Oxford Handbooks Online

Political Food Consumerism between Mundane Routines and Organizational Alliance-Building

Bente Halkier

The Oxford Handbook of Political Consumerism
Edited by Magnus Boström, Michele Micheletti, and Peter Oosterveer

Subject: Political Science, Political Behavior Online Publication Date: Jun 2018
DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190629038.013.11

Abstract and Keywords

Food consumption is a mundane, embodied type of consumption as well as a target of multiple moral contestations. Politicized quite early, food consumption has remained a regular example of political consumerism, framed through a number of societal issues such as sustainability and global justice. This chapter shows that the research on political food consumerism is characterized by three tendencies. First, across other differences, researchers apparently agree in assuming that ordinary consumers have some sort of agency in carrying out food political consumption. Second, across food issues, settings, and cases, a majority of the research highlights alliances between public and private actors as decisive for political food consumerism to achieve societal change. Third, the forms of buycott and lifestyle seem to be dominant in political food consumerism, although these very forms of participation are also criticized in the literature for not being doable in everyday life.

Keywords: food, political consumerism, everyday life, responsibility, alliance building

Food has a long history of becoming involved in political consumerism. One of the early registered examples of political consumerism, which is nearly always mentioned, is the Boston Tea Party. Nonnative Americans in colonial New England in 1776 protested over a British tea law and colonialism by publicly destroying large quantities of tea (Jacobsen, 2017). In the 1970s, in the wake of the critique of mass consumerism and mass production for causing social and environmental problems, the boycott of the multinational firm Nestlé's breastfeeding milk became an iconic and long-running political consumerism campaign (Sasson, 2016). When the actual term "the political consumer" was coined in the mid-1990s, food also played its part here, because one of

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

the two boycotts that spurred the coining was a boycott of French wines as a protest against France conducting nuclear tests in the Pacific (Halkier & Holm, 2008).

Food is a vital component of the everyday lives of ordinary citizens. Not only is it necessary for survival and sustenance, but shopping for food, providing for meals, cooking, and eating food consist to a large degree of mundane, tacit routines that also overlap with a number of other important everyday routines such as socializing, parenting, working, and transporting. Consuming food is a particular kind of consumption in the sense that consumer goods enter people's bodies—unlike mobile phones and bicycles. Thus, food forms a significant part of all kinds of cultural frames and social identifications in society. The phrase "You are what you eat" is not coincidental. Hence, food consumption in everyday life can be related to a number of moral worries such as eating proper meals, cooking in healthier ways, and providing for less unsustainable food. However, the politicization of food in a consumerist manner has also historically been driven by different social actors and certainly not only by consumers themselves.

Food producers are important actors. In an example from the World War II, American breweries ran national advertisement campaigns where beer became constructed as a token of national identity and beer drinking as a patriotic act, supporting the battle against fascism, which enabled the breweries to obtain a status as a wartime industry and to reframe brewer's yeast as nutritious (Jacobson, 2009).

State or public-sector agencies are another kind of social actor that historically has politicized food as a responsibility for the individual consumer. In Europe, in the wake of mad cow disease in the 1990s, food safety became one of the top food policy issues. National as well as European Union (EU) regulations of the food sector were reorganized in response to the debates about who was responsible for the safety of food (Halkier & Holm, 2006). A central element of the public strategies to restore the confidence in the safety of foodstuff was to invoke the responsibility of individual consumers and their consumption choices in the actual regulation of food safety. It was done differently in different countries; for example, in Denmark, consumer choice was directly involved via a labelling scheme known as the Smiley System (Nielsen, 2006), whereas in the United Kingdom, consumer choice was also included in relation to policy formation via formal consultation and informal activism (Draper & Green, 2002).

Social movements and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) are a third type of social actor that has been driving the politicization of food in a consumerist way. In an article about the American roots of the political consumerism movement, Vogel (2004) highlights the boycott of food retailers and producers as one of the strategies of the American civil rights movement in the 1960s and also as one of the tools in the international boycott of products from South Africa as a protest against the apartheid system in the 1970s and 1980s (see de Jager, this volume). When comparing the American development with the European one, Vogel highlights food products as a successful example of mobilizing

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

consumers behind “positive political consumerism” (Vogel, 2004, p. 97) due to the existence of public and semipublic labelling schemes.

This chapter consists of four parts. First, a brief introduction to the food sector is given, and secondly a comparative example of political consumerism in a food context is offered. The third section provides an overview of social science research on the social actors and parts of the food sector that have been associated the most with political consumerism. Finally, the fourth section describes and discusses which issue-types in political food consumerism have been prevalent in the research and how issue-types seem to be connected with different forms of political consumerism.

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

Brief Introduction to the Food Sector

In an overview of the types of social actors and scales of social arrangements in the food supply chain, the food sector is a fairly compound sector. The food supply chain alone consists of supply of primary production (e.g., farmers and fishermen) and the suppliers of input to primary production (e.g., producers of fertilizers and pesticides); supply of food processing (e.g., dairies and ready-meal industries); food distribution (e.g., import/export firms and marketing firms); and food retailing and catering (e.g., supermarkets and canteens) (Lang & Heasman, 2004, p. 14). The food supply chain represents actors and arrangements that include multinational and global firms, such as McDonald’s; national and regional ones, such as the Scandinavian dairy producer Arla and the Netto supermarket chain; and local and small-scale food producers and providers, such as organic meal-box schemes.

At the end of the chain are the ordinary food consumers themselves. But along the chain, two additional types of social actors are involved in the food sector.

First, there are the public food policy bodies (e.g., the Food Standards Agency in the United Kingdom), which are attempting to regulate the conditions of food production and consumption by drawing upon legislation, economic incentives, and expert advice on food issues such as nutrition, hygiene, and climate consequences (Clarke, 2008, p. 1876; Lang & Heasman, 2004, pp. 122–123).

Second, there are consumer organizations such as the European Consumer Organization (BEUC) and the movement of alternative food networks (Whatmore, Stassart, & Renting, 2003), which are attempting to influence and shape the conditions of food production and consumption by way of, for example, lobbying food policy formulations, cooperating with alternative food producers and retailers, and mobilizing groups of food consumers for different campaigns and consumption activities (Hinrichs & Allen, 2008).

