

Green logo

A study of food labeling as an initiative to govern
consumption

Henrietta Flodell

Abstract

The great climate impact of the agri-food sector has only recently been brought into light, and become a concern of political actors around the world. Standardizations as an initiative to govern this sector have received increasing attention, but while these initiatives can prove an effective tool for influencing consumer choice, they also hold certain problematic characteristics. Although they are often perceived as objective, standardizations innately aim to govern, albeit indirectly. This type of government differs radically from the one of democratic rule. To this background, this thesis asks how labels, as a type of standardization, govern food consumption. It conducts a study of eight food labels in Swedish grocery stores, and by doing so, highlights principal questions of governance, power and legitimacy. The theoretical base is provided by governmentality and is strengthened with a discursive methodological approach. The empirical analysis shows that the labels constitute a technology of government in themselves, and govern food consumption as they connect rationalities of government to the act of buying the labeled product. Key in the linking of knowledge into action is logic, and three coherent systems of thought; sustainable development, democracy and environmental limits, emerge. Through these, the governing of consumption is enabled.

Key words: agri-food, governmentality, consumption, climate, standardization
Words: 9873

Table of contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Aim and research question.....	2
1.2	Definitions and delimitations.....	3
1.2.1	Agri-food.....	3
1.2.2	Labels and standards.....	3
1.3	Disposition	4
2	Standardizations.....	5
2.1	Standardizations and power	5
3	Governmentality	7
3.1	Origins of governmentality.....	7
3.2	Governmentality in this thesis	8
3.2.1	Governing freedom.....	9
3.2.2	The act of problematizing.....	9
3.2.3	Standardizing governmentality.....	10
3.3	Constructing the analytical framework.....	10
3.3.1	Methodological assumptions	10
3.3.2	An integrated perspective	12
3.4	Selecting the material.....	13
4	Analysis.....	15
4.1	Results of empirical analysis	15
4.1.1	Cross-cutting practices.....	16
4.1.2	Sustainable development	17
4.1.3	Democracy	19
4.1.4	Environmental limits.....	20
5	Summary and further reflections	22
5.1	Summary.....	22
5.2	Discussion.....	23
5.3	Conclusion	24
6	Appendix	26
7	References	29
7.1	Grocery stores' lists of green food labels	31
7.2	Material used in the analysis.....	32

Table 1 “Analytical framework for the analysis of green labeling”..... 13

Table 2 ”Selected labels”

Table 3 ” Cross-cutting practices identified in empirical analysis”

1 Introduction

Food. Food is the source of livelihood for millions of people around the world, a source of instability and conflict, and a crucial sector to address in the attempt to minimize the world's climate impact. Food production and agriculture, after all, both affects and is affected by climate change (Fuchs et al 2009). According to the latest assessment from the IPCC, the AFOLU sector (agriculture, forestry, and other land use) is responsible for 25 per cent of the world's total GHG (greenhouse gas) emissions (Smith 2014). Only in Sweden, food consumption made for a third of household GHG emissions in 2013 (Swedish EPA 2013). There is growing awareness of the relationship between food and climate, and concerns about the lack of tools to control the climate impact of food consumption have been voiced. In its report to the United Nations Commission for Sustainable Development, the International Agri-Food Network highlighted the possibilities of market-based policy instruments, and defined a variety of actors as key players in creating a more sustainable food system (IAFN 2015). Indeed, consumption patterns are complex, but initiatives to govern consumption also require an understanding of the fact that consumption takes place in the market sphere. This realization falls in line with observations that politics no longer can be confined to the public realm, but that a transition to the private has occurred, and that state no longer is the pre-given dominant actor in governing (Higgins & Lerner 2010: 14). Standardizations as a form of governing initiative has emerged as an increasingly referenced to alternative in regulating agri-food, and received increasing attention from political, economic, and social theorists (Bain & Hatanaka 2010: 56). Labeling food as climate friendly has opened up the possibility of making the labeled product into a tool which can be used to regulate the climate impact of food consumption. Partly as a response to consumer demand, and as a selling point, the label appeal to the environmentally concerned consumers. Similar to date labeling, labeling "climate-friendly" food provides consumers with information, and facilitates consumption practice (Yngfalk 2012). In this sense the labeling practices govern consumption as they enable the consumer to make informed decisions (Boström & Klintman 2011: 6-8), and governing consumption is thereby less about hard regulation, and more about encouraging the actions of individuals. Or as the WWF stated in its analysis of the Swedish carbon footprint, about "helping people help climate" (Minx 2008).

That labels can be used to govern the behavior and climate impact of individuals motivate certain questions, however. This thesis starts with a recognition of the fact that the rise of labeling initiatives problematizes and challenges traditional political assumptions of power, agency and sovereignty. Despite the fact that the labels might seek to address crucial public concerns, they operate without democratic legitimacy. Understanding governing of consumption

does not appear possible when power and agency are confined to the state; if the governing of consumers happens in the market space and is carried out by non-state actors, how then should we understand this type of governance and power? Analyzing the governing practices of standardizations requires new interpretations of power, and for this purpose, I draw on Foucault's concept of governmentality and an analytical framework developed by Mitchell Dean (2011). To the described background, the aim of this thesis is to understand the practices with which green food labels seek to govern. By mapping the discourses surrounding food labeling practices I hope to bring to light what issues and solutions are being made visible, how knowledge is codified into actions as well as which identities are presupposed by the labels. Who governs and what is being governed?

1.1 Aim and research question

As mentioned, this thesis erupts as a result of the realization that the governing intentions of labels appears to make previous conceptualizations of government, and divisions of public and private, inadequate. The purpose of this thesis is therefore to analyze how green labeling governs food consumption by mapping the practices that shape and give meaning to actions, objects and subjects. This study aims to contribute to literature on standardization and political consumption in two ways; where previous studies have been occupied with similar questions of standardizations and government, they have done so at a global level, and failing to adopt an analysis of the local (Higgins & Lerner 2010: 215). A smaller scope is perhaps natural given the frame of this thesis, but can also provide insight into the micro movements and tendencies of governing. Secondly, as standardizations challenge political assumptions of legitimacy and power, a key focus of an analysis should be to display how these initiatives make governing happen. Through this, the understanding will be enhanced of how an alternative view on power and authority illuminates new types of governing, something which could open up for further discussions on the role of similar initiatives in a broader policy context. To this background, my research questions are as follows:

How is governing of food consumption accomplished by labels? What aspects do they highlight, what technologies are implemented and what knowledge and identities are being produced?

1.2 Definitions and delimitations

1.2.1 Agri-food

The research question of this thesis makes it clear that only *food* labels will be analyzed. A commonly used term is “agri-food”, which includes both plant-based and animalistic agricultural products, as well as fish (e.g. IAFN 2016, Agrifood economics centre). A criterion for academic relevance is cumulativity (Teorell & Svensson 2007: 18). To fill this criterion, assumptions, definitions and other choices made when conducting a study, should build on and contribute to existing research. I have considered limiting the study to only plant-based products, or even a single product, e.g. coffee, but this is not a division normally done by others. One aim of this thesis is to contribute to the field of research on political consumption, which such a narrow scope would obstruct. It would be hard to draw any general conclusions from such a result, and I will therefore analyze agri-food labels, as is customary.

1.2.2 Labels and standards

The terminology surrounding labeling practices can be confusing. Many different terms seem similar, and some appear alike but differ in their implications. For the convenience of the reader, this section will make an effort to distinguish the terms from each other. It should, however, be noted that this does not refer to any empirical division, and that in fact, the terms are often used interchangeably.

The first step will be to define “standards” as a somewhat wider phenomenon than certifications and labels. Under chapter 2. “Background”, the concept and previous research of standards and their relation to government will be elaborated. In the words of Busch; “standards are about the ways in which we order ourselves, other people, things, processes, numbers and even language itself” (2013: 2). Certifications then, are a type of standardization.

Certifications as a governing mechanism have received increasing attention in the field of agri-food, and rely upon some basic assumptions about the nature of the market. Today’s globalized trade is characterized by an asymmetric flow of, and access to, information (Bain & Hatanaka 2010: 57). Consumers have little or no means of knowing the origins, production conditions, transport methods, ingredients or health effects of a product by themselves. Certifications therefore work to decrease this uncertainty and act as mediators of knowledge to fill the void of information. Bain and Hatanaka define third-party certifiers (henceforth TNCs) as “...*private, public or hybrids of private and public organizations responsible for assessing, evaluating, and certifying safety and quality claims based on a particular set of standards and compliance methods*” (2010: 56). More and more NGOs are starting to recognize this, and use TNCs to ensure production methods in line with their values (Busch 2013: 207).

Standards, by nature, rely on differentiation (Busch 2013: 57). In this sense, they not only mediate knowledge, but also codify it. In an analysis of consumer relations to labeled products, Boström et al argue that through this symbolic process, engagement can be shaped and responsibility made visible (Boström et al 2008: 52). Since the principal problem that motivated this thesis related climate impact of agri-food to governance, the definition of green labeling provided by Boström and Klintman is a good starting point. They define green labeling as “...*green labeling is based on the standardization of principles and prescriptive criteria. This type of eco-standard is market-based and consumer-oriented, and it relies on symbolic differentiation*” (2011: 28). This definition also works as a delimitation, and it should be noted that other types of labeling, e.g. dates, or nutritional information, will not be analyzed.

