Unité Mixte de Recherche
MOISA
Marchés Organisations
Institutions Stratégies d'Acteurs

Social and Environmental Attributes of Food Products in an Emerging Mass Market : Challenges of Signaling and Consumer Perception, With European Illustrations

JM. CODRON, L. SIRIEIX, T. REARDON

Agro.M

CIHEAM-IAM.M

CIRAD

INRA

Associé : IRD Institut de recherche pour le développement

Working Paper N° 7 / 2005

Social and Environmental Attributes of Food Products in an Emerging Mass Market: Challenges of Signaling and Consumer Perception, With European Illustrations [1]

Jean-Marie Codron
Institut National de Recherche Agronomique (INRA),
Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR)-Marchés, Organisations, Institutions et Stratégies d'Acteurs (MOISA),
Montpellier, France (codron@ensam.inra.fr)
Lucie Siriex
Ecole Nationale Superieure Agronomique de Montpellier and UMR-MOISA, (siriex@ensam.inra.fr),
Thomas Reardon1
Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, USA, (reardon@msu.edu)

Abstract.
This paper focuses on the environmental and ethical attributes of food products and their production processes. These two aspects have been recently recognized and are becoming increasingly important, in terms of signaling and of consumer perception. There are two thematic domains: environmental and social. Within each domain there are two movements. Hence the paper first presents the four movements that have brought to the fore new aspects of food product quality, to wit: (1) aspects of environmental ethics (organic agriculture and integrated agriculture) and (2) social ethics (fair trade and ethical trade). Then it describes how the actors in the movements (producers, retailers, NGOs, and governments) are organized and how consumers perceive each of the movements. From the perspective of the actors in the movements themselves, the movements are grouped into two "actors' philosophies": a "radical" philosophy (the organic production and fair trade movements that arose in radical opposition to conventional agriculture or unfair trade relations) and a "reformist" philosophy (the integrated agriculture and ethical trade movements that arose as efforts to modify but not radically change conventional agriculture). From the point of view of consumers, the classification of the movements is based on perceptions of the "domain" of the movements. That is, consumers tend to perceive as a grouping the organic production movement and the integrated agricultural movement, as they both deal with the environment. By contrast, consumers tend to group the fair trade movement and the ethical trade movement, as they both deal essentially with social ethics. Recently, key players such as large retailers and agribusinesses have adopted as part of their overall quality assurance programs both the environmental and the ethical attributes. Their involvement in and adoption of the goals of the movements have, however, generated tensions and conflicts, in particular within the radical movements, because of concerns of cooptation. The paper identifies challenges for those promoting food products with environmental and social/ethical attributes to communicate coherent signals to consumers at this crucial moment of an emerging mass market for these products.

Résumé :
Cet article présente une réflexion sur les dimensions environnementale et sociale de la qualité des produits alimentaires, deux dimensions récemment prises en compte mais dont l'importance est croissante, aussi bien du point de vue de l'offre de signaux que de celui des perceptions du consommateur.
L'article présente d'abord les quatre grands mouvements qui se sont constitués pour la construction de la qualité des produits agroalimentaires dans les domaines de l'environnement (l'agriculture biologique et l'agriculture raisonnée) et de l'éthique sociale(le commerce équitable et le commerce éthique). Il caractérise ensuite tour à tour l'organisation des acteurs et les perceptions des consommateurs dans chacun des mouvements. Cette caractérisation vient confirmer l'existence de deux logiques d'organisation et de perception: l'histoire et l'origine des mouvements conduisent à distinguer les mouvements bio et commerce équitable qui se sont constitués en opposition radicale au système dominant et les mouvements agriculture raisonnée et commerce éthique intégrés dans le modèle dominant. Du côté des consommateurs, la proximité des mouvements est plutôt fonction des domaines (environnement vs éthique). Ces proximités restent cependant relatives et de nouvelles dynamiques concurrentes viennent bouleverser les cohésions existantes. Dans une dernière partie, l'article aborde les influences réciproques que peuvent avoir les logiques d'organisation et de perception, suggérant ainsi un certain nombre de questions de recherche.

Keywords: Consumer perception, Ethical trade, Fair trade, Integrated agriculture, Organic agriculture, Organization, Quality signals

Mots-clés: perception du consommateur, commerce équitable, agriculture raisonnée, agriculture biologique, organisation, signes de qualité

JEL : L150, L660, Q010 et D100

[1] Forthcoming 2006, Agriculture and Human Values, Summer 23 (2)

Forthcoming 2006, Agriculture and Human Values, Summer 23 (2),

Social and Environmental Attributes of Food Products in an Emerging Mass Market: Challenges of Signaling and Consumer Perception, With European Illustrations

Jean-Marie Codron, Lucie Siriex, and Thomas Reardon[1]

Abstract. This paper focuses on the environmental and ethical attributes of food products and their production processes. These two aspects have been recently recognized and are becoming increasingly important, in terms of signaling and of consumer perception. There are two thematic domains: environmental and social. Within each domain there are two movements. Hence the paper first presents the four movements that have brought to the fore new aspects of food product quality, to wit: (1) aspects of environmental ethics (organic agriculture and integrated agriculture) and (2) social ethics (fair trade and ethical trade). Then it describes how the actors in the movements (producers, retailers, NGOs, and governments) are organized and how consumers perceive each of the movements. From the perspective of the actors in the movements themselves, the movements are grouped into two "actors' philosophies": a “radical” philosophy (the organic production and fair trade movements that arose in radical opposition to conventional agriculture or unfair trade relations) and a “reformist” philosophy (the integrated agriculture and ethical trade movements that arose as efforts to modify but not radically change conventional agriculture). From the point of view of consumers, the classification of the movements is based on perceptions of the "domain" of the movements. That is, consumers tend to perceive as a grouping the organic production movement and the integrated agricultural movement, as they both deal with the environment. By contrast, consumers tend to group the fair trade movement and the ethical trade movement, as they both deal essentially with social ethics. Recently, key players such as large retailers and agribusinesses have adopted as part of their overall quality assurance programs both the environmental and the ethical attributes. Their involvement in and adoption of the goals of the movements have, however, generated tensions and conflicts, in particular within the radical movements, because of concerns of cooptation. The paper identifies challenges for those promoting food products with environmental and social/ethical attributes to communicate coherent signals to consumers at this crucial moment of an emerging mass market for these products.

[1] Codron (codron@ensam.inra.fr) is at the Institut National de Recherche Agronomique (INRA) and Unité Mixte de Recherche (UMR)-Marchés, Organisations, Institutions et Stratégies d’Acteurs (MOISA), Montpellier, France; Siriex (siriex@ensam.inra.fr) is at the Ecole Nationale Superieure Agronomique de Montpellier and UMR-MOISA; and Reardon (reardon@msu.edu) is at the Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, USA.

Key words: Consumer perception, Ethical trade, Fair trade, Integrated agriculture, Organic agriculture, Organization, Quality signals

Introduction

Starting in the early 1970s until just a few years ago, consumption of organic products and fair trade products was restricted to small niche markets, supplied locally. The radical philosophy actors' promotion was undertaken in two movements[i] defined by those product categories. The production and consumption of these products started in the 1970s in Europe, and gradually took on substantial visibility for a small niche consumer market. The radical movements organized and reorganized themselves over the ensuing decades in order to be most effective in promoting niche markets. They undertook associative efforts aimed at communication to consumers and organization of suppliers, sometimes with the support of governments.

