



LEGATO

LEGumes for the Agriculture of TOMorrow

Collaborative project

Grant agreement no: 613551

SEVENTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME

THEME [KBBE.2013.1.2-02]

[Legume breeding and management for sustainable agriculture as well as protein supply for food and feed]

Deliverable D4.1

***Literature review and inventory:
Consumer behaviour in relation to novel uses
of legumes***

Due date: M6

Actual submission date: M11

Update submission: M24

Project start date: 1st January 2014 Duration: 48 months

Workpackage concerned: 4

Concerned workpackage leader: 1

Concerned task leader: JB Traversac INRA in collaboration with A. Seabra-Pinto ISA Lisbon

Dissemination level: PU (public)


Content

Introduction	3
1. Grain legumes: geographical distribution and cultural importance	5
2. Meat vs Plant Protein: meat advantages	12
2.1 Cost opportunity of the meat proteins regarding alternative sources.....	12
2.2 Strategy of meat substitution regarding agriculture sustainability and societal concerns	15
2.3 The Novel and innovative Protein Food: For an unlimited extension of resources	16
2.4 On the availability of NPF.....	18
3. Consumer willingness to adopt legumes	19
3.1 Plant protein qualitative studies	19
3.2 Hedonic prices of Pulses	20
3.3 Vegetable proteins - GM food.....	22
Conclusion	24
References (43)	25
Annex 1. Results of the research in databases related to consumer study and Novel Protein Food.....	29
Annex 2. Corpus description	30

INTRODUCTION

In this report we will provide evidence for the principal aspects that have been considered in the consumer behavior literature in relation to novel or innovative protein food. There is an incredible paradox on the relatively low level of Legume / Pulse use compared to their nutritional, environmental and social benefits. These products provide an opportunity to increase consumer acceptability for more sustainable sources of protein and an interesting solution to malnutrition considering their cost and their environmental merits. This document presents the results of a bibliographical analysis on plant protein consumption. We have examined a wide range of consumer studies on the subject of Novel Food or Innovative Food¹ intended as Novel Protein Food, to perform our research. Whereas the diverse legumes in all their variety of forms and cooking presentation are not exactly new food components, their limited place in diets demonstrates the need for innovations in their use as ingredients. The following presentation resumes current knowledge related to legume consumption as alternatives to meat products.

¹ The European Union's (EU's) Novel Foods Regulation (EC) No 258/97 applies to foods and food ingredients that have not been used for human consumption to a significant degree within the European Community before 15 May, 1997. This can be newly developed, innovative food or food produced using new technologies and production processes as well as food traditionally eaten outside of the EU. Although the limited frame, several grain legumes traditionally eaten in non-EU countries are included on the list subject to the Novel Food Regulation such as several beans (*adzuki-Phaseolus angularis*; runner-*Phaseolus coccineus*), cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata*) and lupin (*Lupinus albus*, *Lupinus angustifolius*, *Lupinus luteus*).
http://ec.europa.eu/food/safety/novel_food/catalogue/index_en.htm




CORPUS ON NOVEL AND INNOVATIVE PROTEIN FOODS

This report began with some data on the importance of pulse consumption to global food and nutrition security and how the aspects such as cultural and geographical localization impinge on the discussion about the future of plant proteins in food security (part 1). We then introduce the current debate on meat consumption and its actual or potential substitutes. An important debate started when meat consumption and its consequences for the earth and human beings – environmental, health and nutrition - were put in question. Researchers and NGO have investigated the trade-off between animal and vegetable proteins and the consequences of meat substitution for the earth's future (part 2). This trade-off is the major driver for a renewal of the political consideration of legumes in Europe and in other parts of the world, in the OECD as well as in developing countries. We follow with the central question of our task: How does the consumer appreciate and judge the intrinsic and extrinsic characteristics of legumes? Do consumers and citizens react to the debate on the future of the food security regime through the consumption of legumes? The last part of this document presents some studies that analyze consumer behavior faced with different sources of protein (part 3).

1. GRAIN LEGUMES: GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION AND CULTURAL IMPORTANCE

According to the data provided by FAO, protein consumption is unequally distributed in the world and between populations. In a world with a dramatic increase in its population, innovative legume-based food could offer an important sustainable path for ensuring food security². Heterogeneity in protein consumption appears also at a regional level. In Europe there are significant differences between, on the one hand, countries with large supplies of protein provided by vegetables and cereals, and, on the other hand, countries with large supplies of protein derived from meat and milk. In this respect, Portugal, Italy and Greece can be contrasted with the Netherlands, Sweden and Finland as the two poles of an axis, with intermediate positions for the other countries or regions. France as an example being divided between the butter and the olive oil/legume regions. A number of interrelated differences between these countries/regions clearly demonstrate the impacts of ecological, economic and cultural factors on current dietary protein supply.



SOURCE: FAO 2012

² United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (2014). World Population Prospects: The 2012 Revision, Methodology of the United Nations Population Estimates and Projections. ESA/P/WP.235.

Pulses play an important role in the nutritional security of a large number of people, representing a major source of protein in many developing countries and being traditionally present in their dietary patterns. In the industrialized countries, pulses are increasingly considered as an alternative source of protein and as health foods. Moreover pulses are a major contributor to food security and sustainable agriculture. As “about half of global usable land is already in pastoral or intensive agriculture, and agriculture adds globally significant and environmentally detrimental amounts of nitrogen and phosphorus to terrestrial ecosystems” (Tilman, 2002, p. 671), pulses are an important option for addressing food security and intensive agriculture. The presence of pulses is “essential” in a sustainable farming system and their environmental benefits contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission in agriculture (Andersons, 2015).