An additional delimitation lies in the act of distinguishing the intention of this thesis. It focuses upon the governing practices of these labels, not on their political origin. Nor is it a study of consumer behavior. The intent is not to explain, but to understand and map these governing practices. That is why this thesis asks the questions of “how?”.

1.3 Disposition

The thesis is divided into five parts. The following chapter provides the reader with a background to the field of standardization, and some previous research on its relation to power and democracy. Chapter three outlines the methodological standpoints and theoretical framework. It also presents the material of the analysis. The result of the analysis is reviewed in chapter four, whilst the fifth and final chapter concludes the thesis and reflects upon matters of power and governance once more.

2 Standardizations

Standardizations can be understood as a process of shaping action and providing meaning to our everyday lives (Busch 2013: 2-4). Through this process we can act on codes of conduct and relate to social norms. Everywhere we go, we are affected by standards. A simple commute will most likely provide us with an extensive set; of anything between how the queuing on the platform is executed, to the various mechanisms that drive the train by connecting it to electric wires.

Standards constitute both people and objects, and no matter whether we perceive ourselves as autonomous individuals, the notion of freedom itself is interlaced with standards. Standards tend to be taken for granted and considered objective of human interference, whilst in reality they play a very large role in the construction of modern society. Complex structures, such as the idea of the nation-state or daylight-saving time, but also consumption, are enabled by standards. Standards are also intimately connected to speech. Through language, standards can be constructed, but also upheld. In fact, standards are a communicative process in themselves. Compared to a “communicative infrastructure”, one can envision how they make the basis for the connection of knowledge and practice (Henman & Dean 2010: 80).

2.1 Standardizations and power

Standards as a phenomena have traditionally not been granted much political attention, and have displayed a tendency to be appreciated as an objective technicality. The reasons for problematizing their practices are however several. The foregoing section has shown that standards both enable and constrain action, a realization amplified by the important notion that in spite of standards not portraying any empirical attributes, the implications they have for people and actions are real (Busch 2013: 70). Acknowledging this feature of standardization practice motivates a critical perspective on its relation to power. As Henman and Dean point out, they involve a form of power that is highly productive (2010: 80). Whilst advocating objectivity and neutrality, Bain and Hatanaka show that, in practice, certifiers rarely are the transparent channel for communications between producers and consumers that they claim, but that certifications actually propagate information that is neither neutral nor representative (2010: 68-70).

Standards are not only children of certain values, but they also have an intended recipient. In “Standards: recipes for reality”, Busch’s main focus in his critical discussion is the relation between democracy and expertise, of which he argues that standardizations have a deficit in the former and abundance of the

latter (2013: 269-279). In their construction, standards in general, and certifications in particular, aim to govern. This type of governance differs from democratic initiatives of similar intent, and private certifications therefore, regardless of their effectiveness, require critical examination (Busch 2013: 298).

The identity and actions of the individual is at the core of this problematization. In the free and globalized market, the consumer is expected, but also restricted, to perform a rational cost-benefit analysis of his or her actions. This rational practice is however distorted due to the failure of the market to provide with information, and knowledge will always be both partial and incorrect (Busch 2013: 289).

3 Governmentality

This chapter will present the reader with an overview of governmentality as an approach, and an analytical framework to analyze and understand governing and power. Scholars have developed these ideas into analytical tools with which to analyze modern expressions of government, and this thesis will mainly rely on the conceptualization of power provided by Rose (Rose et al 2006, Rose & Miller 2008) and Walters (2012), and the analytical framework developed by Dean (2011) to do so. Notions such as “the conduct of conduct”, and “advanced liberal government” are introduced, along with the act of *problematizing* as a governing process. As governmentality is vague in its implications for research methods, section 3.3 of this chapter will admit to certain epistemological assumptions and in part rely on discourse analysis as a methodological groundwork. The final section of this chapter will reflect upon the selection of material.

3.1 Origins of governmentality

In the spring of 1978, Michel Foucault gave a series of lectures under the name “Security, territory, population” (2007). Reflecting upon the role of the state, whether power and sovereignty were intrinsically linked and which actors could exercise power, he coined the term “governmentality” (Walters 2012: 21).

Governmentality might not be the most famous bit of Foucault’s studies, but the concept has received an increasing amount of attention since it was coined. Following him, scholars have continued to develop and adapt governmentality into an approach that has capacity to bring attention to modern forms of government, and show the need of understanding power as something more than, and beyond the state (Walters 2012: 50-52). Contesting the *à priori* assumptions of the state as a fixed exerciser of power and sovereignty, governmentality displays forms of power that stretch beyond the state. All kinds of actors on all levels participate in this process, and power is in this sense productive, rather than repressive, of social action.

Governmentality has been approached in many ways, of which three popular definitions can be distinguished; as a distinct critique against liberalism, as governance of and by states in particular and as the exercise of power in the broadest sense, as the “conduct of conduct” (Walters 2012: 11). This last definition is the starting point for this thesis. Important to note though, it is not “broad” in the sense that it is vague in an unwillingness to exclude, but rather that it understands a “multiplicity” of actors, of authorities, processes and different programs and techniques involved in governing. The analysis carried out in this

thesis will focus on non-state actors and a deconstruction of different expressions of power relations, which is why this wider definition will be adopted. Dean provides a general definition:

“Government is any more or less calculated and rational activity, undertaken by a multiplicity of authorities and agencies, employing a variety of techniques and forms of knowledge, that seeks to shape conduct by working through the desires, aspirations, interests and beliefs of various actors for definite but shifting ends and with a diverse set of relatively unpredictable consequences, effects and outcomes” (2011: 18).

3.2 Governmentality in this thesis

To study governmentality will ultimately be to study power. If governmentality is understood as a way to question and problematize the foundations of society we take for granted, re-conceptualizing power is the first step of the process.

While previous studies of political power have been occupied with questions concerning the state, of sovereignty and authority, governmentality understands the very division of public and private as an expression of government, and challenges the assumption that the exercise of power need be derived from sovereignty (Oels 2005: 187). Power by Foucault is understood in a wider sense; it can be held and exercised by several actors, in many different sites (ibid.). With this new understanding of power in mind, we can now see actors on all levels as wielders and subjects of it. Indeed, re-conceptualizing by whom and where power is exercised is important, but the key contribution is in the widening of the concept itself, to understand that the way actions, discourses and subjects interact is both results, but also constituting, of power.

It is important to point out that Foucault does understand that power too *can* be repressive, but the real contribution lies in the realization that it is much more than that. It can gently nudge and imply, but this kind of power governs at a distance (Rose et al 2006: 86). Foucault refers to “pastoral power”, and likens it to a shepherd caring for his flock; a power that guides and shapes behavior indirectly (2007: 103).

It is in this shape governmentality makes the exercise of power visible (Rose et al 2006: 86). It illuminates governing at all levels of society, and in the end, also enables the government of the self (Dean 2011: 19). Governing is thus not an endeavor to a fixed result, nor the means to achieve it, but something more indirect than that. Still, the enabling of conduct of conduct and the government of the self depends upon two matters; the assumption of freedom and the act of problematizing.

3.2.1 Governing freedom

The concept of governmentality has caused some confusion as to its relation to liberalism, and one could indeed interpret the indirect notion of governing as falling well in line with the liberal belief of the market as a self-managing force. On the other hand, to understand the governing of society on all levels, including the regulation of individual behavior, can also appear repressive of freedom. The implications of governmentality should be understood as somewhat more complex than subjugated to this dialectal separation. Governmentality assumes freedom and agency of the subject (Dean 2011: 21). In his later years, Foucault visualized the birth of a new type of government, which scholars since have named "Advanced liberal government" (henceforth ALG) (Miller & Rose 2008: 18). The ALG is decentralized in the sense that it doesn't organize itself around a dominant unit, e.g. the state. It rejects the notion of society, and instead allows market forces to control the subunits or communities within which people act (Oels 2005: 192). It might not govern the freedom to act, but does govern the space within which actions can take place (Dean 2011:22). In this sense the governing of the ALG creates freedom, and thus also the subjects which hold this freedom. As a critique against society the ALG doesn't result in a withdrawal from government. Instead, it is a composition of governing rationalities and technologies that create autonomy and responsibility of the subject (Rose et al 2006: 91). Dean categorized these technologies into those of agency and those of performance. Together they regulate conduct of the individual, whilst also optimizing outcome (2011: 202). These ALG practices are reflexive and they oblige the subject to act on its own freedom. The individuals are entrepreneurs of themselves (Oels 2005: 192). The ALG governs freedom, which shapes its problem space (Rose et al 2006: 92).

