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Summary

The Food Standards Agency (FSA or Agency) places ten questions on the TNS\(^1\) consumer face to face omnibus survey on a biannual basis in order to monitor key Agency issues. Fieldwork for this wave of research took place from the 9 May to the 13 May 2012 and a representative sample of 2141 adults in the UK was interviewed. The following report shows top-line findings from in-house analysis. All sub group differences and wave on wave changes cited are statistically significant and reported at the 95% confidence level\(^2\).

- The main food safety issues of total concern for respondents were food hygiene when eating out (38%) and food poisoning such as Salmonella and E. Coli (32%). Respondents were also concerned about the use of additives in food products (28%). The same main food safety issues of concern were reported in the previous waves of the Tracker (November 2010 to November 2011).

- Time series data indicates a general decrease in concern for food safety issues. For example, total concern for food poisoning decreased from 61% in March 2001 to 32% in May 2012.

- 84% of respondents reported being aware of the hygiene standards of places they eat out at or buy food from. This figure has increased compared to wave 1 of the Tracker (80% in November 2010).

- The main ways respondents reported being aware were from general appearance of premises (69%), appearance of staff (54%) and reputation (41%). The same main ways were reported in the previous wave of the Tracker (November 2011).

---

\(^1\) www.tnsglobal.com

\(^2\) This is where we can be 95% confident that the results did not come about by chance.
• 81% of respondents reported being aware of the Food Standards Agency in this wave.

• The main issue that respondents reported the FSA to be responsible for was ensuring food bought is safe to eat (85% for total awareness). This was also the case in November 2011.

• 64% of respondents reported that they trusted the Agency to do its job. This figure is similar to the previous waves of the Tracker (November 2010 to November 2011).

• When prompted, 24% of respondents reported that they had seen or heard about the Food Hygiene Rating Scheme, 20% had seen or heard about Scores on the Doors and 11% had seen or heard about the Food Hygiene Information Scheme. Awareness of the Food Hygiene Rating Scheme and Scores on the Doors increased in this wave compared to the previous wave.

---

3 The Food Hygiene Rating Scheme (FHRS), which is for England, Wales and Northern Ireland, and the Food Hygiene Information Scheme (FHIS) are FSA/local authority partnership initiatives for providing consumers with information about hygiene standards in food premises at the time they are inspected. The FHRS was launched in November 2010 and the FHIS has been operating in some parts of Scotland since 2006. Not all local authorities are operating these ‘national’ schemes yet and some currently operate their own ‘local’ schemes, many of which are called ‘scores on the doors’.
Background

The Food Standards Agency (FSA or Agency) has traditionally placed six questions on the TNS consumer face to face omnibus survey on a quarterly basis in order to monitor key Agency issues. Tracking began in 2001.

These questions were redeveloped in spring 2010 and three new questions were added to the redeveloped tracker in wave 3. The Agency now places ten questions on the TNS consumer face to face omnibus survey on a biannual basis. See Annex A for detail on the changes made to the Tracker.

This is wave 4 of the new tracker. The fieldwork period for this wave of research was 9 May to 13 May 2012. A representative sample of 2141 adults in the UK was interviewed.

The questions cover concern about specific food issues (spontaneous and prompted), attitudes towards particular food safety issues, awareness of hygiene standards in eating establishments, awareness of the FSA and the Agency’s responsibilities (spontaneous and prompted), trust in the FSA, and awareness of initiatives or schemes concerning food hygiene (spontaneous and prompted). (See Annex B for the questionnaire).

Where the term ‘total’ is used to report the research findings it refers to spontaneous and prompted responses combined.

The following report shows top-line findings from in-house analysis. All sub group differences and wave on wave changes cited are statistically significant and reported at the 95% confidence level^4. Earlier Tracker reports and full results, including wave on wave figures, are available on request in table format. Please contact helen.atkinson@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk

---

^4 This is where we can be 95% confident that the results did not come about by chance.
1. Concern about Food Issues

The main food issues of total concern for respondents were food prices (63%), the amount of salt in food (49%), food waste (45%), the amount of fat in food (45%), the amount of sugar in food and the amount of saturated fat in food (both at 42%) (See Figure 1 for more information).

