interest in Information About Fish*; Wageningen Academic Publishers: Wageningen, The Netherlands, 2006.
53. Han, L.; Wang, S.; Zhao, D.; Li, J. The intention to adopt electric vehicles: Driven by functional and non-functional values. *Transp. Res. Part A Policy Pract.* **2017**, *103*, 185–197. [CrossRef]
54. Martinho, V.J.P.D. Food and Consumer Attitude(s): An Overview of the Most Relevant Documents. *Agriculture* **2021**, *11*, 1183. [CrossRef]
55. Chen, B.; Qiu, Z. Consumers' Attitudes towards Edible Wild Plants: A Case Study of Noto Peninsula, Ishikawa Prefecture, Japan. *Int. J. For. Res.* **2012**, *1*, 872413. [CrossRef]
56. Szakály, Z.; Kovács, B.; Soós, M.; Kiss, M.; Balsa-Budai, N. Adaptation and Validation of the Food Neophobia Scale: The Case of Hungary. *Foods* **2021**, *10*, 1766. [CrossRef]
57. Bugi, M.-A.; Jugănar, I.; Simina, I.-E.; Nicoară, D.-M.; Cristun, L.-I.; Brad, G.-F.; Boru, C.; Cîrnatu, D.; Mărginean, O. Exploring Adult Eating Behaviors and Food Neophobia: A National Study in Romania. *Foods* **2024**, *13*, 1301. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
58. Schunko, C.; Vogl, C.R. Factors determining organic consumers' knowledge and practices with respect to wild plant foods: A countrywide study in Austria. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2020**, *82*, 103868. [CrossRef]
59. Choe, J.Y.; Cho, M.S. Food neophobia and willingness to try non-traditional foods for Koreans. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2011**, *22*, 671–677. [CrossRef]
60. Tuorila, H.; Lähteenmäki, L.; Pohjalainen, L.; Lotti, L. Food neophobia among the Finns and related responses to familiar and unfamiliar foods. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2001**, *12*, 29–37. [CrossRef]
61. Olabi, A.; Najm, N.E.O.; Baghdadi, O.K.; Morton, J.M. Food neophobia levels of Lebanese and American college students. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2009**, *20*, 353–362. [CrossRef]
62. Pliner, P.; Hobden, K. Development of a scale to measure the trait of food neophobia in humans. *Appetite* **1992**, *19*, 105–120. [CrossRef]
63. Maksan, M.T.; Kalit, M.T.; Mesic, Z. Food Neophobia as a Determinant of Consumer Behaviour in Ethnic Food Consumption. Available online: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/338389209> (accessed on 1 September 2024).
64. Johns, N.; Edwards, J.S.A.; Hartwell, H. Food neophobia and the adoption of new food products. *Nutr. Food Sci.* **2011**, *41*, 201–209. [CrossRef]
65. La Barbera, F.; Verneau, F.; Amato, M.; Grunert, K. Understanding Westerners' disgust for the eating of insects: The role of food neophobia and implicit associations. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2018**, *64*, 120–125. [CrossRef]
66. Diamantopoulos, A.; Schlegelmilch, B.B.; Sinkovics, R.R.; Bohlen, G.M. Can socio-demographics still play a role in profiling green consumers? A review of the evidence and an empirical investigation. *J. Bus. Res.* **2003**, *56*, 465–480. [CrossRef]
67. Crosby, L.A.; Gill, J.D.; Taylor, J.R. Consumer/Voter Behavior in the Passage of the Michigan Container law. *J. Mark.* **1981**, *45*, 19–32. [CrossRef]
68. Hines, J.M.; Hungerford, H.R.; Tomera, A.N. Analysis and Synthesis of Research on Responsible Environmental Behavior: A Meta-Analysis. *J. Environ. Educ.* **1987**, *18*, 1–8. [CrossRef]
69. Newman, C.L.; Howlett, E.; Burton, S.; Kozup, J.C.; Tangari, A.H. The influence of consumer concern about global climate change on framing effects for environmental sustainability messages. *Int. J. Advert.* **2012**, *31*, 511–527. [CrossRef]
70. Yadav, R.; Pathak, G.S. Young consumers' intention towards buying green products in a developing nation: Extending the theory of planned behavior. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2016**, *135*, 732–739. [CrossRef]
71. Schiffman, L.G.; Kanuk, L.L. *Customer Behavior*, 7th ed.; Prentice Hall: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2000.
72. Bradmore, D.D. *Purchase Intentions*, 7th ed.; Prentice Hall: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2004.
73. Gumirakiza, J.D.; Curtis, K.R.; Bosworth, R. Who Attends Farmers' Markets and Why? Understanding Consumers and their Motivations. *Int. Food Agribus. Manag. Rev.* **2014**, *17*, 65–82.
