

Article

Mountain Food Products: A Cluster Analysis Based on Young Consumers' Perceptions

Alessandro Bonadonna ^{1,2,*}, Stefano Duglio ^{1,2}, Luigi Bollani ³ and Giovanni Peira ^{1,2}¹ Department of Management, University of Turin, Corso Unione Sovietica 218 bis, 10134 Torino, Italy² Research Center on Natural Risk in Mountain and Hilly Environment (NATRISK), University of Turin, 10126 Turin, Italy³ Department of Esomas, University of Turin, 10126 Turin, Italy

* Correspondence: alessandro.bonadonna@unito.it

Abstract: Even though many studies focus on consumer perception of local food, only limited research concerns mountain areas. This paper aims to fill this gap by concentrating on the potential value of mountain food products, with particular reference to young consumers' perceptions. To this end, an online survey was conducted on a sample of 4079 University students using a specific questionnaire. Collected data underwent hierarchical cluster analysis, defining four clusters. Respondents were found to consider "mountain products" a fundamental commodity with reference to all related categories of food (cheese, meat, honey, fruits and vegetables) and believed that all stages of the supply chain should be carried out in mountain areas. All of the four clusters also reported a positive perception of mountain products, and they associated mountain foodstuffs with various key concepts, such as sustainable development (32.56%, two clusters), local traditions and specialities (49.11%, two clusters) and health (18.34%, three clusters). Therefore, this study provides useful insights for institutions, by further reinforcing the importance of agri-food products in the collective imagination of consumers and producers in mountain areas by promoting understanding of the characteristics sought by younger generations. Finally, this study contributes to increasing knowledge of mountain food products and related perceptions among younger consumers and expands contemporary literature on consumers in mountain market areas.

Citation: Bonadonna, A.; Duglio, S.; Bollani, L.; Peira, G. Mountain Food Products: A Cluster Analysis Based on Young Consumers' Perceptions. *Sustainability* **2022**, *14*, 12511. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141912511>

Academic Editor: Riccardo Testa

Received: 24 August 2022

Accepted: 29 September 2022

Published: 30 September 2022

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2022 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/>).

Keywords: mountain food product; young generation; consumer perception; cluster analysis; food

1. Introduction

Across the continents, mountains cover 24% of the world's surface [1], hosting approximately 12 percent of the world's human population, with another 14 percent relying or dependent on resources provided by mountainous areas [2].

Mountains represent a reservoir of several resources for human life, i.e., fresh water, wood, minerals and raw materials: they encourage human beings to settle down in mountainous areas and develop local communities.

On the other hand, due to the different geomorphological, climatic and physical characteristics, the economic growth of mountain societies is highly variable from place to place; thus, while there are many well-established mountain areas, especially thanks to the thriving tourism sector, there are also several mountain communities still needing to find ways to sustain and boost their economies [3].

Agriculture and related food products are often considered a way of supporting local communities and economic operators since they trigger socio-economic benefits for mountain people [4] both in the agricultural and tourism sector [5]: the relationship between food products and consumers has been widely studied by scholars and practitioners. Some studies concentrate on the impact of local food products' origin and

tradition on consumers' opinions [6], whereas others point out the role of local food in creating the tourism image of a local community [7].

Moreover, even if many studies analyse consumer perception of local food from different angles [8–10], only limited research in this field concerns mountain areas. In particular, to the Authors' knowledge, very few studies measured the perception of the younger generation of consumers [11], i.e., those expected to "drive" the market in coming years.

Based on the above considerations, this paper aims to contribute to the open debate on the potential value of mountain food products by investigating young consumers' perception of their characteristics and values. Through a process of cluster analysis, the study intends to explore whether there are different types of young consumers and whether these differences lead to different approaches to mountain products and to their specific characteristics, namely preference for different categories of mountain food products, focus on different stages of the supply chain (raw materials, processing, purchase channels) and characteristics sought for (ancient flavours, tradition and contact with the territory, healthiness, tasty and natural food, sustainability).

In this sense, the study aspires to contribute to the literature on mountain products, which is still minor considering their relevance in social, economic and environmental terms.

The paper is thus organised as follows: Section 1.1 contains a literature review with the main conceptual framework of the study, which, starting from an analysis of how consumer perception is approached by scholars, centres on literature concerning the mountain context. Section 2 details the methodological approach chosen for the analysis. Section 3 presents the main results of the study, and Section 4 discusses them in line with previous studies on the relationship between consumer perception and mountain products. Section 5 offers final considerations summarising the main research outcomes: it points out the implications and main limitations of the study as well as new avenues for future research.

1.1. Literature Review

Food is one of the most important goods provided by mountains to humanity. In accordance with the UNGA [12], 6 out of the 20 plant species able to supply 80% of the world's food originate from mountain areas.

The key role of mountain territories in providing this fundamental commodity is widely recognised by international institutions; however, some concern has been pointed out on the vulnerability of mountain food and agricultural production and, consequently, on the need to support local farmers, recognising in food a central income generating role for local communities [13].

Food products can truly be a flywheel for the development of rural communities because they can help sustain both local farmers and tourism operators [14] by increasing the attractiveness of the territory [15] and strengthening local identity. Furthermore, local foodstuffs are appreciated by consumers, being associated with positive characteristics that differentiate them from the not local ones [8]. Therefore, consumer behaviour and perception of food products, specifically those produced in mountain areas, can be key factors for generating revenue for mountain societies.

Since the mid-1990s, abundant literature has focused on the relationship between consumer perception and food products in general [16–21], and the topic has been debated from different perspectives. Two different centres of interest are presented below, one pertaining to the role of quality systems and related schemes (e.g., labelling and certification schemes) and the other to the topic of local food products.

1.1.1. Quality Systems

Literature on the role of labels and certification systems of environmental quality or quality associated with the origin of consumer perception of food products has significantly grown in the last two decades [22–25]. In this field, together with well-known and implemented certification systems such as the Protected Denomination of Origin (PDO) and Protected Geographical Indication (PGI), new ones have entered the market, specifically intended to boost mountain foodstuff, i.e., the “Mountain product” label, which might significantly contribute to mountain economy [11,26–30]. Furthermore, some studies highlighted that consumer perception increases if foodstuffs with a Geographical Indication specify production in a mountain area [31–33]. Consumer willingness pay a premium price has been recognized in two studies on certified grass-fed dairy products [34,35].