The main food safety issues of total concern for respondents were food hygiene when eating out (38%) and food poisoning such as Salmonella and E. Coli (32%). Respondents were also concerned about the use of additives in food products (28%). The same main food safety issues of concern were reported in the previous waves of the Tracker (November 2010 to November 2011) (See Figures 1, 8 and 9 for more information).

The main food issues of spontaneous concern for respondents were food prices (16%), the amount of salt in food (8%), the amount of fat in food (7%) and the amount of sugar in food (7%). These issues are similar to the main food issues of spontaneous concern for respondents in the previous waves of the Tracker (November 2010 to November 2011) (See Figure 2, 6 and 7 for more information).

Respondents aged 16-25 demonstrated a lower total concern than every other age group for the following food safety issues: the use of additives in food (16%), food hygiene at home (13%), the use of pesticide to grow food (11%), hormones/steroids/antibiotics in food (6%), and the feed given to livestock (6%) (See Table 1 for more information). Respondents aged 16-25 also showed a lower spontaneous concern than all other age groups for several issues including: food prices (7%), the amount of salt in food (4%) and the use of additives in food (2%) (See Table 2 for more information).

These subgroup findings may reflect the average number of responses stated to this question by the younger age group compared to the other sub groups.
within the category; respondents aged 16-25 had a lower average number of responses compared to the other age groups.

Respondents in social grade AB showed a higher spontaneous concern than all other social grade groups for the use of additives in food (10%), Animal welfare (8%) and food miles (7%) (See Table 2 for more information). Again this finding may reflect the average number of responses stated to this question by AB social grade compared to the other sub groups within the category; respondents in social grade AB had a higher average number of spontaneous responses compared to the other social grades.

Please see Annex C for an explanation of the social grades

Average number of spontaneous mentions to Q1a for different age groups include: 16-25yr (2.26), 26-35yr (2.36), 36-49yr (2.58), 50-65yr (2.41),66+yr (2.74). Average number of total mentions to Q1b for different age groups include: 16-25yr (2.48), 26-35yr (3.39), 36-49yr (3.37), 50-65yr (3.86),66+yr (3.50). Average number of spontaneous mentions to Q1a for different social grades include: AB (2.88), C1 (2.20), C2 (2.22), DE (2.68).
Figure 1. Food issues of total concern (May 2012 and November 2011). Base: All respondents, UK

Red circles indicate a statistically significant change from the previous wave (Nov 2011) of the Tracker, reported at the 95% confidence level.
Figure 2. Food issues of spontaneous concern (May 2012 and November 2011)\(^8\). Base: All respondents, UK

\(^8\) Red circles indicate a statistically significant change from the previous wave (Nov 2011) of the Tracker, reported at the 95% confidence level.
Table 1. Age differences in total concern about food safety issues  
(May 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>16-25yr</th>
<th>26-35yr</th>
<th>36-49yr</th>
<th>50-65yr</th>
<th>66+yr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted base</strong></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food hygiene when eating out</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food poisoning</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of additives in food</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%*</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date labels</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of pesticides</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%*</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM foods</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hormones, steroids and antibiotics in food</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%*</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food hygiene at home</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%*</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSE</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed given to livestock</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%*</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents, UK

* shows a result that is statistically significantly lower compared to all other age groups
### Table 2. Age and social grade differences in spontaneous concern about food issues (May 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>16-25yr</th>
<th>26-35yr</th>
<th>36-49yr</th>
<th>50-65yr</th>
<th>66+yr</th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>DE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted base</strong></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food prices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%*</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount of salt in food</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%*</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of additives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%*</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%*</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animal welfare</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%*</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food miles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%*</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents, UK

