



Article

Why Organic Food? Factors Influence the Organic Food Purchase Intension in an Emerging Country (Study from Northern Part of Bangladesh)

Shahnaj Akter ¹, Shahjahan Ali ^{1,2,*} , Mária Fekete-Farkas ² , Csaba Fogarassy ^{2,†} and Zoltán Lakner ²

¹ Doctoral School of Economic and Regional Sciences, Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Pater Karoly Street-1, 2100 Godollo, Hungary

² Institute of Agricultural and Food Economics, Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Pater Karoly Street-1, 2100 Godollo, Hungary

* Correspondence: ali.shahjahan@phd.uni-mate.hu

† Deceased author.

Abstract: Organic farming is functionally integrated and serves as the foundation for circular agriculture. It guarantees resource efficiency in the deployment of nature-based initiatives to mitigate climate change. Organic farming is the most cost-efficient strategy for fighting climate change. Primarily the intensive generation of waste due to strong urbanization effects, the expression of consumer response is particularly powerful while purchasing organic items. This analysis's major purpose is to examine which various aspects may be applied to consumers' perspectives towards circular agriculture when buying organic foods. In this research, a well-constructed questionnaire was produced. Of the 1030 participants who participated in the survey, 1001 samples were examined. The major study question was, "Would the customer purchase organic food product that is good environment?" The second issue is, how do eco-label foods, knowledge about climate change, consumer education, and specific socio-demographic features impact the value of organic food consumption? According to the study's findings, in the case of the studied customers, people's concerns about climate change, trust, and eco-labels demonstrate a stronger preference for purchasing organic food. It is also a surprise that customer trust has a big effect on consumer buying intention. The new scientific result of the research is that, in the case of emerging countries, due to the significantly lower price level difference between organic products and traditional foods, the healthy properties of foods with an eco-label, as well as the communication of knowledge about climate change, have a significant effect on the level of consumption of organic foods.

Keywords: organic food; emerging country; eco-labelling; climate change adaptation; circular economy; food price



Citation: Akter, S.; Ali, S.; Fekete-Farkas, M.; Fogarassy, C.; Lakner, Z. Why Organic Food? Factors Influence the Organic Food Purchase Intension in an Emerging Country (Study from Northern Part of Bangladesh). *Resources* **2023**, *12*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.3390/resources12010005>

Academic Editor: Eva Pongrácz

Received: 23 September 2022

Revised: 30 November 2022

Accepted: 14 December 2022

Published: 3 January 2023



Copyright: © 2023 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 sustainability challenges affecting the economy, social resources, public health, and the environment are driving the interest in modern organic food production across the globe [1]. Consumers believe that organic food is better for the environment because of the natural growing techniques used [2] and the reduced use of artificial fertilizers and pesticides that are damaging to nature [3,4]. Changes in views about organic foods may be encouraged by a favorable attitude towards the environment, food safety, and better alternatives to traditionally cultivated foods [5,6]. Because of this, it is imperative that the relationship between organic food production and the advancement of food safety, environmental sustainability, and health benefits are enhanced [7]. Due to the fact that the climate remains one of the most critical natural resources to determine the existing and upcoming generations' sustainability, the demand for a circular economy should include modification targets, particularly in their application based upon natural processes that

maximizes the usage of environmental capital. Natural climate movements are the consequence of environmental ecological processes that generate a suite of ecosystem benefits, including those associated with environment regulation. Environment-based interventions generate significant co-advantages, including environmental, economic, and social gains, and are also cost-effective. Economists have long emphasized the critical nature of achieving climate goals at the lowest possible price [8]. National administrations and international organizations have thus far failed to implement an applicable policy for addressing climate change and reaching climate goals [9]. This policy collapse is inextricably linked to a scientific failure: the failure to explain the true costs of environmental consequences and modification activities [10]. This casts doubt on the layout of climate strategies, particularly at the micro-level, where multiple measures might have been performed. Numerous possible mitigating measures have been overlooked, undervalued, or not attempted. Without a good financial appraisal of these measures' climate impact, their implementation has been hampered [11] as effective strategies with economic inducements cannot be adequately devised. Indeed, internalizing these (positive) externalities may aid in the model of climate strategies that send the appropriate market indicators to manufacturers and buyers [12].

Following the United States, China has the second largest world food market. Organic food costs 10–50 percent more than traditional food [13,14]. Researchers have discovered that, more than a decade ago, Chinese customers were price responsive when it came to purchasing fish [15]. According to these studies, Chinese consumers were less inclined to purchase more costly seafood with green labels and were more likely to pick lower-priced seafood which were non-labeled but were similarly accessible in the market. However, a recent study discovered a distinct pattern which indicated that Chinese customers are prepared to spend more for food that is safer [14]. The regular reports of tainted seafood and other food-related incidents were thought to be the cause of this shift in eating habits [16–19].

Consumers in the Western world are becoming more informed about the food they consume. The countrywide campaign in the USA to require the marking of milk supplied by hormone-treated cows is a notable example. The US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) determined that there were no identified health risks connected with the intake of milk with the bST-treated trademark, hence this public request was canceled. The FDA has cleared the use of the animal medication bovine somatotropin (bST), often known as bovine growth hormone, to improve milk output in dairy cows. The public's demand for a regulation solution, on the other hand, demonstrates a perceived advantage connected with food production methodology exposure. The desire for educated dietary decisions is shown by this instance in the United States. Other examples of specific information requirements include product safety features and the environmental effects of manufacturing procedures [20,21].

The projected utility associated with food intake determines the economic impact of labeling [22]. The risk preferences connected with the consumption of food, on the other hand, impacts predicted utility and consequently changes the food bundle selection. When customers perceive a minimal danger, there is less need for further information. Perfect information ignores the premise that food providers respond to financial inducements, and that only profit motivates marketers and producers to offer safe food. The higher the degree of safety attained, however, the higher the marginal cost for providers, resulting in a strongly upward sloping supply curve of food-safety. To define the food safety market equilibrium level, the food safety level given to the market must network with the food safety demand [22–25]. Certainly, food economists have observed that suppliers are generally more knowledgeable concerning food safety than purchasers, and that food safety is frequently scarce [26].

Information, according to economists, is a significant source for players in the market. On the demand side, anybody looking for the best deal must shop about until the marginal benefit of acquiring more evidence equals the marginal cost of searching for it. Consumers' willingness to pay (WTP) for information is influenced by the amount of work required to find it [27]. The abundance of manufactured goods with lower quality in the market

is a consequence of the incentives of sellers to market. In a study focusing on lemons, it was challenging for the public to recognize who marketed low-quality goods and therefore punished the seller. As a consequence, the quality of commodities suffered, which made government involvement desirable to assist the market in restoring the supply and demand balance for food safety [22,26].

Green and organic food products with eco-labels have grown more in the global market [28–32] but Chinese customers are less WTP a premium for products with environmentally friendly labels. According to recent studies, customers were ready to pay a 4.5 percent premium above the basic price for eco-labeled items, contrasted with a 6.6 percent premium for American consumers [33–35]. Trust is very important for buying organic food. Plans to integrate green claims and develop eco-labels that encompass the nutritional, climatic, environmental, and social elements of food production and branding have been rebuffed by organic food businesses [36].

A consumer's five-stage decision model has been developed to better describe the process of buying organic food. Researchers have predicted and examined the demand for organic food using well-known theories such as the Theory of Reasoned Action and the Theory of Planned Behavior [37–39]. To explain why people choose organic and/or local food they have used the Value-Belief-Norm (VBN) theory and the Attitude-Behavior-Context (ABC) theory. Based on the demographics linked to the interview data, they offered a brand-new theoretical framework known as the Alphabet theory to explain the purchasing behavior for organic and local foods [40]. A five-stage model was established to comprehend the purchasing decision making process. The five steps are: recognizing a need; looking for relevant information; assessing multiple alternatives; choosing the best alternative; and post-purchase behavior. A theoretical framework created by Paul and Rana [41] demonstrates the relative significance of elements including health advantages, ecological awareness, accessibility, and freshness as drivers of the desire to purchase organic food. A sequential decision process model was made which included nutrition information consumption, organic food brand tribalism, self-esteem, and sentiments about organic food purchasing [42,43]. The intention to buy soft drinks with artificial sugar and meat from animals kept on a corn diet (as opposed to a grass diet) were both studied using this model, which was then used to explain significant variations in consumers' intentions to buy unhealthy food versus organic food. Food must be produced, processed, distributed, prepared, eaten, and occasionally disposed of. Each of these processes produces greenhouse gases, which trap the heat of the sun and cause climate change. Food is linked to around a third of all emissions of greenhouse gases created by humans [44]. The above reasoning begs the questions: Can concern for health or fear of climate change be a stronger motivational factor in influencing shopping habits? Why do we choose organic food? Is concern for our own health or concern for our planet the main motivating factor? Can the consumer understand the connection between purchasing polluted food and the agricultural production that causes climate change?

Our main research question is: how do consumers' attitudes and perspectives related to climate change and socio-economic status (gender, education) influence consumers' purchase intentions in the case of organic food?

2. Review of the Literature

2.1. Theoretical Framework and Hypothesis Development

The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) has been created to measure and identify behavioral intention variables, especially from an individual's point of view. The TPB model is a popular way to study how people think and act [45]. Experts say that it is not possible to predict future behavior based on past actions [46]. Ajzen and Fishbein [47] noticed that values need to be looked at in the context of the situation to predict behavior.

