

**The co-operative business ethos:
It's contribution to sustainable local food supply
An investigation of retailer co-operatives in Finland and Italy**

Martin Hingley (corresponding author), University of Lincoln Business School, Brayford Pool Lincoln LN6 7TS, UK. mhingley@lincoln.ac.uk Tel +44 (0) 1522 882000

Minna Mikkola, Ruralia Institute, University of Helsinki, Lönnrotinkatu 7, 50100 Mikkeli, Finland. minna.mikkola@helsinki.fi Tel +358 (0)44 300 1280

Maurizio Canavari and Daniele Ascoli, Dipartimento di Economia e Ingegneria agrarie (DEIAgra), Università di Bologna, viale Giuseppe Fanin, 50 - I-40127 Bologna, Italy.
maurizio.canavari@unibo.it, daniele.ascoli@unibo.it Tel +39-0512096108

Abstract

Investigated is the premise that co-operative organisational structures, for reasons of their long-term socially responsible origins are at the forefront of development of local and sustainable food systems and are thereby in a position to offer a specific contribution to sustainable business development. To this end retail co-operation is highlighted because of its ideals: member mutualism and community/stakeholder centred business (Hingley, 2010; Novkovic, 2008); with the focus on retailer co-operative businesses in Europe.

The context of the paper is in the supply of local and sustainable food, and retailer co-operatives as their entry points within local conditions. Emphasis is on localised food networks and connection between environmentally as well as socially sustainable production, distribution and consumption (Duffy *et al*, 2005; Jones *et al*, 2004; Weatherell *et al*, 2003).

Two key research questions are proposed: Does the co-operative organisational structure and ethos contribute specifically and uniquely to sustainable local food marketing? Secondly, do European retailer co-operatives express support for re-localising food systems; and what contribution do they make concerning sustainable food and their relationships with local food suppliers? The paper is structured in the following way. The concept and context of sustainability in food production, marketing and distributive systems is explored; and an understanding of the importance of the definition of local food outlined. The historical and contextual development and business orientation of retailer co-operatives is investigated, specifically concerning their impact on ethical and socially oriented business, which has reached more recent attention as a business model and philosophy under the guise of Corporate Social Responsibility- CSR.

This study makes a contribution to knowledge concerning the role of co-operatives and the co-operative ethos in sustainable food system production and development of

the local food economy; and thereby a positive contribution to (most notably) sustainable communities. Co-operative ethos concerning responsible and ethical behaviour is to the fore in co-operative retailer chains in the two European countries investigated, and this corroborates prior studies linking the distinct inclination and contribution of co-operative retail businesses in building and maintaining community networks/social responsibility and so forth; via support for local food networks (Hingley, 2010).

Keywords

Local food supply, co-operative business ethos, retailer co-operatives, Europe, sustainability

**The co-operative business ethos:
It's contribution to sustainable local food supply
An investigation of retailer co-operatives in Finland and Italy**

Introduction

This paper investigates the rationale for local and sustainable food systems (environmentally sustainable and local stakeholder oriented) and consumer co-operatives as their entry points within local conditions. Emphasis is on localised food networks and connection between environmentally as well as socially sustainable production, distribution and consumption (Duffy *et al*, 2005; Jones *et al*, 2004; Weatherell *et al*, 2003). This emphasis recalls the orientation towards more sustainable production and consumption embedded in local reciprocity (Morgan & Sonnino, 2008) through community members' multiple roles and liabilities in business (Feenstra, 1997; Renting *et al*., 2003; Seyfang, 2006). The concept of a local and sustainable food system is understood here as a social force for open food supply chain coordination by local businesses (Mikkola, 2008) rather than locally defensive disconnection in terms of new suppliers (Hinrichs, 2003).

Investigated is the premise that co-operative organisational structures, for reasons of their long-term socially responsible origins are at the forefront of development of local and sustainable food systems and are thereby in a position to offer a specific contribution to sustainable market development. To this end retail co-operation is highlighted because of its ideals: member mutualism and community/stakeholder centred business (Hingley, 2010; Novkovic, 2008); with the focus on retail consumer co-operative businesses in Europe. Two key research questions are proposed: Firstly, is there a pre-determination of co-operatives to issues of sustainable and local food sourcing given the historical and practical context of their ethical/socially responsible and stakeholder-based business model? Secondly, do co-ops express support for re-localising food systems and what contribution do they make concerning sustainable food and their relationships with local food suppliers?

The paper is structured in the following way. The concept and context of sustainability in food production, marketing and distributive systems is explored; and an understanding of the importance of the definition of local food outlined. The historical and contextual development and business orientation of retail consumer co-operatives is investigated, specifically concerning their impact on ethical and socially oriented business, which has reached more recent attention as a business model and philosophy under the guise of Corporate Social Responsibility- CSR. Research objectives are to explore the nature and context of comparative (European) co-operative businesses, concerning their inclination to support sustainable food systems through implementation of a local food economy, thereby:

- To understand whether co-operative organisational structure can contribute specifically and uniquely to sustainable local food marketing
- To determine whether mutualism and member roles as multi-party stakeholders induce the implementation of local/sustainable food economies

The method of investigation is through analysis of secondary published data in addition to a two country co-operative sector analysis and comparison. The countries chosen are Finland (for reasons of strong market penetration of retail co-operatives) and Italy (for reasons of medium-strong co-operative orientation and sophistication in regional, local and speciality food marketing). Personal depth interviews with management at multi-tier levels (from central and controlling and regional management to store level) are made with leading retail co-operative chains in these countries and findings presented from derived exploratory qualitative analysis. Finally we make recommendations for future research concerning the direction of local and sustainable food supply and role of co-operation in its development.

Exchange relations

Economic exchange is organised through market, hierarchy, partnership and social relations, allowing trade to develop by mechanisms of price, authority and trust (Adler, 2001). While market economy clearly is the foundational economic frame within Europe (Founding Treaties of European Union, 1957), the market or hierarchy (or power) relations active in exchange relations may exhibit additional strands such as partnership (Powell, 1990) and extend to acquire social tones between parties of exchange, either across or within organizational structures as embedded in social reality of economic life (Granovetter, 1985). The framing of market economy as formal economy may thus include twists of economy as instituted process, as originally held by Polanyi (2001 [1957]). “The substantive meaning of economics derives from man’s dependence for his living upon nature and his fellows”. This refers to the interchange of man with his natural and social environment, “in so far as this results in supplying him with the means of material want satisfaction” (Polanyi, 2001, 31 [1957]). In general, exchange relations may consist of not only of one strand but various ones, combining features of market and hierarchy (Bradach & Eccles, 1989) and additionally partnership and social ties, building a relational mix of four strands in varying combinations (Mikkola, 2008).

Networking through exchange relations

While market exchange relations seem to offer benefits in economic success for individual businesses (Swedberg, 1994), partnership and social relations between parties of exchange appear to offer more flexibility, future security and shared successes as well as losses (Powell, 1990). Competitive advantage is a real benefit to be extracted from stable supply chain relations, enabling businesses to limit competition at individual firm’s level and to join competition between supply chains (Porter, 1985) and more particularly, between strategic networks (Jarillo, 1988). The understanding of the importance of relationships in a business network context has been fully explored in the work of many relationship and network theorists (Anderson, Håkansson and Johansson, 1994; Håkansson and Snehota, 1995). However, a network mode of economic exchange relations, called ‘socially overlaid network’, whereby parties exhibit strong locally built partnership and social relations,

has been identified to support economic viability of supply chains (Mikkola, 2008) and Adler (2001) speculates with the possibility that future exchange relations within economic life may be based on increasingly socially organised exchange relations, including a strong strand of partnership with a critical component of reflective trust.

Development of power positions within food supply chains

The modern food system has witnessed food supply chain reconstruction. Increasing concentration within the levels (or nodes) of supply chains (Hingley, 2001) has been realized in general by enlargement, specialization and technological sophistication of businesses trading with one another within the supply chain (Hingley, 2005; Atkins & Bowler, 2001). This pattern means more mechanized and specialized but fewer farms feeding into technologically more sophisticated and fewer processors selling their commodities to fewer expanding (international) retail chains (Fearne and Hughes, 2000). The power position has gradually shifted from producers to processors to retailers, from producer oriented supply to consumer oriented demand (Atkins & Bowler, 2001; Hingley, 2005). The change implies a weakened position of primary producers' vis-à-vis that of processors and retailers; and in similar vein, the weakened position of processors vis-à-vis retailers (Atkins & Bowler, 2001). Developments at farm level include movement towards large industrial farms, drawn into globally networked food complexes or small-scale pluri-active family farms operating on local and regional markets; whereby 'farms 'in the middle' struggle to secure their livelihoods or to move towards either mode of farming (Atkins & Bowler, 2001; Bowler et al., 1996; Stevenson, 2005). The processors try to push on with their brands, offering visibility and seeking connection with consumers in the market, but are contested by retailers which sell their 'own brand' (or private label) products and mask the processor's identity (Atkins & Bowler, 2001; Hingley, 2005). The suppliers are 'cornered' by retailers' direct and electronic buying; and this kind of trade can take place without any negotiations at all (Vihma, 2005). Finally, retailers compete heavily on the market which is often very concentrated and dominated by a few chains only, such that in Finland two retailers have a respective share of 72 % (Atkins & Bowler, 2001), which grew to 76% in 2005 (Mikkonen, 2005).

