Brexit-related food issues in the UK print media: setting the agenda for post-Brexit food policy
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Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of this paper is to explore how Brexit-related food issues are being presented in the UK print media.

Design/methodology/approach: Using the news database Nexis UK, relevant articles were identified based on key search terms, ‘Brexit’ and ‘Food’ or ‘Farm’ or ‘Agriculture’. The search criteria was set to include articles with three or more mentions of these terms. The search period was 6th April – 5th July, 2018.

Findings: The quality newspaper genre, and remain-supporting newspaper, The Guardian, in particular, dominated Food Brexit coverage. 17 distinct Food Brexit issues were covered, with food security and subsidies receiving the most coverage in leave-supporting publications and agriculture, trade and labour receiving the most coverage in remain-supporting publications. Dominant narratives and frames can be identified in the reporting, illustrating newspapers’ tendency to promote certain viewpoints in support of their own standpoint on Brexit. In all publication types, political voices feature far more prominently than any other stakeholder group, highlighting the significant potential for this group to influence public opinion and the post-Brexit food policy agenda.

Research limitations/implications: The authors only examined newspapers over a limited time period. Reporting in other media and at different stages in the Brexit negotiation process may differ.

Practical implications: Media reporting on Food Brexit issues has the potential to influence post-Brexit food policy.

Originality/value: This is the first study to look at reporting on Food Brexit in the UK media.
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Introduction

In June, 2016, the United Kingdom (UK) voted to leave the European Union (EU), a matter which has become commonly known as ‘Brexit’. At the time of the referendum, the form that Brexit would take and the subsequent implications were unknown and these are still being negotiated today. Whilst many uncertainties remain, what is known is that the UK’s food system is highly embedded in European policy and legislation, and that Brexit in any form will have major implications for UK food and farming (Lang & Schoen, 2016). Lang et al., state that over “4,000 pieces of [UK] regulation and law are EU based” (2017: 14) and of these, 40% concern food and farming (2017: 68). Additionally, the Brexit process will include the review and re-negotiation of 759 treaties with 132 non-EU countries, many of which will concern food-related issues (McClean, 2017). Furthermore, 27% of food consumed in the UK (Lang & Schoen, 2016: 24) and 40% of fruit and vegetables are imported from Europe (Lang & Schoen, 2016: 27). Europe is also the UK’s largest export market for food and agricultural products (The European Union Committee, 2017: 13).

Food and farming have therefore been forced on to the UK government’s policy agenda and there are a myriad of issues requiring government attention. How much attention these issues get, and the prevalence of ideas about ways to address them, will determine how they are dealt with. The process by which different issues gain position on the policy agenda is known as agenda setting (Birkland, 2007: 63), which is widely acknowledged as a fundamental part of the policy-making process (Jann & Wegrich, 2007; Walt et al., 2008: 310-312; Buse et al., 2012). While the literature acknowledges the difficulty of pinpointing causal effect, it widely accepts that the ability of the media to draw attention to certain issues make them central to the agenda setting process. This is seen as particularly important as the news media is the main source of information about public affairs for most people (Cobb & Elder, 1983; Buse et al., 2012; John et al., 2013).
Where issues feature more prominently in the media than others, they are likely to be perceived by the public as more important than those which receive less attention (Tuchman, 1978: 2; Russell, et al., 2016). The media also have the capability to shape the opinions of the public through the framing they use, whereby a narrative is constructed in order to encourage a particular interpretation of an issue (Entman, 2007: 164).

Lang et al. use the phrase “Food Brexit” to refer to “both the process during the course of negotiations between the UK and the EU that will be related to issues of agriculture and food, as well as to the new policy regime that will cover the UK’s agricultural and food system post-Brexit” (Lang et al., 2017: 7). ‘Food Brexit issues’ will be used hereinafter when discussing Brexit-related food and agricultural matters. Given the breadth of policy set to be affected by Britain’s departure from the EU, the ramifications of this for the future of British food and farming and the potential for the media to influence the new policy environment, the presentation of Food Brexit issues in the UK media is a valuable topic for analysis. As, to the best of our knowledge, there is an absence of any media analysis on Food Brexit issues specifically, this research will contribute to an understanding of how the agenda around Brexit and food is being set in the UK media in order to fill this knowledge gap. Three core research questions have been developed to respond to the aim of the research:

1. Which Food Brexit issues are reported on in the UK print media, with what frequency and in which publications?
2. How are these issues framed across the different publications?
3. Whose voices are represented in the Food Brexit-related media discourse?