A type of social actor that operates across public food policy bodies and consumer organizations are the standard setting organizations, making standards for e.g.food safety and for organic and fair trade foods (Boström & Klintman, 2008). Just looking at Scandinavia, standard setting for organic foods are different. In Denmark, the standard setting and labelling of organic food is state-controlled, whereas in Sweden it is a private umbrella organization that is in charge of standard setting and labelling. Thus, political consumerism in the food sector involves much more than the “generic” individual consumer (Jacobsen & Dulsrud, 2007), namely a number of different social actors and a range of different social arrangements.

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

Political Consumerism in the Food Context

The discussion in this section exemplifies the potential involvement of different social actors and arrangements in political food consumerism by way of drawing upon some of the results from a comparative European research project on trust in food (Kjærnes, Harvey, & Warde, 2007). The trust in food project analyzed and compared the social and institutional conditions for consumerism in food policies in six countries and at the European level with regards to five food issues: food safety, food quality, price, ethics, and nutrition. Empirically, the study was based on a quantitative survey with consumers, qualitative document analysis, and individual interviews with representatives of different actors in the food sector.

The politicized framing of the ordinary food consumer by other social actors in the food sector, and the consumers' understanding of themselves, varied quite a lot. The responses included Norwegian consumers portrayed as passively trusting the food production and regulation systems and not being active consumers; Italian consumers as quality conscious, active consumers; Portuguese consumers as unprotected by public bodies and partly active consumers; and Danish consumers as complex consumers who are active on ethics issues but more passive on safety and nutrition issues (Halkier, Holm, Domingues, Magaudda, Nielsen, & Terragni, 2007, pp. 385–396).

In Norway, the institutional arrangements in the food sector combined a national food market featuring extensive restrictions on food import with a welfare state–centered Scandinavian model for public consumer protection and clear divisions of responsibility. Denmark too was institutionally arranged along such a Scandinavian consumer protection model but combined with an open food market economy and an increasing tendency for involving and forming alliances with private food actors (supply-side and consumer NGOs) in the policymaking, e.g., the introduction of a national label for organic food that was established through an alliance of the Food Agency, the Co-op supermarket chain, and the Consumer Council. In Italy, institutional arrangements consisted of a complex market situation with a dominating national market where supply-side actors focused on negotiating quality and there was an unclear division of labor regarding responsibility for consumption issues. Portugal likewise showed unclear patterns of responsibility for consumer protection, due to among other things severe controversies over establishing a national food agency (Halkier et al., 2007, pp. 296–298).

The point of this extended example is to draw attention to the significance of the interaction between institutional arrangements and how agency plays out among different types of actors in the politicization of food. The relation between institutional conditions and political agency in food consumption has been highlighted by other researchers who criticize the extensive use of the "generic" individual consumer choice model in research about political food consumption, arguing for example that critical food

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

consumerism may take other forms and that the normality of everyday practices dominates over the new food ethics (e.g., Kjærnes, 2012).

That politicized food choices and moral reflections tend to “drown” in mundane normality and get entangled in other kinds of practices has been shown particularly in research about food consumption, inspired by practice theories (see Oosterveer et al. on social practices in this volume; also see Evans, 2012; Halkier, 2010; Halkier, 2017; Plessz, Dubuisson-Quellier, Gojard, & Barrey, 2016). There are two important points about consumption, everyday life, and political consumerism that come out of this type of research. First, consumers more often than not bump into politicized food as a part of their embodied, tacit shopping, cooking, and eating practices, rather than as a result of deliberate reflection and choice. One may, for example, during lunch at work hear about a colleague’s local organic meal box scheme, which she uses for dinners in her family; or one may coincidentally read a posting from a Facebook friend, encouraging a boycott of Norwegian farmed salmon. Second, consumers partake in multiple overlapping mundane practices with different and sometimes contradictory social conventions for conduct, so food consumption is rarely only about food or about one particular food issue. For example, cooking and serving food in families is nearly always also about reproducing family relations, parenting, and showing love. A very common way of showing love through food is by serving what the children like to eat—and this is not necessarily the same kind of food as something made out of local organic vegetables.

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

Social Actors' Involvement in Political Food Consumerism

The representation of the kinds of research in an overview such as this one depends of course upon the literature search. The following attempt at providing an overview of the research on political food consumerism and its social actors was established on the basis of a search combination of the category food and the categories of political consumerism, political consumers, political consumption, corporate social responsibility (CSR), social movements and public regulation. This search was supplemented with a search in specific relevant journals, such as *Appetite; Food, Culture & Society; Food Policy; Journal of Consumer Culture; Journal of Consumer Policy*; and *International Journal of Consumer Studies*.

The purpose of this overview of research on political food consumerism is to describe and discuss which food actors and thus parts of the food sector have been associated the most with political consumerism.

The inevitable winner is, not surprisingly, the *individual consumers* themselves. All the publications included in this overview (and in the previous sections of this chapter) mention ordinary consumers in their consumer capacity. There is only one exception, and this is an article about a comparison of corporate social responsibility in Europe and the United States from an institutional stakeholder perspective (Doh & Guay, 2006). However, what is far more interesting is that relatively few publications *only* address the individual consumers as actors involved in political food consumerism. This perhaps suggests that a large portion of the social scientific research on political consumerism in the food sector has acknowledged the complexity of the relations between actors and arrangements in terms of political agency.

The publications that only address individual consumers tend to fall into two kinds of research purposes. First, there is the classic purpose of producing a social segmentation or profiling of types of consumers in relation to food political issues, where the category of political consumerism is typically taken for granted as being about individual consumer choice. Thus, studies of this kind describe consumer values behind organic food consumption in e.g. the Czech Republic (Zagata, 2014) and Norway (Honkanen, Verplanken, & Olsen, 2006); sociodemographic factors behind sustainable food consumption in countries such as Spain (Carrero, Redondo, & Fabra, 2016), Germany (Mohr & Schlich, 2016), and the United Kingdom (Kemp, Insch, Holdsworth, & Knight, 2010); and consumer values behind fair trade food consumption in countries such as Portugal (Coelho, 2015) and France (Pedregal & Ozcaglar-Toulouse, 2011).