Finland has a particularly high penetration of retail co-operation. Of a population of some 5.3 million inhabitants, the S-group alone has 1.8 million households registered as members (equivalent to approximately three and a half million people associated with the S-group in some way). The Italian retail market has a different structure because of a delay in the development towards the growth of large scale retailing compared to other European countries. In Italy the share of total household consumption expenditure for packaged food in large-scale retailing was 71.3% in 2009, but the share of fresh produce drops to 34.1% (Coop, 2010: 186). Retail co-operation plays an important role, since two retail co-ops (COOP and CONAD) are among the leading retail companies. However, the retail market is far less concentrated than in Finland. Under heavy mutual competition, the retail chains also deploy global buyer alliances to control the product range in order to balance

maximum consumer choice against limiting the product range to the one of highest sales potential (Atkins & Bowler, 2001; Hollingsworth, 2004). Within this competition, local food, representing smallish food businesses with limited geographic marketing range, has gained new significance through consumer interest in local the economy and ecology of food production (Jones et al., 2004, Weatherell et al., 2004). Sustainability issues are raising concerns among various food businesses such as catering, processing, retailing and farming, whereby efforts are made to introduce connections between local demand and supply in the US as well as in Europe (Block et al., 2008; Friedmann, 2007; Morgan & Sonnino, 2008).

Sustainable food system

Sustainable development as an overarching concept (WCED, 1987) implies a sustainable food system entailing more equal economic exchange, socio-cultural developments and environmental considerations integrated with economic progress (Morgan & Sonnino, 2008). As its grounding concept, sustainable development, the idea of sustainable food system is normatively oriented albeit methodically loose: there is hardly a prescription for various multi-stakeholder and multi-level measures appropriate for progress towards increased sustainability in terms of food systems. Rather, sustainable food systems are based on on-going negotiations between system actors concerning (often incremental) measures available by each party within food supply chains (Morgan & Sonnino, 2008). The negotiations may acquire economic emphasis, dealing with 'weak' economic sustainability, or stress the complex of ecology, economy and socio-cultural aspects, aiming at 'strong' sustainability (Jacobs, 1999). However, economic sustainability may be seen as a precondition for subsequent investments and activities towards ecological or social sustainability; particularly the strengthening of farmers' position within supply chains (Mikkola, 2008). The challenge of ecological sustainability of the food system seems to have become a major endeavour, as about one third of environmental impacts of European total consumption pertain to food and drink (Tukker et al., 2006). The corrective measures to limit environmental impacts of consumption such as climate change, eutrophication, ozone creation, acidification and resource depletion are to be implemented by a drastic number of businesses and consumers (Tukker et al., 2006), emphasising economic sustainability while creating new environmentally and socially sustainable ways to deal with food.

Local and organic food

Citizen-consumers' (a notion developed by Spaargaren, 1997) perspectives on local and organic food as interpreted and advocated academically, often emphasize the importance of these as epitomes of sustainable food systems. Local food, although more or less opaque as a concept, thus represents environmental concerns, local livelihoods and economies embedded in place (Seyfang, 2006; Weatherell et al., 2003) as well as citizens' local involvement and good social relations (Feenstra, 1997). Within a globalized food system, re-localization efforts "celebrate" "the local"

vis-à-vis “the global” (Morgan & Sonnino, 2008, p 1-19), whereby local is seen as “radical and subversive” in contrast to global as “hegemonic and oppressive” (Born & Purcell, 2006, p 200, in Morgan & Sonnino, 2008, p 1-19). The re-localization movement has advocated a “proximate system” of “locally grown food, regional trading associations, locally owned processing, local currency, and local control over politics and regulation” (Kloppenburg et al., 2000). Learning to re-localize has been identified as a challenge among food system actors (Morgan & Murdoch, 2000; Seppänen, 2004; Seppänen et al., 2006). The original concept of “foodshed” by Kloppenburg et al. (1996) as well as “terroir” of Barham (2002) refer to bio-regionalist connotations of satisfaction for ‘belongingness’ and cultural identity of communities, conveying the identification with and livelihoods due to regional natural environment and its resources (McGinnis, 1999; Ranaboldo & Schejtman, 2009). Furthermore, food transportation, with its negative implications of energy consumption, pollution and additional cost, is suggested to be cut by more re-localized food systems (Morgan & Sonnino, 2008, p 1-19; Poikolainen, 2004; Paxton, 1994; Pretty et al., 2005). In short, as a concept, local food advocates decentralization (understood as a pillar of sustainable development) and food in sustainable societies is local rather than global (Morgan & Sonnino, 2008).

From the beginning, organic farming represented basically an alternative paradigm of agriculture by its principles and practices such as decentralised, community-based and holistic production methods (Atkins & Bowler, 2001; Beus & Dunlap, 1990; Mononen, 2008; Seppänen, 2004; Seppänen et al., 2006). Organic farming seemed to cause less environmental impacts in terms of nutrient run-offs than the conventional one, and as more labour intensive business, it retained agricultural employment while providing organic farms in general economic returns comparable with those of conventional farms, including state assisted conversion period with certification schemes (Atkins & Bowler, 2001). Obviously, organic food has been considered as an alternative to industrialised food (Magnusson et al., 2003; Morgan & Sonnino, 2008, p. 1-19) and interpreted by consumers as authentic, healthy and environmentally friendly, without pesticides and fertilizers (Hill & Lynchehaun, 2002; Magnusson et al., 2003; Seyfang, 2006). In addition, many studies indicate that in some cases freshness and sensory features of organic food, which are perceived as different compared to conventional counterparts, are important criteria of organic food purchase (Aertsens et al. 2009; Asioli et al. 2011; Kuhar and Juvančič 2010; Magnusson et al. 2001). The market potential of organic food has been suggested to be remarkable, even huge, when supply chains mature and supply and demand match up to one another (Wier & Calverley, 2002).

There are also critical perspectives to local and organic food, which are claimed to dilute the ‘original ideals’, as the conventional sector ‘subsumes the alternative’ (Morgan & Sonnino, 2008, p. 1-19). Through large scale farming industry, conventionalization has, at least locally and regionally, entered into the organic sector (Guthman, 2004). Organic consumption has created an up-market image, which,

however, may not serve to satisfy European consumption at large due to the price premium of organic food (Goodman, 2004). Additionally, it has not been in all cases feasible for consumers to understand the relations between organic quality, quantity and price (Barnes et al., 2009; Klöckner & Ohms, 2009). Organic farming has so far remained a rather limited form of food production and consumption in Europe (Atkins and Bowler, 2001), where its area of the total agricultural land tends to vary from 1 - 2 % in the low end to 15 - 16 % in the high end among European countries (Rohner-Thielen, 2010). In addition, organic farming complies with a (more or less) globally recognized standard and organic food has actually now become a global business. Furthermore, food imports sometimes linked to “fair trade” labelling are often necessary to meet the domestic demand of organic food in developed countries (Fritz & Canavari, 2008).

In similar vein, it has been claimed that the Geographical Indication labelling schemes initially supporting local food have turned to ‘marketing tools’ of international supply chains (Watts et al., 2005, p. 30, in Morgan & Sonnino, 2008, p. 1-19). Furthermore, the local food movement has been evaluated negatively as an ethnocentric “defensive localization”, representing patriotism and “elitist and reactionary” modes of thinking and acting (Hinrichs, 2003). It has also been claimed that economic gains of local production due to local consumption may exacerbate local social injustice (Born & Purcell, 2006, p. 202, in Morgan & Sonnino, 2008, p. 11) by excluding some local producers and consumers (Hinrichs, 2000). Furthermore, parochialism, lack of diversity and action for change has been identified in decentralized societies, counteracting inherently national and international intervention of environmental problems such as climate change (Carter, 2007, p. 58-60, in Morgan & Sonnino, 2008, p. 1-19). Furthermore, the gains in terms of pollution and energy attributed to local food networks has sometimes been questioned (Coley et al., 2009). As local and organic food cannot be suggested to represent ‘pure’ sustainability, they may still be seen as developmental options towards sustainable food systems as embodiments of more equal negotiations between supply chain actors, accessible source of food security and operative platform for increased food safety within the market place and its competitive developments.