3.2.2 The act of problematizing

Understanding governing as the conduct of conduct, as the government of the free as have been described above, one needs to ask what it means to govern. To render something governable it has to be problematized. An important realization is that problems are not given, but constructed. What and who constitutes the act of problematizing is therefore a key process of governance (Miller & Rose 2008: 14). Dean refers to the practices through which we govern and are governed, and thus the process of making issues appear problematic, as "regimes of government". The practices within these regimes could be split into two components; *rationalities* of government and *technologies* of government. Rationalities of government represent independent systems of thought and truth. Rationalities creates the regime of government, but are also dependent upon it. As Rose and Miller put it, "rationalities are forms of reasoning" (2008: 16). Examples of such knowledge realms could be medicine or the free media; within themselves they represent a certain set of truths and expertise, which defines subjects but also codes how to act within these. Still, thought also has to be made operable. It is

not enough simply to grasp a phenomenon, so technologies of government seek to organize how we act upon our knowledge (Miller & Rose 2008: 17). Technologies are institutions, instruments or mechanisms, which serve the purpose of making it possible to act on the conduct of others. Although there is no empirical divide, this categorization nicely highlights the linkage between knowing problems and acting to solve them. In other words, this is how the conduct of conduct is enabled.

A regime of government should not be understood as a fixed notion. Programmes, as Dean calls them, can intervene and challenge the truths these regimes depend upon, and seeking to transform conduct within that regime (2011: 32). Using new technologies, programmes might create new visibilities, new knowledge and new subjects. It is important to note that programmes do not contradict the regimes themselves, but actually operate within that same space, seeking to transform practices.

3.2.3 Standardizing governmentality

Standardizations, and labels, are through governmentality defined as a technology of government. By their instrumental nature, they serve as tools that aspire to achieve a certain outcome and enable certain actions. The implementation of technologies should not be interpreted as a neutral notion though, but rather as a dynamic instrument with which conduct is shaped and knowledge linked to action (Higgins et al 2010: 171). Standards constitute, but are also part of the context in which they govern. To distinguish between technologies and rationalities of government, and the way that they are linked, is a crucial moment in rendering government visible (ibid.), which strengthens the aim of this thesis.

3.3 Constructing the analytical framework

As explained above, governmentality can be interpreted in different ways, and while some have attempted to develop the concept into a general political theory, one could also argue that it should be understood as more of an analytical tool and critical perspective on governing. This thesis will confess to the latter, which falls in line with the analytical framework of governmentality as developed by Dean. In this way, governmentality serves as a useful toolbox to deconstruct and understand political problems.

3.3.1 Methodological assumptions

One concern for those choosing to conduct a study with a governmentality approach is the realization that it does not offer much guidance in terms of methodology, nor does Dean's analytical framework suggest how it could be

operationalized (Oels 2005: 189). Instead, this task falls upon each researcher respectively. Scientific analyses face methodological challenges and the very nature of this one further highlights the need for intersubjectivity and reflections upon its choice of method. This section will therefore elaborate on some of the key assumptions and contributions of conducting qualitative analyses and the researcher's unavoidable role as an interpreter of the material. Section 3.3.2, whilst keeping an awareness of these reflections in mind, aims to construct an analytical set of questions through which the analysis will be carried out.

This qualitative study takes the form of a text analysis. One could perhaps have imagined similar studies to have more of a quantitative approach, focusing on the effects green labeling has on consumers, but this study operates from a different angle. Rather than analyzing consumer behavior, I try to map out, and understand how governing takes shape and shapes in its relation to its context. Attention will therefore be given to communicative aspects, which is why a qualitative text analysis will serve the purpose of this study well.

This thesis' methodological approach will be inspired by discourse analysis, which is a critical text analysis (Esaiasson et al 2012: 211). Discourse analysis should not be understood as a single theory, but rather as a set of analytical approaches that together assume the notion that how we speak is not neutral, but a way in which our world, identities and relations are created and upheld (Winther-Jørgensen & Philips 2000: 7-11). These assumptions have their origin in social constructionist perspectives (ibid.). Some main features of these perspectives are their critical take on how we relate to the world around us, criticizing how construction of knowledge is an expression of power processes and that our actions and identities are subjugated to different forms of knowledge, which language both shapes and is shaped by.

There is good reason to combine governmentality and discourse analysis: as long as the approaches share common ontological and epistemological ground, a discursive reading can be strengthened by theory, and the study's focus sharpened (Winther-Jørgensen & Philips 2000: 141-142). Combining them is thereby not an issue. Both approaches understand how language is laden with expressions of power, and it thus comes as no surprise that they both challenge the scale, sites and agents of the production of knowledge and subjects. An analysis of government presupposes discourses as a tactic of government (Dean 2011: 37). Rose et al further contribute to this understanding when highlighting that language is more than a mirror of governing, but in fact instrumental in itself (2006: 88-89). The nature of consumption can for example be understood as concept without an *à priori* meaning, but through speech, where articulations are linked to each other, a meaning is created. This makes clear how language becomes a tool of power; the one who decides defines meaning, and has thus determined how we perceive and thereby act on our surroundings.

Since social constructionists view all knowledge as socially constructed, so will also the result of this thesis be. Recognizing that the statements and concepts of any analysis also are reflections of a certain perspective applies to studies of governmentality too (Dean 2011: 15). I would argue that this reflexivity of self is best dealt with by aiming for a high degree of intersubjectivity in the undertaking

of the analysis. The following parts of this chapter are constructed in order to achieve this.

3.3.2 An integrated perspective

Carrying out a text analysis requires an active reading of the material, and engaging in the text by asking it questions is encouraged (Esaiasson et al 2012: 210). The researcher's task then becomes to understand what a text says in relation to what it is asked. Constructing questions as an analytical tool can heighten the degree of intersubjectivity and transparency, but also serve as a way of identifying and structuring discursive readings (Winther-Jørgensen & Philips 2000: 136-137). The answers to the questions should be interpreted as empirical indicators of the phenomena I am examining (Esaiasson et al 2012: 211).

The framework of the analysis enables a study of governing in different forms and by a variety of actors. The focus of such an analysis is the regime of government, and aims to expose the logics of its practices (Dean 2011: 41). The categories which Dean distinguishes are four axes along which we govern and are governed within a regime of government; fields of visibility, technical aspects, forms of knowledge and formation of identities. Analyzing these dimensions makes it possible to see how the exercise of power shapes and takes shape through these practices (Dean 2011: 13), and together they present the tool with which to ask questions of "how". I have operationalized these categories into questions, which are inspired by Angela Oels' operationalization in her study of governmentalities of climate change (2005). It is important to underline the fact that the workings of these practices shouldn't be understood as deterministic. That is not the way of governmentality, which instead can only suggest directions.

Table 1. Analytical framework for the analysis of green labeling

<i>Rationalities and technologies of government</i>	<i>Analytical questions</i>
Fields of visibility	What is illuminated and defined, and what is obscured? What problems and solutions thereto are shown?
Technical aspects	By what technologies, procedures and vocabularies is governing accomplished?
Forms of knowledge	Which forms of knowledge arise from and inform the activity of governing? Which attempts to regulate and reform regimes of practice occur?
Formation of identities	What identities are assumed and which transformations are sought? What forms of conduct are expected and how are some forms of conduct problematized?

(Inspired by Dean 2011: 40-44 and Oels 2005:189)

3.4 Selecting the material

The consideration taken in the choosing of material consisted of two main concerns; which labels to limit the study to and what material to analyze.

Matters of accessibility and time frame of the thesis limits the analysis to labels operating in Sweden. Although the labeled products might have their origin elsewhere, only labels that can be found on products in Swedish stores will be analyzed. Based on this criterion and information gathered from the biggest grocery stores in Sweden (ICA, Axfood, Coop) and the National Food Agency of Sweden (Livsmedelsverket), about which were the most common ones, eight labels were selected.

The most important criterion for selection has been how “green” a green label is. Labeling organizations choose to brand themselves differently in terms of climate, and the presented symbolics are usually a matter of market competition (Klintman et al 2008: 51). This does not necessarily mean that they do not include climate goals in their work. I find that what is or what is not a “green” label is itself a social construction. Selecting which labels to analyze based on what I

interpreted as “green”, or only selecting labels that defined themselves that way, would therefore have severe implications for both the reliability and validity of the study (Esaiasson et al 2012: 58). Through this analysis, the reader should bear in mind that the meaning of the concept of a “green” label is subject to different interpretations and implications by different actors.

Even though the selection of labels will not be conducted based on their “greenness”, some categorizations are useful to nuance the process of labeling. Liljestolpe and Elofsson from the Swedish Board of Agriculture (Jordbruksverket) construct two typologies; *direct* and *indirect* green labels (2009:13-18). Climate impact is the main, or one of the main concerns, in the work of direct green labels, whereas indirect green labels see it as a lesser prioritized concern, or even a byproduct of their work. These categories are not empirical divisions, but are simply used for the purpose of this analysis and to enhance its intersubjectivity.