Another part of research work on the evaluation of customers’ attitudes towards food was carried out in terms of healthiness, given the growing interest of consumers in healthy food understood as food influenced by a wide range of different factors, e.g., ingredients, product category, label information, origin, sensory characteristics and packaging [36]. In this field, some studies aim to understand how this topic is perceived by consumers [37], even by considering the role of labels in driving their opinion about the healthiness of the foods and beverages [38] as well as orienting their choice. Hartmann et al. [39] point out how consumers tend to consider food products labelled “free-from” as healthier. This result was confirmed by subsequent investigations [40,41]. According to Acton et al. [42], the great majority of consumers would like to see health ratings or nutrient-specific information on labels. This is currently intensively discussed among scholars [43,44]; Biondi and Camanzi [45] argue that front-of-pack messages can drive the perception of a product and that the most important drivers are nutrition claims. Oliveira et al. [46] argue that consumers living in the mountains and those living in other areas have different levels of knowledge about mountain farming practices and different perceptions of mountain agri-food products. However, they all insist on the requirement for mountain food to be healthier and sustainably produced.

A third strand of research was conducted to assess the role of the environmental variable in defining consumer perception, choices and willingness to pay for food and beverages [47,48]. This dimension is extremely important, with food consumption being one of the most significant sources of environmental impact deriving from human beings’ everyday life.

Several studies concentrate on the impact of packaging, environmental labels and environmental declarations on consumer willingness to buy or pay; the outcomes are various [49–52].

Consumer consciousness, in any case, does not seem to be completely developed [53], and environmental labels and declarations can act as influencers on customer perception.

In this specific line of inquiry, scholars are discussing organic food [22,54–57] and taking into consideration various dimensions. In a comparative analysis between India and the USA, for instance, Boobalan and Nachimuthu [58] underline the importance of considering the cultural variable when promoting organic food. Annunziata and Mariani’s results [10], on the other hand, point out how consumers tend to adopt an egoistic approach, being more interested in quality and health components rather than environmental, social or economic dimensions of sustainability. In accordance with the authors’ consumer segmentation carried out in Italy, only a small segment of consumers can be called “sustainability-oriented consumers”. German consumers, on the other hand, showed great interest not only in buying organic products but also in local food. Several scholars underlined that willingness to pay a premium price is influenced by environmental and geographical indications, as well as health factors [59–62].

The food market is increasingly interested in promoting natural foods, as consumers are inclined to buy foods containing natural ingredients, which are considered healthier. In fact, natural products tend to be perceived as healthier than as those where human intervention is minimised, while many consumers express concern about the risks

associated with modern technologies. One example is organic food, perceived as more natural; it is also considered less processed and free from pesticides or dubious substances and technologies used in production and processing [63,64]. A recent study, for instance, pointed out how consumers' WTP for organic rice is higher compared to the actual rice price [65].

1.1.2. Local Food Products

The concept of local products was also considered. Numerous scholars worked out models of short food supply chains (SFSCs) for local and mountain food that can bring social, economic and environmental benefits compared to more conventional practices [66]. SFSCs might deliver mutual benefits for farmers and consumers and contribute to a more sustainable food system while addressing some of the most pressing environmental and social issues [67–71].

Ciuchta and O'Toole [72] studied localism, a social movement often associated with "buy local", whilst Bakos [73] pointed out that the empowerment of local food systems is an essential tool for local development. Several studies analysed the perception of consumers buying local foods in short food supply chains (SFSC). Results show an overall positive opinion on quality linked to freshness, healthiness and taste [74–77]. Independently from local contexts, a significant correlation between education and the choice to purchase food through SFSC was identified in several studies. In fact, other socio-economic variables such as gender, income and age are also detected in the consumer samples of the various studies, but what differs is that the consumers involved in SFSC generally have a high level of education [78,79].

Distribution channels for local and/or short supply chain products are another element to consider when analysing the perception of mountain products. Direct sale is the main channel for SFSC and mountain products [5,27]. At the same time, diversification of sales channels can be a winning strategy for farms since integration with conventional distribution can lead to greater economic benefits [80]. In addition, e-commerce may represent an additional opportunity to purchase local products [81,82], although digitization seems to negatively affect this perception as it may disrupt the direct link between consumer and farmer [83].

Some studies evaluate consumer perception of local products compared to products with national and regional brands. Results show that consumers consider local products of higher quality than others [84,85]. Cacciolatti et al. [86] identified five critical factors affecting decision making: product knowledge, country of origin, perceived transactional value, consumers' life stage and available income.

The growing interest shown by consumers in local and mountain products is motivated not only by the quality of these products but also by a rediscovery of local cultures with psychological benefits for consumers [87–89]. Notably, some consumers are oriented to a rediscovery of their roots and therefore value "ancient flavours" [90,91]. Temperini et al. [92] pointed out the willingness of a sample of Italian consumers to pay a premium price for food with national park brands, evidencing the attractiveness of mountain products made in park areas. In this sense, communication strategies aimed at promoting mountain products and guaranteeing better positioning and higher market prices for them are fundamental for the sustainable development of mountain companies and adequate remuneration for high-quality products [93–95].

Some researchers focus on the perception of food by younger generations: they highlight the attention to price, ingredients, origin and healthiness of the products [96], traceability and information on the label [97]. Specifically, local branded foods are perceived by young consumers as very satisfying and of significant quality and are also considered natural. In addition, the local origin is a determining factor in purchasing decisions [98]. Sometimes, younger consumers (college students) who value local, sustainable, family farm systems may not have positive attitudes toward other brands, such as organic

production, showing that the “local” concept may have a greater impact than other characteristics [99].

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Questionnaire Design

An empirical approach was chosen to investigate the perception of mountain products by the younger generation. To this end, University students from the Northwest of Italy were involved in a survey aimed at assessing their perception of mountain products. Initially, a focus group consisting of 6 people (three males and three females) who go to the mountains and are between 19 and 27 years old was formed in order to investigate the topic of mountain food products among people belonging to the younger generations. This step enabled us to collect useful information to draft the first version of the questionnaire. In particular, the different interpretations of mountain food products, in terms of perception, definition, specificity and attributes and characteristics sought, were highlighted. A first version of the questionnaire was defined and then tested by a second expert focus group. This group included 6 people (3 males and 3 females), namely 4 University professors specializing in consumer behaviour and 2 agribusiness professionals. At this stage, further input was collected on the accuracy of the questionnaire and the use of specific terms.

The resulting version of the questionnaire was pre-tested by 20 young consumers selected on the basis of a high level of education in food quality systems and survey organisation. Based on their suggestions and indications, more effective communicative expressions and a more careful evaluation of the order of the proposed questions were applied after the pre-test. In addition, the answers obtained led to the inclusion of some variables and to the definition of the final version of the questionnaire, with closed multiple-choice questions.

Lastly, the questionnaire was structured into 3 parts. The first aimed at assessing behaviour at the stage of buying a food product, e.g., factors influencing choice, factors determining a high-quality product and knowledge of quality brands. The second part delved into issues specifically related to the mountain product: categories of products that can be considered, such as necessary production processes, sought characteristics, purchasing channels and willingness to recognise a higher economic value. The third part looked at some demographic and social characteristics of the respondents: gender, age, municipality of residence, level of education and occupation. In the first and second parts, the level of importance assigned to the different qualitative variables considered was measured using a 1–7-point Likert scale.