Starting in the mid 1990s, food safety crises and workers' rights scandals rendered environmental and ethical issues highly visible not only for the small group of radical actors and small niche of consumers noted above, but now these issues became important for the average consumer, for the broad mass of citizens. Examples of environmental and food safety crises that marked the mind of consumers include the mad cow disease outbreak in 1996, the Valdes oil spill in Alaska, or the Amoco Cadix event in 1978, the contamination of ground water from pork excrement in Bretagne. Workers' rights scandals included for example the Nike case in 1996 exposed by the Canadian organization "Development and Peace" and by a group of American religious investors (the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility) denouncing work conditions in factories in

Indonesia. These events stimulated the start of the growth from a small niche market base to at least potentially a mass market for environmentally friendly/food-safe (beyond organic, now including integrated production) products (Sylvander 1999). It is possible that the same shift from niche to mass could occur in the future for ethical/fair trade products.

Supermarket chains quickly spotted the opportunity in this trend, and that in turn gave further impetus to the development of markets for those products: supermarket chains' merchandising systems have a much greater capacity to reach mass markets than the small shops, coops, and farmers markets that had been selling organic and integrated-agriculture products to niche markets. Moreover, the specific products (organic products and fair-trade products favoring small farmers) that had been the focus of the radical movements since the 1970s, were incorporated into the merchandise lines of supermarkets in the late 1990s and early 2000s as part of a new marketing strategy. The organic and fair-trade products were set alongside health-oriented products that were already on the shelves, such as low-pesticide fruit produced by conventional agriculture.

So now there exist four movements, two radical (organic and fair-trade) plus two reformist movements (integrated-agriculture and ethical trade). Those in the radical movements started in the 1970s suddenly found themselves in a paradoxical situation in the late 1990s/early 2000s – they were competing with each other, through a proliferation of labels and associations and lobbies, and with the supermarket chains and other agribusiness to define the rules and standards for a market for clean and fair products that had suddenly passed from niche to mass market. The competition was in part concerning which group, radicals or supermarkets, would set the pace and define the nature of the new market – and the competition was also to best build confidence in the consumers for the product.

Given however that supermarkets control the great bulk of the healthy and fair trade products at the retail end and are preoccupied with reassuring their clients, they developed private standards for these products. But the producers, the agro-chemical companies, the certification bodies, and the NGOs all also were generating new standards and certification systems. The rush by many well-intentioned actors to be the birth-helpers at the start of the mass market appears to have come to the point of overwhelming the consumer of today in a mass of competing and sometimes conflicting signals that together do not much help promote this market – the final goal of all the actors.

There was another reason for the proliferation of confusing signals. The typical attributes of environmentally and socially desirable products are credence[ii] attributes. Environment and social attributes, unlike the other credence attributes, health and food safety, are not easily enforceable and definable by the government alone. Moreover, brands are relatively well adapted to managing traditional quality attributes (such as convenience, individual consumer's pleasure, or food safety, the "core products"), but are less commonly applied for products embodying environmental and social attributes. Also, it is easier to administer standards on more objective targets such as product safety, and less easy on complex and culturally dependent attributes such as environment and social attributes. The diversity of consumer perceptions, based on cultural diversity, of environment and social attributes, tends to lead to a proliferation of signals and initiatives.

Hence, clarification of and convergence toward the establishment of a minimum benchmark of these signals are necessary to effectively communicate environment and social attributes in an emerging mass market. Yet the efforts to harmonize signals regarding these attributes are obstructed by problems of organization and collective action. These problems arise from a divergence between the logic of consumer perception and the directions followed by collective actions discussed above.

This divergence is not sufficiently treated in the literature because consumer perceptions are usually analyzed in consumer behavior studies by marketing researchers, while the formation of signals by suppliers, as well as subsequent coordination issues, are usually analyzed by economists using approaches such as the "information economy", "institutional economy" or "political economy". To address this gap in the literature, the present paper examines the interaction of consumer perception formation and suppliers' signals about environment and social attributes. Moreover, this perspective is applied in an effort to clarify the issues in the debate to help the actors in the four movements who are at present in a crisis as to the correct strategies and policies to pursue – promoters and consumers alike confused by the multiplicity of signals and strategies with respect to environment and social standards that are undertaken by the lead players, in particular large retailers and agribusiness, multilateral organizations, and governments.

The present study is presented more as a series of hypotheses that merit further analysis than the results of an empirical study. The hypotheses are inspired by case observations in France in particular and Europe in general, with several illustrations as well from the United States.

The paper proceeds as follows. We first present the four main movements that have emerged around food quality in the fields of environmental and social ethics. We then discuss the organization of actors in each movement, and consumers' perceptions of each movement. This leads to the classification of the movements in two ways, one by the logic of consumer perceptions (that is focused on thematic areas such as social versus environment), and the other which is ideological perception of actors in the movements (that is focused on acceptance or rejection of conventional agriculture). We then discuss the implications of these perspectives for signaling[iii] strategies for the actors in the movements and the retailers.

Presentation of the four movements promoting environmental and social standards

The Movements

Four major agrifood-related movements have emerged in the fields of environmental and social ethics: organic agriculture, integrated agriculture, fair trade, and ethical trade.

The organic agriculture movement promotes an alternative to the “productivist” model, which we shall term "conventional agriculture". This movement dates back to the 1920s with “biodynamics," the principles of which were established by R. Steiner with products carrying the brand “Demeter”. In the 1940s organic agriculture was launched by the British Soil Association. These efforts mark the beginning of an alternative agriculture to the productivist model, the latter already widespread in most European countries in the 1940s (Bellon et al., 2000). The promotion of organic agriculture continued during the 1960s and 1970s, with the founding of an ecological movement that one can term “radical” in its opposition to conventional agriculture. Organic includes a number of strands which we regroup here[iv]. By organic here we mean no use of fertilizers, pesticides, or antibiotics. Today, organic agriculture is still considered as an alternative market or niche market, both in terms of production (only 2 % of agricultural land in France) and of sales (the turnover of the organic production sector represents approximately 2 % of food expenditures in France, according to AGENCE BIO 2004 www.agencebio.org).However, consumer trends and growing farmer participation in organic agriculture suggest that organic products have strong potential. In France, some believe that organic production could attain 20 to 30% of the total market (Sylvander, 2002).

The fair trade movement is focused on the creation of a direct link between small producers in developing countries and shops where consumers buy the products in developed countries. This movement started in the 1960s with the aim of improving terms of trade for small farmers by establishing direct and long-term relations between producers and purchasers, by using grants and minimum prices, by giving credit and guaranteeing the transparency of transactions (Zadek and Tiffen, 1996, Lewis, 1998; Waridel and Teitelbaum, 1999; Thompson, 1999). Today, the concept of fair trade is known in most European countries (but very little in France) and many food products with a fair-trade label can be purchased, including coffee, chocolate, sugar, tea, bananas, and orange juice.

We shall use the term "integrated agriculture movement" to denote the movement that promotes one or more of a set of sustainable technologies, including integrated pest and crop management, and the rational use of chemicals (rather than forbidding their use as in organic agriculture). This movement started among farmers and technicians in the 1960s as a response to the technical difficulties encountered by conventional agriculture, in particular pest resistance to pesticides. The movement was given an important early impetus by the International Organization of Integrated Pest Management (Organisation Internationale de Lutte Biologique) in Switzerland. In the 1970s and 1980s, farmers experimented with more environment-friendly plant protection and cultivation techniques that were more management-intensive and that were geared to taking advantage of the diversity of existing farmland resources. By the end of the 1980s, the movement received decisive support from European governments who began to realize what were the environmental stakes of such actions, and from the agro-chemical industry which was becoming aware of the decline in agrochemical profits and the need to become involved in environmental movements themselves in order to influence the definition of strategies … and keep chemicals in the picture…

Attempts to "market" the products of integrated agriculture in the 1970s and 1980s were premature in the sense that consumer demand for environment attributes had not yet reached a critical mass. However, by the late 1990s, large retailers had detected a growing consensus among European consumers that attention was needed concerning environmental attributes of food production. This was linked to the mad cow and other food safety crises. These latter pushed retailers to present integrated-agirculture products as alternatives (Bonny, 1997; Ferron, 1999; Codron et al., 2002).

