

# Contents

<i>List of Tables</i>	viii
<i>List of Figures</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	x
<b>1 Introduction: Problematizing Trust in Food</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Food on the agenda as an issue of consumer trust	1
1.2 How can we understand consumer distrust in food?	4
1.3 Different ways of understanding what 'a consumer' is	9
1.4 Trust as social and relational	11
1.5 Outlining the structure of the book	16
<b>2 Trust and Food Consumption: Theoretical Approaches</b>	<b>18</b>
2.1 Cognitive trust: Individuals and the role of information	19
2.2 Distrust in risk society: A question of uncertainty?	21
2.3 Trust as social	23
2.4 The institutionalization of food consumption: Habits and routines	25
2.5 Trust and institutional performance	27
2.6 Institutionalized relationships of trust	29
2.7 Determinants of trust in institutionalized arrangements	34
2.8 Forms of institutionalization and forms of trust in contemporary food markets	37
<b>3 Enquiring into Trust: Some Methodological Considerations</b>	<b>41</b>
3.1 The project	42
3.2 The nature of the comparative institutional method	47

3.3	The quantitative survey empirical approach	54
3.4	Conclusion	56
<b>4</b>	<b>Variations in Popular Trust</b>	<b>57</b>
4.1	Public opinion on trust in food	57
4.2	Indicators of trust in food	58
<b>5</b>	<b>Culture and Performance: Trust in Meat</b>	<b>78</b>
5.1	The politics of meat consumption	78
5.2	The analysis of dimensions of trust in meat	80
5.3	Cultural influences on trust in meat	83
5.4	The effects of institutional performance	86
5.5	Concluding remarks	89
<b>6</b>	<b>Mobilizations of the Consumer</b>	<b>93</b>
6.1	Introduction	93
6.2	Locating the consumer	94
6.3	Shopping strategies	99
6.4	Mobilizations of the consumer	102
6.5	Consumer organizations	104
6.6	Consumer activism and perceptions of responsibility	105
6.7.	Active individuals	107
6.8	The voice of individuals	108
6.9	Eating, purchasing and protesting: The limits of consumer power	111
6.10	Conclusion	115
<b>7</b>	<b>Buying into Food</b>	<b>118</b>
7.1	Variation in the institutionalization of consumption	121
7.2	Variation in provisioning systems	130
7.3	Putting the relationship back together	138
<b>8</b>	<b>The State and Triangular Affairs of Trust</b>	<b>142</b>
8.1	Introduction	142
8.2	Variations in state regulatory relationships	144
8.3	Regulatory reforms	151
8.4	Regulation and trust: Comparing national configurations	155

<b>9</b>	<b>Conditions for Trust in Food</b>	<b>163</b>
9.1	Complex relationships, emergent trust and distrust	163
9.2	Institutionalization and societal configurations	166
9.3	Public opinion and trust	169
9.4	Institutionalization of distrust	171
9.5	Trust and distrust and their types	177
9.6	Configurations and combinations of trust	181
<b>10</b>	<b>Explaining Trust in Food</b>	<b>185</b>
10.1	Food nations	185
10.2	Limitations of individualist and risk perspectives	188
10.3	Towards a socio-institutional explanation	191
10.4	Establishing and restoring confidence	198
	<i>Notes</i>	203
	<i>Bibliography</i>	210
	<i>Index</i>	221

# 1

## Introduction: Problematizing Trust in Food

### 1.1 Food on the agenda as an issue of consumer trust

Consumer distrust in food has emerged as a pressing issue on the political agenda over the last decade or so. Many have tried to understand this, employing a variety of approaches and explanations, most of them concentrating on what is happening to consumers. But if you look at pan-European public opinion-poll data, there are systematic variations in levels of trust which cannot be attributed either to universal distrust among consumers, or to their inability to understand or evaluate risk. We have to look elsewhere than individualistic explanations. There is obviously something distinctive about each country; but it cannot be some sort of national character, since levels of trust also vary significantly over time. So it has to be something in the way each country or region has dealt with food issues and crises, and the way their governments, markets in food, and so on are organized. This is our main interest in this book. What is it in our modes of food consumption and their social and institutional environment that sustains trust in food in contemporary Europe? What is it that nurtures scepticism and distrust among food consumers and provokes intermittent crises? To answer these questions, the book will present a study of opinions, organizational structures and strategies in six European countries, based on an extensive research project conducted between 2002 and 2004.

People have been eating, digesting, delicately tasting, cooking, fashioning, needing, desiring, being disgusted by, stealing and buying food through history, but only recently have we been trusting – or distrusting – food, or at least so it is often observed. Is there something new about food in the 1990s that has resulted in its emergence as an object to be trusted or distrusted? There have certainly been fairly major historical

changes and the late twentieth century has been blessed with new vocabularies of good and evil: junk food (dangerous food), unnatural (GM) and hyper-natural (organic) food, fast and slow food, and food dedicated to healthy eating. Food has, of course, gone through many historical transformations, but the recent past has certainly witnessed the highlighting of new sensibilities and moralities.

Major technological changes in the way food is produced, transported, prepared, packaged and sold have also resulted in totally new journeys from farm to plate. Many of the activities previously undertaken in the home – like chopping vegetables, washing salads, preparing ready to serve meals – have increasingly been shifted into new commercial processes. Although there has been a long history of the rise of the supermarket, the all-embracing one-stop shop has increasingly heralded the end of the daily shopping round of baker, butcher, grocer and market stall. Across Europe, the pattern has been uneven, but the progress seems relentless. The big brand manufacturers that had become the family favourites of the mid-twentieth century – from Kellogg's to Heinz, Nescafe to Coca Cola – have been knocked off their pedestals by the supermarkets' own-brand labelled produce. Increasingly, food does not come from farmers and markets, but via integrated supply chains. As a result of global sourcing, food has almost ceased to be seasonal (you *can* have fresh strawberries in mid-winter), and instantly transported exotic fruits and vegetables from across the world have rapidly become commonplace, compared with the torrid and tortuous centuries it took the potato or tomato to become accepted as normal to European palates.

And food is probably more regulated now than it has been throughout history. There are labels with long lists of ingredients and additives; There are trading rules on a global scale that define what is safe to eat, sounding like a twentieth-century food Inquisition: the *Codex Alimentarius*. There are global rules, European rules and national rules, in various states of harmony and disharmony. Traceability and control at every point of the food process has become mandatory, but it is difficult to cope with disparate food systems across the world, or with ingredients sliding beneath easy detection. Policing of food has become increasingly complex, and food is governed differently, subject to new political accountability, with shifting responsibilities between farmers, retailers, distributors and manufacturers.

Last, but not least, consumers and patterns of food consumption have changed dramatically over recent decades. The death of the family meal has been widely declared and bemoaned, replaced by micro-waved instant meals for whoever wants what when. Lunch-breaks and mid-day

meals being replaced by sandwiches make their supply the fastest growing business area in UK food production in the 1990s. 'Grazing' and snacking, TV dinners, eating out displacing eating in, all suggest the emergence of new social habits embedded in different lifestyles.