An online version of the questionnaire was created and sent to a large sample of University students. The collection of questionnaires was completed in early 2020, and after careful evaluation of the collected responses, 4079 valid questionnaires were selected.

2.2. Methodology and Variables Description

Given the breadth of the administered questionnaire, a step-by-step process was used to synthesise the responses and turn them into useful information. First, the key points of the questionnaire, i.e., the information collected through the first and second parts of the questionnaire, were considered. Each key point was explored by synthesising a range of information collected through the questionnaire to obtain a qualitative summary variable through a dimensional reduction process conducted by principal component analysis (PCA) and subsequent hierarchical clustering analysis (HCA). HCA was performed on the first dimensions of the PCA, which overall yielded at least 75% of the variance explained. The identified key points are as follows:

- “Purchase influences”. The factors influencing the purchase of agri-food products were analysed on the basis of 8 variables assessed with Likert scales. A qualitative variable was obtained by assigning the respondents to 3 groups, i.e., respondents

influenced mainly by the origin of the raw material, place of production and sensory characteristics; respondents influenced by brands; respondents influenced by price and the outward appearance of the packaging;

- “Definition of high quality food product”. The characteristics that identify a high-quality agri-food product were analysed on the basis of 4 variables assessed with Likert scales. A qualitative variable was obtained by assigning the respondents to 3 groups, i.e., respondents oriented to consider a high-quality agri-food product as a product of verified quality (certified and controlled for health purposes); respondents oriented to consider a high-quality agri-food product as a product with a guaranteed production process and/or raw materials; respondents oriented to consider a high-quality agri-food product as a product characterized by a high-quality production process and/or raw materials;
- “Mountain product categories”. The food categories that can be considered mountainous were investigated using 9 variables assessed with Likert scales. A qualitative variable was obtained by assigning the respondents to 3 groups: respondents oriented to consider all food categories such as oil, wine, liquor, jam, mushroom, cheese, meat and honey, as mountain products; respondents oriented to consider cheese, meat and fresh vegetable products as mountain products; respondents oriented to consider animal food products (i.e., cheese, meat and honey) and processed products as mountain products;
- “Mountain product definition”. Aspects of production processes to consider a mountain food product were analysed on the basis of 3 variables assessed with Likert scales. A qualitative variable was obtained by assigning the respondents to 2 groups: respondents oriented to consider mountain product as a product made from raw materials of mountain origin; respondents oriented to consider mountain product as a product made from raw materials of mountain origin processed in mountain area;
- “Mountain product perception”. The attributes sought in mountain food products were investigated using 7 variables assessed with Likert scales. A qualitative variable was obtained by assigning the respondents to 3 groups: respondents oriented to consider mountain product as a useful tool to achieve the triple bottom line, i.e., environmental, social and economic sustainability; respondents oriented to consider mountain product as a useful tool to rediscover forgotten flavours, tradition and contact with the land; respondents oriented to consider mountain product as a useful tool to eat healthy, tasty and natural food;
- “Place of purchase”. Places of purchase of mountain food products were investigated on the basis of 7 variables assessed with Likert scales. A qualitative variable was obtained by assigning the respondents to 3 groups: through direct sales channels and/or speciality stores; through online sales channels; through large retailers;
- “Willingness to Pay”. The willingness to pay a higher and more recognised value for a mountain food product than for a conventional product was investigated on the basis of 10 variables assessed with Likert scales. A qualitative variable was obtained by assigning the respondents to 3 groups: respondents willing to place a higher and more recognised value on mountain meat and sausages than on the similar conventional category; respondents willing to place a higher and more recognised value on all categories of mountain foods than on the other categories of conventional foods; respondents willing to place a higher and more recognised value on fresh mountain vegetable products than on the similar conventional category.

In the next step, the variables deemed most interesting (corresponding to the key points exposed above) were considered, and multiple correspondence analysis (MCA) was obtained on the dimensions of which an HCA was performed, and four clusters were identified. To better explain the results obtained, variables related to demographic data were also added as “illustrative” variables. Multivariate analysis was performed using the R environment and the FactoMineR package [100]. In particular, PCA, MCA and HCPC (hierarchical cluster on principal components) functions were used.

The identified sample consisted of 4079 valid answers, of which 70.70% were provided by women and 29.4% by men. The age of the individuals was distributed into two main groups: 50.33% of the individuals were less than or equal to 21 years old, and 49.47% were older than 21 years. A description of all variables used in the analysis is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Identified variables, categories for each variable and related descriptions, frequency for each category and related percentages.

Variable	Category Description	Freq	%
Gender	Female	2884	70.70
	Male	1195	29.30
Age	Respondents 18–21 years old	2061	50.33
	Respondents 22+ years old	2018	49.47
Purchase influences	Respondents are influenced by origin and production place in the purchase phase	1254	30.75
	Respondents are influenced by the brand in the purchase phase	1704	41.77
	Respondents are influenced by price and packaging in the purchase phase	1121	27.48
Definition of high quality food product	Respondents are oriented to consider high-quality food products or produce with verified quality, i.e., certified and checked, for health purposes	1444	35.40
	Respondents are oriented to consider high-quality food products or produce with a guaranteed production process and/or raw materials.	1870	45.85
	Respondents are oriented to consider high-quality food products or produce characterized by a high-quality production process and/or raw materials	765	18.75
Mountain product categories	Respondents are oriented to consider all categories of food, i.e., oil, wine, spirits, jam, mushroom, cheese, meat and honey, as mountain products	1631	39.99
	Respondents are oriented to consider cheese, meat and fresh vegetable products as mountain products	1140	27.95
	Respondents are oriented to consider animal origin food (i.e., cheese, meat and honey) and processed products as mountain products	1308	32.06
Mountain product definition	Respondents are oriented to consider mountain products as products made with raw materials of mountain origin	1080	26.48
	Respondents are oriented to consider mountain products as products made with raw materials of mountain origin processed in mountain areas	2999	73.52
Mountain product perception	Respondents are oriented to consider mountain products a useful tool for reaching the triple bottom line (TBL), i.e., environmental, social and economic sustainability	1328	32.56
	Respondents are oriented to consider mountain products a useful tool for rediscovering old flavours, traditions and land contact	2003	49.11
	Respondents are oriented to consider mountain products a useful tool for eating healthy, tasty and natural food	748	18.34

Place of purchase	Mountain products can be purchased through direct sales, through food markets or farms and specialised shops	1411	34.79
	Mountain products can be purchased by e-service	1154	28.29
	Mountain products can be purchased at large-scale retail traders	1514	37.12
Willingness to Pay	Respondents are willing to pay for meat of mountain origin more than other food categories	1065	26.11
	Respondents are willing to pay for all categories of mountain food more than other conventional food categories	909	22.28
	Respondents are willing to pay for fresh vegetarian mountain food more than other food categories	2105	51.61

Legenda. Identified variables (column 1), related categories description (column 2), frequency for each category (column 3) and related percentage (column 4).

