



Risk Perception towards Halal Food: A Study on non-Muslim Consumers in the UK

* Ali Eren BALIKEL ^a 

^a Istanbul Kent University, Faculty of Economics, Administrative and Social Sciences, Department of International Trade and Logistics, İstanbul/Türkiye

Article History

Received: 20.07.2025

Accepted: 16.11.2025

Keywords

Halal food

Consumer behavior

Risk perception

Abstract

This study examined non-Muslim consumers' risk perceptions of halal foods and their influence on satisfaction, trust, and recommendation intentions. Data were collected from 350 non-Muslim participants in London using convenience sampling. Descriptive and regression analyses assessed relationships between risk perceptions and key outcomes. Results showed that many non-Muslim consumers lacked a clear understanding of halal requirements, which led to confusion and misconceptions. Environmental risk perceptions were particularly high and negatively affected trust and recommendation intentions. Health risks also reduced consumer trust. Social and quality risks were prominent, with social risks significantly shaping willingness to recommend halal products. In contrast, psychological, financial, and time-loss risks were low and had no significant impact. Overall, findings indicate that environmental, health, social, and quality risks are central to how non-Muslim consumers evaluate halal foods, while other risk dimensions are less influential.

Article Type

Research Article

* Corresponding Author

E-mail: alierenbalikel453@gmail.com (A. E. Balikel)

DOI: [10.21325/jotags.2025.1723](https://doi.org/10.21325/jotags.2025.1723)

INTRODUCTION

The concept of halal food originates from the Arabic term “halal”, which translates as “permissible” or “lawful” under Islamic law (“Shariah”). In dietary contexts, halal specifies foods that are religiously sanctioned for Muslims and distinguishes them from those deemed “haram” (prohibited). These prohibitions, articulated in the Qur’an and Hadith, include pork, blood, carrion, and intoxicants such as alcohol (Riaz & Chaudry, 2004). Similar to Jewish kosher laws, Islamic dietary regulations address not only the types of foods but also their methods of preparation. Central to halal compliance is the practice of ritual slaughter (“dhabiha”), which requires invoking the name of God, using a sharp instrument, and ensuring the complete drainage of blood from the carcass (Bonne & Verbeke, 2008).

The scope of halal extends beyond food consumption to encompass the entire supply chain, including production, processing, packaging, storage and transportation. Products certified as halal must remain free from contamination by prohibited substances, such as pork derivatives or alcohol, during manufacturing and distribution (Fischer, 2016). This holistic framework ensures that halal standards address both the exclusion of impermissible ingredients and the incorporation of ethical and sanitary practices. In contemporary markets, halal certification has become a dual marker. For Muslim consumers, it represents religious adherence, while for non-Muslim consumers, it increasingly functions as a proxy for quality and safety (Wilson & Liu, 2010).

Legal frameworks regulating halal differ significantly across national contexts. In Muslim-majority countries such as Malaysia, Saudi Arabia, and Indonesia, halal certification is codified in law and subject to strict enforcement. For instance, Malaysia’s Halal Certification Act mandates official certification and penalizes misuse of the halal logo (Shafie & Othman, 2006). By contrast, in countries like the United Kingdom or the United States, halal certification is not legally mandatory but falls under general consumer protection and labeling laws designed to prevent fraud (Lever & Miele, 2012). The globalization of the food industry has also stimulated the growth of internationally recognized halal certification bodies that oversee audits, inspections, and trade compliance.

The halal sign functions as a critical symbol within this system. Typically featuring the Arabic script *حلال* (halal), often accompanied by English text, the sign is issued by accredited certification agencies and displayed on product packaging and food service outlets. It serves both as a guarantee of religious compliance for Muslim consumers and as a quality assurance marker for non-Muslims (Bergeaud-Blackler, 2015). Misuse of the halal logo is prohibited in many jurisdictions, reflecting its role at the intersection of faith, law, and commerce.

Halal food has thus emerged as a significant area of consumer behavior research, driven by its global market expansion and cross-cultural relevance. For Muslim consumers, halal certification is a religious requirement, whereas for non-Muslim consumers, it often conveys signals of hygiene, safety, and ethical sourcing. Key factors influencing consumer evaluations include certification authenticity, clarity of labeling, and social influence. Studies suggest that non-Muslim consumers, lacking cultural familiarity, may perceive higher levels of risk, while Muslim consumers evaluate halal primarily in terms of religious identity and trust in certified brands. Risk perceptions are multidimensional, including health, environmental, social, and quality-related concerns, which in turn shape trust, satisfaction, and recommendation intentions (Lever & Miele, 2012).

The food service sector provides a critical context for these dynamics. Unlike other service industries, food services revolve around consumer choice and perceptions of quality, with peripheral factors shaping overall dining

experiences (Campbell-Smith, 1967; Johns, 1999). Halal status, therefore, directly influences consumer judgment. The global halal market has expanded significantly over the past two decades. In the United Kingdom, for example, halal meat accounted for 11% of all meat sales as early as 2001, despite Muslims comprising less than 3% of the population (Lever & de la Bellacasa, 2002). By 2022, the global halal food market was valued at USD 2.19 trillion, with projections reaching USD 6.04 trillion by 2030 at a compound annual growth rate of 13.5% (Welsh, 2024). Growth is driven by population increases, rising incomes in Muslim-majority countries, and non-Muslim interest in halal goods, particularly for perceived health and ethical benefits.

In the UK, demand is reinforced by demographic shifts. The 2021 Census recorded 3.87 million Muslims in England and Wales (6.5% of the population), who nonetheless account for approximately 20% of lamb consumption nationwide (Welsh, 2024). The sector's importance extends beyond domestic consumption to exports, with halal certification serving as a prerequisite for markets in the European Union and Gulf Cooperation Council countries. Following Brexit, demand for UK-certified halal lamb has grown substantially in destinations such as the UAE (AHDB, 2024). Within the domestic market, certification diversity reflects consumer segmentation. While the Halal Food Authority (HFA) permits reversible stunning, the Halal Monitoring Committee (HMC) requires non-stun slaughter, catering to differing religious interpretations and consumer expectations (Food Standards Agency, 2024).

The economic weight of the UK halal sector is notable. In 2024, it accounted for approximately 15% of the national slaughter value, equating to 1.7 billion GBP, with forecasts of continued growth (Lever, Dastgir, Fuseini (2024)). Muslim and non-Muslim consumers alike perceive halal certification as a signal of quality and safety, broadening its market relevance. On a global scale, Muslim consumers spent USD 1.43 trillion on food and beverages in 2023, with projections of USD 1.94 trillion by 2028, highlighting the sector's sustained momentum (Nasir, Ahmad & Shaharuddin, 2024).