Then, on top of, or perhaps arising out of, these changes, there have been major food scandals and scares – which is where trust and distrust have been seen to arise. Not all of these are of the same kind, and indeed different scandals highlight different dimensions of trust. Some relate to food quality, as when hydrolysed protein masks exactly what meat consumers are being sold. Others, like *E. coli* and salmonella outbreaks, are a consequence of contamination and inadequate hygiene regimes which become much more urgent with the escalation of size and distance. Yet, the dioxin scandal and the contaminated olive oil scandal were strictly 'national', the former specific to Belgium and the latter to Spain. The GM controversies have raised issues ranging from environmental damage by genetic pollution to the implications for human health, but with uneven reactions in different European countries. The introduction of the euro had possibly its most conspicuous impact on everyday purchases, above all of food, rather than purchases of large consumer durables. Being associated with accusations of unfounded and unfair increases in food prices, it constituted an economic 'scandal', affecting many European countries. Outbreaks of foot and mouth disease or swine-fever, and equally the controversial and distressing ways of suppressing them, make especially manifest the consequences of carnivorous consumption, modern intensified farming and the spread of disease through international channels of transporting and rearing animals.

And, most notorious of all, BSE was exemplary of a scandal that combined many different features: a scientific scare in industrial farming revealed by the little-understood prion; catastrophic consequences for neo-liberal market deregulation; and political failures in scandal management. Lack of confidence in beef, the sales of which instantly plummeted, was seamlessly intertwined with distrust in politicians and their expert advisors because government was seen to have concealed for a considerable length of time scientific advice which would have required difficult – and economically costly – intervention. In the context of the integrated market the first response of several governments was to seek to ban imports of British beef. In the face of unilateral trade bans, EU officials felt compelled to act to impose a more consistent resolution, initially to prohibit British exports. It was a rapidly internationalized crisis, becoming an issue that seriously challenged European and other

national regulatory institutions as well as those of world trade. Moreover, it was a particularly contagious scandal which proved difficult to close down or contain. Hence, these different scandals expose different dimensions of trust in food – safety, nutrition, economic value, quality, and environmental and animal welfare ethics. We can also add a social and political dimension, appearing, for example, as boycotts of food coming from particular companies or countries.

Yet we might pause to wonder whether, however spectacular and consequential the BSE episode may have been, it deserves so prominent a role in understanding public anxieties. It had some distinctive features, but it was far from unprecedented. Food has always been contentious (Argenbright, 1993; Burnett, 1989; Helstosky, 2004; Levenstein, 1988; Smart, 1986; Thompson, 1971; Tilly, 1975; Wong, 1983) – not surprisingly, given its importance to life, health and well-being – but the grounds for contention alter in gravity with the passage of time. As Europe modernized the security of food supply, the price of food, its purity and its cleanliness, its composition and its provenance were issues which successively exercised public concern, requiring state intervention to maintain social order, challenge fraud, and to define and police standards of hygiene and authenticity. If we look at the historical record, these issues arise at different times, with different degrees of strength and at different stages of social and economic development.

What we have presented here are the types of questions and issues from which we started in setting out to do our study. If the conflicts are not new, the contemporary issues still seem to have some distinct characteristics. In particular, they seem to be framed as a question of ‘consumer distrust’. This expression has become part of contemporary political discourse and of our everyday language. However, because the trust/distrust dichotomy is so commonly used and because it is so politicized, we first need to take a closer look at what we mean by these terms. This will then allow us to present our questions and to outline our ideas about how we can analyse the contemporary dynamics of trust and distrust in relation to food consumption.

## **1.2 How can we understand consumer distrust in food?**

A British consumer will ‘trust’ her local butcher or the advice given on food labels, but have little ‘confidence’ in the safety of irradiation processes. A German will have ‘*Vertrauen*’ in other persons and in institutions. But there is a stronger word, ‘*Sicherheit*’, which has many

aspects, like certainty, being safe and feeling safe. Similar distinctions are found in Scandinavia. In Danish, trust will be translated into *'tillid'*, a state of trusting something or someone. But in relation to food, Danes often use *'sikkerhed'* – feeling secure and *'tryghed'* – feeling safe. In Norwegian, the idea of *'trygghet'* is widely used and strongly politicized, encompassing this feeling of safety and protection as well as the provision of trustworthiness by institutional actors. Less often used in relation to food is *'tillit'*, which is more relational, to trust someone. The German proverb *'Vertrauen ist gut, Sicherheit noch besser'*, translated by Seligman into 'trust is good, confidence is better', may in Norwegian (and Danish) be *'tillit er bra, men trygghet er bedre'*. The Latin languages don't have this distinction between trust and confidence – or rather, a generalized idea of confidence does not seem to be conceptualized in the same way as in Northern Europe. *'Fiducia'* covers the first, more or less, but *'confidenza'* has a different meaning, overlapping with 'familiarity', indicating something that is more limited, perhaps even confidential. The literal translation of the German proverb does result in an acceptable meaning if *'Sicherheit'* becomes *'esser sicuri'*. Instead, *'Fidarsi e'bene, non fidarsi e'meglio'* – 'trust is good, mistrust is better' – seems to catch the Italian sentiment better. Similarly, in Portuguese trust is translated into *'confiança'*, but then indicating something a bit different, namely a personal belief, a conviction or familiarity. From the word *'confiar'* comes *'fiar'*: *'Não é pessoa em quem podemos fiar-nos'* – 'he is not a man to be trusted'. A notion of confidence/*Sicherheit* seems to be missing even in the Portuguese language (Salvatore and Sassatelli, 2004).

Already we see here that trust is multi-faceted and that it may mean different things in various countries. Many more expressions could be added, each with a distinct meaning in various languages. Perhaps food is a special domain, because conceptualizations of trust so often are intermixed with issues of food safety and security. However, the importance of trust is not at all restricted to food. On the contrary, trust has been emphasized as a key phenomenon in modern societies, ensuring social coherence and collective commitment, allowing cooperation, and making everyday practices possible in a very complex and ever-changing world (Barber, 1983; Luhmann, 1979; Miształ, 1995; Pharr and Putnam, 2000; Seligman, 1997). In many situations that we encounter trust stands as a very flexible alternative to direct control – or to the exercise of power and coercion. For example, people will much more willingly pay their taxes, a basic element of functioning welfare societies, if they trust their fellow citizens to contribute their due share and trust the state authorities to use them as promised. Contracts cannot

control and predict every detail in cooperation between and with business corporations, trust makes it easier. When people put their health and their lives in the hands of medical institutions, it is very burdensome and scary to do so without believing that the hospital, with its doctors and nurses, equipment and medication, will do its best to give proper treatment. Perhaps less personal, it is risky to board an airplane. We have to trust that the airline, the pilots, the control tower and the mechanics all have sufficient competence, resources and commitment to bring us safely down to earth again. All of these arenas are dominated by big, complex and quite abstract institutions, where personal contacts represent, at best, a very partial substitute. We have to trust the whole institution (or even system) as such.

Still, food seems also to contain special qualities and challenges. Food is necessary on a daily basis, a diet is a very complex matter and the relevant dimensions are multiple. And it is truly integrated in the complex and dynamic structures of modern societies. There has been considerable academic interest in people's worries about food, very often framed recently as a question of dealing with risks, usually concerning health and environmental hazards. Two – very different – approaches seem to have been the most influential.