2.1.1. Eco-Label

The main reason people choose organic foods is that they are safer [48]. The risks of eating foods that have been processed with chemicals are lessened by eating organic products [49]. Because organic foods are better for your health, safety concerns have been found to be a big reason why people want to buy them [50–52]. People who care about food safety are more likely to choose organic products and put a higher value on local manufacturing [53]. People who buy organic products believe that what they are doing is very good for the people around them and their families. Therefore, we put forward the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1 (H1). *The eco-label of organic foods has a positive effect on consumer purchase intensity in Bangladesh if it includes information related to climate change.*

2.1.2. Trust

Even though organic foods have flaws, people still pay high prices for their taste, quality, certification, marketing, and production methods. This shows that they are trusted. Trust in the way organic foods are made, including standards and control, has strong effects on both intentions and actions [54,55]. Reports say that organic food products must have a label that is clear and easy to see [56]. According to a study by Perrini et al. [57], the commitment of retailers to customer rights and the environment is a big reason why Italians trust retailers. Trust has a big effect on a consumer's decision to buy [58], and it has also been shown to be a good predictor of behavior intention [59]. Trust has a big impact on what people buy and what they do not buy [60–63]. This is especially true when it comes to buying organic foods [55,64]. Yu's study [65] showed that customers' trust has a big effect on how likely they are to buy organic products. Therefore, we can make the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2 (H2). *Consumer trust is positively influenced by (general) knowledge of production systems when purchasing organic food.*

2.1.3. Education (Health and Environmental Consciousness)

Environmental consciousness is how much people are aware of and willing to do something about environmental problems [66]. Organic farming is good for the environment in many ways, such as protecting the soil, keeping farm ecosystems healthy, and protecting ground and surface water [67]. Environmental concerns have a big effect on how likely Sabahan consumers are to buy something [68,69]. Consumers' intentions to buy green products were directly and positively related to their concern for the environment [70]. Concern for the environment is a big part of whether or not someone wants to buy organic food [71], since buying organic food is seen as a good thing to do for the environment. Therefore, the more a consumer cares about the environment, the more likely they are to buy green products [72]. People's health consciousness shows how they feel about health issues and how willing they are to take steps to protect their health [73,74]. Many people think that organic foods are healthier because they have more nutrients and do not have any chemicals on them [75]. For Polish customers, the most important thing about organic food is that it is healthy [76]. Therefore, health awareness is a very important reason why people eat organic foods [77]. Empirical data shows that HC has a positive and important effect on what customers buy and how much they plan to consume. People who care about their health are more likely to buy organic foods than foods that were not grown in an organic way [56,78,79]. The researchers [72,79,80] found that health consciousness is a strong reason why people want to buy organic foods. In light of this, the following hypothesis can be made:

Hypothesis 3 (H3). *The level of education (information about health and the environment) has a positive effect on organic product consumption (basically only information or regulation is required).*

2.2. Organic Food Production and Consumer Purchase Intention

The term “organic” refers to cultivation and processing methods that are utilized for agricultural goods. The cultivation and processing of organic fresh produce does not involve the application of any conventional or synthetic pesticides, fertilizers, GMOs, sewage sludge, irradiation, or any artificial flavors, colors, or preservatives. For traditional food production, chemical fertilizers are used to help plants grow. Herbicides and pesticides are used to make conventional foods. In conventional animal farming, antibiotics and growth hormones are given to animals to help them grow and feel better [81,82]. Organic farming was started in Bangladesh after 1970 with the help of Non-Government Organizations (NGOs) such as UBINIG and PROSHIKA to produce seasonal vegetables in an appropriate, productive, and equitable manner while adhering to biodiversity principles [83,84]. Because of its distinctive properties, such as environmental concern, food safety, nutrition, and sensory traits, organic food is becoming preferable to consumers in Bangladesh compared with traditional food [85]. Organic food appeals to consumers because of its superior flavor, health advantages, and desirability as a stylish product. Organic goods have a lot of promise in Bangladesh, both as exports and in local markets. Organic items are consumed by both young and elderly individuals, with more males preferring organic food than women. As the family’s seafood purchasers, men are ready to spend more for organic foods than women [83,86].

The shrimp industry in Bangladesh contributes significantly to foreign currency market revenue, hence an increase in the production of food and the boosting of lifestyles. It is also helping to increase the income of agricultural families and related organizations [87–89]. This is the country’s second-largest export business, producing USD 380 million yearly. It is 5.6 percent of the country’s total export value. There are 1.2 million people working directly in the industry and 4.8 million families working indirectly.

Consumers are more interested in buying natural, hormone-free, and antibiotic-free food because they care about their health and the environment [90]. Due to a growing population, the food market is becoming larger day by day. More people are consuming organic fish, more people are aware of how important it is to keep their bodies in good shape, and the price of fish in other countries has gone up. Consumers have got to see the practice of organic farming as making food that meets their needs. Ecological succession has been used in aquaculture to help organic fish farming [91]. According to the practice of organic aquaculture, the majority of fish can be grown in both brackish and marine water [51–53]. Because of these farming opportunities, organic aquaculture food production around the world rose by more than 415 thousand metric tons in 2016 [4,91–95]. However, organic aquaculture products still have a small share of the market [95,96]. There has not been a lot of detailed research on how people can tell the difference between conventionally and organically farmed products from different sources. Globally, demand for aquaculture products is increasing. The availability of commercial and technical prospects has made the growth of fish farming a very important subject. People in Asia grow a lot of fish and shrimp. The top four producers are China, India, Vietnam, and Bangladesh. Since Bangladesh is an agricultural and a riverine country, organic food businesses have a lot of chances to make a lot of money [97,98]. In addition, Bangladesh’s location and culture also make it more likely to back fisheries and aquaculture. Aquaculture products are used by Bangladeshis to get the nutrition and protein they need. In the last few years, they have become richer and more educated, with development and issues of safety becoming major issues. Because organic food is thought to be healthy and safe, the demand for organic foods in urban areas has risen. The number of organic food producers, including those who grow farmed food, is not growing quickly enough to keep up with the demand for organic food [99–104].

In the last few years, both the EU and the USA have seen huge increases in the amount of organic food they make. Researchers looked at how 1,325,435 Instagram users from all over the world responded to posts about organic food. The information was collected from 4 July 2016 to 19 April 2017. They found the three most important hashtag areas (healthy,

vegan, and clean food). The sentiment analysis showed that the #organicfood hashtag was mostly about three things (taste, feelings, and appearance). The cluster analysis revealed six areas: healthy living, raw diets, clean eating, vegetarian, vegan, and active healthy living [105]. In Switzerland and Hungary, the researchers utilized four distinct approaches to track the progression of consumers of varying ages toward more environmentally friendly food options. This study revealed that, in order to attain sustainability, it will not be difficult for Switzerland to alter the eating habits of its people; on the other hand, Hungary will have to resort to the use of rules and regulations. Even while Hungarians are concerned about climate change and the quality of their water, similar to Swiss people, Hungarians over the age of fifty are more price sensitive. A step in the right direction toward achieving sustainability in Hungary may be to introduce a tax on foods [106]. In the Italian market, where goods come from is very important to customers [107]. The market for organic food in Romania is following a favorable trajectory, despite the fact that the country's consumption rate is still rather low in comparison with that of the European Union [108]. Consumers in Mexico had the highest purchase intention for organic food items when their desire to acquire them to accomplish a goal linked with social, personal, and environmental advantages intervened in their decision-making process. This finding was found across all age groups [109]. The attitudes and levels of the environmental concern of customers have a direct impact on the likelihood of their purchasing organic food [110]. Consumers also show that they are willing to pay more for products that are good for the environment if they can show where they came from or how they do not have as many negative effects on the environment. Another important factor in learning about a product is having it certified. The availability of food certification information (organic food or the source of a product) will lead to more final demand [111–114]. The main thing that makes people want to buy natural food is because it is good for health [115]. This has been mostly seen when people eat organic food. Also, it has been said that people who are concerned about their health might want to buy more environmentally friendly products [116]. The intention to buy organic food is positively impacted by environmental consciousness. This conclusion implies that customers are concerned with environmental issues and consider how such issues may affect their purchasing decisions. Consumers who care about the environment may believe that by buying more green items, businesses will be encouraged to spend more time and money developing environmentally friendly products and safeguarding the environment [117]. There is more benefit to having a health and carbon logo together than there is to having separate logos or no logo at all [118]. Sustainability is another important factor in how people think about food. In recent years, a lot of literature has talked about the "ethical consumer," who shows that they care about society by what they buy [119,120]. Research shows that a lot of people are willing to pay more for products that are good for the environment [121]. Consumers were more likely to buy them if they were also labeled as coming from a nearby source when it came to products with a lower carbon footprint [122]. The brand is also very important when it comes to influencing SC. Brand differences play a role in determining how people feel about new ingredients in products [123]. Another thing that comes up in sustainable consumption literature is the desire for organic food [124]. According to the literature, people want organic food because it has less of an impact on the environment, especially in Northern Europe [125]. People who buy organic food are more likely to think that it has less of an impact on the environment than people who buy Waste-To-Value (WTV) goods. This is because there is a positive and growing trend in bio-food consumption. Nutrition data is something that most people are interested in. Nutrition information has been found to change the value of products and make people more willing to pay for better results in a number of studies [126]. Consumer concerns about sustainability, labels, and nutritional information play a role in respondents' choices [127]. Because the foods that will be studied in this article also have more nutrition, it seemed beneficial to see if this might make people more likely to buy them. Finally, this study will assess how big an impact gender has on the likelihood of people buying food that is good for the environment. Women have a

better understanding and are more likely to get sick from food than men [128,129]. There is a connection between people who buy organic food and people who want to keep things recycled. However, the way the customer thinks about the product changes based on their age. With regards to organic food, young people have had a lot of experience. Cities in Hungary have the right attitude about eating organic food and are most aware of the circular economy [130]. This is what some people in Hungary do: they buy organic food and follow the latest trends. The factors that make a group want to eat organic food include how fresh the food is, how healthy their diet is, and how trustworthy they are. Because some food has harmful ingredients, health benefits are the most important thing [131].

