

SCIENCE, SOCIETY AND NEW TECHNOLOGIES SERIES

COMMUNICATION, ENVIRONNEMENT, SCIENCE AND SOCIETY SET



**Volume 2**

# **Popularizing Science**

*The Complex Terminological Interactions  
between Scientific and Press Discourses  
within the Field of Agroecology*

**Hélène Ledouble**

**ISTE**

**WILEY**



## Popularizing Science



**Communication, Environment, Science and Society Set**

coordinated by  
Andrea Catellani and Céline Pascual Espuny

Volume 2

---

# **Popularizing Science**

---

*The Complex Terminological Interactions  
between Scientific and Press Discourses  
within the Field of Agroecology*

Hélène Ledouble

ISTE

WILEY

First published 2024 in Great Britain and the United States by ISTE Ltd and John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, this publication may only be reproduced, stored or transmitted, in any form or by any means, with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction in accordance with the terms and licenses issued by the CLA. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside these terms should be sent to the publishers at the undermentioned address:

ISTE Ltd  
27-37 St George's Road  
London SW19 4EU  
UK

[www.iste.co.uk](http://www.iste.co.uk)

John Wiley & Sons, Inc.  
111 River Street  
Hoboken, NJ 07030  
USA

[www.wiley.com](http://www.wiley.com)

© ISTE Ltd 2024

The rights of H el ene Ledouble to be identified as the author of this work have been asserted by her in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s), contributor(s) or editor(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of ISTE Group.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2023952525

---

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data  
A CIP record for this book is available from the British Library  
ISBN 978-1-78630-712-5

---

---

# Contents

---

<b>Foreword</b> . . . . .	ix
Anne CONDAMINES	
<b>Preface</b> . . . . .	xiii
<b>Acknowledgments</b> . . . . .	xv
<b>Introduction</b> . . . . .	xvii
<b>Part 1. The Challenge of Popularizing Science</b> . . . . .	1
<b>Introduction to Part 1</b> . . . . .	3
<b>Chapter 1. The Dialogue Between Science and Society</b> . . . . .	5
1.1. The popularizing project . . . . .	5
1.1.1. How we talk about popular science . . . . .	6
1.1.2. Promoting popularization . . . . .	7
1.2. Science in the media and the multiplicity of actors . . . . .	10
1.2.1. From scholarly knowledge to social knowledge . . . . .	10
1.2.2. Perspectives on science and experts . . . . .	12
1.3. Scientific and media approaches to popularization . . . . .	17
1.3.1. Divergence between scientific and media approaches . . . . .	17
1.3.2. Convergences between these approaches . . . . .	20
<b>Chapter 2. Discourses on Science</b> . . . . .	25
2.1. Genres in scientific communication . . . . .	25
2.2. Scientific discourse . . . . .	28
2.2.1. Terminological variation in specialized discourse . . . . .	29
2.2.2. Specialized and general language . . . . .	32

2.3. Scientific media discourse . . . . .	33
2.3.1. Language and variation in the popularization process . . . . .	34
2.3.2. Parallel between popularization and education. . . . .	36
<b>Chapter 3. Theoretical and Methodological Tools for Analysis . . . . .</b>	<b>41</b>
3.1. Identification and categorization of names and designations . . . . .	41
3.1.1. Designations in a discursive context . . . . .	42
3.1.2. Analysis and categorization of designations . . . . .	43
3.2. Characterization of objects of discourse . . . . .	43
3.2.1. Characterization of an object of discourse: media schematization . . . . .	44
3.2.2. Formal markers characterizing objects of discourse . . . . .	46
<b>Part 2. Science in the Media: Agroecology in the Daily Press. . . . .</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Introduction to Part 2 . . . . .</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Chapter 4. An Introduction to Agroecology . . . . .</b>	<b>53</b>
4.1. Presentation of biological control . . . . .	54
4.1.1. Definition of terms and terminological instability . . . . .	55
4.1.2. Regulatory approach to plant protection . . . . .	57
4.2. Media discourse under study . . . . .	59
4.2.1. French press corpus. . . . .	60
4.2.2. English-language press corpus. . . . .	61
<b>Chapter 5. Names and Designations of Discourse Objects . . . . .</b>	<b>63</b>
5.1. Designations of plant protection methods . . . . .	63
5.1.1. Protection methods in French . . . . .	63
5.1.2. Control methods in English . . . . .	69
5.1.3. Summary of method designations . . . . .	71
5.2. Designations of agents and plant protection products . . . . .	73
5.2.1. Biocontrol agents (insects) . . . . .	73
5.2.2. Biocontrol products. . . . .	76
5.2.3. Summary of product designations. . . . .	79
<b>Chapter 6. Characterization of Discourse Objects . . . . .</b>	<b>81</b>
6.1. Crossed perspectives on methods and products . . . . .	81
6.1.1. Complementarity of methods and products. . . . .	82
6.1.2. Opposition between methods and products. . . . .	87
6.1.3. Synthesis of oppositions and binarism . . . . .	92
6.2. Simplified look at methods and products . . . . .	93
6.2.1. Simplification through (co)textual structures. . . . .	93
6.2.2. Simplification by analogical reasoning . . . . .	94