* shows a result that is statistically significantly different when compared to all other subgroups in the category
Total concern for the amount of fat in food, the amount of sugar in food, foods aimed at children, food miles and hormones/steroids/antibiotics in food increased this wave compared to the previous wave (November 2011). All other food issues were at a similar level when compared to the November 2011 wave of the Tracker (See Figure 1 for more detail). These results may reflect a seasonal fluctuation in the average number of responses to this question; in spring (waves 2 and 4) the average number of responses to this question was higher than in winter (waves 1 and 3).9

Spontaneous concern for the amount of sugar in food, food hygiene when eating out, food miles and foods aimed at children also increased this wave compared to wave 3. All other food issues spontaneously mentioned were at a similar level to those reported in the previous wave (November 2011). (See Figure 2 for more detail)

Looking at broader time series data for the Tracker this indicates a general decrease in concern for food safety issues.10 For example, spontaneous concern for food poisoning decreased from 24% in March 2003 to 5% in May 2012 (See figure 6, Annex D). While total concern for food poisoning decreased from 61% in March 2001 to 32% in May 2012 (See figure 8, Annex D).

---

9 Average number of mentions for food issues of total concern for all waves of the tracker include: 6.64 (wave 1), 6.92 (wave 2), 6.60 (wave 3), 6.91 (wave 4).
10 Caution should be applied when interpreting this data and the data in the next two paragraphs. Further detail on these cautions can be found in Annex D.
2. Concern about Food Safety

44%\textsuperscript{11} of respondents reported being concerned about the safety of food sold in UK shops and supermarkets in this wave of the tracker, while 34%\textsuperscript{12} of respondents reported being unconcerned. In contrast, 52%\textsuperscript{11} of respondents reported being concerned about the safety of food sold in UK restaurants, pubs, cafes and takeaways, and 28%\textsuperscript{12} reported being unconcerned. These figures are similar to all previous waves of the Tracker (See Table 3 for more detail).

Males were less concerned about the safety of food sold than females. This was also the case in the previous waves of the tracker (See Table 4 for more detail).

Table 3. Total concern about food safety for all four waves of the Tracker (November 2010 to May 2012) \textsuperscript{11}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food sold in UK restaurants,</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pubs, cafes and takeaways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food sold in shops and</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supermarkets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents, UK.

\textsuperscript{11} Figure based on net of respondents who reported being ‘very concerned’ or ‘fairly concerned’
\textsuperscript{12} Figure based on net of respondents who reported being ‘fairly unconcerned’ or ‘very unconcerned’
Table 4. Gender concerns about food safety for all four waves of the Tracker (November 2010 to May 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weighted base</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food sold in UK restaurants, pubs, cafes and takeaways</td>
<td>49%*</td>
<td>48%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food sold in shops and supermarkets</td>
<td>41%*</td>
<td>43%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents, UK. Net concerned figures

* shows a result that is statistically significantly lower compared to females in the same wave of the Tracker
3. Awareness of Hygiene Standards

84%\textsuperscript{13} of respondents reported being aware of the hygiene standards of places they eat out at or buy food from. This figure has increased compared to wave 1 of the Tracker (80% in November 2010).

Those who reported being aware of hygiene standards of places they eat out at or buy food from were asked how they were aware of these standards. The main ways respondents reported being aware were from general appearance of premises (69%), appearance of staff (54%) and reputation (41%). The same main ways were reported in the previous wave of the Tracker.

Awareness of hygiene standards based on general appearance of the premises and hygiene sticker increased in this wave of the tracker compared to November 2011 (See Figure 3 for more information). Furthermore, awareness based on hygiene sticker was higher this wave compared to every other wave of the biannual tracker (See table 5 for more detail).

\textsuperscript{13} Figure based on net of respondents who reported ‘yes – always’ or ‘yes – sometimes’
Figure 3. Awareness of hygiene standards (May 2012 and November 2011)\textsuperscript{14}

Base: All respondents who reported being aware of the hygiene standards of places they eat out at or buy food from.