The ethical trade movement has also only recently emerged. "Ethical trade" is sourcing from firms guaranteeing core labor and human rights standards. (Note that this is not the same as the fair trade movement which focuses on helping disadvantaged producers.) The ethical trade movement promotes the implementation of a code of conduct for good labor practices (labor standards), including the monitoring and independent verification of the observance of ethics code provisions as standards for ethical sourcing (www.ethicaltrade.org). The first ethical trade initiative was launched by the Levi Strauss firm in 1991 and countered child and forced labor and discrimination, and promoted decent wages (Gereffi et al., 2001). Based on ideas and practices that emerged in the 19th century (Christian socialism and Marxism), ethical trade initiatives resulted from the pressure of NGOs in the 1990's on employers - but there were some of these pressures even in the 1970's the campaign against Outspan in South Africa. They are essentially an extension of relatively successful initiatives launched by governments and multilateral organizations (such as the International Labor Organization), and are usually based on the charters and declarations of these initiatives. They primarily target finished products made in countries with "cheap labor" subcontracted by developed country retailers or global-brand companies making designer clothing, tennis shoes, toys, etc. NGOs in this movement mainly aim at "Northern" firms since their reputation, acquired through large

investments, can be threatened by campaigns denouncing labor conditions in the "Southern" firms of their subcontracted partners. There is also significant potential, so far not much realized, of ethical trade in the agrifood sector, such as pertaining to banana plantations.

Two classifications of the 4 movements: By consumers and by the movement actors

There were two waves of promotion of standards identifying products that respect environmental or social ethics: (1) the "radical" wave in the 1970s which arose as a reaction to conventional agriculture and promoted the emergence of the organic production and fair trade movements; this wave mainly involved small-scale actors such as local NGOs, small growers, cooperatives, small specialized retailers such as organics retailers, and focused on niche markets; (2) the "reformist" wave in the late 1990s[v] which essentially took conventional agriculture as a given, or a point of departure, and tried to find solutions to problems which arose from that agriculture. This wave involved broad food markets and more mainstream actors, such as agrochemical companies, the food manufacturing industry, and the large retailers. The movements included were those of integrated agriculture and ethical trade. The reformist wave nearly by definition targets much larger agrifood markets. It also created tensions and conflicts within the radical movements, discussed below.

By contrast, whereas the actors in the above movements identify the main difference between their movements in terms of the dominant philosophy (radical or reformist, with the attribute categories, environmental and social, under each), as shown via literature review in the next section, consumers tend to focus on an attribute domain (environmental versus social), and be relatively less concerned and aware of the philosophical distinctions underlying actions within that domain. For

example, many consumers would not easily distinguish the organic agriculture and integrated agriculture categories, but would lump them in her mind as "environment-friendly products". For instance, a survey of 1,000 consumers in France carried out in 1999 by the Fresh Produce Industry Technical Center (CTIFL) concerning their attitude towards fruit and vegetable quality, showed that pesticide treatments and the pollution they generate were very strongly disapproved, but that most consumers did not feel that agriculture need be strictly organic since they did not clearly differentiate organic from IPM products (Moreau-Rio, 2000). Thus it would be a minority of consumers who would specifically be aware of the radical roots of the organic movement.

In the same way, a typical consumer would tend to lump fair trade and ethical trade as "socially ethical products", not usually being especially aware of differences between the types of social trade attributes; it would instead be a minority of consumers that would be aware of the radical roots of the fair trade movement in emphasis on small farmers.

Hence, the most relevant perspective for analysis of consumer perceptions of suppliers' signals of environmental and social attributes of products is that of the attribute domains, and not the perspective of the movements.

The perspective of the movements: Attribute signaling strategies by radicals and reformists

Attribute signaling involves a sequence of actions that start in formulation of a standard and ends in the communication to the consumer of the attribute specified by the standard: (1) the definition of a standard (such as an organic standard), (2) the implementation of the standard, which comprises the

application and auditing/monitoring of the standard in production and post-harvest processes and practices, (3) the enforcement of the standard; (4) the communication of the standard to the consumer (for example, via the placement of an "organic product" label on the fruit).

Within a given movement, such as the integrated agriculture movement, several strategies of signaling the attribute "integrated agricultural product" coexist because the various actors in the movement choose to define, implement, enforce, and/or signal that attribute in different ways. Examples of this variation of strategies over actors in a movement such as integrated agriculture are given below. To describe the organization of attribute signaling within a given movement, therefore, one needs to specify whether there exists collective action to define and implement standards, to define a single label, and to harmonize standards over actors and places (such as was recently done in the US with a harmonization and government definition of organic standards).

A good proxy for characterizing the process for formulating and enforcing standards within a movement is to identify the dominant type of certification of standards in the movement. The literature distinguishes, as Williamson (1985) did in his work on certification, or Gereffi, Garcia-Johnson and Sasser (2001) did for social standards, four types of "certification institutions." The distinctions are based on who formulates the standards and who certifies compliance with the standards: (1) "first-party certification," if the firm sets and controls its own rules; (2) "second-party certification," where there exists a guideline shared by the firms in the particular sector, self-imposed on all companies in the sector; (3) "third-party certification", where an external, independent group (often an NGO) imposes rules and compliance methods on a particular firm or industry; (4) "fourth-party certification," where government or multilateral agencies are among the entities that set guidelines and delegate monitoring to an external independent group.

There is in practice, as we hypothesized, a clear divide between the organizational strategies of the reformist movements (which tends to promote the use of the first- and second-party certification), versus the radical movements (which promote the use the third- and fourth-party certification). The organizational approaches of each of these movements are now examined in more detail below.

The radical movements' signaling strategies: Initial convergence, developing divergence?

There is a growing divergence of the strategies within each of the two radical movements (organic agriculture and fair trade). That is, some of the radicals became attracted to working with supermarkets (for example, the NGO "Max Havelaar" works with supermarket chains). The attraction was that the mainstream agribusinesses were beginning to offer options for the realization of the objective of the radical proponents to build a "sustainable" option in the market.

The radical movements (organic, and fair trade) were originally based on a focus on small farms, with little engagement with the mainstream market. When their products entered the market, the buyer tended to be either a local rural consumer or a rich urban consumer. The latter included members of consumer associations and politically active movements. The shared values of the radical movements (for example, opposition to large-scale commercial agriculture heavily reliant on chemicals and hired labor) have ensured, until the development of the reformist movements, the cohesion of the radical movements.

Given the success in the past decade of these radical movements, the need for coordination among the different local initiatives and for the creation of clear and relevant signals to consumers became an urgent need.

With respect to organic agriculture, the move to meet the latter need had already begun in the 1970s, with efforts to harmonize organic standards through the IFOAM. Governments joined these efforts during the late 1980s: for example, in France, a single guideline and a national organic label was created in 1993 (the Agriculture Biologique – "AB" label). In 2000, the European Union also created a single organic label.

With respect to fair trade, the creation of NGO labels did not occur until 1988 in Europe (Max Havelaar, Netherlands) and in the 1990s in the United States (TransFair US). All these NGO labeling programs combined in 1997 to form Fairtrade Labeling Organizations International (FLO; www.fairtrade.net). Since then, FLO has conducted the standardization process for 17 national fair-trade standards.

Governments also have worked to create fair-trade standards and labels. In some countries (Sweden, Ireland, Norway, and Finland), national fair-trade labels (sometimes in alliance with NGOs) have already been created. However, while the involvement of some governments in setting fair-trade guidelines and certification systems reinforced the visibility of the fair-trade movements, that involvement also created some resistance within the movements themselves. In France, for instance, where the government is currently involved in setting fair-trade guidelines, there is a worry among some in the radical movements that this government "cooptation" of the process will diminish the movements' power to define and monitor standards, and will impose high costs on small farmers in developing countries trying to meet the standards, possibly leading to their exclusion (Institut National de la Consommation, 2002. INC HEBDO. 2002).

