

Final report

for

Project no. 1897

Farmer Consumer Partnerships - FCP

Period covered: 15.06.2007 – 14.06.2010

| | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| Contract no. | 1897 | Contract Acronym: | FCP | |
| Contract title: | Farmer Consumer Partnerships | | | |
| Coordinator information: | | | | |
| Institution: | University Kassel | Acronym | UKS | |
| Faculty/ Department/ Section/Unit | Agricultural and Food Marketing | | | |
| Address: | Road name and number: Steinstrasse 19 | | | P.O. Box: |
| | Town Witzenhausen | Post Code: 37213 | Region: Hesse | Country: Germany |
| Coordinator: | Family name: Hamm | First name: Ulrich | Title: Prof. Dr. | |
| Address if different from above: | | | | |
| | Phone: +49-5542-981285 | Fax: +49-5542-981286 | E-mail: hamm@uni-kassel.de | |
| Start of Project: | June 15, 2007 | End of project: | June 14, 2010 | |

Project partners and contact persons:

| Partner no. | Organisation name: | Functions*): | Involved in WP's: | Contact person: |
|-------------|---|--------------|------------------------------|--|
| 1 | University of Kassel | PC, WPM, WP3 | WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6 | Prof. Dr. Ulrich Hamm Dr. Katrin Zander |
| 2 | University of Natural Resources and Applied Life Sciences, Vienna | WPM, WP2 | WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6 | Prof. Dr. Bernd Freyer Katharina Goessinger |
| 3 | University of Ancona | WPM, WP4 | WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6 | Prof. Dr. Raffaele Zanolli |
| 4 | Mediterranean Agronomic Institute of Bari | WPCM | WP4, WP6 | Dr. Roberta Callieris |
| 5 | Organic Research Centre, before Aberystwyth University | WPM, WP1 | WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6 | Dr. Susanne Padel |
| 6 | Research Institute of Organic Agriculture | WPM, WP5 | WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6 | Dr. Matthias Stolze |

*) PC: Project Coordinator, WPM: Work package Manager, WPCM: Work package Co-manager, P: Participant

INDEX

| | |
|---|----|
| Project Summary, including objectives and expected outputs | 4 |
| 1. Summary of main results and conclusions achieved in the reporting period | 7 |
| 2. Work package description and progress of the work: | 13 |
| 3. Milestones and Deliverables status | 17 |
| 4. Publications and dissemination activities..... | 18 |
| Final report addendum: | 28 |

Project Summary, including objectives and expected outputs

The main objective of the CORE Organic project 'Farmer Consumer Partnerships' is to determine how the commitment of organic farmers to ethical values additional to organic farming standards can be effectively communicated to organic customers and thus strengthen the positioning in the market.

The research program consisted in the following steps:

- Identification of ethical concerns and related activities going beyond the standards of organic farmers and companies
- Identification of organic consumers' preferences for different aspects of an 'added value' to organic farming standards
- Elicit consumers' willingness to pay for aspects of the 'added value', and
- Conclude on the potential for product differentiation and marketing.

The main outcome of our research is that the communication of additional ethical attributes of organic food offers a promising potential for product differentiation in the organic market. Critical consumers and producers agree that organic production according to the EU regulation on organic farming (EC/834/2007) can be improved with respect to ethical food production.

The analysis of the supply side showed that many producers practise organic farming in ways that go far beyond the minimum requirements of the EU regulation on organic farming. The analysis of the communication activities (internet, labels flyers) of about 100 SMEs with organic producers' involvement in our study showed that companies are engaged with a broad range of values and sustainability goals that they communicate. The most widely used arguments related to local and regional production, followed by resource use, care farming and biodiversity related communication.

Seven 'ethical' attributes were then tested with nearly 1200 organic consumers in 5 European countries with a computer based survey tool. The results of this survey showed that a considerable segment of organic consumers is interested in products which are produced according to 'ethical' standards exceeding the EU regulation. The additional 'ethical' attributes 'regional/local production', 'animal welfare', and 'fair prices for farmers' were found to be most important to consumers. Attributes like 'care farming', 'protection of biodiversity', 'consideration of cultural features in production' and 'social aspects of production' (e.g. working conditions) were less relevant.

The following focus groups discussions with 181 regular and occasional consumers of organic food in five countries were aimed at achieving a deeper understanding of how the three attributes 'regional/local production', 'animal welfare', and 'fair prices for farmers' could be communicated to consumers using labels designed by an advertising company. The results indicated that the consumers generally dislike the rather emotive labels which were used in this research step and that they prefer precise information. The results of these group discussions confirmed that 'animal welfare' arguments were most popular, followed by 'regional/local production' and 'fair prices for farmers'.

In the following research step choice tests were carried out with about 400 organic consumers to elicit their preferences and their willingness to pay for the three most important additional 'ethical' attributes. The results showed that people generally not only prefer organic products with additional ethical attributes but also exhibit an increased willingness to pay for these products. 'From the own region' was the argument most relevant for the purchase decision in all countries.

However, the communication of these additional ethical attributes remains a major challenge. The communication of highest 'animal welfare' standards is particularly difficult, since consumers relate organic farming already with a 'Plus' in animal welfare standards. The lack of clear and accepted definitions of how a higher degree of animal welfare can be measured, the lack of consumers' knowledge on shortcomings in the organic regulations and some existing derogations and exemptions make it difficult to find claims that can clearly be communicated. Although consumers

are interested in animal welfare, they know only little about it. Nevertheless, the examples of communication of additional animal welfare aspects identified in this project (for example related to a short transport distance to slaughter in the UK), demonstrate the possibilities of developing convincing communication strategies.

Consumers clearly expressed preferences for products with clear provenance, but appreciate the possibility to judge themselves whether a product is regional/local to them. Given the difficulties of defining regional/local production and increasingly complex supply chains it is recommended to indicate the production place as precisely as possible rather than refer to 'regional' or 'local production'. Consumers may feel misled when noticing that 'regional' products (or their raw materials) in reality have been transported over long distances. This approach is also helpful in another respect: Consumer perception of the attribute 'regionally/locally produced' depends on the product. While in the UK an apple transported over 200 km might be considered 'regional' compared to apples from Italy, consumers might associate 'regional/local production' with smaller distances for other products (such as eggs).

The suitability of the 'fair prices for farmers' attribute for product differentiation in the domestic market seems to depend highly on the way it is communicated. Concise information like e.g. a definite premium on the average prices as used by some dairy companies proved to work well in our choice experiments with eggs. It is likely that consumers associate not only the situation of the domestic farmers themselves with the 'fair price' argument but also related aspects like the support of family farms and the preservation of traditional landscapes. We found that more general information like 'helping and supporting domestic farmers' was not appreciated by most consumers. Thus, marketers must take care not to connect any 'fair price' argument too strongly with 'Fairtrade', which has been so successful in relation to products from developing countries. Consumers clearly do not see the situation of domestic farmers as comparable to those of poor farmers in developing countries.

In any case farmers claiming additional ethical activities to justify a higher than average organic price should aim at an apparent differentiation compared to existing standards. Only then, their activities are clearly visible by consumers, and communication as well as verification is reliable and promising.

Communication of additional ethical values for product differentiation will be most promising when consumers' concerns are met. Comparing the additional ethical attributes preferred by consumers with those often communicated by producers, it turns out that there are some overlaps but significant differences, too. Consumers mostly prefer organic food with additional characteristics in the fields of 'regional/local production' which corresponds well to a communication emphasis of many organic businesses. Consumers also show preferences for arguments related to 'animal welfare' and 'fair prices for farmers', whereas the SME companies we studied mainly focussed on regional/local production, nature conservation and biodiversity in their communication efforts. It is therefore recommended that producers aiming for product differentiation within the organic market should strengthen their communication activities towards consumer concerns.

The communication of additional ethical values needs a common understanding of each particular attribute under consideration. We detected some shortcomings in this respect. For some concerns that are important to consumers there are neither common definitions nor standards for the time being. Nevertheless, in discussions about future perspectives of organic farming the terms 'fair' and 'regional' have become very popular. 'Fairness' makes people feel good because it implies not only well-being for farmers but also for customers, and high expectations rest on local or regional organic food as a new way to reconnect producers and consumers. However, both terms are not clearly defined and thus might be understood differently by producers and/or consumers.