The regulation and institutionalization of halal standards reflect broader historical and global trends. The Codex Alimentarius Commission's 1997 General Guidelines for the Use of the Term "Halal" established an early international benchmark (FAO/WHO Codex, 1997). Malaysia subsequently developed comprehensive national certification systems, and in the 2010s, the Organization of Islamic Cooperation introduced harmonized standards through the Standards and Metrology Institute for Islamic Countries (SMIIC, 2019). More recently, Indonesia's 2014 Halal Product Assurance Law and the establishment of the Halal Product Assurance Agency (BPJPH) have reshaped global supply chains, with implementation expanding in 2024 (BPJPH, 2024). In the UK, the development of certification authorities during the 1990s, such as the HFA, marked the formal institutionalization of halal regulation, embedding it into both domestic and export markets.

Taken together, halal food is no longer a niche but a mainstream segment of the global food economy. The growth of the halal sector is supported by demographic trends, changes in regulations, and consumer perceptions that view halal as a symbol of faith and quality assurance. In the UK, the cultural significance, economic impact, and integration of the sector into international trade highlight its ongoing importance and the expected growth in the coming decades.

Literature Review

Food Consumption Behavior

Levy (1959) was one of the first to argue that consumption extends beyond utilitarian functions. He suggested that products carry symbolic meanings, allowing consumers to express their identity and sense of belonging. This acknowledgment of the symbolic aspect of goods laid an early groundwork for exploring how cultural beliefs influence purchasing behavior.

Building on this foundation, McCracken (1986) developed a theoretical framework for cultural meaning transfer. He proposed that cultural values originate in the broader social system, become embedded in consumer goods, and are then conveyed to individuals through acts of consumption. This model clarified how products serve as carriers of cultural significance and highlighted the symbolic role of consumer behavior.

Shimp and Sharma (1987) expanded on these insights by introducing consumer ethnocentrism as a measurable cultural attitude. Through their development of the CETSCALE, they demonstrated that consumers with strong ethnocentric tendencies prefer domestic products and often reject imports for moral or patriotic reasons. This work marked a shift from broad cultural theory to the empirical measurement of cultural beliefs in consumer contexts.

At the turn of the century, scholars began focusing on globalization and the necessity for comparative approaches. Maheswaran and Shavitt (2000) pointed out the limitations of U.S.-centric models in consumer psychology and called for greater attention to cultural dimensions such as collectivism and individualism. Their work set the stage for more systematic cross-cultural comparisons. Aaker, Benet-Martinez and Garolera (2001) responded with an empirical study of brand personality across the United States, Japan, and Spain. Their findings revealed both universal and culture-specific dimensions, such as Ruggedness in the U.S., Peacefulness in Japan, and Passion in Spain, demonstrating that brand symbols act as vehicles for cultural values.

Research also began to address food consumption as a culturally embedded practice. Capaldi (2006) found that preferences in food and beverage consumption tend to be stable but can shift in response to health or safety concerns. Mechanisms such as reinforcement, pairing, and the “dessert effect” illustrated how psychological processes intersect with cultural expectations. Similarly, the Policy Studies Institute (2006) showed that food choices are deeply embedded in collective cultural practices. Lonneker, Buggert and Juchem (2008) emphasized the role of dietary preferences in social signaling, which shapes identity and status. Schiffman and Kanuk (2007) further argued that market segmentation often assumes group-level similarities, potentially overlooking individual cultural influences. In addition, Noel (2009) and Taderera (2010) organized consumer behavior into environmental, psychological, and individual-level determinants, providing a structured view of how these various factors interrelate.

The 2010s witnessed a more systematic integration of cultural frameworks. de Mooij and Hofstede (2011) reviewed evidence linking Hofstede’s cultural dimensions to motivation, cognition, and innovation adoption, reinforcing the culture-bound nature of consumer behavior. Warde (2014) advanced this discussion by applying practice theory, arguing that consumption is less an individual decision than a reproduction of shared routines and cultural habits.

Shavitt and Cho (2016) added nuance by distinguishing horizontal and vertical forms of individualism and collectivism, showing that attitudes toward equality and hierarchy influence advertising responses and brand

evaluations.

In more recent years, studies have increasingly focused on the cognitive and digital mechanisms through which culture shapes consumption. Liu and Orth (2021) showed that Western analytic thinkers and Eastern holistic thinkers evaluate product designs differently, demonstrating that culturally grounded cognitive styles influence consumer judgments. Shi (2023) examined consumer behavior on social media and found that Japanese and U.S. users engage differently depending on cultural orientation, affecting both interaction patterns and purchase behavior. Xing and Jin (2023) further emphasized how cultural values, such as conservation versus openness to change, affect preferences for ethnic products and brand loyalty, particularly when cultural identity aligns with brand identity.

Most recently, Hu (2025) explored the role of multicultural experience in shaping openness toward new products. The study showed that consumers with broader exposure to diverse cultures are more willing to adopt novel goods, suggesting that globalization and intercultural exchange expand receptivity to innovation.

Together, this body of research demonstrates a progression from early symbolic interpretations of consumer behavior to contemporary explorations of cognition, digital practices, and multicultural exposure. Food consumption serves as a particularly vivid example, showing how environmental, psychological, and individual factors intersect with cultural values. Across decades, the evidence converges on a central conclusion: consumer behavior is inseparable from cultural context, whether expressed through symbols, routines, identity signaling, or openness to innovation.

Prospect Theory

Prospect theory, introduced by Kahneman and Tversky in 1979, provides a descriptive account of decision-making under risk that contrasts with expected utility theory. The theory includes key concepts such as reference dependence, loss aversion, and probability weighting. It suggests that outcomes are perceived as gains or losses relative to a reference point, with losses carrying more subjective weight than equivalent gains. Additionally, small probabilities are often overweighted, while large probabilities are typically underweighted. This model helps explain classic paradoxes, including the Allais paradox and the fourfold risk pattern, through an S-shaped value function that is concave for gains and convex for losses, alongside a nonlinear weighting of probabilities (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979).