The other kind of studies that only address individual consumers are interested in the social configurations of political food consumption. Political food consumption becomes related to high levels of cultural capital and particular kinds of habitus and practices in a

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

Canadian study (Baumann, Engman, & Johnston, 2015) and in an American study (Carfagna, Dubois, Fitzmaurice, Ouimette, Schor, Willis, & Laidley, 2014). In several studies with Israeli food consumers, the focus is on the sociocultural and political meaning of carrying out political food consumption, such as organic food consumption (Grosglik, 2016) and voluntary simplifiers (Zamwel, Sasson-Levy, & Ben-Porat, 2014), and discussing the criteria for when food consumption (and nonconsumption) patterns can count as political consumption. The same interest in challenging and discussing the category of individual political consumption choice is at the heart of a Danish study of food consumption and food safety (Halkier & Holm, 2008), which suggests distinguishing between food consumers who perform political consumption, those who perform politicized consumption, and those who vocalize the discourse of political consumerism. In other words, the agency of ordinary consumers is much more compound than dividing citizens into political food consumers and nonpolitical food consumers (Halkier, 2015). Practising food political consumerism is more often than not blended into the routinised carrying out of food practices and other overlapping, sometimes conflicting, everyday activities. For example, organic milk may be used in a family, but not organic pork, because the kids think it tastes too much of pork. Here, the parenting practice of feeding children what they like overrules the buycott activity of using organic foodstuff.

The next most prevalent studies in research on food political consumerism focus on three kinds of social actors, namely retailers, organized activism, and public regulatory bodies.

A characteristic of the largest part of the research that associates *retail* actors with political food consumerism is that the retail actors are placed in relation to some form of alliance building or maintaining processes in the food sector (Boström & Klintman, 2006; 2009; Evans, Campbell, & Murcott, 2013 Hartmann, 2011; Lewis & Huber, 2015; Oosterveer, 2006; Reed, 2009; Starr, 2010). In some cases, very specific and narrow alliances seem to build between particular parts of the retail sector and particular parts of alternative food suppliers. For example, Reed (2009) argues that the United Kingdom’s governance of organic food and farming has seen a convergence between parts of organic producers and large supermarket chains in relation to national labelling and standards development. In a parallel manner, Evans, Welch, & Swaffield, 2017 conclude that major retailers recently entered into collaboration with other private and public actors on reducing food waste after earlier public campaigns directed towards the households had helped advance the issue (Evans, Welch, & Swaffield, 2017). In other cases, research shows how alliances can be built across the private-public divide around specific policy instruments, as in an overview study of the use of corporate social responsibility measures in the food sector (Hartmann, 2011), arguing that research needs to address the whole of the food chain, including small- and middle-sized enterprises, large retailers, and government. This type of argumentation can be found also in research that is not about CSR but that focuses on food governance arrangements, such as the analysis of global governance of sustainable consumption of shrimps by Oosterveer (2006). Other studies focus on covering a multiplicity of food actors’ alliances and conflicts in order to

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

understand political food consumerism, such as an analysis of local food in the United States as a possible social movement (Starr, 2010), which addresses the coming together of farmers, agronomic experts, retailers, chefs, food writers, and consumers in driving the provisioning and consumption of local foodstuff.

The focus on retail actors as the most important actors in political food consumerism also covers research that argues how the retail part of the food sector tends to work in a somewhat problematic manner regarding various political food consumerism issues. This covers the classic analysis of market failure in relation to political food consumption, such as that found in a study on the political economy of farm animal welfare (Harvey & Hubbard, 2013). There is a critique of how large suppliers and retailers adopt aspects of alternative food-provisioning schemes, such as organics, carbon footprints, fair trade, animal welfare, etc. for the sake of added commercial gain (Kjærnes, 2012, p. 152). Finally, there are critical analyses of what is seen as socially exclusive strategies of particular retailers, whether in mainstream retailing, such as the story of "horsemeat-gate" in the United Kingdom (Abbots & Coles, 2013), or in alternative food networks in Australia (Lockie, 2009).

When looking at research that associates political food consumerism with different kinds of *organized activism*, one part of the literature is similar to and overlapping with the research connecting political consumerism with retailing, namely where the significance of alliance building and maintenance is highlighted (Boström & Klintman, 2006; Doh & Guay, 2006; Lockie, 2009; Reed, 2009; Starr, 2010). Lockie (2009) presents an analysis of alliance building around the issue of local food where ordinary consumers are invoked surprisingly similarly by alternative local food producers and mainstream and alternative retail outlets—namely as individual commercial actors. A comparative analysis of organic food standardization between Sweden and the United States (Boström & Klintman, 2006) shows, however, much more controversy in the US case, with a state-centered approach that fails to build alliances with organic food NGOs, than in Sweden where the labelling organization itself is an NGO, consisting of social movement organizations, associations for conventional and organic farmers, and the food industry.

Alternative food provisioning as organized activism is the other main perspective in the research. Here, the focus is more to go in-depth with a particular food movement or type of food activism (Dubuisson-Quellier, 2015; Gimenez & Shattuck, 2011; Hinrichs & Allen, 2008; Sassatelli & Davolio, 2010; Scott, Si, Schumilas, & Chen, 2014; Thompson & Coskuner-Balli, 2007). Here we find the classic case of the Italian slow food movement and how it is being politicized (Sassatelli & Davolio, 2010) and the now almost classic case of community-supported agriculture (CSA) in the United States, which manages to make consumers experience, for example, their restricted choice in the scheme as moral virtue (Thompson & Coskuner-Balli, 2007). But there are also examples of analyses comparing one type of organized activism with others, such as in the comparison of "buy local food" campaigns in the United States with other political consumerism campaigns such as "buy black" (Hinrichs & Allen, 2008), or in the analysis of how French consumers,

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

including food issues, are not just invoked as targets of political consumerism campaigns but also as potential recruits to the consumerism movements (Dubuisson-Quellier, 2015).