The organic sector needs a comprehensive discussion on additional ethical attributes, Many consumers already have their own ideas on what is 'fair' and what is 'regionally produced'. It is therefore not up to the producers and marketers to define these terms on their own. As common standards are lacking, and given the different ways in which 'ethical' claims can be interpreted, the organic farming sector should be very cautious in stating its claims.

Organic food that fulfils additional ethical concerns is an increasing market segment, waiting for being developed by sophisticated and innovative communication strategies. Suitable

communication can be realised through investment in public relations but requires a sound understanding of the activities of the sector as well as preferences of consumers. Our experience has shown that not all ideas work equally. The emotive labels used in the focus groups were largely rejected. However, in the choice experiments testing the same three generic attributes but more factual based, consumers showed some willingness to pay an additional premium. The organic food and farming sector offers excellent possibilities to build up a good corporate image with regard to ethical concerns of the public, but our results indicated that “how” attributes are communicated matters as much as what they are.

The aim of the research was to isolate from the wide array of additional ethical concerns within the organic sector those that resonate most with consumers and are therefore most promising in terms of product differentiation in an increasing competitive organic market. It was not the aim to develop a strategy how the complex message of organic farming and its public benefits can be communicated or to carry out a comprehensive review of proven public benefits of organic farming. It appears that such a project would be extremely valuable for future development of the organic sector in Europe and would help to inform organic consumers with factual statements.

The results of the project were presented at many different conferences during the duration of the project and also afterwards. Additionally publications in farmers’ magazines as well as in scientific journals have been realised. An extended summary of all project results was elaborated in German, in English and in Italian in order to make the results available also to practitioners (<http://www.uni-kassel.de/agrar/alm/?c=92>).

Further information at: <http://fcp.coreportal.org/>

1. Summary of main results and conclusions achieved in the reporting period

1st period:

The CORE-Organic project 'Farmer Consumer Partnerships' develops and tests innovative generic communication strategies as a valuable tool for the strategic positioning of organic companies and farmers' initiatives in the five partner countries Austria, Germany, Italy, Switzerland and the UK. The main objective is to determine how the commitment to a broader range of ethical values than those covered by the European organic regulations can be reflected in communication with customers.

In WP1, a conceptual framework for ethical approaches in organic agriculture was developed. The most important ethical traditions frequently mentioned in the context of ethical consumerism and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) were reviewed. It was established, which of the concerns expressed by organic stakeholders go beyond current organic standards, in particular beyond the European Regulation on organic farming. These concerns and the activities with which they are associated are referred to as 'organicPlus' in this report.

The literature overview indicates that 'organicPlus' activities have the potential to differentiate organic products in a growing and increasingly globalised market, where organic products compete with other ethical supplements such as local or regional food and 'fair trade' products. Strengthening the producer-consumer link in the European organic sector in a similar way to 'fair trade' certification could induce consumers to become more aware of food culture and identity and production conditions for organic food. Companies should be able to integrate social and environmental concerns into business activities and communicate how they relate to values of consumers and other stakeholders.

Ethical consumers consider the effect that their purchasing decisions have on others. They have a variety of motives for buying and are influenced by contextual factors. Consumers' ethical decision-making in relation to food consumption is complex and cuts across various disciplines ranging from moral philosophy to natural sciences, from politics to economics and from nature to culture. The many different ways of considering the rights and wrongs of an action represent a challenge for both researchers and companies. The literature points to three underlying philosophical traditions – *consequentialism, deontology and virtue ethics*. Value communication can further be assisted by tools (e.g. Ethical Matrix), aiming at simplifying the analysis of food choices by referring to underlying ethical traditions and the impact on producers, consumers, farm animals and the environment. CSR approaches in European companies relate to a range of ethical values, depending on business context and location. Small and medium sized enterprises (SME) have been slow to respond to the CSR agenda and show a level of scepticism towards formal auditing. Evidence from CSR reporting in the food sector, 'fair trade' principles and the IFOAM Principles of Organic Agriculture indicate that ethical concerns relating to food choices can be categorised in different ways. Most authors refer to the three pillars of sustainable development, environmental impact, social and economic concerns and additionally include categories for impact on animals and cultural issues. There is no evidence that the European organic sector is widely engaged with CSR.

By means of a tool-kit for food companies (Corporate Moral Responsibility Manual by Brom et al., 2006), values expressed in literature about the organic sector are explored. Relevant organic stakeholders are identified and their concerns are mapped and analysed. This leads to 13 categories of concerns under the five principal headings of environmental impact, which are impact on animals, economic and social concerns, and concerns relating to systems or the supply chain. Several categories, such as the preference for local food or concerns about the integrity of the organic supply chain, remain difficult to assign under a principal heading because they consider a range of impacts. These 13 categories of concerns are compared with European Organic Regulations EEC/2092/91 and EC/834/2007.

It can be concluded that organic principles and organic stakeholders express a broader range of concerns than are covered by statutory European regulations and standards. Organic certification

guarantees that certain production rules are followed. This is likely to have a positive impact on food quality and the environment. However, stakeholders' concerns about sustainability of resource use, protection of biodiversity and animal welfare are only partly addressed in direct terms. Concerns about animal welfare reveal potential conflicts and relate to wider questions of how animal welfare should be defined. European standards partly address concerns that relate to the entire food chain and its transparency by clearly stating requirements for all operators. They do not address, however, many fairness-related economic and social concerns with a likely impact on farmers, farm workers or consumers, some of which are covered by national law. Across a range of issues, the discrepancy between stakeholders' expectations and standards can be seen as a threat to the integrity of organic farming and the trust in organic labels, but also as an opportunity for the development of 'organicPlus' activities. Standard-setters have taken first steps to address some of the concerns reviewed. This is illustrated by the fact that the new European Regulation on organic production (EC/834/2007) sets out objectives and principles in which reference is made to a broader range of values than in Regulation (EEC) 2092/91, and that private standards also cover some of these aspects.

In WP2, a two step empirical study, 'organicPlus' approaches and 'communication arguments' of organic companies were identified by analysing written material of the companies and qualitative interviews with the managers. The first step involved mapping of 101 companies in order to develop a general understanding of the issues for organic SMEs. In a second step, the background of organicPlus approaches was explored in greater detail in 20 case study companies.

The qualitative analysis of empirical evidence from the mapping of 101 companies and 20 case studies indicates that 'ethical' production has the potential to improve the companies' image and the relationships between farmers, processors and consumers, and to increase their earnings. The mapping identified 72 different communication arguments and the analysis highlighted the need to extend the categorisation based on three pillars of sustainability to a fourth cultural dimension. The arguments were finally summarised under 16 sub-categories and included several cross-cutting ones. Those arguments relating to regional development issues, regional supply chains or food miles appeared to be very important for organic companies in all participating countries. Communication arguments are a crucial vehicle that can be internally focused (on animal welfare or fair prices for farmers for example) or externally oriented (on community, culture or landscape for example). Communication arguments offer more transparency, make knowledge more accessible and enhance awareness of product quality and its origins through information about how the product relates to nature, the environment, the economy and the social and cultural quality parameters along the supply chain. In summary, communication arguments try to appeal directly to consumers by reflecting the consequences of their purchasing decisions.

More detailed information from the case studies provides first insights into the development of 'organicPlus' approaches. Ethical engagement in many companies appears driven by personal commitment reflecting a holistic approach. The internet, product labels, leaflets/brochures and newspaper articles, as well as the word of mouth are frequently used to communicate 'organicPlus' activities, the main targets being committed organic consumers. The majority of companies does not systematically consider CSR, the sustainability dimensions or the IFOAM principles when developing 'organicPlus' concepts. Besides, attitudes towards the need for documenting ethical engagement vary. Dairies and dairy farms focus mainly on a fair price for farmers, whereas meat producing companies focus more on animal welfare. A SWOT assessment provides the context for analysing the future potential of 'organicPlus' activities and for identifying preliminary trends in developing a typology of such approaches in the future.

