



# Governing complementary responsibility goods through hybrid systems in a globalizing world

Stefan Mann<sup>a</sup>

In Sierra Leone, a Swiss company produces bioethanol using sustainability certification, and European NGOs collect donations against it. This paper describes these markets, related by complementarity, as responsibility goods, goods on which money is spent not for personal satisfaction, but for the sake of others. It then shows how both the different certification schemes for biofuels and the network of Southern and Northern NGOs acting against land grabbing are governed by a high degree of inter-organizational hybridity. It explains why credibility is always a key resource in such markets and why hybrid governance schemes contribute to obtaining this credibility.

**Keywords:** Land Grabbing, Advocacy, Hybridity

**JEL classification:** Z13

## 1 Introduction

New and international forms of “hybrid” governance systems in which public actors, NGOs, private companies, and others interact in various ways have generated increasing attention among social scientists (Elsner 2004; Makadok and Coff 2009; Lambin et al. 2014). Hybrid settings, i.e., institutional forms in which companies, NGOs and/or the state join forces to find a consensus on certain issues, have been found to attain a surprising degree of success (Bostrom 2003). Hybrid systems have a considerable signaling effect to stakeholders (Rickenbach and Overdevest 2006).

“Hybrid forms arise as principals exploit synergies across tasks to indirectly induce effort on tasks that cannot be motivated directly.” This rather abstract explanation for the rise of hybrid forms by Makadok and Coff (2009; 302) raises almost as many questions as it provides answers as to how and why these synergies arise. This paper attempts to develop a more applicable framework for the success of hybrid governance forms.

In doing so, this paper makes three claims:

- (1) The rise of hybrid governance systems on the international playing field is strongly connected with the rise of what Mann (2015) has termed “responsibility goods” and has defined as “goods which are bought to support society as a whole or to support groups or individuals perceived as needy” (Mann 2015, p. 221).
- (2) Hybrid systems have systemic advantages in terms of credibility. While it has been shown that the supply

and demand patterns of responsibility goods deviate systematically from those of conventional goods and are highly in need of credibility (Mann 2015), we intend to show the central role that hybridity plays in providing credibility in this context.

- (3) Finally, we claim that economic globalization is driving the emerging pattern of a growing market for responsibility goods being governed best by hybrid systems as compared to governance by single actors.

This paper examines two interrelated markets for responsibility goods in order to examine the three claims empirically:

- (1) the market for bioethanol produced through large-scale land acquisition by a Swiss company in Sierra Leone;
- (2) the market for support against land grabbing, largely managed by NGOs advocating human rights issues on behalf of the local population.

Bioethanol use is one of the instruments employed to mitigate climate change. Governments and environmental NGOs collaborate in increasing the use of renewable materials in the fuel market. In the case against land grabbing, NGOs, including churches, worry about land expropriation from native populations. Therefore, both goods in this analysis qualify as responsibility goods as money is only spent on them because buyers at some stage have ethical concerns. And both markets are interrelated, forming a broad hybrid governance system.

<sup>a</sup> Federal Department of Economic Affairs, Education and Research, Agroscope, Institute for Sustainability Sciences ISS Tänikon, CH-8356 Ettenhausen, Phone: +41 58 480 32 38, e-mail: stefan.mann@agroscope.admin.ch

In order to support the claims defined above, the methodology is summarized in Section 2. It is then necessary to describe both markets, which is done in Sections 3 and 4. The emerging patterns of governance are discussed in Section 5, particularly with respect to hybridity, credibility, and the connection to the issues of responsibility goods. Section 6 relates the case described here to the literature about globalization, and Section 7 presents a conclusion.

## 2 Method

As described in more detail in the next section, our case study concerns a project by the Swiss company Addax which rented 30,000 hectares of land in one of the poorest countries on earth, Sierra Leone, in order to produce sugar cane and to process it into bioethanol. This project was the cause of both markets for responsibility goods as described above, as it used a large-scale land acquisition (or land grabbing) to produce bioethanol. The Addax project is one of the best documented large-scale land acquisition projects, so a lot of factual information already existed and was easily accessible. However, to obtain a more thorough picture of the stakeholder constellation and the underlying motivations and forces, interviews had to be carried out. All subsequent empirical observations stem from twenty interviews conducted during a field trip in Sierra Leone's Makeni area in January 2014 with farmers, Addax staff, NGO staff and members of the local administration. Respondents were largely selected by the snowball system, following recommendations by former respondents. Although the focus was on the impact of the Addax investment on the situation and respondents' personal and professional strategies, the interviews were semi-structured, containing open questions allowing respondents to focus on crucial issues. The recordings of the interviews were mostly transcribed into Microsoft Word and manually evaluated by content analysis. The following sections primarily contain more theoretical conclusions from the strategies respondents have chosen.