The second concern relates to the concrete material to analyze. Unlike other qualitative text analyses, this study does not have a pre-given material. This demands a high grade of intersubjectivity, which is what these reflections aim to contribute to. The original thought was to exclusively select material with the terms “food” or “climate”, but it soon became clear that this method was not sufficient, mainly because it excluded aspects of the labels that could still be relevant to their governing practices. Instead, the selection of material had to be based on other criteria. Firstly, in line with the purpose of this thesis, only the labels’ own texts will be analyzed. “Texts” in this context can be written, oral and visual communication, which falls in line with social constructionist and discursive assumptions. Esaiasson et al suggest selecting “typical” material of the studied phenomena when there is no reason to believe that it would look any different in other types (2012: 220). They admit that a problem could be that internal lingo is overseen, but since the focus of this thesis is on the labels’ communications to consumers, this shouldn’t be a concern. General documents, visionary statements, annual reports and other similar publications available to the general public, therefore made out the basis for the material, but was also complemented with material relating specifically to agri-food. In this way I was able to grasp both general aspects of the labels governing practices, as well as any specific to food. Based on these criterions, the following labels will be analyzed:

Table 2. Selected labels

<i>Direct green labels</i>	<i>Indirect green labels</i>
- KRAV	- Fairtrade
- Demeter	- Svenskt Sigill
- EU ecolabel	
- Marine Stewardship Council	
- UTZ	
- Rainforest Alliance	

4 Analysis

In this chapter the results of the empirical analysis will be presented. The material for a text analysis is served well by being read several times and in different ways (Esaiasson et al 2012: 210), which the conduction of the analysis was executed with in mind. By dividing the reading into different steps, I aimed to penetrate and lay bare the material at depth. First, the material belonging to each label respectively was read, allowing general appreciation of the material as a whole. Second, a more active read was undertaken by posing to the material my analytical questions. I tried to pay extra attention to any articulations that related to climate or agri-food, but also noted how objects were defined and problematized and which ones were given priority over others.

As I grouped together what I found to be reoccurring articulations according to the rationalities and technologies of governing, I could fit my empirical findings into an analytical scheme. After an analysis of the schemes, some overarching trends started to emerge, and I could separate and schematically organize these accordingly. These practices will be presented later in this chapter, along with reflections on how rationalities of thought enable the governing practices of these labels. I will, as I introduce the practices, strive to feature which labels displayed which tendencies and to what degree, something I hope will contribute to the aim and intersubjectivity of the thesis. This also contributes to the nuance and depth of the empiricism, as it illustrates how the constituting flow of power and knowledge cannot be limited to any kind of divide, but is a continuous flow across borders, sites and actors.

4.1 Results of empirical analysis

Due to sheer size and readability, the schematic summary of the empirical results per label can be found in the appendix of this thesis. From here on I will not further elaborate on any differences in governing between direct and indirect green labels, partly because that was not the purpose of this thesis, but mainly because no major differences in how these labels govern could be distinguished. This section will instead provide a summary of the analytical scheme per label. It will elaborate on which labels articulated what and to what degree, where they differed, and some key practices that united them.

Certain aspects appeared to unite the labels, specifically the way they constructed solutions to their problematizations. What the solutions implied differed, but they were all enabled by the purchase of the product marked with the label. This can for example be seen in the way many labels referred to their own

role, and the logo on the product, as a guarantee that the values they represented had been fulfilled (e.g. EU ecolabel a; MSC 2014g).

The labels' governing practices were not *á priori* linked to meaning, but through their discursive articulations, they displayed a diversity in elements that tied meaning to practice. Although not all terms were articulated by all labels, and were referred to in a varying degree, it also became clear that some were continuously given greater emphasis and meaning. These general trends were adopted by all labels continuously. Some of these were in regard to how they operated, for example with references to the market forces, the power of demand or their cooperation with other actors (e.g. MSC 2015c; KRAV 2015a), while others referred to the values they represented, such as sustainability or workers' rights (e.g. Rainforest Alliance 2014a; Fairtrade 2015b). There is of course variance and diversity in governing, which can be seen in the scheme in the appendix, but in general, how these prioritized articulations were given meaning displayed a relatively widespread homogeneity amongst the labels. Some articulations erupted as general trends which other terms seemed to be tied to. These could be identified and separated with the help of the analytical framework, and will be further elaborated on below.

4.1.1 Cross-cutting practices

As was introduced in chapter 3.3.1 "Methodological assumptions", meaning is not pre-given, but constructed through speech in an exercise of power. It is in this process that the labels constitute fields of visibility, technologies, forms of knowledge and identities, and connect them as they constitute and presuppose each other. From the empirical analysis, it became clear that some articulations, not only were given greater weight when linked to others, but also were given a sort of logic consistency. As meaning was constructed and articulations linked, some patterns emerged. These could be separated and categorized into three coherent systems of thought; *sustainable development*, *democracy* and *environmental limits*. Below, a second analytical scheme is presented, where the articulations from the labels have been rearranged accordingly. The following sections will develop these practices at a greater depth, and also show how this helped distinguish differences in governing between the labels.

Table 3. Cross-cutting practices identified in empirical analysis

Rationalities and technologies of government	Analytical questions	<i>Sustainable development</i>	<i>Democracy</i>	<i>Environmental limits</i>
<i>Fields of visibility</i>	What is illuminated and defined, and what is obscured? What problems and solutions thereto are shown?	The <i>loop</i> of demand and encouragement that places consumers on one end, producers on the other, and the labels as mediators of knowledge in-between The <i>journey</i> , the way forward is always forward, improvements rather than reforms Creates a narrative where issues of e.g. environment, biodiversity, health and human rights are connected The <i>community</i> as site for influence and organizing social unit	Traceability along the production chain Problematizes: lack of insight and risk of abuse, i.e. practices and functions outside the labels Obscures: the lack of democratic legitimacy in these practices	Illuminates the unsustainability of the “system”, e.g. human practices that exploit resources. Problematizes articulations of improvement and emphasizes reform and limitations Obscures: whether consumption can be legitimized
<i>Technologies</i>	By what technologies, procedures and vocabularies is governing accomplished?	Organized around market forces Labels as instruments to inform consumers and channels for the expression of demand	Voting (buying) Buying thereby lends legitimacy and agency to the labels which participate in policy discussions	
<i>Forms of knowledge</i>	Which forms of knowledge arise from and inform the activity of governing? Which attempts to regulate and reform regimes of practice occur?	Liberalism, free market competition	The democratic organization and democratic values	The ecosystem, environmental sciences
<i>Formation of identities</i>	What identities are assumed and which transformations are sought? What forms of conduct are expected and how are some forms of conduct problematized?	The conduct of conduct Labels as enablers of consumers	The “citizen-consumer” Labels as representatives of political positioning	The consumers and labels have limited opportunity to influence, and only <i>together</i> with others can change be achieved

4.1.2 Sustainable development

In general, the discourse of sustainable development appears to be the one that to the highest degree accepts the assumptions of the Advanced Liberal Government. How it attempts to reform the regime of government is both implicit and antagonistic, as it defines it as the opposite of what it constitutes itself through. This is achieved and defined by the creation of a view of the world as an arena in

which problems are given meaning and consumers a context, which in turn creates a scope of action for the strive towards sustainable development.

In line with the assumptions of the ALG, all labels refer to and make use of the force of the market. The Marine Stewardship Council “harnesses market forces” to achieve change and emphasizes the power of consumer demand by articulations such as “the power of you”, while KRAV encourages the consumer to “demand, refuse and choose” (MSC 2015c; KRAV 2015a). The market is understood as the base for action, the material embodiment of liberal ideology and the starting point for the construction of subject positions. Following this, “sustainable development” could be identified as a construction which relied on these forms of knowledge, which can be seen in *Table 3*.

Almost all labels make “sustainable development” into a key aspect of their work; the UTZ declares their main goal to be “to make sustainable farming the norm” (b), and Fairtrade, MSC, Svenskt Sigill, EU eco and KRAV all list sustainability as a top priority (Fairtrade a; KRAV 2015b,d; EU eco c; MSC 2015c; Svenskt Sigill 2015a). Meaning was developed as the concept was linked to articulations such as “the future” or the “power of demand” (MSC k; UTZ 2016a). A key practice in conceptualizing “sustainability” is the construction of a narrative. Apart from the EU ecolabel, no labels list climate as separate goal, but use “sustainability” as an umbrella under which climate, as well as other issues are constituted. Rainforest Alliance, for example, defines sustainable development as “*biodiversity, social responsibility, ethical economy and climate resilience*” (2014a), others have also included *health* (KRAV 2014b; Demeter g; Svenskt Sigill 2015b). It should be noted that these issues might as well have been interpreted as independent of the others, but instead they are being constructed as interlinked and connected to something greater, to sustainability. This is also constituting of action, the action encouraged by sustainable development is the consumer choice, which through this is a solution to other concerns too.

The creation of ways to visualize problems, solutions and the connection of actors is vital to the process of governing. Almost all green labels paint a *cycle* of some kind. KRAV, Svenskt sigill and EU eco use the diagram of the “food cycle”, the UTZ refers to a “loop” and MSC’s “theory of change” connects consumer demand to producer supply (KRAV 2016a; EU eco b,d; MSC a; UTZ 2016c; Svenskt Sigill 2015d). The cycle serves as a communicative channel between producers and consumers, and the labels often position themselves in-between or in the middle of the cycle, as mediators of demand and information (MSC a; UTZ g). In other cases, the cycle illustrates interconnectedness. For Demeter, “the farm” is a key entity; a holistic organism where everything is dependent upon each other (Demeter a,b). The behavior of the consumer is then very much a part of and essential to the flow of the cycle. In all cases, the cycle fills the function of making visible that actions are not executed in a vacuum, and that all is linked, which makes the consumer part of something greater. It also makes it possible to grasp consumption as an expression for something more than a simple need. The metaphor of the *journey* is another way of construction fields of visibility (Rainforest Alliance 2015b; Fairtrade 2015b). Constructing “sustainable development” as a solution is achieved by linking the journey to articulations such

as “the road to change”, “improvements” or by references to the “future” and our “children” (e.g. MSC k).

