**APPENDICES**

**Appendix A**. Dried cranberry survey: Narrative provided to respondents before completing the discrete choice scenarios under treatment 4, example of a discrete choice scenario, and certainty scale–treatment 4.

You will be presented with six scenarios simulating DRIED CRANBERRY sale offers. Each scenario includes two alternative bags of dried cranberries (Option A and B) that vary in levels of total sugar content, intensity of cranberry flavor, cranberry breeding technology, and prices. You will be asked to choose the ONE option you would buy as if you were facing these exact choices in a real store. The third alternative (Option C) gives you the choice of not buying any of the A or B options. Each dried cranberry option will vary by the following attributes:

(1)  Total Sugar Content

(*please see line highlighted in red in image below for a reference of the "Total Sugars" information that will be presented to you*)



(2)  Cranberry Flavor Intensity of cranberry flavor: Flavor refers to the overall combination of sensations, and it is influenced by the taste, aroma, look, and texture.

– Bland /weak cranberry flavor

– Full /intense cranberry flavor

(3)  Breeding technology of cranberry fruit: The desired cranberry traits (e.g., sweetness, level of acidity) could be achieved by different plant breeding technologies:

* Conventional breeding: Plants with desirable traits are bred together, using existing varieties or the offspring of previous breeding programs that have the desired traits. This results in hundreds of potentially desirable plants that must be whittled down to the best candidates for commercial use. Crops improved using conventional breeding may be labelled as GMO–free or organic (if other production and certification requirements are satisfied).
* Gene editing (e.g., CRISPR): Specific genes can be altered, without introducing genes from any other sources. Similar to editing a word in a novel, gene editing can target specific DNA sequences in the genome for slight modification, which can improve plant traits. The USDA recently proposed that plants produced using gene editing will be treated the same as conventionally bred plants. For this study we can assume cranberries produced using gene–editing may also be labeled as GMO–free or organic (if other production and certification requirements are satisfied).

(4)  Price per 6–oz bag

* $ 1.99
* $ 2.99
* $ 3.99

PLEASE KEEP IN MIND THAT

Studies have shown that answering a question about a hypothetical purchase decision, as if the purchase was for real, is difficult for many people. Usually survey respondents indicate they are more likely to state that they would buy a product when responding to a survey than when the purchase decision is real and they have to pay for the product. This happens because respondents might think “Sure, I will buy this product”, but when the decision actually involves digging into their pockets to pay for it, respondents might think instead “Do I really want to spend my money on this product?”. We ask that you try to avoid this situation and answer the following questions as you would if you were really shopping at the store and had to pay for a bag of dried cranberries.

*Page Break ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------*

Please carefully read the following information.

*The FDA defines “Added Sugars” as sugars that are added during the processing of foods. Added sugars increase calories without contributing important nutrients. The Dietary Guidelines for Americans recommend limiting the daily amount of added sugars consumed to no more than 10% of total calories per day (which is equivalent to 200 calories or 50 grams per day). Diets lower in sugar–sweetened foods are associated with a reduced risk of developing cardiovascular disease.*

*Cranberries are considered a superfood due to their high nutrient and anthocyanin content.  Anthocyanins are substances that can prevent or slow damage to cells caused by free radicals. The anthocyanin properties of cranberries provide multiple health benefits, including the support of cardiovascular health and reduction of the risk of some cancers.*

*Page Break ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------*

Choose only THE ONE option (either A or B) that you WOULD REALLY BUY. Otherwise, please select Option C to indicate you would not buy option A or B.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Option A | Option B | Option C |
| Total Sugars(per Serving Size: 1/4 cup) | A picture containing calendar  Description automatically generated14 grams of sugars | Diagram  Description automatically generated with medium confidence29 grams of sugars | I would not buy any of these products |
| Cranberry Flavor | Full /intense  | Bland /weak  |
| Cranberry Breeding Method | Gene edited | Conventional |
| PRICE($ / 6–oz bag) | $3.99 | $2.99 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | OPTION A | OPTION B | OPTION C |
| I WOULD CHOOSE |  |  |  |

In a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 = Very uncertain and 10 = Very certain, how certain are you of your answer above?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Very uncertain |  |  |  |  |  |  | Very Certain |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Appendix B**. Cranberry juice survey: Narrative provided to respondents before completing the discrete choice scenarios under treatment 4, examples of a discrete choice scenario, and certainty scale under treatment 4.

