https://doi.org/10.17221/77/2024-AGRICECON

# Eating 'green' and being 'green': A cross-sectional study among Italian adults through Mediterranean diet adherence

*Fjona Zeneli, Alessia Cavaliere, Lucia Baldi*, Elisa De Marchi, Alessandro Banterle*

*Department of Environmental Science and Policy, University of Milan, Milan, Italy*

**Corresponding author: lucia.baldi@unimi.it*

**Citation**: Zeneli F., Cavaliere A., Baldi L., De Marchi E., Banterle A. (2026): Eating 'green' and being 'green': A cross-sectional study among Italian adults through Mediterranean diet adherence. Agric. Econ. – Czech, 72: 302–313.

The authors are fully responsible for both the content and the formal aspects of the electronic supplementary material. No editorial adjustments were made.

**Electronic supplementary material (ESM)**

Supplementary Table S1
Supplementary Table S2
Supplementary Table S3
Supplementary Table S4
Supplementary Table S5

https://doi.org/10.17221/77/2024-AGRICECON

Table S1. Variables' description

| Variable | Type |
|---|---|
| *Mediterranean diet adherence*[a] | score – discrete [4;32] |
| *Gender* | 0 (male); 1 (female) |
| *Age* | 1 (18 to 24); 2 (25 to 34); 3 (35 to 44); 4 (45 to 54); 5 (55 to 64); 6 (older than 65) |
| *Education level* | 1 (primary school/no school); 2 (secondary school); 3 (high school diploma); 4 (degree and post-degree) |
| *Economic situation* | 1 (poor); 2 (somewhat insufficient); 3 (somewhat sufficient); 4 (optimal) |
| *Family type* | 1 (alone); 2 (couple with children); 3 (couple without children); 4 (single father); 5 (single mother) |
| *Region* | 1 (South); 2 (Central); 3 (North) |
| *Environmental concerns* | score-continuous |
| *Pro-environmental behaviours* | score-continuous |

[a]transformed into a categorical variable, following its quartiles

Source: Own elaboration based on ISTAT (2021) data

https://doi.org/10.17221/77/2024-AGRICECON

Table S2. Robustness check

| Variable | (1) | (2) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Coefficient | Coefficient | Odds ratio |
| Gender | | | |
| male | – | – | – |
| female | 0.761*** | 0.339*** | 1.401*** |
| Age | 0.409*** | 0.189*** | 1.208*** |
| Education level | 0.147*** | 0.072*** | 1.074*** |
| Economic situation | 0.245*** | 0.124*** | 1.132*** |
| Family type | | | |
| alone | – | – | – |
| couple with children | 0.024 | 0.009 | 1.01 |
| couple without children | 0.216*** | 0.107*** | 1.113*** |
| single father | –0.268* | –0.127* | 0.880* |
| single mother | –0.114 | –0.026 | 0.974 |
| Region | | | |
| South | – | – | – |
| Central | 0.118** | 0.078*** | 1.08*** |
| North | –0.312*** | –0.115*** | 0.892 |
| Environmental concerns | 0.087*** | | |
| [a]Climate change concerns | – | 0.028*** | 1.028*** |
| [b]Biodiversity concerns | – | 0.005 | 1.005 |
| [c]Environmental pollution concerns | – | 0.035*** | 1.036*** |
| [d]Human impact concerns | – | 0.036*** | 1.037*** |
| Pro-environmental behaviours | 0.529*** | | |
| [e]Sustainable purchasing behaviours | – | 0.123*** | 1.131*** |
| [f]Environmental and energy-saving behaviours | – | 0.094*** | 1.098*** |
| [g]Environmental and social behaviours | – | 0.036*** | 1.037*** |
| cons | 10.343*** | | |
| $R^2$ | 0.079 | | |
| *F*-test | 243.88*** | | |
| /cut 1 | | 2.638 | |
| /cut 1 | | 3.953 | |
| /cut 1 | | 4.849 | |
| LR chi$^2$ | | 2 630.85*** | |
| Model fit | | 0.028 1 | |
| Observations | 34 151 | 34 151 | |

***, ** and *significance levels at 0.01, 0.05 and 0.l, respectively; [a]C1, C3, C9; [b]C2, C11; [c]C4, C5, C6, C7, C8; [d]C10, C12, C13, C14; [e]B2, B3, B10; [f]B5, B6, B9; [g]B4, B7, B8

It presents the multiple linear regression with aggregated (Model 1) and decomposed EC, PEB (Model 2).