\textsuperscript{14} Red circles indicate a statistically significant change from the previous wave (Nov 2011) of the Tracker, reported at the 95% confidence level.
Table 5. Awareness of hygiene standards for all four waves of the Tracker (November 2010 to May 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Nov 2010</th>
<th>May 2011</th>
<th>Nov 2011</th>
<th>May 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted base</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1594</td>
<td>1637</td>
<td>1579</td>
<td>1676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General appearance of premise</td>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td><strong>46%</strong></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene Sticker</td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td><strong>18%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents who reported being aware of the hygiene standards of places they eat out at or buy food from.

* shows a result that is statistically significantly different when compared to all other waves
4. Awareness of the Food Standards Agency and its Responsibilities

81% of respondents reported being aware of the Food Standards Agency in this wave of the tracker. Awareness is similar to the previous wave (80% in November 2011).

Taking a longer term look, Tracker time series data shows a general increase in awareness of the FSA from June 2001 (64%) to May 2012 (81%)\(^\text{15}\) (See figure 10, Annex D).

Respondents aged 36-65 years were more aware of the FSA than those aged between 16-35 years and 66 years and over. Similarly, respondents in social grades AB, were more aware of the FSA than all other grades. Minority ethnic respondents were less aware of the FSA than white respondents. (See Table 6 for more detail).

\(^{15}\) Caution should be applied when interpreting this data. Further detail on these cautions can be found in Annex D
Table 6. Subgroup differences in awareness of the FSA (May 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighted base</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>16-25 yr</th>
<th>26-35 yr</th>
<th>36-49 yr</th>
<th>50-65 yr</th>
<th>66+ yr</th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>DE</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Minority Ethnic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Base: All respondents, UK
| Aware of FSA  | 81%  | 72%      | 81%*     | 87%**    | 88%**   | 70%    | 92%** | 85%* | 83%* | 68% | 83%** | 65%            |

* shows a result that is statistically significantly higher compared to at least one other sub-group in the category

** shows a result that is statistically significantly higher compared to all other sub-groups in the category
Those who were aware of the FSA were asked which issues they thought the FSA was responsible for. The main issue that respondents reported the FSA to be responsible for was ensuring food bought is safe to eat (51% for spontaneous awareness and 85% for total awareness). This was also the case in November 2011 (See Table 7 for more detail).

98% of respondents in Northern Ireland and 95% of respondents in Scotland reported that ensuring the food you buy is safe to eat fell within the Agency’s remit\(^\text{16}\). These figures were higher than for England and Wales\(^\text{17}\) (see Table 8 for more detail).

\[^{16}\text{Total awareness figures}\]
\[^{17}\text{Results should be interpreted with caution due to the small sample size for participants from Northern Ireland and Wales. Weighted base: 43 and 86 respectively.}\]
Table 7. Total awareness of FSA responsibilities (May 2012 and November 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nov 2011</th>
<th>May 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted base</strong></td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>1617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring the food you buy is safe to eat</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date labels</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition labelling</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of origin labelling</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting and enabling healthy eating</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting food safety in the home</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food sustainability</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents aware of the FSA, UK

* shows a statistically significant change compared to the previous wave of the Tracker (Nov 2011)
Table 8. Total awareness of FSA responsibilities by country for May 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weighted base</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Northern Ireland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring the food you buy is safe to eat</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date labels</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>95%*</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>98%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition labelling</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>68%*</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of origin labelling</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>64%*</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting and enabling healthy eating</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>60%*</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting food safety in the home</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%*</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food sustainability</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%*</td>
<td>47%*</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents aware of the FSA, UK

* shows a result that is statistically significantly higher compared to at least one other subgroup in the category
5. Trust in the Food Standards Agency

In autumn 2010 the Tracker was redeveloped in full due to observed fluctuations in responses to the question on trust. For the purpose of monitoring the impact of the questionnaire changes, wave 1 and 2 of the redeveloped Tracker ran both the old question monitoring trust and the redeveloped question using a split run (50:50) of respondents. We phased out the old question on trust in wave 3 (See Annex A for more details).