The construction of locales falls in line with the rejection of society done by the ALG. Moving beyond the state or international arena, *the community* becomes the site for power and actors to engage in within “sustainable development”. The practice of sustainability appears to focus on the community as a subunit from where influence flows and actors interact. This can for example be seen in both KRAV and Rainforest Alliance, who explicitly refer to communities and encourage the consumers to engage in these (KRAV 2016b; Rainforest Alliance 2015a, b)

By the visualization of the world and the construction of space for action, expectations and identities of the consumer are created. The labels themselves erupt as passive actors, assuming the role of the enabler. They empower farmers, workers and fishers, but first and foremost, enable the consumer. The EU eco-label, for example, describes their work as “making green choices easy” (EU eco a).

4.1.3 Democracy

The sphere that green labels operate in is, as mentioned above, structured around a network of market ideas and tools. However, a number of articulations tied to *democracy* were distinguished during the analysis. These gave the processes of the market other meanings, whilst it also became an act of problematizing others.

The labels continuously made use of terms such as “traceability” and “transparency” in their work (KRAV 2016e; EU eco b,e; MSC d, j; UTZ h), and articulations such as “independence”, “non-profit” and “reliability” were also used frequently (KRAV 2016c, d; Demeter b, h; EU eco a; Rainforest Alliance c; Svenskt Sigill 2014a; Fairtrade 2009b). Within the democratic, the undemocratic is problematic. The functions that are outside the practice of the labels, i.e. non-certified food, are linked to terms such as “lack of transparency” or “greenwashing” (e.g. EU eco a; Rainforest Alliance 2013a), and are almost exclusively antonyms to democratic articulations.

During the analysis of the democracy discourse, it became clear that this practice conceptualized actions and identities in a different way than “sustainable development” did. At the center lies a difference in the understanding of the identity of the consumer.

Although the practice of democracy also makes use of the *cycle* to give the act of purchasing a greater meaning than to satisfy a need, the actions, agency and identity this is linked to, differed. Fairtrade most explicitly depicted this by referring to the “citizen-consumer” (2009a). This implies an identity with characteristics like those of the citizen within a democratic society, possibly with political concerns, but also with a right to express these and the institutions through which these can be expressed. Articulations encouraging the consumers to “engage” or to “make a difference” were often used, and these created an identity of the consumer with political civil interests, as well as a will and a right

to change (Rainforest Alliance 2013a; Fairtrade c). Most notably, these tendencies preceded a shift in the space for actions of the consumer to the one of “the voter”. The technology of buying the labeled product was seen as the equivalence to voting. Through this, the role of the label is also constituted as a representative of the values it stands for (e.g. Fairtrade 2009a). This way, the label has been lent legitimacy and agency to act, but also to represent; very much the way in which a political party is voted for in a democratic election. Both Rainforest Alliance and Fairtrade point out that they are active actors in climate change politics (Rainforest Alliance a, b; Fairtrade 2016a). To further contrast this to the practice of sustainable development, the label no longer serves as a mere codifier or mediator of knowledge, but as an active actor, that engages in political questions and works together with governments and NGOs to achieve a change. Consumption, or demand, is not understood as powerful in itself; it does not directly create change, but can act as the catalyst to the process of creating labels with this power.

Finally, an additional democratic pillar is made visible; the issue of accountability. Accountability partly rests upon reoccurring elections, but also on the possibility of evaluating actors and actions, and thus requires access to information. The purchase might be given the meaning of the vote, but to be able to re-evaluate a choice, behavior or result, information and transparency is needed, which many labels emphasize (e.g. EU eco c, d or Svenskt Sigill 2015f). “Transparency” is an articulation often used, along with what is often referred to as “traceability along the production chain” (UTZ h; MSC e, h; Rainforest Alliance 2013c; Fairtrade b).

To summarize, the practices that operate within this programme originate from democratic processes and values. What is sought to be transformed is constructed as undemocratic. By positioning consumers as voters and the labels as their representatives, certain possibilities for action are created.

4.1.4 Environmental limits

The third practice that could be distinguished will be referred to as “environmental limits”. It was less referenced to than the other two, and not practiced by all labels.

The effort of making limits visible was done in three ways; by highlighting the fragileness of nature, our reliance upon it, and portraying human practice as a threat to it. The problematized relation between nature and human practice was made visible by bringing forth stories of people and farmers that had experienced the impacts of climate change (e.g. Rainforest Alliance a). Fairtrade introduced farmers with dwindling coffee plantations and empty beehives (2015a), KRAV made their certified farmers visible under their campaign #vimedKRAV (2016b, g), Demeter had a public list of their farmers (c), as well as Svenskt Sigill (2015e). MSC referred to “overfishing” as a crucial problem (2014g), and even points out technological innovations as a driver of this change (ibid.). When making the

claims about the danger and threat to people and nature that the practices pose, the labels often refer to science as the base for legitimacy (e.g. KRAV 2015e; Demeter d,e). KRAV, EU eco, Demeter and Svenskt Sigill construe GMO and pesticides as “strange” and with “unknown consequences” (KRAV 2014a, 2015c; Demeter g; EU eco a; Svenskt Sigill 2015c), and Rainforest Alliance brings to light how agriculture is the greatest generator of GHG emissions (b). Rainforest Alliance also writes about how the expansion of agriculture is behind 70 % of deforestation around the world (d). It is implied that human practice is behind these issues.

Through this, a finite amount and an absolute end of the earth’s resources can be visualized. It is in the operationalization of knowledge that the ambiguity erupts. What action is this rationality linked to, and which identities are presupposed? Although not articulated, a paradoxical implication of the second response surfaces, namely that if the practice of environmental limits understands resources as more absolute than the relativity of sustainable development, it should perhaps question the sustainability of consumption in itself. The practice is very vague in this, something which will be further reflected upon in chapter 5 “Conclusions”. However, a more interpretative reading of the material suggests two ways to view this:

One way could be to understand the labels as a guarantee of the absence of the dangerous, unsustainable human practices they have described and opposed. In that sense, they become representatives of the concerned consumer, which makes the act of buying the labeled product a possible action in this concern. At the same time, however, this is questioned in other ways. Several labels, e.g. MSC (i), Fairtrade (2015a, 2016a), emphasize that they do more than mediate communication between producer and consumer, and highlight their work with other actors, such as NGOs and governments. UTZ goes a step further and actually claims that “certifications are not enough” (2015d, e). This implies that they view their own and the consumers’ role and power of influence as relatively limited. What role and purpose they fill is thereby contested, and the legitimacy of their existence, in a way, falls flat.

5 Summary and further reflections

How is governing of food consumption by green labels accomplished? What aspects do they highlight, what technologies are implemented and what knowledge and identities are produced?

5.1 Summary

The responses to the analytical questions were many and diverse. And although the technologies with which knowledge was operationalized made similar action possible (i.e. buying the labeled product), the meaning that was linked to this action differed.

In the great diversity of the articulations, certain patterns of reasoning emerged. By rearranging the articulations of the chart in the appendix, and instead organizing them according to terms to which they were linked by the labels, the diversity and ambiguity decreased. Instead they then constituted more or less coherent systems of thought, with sets of implications for visibilities, actions and identities. These were categorized accordingly, and named “sustainable development”, “democracy” and “environmental limits”.

Within the practice of “sustainable development”, knowledge is constructed on the basis of the free market and the power of demand and supply. Value and meaning was linked to the processes of the market by the construction of “sustainable development” as a solution to concerns such as biodiversity or climate impact, and with a strong favor of the market through articulations such as “the journey”. By portraying consumption and all its components in a “cycle”, consumption became the source of power and change. As a result, the consumer identity was given a relatively high degree of agency, while the labels assumed a more passive role of enablers of consumer influence.

The second practice was the one of “democracy”. The form of knowledge was in this case democratic values and processes. These were operationalized by articulating the act of buying into the act of voting. The democratic process was envisioned by referencing to consumer engagement and communities around these labels, as well as the enabling of democratic accountability by making the chain of traceability visible. Consumers became citizens and the labels their political representatives. This changed the power relations between the actors; instead of consumer demand being the source of change and the labels their mere enablers, the act of buying lent legitimacy to the labels to act on the consumers’ behalf.

Finally, a third practice was identified and separated from the rest; “environmental limits”. Rather than understanding further development as a solution to unsustainable practice, a more absolute view was visualized, where resources were finite. With references to science and an understanding of a fragile ecosystem on a collision course with human inventions, such as GMO, pesticides and agricultural practices, this limit was made visible. The labels’ identity could be interpreted as the representative of these values, which enabled the action of buying the product. At the same time, however, the practice contained some contradictory implications.

5.2 Discussion

The purpose of this thesis was to, with an alternative understanding of power, showcase and problematize new forms of government. The following discussion will therefore aim to nuance how we can understand and relate to the exercise of power, based on the indications provided by the result of the analysis.