## 3 The marketing of bioethanol by Addax

### 3.1 Production site in Sierra Leone

Addax Bioenergy is part of the larger Addax Oryx Group (AOG), which mainly invests in energy and real estate. AOG's and Addax's headquarters are in Switzerland, but AOG's main field of activities is in Africa. Addax Bioenergy has concentrated all activities in the Makeni area in Sierra Leone's heartland. In 2009, it sealed a memorandum of understanding with the government of Sierra Leone about a bioethanol project in the Makeni area. Addax also signed contracts with the landowners in the whole area about renting approximately 30,000 hectares for 12 US\$ per hectare, of which approximately 10,000 hectares are now effectively used for sugarcane pivots, i.e., circle-shaped fields of around 30-50 hectares. Two thousand hectares are used for the Farmer Development Program, in which local smallholders are taught to grow rice in a semi-mechanized production system, and some 1,800 hectares have been con-

verted into ecological corridors and buffer areas, i.e., land exempted from production activities, to protect existing pockets of biodiversity. On the rest of the land, farmers are growing their own crops as they did before, but there are still large areas of idle land left.

The agricultural system that Addax is applying differs greatly from the traditional production system in the region. The local system has been severely impacted by the long civil war (1991-2002) during which the country's agricultural capacity was considerably reduced. Even before the Ebola outbreak, recovery from the war was happening only slowly. Sierra Leone's local agriculture rests on slash-and-burn farming, in which land is used for production for only one year before moving to another site and leaving the former land idle for four years or more. Farmers in Sierra Leone mostly grow several crops (most typically groundnuts, cassava, maize, and rice) on one plot. Animals, apart from maybe a few chickens around the house, play a minimal role in the system so that manure is usually not applied. In recent years mineral fertilizer had been used by two of the twelve farmers interviewed. However, this only happened on one occasion each, because a bag had become available, which they distributed over the land. Neither pesticides nor tillage were applied, and tractors or other machines were usually unavailable or not working.

Addax applies an industrial system for its 150 sugar cane pivots. Systematic irrigation from the adjacent Rokel River, integrated pest management, and a site-adapted fertilizing system combining molasses and mineral nutrients in line with soil analyses generate very competitive harvests of around 1,000 dt/ha. Harvesting is done through partial ripping, after which intensive tillage takes place. The sugar cane is then transported to a company-owned ethanol factory at the center of the site. There, the ethanol is produced using modern equipment and then transported to the port, from where it is shipped to European ports. Overall, the company follows the rationale of an industrialized large-scale production system in the primary and secondary sector. It should also be mentioned that bioethanol prices have been more stable than oil prices over recent years, and world demand has risen from 17 billion gallons in 2008 to 25 billion in 2014, so that the company has invested in a rather attractive market.

### 3.2 Certification and public relations

The Roundtable on Sustainable Biomaterials (RSB) plays a crucial role in Addax's marketing strategy and should therefore be given some attention. The RSB is a forum in which 101 companies, NGOs, associations, farmers' organizations, and governmental organizations meet and discuss appropriate standards for the production of different biomaterials. Because it links diverse stakeholders ranging from the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) to Boeing, the RSB has attracted attention among scholars interested in hybrid forms of governance (Bailis and Baka 2011; Visseren-Hamakers 2013; Ponte and Daugbjerg 2014).

In 2013, several months before going into actual bioethanol production, Addax issued a press release announcing that the company was the first in Africa to earn RSB certification, citing staff of the RSB foundation – from the African Development Bank, from the certifying organization, and from Addax Bioenergy itself.

The activities of the RSB consortium do not stand alone internationally. Several groups from a wide range of backgrounds have formulated sustainability indicators for either biofuel or agricultural production. Among the most relevant for projects like Addax's is certainly the Sustainability Assessment of Food and Agriculture Systems (SAFA; Jawtusch et al. 2013) which focuses on the sustainability of agricultural production, albeit gradually extending to processing. Similar to the RSB guidelines, the SAFA criteria were collected in a broad stakeholder-based process (Schader et al. 2014), in which the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) took the coordinating role, and include environmental, social and economic aspects of sustainability. The main difference, however, lies not only in the RSB's restriction to non-food production but also in the definition of a clear threshold. The RSB follows a basic system in which every criterion must be "passed". SAFA works with a gradual scale in which participants obtain a certain percentage of the maximum score for each point. As this does not include certification, it would not have been possible for Addax to present a positive certification process through SAFA.

