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Introduction

This paper is based on a comparative European study of social and institutional conditions for trust in food.1 Dominant approaches to trust in relation to food and consumption have concentrated on seeing trust as an individual, cognitive phenomenon. We argue that trust should be seen as socially contingent and an emergent property of relations between actors. Based on a population survey, we saw that, overall, people do not have a lot of trust in food, but also that trust levels vary considerably across Europe. The study has investigated macro-level institutional conditions for these variations, concentrating on the tripartite relations between consumers, food provisioning systems and regulatory arrangements. Maintaining this macro-level approach, we ask in this paper whether the ways in which people organize their daily lives around food procurement, preparation and consumption make any difference to the levels of trust. Seeing food consumption as normatively regulated and strongly habitual, we will investigate how these institutionalised practices are patterned across the different national contexts. At the same time, trust is relational, depending on interrelations with provisioning systems, authorities and other actors. The hypothesis is that different forms of institutionalisation and types of interrelations are characterised by distinct forms of trust. We are in particular looking for institutional conditions on the consumer side and types of interrelations that characterise countries with low vs. high trust. Recognising the particularity of various food items (and the provisioning systems behind), we focus specifically on two cases, tomatoes and beef. The paper starts with a theoretical discussion of trust as an element of institutionalised interrelations, considering also the special character of food consumption. How can variations in trust in food be analysed, taking into account cultural frames as well as institutional setup and performance? The argument relies on two major types of theoretical, mainly sociological, contributions; theories of trust emphasising its relational and normative foundations, on the one hand, and theories of consumption as embedded social practices, on

1 The project ‘Consumer Trust in Food. A European Study of Social and Institutional Conditions for the Production of Trust’ (TRUSTINFOOD) (2002-2004) was funded by the European Commission, 5th Framework Programme, Quality of Life, Key Action 1, contract no. QLK1-CT-2001-00291. The project is coordinated by The National Institute for Consumer Research (SIFO) and involves teams at the University of Bologna, The Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University and Roskilde University in Denmark, CRIC University of Manchester, University of Porto, and the Federal Research Institute for Nutrition and Food in Karlsruhe, Germany. The project website is at www.trustfood.org.
the other. After a brief explanation of the data and the methodologies, we start the presentation of empirical data by asking about the association between trust and eating. What happens when significant, familiar foods are not trusted? We then move on to discuss impacts of the societal division of labour with food and control over food preparation, showing that trust in institutional actors varies considerably. Assuming that delegating control over the food to other societal actors is associated with trust in institutions, we focus on ways of keeping control within the realm of household activities as indicated by the character of cooking and eating, personal market exchange, as well as a strong status of the family. This is contrasted to situations characterised by commodification of the food and less reliance on household activities. Such contrasting situations can be identified and seem associated with low and high trust, respectively. The final section summarises in more general terms how variations in the institutionalisation of food consumption may be linked to or imply different types of trust relations.

A theoretical background
While the notion of the European citizen still is important in the discourse on food regulation, there seem to have been increasing references to “the consumer” and “consumer trust”. Policy papers are explicitly referring to consumer choice and consumers’ own responsibility through ‘informed choice’ and labelling strategies. The widespread usage of the term consumer has coincided with neo-liberal precepts, thereby envisaging the consumer as an isolated self-interested individual. Indeed, this kind of consumer has been the model for neo-classical *Homo Oeconomicus*, an abstract and universal agent, conceived of as a black box of given preferences constrained by a given budgetary level and linked to an environment defined in terms of the goods available and their relative prices. This view is also almost hegemonic within the study of consumers’ trust in food and consumers’ perception of risk. Trust affects the way that risks are perceived, evaluated and acted upon. Most aspects of food risks cannot be identified or controlled by consumers at the product level (“credence characteristics”). In communication about risks, trustworthiness therefore emerges as an important factor (“source credibility”), understood as “whether an audience perceives a speaker to be making assertions that she or he considers true or valid” (Hansen et al, 2003). Trust is involved in decision-making about risks, where assessments and decisions are seen as cognitive processes (Slovic, 1999; Scholderer & Frewer, 2003; Foster, 2000). The main representatives of risk research (Löfstedt & Frewer, 1998) admit that their approach has been criticized for its “lack of integration” with the “social and cultural context” and are trying to find ways of considering the institutional sphere. But empirical work conducted within this tradition often ends up with a catalogue of typified individual attitudes towards risk, the context represented by information input (media scandals, educational campaigns, etc.).

There is plenty in contemporary theories of consumer practices which suggests that the consumer is far from being the champion of individualistic forward-looking choices, based on instrumental calculations. Food consumption can be fully appreciated as a form of *social* action only by leaving behind the idea that such action may be modelled exclusively as a purchase decision. So as to avoid conceptualizing consumption as a series of abstract and individualistic decisions, we have to consider that consumer practices happen in
institutions. By this is meant that there are essentially different societal patterns of behaviour related to food provisioning and consumption. For food provisioning does not end at the shop door. To sustain end-market exchanges between consumers and retailers, a whole range of social organization of consumer practices is assumed, that cannot be derived directly from supply-side characteristics. The household as an institution for food consumption is not simply an effect of the products bought and consumed within it.