At the world scale, the market for pulses is divided into two segments: human consumption and animal feed. The largest share is for human consumption (2/3) versus a much smaller share for animal feed. Developing countries account for the bulk of total pulse utilization (3/4). Middle East and North Africa are important consumers on the pulse market. A different picture exists in the European market, where the use of pulses is mainly for animal feed (2/3).

Legume dishes are a traditional component of the food culture in, Latin American, East Indian, and Middle Eastern countries. This has largely been due to the high cost and limited availability of meat in these countries (CANGLOBAL 2001). Beans are often used in exotic dishes, such as in Mexican cuisine. While pulses are currently mainly sold in consumer packing at the retail trade, they are more and more used as bread fortifiers and in prepared foods. They are also increasingly used as a source of products such as protein, flour, starch, and fibre. These ingredients are then used in baked goods, baking mixes, soup mixes, breakfast cereals, processed meats, health foods, pastas and purees.

In northern countries, when compared to meat, legumes are perceived as a low cost protein alternative, preferred by immigrant and low income households (CANGLOBAL, 2001). Nevertheless, legumes are not totally excluded from northern countries' diets. The example of Canada reveals the presence of legumes in developed countries food regime in significant quantities. Ipsos has analysed the factors influencing

Legume (pulse) consumption in Canada (Ipsos 2010). Present in the panel of ingredients of a majority of people surveyed, legumes are however not a major component of the Canadian diet³.

“One-in-five Canadians report they have not consumed any pulses in the past six months. Overall, two-in-three (66%) Canadian adults indicate they have consumed beans in the past six months. This drops to just over half with regard to chickpeas (53%) and peas (52%), while consumption of lentils is limited to four-in-ten (41%) Canadians” p.1 ...
“Overall, two-in-three (66%) Canadian adults indicate they have consumed beans – at home and/or at a restaurant – in the past six months. This drops to just over half with regard to chickpeas (53%) and peas (52%), while consumption of lentils is limited to four-in-ten (41%) Canadians. Four-in-ten (39%) Canadians’ pulse consumption is limited to their home only...” p.5 (Ipsos, 2010)

In Europe legumes are associated with rural heritage and also ethnic foods, reflecting the image of consumers localized or originating from Southern countries. Beyond this perception as “Food of the Past”, legumes hold a substantial potential for feeding future generations.

In terms of trade, the EU is a net importer of pulses/legumes, due to an insufficient domestic production. France, the United Kingdom, Spain and Germany are the leading producers of the principal pulse crops, peas, broad and horse beans. Despite a stable demand, dry peas and lentils are hardly cultivated in the EU and are mainly imported. In 2008, the EU imported 21 million € / 1.5 million tons of pulses (mainly peas for animal feeding). Due to concentration of the major firms involved in the commodity markets, trade channels for pulses/legumes are basically the same for all European countries. Trade goes mainly through commodity traders. In the Southern countries, sales agents and SMEs are more frequent. Most pulses are used in the animal feed industry.

A voluntary politics of subsidy by the French government increased pulse production during the 2008 campaign, unfortunately the production decreased as soon as the level of national subsidies for legumes was reduced (Cavailhes 2009). Legumes have

³ The real importance of Legumes is hidden by their absence as a specific constituent in these statistical databases.

important valuable assets, in regard to their agronomic properties (Meynard *et al* 2011, 2014), their cost, as well as their health benefits.

“Being a source of protein and increasing fibre intake are also important, though relatively lower on the scale. It is notable, however, that being a less expensive protein is not a top factor, nor are digestive considerations. Also, compared to the importance of protein and fibre, the low fat content of pulses is a relatively less important factor.” p.2 (FAO 2010)


The best opportunities on the EU market exist for exports to developing countries. Some of the products, which could profit from current trends, are organically and Fair Trade certified products, GMO-free products and processed or niche products.

Consumption of pulses and grain legumes varies greatly among the different European countries, due to different regional food habits and traditions, and due to differences in production and supplies of pulses and grain legumes (Schneider, 2002). When the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) was conceived, grain legume crops that are used exclusively for human consumption (chickpea, cowpea, groundnut, lentil, and common bean) dominated grain legume cropping in Europe with 67% of the area. This dropped to 22% by 2010. (European Parliament, 2013). Today, only 57% of the food grain legumes consumed in Europe are produced within the EU (FAOSTAT, 2015). The market for pulses in Europe (especially Northern and Western EU) is underdeveloped compared to worldwide trade (CBI, 2015).

Even though the human consumption of grain legumes and pulses in Europe and the EU is lower than in other regions of the world, there is a lot of variation within Europe. The graphic below shows major differences regarding the European consumption of pulses.

The evolution of the quantity of pulses consumed per year by a person in the four different European regions displays two different situations: the North-South disparity and the similar lower consumption in the Eastern and Western regions. Since 2006, the Northern consumption has declined to values closed to the Eastern-Western consumption. In 2011, a Southern European had a consumption of 6,1 kg, a Northern

of 2,4kg and the Eastern and Western Europeans had, respectively, 1,8kg and 1,5kg (FAOSTAT, 2015).



SOURCE: FAOSTAT, 2015; figure created by the authors


Food habits, traditions and markets are the principal factors that explain this diversity of consumption. Dry peas (*Pisum sativum*) and dry beans⁴ hereafter denominated pulse⁵, are the most commonly consumed pulses in Europe, but the preference between species varies according to country (CBI, 2015).

The “Mediterranean diet” that characterizes the consumption habits of the European Mediterranean countries (Italy, Spain, France, Greece and Portugal) is responsible for the majority of human pulse consumption in Europe. One of the ten principles of this diet is the higher consumption of plant products, including vegetables, fruit, bread quality, little refined cereals, dried and fresh legumes, nuts and oilseeds.