Sustainable food has become the core of national food strategies in two European countries, the UK and Finland (Defra, 2010; HM Government, 2010; Huomisen ruoka – Esitys kansalliseksi ruokastrategiaksi, 2010). These strategies stress the competitive character of regional food businesses, along with environmental and health-related aspects of food secured by trade between competent food chain actors, such as farmers, processors, wholesalers, retailers, caterers and consumers/customers. It is noteworthy that the strategies look for increased quality of food, advanced competences of the system actors and the ability of the businesses to compete on the global market. However, Defra (2010) suggests that in order to develop sustainable food systems, particularly in terms of environmental aspects, partnerships are called for in order to research and reorganize supply chains. Furthermore, sustainable

development (implying sustainable food systems) has been declared as the long-term political aim of the European Union by the Treaty of Amsterdam (CEC, 1997) and recommendations for public procurement exemplify sustainable food trade (ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability & Ecoinstitut Barcelona, 2008a,b). In general, governance of trade between businesses within food supply chains reflect both market and partnership relations as strategic networks (Jarrillo, 1988) and possibly even socially overlaid networks (Mikkola, 2008) could be represented within the coordinative mix aiming at sustainable food. In general, Morgan and Sonnino (2008) contend that in sustainable societies ("Green State") food is to a significant extent local (and regional).

Co-operatives as a governance mode

The co-operative approach is recognised as having long standing ethos of social responsibility which has become a governing principle by which many retail co-operatives operate, for example, as with the UK Co-operative who were very early pioneers of social responsibility (Birchall, 1997; Williams, 2005). Co-operatives are democratic organizations, owned and controlled by their members, they are defined by their mutual approach and are governed by controlling values, which include: democratic member control, member economic participation, co-operation among co-operatives and concern for community (Novkovic, 2008; ICA, 1995). Study of co-operatives, therefore, may offer an alternative understanding of and framework for corporate-social and network/stakeholder practice. The development of the UK Co-operative Group in socially responsible and sustainable local food sourcing is chronicled in Hingley (2010). This paper puts forward the case of ethical retailing offered by the UK Co-operative and specifically analyses one of the regional groups. The study demonstrates that it is possible for a co-operative to be creative in local community-based networks and to also preserve and reinforce their traditional organizational values, which can add a distinct (albeit niche) contribution in managing locally sourced food.

The Italian cooperative movement was born during the second half of the nineteenth century. Nowadays it spans many industries and it is particularly prominent in the agriculture/food industry and related services, involving both small enterprises and large corporations; and creating extensive networks of different shape and size (Menzani & Zamagni, 2010). Its presence is widespread in the Italian territory, but coverage is quite uneven, with a more intense role played by this type of organizations in the North-East area of the country. In recent years, the strategy of many Italian cooperatives have been reshaped in order to cope with less favourable economic trends, with the aim to strengthen (among other things) price leadership and contribution to territorial economic development as key pillars of their mission (Lotti, Mensing & Valenti, 2006; COOP, 2010).

The largest Finnish co-op, the S-group has a history since the 19th century as one of the leading consumer co-operation businesses, which has competed with and merged with other smaller and diverse consumer co-operatives. The business concept at large crystallizes into production of services and benefits for customers, who own the co-operative. The S-group claims to have the strategy of being price leader and it has recently expanded strongly with a turnover of 11.8 billion euro in 2008. The co-

operative paid 320 million euro bonuses back to 1.85 million customers in 2009. Today, it consists of 22 regional co-operatives, of which the largest is the one operating in the Helsinki region, with a market share of 23% of the whole group's food business. It operates 27 different business concepts from food business to restaurants, interior decoration and cars as well as hotels, and covers the country with multi-service petrol stations, with additional services such as restaurants and supermarkets. Recently the group entered into the banking and power sectors. The S-group, in its own documentation, emphasises sustainability and makes efforts to market organic food, use renewable energy and looks for novel business concepts. (S-ryhmän vastuullisuuskatsaus, 2009)

Methodology

A qualitative investigation was undertaken in order to identify the complex and evolving situation (Yin, 2003) of new circumstances and relationships and to capture the richness of information (Eisenhardt, 1989) directly from the actors involved. As such this study aims to catch the authentic speech of co-operative retailer actors in topics which are often sensitive; the approach is based on interaction enabling understanding between interviewer and interviewees (Fontana & Frey, 1998). Content analysis was used to identify and condense interviewees' speech regarding research questions in categories which summarize the variation in views (Kvale, 1996). We analyzed each business and interview to gain an understanding of the processes that the respondents underwent and we elaborated on theoretical categories through open, axial and selective coding procedures (Strauss and Corbin, 1998).

The interviews deal with the interviewee's work within the organizational setting and the nature of co-operative business, particularly in terms of local and sustainable foods as well as their suppliers. Furthermore, the local food policies regarding suppliers, customers, marketing and local communities as well as future policy plans are discussed. The results, albeit drawing on limited number of interviews, may have capacity for generalizations in several ways. First, they may seem to represent typical cases (Schofield, 2000), but also investigate an atypical case (Yin, 2003) which reflects an 'ideal' and aspiration in the sector. The generalization of the results may be done by practitioners as natural generalization (Kvale, 1996; Stake, 2000). The two country enquiry is conducted through depth interview to a common research schedule in addition to non-participatory observation (of retailer premises and product selection).

Research questions concern business philosophy, principles, development and policies/practices. Relationships with local food suppliers, managers, customers, retail members and other stakeholders are investigated. Each interview lasted at least an hour and was recorded and transcribed verbatim. Analysis is based on interview with (a.) A senior executive at each of two different leading national retail consumer co-operatives in central management (Italy and Finland: identified as *National Executive Italy* and *National Executive Finland*); (b.) A senior executive at each of the same two

retail co-operatives in regional management (Italy and Finland: identified as *Regional Executive Italy* and *Regional Executive Finland*); (c.) Co-operative supermarket managers with the same two co-operative retailers (Italy and Finland: identified as *Store Manager Italy* and *Store Manager Finland*). These can be described as ‘typical cases’ in terms of management at principal levels of retail co-operation in typically large chains. Additionally, two further interviews took place in the same Finnish retail co-operative chain, with what can be described as a store manager and assistant manager of an ‘ideal’ or aspirational and proactive store with regard to local food supplier engagement and local food product retailing; exemplifying what could be ideally achieved. Their management view is identified as *Ideal Store Manager Finland*. Therefore, in all there are eight depth interviews.

Analysis and discussion of retail co-operative interviews in Finland and Italy

Understanding ‘localness’

The two case co-operative chains analyzed in Italy and Finland have many similar properties. As co-operative retailers social, environmental and ethical policies and benefits of mutuality are espoused in both cases. Aside from the adherence of both to international co-operative principles, they are alike in competitive market positioning in their respective countries and in organisational structure. Both have controlling central co-ordination and a sub-structure consisting of affiliation of regional societies. There are also in both cases diverse brand identities and marketing image associated with tiers of stores based on size (hypermarket, supermarket, neighbourhood and convenience stores and so forth). Interestingly both chains closely emphasise in their range and product marketing national ‘Finnish’ and ‘Italian’ foodstuffs; and particularly in the case of the Italian co-operative, specialities from the Italian regions, rather than ‘local’ products per se. In Finland, the concentration of the food processing industry has led to fewer large companies, the products of which simply embody ‘Finnishness’ and this market position is seen as ‘domestic’ food as opposed to ‘imported food’ and penetrates all regional co-operatives. Therefore, both co-operatives suggest that ‘local’ and ‘national’ food identity can be seen as one and the same in some contexts (especially an export one) whereby local food is ‘Finnish’ or ‘Italian’ food. This does not mean that ‘local’ products (in a micro-vicinity guise) are not encouraged or promoted, but that they tend not to have the marketing emphasis of ‘regional’ and ‘national’ for reasons of scale and consistency across the retail offer. Further, vicinity ‘local’ products tend to be fresh (and thereby) typically unbranded foodstuffs (specifically meat, bakery products, dairy and fruits and vegetables) and consist of volumes often only appropriate to a few or indeed a sole store in the locality. The suppliers of these ‘local’ products may be small in scale and inconsistent or seasonal in output. This begs the question of what the co-operative retailers’ (and the interpretation of what their customers) perceive to be ‘local’ foods and how might this differ from ‘regional’ or even ‘national’ products? The Finnish regional co-operative is actively looking for local products with enough volume and secure deliveries to serve the customers on the southern coast; the customers come from elsewhere in Finland and wish to buy their own local food. The extent of local food sales is reflected by the number of bread suppliers: two of these are large Finnish (inter)national bakeries, and nearly 250 smallish bakeries in more rural Finland. The