Moreover, in terms of food safety and quality assurance, customers' levels of education, income, awareness, and family size, as well as price and, for example, the breed of fish, influence the WTP for organic food [132]. Customers with children, the elderly, and males who purchase organic meat on a regular basis are encouraged to do so in Bangladesh. Researchers have reported that organic food characteristics, including health advantages, vocal suggestions, buying ease, and availability, have a big impact on people's willingness to buy organic beef [43]. People's intentions to purchase organic foods are substantially influenced by their lack of awareness and information about such items, as well as their price premium [84,86]. Many customers believe that organic goods are less available in Bangladeshi local marketplaces, are restricted to certain retailers, and are inadequately certified. As a result, customers have little faith in organic food producers and salespeople [86,133,134].

3. Materials and Methods

People frequently place a particular significance on specific ecological characteristics of agrarian products. Our study's reasoning implies that environment-related services are expressed in an eco-branding programme that certifies tree cultivation's outward climate aid. Residents demonstrate their appreciation for this environment aid by engaging in a marketplace. Because they usually buy licensed eco-branded organic food, this comes at the cost of the advantages associated with the reduced utilization of other items. This section discusses our approach's estimation structure and the layout of the questionnaire along with model features of our evaluation.

3.1. Questionnaire Creation

The current work examines a unique technique for eliciting consumer preferences that has the potential to diminish the hypothetical character of specified preference analyses [135,136]. Buyers were asked to indicate the trade-offs they would be prepared to make to purchase certified organic food with eco-friendly labels from social marketing and online markets after assessing their purchasing experiences and habits. We want to offset the biases associated with the valuation of hypothetical nature frameworks and the lack of real dealings by exploiting citizens' actual purchasing experiences. A well-structured questionnaire was made for face-to-face survey. The questionnaire's first section enquired about the participant's socioeconomic situation, including age, gender, educational attainment, employment, marital status, and monthly family income. The second part of the survey gathered information on customers' experiences and preferences with organic food, with the goal of breaking down the usefulness of organic food into a range of aspects. Participants were asked if they purchase organic food and how much they consume each month. They were also asked where they get organic food and the extent to which important particular aspects/qualities (such as quality, price, organic production, brand, location of origin, etc.) are to them while purchasing the items. Customers' attitudes and perspectives on climate change and climate policy problems were evaluated in the last component, which included their concerns about climate change, the importance of mitigation policies and efforts, and the environmental and climatic imprint of each product they purchased.

3.2. The Sample's Characteristics

We have collected data through face-to-face interviews. In total, ten trained interviewers participated to collect data by using a standardized questionnaire to deliver the survey. Each interview was around 10–15 min long. The interviews were held in the important cities of Rangpur, Dinajpur, Bogura, and Rajshahi, which are all located in the northern region of Bangladesh. We decided to settle in this region because the majority of the agricultural and vegetable goods are produced there. Because we collected data from the major cities, we wanted to make sure that our sample was representative of the urban population in terms of demographic characteristics, consumption patterns including the purchase of vegetables, and environmental awareness and knowledge. This geographic dispersion was intended to guarantee that our sample was representative of the urban population. The survey was conducted throughout the weekends and weekdays between June and August 2021. The original sample of 1027 respondents were reduced to 1001 after excluding the missing values.

3.3. Econometric Modelling

Cronbach's alpha tests were conducted on all the variables to see how reliable they were as a combined scale [137]. The regression models were made to find out what factors make people purchase organic food that is more environmentally friendly. To do this, the model looks at the origin of the product, its nutritional value, the product's label, its certification, its brand, and the socio-demographic characteristics of the people who were interviewed. The empirical strategy that was used looked at a binary logistic regression model that was estimated in sequence with different model specifications to find out what factors influenced people's preferences for their choices. The model looks at how likely it is that someone will purchase organic food if this could cut down on the environmental impact of making it. As a way to measure the independent variable, we used a 5-point scale. Using the Likert scale, each model's dependent variable was made into a two-way choice by setting the highest values (4 and 5) as "yes" (1). In the scale, 1 and 3 stand for "no" (0). Even though dividing things into two groups could mean that some knowledge could be lost, this approach is justified on both functional and empirical grounds [138–140]. Furthermore, binary choice modeling makes it easier to look at the results. The general Equation (1) for the approximate conditional logic models is:

$$P_i(y_i \neq 0 | X_i) = \frac{\exp(X_i\beta)}{1 + \exp(X_i\beta)} \quad (1)$$

where,

$$i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n;$$

P_i = is the expected likelihood of a given option being made by person i .

β_i = is an undefined parameter vector, and X is a vector of explanatory variables representing the individual's characteristics and choices that are supposed to affect the respective option. Equation (2) shows the logistic regression model.

$$\text{OFPI} = \alpha + \beta_1 Gd + \beta_2 Ed + \beta_3 PF + \beta_4 EL + \beta_5 PF + \beta_6 CC + \beta_7 TR \quad (2)$$

where,

OFPI is the organic food purchase intention.

Gd is Gender

Ed is the level of education.

PF is the price of food

EL is Eco-label

CC is Climate Change.

TR is Trust on Suppliers.

The theoretical structure was investigated with the help of Stata version 14. First, the measurement model was used to test the validity and reliability of the model, and then the later statistical model was used to analyze the fit of the model and the validity of the hypothesis.

4. Results

This section highlights the participants' main thoughts and feelings on environmental and climate change issues, as well as sustainable agriculture consumption and production. To ensure the validity and reliability of the quantitative measurement frameworks, a measurement model is required. As evaluated by Cronbach alpha [62], the scale reliability coefficient (α) is 0.80. '0.70' or greater is considered acceptable. Validity and reliability are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The test result of validity and reliability.

Average inter-item covariance:	0.0978649
The number of items on the scale:	9
The scale reliability coefficient (α):	0.80

4.1. Demographic

The primary socioeconomic characteristics of the 1001 respondents are summarized in Table 2 below. Females made up 61.64% of participants, while males made up 31.64 percent, which may be related to the fact that women are more likely than men to buy in supermarkets. This might also be explained by the fact that women are more likely than men to like shopping [126], therefore women may be more willing to take our survey.

Table 2. Frequency Distribution of the respondents.

(a) The Frequency Distribution of the Respondents in the Context of the Region.		
Region	Frequency	Percent
Rangpur	220	21.97
Dinajpur	230	22.97
Bogura	300	29.97
Rajshahi	251	25.07
Total	1001	100
(b) The Frequency Distribution of the Respondents in the Context of Gender		
Female	617	61.64
Male	384	38.36
(c) The Frequency Distribution of the Respondents in the Context of the Age Group		
Age Group	Number of the Respondent	Percent
20–25	76	7.59
26–30	287	28.67
31–35	215	21.47
36–40	192	19.18
41–45	120	11.98
46–50	62	6.19
Above 50	49	4.89
Total	1001	

Table 3 shows the correlation matrix. There is a clear positive connection between buying organic food and its price that a customer considers before purchasing the product. There is also a clear positive connection between the intention to buy and the eco-labelling of organic food purchases, climate change, and trust. There is a weak negative association between gender and the purpose of buying organic food in Bangladesh.

Table 3. Correlation Matrix.

	OFPI	Gender	Education	Price	Eco-Label	Climate Change	Trust
OFPI	1						
Gender	−0.05	1					
Education	0.43	0.00	1				
Price	0.94	−0.04	0.40	1			
Eco-label	0.91	−0.04	0.37	0.88	1		
Climate Change	0.92	−0.04	0.41	0.89	0.86	1	
Trust	0.87	−0.02	0.31	0.83	0.80	0.81	1

There was a positive relationship between the level of education and purchase intention for sustainable organic food. The value of coefficient is 3.27. The coefficient is statistically significant at a 5% level of significance. It is interesting in the case of graduate people, who do not favor adopting the new food products investigated, in line with the literature [141]. There was also a positive relationship between price and the purchase intention of organic food.

