Manuscript Number: APPETITE-D-16-00649R1

Title: Consumers' perceptions of food risks: A snapshot of the Italian Triveneto area

Article Type: Full length Article

Keywords: risk perception; food risk; food quality; focus groups; risk communication; public knowledge

Corresponding Author: Dr. Barbara Tiozzo,

Corresponding Author's Institution: Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale delle Venezie

First Author: Barbara Tiozzo

Order of Authors: Barbara Tiozzo; Silvia Mari; Mirko Ruzza; Stefania Crovato; Licia Ravarotto

Abstract: This study investigated the food risk perceptions of people living in the Triveneto area (Northeast Italy), a territory characterized by a particular interest in the production of quality foodstuffs, to determine what aspects people associate with food risk and to understand what beliefs underlie these perceptions.

Four focus groups were conducted in the major towns of the target area (N = 45). A semi-structured interview was used that focused on beliefs about food risks, the use of information and media sources in relation to food risk, and the behaviours adopted when eating outside the home.

A homogeneous view of food risk emerged among the respondents, and a common definition of risky food was identified. The concept of risk was in opposition to the quality and controllability of food, which emerged as major strategies to cope with food risks. Quality was linked to freshness and local origin, whereas controllability reflected a direct (e.g., checking labels, having a relationship with the vendor, cultivating one's own vegetable garden) or indirect (e.g., control guarantees provided by suppliers and the government) means to check the safety and quality of food. Although people seemed quite informed about food risks, a common sense of impotence with regard to one's own protection prevailed, together with a fatalistic sense of incomplete control over risk.

The results identified food concerns for consumers living in this specific territory and might represent a starting point for public health authorities to increase compliance with responsible behaviours for risk mitigation and to define successful food policies for this area.

Consumers' perceptions of food risks: A snapshot of the Italian Triveneto area

Abstract

This study investigated the food risk perceptions of people living in the Triveneto area (Northeast Italy), a territory characterized by a particular interest in the production of quality foodstuffs, to determine what aspects people associate with food risk and to understand what beliefs underlie these perceptions.

Four focus groups were conducted in the major towns of the target area ($N = 45$). A semi-structured interview was used that focused on beliefs about food risks, the use of information and media sources in relation to food risk, and the behaviours adopted when eating outside the home.

A homogeneous view of food risk emerged among the respondents, and a common definition of risky food was identified. The concept of risk was in opposition to the quality and controllability of food, which emerged as major strategies to cope with food risks. Quality was linked to freshness and local origin, whereas controllability reflected a direct (e.g., checking labels, having a relationship with the vendor, cultivating one's own vegetable garden) or indirect (e.g., control guarantees provided by suppliers and the government) means to check the safety and quality of food. Although people seemed quite informed about food risks, a common sense of impotence with regard to one's own protection prevailed, together with a fatalistic sense of incomplete control over risk.

The results identified food concerns for consumers living in this specific territory and might represent a starting point for public health authorities to increase compliance with responsible behaviours for risk mitigation and to define successful food policies for this area.

Keywords: risk perception; food risk; food quality; focus groups; risk communication; public knowledge

1. Introduction

Promoting public health and food safety requires not only full commitment and attention to activities related to infectious disease control and risk evaluation and management but also listening and communicating with citizens (Wilcock, Pun, Khanona, & Aung, 2004) as part of a wider risk governance strategy (Dreyer & Renn, 2014).

It is widely recognized that concerns about food safety have increased in the last decade, together with recurrent demands for transparency and information (Grunert, 2002; Papadopoulos et al., 2012). In particular, rapid changes to the agro-food system, new or changed lifestyles for many

groups of people and repeated occurrences of food crises (e.g., avian influenza, *E.coli* epidemics, BSE) have deeply affected the relationships between consumers and food and between consumers and the public health agencies that are delegated with guaranteeing food safety (Cope et al., 2010; Holm & Kildevang, 1996; Kjaernes, Harvey & Warde, 2007; Scholliers, 2008).

In response, national and international organizations have launched a variety of public initiatives and communication campaigns to provide adequate answers for consumers and to encourage responsible food habits and behaviours to reduce unjustified alarmism and provide consumers with concrete risk mitigation strategies (Infanti et al., 2013; Sixsmith, Doyle, D'Eath, Barry, 2014; Tiozzo et al., 2011).

The effectiveness of food and health policies in terms of risk prevention is closely linked to the success of these communication interventions (McCarthy & Brennan, 2009; van Dijk, Houghton, van Kleef, van der Lans, Rowe, & Frewer, 2008). Therefore, to design tailored risk/benefit communication campaigns, it is crucial to investigate how people perceive and manage food risks (Honkanen & Frewer, 2009; McCarthy et al., 2007; Wilcock et al., 2004).

1.1.Food risk perception and communication

Food risks are of great concern for consumers, who face daily food choices and must cope with possible hazards. Scholars use the term “food risks” to refer to hazards from food of microbiological (e.g., foodborne diseases), chemical (e.g., pesticides and contaminants) or nutritional (e.g., obesity and cardiovascular diseases) origin (Buzby, 2001). Both microbiological and chemical risks derive from industrial production and domestic practices, such as agricultural practices, the transport and processing of food, food storage and food consumption (Mol & Bulkeley, 2002).

As noted by Miles et al. (2004), “associated attitudes towards a particular hazard are driven more by psychologically determined risk perceptions than the technical risk estimates provided by experts” (p. 9). Public concern about food-related risks is mainly associated with chemicals, pesticides and other substances (European Commission, 2010), whereas experts judge microbiological hazards to be the main risk to health from food (Miles et al., 2004). Moreover, experts estimate that there is still a considerable burden of foodborne illness (Havelaar et al., 2010). In recent years, microbiological contaminations and foodborne infections (e.g. *salmonellosis*, *campylobacteriosis*) have increased significantly (Brennan, Mc Carthy & Ritson, 2007; EFSA-ECDC, 2015; Redmond & Griffith, 2003). These infections are mainly acquired through the ingestion of contaminated food of animal origin, direct contact with infected animals, cross-contamination, environmental sources or person-to-person transmission (Losasso et al., 2012).

A number of studies have highlighted the diffusion of food pathogens in foodstuffs prepared at home (Byrd-Bredbenner, Scaffner & Maurer Abbot, 2010; Milton & Mullan, 2010; Redmond & Griffith, 2003). Particularly in the domestic environment, incorrect beliefs about food storage, handling and preparation can expose consumers to the risk of foodborne diseases (Mari, Tiozzo, Capozza & Ravarotto, 2012; Taché & Carpentier, 2014). However, safety measures taken by consumers have been shown to play a critical role in the prevention of foodborne infections. Therefore, the dissemination of tailored communication materials is crucial to improve food safety management at home. To succeed in increasing knowledge about correct food-handling practices, communication materials should be designed according to the target's beliefs, perceptions and attitudes about these risks. In addition, the socio-cultural context and the geographic territory should be regarded as factors that might influence personal strategies to mitigate risks (Lundgren, 1994; Lupton, 2003). Approaches to food risk management that do not specifically consider public and stakeholders' views have been shown to be inefficient in a number of high-profile cases (Shepherd, 2008).

1.2. Food safety in Italy: the Triveneto area

National food security policies must consider consumers' expectations and concerns about how food is produced and processed as well as its origin and impact on the environment and society (Brunori, Malandrin, & Rossi, 2013). A number of studies have demonstrated that differences in food consumption are also related to territorial aspects (Pieniak, Verbeke, Vanhonacker, Guerrero & Hersleth, 2009).