You will be presented with six different scenarios simulating sale offers of Cranberry Juice. Each scenario includes three alternative juice options (100% juice, cocktail, and juice blend). These vary in the levels of total sugar content, intensity of cranberry flavor, cranberry breeding technology, and prices. You will be asked to choose the ONE option you would buy as if you were facing these exact choices at the store. The fourth alternative (Option D) gives you the choice of not buying either of the other options.

The three cranberry juice options you will see are:

* + - * 100% Juice

You see the words “100% Juice” on the label. This is cranberry juice mixed with other fruit juices from concentrate (apple, grape, pear).

* + - * Cocktail

You will see the word “Cocktail” on the label. This cranberry juice contains less than 100% juice with other ingredients such as water and sugar.

* + - * Juice Blend

You will see the words “Cran–#Name of other fruit” (e.g., Cran-Apple, Cran–Cherry) on the label. This is cranberry juice that is blended with another fruit juice. This product contains less than 100% juice with other ingredients such as water and sugar.

 Each cranberry juice option will vary by the following attributes:

(1)  Total Sugar Content

(*see line highlighted in red in image below for a reference of the "Total Sugars" information that will be presented to you*)



(2)  Cranberry Flavor Intensity of cranberry flavor: Flavor refers to the overall combination of sensations, and it is influenced by the taste, aroma, look, and texture.

* Bland /weak cranberry flavor
* Full /intense cranberry flavor.

(3)  Breeding technology of cranberry fruit: The desired cranberry traits (e.g., sweetness, level of acidity) could be achieved by different plant breeding technologies:

* Conventional breeding: Plants with desirable traits are bred together, using existing varieties or the offspring of previous breeding programs that have the desired traits. This results in hundreds of potentially desirable plants that must be whittled down to the best candidates for commercial use. Crops improved using conventional breeding may be labelled as GMO–free or organic (if other production and certification requirements are satisfied).
* Gene editing (e.g. CRISPR): Specific genes can be altered, without introducing genes from any other sources. Similar to editing a word in a novel, gene editing can target specific DNA sequences in the genome for slight modification, which can improve plant traits. The USDA recently proposed that plants produced using gene editing will be treated the same as conventionally bred plants. For this study we can assume cranberries produced using gene–editing may also be labeled as GMO–free or organic (if other production and certification requirements are satisfied).

(4)  Price per 64 fl oz bottle

* $ 2.49
* $ 2.99
* $ 3.49
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PLEASE KEEP IN MIND THAT

Studies have shown that answering a question about a hypothetical purchase decision, as if the purchase was for real, is difficult for many people. Usually survey respondents are more likely to state that they would buy a product when responding to a survey than when the purchase decision is real and they have to pay for the product. This happens because respondents might think “Sure, I will buy this product”, but when the decision actually involves digging into their pockets to pay for it, respondents might think instead “Do I really want to spend my money on this product?”. We ask that you try to avoid this situation and answer the following questions as you would if were really shopping at the store and had to pay for a bottle of cranberry juice.

*Page Break ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------*

Please carefully read the following information.