First, there is a large volume of research within the framework of 'risk perception' (Frewer, Scholderer and Bredahl, 2003; Hansen et al., 2003; Poortinga and Pidgeon, 2005; Renn and Rohrmann, 2000; Slovic, 1999). Risk perception refers to cognitive, psychological processes of understanding and probability assessment. Differences between 'lay' and 'expert' views have been at the focus of attention, with the sub-text that the laity is either ignorant or irrational. With a cognitive frame of reference, information and communication play a key role. People's worries emerge from information they receive about problems, for example media scares. Correct and understandable information is necessary as an input to establish a more realistic perception of risk and thus reduce worries. Trust in the informant and the ability to distinguish between trustworthy and non-trustworthy information are therefore important. The 'risk communication' literature does increasingly recognize that the social and cultural context for what people think ought to be considered. Distrust is a problem for risk communicators if it interferes with the message and general aims. One problem is the misconceptions that can lead people to worry too much or make the wrong decisions. They may, for example, stop buying a food item because of the health risk, even though the calculated probability of being harmed is extremely low. One example is the Alar scare, others are BSE and GM. Increasingly,

however, risk communication research seems to link to research on risk regulation, thus focusing more on institutional characteristics (Ballantine, 2003; Leach, Scoones and Wynne, 2005; Löfstedt, 2004). It is recognized that consensual models based on implicit, non-participatory and non-contingent forms of trust are no longer working. The notion of 'critical trust' has appeared, indicating that trust and scepticism may coexist (Poortinga and Pidgeon, 2004). Critical citizens indicate more engaged people, which may be a good thing and increase trust. But participation and institutional transparency may be ambiguous in terms of building trust. So also are initiatives to increase institutional independence, for such strategies may also nurture uncertainty and distrust. Yet, is all of this only about communication and media scares? Increasing institutional distrust is recognized, but the major structural changes and conflicts over food that we have described are rarely touched upon. Are there any links between institutional change and trust? And how can we understand variations in trust?

The second dominant perspective starts with the notion that we all now live in a 'risk society', introducing a macro-level and more critical approach to the question of risks, where it is exactly the questions about causes which are discussed (Beck, 1992, 1999; Beck, Bonss and Lau, 2003; Beck, Giddens and Lash, 1994). The emergence of a risk society signifies a transition from the primacy of conflicts over the distribution of material goods and values to contestation over the distribution of risks. Risk society is associated with, among other things, the development of new technologies, globalization processes, and new divisions of labour and responsibility. In this view, 'risks' entail mainly health and environmental hazards. Modern risks typically arise from unintended side-effects of ordinary economic and social processes and call into existence a distinctly new form of reflexivity and contingency. These risks are difficult to detect and measure, the effects may be very long term, and they are not limited to a particular space or social group. The politicization of side-effects leads to crises of legitimacy, as for example with BSE. The role of science and experts becomes more crucial and more contested. Responsibility for managing risks is increasingly accorded to the individual. 'Uncertainty' is a reflection of the conflicts that these processes raise for the individual. Distrust seen as an outcome of increasing reflexivity and uncertainty has formed the background for discussions on food, risk and trust (Almås, 1999; Brown and Michael, 2002; Michelsen, 2001). It is not difficult to see that aspects of this general description fit well for the food sector. However, is contemporary distrust in food a matter of individual uncertainty as a consequence of

reflexive modernization? That would imply that we will find the same tendencies everywhere, variations perhaps depending mainly on individual resources to handle the new responsibilities and the uncertainty. Is that the case? What about the conditional nature of trust?

It is evident that 'trust' is a problematic concept with a number of different connotations. Several questions emerge where established approaches seem to be insufficient to understand and explain the current situation:

- Is trust in food only a question of safety (and environmental hazards), what about other aspects of food?
- Are individual perceptions, decisions and strategies the most central issues?
- Is trust in experts and science the key? Or the authorities? What about market actors? Are there distinctions according to roles and expectations?
- What about the conditionality of trust? How is trust affected by what other actors do?
- What in modern societies 'creates' trust in food? Is it the same in all countries, for example throughout Europe?

These questions form the background for the study of social and institutional conditions for consumer trust in food presented in this book. Our aim is to explore consumer distrust in food and the importance that this issue has had in Europe over the last couple of decades. Trust is usually recorded through public opinion surveys. Such surveys can reveal, for example, variations between individuals and social groups and across countries. However, we explore consumer trust in food as something more, or different from, individual risk perception or uncertainty. As a critique of individualistic approaches, we see trust as a property of the collective organization of social relations, as part of processes of institutionalization. 'Institutionalization' is thus a key concept in our analysis, indicating not only the establishment of formal organizations, like companies, legal or contractual rules, and the setting-up of food agencies, but also of stable informal entities like households and organized interaction, like shopping, meals and citizen relationships to the state. Institutionalization provides organizational and normative frameworks that in most cases are seen as taken for granted, 'normal' procedures which strongly influence what we do as consumers and the expectations that we have. Institutions provide us, as

researchers, with a macro-level, panoramic vantage point from which to account for the regularities of collective conduct.

In trying to understand current issues of trust in food, we therefore consider expressions of public opinion as only part of the story. We also need to look at other actors who are involved, and in particular those interacting directly and having the power to influence conditions. Through studies of institutional actors, like market actors, authorities and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), we directed attention towards the interrelations between those actors and the consuming public. In the process, we studied structural arrangements as well as various key actors' understanding of food issues and trust, including food authorities, farmers, processors, retailers, food experts, the media and consumer organizations. In order to enable us to identify critical elements and issues, we compared six European countries: Denmark, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Norway and Portugal. An important point in our analysis is how institutional actors relate to, and interrelate with, ordinary people as consumers, individually and collectively. In trying to understand consumer trust and distrust, what exactly is meant by the word 'consumer' becomes crucial.

### **1.3 Different ways of understanding what 'a consumer' is**

For most of human history, the main problem of food has been one of obtaining sufficient food for the population. During and after the Second World War, for example, this remained the principal consideration. In the face of real or potential shortages, governments encouraged the mass production of food because it promised a secure and regular supply in sufficient quantity. Distribution of enough food at acceptable prices was the foundation of production-oriented agricultural policies throughout Europe. Safety was an issue between state authorities and producers, so consumers did not have to bother their heads about it. Overall there was little controversy and Europe witnessed scarcely any collective action over food. The threat to social order posed by public reaction to shortages of food or to its hazardous composition disappeared. Nutrition re-emerged as an explicit problem in the 1980s as, thereafter, did matters associated with the industrial manufacture and preservation of foods. At the same time, partly driven by New Right doctrines of economic liberalization, attention became directed towards consumers and consumer choice. The previously almost automatic preference given to the interests of producers began to be questioned, and

the interests of 'the consumer' found a place in the discourse of the food system.

Perceptions of food as problematic in the current period are profoundly influenced by notions of 'the consumer'. There is nothing new about food being exchanged through markets, though there has probably never been a period in Europe when a larger proportion of the food consumed has been commercially provisioned. However, it is not accidental that references to 'consumer' society, or 'consumer' culture, are increasingly common ways to capture in a word the distinctiveness of the contemporary period. Consumption and consumers are central topics. People are addressed as consumers, and come to think of themselves, in some situations, as consumers. Many people develop what Bauman (1988) called 'the consumer attitude'; they expect their wishes to be made real and all their pressing problems to be resolved by purchasing remedies through markets. Their expectations come to be conditioned by the sense of rights afforded by the role of consumer.