74. Archer, G.P.; Sánchez, J.G.; Vignali, G.; Chaillot, A. Latent consumers' attitude to farmers' markets in North West England. *Br. Food J.* **2003**, *105*, 487–497. [CrossRef]
75. Connell, D.J.; Smithers, J.; Joseph, A. Farmers' markets and the 'good food' value chain: A preliminary study. *Local Environ.* **2008**, *13*, 169–185. [CrossRef]
76. Veal, A.J. *Research Methods for Leisure and Tourism: A Practical Guide*; Pearson Education Ltd.: Essex, UK, 2006.



77. Hair, J.F.; Black, W.C.; Babin, B.J. *Multivariate Data Analysis. A Global Perspective*, 7th ed.; Pearson Education Inc.: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2009.
78. de Winter, J.C.F.; Dodou, D. Factor recovery by principal axis factoring and maximum likelihood factor analysis as a function of factor pattern and sample size. *J. Appl. Stat.* **2012**, *39*, 695–710. [[CrossRef](#)]
79. Mabel, O.A.; Olayemi, O.S. A Comparison of Principal Component Analysis, Maximum Likelihood, and the Principal Axis in Factor Analysis. *Am. J. Math. Stat.* **2020**, *10*, 44–54.
80. Rennie, K.M. Exploratory and Confirmatory Rotation Strategies in Exploratory Factor Analysis. In Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Austin, TX, USA, 23–25 January 1997; Available online: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED406446> (accessed on 1 September 2024).
81. DiStefano, C.; Zhu, M.; Mindrilă, D. Understanding and Using Factor Scores: Considerations for the Applied Researcher. *Pract. Assess. Res. Eval.* **2009**, *14*, 20.
82. Parlow, A. Stata and the Problem of Heteroscedasticity. 2013. Available online: <https://pantherfile.uwm.edu/aparlow/www/papers/stata2.pdf> (accessed on 1 September 2024).
83. Breusch, T.S.; Pagan, A.R. A Simple Test for Heteroscedasticity and Random Coefficient Variation. *Econom. J. Econom. Soc.* **1979**, *47*, 1287–1294. [[CrossRef](#)]
84. Ramsey, J.B. Tests for Specification Errors in Classical Linear Least-Squares Regression Analysis. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B* **1969**, *31*, 350–371. [[CrossRef](#)]
85. Flynn, L.R.; Goldsmith, R.E. A Short, Reliable Measure of Subjective Knowledge. *J. Bus. Res.* **1999**, *46*, 57–66. [[CrossRef](#)]
86. Yadav, R.; Pathak, G.S. Determinants of Consumers' Green Purchase Behavior in a Developing Nation: Applying and Extending the Theory of Planned Behavior. *Ecol. Econ.* **2017**, *134*, 114–122. [[CrossRef](#)]
87. Piha, S.; Pohjanheimo, T.; Lähteenmäki-Uutela, A.; Křečková, Z.; Otterbring, T. The effects of consumer knowledge on the willingness to buy insect food: An exploratory cross-regional study in Northern and Central Europe. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2018**, *70*, 1–10. [[CrossRef](#)]
88. Liu, M.T.; Liu, Y.; Mo, Z. Moral norm is the key. *Asia Pac. J. Mark. Logist.* **2020**, *32*, 1823–1841. [[CrossRef](#)]
89. Field, A. *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS*, 2nd ed.; Sage Publication Ltd.: London, UK, 2005.
90. Ozili, P.K. The Acceptable R-Square in Empirical Modelling for Social Science Research. *SSRN Electron. J.* **2022**. [[CrossRef](#)]
91. Baum, C.F. *An Introduction to Modern Econometrics Using STATA*; Stata Press: College Station, TX, USA, 2006.
92. Liang, T.-C.; Situmorang, R.O.P.; Liao, M.-C.; Chang, S.-C. The Relationship of Perceived Consumer Effectiveness, Subjective Knowledge, and Purchase Intention on Carbon Label Products—A Case Study of Carbon-Labeled Packaged Tea Products in Taiwan. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 7892. [[CrossRef](#)]
93. Peschel, A.O.; Grebitus, C.; Steiner, B.; Veeman, M. How does consumer knowledge affect environmentally sustainable choices? Evidence from a cross-country latent class analysis of food labels. *Appetite* **2016**, *106*, 78–91. [[CrossRef](#)]
94. Moorman, C.; Diehl, K.; Brinberg, D.; Kidwell, B. Subjective Knowledge, Search Locations, and Consumer Choice. *J. Consum. Res.* **2004**, *31*, 673–680. [[CrossRef](#)]
95. Engel, J.F.; Blackwell, R.D.; Miniard, P.W. *Consumer Behavior*, 8th ed.; The Dryden Press: Worcester, UK, 1995.

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.