3. Results

Hierarchical clustering analysis was carried out to define the profile of respondents interested in mountain food products. Data processing and hierarchical clustering analysis enabled the identification of four main clusters of respondents with different influences and purchasing behaviour, specific perceptions of mountain food products and different focuses on mountain food categories.

The first cluster (1048 individuals, 25.69%) comprises younger respondents (mainly 18–21-year-olds) willing to pay for fresh vegetarian mountain food more than other food categories. They believe that mountain products can be purchased at large-scale retail traders, and they are attracted by all mountain food categories. They believe mountain products should be made in mountain areas, processing raw materials of mountain origin. Moreover, they are oriented to consider mountain products a useful tool for eating healthy, tasty and natural food. Generally, in the purchasing phase, they are mainly influenced by price, packaging and brand, and they define high-quality food products as those with a guaranteed production process and/or raw materials.

The second cluster (1055 individuals, 25.86%) comprises young respondents who, generally, in the purchasing phase, are mainly influenced by brands and define high-quality food products as those with a guaranteed production process and/or raw materials. They are willing to pay for meat of mountain origin more than other food categories, and, in any case, they pay more attention to all mountain food than to conventional food. They argue that mountain products should be made in mountain areas, processing raw materials of mountain origin. They believe that mountain products can be mainly purchased through direct sales, food markets or farms and from specialised shops. Moreover, they consider mountain products a useful tool for reaching the triple bottom line (TBL), i.e., environmental, social and economic sustainability, and rediscovering old flavours, traditions and land contact.

The third cluster (894 individuals, 21.92%) comprises younger respondents (mainly 18–21-year-olds) largely influenced by price and packaging in the purchasing phase; they define high-quality food products as those with verified (i.e., certified and checked) quality, for health purposes. They are oriented to consider mountain products as products made only from raw materials of mountain origin and are attracted by mountain animal origin food (i.e., cheese, meat) and fresh mountain products such as mushrooms, fruit and vegetables. Similar to the second cluster, they believe that mountain products can be mainly purchased through direct sales and from specialised shops, and they consider mountain products a useful tool for reaching the TBL. Moreover, similar to the first cluster, they consider mountain products a useful tool for eating healthy, tasty and natural food.

The fourth cluster (1082 individuals, 26.53%) comprises young respondents (>21 years old) influenced by origin and production place in the purchasing phase, who consider high-quality food products as those with verified (i.e., certified and checked) quality, for health purposes. They are oriented to consider animal-origin food (i.e., cheese, meat and honey) and processed products as mountain products, which can be mainly purchased through e-service providers but also through direct sales and from specialised shops. They are willing to pay for all categories of mountain products more than other conventional food categories, and they consider mountain products a useful tool for rediscovering old flavours, traditions and land contact and eating healthy, tasty and natural food.

The clusters' characteristics related to mountain food products are summarised in Table 2.

Table 2. Summary of clusters' characteristics related to mountain food products.

Cluster	Freq.	%	Favoured Categories	Production	Sought Attributes	Purchase Channels
First	1048	25.69	All foods	Original mountain raw materials processed in a mountain area	Healthy, tasty and natural food	Large-scale retail traders
Second	1055	25.86	All foods	Original mountain raw materials processed in a mountain area	TBL, old flavours, traditions and land contact	Direct sales, specialised shops
Third	894	21.92	Cheese, meat and fresh vegetable products	Original mountain raw materials	TBL, healthy, tasty and natural food	Direct sales, specialised shops
Fourth	1082	26.53	Animal origin of food and processed products	-	Old flavours, traditions and land contact, healthy, tasty and natural food	E-commerce providers (online shops), direct sales, specialised shops

Legenda. Cluster name (column 1), frequency (column 2) and related percentage (column 3), and a summary of clusters' characteristics related to mountain food products, i.e., favour categories (column 4), production (column 5), searching attributes (column 6) and purchase channels (column 7).

The analysis of the perception of mountain food products by young generations revealed different approaches to considering a food product as a result of a combination of mountain characteristics.

4. Discussion

This research aimed at increasing the knowledge of young consumers' perceptions of mountain products, and data analysis revealed a different approach to viewing a food product as the result of a combination of "mountain characteristics". For respondents, mountain products are a very important commodity, encompassing all categories of food, such as cheese, meat, honey, fruits and vegetables. They believe that mountain products should be produced entirely in the mountains (i.e., all stages of the supply chain), although they realise that the most important stage is the production of raw materials.

Overall, the four clusters emphasise a widespread positive perception of mountain products, showing consumer sensitivity to the issue of mountain product brands [11]. The characteristics of mountain products sought by young respondents refer to aspects related to sustainable development (32.56 percent of the sample), common to two clusters (second and third), territorial traditions and specialities (49.11 percent) considered in two clusters (Second and Fourth), and, although less relevant, health aspects (18.34 percent) shared among the first, third and fourth clusters.

The literature review revealed a small number of articles exclusively concern consumer perceptions of mountain food products. Therefore, the discussion was conducted using scholars' contributions to outline new trends in speciality food consumption in general, which allow some evidence on the topic to be compared.

A portion of young consumers in the sample are very concerned about sustainability in its various dimensions. Local foods, among which mountain foods can be considered, tend to be produced in short supply chains (SFSC) with a high degree of attention to sustainability. Some research conducted on samples of young generations showed that declinations of sustainability can be criteria of choice and/or identified attributes, especially when traceability and short supply chain are considered [10,97,99].

At the same time, many consumers are becoming increasingly aware of the relationship between products and the environment. There is a gradually growing awareness, especially among the younger generation, of the need to buy food products with a low environmental impact [48,51]. In this sense, findings identified a group of respondents who seemed very interested in reaching the TBL by recognising a major value for foods obtained by a farming/breeding activity perceived as more sustainable (third cluster). Moreover, younger consumers seem to be interested in the quality of food and related health [10] in line with the obtained results evidencing the need to identify healthy and natural attributes in mountain foods in the three clusters (first, third and fourth).

Research findings confirm that consumers' growing interest in local and mountain products is also motivated by the necessity to rediscover traditional and local cultures, in line with other studies [87–89]. In addition, roots and "ancient flavours" are attributes identified by different scholars [90,91] that are presented and confirmed by respondents belonging to the second and fourth clusters.