Respondents who reported being aware of the Food Standards Agency were asked how much they trust or distrust the FSA to do its job. 64%\(^{18}\) of respondents reported that they trusted the Agency to do its job; only 5%\(^{19}\) of respondents reported that they distrusted it. These figures are similar to the previous waves of the tracker (62% in November 2010, 66% in May 2011, and 65% in November 2011).

\(^{18}\) Figure based on net of respondents who reported ‘I trust the FSA a lot’ or ‘I trust the FSA’

\(^{19}\) Figure based on net of respondents who reported ‘I distrust the FSA’ or ‘I distrust the FSA a lot’
6. Awareness of initiatives or schemes concerning the hygiene standards in places where people eat out or shop for food

In wave 3, three new questions were added to the end of the survey to measure awareness of initiatives or schemes concerning the hygiene standards in places where people eat out or shop for food. (See Annex B for the questionnaire).

In this wave, 25% of respondents had seen or heard about initiatives or schemes concerning the hygiene standards in places people eat out or shop for food. This figure has increased compared to the previous wave (19% in November 2011).

When asked to spontaneously name these initiatives or schemes, the most common responses given by these respondents were the Food Hygiene Star Rating Scheme (23%), the Scores on the Doors (16%) schemes and the Food Hygiene Award (14%) and Food Hygiene Rating Scheme (12%) (See figure 4 for more detail).

Respondents were then shown the names of the two FSA schemes concerning the hygiene standards in places people eat out or shop for food and the name ‘scores on the doors’ which is used for the majority of other schemes operating in the UK. When prompted, 24% of respondents reported that they had seen or heard about the Food Hygiene Rating Scheme, 20% had seen or heard about Scores on the Doors and 11% had seen or heard about the Food Hygiene Information Scheme. Awareness of the Food

---

20 The Food Hygiene Rating Scheme (FHRS), which is for England, Wales and Northern Ireland, and the Food Hygiene Information Scheme (FHIS) are FSA/local authority partnership initiatives for providing consumers with information about hygiene standards in food premises at the time they are inspected. The FHRS was launched in November 2010 and the FHIS has been operating in some parts of Scotland since 2006. Not all local authorities are operating these ‘national’ schemes yet and some currently operate their own ‘local’ schemes, many of which are called ‘scores on the doors’.
Hygiene Rating Scheme and Scores on the Doors increased in this wave (See figure 5 for more detail).

Respondents from Northern Ireland were more aware of any of these schemes than participants from the other UK countries (See table 9 for more detail).
Figure 4. Spontaneous awareness of initiatives or schemes concerning hygiene standards (May 2012 and November 2011)

Base: All respondents who had seen or heard about any initiatives or schemes concerning the hygiene standards in places where people eat out or shop for food.

21 Red circles indicate a statistically significant change from the previous wave (Nov 2011) of the Tracker, reported at the 95% confidence level.
Figure 5. Total awareness of Food Hygiene Rating Scheme, Food Hygiene Information Scheme and “Scores on the Doors” schemes (May 2012 and November 2011)\textsuperscript{22}

Base: All respondents, UK

\textsuperscript{22} Red circles indicate a statistically significant change from the previous wave (Nov 2011) of the Tracker, reported at the 95\% confidence level.
Table 9. Total awareness of Food Hygiene Rating Scheme, Food Hygiene Information Scheme and “Scores on the Doors” schemes by country (May 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
<th>Wales</th>
<th>Northern Ireland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weighted base</strong></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Hygiene Rating Scheme</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%*</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>36%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores on the Doors</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%*</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%*</td>
<td>49%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Hygiene Information Scheme</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any***</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%*</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>43%*</td>
<td>61%**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents, UK

* Shows a result that is statistically significantly higher compared to at least one other sub-group in the category
** Shows a result that is statistically significantly higher compared to all other sub-groups in the category
*** Any participants who had heard about one or more of the schemes reported in the table.