In a similar vein, European organic farmers believed that the monitoring and control of the organic standard were done effectively by the local organics associations. When the EU and national governments began to take over the monitoring and certification of organics, farmers began to

complain that the enforcement was inadequate, in particular, allowing the import of non-organic products under organic labels[vi]. Some farmers, who wanted to keep the movement more autonomous from third party certification and thus be more flexible, also have concerns about compulsory third-party certification, which replaced controls by the producers themselves (Sylvander, 1997).

Factions within the radical movements have emerged recently driven by the sharp increase in consumer concerns about food safety and the environment, spurred on the one hand by crises such as mad cow disease which increased consumer interest in safer foods, and on the other hand, the developing interest of "mainstream marketers" such as supermarkets chains in marketing organic and fair-trade products. The latter in particular caused a rift (Bellon et al. 2000; Perna 1998) in the radical movements because "suddenly" there was a possibility of making a link to mainstream, commercial markets instead of operating in non-mainstream, community-based marketing channels such as farmers markets, specialty shops, and retail cooperatives that are typically not geared to creating mass markets.

Almost as a caricature, these divergences oppose radicals who want to maintain an alternative strategy outside the dominant system, and those who want to negotiate with the dominant actors and thus open up their market.

On the one hand, the radicals who want to maintain an alternative strategy outside the dominant system hope that it is possible to go on remaining "visible" and being a reference for other movements while staying out of the dominant marketing system. For these "temple guardians" of organic production and fair trade, participating in the dominant circuits can only lead to a weakening of standards, a slackening of controls and reduced legibility of signals[vii]. The maintenance of the proximity between consumers and producers through short marketing circuits, such as farmers

markets, which can be easily monitored by the actors themselves, is their priority and the only guarantee of democratic control.

For some in the organic movement, it is rather by bringing the two radical movements (organics and free trade) together that progress can be made. Thus, the National Federation of Organic Agriculture, in France, is now working on the notion of a fair price for organic producers. Biocoop (a French chain that focuses on bio products), has just started carrying fair-trade products. However, there are some critics of this combination from the fair trade side, who think that going organic is too expensive for the small farmer (that would add one more cost to the existing transaction costs that the small producer already represents to the supermarkets) (Aschehoug, 2001).

On the other hand, for the radicals who want to work with dominant actors, it is possible to negotiate with the large-scale food system actors such as large retail chains, food service companies, and food processing firms, to influence them to change their practices (e.g., labor practices, product choice, labeling, etc.) within the overall constraints of the competitive markets in which these actors function. The radical-reformers believe that the partnership with large retailers is likely to allow a broader market for fair-trade and organic products as well as broad diffusion of the values supported by these movements, in turn creating further pressure on dominant actors. These persons also believe that partnership with retailers may also develop dialogue and thus avoid the confusion that was created by free-riding strategies such as Chiquita's. The latter had their bananas for Europe certified by Rainforest Alliance and labeled as ECO OK or better bananas. In Scandinavia, Chiquita bananas were sold by FDB, a Danish supermarket who claimed, as part of a marketing campaign, that no actions were being taken by the company against workers who wish to organize unions. NGOs who made charges of unfair labor practices launched a public campaign but could not

dissuade FDB from marketing Chiquita's bananas. Reportedly, FDB had entered into an exclusive contractual agreement with Chiquita to market its better-banana-certified bananas and was legally bound to carry out the marketing effort regardless of the public outcry or opposition (Murray and Raynolds, 2000). The selling by supermarkets of allegedly ethical trade products certified under less stringent criteria is likely to create confusion among consumers and to compromise the collective action of the European fair trade associations. Hence the need of dialogue with supermarkets -- but the dialogue will only be possible if fair trade associations are able to provide supermarkets with sufficient volume and consistent quality.

The above reform-leaning faction within the radical movements has led to the emergence of links with the reformist movements in both domains. In the environment domain, organic farmers and IPM farmers are increasingly sharing experiences without being limited by doctrinal differences. In the social domain, there is a rapprochement or even mergers of NGOs who simultaneously help both fair-trade and ethical trade (e.g., the case of the NGO "Labeling Ethics Collective" (Collectif de l'Ethique sur l'Etiquette) in France).

The organizational strategies of the reformist movements: Partial convergence of approaches over the movements, but continuing tensions

The situation of the reformist movements, which emerged from the conventional agriculture perspective, is quite different from that of the radical movements, notably because there is no coherent and well-identified social base underlying these movements. The movement has a variety of orientations, each supported by very different types of actors, some of whom are very powerful.

In the case of the different groups composing the integrated agriculture movement, efforts are underway toward creation of common guidelines as well as rapprochement within a given industry segment, such as among farmers, or among retailers, at the local level and even across countries. At the European level, there exist guidelines made by and for producers (European Initiative for Sustainable Agriculture (EISA[viii]), by and for retailers (EUREPGAP[ix]) and by and for the agro-chemical industry (European Crop Protection Association, ECPA[x]). ISO (the International Standard Organization) also makes a modest contribution to this effort of bringing both movements together, with the introduction of a new series of overall management (private) standards dedicated to the environment, the ISO 14000 series. Sometimes there are inter-segment collective arrangements, such as the case of EUREPGAP where retailers, farmers, agro-chemical firms, and certification bodies are associated in the definition and the implementation of the guidelines – although retailers stay at the helm of the process.

None of these professional guidelines is communicated directly to the consumer, and thus is signaling that does not include product labeling. The only communication is done via retailer brands. Faced with the multiplication of claims and signals and the risks of confusing consumers, public authorities are trying to control advertising and improve understanding for consumers. In France, the decree 25 April 2002 concerning production processes for, certification of, and labeling of products from integrated agriculture, and qualifications of certification bodies, as well as the use of the term "integrated agricultural product" by retailers, strongly restricts the room for maneuver of retailers and producers who would like to communicate more freely on the subject of products free from, or with limited, pesticide residues. Public authorities also try to limit the creation of official labels linked to integrated agriculture. At the European Union level, no plan for a European integrated-agriculture label has yet been discussed[xi].

Governments are also creating third-party certification systems for integrated agriculture (in particular, focused on the environmental aspects), in the hope that most farmers will adopt it, and/or it will create a common benchmark for the various private certification systems and standards. The influence of this kind of government-proposed guideline remains, however, limited. For example, the French government's decree concerning "integrated agriculture," which has been passed but not yet implemented, is to set up a voluntary "qualification procedure" for farmers. Many experts consider the plan unrealistic because of its ambitious scale and the cost of monitoring and enforcement, and potentially ineffective because it will be just one more guideline among the many existing private guidelines of farmer associations and retailers or agrochemical firms, and because the introduction of this new guideline is not manifestly "market driven," that is, with manifest demand by consumers. At the European level, there is as yet no such certification initiative (such as the French government's) to impose such overarching guidelines.

Beyond the organizational difficulties encountered in implementing harmonized guidelines, there are also obstacles related to conflicting economic interests. Integrated agriculture is indeed quite a threat to companies (often large multinationals) selling pesticides and fertilizers. Controlling the definition of environmental standards has become a key goal for agro-chemical companies[xii]. They watch closely for, and attempt to head off, any initiative which could undermine their market - even if this initiative is supported by scientific expertise (such as the founding principles of the IOBC, the International Organization for Biological and Integrated Control of Noxious Animals and Plants) or by commercial interests (retailers seeking to profit by the promotion of food safety).