Turning to *public regulation*, the last of the social actors most associated with food political consumerism in the research, there is quite a consensus in the literature. Research studies focus on how responsibilities and strategies of public food regulatory bodies tend to cross over the traditional public-private divide or are expected to do so (Boström & Klintman, 2009; Doh & Guay, 2006; Hartmann, 2011; Harvey & Hubbard, 2013; Hjelmar, 2011; Lockie, 2009; Oosterveer, 2006; Scott, Si, Schumilas, & Chen, 2014). In one study that compares how corporate social responsibility (CSR) is defined and implemented in the United States and Europe, one of the cases analysed is about food (trade in genetically modified organisms). The conclusion is that different institutional structures and political traditions make for different ways of managing politicized (food) consumerism between the two regions, but similar managing within the regions across public actors and NGOs (Doh & Guay, 2006). A study about China's organic agriculture (Scott, Si, Schumilas, & Chen, 2014) shows, however, that the state-driven public regulation of the ecological market has not gained trust among Chinese consumers, resulting in an expansion of alternative food provisioning strategies for local and organic food, such as CSAs, farmers' markets, and home delivery schemes.

Actors in society that are the least dealt with in the research literature on food political consumerism are primary food producers, the food industry, and food experts. When looking at the research on *primary food producers* and their links to politicized food consumption, there is a clear overlap with the alliance theme of the research on food retailers and public food regulation. Farmers and farmers' organizations are depicted as acting in pursuit of allying themselves with other significant alternative food actors, NGOs, and public regulatory bodies in their attempts to provide, for example, more sustainable and local food products for conscious consumers (Gimenez & Shattuck, 2011; Oosterveer, 2006; Reed, 2009; Starr, 2010). Indeed, civil society networks and grassroots organizations, which support alternative food production and consumption in European countries and the United States, are depicted as a contrast to the situation in China (Scott, Si, Schumilas, & Chen, 2014). Here, it is argued that the relative absence of bottom-up organized civil society activities around local and ecological food production has led to a certain degree of "capturing" of alternative primary food production by business entrepreneurs.

The same tendency of highlighting the embeddedness of food producers in networks and alliance building is also present in the research mentioning the *food industry* as related to political consumerism. However, regarding the food industry, there seems to be a difference between research that frames the food industry as (potentially) constructive actors in the processes of handling the consumerist politicization of food, e.g., as corporate social responsibility (CSR) (Doh & Guay, 2006; Hartmann, 2011; Maloni & Brown, 2006), and research that discusses the role of the food industry more critically in

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

relation to industry strategies towards food issues and consumers (Abbots & Coles, 2013 Kjærnes, 2012).

The few studies that link various *food experts* to politicized food consumerism dovetail with research on retailers, organized activism, producers, and the industry. The studies including food experts argue the importance of networking and alliances around politicized food issues, here looking also at the practices and strategies of food experts such as chefs, food writers, and scientists. But the publications differ in regards to their evaluations of the social implications of food experts being involved in political consumerism. Some studies understand the processes of establishing political food consumerism alliances and the contribution of food experts to this as enhancing social inclusion of consumers, whether it concerns science partaking in organic food alliances (Blue, 2010) or celebrity chefs and food writers partaking in a broader movement for local food (Starr, 2010). Other studies tend to see the inclusion of food experts, such as celebrity chefs, in alliances around ethical and sustainable food products as creating social exclusion of certain consumer groups (Lewis & Huber, 2015).

Summing up, there are two main tendencies in what is considered important in the research with regards to social actors in the food sector and their involvement in political consumerism. The first tendency is not surprisingly the significance ascribed to the ordinary individual consumer, which is characterized by a debate about the degree to which consumer agency on its own makes sense in the food sector, or whether the playing out of consumer agency can only be seen in interaction with other social actor types and depending upon food institutional arrangements.

Following this, the second tendency is the importance ascribed in the research to alliances between different social actors across the traditional public-private dividing line. Processes of building, negotiating, and maintaining alliances among different kinds of consumers, retailers, NGOs, producers, and specific public regulatory bodies seem to saturate many of the empirical case studies related to food political consumerism. The immediate implication of this might be that only focusing on one type of social actor in relation to political consumerism in the food sector seems to be a dead end. Rather, it is necessary to include these alliance interactions, network building, and institutional arrangements and conditions.

Connections between Food Issues and Forms of Political Consumerism

The introduction to this book carves out four major forms of political consumerism: boycotting, buycotting, lifestyle, and discursive strategies (see introductory chapter, this volume). This section discusses how these four forms of political consumerism tend to be

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

linked with the apparent dominant issues of politicizing food that are covered in the literature on political food consumerism.

The food issues that tend to dominate analysis of political consumerism in the social scientific research are *alternative food provisioning* (Carfagna et al., 2014; Dubuisson-Quellier & Lamine, 2008; Hinrichs & Allen, 2008; Kennedy, Parkins & Johnston, 2016; Lockie, 2009; Sassatelli & Davolio, 2010; Starr, 2010; Thompson & Coskuner-Balli, 2007); *organic food* (Carrero, Redondo, & Fabra, 2016; Grosglik, 2016; Hjelmar, 2011; Honkanen, Verplanken, & Olsen, 2006; Zagata, 2014); and *fair trade food* (Carrero, Redondo, & Fabra, 2016; Clarke, 2008; Coelho, 2015; Pedregal & Ozcaglar-Toulouse, 2011).

Production and consumption of alternative food provisioning, organic food, and fair trade food overlap to a certain extent, but in many contexts, organic food has a bigger and more mainstream distributed market than fair trade and especially alternative food provisioning. However, what these three food issues have in common is that they seem to be particularly inviting to buycotts and lifestyle forms of political consumerism as far as the research links food issues and types of political consumerism.