Two other pathways not chosen by Addax should be mentioned because of their significance in the discourse on the sustainability of large-scale land investments. One of them was coordinated by the World Bank and labeled Principles of Responsible Agricultural Investment (PRAI). "Proponents of PRAI argue that more large-scale investments, especially when these involve smallholders through a variety of joint venture arrangements, are seen as the main solution to persistent (rural) poverty" (Borras and Franco 2010), at least when carried out in a sustainable way. The stakeholders included in the process were mainly from intergovernmental organizations such as the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) or the FAO.

Last but not least, Bonsucro is a (likewise hybrid) system specifically designed for the production and processing of bioethanol as fuel, and four percent of all sugar cane grown for bioethanol comes under this scheme. Moura and Chaddad (2012) use Bonsucro as a suitable case study for a multi-stakeholder initiative.

As a result, the four frameworks have a considerable overlap, particularly in environmental aspects. They mostly differ in the level of detail. The PRAI puts things most generally: "Environmental impacts of a project are quantified and measures taken to encourage sustainable resource use, while minimizing the risk/magnitude of negative impacts and mitigating them." The RSB prescribes several environmental restrictions. One of them is that "Biofuel operations shall avoid negative impacts on biodiversity, ecosystems,

and conservation values." Bonsucro guidelines likewise prescribe "to assess impacts of sugarcane enterprises on biodiversity and ecosystems services", distinguishing nine different indicators with thresholds. In turn, SAFA guidelines contain several pages defining what sustainable biodiversity management should look like.

By preferring RSB certification over other options, Addax apparently decided to choose a middle way. PRAI guidelines do not offer the option of certification, nor do they make prescriptions for issues such as climate change or labor rights. Bonsucro and SAFA, on the other hand, have an extremely long and elaborate list of indicators. It appears that Addax made the (economically rational) decision to go for the solution of certification obtained with minimum requirements.

Certification has been considered as one of the institutional foundations of Corporate Social Responsibility (Gjølberg 2009). On the other hand, particularly in the argument about large-scale land acquisitions, certification schemes have also been seriously questioned. Selfa et al. (2014; 455), for example, criticize the Bonsucro principles as policy-blind, giving credibility to a project "premised on deeply entrenched historical patterns of inequitable land ownership patterns and access to natural resources". More general concerns about the accountability and legitimacy of certification schemes have been raised by Auld and Gulbrandsen (2010).

Nevertheless, it is important to understand Addax's motivation to obtain accreditation from RSB for the bioethanol that the company produces. The production cost of one gallon of bioethanol exceeds the production cost of one gallon of crude oil. Therefore, no *ex ante* reason exists for consumers to substitute crude oil with bioethanol except for its environmental effects and the growing scarcity of hydrocarbons. In order to contribute to greenhouse gas mitigation, the European Commission formulated the target for all Member States of 6.5% renewable energy in the transport sector in its Renewable Energy Directive (EU-RED; Howes 2010), in spite of critical voices on the environmental effects of biofuels (e.g. Searchinger et al. 2008). For biofuels to be considered sustainable under the EU-RED, they must be accredited by a scheme like RSB (Johnson et al. 2012). This confirms Fortin and Richardson's (2013; 141) finding that such standards create "new possibilities for corporate accountability in transnational commodity chains".

The need for a confirming certification indicates the character of bioethanol as a public partial responsibility good. Most EU national governments and the European Commission agree that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions should be mitigated, and that they should not be mitigated by generating a large number of unwanted side-effects. It is likely that this is motivated not only by own utility-maximization but also by a sense of responsibility for humankind as a whole, including future generations. However, as bioethanol is purchased only partially for this reason, and partially for fueling cars, it is a partial rather than a pure responsibility good.

## 4 The marketing of resistance against land grabbing

In the wake of the 2008 global economic crisis (and resulting food shortages), the African Network for the Right to Food (ANORF) was founded in Cotonou in 2008 (Windfuhr 2012). Although, overall, this network did not prove to be extremely effective in meeting its goals, it managed to support the founding of eighteen national organizations in Africa, including Sierra Leone. The Sierra Leone Network for the Right to Food (SILNORF) was founded in October 2008 on World Food Day, and its founders claim to be responsible for a 19% increase in the national budget for food security in 2009.

The act of founding SILNORF more or less coincided with the start of the Addax investment in Sierra Leone, which proved more important for the development of SILNORF than the general food security situation in the country. Bread for All, the aid organization of reformed churches in Switzerland, started to commission research about the Addax investment in 2011 and since then has provided a considerable share of SILNORF's revenues. This is just one example of a concept generating considerable funding. In addition, SILNORF made contracts with other European NGOs to assist with information about the investment, and there are numerous other Sierra Leonean organizations like the Foundation for Local Economic Development and Human Rights Sierra Leone or the Women's Initiative Movement for which criticizing the Addax investment has become one of their economically important activities.