The next figure shows the evolution of the quantity of pulses consumption in five Mediterranean countries. It shows a decrease of consumption in all countries in the last five years, with Spain maintaining its position as the principal consumer (8,6kg/per capita, in 2011).

⁴ Urad and mung beans, adzuki beans, kidney beans and other Phaseolus and Vigna beans

⁵ Pulses are the edible dry mature seeds of leguminous crops, excluding those harvested for fresh products which are classified as vegetables (FAO, 2010)



SOURCE: FAOSTAT, 2015; figure created by the authors

This finding is confirmed with the results of the Mediterranean Adequacy Index (MAI). This is an index that measures the degree of adherence to the Mediterranean dietary pattern (Albertini et al., 2009). This index results from the quotient between the proportion of energy from typical Mediterranean food groups compared to that from food groups designated as non-Mediterranean. In Europe, in terms of evolution, there was a tendency for, on average, countries with the highest rates in 1990 (above 1) to have lower values in 2009. On the other hand, countries with lower rates in 1990, showed increases in rates of adoption to the Mediterranean diet (INE, 2014). While consumption habits are changing in the Mediterranean countries, pulses maintain their place in the daily diet (Schneider, 2002).

Another interesting difference between North-European and South-European food habits is that Southern consumers prefer their local dishes and are in general less open to adopting Western food trends, compared to Northern Europeans. Also, South Europeans spend more time shopping for and preparing food. In contrast, Northern Europeans give more importance to convenience food products (Schneider, 2002). Therefore, pulses are increasingly sold in canned or frozen form in northwest Europe, while dried pulses are still popular in the southern European countries (CBI, 2015).

Several works (Schneider, 2002; European Parliament, 2013; CBI, 2015) consider that the trend in consumption of pulses in the European food market can change, because the pulses' benefits for consumers (nutritional, health and environmental) meet several of the current trends and demands of EU consumers and EU society in general. Pulses can expect to become new trendy food alternatives if the benefits of pulses are promoted and if the food industry and professional organizations integrate grain legumes in novel, convenient and healthy food products.

Importers and food processors recognize the nutritional value of pulses, expecting them to become more popular as ingredients. These agents of the European pulse value chain considered that the main factors limiting the consumption of pulses in the EU are: an inadequate level of innovation for developing products adapted to modern life, competition from cheaper low-quality imports, and a small national supply of pulses.

2. MEAT VS PLANT PROTEIN: MEAT ADVANTAGES

The discussion on protein security has focussed in recent years on the confrontation between Animal versus Plant Proteins after decades of politics effectively promoting an increase in the production and consumption of white and red meats. With the dramatic increase in world population, this debate becomes more and more acute (FAO 2012). It is clear now that the Earth's resources are insufficient to provide enough animal protein for the world's population. The inefficient way to produce protein by the animal conversion of plant protein into animal protein is challenged by innovative protein food.

2.1 Cost opportunity of the meat proteins regarding alternative sources

Some declare meat consumption unsustainable, considering on one side the needs of future populations and the dramatic demographic increase, and on the other side, stable or decreasing global resources and the fragility of natural resources. Meat production is directly accused of putting ecological resources under pressure (de Boer et al. 2006).

“Meat protein production is particularly environment-unfriendly, due to an inherently inefficient conversion. On average, 6 kg plant protein is required to yield 1 kg meat protein. Accordingly, direct human consumption of plant proteins is likely to be environmentally more beneficial than indirect consumption via meat. However, the general trend in food markets seems to be the other way around.” (De Boer et al., 2006, p.267)

Whilst the animal supply chain is contested, the future of alternative protein sources remains unclear.

The environmental impact of meat and animal product consumption has been the topic of diverse investigations in the recent literature revealing direct correlations between the diet and the environmental burden on the planet. Meat-based meals generate on average nine times higher greenhouse gas emissions than plant-based equivalents. Moreover specific meat-based products such as beef cause 10 to 20 times more environmental

impact. An animal-based diet requires 2.5 to 5.0 times the energy inputs, 2 to 3 times the water, 13 times the fertilizer, and 1.4 times the pesticide use per calorie produced compared with a plant-based diet (Shrapnel and Baghurst 2007). Considering the waste of protein when meat is produced, 80–96% of all protein in cereal and leguminous grains fed to animals is not converted to edible protein and fat (Orkow 1990). The animal supply chain appears to be inefficient in converting and producing protein for human consumption when using plant protein in intensive production systems.

Besides the fat problem focused on health consequences and weakly concerned by energy waste in the food chain (despite the importance of fat in the food energy contents), the protein debate is actually on the impact of meat protein on the food ecological footprint, which is greater than for other food components. Vieux and colleagues examined the greenhouse gas effects of reducing the consumption of energy-dense, high-fat, nutrient-poor food stuffs, and found that the food category of edible fats contributed 7% of daily diet-associated greenhouse gas emissions compared to fruit and vegetables at 9%, or meat at 27%. Considering that the French diet sources over 40% of its energy from fat-type products, it can be understood that edible fats do not have a large (nor proportional) environmental impact when compared to fruit, vegetables or meat products (Vieux et al. 2012).

In Europe, the Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) methodology applied in the agriculture and food sectors is the object of an increasing number of studies. Authors have compared the relatively high meat intake in the typical diet with meat-free scenarios. The latter were found to be between 18% and 31% lower in greenhouse gas emissions than the average diet, but their environmental impact varies greatly according to the type and production method (Roy et al. 2009, Crews TE. and Peoples MB. 2004). Marlow et al. (2009) compare the environmental effects of a vegetarian and non-vegetarian diet in California. The authors concluded that from an environmental perspective, the diet content makes a difference. Nevertheless, they mentioned that from a food security perspective, a vegetarian diet can induce nutritional risks, in term of balance of amino-acid and micronutrient supply. Worrell and Appleby (2000) or Buttriss (2013) note that this ecological advantage may be counterbalanced by an insufficient intake of certain micronutrients in vegetable diet. If the diet comprises a limited selection of foodstuffs,

even a small animal-based food intake could make a critical difference to micronutrient intake. Thus the advice for a diet high in plant has to be coupled with some meat products.