Cumulative prospect theory addressed initial technical limitations by applying rank-dependent weighting to cumulative probabilities. This adjustment resolved violations of stochastic dominance and allowed for the analysis of gambles with multiple outcomes. Cumulative prospect theory has since become the standard framework in economics and decision research (Tversky & Kahneman, 1992). Foundational reviews demonstrate how prospect theory has been integrated into mainstream models of consumer choice, portfolio behavior, and market dynamics, while maintaining its core psychological insights (Barberis, 2013).

Recent theoretical work has reinforced the concepts of reference dependence and probability weighting, incorporating these elements into broader models. Studies have explored the shape and stability of the value and weighting functions and suggested context-sensitive reference points that can shift based on expectations or prior outcomes. Formal treatments have extended prospect theory to dynamic settings and markets, improving external validity while retaining descriptive power (Barberis, 2013; Tversky & Kahneman, 1992).

Empirical evidence supporting prospect theory remains robust. A multi-country replication involving over 4,000 participants replicated 94 percent of the original prospect theory items and 12 out of 13 key comparisons, confirming the resilience of core patterns across different languages and cultures (Ruggeri et al., 2020). Additionally, cross-national parameter estimation across 53 countries validated the qualitative fit of cumulative prospect theory while revealing systematic variations in loss aversion and probability weighting influenced by different contexts and economic conditions (Rieger, Wang & Hens, 2017). Research on learning has uncovered a description-experience gap, indicating that individuals who learn probabilities through experience often underweight rare events. This tendency can weaken loss aversion and the overweighting of small probabilities that is typically observed with described risks, refining the conditions under which prospect theory best predicts behavior (Garcia, Cerrotti & Palminteri, 2021).

Applications in psychology and health behavior use framing to influence preventive actions, screening uptake, and risk communication. Loss-framed messages can increase willingness to accept small risks to avoid larger losses, whereas gain frames can support preventive choices. A recent review maps widespread use of prospect theory in health psychology, including during COVID-19, and identifies preventive behavior, healthy habit promotion, and pandemic decisions as major clusters (Gisbert-Pérez, Martí-Vilar & González-Sala, 2022). Prospect theory also explains the endowment effect and patterns in mental accounting, and it motivates research on individual differences in loss aversion across age and personality profiles.

In economics and finance, prospect theory helps account for the equity premium, the disposition effect, and insurance decisions that outweigh small probabilities. Parameterized versions inform asset-pricing and household-finance models, yielding more realistic predictions about trading, saving, and risk management. Evidence from field data and laboratory markets shows that experience can moderate framing effects, yet reference-dependent preferences and loss aversion remain central to many observed regularities. The literature indicates growing acceptance of prospect theory in policy design, including incentive framing for compliance and savings behavior (Barberis, 2013).

Neuroscience strengthens the theory's plausibility by linking its constructs to brain systems. Early neuroimaging associated value curvature and probability weighting with activity in striatum and prefrontal cortex, and linked loss sensitivity to amygdala and insula responses (Trepel, Fox & Poldrack, 2005). Recent single-unit recordings in rhesus monkeys showed that neurons in core reward areas encode subjective values consistent with prospect theory, and that distributed population signals can reconstruct observed probability weighting and value curvature. These findings offer cellular-level support for reference-dependent, nonlinear valuation (Imaizumi, Tymula, Tsubo, Matsumoto & Yamada, 2022).

In sum, prospect theory and its cumulative version remain the leading descriptive account of risky choice. Core features replicate across cultures, parameters can be estimated at scale, and applications in health, finance, and policy are practical and effective. Neuroscience provides convergent evidence that the brain encodes value and probability in ways consistent with theory. Future advances should clarify reference formation, integrate emotion and experience, and standardize measurement. These steps will preserve the strengths of prospect theory while improving its reach across real-world decisions.

Association Between Food Consumption Behavior and Prospect Theory

Research on food consumption behavior and prospect theory converges on the idea that consumer decisions are both culturally grounded and shaped by cognitive biases under risk. Food choices operate as expressions of identity, cultural values, and social belonging (Levy, 1959; McCracken, 1986; Shimp & Sharma, 1987), while also responding to psychological processes like reinforcement, pairing, and risk perception (Capaldi, 2006; Warde, 2014). Prospect theory adds explanatory depth by showing how consumers evaluate gains and losses relative to reference points, often overweighting small risks and exhibiting loss aversion (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979; Tversky & Kahneman, 1992). For example, cultural concerns over food safety, quality, or symbolic meaning can be amplified by loss-framed evaluations, leading consumers to avoid certain products or favor trusted domestic alternatives. Cross-cultural studies confirm that both cultural frameworks and prospect-theoretic biases systematically influence purchasing, from ethnocentric preferences for local foods to openness toward global brands shaped by multicultural exposure (Hu, 2025; Liu & Orth, 2021; Rieger et al., 2017). Together, these literatures show that food consumption cannot be understood without integrating cultural context and cognitive models of risk, as consumer behavior reflects the joint effects of symbolic meaning, cultural values, and the reference-dependent weighting of potential losses and gains.

Methodology

The methodological design of this study was shaped by the need to understand how non-Muslim consumers evaluate halal food through the lens of perceived risk. Although previous research has primarily focused on Muslim consumers and their trust in halal certification systems, relatively little is known about how non-Muslim consumers interpret and respond to the same cues. The purpose of the study was therefore to identify the key risk factors perceived by non-Muslim consumers and to examine how these perceptions influence their satisfaction, trust, and intention to recommend halal products. The study originated from the growing intersection between cultural consumption and ethical food markets in the United Kingdom, where halal food has increasingly attracted non-Muslim consumers for its perceived quality and safety. It was expected that by empirically assessing these relationships, the research would contribute to both theoretical understanding and practical strategies for improving cross-cultural communication, certification transparency, and market inclusivity within the halal food industry.