Methodology

This research is grounded in a constructivist epistemology in which it is understood that truth and meaning are constructed and can be done so in different ways, even in relation to the
same phenomenon (Gray, 2014: 20). In accordance with constructivism, the theoretical
perspective of interpretivism, in which the central premise is “to understand the subjective
world of human experience” and how the “glossing of reality goes on” (Cohen et al., 2011: 17
– 18), is implicit in the focus of this research which seeks to establish the ways Food Brexit
issues are presented in the media (including the “glossing of reality” through media framing).

The research method employed was a media content analysis of the top ten national
newspapers in circulation (Audit Bureau of Circulation, 2018) (see Table 1). **Content analysis**
is a commonly used method for analysing media content, allowing for the analysis of both
manifest, quantitative data and latent, qualitative data (Krippendorff, 2004). Quantitative data
such as the number of articles published on each Food Brexit issue and the number of
quotes from different stakeholder groups contributed to answering research questions one
and three. Qualitative data, from the latent content on how issues were framed and any
dominant narratives, contributed to answering questions two and three.

**Newspaper selection**

The analysis focussed on the UK print media, as the articles are available in an accessible
format for study (Wells & Caraher, 2014: 1430). Whilst consumption of news via newspapers
is in decline in the UK, print newspapers are read by one in four adults every day, with a
combined daily reach of almost 13 million (Newsworks, no date-a: 3). As such, their potential
to shape public opinion and the policy environment remains substantial (Robinson et al.,
2012: 39). Furthermore, the newspapers to be included in the study have digital formats
which add significantly to overall consumption figures of those news brands (Ofcom, 2017:
29).

The range of newspapers selected fall under different categories; qualities (also known as
broadsheets), mid-market publications and populars (also known as tabloids) (Newsworks,
They encompass a range of editorial styles, readership profiles and political orientations, as well as positions on Brexit. Based on a study by the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, ‘UK Press Coverage of the EU Referendum’ (Levy et al., 2016), and research by the National Centre for Social Research, ‘Understanding the Leave Vote’ (Swales, 2016), Table 1 illustrates the position of the different newspapers on Brexit, in terms of whether they are broadly in favour of leaving or remaining in the European Union. This is pertinent for the analysis of how Food Brexit issues are being presented in the UK print media to different audiences. By analysing the top ten national newspapers in circulation and their Sunday counterparts, a comprehensive overview of the different ways Food Brexit issues are being framed in different newspaper types, with different political orientations, can be captured to understand how the agenda around Food Brexit is being set.

Table 1. Average circulation per issue for June 2018 and publication position on Brexit of newspapers included in the study.

Search strategy and article selection process
The search period was from 6th April – 5th July, 2018, having identified the Government’s Cabinet meeting at Chequers on 6th July to agree on their Brexit white paper as a key event in the Brexit-related policy-making process. Taking the three months prior to this, the date range enabled the latest developments in, and framing of, Food Brexit issues to be captured. This research was undertaken as part of a course of postgraduate study. As such, it provides a snapshot of reporting on Food Brexit issues. The authors recommend further research should take a more in-depth, longitudinal approach.

Using the news database Nexis UK, relevant articles were identified based on the search terms, ‘Brexit’ and ‘Food’ or ‘Farm!’ or ‘Agricultural’. In order to focus on the most relevant articles, the search criteria was set to include articles where there were ‘3 or more mentions’.
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of the key terms (and exclude newswires, websites and group duplicates) which generated 309 returns. From the Nexis results pages, Irish editions, duplicates, and letters from readers were identified and removed. The remaining 257 results were sorted by relevance according to the frequency of the search terms. Any irrelevant articles, such as those focussed on alcohol, or those which did not deal with Food Brexit issues specifically were removed from the sample, resulting in a pool of 84 articles.