Ethical trade has received only very limited support from governments. Even though many multinational firms have joined the Global Compact since 1999 (Hamm, 2002) as a dialogue effort between the UN and the private sector to promote ethical practices by businesses operating in

developing regions, the initial results are disappointing. The main problem is that the compact is purely voluntary and based on claims by the firms.

No ethical-trade labeling initiative is yet on the agenda of the European Commission, even though the Howitt resolution (formally titled "EU standards for European Enterprises operating in developing countries: towards a European Code of Conduct"), adopted by the EU Parliament in January 1999, called for such labeling initiatives. Belgium is the first country to have passed a law (February 27, 2002) creating a social label, indicating to consumers that the labeled products were produced respecting the bylaws of the ILO. The law is based on voluntary action but establishes a control and monitoring system and specifies sanctions for violations for firms who choose to use the label. The law sets forth a legal framework for the various initiatives undertaken by companies and a first effort at the national level to harmonize codes of conduct. In France, Parliament has so far limited itself to encouraging nationalized companies, schools, and families to take into account social and ethical trade aspects of their purchases (Texier Law, May 1999).

The principal actors in the ethical trade movement are still the NGOs and companies themselves (Gereffi et al., 2001). Several initiatives have emerged to standardize guidelines and practices of ethical trade: (1) those led by NGOs, such as the Collectif de l'Ethique sur l'Etiquette, the Collective for Ethics of Labels (created in France in 1995); (2) those led by industry and unions, such as SA 8000[xiii] in the U.S.; (3) those led by a variety of actors, including the participation of governments, such as the Ethical Trade Initiative in the UK.

The "standards" proposed by the ethical trade movement are received with varying degrees of welcome according to the economic sector and country, and as a function of the relative power of the NGOs. When possible, firms prefer to adopt their own guidelines, set and controlled internally (first-party certification). Firms claim[xiv] that their internal standard systems are more efficient and

effective because they facilitate interaction of various groups in the firm, offer "home-grown" solutions to internal problems, and allow gradual, pragmatic, and voluntary improvement without direct coercion that they feel would be applied by "outsiders," including NGOs were they to implement external standards. Even though first-party certified (internal to the firm) standards are not considered credible by most ethical-trade NGOs[xv], these internal systems are prevalent. A smaller number of firms use ISO-type standards for ethical trade. For example the New York-based NGO, Council on Economic Priorities (CEP), created in 1969 and recently renamed the Center for Responsibility in Business, created an accreditation agency that designed auditable standards for the protection of workers' rights, dubbed Social Accountability 8000 (SA 8000). (Gereffi, 2001). These standards are more stringent but also more credible to outsiders because they are based on international labor conventions and certified by third parties according to internationally recognized procedures. Some NGOs attempt to become engaged in the formulation of such ISO type standards by requesting that their (the NGOs') own guidelines be included in the ISO standard. For example, a petition initiated by the Collective for Ethics of Labels, which had 140,000 signatures in 1998 (compared with 20,000 signatures in 1996) recommends that firms incorporate the code of conduct defined by the Collective into the ISO 9000 certification program.

In sum, there are sharp differences between the radical and the reformist movements in terms of their organizational approach to creating and implementing consumer signals such as labels.

On the one hand, the radical movement is quite organized, incorporates NGO and government actors, and provides consumers with clear, strong, and visible signals of product and practice standards via the certification systems it creates. Paradoxically, the success they sought has actually led to some breakdown in the cohesion of the radical movement. That is, as markets for fair-trade and organic products have expanded beyond their traditional homes in farmers markets, small

specialty shops and coops into mainstream markets such as supermarket chains' sales, the movement has split into those favoring the continuation of focus on the traditional values and market venues, and those that favor taking advantage of the new interest of mainstream retailers in "marketing" these products and practices, and of the interest of consumers in buying them. Their organizational cohesion is now somewhat shattered by the opening and expansion of markets.

On the other hand, by contrast, despite their efforts to harmonize the guidelines promoted by diverse groups in the movement, the reformists are less united than the radicals. The consequence is that they project a less clear-cut image and signaling to consumers, on average. Most of the certification methods they promote are still first- and second-party systems, and by consequence enforced by individual firms (often large firms) and industries, rather than by third-party certifiers, NGOs, or governments. In contrast to the organic and fair-trade markets which might compose some 2% of the total food market[xvi], the markets represented by the reformist groups (such as conventional but low-pesticide products) are of far greater quantitative importance both now, and for the foreseeable future. Thus the sheer size of the latter market, and thus the diverse economic interests represented therein, makes it more difficult for groups within the reformist movement to reach a compromise and harmony. Table 1 summarizes the features of the movements.

Perspective of the consumer: Instead of "radical" versus "reformist," the perception is "environment" versus "social" domains

This section focuses on consumer perceptions in the environmental and social domains. We distinguish between issues that are common to both domains (consumer awareness, consumer

concern, the quality of communication to the consumer of the signal of the attribute) and those that differ over the domains (consumer concerns and perceptions specific to the environment versus to social ethics).

Consumer-related issues common to both domains

First, both "environmentally friendly" and "fair/ethical trade" products suffer from being relatively little known to the great majority of consumers. Even where the markets for these products are growing quickly, usually their share in the total market for their food category is low, in particular in the case of "fair/ethical trade" products. For example, according to an Ipsos survey carried out in October 2001 (www.ipsos.com), 76% of the French have never heard of fair trade (down from 91% in October 2000).

Second, consumers appear in general and on average to be not very concerned about environmental and ethical issues, and more concerned with price and quality of the product. Even if according to some studies, the number of consumers who feel "unconcerned" has been falling over the past years (from 22% (1990) to 15% (1999) in the United Kingdom, Browne et al. 2000), some consumers are opposed to these alternative products, since they are related to alternative lifestyles (e.g. "only hippies eat organic food"). Others just do not care about them. For instance, in a study conducted in Belgium in 2002 on fair-trade coffee (De Pelsmacker, Driesen and Rayp, 2003), consumers had to taste and choose between several coffee types. On the basis of the importance they attach to coffee attributes, consumers were divided in four segments: the "fair-trade lovers" cluster, in which consumers expressed a high preference for the fair-trade label, is the less important cluster. Main preferences go to the brand consumers are used to, or to the flavor. In

another study conducted in France on skepticism and trust in fair trade, a cluster analysis distinguished three groups of consumers: the "convinced ones", the "concerned ones", who both believe in fair-trade but differ in their behaviour, and the "reluctant" consumers, who do not care about fair-trade (Sirieix et al. 2004).

Consumer concern is, however, difficult to measure. When studies aiming to assess consumers' concern are based on direct questions such as "How concerned are you about environmental problems?" , answers are likely to be biased, since respondents may be willing to conform to the sensed presupposition that they should be concerned (Herrmann, Sterngold and Warland, 1998). Most research thus uses attitude scales such as the SRCB (Socially Responsible Consumer Behavior [xvii]) scale (Antil and Bennett, 1979). These scales are generally composed of three types of Likert items with which respondents are asked to indicate their level of agreement [xviii]: (1) general statements about environment (e. g. "Pollution is presently one of the most critical problems facing this nation"); (2) personal statements with higher commitment (e. g. "I worry about the effects of pollution on myself or my family"); (3) injunctions, or sentences regarding society in general, or precise groups like manufacturers, the government (e. g. "Commercial advertising should be forced to mention the environmental disadvantages of products").

However, the usefulness of these studies is limited by poor attitude-behavior consistency: research results regarding the relationship between environmental concern and consumer behavior have been equivocal (Roberts and Bacon, 1997; Giannelloni, 1998). Hence, other studies try to measure the relative importance of ethical or environmental concern in comparison with other quality dimensions. The results show that most consumers do not feel concerned by ethical or environmental concerns (Steptoe et al. 1995 ; Henson and Traill, 2000).