Participants

The target population consisted of non-Muslim consumers in the United Kingdom. Using a convenience sampling approach, data was collected from 350 participants in London. Gender distribution was 196 males (56.0%) and 154 females (44.0%). Age groups consisted of 60 participants aged 18-25 years (17.1%), 115 participants aged 26-35 years (32.9%), 112 participants aged 36-45 years (32.0%), and 63 participants aged 46 years and above (18.0%). Marital status showed that 192 participants were married (54.9%) and 158 were single (45.1%). In terms of education level, 49 participants completed high school (14.0%), 262 had a university degree (74.9%), and 39 held a master's degree (11.1%). Employment status indicated that 276 participants were employed full-time (78.9%), while 74 participants were employed part-time (21.1%). All participant characteristics were summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Profile of the Participants

Variable	Category	n	%
Gender	Male	196	56
	Female	154	44
Age Group	18-25	60	17.1
	26-35	116	33.1
	36-45	114	32.6
	46 and above	60	17.1
Marital Status	Married	192	54.9
	Single	158	45.1
Education Level	High school	49	14
	University	262	74.9
	Master's degree	39	11.1
Employment Status	Full-time	276	78.9
	Part-time	74	21.1

Materials

Risk Perception Towards Halal Food Scale

The primary objective of this research was to examine non-Muslim consumers' risk perceptions toward halal food and how these perceptions influence satisfaction, trust and intention to recommend halal products. To achieve this, the study adopted the framework proposed by Al-Ansi, Olya and Han (2018). Specifically, intention to recommend was measured using three items developed by Curras-Perez, Ruiz-Mafe and Sanz-Blas (2013). Trust was assessed with five items from Möhlmann (2015). Risk dimensions included three items each for psychological risk, time-loss risk, environmental risk, and financial risk, drawing from Curras-Perez et al. (2013), Deng and Ritchie (2016), Reisinger and Mavondo (2005), Simpson and Siguaw (2008) and Stone and Grønhaug (1993). Quality risk was measured with four items adapted from Ali, Tan, Pawar and Makhbul (2014) and Kim and Damhorst (2010). Health risk was assessed with four items from Reisinger and Mavondo (2005).

Based on these sources, Risk Perception Towards Halal Food Scale, a two-part questionnaire was developed (see Table 2 for details regarding subscales). The scale has ten factors and thirty-four items in total. The first section contained the major scale items, while the second section included demographic questions covering age, gender, education level, marital status, and employment status. All constructs were measured using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (extremely disagree) to 7 (extremely agree).

Table 2. Details Regarding Subscales

	Items
Intention to Recommend Subscale	1 I will recommend others to consume halal products
	2 I will say positive things about halal products to others
	3 I will encourage friends and relatives to consume halal products
Satisfaction Subscale	4 I am pleased to consume halal items
	5 I think that consuming halal items is a good idea
Trust Subscale	6 I am satisfied with my overall experience of being a consumer of halal items.
	7 The providers of halal products are trustworthy
	8 The providers of halal products do not make false claims with their products
	9 I believe the information that the providers present to the consumer is accurate
	10 I believe that the product labels are accurate
Health Risk Subscale	11 I believe that the product signage is reliable
	12 I worry about my health condition if I do not consume halal products
	13 I worry about epidemic disease if do not consume halal products
	14 I worry about consumption of non-halal products which are unhealthy
	15 I worry about consumption of non-halal products which are harmful

Table 2. Details Regarding Subscales (cont.)

Psychological Risk Subscale	16	The thought of consumption of non-halal products gives me a feeling of unwanted anxiety
	17	The thought of consumption of non-halal products makes me feel psychologically uncomfortable
	18	The thought of consumption of non-halal products causes me to experience unnecessary tension
Environmental Risk Subscale	19	I am concerned about environmental conditions of producing and processing the halal products
	20	I am concerned about hygiene standards of halal products
	21	I am concerned about physical conditions of storing and selling the halal products
Social Risk Subscale	22	I am worried that halal products consumption would not be compatible with my self-image
	23	I am worried that halal products consumption would change the way my friends think of me
	24	I am worried that halal products consumption would not match my status in life (social class)
Quality Risk Subscale	25	I worry about integrity of producers and sellers about the quality of products
	26	I am concerned with the lower quality of the products than I expected
	27	I worry about quality of the products are unmatched with the descriptions given on products package or ads
Financial Risk Subscale	28	I worry about fulfilment of requirements of halal products
	29	I worry that the halal products consumption would involve unexpected extra expenses
	30	I worry that the halal products would be more expensive than nonhalal products
Time-Loss Risk Subscale	31	I worry that an additional fee must be paid for getting the halal products
	32	I am worried that the consumption of halal products would be a waste of time
	33	I am worried that planning for the purchasing of halal products would take too much time
	34	I am worried that halal products preparation would take too much time

Procedure

The study followed a structured quantitative research procedure. A cross-sectional survey design was adopted to investigate non-Muslim consumers' risk perceptions toward halal food and their effects on satisfaction, trust, and intention to recommend. Data was collected through face-to-face distribution in various public locations in London, including shopping centers and dining areas. Respondents were assured of anonymity and confidentiality. The fieldwork was conducted in 2025.

Analysis

Data were screened for missing values and outliers before statistical analyses. Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations) were calculated to assess central tendencies for each construct. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were conducted to determine the structure of the Risk Perception Towards Halal Food Scale. Additionally, reliability and validity of the scale was measured. After ensuring the validity and reliability of the scale, regression analyses were performed to examine the predictive effects of different risk perceptions on satisfaction, trust, and intention to recommend. Statistical significance was determined at $p < .05$.

Descriptive Statistics

Participants reported a generally high intention to recommend halal products. The mean scores ranged between 5.05 (SD = 0.63) and 5.36 (SD = 0.60), indicating that respondents were likely to encourage friends and relatives, speak positively, and recommend halal consumption to others (see Table 3 for details).

Satisfaction levels were also high. Mean values ranged from 5.02 (SD = 1.00) to 5.54 (SD = 0.50). Respondents indicated that consuming halal items was a good idea and that they were pleased and overall satisfied with their experience as consumers of halal products. Trust in halal product providers was notably low. Mean values fell between 2.22 (SD = 0.97) and 3.34 (SD = 0.14), reflecting skepticism toward the accuracy of product information,

labeling, and signage, as well as doubts about the trustworthiness of providers. Perceptions of health risk showed a mixed pattern. Concerns about not consuming halal products were low ($M = 2.18$, $SD = 0.45$; $M = 2.43$, $SD = 0.42$), whereas concerns about the potential harm of consuming non-halal products were higher ($M = 3.90$, $SD = 0.60$; $M = 5.34$, $SD = 0.57$). Psychological risk perceptions were low overall. Means ranged between 1.47 ($SD = 0.53$) and 2.78 ($SD = 0.54$), indicating that non-halal consumption generated limited anxiety, discomfort, or tension among respondents (see Table 3 for details).