Italy has usually been portrayed as a country with a strong and internationally recognized food culture, and the prominent role of the agro-food sector in the national economy and culture is well acknowledged (Ferretti & Magaudo, 2006). As reported by Casini, Contini, Marone and Romano (2013), any geographic area is generally characterized by different traditions and different lifestyles. This is particularly true for the target territory of the current study, the Triveneto area¹. This area has been renowned for its strong agricultural tradition, its wine and food sectors, and a substantial production of typical foods (i.e., products with high cultural and gastronomic value produced according to local and historical traditions) (Banca d'Italia, 2011; Banca d'Italia, 2015; Centro Studi Unioncamere Friuli Venezia Giulia, 2015; Gallenti, 2014; Regione del Veneto, 2015). Moreover, the Triveneto area is characterized by a growing interest in the sale and consumption of traditional products, especially raw pork such as salami and 'sopresse', which are manufactured

¹ The Triveneto area refers to a geographic area situated in Northeast Italy. It is composed of the Veneto, Friuli Venezia Giulia and Trentino-Alto Adige (autonomous provinces of Trento and Bolzano) regions.

without starter cultures and ripened in a non-standardized environment. Because foodborne outbreaks can be associated to the consumption of such foodstuffs, the local government has recently implemented a simplified procedure to sell small quantities of those products directly from the producer to the consumer (Roccato et al., 2017). In this way, the safeguarding of both food quality and the need for cultural identity (Demos & Pi, 2009) are combined with respect to food safety standards (De Cesare, Mioni & Manfreda, 2007; Roccato et al., 2015).

Despite the acknowledged quality of the local gastronomic products, Italians generally do not trust the food they eat. A recent Italian survey (Accredia, 2013) found that 74% of the respondents were concerned about food risks. In particular, respondents' feelings of anxiety and insecurity were mainly due to the mass media's depictions of risky food. These data have also been confirmed at the local level with specific reference to the Italian Triveneto area. In 2014, Demos and Pi found that three out of four people (74%) living in this area were very or somewhat concerned about food safety and food risks. In addition, the degree of this concern has increased in the last few years compared to previous surveys (Demos & Pi, 2009).

Based on these considerations, it is important to gain deeper knowledge of how people living in the Triveneto area cope with food risks and what characterizes their perceptions. To the best of our knowledge, there is little literature on consumer perceptions of food risks in this area. Arzenton, Neresini and Ravarotto (2005) conducted a preliminary analysis that aimed to identify the most important factors that contribute to social perceptions of food risk for people living in the Veneto region. The findings revealed that consumers living in the Veneto region seemed to have adopted two specific strategies to restore trust in their food: purchases of local products and a propensity towards natural foods that are self-cultivated.

1.3.Aims of the study

The present study aimed to investigate how people living in the Triveneto area perceive and manage food-related risks to gain a deeper understanding of what they consider safe or risky foodstuffs and what strategies they adopt to cope with these risks. By means of exploratory focus groups, we investigated attitudes and beliefs towards food risks with reference to eating both at home and outside the home. Consumers' opinions about the role of media sources in delivering information about food risks were also explored to understand what information sources lay people trust and use for their informational needs about food risks.

This research extended the exploratory study conducted in the Veneto region by Arzenton et al. (2005) to the Friuli Venezia Giulia and Trentino-Alto Adige regions to obtain a snapshot of food risk perceptions throughout the Triveneto area.

Because the institute that conducted the research is based in Triveneto and is mandated with the task of protecting consumers' health by ensuring food safety, the results were intended to provide local public health authorities with useful input to inform and plan food risk communication and policies. This aim responds to the need to consider the actual concerns of the public because societal priorities for risk mitigation activities may not align with those identified by expert groups (Frewer, 2004).

2. Method

2.1. Participants and procedure

Given the study's purpose, a qualitative research approach was used that was based on focus groups. This method is centred on group interaction. It encourages participants to respond to and question one another under the supervision of a moderator (Greenbaum, 1998; Morgan & Krueger, 1993). The aim of this procedure is to reveal the opinions, attitudes, and experiences of the people involved in the discussion. Focus groups are useful for assessing how opinions converge or diverge within a particular group and the reasons why this is the case.

Four focus groups were conducted in 2008 in four different towns in the Triveneto area: Bolzano and Trento (Trentino-Alto Adige Region) and Pordenone and Udine (Friuli Venezia Giulia Region). These towns were selected because they are among the most important in the target territory, and they host peripheral diagnostic laboratories of the research institution that supported the study.

Trained personnel working at the research institution who commissioned the study recruited participants on the basis of specific demographic variables: gender, age, level of education and family composition. Most importantly, the personnel were asked not to involve relatives, friends or expert people (e.g., people working in the field of food safety) to avoid significantly biasing the discussion. Another selection criterion for participants was being the main person responsible for food choices, purchases and preparation in their families because the eating habits of those who buy and prepare food may influence the eating habits of the entire household (Furst, Connors, Bisogni, Sobal, & Falk, 1996; Monsivais, Aggarwal & Drewnowski, 2014).

A total of 45 adults (10 males and 35 females) voluntarily took part in the focus groups. The sample composition is detailed in Tables 1 to 4. Four different age classes were considered (under 30 years old; 31-45; 46-59; 60 and over) to obtain views and reports rooted in different generational groups. Elderly individuals were also enrolled, not only due to their active role in food purchasing and preparation in developed countries but also for their major vulnerability to foodborne diseases and nutrition-related health problems (Gettings & Kiernan, 2001; Havelaar et al., 2010; Losasso et al.,

2012). Participants with young or grown children were included as well (Table 3) because a family context in which children are present has been found to determine food habits (Casini et al., 2013). The participants were not known or well known to one another. All the focus groups took place in the evening; the participants were informed about the scope of the study and were asked to provide their written informed consent to participate and to be audio and video recorded. No specific ethical approval was required because the study presented no more than minimal risk of harm to the participants. The sessions lasted approximately 90 to 120 minutes, including an introduction and an opportunity for the participants to ask questions at the end of the discussion. A note-taker was also present during each focus group. The participants received a recipe book as a reward for their cooperation.

2.2. Interview guide

We used an improved version of the semi-structured interview used by Arzenton et al. (2005), which was developed in accordance with established guidelines (Krueger, 2000) and following an in-depth review of the literature concerning food risk perceptions and communication (Cope, Frewer, Renn & Dreyer, 2010; Parra, Kim, Shapiro, Gravani & Bradley, 2014; Shapiro, Porticella, Jiang & Gravani, 2011; Tiozzo et al., 2011). The interview guide (see Appendix 1 for details) contained a series of open-ended questions that covered the following topics:

1. General beliefs about food risks (risk meaning and coping strategies);
2. Criteria for purchasing safe food (purchases points and motivational choices);
3. Beliefs about eating outside the home (safer places and foods);
4. Seeking information about food risk (preferred information and suggestions).

The participants were then given the opportunity to provide final remarks.

2.3. Data analysis

All focus group discussions were subsequently integrally transcribed. The full transcripts were used as an input for the application of inductive thematic analysis (Boyatzis, 1998; Braun & Clarke, 2006), which involves searching a data set for repeated patterns of meaning. Thematic analysis, as noted by Braun and Clarke (2006), is a method that presents several advantages: it is very flexible, and it can highlight similarities and differences across the data set and lead to unanticipated insights. Moreover, it is useful to summarize the key features of a large body of data and to produce qualitative analyses suited to informing policy development. We followed all the phases described by Braun and Clarke (2006): after transcription, we repeatedly read the text to familiarize ourselves with it, and we created an initial coding system in a systematic fashion.

Subsequently, we looked for overarching themes. Our attention was focused towards a broader level of analysis by sorting the different codes into potential themes and collating all the relevant data. Finally, we reviewed and named the identified themes (see Table 5). The analysis was performed by two scholars in the research group who consulted with a third scholar as an auditor during meetings that allowed debate. The results are presented by reporting the recurrent themes that emerged and following the thematic sessions of the interview guide.

3. Results

Table 5 presents the major findings that emerged from the focus group discussions. Each topic of discussion has been divided into categories according to the main themes that arose from the discussions.

3.1. General beliefs about food risk

Most of the participants responded similarly to the question that asked them to name specific risky foods. The following specific categories were indicated:

- Fresh foods (i.e., those that can rapidly deteriorate), such as vegetables and fruits, and foods that are cultivated or bred far from where they were produced, such as meat or fish;
- Eggs;
- Foods containing chemicals (preservatives, additives, antibiotics, animal hormones and food colouring);
- Industrial sweet snacks;
- Fried foods;
- Frozen foods;
- Convenience foods (e.g., Russian salad);
- Foreign foodstuffs.

Discussions among the participants revealed that food risks are generally associated with specific attributes of food that serve as quality warranties: freshness, naturalness and local provenance. The expiry date and food conservation and manipulation were the topics that the interviewees mainly associated with the concept of “food risk”. The participants had concerns related to these aspects because in their opinion, expired, deteriorated or poorly preserved foods can damage health.