Coordinated acts of purchase, food preparation, and eating within households are critical to the asymmetry of power between sellers and buyers of food, and equally to trust considered as a relationship between them. Thus, for example, whatever the balance of products available in retail outlets, the purchases and preparations by consumers complete a process of food provisioning that affects nutrition, health, quality, economy, and ethics. This raises issues of the degrees and ways in which consumers have control over the food. There is a division of responsibility, and hence of who trusts whom over what, that is constructed through this relationship: a ready-meal heated in a microwave entails quite different possible trust relationships between retailers/manufacturers and consumers than food bought as raw/fresh ingredients to be conserved and prepared in the household. Labour market participation can also be expected to affect not only the gendering of consumer-side food provisioning, but also the extent to which food preparation is undertaken in households or on the supply side. Meal structure and cuisine can be expected to be at least partially shaped by the interdependency between household and commodity-producing market economies, and differences between countries in these terms.

A further aspect, with profound impacts on the nature of food end-markets, relates to what is eaten, when and how. National and regional cultures of eating, themselves historical and changing constructs, shape patterns of food purchasing, and have been argued to be constitutive of national identity. A nation is (in part) what it eats (Mintz, 1996; Hogan, 1997; Appadurai, 1988). The structure of meal-times, the balance in significance between meals at different eating times, as well as the content of meals, have complex interactions with working hours, and the way that has historically evolved (Kjærnes, 2001). The place of the meal in the household as part of its social fabric is changing not only within the internal dynamics of its social organization, but in relation to leisure activities, and competing social relations. The eating and design of food is a changing cultural and social institution that is structured and organized in the sphere of consumption beyond, but in interaction with, the market.

Where does trust come in within this social understanding of food consumption? Trust is frequently considered as something that structures social life and an orientation shared by collectivities. In this way, trust refers to a set of moral values, social cohesion or a cultural community in an abstract sense (Misztal, 1995). The background can be formulated in rational terms, like for Elster who regards trustfulness as an expression of norms that make everyone better off than they would be without it (Elster, 1989a, 113-23). Norms generate common lines of action that make other people’s behaviour predictable. Norms guide social action and contribute to social stability; they create credibility to promises and threats. Norms are motivations that provide ‘the cement of society’, without which ‘chaos and anarchy would prevail’ (Elster, 1989b: 50). Gambetta (1988: 162) seems to agree with Elster’s understanding of trust as norms creating predictability, a prerequisite for social cohesion to emerge. The opposite may be disastrous: ‘(T)he
unpredictability of sanctions generates uncertainty in agreements, stagnation in commerce and industry, and a general reluctance towards impersonal and extensive forms of co-operation’ (Gambetta, 1988: 162).

Theorists who, at first glance, are quite divergent seem to share the idea of trust as fundamental to social order, but at the same time fragile, distrust and disorder being a constant threat to society (Mistzal 1995).

Departing somewhat from these approaches, recent contributions seem to focus more on the dynamics of trust than on its functions. Shared norms and predictability are still central, framed for example as issues of solidarity or cooperation. But attention is directed more towards what people do, like participation in social networks, in social mobilisation and in interpersonal contact. The argument is that confidence develops only very slowly, starting out in primary socialization with the development of basic, trusting personal relations, and continue into secondary socialization processes where young people and adults engage in social networks and organizations. The formation of trust thus requires a certain element of shared and relatively stable norms in a society. Trust in institutions is regarded as an extension of interpersonal trust, projected on to political institutions and therefore conditioning the assessment of political performance (cf. Inglehart, 1997, Putnam, 1993, Uslaner, 1999). These ideas are typically taken in two directions. Some, like Putnam, emphasize trust as a form of social capital, which is intertwined with the (unequal) distribution of social resources, thus varying in kind or degree according to social status and demography. Others, like Luhmann, (1979), see trust as intrinsically embedded in local or national cultural superstructures or systems.

All these accounts seem to suggest that trust can be understood as embedded in, and also expressed through, the tacit continuation of our daily routines\(^2\). Trust then becomes part of the taken-for-grantedness that characterises many of our daily practices. This is not necessarily “blind trust” – trust that is unfounded, because trust is typically being confirmed by experiences and the normative and institutional framing of the practices. Trust therefore includes both particular and conditional dimensions, and unconditional systemic dimensions (Cvetkovich & Löfstedt, 1999, 175).

The conditional elements are first of all associated with the relational aspects of trust. In trusting food within a market context, people trust or distrust someone, not something (Kjærnes, 1999). They trust the provisioning system and the actors and persons inhabiting that system. Food purchase is the situation where people as consumers interact most directly with the system of food provisioning, and indirectly with food regulators, experts, informers, watchdogs, etc. This is in line with Tilly’s more general argument to focus on trust relationships: “Trust consists of placing valued outcomes at risk to others’ malfeasance. Trust relationships include those in which people regularly take such risks.” (Tilly, 2004) But trust does not refer only to ‘malfeasance’. In addition to the will that Tilly refers to, a trust based interrelation assumes shared, or at least clear, norms and expectations as well as the ability or competence to meet these expectations. These aspects point to the character of the interrelationship as such and how it is organized, introducing elements of control and power, knowledge and information.

\(^2\) See also Lagerspetz, who sees tacitness as a basic feature of trust (Lagerspetz, 1998).
Such relational and conditional elements are brought up in so-called ‘institutional’ theories, which propose that trust hinges on citizen evaluations of institutional performance. Institutions that perform well generate trust, while those that perform badly generate distrust and scepticism. Institutional theories seem to oppose a direct causal relationship between the development of interpersonal trust, on the one hand, and institutional or system trust on the other (Coleman, 1990, Mishler & Rose, 2001). A number of studies have focussed on trust in political and regulatory institutions using these perspectives. But trust is not always limited to a matter of acceptance. Some have discussed participatory aspects that seem important for our argument. Trust links citizens to regulatory bodies that are intended to govern on their behalf, and thereby enhance the legitimacy and effectiveness of governance (Hardin, 2001) and democratic processes (Braithwaite & Levi, 1998). For us, the relevant ‘institutional performance’ questions seem to be not only the performance of market as well as political organizations, but even participation, extended from the political sphere to include the market context, as a matter of consumer activism and feedback. Yet, how do they refer to the institutionalisation of consumption?

