The scale **Journal Website:** https://thescalejournal.com.ng/
An Interdisciplinary Journal of
The ACADEMIC STAFF UNION OF POLYTECHNICS - ZONE D
ISSN: 2992-3727 Published 25th May, 2025

PUBLIC TRUST AND NUTRITIONAL OUTCOMES: A BIOCHEMICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL EVALUATION OF GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOOD PRODUCTS

Kanu Micheal Iheanyichukwu.
Abia State College of Health and Management Technology Aba
Department of Science Laboratory Technology
kanu.micheal@yahoo.com, 08068404371

ABSTRACT
Genetically engineered (GE) foods have emerged as a pivotal innovation in addressing global food security and nutritional deficiencies. While scientific consensus affirms their safety and potential benefits, public skepticism persists, influenced by various sociocultural factors. This study delves into the biochemical impacts of GE foods on human nutrition and examines the sociological dimensions influencing public trust. Through a multidisciplinary approach, we aim to bridge the gap between scientific evidence and public perception, offering insights into enhancing acceptance and informed decision-making regarding GE foods.
Keywords: Genetically Engineered Foods, Public Trust, Nutritional Outcomes, Biochemical Analysis, Sociological Perception, GMO, Food Security

1. Introduction

The advent of genetically engineered foods has revolutionized agricultural practices, offering solutions to malnutrition, crop yield limitations, and environmental challenges. Despite these advancements, public apprehension remains a significant barrier to widespread adoption. Understanding the biochemical benefits and the sociological factors influencing public trust is crucial for integrating GE foods into global food systems effectively.

2. Objectives

1. To analyze the biochemical effects of GE foods on human nutrition.
2. To explore sociological factors affecting public trust in GE foods.
3. To assess the interplay between scientific communication and public perception.
4. To propose strategies for enhancing public acceptance of GE foods.

3. Methodology

3.1 Biochemical Analysis

A comprehensive review of peer-reviewed studies assessing the nutritional content and health impacts of GE foods, focusing on staple crops like rice, maize, and soybeans.

3.2 Sociological Assessment

Analysis of surveys and studies examining public attitudes toward GE foods, trust in scientific institutions, and the influence of media and cultural beliefs.

4. Biochemical Impacts of GE Foods

Research indicates that GE foods can enhance nutritional profiles, such as biofortified rice with increased vitamin A content. Studies have shown no significant adverse health effects from consuming approved GE foods, and in some cases, they offer improved nutrient availability.

5. **Sociological Perspectives on Public Trust**

Public trust in GE foods is multifaceted, influenced by factors including:

- Perceived Naturalness: GE foods are often viewed as unnatural, leading to skepticism.
- Media Influence: Sensationalized reporting can amplify fears and misconceptions.
- Institutional Trust: Confidence in regulatory bodies and scientific institutions plays a role in acceptance.
- Cultural and Ethical Beliefs: Personal values and cultural norms significantly impact perceptions

6. **Discussion**

The dichotomy between scientific evidence and public perception underscores the need for effective communication strategies. Enhancing transparency, engaging with communities, and addressing ethical concerns are vital steps toward building trust. Educational initiatives that demystify GE technologies can also play a pivotal role in shifting public opinion.

7. **Conclusion**

Genetically engineered foods hold promises for addressing global nutritional challenges. However, bridging the gap between scientific advancements and public acceptance requires a concerted effort to understand and address the underlying sociological factors influencing trust. By fostering open dialogue and transparent practices, stakeholders can work toward a more informed and accepting public stance on GE foods.

8. **Recommendations**

1. Transparent Communication: Develop clear messaging about the safety and benefits of GE foods.
2. Community Engagement: Involve local communities in discussions and decision-making processes.
3. Educational Programs: Implement curricula that provide balanced information on biotechnology.
4. Policy Development: Establish regulations that ensure safety while addressing public concerns.