Data collection and analysis

In a preliminary analysis, the researcher read the 84 articles closely and, taking an inductive approach (Gray, 2014: 18), identified 17 different categories (see Table 2). This allowed the main focus of the articles to be understood through reading them and categorising them accordingly, rather than applying pre-defined categories. Where articles had a dual focus, the two issues were recorded separately. In addition to the article categories, all of the manifest data on the articles were recorded including the newspaper name, publication date, newspaper format, headline and word count. The leave or remain-supporting position of the newspaper in which the article was printed was also recorded.

To understand the framing of the issues and identify dominant narratives, further, more in-depth qualitative analysis was required. The six issues reported on most frequently (subsidies, trade, agriculture, food prices, labour and food security), were selected for further analysis. This selection process resulted in a pool of 63 articles for closer study. Drawing on Entman’s definition of framing, the articles were critically examined to identify frame elements present, looking in particular, for how the issue was defined (especially in terms of any positive or negative slant), any suggested solutions or proposed courses of action relating to the issues, whether responsibility had been assigned to a particular stakeholder group or groups, and any other points of interest, such as use of language, which contributed to a certain presentation of the issue. Articles were manually colour-coded to identify different
frame elements and analytic memos (Saldaña, 2011: 98) written on key points pertinent to
the research questions.

Findings

84 relevant articles were published in the UK’s top ten print newspapers during the selected
date range. The quality genre overwhelmingly dominated reporting on Food Brexit issues
during this time period, printing almost 80% of the total number of articles. Within this
category, remain-supporting publications The Guardian and Observer were most prolific in
their coverage, printing over a third of the total number of articles alone. 17 Food Brexit
issues were identified in the print newspaper coverage. Table 2 broadly outlines what was
covered within the different issue categories and gives examples of headlines to indicate how
the issues were framed.

Table 2. Food Brexit issues in the UK print media from 6/4/18 – 5/7/18.
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In leave-supporting publications, 14 Food Brexit issues are covered. Those which do not feature are food safety, animal welfare, and fishing. Subsidies, trade and food security receive the most coverage, followed by food prices and agriculture. Reporting in the remain-supporting publications covers 16 issues. The most prominent issue is agriculture, followed by subsidies, trade and labour. Technology is not covered in the remain newspapers and there is very little coverage of the Irish border, food labelling and food policy.

Whilst the selection of, and salience given to, certain issues over others is a key aspect of the media’s role in agenda setting, it is also important to look at how these issues are being framed. The six issues reported on most frequently in terms of number of articles published (subsidies, trade, agriculture, food prices, labour and food security), were selected for further analysis. Dominant narratives could be identified, namely, optimism about the opportunity to improve farming in Britain coupled with a concern that post-Brexit trade deals might undermine British agriculture; Brexit as an opportunity to reform agricultural subsidies but different views on how this should be funded; the impact of limiting freedom of movement for EU workers on British agriculture; the potential for increased port checks if the UK leave the customs union and both optimistic and pessimistic views on the impact of this on food security; the potential impact of trade deals on food prices and the health inequality gap in Britain.

**Representation of Food Brexit stakeholder voices in the UK print media**

96 different individuals, institutions or organisations were quoted in the 63 articles analysed in depth. The different stakeholder voices were categorised as academics, CSOs, farmers, fisherfolk and agricultural workers, the agricultural industry, the retail industry, the logistics industry, the legal profession, political actors or research bodies.
The most frequently quoted group across all newspaper types, by a significant margin, were the political group, including senior level politicians, specific government departments and government spokespeople. It is interesting to note the complete absence of some stakeholder groups from the articles, such as public health professionals, the food manufacturing industry and the food service industry. The division of stakeholder quotes in leave- and remain-supporting publications is presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Stakeholder groups quoted in Food Brexit newspaper articles in leave/remain-supporting publications from 6/4/18 – 5/7/18

Of the 20 named individuals most quoted, 14 of these were political and the remaining six were from the agricultural industry or from farmers. Notably, Conservative MP, Jacob Rees-Mogg was quoted in leave-supporting publications only and then Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, Michael Gove, quoted primarily in remain-supporting papers, other than the Daily Telegraph.