Cultural and institutional theories are often presented as mutually exclusive explanations to trust, but their opposition should not be exaggerated. They may serve as complementary mechanisms. For example, social networks may have more importance when institutional trust fails on a general basis (Guseva & Ronat-Tas, 2001, Völker & Flap, 2001). Familism (and its negative extreme ‘amoral familism’) is well described as a mechanism that serves as protection in social contexts of widespread distrust (Gambetta, 1988, Putnam, 1993). Important within the context of this paper is that norms, resources and skills developed within personal social networks may influence the ways in which interaction with formal organizations is experienced and handled, thus being mutually reinforcing. Evaluations of performance are part of a comprehensive, dynamic process embedded in a cultural and historical setting (Rothstein, 2000). So, stable consumption practices involving interaction with complex market institutions may be embedded in a culture of general trust in other people, but can only be maintained by acceptable performance of these institutions as well as third party actors, first of all the state.

What might be the association between patterns of food consumption and levels and forms of trust? Some major questions can be identified for the empirical analyses:

- What happens when significant, familiar foods are not trusted?
- How does control over food preparation affect trust? What is the division of labour and responsibility regarding the food between consumers (or households) and other actors/institutions, as expressed through the degree of processing and eating at home/out.
- Are a strong focus on the family institution and personal and network based purchasing relations interrelated? To what degrees are such forms of institutionalisation of consumption associated with distrust and with particularised forms of trust?
- Can we in a parallel way identify associations between less family oriented eating, non-personalised shopping relations and generalised forms of trust?
The empirical data: the TRUSTINFOOD survey

The project is a comparative study including six European countries; Denmark, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Norway, and Portugal. Public opinion surveys and institutional studies have been conducted in all six countries, institutional studies even at the EU level. The institutional studies in the six countries and at the EU level are based on secondary data, statistics, key informant interviews, and analyses of media debates. We have had a particular focus on two food cases, i.e. beef and tomatoes. While beef has received considerable attention over the past decade, tomatoes were selected as representing a more ordinary, routine food item. Institutional analyses have been made; firstly for each country, secondly by carrying out systematic comparative analyses, and, thirdly by combining with the survey data.

The population survey interviews were carried out with CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviews) in November 2002. Random samples included 1000 in Denmark, Norway and Portugal; 1500 in GB; and 2000 in Italy and Germany. The target for these surveys was the population between 18 – 80 years of age. The questionnaire focused on various measures of trust, practices and strategies (shopping, eating and as citizens), the distribution of responsibilities for key food issues, and socio-demographic background. The first results have been published in Poppe and Kjaernes (2003).

The statistical methods of analysis used of the survey data are for the most part relatively simple and straightforward. The basic presentation of variables and results are made in the form of cross tabulations. The main analytical tool is regression, offering easy comparisons of mean differences between countries (linear and logistic regressions have been applied, depending on the nature of the dependent variable). In most cases, these are run in the background, so to speak, and not shown in the text here. The results of the regression analyses, in addition to correlation analyses, are reported in other publications from the project (Poppe and Kjaernes, 2003; Kjaernes, Poppe & Lavik, 2005).

Eating and trusting – trusting and eating?

In the introduction we stressed that trust is social. That means that even trust issues in relation to food items are contextualised. We asked people whether they trust the safety of the food they buy, the interpretation being that views on food items express socially contingent norms and expectations as well as reflecting the social relations involved. 12 food items were included; eggs, chicken, pork, fresh fruits and vegetables, fresh tomatoes, canned tomatoes, beef, organic beef, sausages, burgers from a fast-food outlet, low-fat products, and restaurant meals.

---

3 The two former German parts have been kept separate in many survey analyses because previous studies of trust have indicated history and different experiences have led to distinct conditions for trust. We have wanted to investigate to what degree trust in influenced by such long-term effects, as compared to more short-term conditions. The overall comparative analyses will, however, concentrate on Germany as a whole.

4 Three options were used; ‘very safe’, which was meant to express a positive evaluation, ‘rather safe’ and ‘not very safe’. Considering that the included items are ordinarily included in the diet all over Europe, we thought it unlikely that many people would say for example ‘hazardous’ or even ‘unsafe’. So we ended up using a softer version as the lower end of the scale. The distribution of answers on this question is quite consistent, compared to other questions. We therefore believe that the scale reflects trust-distrust distinctions.
Table 1 shows that there is widespread scepticism as to the safety of particular food items among European consumers. Overall, there is a ranking order, between British respondents being most trusting and the Germans least trusting. But there are clear differentiations between the various food items. These differences are relatively consistent between the various countries; fresh tomatoes in particular and fresh fruits and vegetables in general rank highest, meats and particular types of meats typically taking the medium positions, while sausages and burgers from fast-food outlets, along with restaurant meals, were ranked lowest. Compared to vegetables, people are much more sceptical towards all meat products when it comes to safety. They do worry a bit less about organic than conventional beef, but not very much. This is probably not surprising, as it is well recognised that meats are generally more hazardous than vegetables with regard to bacterial contamination. Recent media attention and scares have also mostly referred to meats, like those of BSE and salmonella. There are potential safety issues even related to vegetables, for example pesticide residues – or genetic modification. But those issues seem to be less urgent in people’s opinions. Even though the levels of trust differ, these distinctions are very consistent across countries. The Portuguese, however, ranks considerably higher for vegetables than for meats, compared to the other countries. Some food items seem to be more variable, as reflected in their relative ranking, compared to other food items. This is in particular the case for eggs and chicken. From this, we see that considering a food item as unsafe may refer to a wide range of criteria, like the occurrence of scandals, control over preparation, degree of processing, and unfamiliarity.