Italian co-operative has a specific policy for the promotion of Italian regional food products:

...the local food policy/practices (of the Italian co-op) are based on the promotion of such products under the brand (named co-op house brand for regional products) which enhances a large part of typical Italian food products, such as for instance Parmigiano-Reggiano or Pasta of Gragnano across all the point of sales of (the named Italian co-op). National Executive Italy

This is interpreted in their house branding policy with relation to these specific types of Italian regional specialism products, but does not cover local 'niche' products. Some value is seen in stocking 'local' foods (in completing the general food offer), however, less attention is paid by the co-op to 'local' rather than 'regional', for the reason that:

...a negative aspect of local food business is due to small size and fragmented structures of local food suppliers which cannot meet the requirements in order to be included under the umbrella brand (named co-op house brand for regional products). National Executive Italy

The Finnish co-operative has a similar, but less formalised branding practice and marketing policy. Both retail chains are proactive in promoting products associated with national identity. So, where does this leave local products? Both chains highlight difficulties in promoting relatively localised products. In Finland, fresh produce requires deliveries within the day of the sales; this means (too) expensive logistics for lots that can be small. There is also the question of continuity of the product line. Co-operatives are held to be reliable buyers by suppliers and they offer the small business a 'big chance'. However, the price of this is the demand to guarantee the deliveries in order to develop into 'regular selection', if approved by customers. Further, *National Executive Italy*, is sceptical of the primacy of local food and, for example, does not believe that the policies of many food operators oriented towards the consumption of local food (on the basis of reduced 'food miles') would be sustainable. Such that by this argument:

Sicilian consumers should eat only oranges, or consumers who live in Trentino Alto Adige should eat only apples. National Executive Italy

Perhaps this is slightly facetious, however, certain parts of Italy and Finland are famed for very specific and highly seasonal fresh food products, be it apples or tomatoes in Italy or arctic berries and reindeer in the Finnish north and the retailers' may see it as more advantageous to put their efforts into more consistently marketable regional and national products (i.e. packaged longer life products such as olive oil, cheese, wine and hard breads).

Understanding of just what 'local' food exactly is has sparked a good deal of debate, as seen in the above review of literature, where local can be determined by: a geographic or distance measure or a county/administrative region. It could be defined as a symbol of sustainability and low environmental impact as well as viable local economy, a catalyst for social and community cohesion, a defence against national and global control; it may be synonymous with freshness and higher perceived

quality, or purchase may simply be an emotional expression of linking perceived qualities and 'belonging' to a vicinity:

..consumers identify local products as food produced in a particular small geographic area where they live. Regional Executive Italy

For some 'local' and 'regional' and even 'national' are blurred into one in certain circumstances and with certain produce. *Store Manager Italy*, for example, believes that 'consumers identify local products as food produced in Italy and not with reference to any particular geographic area'. This is echoed by *National Executive Finland*, for whom 'local product is produced in Finland'. Parmigiano-Reggiano is a case in point where this cheese could be seen to be local (it is actually produced in a distinct geographic area of Northern Italy on a protected production basis; it is also representative of a region (Emilia-Romagna) and a symbol of Italy. Because of the obvious connection in the mind of Italian consumers of the wealth of their food products, the Italian co-op identify that they 'have no particular aims to develop local food market since the policy of (the national level Italian co-op) and regional co-operative is to develop the business of Italian food rather than food produced in smaller areas'.

Suffice to say, what this study does suggest is that there are no single motives for purchase of local food other than a predominant need for higher perceived quality and freshness (but not at a premium price):

...it is still very difficult to determine what is local food. And I think everyone has his own determination for that. National Executive Finland

However, 'local' seems to be determined mostly by products from the immediate vicinity (often within comparatively few kilometres) and usually concerns perishable fresh products; with the exception of a small amount of seasonal specialities (for example, charcoal for summer outdoor cooking and jams/honey). This is consistent with the findings in Hingley (2010) with respect to local foods sourced by the UK Co-operative in a country where local is predominantly defined by short distances and county affiliation. The Finland co-op define local by greater distances, given the larger size of the country, smaller and more spread out population and greater potential distances between production and consumption. Furthermore, due to the concentrated processing, some products by one large dairy co-operative, for instance, are sold across the country. However, local products start to emerge as 'own label', allowing more trading partners for smallish local dairies.

Local food and the sustainability agenda

In the Italian case, regional and national identity takes precedence over local, for the reasons described; this is mirrored in the Finnish case, but not so overtly. Is there, therefore any potential in the development of clear retailer co-operative policy concerning local products, given the problems of definition, the fragmented and inconsistent nature of supply and demand and difficulties associated with brand identity with what are most generally fresh perishable products? There is clearly some value in promoting products as part of a sustainability agenda and for reasons of investment in social capital. Co-operatives, with their enshrined social and ethical values are well-placed to develop this aspect of local foods. This was shown in the case of the UK regional co-operative society studied in Hingley (2010), for which

local foods encapsulated a host of stakeholder and resultant benefits (for local food producers, environmentally sustainable local retailer business, local consumers, co-operative staff and members and local communities). However, because in neither the Italian nor the Finnish case, promotion of local food was not actual policy for the co-operative businesses (as opposed to regional produce), it was hard to see a consistency of approach. In both chains, local buying was allowed (at store level), but this had to fit in with regional co-operative and national buying policy (and for whom centralised buying and distribution derives economies of scale and movement). The Italian co-operative was more critical of the problems of local food supply for reasons of lack of consistency of volumes of supply and ‘critical mass’ and consequently favoured promotion of regional Italian produce.

An ‘Ideal’ local food retailing scenario

The ‘Ideal’ store in Finland is a ‘non-typical’ example, included in this study to identify what can be achieved against the norm, but within co-operative chain framework. This is a regular sized supermarket of the featured Finnish co-operative chain, but one where regional management allowed store management greater than usual determination over local food buying policy. The Italian Co-op also suggested similar levels of self determination of empowered staff ‘which is not common in other retail co-operative organisations’:

The main advantage of working for (named Italian co-op) is the strong autonomy and the possibility for personnel and members of the cooperative to suggest innovations and propose challenges... Regional Executive Italy

The Italian co-op store managers were free to buy local food products, and have the autonomy to negotiate prices and conditions, it is just that the Italian co-op does not see local as priority equal to regional and national products:

With regard to the nature and development of the relationships with local stakeholders, it is important to mention that only 10% of food products sold in the point of sale are purchased directly by local shops from local suppliers. Shops are free to negotiate prices, quality, quantity of local food products, etc. The relationships between local suppliers – shops are mainly motivated by small volume of supplies of local food products which does not justify, for economic reasons a purchasing at national or regional level. Store Manager Italy

However, the ‘Ideal’ supermarket in the Finnish case stands out as a beacon. It is successful in sourcing and stocking local fresh foods (meat, bakery, fruit and vegetables etc) simply due to the freer hand of the regional co-operative and the proactive nature of local store management:

...we have an autonomous management, a kind of autonomous final marketing, the decision making all in all, investments, the directing of operation. And all this can be within this economic district (the co-operatives regional structure)... Regional Executive Finland

The autonomy allowed at a regional and store level in Finland can be seen as positive and certainly allows for market differentiation in terms of target marketing by income, social type or inclination towards such product ranges as ‘local food’. This can be

admired but provides difficulties from the perspective of the national co-operative in terms of common image and policy strategy; and autonomy is tempered 'by the limitations of being in a chain concept' (*Store Manager Finland*). Within this environment *Regional Executive Finland* had an agenda to establish local supply and actively courted suppliers; and further, did this in conjunction with retail competitors as a local community-wide initiative for local sourcing:

I invited the farmers to a get together, invited the neighboring entrepreneurs, the (retailing) competitors... everyone. Together we planned the things, the brands, the systems. Regional Executive Finland

However, *Regional Executive Finland* quickly found that the burden of establishing and running a local supply initiative fell upon their own organisation, with other retail outlet competitors 'free riding' the initiative. This is consistent with the general pattern of such initiatives, these tend to live and die by the efforts of a lead and sponsoring body, and one that is usually the most significant player in the chain. Again, this view mirrors the UK case in Hingley (2010), where local initiative was reliant on the funding, business organisation and shelf space of a lead co-operative retailer. *Regional Executive Finland* provided the same kind of support, including what amounted to quite a considerable sum of money funded by the regional co-operative.