The interviewees showed a preference for buying fresh foodstuffs, although fresh foodstuffs such as meat, fish, and fruits and vegetables require major attention from consumers, especially with regard

237 to choosing the supplier. The respondents reported that the product origin was a key factor and that
238 they preferred Italian foods.

239
240 'I am careful and I always ensure that the food is Italian, where it is manufactured.
241 Offers obviously interest me. However, if it has been packed two days before, I do
242 not buy it for sure. Then, the colour, I pay attention to the colour of food. Finally,
243 I also consider the feeling that the food is conveying. After years of shopping, one
244 is surely able to tell whether the stuff is fresh' (woman, 37 years).

245
246 Little attention was given by the participants to organic and genetically modified (GM) foods,
247 which occasionally were spontaneously mentioned by the interviewees. For these foods, the
248 interviewees' opinions were more varied and mostly divergent.

249 250 *3.2. Criteria for purchasing safe food*

251 The discussions revealed that people pay particular attention to the choice of the point of
252 purchase. On the one hand, purchasing at large retail chains is generally perceived to be safe
253 because of the numerous controls required by law with which retailers must abide.

254
255 'I am convinced that large retailers are more controlled because the employees are
256 diverse. Those who work as a butcher or who prepare food are not also the cashier
257 who is at the same time touching the money' (woman, 54 years).

258
259 On the other hand, the possibility of directly interacting with the dealer in case of dissatisfaction or
260 particular doubts about a foodstuff is of great help in choosing and buying foods that are perceived
261 to be safer and healthier. Indeed, whenever possible, people prefer to buy in smaller shops or to buy
262 directly from small producers, who can offer more safety guarantees and convey a sense of trust and
263 authenticity in the product in addition to reduced cost.

264
265 'I think that in a small retail store, one you trust, a certain amount of responsibility
266 can be found, whereas at a large supermarket, things are more depersonalized and
267 there are more products with a lower level of quality. Hardly ever can you
268 question the vendor about the quality of a foodstuff at a large retail store. On the
269 contrary, you can do that at a small retail shop' (man, 44 years).

270
271 Meat is purchased both at the supermarket and at butchers' shops, whereas fish is mainly purchased
272 at local markets. People buy and consume both red and white meat, whereas purchases of fish are
273 less diversified. Large-size fish, farm animals and fish slices are generally avoided as they are
274 considered the most dangerous. Fruits and vegetables are preferably bought from a farmer or at the
275 grocery store and only in season.

276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285

‘There are small farmers who sell the products grown in their fields. I trust them because I think that they do not even know what pesticides are. In fact, it is not so much beautiful stuff, the food they sell’ (woman, 56 years).

However, the interviewees stated that their choice of foodstuffs and the point of purchase largely depended on the amount of time that they had at their disposal. As the time devoted to food purchases has decreased, people (especially those who work) often tend to opt for frozen products, notwithstanding their low level of confidence in them, as a temporary solution linked to the comfort and speed of preparation of such foods.

The focus groups also revealed that many people have the opportunity to grow their own vegetable gardens and consume this produce. The interviewees generally agreed that home-cultivated products are perceived to be safer as their growth is entirely managed by the interviewees themselves or other family members who are directly responsible for their quality and safety.

‘My husband has been cultivating his own vegetable garden for three years, and now I can tell the difference in the taste of the things you eat’ (women, over 65 years old).

With regard to price, a correlation was perceived between high product cost and high quality. In fact, the majority of the respondents declared that they preferred to buy products linked to well-known brands that, although more expensive, are considered to be subject to more controls and thus safer.

‘It is better to try to spend a little more and buy a brand and, as a result, a quality product. Maybe I am wrong, but I think [*brand name*] is more controlled. I prefer drowning in rough seas and take the brand items; at least I know that they undergo rigorous controls because these big companies cannot risk losing face in the market, right?’ (woman, 45 years).

Additionally, a non-varied diet, which is considered risky, could result when people spend little on food.

3.3. Beliefs about eating outside the home

The participants were asked to report which foods they usually did not order when eating out and why. The discussions mainly focused on eating out for business, leisure and when abroad. Hygiene conditions were one of the criteria to which people referred when choosing where to go out to eat.

Overall, the participants noted that they paid particular attention to the consumption of foods prepared by third parties. In particular, a negative perception of canteens emerged, with the foremost concerns being poor hygiene conditions and the supply of leftovers:

316
317 ‘[Canteens offer] either leftovers or recycled foodstuffs. A breaded steak, do you
318 believe that it is done with the bread you buy or ground bread?’ (man, 63 years).
319

320 On the contrary, greater confidence is attributed to school canteens. Because they are responsible
321 for serving food to children, these canteens offer foods based on specific diets that are prepared by
322 experts. Thus, school canteens are perceived to be more controlled and to have higher food safety
323 standards.
324

325 ‘I have direct experience with reference to school canteens. They are connected
326 with the local health service. It is the primary Bolzano hospital dietician who
327 personally composes the menu. One day there is one food, the second day is
328 different, and the menus roll week after week, then in a month you eat it all’
329 (woman, 44 years).
330

331 When eating out, foods that are generally avoided include raw fish, salads, raw vegetables and food
332 containing uncooked eggs. In addition, people generally prefer to consume lightly seasoned dishes
333 with few processed foods. These precautionary measures are also applied when eating abroad.
334 Finally, some reservations emerged with respect to the hygiene conditions in ethnic restaurants.
335

336 3.4. Seeking information about food risk

337 When asked to report which information sources the participants preferred when seeking
338 information about food safety, television was declared to be the most frequently used, followed by
339 sector magazines. The participants also stated that they asked experts, such as general practitioners
340 or doctors at family counselling, who were preferred over friends and word of mouth.
341 Most of the participants blamed the mass media, especially television newscasts, for consciously
342 amplifying risk situations related to food issues.
343

344 ‘[The mass media] inflate the news, create alarmism and then, after a while, no
345 one is talking about that anymore and everything goes away’ (woman, 26 years).
346

347 Many participants noted the mass media's ability to disseminate information with a strong
348 emotional impact that can negatively influence consumers' choices about the purchase and
349 consumption of specific food products. For example, with particular reference to the highly
350 pathogenic avian influenza outbreaks that were publicized in Italy shortly before the focus group
351 discussions took place, many people reported avoiding the consumption of chicken and a preference
352 for red meat. However, they resumed their old eating habits once the emergency had ended.
353 Finally, we found that to be considered reliable and trusted information sources, mass media need to
354 be impartial and more competent about food safety issues.
355

As an alternative to the mass communication channels, the respondents proposed that public health agencies could set up working groups to involve consumers in the management of food risks in an attempt to provide as much information as possible to increase their knowledge. Alternatively, training courses targeting students could be organized. The participants affirmed that beginning in childhood, appropriate education should be provided about recognizing and preventing food risks.

In addition to these communication channels, the consumers stated that they usually referred to food labels to obtain information about food safety. Most participants stated that reading the label was a habit they usually performed during food purchases. In particular, the expiry date was the information to which consumers paid the most attention among the information reported on food labels. At the same time, people also stated that they searched the label information for the product's origin before buying a product. Italian and local foods were preferred and trusted by the interviewees, whereas foreign foods aroused greater suspicion. The food ingredients were another important piece of information sought by consumers, particularly to check for the presence of food colouring, additives, flavours and additional sugars.

‘For example, I buy dark chocolate and look at the amount of cocoa, the percentage of butter, sugar. The same thing for jam. If I buy a quality jam, I want to see the ingredients: how much sugar and fruit it contains, which other sweeteners are used. The same thing applies to yogurt and juice. For all foods, I try to see if it matches what I think I am buying’ (woman, 56 years).

However, the interviewees also stressed that labels do not advise about the possible risks associated with the consumption of the product itself, and understanding the labels often requires prior knowledge about the meaning of the terminology and acronyms.

4. Discussion

The present study described the perceptions of food risks for people living in the Triveneto area and identified what they think is dangerous for their health in terms of food consumption as well as the individual strategies they use to protect themselves from food risks. The project extended a similar research project that was conducted only in the Veneto Region, which is part of the Triveneto area (Arzenton et al., 2005), the findings of which have been generally substantiated by the present study.