The Econometric model is

$$OFPI = \alpha - 1.30Gd + 3.27Ed + 3.57PF + 3.55EL + 4.10CC + 5.14TR \quad (3)$$

Table 4 shows that all the coefficients are statistically significant at a 5% level of significance except demographic characteristics. The coefficients of the logistic regression show the odds ratio. The coefficient of the eco-label (*EL*) at 3.55 indicates that the rate a consumer buys organic food is 3.55 times higher for consumers who consider the product label as opposed to the consumers who do not believe the product label is important. There is a positive relation between climate change and consumer purchase intention. The people who think that the production process of organic food is environment friendly are buying more organic food. The trust that organic food is healthy, and it has nutritional value, also influences the consumer purchase intention. According to the value of Pseudo- R^2 , this model is the best predictor for data. The probability of the Chi-square and Log-likelihood also confirms that this model is the best predictor for data. The value of R^2 is 0.96.79 meaning that the dependent variable organic food purchase intention (OFPI) by consumer is 96.79%, explained by independent variables (Equation (3)). The replies reveal that consumers who are very attentive about the specific labels of products have a higher propensity to organic food. They think that organic food could provide health benefits and have a lower environmental impact, confirming the hypothesis made. Respondents reading food labels are more likely to purchase organic food. It means that people who read product labelling have a higher possibility of buying this product. There was a negative effect of gender on consumer purchase intention to organic food products. Women are generally more likely to buy organic food than men, as they are more aware of and sensitive to food safety and health issues than men [128,129].

Table 4. Logistic Regression Result.

		Dependent Variable: Organic Food Purchase Intention		
		Coefficient	Z-Statistics	p-Value
Independent Variables	Gender (Gd)	−1.30	−1.23	0.218
	Level of Education (Ed)	3.27	2.91	0.004
	Price (PF)	3.57	3.48	0.001
	Eco-label (EL)	3.55	3.43	0.001
	Climate Change (CC)	4.10	4.13	0.000
	Trust (TR)	5.14	4.23	0.000
	Constant	−10.07	−5.32	0.000
	Observation	1001		
	Pseudo-R ²		0.9679	
	Probability > chi		0.0000	
	Log-likelihood		−22.14	

4.2. Test of Endogeneity

Endogeneity arises when a predictor variable is associated with the error term of the dependent variable, either from missing predictor variables that correlate with one or more predictor variables or the dependent variables in the regression model.

To test the endogeneity,

Ho: variables are exogenous

Durbin (score) $\chi^2(1) = 1.89352$ ($p = 0.1686$)

Wu-Hausman $F(1,1000) = 1.91371$ ($p = 0.1678$)

The p -value for this particular investigation is more than 0.05. It suggests that the value does not have any meaningful bearing on the situation. Therefore, there is no endogeneity in the model. As a result, the present research does not include any endogeneity, which is a supporting factor for the model's robustness.

5. Discussion

When it comes to healthy eating and living habits, studies show that women are more likely than men to make informed decisions about what they purchase at the grocery store. These traits are universal, and they apply to people of all ages. Additionally, food labels are highly important to customers, and this is one of the most significant qualities on which the consumption of domestic, traditional foods is chosen. More and more people seek out information about the origins of their food as well as the methods used to create it. Certified organic goods have several advantages over conventional ones. Organic farming does not utilize hazardous pesticides to create nutritious food [142]. Pesticides are used by some organic farmers; however, they are mostly made from natural ingredients. Organic certification is required for the use of these natural insecticides. We found that people who are more aware about climate change buy more organic food. Because of the emphasis on organic methods, rich, fertile soils are produced. Creating healthy food and a healthy environment requires good soil. Organic farming relies on rich, healthy soil as its foundation. Green manures that are produced expressly for soil development are also used by organic farmers to help create healthy soil. Animal manures (with safety limits) are also used by organic farmers to help construct healthy soil. It is easier for crops to withstand disease, drought, and insects when they are planted on soil that is in good health. According to research, women are more likely than men to buy organic goods because they have a better understanding of healthy foods, are more aware of their nutritional benefits, and make more informed decisions when making their purchases. When consumers know where their products come from, they are more likely to pay for ecologically friendly products that have less of an influence on the environment. The perception about climate change also heavily supports the idea of sustainable circular

economic systems, and one of the most important basic systems of this is organic farming. The goals of ecological farming and organic farming are essentially the same. Protecting the land, water, and climate via the practice of ecological farming promotes healthy farming and nutritious food. On the other hand, organic farming is extremely engaging in terms of ultimate goods. Therefore, ecological farming and organic farming are very closely tied to one another. Relatively little is known about the climatic impact of food production (transportation, packaging, energy consumption), and the relationship between sustainable, climate-friendly circulation systems and organic food is not generally known. This is a relatively new form of knowledge (often the facts come from international sources), and they are based on information connections, therefore, their recognition depends to a large extent on education levels [126].

We observed that the significance of climate change and eco-labels positively affects the consumer's inclination to purchase organic food goods after conducting this study. A higher level of education is linked to a higher degree of consumer interest in organic foods, according to our third hypothesis. The survey did not back this up. Previous research had led us to believe that the questionnaire answers would back up the hypothesis. This can be explained by the fact that this is new knowledge and experience (related to climate change), which is currently mostly possessed by the younger generation (under 30 years old) who instinctively incorporate it into their shopping habits and consume organic food since it is more in demand and hence more readily available. The future of our food is up for grabs three times a day when we are consumers. This puts us in a strong position to shape the \$1 trillion food business market in the United States. For future generations, spending money in the organic industry is a vote for a more sustainable world. However, just 5% of food purchases are organic, despite it being the fastest-growing segment of the food market. It will be easier to get more organic food as more people desire it. CO₂ levels in the atmosphere may be reduced by carbon sequestration, which organic farming encourages. As opposed to conventional agriculture, organic crop and animal production focuses on soil-based production with the goal of preserving or increasing soil quality. Cancer risk may be reduced by eating organic food. People who regularly consume organic foods had a decreased overall cancer risk, according to recent research published in JAMA Internal Medicine [142]. According to the research, those who consume mostly organic foods are less likely to develop non-Hodgkin lymphoma or postmenopausal breast cancer than those who eat organic foods infrequently or never.

Young people in Bangladesh are more inclined to purchase organic food. They do so for their own well-being. The results of an investigation of the organic food consumption patterns of Bangladeshi consumers have substantial implications for the expansion of the organic food market. Customers have access to products that are both organic and conventional in nature. As a consequence of this, it is important to clarify for customers why organic food is preferable to conventional food. There is a clear distinction between organic food and traditional food in terms of the color of food, the packaging, and the label. Fresh organic food does not have a pleasant appearance; therefore, marketers should highlight the benefit of organic food consumption. There are no hormones or medicines used in the production of organic food, making it a healthier option. In addition to the health benefits of organic food, it is crucial for consumers to know about the nutritional content. Transparency in the production, processing, and handling of organic products should be a priority for organic producers. According to the findings, the most significant barrier to greater organic food consumption is the price. A product's price can also be utilized to portray it as a good investment. Consumers are more prepared to pay for a product that is regarded as better value and organic food purchases are more likely to be made by those who believe the benefits outweigh the expenses. Organic sellers need to explain why they charge a premium price to their customers. Bangladeshi organic food production and markets have a bright future in organic food. Bangladesh's younger generations are becoming increasingly health-conscious and concerned about the quality of their lives. The purchasing power of Bangladeshi consumers will rise as the economy

grows rapidly. More and more young people will put their faith in organic food certificates because of government efforts to monitor the production of organic food. Young people will be more accepting of and able to afford organic food.

6. Conclusions

Based on the survey, organic food is most popular among conscious customers, who are also the most likely to purchase it on a regular basis. However, many of the more traditional-minded shoppers have reservations about the authenticity of organic foods. Critical customers believe that organic food is difficult to get due to a lack of availability, a lack of variety, and expensive pricing, and they have little faith in the product's authenticity. Consumers who are not interested about health, humanity, and the environment believe that organic food and farming is not beneficial. They think it's a societal phenomenon. They have a poor degree of knowledge and awareness, as well as a low level of confidence in organic food. Organic food and farming are unfamiliar concepts to the public. However, organic foods are mainly produced by peasants or very small farmers, and they use a short supply chain. Usually, they sell in the local rural market. This is the reason why organic food is cheaper in Bangladesh. Also, it is because of labor cost and cheap traditional technology. Producers, farmers, and marketers of organic food must aim for customers who share their views, perceptions, attitudes, and purchasing habits, as well as those who are more conservative. When it comes to organic food items, congruent customers have the most favorable attitude and do not perceive any hurdles in purchasing these food goods. Organic food has a favorable reception among conservative customers, although they are skeptical of the items' authenticity. The cuisines of Bangladesh are extremely similar to those of India. It may be possible to win over clients who already have a positive attitude toward organic food and farming in India by highlighting the country's rich heritage in these areas, as well as by providing complementary services and amenities. In order to adequately convey the quality of the cuisine while simultaneously promoting Bangladeshi culture and history, as well as the flavor of these goods, businesses need to reevaluate their marketing strategy by going back to basics [143–145].