Turning now to eating patterns, food items will have varying cultural significance, norms and conventions with regard to various key food issues, competence, etc. Foodstuffs are “products” or “goods” acquired by a household member to be transformed at home into dishes and meals. Items playing a central role in the everyday diet may imply higher sensitivity towards trust issues. But the opposite may also hold, in that frequent use is associated with a taken for granted trust, more marginal foods being met with more reflection and perhaps stronger scepticism. Both might mean a correlation between the frequency of eating and trust, but in different directions. Food items also represent distinct supply chains, technologies, expert knowledge, regulatory regimes, and public discourses – which will influence expectations, experiences and trust relations.

We asked a very simple question about the frequency of eating various food items and find very varying patterns across the countries (Table 2). While broad food categories like meat and vegetables are represented in most people’s diets all over Europe, we found large variations for more specific food items, and, in particular, for more processed varieties. The frequency of eating foods like canned tomatoes, fish, beef and minced beef vary significantly between the countries. We see variations in the prominence of our two food cases, beef and tomatoes. Moreover, while patterns are quite homogeneous within some countries, there is much more variation and polarisation in others. We will comment on these patterns in relation to the distinctions identified for trust in food items.

Vegetables and meat have very different roles as elements of diets and meals. Both are in Europe usually part of “cooked meals”, but the structure of such meals as well as the daily rhythms may be quite diverse. While Danes and Norwegians eat only one cooked meal a day, two cooked meals is a more
widespread norm in the rest of Europe. That means for example that food items and dishes, which represent alternatives on the daily menu in Denmark and Norway, may very well co-appear daily in the other countries. Moreover, while a contemporary cooked meal in Northern Europe is very often “a plateful” (staple + meat/fish + salad or cooked vegetable), several serial dishes are more common in the south. Turning to more specific items, there is more variation. Fresh tomatoes seem to be part of the ordinary menu in all the six countries, most so in Great Britain, least in Germany and Norway. Eating beef is much more varied, this time with Italians and Danes ranking highest, while again we find Germans and Norwegians at the bottom of the list.

At his very general level of recording national eating patterns and their potential links to trust, there do not seem to be any clear patterns. This is hardly surprising. The figures show that food items like beef and tomatoes are important parts of the ordinary diet all over Europe and are thus not easily swapped for other types of food. While tomatoes have remained uncontested with regard to food safety, there has been much more turbulence around beef. Logistic regression analyses indicate that there are links between eating tomatoes and beef and trust in them, respectively, even when controlled for various socio-demographic background variables (data not shown). So not eating may constitute an exit strategy for people who are very sceptical about the safety of a food item. Aggregate effects of that were demonstrated when demand fell sharply as an immediate response to (domestic) cases of BSE (and the publication of its effects on humans). But this sudden response was short-lived. Demand – and eating patterns – was gradually normalised (Kjørstad 2005). Moreover, this drop did not happen to the same degree everywhere. Denmark has experienced a long-term increasing trend in beef consumption during the whole period, in spite of a couple of incidents of BSE. Norway, with no cases of BSE at all, has had a stable, slightly upward trend. Vegetarianism may, in part, be interpreted as an expression of distrust. But there are no clear national patterns in the proportions not eating meat as related to trust in the safety of meats. The proportions are highest in Great Britain and West Germany, while remaining very small in all the other countries. Declining to eat certain items often seems short-lived, habits representing a strong force. But, in some cases, habits have changed. The occurrence of such responses seem to depend on the institutional context, rather than being linked to individual habits as such or to for example household resources.

**Trust and control**

If we consider trust as influenced by the degree of control an agent has over food preparation, industrial processing, and, even more so, eating out, might be expected to reduce or challenge trust. When buying a food item or a meal, few aspects can be assessed by its looks and smell. The more processes and relations involved, the more problematic or complex this assessment may become. As important, the less will the consumer influence directly how the food is handled. However, processing can also make cooking easier and the purchased goods standardised and more predictable.

As indicated in Table 1, people make sharp distinctions in how they evaluate the safety of fresh and processed foods. This is exemplified by fresh vs. canned tomatoes, and between beef (as steaks and roasts)
and burgers. The same picture is found for meats in general, on the one hand, and sausages, on the other. Even though this ranking order is evident for all countries, Germans are particularly sceptical towards canned tomatoes, Italians and Portuguese towards burgers. We also included a question about a very different food category, namely low-fat foods. This may indicate foods that are particularly nutritious and healthy, but also foods that are highly processed, including ‘artificial’ ingredients or removing ‘natural’ components. The results show a very mixed picture. While the British and the Portuguese, to some degree even the Danish, seem to think of these types of foods, as healthy and safe, Germans and Italians, along with Norwegians, are highly sceptical. The degree of processing matters, Germans, perhaps Italians, being the most sceptical, the British, as for all these safety questions referring to particular food items, being most positive.