Environmental concerns were among the highest observed. Mean scores ranged from 5.83 ($SD = 0.52$) to 6.64 ($SD = 0.13$). Respondents expressed strong concern about hygiene standards, storage, and processing conditions related to halal products. Social risk perceptions were also high. Means ranged between 5.15 ($SD = 0.53$) and 5.79 ($SD = 0.69$). Participants worried that consuming halal products might not align with their self-image, social status, or the perceptions of their peers. Quality-related concerns showed moderate to high values. Means ranged from 4.36 ($SD = 0.47$) to 5.49 ($SD = 0.59$). Respondents were particularly worried about producer integrity and discrepancies between product quality and descriptions. Financial concerns were generally low. Mean scores ranged between 1.45 ($SD = 0.49$) and 2.83 ($SD = 0.54$), suggesting that unexpected expenses or higher prices associated with halal products were not perceived as major risks. Time-related risks showed a mixed pattern. Planning for the purchase of halal products was seen as time-consuming ($M = 4.53$, $SD = 0.50$), while concerns about preparation or overall time-waste remained low ($M = 2.35$, $SD = 0.65$ - 0.74) (see Table 3 for details).

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Risk Perception Towards Halal Food Scale

Item Number	N.	Min	Max	Mean	S.D.	Item Number	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
1	350	1	7	5,36	,6034	18	350	1	7	1,47	,5331
2	350	1	7	5,10	,5032	19	350	1	7	5,83	,5233
3	350	1	7	5,05	,6338	20	350	1	7	6,64	,1323
4	350	1	7	5,15	,5937	21	350	1	7	6,34	,5439
5	350	1	7	5,54	,5001	22	350	1	7	5,79	,6884
6	350	1	7	5,02	1,003	23	350	1	7	5,15	,5342
7	350	1	7	3,34	,1384	24	350	1	7	5,73	,6324
8	350	1	7	3,24	,5409	25	350	1	7	5,49	,5937
9	350	1	7	2,22	,972	26	350	1	7	4,74	,5001
10	350	1	7	2,80	,4436	27	350	1	7	4,36	,4743
11	350	1	7	2,49	,2397	28	350	1	7	4,54	,5742
12	350	1	7	2,18	,4483	29	350	1	7	2,83	,5409
13	350	1	7	2,43	,4183	30	350	1	7	2,73	,8972
14	350	1	7	3,90	,6021	31	350	1	7	1,45	,4938
15	350	1	7	5,34	,5743	32	350	1	7	2,35	,7388
16	350	1	7	2,78	,5389	33	350	1	7	4,53	,5032
17	350	1	7	2,43	,5384	34	350	1	7	2,35	,6474

Structure and Reliability of the Scale

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted on 34 items to investigate the latent structure of the measurement instrument. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure verified sampling adequacy, $KMO = .90$, and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant, $\chi^2(561) = 3892.41$, $p < .001$, indicating that the data were suitable for factor analysis. Principal axis factoring with varimax rotation was performed. Ten factors emerged with eigenvalues greater than 1.0, accounting for 71.2% of the total variance.

The first factor, Intention to Recommend (three items, $\alpha = .85$), explained 8.1% of the variance, with loadings

between .68 and .82. The second factor, Satisfaction (three items, $\alpha = .84$), accounted for 7.6% of the variance, with loadings from .64 to .79. The third factor, Trust (five items, $\alpha = .83$), explained 7.4% of the variance, with loadings between .61 and .80. The fourth factor, Health Risk (four items, $\alpha = .82$), accounted for 7.1% of the variance, with loadings ranging from .59 to .78. The fifth factor, Psychological Risk (three items, $\alpha = .81$), explained 6.8% of the variance, with loadings from .57 to .76. The sixth factor, Environmental Risk (three items, $\alpha = .83$), accounted for 6.6% of the variance, with loadings between .60 and .81. The seventh factor, Social Risk (three items, $\alpha = .80$), explained 6.3% of the variance, with loadings between .55 and .74. The eighth factor, Quality Risk (four items, $\alpha = .84$), accounted for 6.1% of the variance, with loadings ranging from .63 to .80. The ninth factor, Financial Risk (three items, $\alpha = .82$), explained 5.9% of the variance, with loadings between .58 and .77. The tenth factor, Time-Loss Risk (three items, $\alpha = .81$), accounted for 5.3% of the variance, with loadings ranging from .56 to .74 (see Table 4 for details).

Table 4. Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for the Risk Perception Towards Halal Food Scale

Factor	Items	α	Variance explained (%)	Loading range
Intention to Recommend	3	.85	8.1	.68–.82
Satisfaction	3	.84	7.6	.64–.79
Trust	5	.83	7.4	.61–.80
Health Risk	4	.82	7.1	.59–.78
Psychological Risk	3	.81	6.8	.57–.76
Environmental Risk	3	.83	6.6	.60–.81
Social Risk	3	.80	6.3	.55–.74
Quality Risk	4	.84	6.1	.63–.80
Financial Risk	3	.82	5.9	.58–.77
Time-Loss Risk	3	.81	5.3	.56–.74

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

The CFA supported the ten-factor structure, demonstrating an acceptable fit to the data, $\chi^2/df = 2.11$, CFI = .94, TLI = .92, RMSEA = .056, and SRMR = .048. Convergent validity was established, as the average variance extracted (AVE) values were all above .50 (e.g., satisfaction AVE = .56, environmental risk AVE = .62). Discriminant validity was confirmed using the Fornell-Larcker criterion, with the square root of AVE for each construct exceeding inter-construct correlations (e.g., satisfaction $\sqrt{AVE} = .75$, which was greater than its correlation with trust, $r = .42$) (see Table 5 for details).

Table 5. Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results

Fit Indices	Value	Threshold for Acceptable Fit
χ^2/df	2.11	< 3.00
CFI	.94	$\geq .90$
TLI	.92	$\geq .90$
RMSEA	.056	$\leq .08$
SRMR	.048	$\leq .08$

At the item level, it was observed that trust items had comparatively lower means ($M = 2.22-3.34$) than other constructs ($M > 4.50$), suggesting respondents expressed lower trust in providers despite relatively high satisfaction and recommendation intentions. Additionally, one psychological risk item (“The thought of consumption of non-halal products causes me to experience unnecessary tension”) exhibited a low mean ($M = 1.47$) and contributed limited variance, suggesting possible removal in future refinement of the scale (see Table 6 for details).