*The FDA defines “Added Sugars” as sugars that are added during the processing of foods. Added sugars increase calories without contributing important nutrients. The Dietary Guidelines for Americans recommend limiting the daily amount of added sugars consumed to no more than 10% of total calories per day (equivalent to 200 calories or 50 grams per day). Diets lower in sugar-sweetened foods are associated with a reduced risk of developing cardiovascular disease.*

*Cranberries are considered a superfood due to their high nutrient and anthocyanin content.  Anthocyanins are substances that can prevent or slow damage to cells caused by free radicals. The anthocyanin properties of cranberries provide multiple health benefits, including the support of cardiovascular health and reduction of the risk of some cancers.*
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Choose only ONE option that you WOULD REALLY BUY. Otherwise, please select the None option.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 100% Juice | Cocktail | Juice Blend | None |
| Total Sugars(per Serving Size: 1 cup) | A picture containing red  Description automatically generated25 grams of sugars | A picture containing red  Description automatically generated12 grams of sugars | A picture containing red  Description automatically generated25 grams of sugars |  |
| Cranberry Flavor | Full /intense | Full /intense | Full /intense |
| Cranberry Breeding Method | Conventional | Conventional | Conventional |
| PRICE($ / 64 fl oz bottle) | $3.49 | $2.99 | $2.49 |
| I WOULD CHOOSE |  |  |  |  |

On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 = Very Uncertain and 10 = Very Certain, how certain are you of your answer above?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Very uncertain |  |  |  |  |  |  | Very Certain |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Appendix C**. The marginal rate of substitution between CRISPR and regular sugar content

To analyze the trade-off between regular sugar content and CRISPR, we employed the marginal rate of substitution (MRS) between regular sugar content and CRISPR to represent the trade–off:

$MRS\_{RS, CRISPR, n}=\frac{β\_{RS,n}}{β\_{CRISPR,n}}$.

This ratio captures the relative discount for products with regular sugar content versus CRISPR-bred cranberries. This study approximated the variance of the trade-off using the delta method, which is often employed to approximate the variance of the ratio of two random variables. The Delta method can be viewed as a generalized central limit theorem that asymptotically approximates normal random variables using the Taylor series (Casella & Berger, 2021). Based on the following equation, the variance of the trade-off can be estimated using the delta method:

$$Var(\frac{X}{Y})≈\left(\frac{μ\_{X}}{μ\_{Y}}\right)^{2}(\frac{Var\left(X\right)}{μ^{2}\_{X}}+\frac{Var\left(Y\right)}{μ^{2}\_{Y}}-2\frac{Cov(X,Y)}{μ\_{X}μ\_{Y}})$$

A coefficient closer to 1 denotes that respondents were indifferent between having a product with regular sugar content and the breeding method CRISPR, a coefficient > 1 indicates that the aversion to regular sugar is larger than the aversion to CRISPR, and a coefficient < 1 suggests that the aversion to CRISPR is larger than the aversion to regular sugar content in the cranberry products included in this study.

Figure Appendix C. Trade-off between the WTP for regular sugar content and the WTP for CRISPR.

Notes:

The pairwise t-tests were based on the following hypotheses: H04: Tradeofftreatment1$\leq $Tradeofftreatment2; H05: Tradeofftreatment1$\geq $Tradeofftreatment3; H06: Tradeofftreatment1=Tradeofftreatment4.

The t-test uses tradeoff values that were bootstrapped from the normal distribution based on estimates from the GMNL–II model. Single and double asterisks (\*, \*\*) indicate statistical significance at the 10% and 5% levels. Figure Appendix C shows that for dried cranberries under all treatments, the coefficient is significantly larger than one, implying that the aversion to regular sugar content is larger than the aversion to CRISPR. The effect of information on the coefficient is not consistent across products. Only treatment 3 yields a statistically significant different result from the control. For the cranberry juice, the coefficients in treatment 1, 2, and 3 are not significantly different from 1, meaning that respondents are indifferent between the regular sugar content and CRISPR. However, in treatment 4, the coefficient is significantly lower than the control, indicating that when both pieces of information were provided, the aversion towards CRISPR is larger than the aversion to regular sugar content.