It is important to consider the information chain between the partners. SILNORF criticizes Addax's claims on environmental and on socioeconomic aspects. Representatives of SILNORF claim that "the environmental impact of bio-ethanol from sugarcane is bigger than the one of oil (up to +200%)" (SILNORF 2014; 8), and they label reimbursements to landowners as unfair. They repeatedly emphasize, however, that neither they nor the local population are against the Addax investment (Gbenda 2012; Sesay 2013) and that the project shows many positive effects. Whereas unions do not play any major role in the Makeni area, SILNORF's role is very comparable to that of a union because they represent the rights not only of employees but also of the local population. Formally, SILNORF has neither a mandate nor any rights to influence decisions, but their potential to influence both the national and the international press and other publicity for Addax makes the company listen to them. Through this kind of power play, they ensure that power asymmetries between local landowners or local employees on the one hand and the Addax management on the other hand do not lead to unacceptable outcomes such as unfair land deals or poisoned drinking water. In one of the affected villages, for example, they initiated a contract change that restricted land tenure to the land actually worked on by Addax.

The European NGOs collaborating with SILNORF take a less ambiguous stance on the Addax investment. The Swiss

partner organization Bread for All (2011), for example, chose the title "Land Grabbing: The Dark Side of 'Sustainable' Investment", bluntly criticizing economic, environmental, and social aspects of the investment in the Makeni region. They demonstrated, for example, that only 2-7% of the company's revenues will be used to pay the 2,000 Addax workers. An association of several European organizations, collaborating with SILNORF and citing reports from Bread for All, has called itself "Hands Off the Land" and regularly issues publications with a clearly negative view on large-scale land investment (Ferrando 2014), including the Addax investment.

In order to understand the dynamics behind such campaigns, it may be useful to take an economic perspective. Although NGOs may stand for a noble cause (as some profit-oriented enterprises do), it may be the ultimate goal of NGOs to collect donations (Aldashev and Verdier 2009). Resistance against land grabbing is a good cause for the collection of donations. All the organizations mentioned above, but also leading international emergency funds like Oxfam or ActionAid, use the prevalence of large-scale land investments to mobilize donors. This money is then used primarily to support local organizations like SILNORF. SILNORF's difficult situation before the Addax investment and its vast expansion afterward has made it clear that this strategy has proven successful.

Whereas ethanol is a public and partial responsibility good, the opposition against land grabbing is a pure and private responsibility good. People donate individually and solely with the purpose of helping those affected by land grabbing projects.

## 5 Hybridity and credibility

The empirical evidence from the two cases examined above points to two different causal links that will be crucial for understanding the dynamics of responsibility goods like opposition against land grabbing or climate-friendly bio-ethanol. One is the key role that credibility plays in the demand for responsibility goods; the other is the important role for credibility of hybridity, defined as a combination of the concepts of markets, hierarchies, and networks (Skelcher and Smith 2013).

On an intra-organizational level, the latter link has already been made by management scholars: "Hybridity can strengthen an organization's credibility when it manages to combine the best of both worlds by bringing the most prominent values of the public and the private sector together" (Karré and van Montfort 2013; 5 et seq.). Vice versa, a centralization of authorities has been shown to decrease the credibility of a company's marketing planning (John and Martin 1984). A large coalition not only decreases the likeliness of misinformation or mental flaws, but also increases the durability and robustness of a mental concept. It is unlikely that a large number of actors simultaneously change their minds.

These findings from companies can apparently be extrapolated to an inter-organizational level. For Addax, the RSB guidelines have been a convenient institutional location in which many worlds have been brought together and have agreed on a joint mental concept. When governments, businesses, NGOs, and intergovernmental agencies all agree that bioethanol has been produced in a sustainable way, who could doubt, even though such roundtables are not necessarily inclusive with respect to local farmers' opinions (Cheyns 2014)? The repeated (albeit failed) attempts of the Addax management to collaborate with independent scientists is another indicator of the company's longing for hybridity. The more heterogeneous the coalition, the better. The front against land grabbing is somewhat less hybrid in its institutional appearance as it is dominated by NGOs. The Addax case, however, is used in the communication strategy of many different European NGOs. This joint approach is also displayed actively through, for example, four logos of NGOs printed on publications of the "Hands Off the Land" coalition. The broad alliance of organizations actively speaking against land grabbing is meant as an impressive proof that the situation is largely unambiguous against the investors. While NGO accountability has always been a critical issue (Jordan and van Tuijl 2006), the accountability of an alliance of NGOs would appear more likely for donors. "If they all say the same and they are all different people you would probably believe it" (Sweeney et al. 2008; 357).