While the majority of evidence suggests that an increased intake of fruit and vegetables will reduce environmental impact, there is a growing literature that suggests a diet low in meat and high in fruits and vegetables is not always low in environmental impact. This is because the difference in quantity of vegetable substitutes eaten to replace animal proteins can contribute to increase the environmental impacts, due to the increased quantities of cereals and vegetables for human consumption only slightly outweighing the corresponding decline in the resources required for animal feed cereal. Variability in methods and data can considerably affect the result of GES measures on the impact of feed ingredients (Van Middelaar *et al.* 2013). More will have to be done in this question regarding the impact of both types of diet sourced from regions with different land feed bases (e.g. meat from grassland vs meat from cereal-feed base). Methods to calculate the NO₃ impact need harmonization and enriched databases for comparative studies.

A further factor to be taken into consideration is the meat production on land unsuitable for other crops, such as permanent pastures, which makes a positive environmental contribution in terms of carbon storage and soil husbandry.

Reijnders and Soret (2003) evaluate the impact of animal and vegetable protein on the environment considering the whole supply chain. The comparison of meat and processed protein based on soybeans, of cheese varieties made from cow milk and directly from lupine, are favorable to plant protein ingredients. They observe that the environmental burden of vegetarian foods is usually relatively low when production and processing are considered. The environmental comparison on the evaluation of energy inputs and their carbon emission in fish protein and vegetable protein also suggest an advantage for vegetarian foodstuffs.

"In the evaluation of processed protein food based on soybeans and meat protein, a variety of environmental impacts associated with primary production and processing are a factor 4.4-> 100 to the disadvantage of meat. The comparison of cheese varieties gives differences in specific environmental impacts ranging between a factor 5 and 21. And

energy use for fish protein may be up to a factor 14 more than for protein of vegetable origin. Assessment suggests that on average the complete life cycle environmental impact of non-vegetarian meals may be roughly a factor 1.5-2 higher than the effect of vegetarian meals in which meat has been replaced by vegetable protein.” (Reijnders and Soret, 2003, p. 664)

Technically the lever is mostly feed conversion efficiencies. The efficiency of the transformation of vegetable into animal feed varies between 2.2 and 2.7 kg of feed per kg (Carlsson-Kanyama and Faist 1999). More than the double the weight of vegetables may be needed to provide food through animal food chain. Generally, fish and broilers are the most efficient feed converters with 1.1-2.6 kg of feed per kg of carcass. Significant feed waste arises due to inefficient protein production systems (subject to differences in nutrient balance).

2.2 Strategy of meat substitution regarding agriculture sustainability and societal concerns

In order to achieve sustainability objectives, NGO attempt to change citizens' attitudes regarding their protein consumption. Any attempt to address directly the daily behavior of the consumer concerning the problem of the ecological cost of meat consumption considers the amount and the source of protein consumption. These nutritional initiatives to change consumer behaviors provide complementary information on consumer perception concerning a shift on protein sources. One of the strategies that several NGOs are already using to encourage dietary changes is promoting meatless days. This strategy fits into an approach to change decisions at the level of meals. (Laestadius *et al.* 2013). Consumers may respond to it by leaving the meat out of their meal or by replacing it by another source of protein. The strategy of promoting meatless days is mainly an attempt to highlight commitment to a higher order goal.

For the sustainability of agriculture, small changes on protein intakes have positive effects and no direct consequences on diet quality if the change is well oriented in the right substitutes. The study on this issue by Aiking and colleagues on Netherlands came to the conclusion that if consumers were to reduce their overall protein intake by about one third, this shift would result in a substantial reduction of the pressure on the

environment without putting a healthy nutrition in jeopardy (Aiking et al. 2006). The hypothesis of the neutral consequence on health of the low meat diet is strengthened by the observation that in developed countries on average people consume 60% more protein than the FAO's Recommended Daily Intake. One third of the protein supply is meat-based, one third is dairy-based, and one third is plant-based (de Boer et al. 2006). The basic idea of the meatless day is to reduce the level of meat protein intake with or without increase of vegetable proteins.

Other possible strategies to encourage dietary changes are focused on the portion size of meat in each meal. These strategies may promote smaller portions of meat, smaller portions using meat raised in a more sustainable manner, or smaller portions and eating more vegetable protein. Regarding meat choices, "less but better" may be improved in different ways. One interpretation is that it is favored by extensively produced meat, such as organic and free-range meat, over intensively produced meat.

2.3 The Novel and innovative Protein Food: For an unlimited extension of resources

In recent years the debate on the protein food security was enriched by the discussion on novel protein sources⁶ to complement traditional meat (and vegetable) proteins. New sources with an expectedly huge yield and low production costs have appeared on the market.

"The literature shows a huge potential of diverse protein sources: the soluble and insoluble proteins that exist in agricultural raw materials, the proteins that are obtained from oilseed meals and from several animal by-products; the potential co-production of protein from biofuel production; the promising RuBisCo protein, the major protein component of all green leaves; the proteins extracted from algae, fungus, and insects. Food waste is also considered as a source of protein that appears in different steps of the food supply chain and that could be used in animal feed and human consumption." (Boland et al., 2013)

⁶ Boland et al. (2013) consider that novel proteins are "proteins that are not currently used as animal feed, and proteins that are currently used as animal feed modified and improved for human consumption" (p.66).