Other studies try to relate environmental or ethical concern and behavior. A first type of this research describes behaviors, and then relates them to different variables that might explain these behaviors.

The review of marketing research regarding the variables which can explain behaviors proposed by Giannelloni (1998), clearly shows that research results are equivocal, as illustrated by the example of the influence of socio-demographic characteristics on behavior towards organic food: on the one hand, studies found foremost young consumers among the buyers of organic food (e. g. Dufour and Loisel, 1996; Roddy, Cowan and Hutchinson, 1996), and on the other hand, several studies show that socio-demographic characteristics of the buyers do not significantly differ (Robert-Kréziak, 1998). Moreover, a lot of determinants of organic food buying can be identified, and several of them are not related to environment (Robert-Kréziak, 1998; Schifferstein and Oude Ophuis, 1998).

Third, consumers are often confused or incredulous about the attribute signaling for these products. The profusion of signals confuses consumers, who do not clearly distinguish certified products from non-certified products (Blend and van Ravenswaay, 1998). Moreover, there is great variation in how much consumers trust governments and companies as one goes from country to country. In Europe, surveys show that trust in government at the local, regional, and national level is high in Netherlands and Scandinavia, but lower in Spain, France, Italy, and Greece (Eurobaromètre, 1998). A study on consumer trust in organic labels in two regions of France and Germany in 1998 showed that 80% of French consumers versus only 53% of Germans (Sirieix and Schaer, 1999) have high confidence in the organic label. Another reason for such a difference is that France has a single government-sponsored organic label whereas in Germany there were still 14 local organic labels coexisting in 1999. Note that now there appears at first glance to be a resolution of this

confusion, with the existence of a single European label for organics. In fact, recent research (Butault, 2003) shows that while the new label somewhat improves the situation in providing the image of unanimity, there is still ambiguity in the acceptance of the unified label by the operators.

Consumer-related issues that differ between the domains

Three issues concerning differences stand out.

First, do consumers who buy products of organic or integrated agriculture share common values with those consumers who buy products having an ethical/fair-trade dimension? Some authors support a positive answer to that question, that values are shared. Murray and Raynolds (2000) note: "While alternative trade initiatives vary considerably in their focus and scope, their common goal is to link socially and environmentally conscious consumers in the North with producers in the South pursuing more socially just and ecologically sound production strategies". The concerns and actions of consumers are related to consumers' values. Schwartz (1992) distinguishes ten values, grouped into two dimensions: the first concerns the contrast between openness to change and a more conservative tendency, while the second contrasts selfish behavior with the priority given to others, itself shared between "good will" and "universalism"[xix].

Studies show that consumers of ethical-trade products tend to be motivated in their purchase of these goods only by "universal values" rather than also by consumerist or self-centered values. The universal values mainly relate to the well-being of workers and farmers in developing countries,. For instance, in the study conducted in Belgium in 2002 on fair-trade coffee (De Pelsmacker, Driesen and Rayp, 2003), "fair-trade lovers" were significantly more idealistic and concerned by a better world than the other clusters; in another study carried out in France in 2003 (Tagbata and Sirieix,

2004), consumers had to taste and choose between several coffee types; consumers who were ready to buy fair-trade coffee did not find it better than the others, but were willing to help small producers.

Consumers of environmental products, by contrast, tend to have a mix of values: (1) universal values, such as the protection of the environment; and (2) self-centered values, such as one's own (or one's family's) health, tradition, or pleasure. For example, studies tend to show that consumers mainly buy organic products for their health rather than for the environment (Blend and van Ravenswaay, 1998; Schifferstein and Oude Ophuis, 1998), or for health and taste (Sirieix and Schaer, 1999). According to Sylvander (1999), important differences appear in Europe from one country to another. For instance, in Great Britain, many organic consumers also are vegetarians, and really concerned by animal welfare; in Germany and Denmark, most consumers are concerned by environment; in Italy and France, "traditional", convinced consumers who are aware of what certification means are opposed to new consumers who discovered organic products after the food crises during the 1990's .

Note that a main value of some consumers of environmental products concerns helping the producers of farm products, a "universal value" that can extend to helping small farmers in terms of fair returns to their work, or helping workers in terms of good labor conditions.

Second, is the relation between the concerns/values and the purchasing behavior of consumers similar between the environmental and ethical/fair-trade domains? One can hypothesize that the link is stronger when the set of values motivating purchases is more homogeneous, which is the case for consumers in the ethical/fair-trade domain, but not in the mixed-motive purchases in the environmental domain. In fact, although the market for organic products has recently developed in Europe, this is not mainly due to consumers' increasing concern for environmental issues, but rather

to a reaction to recent food crises (AGENCE BIO 2004 www.agencebio.org).. Given that consumers buy organic products for both ethical and selfish or pragmatic reasons, one would expect that market to grow faster and larger than the market for fair-trade products, which relies only on altruistic values of consumers.

Third, do consumers buying environmentally friendly goods perceive the problem that such an action addresses with the same sense of immediacy and urgency as do those buying ethical/fair-trade products? One can hypothesize that consumers perceive as more proximate risks regarding health and environment because these affect these consumers in their daily lives. By contrast, the condition of the lives of farmers and workers is less immediate and proximate. Recent environmental and food safety crises (such as mad cow) have further sharpened consumer awareness.

Paradoxically, whereas consumers pay more attention when an environmental problem is closer, they appear to pay less attention to a social/ethical problem the closer it is. Hence, for example, consumers seem to pay more attention to social problems only if they are very distant. In rich countries, it is as if labor relations in large farms and food firms are judged by consumers to be on the whole satisfactory. The deterioration of Labor Rights and the rise of racism in Europe in the 1990s were conspicuously absent in general in the social ethics debates related to fair/ethical trade in foods. There were of course some important exceptions such as the call by the Collective for Ethics in Labeling to link the concerns for workers in foreign lands with local workers – but the very absence of an answering "echo" in the general debate was telling. Yet there is much evidence that social and ethical problems, for example, for farm and food firm laborers, are severe in industrialized countries. The International Labor Organization found severe racial discrimination in the workplace in eight European countries (see Bourgeois, 2000). While there is some pressure put on firms by NGOs, firms in Northern countries are hardly affected by the ethical/fair trade movement, although

there is a fear that it will affect them by some large food firms who employ many immigrants in Europe. To prevent this, the multinational banana firm Dole, for example, has adopted an SA 8000 certification for its Spanish subsidiary Pascual Hermanos.

Table 2 summarizes the issues linked to consumer concerns encountered by the movements in both domains.

Conclusions

This paper first established the sequence of events from niche to mass market for these products; second, taking the current situation as a point of departure concerning the problem for the growth of the market for these products posed by the proliferation and disorder of signals given to consumers, sought to generate strategic lessons for the movements, for the retailers, and for governments. We did this by combining two types of analysis not usually combined, an analysis of the actions of the movements in organizing the supply of signals to consumers, and an analysis of the perceptions of consumers. The following lessons emerge.

First, both the movements promoting these (environmentally friendly and food-safe, as well as fair/ethical trade) products as well as the retailers selling these products, need above all to focus on the perceptions of the consumers. Movement activists and retailers need to keep in mind that ethical/social trade and even environmental concerns related to food are relatively new for consumers, and carefully mold the signals/labels and merchandising to them. We showed that this will be easier in the domain of food safety and the environment, as the individual's desire to eat safe food cuts across consumer types.

By contrast, although the motivation of "universal values" cuts across the diverse individual motivations of consumers purchasing ethical/fair trade products, there is nevertheless within those values a strong diversity of philosophies that in turn imply a diversity of messages. The movements and retailers will need to be prepared to deliver this diversity, but it can also be a challenge to collective action with a critical mass needed to promote this market. Moreover, it will be harder to marry efforts to promote environmentally friendly/safe foods and ethical/fair trade products except among the original group of niche market consumers who sought these products especially because the production systems that generated them were not the commercial, mainstream and conventional.