To what degree can the two case studies be generalized to claim a general link between hybridity and credibility? Consulting various sources is often used as a tool for the verification of information (Rycroft-Malone et al. 2004; Hermans et al. 2009). In hybrid settings, consent of various parties is often considered as a sign that there is already a consolidated standpoint. The link between hybridity and credibility is therefore not only empirically observable, but also theoretically plausible.

The two examples of attaining credibility through hybridity in the cases of bioethanol sustainability and resistance against land grabbing are complementary. Bread for All's option to make a case against Addax is, of course, dependent on the investment by Addax and gets additional support through the company's attempt to label their product as sustainable biofuels. Nevertheless, Addax and Bread for All construct, of course, highly contradicting stories. As Gieryn (1999), in his seminal work on creating credibility in scientific discourses, describes different contradicting scientific schools that emerge as "contestants for credibility", both organizations have created their more or less hybrid network underlining their credibility.

The important role of credibility for initiating consumption decisions has been identified before (Lafferty et al. 2002; Erdem and Swait 2004), particularly in the extensive literature on credence goods (Dulleck and Kerschbamer 2006). However, Figure 1 shows why the role of credibility will be much stronger in the markets for responsibility goods than in those for most conventional goods. In the traditional markets for the latter, a good part of utility usually comes from the process of consumption itself. This does not apply to the case of responsibility goods, as is particularly evident in the case of a pure responsibility good like solidarity with farmers in areas of land grabbing. The utility derived from donations has been described as a "warm glow" by Andreoni (1990), Harbaugh (1998), and Barnea and Rubin (2010). While some economists use this term to indicate that donations simply increase personal satisfaction, we may well understand it as a concept describing utility derived from acting in a way perceived as responsible in a broad sense. However, this warm glow, as derived from a donation to Bread for All, will usually not depend on any direct experience. Instead, the donation will be perceived as successful if many sources report the awful effects of the land grabbing and the relief that can be accomplished due to generous donations. Although NGOs' advocacy is based on interviews with farmers and other local stakeholders, it relies on unsystematic field work and non-representative samples.



Figure 1: A mental model of responsibility goods (own presentation)

In the case of a partial and public responsibility good like bioethanol, the situation is somewhat more complex. Of course, many of the benefits of bioethanol are derived by car drivers. This effect, however, could also be obtained by cheap petrol. The added value of bioethanol as compared with petrol is the greenhouse gas mitigation effect. Policy makers have imposed the substitution of petrol with bioethanol in order to slow down climate change. A broad consensus among the media and stakeholders will lead to a high degree of stability of this policy. Finally, the perception of African bioethanol as a sustainable energy source will be decisive for Addax's success.

The commonality between the success factors of spending money (individually) against land grabbing and of spending it (collectively) on bioethanol is that both rely on a social construction. It is entirely possible that one of them is justified, but in neither case is the donor's perception based on direct observations or even personal experience.

## 6 The role of globalization in creating responsibility goods

An increasing part of today's transactions deals with responsibility goods of different kinds. The markets for donations or fair trade labels have become more dynamic than the markets for coffee or cars (Le Velly 2015), often displaying double-digit growth rates (Voinea 2014). The cases of a bioethanol investment in Sierra Leone and opposition against land grabbing help to explain the growth in responsibility goods. Both cases are examples of global markets with some potential for generalization. This applies to large-scale land acquisitions in which large companies challenge the sovereignty of poor states, and ship their products back to industrialized countries. It applies to certification schemes which are increasingly institutionalized on a global level. It also applies to the international alliances of NGOs in their opposition against land grabbing.

As a starting point for his sociology of globalization, Martell (2010; 9) observes that "internationalization involves the growth of transactions and interdependencies between countries". These interdependencies on an objective scale through trade or migration are reflected by the public's increased awareness of worldwide interdependencies (Sandler and Arce 2002). Shrinking cultural distances were identified early as a core constituent of globalization (Tomlinson 1996). This consciousness, however, could not be translated into increased global equality. Economic inequalities between continents and countries have never been so large. In industrialized countries, both the vivid awareness of extreme poverty elsewhere and the saturation in consumerism have led to a growing demand for responsibility goods leading to a higher degree of social responsibility (Bonn and Fisher 2005).