If the huge potential of NPF based on “exotic” sources is expected, the form and the structure of these innovations restrict their entry on the human protein market. To persuade consumers to adopt food from novel protein sources it is clear that consumer education is needed to change behavior (Rothschild 1999) with from little to a major effort by the consumer (Van Trijp and Fischer 2011). A change of diet may run into consumer preferences or dislikes of specific foods (Boland et al. 2013).

Some meat sources are unacceptable due to religious proscription (Kaci *et al.* 2012). Similarly, innovative protein sources may not be acceptable in some cultures (Grigg 1995). Truly novel protein sources may run into additional dislike by the consumer: insect phobia, a fear of the new, has been shown to be particularly high for foodstuffs (Cox and Evans 2008, Boland et al. 2013). Legal barriers could also hinder the development of some interesting solutions, e.g. a unified and worldwide accepted classification of insect-based food products does not exist yet. The European Novel Food Regulation is still assessing the status of insect-based food products, “tolerating” commercialization in the European market of products in which insects are used as a whole, while forbidding commercialization of processed insect-based products (EC 258/97).

Economists began to investigate the role of information bias on consumer acceptance and willingness to pay (WTP) for an emerging category of radical food innovation, insect-based products (Pascucci and de-Magistris 2013). Because food products with processed insects are not allowed by European legislators, food firms sell these products using non processed insects and usually having the insects clearly visible on product. In a choice experiment using a sample of 122 Dutch consumers, they showed this is undermining the possibility of business actors to increase the value-added of these products, while increasing the risk of consumers’ rejection. An intensive use of positive frames associated to social and environmental benefits of consumption of insect-based foods is not significantly impacting the WTP of interviewed consumers. The negative effects of visualization are difficult to mitigate and represent a serious threat for future success of this marketing strategy.

2.4 On the availability of NPF

Note that the presence of plant protein is already noticeable in addition to meat protein in many processed foods. Additions of plant-derived products to animal foodstuffs in the order of 5% of the total fresh mass are already quite common in prepared meals (Smil 2000). Addition of plant protein in traditional as well as modern meals is generally driven by cost and household budget considerations. Vegetable proteins are cheap compare to meat protein sources.

Proteins are not all equally effective in their nutritional characteristics and in promoting growth. The quality of a protein is determined by its amino acid composition. Good-quality proteins contain all the essential amino acids in proportions necessary for the construction of muscle. Such proteins are known as complete proteins or proteins of high biological value. All animal protein sources are complete proteins, and if eaten in adequate amounts they meet all a person's protein needs. Proteins from vegetable sources, such as beans, contain all the essential amino acids, but generally contain one or more of them in insufficient quantity to meet growth requirements. Bean proteins are generally rich in lysine but poor in Sulphur-containing amino acids whereas cereal proteins have the opposite profile. Therefore legume proteins are therefore valuable supplements to cereal-based diets. For example, an optimal protein quality can be obtained by combining wheat and chickpea at a ratio of approximately 2:1.

Among the Novel Protein Foods, Legumes are more acceptable than insect-derived proteins, but less so than meat proteins

3. CONSUMER WILLINGNESS TO ADOPT LEGUMES

The central question of our research is the following one: What do we know about the consumer preference regarding novel and innovative protein foods and legumes in particular? Is the consumer ready to pay a premium for the role of NPF in the sustainability of agriculture? Hereafter we present up-to-date analyses on consumer behavior confronted with different sources of protein.

3.1 Plant protein qualitative studies

Klemcke and colleagues' research, which formed part of the LeGUAN project, aimed at establishing how grain legumes are accepted by consumers (Klemcke et al. 2013). They conducted a qualitative study supported by interviews with 103 participants in Berlin and Munich. The interviewees most often described pulses in positive terms. They regard pulses as containing protein and vitamins. They were therefore "good for health". They describe dishes in which pulses are used – *e. g.* lentil or bean soups, stews – as positive in term of organoleptic perception. However, 9% of the interviewees regretted that the preparation was too time-consuming – *e.g.* soaking the vegetables during the preparation took too much time.

On the side of negative factors; it appears that the flatulence is not an explanation for the unwillingness to accept pulses. The study result suggests that this problem hardly inhibits the purchase of pulses. Although one-third of the respondents stated that pulses caused them digestive problems, only 14 persons would not consume pulses because they caused flatulence. Of the 20% of interviewees who generally consumed no pulses, the main obstacles to consumption were the taste and the demanding preparation. The favorable association of pulses is much stronger than the unfavorable associations.

The study found that price, freshness, health and ecological aspects were the most important points for the respondents. On the other hand, it was concluded that customers hardly look at product characteristics. Grain legumes are generally accepted to be healthy. For the consumer they are part of a diet diversification, and for this reason are expected to be favorable to health. Surprisingly negative associations such as flatulence are of comparatively little importance. This point has to be questioned

considering the social characteristics of the consumers. To improve grain legume marketing, the authors recommend providing consumers' information to explain the benefits they provide to health and the environment.

To investigate feasible substitution options, Schösler and colleagues presented a variety of meals without meat to subjects (Schösler *et al.* 2012). These meals were rated by the participants in terms of attractiveness and chances that they would prepare a similar meal at home. The results demonstrated the influence of meal formats, product familiarity, cooking skills, preferences for plant-based foods and motivational orientations towards food. In particular, a lack of familiarity and skill hampered the preparation of vegetarian meals.

De Boer and colleagues have analyzed the willingness to adopt a meat-free day and the willingness to adopt a plant protein substitute (de Boer 2009). Their data consist of a sample of 1083 consumers in the Netherlands based on a survey among consumers with internet access. The stratified sample was drawn from a large panel of persons who were willing to participate in web-based research for a small reward. The subject of meat substitution was introduced with a question deliberately substituting something for meat. The first results on the preferred meat portion size reveals that the preferred meat portion size significantly increased with number of meat-eating days and BMI category, but decreased with a preference for plant-based proteins, being female, increased age, and higher level of education. The results confirmed that a substantial number of consumers do not understand or appreciate the idea that they might have to eat less meat exclusively or primarily for environmental reasons.