WP1 and WP2 conclude with the selection of the most promising communication arguments for further testing in WP3. This selection was based on the results obtained in WP1 and WP2 and was finally decided on by expert rating of project partners. It includes two arguments each under the headings of 'biodiversity', 'animal welfare', 'regional production', 'fairness for farmers', 'care farms', 'social aspects of production' and 'preservation of cultural features' (Table 1).

Table 1: Communication arguments to be tested by means of the IDM

| Attribute | Argument 1 | Argument 2 |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Protection of biodiversity | Protection of the diversity of wild plant and animal varieties on the farms | Protection of traditional plant varieties and traditional animal breeds |
| Animal welfare | When the animals are transported to the slaughterhouse, they are accompanied and looked after by a person they know in order to reduce unnecessary stress. | Animal husbandry according to the animals' physical, physiological and behavioural needs |
| Regional production | Using regional supply chains to reduce food miles | Support of the local economy |
| Fair prices for farmers | Of the total price for every litre of milk, five cents are additionally paid to local farmers | The farmers get fair prices that allows them to secure their livelihood and future |
| Care farms | Integration and participation of disabled people in the work place | Providing support and work for disadvantaged young people and former convicts (IT: Support of people opposing criminal structures like the Mafia) |
| Social aspects of production | Support for family farms | Good working conditions for farm workers |
| Preservation of cultural features | Revival of traditional artisan processing methods | Preservation of the local cultural landscape |

The aim of WP3 was to confront consumers with these ethical concerns and to identify the most promising communication attributes for further analyses within the next work packages. It was to be determined which ethical information is most interesting for consumers in the partner countries with respect to the purchase decision on organic food.

There are different methods for evaluating consumer behaviour regarding information acquisition and processing. For the analyses within this research, it was decided to use an Information Display Matrix (IDM). The IDM is a process tracing method aiming at monitoring the cognitive processes underlying information search, judgement and choice. The two-dimensional matrix lists alternative product stimuli in columns, while product attributes are listed in rows. Each cell contains concealed information about a product-related attribute, which has to be accessed one after another by the interviewee in order to obtain the information.

The IDM was used to analyse the information search regarding ethical values of organic food and to identify those ethical attributes most relevant for decision making. The ethical attributes were tested by means of organic milk. The IDM was accompanied by a questionnaire aiming at the validation of the results obtained by the IDM, at explaining information acquisition behaviour and at giving answers on the 'real life' information behaviour concerning organic food.

The results on the 'real life' information behaviour of the participants show that 'articles in newspapers etc.' are preferred sources of information on organic food, followed by 'conversation with family and friends' and 'product packaging'. 'Information by sales personnel' is rather frequently mentioned in Italy but quite rarely in Switzerland and in the UK. 'Reports on radio or TV' seem to be less important in Italy than in all other countries. When asked for the kind of information they had actively been looking for within the last two months, 'product origin' was mentioned most often, followed by information on 'ingredients'. In Switzerland and Germany, on the other hand, information on 'organic certification' and 'production and processing methods' are ranked higher than information on 'ingredients'. In Italy, information on 'product quality' is more frequently asked for than on 'ingredients', whereas in the UK information on 'food miles' is more important. Information on 'prices' seems to be much more important in Austria than in all the other countries.

On average, respondents spent 4:28 minutes for their information search and opened 34 information fields within the IDM. There were marked differences between the countries. Besides socio-demographic factors like age and the level of education, attitudes regarding organic food consumption were found to have an impact on the amount of information looked for preceding the product choice.

The importance of different attributes for consumers' choice on organic food was analysed via the share each attribute had in all firstly accessed attributes and the frequency of accession of each attribute. According to these indicators, the most important attributes are 'animal welfare', 'regional production' and 'fair prices for farmers'. These attributes are followed by 'product price', indicating that consumers prefer cheap products over ethical products with attributes like 'care farming', 'social criteria of production', 'protection of biodiversity' or 'cultural aspects'. There are only minor differences between the countries in the order of the most important attributes. Only in Italy 'product price' seems to be more important than 'fair prices' and 'animal welfare'.

The cheaper organic product without any additional ethical value was preferred by only 6% of the respondents. While in Germany only 3% decided in favour of the cheaper product, 9% of the Austrian respondents chose the cheaper one. This result allows the conclusion that a large share of consumers of organic food would be willing to pay a price premium of at least 20% for ethical products.

The results of WP3 entered already in the initial discussions of WP4 during the third project meeting. Since the most important ethical attributes proved to be almost the same in all countries, it was decided to have a joint call to advertising companies for the production of communication tools. The joint tender was sent out in early December and an Italian advertisement agency was contracted.

2nd period:

The main activities in the 2nd reporting period belong to work packages (WP) 4 and 5. The aim of WP4 (responsible partner 'Università Politecnica delle Marche', Ancona) was to elaborate and to test new communication concepts based on the outcome of previous work packages. According to the results of WP3 the most important attributes from the consumers' perspective are 'animal welfare', 'local production' and 'fair prices'. For each of these attributes two different arguments were framed in WP4. The attributes and arguments were tested by focus group discussions in all five partner countries. It was decided to test the attributes with the product 'eggs'. An advertising company designed six different egg labels expressing the ethical arguments in words (slogan and body text) and symbols. The labels had a relatively strong emotional character with a heart in the centre of the ethical messages. In all study countries the same labels and texts were used (the facts were translated to the respective country language). All labels featured the respective national organic logos.

The new product labels were tested in three focus group discussions in each of the study countries Austria, Germany, Switzerland and United Kingdom. In Italy a total of six focus group discussions was conducted. Participants of the focus group discussions were recruited according to socio-demographic criteria reflecting the distribution of men and women and age groups among food shoppers. Only organic eggs buyers, either regular or occasional buyers, were asked to participate.

The participants discussed the labels extensively under the headings of perception, evaluation and effectiveness of each label. When finishing the focus group discussions the participants were asked to fill in individual questionnaires. These were aimed to measure participants' reactions and responses to the labels arguments and their general attitude towards advertising. Different measures were used in the questionnaires to evaluate participants' attitudes towards the eggs labels: emotional quotient (label liking), credibility and effectiveness (willingness to buy). General attitudes of participants towards advertising were elicited. Ten days after the focus group discussions took place, participants' recall of the labels was tested through structured telephone interviews.

The results of these group discussions showed that 'animal welfare' arguments were liked most, followed by 'regional/local food production' and 'fair prices for farmers'. The 'animal welfare' argument 'freedom to live and roam outdoors' was widely appreciated in all countries. Statements like 'the hens are looked after with love and care' were liked by some of the participants of the group discussions and less by others. Particularly German and Swiss participants preferred more factual statements.

Confronted with the 'regional/local production' attribute consumers favoured specific information on the product place or even on the producer/farmer himself. Generally, local products were preferred over regional and regional over national products. 'Minimum transport and less pollution' is an example for concise information appreciated by many participants of the group discussions.

Generally, the 'fair prices for farmers' attribute was rather difficult to communicate in the context of organic egg production. The relation with the 'fair trade' approach of supporting farmers in developing countries did not work out well. Consumers' perception was that the situation of European farmers cannot be compared with that of poor farmers in developing countries. They did not understand why domestic egg farmers should receive special support. This illustrates that 'fair prices for farmers' is a very complex attribute and should be used carefully. Consumers' reactions to this attribute may also depend on the product: while there are several examples of successful communication of fair prices with dairy products, consumers' response in the context of egg producers turned out to be unsatisfactory.

The next research step of testing attributes with consumers consisted of a quantitative survey of 80 consumers in each of the study countries in a 'Consumer Choice Test' (WP5: responsible partner FiBL, Frick). The aim was to test consumers' preferences and their willingness to pay for specific ethical arguments in a near shopping situation. Again, the attributes 'animal welfare', 'regional/local production' and 'fair prices for farmers' were tested. Because of the widespread dislike of the emotional design of the labels by most participants of the Focus Group Discussions, the labels were changed and the information was given in the form of clear statements.