Discussion

Leading academics on Brexit and food in Britain, Lang, Millstone and Marsden (2017), place significant responsibility in the hands of the British public to determine the outcome of Food Brexit. They contend that,

The outcome [of Food Brexit] will depend on…what the public requires its politicians and negotiators to deliver (Lang et al., 2017: 8).

However, in the same paper, the lack of information that has been made publically available by the UK government is highlighted, and the authors assert that “the British public has not been informed about its [the realities of a Food Brexit] implications” (Lang et al., 2017: 4).
They go on to argue that “the British media has a major role (and responsibility) to monitor what happens in the Food Brexit negotiations” (Lang et al., 2017: 68).

These assertions demand further consideration, as it is commonly accepted that the media is not impartial and publishes information that has been selected and presented in a particular way (Buse et al., 2012: 78; Wells & Caraher, 2014: 1428). Furthermore, these comments bring more general concerns about media plurality to the fore – that is the diversity of views available to citizens across the media (Foster, 2012; Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport, 2014; Ofcom, 2015) and the importance of media plurality to a properly functioning modern democracy. Foster (2012) articulates why media plurality matters:

1. that all citizens can access a range and diversity of high-quality news, opinion, and analysis from different sources, and second, that no single media owner can exercise undue power and influence over the political agenda (Foster, 2012: 5).

Many of the current concerns in this area stem from increasingly monopolised traditional mass media outlets, their continuing domination in the digital domain and the enormous influence of digital intermediaries or media gatekeepers such as Google and Facebook. In this context, the presentation of a diversity of views can be seen as increasingly important (Media Reform Coalition, 2019).

The findings of this study contribute to the media plurality debate, raising concerns about the range and diversity of opinion and analysis on offer in the UK print media. It found that the quality newspapers dominate Food Brexit reporting in the date range studied, in terms of both number of articles published and scope of Food Brexit issues covered. This can be attributed in large part to the stylistic differences between newspaper types, as the ‘quality’ publications generally publish ‘serious’, longer pieces with in-depth analysis, focussing on
politics, current affairs and international news. Conversely, popular and mid-market publications usually feature shorter articles with much less in-depth reporting (Branston & Stafford, 2010: 198; Williams, 2010: 10). These publications tend to have a lower socio-economic audience whereas the readers of quality newspapers tend to be from higher socio-economic groups (Hilton, et al., 2010: 943). The Guardian and the Observer, which dominated the Food Brexit coverage during this date range, are Britain’s most left-wing national newspapers (Smith, 2017) and have a clear remain-supporting standpoint. This can be understood as a “knowledge gap”, whereby information is “geared towards persons of a higher socio-economic status” and results in “a group of better-educated people who know more about most things, and those with low education who know less” (Hilton, et al., 2010: 943). It is critically important for policymakers to consider this in their development of post-Brexit food policy, particularly to ensure that poorer groups in society are not adversely affected by Food Brexit outcomes.

Although the greatest number of articles were published in the ‘quality’ genre, there are significant differences in the circulation figures of the different publications, as shown in Table 1. Of the five publications with the largest audiences (with an average circulation of over 500,000 per issue) only one is a ‘quality’ newspaper. Further, only one of these publications has a remain-supporting position on Brexit. Whilst there is some similarity between the most prolific issues in terms of number of articles and reach, the higher the number of articles published on an issue does not necessarily equate to that issue reaching the largest audience. This is pertinent when thinking about the potential for the presentation of Food Brexit issues in the UK print media to influence post-Brexit food policy; those issues which are most prominent in the media are likely to be assigned a higher degree of importance (McCombs: 2011: 3), and could subsequently influence the policy agenda.