---

<b>Part 3. Challenges in the Mediation of Agroecological Issues</b> . . . . .	97
<b>Introduction to Part 3</b> . . . . .	99
<b>Chapter 7. Terminological and Cognitive Issues</b> . . . . .	101
7.1. Designations and specialization . . . . .	101
7.1.1. Semantic shift between areas of expertise . . . . .	102
7.1.2. Determinologization . . . . .	104
7.1.3. Designations and connotations. . . . .	106
7.1.4. Name equivalents in discourse. . . . .	111
7.1.5. Agent and product status . . . . .	112
7.2. Binarism and cognitive bias . . . . .	114
7.2.1. Strengths and weaknesses of binary reasoning. . . . .	114
7.2.2. Strengths and weaknesses of analogical reasoning. . . . .	123
<b>Chapter 8. Challenges in Agroecology</b> . . . . .	129
8.1. A shared responsibility . . . . .	129
8.1.1. The connection between content and style . . . . .	130
8.1.2. Development is inseparable from dissemination. . . . .	136
8.2. Scientific mediation . . . . .	137
8.2.1. Reflexivity and scientific mediation. . . . .	138
8.2.2. Language and terminology. . . . .	143
8.2.3. Involving the public . . . . .	149
<b>Conclusion</b> . . . . .	159
<b>Glossary</b> . . . . .	167
<b>References</b> . . . . .	171
<b>Index</b> . . . . .	193



---

## Foreword

---

The book written by H  l  ne Ledouble, *Popularizing Science: The Complex Terminological Interactions between Scientific and Press Discourses within the Field of Agroecology*, is the result of the author's experience, as a linguist, in an interdisciplinary research project that began in 2017 at the initiative of INRAE (Institut national de recherche pour l'agriculture, l'alimentation et l'environnement – French National Research Institute for Agriculture, Food and the Environment).

It is original in more ways than one: by the questions it addresses (the popularization of science); by the field it concerns (agroecology); by the methods it presents (linguistic corpus analysis and cognitive analysis) and more generally, by the questions it raises about the possibilities of transmitting scientific knowledge to the general public. A crucial (and fascinating) problem underlies the book – is it possible to popularize science? As the author reminds us, epistemologists, educators and, of course, linguists have taken up this question and put it in another way – are scientific concepts accessible to the general public? Isn't popularization a distortion of science? Is it a simple translation? What is the relationship between popularization and education? More generally, how do political and social perspectives interfere with the goal to popularize? H  l  ne Ledouble introduces these questions in a manner that is highly relevant, relying on an abundant bibliography. Taking the stance that popularization is possible, she bases her reflection on the study of the media coverage of agroecology. This is a field that is not well known to the general public, although it touches on major issues such as food, health, ecology and the climate.

The analysis presented by H  l  ne Ledouble focuses on the detailed study of several concepts: biocontrol methods, agents and products. The corpus, made up of press articles in English and French, allows us to identify similarities in the way the

two languages work. The systematic exploration of the contexts leads H el ene Ledouble to identify processes that may seem contradictory. For example, the significant use of terminological variation (denominative competition), which does not necessarily result in the “simplification” that is assumed to be the primary concern of journalists. This dual tendency (terminological variation versus simplification) underlines a specific construction of meaning, one that is not inherent to the terms but rather developed during the discursive process, involving both journalists and the readers they are trying to inform.