Such a pattern makes a lot of sense. The buycott strategy relies on supportive shopping. Both organic food consumption and fair trade consumption are positive types of consumption activities insofar as that they constitute supportive buying of a particular type of food, replacing (some) nonorganic and non–fair trade products. Buycotting as a political consumerism strategy rests on labelling, social legitimacy of labels, and a sufficient degree of availability of the labelled foodstuff in mainstream retail outlets. For example, the buycott strategy for organic foodstuff in Denmark involved few consumers until an alliance between the consumer council, the co-op supermarket, and the food agency forged the state-controlled Danish organic label (the red ø) and coop launched a discount campaign on officially labelled organic foodstuff (Klint, 1996). Alternative food provisioning consumption also involves buycotting, although the research highlights that consumers here support not only particular products but also alternative food production and distribution processes such as urban gardening and community-supported agriculture (e.g., Thompson & Coskuner-Balli, 2007).

The lifestyle strategy relies in principle on more comprehensive changes of everyday practices, the consumption involved, and the arrangements supporting such changes (Keller, Halkier, & Wilska, 2016). Thus, as a strategy of political consumerism, the lifestyle strategy might be seen to fit the issue of alternative food provisioning better than the issues of organic food and fair trade food that are part of the arguments in research about localized alternative food provisioning. However, just like the term “political consumerism” itself is interpreted differently, so is the concept of lifestyle: When is a sufficient amount of consumption patterns or everyday practices sufficiently changed into, for example, organic foodstuff in order for it to count as a lifestyle change or ethical consumerism as part of peoples’ general lifestyle? (Coelho, 2015; Grosglik, 2016).

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

Especially in the literature on the issue of alternative food provisioning, an ambivalence between the buycott form of political consumerism and the lifestyle form of political consumerism can be detected. In an overview article about the development of responsibility and agency in alternative food networks in a number of countries, Lockie (2009) argues that, although alternative food network actors tend to see political consumerism as a kind of food citizenship where consumers participate actively and socially together with other food citizens and alternative producers and providers, the actual marketing, distribution, pricing, and official food standards tend to encourage more narrow and individualized consumerist type of practices. Similarly, a qualitative study of Canadian “eat local” activists (Kennedy, Parkins, & Johnston, 2016) argues that there is an ambivalence between food activists’ sophisticated democratic understandings of and reflections over societal food problems that makes it necessary for them to ”eat local” and the same food activists’ limited democratic repertoire of imagining their own activities as being other and more than “shopping for change.” Likewise, a French study of consumer involvement in local food networks (Dubuisson-Quellier & Lamine, 2008) shows that two kinds of political consumerist involvement exist side by side. The first type of consumer involvement is called “delegation”; it is based on the market relation and seems to be parallel to the buycott strategy. The second is called “empowerment,” and it is based on consumers and producers collaborating on collective choices; thus it could be said to be somewhat parallel to the lifestyle strategy.

One food issue is as much represented in the research literature as alternative food provisioning, organic foodstuff, and fair trade foodstuff, but it is linked slightly differently to various forms of political consumerism. This is the broad issue of *sustainability* (Dixon & Isaacs, 2013; Kemp, Insch, Holdsworth, & Knight, 2010; Mohr & Schlich, 2016; Shaw & Moraes, 2009; Zamwel, Sasson-Levy, & Ben-Porat, 2014).

Under the umbrella of sustainability, we can find subissues such as climate, food miles, less or no consumption of meat and other energy-dense types of food, and voluntary simplicity. There are of course overlaps between the sustainability issue and the organic food issue and local food issue in terms of the environmental dimension and, thus, the buycott form—the supportive buying. But otherwise, the sustainability issue is clearly linked to a combination of boycott and lifestyle as forms of political consumerism.

The subissues of climate, food miles, less meat eating and even voluntary simplicity all fit with the boycott strategy. These subissues have in common that consumers are encouraged *not* to buy and use particular kinds of food, such as those which travel too far, those which are too energy-dense, meat as a separate category, and they are also advised to consume less and waste less food. For example, Mohr & Schlich (2016), in their quantitative study of German sustainable consumerism, operationalized an important part of this as eating less meat. Likewise, a study of British environmentally friendly food consumerism (Kemp, Insch, Holdsworth, & Knight, 2010) focused on the boycott of overseas food products but concluded that this did not seem particularly important to the sample of British consumers.

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

The lifestyle strategy is primarily linked with the research on the subissue of voluntary simplicity, because the principles for consumer practices in voluntary simplicity clearly add up to more comprehensive changes. These principles are the “five Rs” in consumption: recycle, repair, reuse, reduce, and refuse. An Israeli qualitative study of voluntary simplicity concludes that voluntary simplifiers can be seen as political consumers. But the study also shows the amount and degree of changes in everyday life required if living after the five Rs (Zamwel, Sasson-Levy, & Ben-Porat, 2014, p. 206). The degree of comprehensiveness of lifestyle changes also comes forward in a British study of voluntary simplifiers who live in rural areas and struggle with their relations to the local rural market economy (Shaw & Moraes, 2009).

The less dominant food issues in the research literature on political consumerism are *animal welfare* (Evans & Miele, 2017; Harvey & Hubbard, 2013), *food safety* (Halkier & Holm, 2008), and *health* (Dixon & Isaacs, 2013). The issue of animal welfare is clearly linked to forms of both boycott and buycott when this is possible insofar as consumption strategies consist in avoiding food products that are not considered sufficiently animally friendly, combined with supportive buying of meat, eggs, and fish products where the production methods are considered (and labelled as) taking animal welfare into account. There is of course also the variety of animal welfare consumerism, which consists in a total boycott—namely becoming a vegetarian or vegan—which brings the form of political consumerism closer to the lifestyle strategy (see Jallinoja et al., this volume, on vegetarianism/veganism).

The health issue seems related to the lifestyle form of political consumerism, again because in principle acting along this issue as a consumer demands more comprehensive changes of everyday practices. This is precisely why an Australian qualitative study (Dixon & Isaacs, 2013) criticizes the moralizing of the individual in the public reliance upon a strategy for more healthy (and sustainable) food consumption via individual consumption practices. The social and economic conditions of households for managing such comprehensive changes are unequally distributed. The health issue, however, is also indirectly related to the buycott strategy via organic food consumption, because the most popular reason often given in surveys for buying organic food is healthier food for oneself and one’s family (Hjelmar, 2011, p. 337).