Source: Own elaboration based on ISTAT (2021) data

https://doi.org/10.17221/77/2024-AGRICECON

Table S3. Correlation/association test among covariates

| | Age | Gender | Education level | Economic situation | Family type | Region | Environmental concerns score | Pro-environmental behaviours score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age | 1.00 | | | | | | | |
| Gender | 0.05 | 1.00 | | | | | | |
| Education level | –0.46 | –0.03 | 1.00 | | | | | |
| Economic situation | 0.06 | –0.02 | 0.16 | 1.00 | | | | |
| Family type | –0.04 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 1.00 | | | |
| Region | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.08 | –0.01 | 1.00 | | |
| Environmental concerns score | –0.07 | –0.00 | 0.19 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 1.00 | |
| Pro-environmental behaviours Score | –0.09 | 0.08 | 0.28 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.13 | 0.24 | 1.00 |

Polyserial correlation coefficients are reported (covariates are continuous and categorical); all coefficients are significant at 1%

Source: Own elaboration based on ISTAT (2021) data

Table S4. Multicollinearity test on multiple linear regression

| MD | VIF | 1/VIF |
|---|---|---|
| Gender | | |
| male | – | – |
| female | 1.04 | 0.96 |
| Age | 1.50 | 0.67 |
| Education level | 1.33 | 0.75 |
| Economic situation | 1.04 | 0.96 |
| Family type | | |
| alone | – | – |
| couple with children | 2.08 | 0.48 |
| couple without children | 1.72 | 0.58 |
| single father | 1.11 | 0.89 |
| single mother | 1.39 | 0.72 |
| Region | | |
| South | – | – |
| Central | 1.24 | 0.81 |
| North | 1.26 | 0.79 |
| Environmental concerns score | 1.08 | 0.92 |
| Environmental behaviours score | 1.14 | 0.88 |
| Mean VIF | 1.33 | |

Since VIF cannot be performed directly after an ordinal logistic model, the multiple linear regression was used as a representative model (and as a robustness check previously)

VIF – variance inflation factor

Source: Own elaboration based on ISTAT (2021) data

https://doi.org/10.17221/77/2024-AGRICECON

Table S5. Sample descriptive statistics (%)

| Variables | All ($n$ = 34 151) | Male ($n$ = 16 331) | Female ($n$ = 17 820) |
|---|---|---|---|
| MD adherence score[a] | 20.891 | 20.938 | 20.847 |
| Low (4–15) | 27.08 | 26.60 | 27.51 |
| Medium-low (16–18) | 28.47 | 28.34 | 28.59 |
| Medium-high (19–20) | 26.27 | 26.28 | 26.26 |
| High (21–32) | 18.18 | 18.77 | 17.64 |
| Age (years) | | | |
| 18 to 24 | 7.53 | 8.11 | 7.01 |
| 25 to 34 | 10.26 | 11.08 | 9.51 |
| 35 to 44 | 13.14 | 13.02 | 13.24 |
| 45 to 54 | 19.14 | 19.75 | 18.57 |
| 55 to 64 | 18.76 | 18.81 | 18.71 |
| older than 65 | 31.17 | 29.22 | 32.96 |
| Education level | | | |
| primary school / no school | 16.11 | 12.60 | 19.32 |
| secondary school | 25.49 | 28.44 | 22.78 |
| high school diploma | 40.69 | 42.84 | 38.72 |
| degree and post-degree | 17.71 | 16.11 | 19.18 |
| Economic situation | | | |
| poor | 3.20 | 3.33 | 3.08 |
| somewhat insufficient | 26.75 | 25.98 | 27.46 |
| somewhat sufficient | 68.54 | 69.10 | 68.03 |
| optimal | 1.51 | 1.59 | 1.44 |
| Family type | | | |
| alone | 19.89 | 16.93 | 22.61 |
| couple with children | 44.82 | 48.53 | 41.43 |
| couple without children | 24.59 | 25.91 | 23.38 |
| single father | 2.11 | 3.56 | 0.77 |
| single mother | 8.58 | 5.06 | 11.81 |
| Region | | | |
| South | 37.19 | 37.44 | 36.96 |
| Central | 19.63 | 19.51 | 19.74 |
| North | 43.18 | 43.05 | 43.29 |

[a]The transformation of the Mediterranean diet (MD) adherence into an ordinal variable was done following the quartiles of its distribution. For all the covariates and their categories, the percentage out of the sample is presented, for MD, the score is provided as the mean

Source: Own elaboration based on ISTAT (2021) data