**Appendix D.** Measures of goodness of fit as part of the selection criteria to identify the number of classes in the latent class model, for the three survey versions: Dried cranberries and cranberry juice.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classes | N. of observations | Likelihood function | AIC | BIC |
| Model selection criteria for the latent class model – Dried cranberries |
| 2 | 1500 | -1339.12 | 2730.24 | 2868.30 |
| 3 | 1500 | -1284.90 | 2663.80 | 2913.52 |
| 4 | 1500 | -1242.81 | 2621.63 | 2982.92 |
| Model selection criteria for the latent class model – Cranberry juice |
| 2 | 1500 | -1692.57 | 3445.13 | 3604.53 |
| 3 | 1500 | -1600.09 | 3306.18 | 3587.78 |
| 4 | 1500 | -1540.95 | 3233.91 | 3637.71 |

**Appendix E.** Summary statistics of respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics for the two surveys (dried cranberries and cranberry juice) and four treatments of information

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |   |   | U.S. |  | Dried cranberries |  | Cranberry juice |  | Pairwise comparison between treatments (t–stat) |
| Description |  | Census | Dried cranberries |  | Cranberry juice |
|  |  | 20201 | Treatment | Treatment | Treatments | Treatments |
|   |   |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1–2 | 1–3 | 1–4 | 1–2 | 1–3 | 1–4 |
| Gender | Female |   | 0.51 |  | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 |  | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.52 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Age | 24 years or less |  | 0.32 |  | 0.11 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.15 |  | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.14 | 0.13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25‐34 years |  | 0.14 |  | 0.30 | 0.26 | 0.25 | 0.26 |  | 0.27 | 0.29 | 0.27 | 0.27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35‐44 years |  | 0.13 |  | 0.25 | 0.28 | 0.26 | 0.28 |  | 0.28 | 0.32 | 0.26 | 0.28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45‐54 years |  | 0.13 |  | 0.20 | 0.17 | 0.18 | 0.17 |  | 0.16 | 0.12 | 0.18 | 0.16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55‐64 years |  | 0.13 |  | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.06 |  | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65+ years |  | 0.16 |  | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.09 |  | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean  |  |  |  | 40.69 | 40.24 | 40.02 | 39.82 |  | 40.14 | 39.86 | 40.26 | 39.99 |  | 0.35 | 0.51 | 0.67 |  | 0.21 | 0.09 | 0.11 |
| College | 1 if college degree |  | 0.32 |  | 0.58 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.60 |  | 0.49 | 0.53 | 0.56 | 0.48 |  | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.54 |  | 0.89 | 1.43 | 0.18 |
| Income  | 1 if <$25,000/year |  | 0.16 |  | 0.19 | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.20 |  | 0.17 | 0.23 | 0.20 | 0.21 |  | 1.82\*\* | 1.44 | 0.11 |  | 1.67\* | 0.91 | 1.13 |
| 2 if $25,000–$34,999/year |  | 0.09 |  | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.14 | 0.06 |  | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.11 | 0.10 |  | 0.59 | 0.81 | 1.90\*\* |  | 0.74 | 0.14 | 0.59 |
| 3 if $35,000–$49,999/year |  | 0.12 |  | 0.10 | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.10 |  | 0.11 | 0.07 | 0.10 | 0.09 |  | 1.00 | 0.44 | 0.00 |  | 1.41 | 0.44 | 0.75 |
| 4 if $50,000–$74,999/year |  | 0.17 |  | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.15 |  | 0.14 | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.16 |  | 0.27 | 0.41 | 0.65 |  | 0.63 | 0.13 | 0.50 |
| 5 if $75,000–$99,999/year |  | 0.13 |  | 0.12 | 0.16 | 0.11 | 0.14 |  | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.12 | 0.10 |  | 1.43 | 0.14 | 0.80 |  | 0.00 | 0.73 | 0.30 |
| 6 if $100,000–$149,999/year |  | 0.16 |  | 0.20 | 0.22 | 0.17 | 0.20 |  | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.22 |  | 0.33 | 1.03 | 0.22 |  | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.55 |
| 7 if $150,000–$199,999/year |  | 0.07 |  | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.11 | 0.08 |  | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.06 |  | 0.35 | 1.41 | 0.17 |  | 0.51 | 0.48 | 0.88 |
| 8 if $200,000/year or more |  | 0.08 |  | 0.08 | 0.09 | 0.11 | 0.08 |  | 0.10 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.07 |  | 0.32 | 1.07 | 0.16 |  | 0.63 | 1.88\*\* | 1.14 |
| Mean |  |  |  | 4.16 | 4.42 | 4.39 | 4.28 |  | 4.26 | 4.07 | 4.07 | 4.07 |  | 1.32 | 1.12 | 0.60 |  | 0.96 | 0.97 | 0.95 |
| Household size | 1 if ≥3 members |  |  |  | 0.56 | 0.54 | 0.6 | 0.61 |  | 0.50 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.60 |  | 0.36 | 0.9 | 1.18 |  | 0.27 | 0.89 | 2.16\*\* |
| Children | 1 if ≥1 child under 18 |  | 0.31 |  | 0.47 | 0.46 | 0.48 | 0.52 |  | 0.43 | 0.46 | 0.5 | 0.53 |  | 0.27 | 0.18 | 1.16 |  | 0.72 | 1.52 | 2.24\*\* |