The current dominant understanding of the term 'the consumer' derives from neoclassical economics (Gagnier, 2000; Winch, 2006). It characterizes the consumer as sovereign; its theory of demand posits autonomous individuals choosing items in accordance with a preference schedule that reflects personal utility. This notion has played a theoretical role in estimating the value of exchange in economics; but as a comprehensive basis for understanding *social* processes of consumption, it is obviously wanting. Indeed, for the purposes of our argument, it is important to recognize that there is a different, and older, genealogical root for the term 'consumption', which emerged from Latin into early English and meant 'to destroy, to waste, to use up', a sense long predating the neutral sense developed in the eighteenth century to describe market relationships – whence the distinguishing of consumer from producer and, analogously, consumption from production. The more recent meaning signalled greater interest in the changing values of items in exchange, rather than the purposes to which goods and services might be put. These two meanings have existed in tension ever since, even though it is the consumer as purchaser (or, more broadly, as a 'chooser') rather than as user which currently predominates (Bennett et al., 2005, 58). With little interest in what commodities are used for, economics offers no account of why people choose the items they do, because the explanation from utility is formal rather than substantive. Nevertheless, the concept of the consumer has achieved wider and wider circulation in recent years. It has been extended to describe and prescribe an orientation to action which extends far beyond the purview

of individual choice in market situations. Most obviously, citizens have been encouraged to approach the state and its provision of public goods from the point of view of the consumer role. The social construction of the character of the consumer, and the extension of the terrain upon which (consumer) the attitude is deemed appropriate, is a major impetus and a fundamental backdrop to understanding crises of trust in food.

Much that happened in the field of food in Europe could be read as the consequence of a more demanding consumer. Key actors – the European Union, national politicians, corporations and mass media – increasingly frequently and explicitly attended to consumers and their putative interests. A series of movements and campaigns gave a new political gloss to concerns of consumption in general and food consumption in particular – global anti-capitalism, Fair Trade, opposition to GMOs, the Slow Food Movement, observing ‘no-shopping’ day and concern with food miles come to mind (Micheletti, Follesdal and Stolle, 2003; Miele and Murdoch, 2002; Sassatelli and Scott, 2001). American contributions like those from Marion Nestle (2002) and Naomi Klein (2000) have received considerable attention as a reference point for mobilization. These are new forms of activism, though they may still be less widely supported than the primarily instrumentalist and practical consumer associations, like the British Consumers’ Association, the Norwegian Consumer Council and the Italian Altroconsumo (Cohen, 2003; Hilton, 2004). But whether wider publicity implies greater power is disputable. After considering the question in the context of the institutionalization of consumption, a somewhat unorthodox approach, we argue that populations exert influence to some degree because of publicity accorded to consumer interest, but that this is not indicative of a transfer of power sufficient in itself to command major changes in the organization of food supply.

#### 1.4 Trust as social and relational

Trust is subject to much philosophical dispute. Following from the questions that we posed and the problematization of ‘the consumer’ and consumer choice, we will explore trust not only as social (i.e., not a matter of individual psychology), but also as relational. This means that instead of trying to contextualize individual opinions of trust, we study trust and distrust as emergent properties of on-going relationships between social actors. For example, in the case of food, the relations that people have *vis-à-vis* a producer or a retailer will be different from those they have towards government bodies. Mostly people want access to

food which is safe, nutritious, gives fair value for money, is consistent, tasty and so on. Trust could be seen as an expectation, a practical confidence, that other relevant actors in the food system will behave in such a way as to ensure that some or all of these objectives are met. The main point is that it is *actors* who can be trusted or mistrusted. Trust is thus a strand, or a dimension, of a relationship between actors. Trust depends on who they are, what they do, and the interaction involved.

In order to undertake a comparative institutional analysis of trust and distrust in food that takes account of complex interrelations, we maintain that it is best to examine the trust relationships between the key actors or agents involved within given food systems. We consider three sets of actors particularly important because they are directly involved – market actors who supply food, state agents responsible for regulation and governance, and consumers and their representatives. Above all, it is the extent to which consumers find these various actors trustworthy which concerns us. These are, theoretically, the key institutional formations from which public trust in food emanates.

In part, the question of trust in food is one of the divisions of responsibilities over food and its provisioning. If the matter was to be left to households and markets alone, trust would be a matter between buyers and sellers, and the responsibilities of the consumer would be those of the utility-maximizing individual; ranking issues of safety, price, aesthetic quality, nutritional value in relation to different food items in an economist's calculus of preference. The contentious debate over school meals in the United Kingdom represents a recent example in an age-old history of controversy over the consequences of the market provision of food. Another example is the long-standing question of obligatory versus voluntary nutrition labelling. As in other major areas of consumption – transport or health care, for example – there have been many more political and academic debates over the respective role of state and market in provisioning. Food being an 'essential' item, states have long assumed the responsibility for regulating its production, marketing and consumption. In the contemporary period, a range of issues has emerged beyond those of food safety and price, to include various aspects of quality, health claims, and claims as to origin, like those concerning champagne or different kinds of cheese. Labelling of food has become a focus of regulatory activity: how much information, and of what kind, should be displayed about a given food item. Esping-Andersen's (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism* is typical of a vision in which the relative balance between public or private provisioning and of goods and services, commodification and de-commodification, privatization and

nationalization, have positioned state and market as essentially antagonistic forces, often sustained by contrary ideological perspectives and political strategies. What is interesting about the issues raised by trust in food is that it slices this question of the relationship between state and market in quite a different way. It is widely taken for granted that there should be a governmental role in the regulation of food markets, and that the provision of food cannot be left to the market alone. But equally, it is clear that the complexity and scale of contemporary food provisioning requires that food suppliers and retailers assume major, publicly accountable responsibilities for standards of trading, and that these cannot be left to the forces of market competition. For example, a radical down-loading of risk to the consumer by removing a safety floor, and giving the consumer the right to choose between price and safety usually appears as very problematic; like selling cheap eggs that have to be thoroughly cooked because they may contain salmonella. With the extension and globalization of markets, it is also evident that what were previously national regulatory systems have had to change accordingly. The need to consider food safety when the GATT agreement was extended to agricultural products is a prominent example (Micklitz, 1992; Vogel and Kagan, 2002).

Comparing different countries, however, raises the question of whether the division of responsibilities for key aspects of food (safety, quality, nutritional value, economic value, environmental and animal welfare) is the same in all of them, and if not, as seems likely, how do they vary? So the question 'what sustains trust in food?' led us to investigate just what differences there may be in the relationships and responsibilities between state and market actors, and how much and what kind of responsibilities are assumed by consumers in different countries. How does the model of a market-oriented Anglo-Saxon political economy versus a continental European social state play out in this respect? What about the Scandinavian welfare state solutions? Moreover, given the integration of a European market and the Common Agricultural Policy, how does a new layer of supra-national regulation and governance impact on different national state – market relationships? This in turn led us to explore how the division of responsibility was expressed in the institutions of the state itself. For example, how is a consumer voice represented, if at all? Is control over issues of food practised in a 'productionist' manner, within ministries of agriculture and fisheries? Or does it lie in the ministries of health? Or are consumer matters instead handled as part of trade policy? Or, indeed, is it divided between all three? And what is the significance of the emergence of new,

more autonomous agencies across Europe, such as the European Food Safety Authority? We explore variations in terms of the different divisions of responsibility, but also in terms of governmental efficiency, transparency and accountability – broadly, modes of governance – as they vary from country to country.

