



Are consumers willing to pay for farmers' Use of carbon offsets ?

Douadia Bougherara, Sandrine Costa-Migeon Costa, Mario Teisl

► To cite this version:

Douadia Bougherara, Sandrine Costa-Migeon Costa, Mario Teisl. Are consumers willing to pay for farmers' Use of carbon offsets ?. 18. Annual Conference EAERE, Jun 2011, Rome, Italy. 1 p., 2011. hal-02804931

HAL Id: hal-02804931

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02804931>

Submitted on 5 Jun 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Are Consumers Willing to Pay for Farmers' Use of Carbon Offsets?

Douadia Bougherara¹

INRA, UMR1302 SMART, F-35000 Rennes, France

E-mail: douadia.bougherara@rennes.inra.fr

Sandrine Costa

INRA, UMR 1110 MOISA, F-34000 Montpellier, France

E-mail: costa@nancy-engref.inra.fr

Mario Teisl

School of Economics, University of Maine, USA

E-mail: teisl@maine.edu

*Poster presented at the 18th Annual Conference of the European Association of
Environmental and Resource Economists
June 29th - July 2nd, 2011, Rome, Italy*

¹ Address: INRA-Agrocampus, UMR SMART, 4 allée Bobierre, CS61103, 35011 RENNES Cedex FRANCE.
Phone: + 33 (0)2.23.48.56.03. Fax: + 33 (0)2.23.48.53.80

Are Consumers Willing to Pay for Farmers' Use of Carbon Offsets?

Douadia BOUGHERARA
INRA, UMR1302 SMART, F-35000 Rennes, France

Sandrine COSTA
INRA, UMR 1110 MOISA, F-34000 Montpellier, France

Mario TEISL
School of Economics, University of Maine, USA

Background and Motivation

- With carbon offsetting a company can mitigate its carbon emissions by paying another party to reduce greenhouse gases (GHG) emissions.
- Some oppose offsets because of an indulgence argument:
"Just as in the 15th and 16th centuries you could sleep with your sister and kill and lie without fear of eternal damnation, today you can live exactly as you please as long as you give your ducats to one of the companies selling indulgences." (G. Monbiot)

Stated choice survey design

- Internet survey (literature indicates no clear evidence of sample selection).
- Choice between 3 types of milk
 - Product of homogenous quality
 - Dairy cattle is the largest French agricultural contributor to GHG emissions.
- 6 attributes chosen to control for technology used and public goods levels (global & local).
- Fractional factorial design with 36 choice sets blocked in 12 groups of 3 (D-efficiency=98%). 12 survey versions; each respondent sees 3 choice sets.

ATTRIBUTES USED IN STATED CHOICE SURVEY

Description	Name and Levels
Production is located where respondent lives	LOCAL: No, Yes
Purchase of offsets by producer	OFFSET: No, Yes
Decrease in number of cows on farm	COW: No, Yes
Improvement in water quality	H2O: +0%, +40%, +60%
Reduction in GHG emissions	GHG: -0%, -40%, -60%
Increase in price of the good	PRICE: +0%, +10%, +20%, +40%

EXAMPLE OF A CHOICE SET

Usual milk	Milk produced in region A	Milk produced in region B
Produced with the usual number of cows per hectare	Produced with a reduced number of cows per hectare	Produced with the usual number of cows per hectare
The farmer pays no one to reduce pollution	The farmer pays no one to reduce pollution	The farmer pays a farmer in region A to reduce pollution
No improvement in water quality	40% improvement in water quality in region A	20% improvement in water quality in region A
No reduction in GHG emissions	40% reduction in GHG emissions	60% reduction in GHG emissions
Usual price	Usual price + 20%	Usual price + 40%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Results

Sample description

- 722 respondents from 2 regions in France: Bretagne (region A) et Picardie-Champagne-Ardenne (region B).

Factor analysis to create a smaller set of variables

- 10 variables for attitudes towards offsets reduced to 2 factors:

AGAINST:

"Producers should not use offsets"

IN FAVOR:

"Producers should use offsets"

Econometric models

- CL - Conditional Logit (IIA hypothesis rejected)
- RPL(1) - Random Parameter Logit
- RPL(2) - Random Parameter Logit with interactions to determine source of heterogeneity.

SUMMARY STATISTICS

	Mean	Min	Max
GENDER (dummy: 1 = male; 0 = female)	0.49	0	1
AGE (in years)	49.70	16	82
EDUC (dummy: 1 = strictly higher than high school degree; 0 otherwise)	0.70	0	1
ORG (dummy: 1 = belongs to environmental association; 0 otherwise)	0.13	0	1

Econometric results

- Respondents and their choices are generally not affected by offsets.
- Preferences for offsets are not affected by age and education.
- Male and more environmentally active respondents oppose offsets.
- Choices of alternatives are positively affected for those who have a positive attitude towards offsets (OFFSET x IN FAVOR)

SIGNS AND SIGNIFICANCES OF PARAMETERS AND WTP

	CL	RPL (1)	RPL (2)	WTP (from CL)	
				€/Liter	% of price
Main effects					
LOCAL	+	+	+	0.068	6.83
OFFSET	- (ns)	- (ns)	- (ns)	0.069	6.87
COW	+	+	+	0.137	13.75
H2O	+	+	+	0.007	0.68
GHG	+	+	+	0.003	0.25
PRICE	- (***)	- (***)	- (***)		
Interactions with OFFSET attribute					
GENDER			- (*)		
AGE			+ (ns)		
EDUC			- (ns)		
ORG			- (**)		
AGAINST			- (ns)		
IN FAVOR			+ (*)		

ns, *, ** and *** respectively mean not significant, 10%, 5% and 1% significant

Conclusion

- Consumers do not generally care for the producers' use of offsets when level of local externalities is controlled for.
- Negative attitudes do not impact preferences for offsets.
- Positive attitudes positively impact preferences for offsets.

Aim of the study

1) Elicit consumers' willingness to pay (WTP) for producers' voluntary use of carbon offsets

- Few studies to date, none related to agriculture
- Control for the role of joint public goods: Offsets may shift joint local public goods to another region.

2) Explain WTP by consumers' motivations

- negative (e.g. moral such as the indulgence argument)
- and positive (e.g. economic such as cost-efficiency).

Further work

- Test for sample selection (Internet survey).
- Use a latent class model (LC) and add alternative specific constant to control for status quo effects.
- Estimate WTP for RPL and LC models.

We acknowledge financial support from the ANR (Agence Nationale de Recherche) under the "Programme Agriculture et Développement Durable", project "ANR-05-PADD-009, Ecolabels". We would also like to thank J.M. Rousselet for his technical support and S. Bitteur for her help in designing this poster.

18th Annual Conference of the European Association of Environmental and Resource Economists • June 29th - July 2nd, 2011 • Rome, Italy.