From the overview of eating patterns (Table 2), we see that the frequency of eating the two food items typifying a higher degree of processing, namely canned tomatoes and minced beef, varies a lot, much more than for their fresh varieties. Canned tomatoes are rarely eaten in Germany and not much in Portugal either, while they are eaten considerably more often in Great Britain and Italy. The variations in patterns for minced beef and products and dishes from that are even more pronounced. While minced varieties appear on the Norwegian menu more than twice as often as roasts and steaks, the opposite is the case in Portugal. Minced beef is in general used more in the north, less in the south, Great Britain taking a middle position. Differentiation in trust between beef with high and low processing according to Table 1 seems most pronounced in countries where minced beef is eaten most often (Norway and Denmark) and least often (Portugal). Apart from Portugal, where there is a very strong differentiation between fresh and canned tomatoes in terms of safety and also a strong preference for the fresh varieties, there are not the same types of national patterns for tomatoes.

Another type of distinction regarding food safety can also be associated with the degree of control, which is between foods prepared in the household and foods served as dishes outside the home. When asking about food items, the underlying understanding is probably that these foods are bought and brought home for further preparation. The exceptions in our list are burgers from fast-food outlets and restaurant meals. As we have already indicated, these are being evaluated very negatively with regard to safety in all countries. As indicated from Figure 1, people eat out most seldom in Norway. Fewest people eat out infrequently in Great Britain. But eating out daily is most common in Portugal. While eating out seems to be a weekly treat for many Britons (Warde & Martens, 2000), it is part of ordinary daily patterns for a quarter of the Portuguese population. When we then talk about trust as linked to control, eating out may mean very different things. Seeing trust as part of institutionalisation processes, it might be expected that the Portuguese worry more. But, as we can see from Table 1, even though associated with considerable scepticism, Portugal is actually the country where fewest respondents characterise restaurant meals as particularly unsafe. Rather than being

---

5 These food items to not represent very high degrees of processing. Minced beef may even be produced by the butcher on direct request from the consumer – or be prepared at home. Due to the degrees of variation and differentiation, however, it was difficult to find standardised, relatively commonly used items that could represent more clearly processed beef across Europe.
only a matter of lack of control, the observation suggests that trust associated with eating out may be as much a question of whether it is “normal” and “ordinary”.

From this, it seems that when making statements about the safety of food items, a range of criteria are being employed. There is a framing of familiarity and habit, on the one hand, and the extraordinary, such as scandals, on the other. But there are also aspects that seem to refer to control over preparation, degrees of processing, etc. Control seems to refer not merely to knowledge and information, but as much to the societal division of labour and responsibility for the food.

**Trust in institutions?**

The question of control is therefore not as straightforward as it may seem. In the trust literature many have pointed to the forms of trust that are required in complex institutional setting where we have to rely on impersonal relations and rather abstract institutions (Luhmann, 1988, Seligman, 1997).

The survey included a question about truth-telling of various institutional actors, whether these would, in a specific case with salmonella in chicken, tell the whole truth, parts of the truth or rather withhold information. Figure 2 shows systematic differences between the various countries with regard to the proportions thinking that various actors would hold information back. The Germans are most sceptical, while Norwegians and the Danes seem most trustful. The ranking of the actors was identical (irrespective of whether we consider the proportion telling the whole truth or those withholding information). From highly to not trusted, the order was: consumer organizations, food experts, public authorities, the media, farmers, supermarkets, the processing industry, and politicians. The findings indicate that people have a very clear perception of roles, distinguishing basically between actors who have direct commercial interests and those who have a more independent role. A regression analysis of the impact of truth-telling on trust in food items (results not shown) indicates that trust in institutional actors is quite important for trust in food safety in some countries, especially Portugal and Italy, while that aspect is of little or no importance in countries like Denmark and Norway, where institutional actors are generally highly trusted. While consumer organizations are trusted for telling the truth, they are not important for explaining variations in the respondents’ trust in food safety. The media do not seem to have a big impact either. The actors with most importance are the market actors and the food authorities. Food experts are significant only in Portugal. Those actors who are most directly involved in terms of power and control have the largest impact, rather than those most prominent with regard to information.

We have seen that assessments of the safety of food items refer partially to the degree of control that the consumer has. At the same time, contemporary eating patterns may include highly processed foods sold through complex supply chains. And it seems that control as well as performance matters when judging institutional actors. What happens when institutional actors are not trusted? In some countries, this seems to be mainly a matter of clearer differentiations. Compared to the Scandinavians, British respondents seem to have relatively lower trust in authorities and more in the supermarkets. Yet, the overall scepticism towards institutional actors that we find in several of the countries may also represent a more generalised distrust in
Familism and familiarity

Familism, and especially its negative version, has received considerable attention in studies of societies marked by widespread distrust, southern Italy being the typical case. Banfield (1958, cited in Misztal 1995) described ‘amoral familism’ as the absence of feelings of trust or moral obligation towards anyone outside the family. They ‘maximize the material, short-run advantage of the nuclear family and assume that all others will do likewise’, thus distrusting and avoiding public solutions. (Putnam, 1993, Gambetta, 1988) and others have later followed up these ideas. It seems relevant to search for patterns regarding types of households and patterns of consumption that may be associated with a traditional family orientation. At a different level, the concept of ‘familiarity’ is central in studies of trust, as a special form of trust associated with personal or network based relations (see for example Seligman 1997, who refers to Luhmann 1988). Like familism, familiarity is also associated with more traditional conditions, but not necessarily to distrust. Quite a few even suggest this as a way of generating trust in food in a contemporary context (Murdoch & Miele, 1999). So, while familism in the literature is associated with conditions of distrust, familiarity is judged more positively. We therefore want to investigate this empirically. Are there links between familism and familiarity when it comes to the particular case of food? And to what degree are such patterns of familism and familiarity associated with distrust in institutions?