The same kinds of issue apply equally to market provisioners and consumers. Any tourist knowledge of food provisioning in different countries – experiences of buying food, or eating out – gives hints of major differences in the roles of street markets, farmers' markets, processed and branded food, and retailers, both small and large. Going into these differences in greater depth, we aim to examine how the market provisioners, especially farmers, processors and retailers, are organized and institutionalized differently across Europe. Whether responsibilities are or are not divided makes a difference. A retailer can be responsible for, and organize, the whole food chain from wherever in the world food comes. In other cases, a farmer sells food to a wholesaler, who sells it on to a processor or retailer, who then sells on to the final consumer, where there is no overall responsibility assumed by any one of these actors. We explore this kind of variation.

If we consider these two aspects of the division of responsibility and governance together, we can see how the complex relationships between state regulation and market responsibility are differently institutionalized in different countries. Some economic sociologists have chosen to call this the 'embeddedness of markets', stressing how markets operate within different societal frameworks. We prefer to emphasize both the ways in which different provisioning systems are organized as interdependent markets and the ways in which these articulate with the state – which itself, of course, is organized in different ways in respect to the division of responsibilities between different state agencies and modes of governance.

Since our main concern is to explore the issue of consumer distrust, consumers constitute the third major type of actor in our analysis. Above we discussed how the notions of 'consumption' and 'consumers' may be problematized. In order to be able to include consumers in our comparative, macro-level analysis of trust in actors, it has been crucial that we deliberately and explicitly break with the tradition of analysing consumers as individuals and consumption as a matter of (individual) consumer choice. Instead, consumption is seen as the outcome of processes of institutionalization, including several sets of everyday practices, such as cooking and eating, buying food, reading about food, and more. Similarly, consumers are seen as actors with reference to a

complex bundle of roles, such as being a carer, a customer, a citizen. Such practices and roles will vary. And, as one element affecting this, we know, for example, that the institution of the family and the gender division of labour is quite different throughout Europe and has also changed considerably in recent years.

We have suggested that the state, market provisioners and consumers may be differently institutionalized in different countries. When we talk of the institutional basis for trust in food, therefore, we consider that the core of any explanation requires an analysis of the relationships between these three 'poles', a triad of relationships, or what we name 'triangular affairs'. All three poles may vary from country to country, but to understand trust, we need to understand the relationships between them: between consumers as purchasers of food and food provisioners; between consumers or citizens and those responsible for the regulation and governance of food provisioning in the state; and, finally, between market provisioners and state authorities. We do not wish to argue that this is the basis for a complete or closed explanation. Any brief consideration of the food scandals that have shaken trust in food across Europe in recent years provides evidence for many other influences, notably the role of the media, science and technology, international trade and competition, to name but the most obvious. But we will argue that this triangle of three poles is central to any plausible explanation, if only because these food scandals have critically upset the 'good relationships' between them. The trust crises were not restricted to a relationship between consumers and provisioners. The BSE crisis, as analysed in our different countries in this book, and the respective roles and responses of state and market actors, suggest that trust is tri-polar, that trust in food rapidly became an issue of trust in public authorities, including public scientists, regulators, and most certainly politicians. Because the different countries have developed each of the three types of institutions along historically different trajectories, and because the origins and impacts of different crises or scandals have been so uneven across Europe, we believe that this 'deep institutional' account is well placed to understand the huge variation in food experience within Europe and the emergence of distrust in food as a late twentieth-century phenomenon.

To summarize, to see trust as social and relational means that we should seek to understand the dynamics of 'who trusts whom in regard to what'. By this expression we do not want to indicate that we are looking at rational decision-making processes. We are looking first of all for aggregate effects in terms of variations in institutionalization processes. Seeing distribution of responsibilities as a central issue, both in respect

to states and markets and in respect to private and public spheres, we concentrate on macro-level interrelations between three poles: the provisioning system, the regulatory system and consumers. We use both survey and institutional data as inputs to this analysis. In doing this, we see consumers and consumption in a particular way, where ‘the institutionalization of consumption’ is a key concept, a concept that directs attention towards distinctive patterns of how consumption is organized and normatively founded.

### **1.5 Outlining the structure of the book**

As already noted, trust is a tricky, multi-dimensional concept. We therefore start our analysis by giving some attention, in Chapter 2, to theoretical understandings of ‘trust’, and of ‘consumer trust’ more specifically. We also give some consideration to what trust in food might imply. We review the relevant debates and indicate where our own study fits. After outlining our conceptual orientation, we discuss in Chapter 3 the implications of our approach for the design of the study, presenting briefly the methodologies for data collection and the empirical analyses. Thereafter, we present and discuss a large body of empirical findings. In Chapter 4 we give an overview of the large and consistent variations in public opinion observed in the survey in relation to trust in food across Europe. The survey data also form the basis for a more extensive analysis of factors that affect trust in food items presented in Chapter 5, focusing particularly on beef as a central and contentious issue in debates over trust in food in recent years. This analysis provides an even stronger indication that institutional and structural explanations are needed to understand variations and changes in trust in food. As a first step towards this, we take a closer look in Chapter 6 at what the survey revealed about the consumer. The roles of citizen, active consumer and the market consumer are explored, the evidence pointing even more strongly towards national and societal differences between consumers in different countries.

This leads us directly to the institutional perspective, introducing a new range of empirical data concerning how consumers in their food related practices, provisioning systems in their delivery of food to the consumer, and states and governments in their regulation of food matters, differ from country to country. This argument is built in two steps. First, we look at the relationship between consumers and provisioners, on the grounds that in all modern societies, the main channel for food provisioning is exchange between market providers and households.

We find that there are systematic differences in how households are organized in their consumption of food, but also that provisioning systems, people buy their food which determine how, vary from country to country (Chapter 7). We find, though, that the relationship between societal consumers and national provisioning systems is insufficient to account for the differences in levels of trust discerned in the survey. Hence, in Chapter 8 we bring the state and regulation into the picture, showing that here, too, there are significant differences in the ways that states operate with respect to market actors, and also in how consumers are engaged in, or represented by, state regulatory systems. We conclude this stage of the argument by constructing ‘triangular affairs of trust’, between consumers, market actors and the state.

Having completed our main empirical analysis, we then reflect on what this means for our understanding of trust as an emergent aspect of social relationships, returning to questions raised earlier. We consider what the nature of the changing social basis of trust might be, following the major scandals certainly, but also following the longer-term shifts in the nature of the food we eat, how we behave as consumers, and the effects of ‘modernization’ and the increasing dominance of supermarkets (Chapter 9). We emphasize the significance and, indeed, positive role of distrust, and how distrust may be institutionalized in different countries. This completes the journey so that, finally, in Chapter 10, we give an overview of both the major surprises and the most significant outcomes of our research, and how these have changed our views of what constitutes ‘trust in food’.