Cumulatively, the analysis of the focus groups revealed a common view of food risk perceptions among the people involved in the discussions, showing the existence of widespread perceptions of food risks. Similar to Arzenton et al. (2005), these perceptions were considered to be

strongly rooted in the social context of the reference group and yielded a unique definition of what people think about when they refer to food risks.

In the interviewees' opinion, food is safe when it is from one's personal vegetable garden or animal breeding; when it is fresh and in season; when its quality can be directly or indirectly controlled by the consumer; when it is not overly manipulated; and when its preparation is associated with a high level of hygiene.

Food risk was mainly associated with microbiological contaminations and foodborne infections and with the handling and consumption of eggs, meat and fresh products that expire in a short time. Similar to previous studies (Bearth, Cousin, & Siegrist, 2014; Dickson-Spillmann, Siegrist, Keller, & Wormuth, 2009; Dickson-Spillmann, Siegrist, & Keller, 2011), our interviewees expressed concerns about chemicals in their diet (e.g., pesticides, animal hormones, antibiotics and food additives) and declared that they were worried about potential, sometimes unknown, health implications. The interviewees noted that food risks could also be associated with childhood obesity and a lack of respect for nutritional aspects. Many participants reported paying significant attention when they prepared food for their relatives, especially for children, and stated their intention to consume healthy, fresh and homemade foods instead of industrial products. However, other respondents stressed that food risk might result from a lack of food diversity, which can hinder the adoption of a healthier and more varied diet.

These findings show that consumers are aware of food risk in all its different aspects, including microbiological, chemical and nutritional aspects. In particular, major attention and coping strategies are devoted to avoiding microbiological risk. In fact, although the great majority of Italian consumers associate food risk with chemical products, pesticides and toxic substances (European Commission, 2010), our results better reflect experts' concerns about food-related risk (Buzby, 2001) because interviewees were more concerned about the microbiological risks of food. Sparks and Sheperd (1994) obtained similar results.

Notably, food risk perceptions emerged as a two-dimensional construct based on the following dimensions:

- quality warranties;
- perceived level of food controllability.

These dimensions were found to characterize participants' perceptions and attitudes towards food risk when eating both at home and outside the home and served as coping strategies, together with the search for good hygiene conditions, especially outside the home.

4.1. Quality warranties

Quality has emerged as a decisive factor in defining whether a food poses a risk for health, and a number of factors that affect the perceived quality of food have been identified. In particular, the consumers realized that they had to actively search for safe food, which they referred to as a preference for quality food (i.e., fresh products, such as meat, fish, fruits and vegetables) that are in season and locally produced. This result confirms Van Rijswijk and Frewer's evidence (2008), which showed that food quality and food safety are overlapping concepts. Moreover, Dreyer and Renn (2014) noted that attributes such as 'natural, authentic and traditional' have gained importance across Europe as motives for consumer choices. With regard to Italy, Mascarello et al. (2014) recently confirmed this assumption; when assessing food quality, Italian consumers consider the most important aspects to be the product's sensory characteristics (taste, appearance and freshness of the product). Green et al. (2005) similarly used focus groups to assess public understanding of food risks in four European countries that included Italy. Italian consumers were found to be 'more concerned with naturalness and taste, and in some locations had concerns about the "industrialisation" of food production or specific issues of food adulteration' (p. 524). Halkier and colleagues (2007) also found the Italian food consumer to be a quality-conscious consumer.

The quality of food was also associated with the perceived degree to which the food had been handled by third parties along the food production chain. In this sense, the level of perceived handling acts as another determinant of quality based on the following factors:

- the quantity of added substances (pesticides, antibiotics, preservatives, food colouring), i.e. chemical risk;
- how much the foodstuff is perceived to differ from its proper characteristics (taste, colour), i.e. microbiological risk;
- the length of the production chain, i.e., risks related to industrial food production.

These beliefs justify the general avoidance of frozen and gastronomic foods and ready-to-eat products and are consistent with the general preference for consuming home-grown products or products cultivated by a trusted person.

The food provenance was considered to be a determinant of food quality as well, as previously shown by Feldmann and Hamm (2015) and Lobb and Mazzocchi (2007). In particular, the focus group participants agreed that the farther away the source of the food is, the more it has been significantly manufactured by many parties along the food chain. Therefore, the interviewees expressed a preference for domestically produced food, whereas imported foods and ethnic or industrial foodstuffs were associated with risk. These beliefs may be due to food neophobia (i.e., the individual tendency to avoid consuming unfamiliar food, as explained by Fischer and Frewer (2009)) or, more generally, to the sense of belonging to a specific territory that causes the

interviewees to prefer local food, or safer food, because of their social identity (Demos & Pi, 2009; Pino, Amatulli, De Angelis & Peluso, 2016)).

It is reasonable to assume that a local product is considered safe when it is viewed as a familiar product. The literature has found that familiarity may be a predictor of the perception of benefit (Fischer & Frewer, 2009). Familiarity is also one of the most important drivers of a preference for certain food products because it reduces product uncertainty (Borgogno, Favotto, Corazzin, Cardello & Piasentier, 2015). Our results highlighted that typical and local foods are preferred when eating outside the home and abroad as an individual strategy to reduce concerns associated with globalization and the standardization of food consumption habits. However, if people had a positive experience with the consumption of food abroad or the opportunity to check the food manufacturing, they declared the consumption of these foreign foodstuffs to be equally acceptable. This study found the dimension of control to be fundamental in defining food risk perceptions, as will be discussed below.

4.2.The perceived level of food controllability

The focus group discussions highlighted the importance of the perceived level of controllability in shaping consumers' perceptions and demonstrated the key role of this dimension in reducing anxiety about food risks. Controllability was mainly associated with consumers' direct control over the quality and safety of food. In particular, a preference for self-produced foodstuffs (e.g., vegetables cultivated in one's own garden) and for local food emerged, which is in line with Italians' overwhelming preference for traceable food produced according to local traditions and culture (Pino et al., , 2016). This preference might reflect consumers' increased awareness of food risks as well as people's choice to experience sustainable alternatives to the industrial production of food. However, the choice to consume self-made foodstuffs, such as those produced in a short supply chain (Verraes et al., 2015), can unwittingly expose consumers to foodborne pathogens that they might be unaware of because of an optimism bias, as widely reported by the literature (Millman, Rigby, Edward-Jones, Lighton & Jones, 2014). Reading food labels was found to be another important form of direct control over food because it allows consumers to check the ingredients and properties of the food they purchase.

In line with the previous literature (Dinga, Veemanb & Adamowicz, 2013; Siegrist & Cvetkovich, 2000), when direct control cannot be exerted, a trustworthy relationship with vendors is considered a good proxy for controllability. Choices related to the evaluation of food risks need to be made more than once a day and might represent a highly time-consuming activity. Therefore,

people need to delegate control on some occasions and have other trusted figures act on their behalf, as some interviewees stated.

The safety controls requested by law for public health agencies and certifying bodies offer another source of indirect controllability. Interestingly, some interviewees declared a willingness to delegate control over food quality and safety to suppliers and retailers because they believe that food chain and manufacturing processes are highly controlled and require conformity with food safety standards and laws. Indeed, previous studies have reported relatively high consumer confidence and trust in the safety of the food supply chain (Barnett et al., 2016; Van Kleef et al., 2007; Van Wezemael, Verbeke, Kügler, & Scholderer, 2011).

Moreover, the participants identified both large and small retailers as safe sale points. This finding may appear contradictory, but it is in line with consumer studies on food suggesting that such contradictions can be reconciled if one considers that opposing practices highlight different consumer strategies to address the complex context of food choices in consumers' daily lives (Fischer, 2016). Contradictory practices might also derive from consumers' different levels of knowledge and information exposure or availability. The present study is limited by omitting these factors in the sample composition. Further research could verify this hypothesis.

Interestingly, the interviewees appeared to be supported by a high level of self-confidence in their capability to recognize safe food. Their reported experiences and coping strategies of direct or indirect control in choosing and buying food corroborate this hypothesis. The focus group discussions revealed a tendency among consumers to underestimate the risks associated with the domestic manipulation of food or with the consumption of food from a short supply chain. For example, none of the interviewees specifically referred to dangerous practices adopted at home that would be likely to damage their own or their family's health (see, for instance, Leikas, Lindeman, Roininen, & Lähteenmäki, 2009). An optimistic bias can play a role as well; people tend to view themselves as less vulnerable to food risks than other people and as less vulnerable than they actually are (Sparks & Shepherd, 1994).

