Media and Crime: Influence of Food Crime Investigations on Consumer Perception

Abstract
The current study is an examination of increasing coverage of food crimes on media and its influence on the public. There are number of broadcasts, commentaries, articles and investigations that have surfaced on public platforms regarding the heinous individual and organized food crimes in Pakistan, literature about the food safety standards in Pakistan has also confirmed that the increasing safety violations have created an impact on public health. These investigative initiatives have created an impact on the audience about reevaluating their choices and decisions about the procurement of common to specialized food items and supplies. This study assesses a range of concepts related to food risk and safety perception amongst the audience with reference to the role and effectiveness of media. The media’s function is assessed in the broader framework of public service and social responsibility theories.
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Introduction
Food journalism has created an impact on various areas of public interest ranging from redefining culinary experience, representing culture and traditions to highlighting the serious issues of food safety, which pose a threat to public health. Food journalism in recent years has been effective in investigating the organized food crimes in various regions of the world and calling out authorities for action. For example, Jeanne Voltz’s food column in Los Angeles time has documented the most significant food experiences of American culture her hard core stories of food safety violations to soft news stories regarding recipes and restaurant reviews contributed to the culinary anthropology (Voos 2012). Food and gastronomy have been an important part of lifestyle, media has given sufficient coverage and built narratives to understand social and cultural realities (Fusté-Forné and Masip, 2018). Similarly, media has played a significant role in creating awareness about the safety standards of food in Pakistan as well. There are a number of investigative ventures that question the standards of preparation, procedures, and packaging of food items by small and large food industrial units. Consumer crime programs specifically related to food crimes have raised issues of adulteration of food items; use of substandard ingredients, questionable hygiene standards of eateries; absence of quality control and assurance. After the infamous “Karachi Food Poisoning Case 2019” which resulted in the death of two minor siblings surfaced and widely covered by the media and food crime investigations became an important part of investigative reports of various media houses. Amongst the several famous television broadcasts in Pakistan, program Sar-e-Aam with Iqrar-Ul-Hasan and Aashkaar with Mohsin Bhatti have created a significant influence in reporting and investigating food crimes in Pakistan. These investigations incorporate the scrutiny of the role of authorities and how media serve as a platform for both government and public to identify, prevent and rectify food crimes in Pakistan.

Punjab and Sindh food authorities have been the focus of media attention for their role in curbing the food crimes in Pakistan. Both authorities have prescribed procedure of surveillance and standard operating procedures for the food manufacturers and suppliers. Investigative reporting about food crimes in Pakistan is just not confined to the manufacturers and food suppliers, but these programs also highlight the role and intervention of concerned government authorities. Food safety issues are
further aggravated by feeble response of food control authorities and lack of implementation of subsequent penalties. In addition, there is also an important cultural and religious reference to food crimes in Pakistan, being a majority Muslim state eating “Halal” food has religious significance.

Objectives of the Study

To analyze the role consumer investigative journalism in increasing the level of awareness of general public regarding food crimes, the study has two levels of analysis. First levels deal with analysis of public awareness and realization that food crime is an important problem and it is an increasing concern amongst public for its effect on public health and influence on the audience food safety perception and awareness of health risk associated with unsafe food choices. Second level of the analysis deals with the influence of coverage of food crimes on audience’s behavioral changes.

Review of Literature

Food production, distribution and consumption in Pakistan are increasing the vulnerability due to growing food safety concerns. Current article discusses various issues including microbiological safety of food (bacteria, virus and parasite which are causing food borne diseases); presence of pesticides residues in food since fruits and vegetables are major part of diets of the people in Pakistan and the exposure to pesticides pose a direct health threat to consumers; metal contamination is also detected upon the analysis of various products used by the consumers; presence of aflatoxins in foods and food adulteration. The study has also discussed how a large population of children is affected by these diseases especially due to diarrhea. These food safety concerns have far reaching consequences on the growth and economy of Pakistan (Akhtar, 2013).

Similarly, another study has discussed that how the food safety issues are perceived by youth. The general belief is that food prepared outside houses is a cause of food-borne diseases but on the contrary food prepared and eaten at homes can also cause more serious food borne diseases. Study further analyses the growing culture of food services all over the world. Dining out is an important part of youth culture and consumers’ increasing interest and dependence has factored to the expansion of industry and workforce. The growth of industry and workforce has brought issue of food safety training, education and experience to the forefront. Another important thing of youth culture is the use of technology and online resources in order to acquire information. This study examines that the use of YouTube. The objectives are to analyze the content and coverage of food safety issues in YouTube videos, authenticity of the content and framing of issues. Framing as a theoretical framework discusses how the representation of a certain issue by media influences audience understanding of the issue. It is established in the framework that audience while processing information use primary knowledge in order to reach a decision. After carrying out the content analysis of the selected videos it was found out that 42.1% of the videos do include some educational component about food safety (Rhoades and Ellis, 2010).