# Index

- active trust, 33, 179
- actors
  - categories, 43
  - power of, 171
  - relationships between, 44–5
  - and trust, 12, 29–30, 42–3, 71–5, 143–4, 181–4
  - see also* institutional actors
- additives, 172
- agencification, 176, 201
- Agency for Food Safety and Quality (AQSA), Portugal, 153, 161
- agents *see* actors
- Aldi, 134, 135
- Asda, 133
- Auchan, 135
- authorities (public food), 68–71, 73, 76, 175–6
  - see also* institutional actors
- Bauman, Z., 10
- Beck, Ulrich, 21–2
- beef
  - consumption, 123–4
  - demand for, 78–9
  - food safety, 61–4, 185
  - organic, 61–4, 80
  - shopping habits, 99–102, 127
  - trust in, 80, 178–80
  - see also* meat
- Belgium, 3
- Bijlsma-Frankema, K., 177
- Boltanski, L., 51
- box schemes, 110
- Britain *see* United Kingdom
- BSE (bovine spongiform encephalopathy)
  - dimensions of trust, 3–4
  - fall in demand for beef, 79
  - reflection of trust configuration, 46
  - regulatory changes resulting from, 150–5
  - societal event, 194–5
  - state response, 146, 149
  - and trust, 165, 167, 170
- burgers, 46–7, 61–4, 80, 186
- Carrefour, 135
- case-oriented research, 49–50
- CATI (Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviews), 54
- chicken, 61–4, 79, 80
  - see also* meat
- Christian Democratic Union, 134
- Cirio, 161, 208
- civic ethos, 112–15
- Codex Alimentarius, 2
- cognitive process, 19–21, 26
- Cohen, L., 96–7, 182
- Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), 13, 135, 136, 145, 146, 154, 185
- concealment, 168
- confidence
  - in institutions, 31, 35, 39
  - national expressions of, 4–5
  - in own food, 85–6, 88
  - restoring, 198–202
  - type of trust, 177–8, 199
- consumer organizations, 68–71, 72, 76, 104–5, 108–11
  - see also* institutional actors
- consumers
  - economic perspective, 25, 93–4
  - and food provisioners, 118, 138–41, 156–62
  - institutionalization of, 120–30, 187
  - perceptions of change, 111–15
  - political action, 93–4, 102–3, 105–11, 115–17
  - responsibilities, 106–7
  - role of, 11, 94–9, 172–4, 201
  - sociologists' perspective, 25
  - as stakeholders, 176
  - and the state, 143–4, 148, 150, 151–5, 156–62

- consumers – *continued*  
     trust relationships, 45, 118–19  
     *see also* triangular affairs of trust  
 consumption patterns, 2–3  
 control, and trust, 29–34  
 Coop Danmark, 134  
 Coop-Italia, 135  
 Co-op Norge, 133  
 Costa, A.C., 177  
 country of residence *see* national differences  
 crises, 45–7, 165, 170–1, 194–5  
     *see also* BSE (bovine spongiform encephalopathy)  
 critical trust, 7  
 cuisine, 122–4  
 cultural influences, 81–2, 83–6, 89–92, 197  
 cultural theories of trust, 25–7, 79  
  
 Dansk Supermarked, 134  
 deception, 168  
 deficit model, 19, 21  
 Denmark  
     activism, 107–8  
     consumer confidence, 116  
     consumer organizations, 104  
     consumers' perception of change, 113–15  
     consumers' responsibilities, 106–7  
     consumer voice, 108–11, 153  
     degree of trust, 58, 186  
     evaluation of food trends, 65–8, 84, 87–9  
     expressions of trust, 5  
     food provisioning, 132–8  
     food safety, 60–4  
     institutionalization of  
         consumption, 123–30  
     institutional responsiveness, 165  
     market exchange relationships, 139  
     meat, 78–9, 80–6, 90, 91, 92  
     PDO/PGI protected products, 146  
     regulation of food, 188  
     shopping habits, 100–1  
     triangular affairs of trust, 158, 160  
     trust in institutional actors, 72–5, 144, 182, 184  
     truth-telling by institutional actors, 68–71, 84, 87–9  
  
 Department of Health, UK, 151  
 dioxin scandal, Belgium, 3  
 distribution systems, 203  
 distrust  
     and consumer reassurance, 38  
     crises and, 45–7, 165  
     and familiarity, 199–200  
     institutionalization of, 33–4, 40, 48, 171–7  
     triangular affairs of trust, 161, 196–7  
     types, 177–81, 190–1  
 division of responsibility, 13–14, 48, 148, 192–4  
 domestic organization, 125–6  
  
 East Germany  
     activism, 107–8  
     evaluation of food trends, 65–8, 84, 87–9  
     food provisioning, 132–8  
     food safety, 62, 64  
     institutionalization of  
         consumption, 123–30  
     meat, 80–6, 90, 91  
     shopping habits, 100–1  
     trust in institutional actors, 72–5  
     truth-telling by institutional actors, 68–71, 84, 87–9  
     *see also* Germany; West Germany  
 eating habits, 122–4  
 E. coli, 3  
 economic action, by consumers, 93–9  
 Edeka, 135  
 eggs, 61–4  
 Elster, J., 23  
 environmental organizations, 104  
 Esping-Andersen, G., 12  
 euro, 3, 146  
 Eurobarometer surveys, 63, 70, 76  
 European Food Regulation, 149  
 European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), 150, 153, 187  
 European Study of the Social and Institutional Conditions for the Production of Trust ('the project'), 42–56, 58–9  
 European Union (EU)  
     consumer role, 95, 103  
     reassurance, 173–4, 175

- European Union – *continued*  
 regulation of food, 145, 149, 150,  
 153, 169, 187  
 single market, 185  
 expectations, 25–7, 164–7, 177, 193,  
 194–6, 200  
 expenditure on food, 124–5  
 experts, 68–71, 72, 76, 189–90  
*see also* institutional actors
- Fair Trade, 98  
 familiarity, 34, 39, 177–8, 184, 198–9  
 farmers  
 markets, 35, 108, 110, 181, 184  
 national importance, 134, 135, 136  
 political influence, 147  
 power of, 134  
 responsibilities, 106  
 trust in, 67, 73–4, 76  
 truth-telling, 68–71  
*see also* institutional actors
- Federal Agency for Consumer  
 Protection and Food Safety (BfR),  
 Germany, 153
- Federal Ministry for Consumer  
 Protection, Nutrition and  
 Agriculture, Germany, 153
- fish, 123, 133, 136
- food, 1–4, 111–15, 122–4
- food provisioners  
 behaviour, 120  
 and consumers, 118, 138–41,  
 156–62  
 shopping habits, 127–30  
 and the state, 143–4, 148, 149–50,  
 151–5, 156–62  
 variation in, 130–8  
*see also* triangular affairs of trust
- food safety  
 consumers' views, 59–65, 67,  
 112–14, 137  
 and distrust, 190–1  
 meaning of, 42  
 and power, 193  
 state responsibility, 146–7, 153–4
- Food Safety Act (1990), 151
- Food Standards Agency (FSA), 150–1,  
 152, 160, 165, 187
- food trends, consumer evaluation,  
 65–8, 82–3, 84, 87–9
- free markets, 168–9
- fresh foods, 63, 77
- fruits, 61–4
- GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs  
 and Trade), 13
- gender gap, 126–7
- General Directorate for Health and  
 Consumer Protection (DG Sanco),  
 153, 187
- geographic scale of food provisioning,  
 132, 133–8
- German Farmers Association (DBV),  
 134
- Germany  
 consumer confidence, 116  
 consumer organizations, 104  
 consumers' perception of change,  
 113–15  
 consumer voice, 108–11  
 degree of trust, 58, 171, 180, 186, 196  
 expressions of trust, 4–5  
 food provisioning system, 187  
 food safety, 60–4  
 institutionalization of  
 consumption, 123–30  
 institutional responsiveness, 165–6  
 market exchange relationships, 139,  
 140  
 meat, 78  
 PDO/PGI protected products, 146  
 regulation of food, 153, 154–5, 188  
 triangular affairs of trust, 158,  
 161–2  
 trust in institutional actors, 75–6,  
 77, 183, 184  
*see also* East Germany; West  
 Germany
- Giddens, A., 32, 33, 178, 179
- Gilde, 131
- globalization of food provisioning,  
 132
- GM (Genetically Modified) food, 3, 32
- Goldthorpe, John, 50
- governance, 12, 14, 28, 151, 176, 201
- government *see* state
- 'grammars of trust', 51
- 'grammars of worth', 51
- Great Britain *see* United Kingdom
- Guseva, A., 177