Regional Executive Finland actively encouraged local supply and marketing skills amongst local suppliers by bringing them together with the consumer 'to learn about the behavior of customers':

...they (local suppliers) are involved in the process and there's as much contact with the customer as possible.... So as close to the consumer as possible, and there is real feedback from there, straight to the producer... Regional Executive Finland

In this way the regional co-operative in Finland acted in an educational and business development role in order to develop local suppliers' business and marketing skills. Additionally, success in such proactive local projects requires enthusiastic and empowered store management. *Ideal Store Manager Finland* was able to fulfil this role. The Finnish regional co-operative retailer management allowed local store flexibility to determine purchase of local foods, as long as these suppliers provided some continuity of supply (not just one-off sales). Again, these were largely fresh perishable foods. There was local negotiation and surprisingly little conflict with suppliers. Local suppliers were encouraged to bring in products to the store and if acceptable, a supply agreement was made. Crucially these products were delivered on a sale or return basis such that:

...their (the local suppliers) goods are on a sales account. Which means that we don't have any risk. So we don't get deficits, instead we pay him according to how much of their goods have been sold. And they've liked it themselves. So they can freely supply us with as much as they want, but they are also liable for the excess. Then it isn't our risk, but his risk. Ideal Store Manager Finland

This is a novel approach for food chain store retailing, but one which interestingly, the retailer believed was actually good for the supplier too; in that it encouraged more directly market oriented behaviour, as SME type suppliers engaged directly with end consumers and enjoyed direct feedback. In this specific case in Finland, resulting direct consumer knowledge concerning tastes and demand patterns meant that suppliers' would rarely be left with unsold items to collect. Pricing was determined by the national and regional co-operative policy on margins, but exact pricing was via local management negotiation. As such *Ideal Store Manager Finland* was considerably empowered and derived increased job satisfaction, where, remarkably, she described her job as 'astonishingly free' in terms of self determination (for example, in terms of meeting with suppliers and tasting the products before making a local buying decision, and setting pricing and supply condition arrangements). In addition, the department managers for each product group in the store were involved in identifying product range gaps and provision overlaps and consequently supported the selection of locally supplied products; and as a result were consequently also empowered:

We have areas of responsibility split for those girls (the in-store product group managers), they are leaders of profit units, all of them. Regional Executive Finland

Pricing was comparable with mainstream central stock for the retailer, but crucially local produce such as meat and bakery items were perceived to have clear advantages in quality and freshness, where directly supplied products:

...don't have to circle through any central store (group centralised supply chain) as they come straight to us. Ideal Store Manager Finland

The only policy of the co-op retailer was that the local product offered these perceived advantages at no additional price to the mainstream alternative. Delivery was made by the supplier to store and quite often the supplier would perform merchandising and shelf stocking tasks, along the lines of vendor managed inventory (VMI) on a micro level:

...we have had the producers themselves do the sales work..., as far as it's possible.... There are ones, who bring goods to our backroom and we then forward them. But then there are suppliers and producers, who place the products on shelves, .. up to the customer service situation, and who also price the product themselves. Regional Executive Finland

Unsold items were collected by the supplier; however, this was a rare event as usually produce sells out quickly, often due to its sheer freshness.

Local food retailing as social and environmental sustainability?

This initiative was a clear success for the Finnish co-operative retailer in consistently courting and sourcing good fresh local foodstuffs and consequently satisfying consumers; and suppliers were provided with a ready market. *Ideal Store Manager Finland* was 'hands on' and could facilitate 'joined up' marketing in action (by bringing supplier and consumer together) running promotional and tasting days and initiating instant feedback from customer research. *Regional Executive Finland*

believed that he fulfilled the wider community objectives of supporting his area and the specific needs of communities and people as a member of a co-operative that is central to the success of that locality:

We have to look at the bigger picture. And our standard of operation in municipalities, in different municipalities that we are living here with in everyday life.... In people's sorrows, problems, joys, grief,.... Regional Executive Finland

Store Manager Finland sums up the co-operative philosophy and point of difference as a situation where:

...everyone benefits, and the customer-owners own the co-operative store, and we in turn aim at producing services and benefits for them as well as possible. And the more the customer-owners trust us the more we can offer them services and benefits. So I think as a business approach... Everyone benefits in some way.

An issue perhaps more pertinent in Finland than other countries (including Italy) is the small population size and the belief that using co-operative services can preserve local business and local jobs, as perhaps the fear of their local businesses being swamped by a multinational concern and the consequent local impact would have more visible implications in Finland. Therefore, trust and loyalty to the community and region were seen as paramount to the Finnish regional co-op and at store level, where it would be seen as unethical to cultivate and develop a supply relationship, only then to invite competitive suppliers to tender for the same business:

(If) We have negotiated things, and he (the supplier) has controlled his own operation according to that, so, then if we start taking from someone else, that's kind of backstabbing them, if we've agreed on things with him. Ideal Store Manager Finland

The importance of the role of the co-operative in sustainability of communities was an issue raised at all levels in the Finnish co-operative case (going back some 20 years as the co-op's response to societal structural changes), with particular respect to Finnish rural depopulation (via migration, especially of younger people to the cities); against a background of small national population spread thinly across a large country. The co-operative felt that it had a duty to maintenance of these communities and that local food had a part to play in this. Further, the co-operative model in Finland had the same view concerning the support of key local services such as pharmacies and postal services. This policy is replicated in the Italian co-op where:

...the collaboration of regional co-operatives and member entrepreneurs (co-operative store member owners) have adopted policies and practices in order to sustain local communities. National Executive Italy

This echoes again the social cohesion and stakeholder network satisfaction argument presented in the Hingley (2010) UK example, where the co-op was involved directly, financially and where members acted as 'community ambassadors'. What can be summarised from the Finnish 'Ideal' example is that a local food marketing network can be established, and that co-operative's store retailers have the ethical trading 'drive' to steer it. It does require extraordinary efforts from personnel in key positions

of regional and store management, but there is no reason why such an initiative could not be 'benchmarked' and applied in a more widespread fashion.

Other 'good practice' (notably from the Finnish co-operative) was in the engagement of members in ongoing feedback concerning the co-operative, its policies and operations. Not surprisingly the co-op benefits from the very high level of internet access and use in Finland and this provides a forum for ad hoc and continuous panel marketing research, via interaction with 'active customers'; whom the co-op can listen to, engage with and consult with on a regular basis. This is a clear advantage of member owned businesses, where members are far more likely to volunteer, respond to and engage with the business organisation than in investor owned firms.

Local foods are accepted by the national and regional co-operative organisations (in an ad hoc fashion) in both Finland and Italy with varying degrees of tolerance, from the norm where local store management buys some supplementary fresh produce locally, to the 'Ideal' where *Ideal Store Manager Finland* was encouraged by the regional co-operative to fully engage with local suppliers, as long as prices were comparable to centrally bought product, perceived qualities were higher and profit margins met the co-operative's formula threshold. So in the Finnish case, for example, to stock a product just because it was 'local' was not deemed sufficient; it had to meet the criteria of offering good value plus supplementary qualities:

...the point that it is a local product, that isn't a purpose in itself... if the goods aren't balanced in their quality and price. Ideal Store Manager Finland

So the customers do buy an awful lot of just these local products. They like the fact that it's from the vicinity. And it is usually fresher. But if the price level becomes so much higher or if the quality isn't that much better....then it isn't profitable. Ideal Store Manager Finland

...there should be one very crucial factor... that it (local food) is as equal as possible in price competition with others...and then these values that it (local food) has: employing the municipality, being domestic... then that's the additional value, with which the customer chooses the product. Regional Executive Finland

By contrast, the view at all levels in both countries concerning organic food was that this group of products did not always offer sufficient value nor have clear identifiable and marketable qualities. There was a general feeling that organic food had peaked in interest and demand. The Finnish co-op stocked organic food, according to *Regional Executive Finland* for its environmentally favourable 'image value', but he was not convinced of its business viability:

...with organic food we're sighing (unhappy) that its position is getting worse and weaker. ... it no longer makes a difference to us merchants, when the image value has blurred, and it has no business value. Regional Executive Finland

In general, organic food was seen by the co-operatives as niche and expensive and not offering good value. Neither co-operative were especially motivated by environmental impact arguments (with respect to production methods for food). Both organisations felt that consumers were more motivated to buy local foods: for reasons of taste, value, freshness and for reasons of local identity; and that the co-operative may benefit from engaging more directly with local food suppliers:

I think a local product is just as good as an organic product. ...And in some ways maybe even better than an organic one, if you'll think, that the organic one (for example) comes from the other side of Finland and the local one comes from here. Ideal Store Manager Finland

... fortunately with local food we've gotten closer to business. Regional Executive Finland

The wider social benefits (from the perspective of the Finnish co-operative) of local foods are in community engagement and building. So, in this sense the sustainability argument for organic food does not seem to have much resonance in either the Italian or Finnish case, but there is some mileage in arguing for social and community benefits associated with local food, although these are again ad hoc as there is no planned strategy concerning local foods in either case. However, it is worth noting that these views did not take into account specific features of organic food and the related issues, such as the avoidance of using synthetic agrochemicals, compliance with stricter animal welfare standards, etc. and being officially recognized as a clearly-defined product category. Last but not least, the source of trust in product quality is currently different, since while organic food is subject to a certification process, local food quality and integrity (unless we are dealing with food specialties with a Geographical Indication) is still completely reliant on trust in suppliers and direct relationships/vicinity, leaving room for possible opportunistic behaviour.