Another study investigated the food safety issues in capitalist economy specifically explore the concept of cheap capitalism in which sub-standard goods and inferior quality products are mass produced and sold to maximize the large profits. Cheng concluded in his article that issues related to food safety has two aspects. These aspects promote a system which does not consistently reward the high-quality food products but also does not punish cheap substandard food goods and other food safety violations. There is clear divide between poor and elite consumers. Poor consumers are exploited and are not granted fair access to the resources. High-priced and high-quality food products are marketed and sold into luxury urban stores thus restricting the access of average and below average consumer. In addition, the capitalists have over exploited the environment and natural resources furthering the organized white-collared food crimes (Cheng, 2012).

Griffith, Mahias, and Price (1994) evaluated the role of media in food hygiene education. Upon analysis investigation reveals that media largely communicate issues and scares related to food safety and do not adequately educate people about the food safety education. Media communication campaigns can be prepared and executed to talk the issues food safety and reinforce food safety and hygiene education. As part of their recommendation mass media can encourage consumers to use...
information of good practice in food safety prepared by relevant authorities. Cooking shows must demonstrate and emphasis on food safety aspect as well.

As far as media, food and risk perception is concerned a study discussed that how a discussion on Oprah Winfrey’s show about the beef as a potential cause for bovine spongiform encephalopathy created a decline in beef sales in USA. The food scares communicated by the media has ability to mark an influence consumer behavior and also create an impact on the demand and supply for a certain product. As media is a private entity and their growing interests with stakeholders such as food, biotechnology and agriculture companies can influence the media’s selection, representation and coverage of food safety issues. The risk perception of consumer about the food may be influenced by two factors for example unknown risks or dreads such as food scares may not receive the same level of attention as the known risks such as risk of genetically modified food (McCluskey and Swinnen, 2011).

Another article explained the relationship between stigma related to food safety and public’s willingness to pay. Article is based on the food panic created by the media regarding mad cow disease and its subsequent impact on consumer and beef market. Intervention is established to mitigate food scares induced by media impact the behavioral economics (Payne, Messer and Kaiser, 2009).

When food crimes are concerned it is very important to understand the state’s institutional responsibility for constituting the framework against the food crimes. Despite the increase in food crimes and its potential threat to the public health food crimes are not considered important when it comes to criminal justice. There are various dimensions of food crimes ranging from issues of hoarding and over pricing to fake branding. State’s should prioritize the organization and action must be taken against the illegal practices in food production (Croall, 2012).

Research Questions

1. What is level of exposure and awareness amongst the audience about the food crimes covered in media?
2. How the food crimes covered on media create an influence on behavioral changes amongst audience related to their food habits?
3. What is the overall performance evaluation of the public regarding media’s role in investigating food crimes?

Theoretical Framework

The current study deals with the public service and developmental role of media in society. The social responsibility theory which advocates that media professional should self-assume their responsibility for public betterment and welfare (Painter, 2019). This study also emphasizes the role of media professional in disseminating, advocating and interpreting the information of the issues crucial to public interest especially in the area of public health and safety. Public service role of media professionals includes the constant effort to bring the powerful team to be accountable to public, call for action to authorities, voicing concerns, representing public sentiment and facilitating and negotiating the dialogs between stakeholders.

Methodology

A 25-item survey questionnaire is constructed to investigate the role of media on consumer’s perception of food crime. Questionnaires were distributed online to a demographically diverse group the objective was to cater to a respondent group which have some level of exposure to the media programs related to food crimes. A sample of 76 respondents was included in the study. Descriptive statistical analysis is performed to explore the answers to the study questions.
Results & Analysis

Table 1.

| Age Group-Profile | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| 18-25             | 14        | 18.4          | 18.4               |
| 26-35             | 45        | 59.2          | 77.6               |
| 36-45             | 6         | 7.9           | 85.5               |
| 46-60             | 11        | 14.5          | 100.0              |
| Total             | 76        | 100.0         |                    |

The respondent belongs to four different age cohorts, the majority of the population (59.2 %) represented the age group between 26-35.