Source: United States Census Bureau, 2020.

Single, double, and triple asterisks (\*, \*\*, \*\*\*) indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels.

**Appendix F**. Parameter estimates for the latent class model to represent preference heterogeneity for reduced sugar content – dried cranberries.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Variable | Latent class model parameter estimates |
| Class 1 | Class 2 | Class 3 |
| Share | 41 % | 23% | 35% |
| Price | -0.16(0.14) | 0.04(0.06) | -0.94\*\*\*1(0.13) |
| Breeding method: CRISPR vs. conventional breeding | -1.37\*\*\*(0.27) | -0.45\*\*\*(0.09) | 0.43\*\*\*(0.16) |
| Sugar content: Regular vs. reduced | -0.73\*\*\*(0.24) | -0.44\*\*\*(0.09) | -0.99\*\*\*(0.19) |
| Cranberry flavor: Bland/weak vs. full/intense | -1.84\*\*\*(0.30) | -0.73\*\*\*(0.09) | 0.17(0.16) |
| Opt-out  | -0.81\*(0.47) | -2.84\*\*\*(0.27) | -3.91\*\*\*(0.44) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Household income ≥$87,500/year | BASE | 0.91\*\*\*(0.20) | -1.02\*\*\*(0.31) |
| Added sugar info on NFP is important/crucial |  | -0.65\*\*\*(0.21) | -0.30(0.35) |
| Interpret correctly total sugars and added sugar on NFP |  | -0.13(0.19) | -0.82\*\*\*(0.25) |
| Highest attention is to total sugars content on NFP |  | 0.91\*\*\*(0.22) | -3.27\*\*\*(0.91) |
| Like intense cranberry flavor |  | 0.33\*(0.20) | 0.08(0.27) |
| Health motives important when buying cranberry products |  | 0.92\*\*\*(0.25) | 0.54\*(0.31) |
| Ingredients important/crucial when buying cranberry products |  | -0.46\*\*(0.22) | 0.32(0.37) |
| CRISPR and GMO are different and know the difference |  | 1.27\*\*\*(0.31) | 0.25(0.43) |
| CRISPR and GMO are different but don’t know the difference |  | 1.20\*\*\*(0.22) | -0.52(0.37) |
| No difference between CRISPR and GMO |  | 1.19\*\*\*(0.32) | 0.31(0.38) |
| Willing to purchase CRISPR food if breeding method is only information known |  | 1.18\*\*\*(0.43) | 0.22(0.41) |
| Willing to purchase CRISPR food if this increases insect resistance and herbicide tolerance |  | -0.93\*\*(0.40) | 1.83\*\*\*(0.39) |
| Willing to purchase CRISPR food if this reduces environmental impact of food production |  | 0.31(0.29) | -0.13(0.42) |
| Willing to purchase CRISPR food if this increases nutrient content in food |  | 2.12\*\*\*(0.40) | -2.46\*\*\*(0.75) |
| Willing to purchase CRISPR food if this reduces the need to add sugars in food processing |  | -1.37\*\*\*(0.35) | 3.40\*\*\*(0.81) |
| Constant |  | -0.56\*\*(0.27) | -0.15(0.27) |
|  |  |  |  |
| N. of observations | 1500 |  |  |
| Log likelihood | -1284.90 |  |  |
| Akaike information criterion | 2663.80 |  |  |
| Bayesian information criterion | 2913.52 |  |  |

Single, double, and triple asterisks (\*, \*\*, \*\*\*) indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels.