As was assumed in the presented theoretical understanding of the question, the empirical analysis echoed the understanding of standardizations and labels as a technology of government. Although the meanings it was defined by differed, all labels provided an implementation of technology that, either implicitly or explicitly, enabled the act of buying the labeled product.

As the analysis has shown, the response to the analytical questions based on Dean’s framework of government displayed diversity, but also some general, reoccurring logics that connected rationalities to technologies. How this result can be understood and explained in a context of government is imperative to how we relate to the questions of legitimacy and power that these labels beg.

One of the contributions of the governmentality approach is that it makes the governing “at a distance” visible. The process of how rationalities are created and made operable through their linking to technologies, is an act of government, as it is through this practice the conduct of conduct is carried out. Not unlike the way spades dig the furrow and shape the river bank that enables the flow of water, this process enables and shapes the behavior of the individual. To this background, recognizing the role of logic is key, as it links the different features of technologies and rationalities of governing to each other. The conduct of conduct, in its shepherd-like shape of power, is carried out by this streamlining practice. In the realm of logic, a set of rationalities can *only* be followed by *one* act. These systems of thought set the frame for what is possible, as it is the logic that they create and link, that enables governing.

A challenge to this conclusion is the third practice of “environmental limits”. As the most confusing, but equally interesting result of the analysis, it holds several contradictory and illogical elements. The knowledge this practice appeared to draw upon, and the diagram of the limit it made visible, suggested that human practice was unsustainable in itself. Rather than enabling consumption, it made action impossible. The empirical analysis showed that the

discourse that constituted this practice did not appear to be fixated. That is, there were still elements whose meaning was not completely defined. Understanding the speech-act as an exercise of power is a way of showing how certain elements in the practice of environmental limits were exposed to attempts of interpretation, and can in part explain the practice's ambiguity. The incomplete and vague nature of logic it displayed could indicate that power relations are still at play, competing over the defining of meaning and linking of articulations.

At the same time, the analysis also showed that "environmental limits" contradicted the very regime of government that labels operate within. Implicitly, it suggests and criticizes the practices that constitute the regime, i.e. the market forces of demand and supply. At the same time, the other two systems of thought rather explicitly act as children of the ALG. They might seek to transform behavior, but the change sought is still confined to the boundaries of the regime of government. Programmes, as attempts to transform behavior are called by Dean, do not challenge the very regime they are part of. But to the background of the knowledge and visibilities created by the environmental limits practice, consumption in itself appears a constructor of the problems they paint. This technology, to give up consumption, is never articulated, and any actions that could be linked to rationalities are obscured - perhaps because of its impossible nature.

This suggests that only practices, or programmes, that accept certain conditions have the ability to govern. Only some systems of thought can be consolidated, and thus affect practice, whereas the more critical perspective of environmental limits seems doomed to the periphery of the regime.

Based on this realization, that a regime of government puts boundaries on thought, what implications does this have on the nature of politics on a wider political scale? If some thought and truths can be only voiced, but not actually affect practice, then the global environmental arena is one with limited opportunities to change. This analysis suggests that any agreements, protocols or treaties that climate meetings can result in, will inevitably be a product of the infinite "development" as is favored, and thereby allowed, in today's modern and global capitalist society. This analysis has shown that the constitution of power should be understood both as flowing to and from different actors on different levels, but also as a product of its context, and that the Advanced Liberal Government in this sense becomes more restraining than liberating.

5.3 Conclusion

The conclusion of this thesis is that green labels govern food consumption by constructing systems of thought, that within themselves create a coherent connection between visibilities, knowledge and presupposed identities. The three practices that attempted to do so in the material used on this paper were: *sustainable development*, *democracy* and *environmental limits*. The labels governed consumption as they connected rationalities of government to

technologies. The technology constructed by all three practices was the act of buying the labeled product, and key in the linking of knowledge to action was logic. Green labels assume a role of passive government, where they conduct conduct and enable consumption behavior. To be able to govern, inevitably, these systems of thought must accept the conditions under which the labels operate.

6 Appendix

Analytical categories	Analytical questions	KRAV	Demeter	EU eco
Fields of visibility	What is illuminated and defined, and what is obscured? What problems and solutions thereto are shown?	<u>Illuminated and visible</u> : the life cycle, proximity to nature, connects issues of climate, social responsibility, biodiversity, animal welfare, nutrition <u>Problematized</u> : threats of GMO and chemical substances, the future <u>Key site</u> : communities, where consumers and producers engage, e.g. under hashtag #vimedKRAV <u>Solutions</u> : sustainable development	<u>Illuminated and visible</u> : the life cycle, proximity to nature, biodiversity, animal welfare, nutrition <u>Problematized</u> : threats to the holistic organism “the farm”, the future <u>Obscured</u> : agriculture as possible threat to nature, problems of consumption <u>Solutions</u> : sustainable development	<u>Illuminated and visible</u> : the life cycle, sustainable development as the “journey” to improvements, connects issues of climate, health, animal and plant life <u>Problematized</u> : dishonest actors on the market, the future <u>Obscured</u> : problems of consumption <u>Solutions</u> : sustainable development
Technologies	By what technologies, procedures and vocabularies is governing accomplished?	<u>Technologies of performance</u> : using market forces and labels as instruments <u>Technologies of agency</u> : the consumer’s choice as the tool for change	<u>Technologies of performance</u> : using market forces and labels as instruments <u>Technologies of agency</u> : the consumer’s choice as the tool for change	<u>Technologies of performance</u> : using market forces and labels as instruments <u>Technologies of agency</u> : the consumer’s choice as the tool for change
Forms of knowledge	Which forms of knowledge arise from and inform the activity of governing? Which attempts to regulate and reform regimes of practice occur?	References to science as source of legitimacy Market practices and power of demand Sustainable development is source of improvement	References to science as source of legitimacy Market practices and power of demand Sustainable development is source of improvement	References to the European Union as source of democratic legitimacy scientific credibility Market practices and power of demand Sustainable development is source of improvement
Formation of identities	What identities are assumed and which transformations are sought? What forms of conduct are expected and how are some forms of conduct problematized?	The consumer as entrepreneur of itself, emphasis on “the choice” <u>Articulations that construe the “consumer”</u> : refuse, demand, choose, make a difference, do nature a favor <u>Articulations that depict identity of the label</u> : trustworthy, mediators of information, enabler of consumption choice	The consumer as entrepreneur of itself, emphasis on “the choice” <u>Articulations that construe the “consumer”</u> : engagement in the future and nature <u>Articulations that depict identity of the label</u> : enabler of consumption choice, provides a guarantee, trust, transparency	The consumer as entrepreneur of itself, emphasis on “the choice” <u>Articulations that construe the “consumer”</u> : eco suits you, good for your pocket, wants to make responsible choices, skeptical of green claims <u>Articulations that depict identity of the label</u> : independent, enabler of consumption choice, trustworthy, reliable, provides a guarantee

Analytical categories	Analytical questions	Marine Stewardship Council	UTZ	Rainforest Alliance
Fields of visibility	What is illuminated and defined, and what is obscured? What problems and solutions thereto are shown?	<u>Illuminated and visible</u> : the theory of change, sustainable development as the “journey” to improvements, connects issues of climate to biodiversity <u>Key site</u> : communities, where consumers engage, care for others and have power <u>Problematized</u> : unsustainable fishing, finite resources and fragile ecosystem, the future <u>Obscured</u> : whether fish really is a property of human society, problems of consumption <u>Solutions</u> : sustainable development	<u>Illuminated and visible</u> : the UTZ loop that connects farmers to companies that promote demand,” making sustainable farming the norm”, connects issues of climate to social responsibility <u>Problematized</u> : finite resources and fragile ecosystems, the future, structural issues that certifications cannot solve <u>Obscured</u> : problems of consumption <u>Solutions</u> : sustainable development, need of different actors working together	<u>Illuminated and visible</u> : makes climate change concrete by introducing farmers and their individual experiences, narrative of how the breakfast tables around the world are produced, the “journey” to improvements, emphasizes importance of economic incentives, connects issues of climate to social responsibility and inequality <u>Key site</u> : communities, where consumers engage, care for others and have power <u>Problematized</u> : agriculture as major contributor to GHG emissions and labor abuse, the “unethical” economy <u>Obscured</u> : problems of consumption <u>Solutions</u> : sustainable development
Technologies	By what technologies, procedures and vocabularies is governing accomplished?	<u>Technologies of performance</u> : using market forces and labels as instruments <u>Technologies of agency</u> : the consumer’s choice as the tool for change	<u>Technologies of performance</u> : using market forces and labels as instruments <u>Technologies of agency</u> : the consumer’s choice as one of the tools for change, but also partnerships with companies, farmers, NGOs, governments	<u>Technologies of performance</u> : using market forces and labels as instruments <u>Technologies of agency</u> : the consumer’s choice as the tool for change
Forms of knowledge	Which forms of knowledge arise from and inform the activity of governing? Which attempts to regulate and reform regimes of practice occur?	Market practices and power of demand Sustainable development is source of improvement Awareness of differences in practice and concern about climate in different cultures and regions	Market practices and power of demand Sustainable farming is source of improvement Awareness of the fact that practice and concern about climate differs in different cultures and regions Political engagement with other actors (governments, international arena)	Market practices, economic incentives and power of demand Sustainable development is source of improvement Political engagement with other actors (governments, international arena)
Formation of identities	What identities are assumed and which transformations are sought? What forms of conduct are expected and how are some forms of conduct problematized?	The consumer as entrepreneur of itself, emphasis on “the choice” <u>Articulations that construe “consumer” agency</u> : demand, “power of you”, encourage and drive change by buying <u>Articulations that depict identity of the label</u> : independent, transparent, inclusive, traceability, credibility, impartial, non-profit, enabler of consumption choice	The consumer as entrepreneur of itself, emphasis on “the choice” <u>Articulations that construe “consumer” agency</u> : limit on the power of consumer, also lends agency to other actors <u>Articulations that depict identity of the label</u> : enabler of consumption choice, innovative, helps and safeguards farmers and resources, trustworthy,	The consumer as entrepreneur of itself, emphasis on “the choice” <u>Articulations that construe the “consumer”</u> : an informed consumer that can distinguish which labels “walk the walk”, <u>Articulations that depict identity of the label</u> : independent, active in policy discussions