Customers are more likely to become advocates for organic food if they are provided with ecologically friendly packaging, a consistent supply, and free home delivery. Communication tactics may benefit from their advice, tales, and testimonies. More information on labels, standards, and the step-by-step certification system should be incorporated in the communication plan to answer the concerns of conservative customers. Consumers' confidence may be bolstered through third-party certification. Those interested in learning more about organic farming might arrange for a visit (or they can follow the processes related to the production of products on an online camera) to an organic farm to examine and assess the processes firsthand. These customers may be persuaded to switch to organic alternatives if they are given reassurances regarding their authenticity. When it comes to purchasing sustainable organic food items, most customers do so because they are concerned about cutting down on the production process. The readiness of consumers to buy organic food is more likely to be favorable if they read food labels and believe that it might have advantages for the environment or their health. Sustainable consumers who believe that buying organic food reduces the environmental impact of food consumption seem to be forming, and they are more inclined to purchase organic food. The effective shift to a circular economy requires sustainable use and the production of organic foods, but this alone will not suffice.

Environmental and economic sustainability are linked via organic farming and food consumption. Consumer views about organic food, hurdles to purchasing, and consumer purchasing habits have all been analyzed in this study's findings. Organic food and its advantages for health, humanity, and the environment are unknown to a huge majority of customers. The government should use mass media, such as television, print, radio, and social media, to spread the word about organic food and bring it into the mainstream. Using organic agricultural methods, as well as the health benefits and the environmental

advantages they provide, should be promoted. Organic farming's advantages and methods may be used to justify the high cost of this produce. Government authorities might provide particular measures for the promotion of organic food, such as community-supported agriculture, contract farming, and farmers' markets, to help consumers overcome difficulties including unpredictable supply and availability and trust concerns surrounding sincerity. It is possible for farmers and consumers to understand each other's needs and expectations via community supported farming. Contract farming must be made available to small farmers in order to ensure the long-term viability and support for the local economy. To overcome the problem of scarcity, weekly farmers' markets might be an option. Participation in contract farming has positive short- and long-term effects on the behavior of applying organic fertilizer [146–148]. A place where shoppers and farmers may connect is possible at these marketplaces, as in traditional organic markets these encounter events are usually observed. If we take into account the fact that the young generation makes purchases electronically, the influence of their consumption habits and the establishment of trust relationships also have digital foundations, and relationships must be handled differently here. The use of the previously mentioned online camera systems for product authentication may become common among this consumer group. An overarching idea of sustainability must be adopted in order to shift from weak to strong consumption policies. Circular economy researchers and policymakers have focused on how consumers might be persuaded to support the development of long-term markets for organic foodstuffs. According to the results of this survey, most young customers are aware of climate change and the nutritional content of their food and buy more organic food because of the environmental and health advantages. One of the most important issues in food policy is how much importance should be given to the governmental regulations in relation to a healthy and climate-friendly transition, and at what level consumers should be educated and provided with information. The open question is with what efficiency and what role can product labelling enter these market segments in the case of rapidly developing, emerging Asian countries.

Limitations: The study shows the trends related to the consumption of organic food in a rapidly developing economic environment. When considering the results and during the generalisation, it is therefore important to clarify the background differences related to economic development. It should be emphasized here that the differences between organic farming and traditional production are significantly smaller in this context (e.g., the general level of fertilizer use is significantly lower in less polluted foods), which can also be seen in the differences between product prices. Another significant factor in the case of developing countries is age, as the number of young, conscious consumers can grow exponentially in the case of organic products which takes place in a favorable but insufficiently prepared and established consumption environment. This means that soon there may be a shortage of products on the organic product market, and additionally the counterfeiting of trademarks may become common.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, S.A. (Shahnaj Akter) and C.F.; methodology, S.A. (Shahnaj Akter) and S.A. (Shahjahan Ali); software, S.A. (Shahjahan Ali); validation, M.F.-F., C.F.; formal analysis; investigation, S.A. (Shahnaj Akter) and S.A. (Shahjahan Ali); resources, S.A. (Shahnaj Akter) and S.A. (Shahjahan Ali); data curation, S.A. (Shahjahan Ali); writing—original draft preparation, S.A. (Shahnaj Akter) and S.A. (Shahjahan Ali); writing—review and editing, C.F.; visualization, M.F.-F., C.F. and Z.L.; supervision, M.F.-F., Z.L. and C.F.; project administration, C.F. and Z.L.; funding acquisition, C.F. and Z.L. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: Special thanks to the Hungarian National Research, Development, and Innovation Office—NKFIH (Program ID: OTKA 131925).

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable here.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Thøgersen, J. Sustainable food consumption in the nexus between national context and private lifestyle: A multi-level study. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2017**, *55*, 16–25. [CrossRef]
2. McEachern, M.G.; McClean, P. Organic purchasing motivations and attitudes: Are they ethical? *Int. J. Consum. Stud.* **2002**, *26*, 85–92. [CrossRef]
3. Cornelissen, G.; Pandelaere, M.; Warlop, L.; Dewitte, S. Positive cueing: Promoting sustainable consumer behavior by cueing common environmental behaviors as environmental. *Int. J. Res. Mark.* **2008**, *25*, 46–55. [CrossRef]
4. Willer, H.; Trávní, J. The World of Organic Agriculture Statistics and Emerging Trends 202. 2021, p. 340. Available online: <https://orprints.org/id/eprint/15575/3/willer-kilcher-2009-1-26.pdf> (accessed on 21 March 2022).
5. Azzurra, A.; Massimiliano, A.; Angela, M. Measuring sustainable food consumption: A case study on organic food. *Sustain. Prod. Consum.* **2019**, *17*, 95–107. [CrossRef]
6. Hsu, C.-L.; Chen, M.-C. Explaining consumer attitudes and purchase intentions toward organic food: Contributions from regulatory fit and consumer characteristics. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2014**, *35*, 6–13. [CrossRef]
7. Shafie, F.A.; Rennie, D. Consumer Perceptions towards Organic Food. *Procedia-Soc. Behav. Sci.* **2012**, *49*, 360–367. [CrossRef]
8. Runge-Metzger, A.; Ierland, T.V. The Effort Sharing Regulation. In *Towards a Climate-Neutral Europe*, 1st ed.; Delbeke, J., Vis, P., Eds.; Routledge: London, UK, 2019; pp. 95–116. ISBN 978-92-76-08256-9.
9. Somerville, P. A critique of climate change mitigation policy. *Policy Polit.* **2020**, *48*, 355–378. [CrossRef]
10. Pramova, E.; Locatelli, B.; Djoudi, H.; Somorin, O.A. Forests and trees for social adaptation to climate variability and change. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Clim. Chang.* **2012**, *3*, 581–596. [CrossRef]
11. Nejadi, A.; Rahbar, F. Economic valuation of annual carbon sequestration potential for woody and shrubby land cover. *J. Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2012**, *5*, 389–396. [CrossRef]
12. Bithas, K. Sustainability and externalities: Is the internalization of externalities a sufficient condition for sustainability? *Ecol. Econ.* **2011**, *70*, 1703–1706. [CrossRef]
13. Paull, J. The Greening of China’s Food—Green Food, Organic Food, and Eco-Labeling. 2008. Available online: <https://orprints.org/id/eprint/13563/> (accessed on 31 August 2022).
14. Lee, H.-J.; Yun, Z.-S. Consumers’ perceptions of organic food attributes and cognitive and affective attitudes as determinants of their purchase intentions toward organic food. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2015**, *39*, 259–267. [CrossRef]
15. Wu, Y.; Li, E.; Samuel, S.N. Food consumption in urban China: An empirical analysis. *Appl. Econ.* **1995**, *27*, 509–515. [CrossRef]
16. Wang, Z. Consumers’ recognition of food safety and their decision making for consumption. *Chin. Rural Econ.* **2003**, *4*, 41–51.
17. Wang, Z.; Mao, Y.; Gale, F. Chinese consumer demand for food safety attributes in milk products. *Food Policy* **2008**, *33*, 27–36. [CrossRef]
18. Xu, P.; Zheng, S.; Zhou, S. Family and Western-style fast food: Influences on Chinese college students’ dairy consumption. *J. Food Prod. Mark.* **2010**, *17*, 1–24. [CrossRef]
19. Zhou, H.; Nanseki, T.; Hotta, K.; Shinkai, S.; Xu, Y. Analysis of consumers’ attitudes toward traceability system on dairy products in China. *J. Fac. Agric. Kyushu Univ.* **2010**, *55*, 167–172. [CrossRef]
20. Gutierrez, J.; Barry-Ryan, C.; Bourke, P. The antimicrobial efficacy of plant essential oil combinations and interactions with food ingredients. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* **2008**, *124*, 91–97. [CrossRef]
21. Wessells, C.R. The economics of information: Markets for seafood attributes. *Mar. Resour. Econ.* **2002**, *17*, 153–162. [CrossRef]
22. Caswell, J.A.; Mojduszka, E.M. Using informational labeling to influence the market for quality in food products. *Am. J. Agric. Econ.* **1996**, *78*, 1248–1253. [CrossRef]
23. Dimara, E.; Skuras, D. Consumer demand for informative labeling of quality food and drink products: A European Union case study. *J. Consum. Mark.* **2005**, *22*, 90–100. [CrossRef]
24. Grolleau, G.; Caswell, J.A. Interaction between food attributes in markets: The case of environmental labeling. *J. Agric. Resour. Econ.* **2006**, *31*, 471–484. [CrossRef]
25. Roosen, J. Marketing of safe food through labeling. *J. Food Distrib. Res.* **2003**, *34*, 77–82.
26. Akerlof, G.A. The Market for “Lemons”: Quality Uncertainty and the Market Mechanism. *Q. J. Econ.* **1970**, *84*, 488–500. [CrossRef]
27. Stigler, G.J. The economics of information. *J. Polit. Econ.* **1961**, *69*, 213–225. [CrossRef]
28. Liu, Y. Green Marketing: A New Marketing Era for China in the Coming Century. In Proceedings of the 10th Annual Academic Conference of the Chinese Marketing Association of Colleges and Universities, Shanghai, China, July 1994.
29. Zeng, Y.; Wei, X. Consumers’ attitudes and willingness-to-pay for green food in Beijing, China. In Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Management ICM 2007, Wuhan, China, 3–5 August 2007; p. 1737e1747.
30. Liu, Q.; Yan, Z.; Zhou, J. Consumer Choices and Motives for Eco-Labeled Products in China: An Empirical Analysis Based on the Choice Experiment. *Sustainability* **2017**, *9*, 331. [CrossRef]
31. Chen, X.; Gao, Z.; Swisher, M.; House, L.; Zhao, X. Eco-labeling in the fresh produce market: Not all environmentally friendly labels are equally valued. *Ecol. Econ.* **2018**, *154*, 201–210. [CrossRef]
32. Riskos, K.; Dekoulou, P.; Mylonas, N.; Tsourvakas, G. Ecolabels and the Attitude–Behavior Relationship towards Green Product Purchase: A Multiple Mediation Model. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 6867. [CrossRef]