The results confirm that test persons generally preferred organic products with additional ethical characteristics. In all countries the argument 'regionally/locally produced' increased the probability that a product was chosen. Only in Austria, domestically produced eggs were preferred over eggs without any information on origin. The surprisingly low preference for domestically produced eggs might be due to the fact that consumers expected eggs to be from the same country. Therefore, the labelling of 'domestic or national production' was in most countries not seen as an additional value. Animal welfare standards which exceed the demands of the EU regulation increased the probability of choice in Germany, Austria and Switzerland but not in Italy and UK. For Italy it is well known that 'animal welfare' aspects are less important for consumers than in other countries. However, Italian consumers reacted to the less factual statements presented in the group discussions with higher interest than expected.

The attribute of 'fair prices for farmers' increased the probability of purchase only in Switzerland and in Germany. The differences between countries might be due to ongoing discussions about fair prices for milk in Germany and Switzerland at the time the survey was done. These results seem to contradict the outcome of the group discussions, where the 'fair price for farmers' labels were mostly rejected. Going in-depth the most probable explanation is that the factual statement on price premia for farmers also worked for eggs, whereas the emotional statements that were tested in the discussion rounds turned out not to be helpful at all in communicating the 'fair price for farmers' idea. People do not want to get the feeling of acting 'immorally' if they do not buy the 'ethical' product.

The comparison of the willingness to pay (WTP) for each of these arguments gives information on the participants' relative preferences. In most countries the argument 'from the own region' was most important since additional WTP was highest. This argument was followed by 'higher animal welfare standards' and by the 'fair price for farmers' argument in Germany and in Switzerland. In Austria, the additional WTP was highest for the 'animal welfare' argument and lowest for being produced in the own region. However, there was no additional WTP at all for the 'fair prices' argument in Austria, Italy and UK. In Italy and in the UK there was no additional willingness to pay for any of the tested arguments except 'from the own region'.

Thus, the research results indicate that farmers and processors should concentrate on the communication of 'regional/local production' and of 'animal welfare'. 'Fair prices for farmers' is a topic as well, particularly in Germany and Switzerland.

Communication of additional ethical attributes will be most promising when consumers' concerns are met. Comparing the additional ethical attributes preferred by consumers with those often communicated by producers, it turns out that there is some consent, but also significant differences. While consumers mostly prefer organic food with additional characteristics in the fields of 'regional/local production', 'animal welfare' and 'fair prices for farmers', farmers themselves mainly focus on regional/local production, nature conservation and biodiversity in their communication efforts. Thus, producers who aim to achieve a higher price and market differentiation are recommended to reorient their activities and communication more towards consumers concerns.

Communication of additional ethical values needs a common understanding of each particular attribute under consideration. We detected some shortcomings in this respect. There are no common definitions or standards for the time being. Nevertheless, in discussions about future perspectives of organic farming the terms 'fair' and 'regional' have become very popular. 'Fairness' makes people feel good because it implies not only well-being for farmers but also for customers, and high expectations rest on local or regional organic food as a way to reconnect producers and consumers. However, both terms are not clearly defined or protected and thus might be understood differently by producers and consumers.

The organic sector needs a comprehensive discussion on additional ethical attributes also in the context of further development of standards and certification. This holds particularly true as the terms under discussion are well-known by consumers. Many consumers already have their own ideas on what is 'fair' and what is 'regionally/locally produced'. That is why it is not up to the producers and marketers to define these terms on their own. As common standards are lacking, and given the different ways in which 'ethical' claims can be interpreted, the organic farming sector should be very cautious in stating its claims.

2. Work package description and progress of the work:

| | |
|--|---|
| WP 1 | "Conceptual framework and definition of CSR arguments" |
| Responsible partner: partner no 5, UWA, Susanne Padel | |
| <p>Description of work: Trans-disciplinary framework integrating the different research and CSR approaches and stakeholder perspectives: With the help of key stakeholder interviews a conceptual framework was developed in relation to the overall project question of how organic companies can adopt and communicate CSR ethical trade approaches. This promote a trans-disciplinary and trans-national understanding of the complexity of researching ethical values, the range of existing CSR approaches and the different perception of the research partners and organic farmers, processors, standard setting bodies and consumers for consideration in the following WPs.</p> | |
| <p>Mid term report on work carried out, and progress of the work compared to the original plan: The development of the trans-disciplinary framework took place at project meetings and through drafting the WP1 contribution for the first project deliverable. Structured discussions at the first project meeting contributed to an increased awareness of the different perceptions and disciplinary backgrounds of the research partners of the project. Besides, a brainstorming on the awareness of CSR and similar approaches and the perceptions of the development of the organic sector in each country was conducted. This was followed by a review of CSR concepts, philosophical traditions of ethical consumerism and tools to assist value communication (such as CoMoRe, Brom et al. 2006). Finally, studies about the concerns of organic farmers, marketing companies, standard setting bodies and consumers were identified by the partners in all countries. This material, together with European studies, was reviewed and presented in 13 categories of concerns about the organic sector under the five principal headings of environmental impact, impact on animals, economic and social concerns, and concerns relating to systems or the supply chain for further discussion at the second project meeting by Susanne Padel. The material was further edited by UWA during discussions at the project meetings and an internal peer review. It was included in the first deliverable of the project together with Material from WP2 and was presented at the 16th IFOAM congress in Modena, Italy.</p> <p>Brom, F., Bakker, E. d., Deblonde, M. and Graaff, R. d. (2006) Corporate Moral Responsibility Manual. LEI. The Hague.</p> <p>Milestones related to WP1 Milestone 1 was met on time, Milestone 3 was not met, because of a tight timing schedule for the initial stages of the project and due to illness of the main contractor in Austria. The final editing of the provided material turned out to be more time consuming than anticipated, and additional support to help with the English language was recruited. All this delayed the publication of the first project deliverable. However, it did not result in delays to any other part of the project, as the selection of communication arguments for further use in WP3 had been completed on time. The first project report was delivered to the German Ministry at the end of July 2008.</p> | |
| <p>Final report on work carried out, and progress of the work compared to the original plan: The work on WP1 was finished as proposed when the Midterm report was delivered. However, additional publications were elaborated (see publication list).</p> | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| WP 2 | "Case studies" |
| Responsible partner: partner no 2, BOKU, Bernhard Freyer | |
| Description of work: Emerging CSR marketing concepts: In each country, three selected companies that have adopted CSR marketing concepts were studied in a comparative case study approach. Interviews with selected stakeholders focused on the successful communication strategies, assurance procedures and the farmers' point of view. The results of the case studies provide a selection of the most promising CSR communication arguments from the perspectives of interviewed stakeholders. | |
| Mid term report on work carried out, and progress of the work compared to the original plan: The empirical surveys, one consisting of 101 farms and companies and second consisting in in-depth interviews of 20 case studies was done, data analysis took place and the report, which was written in cooperation with UWA (WP1) was finished by July 2008 (with a delay of two months). Additional analysis of data was finished by the end of 2008. | |
| Milestones related to WP2 Milestone 2 was met on time, the common decision on the most promising CSR arguments to be tested within the further project was done in December '07. Milestone 3, the publication of the first deliverable, was delayed because of the tight time schedule and because of illness of the Austrian partner (see WP1). The report on the results of WP1 and WP2 was completed by the end of July 2008. However, this did not caused any delay within the whole project. | |
| Final report on work carried out, and progress of the work compared to the original plan: The work on WP2 was finished according to the proposal when the Midterm report was delivered. However, additional publications were elaborated (see publication list). | |

