Mapping and survey of alternative food organizations in the canton of Geneva

Huber, Johanna Clara; Lorenzini, Jasmine; Moynat, Orlane (transl.)

Mapping and survey of
Alternative Food Organizations in the Canton of Geneva

Johanna Huber and Jasmine Lorenzini

University of Geneva

Geneva, Switzerland, April 2020

Funding: FNS Ambizione "Political Consumerism in Switzerland"

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank everyone who has contributed to this research. Firstly, we would like to thank all people from alternative food organizations who took the time to fill out our questionnaire despite their busy agendas. Secondly, we are grateful to the people that supported us at different stages of the research process such as the identification of alternative food organizations for our mapping, designing the questionnaire, as well as putting us in contact with alternative food organizations. These people are: Philip Balsiger, Gaëlle Bigler, Marie Brault, Antonin Calderon, Francesca Forno, Marco Giugni, Maria Kousis, Charles Levkoe, René Longet, Flora Madic, and Enea Rezzonico.

Executive summary

Alternative Food Organizations (AFOs) are organizations that contest, counter, or reduce one or several of the mainstream food system's negative externalities, or question the overall mainstream food system. We studied a large variety of organizations to grasp the diversity and richness of this field. Our study builds on a representative survey conducted with 114 AFOs during the summer 2019.

AFOs include different types of organizations active in four sectors. First, the production sector is the largest. It represents about half of all surveyed organizations among which there are agricultural projects, unions and federations, solidarity jobs, food transformation, and restaurants. The next two sectors – the consumption and autoproduction sector – are equally large, with one fifth of all surveyed organizations. The former includes mostly organizations that are active in the diffusion of food-related information through campaigns or courses to raise awareness in relation to the impact of food on the environment, health, or animal rights. The autoproduction sector includes only community gardens. The smallest sector of activity is made of food distributors such as charity food organizations and food shops (e.g. in bulk, participatory supermarkets). It represents only a tenth of all surveyed organizations.

AFOs are rather young, with an average age of 23.3 years. Yet, the young age hides a broad variation between newly created organizations and older ones, which are up to 119 years old. Often people imagine that the alternative food sector is booming, yet we only observe a significant growth during the last ten years for community gardens. However, this apparent youth might be due to the fact that these projects are shorter-lived than other AFOs.

The size of AFOs varies from micro-organizations with less than 10 persons to large organizations with more than 250 persons involved. The size varies among the sectors of activity - the production sector includes mostly micro-organizations that mainly rely on employees, while organizations in the distribution sector are significantly larger. This is partially due to some charity food shops, which are part of large NGOs with many employees and volunteers. In general, one-fifth of all AFOs rely on the work of volunteers. This is especially the case for community gardens.

When it comes to changing the food system, **a large majority of AFOs advocate local agriculture and environmental protection**. Fewer AFOs share goals associated with the democratization of the food system or changing the economic system. To implement these goals, AFOs chose to sell, produce and transform food. They also engage in direct social action such as tending to a beehive or a hen house, or saving seeds. AFOs also collect unsold food for charity and raise awareness through campaigns and labels.

Lastly, we observe that **financial issues constitute the main challenge for two-thirds of the surveyed. AFOs**. Other, less common challenges are the lack of support by public authorities and the lack of visibility. Additionally, the production sector struggles with market pressure.

Table of contents

1. Introduction

This report presents the results drawn from a survey conducted with alternative food organizations active in the Canton of Geneva, Switzerland, during the summer of 2019. The mapping and survey of alternative food organizations (AFO) is the first part of the data collection for the Ambizione project "Political Consumerism in Switzerland" funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (2018-2022). The goal of this report is, on the one hand, to describe and reflect on the method used to collect the data and, on the other hand, to propose a detailed descriptive analysis of the majority of the variables present in the data set. This allows getting a deeper understanding of our data and the field of alternative food organizations.

