

Review of: "Perception of Biodiversity versus Connection to Nature: Which Can Influence Wildlife Product Consumption in Vietnam?"

Amy Lykins¹

¹ University of New England

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This study reports on 500+ adults from Vietnam to assess the contributions of “perceptions of biodiversity” and “connection to nature” in predicting wildlife product consumption. The study is potentially an interesting contribution to the conservation literature, but it is limited by a number of factors. More details below. A somewhat minor point, but essentially everything presented in the study should be written in past tense. This is certainly the case for studies that have already been conducted and published, as well as when discussing what you did in your study.

Introduction

1. Please define “bush meat” (pg. 2, para. 1).
2. Can you provide more information on why the Javan rhinoceros went extinct to better connect it to the purpose of your study? (pg. 2, para. 1)
3. Really, every single participant with positive attitudes toward diversity in the Nisiforou and Charalambides (2012) study were willing to engage in environmental behaviour? Not just most or many?
4. I am not following the logic that urban residents would not prefer WPC based on the information provided before it. Can you please make that connection more specific to actual consumption? (pg. 3, para. 1). Same comment for the relationship between WPC and CTN. Given the many other reasons (cultural, etc.) that people may elect to consume wildlife products even if they care about the environment, I think this relationship needs to be made more strongly.
5. If you are going to state that “According to the Theory of Change, CTN and POB cannot possibly lead to WPC. But, this judgment has been obviously violated in Vietnam,” you need to provide more information about the current situation in Vietnam—what is known about their perceptions of biodiversity and their general connectedness to nature. None of this has been presented about Vietnam (aside from the Javan rhino, tiger, and box turtle—are these the only threatened/extinct species?) prior to the hypotheses, so the reader has no idea what the general attitude toward animals, nature, and biodiversity is amongst the Vietnamese population, or how this would relate to WPC (pg. 3).
6. Your hypotheses should be stated in a directional manner (e.g., POB is negatively associated with WPC, etc.).

Methodology

1. Are you concerned that your data collection dates (coinciding with the COVID-19 pandemic) may have influenced responding, particularly to questions about WPC? Are you concerned that your participants may have been less willing

to admit to the consumption of bushmeat, given the understood genesis of the novel coronavirus?

2. How (or did) you determine that your question about animal skin/leather/fur was obtained via wildlife? Leather products in many countries are obtained from cows and other non-wildlife animals, so this seems to be a confound if you did not specify that these products were obtained from dead wildlife. I wonder if your internal consistency would be improved by removing this item.
3. Why didn't you use a standardized connectedness to nature scale? Some of them are quite short, are free to use, and have good psychometric properties, which would have removed the issue with your scale's poor internal consistency.
4. I'm curious as to why the "older" group started at age 51. Is this retirement age in Vietnam? It still seems quite middle-aged to this reviewer.

Results

1. When you say that "Particularly, most of the sample behaves as green consumers," how was this defined and assessed? (pg. 8, para. 1)
2. A significance of $p = .1$ is nothing worth reporting. I would remove all of the one stars in Table 1, as these are not meaningful.
3. I think that "self-assessed" or "self-reported" knowledge about biodiversity would be a more correct statement, given you did not actually test their knowledge (pg. 9, para. 1).
4. I know that this was a major part of the purpose of your paper, but given the very poor psychometrics of your connectedness to nature scale (as well as any WPC scale you created from those individual items), I would recommend removing any analyses that includes these. It is hard to know what to conclude when these scales are so poor. You may have enough to talk about just discussing your findings on wildlife product consumption (minus the skin/leather/fur item) and some of your other scales that had better psychometrics.

Discussion

1. I think that paragraph 2 on page 18 would be better placed in the Introduction so that readers have a better understanding of common wildlife consumption by the Vietnamese population. Same comment for the first complete paragraph on page 19.
2. I can't really comment a great deal on the information in the Discussion, as I'm not confident in the findings due to the issues with the scales used in the analyses. It would be worth replicating this study using valid and reliable measures of the constructs of interest, as I agree that this issue is important and the study, as presented, could provide important information about why some people in Vietnam still choose to consume wildlife products and, consequently, the likely best and most effective to encourage this practice to support wildlife conservation efforts.
3. The second author is a child?