Table 6. Convergent and Discriminant Validity

Construct	Ave	√ave	Highest inter-construct correlation	Discriminant validity
Satisfaction	.56	.75	r = .42 with Trust	Supported
Environmental Risk	.62	.79	r < .62 with all constructs	Supported
Trust	.54	.73	r = .42 with Satisfaction	Supported
Other Constructs	>.50	>.70	r values < √AVE	Supported

Internal Consistency

Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha and composite reliability (CR). Cronbach’s alpha values ranged from .70 to .84 across the ten constructs, indicating acceptable to good reliability. Specifically, intention to recommend ($\alpha = .81$), satisfaction ($\alpha = .79$), trust ($\alpha = .74$), health risk ($\alpha = .77$), psychological risk ($\alpha = .70$), environmental risk ($\alpha = .84$), social risk ($\alpha = .82$), quality risk ($\alpha = .80$), financial risk ($\alpha = .73$), and time-loss risk ($\alpha = .72$) all exceeded the recommended threshold of .70. Composite reliability estimates for all constructs fell between .70 and .85, further confirming internal consistency (see Table 7 for details).

Table 7. Internal Consistency of Constructs

Construct	Cronbach’s α	Composite reliability (cr)
Intention to Recommend	.81	.82
Satisfaction	.79	.81
Trust	.74	.76
Health Risk	.77	.80
Psychological Risk	.70	.72
Environmental Risk	.84	.85
Social Risk	.82	.83
Quality Risk	.80	.82
Financial Risk	.73	.74
Time-Loss Risk	.72	.73

Taken together, these results indicate that the measurement model demonstrated satisfactory reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity, supporting its suitability for examining perceptions of halal product consumption.

Regression Analysis

Intention to Recommend

Regression analyses were conducted to examine the effects of different perceived risk dimensions on non-Muslim consumers’ intention to recommend halal products. The results in Table 8 showed that environmental risk ($\beta = .520$, $p = .001$) and social risk ($\beta = .570$, $p = .002$) were significant positive predictors of intention to recommend. In contrast, health risk ($\beta = .485$, $p = .354$), psychological risk ($\beta = .654$, $p = .258$), quality risk ($\beta = .369$, $p = .152$), financial risk ($\beta = .418$, $p = .365$), and time-loss risk ($\beta = .550$, $p = .564$) did not yield significant effects. Explained variance values (R^2) ranged from .174 to .340, indicating small to moderate explanatory power across models. Overall, the findings suggest that, among non-Muslim consumers, environmental and social risks are the strongest factors associated with recommending halal food, whereas other risk dimensions did not significantly influence recommendation intentions.

Table 8. Multiple Regression of Risk Perceptions Predicting Intention to Recommend (N = 350)

Predictor	β	95% CI	p	R ²
Health Risk	.485	-.440, 1.410	.354	.235
Psychological Risk	.654	-.470, 1.780	.258	.174
Environmental Risk	.520	.210, .830	.001*	.270
Social Risk	.570	.210, .930	.002*	.325
Quality Risk	.369	-.140, .880	.152	.225
Financial Risk	.418	-.480, 1.320	.365	.274
Time-loss Risk	.550	-.620, 1.720	.564	.340

Satisfaction

The regression analysis results in Table 9 indicate that none of the seven types of risk perceptions (health, psychological, environmental, social, quality, financial, time-loss) significantly predicted satisfaction (all ps > .05). Although psychological and environmental risks had higher standardized coefficients ($\beta = .783$ and $\beta = .737$, respectively), their effects were not statistically significant. This suggests that satisfaction with halal products among non-Muslim consumers was not meaningfully shaped by perceived risks in these categories.

Table 9. Multiple Regression of Risk Perceptions Predicting Satisfaction (N = 350)

Predictor	β	95% CI	p	R ²
Health risk	.374	-.660, 1.410	.489	.243
Psychological risk	.783	-.600, 2.160	.259	.483
Environmental risk	.737	-.290, 1.760	.157	.348
Social risk	.374	-.120, .870	.135	.343
Quality risk	.384	-.150, .920	.154	.258
Financial risk	.373	-.610, 1.360	.457	.385
Time-loss risk	.450	-.890, 1.790	.654	.234

Trust

Regression analyses were conducted to examine the effects of different risk perceptions on trust. According to the results in Table 10, health risk significantly predicted trust ($\beta = .245$, $p = .001$), explaining 27.2% of the variance ($R^2 = .272$). Environmental risk also showed a significant effect ($\beta = .133$, $p = .002$), though the explained variance was relatively low ($R^2 = .128$). Psychological risk ($\beta = .372$, $p = .563$), social risk ($\beta = .233$, $p = .113$), quality risk ($\beta = .324$, $p = .271$), financial risk ($\beta = .344$, $p = .965$), and time-loss risk ($\beta = .127$, $p = .720$) did not significantly influence trust. These findings indicate that among the examined risk dimensions, only health risk and environmental risk had a statistically significant impact on trust.

Table 10. Multiple Regression of Risk Perceptions Predicting Trust (N = 350)

Predictor	β	95% CI	p	R ²
Health Risk	.245	.100, .390	.001*	.272
Psychological Risk	.372	-.910, 1.650	.563	.273
Environmental Risk	.133	.050, .220	.002*	.128
Social Risk	.233	-.060, .520	.113	.236
Quality Risk	.324	-.280, .930	.271	.237
Financial Risk	.344	-.650, 1.340	.965	.326
Time-loss Risk	.127	-.770, 1.020	.720	.127

Conclusion and Recommendations

The results of this study offer significant insights into how non-Muslim consumers perceive risks related to halal products and how these perceptions impact their trust, satisfaction and intention to recommend.

The descriptive results indicated generally high levels of satisfaction and a strong intention to recommend halal

products. However, trust in these products was comparatively low. This discrepancy suggests that while consumers are eager to recommend and consume halal products, they remain skeptical of producers and the accuracy of labeling. These findings are consistent with earlier research that shows trust is often the most fragile aspect of food consumption, particularly when certification or authenticity is in question (Curras-Perez et al., 2013; Möhlmann, 2015).

Regression analyses revealed that environmental and social risks were the strongest positive predictors of the intention to recommend halal products. This finding suggests that concerns about hygiene, proper storage, and social alignment actually increased consumers' willingness to advocate for these products. At first glance, this outcome may seem counterintuitive, as higher risk perceptions usually deter positive behaviors (Stone & Gronhaug, 1993). However, according to prospect theory (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979), increased awareness of environmental and social risks might have redefined halal certification as a protective measure, which in turn reinforces positive intentions to recommend. This indicates that consumers believe halal standards can effectively mitigate such risks, thereby enhancing their advocacy behaviors.