With regard to organic and GM foods, the opinions were quite controversial in terms of controllability. Most people did not consider organic food a valuable alternative to traditional products. Only a small number of the participants considered organic food safer or less treated and believed that it had a higher quality standard. Rather, people showed a lack of confidence in these foods because of unsafe treatments and the presence of air pollution, which affects organic and non-organic products equally and makes them equally dangerous, in addition to their high cost. GM foods were mainly associated with negative judgements, probably due to a lack of knowledge of these products. The participants reported contradictory information and affirmed that they were not

aware of the consequences of consuming GM foods over a long period. Thus, the respondents generally preferred to avoid buying these products. Both previous and more recent studies have confirmed this finding regarding the consumption of GM foods in Italy (Harrison, Boccaletti, House, 2004; Montuori, Triassi & Sarnacchiaro, 2012; Pino et al., 2016). These findings seem to suggest that both of these types of food are still considered major concerns for consumers' health. Therefore, future research is needed to help consumers resolve their uncertainty.

4.3. Use of media outlets for food risk information

Although the participants stated that they were not experienced with regard to food safety topics, they appeared to be sufficiently informed and active seekers of this type of information, especially during food emergencies. Their use of media outlets for food risk information resonates with previous studies (European commission, 2010; Kornelis, de Jonge, Frewer & Dagevos, 2007). However, respondents complained about the reliability and credibility of information sources that were blamed for disseminating inaccurate and misleading information, exaggerating risks and providing contradictory advice. Nevertheless, the participants stated they sought reassuring and updated information from these sources. Indeed, media information on food safety is generally highly distrusted compared to other sources, but at the same time, it remains a primary source for many consumers (*manuscript in preparation*).

Importantly, the discussions revealed feelings of resignation and scepticism towards food risks and, more generally, towards food safety management. Although the respondents seemed to be quite informed about food risks, a fatalistic sense of incomplete control was predominant in response to the lack of precise information on recognizing and preventing food risks. In their cross-cultural study in Europe, van Kleef et al. (2006) also found that for consumers, responsibility for self-protection was regarded as necessary because of scientific uncertainty and a lack of proper information, among other reasons.

Finally, although food labels cannot be considered a proper communication channel like those mentioned above, the participants reported using them to obtain information about the purchased food. This reported behaviour is in line with previous research linking consumer label-reading behaviour with the management of food risks (Tonkin, Coveney, Meyer, Wilson & Webb, 2016).

4.4. Considerations for risk communication

The ability to differentiate among perceptions of risks according to cultural belonging is a fundamental part of the implementation of targeted and effective communication campaigns. The literature has highlighted the need to analyse the reactions of individuals to risky situations, starting

from the cultural contexts and the communities to which they belong and in which they were raised (Lupton, 2003). In this situation, the investigation of people living in a well-defined territory, such as the Triveneto area, is crucial to discover which topics require deeper knowledge and understanding by consumers to improve perceptions that may lead to more effective risk communication.

First, local public health agencies mandated to ensure food safety should exert greater efforts to inform consumers in response to the widespread feeling of impotence in properly managing and avoiding food risks, as the focus group participants noted. For example, public health actors might invest in delivering more detailed information to explain (i) who is responsible for food safety and (ii) which actions are implemented at the food chain level and the governmental level to ensure such controls on food.

Second, our findings suggest that more attention should be paid to increasing consumers' awareness of possible food hazards related to the consumption of self-produced food and food derived from a short supply chain in response to the judgements of optimism bias that emerged from the discussions. This is a finding of major concern for experts, who generally consider self-produced food and food from short supply chains to pose a greater risk to health than foodstuffs from food industries (Roccato et al., 2017). For instance, communication messages might persuade consumers to responsibly adopt preventive behaviours when handling raw foods and to control the safety of self-made food products before consumption. These communication messages might suggest best practices for the transportation and storage of food to ensure its safety (e.g., do not eat undercooked foods that could pose a risk, such as pork, chicken and shellfish; thaw meat in the refrigerator and not at room temperature; and wash kitchen utensils between uses, especially if they have been used to cut raw food). Educational materials and news in well-read magazines might serve this purpose (see Tiozzo et al., 2011; Mari et al., 2012).

Our findings also suggest the need to develop concrete communication materials to resolve concerns about chemicals in food, such as those suggested by Bearth et al. (2014). The importance given by the participants to nutritional aspects as possible food risks may provide a stepping stone for future research to investigate consumers' perceptions.

Communication interventions should also provide consumers with detailed and exhaustive information on both organic and GM foods to increase their knowledge and to enable them to make informed decisions regarding the consumption of these products. In particular, the interviewees claimed that this information should be delivered by authoritative and impartial sources.

In addition, the focus group discussions illuminated the need for a greater commitment by the mass media to ensure the dissemination of clear-headed and scientifically validated information. The

mass media should depict food risk news without provoking unjustified alarmism by being more informative and reporting objective measures of risks (Benson, 2011; Tiozzo, Mantovani, Neresini & Ravarotto, 2015).

Ultimately, this study confirms the key informative role of food labels (Dimara & Skuras, 2005) and suggests that policy makers should adopt more comprehensible and exhaustive food labels.

4.5. Final remarks

Because the focus groups were exploratory and referred to a delimited socio-cultural context, the results need to be interpreted with caution and cannot be applied *tout court* to a wider context. Nonetheless, our findings are in line with previous international studies on food risk perceptions. Similar to Holm and Kildevang's study (1996), our research showed that consumers combine quality cues and make inferences when information is incomplete, suggesting that food choices often reflect compromises in everyday life rather than consumers' preferences. Green et al. (2005) showed that the public's understanding of food risks is multi-dimensional, rational and sophisticated and that choosing safe foodstuffs is, to a certain extent, influenced by a sensible pragmatism. Thus, consumers are given substantial responsibility with regard to choosing quality and safe products for their own health as well as in complying with food hygiene standards when they handle, cook and store food at home. Moreover, consumers in the focus group discussions noted that they rely on personal knowledge as a successful strategy for risk avoidance. In this sense, food risk communicators need to better hone communication interventions to increase consumers' knowledge and strengthen the trust between consumers and institutions.

It is also worth noting that the focus group discussions were held shortly after some of the most important food incidents that occurred in Europe (e.g., BSE, dioxin crisis) and in Italy (e.g., highly pathogenic avian influenza), so the risk perceptions from these incidents and the impact of food safety information had important effects on food consumption (Lobb, Mazzocchi, & Traill, 2006). Therefore, our study might be considered a snapshot of the concerns of people who, to a certain extent, have become familiar with food risks and with mitigation strategies to resolve uncertainties about food safety and to make rational and responsible decisions in terms of food choice and consumption.

The present study has one important limitation. A focus group is a research method that uses self-reported information to provide a top-of-mind view of what people think about a specific theme. The discussions might be biased by social desirability concerns linked to self-presentation management (e.g. Marlowe & Crowne, 1960), which can make the interviewees talk and act as informed and responsible consumers.

Additionally, the current research intended to provide insights about perceptions, beliefs and attitudes for further quantitative research (e.g., survey) applied in a wider area and with a larger sample. This type of research could also consider and measure social desirability bias. Furthermore, a longitudinal research design could investigate the gap between attitudes and behaviours.

Focus group discussions revealed which topics generate major concerns in consumers. Additional investigations could assess whether these concerns are specific to particular risks or could rank the risks according to different levels of concern.

Ultimately, perceptions of food risk might be further investigated according to socio-demographic variables, which was outside the scope of this article's initial premise.

5. Conclusions

Currently, safe food is at the centre of concern for governments, scientists and the public (Scholliers, 2008). Communication research has stressed the importance of developing effective risk communication processes as an integral part of risk assessment and management (Sheperd, 2008). In addition, previous research has noted that a national or regional strategy for food risk communication is more desirable due to cross-cultural differences in consumer perceptions and information preferences (Cope et al., 2010; see also Tiozzo et al., 2011).