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| WP 3 | "Information Display Matrix" |
| Responsible partner: partner no 1, UKS, Ulrich Hamm | |
| Description of work: Test of the most promising CSR communication arguments of WP2 by means of an Information Display Matrix (IDM) in five European countries: Tasks were the development and programming of a software tool for the IDM for all partners, the development of screening criteria and an additional survey for face-to-face interviews with 240 consumers in all partner countries, development of guidelines for the analysis and writing of the five national reports on the results. At the end of WP3 the most promising communication arguments (two to three per country) have been chosen by the whole project consortium in a project meeting. | |
| Mid term report on work carried out, and progress of the work compared to the original plan: The survey, containing the Information-Display-Matrix and the accompanying questionnaire, was completed on time by June 2008. The following data analysis turned out to be more time consuming than expected, so that the deliverable on the results of WP3 (MS 3) was delayed by 2 months. Nevertheless, the results entered the third project meeting in order to start work on WP4. | |
| Milestones related to WP3 Milestone 4, the report on the results of WP3, was completed with 3 months delay due to more time consuming data analysis than proposed. Nevertheless, this delay did not have an impact on the upcoming work packages. The important results of WP3 concerning the most promising communication arguments were communicated and discussed during a project meeting in September 2008. These discussions resulted in the decision to have a joint tender in all countries (see WP4). | |
| Final report on work carried out, and progress of the work compared to the original plan: The proposed work on WP3 was finished when the Midterm report was delivered. After delivering | |

the report additional analyses on the data was done which resulted in another journal article. This paper has been submitted to a scientific journal. Other publications were elaborated (see publication list).

| | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| WP 4 | "Focus group discussions" |
| Responsible partner: partner no 3, UNIVPM, Raffaele Zanolì | |
| Description of work: Elaboration and test of new communication concepts: Tasks are a national public call to advertising companies for the production of communication tools (e.g. leaflets, bills and product labels) using the most promising national CSR arguments of WP 3. In the next stage, three to six of the best national proposals will be tested in each country by Focus Group Discussions (three focus groups per country) to find out the most promising for each country. A recall-test by telephone with the participants of the Focus Group Discussions ten days after the discussions will identify participants' recollection of the main CSR arguments and therefore help to choose the most promising proposals. | |
| Mid term report on work carried out, and progress of the work compared to the original plan: The tender has been submitted and evaluated, though a delay of one month was needed to complete the tender process and an Italian advertisement agency was contracted. | |
| Final report on work carried out, and progress of the work compared to the original plan: The proposed work was finalised with some months delay, due to administration problems in handling the public call for advertising services. Preliminary results have been presented in the EURSAFE conference in Nottingham in July 2009, while final results were presented in the 199th EAAE Conference in Capri, in June 2010. Results were disseminated via a farmers' journal too. Two scientific paper submissions – one on an Italian journal and one on an international journal – have been prepared (See publication list). | |

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| WP5 | "Consumer Choice Test" |
| Responsible partner: partner no 6, FIBL, Matthias Stolze | |
| Description of work: Conduction of sales experiments with the best two (country-specific) proposals to find out consumers' Buying behaviour for products which were offered with additional benefits using the CSR arguments and the communication tools chosen in WP4: Sales experiments will be elaborated and analysed as Consumer Choice Tests (CCT) with 80 consumers per country in a near-by buying situation and an accompanying survey. | |
| Mid term report on work carried out, and progress of the work compared to the original plan: The work was not scheduled to start within the reporting period. | |
| Final report on work carried out, and progress of the work compared to the original plan: The work on WP5 was finished as planned and the final report was submitted to the co-ordinator in month 38. Parallel to finalising the WP5 report, a paper on the WP5 results was submitted and accepted for the EAAE seminar on Sustainability in the Food Sector (see publication list). Further publication activities are scheduled for autumn 2010. Milestone 6, the report on the results of WP5, was completed with 4 months delay due to more time consuming data analysis than scheduled. Nevertheless, as the final draft was available in month 35, the WP5 results could be integrated in the farmer oriented handbook. In February 2010, the WP5 results on the consumer choice experiments were presented and discussed during the project meeting in Frick. | |

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| WP6 | "Dissemination activities" |
| Responsible partner: all partners, UKS, BOKU, UNIVPM, MAIB, UWA, FIBL | |
| Description of work: Dissemination activities and compilation of the interim WP reports (after finishing WP2, 3, 4 and 5) and the final report on the project results (responsibilities: dissemination of results: all project partners in their countries; overall WP results: WP leaders; final report: UKS) | |
| Mid term report on work carried out, and progress of the work compared to the original plan: | |
| Final report on work carried out, and progress of the work compared to the original plan: Please see list of dissemination activities. The partners are still about to submit further publications. The homepage will be updated whenever necessary. The coordinator will present joint results at upcoming conferences like "Wissenschaftstagung Ökologischer Landbau" and ISOFAR congress in 2011. | |

3. Milestones and Deliverables status

Milestones:

| Milestone no: | Description | Planned time | Actual time |
|---------------|---|--------------|-------------|
| Milestone 1 | Conceptual framework and definition of CSR arguments and elaboration for selection of case studies completed (UNIW) | Month 4 | Month 6 |
| Milestone 2 | Case studies completed and common decision taken on the most promising CSR arguments to be tested in the further project (BOKU) | Month 6 | Month 6 |
| Milestone 3 | Report/deliverable No 1 on conceptual framework and case studies (UNIW/BOKU) | Month 10 | Month 13 |
| Milestone 4 | Report on results of the IDM completed (responsible: UKS) | Month 16 | Month 19 |
| Milestone 5 | Report on results of the FGD completed (UNIVPM) | Month 26 | Month 31 |
| Milestone 6 | Report on the results of CCT completed (FIBL) | Month 33 | Month 37 |
| Milestone 7 | Vol. 2 of the book series ready for publishing (month 35, responsible UNIVPM/FIBL) | Month 35 | * |
| Milestone 8 | Vol. 3 of the book series (also final project report) completed (UKS) | Month 36 | * |

* Instead it was agreed on having a farmer oriented handbook with all results. The handbook is to be published by August 2010, Month 38.

Deliverables:

| Deliverable no: | Description | Planned time | Actual time |
|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------|
| Deliverable 1 | Farmer Consumer Partnerships Communicating Ethical Values: a conceptual framework http://orgprints.org/12821/ | Month 10 | Month 13 |
| Deliverable 2 | Farmer Consumer Partnerships: Information search and decision making – the case of ethical values of organic products http://orgprints.org/15199/ | Month 16 | Month 19 |
| Deliverable 3 | Report on Focus Group Discussion Results http://orgprints.org/16678/ | Month 26 | Month 31 |
| Deliverable 4 | Report on Consumer Choice Tests http://orgprints.org/17247/ | Month 33 | Month 37 |
| Deliverable 5 | Final report, summary of all project results | Month 36 | Month 38 |

4. Publications and dissemination activities

Scientific journal articles

| Year | Authors and title | Journal | Partners involved: (partner acronyms) | Language / |
|------|---|--|--|------------|
| 2010 | Zander, K. and Hamm, U.: Consumer preferences for additional ethical attributes of organic food. | Food Quality and Preference 21(5): 495-503. http://orgprints.org/17046/ | UKS | English |
| 2010 | Zander, K. und U. Hamm (2010): Welche zusätzlichen ethischen Eigenschaften ökologischer Lebensmittel interessieren Verbraucher? | German Journal of Agricultural Economics 59(4): 246-257. http://orgprints.org/18596/ . | UKS | German |

Scientific journal articles (submitted)

| Year | Authors and title | Journal | Partners involved: (partner acronyms) | Language / |
|------|---|---|--|------------|
| 2010 | Naspetti, S. and Zanolini, R.: Cross-cultural issues in communicating ethical arguments to organic consumers: Evidence from a pre-testing study in Europe | Journal of Advertising (submitted) | UNIVPM | English |
| 2011 | Zander, K. und U. Hamm (2011): Information search behaviour and its determinants: the case of ethical attributes of organic food. | International Journal of Consumer Studies Early view: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1470-6431.2011.00998.x/abstract . http://orgprints.org/18602/ . | UKS | English |