Although many people accept the notion of such poverty in Sierra Leone, only a small number have been there to check whether this is really the case. Much has been written

on the important role of the media in the globalization process (Liebes et al. 1998; McQuail and Siune 1998; Cornali and Tirocchi 2012), and it is often emphasized that most of the bridging between cultures has to be accomplished by broadcasters. It is less often emphasized that our growing dependency on media reports increases the value of credibility. Cameras and microphones have much more potential to skew the real world, by skipping details, wrong labeling or biased comments, than do our personal observations (Quatrococchi et al. 2011).

In addition to the media, the role of certification in a globalized world has been highlighted as well. For organic food, some regions have seen an increasing role of the state in certifying organic production standards (Stolze and Lampkin 2009). In the other realms of the agrifood system, however, the increased reliance on certification has been described as the transformation from public to private governance (Hatanaka et al. 2005). Bartley (2007) follows a very similar reasoning when it comes to issues of labor and the environment where standards elaborated by hybrid and mostly private consortia are becoming more important than a great deal of national legislation. The sustainability assessment tools presented in Section 3 are examples of this claim. The 20<sup>th</sup> century has proven that private organizations are better suited than the state to satisfy consumer needs. Is the lesson of the 21<sup>st</sup> century now that privately formed institutions are also doing better than the state in delivering credible information?

The higher the cost to verify information ourselves, the more crucial is trust that the reported situation reflects the actual situation, for social and environmental issues. For the vast majority of us, the complex ecology of our planet is far from understandable through our own analysis. As we become increasingly aware that preserving the global environment is one of the most important challenges of our time, we fully rely on credible sources about the extent of problems and causalities (Grunert et al. 2000).

A large number of communication sources and wide diversity of actors decrease the likeliness of misinformation. This is where hybridity enters the game. If a large variety of organizations agree on guidelines for sustainable biofuels, and if similar assemblies of organizations come to similar results on comparable issues, the likeliness is high that both the guidelines and the certification process have some degree of reliability. The same applies if all major NGOs stand united against land grabbing. These are governance mechanisms designed primarily for a high degree of credibility. Displaying the controversy about sustainability criteria of such investments may become, in a subsequent step, an emerging hybrid system. The debate between biofuel supporters and opponents plays an important role in enforcing public and corporate standards. Hybridity plays a fundamental role in building consumers' opinions.

## 7 Conclusions

Responsibility goods – goods on which money is spent with the intention of supporting other people – are playing an increasing role in a globalizing society. Bioethanol with sustainability certificates has been presented as one exemplary case, the global struggle against land grabbing as another. While the two specific cases in Sierra Leone described here contradict each other, they are also complementary in that the issue of land grabbing by Addax has only become pertinent because of the industrial bioethanol production which has been implemented by the company.

The rise of hybridity has been sufficiently described before but not fully been understood in terms of systemic advantages that hybridity is generating. The empirical evidence from the two interrelated markets of bioethanol and opposition against land grabbing has clarified the advantages of hybridity. The concept of responsibility goods is a helpful model to explain the higher requirements for credibility in the global market, which in turn helps to understand the institutional advantages of hybrid organization.

This may sound somewhat abstract but it contributes, for example, to a better comprehension of the developments around the environmental certification of agricultural production where the many parallel systems with a diversity of stakeholders may otherwise appear confusing. Likewise, hybridity obtained by forming networks of NGOs has also been shown to be a promising institutional condition for credible and lasting campaigns supporting worthy causes.

## Acknowledgments

I am most grateful to Patrick Bottazzi for helpful comments.

The usual disclaimer applies.