3.2 Hedonic prices of Pulses

The economic literature on the price determination at the consumer level and willingness to adopt grain legumes is scarce. Very few studies have been carried out on the relation between legume characteristics and market prices. One example is the research conducted by Langyintuo and others (2003, 2004) on the hedonic prices of cowpea in Central-Africa markets. Their data were generated through purchase of samples in seven spatially separated markets, three in Ghana and four in Cameroon, between 1996 and 2000 using similar data collection protocols. During three years, five

samples of cowpea were randomly purchased, once per month, in each market. In the market, price and vendor characteristics were noted. In the laboratory, size of grains, color, texture, and damage levels were recorded. The data generated are thus pooled cross-section and time series outcomes with 180 observations per market. The characteristics of the transaction noted are weight of grains purchased per the common unit of measure, usually a bowl in grams, and cowpea grain characteristics, such as grain size, color of the eye, seed coat color, and number of bruchid holes in every 100 grains. The bowl weight is included as an explanatory variable to account for volume discounts. In the markets, cowpea grains are sold by volume and hence prices were observed on per bowl basis which were subsequently converted into per kilograms. The estimated regression results indicate that seasonality, grain size, color and insect damage level explain 63 and 97% of price variability in Ghana and Cameroon (Langyintuo 2003, 2004).

In all markets, the grain weight per measuring unit is statistically significant in explaining price variability. Cowpea grain size is statistically significant in five of the seven markets studied⁷. All estimated coefficients on the number of holes have the hypothesized negative sign. Consumers in Ghana and Cameroon seem to differ in their preferences for grain eye color. While consumers in Cameroon discount black-eyed cowpea those in Ghana pay a premium.

The study indicates that quality characteristics are very important in Central Africa food markets for legumes, whereas they are considered as raw materials. Moreover consumers in low income markets are willing to pay a premium for products that match their preferences. They are vigilant in identifying products that do not meet their standards. In the Central Africa cowpea market, the color of the grain is central for consumer (colored vs white grain). Interestingly, this preference may differ from one market to another. Some prefer black, others prefer white pea.

⁷ To avoid the contemporaneous correlation, the authors used an estimation of all equations jointly with the seemingly unrelated regression estimator, rather than to estimate each one separately using least squares.

3.3 Vegetable proteins - GM food

To learn more about preferences for Genetically Modified (GM) food, products based on vegetable proteins are interesting models due to the importance of soy in GM markets. Comparable surveys were conducted in different European and Asian countries by McCluskey and colleagues to determine consumer acceptance for GM foods (McCluskey et al. 2003). The surveys solicited respondents' attitudes about food safety and the environment, and perceptions about biotechnology. Respondents were asked about their willingness to pay the same for GM food as for a corresponding non-GM product. In Japan, consumers were asked about GM tofu and noodles, in Norway, consumers were asked about GM bread and about salmon grown with GM feed, and in China, consumers were asked about GM rice and GM soy oil.

The results for Japan show that variables representing food safety and environmental attitudes, self-reported knowledge about biotechnology, self-reported risk perceptions of GM-foods, income, and education all significantly increase the necessary discount required for consumers to choose GM foods (McCluskey et al. 2003). The results indicate that Seikyou (Japanese agricultural cooperative) members, on average, want a 60-percent discount on GM noodles compared to non GM noodles. Increasing self-reported risk perceptions toward GM foods and preferences for domestically produced food both also significantly increase the discount required for Norwegian consumers to choose GM foods (Grimsrud et al. 2003).

The results indicate that, on average, the Norwegian consumers in the studies want a 49.5-percent discount on GM bread compared to conventional bread. Interestingly, the results for China present a very different picture (Li et al. 2003). These results show that positive opinions regarding biotechnology significantly increase the premium that Chinese consumers are willing to pay for GM foods. For GM rice, age significantly decreased the consumers' willingness to pay for GM foods. The results indicate that Chinese consumers, on average, were willing to pay a 16.3-percent premium for GM soybean oil over non-GM soybean oil. This is not surprising, given that 23 percent of the survey respondents were very positive about the use of biotechnology in foods and 40 percent of the respondents were somewhat positive about the use of biotechnology in foods. It makes sense that consumers in China, who have low perceived levels of risk

(82 percent felt there was little or no risk associated with GM foods) would be willing to pay a premium for GM products.

Chinese consumer attitudes concerning biotechnology may reflect the Chinese government's traditionally strong support for it. Thus far, the controversy taking place in Europe and Japan is not apparent in China, but new regulations regarding labeling and safety testing are most likely leading to increased public awareness of the application of biotechnology to agricultural products.

Japanese and Norwegian cultures both place a great deal of value on tradition. This world-view extends to the food they eat and feed to their children. In contrast, the vast majority of the Chinese respondents have positive attitudes toward the use of biotechnology in agriculture and, in general, toward science. Younger people are more willing to purchase the GM Soy products considering that GM is a product-enhancing attribute. This result indicates that the Chinese market may be even more open to GM foods than European consumers.