Second, governments need to take into account the great importance of the private actors, whether supermarket chains, suppliers, NGOs, or consumers and the pre-existence of their efforts to propose standards and certifying systems, and understand and adjust the efforts of the government within that context. To realize that the crafting of a convergence of signals to consumers will be a delicate and difficult process would already be a step forward.

Third, for the radical movements themselves, it is crucial to see that the mass market differs fundamentally from the niche market in which they formerly operated, and the rules, actors, and dynamics of this new market will be challenging for them to act in. Partnerships or at least close communication with the "market engines" such as the supermarket chains, and the standards bodies such as ISO will be useful. The relations might be of cooperation or of vigilance depending on the case, but they will not be of isolation.

Fourth, the supermarket chains may well find that the NGOs and other groups that promote the market for these products can turn into important allies given their ties to a "core group" of consumers, and their facility in influencing political and social attitudes toward the values represented by the products.

Several directions for future research are appealing.

First, there is a need for further research on the development of social movements related to the movements related to product attributes discussed in this article. A particularly interesting direction would be to examine European political consumerism, defined as a movement which seeks to turn the apolitical marketplace into a domain contested by consumers expressing personal attitudes and values, expressed in product choice as well as in product boycotts (see Micheletti, 2003).

Second, with reference to actors, there is a need to deepen and extend analysis of the role of governments in the formulation and enforcement of standards, how that is changing under globalization, under pressure from consumers, and in the face of the trend toward increasing importance of voluntary approaches and the rapid emergence of private standards that at times supplant public standards.

Table 1. The characteristics of the radical and the reformist movements

.	Radical Movements (organic agriculture and fair trade)	Reformist Movements (integrated agriculture and ethical trade)
Initial structure and trajectory		
• Links with the dominant economic model	Low	High
• Emergence of the movement (commercially)	1970's	End of 1990's
• Size of units	Small	Large
• Market shares (potential)	Small	Large
• Trading chain length	Short	Long
Approach to signaling attributes for consumers		
• Dominant standard monitoring	States/NGOs	Firms/Sectors
• Certification by an independent group	Yes	Not frequent
• Degree of signal harmonization	Strong	Low

Table 2. Consumer concerns

	Environment	Social ethics
Similar problems		
• Awareness	Low	Low
• Degree of Concern	Low	Low
• Capacity to Differentiate Signals	Small	Small
• Institutional Credibility	Variable	Variable
Differences		
• Content Homogeneity	Yes	No
• Motivation Homogeneity	No	Yes
• Values	"Self-centered" and/or universal	Universal
• Links between Values and Purchase Behavior	No	Yes
• Immediacy and urgency of the problem	Yes	No
• Attention paid to the problem, the closer it is	Positive	Negative

Acknowledgements. The authors are grateful for useful comments from three anonymous external reviewers.

Notes

[i] We use movement in the "actors" sense, abstracting from political and consumer movements, as it has been used in the sociological literature, see for instance Raynolds (2000).

[ii] "Credence attributes" are attributes that "may not be detected, even during consumption, for example, many process attributes." (Darby and Karny, 1973).

[iii] We use "signaling" as it is the broader set of which "labeling" is a subset. We could limit ourselves to the use of "labeling" (label on a product) but there are other ways of signaling quality: one can signal quality via the persons or firms that market the product, whether they are local individuals or chains or networks, which undertake product ratings, product publicity, establish websites or distribute brochures signaling the use of a quality rating system or a quality assurance scheme or a traceability program, or a best practices code, an ISO standard, and so on. Sometimes there is a signal of quality merely via the name of the store, such as "health foods coop." Finally, a firm or association can signal quality of a product by providing general information on the product's quality to the public (such as publicity campaigns regarding the health benefits of blueberries).

[iv] For more information about the history of alternative agriculture, see Ingram (2003).

[v] The reformist movements (integrated agriculture and ethical trade) started as early as the radical movements (organic agriculture and fair trade) movements. But they can be considered as more recent using the criteria of consumers' awareness of them (knowing about and understanding them).

[vi] The French National Federation of Organic Agriculture (FNAB) rejects the use of a European logo on products from non-European countries because of insufficient controls (FNAB annual meeting, Poitiers, 19-20 March 2002).

[vii] In France, the opposition to the governmental decree on integrated agriculture is particularly strong in the French National Federation of Organic Agriculture (FNAB). Its president declared: "Integrated agriculture is a vast cheat inflicted on consumers. It will not bring anything at all to producers and is only there to give a better image of traditional agriculture" (FNAB annual meeting, March 2002).

[viii] EISA (the European Initiative for Sustainable Agriculture) (www.farre.org/agri_raison/EISA_convention.htm) is an international agreement among six national European organizations: FNL for Germany, LEAF for the United-Kingdom, ODLING I BALANS for Sweden, FARRE for France, FILL for Luxemburg and l'Agricoltura che Vogliamo for Italy. At the national level, these organizations consist of independent producers and other participants in the agricultural sector (e.g., agro-chemicals and food processing industries).

[ix] Some large European food retailers, mostly British, Dutch, or Scandinavian, have grouped themselves to create EUREP (www.eurep.org) and promote through this organization a code of good agricultural practices (GAP), which must be respected by any vegetable and fruit producer who wants to sell to a member of EUREP.

[x] ECPA (European Crop Protection Association) (www.ecpa.be) has as its principal interest the harmonization of registration procedures and regulations of products used for crop protection. The members of ECPA also participate in EUREP and EISA to develop GAPs.

[xi] A European Ecolabel exists for non-food sectors. However, it does not have many supporters and is perceived by WTO and some other countries as a barrier to free markets (Herrup, 1999).

[xii] The agrochemical companies in the 1990s used GMOs to buck up the declining pesticide markets. However, in the late 1990s, the reaction against GMOs made that strategy backfire. Hence, now that the companies must again directly address the problem of declining pesticide use, they have a strong desire to control the integrated agriculture movement in order to make sure that pesticides stay on the agenda and used by producers (Assouline, Joly and Lemarié 2001).

[xiii] SA 8000 was developed by the "CEPAA " (Council on Economic Priorities Accreditation Agency; www.cepaa.org). This international organization has no direct link with governments but brings together interested firms and unions.

[xiv] For example, Doug Cahn, Reebok's vice president of human right programs, said that he has experimented with outside monitors but has found that internal auditors are better able to influence factory managers. (Johanna Slater, "The inspector calls working conditions in Asian factories is a hot issue", e-newsletter from the Far Eastern Economic Review issue cover dated July 6, vol 163 n° 27)

[xv] For example, only 15% of codes voluntarily adopted by firms mention freedom to unionize (Diller, 1999).

[xvi] For example, (1) the total organic food market in OECD countries in 2000 was only about USD 25-30 billion which is less than 2% of total food sales; market growth rates in most OECD countries are estimated to range from 15% to 30% per year (OECD, 2003), (2) sustainable coffee in the European market is 1.6% of total consumption; Giovannucci and Koekoek, F.J. The state of

sustainable coffee. A study of twelve major markets, World Bank, 2003, October 14.

[xvii] In spite of its name, this scale does not deal with general socially responsible behavior, but only with environmental concern.

[xviii] The examples come from the scale used by Berger and Kanetkar (1995), and adapted from SRCB scale.

[xix] Openness to change includes the values of "autonomy", "stimulation" and "hedonism", whereas the conservative tendency groups "security", "conformity" and "tradition". Self-esteem corresponds to values of "power" and "self-realization", and priority given to others comprises "good will" and "universalism".