The popularization of any subject through the media brings into play other issues in addition to didactics alone. It is necessary, in one way or another, to spark an interest or even to seduce the reader, who is also a consumer, even if it means putting knowledge on show, sometimes in a way that borders on sensationalism. H el ene Ledouble shows that the use of metaphors (gastronomy, control, conflict), of childish discourse or of specific (binary) arguments to convey a perspective are frequent, and undoubtedly characteristic of popularization as a journalistic genre.

Regarding sensitive issues such as those related to ecology (in one way or another), the reader approaches general press articles with “knowledge” that is more or less accurate, as well as opinions and expectations that can create cognitive biases. H el ene Ledouble describes how, in the specific case of agroecology, a binary framing is implemented, which may introduce incorrect representations. Thus, “organic” and “natural” methods and products are seen as positive, while chemical and traditional methods (and products) are assumed to be negative. In popular imagination, this binary vision has generated negative connotations that are associated with linguistic structures such as the prefix *phyto* (as in *phytosanitary* products) or the suffix *cide* (as in *insecticide*), connotations that are not present in the etymology. Journalists must consider the impact of these implicit meanings, in order to try to rectify them without “offending” the readers’ beliefs too much. The popularization of a discipline such as agroecology therefore appears to be a complex process that must combine the simplification (of concepts) and the increasing number of terms, collective thought and scientific knowledge, as well as interest from the reader and the transmission of proven facts. Far from being a predefined path from expert to novice, the popularization of scientific knowledge thus appears to be a construction that is developed by the generalist journalist, who hopes to make the reader part of this process, with a necessary effort to interpret science.

However, the journalist’s position does raise certain ethical questions. Indeed, on sensitive subjects such as the one dealt with in this book and given the journalists’ complex intentions (to inform but also to spark interest), the way in which knowledge is presented can give the reader a distorted vision of the situation, even

to the point of feeling that science has become “crazy”. In order to not move too far into sensationalism and emotion, the journalist must maintain a close relationship with the scientific world. Their texts are also situated in a social, political, economic and sometimes local context, which has an impact on how they write. As H el ene Ledouble maintains, the journalist must also clarify the role of the scientist, which is to not only tell a “truth” but to also doubt and share uncertainty, even if that may be unsettling for the reader. In the process of circulating terms, the journalist thus maintains a sort of partnership with the scientists and the readers (and other actors). Together, they participate in the process of popularization and even in the development of the discipline.

The complexity of the popularization process could lead H el ene Ledouble to question the possibility of popularizing via the media. However, her conviction that such an undertaking is possible and necessary leads her to propose alternatives (or rather complementary approaches). She thus evokes the very current work that is being done in various fields to design simplified languages (plain languages). She also suggests assistance that would help the journalist’s writing and the reader’s interpretation by constructing a resource to reflect the different points of view, so as to shed light on all the facets of the problem. We may think that this could mean building a fairly standard terminological resource. However, several aspects would make this resource more adapted to this specific purpose, including links to usage, links to needs or joint construction of the research question. The author thus develops a real plea for the joint involvement of scientists, citizens and mediators in the development of agroecology.

H el ene Ledouble’s work is based on a terminological approach based on corpus. However, by evoking the complexity of the popularization process, it opens up numerous perspectives on the nature of expert knowledge. It therefore raises questions to do with the role of language in developing knowledge, the possibility of a “neutral” approach, the possibilities of disseminating knowledge to non-experts and the role of simplification (linguistic and conceptual) in this undertaking. Of course, a linguistic study in which the reflection combines detailed analysis with proposals for the general public and decision-makers is most welcome. There is no doubt that the author’s reflections, which are anchored in a solid corpus analysis, will not only give food for thought to linguists but also to epistemologists, scientists, students and, of course, journalists.

Anne CONDAMINES  
Research Director, CNRS, CLLE (Cognition, Langues,  
Langage, Ergonomie) and Universit e Toulouse Jean Jaur es



---

## Preface

---

By way of a preface to this entire work, and following the example of Jeanneret (1994), we wish to state that, for us, the work of journalists popularizing science is unconditionally “worthy of respect and requires great vigilance”, regardless of the form it may take. In this book, therefore, everything is thought out, analyzed and written with a deep consideration for this desire for dialogue, between two perspectives that are divergent by nature – the scientific approach and the media approach – the meeting of which is not only necessary, but a decisive factor for good cross-comprehension. The objective of this book is therefore to try to contribute to the reinforcement and enrichment of this dialogue between science and society.