CONCLUSION

Considering advances in the economic and sensory research on preference for novel foods such as GM foods, or the research on food labelling, the work done regarding the preference for NPF is tiny. First investigations reveal that the behavior of the consumer whilst choosing legumes is little documented whereas the question is complex from both social and nutritional viewpoints. Results confirm that a substantial number of consumers do not appreciate the idea that they would have to eat less meat, for any reason (de Boer 2009, Vogel 2010, Pascucci and de-Magistris 2013). The structure of meals is closely connected to meat's status in society, as it was for wine in some countries. Physiological and nutritional considerations interfere with social attitudes. From a nutritional perspective, asking consumers to eat less meat may trigger not only resistance to change but also confusion regarding amounts and sources of proteins. A change at the level of macronutrients is hardly managed by individuals. Humans regulate their protein intake by selecting a low/high-protein food. After a protein deficit, people tend to select, savory high-protein foods (Griffioen-Roose et al. 2012), consciously or unconsciously. This healthy correction mechanism may not work properly if people are changing their diets.

As we have seen, numerous factors impinge on the preference for plant protein, not only the consumer's budget. Cultural positions and cooking constraints are real barriers to the entry of legumes in the daily meal of the European citizens. A lot has still to be done regarding these novel or innovative legume based foodstuffs including food processing to reduce anti-nutritional factors, increasing palatability and convenience, and accelerating commercial innovation including economics of the consumer behavior. Considering the current lack of information in the economic literature on legume consumer behavior, we propose to focus on consumer's WTP for intrinsic (taste, color) and extrinsic attributes (nutritional and environmental) of legumes. Experimental markets offer appropriate tools for this exercise. The control of the product characteristics permits questions on future marketing trends.

References (43)

- Alberti A., Fruttini D., Fidanza F. 2009. The Mediterranean Adequacy Index: Further confirming results of validity. *Nutrition, Metabolism & Cardiovascular Diseases*, 19: 61-66
- Aiking H. 2011. Future protein supply. *Trends in Food Science & Technology* 22: 112-120
- Aiking H., de Boer J., Vereijken JM. 2006. Sustainable protein production and consumption: Pigs or peas? *Environment & policy*. 45
- Andersons, 2015. Revealing the opportunities for growing peas and beans in the UK. The Andersons Centre for the John Inn Centre.
- Boland MJ, Rae AN, Vereijken JM, Meuwissen MPM, Fischer ARH, Van Boekel MAJS, Rutherford SM, Gruppen H, Moughan PJ, Hendriks WH., 2013. The future supply of animal-derived protein for human consumption. *Trends Food Sci Technol* 29(1):62–73.
- Buttriss J. 2013. Food security through the lens of nutrition. *Nutritional Bulletin*. 38:254–261
- Carlsson-Kanyama A., Faist, M. 1999. *Energy Use in the Food Sector: A data survey* By Environmental Strategies Research Group, Stockholm, 36 p.
- Cavaillès E., 2009. La relance des légumineuses dans le cadre d'un plan protéine : quels bénéfices environnementaux ? Collection « Études et document » du Service de l'Économie, de l'Évaluation et de l'Intégration du Développement Durable (SEEIDD) du Commissariat Général au Développement Durable (CGDD), Paris, 44 p.
- CBI, 2010. CBI market survey: the rice and pulses market in The EU. CBI market information database, p.54.
- CBI, 2015. Trends: grains and pulses in Europe. CBI Market Intelligence.
- Crews TE. and Peoples MB. 2004. Legume versus fertilizer sources of nitrogen: ecological tradeoffs and human needs. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 102: 279-297
- de Boer J., Schösler H., Aiking H. 2014. “Meatless days” or “less but better”? Exploring strategies to adapt Western meat consumption to health and sustainability challenges. *Appetite*. 76: 120–128
- de Boer J., Boersema JJ., Aiking H. 2009. Consumers' motivational associations favoring free-range meat or less meat. *Ecological Economics*. 68: 850–860.
- de Boer J., Helms M., Aiking H. 2006. Protein consumption and sustainability. Diet diversity in EU-15. *Ecological Economics*. 59: 267–274.

European Parliament, 2013. The environmental role of protein crops in the new Common Agricultural Policy. Directorate-General Policies.

FAO, WFP and IFAD. 2012. The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2012. Economic growth is necessary but not sufficient to accelerate reduction of hunger and malnutrition. Rome, FAO.

FAOSTAT, 2015. Food Balances. Food And Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Statistic Division. In: <http://faostat3.fao.org/home>

Griffioen-Roose S., Mars M., Siebelink E., Finlayson G., Tomé D., de Graaf, C. 2012. Protein status elicits compensatory changes in food intake and food preferences. The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition. 95: 32–38.

INE, 2014. Balança Alimentar Portuguesa 2008-2012, *Destaque* 2 de Abril de 2014.

Klemcke S., Glende S., Rohn S. 2013. The revitalisation of native grain legumes - Survey on buying habits and assessment of image of legumes. *Ernaehrungs Umschau international*. 60(4): 52–58.

Laestadius L.I., Neff R.A., Barry C.L., Frattaroli, S. 2013. Meat consumption and climate change. The role of non-governmental organizations. *Climatic Change*. 120: 25–38.

Langyintuo AS., Ntougamb G., Murdock L., Lowenberg-DeBoer J., Miller DJ. 2004. Consumer preferences for cowpea in Cameroon and Ghana. *Agricultural Economics*. 30: 203–213

Langyintuo AS., Lowenberg-DeBoer J., Fayec M., Lambert D., Ibrod G., Moussad B., Kergnae A., Kushwahaf S., Musaf S., Ntougamb G. 2003. Cowpea supply and demand in West and Central Africa. *Field Crops Research*. 82: 215–231

Marlow H.J., Hayes W.K., Soret S., Carter R.L., Schwab E.R., Sabaté J. 2009. Diet and the environment: Does what you eat matter? *American Journal Clinical Nutrition*. 89:1699S–1703

McCluskey, J.J., Grimsrud K.M., Ouchi H., Wahl T.I. 2003. “Consumer Response to Genetically Modified Food Products in Japan,” *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review*. 32(2):222–231

Mihalopoulos, Vassilis; Demoussis, Michael, 2000 Consumption Profiles for Various Food Groups in Greece- *Agricultural Economics Review*. vol. 1(2), pp. 46-56

Orskov ER. 1990. Energy nutrition in ruminants. New York: Elsevier

PBL (Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency), 2011. The protein puzzle. The consumption and production of meat, dairy and fish in the European Union. Bilthoven: Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving.