As well as issue salience, the framing of Food Brexit issues by the media could influence the way that policy around that issue is shaped (Stromberg, 2004; Olper and Swinnen, 2013).
This is particularly concerning when considering the potential implications of Food Brexit for public health. Food prices were framed as both a positive and negative potential outcome of post-Brexit trade deals in the Food Brexit reporting. Whereas the popular and mid-market publications, with lower socio-economic readership profiles, framed cheaper food imports as a potential positive outcome of Brexit, The Guardian (with a predominantly middle-class readership), present cheaper foods as a negative outcome that could exacerbate health inequalities; “…shoppers could be left in a two-tier system that means the better off buy more expensive, British goods while those who are poorer are left with lower standard cheap imports” (Butler, 2018a). Where the popular and mid-market articles equate cheaper food with ending the need for food banks, significant pressure is placed on the government to pursue the free market agenda that would make this possible. The Daily Star quote Conservative Member in the European Parliament (MEP), David Campbell Bannerman saying, “Leaving the customs union will benefit the poorest in society the most” (Donnelly, 2018) and the Sunday Express state that “If tariffs…are cut and the savings are passed on to shoppers…basic groceries become more affordable for struggling families” (Tominey, 2018).

The implications for public health are not a focus for these articles. It is worrying that the groups in society who might be adversely affected by post-Brexit trade deals, particularly in health terms where inequities between socio-economic groups are already prevalent, are not receiving information about the potential health outcomes through the media.

In all cases, where articles featured quotes, these were primarily from individuals whose narrative reinforced the broader position on Brexit of the newspaper it was featured in. In terms of the specific individuals, institutions or organisations whose voices were most prevalent, Conservative MP, Jacob Rees-Mogg and then Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, Michael Gove were the most prolific, both of whom voted to leave the EU in the referendum. Whilst some representatives from CSOs, the agricultural industry and the farmer, fisherfolk and agricultural workers group were heard from, this was primarily in remain-supporting ‘quality’ newspapers and served to amplify negative reporting on the
impact of Brexit on UK food and farming. For example, an article about the potential impact
of Brexit on agricultural labour in the Guardian quotes asparagus farmer, Andy Allen, “We
are completely reliant on seasonal migrant workers. If we can’t get that labour I’ll have to
pack up” (Weaver, 2018).

The complete absence of voices from the public health sector and food manufacturing and
food service industries was particularly notable given the major implications of Food Brexit
for these sectors. The way issues are presented in the media, including proposed solutions,
can influence the way they are dealt with by policy makers (Cobb & Elder, 1983: 96;
Stromberg, 2004; Olper and Swinnen, 2013). It is therefore essential for these actors to
ensure that they clearly communicate the potential implications of Brexit and put forward
clear arguments for policy measures that will ensure the best possible Food Brexit outcome.
Furthermore, part of the responsibility of journalists in producing news media is to reflect a
wide variety of views and perspectives (Costera Meijer, 2001; Deuze, 2005; Christians et al.,
2010). This forms part of their professional ideology and it is therefore important that they
seek views on Food Brexit from across the different food sectors.

The dominance of political voices found in the Food Brexit coverage is in keeping with the
idea that “journalists typically prefer sources in positions of authority because of their
perceived trustworthiness” (Coleman & Dysart, 2005: 8). It is also pertinent to note that
politicians use the media as a tool to communicate with the public (John et al., 2013: 153). In
terms of influencing public opinion and the post-Brexit food policy agenda, this must be
carefully considered as the interaction between politicians, media and public creates
“complex chains of causation” (John et al., 2013: 131). Agenda setting theory suggests that
the media influence public opinion which in turn influences the policy agenda (Buse et al.,
2012). However, if politicians are influencing media reporting, are they not playing a
significant role themselves in setting the policy agenda to determine the outcome of Food
Brexit? With this in mind, the assertion made by Lang et al. (2017), that the media should
monitor and report on Food Brexit in order to inform and equip the public to hold the
government responsible for desirable Food Brexit outcomes, should be regarded with some
scepticism. Furthermore, newspaper audiences choose to read publications that validate
their own worldview and justify their prejudices (Williams, 2010: 6). The danger of this is
where voices and messages are amplified in publications whose political positioning they
share and serve to reinforce, they in turn, will only reach audiences who already broadly
share their worldview.