The food safety issue is the only issue where some research has highlighted the discursive form of political consumerism, although together with forms of buycott. In a quantitative Danish study (Halkier & Holm, 2008), it is argued that Danish food consumers can be placed in three different categories: consumers who carry out political consumption, parallel to intent buycotting of “safer food”; consumers who carry out politicized consumption, buying roughly the same foodstuff as the first group but not doing it as an intentional strategy; and consumers who vocalize the discourse of political consumerism in relation to food safety but do not act upon it. This does not mean that there is not a whole lot of discursive political consumerism going on in relation to food. This is especially so if we take into account media development (Bennett & Iyengar, 2008) with a multiplicity of media discourses in and across different genres, through different

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

media platforms, leading to an ever more media-saturated everyday life (Couldry, 2004). For instance, politicised discourses on food have come to form part of both traditional flow television shows (Hollows, 2016) as well as social media displays (Rousseau, 2012). This is where food writers, food experts, and chefs are part of forming the political consumerism strategy, but this has not been studied so much under the heading of political consumerism.

Finally, there are some food political consumerism issues that did *not* crop up in the search for this chapter, covering the current research. The *issue of food waste* is in itself apparently not explicitly linked with food political consumerism, although the issue is clearly a dimension of climate and sustainability problems linked to consumption. Furthermore, food waste fits with the lifestyle form of political consumption insofar as if consumers attempt to consume with less food waste, this becomes part of not just acquisition but to a large degree also planning, storing, cooking, and eating (e.g., eating leftovers) (Evans, 2012). The reason for the food waste issue missing in a direct coupling with food political consumerism may simply be that it is a relatively recently politicized food issue. Adding on this, food sector arrangements and procedures for food waste reduction involving ordinary consumers are only beginning to become institutionalized through for example waste sorting and composting, meal-box schemes (Hertz & Halkier, 2017), supermarkets that sell surplus food, and fridge-sharing (Wahlen, 2016).

Another type of food political consumerism issue that was not explicitly expressed in the current research is the *boycott of food products for political reasons not to do with the food itself.* Earlier examples of this would be the boycott of South African fruit in the 1980s as a protest against the apartheid system, and the boycott of French wine in the 1990s as a protest against French nuclear tests conducted in the Pacific. There are indeed current examples of this type of boycott, for example the boycott of food products grown in settler areas of Israel as a protest against Israel's policy towards Palestinians. The 2016 election of Donald Trump as president of the United States has also spurred a boycott of firms who supported his candidacy economically, including food companies. But these kinds of boycotts demand quite some organization around them, since they are often international, and thus they don't necessarily show up in searches about political consumerism and would perhaps be more prevalent in research focusing on NGOs, social movements, and international campaigns.

Summing up, the most prevalent and most discussed forms of food political consumerism in the research are buycotts and lifestyle strategies. One way of understanding this is that the potential for acting for ordinary consumers themselves range from more mainstream marketized possibilities with supportive buying to various kinds and degrees of changing patterns in consumers' everyday lives. In a way, this is parallel to social movement activity. There are different levels of engagement (Halkier, 2015), so there are also more ways of participating and potential for a variety of consumers. However, this doesn't mean that such strategies are carried out by a variety of consumers. Seen from a practice theoretical perspective, everyday life is a particular kind of social organization, based on a multiplicity of overlapping routinised and conventions-based activities, and a change in

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

food consumption activities relies on how socially and practically "do-able" (Halkier, 2010, p. 36) such changes are. This is related to the character of food consumption as being highly embodied, because food is taken into the body. On the one hand, this embodiment is part of the routinised tacit repeating of what is shopped, cooked, and eaten and so it is not particularly noticed. On the other hand, if food is noticed in everyday life, the highly embodied character may lead to a higher level of worry about what to consume.

Conclusion

For the food sector, the overview of research related to political consumerism has shown three main points. First, across all other differences, researchers agree without question on the importance of ordinary consumers in carrying out food political consumerism. Questions and disagreements arrive as part of describing, interpreting, and explaining how ordinary consumers can and should play out their alleged agency in relation to a complicated, global, multilevel organized industry such as food. Second, across food issue areas, settings, and cases, a large strand of the research highlights that it is alliances between different social actors in the food sector across the public-private divide that are decisive for how food political consumerism fares as an activity for change. Thus, individual ordinary consumer strategies are part of this, but they are dependent upon alliance building, maintaining, and negotiating among other organized food actors and intersecting institutional arrangements. Third, the political consumerism forms of buycott and lifestyle are the ones that seem to be prevalently reported across different food issues represented in the research. But there are also critical voices, maintaining that research on everyday life—the potential hotbed of supportive buying and comprehensive lifestyle changes—shows numerous challenges to the "do-ability" of these two forms of political food consumerism, such as the routinised and socially conventionalized character of mundane life.

Pondering upon future perspectives in investigating political food consumerism, this conclusion mentions two possibilities.

When thinking about how complex the food sector is and how much existing research underlines the need to look at the embedding of political consumerism in alliances among different actor types, it seems obvious that more research is needed on the different levels of more or less institutionalized arrangements and interactions. This may call for more use of theoretical approaches such as network governance (Oosterveer, 2006), regime-thinking, multilevel perspective analysis (Hargreaves, Longhurst, & Seyfang, 2013), and global supply and value chain analyses (Fridell, this volume). It might also call for more research on slightly overlooked food actors, such as food experts, food writers, and chefs, who play a part in influencing the institutionalized arrangements of the food sector in various ways.

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

Pointing in a slightly different direction, the very material character of food, combined with a focus on the importance of alliances among different kinds of actors in the existing literature, could suggest more application of Actor-Network Theory in the field of food political consumerism studies. One of the main assumptions here is to "follow the actors," covering both human and nonhuman actors, so a different way of aiming to cover alliance building, negotiation, and processes of normalization and institutionalization might be to "follow the foodstuff."

References

Abbots, Emma-Jayne, & Coles, Benjamin. (2013). Horsemeat-gate. *Food, Culture & Society*, *16*(4), 535–550.

Baumann, Shyon, Engman, Athena, & Johnston, Josee. (2015). Political consumption, conventional politics and high cultural capital. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, *39*(5), 413–421.

Bennett, W. Lance, & Iyengar, Shanto. (2008). A new era of minimal effects? *Journal of Communication*, *58*(4), 707–731.