The goal of the survey was to gain a broad overview of the actors in the field of alternative food organizations. With the renewed growth of alternative food organizations in the last decade, scientific interest in studying such initiatives has also increased and led to an ample literature (see for example, Alkon and Guthman 2017; Forno and Graziano 2014; Goodman, DuPuis and Goodman 2012). However, most studies propose case studies of one or two types of initiatives and we lack broader knowledge about the variety of actors, their action repertoires and other characteristics. To gain an overview of the field, we defined alternative food organizations broadly, which includes, for example, soup kitchens, community-supported agriculture initiatives, participatory supermarkets but also environmental organizations that raise awareness regarding issues linked to food. Consequently, we define alternative food organizations theoretically as organizations that contest, counter, or reduce one or several of the mainstream food system's negative externalities or question the overall mainstream food system.

This report is structured in the following way. Firstly, we describe the method used and reflect on various methodological considerations. Secondly, we propose descriptive analyses of the majority of variables present in the data set. Lastly, we describe the four sectors present in the field of alternative food organizations to show the main tendencies of each sector. This also allows highlighting some key insights from the analysis as well as reflecting on the limitations of this study.

2. Method

As mentioned in the introduction, the goal of this part of the project was to gain a broad understanding of the field of alternative food organizations through mapping the field and surveying it. To circumscribe the field of alternative food organizations and to be able to map it, we developed a set of criteria to operationalize the theoretical definition of alternative food organizations. Firstly, organizations had to be active in the field of food in a broad sense. This can include organizations producing or distributing food but also organizations which raise awareness to issues linked to food or defend the rights of food workers. Secondly, the organization had to have an office in the Canton of Geneva. Thirdly, they had to be either: an association, cooperative, or foundation (a legal form that guarantees they are non-profit organizations); a member of the social and solidarity economy[1]; a member of an organic food label[2]; a member of the community supported agriculture umbrella organization[3]; or a member of the Genevan movement for a peasant and citizen agriculture[4]. We developed these criteria in order to include also organizations that are not legally registered as non-profit organizations but which are ready to limit their profits for political reasons. In general, this means that we do not include conventional food shops, supermarkets, butchers, bakeries, or any other food producers and distributors. They are only included if they promote alternatives to the corporate-environmental food regimes (Friedmann 2005) and if this is reflected by a membership in specific umbrella organizations that adopt a charter to limit profit by requiring compliance with fair wages and a limited environmental impact.

To map the field, we retrieved in a first step alternative food organizations identified in a project on resilience in times of crisis (Kousis and Paschou 2017). We selected all organizations that are active in Geneva and that work in the food sector. Then, we chose a multi-entry approach using different sources to identify organizations. To do so, we consulted websites of umbrella organizations and other organizations where we checked lists of partner organizations. Then, we used platforms of networks or associations regrouping such organizations, flyers, and festival programs, as well as keyword search in Google and on Facebook to complete our mapping. In a last step, we presented our mapping to actors from the field and public authorities to finalize it. Table 1 presents the number of organizations that we identified in the mapping and the survey respondents. During the spring of 2019, we identified 226 alternative food organizations. Organizations that were created or joined an umbrella organization after the end of May 2019 were not taken into account. Furthermore, after contacting organizations to take

[1] In Geneva, there is a chamber of the social and solidarity economy (APRES-Genève). We included all their members who are active in the food sector.
[2] We consider two different labels, the Bourgeon Bio Genève and Demeter. The latter is stricter than the other, which allows us to see different degrees of engagement for the environment and for social justice.
[3] In the French-speaking part of Switzerland, the FRACP (Fédération Romande de l'Agriculture Contractuelle de Proximité) is the umbrella organization for community supported agricultural projects.
[4] The MAPC – Mouvement pour une Agriculture Paysanne et Citoyenne – is a newly created umbrella organization which brings together food producers, transformers and consumers. It includes both organizations and private citizens as members. We included all their organizational members.