The results of the sample also showed a strong interaction between mountain food and the origin of the raw materials, as well as the production process. In this sense, respondents underline the specific importance of the production process and the origin of raw materials in three different clusters (first, second and third). This indication may be interpreted as a need for strengthening communication tools for the identification of the main characteristics of mountain products; the European Union took this direction in its "Mountain Product" labelling scheme, as already identified by other authors [27–29]. At the same time, further insights are provided by several studies [23,25,92] emphasising that reference to origin might be enhanced by geographical indications and trademarks of parks located in mountain areas.

Lastly, results identified the orientation of the respondents as to the distribution channels chosen for purchasing mountain products. Specialised shops and direct sales are indicated as the main channels by the sample; specifically, three clusters underlined the importance of direct sales, in line with other studies [5,27]. Large distribution and online shops are also identified as purchasing channels and, therefore, can be considered useful paths to reach final consumers [80–82].

5. Conclusions

The mountain agri-food economy is a fundamental pillar not only for economic resilience but also for boosting the social and environmental sphere of mountain areas in need of solid economic activities in order to support their population and protect the environment.

The results are in line with the indications of scholars dealing with these issues and contribute to improving knowledge in the sector, showing that interviewees are sensitive to the issue of mountain products. The main evidence that emerged offers precious suggestions to public and private stakeholders. In the case of institutions, the need to further strengthen the importance of agri-food products in the collective imagination of consumers was highlighted; in this sense, the study provides insights into the need to define new communication tools to enhance the qualities of mountain products. In the private sphere, it suggests to marketers that mountain products are considered high-quality products and

that they are positively perceived for several aspects reaching beyond the intrinsic characteristics of the products. However, the research is limited to a sample of young, highly educated consumers; therefore, future research should be geared towards extending the study to other categories of the respondents' generation and to other generations. In this context, a confirmatory analysis could be performed by applying tools such as analysis of variance (ANOVA) as well as specific models, including structural equation models.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, A.B., S.D., L.B. and G.P.; methodology, A.B. and L.B.; software, L.B.; validation, A.B., S.D., L.B. and G.P.; formal analysis, A.B., S.D., L.B. and G.P.; investigation, A.B., S.D., L.B. and G.P.; data curation, L.B.; writing—original draft preparation, A.B., S.D., L.B. and G.P.; writing—review and editing, A.B., S.D., L.B. and G.P.; supervision, A.B., S.D., L.B. and G.P. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Ethical review and approval were waived for this study because were not necessary at the time of the survey.

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

Data Availability Statement: Please, contact the corresponding author.

Acknowledgements: This study was carried out during the research project Eco-management of Agri-tourism in Mountain Areas (EMERITUS—Compagnia di San Paolo of Turin, Italy).

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

References

- Richins, H.; Johnsen, S.; Hull, J.S. Overview of Mountain Tourism: Substantive Nature, Historical Context, Areas of Focus. In *Mountain Tourism: Experiences, Communities, Environments and Sustainable Futures*; CABI: Wallingford, England, 2016; pp. 1–12.
- Charters, T.; Saxon, E. *Tourism and Mountains. A Practical Guide to Managing the Environmental and Social Impacts of Mountain Tours*; UNEP: Paris, France, 2007. Available online: <https://wedocs.unep.org/handle/20.500.11822/7687;jsessionid=75EFE49FF1A3BB9426D2456AA5118A56> (accessed on 12 July 2022).
- Duglio, S.; Bonadonna, A.; Letey, M. The Contribution of Local Food Products in Fostering Tourism for Marginal Mountain Areas: An Exploratory Study on Northwestern Italian Alps. *Mt. Res. Dev.* **2022**, *42*, R1–R10. <https://doi.org/10.1659/MRD-JOURNAL-D-20-00075.1>.
- Schnell, S.M. The local traveler: Farming, food, and place in state and provincial tourism guides, 1993–2008. *J. Cult. Geogr.* **2011**, *28*, 281–309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08873631.2011.583441>.
- Bonadonna, A.; Duglio, S. A Mountain Niche Production: The Case of Bettelmatt Cheese in the Antigorio and Formazza Valleys (Piedmont–Italy). *Qual. Access Success* **2016**, *17*, 80–86.
- Vanhonacker, F.; Verbeke, W.; Guerrero, L.; Claret, A.; Contel, M.; Scalvedi, L.; Żakowska-Biemans, S.; Gutkowska, K.; Sulmont-Rossé, C.; Raude, J. How European consumers define the concept of traditional food: Evidence from a survey in six countries. *Agribusiness* **2010**, *26*, 453–476. <https://doi.org/10.1002/agr.20241>.
- Berno, T.; Fusté-Forné, F. Imaginaries of cheese: Revisiting narratives of local produce in the contemporary world. *Ann. Leis. Res.* **2019**, *23*, 608–626. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2019.1603113>.
- Szegedyné Fricz, Á.; Ittész, A.; Ózsvári, L.; Szakos, D.; Kasza, G. Consumer perception of local food products in Hungary. *Br. Food J.* **2020**, *122*, 2965–2979. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-07-2019-0528>.
- Ercilla-Montserrat, M.; Sanjuan-Delmás, D.; Sanyé-Mengual, E.; Calvet-Mir, L.; Banderas, K.; Rieradevall, J.; Gabarrell, X. Analysis of the consumer's perception of urban food products from a soilless system in rooftop greenhouses: A case study from the Mediterranean area of Barcelona (Spain). *Agric. Hum. Values* **2019**, *36*, 375–393. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-019-09920-7>.
- Annunziata, A.; Mariani, A. Consumer perception of sustainability attributes in organic and local food. *Recent Pat. Food Nutr. Agric.* **2018**, *9*, 87–96. <https://doi.org/10.2174/2212798410666171215112058>.
- Mazzocchi, C.; Sali, G. Supporting mountain agriculture through “mountain product” label: A choice experiment approach. *Environ. Dev. Sustain.* **2022**, *24*, 701–723. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-021-01464-3>.
- UNGA. Sustainable Mountain Development. Report of the Secretary-General, A/74/209 2019. Available online: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/3825219> (accessed on 10 July 2022).
- UNGA. Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly on 19 December 2019. Sustainable Mountain Development, A/RES/74/227. FAO 2020. Available online: <https://www.fao.org/mountain-partnership/publications/publication-detail/en/c/1259593/> (accessed on 27 July 2022).