Standard errors are in parentheses.

**Appendix G.** Parameter estimates for the latent class model to represent preference heterogeneity for reduced sugar content –cranberry juice.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Variable | Latent class model parameter estimates |
|  | Class 1 | Class 2 | Class 3 |
| Share | 24% | 56% | 19% |
|  |  |  |  |
| Price | -0.97\*\*\*1(0.26) | -0.38\*\*\*(0.12) | 0.10(0.26) |
| Breeding method: CRISPR vs. conventional breeding | -0.76\*\*\*(0.20) | -0.35\*\*\*(0.11) | -0.05(0.30) |
| Sugar content: Regular vs. reduced | -1.22\*\*\*(0.25) | -0.17(0.12) | -0.95\*\*\*(0.29) |
| Cranberry flavor: Bland/weak vs. full/intense | -1.51\*\*\*(0.27) | -1.27\*\*\*(0.14) | 0.77\*\*(0.31) |
| 100% Juice | 3.91\*\*\*(0.83) | 1.09\*\*\*(0.42) | 5.00\*\*\*(1.44) |
| Cocktail | 3.34\*\*\*(0.90) | 3.79\*\*\*(0.44) | 2.32(1.43) |
| Blend | 2.90\*\*\*(0.85) | 4.13\*\*\*(0.41) | 2.09(1.48) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Household income ≥$87,500/year | BASE | 0.37\*\*(0.18) | 1.18\*\*\*(0.19) |
| Added sugar info on NFP is important/crucial |  | -0.66\*\*\*(0.19) | -0.36\*(0.21) |
| Interpret correctly total sugar and added sugar on NFP |  | -0.07(0.17) | -0.28(0.18) |
| Highest attention is to total sugar content on NFP |  | 0.14(0.22) | 0.15(0.24) |
| Like intense cranberry flavor |  | 0.31(0.19) | -0.45\*\*(0.22) |
| Health motives important when buying cranberry products |  | 0.18(0.20) | 0.32(0.21) |
| Ingredients important/crucial when buying cranberry products |  | -0.87\*\*\*(0.20) | -0.36(0.22) |
| CRISPR and GMO are different and know the difference |  | 1.37\*\*\*(0.38) | 1.21\*\*\*(0.40) |
| CRISPR and GMO are different but don’t know the difference |  | -0.20(0.19) | -0.05(0.20) |
| No difference between CRISPR and GMO |  | 0.22(0.28) | 0.06(0.30) |
| Willing to purchase CRISPR food if breeding method is only information known |  | -0.50(0.31) | -1.01\*\*\*(0.34) |
| Willing to purchase CRISPR food if this increases insect resistance and herbicide tolerance |  | -0.18(0.29) | 0.44(0.30) |
| Willing to purchase CRISPR food if this reduces environmental impact of food production |  | 0.06(0.31) | 0.26(0.36) |
| Willing to purchase CRISPR food if this increases nutrient content in food |  | 0.83\*\*\*(0.32) | 0.46(0.32) |
| Willing to purchase CRISPR food if this reduces the need to add sugars in food processing |  | 1.11\*\*\*(0.33) | 0.01(0.37) |
| Constant |  | 0.83\*\*\*(0.22) | -0.23(0.23) |
|  |  |  |  |
| N. of observations | 1500 |  |  |
| Log likelihood | -1600.09 |  |  |
| AIC | 3306.18 |  |  |
| BIC | 3587.78 |  |  |

Single, double, and triple asterisks (\*, \*\*, \*\*\*) indicate statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels.

Standard errors are in parentheses.