Conference papers and book chapters

| Planned / actual date | Type and Title of contribution: | Book title / Conference: | Partners involved: (partner acronyms) | Type of audience (General public, higher education, researchers, industry, farm sector, advisors etc.) | Language / Size of audience | Countries addressed |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| 06/2008 | Conference paper: Freyer, B.: IFOAM principles in the light of different ethical | 16th IFOAM-conference, Modena. June 19, 2008. http://orgprints.org/12121/ | BOKU | Researchers, advisors, farm sector | English | All |

| | | | | | | |
|---------|--|--|---------|--|---------|---|
| | concepts. | | | | | |
| 06/2008 | Conference paper: Gössinger, K. and Freyer, B.: Corporate Social Responsibility and Organic farming – Experiences in Austria. | 16th IFOAM-conference, Modena. June 19, 2008. http://orgprints.org/11978/ | BOKU | Researchers, advisors, farm sector | English | All |
| 06/2008 | Conference paper: Padel, S., Nicholas, P., Jasinska, A. and Lampkin, N.: Ethical concerns associated with organic food in Europe | 16th IFOAM-conference, Modena. June 19, 2008. http://orgprints.org/12132/ | UWA | Researchers, advisors, farm sector | English | All |
| 06/2008 | Conference paper: Zander, K. and Hamm, U.: Communication of ethical values in organic farming. | 16th IFOAM-conference, Modena. June 19, 2008. http://orgprints.org/14001/ | UKS | Researchers, advisors, farm sector | English | All |
| 09/2008 | Conference paper: Zander, K. and Hamm, U.: Präferenzen von Konsumenten für ethische Werte ökologischer Lebensmittel. | Tagungsband der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Agrarökonomie 2008: Neue Impulse in der Agrar- und Ernährungswirtschaft?! Wien, S. 95f. | UKS | Researchers, administration | German | AT, CH, DE |
| 02/2009 | Conference paper: Gössinger, K. and Freyer, B.: Höhere Standards in europäischen Biobetrieben und ihre Kommunikation an KonsumentInnen | 10. Wissenschaftstagung Ökologischer Landbau, Zürich, Feb 11 to 13, 2009. http://orgprints.org/14292/ . | BOKU | Researchers | German | AT, CH, DE |
| 02/2009 | Conference paper: Zander, K. and Hamm, U.: Informationsverhalten der Konsumenten und ethische Werte ökologischer Lebensmittel | 10. Wissenschaftstagung Ökologischer Landbau, Zürich, Feb 11 to 13, 2009. | UKS | Researchers | German | AT, CH, DE |
| 05/2009 | Conference paper: Padel, S. and Zander, K.: OrganicPlus values and their relevance to consumers: First results from the CORE FCP project. | In: P. Fredriksson and K. Ullven (eds.) Towards increased sustainability in the food supply chain. 1 st Nordic Organic Conference Gothenburg, Sweden, 18. – 20. May 2009, p.104–106. Centre for sustainable land use CUL at SLU. | UWA/UKS | Researchers | English | SE, DK, FE, NO and other countries |

| | | | | | | |
|---------|--|--|--------|--|---------|------------|
| | | Archived online at: http://orgprints.org/15772/ . | | | | |
| 06/2009 | Conference paper: Gössinger, K., Hametter, M., Freyer, B.: Ethical oriented activities going beyond organic standards in European enterprises/farms from different theoretical perspectives. | In: B. Sarapatka (ed.) Bioacademy 2009 – Proceedings 2nd Scientific Conference. Organic Farming – A Response to Economic and Environmental Challenges. p.75 – 79. [9 th Bioacademy, Lednice, Czech Republic, June 24 – 26, 2009] | BOKU | Researchers | English | Various |
| 07/2009 | Book chapter: Gössinger, K. and Freyer, B.: Communication of ethical activities going beyond organic standards in European organic enterprises | In: K. Millar, P. Hobson West and B. Nerlich (eds.) Ethical futures: Bioscience and food horizons. Wageningen Academic Publishers. p.389–393. | BOKU | Researchers | English | Various |
| 07/2009 | Book chapter Padel, S and Röcklingsberg, H: A conceptual framework for the communication of ethical values in organic farming | In: K. Millar, P. Hobson West and B. Nerlich (eds.) Ethical futures: Bioscience and food horizons. Wageningen Academic Publishers. p.394–399. | UWA | Researchers | English | Various |
| 07/2009 | Book chapter: Zander, K. and Hamm, U.: Consumers' preferences for ethical values of organic food | In: K. Millar, P. Hobson West and B. Nerlich (eds.) Ethical futures: Bioscience and food horizons. Wageningen Academic Publishers. p.400–405. | UKS | Researchers | English | Various |
| 07/2009 | Book chapter: Zamoli, R. and Naspgetti, S.: Testing of communication tools on animal welfare with focus groups | In: K. Millar, P. Hobson West and B. Nerlich (eds.) Ethical futures: Bioscience and food horizons. Wageningen Academic Publishers. p.394–400. | UNIVPM | Researchers | English | Various |
| 09/2009 | Book chapter: Zander, K. and Hamm, U.: Ethische Werte aus Sicht der Verbraucher: Das Beispiel von Lebensmitteln aus ökologischer Produktion. [Ethical values from the consumers' perspective: The case of organic food] | In: Schriften der Gesellschaft für Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften des Landbaus, Bd. 45. p. 169-180 Also at: http://purl.umn.edu/53963 . | UKS | Researchers | German | DE |
| 11/2009 | Book chapter: Zander, K.: Ethische Werte | In: Leitzmann, C., Beck, A. Hamm, U., Hermanowski, R.: Praxishandbuch Bio- Lebensmittel, Hamburg | UKS | Researchers, practitioners, advisors | German | AT, CH, DE |

| | | | | | | |
|---------|--|--|----------------------------------|----------------------|---------|--------------|
| | ökologischer Lebensmittel und ihre Kommunikation an Verbraucher. | | | | | |
| 06/2010 | Conference paper: Naspetti, S. and Zanolli, R.: Communicating ethical arguments to organic consumers: a study in 5 EU countries. | 119 th EAAE Seminar "Sustainability in the Food Sector" | UNIVPM | Researchers | English | All |
| 06/2010 | Conference paper: Stolz, H., Stolze, M. and Zanolli, R.: Consumer preference and willingness to pay for OrganicPlus communication arguments. | 119 th EAAE Seminar "Sustainability in the Food Sector" | FibL, UNIVPM | Researchers | English | All |
| 06/2010 | Book chapter: Zander, K. and Hamm, U.: Werte-ethischer Konsum-Corporate Social Responsibility | In: Meyer, A.: Lebensmittel heute, Qualität und Recht | UKS | Food sector | German | AT, CH, DE |
| 07/2010 | Conference paper: Padel, S., Zander, K. and Goessinger, K.: 'Regional production' and 'Fairness' in organic farming. | 9 th European IFSA-Symposium, Vienna, July 4-7. http://ifsa.boku.ac.at/cms/fileadmin/Proceeding2010/2010_WS4.3_Padel.pdf | UWA (ORC), UKS, BOKU | Researchers | English | All |
| 07/2010 | Scientific journal article: Zander, K. and Hamm, U.: Consumer preferences for additional ethical attributes of organic food. | Food Quality and Preference 21(5): 495-503. http://orgprints.org/17046/ | UKS | Researchers | English | All |
| 08/2010 | Handbook: Zander, K., Hamm, U. Freyer, B., Gössinger, K., Hametter, M., Naspetti, S., Padel, S., Stolz, H., Stolze, M. and Zanolli, R.: Farmer Consumer Partnerships – How to successfully communicate the values of organic food to consumers. | Zander, K., Hamm, U. Freyer, B., Gössinger, K., Hametter, M., Naspetti, S., Padel, S., Stolz, H., Stolze, M. and Zanolli, R.: Farmer Consumer Partnerships – How to successfully communicate the values of organic food to consumers http://orgprints.org/17852/ | UKS, BOKU, FiBL, UWA/ORC, UNIVPM | Farmers, Food sector | English | UK and other |
| 08/2010 | Handbook: | Zander, K., Hamm, U. Freyer, B., Gössinger, K., Hametter, M., Naspetti, S., | UKS, BOKU, FiBL, | Farmers, Food sector | German | AT, CH, DE |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|--|--|--|
| Zander, K., Hamm, U. Freyer, B., Gössinger, K., Hametter, M., Naspetti, S., Padel, S., Stolz, H., Stolze, M. and Zanoli, R.: Farmer Consumer Partnerships – Erfolgreiche Kommunikation von Werten ökologischer Lebensmittel an Verbraucher | Padel, S., Stolz, H., Stolze, M. and Zanoli, R.: Farmer Consumer Partnerships – Erfolgreiche Kommunikation von Werten ökologischer Lebensmittel an Verbraucher http://orgprints.org/17851/ | UWA/ORC, UNIVPM | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|--|--|--|