Conclusion

The main policy implication arising from this paper is the potential agenda-setting influence of the
media reporting on Food Brexit. The findings suggest that Food Brexit issues are presented
differently to different audiences and that UK print newspapers select and promote the issues,
frames and voices that reflect and reinforce their own political positioning. When considering the
potential influence on the policy agenda, it is important to note the readership and reach of the
different publications. As noted in the introduction, the prominence and framing of Food Brexit
issues in the media can shape public opinion and subsequently affect the government’s policy
response. Further research should take a longitudinal approach (covering media reporting from the
referendum campaign up to present day and across all media platforms) in order to capture any
changes in narrative and framing over time, providing a sense of the direction post-Brexit food
policy is taking. In particular, it would be useful to understand the role of digital and social media on
agenda-setting with regard to Food Brexit, given the capacity for internet technologies to tailor
news content to specific audiences, facilitating increasingly personalised news consumption and
audience fragmentation (Tewksbury and Rittenberg, 2012; Feezel, 2018). This evidence could be
used by policy makers, industry, CSOs and the research community to assess whether that
direction is conducive to a policy environment that will facilitate the Food Brexit outcomes sought.

Whilst the evidence suggests that media bias and political influence play a significant role in
the way that Food Brexit issues are presented in the UK print media, the news media are,