*Note: Results should be interpreted with caution due to small sample for participants from Northern Ireland.*
Annex A. Technical summary

Fieldwork for the Tracker is conducted every six months; however the frequency has changed over the history of the survey:

- **April 2001-December 2001**: research conducted every three months;
- **October 2001-September 2002**: research conducted every month;
- **December 2002-March 2010**: research conducted every three months;
- **November 2010 – Onwards**: research conducted every six months.

From April 2001 to June 2006 research was conducted via face-to-face interviews amongst a random location sample in order to gain a nationally representative sample of adults aged 16 and over in Great Britain. From September 2006 the sample was extended to be representative of the United Kingdom.

An additional question was asked each wave between September 2008 and March 2010 to measure trust in the FSA. This question had previously been asked in the FSA annual Consumer Attitudes Survey (CAS) which was last conducted in 2007. Due to differences in question order and sampling, results from the Tracker were not directly comparable to the CAS. During this time the trust question from CAS was included in the Tracker. This was in addition to an existing question in the Tracker that measured confidence in the FSA.

In autumn 2010 the Tracker was redeveloped in full due to observed fluctuations in responses to the question on trust. Trust in the FSA remained stable from the time of its introduction (50% in September 2008) until September 2009 (48%). However, there was a statistically significant decrease in trust to 44% in December and a statistically significant increase to 50% in March 2010. These fluctuations were thought to be likely to be due to methodological reasons (question wording, ordering and response scale). This prompted the FSA to commission a review of the Tracker as a whole and to redevelop the survey questionnaire.
The reports on the redevelopment of the Tracker can be viewed at http://www.food.gov.uk/science/socsci/surveys/publictrackingsurvey.

For the purpose of monitoring the impact of the questionnaire changes, wave 1 and 2 of the redeveloped Tracker ran both the old question monitoring trust (that had previously been asked in the FSA annual Consumer Attitudes Survey) and the redeveloped question using a split run (50:50) of respondents. We phased out the old question on trust in wave 3 as we had sufficient data to monitor the question change at this stage.

In wave 3, three new questions were added to the end of the survey to measure awareness of initiatives or schemes concerning the hygiene standards in places where people eat out or shop for food. (See Annex B for the questionnaire).

The earlier reports and full data set in table format are available upon request. Please contact helen.atkinson@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk

Data has been weighted on 2006 BARB data, according to age, gender, class and the regions North, South and Midlands.

\[^{23}\text{This was a recommendation from the development work for the new biannual Tracker. For the full reports on the development work please see: http://www.food.gov.uk/science/socsci/surveys/publictrackingsurvey}\]
Annex B. Questionnaire

Q.1a What food issues, if any, are you concerned about? Which others? (Base: All adults UK)

(Spontaneous)

Q.1b And which of these food issues are you concerned about, if any? Please select all that apply. Which others? (Base: All adults UK)

07: Food poisoning such as Salmonella and E.Coli
11: Genetically Modified (GM) foods
02: BSE (‘mad cow disease’)
17: The feed given to livestock
19: The use of pesticides to grow food
18: The use of additives (such as preservatives and colouring) in food products
12: Hormones\steroids\antibiotics in food
03: Date labels, such as “best before” and “use by” labels
05: Food hygiene when eating out
04: Food hygiene at home
21: None of these
(DK)

Q.1c And which of THESE food issues are you concerned about, if any? Please select all that apply. Which others? (Base: All adults UK)

14: The amount of salt in food
16: The amount of sugar in food
13: The amount of fat in food
15: The amount of saturated fat in food
09: Foods aimed at children including school meals
21: None of these
(DK)

Q.1d And, finally in this section, which of THESE food issues are you concerned about, if any? Please select all that apply. Which others? (Base: All adults UK)

01: Animal welfare
08: Food prices
10: Food waste
06: Food miles (e.g. the distance food travels)
21: None of these
(DK)
Q.2a How concerned or unconcerned are you about the safety of ALL food that is sold in UK restaurants, pubs, cafes and takeaways? (Base: All adults UK)