Familism will be described generally through household structures and women’s employment and, more specifically with reference to daily routines of food – cooking, division of labour – and culinary traditions. Familiarity, as defined more relationally, will be described through shopping strategies and priorities as well as routines for purchasing food. The survey gives some information about households and potential associations with consumption practices. The presentation here will be based, partly, on simple distributions of variables, partly on multivariate statistics. We made a large number of regression analyses, using as dependent variables eating and purchasing beef and tomatoes, as well as trusting these two food items. Independent variables were mainly socio-demographic background factors. In general, such factors explain little of the observed variation. Yet, it is possible to see some patterns. When trying to identify country profiles it is, however, equally important to notice factors that do not differentiate within the country setting. Homogeneity within a country can be very important in order to understand the characteristics of the institutionalisation of food consumption within that country.

---

6 As a word of caution: this is not necessarily to be interpreted directly as a deep, culturally embedded distrust, that familism (of certain types) and familiarity relations “produce” distrust, for it can also reflect a failure of institutional actors to meet expectations.
Table 3 presents national variations in family organization, meal patterns and shopping practices. The description of the association between household structure and food consumption has been compiled through logistic regression analyses of eating and shopping practices (based on variables that are significant) as well as overall distributions regarding the gender division of labour. The results indicate that the status of the household matters everywhere, both for eating and purchasing, to some degree even for trust. In particular, single people tend to eat and buy less beef, in some places even tomatoes. Still, there is considerable variation in the manner in which consumption is institutionalised, more than for regulation or provision. We must here remember that the household structure is very diverse across the countries. In particular, the “single” category is smaller in Italy and Portugal, with few young (or not so young) people who have not yet established their own family, divorcees etc., while the proportion of widows is larger. There are also more families with more than two adults, for example a grandmother or a grown-up son. This is a reflection of the family institution as such being stronger in Italy, so also food consumption patterns associated with that (Lewis, 1997; Barbagli & Saraceno, 1997). Similar patterns are observed in Portugal. The relatively larger proportions of large families show distinct patterns, especially reflected in more use of beef. We can also see, that especially in Portugal eating out means something different from for example Great Britain, representing a daily alternative to home eating, as opposed to the British eating out as a treat. A very noticeable characteristic of food purchasing in these family oriented countries is the considerably larger division of labour between the genders.

The character of the household also has an impact on consumption patterns in the other countries. The point is that the family structure is different, in particular with higher proportions of singles, and the overall picture of the institutionalisation of food consumption therefore becomes different. Norway and Denmark barely differ from one another. Controlled for other background variables, gender is significant for eating as well as trust in these two countries, but is not reflected in purchasing practices and the division of labour within the household. Germany seems to be quite similar, but perhaps with somewhat larger differences in consumption practices between the different household types. Britain is distinctive, in that gender matters less, while distinctions according to education are more pronounced.

This table seems to indicate that variations in family structure is important for understanding variations in how eating and purchasing is organized as part of daily routines. This is reflected also in food preparation and what is eaten. When looking across the national contexts, the consumption of tomatoes and beef are institutionalised in very different ways and the role of trust is different in the two cases. Compared to beef, consumption patterns for tomatoes seem to be less country specific, perhaps less associated with particular types of interrelations in the market. It could be that what we see for tomatoes is not that the market structure has less impact, but a more uniform, globalized pattern, strongly influenced by multinational companies (Harvey et al 2003). For beef, national (in some cases local) producers dominate. Differences between tomatoes and beef are also apparent when looking at trust in their safety.

So, what about the more relational aspects and the question of familiarity? Food purchasing represents a key to our relational understanding of trust. We anticipate that routines and experiences
associated with food purchases will make the references for trust different from those held by people who rarely shop for food by themselves. Yet, the relational aspects are not limited to whether people are shoppers or not. We also assume that various systems of distribution and retailing imply different types of relations and thus also different conditions for trust. Modern big supermarket chains represent a very different, impersonal, standardised, and contract-based form of relation, compared to small scale, specialised outlets like butchers, fruit and vegetable shops and food markets, which rely much more on personal relations.

We asked where people normally buy beef and tomatoes. The supermarket dominance is strongest in Norway and Denmark (Table 4). A large majority of the Danes buy their beef and tomatoes in a supermarket, but there are also a certain proportion of respondents who usually buy beef in a butcher shop and tomatoes in a fruit and vegetable shop. In Norway, alternatives hardly exist. If we turn to Great Britain, tomatoes and beef are mostly purchased in a supermarket, but quite a few rather buy beef in a butcher shop and tomatoes in a fruit and vegetable shop. Patterns are more heterogeneous in Germany, where people buy tomatoes in fruit and vegetable shops, on food markets, in supermarkets, as well as in other places, and a majority of the respondents buy beef at the butchers or in other places, rather than supermarkets. The balance is even more towards small shops in the southern countries. Many Italians buy tomatoes in fruit and vegetable shop and on a food market and the majority buy beef in a butcher shop. This suggests a predominance of contexts where personal relations are more important. However, we should not overlook the high proportions of supermarket shopping, which is nearly 50 percent for tomatoes and nearly 40 percent for beef. While a little more than half of the Portuguese respondents buy fresh tomatoes in supermarkets, only one fifth buy beef there. Most people in Portugal buy beef from a butcher (77 %), which is the highest proportion in our material.

Shopping experience. Table 4 indicates that countries where supermarket shopping is most prevalent value accessibility above other values. Among Germans and Italians, around one fifth say that accessibility is unimportant. The process of the supermarketisation of food retailing, which has gone much further in the Nordic countries and Britain, but which is gradually affecting the other three countries more and more, seems to entrench a concern for convenience. Perhaps this is because there is little other reason besides accessibility for distinguishing between one retail outlet and another, since the products on offer are relatively homogeneous across shops.