Table 2.

| Gender-Profile | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Female         | 23        | 30.3          | 30.3               |
| Male           | 53        | 69.7          | 100.0              |
| Total          | 76        | 100.0         |                    |

The major segment in sample (69.7 %) are males whereas the response rate from female population has been 30.3 %.

Table 3.

| Occupational-Profile | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Academician          | 26        | 34.2          | 34.2               |
| Banker               | 2         | 2.6           | 36.8               |
| Self-Employed        | 4         | 5.3           | 42.1               |
| Media Professional   | 12        | 15.8          | 57.9               |
| Army/Police Officer  | 5         | 6.6           | 64.5               |
| Management Professional | 4   | 5.3           | 69.7               |
| Free Lancer          | 2         | 2.6           | 72.4               |
| Medical Practitioner | 2         | 2.6           | 75.0               |
| Marketing Professional | 6   | 7.9           | 82.9               |
| Psychologist         | 3         | 3.9           | 86.8               |
| Lawyer               | 1         | 1.3           | 88.2               |
| Homemaker            | 6         | 7.9           | 96.1               |
| Unemployed           | 2         | 2.6           | 98.7               |
| Engineer             | 1         | 1.3           | 100.0              |
| Total                | 76        | 100.0         |                    |

Respondent has a lot of diversity in occupation and majority of the respondent belong to academic with (34.2 %)

Table 4.

| Income Group-Profile | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| 15000-30000          | 20        | 26.3          | 26.3               |
| 31000-45000          | 11        | 14.5          | 40.8               |
| 46000-60000          | 11        | 14.5          | 55.3               |
| 61000-75000          | 16        | 21.1          | 76.3               |
| 76000 or above       | 8         | 10.5          | 86.8               |
| Prefer not to say/None | 10  | 13.2          | 100.0              |
| Total                | 76        | 100.0         |                    |
The income group variable is about the respective income group the it is indicated that 26.3% belong to the group A which is considered as lower as and group C in the second lead with 21.1% which is considered upper lower middle class.

Table 5.

| Estimated Expense on Food (Per Month) | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Spends Extensively                    | 9         | 11.8          | 11.8               |
| Spends Adequately                     | 19        | 25.0          | 36.8               |
| Spends Moderately                     | 38        | 50.0          | 86.8               |
| Spends Scarcely                       | 10        | 13.2          | 100.0              |
| Total                                 | 76        | 100.0         |                    |

The last background variable reveals that majority of the respondent spends moderately from the monthly expense as far as food is concerned especially in a category of food which deals with food prepared at restaurants and eateries.

Analysis of Variable 1: Level of Exposure and Awareness

Respondents are asked a series of questions related to their exposure of food crimes of the media key variables included with what frequency they watch the crime programs on mainstream and social media; is there an increase in their level of awareness due to media and do they consider food crimes a serious problem. All three questions were coordinating as majority (47%) of the sample often watch program on media or social media and 36.8% sample has some level of knowledge and exposure to food crime program on media. Majority of the respondents (69.7%) identified all the issues i.e. adulteration; Violating of hygiene practices (issues of personal hygiene and health standard for employees); Using unsafe materials and ingredients; Relabeling, repackaging and reselling expired food products and Issues of infestation in kitchens/area of preparation as part of their exposures to food crimes on the media. 67.1% sample strongly agreed and 22.4% agreed that food crime is a serious issue which makes the cumulatively of 89.5% of the agreement amongst the audience regarding food crimes being a serious issue and threat to human life. 38.2% sample is agreeing strongly that media has increased their exposure regarding food crimes and 23.7% sample is agreeing very strongly that media has increased which makes the cumulatively of 61.9% of the agreement amongst the audience regarding the increase in the level of awareness regarding food crimes covered by media. Corresponding tables are given below for reference.

Table 6.

| Degree of Exposure to Food Crimes on Media | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Never                                     | 7         | 9.2           | 9.2                |
| Sometimes                                 | 28        | 36.8          | 46.1               |
| Often                                     | 36        | 47.4          | 93.4               |
| Always                                    | 5         | 6.6           | 100.0              |
| Total                                     | 76        | 100.0         |                    |

Table 7.

| Please Mention the Categories of Food Crime you have Watched on Media? | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Adulteration                                                          | 2         | 2.6           | 2.6                |
| Violating of hygiene practices                                        | 3         | 3.9           | 6.6                |
| Using unsafe materials and ingredients                               | 7         | 9.2           | 14.5               |
| Relabeling, repackaging and reselling                                 | 2         | 2.6           | 26.3               |
Please Mention the Categories of Food Crime you have Watched on Media?

| Category                        | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Issues of infestation in kitchens | 3         | 3.9           | 30.3               |
| All of them above               | 53        | 69.7          | 100.0              |
| Total                           | 76        | 100.0         |                    |

Table 8.