February 2024





---

## Acknowledgments

---

First of all, I would like to thank Anne Condamines for proofreading this manuscript before its publication and for writing the foreword. We share the belief that both the linguist and linguistics (applied but also “engaged”) have a role to play, in the professional world and in society in general.

I would also like to pay tribute to the late Professor Henri Zinglé, Director of the Laboratory of Linguistic Engineering and Applied Linguistics (LILLA) at the University of Nice, who shared this same vision. He knew how to spark vocations in young researchers thanks to his passion for linguistics and language processing tools.

I would also like to express my gratitude to my colleagues in linguistics at the University of Toulon, for our enriching exchanges and seminars. I would like to thank Michèle Monte in particular, for infusing her energy into our research team, and for her open-mindedness, which ensures the interdisciplinarity that is so essential to scientific research.

Three proofreaders of my manuscript have helped to nourish both the content and the form of my thoughts. Mojca Pecman, professor at Université Paris Cité, has accompanied my work since its outset, and I thank her in particular for her thorough proofreading and precious advice. Aura Parmentier, associate professor at the Université Côte d’Azur, enabled me to enrich this manuscript with her approach to social sciences and her decisive role as coordinator of the Valbio Collective since its inception. I extend my gratitude to Katharine Throssell for her outstanding proofreading and translating skills, unwavering professionalism, and meticulous attention to detail, which significantly contributed to the refinement of (part of) the English version of this book.

I would also like to thank my colleagues at INRAE (notably Thibaut Malausa, Nicolas Ris, and Louise van Oudenhove), and the Valbio and ENI-BC collectives, who devoted time and attention to my work, as well as my colleagues from Université Côte d’Azur and the research team *Transitions*, at the heart of this project.

I am also grateful to Andrea Catellani (Université Catholique de Louvain) and Céline Pascual Espuny (Université Aix-Marseille) for their proofreading, as well as the inclusion of this book in the “Communication, environment, science and society” set, which they initiated.

On a more personal note, I would like to thank all those who read the various texts that led to this book, and who helped improve them through constructive feedback: Vincent, Sophie, Peggy C., Alexandre, David, Dany, Cyril, Isabelle, Caroline, Peggy F. and Karine.

Naturally, my heartfelt thanks go to Astier, who has understood the time I needed for this project to go forwards. In keeping with his initial promise, Astier has always accepted my work as part of our family.

Lastly, I cannot conclude this section without thinking of my parents, to whom I give my warmest thanks for their constant support in my personal and professional life, for our rich exchanges which bring so much to me and for the attention they have always given to my most important writings.

---

## Introduction

---

For a long time, scientific information has reached the general public through the media. This book will question the public's ability to appropriate or to (re)construct scientific knowledge by reading the national and regional daily press. Originally, the media does not set out to transmit scientific knowledge as its primary objective, and we will discuss the role (and the responsibility) of the media in popularizing science in Part One of this book. Nevertheless, we hypothesize that it is difficult to provide information to the reader without also providing a minimum of knowledge<sup>1</sup>. This poses a major challenge for journalists; they must create high-quality information that is both accessible and intelligible, and which enable the reader to participate – in full knowledge of the facts – in the democratic debate on scientific issues.

In this context, it is important to avoid a simplistic approach to the process of popularizing science or minimizing the complexity of these social practices and technical and semiotic devices<sup>2</sup>. The paradox inherent in this process is now well established, being both “trivial”, because it has existed for a long time, and “complex”, mostly because it relies on a set of disciplines, and therefore on a set of perspectives. Because the popularization of science relies on the intersection of communication devices, knowledge and social logic, it is of interest to “hard sciences” (chemistry, physics, biology, agronomy, etc.), as well as to the humanities (information and communication, linguistics, history, etc.). Moreover, since the subjects covered by the media concern both the political world and society, the process is of interest to social sciences as a whole (sociology, economics, law, management, etc.).

---

1 We thus follow the principles proposed by other researchers, such as Jeanneret (1994), Véron (1997) or Schiele (2005), for example, who consider that popularizing science requires the dissemination of a minimum amount of scientific knowledge.