Do people pay more for taste? Preparedness to pay for extra quality and taste is not entirely avoided in the supermarketised countries, ie it is said not to occur ‘seldom’ in the three supermarketised countries. It occurs more than averagely often in Great Britain and Denmark, but not Norway. In Portugal, consumers do spend extra for quality more frequently than the mean. But all countries are close to the mean on this question. It probably doesn’t matter what sort of a retailing system one has, there will be occasions when one spends extra for better quality; though there may be some people with a sustained objection to doing so.

Yet, there is probably some significant difference between what is available in the different supermarkets, the German and Nordic supermarkets being more functional and more concerned with prices than in the Great Britain. The British supermarkets are distinctive in the degree to which they sell the same produce at several different levels of quality and of price, offering a range of qualities makes the selection
process somewhat more engaging. This perhaps explains the reported experience of shopping. One question asked whether people who went shopping for food how often they enjoyed it. The proportions saying that they *seldom* enjoyed shopping for food were 70 per cent in Norway, 57 per cent in Denmark, 55 per cent in West Germany, 49 per cent in Italy, 30 per cent in GB and 11 per cent in Portugal. Clearly Britons must enjoy their supermarket shopping quite a lot since those who avoid supermarkets could not account for the total amount of enjoyable experiences of shopping.

**Personal contact.** The question asked in the survey, when buying beef ‘is it important to you that you know the staff personally?’, radically differentiates the supermarketised countries from those where specialist shops predominate. We cannot determine whether this importance is a matter of strategy for dealing with potentially hazardous food, or whether it is the use of such outlets that results in customers feeling that their food is problematic. It is possible that there is a different explanation for the staff being familiar in Portugal. Since people very often enjoy shopping for food in Portugal it may well be the pleasures of social intercourse that provides much of the enjoyment. If so, we could understand why knowing the staff personally might matter. It need not necessarily be a matter of guarantee of safety; indeed it is just as likely to be a guarantee of quality (though perhaps not of price). Similar patterns, although less pronounced, are shown for the emphasis on knowing the shop from previous experience. Interestingly, however, this is quite highly valued by the British respondents. Presumably it matters not in Norway and Denmark, just as it matters relatively little whether it is known where beef originates from, because they have a perception of homogeneous products in their supermarkets with their properties somehow guaranteed. In addition, Norway, Denmark and UK all record between 32 - 34 percent of shoppers who say it doesn’t matter which country beef comes from. The Portuguese and the Italians, followed by the Germans, are most likely to say that they prefer beef from their home country. Once again, becoming inured to a supermarketised regime appears to result in the consumer rescinding power and control, exercising fewer discriminatory preferences, and accepting as given what is made available. This may be a result of having no choice – alternatives to the supermarkets are often even more inaccessible, probably with worse prices, except for a set of niche, up-market shops which are expensive for a different reason. In any case, different purchasing practices and distribution systems seem to affect (or be affected by) the norms and expectations that people have.

**Consumption and trust – key characteristics of different forms of institutionalisation**

In this paper we have explored the consumer side in terms of consumption routines and relational aspects of trust, thus trying to characterise different types of trust relations. We can assert that the institutionalisation of consumption is a major source of national differences. Practices and contexts differ and continue to provide resistance against tendencies for the food systems of Europe to converge. It shows that consumers are not merely subject to the influence of the market actors of the private sector. As with these other domains, the sphere of consumption retains a degree of autonomy while operating interdependently with them.
What are then the associations between variations in the institutionalisation of food consumption and trust? For beef in particular (not that much for tomatoes) the patterns are quite diverse, not only in terms of trust levels but also with different interrelations to consumption practices. Variations in trust are, at least to some degree, reflected in consumer practices and strategies. We find that reducing consumption or dropping beef from the diet represent an exit strategy. Apart from the Scandinavian countries, where distrust is very low, there are considerable proportions of non-beef eaters (and buyers). And while the reason may very well be a number of other things than beef safety, these respondents tend to be more distrustful.

Looking across the countries, it seems that different types of relations and characteristics of the institutionalisation of food consumption are associated with varying levels of trust. There is considerable national variation as a function of combinations and transitions in institutional and structural conditions, but two general ideal-typical patterns can be identified. On the one hand, we have relations that are particular and network based. It refers to a society where the traditional, large family predominates, few people live as singles, and there is a clear division of labour between men and women. Several cooked daily meals based on raw ingredients are prepared within the family context (the alternative being eating out rather than convenience food at home for one person). Purchases are made in small shops within local, small-scale distribution systems. Food quality is not standardised, evaluations are rather based on experience and personal exchange. Familiarity is a key word; also making the provenance of the food very important. Uncertainty and distrust can be handled by being even more particular with regard to outlets and sources. It is a privatised consumer role which makes the public agenda and consumer agency within large systems of less relevance.

This is contrasted by more generalised relations with reliance on complex institutions. If we turn first to the context of eating, evening meals are important in contributing to the social fabric of the modern nuclear family, also making them very different from eating in single households. Eating out is not an option within the daily context, and time constraints are instead handled by emphasising convenience. Eating highly processed foods is high, linked to many women being employed and to a larger group of singles. Market interaction is based on predictability and with little differentiation between outlets, food qualities or provisioning systems. The manufacturing industry takes a key position of in ensuring this predictability, but strongly based on distribution through supermarkets. This allows for generalisations of trust relations, as suggested by the responses to the questions on trust in the high trust countries, Great Britain, Denmark and Norway. Provenance matters less.