Analytical categories	Analytical questions	<i>Svenskt Sigill (Swedish Seal)</i>	<i>Fairtrade</i>
Fields of visibility	What is illuminated and defined, and what is obscured? What problems and solutions thereto are shown?	<u>Illuminated and visible</u> : the life cycle, connects issues of climate to biodiversity, food safety, origin, animal welfare, prioritizes origin but climate certification can be added <u>Problematized</u> : fragile ecosystems, the future <u>Obscured</u> : problems of consumption <u>Solutions</u> : sustainable development	<u>Illuminated and visible</u> : connects issues of climate to social responsibility <u>Problematized</u> : finite resources and fragile ecosystems, the future, structural issues that certifications cannot solve <u>Obscured</u> : problems of consumption <u>Solutions</u> : sustainable development
Technologies	By what technologies, procedures and vocabularies is governing accomplished?	<u>Technologies of performance</u> : using market forces and labels as instruments <u>Technologies of agency</u> : the consumer's choice as the tool for change	<u>Technologies of performance</u> : using market forces and labels as instruments <u>Technologies of agency</u> : the consumer's choice as one of the tools for change, but also partnerships with companies, farmers, NGOs, governments
Forms of knowledge	Which forms of knowledge arise from and inform the activity of governing? Which attempts to regulate and reform regimes of practice occur?	Market practices and power of demand Sustainable development is source of improvement	Market practices and power of demand Sustainable farming is source of improvement Political engagement with other actors (governments, international arena)
Formation of identities	What identities are assumed and which transformations are sought? What forms of conduct are expected and how are some forms of conduct problematized?	The consumer as entrepreneur of itself, emphasis on "the choice" <u>Articulations that construe the "consumer"</u> : make a difference, food that does and tastes good, demand <u>Articulations that depict identity of the label</u> : independent, traceability, guarantee, enabler of consumption choice	The consumer as entrepreneur of itself, emphasis on "the choice" <u>Articulations that construe the "consumer"</u> : "citizen-consumer", emphasis on food quality, motivated to pay premium price, make a difference, <u>Articulations that depict identity of the label</u> : raises awareness, empowers workers, enabler of consumption choice, ethical, independent

7 References

Agrifood economics centre (2016). <http://www.agrifood.se/about.aspx>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Bain, Carmen & Hatanaka, Maki (2010). "The Practice of Third-Party Certification: Enhancing Environmental Sustainability and Social Justice in the Global South?", in Higgins, Vaughan & Larner, Wendy (red.) (2010). *Calculating the social: standards and the reconfiguration of governing*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan

Boström, Magnus & Klintman, Mikael (2011). *Eco-standards, product labelling and green consumerism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Busch, Lawrence. (2011). *Standards: recipes for reality*. Cambridge: MIT Press

Dean, Mitchell. (2011). *Governmentality power and rule in modern society*. Johanneshov: TPB

Esaiasson, Peter, Gilljam, Mikael Oscarsson, Henrik & Wängnerud, Lena (red.) (2012). *Metodpraktikan: konsten att studera samhälle, individ och marknad*. 4., [rev.] uppl. Stockholm: Norstedts juridik

Foucault, Michel, Senellart, Michel. & Davidson, Arnold Ira. (2007). *Security, territory, population: lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan

Fuchs, Doris, Kalfagianni, Agni & Havinga, Tetty (2009). Actors in private food governance: the legitimacy of retail standards and multistakeholder initiatives with civil society participation. *Agriculture and Human Values* September 2011, Volume 28, Issue 3, pp 353-367

Henman, Paul & Dean, Mitchel (2010). "E-government and the Production of Standardized Individuality", in Higgins, Vaughan & Larner, Wendy (red.) (2010). *Calculating the social: standards and the reconfiguration of governing*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan

Higgins, Vaughan, Dibden, Jacqui & Cocklin, Chris (2010). "Adapting Standards: The Case of Environmental Management Systems in Australia", in Higgins, Vaughan & Larner, Wendy (red.) (2010). *Calculating the social: standards and the reconfiguration of governing*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan

Higgins, Vaughan & Wendy Larner (2010). "From Standardization to Standardizing Work", in Higgins, Vaughan & Larner, Wendy (red.) (2010). *Calculating the social: standards and the reconfiguration of governing*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan

Higgins, Vaughan & Wendy Larner (2010). "Standards and Standardization as a Social Scientific Problem", in Higgins, Vaughan & Larner, Wendy (red.) (2010). *Calculating the social: standards and the reconfiguration of governing*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan

International Agri-Food Network (2016). <http://www.agrifood.net/>
[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

International Agri-Food Network (2015). *Discussion paper: Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue Segment on Sustainable Agriculture*.
<http://www.agrifood.net/position-papers/60-discussion-paper-multi-stakeholder-dialogue-segment-on-sustainable-agriculture/file>
[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Klintman, Mikael, Boström, Magnus, Ekelund, Lena & Lindén, Anna-Lisa (2008). *Maten märks: förutsättningar för konsumentmakt*. Research Report in Sciology, 2008:1. Lund university, Lund.

Liljenstople, Carolina & Elofsson, Katarina (2009). *Miljömärkning för konsumenten, producenten eller miljön?* Jordbruksverket.
http://www2.jordbruksverket.se/webdav/files/SJV/trycksaker/Pdf_rapporter/ra0912.pdf
[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Miller, Peter & Rose, Nikolas S. (2008). *Governing the present: administering economic, social and personal life*. Cambridge: Polity

Minx, Jan, Kate Scott, Glen Peters & John Barrett (2008). *WWF Sweden 2008: An analysis of Sweden's carbon footprint*. Stockholm Environment Institute

Oels, Angela (2005) Rendering climate change governable: From biopower to advanced liberal government?, *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 7:3, 185-207, DOI: 10.1080/15239080500339661

Rose N, O'Malley P, Valverde M, 2006, "Governmentality" *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 2(1) 83-104

Smith P., M. Bustamante, H. Ahammad, H. Clark, H. Dong, E. A. Elsidig, H. Haberl, R. Harper, J. House, M. Jafari, O. Masera, C. Mbow, N. H. Ravindranath, C. W. Rice, C. Robledo Abad, A. Romanovskaya, F. Sperling, and F. Tubiello

2014: Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU). In: Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Edenhofer, O., R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, E. Farahani, S. Kadner, K. Seyboth, A. Adler, I. Baum, S. Brunner, P. Eickemeier, B. Kriemann, J. Savolainen, S. Schlömer, C. von Stechow, T. Zwickel and J.C. Minx (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA

Swedish Environmental Protection Agency (2013). *Konsumtionsbaserade utsläpp av växthusgaser, hushållens konsumtion per område*.

<http://www.naturvardsverket.se/Sa-mar-miljon/Statistik-A-O/Vaxthusgaser-utslapp-per-konsumtionsomrade-Sverige/#>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Teorell, Jan & Svensson, Torsten (2007). Att fråga och att svara: samhällsvetenskaplig metod. 1. uppl. Stockholm: Liber

Walters, William, *Governmentality: critical encounters*, Routledge, London, 2012

Winther Jørgensen, Marianne & Phillips, Louise (2000). Diskursanalys som teori och metod. Lund: Studentlitteratur

Yngfalk, C 2012, *The Constitution Of Consumption. [Elektronisk Resurs] : Food Labeling And The Politics Of Consumerism*, n.p.: Stockholm : School of Business, Stockholm University, 2012 (Stockholm : US-AB), Library catalogue (Lovisa), EBSCOhost, viewed 7 April 2016.

7.1 Grocery stores' lists of green food labels

Axfood. "Certifieringar och miljömärkningar".