part in the survey, 13 organizations mentioned that they were not active in the alternative food sector and for six we realized that they no longer exist

Table 1: Number of organizations in mapping and response rates

	Number of organizations	Response rate (%)
Mapped organizations	226	
Organization no longer exists	6	
Received survey invitation [1]	216	
Self-exclusion in response mail [2]	13	
Relevant mapped organizations	203	
Responded in the first wave (email invitation)	49	24.1
Responded in the second wave (phone calls)	119	58.9
Respondent excluded[3]	5	
Number of organizations analyzed	114	56.1

Note
[1] Four organizations had no contact information.
[2] Organizations that received the invitation but did not identify with our definition of AFOs.
[3] Organizations that answered the survey but were identified as irrelevant in the data-cleaning phase.

For the survey, we developed a questionnaire based on existing research on food organizations (Forno 2013; Levkoe 2001) and other civil society organization (YOUNEX, DEMOS, LIVEWHAT, TransSol). The questionnaire consists of about 50 questions organized into six thematic blocks. We were interested in the organization's goals and actions, their organizational structure, their relationship to the market, how they finance their organization, as well as how they interact with public authorities and other organizations.

We elaborated an online questionnaire administered using Qualtrics[5], which alternative food organizations accessed through a link sent by email. To increase our response rate we first informed the organizations by letter about our survey. We also met certain actors to introduce ourselves during public events related to the alternative food scene and had people active in the field supporting our survey by encouraging others to participate.

Each organization received an email with some short instructions and the link to access the questionnaire. They had two weeks to fill in the questionnaire and we sent a first reminder after a week. After two weeks, we realized that the deadline was too short and we sent out an email to extend it for

[5] Qualtrics is a program that allows creating, organizing, and managing an online survey.

another week. We then sent a reminder to organizations, which had not responded at that time. Two organizations had requested an in-person interview to fill out the questionnaire. During the summer, we contacted organizations which had not responded to the questionnaire by phone. At the end of the data collection, five organizations had to be excluded because they did not correspond to the selection criteria. The analysis is based on 114 responses, which makes a response rate of 55.9 percent and which is satisfactory for this kind of survey (Baruch and Holtom 2008).

In Table 2, we show the distribution of organizations that are member as well as organizations that are not a member of an umbrella organization. This allows comparing their shares in the mapping with their share among the survey respondents and see if there is an over- or under-representation of some organizations among the survey respondents. In general, we observe that the share of member organizations among the survey respondents is higher than in the mapping. Consequently, the share of member and non-member organizations are closer to parity in the survey than in the mapping. Furthermore, we look at each umbrella organization to see whether we observe any specificity regarding the response rate among its members. We see in Table 2 that members of Après-Ge represent a larger share among the survey respondents than in the mapping. For the other umbrella organizations, we see a slight increase for MAPC and FRACP among the survey respondents and not much change for BioGenève and Demeter.

Table 2: Share of different umbrella organizations, federation or chamber in the mapping and among survey respondents

	Mapping	Survey respondents
Members	39.1	46.5
Non-members	60.9	53.5
Après-Ge	20.7	29.0
BioGenève	20.8	20.2
MAPC	11.4	15.8
FRACP	5.9	9.7
Demeter	2.0	1.8
N=	202	114

3. Results

The result section presents descriptive statistics for many variables included in the data set. It offers an overview of the questions that we asked and, therefore, shows the richness of the dataset. The data on network-related questions are analyzed separately (see report on social network analysis of AFOs).

This report firstly presents an overview of what types of organizations are present in the field of alternative food organizations in Geneva, in what sectors they are active, and how old they are. Secondly, we analyze AFOs' organizational structure including their legal form, size, decision-making processes, as well as constitutive documents. Thirdly, we wish to understand if alternative food organizations in Geneva have a transformative agenda. We analyze their goals, as well as their action repertoires and scale of action. Fourthly, we offer an analysis of the challenges these organizations face. Finally, we conclude with a summary of the four sectors to show what a typical organization in each sector could look like.