I:
nonetheless, the main source of information for the public on Food Brexit issues. As such, those seeking to influence post-Brexit food policy must strive to get their voices heard and messages across as widely as possible. Using the evidence to identify gaps or weaknesses in the communication of key messages in the media, stakeholder groups can then develop strategies to improve this. Furthermore, opportunities for more joined-up messaging could be identified. Where different stakeholder groups share concerns about a particular Food Brexit outcome (albeit probably for different reasons), opportunities for collaborative communications could be explored. This could be of particular benefit where groups have more traction with certain publication types than others. As highlighted by Buse et al., the “prominence of an issue is a product of how well actors...construct a persuasive account of the issue and its solution, and take advantage of opportunities to draw attention to the issue” (2012: 83). For a socially, environmentally and economically sound Food Brexit, an integrated approach to both communication and policy-making would be critical. If the public are ultimately responsible for holding policy makers to account, journalists have a responsibility to represent and interrogate a wide range of views and opinion from across the food sector in the news media. For their part, the food and agricultural industries, CSOs, government and the research community must work harder to have their voices heard in the media to better inform the public and, in doing so, lay the foundations for the policy environment required for the Food Brexit they seek.
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Table 1. Average circulation per issue for June 2018 and publication position on Brexit of newspapers included in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Circulation in June 2018</th>
<th>Leave/Remain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Sun</td>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>1,368,051</td>
<td>Leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mail</td>
<td>Mid-market</td>
<td>1,184,205</td>
<td>Leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sun on Sunday</td>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>1,141,107</td>
<td>Leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail on Sunday</td>
<td>Mid-market</td>
<td>947,204</td>
<td>Remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sunday Times</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>623,310</td>
<td>Leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mirror</td>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>503,224</td>
<td>Remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Mirror</td>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>431,641</td>
<td>Remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Times</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>410,677</td>
<td>Remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Telegraph</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>357,924</td>
<td>Leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Express</td>
<td>Mid-market</td>
<td>327,755</td>
<td>Leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Star</td>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>320,133</td>
<td>Leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Express</td>
<td>Mid-market</td>
<td>284,681</td>
<td>Leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sunday Telegraph</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>279,152</td>
<td>Leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>248,234</td>
<td>Remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Star Sunday</td>
<td>Popular</td>
<td>202,163</td>
<td>Leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Observer</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>162,232</td>
<td>Remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Guardian</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>136,139</td>
<td>Remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Times</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>63,874</td>
<td>Remain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Food Brexit issues in the UK print media from 6/4/18 – 5/7/18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Brexit issue</th>
<th>Key points covered</th>
<th>Examples of headlines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>• The potential to improve British agricultural practices post-Brexit and develop an integrated approach to farming to benefit public health, the environment and the UK economy.  &lt;br&gt;• Concern about post-Brexit trade deals undermining British agriculture if British farmers are required to uphold certain standards but food imports are not required to meet the same standards.</td>
<td>&quot;Industrial-scale beef production is a sign of crisis in Britain’s farming; Most farmers make a loss and rely on Brussels subsidies. Before it's too late we must decide the kind of meat we want to eat&quot; (Lawrence, The Guardian, 2018b)  &lt;br&gt;&quot;Farmers warn EU deal failure may ruin them&quot; (Ungoed-Thomas, The Sunday Times, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal welfare</td>
<td>• Concern that proposed shortcuts to pre-slaughter inspections would jeopardise animal welfare.  &lt;br&gt;• Concern that animal welfare standards will be compromised in post-Brexit trade deals.</td>
<td>&quot;Gove opening door to food fraud, warn vets&quot; (Starkey, The Times, 2018)  &lt;br&gt;&quot;Cheap bacon: how shops and shoppers let down our pigs; With Brexit looming our animal welfare...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Brexit as an opportunity to improve fishing policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The impact of a hard Brexit and banning EU fisherfolk from British waters on fish prices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Fishing for Benefits; The Scottish government should look past its Brexit bias and recognise that at least one industry stands to gain from the UK leaving the EU” (The Times, 2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Hard Brexit would mean more and cheaper British fish - but there’s a catch. Exclusive: taking back control of UK waters would lower the price of British-caught fish, new analysis shows - but most of the fish we eat is imported” (Carrington, The Guardian, 2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food labelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Brexit as an opportunity to enforce standardised traffic light nutrition labelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“CEREAL BOXES MISLEAD OVER SUGAR” (Poulter, Daily Mail, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“UK urged to make ‘traffic light’ food labelling mandatory; Which? Says Brexit is chance to update law to help shoppers faced with bewildering array of nutritional data” (Smithers, The Guardian, 2018)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The opportunity and need to develop integrated food policy post-Brexit, taking public health, farmer livelihoods, social equity and the environment into account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The potential impact of further trade liberalisation on our food system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Fresh