## References

- Aldashev, G. & Verdier, T. (2009). When NGOs go global: Competition on international markets for development donations. *Journal of International Economics* 79 (2): 198-210.
- Andreoni, J. (1990). Impure Altruism and Donations to Public Goods: A Theory of Warm-Glow Giving. *The Economic Journal* 100 (401): 464-477.
- Auld, G. & Gulbrandsen, L.H. (2010). Transparency in Nonstate Certification: Consequences for Accountability and Legitimacy. *Global Environmental Politics* 10 (3): 97-119.
- Bailis, R. & Baka, J. (2011). Constructing Sustainable Biofuels: Governance of the Emerging Biofuel Economy. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 101 (4): 827-838.
- Barnea, A. & Rubin, A. (2010). Corporate Social Responsibility as a Conflict between Shareholders. *Journal of Business Ethics* 97 (1): 71-86.
- Bartley, T. (2007). Institutional Emergence in an Era of Globalization: The Rise of Transnational Private Regulation of Labor and Environmental Conditions. *American Journal of Sociology* 113 (2): 297-351.
- Bonn, I. & Fisher, J. (2005). Corporate Governance and Business Ethics: insights from the strategic planning experience. *Corporate Governance* 13 (6): 730-738.
- Borras, S. & Franco, J. (2010). Regulating Land Grabbing? <http://www.commercialpressuresonland.org/research-papers/regulating-land-grabbing> (Nov 19, 2014).
- Boström, M. (2003). How state-dependent is a non-state driven rule-making project? The case of forest-certification in Sweden. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning* 5 (2): 165-180.
- Bread for All (2011). Land Grabbing – the dark side of ‘sustainable’ investments. Concerns of Bread for all on the Addax Bioenergy project in Sierra Leone. Bern: BfA.
- Cheyns, E. (2014). Making “minority voices” heard in transnational roundtables. *Agriculture and Human Values* 31 (3): 439-453.
- Cornali, F. & Tirocchi, S. (2012). Globalization, education, information and communication technologies: what relationships and reciprocal influences? *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Science* 47: 2060-2069.
- Dulleck, U. & Kerschbamer, R. (2006). On Doctors, Mechanics and Computer Specialists: The Economics of Credence Goods. *Journal of Economic Literature* 44 (1): 5-42.
- Elsner, W. (2004). The “new” economy: complexity, coordination and a hybrid governance approach. *International Journal of Social Economics*, Vol. 31 (11/12): 1029-1049.
- Erdem, T. & Swait, J. (2004). Brand credibility, brand consideration, and choice. *Journal of Consumer Research* 31 (1): 191-198.
- Ferrando, T. (2014). Beyond the BRIC’s rhetoric: An inquiry on South-South land grabbing. <http://triplecrisis.com/?p=10782> (Nov 27, 2014).
- Fortin, E. & Richardson, B. (2013). Certification schemes and the governance of land: enforcing standards or enabling scrutiny? *Globalizations* 10 (1): 141-159.
- Gbenda T. (2012). SiLNoRF hosts experience sharing for affected land users. <http://theogbenda.blogspot.ch/2012/01/silnorf-hosts-experience-sharing.html> (Nov 20, 2014).
- Gieryn, T.F. (1999). *Cultural Boundaries of Science: Credibility on the Line*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gjølberg, M. (2009). Measuring the immeasurable? Constructing an index of CSR practices and CSR performance in 20 countries. *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 25 (1): 10-22.
- Grunert, K.G., Bech-Larsen, T. & Bredahl, L. (2000). Three issues in consumer quality perception and acceptance of dairy products. *International Dairy Journal* 10 (8): 575-584.
- Harbaugh, W.T. (1998). What Do Donations Buy? A Model of Philanthropy Based on Prestige and Warm Glow. *Journal of Public Economics* 67 (2): 269-284.
- Hatanaka, M., Bain, C. & Busch, L. (2005). Third-party certification in the global agrifood system. *Food Policy* 30 (3): 354-369.
- Hermans, L., Vergeer, M. & D’Haenens, L. (2009). Internet in the Daily Life of Journalists: Explaining the use of the Internet by Work-Related Characteristics and Professional Opinions. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 15 (1): 138-157.
- Howes, T. (2010). The EU’s New Renewable Energy Directive. In M. Pallemarts: *The New Climate Policies of the European Union*. Amsterdam: ASP.
- Jawtuschk, J., Schader, C., Stolze, M., Baumgart, L. & Niggli, U. (2013). Sustainability Monitoring and Assessment Routine: Results from pilot applications of the FAO SAFA Guidelines. In: *Symposium International sur l’Agriculture Biologique Méditerranéenne et les Signes Distinctifs de Qualité liée à l’Origine*, 2-4 Décembre 2013, Agadir, Morocco.
- John, G. & Martin, J. (1984). Effects of Organizational Structure of Marketing Planning on Credibility and Utilization of Plan Output. *Journal of Marketing Research* 21 (2): 170-183.
- Johnson, F.X., Pacini, H. & Smeets, E. (2012). Transformation in EU biofuel markets under the Renewable Energy Directive and the implication for land use, trade and forests. Occasional Paper 78. Bogor: Center for International Forestry Research.