3.1 Who are the members of the field of alternative food organizations?

3.1.1 Organizational types and sectors

Firstly, we grouped alternative food organizations into eleven specific types of organizations to understand what kinds of actors are present in the field of alternative food organizations. To do so, we based ourselves on a self-categorization where organizations could pick among 18 categories. Due to a filter question in the questionnaire, certain organizations were not asked to self-categorize and we attributed an organizational type based on our knowledge of these organizations and their answers to other questions. The proposed categories were consolidated into eleven categories (for example, community-supported agriculture, family, and community farms were regrouped into agricultural projects). Table 3 presents the eleven types in a descending order. The most common type of alternative food organization in Geneva is agricultural projects. They represent a quarter of all AFOs who answered our survey (24.5 percent). Secondly, AFOs take the form of community gardens (20.2 percent). The third most common type of AFOs are food knowledge organizations (12.3 percent), which are organizations that organize courses or campaigns about food. The other types are less common as can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3: Types of organizations by sectors

	AFOs	Share in each sector of activity			
		Production	Distribution	Consumption	Autoproduction
Agricultural projects	24.5	54.9	-	-	-
Community gardens	20.2	-	-	-	100
Food knowledge	12.3	-	-	60.9	-
Unions, Federations…	8.8	19.6	-	-	-
Charity food	8.8	-	58.8	-	-
Food shops	6.1	-	41.2	-	-
Environmental groups	6.1	-	-	30.4	-
Solidarity jobs	4.4	9.8	-	-	-
Food transformation	3.5	7.8	-	-	-
Restaurants	3.5	7.8	-	-	-
Animal rights	1.8	-	-	8.7	-
Total (%)	100	44.7	14.9	20.2	20.2
N=	114	51	17	23	23

We distinguish four sectors of activity, which are production, distribution, consumption, and autoproduction. The fourth category captures food initiatives that cut across the division of food production and consumption, like community gardens where citizens come together to produce food for their own consumption. The results show, as displayed in Table 3, that the production sector makes up the largest part of the field of alternative food organizations with 44.7 percent, followed by the consumption and autoproduction sector (20.2 percent each), the smallest being the distribution sector (14.9 percent).

Table 3 also presents the share of specific types of organizations within the four sectors of activity identified above. Food production is the most diversified sector. More than half of the organizations are agricultural projects (54.9 percent). The other half is made up of a variety of organizations including unions and federations defending farmers' or food workers' rights (19.6 percent), solidarity jobs in the food sector (9.8 percent), food transformers such as breweries or a dairy transformer and restaurants (both 7.8 percent). Among alternative food distributors, we find both charity food (58.8 percent) such as soup kitchens or free food baskets, as well as food shops (41.2 percent) such as participatory supermarkets as well as organic and fair trade stores. Among the organizations that we consider as primarily active in the consumption sector, we find a majority of food knowledge organizations which offer food-related courses or training, as well as dietary advice or that propose a labels (60.9 percent).

The other types of consumption organizations are environmental groups (30.4 percent) and a small share of animal rights groups (8.7 percent). The autoproduction sector is only made up of community gardens.