Deliverable reports, proceedings, internal reports, newsletters, web communication etc.

| Planned / actual date | (No.) and title | Type: Deliverable, proceedings, internal report, newsletter, web communication | Partners involved: (partner acronyms) | Type of users addressed (General public, higher education, researchers, industry, farm sector, advisors etc.) | Countries addressed |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|--|---------------------|
| 07/2008 | Deliverable 1: Farmer Consumer Partnerships: Communicating ethical values: a conceptual framework | Deliverable | UWA, BOKU | Researchers, higher education | AT, CH, DE, IT, UK |
| 01/2009 | Deliverable 2: Farmer Consumer Partnerships: Information search and decision making – the case of ethical values of organic food | Deliverable | UKS | Researchers, higher education | AT, CH, DE, IT, UK |
| 01/2010 | Deliverable 3: Elaboration and test of new communication concepts | Deliverable | UNIVPM | Researchers, higher education | AT, CH, DE, IT, UK |
| 07/2010 | Deliverable 4: Farmer Consumer Partnerships: WP 5 report on the results of Consumer Choice Experiments | Deliverable | FIBL | Researchers, higher education | AT, CH, DE, IT, UK |

Popular articles and other dissemination activities (presentations at workshops or meetings, leaflets, posters, press releases, interviews etc.)

| Planned / actual date | Title of contribution | Type of contribution (presentation, leaflet, poster etc.) | Partners involved: (partner acronyms) | Type of audience (General public, industry, farm sector, advisors, policy makers, public authorities, higher education, researchers, etc.) | Language / Size of audience | Countries addressed |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| 10/2007 | Gössinger, K. and Freyer, B.: Corporate social responsibility: oft | Article in Agrarische Rundschau, 4, 14-16 | BOKU | Researchers, advisors | German | All |

| | | | | | | |
|------------|--|--|------|--|---------|------------|
| | gelebt - selten kommuniziert | | | | | |
| 19/08/2007 | Stolze, M.: Partnerschaften zwischen Landwirten und Verbrauchern | Presentation Open Day at FiBL (Forschungsinstitut für Biologischen Landbau, Frick/Switzerland) | FiBL | General Public, farm sector, advisors | German | CH |
| 27/08/2007 | Bahrtdt, K.: Farmer Consumer Partnership | Presentation Agridea (Swiss Association for the Development of Agriculture and Rural Areas), Lausanne/ Switzerland | FiBL | Advisors, researchers | English | CH |
| 04/12/2007 | Zander, K.: Kommunikation ethischer Werte im ökologischen Landbau (Communication of ethical values in organic farming). | Presentation University of Kassel in Witzenhausen/Germany: Hochschultagung – Forschung und Praxis im Dialog. Witzenhausen | UKS | Researchers, advisors, farm sector | German | DE |
| 09/06/2008 | Gössinger, K., Douche, C.: Corporate Social Responsibility, Values and Organic Farming. | Workshop at Erasmus Intensive Programme “Organic Agriculture – Innovation for a Sustainable Agriculture, Food Safety and Public Health” at Mendel University of Agriculture and Forestry in Brno/ Czech Republic | BOKU | Students from different European countries | English | All |
| 02/2009 | Conference contribution: Zander, K. and Hamm, U.: Entscheidungsverhalten von Verbrauchern für ethische Werte von Öko-Lebensmitteln | Presentation at Biofach Congress 2009, Nuremberg/Germany | UKS | Researchers, industry, advisors | German | DE, AT, CH |
| 02/2009 | Schneider, F.: Kommunikation ethischer Werte im Biolandbau | Article in BioAktuell 1/2009 | FiBL | Farm sector, organic movement | German | CH |
| 19/03/2009 | Zander, K.: CORE Organic Projekt ‚Farmer Consumer Partnerships‘ – Ethische Werte und der Verbraucher. | Presentation at expert workshop within the project ‚Fairness entlang der Wertschöpfungskette‘, Kasseler Institut für ländliche Entwicklung | UKS | Researchers | German | DE |
| 06/05/2009 | Hamm, U. and Zander, K.: Öko und Fair. | Presentation at discussion-platform at University of Kassel -Witzenhausen. | UKS | Higher education | German | DE |
| 08/06/2009 | Hamm, U. und Zander, K.: Farmer Consumer Partnerships. | Presentation at the CORE Organic meeting in Rome. | UKS | Public authorities | English | |
| 28/06/2009 | Zander, K. and Hamm, U.: CORE Organic Pilot Project Farmer Consumer Partnerships | Poster at Hoffest Domäne Frankenhausen, Versuchsbetrieb der Universität Kassel | UKS | General public, advisors | German | DE |

| | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|--------|---|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 07/2009 | Gössinger, K. and Freyer, B.: Communication of ethical activities going beyond organic standards in European organic enterprises | Presentation at EURSAFE Congress July 2009 in Nottingham | BOKU | Researchers | 50 | Various |
| 07/2009 | Padel, S. and Röcklingsberg, H.: A conceptual framework for the communication of ethical values in organic farming | Presentation at EURSAFE Congress July 2009 in Nottingham | UWA | Researchers | 50 | Various |
| 07/2009 | Zander, K. and Hamm, U.: Consumers' preferences for ethical values of organic food | Presentation at EURSAFE Congress July 2009 in Nottingham | UKS | Researchers | 50 | Various |
| 07/2009 | Zanoli, R. and Naspetti, S.: Testing of communication tools on animal welfare with focus groups | Presentation at EURSAFE Congress July 2009 in Nottingham | UNIVPM | Researchers | 50 | Various |
| 08/2009 | Gössinger, K.: Ethical aspects of organic food chains – with a special focus on Austria. | Workshop at Summerschool "Organic Food Production Chain" at Warsaw University of Life Sciences, Warsaw/Poland | BOKU | Students of agriculture and related areas | English | All |
| 09/2009 | Gössinger, K. and Freyer, B.: Kommunikation von "bioPlus"-Leistungen | Article in Ökologie & Landbau 04/2009, Heft 152 (37.Jg.), 44-46 | BOKU | Researchers, advisors, farm sector | German | All |
| 09/2009 | Levite, M. and Schneider, F.: Welche Parolen auf Banderolen? Ethische Werte am Beispiel Ei. | Article in Bioaktuell 09/2009, 6-7 | FibL | Farm sector, public authorities, industry | German, French, Italian | AT, CH, DE, IT? |
| 09/2009 | Zander, K. and Hamm, U.: Information acquisition on ethical values of organic food – an application of the Information-Display-Matrix. | Presentation at 113. EAAE-Seminar in Chania, Griechenland (3.-6. September 2009) | UKS | Researchers | English | various |
| 09/2009 | Zander, K. and Hamm, U.: Ethische Werte aus Sicht der Verbraucher: Das Beispiel von Lebensmitteln aus ökologischer Produktion. [Ethical values from the consumers' perspective: The case of organic food] | Presentation at Jahrestagung der Gesellschaft für Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften des Landbaus 2009. 30. September – 2. Oktober 2009. | UKS | Researchers | 50 | DE |
| 15/10/2009 | Zander, K.: Ethical values of organic food and consumers. | Presentation at International conference for IFBC and SIA students, University Kassel-Witzenhausen | UKS | Higher education | English | various |