14. Duglio, S.; Bonadonna, A.; Letey, M.; Peira, G.; Zavattaro, L.; Lombardi, G. Tourism Development in Inner Mountain Areas. The Local Stakeholders' Point of View through a Mixed Method Approach. *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 5997. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11215997>.
15. Pasca, A.; Rouby, A. *Strategies to Increase the Attractiveness of Mountain Areas: How to Approach Depopulation in an Integrated Manner. Final Report from Work Package*; Euromontana: Bruxelles, Belgium, 2012. Available online: https://www.euromontana.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/PADIMA_policy_guidelines_EN.pdf (accessed on 20 July 2022).
16. Nassivera, F.; Sillani, S. Consumer perceptions and motivations in choice of minimally processed vegetables a case study in Italy. *Br. Food J.* **2015**, *117*, 970–986. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-03-2014-0132>.
17. Seitz, C.C.; Roosen, J. An empirical analysis of international consumers' associations with Bavarian food products by means of concept mapping. *Br. Food J.* **2015**, *117*, 987–1006. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-10-2013-0307>.
18. Cohen, E.; Schwartz, Z.; Antonovski, R.; Saguy, S. Consumer perceptions of kosher products. *J. Foodserv. Bus. Res.* **2002**, *5*, 69–88. https://doi.org/10.1300/J369v05n03_06.
19. Viaene, J.; Verbeke, W.; Gellynck, X. Quality perception of vegetables by Belgian consumers. *Acta Hort.* **2000**, *524*, 89–95. <https://doi.org/10.17660/actahortic.2000.524.10>.
20. Juric, B.; Worsley, A. Consumers' attitudes towards imported food products. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **1998**, *9*, 431–441. <https://doi.org/10.1016/s0950-329300027-5>.
21. George, R.J. A comparison of american and irish consumers perceptions of the quality of food products and supermarket service. *J. Food Prod. Mark.* **1993**, *1*, 72–81. https://doi.org/10.1300/J038v01n03_09.
22. Kun, A.I.; Kiss, M. On the mechanics of the organic label effect: How does organic labeling change consumer evaluation of food products? *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 1260. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13031260>.
23. Sadílek, T. Consumer preferences regarding food quality labels: The case of Czechia. *Br. Food J.* **2019**, *121*, 2508–2523. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-03-2019-0150>.
24. Hocquette, J.-F.; Jacquet, A.; Giraud, G.; Legrand, I.; Sans, P.; Mainsant, P.; Verbeke, W. Quality of food products and consumer attitudes in France. In *Consumer Attitudes to Food Quality Products. EAAP—European Federation of Animal Science*; Wageningen Academic Publishers: Wageningen, Netherlands, 2013; Volume 133, pp. 67–82. https://doi.org/10.3920/978-90-8686-762-2_5.
25. Espejel, J.; Fandos, C.; Flavián, C. Consumer satisfaction: A key factor of consumer loyalty and buying intention of a PDO food product. *Br. Food J.* **2008**, *110*, 865–881. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00070700810900585>.
26. Bentivoglio, D.; Savini, S.; Finco, A.; Bucci, G.; Boselli, E. Quality and origin of mountain food products: The new European label as a strategy for sustainable development. *J. Mt. Sci.* **2019**, *16*, 428–440. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11629-018-4962-x>.
27. Bonadonna, A.; Peira, G.; Giachino, C.; Molinaro, L. Traditional cheese production and an EU labeling scheme: The Alpine cheese producers' opinion. *Agriculture* **2017**, *7*, 65. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture7080065>.
28. Bassi, I.; Carzedda, M.; Grassetti, L.; Iseppi, L.; Nassivera, S. Consumer attitudes towards the mountain product label: Implications for mountain development. *J. Mt. Sci.* **2021**, *18*, 2255–2272. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11629-020-6616-z>.
29. Finco, A.; Bentivoglio, D.; Bucci, G.A. Label for mountain products? Let's turn it over to producers and retailers. *Qual. Access Success* **2017**, *18*, 198–205.
30. Chalupová, M.; Rojík, S.; Kotoučková, H.; Kauerová, L. Food labels (quality, origin, and sustainability): The experience of Czech producers. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 318. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13010318>.
31. Endrizzi, I.; Clicerì, D.; Menghi, L.; Aprea, E.; Gasperi, F. Does the 'mountain pasture product' claim affect local cheese acceptability? *Foods* **2021**, *10*, 682. <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods10030682>.
32. Rabadán, A.; Martínez-Carrasco, L.; Brugarolas, M.; Bernabéu, R. Perceptions of geographical indication labels as quality indicators inside and outside the labels' area of influence: The case of spring fruits. *Renew. Agric. Food Syst.* **2021**, *36*, 569–575. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742170521000181>.
33. Mancini, M.C.; Menozzi, D.; Donati, M.; Biasini, B.; Veneziani, M.; Arfini, F. Producers' and consumers' perception of the sustainability of short food supply chains: The case of Parmigiano Reggiano PDO. *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 721. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11030721>.
34. Palmieri, N.; Pesce, A.; Verrascina, M.; Perito, M.A. Market opportunities for hay milk: Factors influencing perceptions among Italian consumers. *Animals* **2021**, *11*, 431. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani11020431>.
35. Peira, G.; Cortese, D.; Lombardi, G.; Bollani, L. Grass-fed milk perception: Profiling Italian consumer. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 10348. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su122410348>.
36. Motoki, K.; Park, J.; Pathak, A.; Spence, C. Constructing healthy food names: On the sound symbolism of healthy food. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2021**, *90*, 104157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2020.104157>.
37. Lusk, J.L. Consumer beliefs about healthy foods and diets. *PLoS ONE* **2019**, *14*, e0223098. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0223098>.
38. Siegrist, M.; Hartmann, C.; Lazzarini, G.A. Healthy choice label does not substantially improve consumers' ability to select healthier cereals: Results of an online experiment. *Br. J. Nutr.* **2019**, *121*, 1313–1320. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007114519000448>.
39. Martini, D.; Bo, C.D.; Cavaliere, A. Current legislation in the European context: A focus on food labeling, novel foods, nutrition, and health claims. In *Nutraceutical and Functional Food Regulations in the United States and Around the World*, 3rd ed.; Bagchi, D., Ed.; Academic Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-816467-9.00018-6>.
40. Hartmann, C.; Hieke, S.; Taper, C.; Siegrist, M. European consumer healthiness evaluation of 'Free-from' labelled food products. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2018**, *68*, 377–388. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2017.12.009>.