3.1.2 Age

Furthermore, we were interested in knowing how the field of alternative food organizations developed over the years. Alternative food organizations are trendy at the moment and are highly visible in the media and in everyday discussions. However, some of the organizations we surveyed are far from new. The average age of the AFOs included in our survey is 23.3 years (std +/- 2.9 years). In order to gain a finer understanding of the development of the field of alternative food organizations over time, we compare different age categories. Table 4 shows that 44 percent of the AFOs are less than 10 years old. Looking at the youngest organizations, we find that 17 organizations (15.7 percent) were created during the last three years. The other half of the organizations are divided equally into organizations that are 10 to 25 years old (28.5 percent) or more than 25 years old (27.5 percent) with organizations as old as 119 years old. These older organizations are two family farms, a bakers' association, as well as a charity food organization. When comparing across sectors of activities, we state that the autoproduction sector (community gardens) is the only one that has experienced significant growth during the last decade. We use adjusted residuals to identify statistically significant differences between sectors of activities. Since we have a small sample, it is important not to over-interpret differences that are not statistically significant as these could be related to the composition of our sample. Hence, we focus on differences that are larger or smaller than 1.96. When the adjusted residuals are larger than 1.96, the percentage is higher than expected and we highlight this comparatively high percentage using bold. Similarly, we use underscore to highlight percentages that are lower than expected. Indeed, 81.8 percent of autoproducers are less than 10 years old in 2019. This could be due to at least two factors. On the one hand, it could be interpreted as a boom of community gardens in recent years. On the other hand, it could also hint that these organizations might be short-lived. In fact, community gardens are often organizations that do not have a strong formal organization and only rely on a patch of land and a few volunteers to make it work. Consequently, if a key person of the garden disengages from the project, it might not survive.

Table 4: Number of years active for all AFOs & per sector

	AFOs	Production	Distribution	Consumption	Auto-production
Average age	23.3	29.3	26.4	21.4	9.3
(std deviation)	(2.9)	(5.0)	(7.7)	(5.3)	(3.2)
Less than 10 years	44.0	32.7	31.3	38.1	**81.8**
10 to 25 years	28.5	36.7	25.0	28.6	13.6
More than 25 years	27.5	30.6	43.8	33.3	4.6
N=	108	49	16	21	22

Note
Bold-print is used to highlight cells that display a higher than expected percentage and lower than expected percentages are underlined. This is calculated using adjusted residuals and points at statistically significant differences (adjusted residuals > +/-1.96).

In the other three sectors – production, distribution, and consumption – the organizations are distributed about evenly among the three age categories 'less than 10 years', '10 to 25 years', and 'more than 25 years'. However, if we look at the organizational types in more detail (seas shown in Table 5), we see that there are actually some significant differences within sectors. For example, in the distribution sector, charity food organizations are significantly older than food shops. More specifically, 77.8 percent of charity food organizations are 25 years old or older while 71.4 percent of food shops fall into the youngest category. This reflects the more established presence of food banks and soup kitchens in the Genevan landscape compared to the newly created participatory supermarkets.

Table 5: Number of years active per organizational type

	Less than 10 years	10 to 25 years	More than 25 years
Community gardens	**81.8**	13.6	4.6
Food shop	71.4	28.6	0
Agricultural projects	33.3	37.0	29.6
Charity food	0	22.2	**77.8**
Food transformation	25.0	50.0	25.0
Food knowledge	33.3	25.0	41.7
Animal rights	100	0	0
Solidarity jobs	20.0	40.0	40.0
Unions and Federations	22.2	33.3	44.4
Environment	28.6	42.9	28.6
Restaurants	75.0	25.0	0
N=	47	31	30

Note
Bold-print is used to highlight cells that display a higher than expected percentage and lower than expected percentages are underlined. This is calculated using adjusted residuals and points at statistically significant differences (adjusted residuals > +/-1.96).

3.2 Organizational structure

After analyzing who the members of the field of alternative food are, we wanted to understand the organizational structure of these organizations. What legal form did they choose? Are they rather large or smaller organizations? Do they rely more on volunteers or employees to make the organization work? How are decisions taken – through coming to a consensus or voting?