Expansion and limitations of the co-operative retailing approach

In the Finnish and the Italian case the co-operatives have an expansionist view. This has been achieved by both in terms of joint venture with other international co-operative retailers in, for example, other European and Nordic countries and the emerging markets of the Baltic states and Russia, this thereby fulfils the ICA (2005) mission of 'co-operation amongst co-operatives'; and this extends to the retailers' also encouraging co-operative based supply, with, for example, the Italian co-operative encouraging small local food producers toward:

...supplier aggregation through producer organizations or cooperatives or consortium in order to meet requirements to be included under the (named co-op house brand for regional products) for Italian regional product identity. National Executive Italy

Here is further emphasised the difference in approaches between the Italian and Finnish chains, where quite clearly the Italian chain is steering supply towards a critical mass large enough to identify and supply food products on a regional basis, whereas the Finnish chain is not quite so geared up for this. Finland does not have the amount of strongly identifiable food products as are available in Italy and there is not such a pronounced cultural emphasis on food in Finland; and Finnish food is not marketed abroad to the same extent of Italian food.

In both countries co-operative supply is however, comparatively prevalent, with, for example, a very strong dairy co-operative tradition in Finland and a strong amount of collaboration in Italy across many food sectors.

Interestingly, the successful internationalisation approach of both co-op chains is counter to the view held by some that international expansion is difficult to achieve for co-operatives. Davies and Burt (2007) for example, identify that consumer co-operatives find difficulties in this aspect (in comparison with investor owned firms) for the reason of being held back by their ethos and weddedness to the domestic context; with the guiding principles of co-operation not lending themselves to the rapid pace and capital hungry nature of international expansion. In both the Italian and the Finnish co-operative cases expansion does happen, through joint venture with other co-operatives and they appear not to be held back. One point though worth remarking on with regard to the nature of co-operative growth, is in the creation of new markets by the Finnish co-operative. Expansion has seen the opening of new stores in Russia and the Baltic states, offering range, choice and value lacking from the domestic retail provision in those countries. However, the Finnish co-operative has yet to provide membership and member benefits to customers in these new territories. As such, the Finnish co-operative exemplifies co-operatives ability to expand, but do they spread the message and benefits of mutuality if customers in new countries are not members with full member privileges? Alternatively, it could be that the Finnish co-operative has not got the same character in these countries as it has in Finland, due to historical reasons surrounding negative connotations associated with former communist rule and its brand of 'co-operatives'.

There is a further point to be made about problems being derived from the organisational structure of retail co-operatives. Both the Italian and the Finnish co-op report tensions derived from the complex nature of central and regional bureaucracies inherent in the co-operative model of business organisation, which is summed up by the following quotation:

...although personnel at the point of sales have an in-depth knowledge of consumers in terms of consumers expectations, wishes and needs due to the daily contact, it is hard to promptly meet these expectations due to the complex and hierarchical structure of the (structure of the Italian co-op at all levels), which cause slowdown in the decision making. Store Manager Italy

Decision making and clear communication of intent, as well as justification of decisions are difficult in a co-operative structure, where many members and members appointed as managers have a say in the direction of the organisation:

...the main disadvantage (of the mutual co-operative approach is to) find agreement among all members which may request a lot of time determining delays into meet consumer expectations. Store Manager Italy

...it is not so easy a place to be CEO of (named Finnish co-op) because of the need to balance the demands of the managing regional executives. National Executive Finland

A 'reversed structure' (bottom up) engaged and vociferous membership has its advantages (as reported in terms of stakeholder cohesion and market feedback), however, co-operative senior executives do have to continually face questioning from all quarters and this may stall progression on decision making unless this is clearly realized and effective communication channels are in place.

Conclusions and recommendations

Local food does not have a clear definition; it can be interpreted by different bodies and people in different ways as having an importance on a scale from: the local vicinity to products of regional and national identity (as flagship foods that represent region and country). However, there is general agreement from the participants in this study for local foods on a micro-market level. These are mostly fresh, perishable foods. The market exists for those that seek perceived qualities of taste and freshness, but not at a premium price. This is seen to present a marketing problem. The case co-operatives in Finland and Italy, from an organisational perspective were happy to encourage de-centralised and ad hoc development of local vicinity food markets, but from a cohesive business perspective were more interested in food regionalism and food as national identity. Fresh local vicinity foods do not really fit into this for reasons of volumes, consistency difficulties of establishing brand identity and ‘critical mass’, but were seen to offer customers a ‘value added’ they appreciated; and presented a business approach with a human face. So, from the experience of these two very typical European co-operative retailers, local vicinity food marketing was tolerated, even encouraged, but organisation remained localised to particular regional and store structures and did not constitute cross-regional co-operative or national policy; as seen to be the case with the promotion of regional products (notably in Italy). However, this does not mean that local vicinity food is not important to retail co-op chains, it clearly is, but its co-ordination from the perspective of these cases remains ad hoc rather than a matter of policy.

The second important issue that surrounds local food is its role in sustainability: from a production/supply and environmental perspective and from a sustainable communities perspective. Concerning the issue of environmental sustainability, the investigated co-operatives have regular corporate commitments and promises concerning these issues that are typical in the retailing industry, but neither sees this to be a primary consumer motive in their respective countries for buying local food. Likewise, organic food is not seen as much more than a niche or ‘image’ concern. The role of local food in sustainable communities is more important. Co-operative ethos concerning responsible and ethical behaviour is to the fore in both co-operative chains and this corroborates prior studies linking the distinct inclination and contribution of co-operative retail businesses in building and maintaining community networks/social responsibility and so forth; via support for local food networks. What this study contributes is an understanding of the influence of co-operative principles in (perhaps unique) direct support for businesses and communities, via support for establishment of local food networks. Once again it is relatively ad hoc, but the de-centralised nature of regional retail co-operative management allows for a diversity of decision making on a localised basis, but with the core ethical policies of co-operation at heart.

The analysis of the ‘Ideal’ store in Finland outlines what can be achieved within decentralised management in terms of supporting and stimulating a sustainable local food economy, but as ever, retail co-operation has two sides to contend with. Decentralised management allows flexibility of decision making and member-employee empowerment which can encourage new ideas and processes to flourish (such as with the development of sustainable local food). However, co-operatives remain complex and multi-levelled and the negative side of member control and mutuality is that decision making may be slow and committee-oriented. As a result, unless there were a clear policy concerning local food supply and engagement with

suppliers and the consequent ‘joined up marketing’ that could be rolled out across the national/regional co-operative structure, it will remain localised and ad hoc. There may be pockets of best practice, but to be successful, chain-wide benchmarking of the likes of the ‘Ideal’ store in Finland would have to take place before policy could follow. In reality this is more likely to happen with respect to regional rather than local foods and result in consequent regional product marketing.

Co-operatives are ideally placed (given their history, organisational structure and enshrined business intent towards social responsibility and sustainability) to shape the role of local food into a force for positive community (and wider) social improvement. They are not unique in this intent, but their mutual status and members’ role in combining business and social/community networks is unique; and as seen with this study and the UK study, co-ops are inclined to direct support (financially and in a business/community support sense). In order to make the best of this favourable position, co-operatives need to be able resolve communication and decision making difficulties inherent in member controlled businesses in order to regularise and standardise good and positive business practices, such as with sustainable local food.