Based on general theories of trust, we argued in the introduction that particular, network based relations would exist mainly as a response to general institutional distrust, associated also with keeping more control and responsibility for the food within the household. To some degree this is what we found. Italy would be a case that supports such a view. However, the analyses allow us to make some further precisions. We have found in the Portuguese case a surprising stability of the traditional family and associated meal patterns, along with the predominance of small-scale distribution systems. This can explain why the Portuguese have higher trust in food items than the Italians and the Germans, while they share their pessimism about the development within the food sector and the general distrust in institutional solutions.
Italians have the same expectations about trust relations as the Portuguese, and they share even some of the structural features, such as a more traditional family institution. The market seems, however, to be different, with more complexity and rapid change, as reflected even in higher consumption of processed foods. The German case, with its low levels of trust, is not simply a “negation” of any of the idealised forms of trust, but is rather bringing up elements of both. The market is obviously both dynamic and differentiated, but, according to the German institutional study, poorly integrated and less predictable. The small outlets take a strong position; it seems especially as recourse for those who are uncertain or distrustful. The German family institution is more similar to what we find in the other North European countries, so are even many features of the eating habits.

Perhaps surprisingly, we therefore find that countries where food quality and personal interrelations are most strongly emphasised are also the countries with generally the lowest levels of trust in food. Trust is here presented as a matter of food safety. But these low levels are reflected even when other food issues are brought up (Poppe and Kjaernes 2003).

In contrast to these countries with generally low levels of trust, Great Britain, Denmark and Norway stand out as having higher levels of trust in food. Interrelations and strategies that can be characterised as reflecting familiarity are considerably less important. Labour and responsibilities for food are to a much higher degree delegated to institutional actors, market actors and the state. The family is important as a social context for food preparation and eating, but perhaps less for keeping control over the food. Trust is therefore more widespread in countries where commodification and supermarketisation are most developed. These processes imply, on the one hand, increased standardisation, predictability and convenience. On the other hand, they represent a delegation of control over the food that seems to require trust in institutionalisation processes and institutional actors. It is not easy to say to what degree this high institutional trust is determined by a general cultural context of high trust in other people, and to the influence of food institutions performing well, respectively. Rapid change, such as in the cases of Great Britain and Italy, may indicate that performance is at least important when serious problems are to be handled. Within the much more quiet situation in for example Norway, the tolerance for failing expectations may be higher.

References
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Table 1: Percentage claiming that it is ‘very safe’ to eat … in the various countries. Weighted results. N:
Denmark (1001), W. Germany (1594), E. Germany (407), G.B. (1563), Italy (2006), Portugal (1001), Norway
(1004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>W. Germany</th>
<th>E. Germany</th>
<th>G.B.</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fre. fruit/ veg.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh tom.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canned tom.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic beef</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pork</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sausages</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low fat prod.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant m.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a) All twelve variables are dummies, coded 1 for ‘very safe’ and 0 otherwise (‘rather safe’, ‘not very safe’, ‘don’t know’). Cf. Q21 a) – l.

Table 2 Eating various food items ‘daily’ or ‘weekly’ (per cent) *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>West Germany</th>
<th>East Germany</th>
<th>GB</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh tomatoes</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canned tomatoes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef (roasts/steaks)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minced beef, products and dishes from that</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) ‘Don’t know’ has been excluded
Table 3 Important dimensions in the institutionalisation of consumption of beef and tomatoes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family organization</th>
<th>Meal patterns</th>
<th>Shopping practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denmark</strong></td>
<td>High beef/high process., moderate tomatoes. Few non-eaters One daily cooked meal Little eating out</td>
<td>Moderate beef/high proc. Moderate tomatoes/high proc. Few non-eaters One daily cooked meal Little eating out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norway</strong></td>
<td>Moderate beef/high proc. Moderate tomatoes/high proc. Few non-eaters One daily cooked meal Little eating out</td>
<td>Very high supermarket shopping Accessibility and price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Great Britain</strong></td>
<td>High beef/moderate proc. High tomatoes/high proc. One-two daily meals High eating out</td>
<td>High/moderate supermarket shopping Accessibility, quality and know the shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germany</strong></td>
<td>Moderate beef/high proc. Moderate tomatoes/low proc. One-two daily meals Moderate eating out</td>
<td>Low supermarket beef, low/moderate tomatoes Moderate on all strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Italy</strong></td>
<td>High beef/moderate proc. High tomatoes/high proc. Two daily cooked meals Moderate eating out</td>
<td>Low supermarket beef, moderate tomatoes Know staff, shop and origin of beef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portugal</strong></td>
<td>High beef/low proc. Moderate tomatoes/low proc. Two daily cooked meals High eating out</td>
<td>Very low supermarket beef, moderate tomatoes Know staff and origin of origin of beef</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 More seldom=more seldom+never+varies, and don’t know
Table 4 Shopping habits and strategies for beef, by country. Per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Denmark</th>
<th>GB</th>
<th>W Germany</th>
<th>E Germany</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Portugal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usually buying tomatoes in supermarkets x)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually buying beef in supermarkets x)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important that shop is accessible (beef) xx)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to know staff personally (beef) xx)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important know shop from previous experience (beef) xx)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important know origin of beef xx)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often pay more for good taste xxx)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x) Alternatives: supermarket, fruit and vegetable shop/butcher, another small shop, a food market, another way
xx) Alternatives: Important, matters a bit, unimportant, don’t know
xxx) Alternatives: Often, sometimes, seldom, don’t know

Figure 2. Imagine a scandal with salmonella in chicken; would the following actors tell the whole truth, parts of the truth or rather withhold information? Per cent who would hold information back, added for all actors.