01: I am very concerned
02: I am fairly concerned
03: I am neither concerned nor unconcerned
04: I am fairly unconcerned
05: I am very unconcerned

Q.2b How concerned or unconcerned are you about the safety of ALL food that is sold in UK shops and supermarkets? (Base: All adults UK)

01: I am very concerned
02: I am fairly concerned
03: I am neither concerned nor unconcerned
04: I am fairly unconcerned
05: I am very unconcerned

Q.3a When you buy food in shops or supermarkets, or eat at restaurants, cafes, pubs and takeaways, do you tend to be aware of the standards of hygiene of these places? (Base: All adults UK)

01: Yes – always
02: Yes – sometimes
03: No

Q.3b How do you know about the hygiene standards of the places you buy food from or eat out at? Please select all that apply. How else? (Base: All adults who are at all aware of the standards of hygiene when they buy food UK)

01: Word of mouth
02: Reputation
03: Appearance of people working there
04: General appearance of shop\restaurant\cafe\pub\takeaway
05: Hygiene sticker
06: Hygiene certificate
07: Websites
08: Other (specify)
Q.4 Which of the following, if any, have you heard of? Please select all that apply. Which others?  (Base: All adults UK)

01: Department of Health (only show if England)
02: Department for Health, Social Services and Public Safety (DHSSPS) (only show if NI)
03: Public Health Agency (PHA) (only show if NI)
04: Scottish Government Health Improvement Directorate (only show if Scotland)
05: Department for Public Health and Health Professions (only show if Wales)
06: Food Standards Agency
07: Safefood (only show if NI)
08: National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE)
09: Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) (only show if England)
10: Department for Rural Affairs (only show if Wales)
11: Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD) (only show if NI)
12: The Environment Agency (only show if England or Wales)
13: Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) (only show if Scotland)
14: Scottish Government Rural Directorate (only show if Scotland)
15: The British Medical Association
16: Office of Communications (OFCOM)
17: Audit Scotland (only show if Scotland)
18: Health & Safety Executive
19: Office of Fair Trading
20: World Health Organisation (WHO)
21: British Dietetic Association (BDA)

Q.5a And please can I check, which issues do you think the Food Standards Agency is responsible for? Which other issues?  (Base: All adults aware of the Food Standards Agency UK)

(Spontaneous)

Q.5b And which of these issues do you think the Food Standards Agency is responsible for?  (Please select all that apply. Which others? Base: All adults aware of the Food Standards Agency UK)

01: Ensuring the food you buy is safe to eat
02: Promoting food safety in the home
03: Promoting and enabling healthy eating and healthy lifestyles
04: Ensuring food is sustainable – such as reducing green house emissions and reducing waste when producing food
05: Nutrition labelling information, such as traffic light labelling
06: Date labels, such as “best before” and “use by” labels
07: Country of origin labels, which identify where food comes from
Q.6a How much do you trust or distrust the Food Standards Agency to do its job? That is, trust it to make sure the food sold in shops and restaurants is safe, and to provide advice on food safety in the home. (Base: All adults UK)

01: I trust it a lot
02: I trust it
03: I neither trust nor distrust it
04: I distrust it
05: I distrust it a lot

(QD)

Q.7 Have you seen or heard of any initiatives or schemes that tell you about the hygiene standards in places where you eat out or shop for food? (Base: All adults UK)

01: Yes
02: No

(QD)

Q.8 And what initiatives or schemes are they? (Base: All adults who have seen or heard of any initiatives/schemes that tell you about hygiene standards in places where people eat out or shop for food)

01: Food Hygiene Information Scheme
02: Food Hygiene Rating Scheme
03: Scores on the Doors
04: “H” for Hygiene Award Scheme
05: Food Hygiene Assessment Scheme
06: Food Hygiene Award
07: Food Hygiene Inspection Rating Scheme
08: Food Hygiene Star Rating Scheme
09: Food Safety Star Rating Scheme
10: Ratemyplace
11: Safe2eat
12: Smilesafe
13: Other

(QD/CR)