33. Chan, R.Y. Environmental attitudes and behavior of consumers in China: Survey findings and implications. *J. Int. Consum. Mark.* **1999**, *11*, 25–52. [[CrossRef](#)]
34. Chan, R.Y.K. An emerging green market in China: Myth or reality? *Bus. Horiz.* **2000**, *43*, 55–60. [[CrossRef](#)]
35. Chan, R.Y. Determinants of Chinese consumers' green purchase behavior. *Psychol. Mark.* **2001**, *18*, 389–413. [[CrossRef](#)]
36. Zheng, G.-W.; Akter, N.; Siddik, A.B.; Masukujjaman, M. Organic Foods Purchase Behavior among Generation Y of Bangladesh: The Moderation Effect of Trust and Price Consciousness. *Foods* **2021**, *10*, 2278. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
37. Paul, J.; Modi, A.; Patel, J. Predicting green product consumption using theory of planned behavior and reasoned action. *J. Retail. Consum. Serv.* **2016**, *29*, 123–134. [[CrossRef](#)]
38. Smith, S.; Paladino, A. Eating clean and green? Investigating consumer motivations towards the purchase of organic food. *Australas. Mark. J. AMJ* **2010**, *18*, 93–104. [[CrossRef](#)]
39. Tarkiainen, A.; Sundqvist, S. Subjective norms, attitudes and intentions of Finnish consumers in buying organic food. *Br. Food J.* **2005**, *107*, 808–822. [[CrossRef](#)]
40. Zepeda, L.; Li, J. Characteristics of organic food shoppers. *J. Agric. Appl. Econ.* **2007**, *39*, 17–28. [[CrossRef](#)]
41. Paul, J.; Rana, J. Consumer behavior and purchase intention for organic food. *J. Consum. Mark.* **2012**, *29*, 412–422. [[CrossRef](#)]
42. Sierra, J.J.; Taute, H.A.; Turri, A.M. Determinants of intentions to purchase unhealthy food and beverage options: A dual-process theoretical perspective. *J. Food Prod. Mark.* **2015**, *21*, 503–520. [[CrossRef](#)]
43. Sierra, J.J.; Turri, A.M.; Taute, H.A. Unhealthy food and beverage consumption: An investigative model. *J. Foodserv. Bus. Res.* **2015**, *18*, 470–488. [[CrossRef](#)]
44. Reisch, L.A.; Sunstein, C.R.; Andor, M.A.; Doebbe, F.C.; Meier, J.; Haddaway, N.R. Mitigating climate change via food consumption and food waste: A systematic map of behavioral interventions. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2021**, *279*, 123717. [[CrossRef](#)]
45. Fishbein, M.; Ajzen, I. Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research. *Philos. Rhetor.* **1977**, *10*, 177–188.
46. Ogden, J. Some problems with social cognition models: A pragmatic and conceptual analysis. *Health Psychol.* **2003**, *22*, 424. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
47. Fishbein, M.; Jaccard, J.; Davidson, A.R.; Ajzen, I.; Loken, B. Predicting and understanding family planning behaviors. In *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behavior*; Prentice Hall: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 1980.
48. Pham, T.H.; Nguyen, T.N.; Phan, T.T.H.; Nguyen, N.T. Evaluating the purchase behaviour of organic food by young consumers in an emerging market economy. *J. Strateg. Mark.* **2019**, *27*, 540–556. [[CrossRef](#)]
49. Padel, S.; Foster, C. Exploring the gap between attitudes and behaviour: Understanding why consumers buy or do not buy organic food. *Br. Food J.* **2005**, *107*, 606–625. [[CrossRef](#)]
50. Prentice, C.; Chen, J.; Wang, X. The influence of product and personal attributes on organic food marketing. *J. Retail. Consum. Serv.* **2019**, *46*, 70–78. [[CrossRef](#)]
51. Hsu, S.-Y.; Chang, C.-C.; Lin, T.T. An analysis of purchase intentions toward organic food on health consciousness and food safety with/under structural equation modeling. *Br. Food J.* **2016**, *118*, 200–216. [[CrossRef](#)]
52. Pino, G.; Peluso, A.M.; Guido, G. Determinants of regular and occasional consumers' intentions to buy organic food. *J. Consum. Aff.* **2012**, *46*, 157–169. [[CrossRef](#)]
53. Winter, M. Embeddedness, the new food economy and defensive localism. *J. Rural Stud.* **2003**, *19*, 23–32. [[CrossRef](#)]
54. Giampietri, E.; Verneau, F.; Del Giudice, T.; Carfora, V.; Finco, A. A Theory of Planned behaviour perspective for investigating the role of trust in consumer purchasing decision related to short food supply chains. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2018**, *64*, 160–166. [[CrossRef](#)]
55. Nuttavuthisit, K.; Thøgersen, J. The Importance of Consumer Trust for the Emergence of a Market for Green Products: The Case of Organic Food. *J. Bus. Ethics* **2017**, *140*, 323–337. [[CrossRef](#)]
56. Nasir, V.A.; Karakaya, F. Underlying motivations of organic food purchase intentions. *Agribusiness* **2014**, *30*, 290–308. [[CrossRef](#)]
57. Perrini, F.; Castaldo, S.; Misani, N.; Tencati, A. The impact of corporate social responsibility associations on trust in organic products marketed by mainstream retailers: A study of Italian consumers. *Bus. Strategy Environ.* **2010**, *19*, 512–526. [[CrossRef](#)]
58. Piri, Z.; Lotfizadeh, F. Investigation of the Influence of Perceived Quality, Price and Risk on Perceived Product Value for Mobile Consumers. *Asian Soc. Sci.* **2015**, *12*, 103. [[CrossRef](#)]
59. Sultan, P.; Wong, H.Y.; Sigala, M. Segmenting the Australian organic food consumer market. *Asia Pac. J. Mark. Logist.* **2018**, *30*, 163–181. [[CrossRef](#)]
60. Chuah, S.H.-W.; El-Manstrly, D.; Tseng, M.-L.; Ramayah, T. Sustaining customer engagement behavior through corporate social responsibility: The roles of environmental concern and green trust. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2020**, *262*, 121348. [[CrossRef](#)]
61. Lee, T.H.; Fu, C.-J.; Chen, Y.Y. Trust factors for organic foods: Consumer buying behavior. *Br. Food J.* **2020**, *122*, 414–431. [[CrossRef](#)]
62. Roy, S.K.; Balaji, M.S.; Soutar, G.; Lassar, W.M.; Roy, R. Customer engagement behavior in individualistic and collectivistic markets. *J. Bus. Res.* **2018**, *86*, 281–290. [[CrossRef](#)]
63. Pandey, S.; Khare, A. The Role of Retailer Trust and Word of Mouth in Buying Organic Foods in an Emerging Market. *J. Food Prod. Mark.* **2017**, *23*, 926–938. [[CrossRef](#)]
64. Vega-Zamora, M.; Torres-Ruiz, F.J.; Parras-Rosa, M. Towards sustainable consumption: Keys to communication for improving trust in organic foods. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2019**, *216*, 511–519. [[CrossRef](#)]
65. Yu, W.; Han, X.; Ding, L.; He, M. Organic food corporate image and customer co-developing behavior: The mediating role of consumer trust and purchase intention. *J. Retail. Consum. Serv.* **2021**, *59*, 102377. [[CrossRef](#)]