Research on food risk perceptions is still sparse in Italy. Although the present study was conducted in a limited socio-cultural territory, it can be considered a pilot study to increase attention to and public debate on the importance of ensuring food safety through the promotion of tailored risk communication interventions. In particular, communication messages should aim to raise consumers' awareness about the adoption of adequate behaviours as normal daily practices when preparing food at home and to promote risk mitigation strategies in response to the predominant sense of impotence with regard to one's own protection. In this sense, our results represent a starting point to inform food risk communication and policies for the territory under study.

Ultimately, our findings may provide useful insights to local food manufacturers and industries, which may gain greater understanding of consumers' preferences and choices of food products at different shopping places and consequently may improve food marketing strategies.

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by the Italian Ministry of Health (research project RC IZSVe 04/2006). The authors would like to thank the focus group participants and colleagues at the IZSVe peripheral diagnostic laboratories in Bolzano, Udine, Trento and Pordenone who arranged the recruitment and logistic organization of the focus group discussions.

References

- Accredia (2013). *Osservatorio Accredia. Sicurezza e qualità alimentare. [Accredia Observatory. Food security and quality]*. Retrieved June 6 2016 from Accredia http://www.accredia.it/UploadDocs/4384_03_2013_Osservatorio_ACCREDIA_web.pdf
- Arzenton, V., Neresini, F., & Ravarotto, L. (2005). *A tavola con sicurezza: La percezione del rischio alimentare in Veneto [At the table with security: The perception of food risk in Veneto]*. Vicenza: Ergon.
- Banca d'Italia (2011). *L'economia del Nord Est [Economy in North East Italy]*. Retrieved June 6 2016 from Banca d'Italia <https://www.bancaditalia.it/pubblicazioni/collana-seminari-convegni/2011-0008/economia-del-Nord-Est.pdf>.
- Banca d'Italia (2015). *Le economie regionali. L'economia delle Province autonome di Trento e Bolzano [Regional economies. The economies of the autonomous provinces of Trento and Bolzano]*. Retrieved June 6 2016 from Banca d'Italia <https://www.bancaditalia.it/pubblicazioni/economie-regionali/2015/2015-0004/1504-trentino.pdf>
- Barnett, J., Begen, F., Howes, S., Regan, A., McConnon, A., Marcu, A., et al. (2016). Consumers' confidence, reflections and response strategies following the horsemeat incident. *Food Control*, 59, 721-730. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2015.06.021>.
- Bearth, A., Cousin, M. E., & Siegrist, M. (2014). The consumer's perception of artificial food additives: Influences on acceptance, risk and benefit perceptions. *Food Quality and Preference*, 38, 14-23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2014.05.008>.
- Benson, P. (2011). Communicating risk to consumers in domestic and internationally traded products. *Food Control*, 22, 1529-1534. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2010.07.015>.
- Borgogno, M., Favotto, S., Corazzin, M., Cardello, A.V., & Piasentier, E. (2015). The role of product familiarity and consumer involvement on liking and perceptions of fresh meat. *Food Quality and Preference*, 44, 139-147. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2015.04.010>.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>.
- Brennan, M., McCarthy, M., & Ritson, C. (2007). Why do consumers deviate from best microbiological food safety advice? An examination of 'high-risk' consumers on the island of Ireland. *Appetite*, 49, 405-418. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2006.12.006>.

- Brunori, G., Malandrin, V., & Rossi, A. (2013). Trade-off or convergence? The role of food security in the evolution of food discourse in Italy. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 29, 19-29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2012.01.013>.
- Buzby, J. C. (2001). Effects of food-safety perceptions on food demand and global trade. *Changing structure of global food consumption and trade*, 55-66.
- Byrd-Bredbenner, C., Scaffner, D. W., & Maurer Abbot, J. (2010). How food safe is your home kitchen? A self-directed home kitchen audit. *Journal of Nutrition Education Behaviour*, 42(4), 286-289. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jneb.2010.01.008>.
- Casini, L., Contini, C., Marone, E., & Romano, C. (2013). Food habits: Changes among young Italians in the last 10 years. *Appetite*, 68, 21-29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2013.04.009>.
- Centro Studi Unioncamere Friuli Venezia Giulia (2015). L'industria alimentare nell'economia del Friuli Venezia Giulia. [*The role of food industry in the Friuli Venezia Giulia Region economy*]. Retrieved June 6 2016 from Starnet Unioncamere <http://www.starnet.unioncamere.it/download.php?id=22607>.
- Cope, S., Frewer, L. J., Houghton, J., Rowe, G., Fischer, A. R. H., & de Jonge, J. (2010). Consumer perceptions of best practice in food risk communication and management: Implications for risk analysis policy. *Food Policy*, 35, 349-357. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2010.04.002>.
- Cope, S., Frewer, L. J., Renn, O. & Dreyer, M. (2010). Potential methods and approaches to assess social impacts associated with food safety issues, *Food Control*, 21, 1629-1637. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2009.05.008>.
- De Cesare, A., Mioni, R., & Manfreda, G. (2007). Prevalence of *Listeria monocytogenes* in fresh and fermented Italian sausages and ribotyping of contaminating strains. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 120(1-2), 124-130. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2007.06.009>.
- Demos&Pi (2009). Cittadini d'Italia e del mondo tra campanili e piccole patrie [*Italian citizens: citizens of Italy and of the world between bell towers and little homelands*]. Retrieved June 6 2016 from Demos&Pi <http://www.demos.it/a00367.php>.
- Demos&Pi (2014). Alimenti, la sicurezza preoccupa tre su quattro [*Foodstuffs: food safety worries 3 people out of 4*]. Retrieved June 6 2016 from Demos&Pi <http://www.demos.it/a01018.php>.
- Dickson-Spillmann, M., Siegrist, M., Keller, C., & Wormuth, M. (2009). Phthalate exposure through food and consumers' risk perception of chemicals in food. *Risk Analysis*, 29(8), 1170-1181. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2009.01233.x>.

- Dickson-Spillmann, M., Siegrist, M., & Keller, C. (2011). Attitudes towards chemicals are associated with preference for natural food. *Food Quality and Preference*, 22, 149-156. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2010.09.001>.
- Dimara, E., & Skuras, D. (2005). Consumer demand for informative labeling of quality food and drink products: a European Union case study. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 22(2), 90-100. doi: 10.1108/07363760510589253.
- Dinga, Y., Veemanb, M. M., & Adamowicz, W. L. (2013). The influence of trust on consumer behavior: An application to recurring food risks in Canada. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 92, 214–223. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2013.06.009>.
- Dreyer, M., & Renn, O. (2014). Public health measures: Risk governance. In Y. Motarjemi (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of food safety*, (vol. 4, pp. 13-19). Waltham, MA: Academic Press.
- EFSA (European Food Safety Authority) and ECDC (European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control). (2015). The European Union summary report on trends and sources of zoonosis, zoonotic agents and food-borne outbreaks in 2014. *EFSA Journal*, 13(12), 4329. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2015.4329>
- European Commission (2010). Food-related risks. Special Eurobarometer, 354, http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_354_en.pdf.
- Favretti, M., Pezzuto, A., Roccato, A., Piovesana, A. & Cereser, A.(2012). *Development of a simplified own-check model for micro-enterprises based on good hygiene practices*, XXIII International ICFMH Symposium FoodMicro 2012, 264, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Feldmann, C., & Hamm, U. (2015). Consumers' perceptions and preferences for local food: a review. *Food Quality and Preference*, 40, 152-164. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2014.09.014>.
- Ferretti, M.P., & Magaudda, P. (2006). The slow pace of institutional change in the Italian food system. *Appetite*, 47, 161-169. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2006.05.005>.
- Fischer, A. R. H., & Frewer, L. J. (2009). Consumer familiarity with foods and the perception of risks and benefits. *Food Quality and Preference*, 20(8), 576–585. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2009.06.008>.
- Fischer, A. R. H. (2016). *Consumer Behavior and Food Science. Reference Module in Food Science*. Elsevier. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-100596-5.03335-7>.
- Frewer, L. (2004). The public and effective risk communication. *Toxicology letters*, 149(1), 391-397. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.toxlet.2003.12.049>
- Furst, T., Connors, M., Bisogni, C. A., Sobal, J., & Falk, L. W. (1996). Food Choice: A Conceptual Model of the Process. *Appetite*, 26(3), 247–266. <http://doi.org/10.1006/appe.1996.0019>.