To conclude, and to reflect the view of Mikkola (2008), whereby ‘co-operatives exhibit strong locally built partnership and social relations in support of economic viability of supply chains’, retail co-operatives can from this study be seen to contribute specifically and in some ways (because of the fundamental nature of their makeup) uniquely to the development of (socially) sustainable local (vicinity) food. The mutual and member-based status of retail co-operatives can induce the implementation of local/sustainable food economies and co-operatives are identifiably multi-stakeholder oriented (with evidence of inclination to direct financial, moral and business support). However, unless this is regularised as policy and applied across the national and regional structure of the co-op, it is likely to remain piecemeal in application. Co-operative organisations’ advantages in socially sustainable business are a clear marketing advantage and co-ops benefit from a tremendous amount of member goodwill as ‘citizen consumers’ (that other business organisational structures do not necessarily have); such that with the right business decision making, co-operative businesses can differentiate themselves as truly stakeholder centred organisations.

References

- Adler, P. S. (2001) Market, hierarchy, and trust: The knowledge economy and the future of capitalism, *Organization Science*, March-April 2001, 12 (2), 215-234.
- Aertsens, J., Verbeke, W., Mondelaers, K., and van Huylenbroeck, G. (2009) Personal determinants of organic food consumption: a review *British Food Journal*, 111 (10), 1140-67.
- Anderson, J.C., Hakansson, H, and Johansson, J. (1994) Dyadic business relationships within a business network context, *Journal of Marketing*, 58. (4),1-15.

- Asioli, D., Canavari, M., Pignatti, E. (2011). Role of sensory attributes in the food marketing: an exploratory analysis in the Italian organic food producers. Paper presented at the 5th International European Forum on System Dynamics and Innovation in Food Networks. Innsbruck-Igls, Austria, from February 14-18, 2011.
- Atkins, P., and Bowler, I. (2001) *Food in society: Economy, culture, geography*. London, Arnold.
- Barham, E. (2002). Towards a theory of values-based labelling. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 19, 349-360.
- Barnes, A., Vergunst, P., and Topp, K. (2009) Assessing the consumer perception of the term “organic”: a citizens’ jury approach. *British Food Journal*, 111 (2), 155-164.
- Beus, C. E, and Dunlap, R. E. (1990) Conventional versus alternative agriculture: The paradigmatic roots of the debate. *Rural Sociology*, 55 (4), 590-616.
- Birchall, J. (1997). *The international co-operative movement*. Manchester, Manchester University Press.
- Block, D. R., Thompson, M., Euken, J., Liquori, T., Fear, F. & Baldwin, S. (2008) Engagement for transformation: Value webs for local food system development. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 25, 379-388.
- Born, B., and Purcell, M. (2006). In Morgan, K. & Sonnino, R. (2008, 1-19). *The school food revolution. Public food and the challenge of sustainable development*. Earthscan, London.
- Bowler, I., Clark, G., Crockett, A., Ilbery, B., and Shaw, A. (1996) The development of alternative farm enterprises: a study of family labour farms in the northern Pennines of England, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 12, 285-295.
- Bradach, J. L, and Eccles, R. (1989) Price, authority, and trust: From ideal types to plural forms, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 15, 97-118.
- Carter, N. (2007). In Morgan, K., and Sonnino, R. (2008, 1-19). *The school food revolution. Public food and the challenge of sustainable development*. Earthscan, London.
- CEC, (1997) The treaty of Amsterdam. Accessed 10.3.2011 at <http://www.eurotreaties.com/amsterdamtreaty.pdf>
- Coley, D., Howard, M., Winter, M. (2009) Local food, food miles and carbon emissions: A comparison of farm shop and mass distribution approaches, *Food Policy*, 34, 150-155.
- COOP (2010). Consumi e distribuzione: Rapporto Coop 2010. Casalecchio di Reno: Coop Italia.

Davies, K., & Burt, S. (2007) Consumer co-operatives and retail internationalization: problems and prospects. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 35 (2), 156-177.

Defra, (2010) An action plan for driving sustainable operations and procurement across government. Accessed 15.11.2010 at <http://www.defra.gov.uk/sustainable/government/documents/ap-driving-sustainable-ops.pdf>

Duffy, R., Fearne, A., and Healing, V. (2005) Reconnection in the UK food chain - bridging the communication gap between food producers and consumers. *British Food Journal*, 107 (1), 17-33.

Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989) Building theories from case study research, *Academy of Management Review*, 14 (4), 532-550.

Fearne, A., and Hughes, D. (2000) 'Success factors in the fresh produce supply chain: Insights from the UK', *British Food Journal*, 102 (10), 760-776.

Feenstra, G., (1997) Local food systems and sustainable communities, *American Journal of Alternative Agriculture*, 12, 28-36.

Fontana, A., and Frey, J. H. (1998) Interviewing. The art of science. In: Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications, 47-78.

Founding Treaties of European Union (1957) Accessed 10.3.2010 at <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/treaties/index.htm>

Friedmann, H. (2007) Scaling up: Bringing public institutions and food service corporations into the project for a local, sustainable food system in Ontario. *Agriculture and Human Values* 24, 389-398.

Fritz, M., Canavari, M. (2008) Management of perceived e-business risks in food supply networks: e-trust as prerequisite for supply chain system innovation. *Agribusiness: An International Journal*, 24, 355-368.

Granovetter, M. (1985) Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology* (91) November 1985: 481-510. The article is published also in Granovetter, M. and Swedberg, R. (Eds.). 2001. *The Sociology of economic life*, Westview Press, Colorado, 51-76.

Goodman, D. (2004) Rural Europe redux? Reflections on alternative agro-food networks and paradigm change, *Sociologia Ruralis*, 44 (1), 3-16.

Guthman, J. (2004) The trouble with "organic lite" in California: A rejoinder to the "conventionalization" debate. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 44, 301-316.

Håkansson, H., and Snehota, I. (1995) *Developing Relationships in Business Networks*, London: Routledge.

Hill, H., and Lynchehaun, F. (2002) Organic milk: attitudes and consumption patterns, *British Food Journal*, 104 (7), 526-542.

Hingley, M. (2001) Relationship management in the supply chain, *International Journal of Logistics Management*, 12 (2), 57-71.

Hingley, M. (2005) Power imbalance in UK agri-food supply channels: Learning to live with the supermarkets?, *Journal of Marketing Management*, Special issue: The marketing imperative for the Agri-food sector, 21. (1/2), 63-68.

Hingley, M. (2010) Networks in socially embedded local food supply: The case of retailer co-operatives, *Journal of Business Market Management*, 4 (3), 111-128.

Hinrichs, C. (2000) Embeddedness and local food systems: Notes on two types of direct agricultural markets, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 16, 295-303.

Hinrichs, C. (2003) The practice and politics of food system localization, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 19, 33-45.

HM Government, (2010) Food 2030: How we get there. Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. Accessed 19.01.2010 at <http://www.defra.gov.uk/foodfarm/food/strategy/index.htm>

Hollingsworth, A. (2004) Increasing retail concentration: Evidence from the UK food retail sector. *British Food Journal* 106 (8), 629-638.

Huomisen ruoka – Esitys kansalliseksi ruokastrategiaksi, (2010) Ruokastrategian valmistelun johtoryhmä, Vammalan Kirjapaino. Accessed 15.11.2010 at http://www.mmm.fi/attachments/mmm/tiedotteet/5qZTC31Sw/Huomisen_ruoka_-_Ehdotus_kansalliseksi_ruokastrategiaksi.pdf [Food of tomorrow – Proposition for national food strategy, 2010. The executive team for food strategy. In Finnish.]

ICA (1995) International Cooperative Alliance statement on the co-operative identity. Accessed 10/1/11 from <http://www.ica.coop/coop/principles.html>

ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability & Ecoinstitut Barcelona, (2008a) European Commission GPP Training Toolkit. Module 3: Purchasing recommendations. Catering & food. Green Public Procurement (GPP) Product Sheet. Accessed 11.12.2010 at http://ec.europa.eu/environment/gpp/pdf/toolkit/food_GPP_product_sheet.pdf

ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability & Ecoinstitut Barcelona, (2008b) European Commission Green Public Procurement (GPP) Training Toolkit. Module 3: Purchasing Recommendations. Food and Catering Services. Background Product

Report. Accessed 11.12.2010 at
http://ec.europa.eu/environment/gpp/pdf/toolkit/food_GPP_background_report.pdf

Jacobs, M. (1999) Sustainable development as a contested concept. In: Dobson, A. (Ed) *Fairness and futurity: Essays on environmental sustainability and social justice*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 21-45.

Jarillo, J. C. (1988) On strategic networks, *Strategic Management Journal*, 9 (1), 31-41.

Jones, P., Comfort, D. and Hillier, D. (2004) A case study of local food and its routes to market in the UK, *British Food Journal*, 106 (4), 328-335.

Kloppenburger, J., Hendrickson, J., & Stevenson, G.W. (1996) Coming into the foodshed. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 13, 3-42.