66. Alibeli, M.A.; Johnson, C. Environmental concern: A cross national analysis. *J. Int. Cross-Cult. Stud.* **2009**, *3*, 1–10.
67. Egea, J.M.O.; de Frutos, N.G. Toward consumption reduction: An environmentally motivated perspective. *Psychol. Mark.* **2013**, *30*, 660–675. [[CrossRef](#)]
68. binti Aman, A.L. The Influence of Environmental Knowledge and Concern on Green Purchase Intention: The Role of Attitude as Mediating Variable. Ph.D. Thesis, Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia, 2011.
69. Asif, M.; Xuhui, W.; Nasiri, A.; Ayyub, S. Determinant factors influencing organic food purchase intention and the moderating role of awareness: A comparative analysis. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2018**, *63*, 144–150. [[CrossRef](#)]
70. Pagiaslis, A.; Krontalis, A.K. Green consumption behavior antecedents: Environmental concern, knowledge, and beliefs. *Psychol. Mark.* **2014**, *31*, 335–348. [[CrossRef](#)]
71. Petrescu, D.C.; Petrescu-Mag, R.M.; Burny, P.; Azadi, H. A new wave in Romania: Organic food. Consumers' motivations, perceptions, and habits. *Agroecol. Sustain. Food Syst.* **2017**, *41*, 46–75. [[CrossRef](#)]
72. Katt, F.; Meixner, O. Is it all about the price? An analysis of the purchase intention for organic food in a discount setting by means of structural equation modeling. *Foods* **2020**, *9*, 458. [[CrossRef](#)]
73. Chen, M. Attitude toward organic foods among Taiwanese as related to health consciousness, environmental attitudes, and the mediating effects of a healthy lifestyle. *Br. Food J.* **2009**, *111*, 165–178. [[CrossRef](#)]
74. Le-Anh, T.; Nguyen-To, T. Consumer purchasing behaviour of organic food in an emerging market. *Int. J. Consum. Stud.* **2020**, *44*, 563–573. [[CrossRef](#)]
75. Dubé, L.; Labban, A.; Moubarac, J.; Heslop, G.; Ma, Y.; Paquet, C. A nutrition/health mindset on commercial Big Data and drivers of food demand in modern and traditional systems. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **2014**, *1331*, 278–295. [[CrossRef](#)]
76. Bryła, P. Organic food consumption in Poland: Motives and barriers. *Appetite* **2016**, *105*, 737–746. [[CrossRef](#)]
77. Rana, J.; Paul, J. Consumer behavior and purchase intention for organic food: A review and research agenda. *J. Retail. Consum. Serv.* **2017**, *38*, 157–165. [[CrossRef](#)]
78. Irianto, H. Consumers' Attitude and Intention towards Organic Food Purchase: An Extension of Theory of Planned Behavior in Gender Perspective. *Int. J. Manag. Econ. Soc. Sci.* **2015**, *4*, 17–31.
79. Yadav, R.; Pathak, G.S. Intention to purchase organic food among young consumers: Evidences from a developing nation. *Appetite* **2016**, *96*, 122–128. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
80. Teng, C.-C.; Lu, C.-H. Organic food consumption in Taiwan: Motives, involvement, and purchase intention under the moderating role of uncertainty. *Appetite* **2016**, *105*, 95–105. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
81. Niggli, U. Sustainability of organic food production: Challenges and innovations. *Proc. Nutr. Soc.* **2015**, *74*, 83–88. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
82. Roitner-Schobesberger, B.; Darnhofer, I.; Somsook, S.; Vogl, C.R. Consumer perceptions of organic foods in Bangkok, Thailand. *Food Policy* **2008**, *33*, 112–121. [[CrossRef](#)]
83. Hoque, M.Z.; Akhter, N.; Mawa, Z. Consumers' Willingness to Pay (WTP) for Organically Farmed Fish in Bangladesh. *J. Agric. Appl. Econ.* **2021**, *53*, 482–509. [[CrossRef](#)]
84. Iqbal, M. Consumer behaviour of organic food: A developing country perspective. *Int. J. Mark. Bus. Commun.* **2015**, *4*, 58–67. [[CrossRef](#)]
85. Mukul, A.Z.A.; Afrin, S.; Hassan, M.M. Factors Affecting Consumers' Perceptions about Organic Food and Their Prevalence in Bangladeshi Organic Preference. *J. Bus. Manag. Sci.* **2013**, *1*, 112–118.
86. Ahmed, R.; Rahman, K. Understanding the Consumer Behaviour towards Organic Food: A Study of the Bangladesh Market. *IOSR J. Bus. Manag.* **2015**, *17*, 49–64.
87. Ahmed, N. Linking prawn and shrimp farming towards a green economy in Bangladesh: Confronting climate change. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* **2013**, *75*, 33–42. [[CrossRef](#)]
88. Ahmed, N.; Allison, E.H.; Muir, J.F. Rice fields to prawn farms: A blue revolution in southwest Bangladesh? *Aquac. Int.* **2010**, *18*, 555–574. [[CrossRef](#)]
89. Islam, M.S. From pond to plate: Towards a twin-driven commodity chain in Bangladesh shrimp aquaculture. *Food Policy* **2008**, *33*, 209–223. [[CrossRef](#)]
90. Román, S.; Sánchez-Siles, L.M.; Siegrist, M. The importance of food naturalness for consumers: Results of a systematic review. *Trends Food Sci. Technol.* **2017**, *67*, 44–57. [[CrossRef](#)]
91. Gandini, G.; Ababouch, L.; Anichini, L. From eco-sustainability to risk assessment of aquaculture products. *Vet. Res. Commun.* **2009**, *33*, 3–8. [[CrossRef](#)]
92. Datta, S. Organic Aquaculture—A new approach in fisheries Development. *Recent Adv. Agric. Technol.* **2012**, 105–120. [[CrossRef](#)]
93. Deng, Y.; Zhou, F.; Ruan, Y.; Ma, B.; Ding, X.; Yue, X.; Ma, W.; Yin, X. Feed Types Driven Differentiation of Microbial Community and Functionality in Marine Integrated Multitrophic Aquaculture System. *Water* **2019**, *12*, 95. [[CrossRef](#)]
94. Ahmed, N.; Thompson, S.; Turchini, G.M. Organic aquaculture productivity, environmental sustainability, and food security: Insights from organic agriculture. *Food Secur.* **2020**, *12*, 1253–1267. [[CrossRef](#)]
95. Leire, C.; Thidell, Å. Product-related environmental information to guide consumer purchases—a review and analysis of research on perceptions, understanding and use among Nordic consumers. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2005**, *13*, 1061–1070. [[CrossRef](#)]
96. Risius, A.; Hamm, U.; Janssen, M. Target groups for fish from aquaculture: Consumer segmentation based on sustainability attributes and country of origin. *Aquaculture* **2019**, *499*, 341–347. [[CrossRef](#)]