Blue, Gwendolyn. (2010). Food, publics, science. *Public Understanding of Science*, *19*(2), 147–154.

Boström, Magnus, & Klintman, Mikael. (2006). State-centered versus nonstate-driven organic food standardization: A comparison of the US and Sweden. *Agriculture and Human Values*, *23*(2), 163–180.

Boström, Magnus, & Klintman, Mikael. (2008). *Eco-standards, product labelling and green consumerism*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Boström, Magnus, & M. Klintman (2009). The green political food consumer: A critical analysis of the research and policies. *Anthropology of Food*, S5, 1–17, **https://journals.openedition.org/aof/6394**

Carfagna, Lindsey B., Dubois, Emilie A., Fitzmaurice, Connor, Ouimette, Monique Y., Schor, Juliet B., Willis, Margaret, & Laidley, Thomas (2014). An emerging eco-habitus: The reconfiguration of high cultural capital practices among ethical consumers. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, *14*(2), 158–178.

Carrero, Isabel, Redondo, Raquel, & Fabra, Maria E. (2016). Who is behind the sustainable purchase? The sustainable consumer profile in grocery shopping in Spain. *International Journal of Consumer Studies, 40*(6), 643–651.

Clarke, Nick. (2008). From ethical consumerism to political consumption. *Geography Compass*, *26*(6), 1870–1884.

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

Coelho, Sandra L. (2015). Fair trade consumers in Portugal: Values and lifestyles. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, *39*(5), 437–444.

Couldry, Nick. (2004). Theorising media as practice. *Social Semiotics*, *14*(2), 115–132.

Dixon, Jane, & Isaacs, Bronwyn. (2013). Why sustainable and “nutritionally correct” food is not on the agenda: Western Sydney, the moral arts of everyday life and public policy. *Food Policy*, *43*, 67–76.

Doh, Jonathan P., & Guay, Terrence R. (2006). Corporate social responsibility, public policy and NGO activism in Europe and the United States: An institutional-stakeholder perspective, *Journal of Management Studies*, *43*(1), 47–73.

Draper, Alizon, & Green, Judith. (2002). Food safety and consumers: Constructions of choice and risk. *Social Policy & Administration*, *36*(6), 610–625.

Dubuisson-Quellier, Sophie. (2015). From targets to recruits: The status of consumers within the political consumption movement. *International Journal of Consumers Studies*, *39*(5), 404–412.

Dubuisson-Quellier, Sophie, & Lamine, Claire. (2008). Consumer involvement in fair trade and local food systems: Delegation and empowerment regimes. *GeoJournal*, *73*(1), 55–65.

Evans, David. (2012). Beyond the throwaway society: Ordinary domestic practice and a sociological approach to household waste. *Sociology*, *46*(1), 41–56.

Evans, David, Campbell, Hugh, & Murcott, Anne. (2013). A brief pre-history of food waste and the social sciences. *The Sociological Review*, *60*(2), 5–26.

Evans, David, Welch, Daniel, & Swaffield, Joanne. (2017). Constructing and mobilizing “the consumer”: Responsibility, consumption and the politics of sustainability. *Environment and Planning A*, *49*(6), 1396–1412.

Evans, Adrian, & Miele, Mara. (2017). Food labelling as a response to political consumption. In M. Keller, B Halkier, T.-A. Wilska, & M. Truninger (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook on Consumption*, London: Routledge, pp. 191–203.

Gimenez, Eric H., & Shattuck, Annie. (2011). Food crises, food regimes and food movements: Rumblings of reform or tides of transformation? *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, *38*(1), 109–144.

Grosglik, Rafi. (2016). Citizen-consumer revisited: The cultural meanings of organic food consumption in Israel. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, *16*(1), 1–20.

Halkier, Bente. (2010). *Consumption challenged: Food in medialized everyday lives*. Farnham: Ashgate.

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

Halkier, Bente. (2015). Contested food consumption and everyday agency in a Danish context. In P. Strandbakken & J. Gronow (Eds.), *The consumer in society*. Oslo: Abstrakt Forlag, pp 191–206.

Halkier, Bente. (2017). Mundane science use in a practice theoretical perspective: A discussion of different understandings of the relations between citizen-consumers and public communication initiatives build on scientific claims. *Public Understanding of Science*, *26*(1), 40–54.

Halkier, Bente, & Holm, Lotte. (2006). Shifting responsibilities for food safety in Europe: An introduction. *Appetite*, *47*(2), 127–133.

Halkier, Bente, & Holm, Lotte. (2008). Food consumers and political agency: On concerns and practices among Danish consumers. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, *32*(6), 667–674.

Halkier, Bente, Holm, Lotte, Domingues, Mafalda, Magaudda, Paolo, Nielsen, Annemette, & Terragni, Laura (2007). Trusting, complex, quality conscious or unprotected? Constructing the food consumer in different European national contexts. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, *7*(3), 379–402.

Hargreaves, Tom, Longhurst, Noel, & Seyfang, Gill. (2013). Up, down, round and round: Connecting regimes and practices in innovation for sustainability. *Environment and Planning A*, *45*(2), 402–420.

Hartmann, Monika. (2011). Corporate social responsibility in the food sector. *European Review of Agricultural Economics*, *38*(3), 297–324.

Harvey, David, & Hubbard, Carmen. (2013). Reconsidering the political economy of farm animal welfare: An anatomy of market failure. *Food Policy*, *38*, 105–114.

Hertz, Frej, & Halkier, Bente. (2017). Meal box schemes as a convenient way to avoid convenience food? Uses and understandings of meal box schemes among Danish consumers. *Appetite*, 114, 232–239.

Hinrichs, C. Clare, & Allen, Patricia. (2008). Selective patronage and social justice: Local food consumer campaigns in historical context. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, *21*(4), 329–352.

Hjelmar, Ulf. (2011). Consumers’ purchase of organic food products: A matter of convenience and reflexive practices. *Appetite*, *56*(2), 336–344.