- Jordan, L. & van Tuijl, P. (2006). *NGO Accountability: Politics, Principles and Innovations*. New York: Routledge.
- Karré, P.M. & van Montfort, C. (2013). The (non-)credible hybrid: A model to analyse hybrid organizations and to discuss their credibility. Presentation at the 29<sup>th</sup> EGOS-colloquium, 4<sup>th</sup> July 2013.
- Lafferty, B.A., Goldsmith, R.E. & Newell, S.J. (2002). The Dual Credibility Model: The influence of corporate and endorser credibility on attitudes and purchase intentions. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice* 10 (3): 1-12.
- Lambin, E.F., Mexfroidt, P., Rueda, X., Blackman, A., Borner, J., Cerutti, P.O., Dietsch, T., Jungmann, L., Lamarque, P., Lister, J., Walker, N.F. & Wunder, S. (2014). Effectiveness and synergies of policy instruments for land use governance in tropical regions. *Global Environmental Change* 28 (1): 129-140.
- Le Velly, R. (2015). Fair trade and mainstreaming. In L.T. Reynolds and Bennett, E.A. (2015). *Handbook of Research on Fair Trade*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Liebes, T., Curran, J. & Katz, E. (1998). *Media, Ritual and Identity*. London: Psychology Press.
- Makadok, R. & Coff, R. (2009). Both market and hierarchy: An incentive-system theory of hybrid governance forms. *Academy of Management Review* 34 (2): 297-319.
- Mann, S. (2015). Responsibility Goods – Exploring a Possible Definition. *International Journal of Sustainable Economy* 7 (3): 220-230.
- Martell, L. (2010). *The Sociology of Globalization*. New York: Polity.
- McQuail, D. & Siune, K. (1998). *Media Policy*. New York: SAGE.
- Mouro, P.T. & Chaddad, F.R. (2012). Collective action and the governance of multi-stakeholder initiatives: a case study of Bonsucro. *Journal on Chain and Network Science* 12 (1): 13-24.
- Ponte, S. & Daugbjerg, C. (2014). Biofuel sustainability and the formation of transnational hybrid governance. *Environmental Politics* (in print).
- Quatrociochi, W., Conte, R., Labss, C. & Lodi, E. (2011). Opinions manipulation: Media, power and gossip. *Advances in Complex Systems* 14 (4): 567-583.
- Rickenbach, M. & Overdevest, C. (2006). More than Markets: Assessing Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Certification as a Policy Tool. *Journal of Forestry* 104 (2): 143-147.
- Rycroft-Malone, J., Seers, K., Titchen, A., Harvey, G., Kitson, A. & McCormack, B. (2004). What counts as evidence in evidence-based practice? *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 47: 81-90.
- Sandler, T. & Arce, D.G. (2002). A conceptual framework for understanding global and transnational public goods for health. *Fiscal Studies* 23 (2): 195-222.
- Schader, C., Grenz, J., Meier, M.S. & Stolze, M. (2014). Scope and precision of sustainability assessment approaches to food systems. *Ecology & Society* 19 (3): 42-56.
- Searchinger, T., Heimlich, R., Houghton, R.A., Dong, F., Elobeid, A., Fabiosa, J., Tokgoz, S., Hayes, D. & Yu, T.-H. (2008). Use of U.S. Croplands for Biofuels Increases Greenhouse Gases Through Emissions from Land-Use Change. *Science* 5867 (29): 1238-1240.
- Selfa, T., Bain, C. & Moreno, R. (2014). Depoliticizing land and water “grabs” in Colombia: the limits of Bonsucro certification for enhancing sustainable biofuel practices. *Agriculture and Human Values* 31 (3): 455-468.
- Sesay, S. (2013). SiLNoRF Trains CSOs on Land Negotiation Skills. SEM Contributor, Oct 18, 2013.
- SILNORF (2014). Annual Monitoring Report. Makeni: SILNORF.
- Skelcher, C. & Smith, S.R. (2013). Hybridity and Institutional Logics: Framing a Comparative Study of UK and US Nonprofits. <http://www.union.wisc.edu/pmra2013/Paper%20Submissions/New/Hybridity%20and%20Institutional%20Logics-%20Framing%20a%20Comparative%20Study%20of%20UK%20and%20US%20Nonprofits.pdf> (Jan 6<sup>th</sup>, 2015).
- Stolze, M. & Lampkin, N. (2009). Policy for organic farming: Rationale and concepts. *Food Policy* 34 (4): 237-244.
- Sweeney, J.C., Soutar, G.N. & Mazzarol, T. (2008). Factors influencing word of mouth effectiveness: receiver perspectives. *European Journal of Marketing* 42 (3/4): 344-364.
- Tomlinson, J. (1996). Cultural globalisation: Placing and displacing the west. *The European Journal of Development Research* 8 (2): 22-35.
- Visseren-Hamakers, I.J. (2013). Partnerships and Sustainable Development: the Lessons Learned from International Biodiversity Governance. *Environmental Policy and Governance* 23 (3): 145-160.
- Voinea, A. (2014). Fairtrade products witness a 15% growth in the market. <http://www.thenews.coop/89553/news/fairtrade/fairtrade-products-witness-a-15-growth-in-the-market/> (October 5, 2016).
- Windfuhr, M. (2012). Food Security – a global challenge. In: *Development and Peace Foundation: Global Trends 2013*.