References

Anonymous (2002). "Démarche pour une normalisation du commerce équitable." *INC Hebdo* 1204, 15/03: 2.

Anonymous (2001). "La mondialisation citoyenne." *Alternatives Economiques* 188: 38-43.

Anonymous (1998). "La sécurité des produits alimentaires", report, *Eurobaromètre 49*, INRA Europe

Anonymous (2004). Baromètre de consomation et de perceptions des produits biologiques en France. Rapport CSA Agence Bio, November; www.agencebio.org accessed April 15th 2005

Anonymous (2000). "Produits bio: le nombre d'acheteurs croît très vite." *AGIA Alimentation* 1678, 16/11: 36-37.

Aschehoug, A.S. (2001). "La bio s'engage dans le solidaire." *FLD Hebdo* 289, 18/12 : 10.

Assouline, G., P.B. Joly, and S. Lemarié (2001). "Biotechnologies végétales et restructurations de l'agrofourniture: un horizon stratégique marqué de fortes incertitudes." *Economie et Société 3,* Série Développement, Croissance et Progrès 38: 427-450.

Bellon, S, Y. Gautronneau, G. Riba, I. Savini, and B. Sylvander (2000). "L'agriculture biologique et l'INRA: vers un programme de recherche." *INRA mensuel*: 104 March-April: 1-25.

Blend, J. and E. van Ravensway (1998). "Consumer Demand for Ecolabeled Apples: Survey Methods and Descriptive Results." *Staff Paper* 98-20, Dept. Of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University.

Bonny, S. (1997). "L'agriculture raisonnée, l'agriculture intégrée et Farre". *Nature Sciences et Sociétés* 5: 64-71.

Bourgeois, F. (2000). "Discrimination Raciale dans le Monde du Travail: l'Etendue du Mal en Europe." *Economisme et Humanisme* 353, July : 10-14

Browne, A.W., P.J.C. Harris, A.H. Hofny-Collins, N. Pasiecznik, R.R. Wallace (2000). "Organic Production and Ethical Trade: definition, practice and link." *Food Policy* 25: 69-89.

Butault, J. (2003). "L'achèvement de l'édifice juridique de l'agriculture biologique: la certification de l'étiquetage à l'international des aliments." *Revue de droit rural* 316, October: 528-540.

Chaffee, E. (1985). "Three Models of Strategy." *Academy of Management Review* 10 (1): 89-98.

Codron, J.M., R. Habib, F. Jacquet, and B. Sauphanor (2002). "Bilan et perspectives de l'agriculture raisonnée en arboriculture fruitière : expertise INRA. "*Agriculture, Territoire et Environnement dans les Politiques Européennes.* " 40: 3-10.

Darby, M.R. and E. Karny (1973). "Free Competition and the Optimal Amount of Fraud." *Journal of Law and Economics* 16: 67-88.

Diller, J. (1999). "Responsabilité sociale et mondialisation." *Revue Internationale du Travail* 138 (2): 107-139.

Ferron, P. (1999). "Protection Intégrée des cultures: évolution du concept et de son application." *Les Dossiers de l'Environnement*. http://www.inra.fr/Internet/Produits/dpenv/do.htm#d19 . Accessed June 14, 2003.

Gereffi, G., R. Garcia-Johnson, and E. Sasser (2001). "The NGO-Industrial Complex." *Foreign Policy* 125 (July-August): 56-65.

Hamm, B. (2002). "The Global Compact: A Forum for Dialogue between the UN and Private Business." *D+C Development and Cooperation* 4, July/August: 20-22. (publication of the Deutsche Stiftung fur Internationale Entwicklung, Berlin).

Herrup, A. (1999). "Eco-Labels: Benefits Uncertain, Impacts Unclear?" *European Environmental Law Review* 8 (5): 144-153.

Ingram, M. (2003). "Fertile Ground for New Ideas? Definitions of science, nature and risk in the alternative agriculture movement." Paper Presented at the *Association of American Geographers Annual Meeting*, New Orleans, March 5-8.

Lewis, D. (1998). " Nongovernmental Organizations, Business and the Management of Ambiguity." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership 9*: 135-151.

Micheletti, M. (2003*): Political Virtue and Shopping : Individuals, Consumerism and Collective Action*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Moreau-Rio, M.-A. (2000). "Crises alimentaires et environnementales : les attitudes vis-à-vis des fruits et legumes." *Infos-CTIFL* 158, January-February: 12-15.

Murray, D. L., and L. T. Raynolds (2000). "Alternative Trade in Bananas: Obstacles and Opportunities for Progressive Social Change in the Global Economy." *Agriculture and Human Values* 17:65-74.

De Pelsmacker, P., L. Driesen and G. Rayp (2003). "Are fair trade labels good business? Ethics and coffee buying intentions." Working Paper, Universiteit Gent, D/2003/7012/03.

Perna, T. (1998). *Fair Trade. Torino:* Bollati Boringhieri, Torino.

Raynolds, L.T. (2000). "Re-embedding global agriculture: The international organic and fair trade movements." *Agriculture and Human Values* 17: 297-309.

Roberts, J. and D. Bacon (1997). "Exploring the Subtle Relationships between Environmental Concern and Ecologically Conscious Consumer Behavior." *Journal of Business Research* 40: 79-89.

Schifferstein, H. and P. Oude Ophuis (1998). "Health-related determinants of organic food consumption in the Nederlands." *Food quality and Preference* 9 (3): 119-133.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). "Universals in the content and structure of values: theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries." in M. Zanna (Ed.) *Advances in experimental social psychology* 25: 1-65, Orlando, Fl: Academic Press.

Sirieix, L. and B. Schaer (1999). "A Cross-Cultural Research on Consumers Attitudes and Behaviors Towards Organic and Local Foods." Paper presented at the *Seventh Symposium on Cross-Cultural Consumer and Business Studies,* 10-13 December, Cancun, Mexico.

Sirieix, L., A. Meunier. and B. Schaer (2004). "Les consommateurs et le commerce équitable: Scepticisme, confiance accordée et disposition à s'engager. » *Economie et Société* 38 (3): 571-590.

Steidlmeier, P. (1993). “Institutional Approaches in Strategic Management." *Journal of Economic Issues* XXVII: 189-211.

Sylvander B. (1997). "Le rôle de la certification dans l'évolution des modes de consommation: le cas de l'agriculture biologique." *Revue d'Economie Industrielle* 80, Second Quarter: 47-66.

Sylvander B. (1999). "Les tendances de la consommation de produits biologiques en France et en Europe: conséquences sur les perspectives d'évolution du secteur." Paper Presented at the Colloque ISARA – Université Laval : Organic agriculture faces its development : the future issues, Lyon, 6-8 December.

Sylvander, B. (2002). "Le bio peut être une locomotive pour l'agriculture raisonnée" *Les Echos*, 27 February.

Thomson, B. (1999). “Fair Trade – Frequently Asked Question – FAQ.” http://www.web.net/fairtrade/who/fair2.html. Accessed May 15, 2003.

Waridel, L. and S. Teitelbaum (1999). “Fair Trade in Europe: An Equiterre/ASEED Research Report.” http://www.cam.org/~equiter/Rapport_e

Williamson, O. (1985). *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism* New York: The Free Press.

Zadek, S. and P. Tiffen (1996). “Fair Trade: business or campaign?” *Development* 3: 48-53.

Correspondence address.

Dr. Jean-Marie Codron, Institut National de Recherche Agronomique (INRA) and Unite Mixte de Recherche (UMR)-Marches, Organisations, Institutions et Strategies d’Acteurs (MOISA), 2 place Viala, 34060 Montpellier Cedex 1, France. tel : 33 (0)4 99 61 23 05
fax: 33 (0)4 67 63 54 09 Email codron@ensam.inra.fr