Do you think Food Crime is a Serious Issue?

| Rating                | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Disagree     | 1         | 1.3           | 2.6                |
| Somewhat agree        | 6         | 7.9           | 10.5               |
| Agree                 | 17        | 22.4          | 32.9               |
| Strongly Agree        | 51        | 67.1          | 100.0              |
| Total                 | 76        | 100.0         |                    |

Table 9.

Do you think Media has Increased the Awareness about Food Crimes?

| Rating                | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Disagree     | 3         | 3.9           | 3.9                |
| Disagree              | 7         | 9.2           | 13.2               |
| Somewhat agree        | 19        | 25.0          | 38.2               |
| Agree                 | 29        | 38.2          | 76.3               |
| Strongly Agree        | 18        | 23.7          | 100.0              |
| Total                 | 76        | 100.0         |                    |

Analysis of Variable 2: Key indicators of Perception and Behavioral changes amongst audience

- Indicator 1: Perceived Food quality
- Indicator 2: Perceived Trust in food manufacturers/providers
- Indicator 2: Developing Precautionary behavior
- Indicator 3: Developing Inhibitory Behavior
- Indicator 4: Developing Information Seeking Behavior
- Indictors 6: Developing Social Responsibility Behavior

The next set of questions ask audience about the corresponding changes due to increase in the coverage of food crimes on media. The first indicator of change is indicated by change in perception of quality of food. Majority of the sample (48%) agree that their perception regarding the kind of food quality offered at eateries has changed due to the coverage of food crimes in media.

Table 10.

Do you Think your Perception Towards the Quality of Food has Changed due to Media?

| Rating          | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Disagree        | 8         | 10.5          | 10.5               |
| Somewhat agree  | 20        | 26.3          | 36.8               |
| Agree           | 40        | 52.6          | 89.5               |
| Strongly Agree  | 8         | 10.5          | 100.0              |
| Total           | 76        | 100.0         |                    |

The second indicator deals with the increase in precautionary behavior due to coverage of food crimes on media. 50 % percent of the sample agree that they ensure that products are fit for human consumption before buying them from market. Majority of the sample 56.6 % agreed that are dealing with more caution now due to media coverage of food crimes. Corresponding tables are given below.
Table 11.

| Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Disagree  | 8             | 10.5               | 10.5               |
| Somewhat agree | 8            | 10.5               | 21.1               |
| Agree     | 38            | 50.0               | 71.1               |
| Strongly Agree | 22          | 28.9               | 100.0              |
| Total     | 76            | 100.0              |                    |

Table 12.

| Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 1          | 1.3                | 1.3                |
| Disagree   | 4             | 5.3                | 6.6                |
| Somewhat agree | 11          | 14.5               | 21.1               |
| Agree      | 43            | 56.6               | 77.6               |
| Strongly Agree | 17          | 22.4               | 100.0              |
| Total      | 76            | 100.0              |                    |

The third indicator deals with the inhibition develops as the result of negative consequence develop through media stimuli (Bendura, 2014). The 43.4% of the sample agreed that they have started eating more at home because of the increasing violations covered on media regarding food prepared and distributed outside, this indicates the inhibition of consumers towards food prepared and served by restaurants and eateries. Similarly, 47.4% of the sample agreed that they have started spending less on the food prepared outside also indicate the inhibitory behavior due to coverage on media. 46.1% respondent agreed that they are reluctant to try new food products due to increase in food crimes. Corresponding tables are given below.

