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1. Introduction

- Consumer risk reactions during a product-harm crisis may substantially impact the demand of food products and other services, affect business reputations and sales, and compromise the performance of marketing channels of an entire industry.
- Consumer reactions may vary greatly among countries because of cultural differences and diverging public and industry risk-management policies regarding the communication of the “actual” level of risk.
- Market barometers and consumption dropped dramatically in many countries throughout the BSE and bird flu crisis.

2. Research Objective

- To evaluate consumer risk attitudes towards and risk perceptions of harmed products (beef due to BSE; chicken due to bird flu/BF) across different countries in which different contingent market conditions occur, and
- To quantify how consumer attitudes and perceptions affect the consumption of the harmed products within different crisis phases (pre-; incipient-; and post-crisis phases).

3. Theoretical Background

The influence of risk attitudes and risk perceptions on consumer risk behavior (CRB) can be used to formulate effective marketing strategies in case of a product-harm crisis (Pennings et al., 2002; Pennings & Wansink, 2004; Schroeder et al., 2007; Kalogerias, 2010). How?

By decoupling consumer risk behavior into the separate components of risk attitude (RA) and risk perception (RP), and the interaction of the two: (RA * RP), a more robust conceptualization and prediction of the puzzling consumer reactions to a market crisis situation may be possible.

Yet, CRB is a part of a dynamic decision problem that does not simply terminate in a specific point in time. Instead, the behavior of an individual consumer may adapt to the contingent conditions (i.e., contingent contexts) occurring in a dynamic decision environment (Hogarth, 1981; Hoch & Deiton, 1989; Bettman et al., 1998; Moorman et al., 2004)

4. Conceptual Model

- CRB may be conceptualized as comprising two decisions that share the same decision-making structure:
  a) participation decision, and
  b) quantity (reduction) decision.

These two separate but interdependent decisions reflect the reduction in the consumption of a harmed product. We hypothesize that:

The impact of consumers RA, RP and RA*RP on consumer decisions is more likely to decrease in the pre- and post- phases than in the incipient-phase of a product harm crisis.

5. Research Design

- Method: Face-to-face interviews with Americans & Germans regarding reduction in beef consumption due to the BSE crisis; and with Dutch, Greek and Egyptian consumers regarding reduction in chicken consumption due to the BF crisis. Interviews conducted at grocery malls.
- A structured questionnaire was used including psychometric scales for measuring RA and RP. A total of 823 American, 600 German, 294 Dutch, 302 Egyptians, and 347 Greek consumers were interviewed during different BSE and BF crisis phases.
- Analysis: A double-hurdle model was applied

6. Main Findings & Implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-crisis phase</th>
<th>Incipient-crisis phase</th>
<th>Post-crisis phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(RA) Product elimination &amp; recalls</td>
<td>Increased influence &amp; magnitude</td>
<td>Full product-elimination and recall strategies</td>
<td>Partial product-elimination and recall strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RP) Communication strategies</td>
<td>Investing more in communication strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA*RP</td>
<td>Mixture of strategies based on the relative importance of RA &amp; RP</td>
<td>Strengthening both product-elimination and communication strategies</td>
<td>Partial product-elimination and investing less in communication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The relative importance of RA, RP, and RA*RP changed during crisis phases for different segments of the population: it is lower in the pre- and post-crisis phases.
- Marketing strategies, agribusinesses and public policies must be adapted over time.