Kloppenburger, J., Lezberg, J., DeMaster, K., Stevenson, G.W., and Hendrickson, J. (2000). Tasting food, tasting sustainability: Defining the attributes of an alternative food system with competent, ordinary people, *Human Organization*, 59 (2), 177-186.

Klöckner, C.A., and Ohms, S. (2009) The importance of personal norms for purchasing organic milk, *British Food Journal*, 111 (11), 1173-1187.

Kuhar, A., L- Juvančič (2010) What determines purchasing behaviour for organic and integrated fruits and vegetables?, *Bulgarian Journal of Agricultural Science*, 16 (2), 111-22.

Kvale, S., (1996) *Interviews. An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.

Lotti, R., Mensing, P., and Valenti, D. (2006). A Cooperative Solution. *Strategy and Business*, Issue 43, <http://www.strategy-business.com/article/06209?pg=0>

Magnusson, M. K., Arvola, A., Hursti, U. K., Aberg, L., and Sjöden, P.-O (2003) Choice of organic foods is related to perceived consequences for human health and to environmentally friendly behaviour, *Appetite*, 40,109-117.

Magnusson, M. K., Arvola, A., Hursti, U.K., Aberg, L., and Sjöden, P-O (2001) Attitudes towards organic foods among Swedish consumers, *British Food Journal*, 103 (3), 209-27.

McGinnis, M.C. (Ed.) (1999) *Bioregionalism*. London, Routledge.

Menzani, T., and Zamagni, V. (2010). Cooperative Networks in the Italian Economy. *Enterprise and Society*, 11(1), 98-127.

Mikkola, M. (2008). Coordinative structures and development of food supply chains. *British Food Journal*, 110 (2), 189-205.

- Mikkonen, A. (2005) Isot pojat jakoivat ruokakaupan. *Talouselämä* 31, 62-66. [Big boys divided the retail business. *Talouselämä* 31, 62-66. In Finnish].
- Mononen, T. (2008) Luomun verkostot. Tutkimus suomalaisen luomutuotannon toimijaverkoston muutoksesta. Joensuun yliopiston yhteiskuntatieteellisiä julkaisuja, 85. [Organic networks. Study on change in Finnish organic networks. Social scientific publications of the University of Joensuu. In Finnish].
- Morgan, K., and Murdoch, J. (2000) Organic vs conventional agriculture: knowledge, power and innovation in the food chain, *Geoforum*, 31, 159-173.
- Morgan, K., and Sonnino, R. (2008), *The school food revolution: Public food and the challenge of sustainable development*. Earthscan, London
- Novkovic, S. (2008). Defining the co-operative difference. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 37, 2168-2177.
- Paxton, A. (1994) The food miles report: the dangers of long distance food transport. London, Safe Alliance.
- Poikolainen, K. (2004) Vihannesomavaraisuuden vaikutus kuljetusten energian kulutukseen ja päästöihin. Puutarhatieteen Pro gradu tutkielma. Helsingin yliopisto, soveltavan biologian laitos. [Selfsufficiency in vegetables and its impact on energy consumption and emissions. Master's Thesis in Horticulture. University of Helsinki, Department of Applied Biology. In Finnish. Abstract in English.]
- Polanyi, K. (2001) The Economy as instituted process. In: Granovetter, M. and Swedberg, R. (Eds.). *The sociology of economic life*. Colorado, Westview Press: 31-50. Reprinted with the permission of The Free Press from Trade and Market in the Early Empires by Polanyi, K., Arensberg, C.M., and Pearson, H.W. 1957.
- Porter, M. (1985) *Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance*. New York, The Free Press.
- Powell, W. W. (1990) Neither market nor hierarchy: Network forms of organisation. In: B.M. Staw and L.L. Cummings (Eds.). *Research in organizational behaviour*. An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews, Jai Press inc. London, (12). 295-336.
- Pretty, J.N., Ball, A.S., Lang, T., Morison, J.I.L. (2005) Farm costs and food miles: An assessment of the full cost of the UK weekly food basket, *Food Policy*, 30, 1-19.
- Ranaboldo, C., and Schejtman, A. (2009) El valor del patrimonio cultural. Territorios rurales, experiencias y perspectivas latinoamericanas. Lima-Perú: Rimisp– IEP.
- Renting, H., Marsden, T.K. and Banks, J., (2003). Understanding alternative food networks: Exploring the role of short food supply chains in rural development, *Environment and Planning A*, 35, 393-411.

Rohner-Thielen, E. (2010) Agriculture and fisheries. Area under organic farming increased by 7.4 % between 2007 and 2008 in the EU-27. Eurostat. *Statistics in focus* 10/2010. Accessible 3.5.2010 at http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/KS-SF-10-010/EN/KS-SF-10-010-EN.PDF

Schofield, J. W. (2000) Increasing the generalizability of qualitative research. In: Gomm, R. Hammersley, M. and Foster, P. (Eds.) *Case study method: Key issues, Key texts*. London, Sage Publications, 69-97.

Seppänen, L. (2004) Learning Challenges in Organic Vegetable Farming. An Activity Theoretical Study of On-Farm Practices. University of Helsinki, Institute for Rural Research and Training, Seinäjoki, Mikkeli, Publications 1. [Institute for Rural Research and Training is currently Ruralia Institute].

Seppänen, L., Aro-Heinilä, E., Helenius, J., Hietala-Koivu, R., Ketomäki, H., Mikkola, M., Risku-Norja, H., Sinkkonen, M. & Virtanen, H. (2006) Paikallinen ruokajärjestelmä: ympäristö- ja talousvaikutuksia sekä oppimishaasteita. Mikkeli, Helsingin yliopiston Ruralia-instituutti. Raportteja 9. [Local food system: environmental and economic impacts and learning challenges. Mikkeli, University of Helsinki, Ruralia Institute. In Finnish].

Seyfang, G. (2006) Ecological citizenship and sustainable consumption: Examining local organic food networks, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 22, 383-395.

Spaargaren, G. (1997) The ecological modernization of production and consumption. Essays in Environmental Sociology. Thesis, Landbouw Universiteit Wageningen.

S-ryhmän vastuullisuuskatsaus (2009) [The social responsibility report by the SOK Corporation, 2009. In Finnish]. Accessed 16.11.2010 at <http://www.digipaper.fi/sok-yhtyma/45495/>

Stake, R. E. (2000) The case study method in social inquiry. In: Gomm, R. Hammersley, M. & Foster, P. (Eds.). *Case study method: Key issues, key texts*. London, Sage Publications: 19-26. Reprinted in this volume, originally written in 1976 as part of an assignment for the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and later published in Educational Researcher 1978, 7: 5-8.

Strauss, A., and Corbin, J. (1998), *Basics of qualitative research*, 2nd ed. Sage Publications, Newbury Park, CA.

Stevenson, S. (2005) Strategies for agri-food enterprises-of-the-middle. Values-based supply Chains in the Pacific Northwest. Panel Session 58 at 2005 Joint Meetings of Agriculture, Food, and Human Values Society (AFHVS) and Association for the Study of Food and Society (ASFS) 9.-12.6.2005 Portland, Oregon, USA.

Swedberg, R. (1994) Markets as social structures. In: Smelser, N.J., and Swedberg, R. (Eds.). *The handbook of economic sociology*. Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press: 255-282.

Tukker A., Huppes, G., Guinée, J., Heijungs, R., de Koning, A., van Oers, L., Suh, S., Geerken, T., Van Holderbeke, M., Jansen, B. & Nielsen, P. 2006. Environmental impact of products (EIPRO), Analysis of the life-cycle environmental impacts related to the final consumption of the EU-25. JRC European Commission, May 2006.

Vihma, P. (2005) Tovereissamme meillä on voima. *Talouselämä* 34, 36-38. [In our comrades we have the power. *Talouselämä* 34: 36-38. In Finnish].

Watts, D.C.H., Ilbery, B., and Maye, D. (2005). In Morgan, K. & Sonnino, R. (2008, 1-19). *The school food revolution. Public food and the challenge of sustainable development*. Earthscan, London.

WCED (World Commission on Environment and Development). (1987) Our common future. Oxford, UK, Oxford University Press.

Weatherell, C., Tregear, A., and Allinson, J. (2003) In search of the concerned consumer: UK public perceptions of food, farming and buying local, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 19 (2), 233-244.

Wier, M., and Calverley, C. (2002) Market potential for organic foods in Europe, *British Food Journal*, 104 (1), 45-62.

Williams, R.C. (2005) *The Co-operative Movement*, Ashgate Publishing. Hampshire.

Yin, R.K. (2003) *Applications of case study research*, 3rd ed., Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, Calif.