9. **References**

1. Anderson, S. M., & Gordon, R. T. (2009). Impact of genetically modified foods on human health. Journal of Food Science & Technology, 22(3), 153–162. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2042-6480.2009.00329.x

2. Better Health Channel. (2010, February). Genetically modified foods. Department of Health & Human Services, State Government of Victoria. Retrieved from https://www.betterhealth.vic.gov.au/health/healthyliving/genetically-modified-foods

3. Bourgeois, F. T., Murthy, S., & Mandl, K. D. (2010). Outcome reporting among drug trials registered in ClinicalTrials.gov. Annals of Internal Medicine, 153(3), 158–166. https://doi.org/10.1059/0003-4819-153-3-201008030-00006

4. Erin Brockovich: The Biotech Industry Is Jeopardizing Our Health. (2015). Time. Retrieved from https://time.com/4129785/erin-brockovich-gmos/

5. FDA Will Launch a Campaign to Educate the Public About GMOs. (2017). Food & Wine. Retrieved from https://www.foodandwine.com/news/fda-will-launch-campaign-educate-public-about-gmos

6. Genetically Modified Food Labels Are Coming, Here's What You Need to Know. (2018). Teen Vogue. Retrieved from https://www.teenvogue.com/story/genetically-modified-food-labels-are-coming

7. GMO Foods Will Be Labeled 'Bioengineered'. (2021). Verywell Health. Retrieved from https://www.verywellhealth.com/usda-food-label-gmo-bioengineered-5214882

8. Impacts of knowledge and trust on consumer perceptions and purchase intentions towards genetically modified foods. (2023). PMC. Retrieved from https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11446447/

9. Lang, J. T., & Hallman, W. K. (2005). Who does the public trust? The case of genetically modified food in the United States. Risk Analysis, 25(5), 1241–1252. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2005.00668.x

10. Connor, M., & Siegrist, M. (2010). Factors influencing people's acceptance of gene technology: The role of knowledge, health expectations, naturalness, and social trust. Science Communication, 32(4), 514–538. https://doi.org/10.1177/1075547009358919

11. Gutteling, J. M., Hanssen, L., van der Veer, N., & Seydel, E. R. (2006). Trust in governance and the acceptance of genetically modified food in the Netherlands. Public Understanding of Science, 15(1), 103–112. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662506057479

12. Frewer, L. J., Howard, C., & Shepherd, R. (1996). The influence of realistic product exposure on attitudes towards genetic engineering of food. Food Quality and Preference, 7(1), 61–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0950-3293(96)00038-6

13. Cuite, C. L., Aquino, H. L., & Hallman, W. K. (2005). An empirical investigation of the role of knowledge in public opinion about GM food. International Journal of Biotechnology, 7(1-3), 178–194.

14. Einsele, A. (2007). The gap between science and perception: The case of plant biotechnology in Europe. In T. Scheper (Ed.), Green gene technology (pp. 1–14). Springer.

15. Evans, G., & Durant, J. (1995). The relationship between knowledge and attitudes in the public understanding of science in Britain. Public Understanding of Science, 4(1), 57–74. https://doi.org/10.1088/0963-6625/4/1/004

16. 16. Frewer, L. J., Howard, C., & Shepherd, R. (1995). Genetic engineering and food: What determines consumer acceptance? British Food Journal, 97(8), 31–36. https://doi.org/10.1108/00070709510099158

17. Frewer, L. J., Howard, C., & Shepherd, R. (1996). Effective communication about genetic engineering and food. British Food Journal, 98(4/5), 48–52. https://doi.org/10.1108/00070709610119874

18. Frewer, L. J., Howard, C., & Shepherd, R. (1997). Public concerns in the United Kingdom about general and specific applications of genetic engineering: Risk, benefit, and ethics. Science, Technology, & Human Values, 22(1), 98–124. https://doi.org/10.1177/016224399702200106

19. Frewer, L. J., & Shepherd, R. (1995). Ethical concerns and risk perception associated with different applications of genetic engineering: Interrelationships with the perceived need for regulation of the technology. Agriculture and Human Values, 12(1), 48–57. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02347694