start for food policy must put consumers at the top table” (Vicary Smith, The Daily Telegraph, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Food deals are the forgotten bread and butter issues of Brexit; Trade negotiations with the EU have descended into a political circus - yet the quality of what we eat is too important to overlook” (Baggini, The Guardian, 2018)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food prices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The potential for the UK government to reduce tariffs on food imports if the UK leave the customs union, resulting in cheaper food prices and potentially ending the need for food banks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“FOOD BANKS BUST; Brexit to slash grocery prices” (Donnelley, Daily Star, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Shoppers’ main fear after leaving EU is rising price of food” (Bashforth, The Times, 2018)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Food safety | • The potential for food prices to increase if tariffs are imposed on food imports.  
• Potential exacerbation of health inequities if lower income households can only afford cheaper, less healthy imported foods.  
• Additional post-Brexit demands on local authorities resulting in decreased capacity to enforce food hygiene standards.  
• Concerns about a reduction in information sharing on contamination and disease outbreaks.  
• Concerns about the capacity of the UK’s Food Standards Agency to assume additional responsibilities currently dealt with by the European Food Safety Authority. | “UK food risk after Brexit” (Daily Mirror, 2018)  
“Local authorities fear Brexit threat to food safety standards” (Connolly, i, 2018) |
| Food security | • Potential disruption of food supply due to increasing checks at borders. | “Revealed: plans for Doomsday no-deal Brexit; Food, petrol and medicines would run out” (Shipman, The Sunday Times, 2018)  
“Brexit voices of doom like ‘Project Fear on speed’” (Swinford & Yorke, The Daily Telegraph, 2018) |
| Food standards | • The potential for post-Brexit trade deals with the US and other countries to result in the UK importing products such as chlorine-washed chicken and hormone-treated beef. | “Gove: I’ll keep out US meat” (Coates, Sunday Express, 2018)  
“Post-Brexit food standard ‘overstated’” (Hurley & Jones, The Times, 2018) |
| Geographical indication | • The debate about continued recognition and protection of regional specialities (such as stilton, feta cheese and Cornish pasties). | “There’s only one Cornish pasty…EU urged to protect British food from imitation” (Stone, i, 2018)  
“Brexit indigestion: row brewing over call for UK laws to protect likes of cognac and feta; EU demand for legislation to indicate origins of food and drink to be flashpoint in talks” (Rankin, The Guardian, 2018) |
| Impact on food | • The negative impact on food | “Hard Brexit could force part of...” |
| Industry | Manufacturing businesses if the UK leave the single market and customs union, due to tariffs on exports.  
• The negative impact of the referendum result on the food service sector, with increased ingredient costs and less people eating out due to the decreased value of the pound.  
• The potential for the UK’s food manufacturing sector to grow through the expansion of non-EU export markets. | *Tilda’s Essex mill to close; Withdrawal from customs union and single market would take heavy toll, executive says*  
(O’Carroll, The Guardian, 2018)  
*“Cheers, let’s drink to success of Brexit”* (Sunday Express, 2018) |
|---|---|---|
| Irish border | The complexities of addressing a hard border on the island of Ireland for the agri-food industry, and the potential for technological solutions. | *“Ireland’s open border is more than a symbol. It ensures people can eat; Dublin is thinking through the consequences of Brexit for real people, but Westminster’s head remains buried in the sand”*  
(Lawrence, The Guardian, 2018a)  
*“PROOF THE REMAINDER ROW OVER EU CUSTOMS UNION IS CLAP-TRAP”* (Hardman, Daily Mail, 2018) |
| Labour | Concern about the future of British farming due to its dependence on migrant labour. | *“Don’t cut off farm workers”* (Daily Express, 2018)  
*“Forbidden fruit: berry growers warn Brexit could ruin sector; Wimbledon staple under threat as EU pickers stay away - and Brits refuse to plug the gap”* (Butler, The Guardian, 2018) |
| Public health | Concern that post-Brexit trade deals will result in imports of cheaper, unhealthy foods which could have a detrimental impact on public health.  
• The potential to make public health a central priority for British farming post-Brexit. | *“Big Brexit Sweetener”* (Daily Star, 2018)  
*“Meat is crucial to balanced diet, Michael Gove tells farmers; environment secretary’s vision for UK agriculture post-Brexit sees farmers playing a vital role in improving public health”* (van der Zee, The Guardian, 2018) |
| Subsidies | Criticism of the current agricultural subsidy system as favouring wealthy landowners.  
• The potential for an improved subsidy system based on | *“BREXIT WRECKER LORD AND HIS EU HANDOUTS; Meddling Duke of Wellington pocketed farming subsidies ‘Arrogance of the Lords is unbelievable’*
| Environmental and Public Health Outcomes | Environmental and Public Health Outcomes.  
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| • Additional financial support needed for Scottish farmers due to the nature of the Scottish rural landscape. | © (Chapman et al., Daily Express, 2018)  
|                                                      | “Farmer subsidies overhaul in 2024” (Johnson, The Daily Telegraph, 2018)  
|                                                      |                                                                                         |
| Technology | Technological innovations for improving agricultural efficiency to help farmers facing rising costs and subsidy cuts post-Brexit. | “The robot farmers leaving tractors in the dust; A British start-up aims to raise yields dramatically using a range of AI-driven agricultural machines” (Burn Callander, The Daily Telegraph, 2018)  
|                                                      |                                                                                         |
| Trade | The perceived risks and benefits of leaving the single market and/or customs union, including knock-on impacts on farmer livelihoods, British agriculture, the food manufacturing and service industry, food prices and food standards.  
|                                                    | • Concern and optimism about the UK’s ability to deal with new responsibilities for policing trading practice and the logistical demands of increased border checks. | “Lord Price: "UK has up to five years of bumps"; ex-trade minister is optimistic of an eventual good independent trading relationship after Brexit” (Wood, The Guardian, 2018).  
|                                                      | “Trade authority ‘will not be ready for Brexit’” (Jones, The Times, 2018).  
|                                                      |                                                                                         |
Figure 1. Stakeholder groups quoted in Food Brexit newspaper articles in leave/remain-supporting publications from 6/4/18 – 5/7/18