Table 13.

| Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Disagree  | 9             | 11.8               | 11.8               |
| Somewhat agree | 18          | 23.7               | 35.5               |
| Agree     | 33            | 43.4               | 78.9               |
| Strongly Agree | 16          | 21.1               | 100.0              |
| Total     | 76            | 100.0              |                    |

Table 14.

| Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Disagree  | 17            | 22.4               | 22.4               |
| Somewhat agree | 12          | 15.8               | 38.2               |
| Agree     | 36            | 47.4               | 85.5               |
| Strongly Agree | 11          | 14.5               | 100.0              |
| Total     | 76            | 100.0              |                    |
Table 15.

| Do you Only use the Products and Food Services that you Trust and Reluctant to try New Ones Because of the Increase in Food Crimes? | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.3 | 3.9 |
| Disagree | 2 | 2.6 | 6.6 |
| Somewhat agree | 19 | 25.0 | 31.6 |
| Agree | 35 | 46.1 | 77.6 |
| Strongly Agree | 17 | 22.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 76 | 100.0 | |

The fourth indicator deals with information seeking behavior as 52.6 % respondents agree that they do consider taking reviews about food safety before making a purchase. 44.7 % respondents agree that they do consider reading the food labels carefully due to increase in food crimes and 26.3 % strongly agree that the read food labels carefully. Cumulatively 71 % population is in agreement that they have developed the habit of reading food labels carefully. Majority 47 % strongly agree that they ensure that products are halal before they make purchase decision. Corresponding tables are given below.

Table 16.

| Do you Seek Reviews about Food Safety Before Ordering the Food from Restaurants/Eateries? | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Disagree | 8 | 10.5 | 10.5 |
| Somewhat agree | 14 | 18.4 | 28.9 |
| Agree | 40 | 52.6 | 81.6 |
| Strongly Agree | 14 | 18.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 76 | 100.0 | |

Table 17.

| Do you Care to Inquire about Restaurants for their Safety and Hygiene Practices? | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Disagree | 5 | 6.6 | 7.9 |
| Somewhat agree | 11 | 14.5 | 22.4 |
| Agree | 28 | 36.8 | 59.2 |
| Strongly Agree | 31 | 40.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 76 | 100.0 | |

Table 18.

| Do you Read Food Labels Carefully Before Buying the Products to Ensure Safety Because of an Increase in Food Crimes? | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Disagree | 8 | 10.5 | 11.8 |
| Somewhat agree | 13 | 17.1 | 28.9 |
| Agree | 34 | 44.7 | 73.7 |
| Strongly Agree | 20 | 26.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 76 | 100.0 | |

Table 19.

| Do you Care to Ensure that the Products are Labeled as Halal? | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.3 | 3.9 |
Do you Care to Ensure that the Products are Labeled as Halal?

|                | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Disagree       | 3         | 3.9           | 7.9                |
| Somewhat agree | 12        | 15.8          | 23.7               |
| Agree          | 22        | 28.9          | 52.6               |
| Strongly Agree | 36        | 47.4          | 100.0              |
| Total          | 76        | 100.0         |                    |

The fifth indicator deals with the perceived trust of audience in street food vendors. 35.5 are in agreement and 28.9 % are in strong degree of agreement that street food vendors are more likely to involve in street food crimes. Surprisingly, respondents have more trust in street food vendor as 50 % of the respondents agree that mid-range restaurants are more likely to involve in food crimes. Majority of the respondents strongly disagree to visit a restaurant if it is involved in food crime. Corresponding tables are given below.

Table 20.

Do you think Street Food Vendors are more Likely to Commit Food Crimes?

|                | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 1        | 1.3           | 1.3                |
| Disagree        | 10        | 13.2          | 14.5               |
| Somewhat agree  | 16        | 21.1          | 35.5               |
| Agree           | 27        | 35.5          | 71.1               |
| Strongly Agree  | 22        | 28.9          | 100.0              |
| Total           | 76        | 100.0         |                    |

Table 21.

Do you think if Restaurants and Mid-Range Eateries Likely to Commit Food Crimes?

|                | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 2        | 2.6           | 2.6                |
| Somewhat agree   | 23        | 30.3          | 32.9               |
| Agree            | 38        | 50.0          | 82.9               |
| Strongly Agree   | 13        | 17.1          | 100.0              |
| Total            | 76        | 100.0         |                    |

Table 22.

Do you Visit a Restaurant if it Caught for Committing Food Crime?

|                | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Disagree | 16       | 21.1          | 22.4               |
| Disagree         | 29        | 38.2          | 60.5               |
| Somewhat agree   | 8         | 10.5          | 71.1               |
| Agree            | 5         | 6.6           | 77.6               |
| Strongly Agree   | 17        | 22.4          | 100.0              |
| Total            | 76        | 100.0         |                    |

The sixth indicator is related to socially responsible behavior of audience towards food crimes, which includes realization of social responsibility by the audience to aware the peers and notify authorities about the food crimes. 47.4 % percent agree and 34.2 % strongly agree that they share information about food crimes with their peers. Whereas, 30.3 % agree and 30 % strongly agree that they share information with the authorities as well.
Table 23.