- Gallenti, G. (2014). *La competitività del sistema agro-industriale del Nord-Est [Competitiveness in the North-East agro-industrial system]*. Research Paper Series, 1. Trieste: EUT Edizioni Università di Trieste.
- Gettings, M. A., & Kiernan, N. E. (2001). Practice and perceptions of food safety among seniors who prepare meals at home. *Journal of Nutrition Education*, 33, 148-154. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1499-4046\(06\)60184-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1499-4046(06)60184-X).
- Green, J. M., Draper, A. K., Dowler, E. A., Fele, G., Hagenhoff, V., Rusanen, M., & Rusanen, T. (2005). Public understanding of food risks in four European countries: A qualitative study, 15(5), 523–527. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/cki016>.
- Greenbaum, T. L. (1998). *The handbook for Focus Group research*. London: Sage.
- Grunert, K. G. (2002). Current issues in the understanding of consumer food choice. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 13, 275-285. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0924-2244\(02\)00137-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0924-2244(02)00137-1).
- Halkier, B., Holm, L., Domingues, M. Magaúda, P., Nielsen, A., & Terragni, L. (2007). Trusting, complex, quality conscious or unprotected? Constructing the food consumer in different European national contexts. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 7, 379-402. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1469540507081629>.
- Harrison, R. W., Boccaletti, S., & House, L. (2004). Risk perceptions of urban Italian and United States consumers for genetically modified foods. *AgBioForum*, 7(4), 195-201.
- Havelaar, A. H., Brul, S., de Jong, A., de Jonge, R., Zwietering, M. H., & Ter Kuile, B. H. (2010). Future challenges to microbial food safety. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 139(SUPPL. 1), S79–S94. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2009.10.015>.
- Holm, L., & Kildevang, H. (1996). Consumers' views on food quality: A qualitative interview study. *Appetite*, 27, 1-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/appe.1996.0029>.
- Honkanen, P., & Frewer, L. (2009). Russian consumers' motives for food choice. *Appetite*, 52, 363-371. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2008.11.009>.
- Infanti, J., Sixsmith, J., Barry, M. M., Núñez-Córdoba, J., Oroviogicoechea-Ortega, C., & Guillén-Grima, F. (2013). *A literature review on effective risk communication for the prevention and control of communicable diseases in Europe*. Stockholm: ECDC.
- Kjaernes, U., Harvey, M., & Warde, A. (2007). *Trust in food: A comparative and institutional analysis*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kornelis, M., de Jonge, J., Frewer, L., & Dagevos, H. (2007). Consumer selection of food-safety information sources. *Risk Analysis*, 27(2), 327–335. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2007.00885.x>.

- Krueger, R. A. (2000). *Focus group: A practical guide for applied research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Leikas, S., Lindeman, M., Roininen, K., & Lähteenmäki, L. (2009). Who is responsible for food risks? The influence of risk type and risk characteristics. *Appetite*, 53, 123-126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2009.05.003>.
- Lobb, A. E., Mazzocchi, M., & Traill, W. B. (2006). *Risk perception and chicken consumption in the avian flu age: A consumer behaviour study on food safety information*. Proceedings of the American Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meeting, Long Beach, California, July 23-26. AgEcon Search - University of Minnesota.
- Lobb, A. E., & Mazzocchi, M. (2007). Domestically produced food: Consumer perceptions of origin, safety and the issue of trust. *Food Economics - Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica*, 4, 3-12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/16507540701192485>.
- Losasso, C., Cibin, V., Cappa, V., Roccato, A., Vanzo, A., Andrighetto, I. & Ricci, A. (2012). Food safety and nutrition: Improving consumer behaviour. *Food Control*, 26, 252-258. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2012.01.038>.
- Lundgren, R. (1994). *Risk communication: A handbook for communication of environmental safety and health risks*. Columbus, OH: Battelle Press.
- Lupton, D. (2003). *Il rischio. Percezione, simboli, culture [Risk. Perception, symbols and culture]*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Marlowe, D., & Crowne, D. P. (1960), A New Scale of Social Desirability Independent Psychopathology, *Consulting Psychology Journal*, 24, 349-354.
- Mari, S., Tiozzo, B., Capozza, D., & Ravarotto, L. (2012). Are you cooking your meat enough? The efficacy of the Theory of Planned Behaviour in predicting a best practice to prevent salmonellosis. *Food Research International*, 45(2), 1175-1183. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2011.06.028>.
- Mascarello, G., Pinto, A., Parise, N., Crovato, S., & Ravarotto, L. (2015). The perception of food quality: Profiling Italian consumers. *Appetite*, 89, 175-182. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2015.02.014>.
- McCarthy, M., Brennan, M., Kelly, A. L., Ritson, C., de Boer, M., & Thompson, N. (2007). Who is at risk and what do they know? Segmenting a population on their food safety knowledge. *Food Quality and Preference*, 18(2), 205-217. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2005.10.002>.
- Miles, S., Brennan, M., Kuznesof, S., Ness, M., Ritson, C., & Frewer, L. J. (2004). Public worry about specific food safety issues. *British Food Journal*, 106(1), 9-22.

832 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00070700410515172>.

833 Millman, C., Rigby, D., Edward-Jones, G., Lighton, L., & Jones, D. (2014). Perceptions, behaviours
834 and kitchen hygiene of people who have and not have suffered campylobacteriosis: A case
835 control study. *Food Control*, 41, 82-90. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2014.01.002>.

836 Milton, A., & Mullan, B. (2010). Consumer food safety education for the domestic environment: A
837 systematic review. *British Food Journal*, 112(9), 1003-1022.
838 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00070701011074363>.

839 Mol, A. P. J. & Bulkeley, H. (2002). Food risks and the environment: changing perspectives in a
840 changing social order, *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 4, 185-195.
841 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jepp.109>.

842 Monsivais, P., Aggarwal, A., & Drewnowski, A. (2014). Time spent on home food preparation and
843 indicators of healthy eating. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 47(6), 796–802.
844 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2014.07.033>.

845 Montuori, P., Triassi, M., & Sarnacchiaro, P. (2012). The consumption of genetically modified
846 foods in Italian high school students. *Food Quality and Preference*, 26(2), 246–251.
847 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2012.05.004>.

848 Morgan, D., & Krueger, R. A. (1993). When to use focus groups and why. In D. Morgan (Ed.),
849 *Successful focus groups: Advancing the state of the art* (pp. 3-19). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

850 Papadopoulos, A., Sargeant, J. M., Majowicz, S. E., Sheldrick, B., McKeen, C., Wilson, J., &
851 Dewey, C. E. (2012). Enhancing public trust in the food safety regulatory system. *Health*
852 *Policy*, 107(1), 98–103. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2012.05.010>.

853 Parra, P. A., Kim, H. K., Shapiro, M. A., Gravani, R. B. & Bradley, S. D. (2014). Home food safety
854 knowledge, risk perception, and practices among Mexican-Americans. *Food Control*, 37,
855 115-125. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2013.08.016>.

856 Pieniak, Z., Verbeke, W., Vanhonacker, F., Guerrero, L., & Hersleth, M. (2009). Association
857 between traditional food consumption and motives for food choice in six European
858 countries. *Appetite*, 53, 101-108. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2009.05.019>.

859 Pino, G., Amatulli, C., De Angelis, M., & Peluso, A. M. (2016). The influence of corporate social
860 responsibility on consumers' attitudes and interventions towards genetically modified foods:
861 Evidence from Italy. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 112, 2861-2869.
862 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.10.008>.

863 Redmond, E. C., & Griffith, C. J. (2003). Consumer food handling in the home: A review of food
864 safety studies. *Journal of Food Protection*, 66, 130-161.