97. OECD. "BUSINESS INSIGHTS ON EMERGING MARKETS." OECD Development Centre, Paris. 2020. Available online: <https://www.oecd.org/dev/EMnet-Business-Insights-2020.pdf> (accessed on 23 March 2022).
98. Hoque, M.Z.; Alam, M.N. Consumers' knowledge discrepancy and confusion in intent to purchase farmed fish. *Br. Food J.* **2020**, *122*, 3567–3583. [[CrossRef](#)]
99. Bostan, I.; Onofrei, M.; Gavriluță (Vatamanu), A.F.; Toderășcu, C.; Lazăr, C.M. An Integrated Approach to Current Trends in Organic Food in the EU. *Foods* **2019**, *8*, 144. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
100. Ghufran, M.; Ali, S.; Ariyesti, F.R.; Nawaz, M.A.; Aldieri, L.; Xiaobao, P. Impact of COVID-19 to customers switching intention in the food segments: The push, pull and mooring effects in consumer migration towards organic food. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2022**, *99*, 104561. [[CrossRef](#)]
101. Jensen, K.O.; Denver, S.; Zanolli, R. Actual and potential development of consumer demand on the organic food market in Europe. *NJAS Wagening. J. Life Sci.* **2011**, *58*, 79–84. [[CrossRef](#)]
102. Somasundram, C.; Razali, Z.; Santhirasegaram, V. A Review on Organic Food Production in Malaysia. *Horticulturae* **2016**, *2*, 12. [[CrossRef](#)]
103. Wojciechowska-Solis, J.; Kowalska, A.; Bieniek, M.; Ratajczyk, M.; Manning, L. Comparison of the Purchasing Behaviour of Polish and United Kingdom Consumers in the Organic Food Market during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2022**, *19*, 1137. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
104. Witek, L.; Kuźniar, W. Green Purchase Behavior: The Effectiveness of Sociodemographic Variables for Explaining Green Purchases in Emerging Market. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 209. [[CrossRef](#)]
105. Pilař, L.; Stanislavská, L.K.; Rojik, S.; Kvasnička, R.; Poláková, J.; Gresham, G. Customer experience with organic food: Global view. *Emir. J. Food Agric.* **2018**, *30*, 918–926.
106. Fogarassy, C.; Nguyen, H.H.; Oláh, J.; Popp, J. Transition management applications to accelerate sustainable food consumption—Comparative analysis between Switzerland and Hungary. *J. Int. Stud.* **2018**, *11*, 31–43. [[CrossRef](#)]
107. Perito, M.A.; Di Fonzo, A.; Sansone, M.; Russo, C. Consumer acceptance of food obtained from olive by-products. *Br. Food J.* **2019**, *122*, 212–226. [[CrossRef](#)]
108. Chiciudean, G.; Harun, R.; Ilea, M.; Chiciudean, D.; Arion, F.; Ilies, G.; Muresan, I. Organic Food Consumers and Purchase Intention: A Case Study in Romania. *Agronomy* **2019**, *9*, 145. [[CrossRef](#)]
109. Leyva-Hernández, S.N.; Toledo-López, A.; Hernández-Lara, A.B. Purchase Intention for Organic Food Products in Mexico: The Mediation of Consumer Desire. *Foods* **2021**, *10*, 245. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
110. Zayed, M.F.; Gaber, H.R.; El Essawi, N. Examining the Factors That Affect Consumers' Purchase Intention of Organic Food Products in a Developing Country. *Sustainability* **2022**, *14*, 5868. [[CrossRef](#)]
111. Canavari, M.; Coderoni, S. Green marketing strategies in the dairy sector: Consumer-stated preferences for carbon footprint labels. *Strateg. Chang.* **2019**, *28*, 233–240. [[CrossRef](#)]
112. Canavari, M.; Coderoni, S. Consumer stated preferences for dairy products with carbon footprint labels in Italy. *Agric. Food Econ.* **2020**, *8*, 4. [[CrossRef](#)]
113. Gracia, A.; de Magistris, T. The demand for organic foods in the South of Italy: A discrete choice model. *Food Policy* **2008**, *33*, 386–396. [[CrossRef](#)]
114. Wier, M.; O'Doherty Jensen, K.; Andersen, L.M.; Millock, K. The character of demand in mature organic food markets: Great Britain and Denmark compared. *Food Policy* **2008**, *33*, 406–421. [[CrossRef](#)]
115. Binninger, A.-S. Perception of naturalness of food packaging and its role in consumer product evaluation. *J. Food Prod. Mark.* **2017**, *23*, 251–266. [[CrossRef](#)]
116. Laureti, T.; Benedetti, I. Exploring pro-environmental food purchasing behaviour: An empirical analysis of Italian consumers. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2018**, *172*, 3367–3378. [[CrossRef](#)]
117. Wang, J.; Pham, T.L.; Dang, V.T. Environmental Consciousness and Organic Food Purchase Intention: A Moderated Mediation Model of Perceived Food Quality and Price Sensitivity. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2020**, *17*, 850. [[CrossRef](#)]
118. Hoek, A.C.; Pearson, D.; James, S.W.; Lawrence, M.A.; Friel, S. Healthy and environmentally sustainable food choices: Consumer responses to point-of-purchase actions. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2017**, *58*, 94–106. [[CrossRef](#)]
119. De Pelsmacker, P.; Driesen, L.; Rayp, G. Are fair trade labels good business? Ethics and coffee buying intentions. *J. Consum. Aff.* **2003**, *39*, 1–20.
120. De Pelsmacker, P.; Driesen, L.; Rayp, G. Do Consumers Care about Ethics? Willingness to Pay for Fair-Trade Coffee. *J. Consum. Aff.* **2005**, *39*, 363–385. [[CrossRef](#)]
121. Bernard, J.C.; Bernard, D.J. What Is It About Organic Milk? An Experimental Analysis. *Am. J. Agric. Econ.* **2009**, *91*, 826–836. [[CrossRef](#)]
122. Onozaka, Y.; McFadden, D.T. Does Local Labeling Complement or Compete with Other Sustainable Labels? A Conjoint Analysis of Direct and Joint Values for Fresh Produce Claim. *Am. J. Agric. Econ.* **2011**, *93*, 693–706. [[CrossRef](#)]
123. Aschemann-Witzel, J.; Peschel, A.O. How circular will you eat? The sustainability challenge in food and consumer reaction to either waste-to-value or yet underused novel ingredients in food. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2019**, *77*, 15–20. [[CrossRef](#)]
124. Defrancesco, E.; Perito, M.; Bozzolan, I.; Cei, L.; Stefani, G. Testing Consumers' Preferences for Environmental Attributes of Pasta. Insights from an ABR Approach. *Sustainability* **2017**, *9*, 1701. [[CrossRef](#)]

125. Pearson, D.; Henryks, J.; Jones, H. Organic food: What we know (and do not know) about consumers. *Renew. Agric. Food Syst.* **2011**, *26*, 171–177. [[CrossRef](#)]
126. Ali, S.; Akter, S.; Fogarassy, C. Analysis of Circular Thinking in Consumer Purchase Intention to Buy Sustainable Waste-To-Value (WTV) Foods. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 5390. [[CrossRef](#)]
127. Grunert, K.G.; Hieke, S.; Wills, J. Sustainability labels on food products: Consumer motivation, understanding and use. *Food Policy* **2014**, *44*, 177–189. [[CrossRef](#)]
128. Vecchio, R.; Van Loo, E.J.; Annunziata, A. Consumers' willingness to pay for conventional, organic and functional yogurt: Evidence from experimental auctions: Consumer WTP for conventional, organic and functional yogurt. *Int. J. Consum. Stud.* **2016**, *40*, 368–378. [[CrossRef](#)]
129. Aertsens, J.; Verbeke, W.; Mondelaers, K.; Van Huylenbroeck, G. Personal determinants of organic food consumption: A review. *Br. Food J.* **2009**, *111*, 1140–1167. [[CrossRef](#)]
130. Fogarassy, C.; Nagy-Pércsi, K.; Ajibade, S.; Gyuricza, C.; Ymeri, P. Relations between Circular Economic "Principles" and Organic Food Purchasing Behavior in Hungary. *Agronomy* **2020**, *10*, 616. [[CrossRef](#)]
131. Nagy-Pércsi, K.; Fogarassy, C. Important Influencing and Decision Factors in Organic Food Purchasing in Hungary. *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 6075. [[CrossRef](#)]
132. Sarma, P.K.; Raha, S.K. Consumers' willingness to pay for organic beef: Evidence from Dhaka City. *J. Bangladesh Agric. Univ.* **2016**, *14*, 83–91. [[CrossRef](#)]
133. Sumi, R.S.; Kabir, G. Factors Affecting the Buying Intention of Organic Tea Consumers of Bangladesh. *J. Open Innov. Technol. Mark. Complex.* **2018**, *4*, 24. [[CrossRef](#)]
134. Finch, J.E. The impact of personal consumption values and beliefs on organic food purchase behavior. *J. Food Prod. Mark.* **2006**, *11*, 63–76. [[CrossRef](#)]
135. Murphy, J.J.; Allen, P.G.; Stevens, T.H.; Weatherhead, D. A meta-analysis of hypothetical bias in stated preference valuation. *Environ. Resour. Econ.* **2005**, *30*, 313–325. [[CrossRef](#)]
136. Loomis, J.B. Comparative reliability of the dichotomous choice and open-ended contingent valuation techniques. *J. Environ. Econ. Manag.* **1990**, *18*, 78–85. [[CrossRef](#)]
137. Cronbach, L.J. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika* **1951**, *16*, 297–334. [[CrossRef](#)]
138. Coderoni, S.; Perito, M.A. Sustainable consumption in the circular economy. An analysis of consumers' purchase intentions for waste-to-value food. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2020**, *252*, 119870. [[CrossRef](#)]
139. Verbeke, W. Profiling consumers who are ready to adopt insects as a meat substitute in a Western society. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2015**, *39*, 147–155. [[CrossRef](#)]
140. Ding, Y.; Veeman, M.M.; Adamowicz, W.L. Functional food choices: Impacts of trust and health control beliefs on Canadian consumers' choices of canola oil. *Food Policy* **2015**, *52*, 92–98. [[CrossRef](#)]
141. Cavaliere, A.; Ventura, V. Mismatch between food sustainability and consumer acceptance toward innovation technologies among Millennial students: The case of Shelf Life Extension. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2018**, *175*, 641–650. [[CrossRef](#)]
142. Baudry, J.; Assmann, K.E.; Touvier, M.; Allès, B.; Seconda, L.; Latino-Martel, P.; Ezzedine, K.; Galan, P.; Herberg, S.; Lairon, D.; et al. Association of Frequency of Organic Food Consumption With Cancer Risk: Findings From the NutriNet-Santé Prospective Cohort Study. *JAMA Intern. Med.* **2018**, *178*, 1597–1606. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
143. Cain, M. Risk and insurance: Perspectives on fertility and agrarian change in India and Bangladesh. *Popul. Dev. Rev.* **1981**, *7*, 435–474. [[CrossRef](#)]
144. Ramesh, P.; Panwar, N.; Singh, A.; Ramana, S.; Yadav, S.K.; Shrivastava, R.; Rao, A.S. Status of organic farming in India. *Curr. Sci.* **2010**, *98*, 1190–1194.
145. Sarker, M.; Itohara, Y.; Hoque, M. Determinants of adoption decisions: The case of organic farming (OF) in Bangladesh. *Ext. Farming Syst. J.* **2009**, *5*, 39–46.
146. Ferdous, Z.; Zulfiqar, F.; Datta, A.; Hasan, A.K.; Sarker, A. Potential and challenges of organic agriculture in Bangladesh: A review. *J. Crop Improv.* **2021**, *35*, 403–426. [[CrossRef](#)]
147. Gahukar, R. Contract farming for organic crop production in India. *Curr. Sci.* **2007**, *93*, 1661–1663.
148. Mishra, A.K.; Kumar, A.; Joshi, P.K.; D'Souza, A.; Tripathi, G. How can organic rice be a boon to smallholders? Evidence from contract farming in India. *Food Policy* **2018**, *75*, 147–157. [[CrossRef](#)]

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.