<http://www.axfood.se/sv/Hallbarhet/Kundens-val/Markningar/>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

ICA (no date). "Märkningar som guidar rätt"

<http://www.ica.se/ica-tar-ansvar/markningar/>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

COOP (no date). "Våra utmärkta märken"

<https://www.coop.se/Vart--ansvar/Hallbar-konsumtion/Vad-betyder-markningen/Vara-utmarkta-marken/>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Swedish Board of Agriculture (no date). "Miljömärken på mat"

<http://www.livsmedelsverket.se/globalassets/matvanor-halsa-miljo/miljo/markesguiden.pdf?id=6756>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

7.2 Material used in the analysis

Demeter a (no date) ”Regler”

<http://www.demeter.nu/index.php?id=5>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Demeter b (no date) ”Odlingsmetoden”

<http://www.demeter.nu/index.php?id=4>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Demeter c (no date) ”Odlare”

<http://www.demeter.nu/index.php?id=12>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Demeter d (no date) ”De biodynamiska preparaten”

<http://www.demeter.nu/index.php?id=17>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Demeter e (no date) ”Forskning”

<http://www.demeter.nu/index.php?id=10>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Demeter g (no date) ”Konsumenter: kvalitet”

<http://www.demeter.nu/index.php?id=6>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Demeter h (no date) ”Om oss”

<http://www.demeter.nu/index.php?id=1>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

EU eco a (no date) ”Eco label suits you”

<http://ec.europa.eu/environment/ecolabel/documents/EU%20Ecolabel%20leaflet.pdf>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

EU eco b (no date) ”The EU ecolabel”

http://ec.europa.eu/environment/ecolabel/index_en.htm

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

EU eco c (no date) "Information and contacts"

<http://ec.europa.eu/environment/ecolabel/information-and-contacts.html>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

EU eco d (no date) "More about the ecolabel"

<http://ec.europa.eu/environment/ecolabel/the-ecolabel-scheme.html>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

EU eco e (no date) "EU ecolabel for consumers"

<http://ec.europa.eu/environment/ecolabel/eu-ecolabel-for-consumers.html>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Fairtrade a (no date) "Our vision and mission"

<http://www.fairtrade.net/about-fairtrade/our-vision.html>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Fairtrade b (no date) "Certifying Fairtrade"

<http://www.fairtrade.net/about-fairtrade/certifying-fairtrade.html>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Fairtrade c (no date) "Kort om Fairtrade"

<http://fairtrade.se/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Kort-om-Fairtrade.pdf>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Fairtrade (2009a). "Theory of change"

http://www.fairtrade.net/fileadmin/user_upload/content/2009/resources/140112_Theory_of_Change_and_Indicators_Public.pdf

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Fairtrade (2009b). "A charter of fair trade principles"

http://fairtrade-advocacy.org/images/Charter_of_Fair_Trade_principles_EN_v1.2.pdf

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Fairtrade (2009c) "Fairtrade at a glance"

http://www.fairtrade.net/fileadmin/user_upload/content/2009/resources/2012_Fair_trade_at_a_Glance_English.pdf

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Fairtrade (2015a). "Annual report"

<http://annualreport.fairtrade.net/en/>

○ Fairtrade (2015b) "Journeys to change"

<http://annualreport.fairtrade.net/en/journeys-to-change/>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Fairtrade (2016a). "Fairtrade's global strategy"

<http://www.fairtrade.net/about-fairtrade/our-vision/our-strategy.html>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

KRAV (2014a). "Rester av kemiska bekämpningsmedel i mat"

<http://www.krav.se/nyhet/rester-av-kemiska-bekampningsmedel-i-mat>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

KRAV (2014b). "Hälsa"

<http://www.krav.se/halsa>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

KRAV (2015a). "Vårt manifest"

<http://www.krav.se/vart-manifest>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

KRAV (2015b). "Policyer"

<http://www.krav.se/policyer>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

KRAV (2015c). "GMO-policy"

<http://www.krav.se/kravs-gmo-policy>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

KRAV (2015d). "Hållbarhetspolicy"

<http://www.krav.se/hallbarhetspolicy-krav>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

KRAV (2015e). "Vetenskapligt råd"

<http://www.krav.se/vetenskapligt-rad>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

KRAV (2016a). "Matens kretslopp"

<http://www.krav.se/matens-kretslopp>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

KRAV (2016b). "#vimedKRAV"

<http://www.krav.se/vimedkrav>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

KRAV (2016c). "Organisationen KRAV"

<http://www.krav.se/organisationen-krav>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

KRAV (2016d). "Kravs vision"

<http://www.krav.se/kravs-vision>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

KRAV (2016e). ”Kontrollen”
<http://www.krav.se/kontrollen>
[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

KRAV (2016g). ”Joel brinner för jordhälsa”
<http://www.krav.se/joel-brinner-jordhalsa>
[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Marine Stewardship Council a (no date). ”Changing behavior”
<https://www.msc.org/about-us/changing-behaviour>
[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Marine Stewardship Council b (no date). ”Harnessing market forces to achieve positive environmental change”
<https://www.msc.org/documents/msc-brochures/msc-theory-of-change>
[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Marine Stewardship Council c (no date). ”Strategic plan”
<https://www.msc.org/about-us/governance/strategic-plan>
[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Marine Stewardship Council d (no date). ”The MSC standards”
<https://www.msc.org/about-us/standards/msc-standards>
[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Marine Stewardship Council h (no date). ”Ocean to plate traceability”
<https://www.msc.org/about-us/ocean-to-plate-traceability>
[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Marine Stewardship Council i (no date). ”Governance”
<https://www.msc.org/about-us/governance>
[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Marine Stewardship Council j (no date). ”10 facts about the MSC”
<https://www.msc.org/about-us/10-facts>
[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Marine Stewardship Council k (no date). ”Fish and kids”
<https://fishandkids.msc.org/en>
[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Marine Stewardship Council (2014a). ” What is the MSC and why is certified sustainable seafood important?”
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3rVeSBdpO6Q>
[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Marine Stewardship Council (2015a). "Annual report 2014-2015"
<https://www.msc.org/documents/msc-brochures/annual-report-archive/annual-report-2014-15-english>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Rainforest Alliance a (no date). "Vårt arbete med att bekämpa klimatförändringar"
<http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/sv/work/climate>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Rainforest Alliance b (no date). "Klimatsmart jordbruk"
<http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/sv/work/climate/climate-smart-agriculture>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Rainforest Alliance c (no date). "Ensuring our integrity"
<http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/about/integrity>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Rainforest Alliance d (no date). "Our work in sustainable agriculture"
<http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/work/agriculture>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Rainforest Alliance (2013a). "Sustainability that sells"
<http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/publications/sustainability-that-sells>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Rainforest Alliance (2014a). "Annual report"
<http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/publications/ar-2014>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Rainforest Alliance (2015a). "Overview"
http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/sites/default/files/publication/pdf/overview_EN_150608-Final.pdf

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Rainforest Alliance (2015b). "Impacts report"
http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/sites/default/files/publication/pdf/SAN_RA_Impacts_Report_Executive_Summary.pdf

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Svenskt Sigill (2014a). "Svenskt Sigill"
<http://sigill.se/IP-STANDARD/KONTROLLMARKET-SVENSKT-SIGILL/EN-VAG-TILL-BATTRE-MAT--BLOMMOR/SVENSKT-SIGILL/>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Svenskt Sigill (2015a). ”Ett märke som gör skillnad”
<http://sigill.se/IP-STANDARD/KONTROLLMARKET-SVENSKT-SIGILL/EN-VAG-TILL-BATTRE-MAT--BLOMMOR/ETT-MARKE-SOM-GOR-SKILLNAD/>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Svenskt Sigill (2015b). ”Fem löften”
<http://sigill.se/IP-STANDARD/KONTROLLMARKET-SVENSKT-SIGILL/EN-VAG-TILL-BATTRE-MAT--BLOMMOR/FEM-LOFTEN-/>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Svenskt Sigill (2015c). ”Svenskt Sigill och gentekniken”
<http://sigill.se/IP-STANDARD/KONTROLLMARKET-SVENSKT-SIGILL/EN-VAG-TILL-BATTRE-MAT--BLOMMOR/Svenskt-Sigill-och-gentekniken/>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Svenskt Sigill (2015d). ”Maten och miljön”
<http://sigill.se/IP-STANDARD/KONTROLLMARKET-SVENSKT-SIGILL/EN-VAG-TILL-BATTRE-MAT--BLOMMOR/MATEN-och-MILJON/>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Svenskt Sigill (2015e). ”Certifierade företag”
<http://sigill.se/IP-STANDARD/KONTROLLMARKET-SVENSKT-SIGILL/EN-VAG-TILL-BATTRE-MAT--BLOMMOR/CERTIFIERADE-FORETAG/>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

Svenskt Sigill (2015f). ”Bli en trygg leverantör”
<http://sigill.se/IP-STANDARD/CERTIFIERING-ENLIGT-IP/CERTIFIERING-ENLIGT-IP/>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

UTZ a (no date). ”About UTZ”
<https://www.utz.org/who-we-are/about-utz/>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

UTZ b (no date). ”Governance & committees”
<https://www.utz.org/who-we-are/governance-committees/>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

UTZ c (no date). ”How UTZ works”
<https://www.utz.org/who-we-are/about-utz/how-utz-works/>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

UTZ d (no date). ”Traceability system”
<https://www.utz.org/what-we-offer/traceability-system/>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

UTZ (2015a). "Annual report 2015"

<https://www.utz.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/UTZ-Annual-Report-2015.pdf>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

UTZ (2016a). "Impact Report 2016"

https://www.utz.org/?attachment_id=6120

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]

UTZ (2016b). "The UTZ loop"

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m-fURrQI1wU>

[Accessed: 2016-05-19]