- Regione del Veneto (2015). Rapporto statistico. Energie. 2015 [Statistical report: energy. 2015].
Catanzaro: Rubbettino editore.
- Roccato, A., Cibin, V., Barrucci, F., Favretti, M., Piovesana, A., Pezzuto, A. et al. (2015). *Risk-based control options to mitigate microbial risks associated to traditional fermented Italian salami and sopresse consumption*, in EFSA - European Food Safety Authority- (2015). *Shaping the Future of Food Safety, Together: Proceedings of the 2nd EFSA Scientific Conference*. Milan, Italy, 14–16 October 2015. EFSA Journal 2015;13(10):s1310, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2015.s1310>.
- Roccato, A., Uyttendaele, M., Barrucci, F., Cibin, V., Favretti, M., Cereser, A. et al. (2017). Artisanal Italian salami and sopresse: Identification of control strategies to manage microbiological hazards, *Food Microbiology*, 61, 5-13. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2016.07.010>
- Scholliers, P. (2008). Defining food risks and food anxieties throughout history. *Appetite*, 51(1), 3–6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2008.02.008>.
- Shapiro, M. A., Porticella, N., Jiang, L. C., & Gravani, R. B. (2011). Predicting intentions to adopt safe home food handling practices: Applying the theory of planned behaviour. *Appetite*, 56(1), 96-103. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2010.11.148>.
- Shepherd, R. (2008). Involving the public and stakeholders in the evaluation of food risks. *Trends in Food Science and Technology*, 19, 234-239. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2007.12.005>.
- Siegrist, M., & Cvetkovich, G. (2000). Perception of hazards: The role of social trust and knowledge. *Risk Analysis*, 20(5), 713-719. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0272-4332.205064>.
- Sixsmith, J., Doyle, P., D'Eath, M., & Barry, M. M. (2014). *Health communication and its role in the prevention and control of communicable diseases in Europe: Current evidence, practice and future developments*. Stockholm: ECDC.
- Sparks, P. & Shepherd, R. (1994). Public perceptions of the potential hazards associated with food production and food consumption: an empirical study, *Risk Analysis*, 14(5), 799-806. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.1994.tb00291.x>.
- Taché, J., & Carpentier, B. (2014). Hygiene in the home kitchen: Changes in behaviour and impact of key microbiological hazard control measures. *Food Control*, 35(1), 392–400. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2013.07.026>.
- Tiozzo, B., Mari, S., Magaudo, P., Arzenton, V., Capozza, D., Neresini, F. et al. (2011). Development and evaluation of a risk-communication campaign on salmonellosis. *Food Control*, 22, 109-117. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2010.04.030>.
- Tiozzo, B., Mantovani, C., Neresini, F. & Ravarotto L. (2015). Food risk media monitor:

development of an automatic web tool analyse the Italian mass media discourse in food safety and food related risks. *Proceedings of the 24rd SRA E- Conference “Science, Policy and Society – Bridging the gap between risk and science, Maastricht*, 90.

Tiozzo, B., Pinto, A., Mascarello, G., Mantovani, C. & Ravarotto, L. (2016). *Which food safety information sources do Italian consumers prefer? Results from a national survey*, Manuscript in preparation

Tonkin, E., Coveney, J., Meyer, S. B., Wilson, A. M. & Webb, T. (2016). Managing uncertainty about food risk – Consumer use of food labelling, *Appetite*, 107, 242-252. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2016.08.015>.

Van Dijk, H., Houghton, J., Van Kleef, E., Van Der Lans, I., Rowe, G., & Frewer, L. (2008). Consumer responses to communication about food risk management. *Appetite*, 50(2), 340-352. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2007.08.011>

Van Kleef, E., Frewer, L. J., Chryssochoidis, G. M., Houghton, J. R., Korzen-Bohr, S., Krystallis, T., et al. (2006). Perceptions of food risk management among key stakeholders: Results from a cross-European study. *Appetite*, 47(1), 46–63. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2006.02.002>.

Van Kleef, E., Houghton, J., Krystallis, A., Pfenning, U., Rowe, G., Van Dijk, H., et al. (2007). Consumer evaluations of food risk management quality in Europe. *Risk Analysis*, 27, 1565-1580. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2007.00989.x>.

Van Rijswik, W., & Frewer, L.J. (2008). Consumer perception of food quality and safety and their relation to traceability. *British Food Journal*, 110(10), 1034-1046. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00070700810906642>.

Van Wezemael, L., Verbeke, W., Kügler, J. O. & Scholderer, J. (2011). European consumer acceptance of safety-improving interventions in the beef chain. *Food Control*, 22, 1776-1784. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2011.04.017>.

Verraes, C., Uyttendaele, M., Clinquart, A., Daube, G., Sindic, M., Berkvens, D., et al., (2015). Microbiological safety and quality aspects of the short supply chain. *British Food Journal*, 117(9), 2250–2264. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-04-2015-0122>.

Wilcock, A., Pun, M., Khanona, J., & Aung, M. (2004). Consumer attitudes, knowledge and behaviour: A review of food safety issues. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 15, 56-66. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2003.08.004>.

1 Table 1. Distribution of the sample by gender and province of residence

2

<i>Province</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Total</i>
Bolzano	3	8	11
Pordenone	1	10	11
Trento	4	9	13
Udine	2	8	10
<i>Total</i>	10	35	45

3

4

5

Table 2

1 Table 2. Distribution of the sample by age and gender

2

<i>Age</i>	<i>Gender</i>		<i>Total</i>
	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	
21-30	0	6	6
31-40	3	3	6
41-50	3	8	11
51-60	1	5	6
Over 60	3	13	16
<i>Total</i>	10	35	45

3

4

1 Table 3. Distribution of the sample by presence of young or grown children in the family
2 composition
3
4

<i>Province</i>	<i>Participants with children < 12 years old</i>	<i>Participants with children > 12 years old</i>
Bolzano	5	4
Pordenone	5	7
Trento	4	7
Udine	2	7

1 Table 4. Distribution of the sample by level of education

2

3

<i>Province</i>	<i>Primary school</i>	<i>Middle school</i>	<i>High school</i>	<i>Degree</i>
Bolzano	0	1	5	5
Pordenone	0	3	5	3
Trento	0	3	5	5
Udine	3	2	4	1

4

1 **Table 5. Topics of discussion and categories that emerged from the focus group discussions**

2

<i>Topics of discussion</i>	<i>Categories</i>
<i>General beliefs about food risk</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Identification of microbiological, chemical and nutritional aspects of food risk- List of risky foodstuffs- Identification of quality warranties (freshness, naturalness, local provenance)- Identification of risk factors (expiry date, food conservation and food manipulation)- Attitude towards GM and organic foods
<i>Criteria for purchasing safe food</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Selection of the point of purchase according to the type of food- Role of (direct/indirect) control- Attention to the origin of the product- Role of time devoted to purchase food- Role of price and brands-
<i>Beliefs about eating outside the home</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Eating out for business and leisure and eating abroad- Role of canteens- Definition of criteria to eat safely outside the home
<i>Preferred media outlet for food risk information</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Use of mass media and food labels as information sources- Role of mass media in reporting risks- Informational needs about food risks

3

4

1 **Appendix 1. Interview guide used for the focus group discussions**

2

3 **1. General beliefs about food risk**

4 - Meaning and examples of risky/safe foods

5 - Personal strategies to cope with food risk

6

7 **2. Criteria for purchasing safe food**

8 - Preferred points of purchase

9 - Which motivations underlie the choice of food and the preference for certain points of
10 purchase

11

12 **3. Beliefs about eating outside home**

13 - Examples of safer places to go to eat

14 - Preferred foods

15

16 **4. Seeking information about food risk**

17 - Preferred information sources about food risk

18 - Suggestions to improve communication about food risk

19

20 **5. Conclusion**

21 - Final remarks

22 - Further insights and suggestions

23

24

Title: Consumers' perceptions of food risks: A snapshot of the Italian Triveneto area

Author names and affiliations

Barbara Tiozzo^a btiozzo@izsvenezie.it – *Corresponding author*

^aHealth Awareness and Communication Department, Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale delle Venezie, viale dell'Università 10, 35020 Legnaro (PD), Italy

Silvia Mari^b silvia.mari@unimib.it

^b Department of Psychology, University of Milano-Bicocca, p.zza Ateneo Nuovo 1, 20126 Milano, Italy

Mirko Ruzza^a mruzza@izsvenezie.it

^aHealth Awareness and Communication Department, Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale delle Venezie, viale dell'Università 10, 35020 Legnaro (PD), Italy

Stefania Crovato^a scrovato@izsvenezie.it

^aHealth Awareness and Communication Department, Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale delle Venezie, viale dell'Università 10, 35020 Legnaro (PD), Italy

Licia Ravarotto^a lravarotto@izsvenezie.it

^aHealth Awareness and Communication Department, Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale delle Venezie, viale dell'Università 10, 35020 Legnaro (PD), Italy