41. Borrello, M.; Annunziata, A.; Vecchio, R. Sustainability of palm oil: Drivers of consumers' preferences. *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 4818. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11184818>.
42. Acton, R.B.; Vanderlee, L.; Hammond, D. Influence of front-of-package nutrition labels on beverage healthiness perceptions: Results from a randomized experiment. *Prev. Med.* **2018**, *115*, 83–89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2018.08.022>.
43. Song, J.; Brown, M.K.; Tan, M.; MacGregor, G.A.; Webster, J.; Campbell, N.R.C.; Trieu, K.; Ni Mhurchu, C.; Cobb, L.K.; He, F.J. Impact of color-coded and warning nutrition labelling schemes: A systematic review and network meta-analysis. *PLoS Med.* **2021**, *18*, e1003765. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003765>.
44. Temple, N.J. Front-of-package food labels: A narrative review. *Appetite* **2020**, *144*, 104485. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2019.104485>.
45. Biondi, B.; Camanzi, L. Nutrition, hedonic or environmental? The effect of front-of-pack messages on consumers' perception and purchase intention of a novel food product with multiple attributes. *Food Res. Int.* **2020**, *130*, 108962. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2019.108962>.
46. Oliveira, M.; Sidali, K.L.; Busch, G. Mountain beef and wine: Italian consumers' definitions and opinions on the mountain labelling-scheme. *Econ. Agro-Aliment.* **2021**, *23*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.3280/ECAG1-2021OA11549>.
47. Nguyen, A.T.; Parker, L.; Brennan, L.; Lockrey, S. A consumer definition of eco-friendly packaging. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2020**, *252*, 119792. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119792>.
48. Ertz, M.; François, J.; Durif, F. How Consumers React to Environmental Information: An Experimental Study. *J. Int. Consum. Mark.* **2017**, *29*, 162–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08961530.2016.1273813>.
49. Bastounis, A.; Buckell, J.; Hartmann-boyce, J.; Cook, B.; King, S.; Potter, C.; Bianchi, F.; Rayner, M.; Jebb, S.A. The impact of environmental sustainability labels on willingness-to-pay for foods: A systematic review and meta-analysis of discrete choice experiments. *Nutrients* **2021**, *13*, 2677. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu13082677>.
50. Rondoni, A.; Grasso, S. Consumers behaviour towards carbon footprint labels on food: A review of the literature and discussion of industry implications. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2021**, *301*, 127031. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.127031>.
51. Zhang, B.; Fu, Z.; Huang, J.; Wang, J.; Xu, S.; Zhang, L. Consumers' perceptions, purchase intention, and willingness to pay a premium price for safe vegetables: A case study of Beijing, China. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2018**, *197*, 1498–1507. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.06.273>.
52. Orzan, G.; Cruceru, A.F.; Balaceanu, C.T.; Chivu, R.G. Consumers' behavior concerning sustainable packaging: An exploratory study on Romanian consumers. *Sustainability* **2018**, *10*, 1787. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10061787>.
53. Eldesouky, A.; Mesias, F.J.; Escribano, M. Perception of Spanish consumers towards environmentally friendly labelling in food. *Int. J. Consum. Stud.* **2020**, *44*, 64–76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12546>.
54. Mtimet, N.; Souissi, A.; Mhamdi, N. Tunisian consumers perception and behaviour towards organic food products. *New Medit* **2020**, *19*, 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.30682/nm2001a>.
55. Jensen, J.D.; Christensen, T.; Denver, S.; Ditlevsen, K.; Lassen, J.; Teuber, R. Eterogeneity in consumers' perceptions and demand for local (organic) food products. *Food Qual. Prefer.* **2019**, *73*, 255–265. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2018.11.002>.
56. Oroian, C.F.; Safirescu, C.O.; Harun, R.; Chiciuden, S.O.; Harion, S.H.; Muresan, I.C.; Bordeanu, I.M. Consumers' attitudes towards organic products and sustainable development: A case study of Romania. *Sustainability* **2017**, *9*, 1559. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su9091559>.
57. Thøgersen, J.; Pedersen, S.; Paternoga, M.; Schwendel, E.; Aschemann-Witzel, J. How important is country-of-origin for organic food consumers? A review of the literature and suggestions for future research. *Br. Food J.* **2017**, *119*, 542–557. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-09-2016-0406>.
58. Boobalan, K.; Nachimuthu, G.S. Organic consumerism: A comparison between India and the USA. *J. Retail. Consum. Serv.* **2020**, *53*, 101988. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.101988>.
59. Profeta, A.; Hamm, U. Who cares about local feed in local food products? Results from a consumer survey in Germany. *Br. Food J.* **2019**, *121*, 711–724. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-07-2018-0446>.
60. Hempel, C.; Hamm, U. How important is local food to organic-minded consumers? *Appetite* **2016**, *96*, 309–318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2015.09.036>.
61. de-Magistris, T.; Gracia, A. Consumers' willingness to pay for light, organic and PDO cheese: An experimental auction approach. *Br. Food J.* **2016**, *118*, 560–571. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-09-2015-0322>.
62. Naspetti, S.; Bodini, A. Consumer perception of local and organic products: Substitution or complementary goods? *Int. J. Interdiscip. Soc. Sci.* **2008**, *3*, 111–121. <https://doi.org/10.18848/1833-1882/cgp/v03i02/52526>.
63. Saraiva, A.; Carrascosa, C.; Raheem, D.; Ramos, F.; Raposo, A. Natural sweeteners: The relevance of food naturalness for consumers, food security aspects, sustainability and health impacts. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2020**, *17*, 1.22. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17176285>.
64. Aschemann-Witzel, J. Consumer perception and trends about health and sustainability: Trade-offs and synergies of two pivotal issues. *Curr. Opin. Food Sci.* **2015**, *3*, 6–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cofs.2014.08.002>.
65. Amin, Z.; Andry, E.H.; Wahyuni, N.; Ningsih, V.Y. Consumers' perceptions and willingness to pay (WTP) organic rice. *J. Crit. Rev.* **2020**, *7*, 48–51. <https://doi.org/10.22159/jcr.07.01.08>.
66. Evola, R.S.; Peira, G.; Varese, E.; Bonadonna, A.; Vesce, E. Short Food Supply Chains in Europe: Scientific Research Directions. *Sustainability* **2022**, *14*, 3602. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14063602>.