Pascucci S., de-Magistris T. 2013. Information Bias Condemning Radical Food Innovators? The Case of Insect-Based Products in the Netherlands. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review* 16, Issue 3, 2013

Rao, Parthasarathy, Birthal P.S., Bhagavatula S. and Bantilan M.C.S. 2010. Chickpea and Pigeonpea Economies in Asia: Facts, Trends and Outlook. Patancheru, Andhra Pradesh, India: International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics. 76 pp. ISBN: 978-92-9066-530-4.

Reijnders, L. and Soret, S., 2003. Quantification of the environmental impact of different dietary protein choices. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* (78) 664–668

Reynolds CJ., Buckley JD., Weinstein P., Boland P. 2014. Are the Dietary Guidelines for Meat, Fat, Fruit and Vegetable Consumption Appropriate for Environmental Sustainability? A Review of the Literature, *Nutrients*, 6(6): 2251–2265

Roy P., Nei D., Orikasa T., Xu Q., Okadome H., Nakamura N., Shiina T. 2009. A review of life cycle assessment (LCA) on some food products. *Journal of Food Engineering*. 90:1–10.

Scheineider, A.V.C., 2002. Overview of the market and consumption of pulses in Europe. *British Journal of Nutrition*. 88(3): 243-250.

Schösler H., de Boer J., Boersema JJ.. 2012. Can we cut out the meat of the dish? Constructing consumer-oriented pathways towards meat substitution. *Appetite*. 58: 39–47

Shrapnel B., Baghurst K., 2007. Lack of nutritional equivalence in the ‘meats and alternatives’ group of the Australian guide to healthy eating. *Nutr. Diet*. 64:254–260

Smil V. 2002. Worldwide transformation of diets, burdens of meat production and opportunities for novel food proteins. *Enzyme and Microbial Technology* 30 305–311

Swamy G. 2010. Will Indians stop consuming Pulses? Draft, February 2010.

Tilman, D., Cassman, K.G., Matson, P.A., Naylor, R., Polasky, S., 2002. Agricultural sustainability and intensive production practices. *Nature*, 418: 671-677.

Van Middleaar C., Cederberg C., Vellinga TV., van der Werf H., de Boer I., 2013 Exploring variability in methods and data sensitivity in carbon footprints of feed ingredients. *The International Journal of Life Cycle Assessment*. 18(4) 768-782

Vieux F., Darmon N., Touazi D., Soler L.G. 2012. Greenhouse gas emissions of self-selected individual diets in France: Changing the diet structure or consuming less? *Ecological Economics*. 75:91–101.

Vogel, G. 2010. For more protein, filet of cricket. *Science*. 327: 811.

Worrell R., Appleby M.C. 2000 Stewardship of natural resources: Definition, ethical and practical aspects. *J. Agric. Environ. Ethics*. 12:263–277

Annex 1. Results of the research in databases related to consumer study and Novel Protein Food

WOS (from Web of Science Core Collection). Results: 7

You searched for: TI=(LEGUME and CONSUMPTION) OR TI=(PROTEIN and WILLINGNESS TO PAY) OR TI=(VEGETABLE AND PROTEIN) OR TI=(NOVEL PROTEIN FOOD)
Refined by: DOCUMENT TYPES: (ARTICLE OR PROCEEDING PAPER)

No results for:

- TI=(LEGUME and WILLINGNESS TO PAY)
- TI=(PULSE and WILLINGNESS TO PAY)

SCOPUS. Results: 01

(TITLE(NOVEL PROTEIN FOOD))

No results for:

- (TITLE(LEGUME) AND TITLE(CONSUMPTION OR WILLINGNESS TO PAY))

CAB Abstract. Results: 00

(TITLE(NOVEL PROTEIN FOOD))

(TITLE(LEGUME) AND TITLE(CONSUMPTION OR WILLINGNESS TO PAY))

No results

Others databases. Results: 09

(TITLE(NOVEL PROTEIN FOOD))

(TITLE(LEGUME) AND TITLE(CONSUMPTION OR WILLINGNESS TO PAY))

Econlit: 0 results,

ScienceDirect: 7 results

Wiley: 1 results

Cairn: 1 result

These 17 references are:

- From 1990 to 2014
- Document types: Journals: 15 + Book and book section: 4

These publications do not correspond to specialized journals or authors, with the exception of a few journals, Appetite, Food Quality and Preference.

There are no scientific and professional communities structured around Legume consumption. One team is distinguished for its work on meat substitute in WU.

Annex 2. Corpus description

The analysis reveals three groups of references (table 1):

- First, 11 references dealing with Legume Markets and Environmental Impact;
- Second, 19 dealing with Novel Protein Food;
- Third, 4 dealing with Method for the Estimation of the Consumer Preference for Legumes.

Table 1: Topics and Subtopics related to Legume and Pulse consumption

Topic	Number	Sub-topic	Number
Legume Markets & Environment	11	Legume Supply Chain	6
		Plant Protein Efficiency	5
Meat Substitutes and Novel Protein Food (other than Legumes)	19	Shifts from Meat to Meat Substitutes	8
		Novel Food Preferences and Barriers to Entry	11
Understanding Consumer Attitude Toward Legumes	4	Experimental Market of Legume	0
		Qualitative analysis of Legume Willingness to Buy	3
		Hedonic Prices on Legume Markets	1
Total	34		34