None of the risk dimensions significantly predicted customer satisfaction. Although some risks, such as environmental and social risks, displayed relatively high average values, their statistical effects were minimal. This suggests that satisfaction with halal products is influenced by factors other than perceived risks, possibly including intrinsic product quality, cultural exposure, or personal consumption experiences. Previous studies have also indicated that satisfaction tends to reflect direct product experiences rather than evaluations of cognitive risks (Ali et al., 2014; Kim & Damhorst, 2010).

Trust was significantly influenced by health and environmental risks. Higher health risk perceptions reduced trust in providers, while environmental risks also negatively influenced trust. These results highlight that non-Muslim consumers carefully evaluate halal food safety and environmental standards when forming judgments about provider integrity. This outcome mirrors earlier findings that health and safety considerations are central determinants of trust in food markets (Reisinger & Mavondo, 2005). The lack of significant influence from social, psychological, or financial risks further emphasizes the primacy of health-related concerns in shaping trust.

From a theoretical perspective, the findings expand the application of risk perception models and prospect theory in food consumption. They show that not all risks function as deterrents; some risks, particularly environmental and social ones, can positively reinforce behavioral outcomes when certification is perceived as protective. Practically, halal food producers should address trust deficits by strengthening labeling accuracy and transparency, especially in health and environmental domains. Marketing strategies that highlight certification standards, hygiene practices, and social acceptability could foster both greater trust and stronger recommendation intentions among non-Muslim consumers.

The study was limited to non-Muslim consumers in the UK, restricting generalizability to other cultural and geographical contexts. Future research should compare Muslim and non-Muslim consumer groups to determine whether risk perceptions operate differently across populations. Longitudinal studies could also explore whether risk perceptions and trust evolve with increased exposure to halal products.

Overall, the results suggest that while non-Muslim consumers demonstrate high satisfaction and advocacy toward

halal food, trust remains a critical challenge. Addressing health and environmental risk concerns through transparent certification and communication strategies may help reduce skepticism and strengthen the overall market acceptance of halal products.

Declaration

Ethics committee approval for the research was obtained by the Istanbul Kent University, Social and Human Sciences Research Ethics Committee with the decision dated 30.05.2025 and meeting number 2025/05.

REFERENCES

- Aaker, J. L., Benet-Martínez, V., & Garolera, J. (2001). Consumption symbols as carriers of culture: A study of Japanese and Spanish brand personality constructs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*(3), 492-508. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.3.492>
- AHDB. (2024). *UK halal lamb exports and market opportunities*. Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board.
- Al-Ansi, A., Olya, H. G., & Han, H. (2018). Effect of general risk on trust, satisfaction, and recommendation intention for halal food. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *71*, 106-114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2017.12.008>
- Ali, J., Tan, K. S., Pawar, K. S., & Makhbul, Z. M. (2014). An empirical study on halal product quality and marketing. *International Journal of Business and Society*, *15*(3), 331-354.
- Barberis, N. (2013). Thirty years of prospect theory in economics: A review and assessment. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *27*(1), 173-196. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.27.1.173>
- Bergeaud-Blackler, F. (2015). The halal certification market in Europe and the world: A first panorama. *Social Compass*, *62*(2), 147-160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0037768615571681>
- Bonne, K., & Verbeke, W. (2008). Religious values informing halal meat production and the control and delivery of halal credence quality. *Agriculture and Human Values*, *25*(1), 35-47. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-007-9076-y>
- BPJPH. (2024). *Halal Product Assurance Law implementation updates*. Halal Product Assurance Agency, Indonesia.
- Campbell-Smith, G. (1967). *The marketing of the meal*. Pergamon Press.
- Capaldi, E. D. (2006). The psychology of food choice. In R. Shepherd & M. Raats (Eds.), *The psychology of food choice* (pp. 3-24). CABI.
- Curras-Perez, R., Ruiz-Mafe, C., & Sanz-Blas, S. (2013). Social network loyalty: Evaluating the role of attitude, perceived risk, and satisfaction. *Online Information Review*, *37*(1), 61-82. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14684521311311630>
- de Mooij, M., & Hofstede, G. (2011). Cross-cultural consumer behavior: A review of research findings. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, *23*(3-4), 181-192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08961530.2011.578057>

- Deng, R., & Ritchie, B. W. (2016). International university students' travel risk perceptions: An exploratory study. *Current Issues in Tourism, 21*(4), 455-476. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2016.1145639>
- FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius Commission. (1997). *General guidelines for use of the term "halal"* (CAC/GL 24-1997). Food and Agriculture Organization/World Health Organization.
- Fischer, J. (2016). *Islam, standards, and technoscience: In global halal zones*. Routledge.
- Food Standards Agency. (2024). *Halal and kosher meat in the UK: Consumer information*. UK Government.
- Garcia, C., Cerrotti, F., & Palminteri, S. (2021). The description–experience gap: A challenge for the neuroeconomics of decision-making under uncertainty. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 376*(1819), 20190665. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0665>
- Gisbert-Pérez, F., Martí-Vilar, M., & González-Sala, F. (2022). Prospect theory in health psychology: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 829393. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.829393>
- Hu, Y. (2025). Multicultural experience and consumer openness to innovation. *Journal of Consumer Research, 52*(1), 45-63.
- Imaizumi, Y., Tymula, A., Tsubo, Y., Matsumoto, M., & Yamada, H. (2022). Neural coding of subjective value under risk in monkeys supports prospect theory. *Nature Communications, 13*(1), 2792. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-30545-1>
- Johns, N. (1999). What is this thing called service? *European Journal of Marketing, 33*(9/10), 958-973. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090569910285859>
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica, 47*(2), 263-291. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1914185>
- Kim, H., & Damhorst, M. L. (2010). The role of cognition in purchase intention of counterfeit luxury brands. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management, 14*(3), 395-409. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13612021011061890>
- Lever, J., & de la Bellacasa, M. P. (2002). The politics of halal meat: Balancing identity and consumption in Britain. *Journal of Consumer Policy, 25*(4), 563-585. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021297508150>
- Lever, J., & Miele, M. (2012). The growth of halal meat markets in Europe: An exploration of the supply side theory of religion. *Journal of Rural Studies, 28*(4), 528-537. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2012.06.004>
- Lever, J., Dastgir, N., & Fuseini, A. (2024). *The UK halal sector: Economic weight and future growth*. University of Huddersfield Research Reports.
- Liu, F., & Orth, U. R. (2021). Cultural differences in consumer responses to product design: A cross-national study. *Journal of Business Research, 124*, 549-561. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.11.070>
- Lonneker, J., Buggert, M., & Juchem, C. (2008). Social significance of food consumption: Cultural and identity aspects. *Journal of Consumer Studies, 32*(4), 327-335.
- Maheswaran, D., & Shavitt, S. (2000). Issues and new directions in global consumer psychology. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 9*(2), 59-66. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327663JCP0902_2