| | | | | | | |
|------------|--|---|---------------|---|---------|-----|
| 11/2009 | Moschitz, H., Feldmann, C. und Stolze, M.: Ist Andeer anders? Welche Kommunikationsaspekte interessieren den Kunden beim Käsekauf? | Presentation at the colloquium of agricultural economists at FiBL, Frick | FiBL | Researchers, extension services, farmers | German | CH |
| 11/2009 | Zander, K.: Kunden honorieren Mehrwert. | Article in Bioland 11/2009, 36–37 http://orgprints.org/16601/ | UKS | Farm sector, public authorities, industry | German | |
| 08/01/2010 | Padel, S: Research perspectives on organic market trends and consumers | Presentation in the session on market trends at the 2010 Organic Producer conference of the Organic Research Centre | ORC(UWA) | Farmers, Advisors, organic industry | English | UK |
| 12/01/2010 | Zander, K.: Ethische Werte aus Sicht der Verbraucher- das Beispiel von Lebensmitteln aus ökologischer Produktion. | Presentation at seminar of agricultural economists, University Kiel | UKS | Researchers | German | DE |
| 02/2010 | Stolz, H. and Stolze, M.: Preferences and WTP for ethical values | Presentation at Biofach Congress 2010, Nuremberg/Germany | FIBL | Researchers, industry, advisors | English | All |
| 02/2010 | Conference contribution: Zander, K. and Hamm, U.: Consumers' interest in additional ethical attributes of organic products. | Presentation at Biofach Congress 2010, Nuremberg/Germany | UKS | Researchers, industry, advisors | English | All |
| 04/2010. | Padel, S and Zander, K.: Paying more for added ethics – “Organic Plus” values and their relevance to consumers | Article in Bulletin of the organic Research Centre- Elm Farm No. 99- April 2010, 6-7 | ORC (UWA)/UKS | Advisors, Farmers, Policy-makers | English | UK |
| 12/05/2010 | Conference contribution: Hamm, U. et al.: Bio-Marktentwicklung in Deutschland. Differenzierung im deutschen Biomarkt unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Bioland-Warenzeichens. | Presentation at Bioland-Fachtagung Baden-Württemberg, Zeulenroda. | UKS | Advisors, Farmers | German | DE |
| 08/06/2010 | Conference contribution: Hamm, U. and Zander, K.: Ethische Werte bei Einkaufsentscheidungen für Lebensmittel. | Presentation at Behr's Lebensmitteltage 2010, Hamburg | UKS | Food industry | German | DE |
| 15/06/2010 | Padel, S: Consumer attitudes | Presentation at the The Organic | ORC/UWA | Farmers, Food | English | GB |

| | | | | | | |
|------------|--|---|----------------|------------------------|---------|-----|
| | | Research Centre Open Day at Wakelyns Agroforestry at 15/06/2010 | | industry | | |
| 06/2010 | Zanoli, R., Callieris, R. and Naspetti, S.: Anche le confezioni delle uova possono comunicare i valori etici. | Article in Terra e Vita 22/2010, 28-29 | UNIVPM, MAIB | Farmers | Italian | IT |
| 06/2010 | Conference contribution: Zander, K. and Hamm, U.: Decision making strategies on ethical values of organic food. | Presentation at 119 th EAAE Seminar "Sustainability in the Food Sector" | UKS | Researchers | 30 | All |
| 07/2010 | Conference contribution: Padel, S., Zander, K. and Goessinger, K.: 'Regional production' and 'Fairness' in organic farming. | Presentation at 9 th European IFSA-Symposium, Vienna, July 4-7. | UWA, UKS, BOKU | Researchers | English | All |
| 07/2010 | Researchers, extension services, farmers | Presentation at 9 th European IFSA-Symposium, Vienna, July 4-7. | FiBL | Researchers | English | All |
| 16/07/2010 | Padel, S: Consumer attitudes to standards and ethical attributes | Presentation at the The Organic Research Centre Open Day at Elm Farm – Hamstead Marshall 15/06/2010 | ORC/UWA | Farmers, food industry | English | GB |

4.2 Further possible actions for dissemination

-List publications/deliverables arising from your project that Funding Bodies should consider disseminating (e.g. to reach a broader audience)

The project partners of the FCP project were highly engaged in publishing the project results at different levels and for different target groups. We consider the handbook to be the most valuable result for a broader audience. There will be a free pdf-version for download.

>>Zander, K., U. Hamm, B. Freyer, K. Gössinger, M. Hametter, S. Naspetti, S. Padel, H. Stolz, M. Stolze and R. Zanolli (2010): Farmer Consumer Partnerships - How to successfully communicate the values of organic food to consumers. Witzenhausen. <<

An open issue is the funding of printed copies of this handbook. It could be interesting to give it away for free to specific target groups. At least the German partner does not have any funding for that.

- Indicate publications/deliverables that could usefully be translated (if this has not been done, and indicate target language)

We translated the English Handbook on the joint project results already in German and Italian. It would be interesting to translate it into French, Spanish and maybe other languages.

4.3 Specific questions regarding dissemination and publications

- Is the project website up-to-date?

Yes, <http://fcp.coreportal.org/>

- List the categories of end-users/main users of the research results and how they have been addressed/will be addressed by dissemination activities

Researchers: journal articles, scientific presentations at conferences

Politicians: articles, presentations at conferences

Extension services: articles in farmers magazines, presentations at conferences

Marketers: presentations at trade fairs and conferences

Farmers: articles in farmers magazines

- Impact of the project in relation to main beneficiaries of the project results

Note: for the different categories of end-users/main users of the research results, explain how well the project has been able to reach these target groups, and any known impact

Main target group of the FCP project are farmers and marketers of organic food. We think that by publishing our results in farmers magazines, at trade fairs and in our handbook we are able to reach the main beneficiaries very well. It might be too early to say anything on the impact, however we have been invited to many conferences to present our CORE Organic results this autumn and winter.

FINAL REPORT Addendum:

A. Added value of the transnational cooperation in relation to the subject

1st period:

The main advantage of the transnational research consists in the identification and screening of successful organic farmers' initiatives in five European countries, regarding their CSR communication arguments by using a joint approach (WP1 and WP2). The identification of smaller, regionally based initiatives is much easier for domestic researchers and in order to understand different communication arguments, it is very helpful to have the same cultural background. This way a comparative analysis between countries became possible. Another important advantage is that the international perspective opened the opportunity to know each other's concepts and to learn from neighbours.

The task of WP3 consisted in the identification of the most promising communication arguments from the consumers' point of view by means of an Information Display Matrix. This tool was developed by UKS and translated into English and Italian in order to conduct exactly the same survey in the five study countries.

The trans-disciplinary cooperation between agricultural economists (CH, UK), marketing researchers (DE, IT) and specialists for regional development (AT, IT) enhances the exchange of different scientific approaches and of experience of team members working on common tasks.

2nd period:

Similarly to WP3, also WP4 and WP5 were done using an identical framework in all study countries. In WP4 differences between the cultural backgrounds of different countries became obvious. The same labels for egg packages caused very different reactions by consumers within the Focus Group Discussions. The labels which were developed by an Italian agency were liked in Italy, while in all other countries the acceptance was rather limited. This additional information was used to change the labels before starting the survey in WP5. Labels were simplified and only central claims were tested then. By that it was possible to get well-based results.

B. Impact of the project in relation to main beneficiaries of the project results

1st period:

The first results have been published at various conferences and journals (see list of publications). Publishing activities are ongoing.

The companies that participated in the case studies received a summary of the results of WP1 and WP2. They are able to reflect their own 'ethical' activities and their communication to consumers in the light of the first study results.

Generally the project consists of various work steps, one following the other, analysing a similar topic in more detail in each following step. Thus, the main results are expected when the whole project is finished.

2nd period:

Main beneficiaries of the project are farmers and processors of organic food with additional ethical attributes. The project results of the different workpackages were published in professional journals. Other publications in farmers' journals are submitted and are waiting to be printed and published. At the end of the project a handbook was elaborated which directly is addressed towards farmers and processors. This handbook was written in English, and will be translated into

German and Italian. There will be few printed versions for distribution and a free pdf-version in the internet.

Interesting aspects from the scientific perspective are the trans-national use of the rarely applied Information Display Matrix in order to identify consumer preferences. The trans-national aspect is an important issue also in the application of the Consumer Choice Tests. They were designed to be rather near to real purchase decisions in all countries in each language.

C. Recommendations to the CORE Organic Funding Body Network in relation to launching and monitoring of future transnationally funded research projects

The coordinator's work is underestimated and not paid for. Overhead funds like they are granted in EU projects (8%) are necessary to cover all the costs and to improve the flexibility in spending.

Coordinators should have a contract which exceeds the duration of the project by two to three month in order to finish reporting (final report) and publication duties.