67. Bareja-Wawryszak, O. Forms of organization and spatial concentration of local food systems. A case from Poland. *Entrep. Sustain. Issues* **2020**, *8*, 471–483. <https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2020.8.1>.
68. Del Giudice, T.; Cavallo, C.; Vecchio, R. Credence attributes, consumers trust and sensory expectations in modern food market: Is there a need to redefine their role? *Int. J. Food Syst. Dyn.* **2018**, *9*, 307–313. <https://doi.org/10.18461/ijfsd.v9i4.941>.
69. Tongaralak, M.H.; Lee, D.; Ata, B. Mechanisms for Increasing Sourcing from Capacity-Constrained Local Suppliers. *Decis. Sci.* **2017**, *48*, 108–149. <https://doi.org/10.1111/decis.12204>.
70. Dunne, M.; Wright, A. Irish local and artisan foods: Multiples make space! *Cogent Bus. Manag.* **2017**, *4*, 1324242. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2017.1324242>.
71. Sanz-Cañada, J.; Muchnik, J. Geographies of origin and proximity: Approaches to local agro-food systems. *Cult. Hist. Digit. J.* **2016**, *5*, e002. <https://doi.org/10.3989/chdj.2016.002>.
72. Ciuchta, M.P.; O'Toole, J. Buy Local? Organizational Identity in the Localism Movement. *Bus. Soc.* **2018**, *57*, 1481–1497. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650316648642>.
73. Bakos, I.M. Local food systems supported by communities nationally and internationally. *Deturope* **2017**, *9*, 59–79. <https://doi.org/10.32725/det.2017.006>.
74. Bir, C.; Lai, J.; Widmar, N.O.; Thompson, N.; Ellett, J.; Crosslin, C. “There’s no place like home”: Inquiry into preferences for local foods. *J. Food Distrib. Res.* **2019**, *50*, 29–45. <https://doi.org/10.22004/ag.econ.292181>.
75. Spielmann, N.; Bernelin, M. Locavores: Where you buy defines who you are. *Int. J. Retail Distrib. Manag.* **2015**, *43*, 617–633. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJRDM-03-2014-0028>.
76. Mirosa, M.; Lawson, R. Revealing the lifestyles of local food consumers. *Br. Food J.* **2012**, *114*, 816–825. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00070701211234345>.
77. Pearson, D.; Henryks, J.; Trott, A.; Jones, P.; Parker, G.; Dumaresq, D.; Dyball, R. Local food: Understanding consumer motivations in innovative retail formats. *Br. Food J.* **2011**, *113*, 886–899. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00070701111148414>.
78. Kiss, K.; Ruzsakai, C.; Szűcs, A.; Koncz, G. Examining the Role of Local Products in Rural Development in the Light of Consumer Preferences - Results of a Consumer Survey from Hungary. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 5473. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12135473>.
79. Corsi, S.; Mazzocchi, C. Alternative Food Networks (AFNs): Determinants for Consumer and Farmer Participation in Lombardy, Italy. *Agric. Econ.* **2019**, *65*, 259–269. <https://doi.org/10.17221/230/2018-AGRICECON>.
80. Yacamán Ochoa, C.; Matarán Ruiz, A.; Mata Olmo, R.; Macías Figueroa, Á.; Torres Rodríguez, A. Peri-Urban Organic Agriculture and Short Food Supply Chains as Drivers for Strengthening City/Region Food Systems—Two Case Studies in Andalucía, Spain. *Land* **2020**, *9*, 177. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land9060177>.
81. O’Hara, J.K.; Low, S.A. Online Sales: A Direct Marketing Opportunity for Rural Farms? *J. Agric. Appl. Econ.* **2020**, *52*, 222–239. <https://doi.org/10.1017/aae.2019.44>.
82. Thilmany, D.; Canales, E.; Low, S.A.; Boys, K. Local Food Supply Chain Dynamics and Resilience during COVID-19. *Appl. Econ. Perspect. Policy* **2021**, *43*, 86–104. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aepp.13121>.
83. Lioutas, E.D.; Charatsari, C. Smart Farming and Short Food Supply Chains: Are They Compatible? *Land Use Policy* **2020**, *94*, 104541. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.104541>.
84. Barska, A.; Wojciechowska-Solis, J. Traditional and regional food as seen by consumers – research results: The case of Poland. *Br. Food J.* **2018**, *120*, 1994–2004. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-01-2018-0054>.
85. Pícha, K.; Navrátil, J.; Švec, R. Preference to Local Food vs. Preference to “National” and Regional Food. *J. Food Prod. Mark.* **2018**, *24*, 125–145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10454446.2016.1266549>.
86. Cacciolatti, L.A.; Garcia, C.C.; Kalantzakis, M. Traditional Food Products: The Effect of Consumers’ Characteristics, Product Knowledge, and Perceived Value on Actual Purchase. *J. Int. Food Agribus. Mark.* **2015**, *27*, 155–176. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08974438.2013.807416>.
87. Spence, C. Comfort food: A review. *Int. J. Gastron. Food Sci.* **2017**, *9*, 105–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijgfs.2017.07.001>.
88. Abdullah, N. Comfort food, memory, and ‘Home’: Senses in transnational contexts. In *Everyday Life in Asia*, 1st ed.; Kalekin-Fishman, D., Low, K.E.Y., Eds.; Routledge: London, England, 2012.
89. LeBel, J.; Lu, J.; Dube, L. Positive versus negative affect asymmetry and comfort food consumption. In *Advances in Consumer Research*; Pechmann, C., Price, L., Eds.; Association for Consumer Research: Duluth, Minnesota, 2006; Volume 33, pp. 263–264. Available online: <https://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/12324/volumes/v33/NA-33>.
90. Krüger, T.; Strüver, A. Narratives of “good food”: Consumer identities and the appropriation of sustainability discourses. *Z. Fur Wirtsch.* **2018**, *62*, 217–232. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zfw-2017-0006>.
91. Spence, C. Fondue make a comeback. *Int. J. Gastron. Food Sci.* **2018**, *12*, 14–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijgfs.2018.04.001>.
92. Temperini, V.; Limbu, Y.; Jayachandran, C. Consumers’ Trust in Food Quality and Willingness to Pay More for National Parks’ Brands: Preliminary Evidence from Italy. *J. Int. Food Agribus. Mark.* **2017**, *29*, 120–138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08974438.2016.1266569>.
93. Henchion, M.; Mcintyre, B. Regional imagery and quality products: The Irish experience. *Br. Food J.* **2000**, *102*, 630–644. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00070700010348514>.
94. Turra, E. Culture, communication and persuasion on gastronomic tourism websites: A multimodal analysis. *J. Vis. Lit.* **2020**, *39*, 256–272. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1051144X.2020.1828676>.
95. Fares, M.; Raza, S.; Thomas, A. Is There Complementarity Between Certified Labels and Brands? Evidence from Small French Cooperatives. *Rev. Ind. Organ.* **2018**, *53*, 367–395. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11151-018-9618-z>.

96. Savelli, E.; Murmura, F.; Liberatore, L.; Casolani, N.; Bravi, L. Food habits and attitudes towards food quality among young students. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences* **2017**, *9*, 456–468. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQSS-02-2017-0011>.
97. Tessitore, S.; Iraldo, F.; Apicella, A.; Tarabella, A. The Link between Food Traceability and Food Labels in the Perception of Young Consumers in Italy. *Int. J. Food Syst. Dyn.* **2020**, *11*, 425–440. <https://doi.org/10.18461/ijfsd.v11i5.65>.
98. Fernández-Ferrín, P.; Bande, B.; Calvo-Turrientes, A.; Galán-Ladero, M.M. The Choice of Local Food Products by Young Consumers: The Importance of Public and Private Attributes. *Agribusiness* **2017**, *33*, 70–84. <https://doi.org/10.1002/agr.21470>.
99. Torres, A. For young consumers farm-to-fork is not organic: A cluster analysis of university students. *HortScience* **2020**, *55*, 1475–1481. <https://doi.org/10.21273/HORTSCI15228-20>.
100. Lê, S.; Josse, J.; Husson, F. FactoMineR: An R package for multivariate analysis. *J. Stat. Softw.* **2008**, *25*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v025.i01>.