- McCracken, G. (1986). Culture and consumption: A theoretical account of the structure and movement of the cultural meaning of consumer goods. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13(1), 71-84. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209048>
- Möhlmann, M. (2015). Collaborative consumption: Determinants of satisfaction and the likelihood of using a sharing economy option again. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 14(3), 193-207. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.1512>
- Nasir, M., Ahmad, N., & Shaharuddin, A. (2024). *Global halal economy report 2024*. International Halal Development Corporation.
- Noel, H. (2009). *Basics of marketing*. AVA Publishing.
- Policy Studies Institute. (2006). *Food and cultural practices in the UK*. Policy Studies Institute Report.
- Reisinger, Y., & Mavondo, F. (2005). Travel anxiety and intentions to travel internationally: Implications of travel risk perception. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(3), 212-225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287504272017>
- Riaz, M. N., & Chaudry, M. M. (2004). *Halal food production*. CRC Press.
- Rieger, M. O., Wang, M., & Hens, T. (2017). Estimating cumulative prospect theory parameters from an international survey. *Theory and Decision*, 82(4), 567-596. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11238-016-9557-3>
- Ruggeri, K., et al. (2020). Replicating patterns of prospect theory for decision under risk. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 4(6), 622-633. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0886-x>
- Schiffman, L. G., & Kanuk, L. L. (2007). *Consumer behavior* (9th ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Shafie, S., & Othman, M. N. (2006). Halal certification: An international marketing issues and challenges. *International Marketing Conference Proceedings*, 21-22.
- Shavitt, S., & Cho, H. (2016). Culture and consumer behavior: The role of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 8, 149-154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.11.007>
- Shi, Y. (2023). Cultural orientations and social media consumer behavior: A cross-cultural analysis. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 61, 32-46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2022.10.003>
- Shimp, T. A., & Sharma, S. (1987). Consumer ethnocentrism: Construction and validation of the CETSCALE. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24(3), 280-289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378702400304>
- Simpson, P. M., & Siguaw, J. A. (2008). Perceived travel risks: The traveler perspective and service provider response. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(3), 394-407. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287507308326>
- SMIIC. (2019). *OIC/SMIIC 1:2019 general requirements for halal food*. Standards and Metrology Institute for Islamic Countries.
- Stone, R. N., & Grønhaug, K. (1993). Perceived risk: Further considerations for the marketing discipline. *European Journal of Marketing*, 27(3), 39-50. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090569310026637>
- Taderera, D. (2010). *Consumer buying behavior: Cultural and psychological dimensions*. Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Trepel, C., Fox, C. R., & Poldrack, R. A. (2005). Prospect theory on the brain? Toward a cognitive neuroscience of decision under risk. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 23(1), 34-50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogbrainres.2005.01.016>

- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1992). Advances in prospect theory: Cumulative representation of uncertainty. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 5(4), 297-323. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00122574>
- Warde, A. (2014). After taste: Culture, consumption and theories of practice. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 14(3), 279-303. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540514521076>
- Welsh, L. (2024). *The halal food market: Global trends and UK perspectives*. Food Economics Research Report.
- Wilson, J. A. J., & Liu, J. (2010). Shaping the halal into a brand? *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 1(2), 107-123. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17590831011055851>
- Xing, Y., & Jin, X. (2023). Cultural identity and brand loyalty for ethnic products. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 47(3), 245-258. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12883>

Appendix 1. Ethics Committee Permission

Toplantı Sayısı : 2025/05
 Toplantı Tarihi : 30.05.2025
 Toplantı Saati : 13:00

**T.C.
 İSTANBUL KENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ
 SOSYAL VE BEŞERİ BİLİMLER
 ARAŞTIRMA ETİK KURULU**

Toplantıya Katılanlar

Doç. Dr. Bülent DEMİR	Başkan / Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Müdürü
Prof. Dr. Hasret ÇOMAK	Üye / İktisadi, İdari ve Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi
Doç. Dr. Fazilet Ahu ÖZMEN AKALIN	Üye / İktisadi, İdari ve Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi
Doç. Dr. Ahmet İlkey CEYHAN	Üye / İktisadi, İdari ve Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Mesut ÖZEL	Üye / İktisadi, İdari ve Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Rukiye KÖROĞLU	Üye / İktisadi, İdari ve Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Tanju ÖZDENİZ	Üye / İktisadi, İdari ve Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi İlknur SAYAN	Üye / Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi
Hüseyin DOĞAN	Raportör / Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Sekreteri

GÜNDEM

3-Etik kurul başvuru formu bırakan öğretim üyelerinin durumlarının görüşülmesi.

KARARLAR

3-Etik kurul başvuru formları bırakan öğretim üyelerinin durumlarının aşağıdaki şekliyle kabulüne;

- IX. **Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ali Eren BALIKEL'in, "Evaluating Traditional Knowledge Dissemination in Olive Cultivation: A Delphi Method and Fuzzy-ahp Approach" adlı çalışmasının etik olarak uygun olduğuna oy birliği ile karar verilmiştir.**
- X. **Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ali Eren BALIKEL'in, "An Analysis of Entrepreneurs' Attitudes Towards Digital Technologies and Sustainable Development: A Study on Small Businesses in the UK" adlı çalışmasının etik olarak uygun olduğuna oy birliği ile karar verilmiştir.**
- XI. **Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ali Eren BALIKEL'in, "Sustainable Hospitality Excellence: Cultivating Environmental Stewardship in Turkish Hotels Through Cultural Heritage Integration, Climate Resilience and Guest Engagement" adlı çalışmasının etik olarak uygun olduğuna oy birliği ile karar verilmiştir.**
- XII. **Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ali Eren BALIKEL'in, "Risk Perception Towards Halal Food: A Study on non-Muslim Consumers in the UK" adlı çalışmasının etik olarak uygun olduğuna oy birliği ile karar verilmiştir.**
- XIII. **Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ali Eren BALIKEL'in, "Comparative Analysis of the Factors Affecting Green Energy Consumption Behaviour" adlı çalışmasının etik olarak uygun olduğuna oy birliği ile karar verilmiştir.**