Q.9 Below are some initiatives and schemes that tell you about the hygiene standards in places where you eat out or shop for food. Which of them have you seen or heard of? – Total (Base: All adults UK)
Q.10 The questions I've just asked you about food hygiene and safety were funded by the Food Standards Agency (FSA). The FSA, or a social research organisation working on behalf of the Agency, may like to contact you within the next 12 months to take part in some further social research. Would you be willing for your contact details (name, address and telephone number), along with some of your answers to the survey, to be passed to the FSA, or a social research organisation working on behalf of the Agency, so that they can contact you for further research. The information provided to the Agency will be used for research purposes only. (Base: All adults UK)

01: Yes
02: No
(DK)
Prior to 1993 the standard means of social grading was based on the occupation of the head of the household. It is assumed that the family environment will affect the individual’s attitude and behaviour and that the status of the head of household is the most convenient means of defining it.

Since 1993 Market Research Companies have begun to base social grading on the occupation of the Chief Income Earner in the household i.e. the person in the household with the largest income, whether from employment, pensions, state benefits, investments or any other source.

More detail on the individual groupings below.
Occupational Groupings

A
- Approximately 3% of the total population
- These are professional people, or are very senior in business or commerce or are top level civil servants
- Retired people, previously grade A, and their widows

B
- Approximately 18% of the total population
- Middle management executives in large organisations, with appropriate qualifications
- Top management or owners of small business
- Retired people, previously grade B, and their widows.

C1
- Approximately 28% of the total population
- Junior management owners of small establishments: and all others in non-manual Positions
- Jobs in this group have very varied responsibilities and educational needs
- Retired people previously grade C1 and their widows.

C2
- Approximately 22% of the total population
- All skilled manual workers, and those manual workers with responsibility for other people
- Retired people previously grade C2 with a pension from their job
- Widow’s if receiving pensions from their late husbands job

D
- Approximately 18% of the total population
- All semi skilled and unskilled manual workers, and apprentices and trainees to skilled workers
- Retired people previously grade D with a pension from their job
- Widows if receiving pensions from their late husbands job

E
- Approximately 11% of the total population
- All those entirely dependant on the state long term, through sickness, unemployment, old age or other reasons.
  Those unemployed for a period exceeding 6 months (otherwise classify on previous occupation)
- Casual workers and those without a regular income
- Only households without a chief wage earner will be coded in this group
Annex D. Time series data

Figure 6. Spontaneous concerns for food safety issues since March 2003

Base: All UK respondents excluding those ‘totally unconcerned’ about food safety issues (March 2003 to March 2010); All UK respondents from November 2010 onwards

Dashed red line in each time series graph indicates when the redeveloped biannual tracker started (wave 1 was November 2010).

These food safety issues have been tracked since March 2003. Caution should be applied when interpreting this data. The food issues question has changed several times since the tracker started in March 2001. The respondent base has also changed. Please contact us for further details on the cautions surrounding this data.
Figure 7. Spontaneous concerns for food safety issues since September 2009\textsuperscript{27}

Base: All UK respondents excluding those ‘totally unconcerned’ about food safety issues (September 2009 to March 2010); All UK respondents from November 2010 onwards

\textsuperscript{27} These food safety issues have been tracked since September 2009. Caution should be applied when interpreting this data. The food issues question has changed several times since the tracker started in March 2001. The respondent base has also changed. Please contact us for further details on the cautions surrounding this data.
Figure 8. Total concerns for food safety issues since March 2001

These food safety issues have been tracked since March 2001. Caution should be applied when interpreting this data. The food issues question has changed several times since the tracker started in March 2001. Please contact us for further details on the cautions surrounding this data.
These food safety issues have been tracked since September 2009. Caution should be applied when interpreting this data. The food issues question has changed several times since the tracker started in March 2001. Please contact us for further details on the cautions surrounding this data.
Base: All respondents, UK

Caution should be applied when interpreting this data. The awareness question has changed several times since the tracker started in March 2001. Please contact us for further details on the cautions surrounding this data.