- habits, 25–7, 124  
 Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP), 167, 176  
 healthy eating, 106–7  
 Hirschman, A.O., 180  
 household composition, 125–6  
 household prepared food, 63–4, 77  
 hydrolysed protein, 3
- ICA (Ahold), 133  
 ignorance, and trust, 21–3  
 independence (trust strategy), 175–6  
 independent agencies, 175–6  
 individualization, 22, 32–3  
 industry, 68–71, 73–4, 76, 106, 131, 133–4  
   *see also* institutional actors  
 information, role of, 6–7  
 institutional actors, 9, 68–75, 81–2, 86–92  
   *see also* actors  
 institutionalization  
   change in, 164–5  
   concept of, 8–9, 48  
   consumers, 105–11, 115–17, 187  
   of consumption, 48, 120, 121–30  
   of distrust, 33–4, 40, 48, 171–7, 201  
   forms of, 37–40  
   and routines, 25–7  
   of trust, 24–5, 29–40, 197–8  
 institutional performance, 27–9  
 integration of food provisioning, 131–2, 133–8, 148, 149–50  
 inter-personal trust, 81–2, 83–5, 90
- Italy  
   activism, 107–8  
   consumer confidence, 116  
   consumer organizations, 105  
   consumers' perception of change, 113–15  
   consumers' responsibilities, 106–7  
   consumer voice, 108–11  
   degree of trust, 58, 169, 171, 179–80, 186, 196–7, 198  
   evaluation of food trends, 65–8, 84, 87–9  
   expressions of trust, 5  
   food provisioning, 132–8, 187  
   food safety, 60–4, 191
- institutionalization of  
   consumption, 123–30  
 institutional responsiveness, 165  
 market exchange relationships, 139, 141  
 meat, 78, 80–6, 90, 91  
 PDO/PGI protected products, 146  
 regionalism, 192  
 regulation of food, 154–5, 167, 188  
 shopping habits, 100–1  
 triangular affairs of trust, 159, 161, 164  
 trust in institutional actors, 72–5, 182–3, 184  
 truth-telling by institutional actors, 68–71, 84, 87–9
- Jerónimo Martins, 136  
 'junk' food, 2, 172
- Kjaernes, U., 47, 54, 81  
 Klein, Naomi, 11
- labelling, 176–7  
 legitimacy, 33–4, 176  
 Lidl, 135  
 low-fat products, 61–4  
 loyalty, 180  
 Luhmann, N., 24, 31, 33, 34, 177
- Majone, G., 176  
 market actors *see* provisioners of food  
 market exchange, 29–34, 94  
 Maurice, M., 53  
 meat, 61–4, 77, 78–9, 80–3, 123  
   *see also* beef  
 media, 68–71, 72  
   *see also* institutional actors  
 methodology of research, 47–56, 58–9  
 microwave ovens, 124–5  
 Ministry for Family and Consumer Affairs, Denmark, 153  
 Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF), UK, 151  
 Ministry of Agriculture, Norway, 154  
 Ministry of Family and Consumer Affairs, Denmark, 160  
 Mishler, W., 27  
 Misztal, B., 27

- Modelo Continente, 135–6
- national differences  
 configurations of trust, 181–4  
 institutionalization of  
 consumption, 121–30  
 relationships between actors, 43–5  
 significance, 115, 117  
 trust in food, 4–5, 185–8  
 units of analysis, 191–2
- Nestlé, 131
- Nestle, Marion, 11
- networks, 34–7
- New Right, 95
- non-governmental audit bodies, 176, 201
- Norgesgruppen, 133
- norms, 23–7, 164–7, 177, 193, 194–6, 200
- Norway  
 activism, 107–8  
 consumer confidence, 116, 201  
 consumer organizations, 104, 105, 109  
 consumers' perception of change, 113–15  
 consumers' responsibilities, 106–7  
 consumer voice, 108–11  
 degree of trust, 58, 171, 178–80, 186, 196  
 evaluation of food trends, 65–8, 84, 87–9  
 expressions of trust, 5  
 food provisioning, 131, 132–8, 187  
 food safety, 60–4  
 institutionalization of  
 consumption, 123–30  
 institutional responsiveness, 165  
 market exchange relationships, 139, 140, 141  
 meat, 78, 80–6, 90–1  
 regulation of food, 153–4, 188  
 shopping habits, 100–1  
 triangular affairs of trust, 157, 160, 161, 162, 164  
 trust in institutional actors, 72–5, 144, 171, 181–2, 184  
 truth-telling by institutional actors, 68–71, 84, 87–9
- nutrition, 67, 112–14, 172, 194
- obesity, 146, 172, 194
- olive oil contamination, Spain, 3
- opinion, characterizing, 52
- 'orders of worth' analysis, 49
- organic food  
 alternative strategies, 108, 110, 181, 184, 199  
 beef, 61–4, 80  
 European standards, 146  
 new developments, 2  
 promotion of, 137–8  
 standards, 132
- organizational networks, 35–7
- Parmalat, 161, 208
- PDO (protected designation of origin), 145–6, 169, 207
- performance-oriented theories of trust, 27–9, 79
- performance-related factors for trust, 89–92
- personal networks, 34–5
- PGI (protected geographical indications), 145–6, 169, 207
- political action, by consumers, 93–9, 102–3, 105–11, 112–14
- politicians, 68–71, 72, 143–4  
*see also* institutional actors; state
- Poppe, C., 47, 54, 81
- pork, 61–4, 80  
*see also* meat
- Portugal  
 activism, 107–8  
 consumer confidence, 116  
 consumer organizations, 105  
 consumers' perception of change, 113–15  
 consumers' responsibilities, 106–7  
 consumer voice, 108–11  
 degree of trust, 58, 169, 171, 178–80, 186  
 evaluation of food trends, 65–8, 84, 87–9  
 expressions of trust, 5  
 food provisioning, 132–8, 187  
 food safety, 60–4, 191