Hollows, Joanne. (2016). “The worst mum in Britain”: Class, gender and caring in the campaigning culinary documentary. In *Jonatan*. *Leer & Karen Klitgaard Povlsen* (Eds.), *Food and media: Practices, distinctions and heterotopias*. London: Routledge, pp. 78–94.

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

Honkanen, Pirjo, Verplanken, Bas, & Olsen, Svein O. (2006). Ethical values and motives driving organic food choice. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, *5*(5), 420–430.

Jacobsen, Eivind. (2017). Political consumption—citizenship and consumerism. In Margit Keller, Bente Halkier, Terhi-Anna Wilska, & Monica Truninger (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook on Consumption*. London: Routledge, pp. 181–190.

Jacobsen, Eivind, & Dulsrud, Arne (2007). Will consumers save the world? The framing of political consumerism. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, *20*(5), 469–482.

Jacobson, Lisa. (2009). Beer goes to war: The politics of beer promotion and production in the Second World War. *Food, Culture & Society*, *12*(3), 275–312.

Keller, Margit, Halkier, Bente, & Wilska, Terhi-Anna. (2016). Policy and governance for sustainable consumption at the crossroads of theories and concepts. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, *26*(2), 75–88.

Kemp, Katherine, Insch, Andrea, Holdsworth, David K., & Knight, John G. (2010). Food miles: Do UK consumers actually care? *Food Policy*, *35*(6), 504–513.

Kennedy, Emily H., Parkins, John R., & Johnston, Josee. (2016). Food activists, consumer strategies and the democratic imagination: Insights from eat-local movements. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, *16*, 1–20.

Kjærnes, Unni. (2012). Ethics and action: A relational perspective on consumer choice in the European politics of food. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, *25*(2), 145–162.

Kjærnes, Unni, Harvey, Mark, & Warde, Alan. (2007). *Trust in food: A comparative and institutional analysis*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Klint, J. (1996). Er der salg I etik? [Does ethics sell?]. Copenhagen: Centre for Alternative Analysis (CASA).

Lang, Tim, & Heasman, Michael. (2004). *Food wars: The global battle for mouths, minds and markets*. London: Earthscan.

Lewis, Tania, & Huber, Alison. (2015). A revolution in an eggcup? *Food, Culture & Society*, *18*(2), 289–307.

Lockie, Stewart. (2009). Responsibility and agency within alternative food networks: Assembling the "citizen consumer." *Agriculture and Human Values*, *26*(3), 193–201.

Maloni, Michael J., & Brown, Michael E. (2006). Corporate social responsibility in the supply chain: An application in the food industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *68*(1), 35–52.

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

Mohr, Manuel, & Schlich, Michaela. (2016). Socio-demographic basic factors of German costumers as predictors for sustainable consumerism regarding foodstuffs and meat products. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, *40*(2), 158–167.

Nielsen, Annemette. (2006). Contesting competence: Change in the Danish food safety system. *Appetite*, *47*(2), 143–151.

Oosterveer, Peter. (2006). Globalization and sustainable consumption of shrimp: Consumers and governance in the global space of flows. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, *30*(5), 465–476.

Pedregal, Virginie D., & Ozcaglar-Toulouse, Nil. (2011). Why does not everybody purchase fair trade products? The question of the fairness of fair trade products' consumption for consumers. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, *35*(6), 655–660.

Plessz, Marie, Dubuisson-Quellier, Sophie, Gojard, Severine, & Barrey, Sandrine. (2016). How consumption prescriptions affect food practices: Assessing the roles of household resources and life-course events. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, *16*(1), 101–123.

Reed, Matt. (2009). For whom? The governance of organic food and farming in the UK. *Food Policy*, *34*(3), 280–286.

Rousseau, Signe. (2012) . *Food and social media: You are what you tweet*. Plymouth: Altamira Press.

Sassatelli, Roberta, & Davolio, Federica. (2010). Consumption, pleasure and politics: Slow food and the politico-aesthetic problematisation of food. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, *10*(2), 202–232.

Sasson, Tehila. (2016). Milking the third world? Humanitarianism, capitalism and the moral economy of the Nestlé boycott. *American Historical Review*, *121*(4), 1196–1224.

Scott, Steffanie, Si, Zhenzhong, Schumilas, Theresa, & Chen, Aijuan. (2014). Contradictions in state- and civil society–driven developments in China's ecological agriculture sector. *Food Policy*, *45*, 158–166.

Shaw, Deirdre, & Moraes, Caroline. (2009). Voluntary simplicity: An exploration of market interactions. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, *33*(2), 215–223.

Starr, Amory. (2010). Local food: A social movement? *Cultural Studies—Critical Methodologies*, *10*(6), 479–490.

Thompson, Craig J., & Coskuner-Balli, Gokcen. (2007). Enchanting ethical consumerism: The case of community supported agriculture. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, *7*(3), 275–303.

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018

Vogel, David. (2004). Tracing the American roots of the political consumerism movement. In Michele Micheletti, Andreas Follesdal, & Dietlind Stolle (Eds.), *Politcs, products and markets: Exploring political consumerism: Past and present*. New Brunswick: Transaction, pp. 83–100.

Wahlen, S. (2016). Fridge fight—when food sharing meets food safety. Paper for the ESA Sociology of Consumption Conference, Bologna.

Whatmore, Sarah, Stassart, Pierre, & Renting, Henk. (2003). What's alternative about alternative food networks. *Environment and Planning A*, *35*, 389–391.

Zagata, Lukas. (2014). Towards conscientious food consumption: Exploring the values of Czech organic consumers. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, *38*(3), 243–250.

Zamwel, Einat, Sasson-Levy, Orna, & Ben-Porat, Guy. (2014). Voluntary simplifiers as political consumers: Individuals practicing *politics*through reduced consumption. *Journal of Consumers Culture*, *14*(2), 199–217.

Bente Halkier

Bente Halkier, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

PRINTED FROM OXFORD HANDBOOKS ONLINE (www.oxfordhandbooks.com). © Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Under the terms of the licence agreement, an individual user may print out a PDF of a single chapter of a title in Oxford Handbooks Online for personal use (for details see Privacy Policy and Legal Notice).

Subscriber: Royal Library, Copenhagen University Library; date: 15 August 2018