2 These terms (*social practices, technical and semiotic devices*) are borrowed from Le Marec and Babou (2004).

In his seminal work *Écrire la science*, Jeanneret (1994) suggested that the popularization project should be taken very seriously, reminding us of this necessary interdisciplinarity, a principle that is now accepted in all research on this subject<sup>3</sup>. The extent and development of the field in recent decades can be seen in the numerous workshops, conferences and publications in this area. They also illustrate the wide variety of approaches that are devoted to it, which we will explore in this work<sup>4</sup>.

Our study follows on from research devoted to the “science-society dialogue” and to the dissemination of scientific information beyond experts. The scientific field at the heart of this research is agroecology, and in particular the protection of plants by natural mechanisms (insects or substances of natural origin, for example). Our objective is to study terminological and cognitive issues when popularizing the processes of *biological control* (in French and English)<sup>5</sup>. The analysis of this field is particularly interesting for at least three complementary reasons, which we will outline below.

First, although its denominations and concepts are still not well known to the general public, scientific research on biological control is constantly progressing, and the development of its methods is likely to have a significant societal and environmental impact in the decades to come. Faced with the pressing issue of

---

3 In the wake of other seminal works such as Schoenfeld (1980) and Nelkin (1986).

4 Among many references, let us mention for example: the conference “Parcours linguistiques de discours spécialisés” (Sorbonne and Cediscor 1992); the workshop “La communication de l’information scientifique” (Centre de recherche en information et communication, 2001); the conference “Le traitement scientifique de la complexité” (Lille, 2001); the conference “Sciences, Médias et Sociétés” (ENS Lyon, 2004); the conference “La publicisation de la science” (Institut de la communication et des médias, Grenoble, 2004); the conference “Sciences et société en mutation” (CNRS, 2007); the workshop “La mise en récit de discours spécialisés” (GERAS, 2015); the workshop “Rencontres, Sciences et Société” (University of Lyon, 2017); the conference “Les nouvelles formes de la vulgarisation et de l’écriture du savoir” (University of Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2018); the ACFAS 2019 congress “Engager le dialogue Savoirs-Sociétés” (University of Montreal, 2019); the workshop “Pesticides, approches pluridisciplinaires” (University of Burgundy, 2021), etc. There are also numerous journals or special issues of journals devoted to these topics: *Public Understanding of Science*; *Les Carnets du Cediscor*; the *Hermès* journal; *Discourse Studies*, *Discourse & Communication*; the proceedings of the TIA (*Terminologie et Intelligence artificielle*) conferences; *Les enjeux de l’information et de la communication* (2021); “Recherche scientifique et Médias” in the *Revue française de la SFSIC* (2020); *Études de communication*; *Les Cahiers du journalisme*; *Quaderni*, and other books and multidisciplinary research works that we will mention throughout this book.

5 These and other terms related to this specialized area will be defined in Chapter 4, as well as in the glossary at the end of the book.

environmental protection, society is taking up these subjects and – as already noted by Guilbert (1975) – the situation is therefore becoming favorable for the observation of an object of discourse and its evolution.

Second, this field is gaining momentum in the French and international news, as recent regulations (see the law for Agriculture, Food and Forestry<sup>6</sup>, the Labbé law<sup>7</sup>, the Ecophyto II governmental plan<sup>8</sup>, etc.) impose a transition towards more natural methods of plant protection.

Third, the (plant protection) products developed in this field are presented as alternatives to (chemically produced) phytosanitary products (commonly called “pesticides”), which have been disparaged for a long time and are increasingly controversial today. Since the work of Carson (1962), many multidisciplinary studies have been devoted to these controversial products<sup>9</sup>, as well as to the necessary transition from agrochemistry to agroecology<sup>10</sup>.

Citizens are therefore likely to have a positive preconception of this field, given that scientific research is seen as being able to propose concrete solutions for the reduction of pollution (in soils, waterways, crops), with positive health benefits<sup>11</sup>.

On the other hand, agroecology is a complex scientific field that also has controversial aspects, if we look into the processes involved: biological control methods involve human intervention in the natural ecosystem and affect living organisms (macro or micro-organisms). It is therefore likely to evoke other sensitive and widely covered issues that are related to human interference in natural phenomena (genetically modified organisms, cloning, etc.). The way in which these

---

6 Law No. 2014-1170 of October 13, 2014. See: <https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/jorf/id/JORFTEXT000029573022> [Accessed November 1, 2023].