| Don't Care to Share Information Related to Food Crimes with Their Peers? | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------------|
| Disagree                                                                | 2         | 2.6          | 3.9                |
| Somewhat agree                                                         | 11        | 14.5         | 18.4               |
| Agree                                                                  | 36        | 47.4         | 65.8               |
| Strongly Agree                                                        | 26        | 34.2         | 100.0              |
| Total                                                                  | 76        | 100.0        |                    |

Table 24.

| Do you Care to Report Food Crimes to Relevant Authorities? | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Disagree                                        | 1         | 1.3          | 2.6                |
| Disagree                                                 | 8         | 10.5         | 13.2               |
| Somewhat agree                                           | 20        | 26.3         | 39.5               |
| Agree                                                    | 23        | 30.3         | 69.7               |
| Strongly Agree                                           | 23        | 30.3         | 100.0              |
| Total                                                    | 76        | 100.0        |                    |

Analysis of variable 3: Performance evaluation of media’s role regarding food crimes reporting.

The last variable deals with public’s evaluation of media’s role regarding their performance against food crimes. Majority of the respondents 38.2 % strongly agree that media has played a significant role in changing people’s food perception. 36.8 % are in agreement of media’s role regarding food safety perception. Cumulatively 75 % respondents have an agreement regarding the role of media in playing an important role of changing public’s perception towards food safety.

Table 25.

| Do you think Media has Played a Significant Role in Changing Food Safety Perception? | Frequency | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------------|
| Disagree                                                                          | 2         | 2.6          | 3.9                |
| Somewhat agree                                                                    | 16        | 21.1         | 25.0               |
| Agree                                                                             | 28        | 36.8         | 61.8               |
| Strongly Agree                                                                    | 29        | 38.2         | 100.0              |
| Total                                                                             | 76        | 100.0        |                    |

Discussion and Conclusion

Valkenburg, Peter and Walther (2016) explained the overall role of media in creating the effect on the audience. There is nexus of theoretical standpoints explaining the role of media in creating an influence on public perception. For example, framing analysis, agenda setting theory and propaganda theory all primarily discuss the role of media with somewhat negative connotation. As all these theories claim that media is generally leading public perception and opinion for their own interest. This research takes a different approach on what popularly known as “media lead public what to think about and how to think about” narrative. Media also educate public about pressing issues and do direct their attention about the emerging issues of social and political world. The study provides an overall assessment of public’s opinion regarding the public service role of media in food crimes and how food crime investigations have prioritized the food crimes as key public concern in recent times. Brevini (2015) has discussed how community media around the world has helped different communities reach their goals. Community media create common cultural and educational goals of society and engage community to reach the goals. According to the report media has been effective in increasing knowledge and awareness amongst public regarding food crimes. But it is important to note here that sometimes the increase in knowledge may not always transform in behavioral change.
Arlt, Hoppe and Wolling (2011) while explaining the role of media and its influence on public, authors did confirm that there is some influence of media on people’s intention and behavior regarding to the climate change effect but the influence can be simplified as there are number that intervene with the intention and action. According to the current study results the influence on the media is also created on several indicators of perception and behavioral changes. There is a range of behavioral changes respondents agree that have happened due to media’s coverage of food crimes. For example, respondents have adopted more precautionary measure; exercised restrained to spend on the food prepared outside and actively sought information about the food safety standards of various food manufacturers and suppliers. But there is a lot of diversity as far as information seeking is concerned, audience generally tend to rely asking their peers about the food quality and safety and comparatively do less effort in inquiring the restaurants directly about food safety standards. In addition to that media also influenced on the perceived trust of audience towards restaurants and eateries. The final variable deal with the overall evaluation of media’s role in society with reference to criminal justice regarding food crimes. There is also an agreement amongst the audience about the socially responsible role of media. Majority of the audience strongly agreed that media has played an important role regarding alleviating the perception of public regarding food safety standards. The social responsibility framework of media provides a vision to media organizations and journalism practitioners to safeguard and prioritize public interest. Decisions and choices of media organization should be a reflection of self-responsibility and self-accountability (Christians and Fackler, 2014). Since the role of media with reference to food crimes has not received a lot of attention of academia and community. It is suggested for researchers to undertake the role of media against food crimes from several perspectives for example relationship of media and organized food crimes; analysis of criminal justice representation on media and how media aids the authorities and associations with reference to food crimes.
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