- Portugal – *continued*  
 institutionalization of  
   consumption, 123–30  
 institutional responsiveness, 165  
 market exchange relationships, 139,  
 140, 141  
 meat, 78–9, 80–6, 90, 91  
 PDO/PGI protected products, 146  
 regulation of food, 153, 155, 161,  
 167, 188  
 shopping habits, 100–1  
 triangular affairs of trust, 159, 161,  
 164  
 trust in institutional actors, 72–5,  
 183, 184  
 truth-telling by institutional actors,  
 68–71, 84, 87–9  
 poultry, 61–4, 79, 80  
   *see also* meat  
 power, of actors, 131, 133–8, 171  
 prices, 66, 112–14  
 processed foods, 63, 77  
 producers, 68–71, 73–4, 76, 106, 131,  
 133–4  
   *see also* institutional actors  
 protest, 171–3, 174  
 provisioners of food  
   behaviour, 120  
   and consumers, 118, 138–41,  
   156–62  
   shopping habits, 127–30  
   and the state, 143–4, 148, 149–50,  
   151–5, 156–62  
   variation in, 130–8  
   *see also* triangular affairs of trust  
 Public Guardianship Offices (PGOs),  
 169  
 public opinion, 57–8, 169–71  
 Putnam, R.D., 24
- Qualitative Comparative Analysis  
 (QCA), 49–50  
 quality, 66–7, 145–6, 148, 176–7  
 questionnaire format, 58–9
- Ragin, C., 49–50, 51–2  
 ready prepared food, 124–5  
 reaffirmation, 199–200  
 realignment, 200–2
- reassurance, 173–7, 183–4, 200  
 regionalism, 154–5  
 regulation  
   European Union (EU), 145, 149,  
   150, 153, 169, 187  
   growth of, 2  
   and independence (trust strategy),  
   175–6  
   institutional, 165  
   jurisdictional areas, 43  
   by the state, 144–7, 150–5, 160,  
   161, 165, 167, 188  
   and trust, 167–8  
 relationships, 164–8, 196–8  
   *see also* triangular affairs of trust  
 reputation, 31  
 responsibility, division of, 13–14, 48,  
 148, 192–4  
 restaurant food, 61–4, 77, 123, 126,  
 186  
 retailers, 131, 133, 137, 149  
   *see also* supermarkets  
 Rewe, 135  
 risk assessment, 21  
 risk communication, 6–7, 20–1  
 risk perception, 6–7, 19–21, 189–90  
 risk society, 7–8, 21–2, 39  
 Rona-Tas, A., 177  
 Rose, R., 27  
 routines, 25–7
- safety, of food  
   consensus within the market, 137  
   consumers' perception of change,  
   112–14  
   and distrust, 190–1  
   evaluation of food trends, 67  
   issues of, 42  
   and power, 193  
   research results, 59–65  
   state responsibility, 146–7, 153–4  
 Sainsbury's, 133  
 salmonella, 3  
 sausages, 61–4, 80  
   *see also* meat  
 scandals *see* crises  
 scepticism, 21, 28, 36  
 school dinners, 12  
 Seligman, A.B., 30–1, 33, 177–8

- shopping habits, 99–102, 112–14, 126–9
- Short Food Supply Chains (SFSCs), 132
- Slow Food Movement, 11, 35, 43, 105
- social activities, 23–5
- social relationships, 128
- social responsibility for food, 48
- 'societal effect' analysis, 49, 51
- societal relationships, 191–8
- society, profiling, 52–3
- socio-demographic characteristics, 112–15
- socio-institutional explanations of trust, 191–8
- Sorge, A., 53
- Spain, 3
- Standa, 141
- state
  - and consumers, 143–4, 148, 150, 151–5, 156–62
  - organization, 147–9
  - and provisioners of food, 148, 149–50, 151–5, 156–62
  - regulation of food, 144–7, 150–5, 160, 161, 165, 167, 188
  - role of, 106, 142
  - trust in, 143–4, 160
  - see also* triangular affairs of trust
- supermarkets
  - consumers' relationships with, 118
  - national differences, 135, 137, 187
  - own label produce, 133
  - power of, 131, 133, 136, 137, 149
  - trust in, 73–4, 76, 160
  - truth-telling, 68–71
  - see also* institutional actors
- taste, 66–7, 112–14
- technological changes, 2
- Tesco, 133
- Theien, I., 104
- Thévenot, L., 51
- Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism, The* (Esping-Andersen), 12
- Tine, 131
- tomatoes, 61–4, 99–101, 123–4, 127
- traditional food, 195
- transparency (trust strategy), 176–7, 201
- triangular affairs of trust
  - configuration, 166–9, 196–8
  - construction of, 156–62
  - degree of trust, 163–6
  - description, 15, 118–19
  - state role, 142–4
- trust
  - and actors, 12, 29–30, 42–3, 71–5, 143–4, 181–4
  - analytical approach, 11–16
  - and cognition, 19–21
  - concept of, 8
  - and consumer relationships, 118–19, 163
  - and control, 29–34
  - and familiarity, 199–200
  - forms of, 37–40
  - and ignorance, 21–3
  - indicators of, 58–9
  - and institutionalization, 24–5, 29–40, 197–8
  - and institutional performance, 27–9
  - manipulation of, 174–7
  - national differences, 4–5, 75–7, 181–4, 185–8
  - national expressions of, 4–5
  - and public opinion, 57–8, 169–71
  - and regulation, 167–8
  - and relationships, 164–8
  - and risk perception, 19–21
  - and routines, 27
  - and social activities, 23–5
  - socio-institutional explanations, 191–8
  - types, 177–81
  - and uncertainty, 21–3
- trust in food project, 42–56, 58–9
- truth-telling
  - by institutional actors, 68–71, 82–3, 143–4
  - meat, 83, 87–9
  - and trust, 71–5, 162
- uncertainty, and trust, 21–3
- Unilever, 131
- United Kingdom
  - activism, 107–8
  - concealment by authorities, 168
  - consumer confidence, 117, 201

United Kingdom – *continued*

- consumer organizations, 104, 105
- consumers' perception of change, 113–15
- consumers' responsibilities, 106–7
- consumer voice, 108–11
- degree of trust, 58, 179–80, 185–6, 196
- evaluation of food trends, 65–8, 84, 87–9
- expressions of trust, 4
- food provisioning, 131, 132–8, 187
- food safety, 60–4
- institutionalization of
  - consumption, 123–30
- institutional responsiveness, 165
- market exchange relationships, 139, 140
- meat, 78, 80–6, 91
- PDO/PGI protected products, 146
- regulation of food, 150–2, 160, 165, 167, 187
- school dinners, 12
- shopping habits, 100–1
- state authority, 154
- triangular affairs of trust, 157, 160, 162, 164
- trust in institutional actors, 72–7, 170, 171, 182, 184

- truth-telling by institutional actors, 68–71, 84, 87–9

## United Kingdom Competition Commission, 137

## United States (US), 95, 96–7

## vegetables, 61–4, 77, 123

## vocabularies of food, 2

## Wal-Mart, 133

## West Germany

## activism, 107–8

## consumers' responsibilities, 106–7

## evaluation of food trends, 65–8, 84, 87–9

## food provisioning, 132–8

## food safety, 62, 64

## institutionalization of

## consumption, 123–30

## meat, 80–6, 91

## shopping habits, 100–1

## trust in institutional actors, 72–5

## truth-telling by institutional actors, 68–71, 84, 87–9

*see also* East Germany; Germany

## World Bank, 95

## World Trade Organization (WTO), 95, 145, 185

## World Value Survey, 81

## Wynne, B., 21