7 See: <https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/eli/loi/2014/2/6/2014-110/jo/texte> [Accessed November 1, 2023].

8 See: <https://agriculture.gouv.fr/le-plan-ecophyto-quest-ce-que-cest> [Accessed November 1, 2023].

9 Examples include some recent multidisciplinary studies on pesticides: (Roussary et al. 2013; Aulagnier and Goulet 2017; Chateauraynaud and Debaz 2017; Botero 2021; Foucart 2021; Jouzel 2019; Lambert 2020).

10 Among a profusion of multidisciplinary works and publications on these issues, the following references are strongly similar to our work, by their theme or their methodology (see Galochet et al. 2008; Deguine et al. 2016; Chlous et al. 2017b; Catellani et al. 2019; FAO 2019; HLPE 2019; Fauvergue et al. 2020; Allard-Huver 2021).

11 According to the *One Health* concept, or *Global Health*, which addresses the health of humans, animals and plants in a holistic manner. See: <https://www.inrae.fr/alimentation-sante-globale/one-health-seule-sante> [Accessed November 1, 2023].

subjects are presented by the media may therefore have an impact on how the citizen understands and perceives the field (in a positive or negative light). Indeed, the capacity of any individual to understand, to accept or to reject scientific progress will largely depend on the way in which it is presented (named, designated, described) in the media, and thus popularized.

This is the central focus of this book. Here, we set out to explore the way in which the field of biological control is presented by the written press, through the general perspective and methods of applied linguistics.

The book is divided into three parts, which will enable us to explore these questions in greater depth. Part 1 is made up of three chapters and sets the overall framework in which we place ourselves, that of the challenge assigned to the media in this dialogue between science and society. We address the multiple forms (and perceptions) of this dialogue, the role and the responsibility of the media in this process, as well as the complex relations between scientific and media methods and perspectives (Chapter 1). These elements are then enriched by a text-based approach, dealing with discourses around science and, in particular, the link between language and the different forms of knowledge that can be conveyed (Chapter 2). This first part concludes with the way we envisage textual data analysis, and the presentation of theoretical and methodological tools that are specific to textual terminology and which constitute an interesting entry point for the study of media discourse (Chapter 3).

Part 2 of this book is devoted to the case study at the heart of this research: the media coverage of the specialized field of biocontrol. After a presentation of scientific methods and products involved, and of the dual French and English corpora selected for this study (Chapter 4), the two following chapters highlight the results of the analysis in context. First, we present the different terms that refer to the same methods and products in this field of specialization, in other words, the competitive denominations throughout press articles (Chapter 5). We then discuss the description of these objects of discourse, through various simplification strategies, for example, the use of a “binary” cognitive procedure pitting the biological against the chemical, as well as the use of reasoning by analogy (Chapter 6). These discursive strategies ensure a clear and accessible dissemination of information to a wide audience but can raise questions and even interpretation difficulties for a non-expert reader.

Part 3 of this book consists of two chapters that look back on issues and challenges related to media coverage in the field of agroecology. The first chapter (Chapter 7) presents a summary of the questions generated by the analysis of media discourse, revealing the linguistic instability that can hinder effective communication. The second and final chapter of this part (Chapter 8) identifies a set

of challenges that need to be addressed in order to improve communication in this emerging field, which are related to scientific issues in environmental communication more generally.

NOTE.– This study is being conducted as part of an interdisciplinary research project (BOOST: Bioprotection and Biostimulation of Plants) initiated in 2017 by the French National Research Institute for Agriculture, Food and the Environment (Institut national de recherche pour l’agriculture, l’alimentation et l’environnement – INRAE). It is supported by the Université Côte d’Azur (UCA) as part of its structuring research projects and brings together several scientific partners (including the Institut Sophia Agrobiotech (ISA), the Group for Research in Law, Economics and Management (Groupe de recherche en droit, économie et gestion – GREDEG), the URE Transitions (UCA) and the BABEL research laboratory (University of Toulon)<sup>12</sup>.

---

12 The BOOST project (under the IDEX UCA-JEDI of the Université Côte d’Azur), launched in 2017, brings together researchers in biology, agronomy, entomology, chemistry, management, sociology, linguistics, information sciences, psychology, philosophy, etc.