3.2.1 Legal form

First, we analyzed alternative food organizations' legal forms. When looking at these statistics, it is important to bear in mind how we mapped the field. We started including all organizations, which had a nonprofit status (associations, cooperatives, and foundations) and added private businesses only if they were a member of certain networks. Table 6 presents legal forms. We see that 'association' is the most frequent legal form with 56.8 percent. In fact, 'association' is the most common legal form in general in the nonprofit sector in Switzerland (Nollert and Budowski 2009). Furthermore, even though we started with nonprofit organizations in our mapping, the second largest group are private businesses with 17.9 percent, which shows that it is also important to take enterprises into account. This is especially the case in the production sector where there are significantly more private businesses than in other sectors (33.3 percent). Nevertheless, 50.0 percent of producing organizations are associations. No private businesses were found in the consumption and autoproduction sector. Next, foundations make up 11.6 percent of all alternative food organizations, followed by informal or grassroots organizations with 7.4 percent. Interestingly, informal or grassroots organizations are significantly more present in the autoproduction sector (21.1 percent) while none are found in the production sector. Lastly, 6.3 percent of all alternative food organizations are cooperatives.

Table 6: Legal form by sector

	AFOs	Production	Distribution	Consumption	Autoproduction
Association	56.8	50.0	43.6	72.2	68.4
Private business	17.9	**33.3**	18.6	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Foundation	11.6	9.5	25.0	11.1	5.3
Informal/grassroots	7.4	<u>0</u>	0	16.7	**21.1**
Cooperative	6.3	7.1	12.5	0	5.3
N=	96	43	16	18	19

Note
Bold-print is used to highlight cells that display a higher than expected percentage and lower than expected percentages are underlined. This is calculated using adjusted residuals and points at statistically significant differences (adjusted residuals > +/-1.96).

3.2.2 Size

Considering the size of an organization offers a cursory understanding of the transformative capacity of the alternative food sector in Geneva. Are we talking about small organizations, medium-sized, or very large organizations? This can influence the magnitude of change as a large organization with a horizontal structure, for example, impacts more people than a small organization. In the questionnaire, organizations indicated whether they have members, employee, and/or volunteers. In each case, they also mentioned how many. In the category ‘very small organizations’, we include organizations that function with the work of a single person, the owner.

To analyze the size of alternative food organizations, we created four categories: 'very small organizations', 'small organizations', 'medium organizations', and ‘large organizations’. We calculated the total number of people independently of the type of people involved (employees, members, or/and volunteers). Very small organizations are organizations with 10 or less persons, small organizations have 11 to 50 persons, medium organizations have 51 to 250 persons, large organizations have more than 250 persons involved. Table 7 shows that the sampled organizations are equally divided among the four size categories, each represent about a fifth of the overall sample.

If we have a look at the different sectors, we notice that production organizations are rather very small organizations (25.5 percent). Most of these very small organizations are agricultural projects. About one-fifth are small organizations (19.6 percent) and slightly less are medium-sized organizations (17.7 percent). Large organizations are less common. The distribution sector is mostly made up of large organizations (47.1 percent). In addition, there are significantly more large organizations than in other sectors and only very few very small organizations (5.9 percent). Consumption organizations are mostly medium and small organizations (both 21.7 percent) but there is also an important share of large organizations (21.8 percent). The autoproduction sector is mostly made up of small (34.8 percent) and medium organizations (26.1 percent) while there are no large organizations. In all sectors except the distribution sector, one-fifth of the organizations did not indicate their size. For the distribution sector, it is much lower (5.9 percent).

Table 7: Size of organizations

	N	AFOs	Production	Distribution	Consumption	Autoproduction
Very small organizations	21	18.4	25.5	5.9	13.0	17.4
Small organizations	26	22.8	19.6	17.7	21.7	34.8
Medium	24	21.1	17.7	23.5	21.7	26.1
Large organizations	21	18.5	15.7	**47.1**	21.8	0
Unknown size	22	19.3	21.6	5.9	21.7	21.7
N=	114		51	17	23	23

Note
Bold-print is used to highlight cells that display a higher than expected percentage and lower than expected percentages are underlined. This is calculated using adjusted residuals and points at statistically significant differences (adjusted residuals > +/-1.96).

3.2.3 Groups of people involved in alternative food organizations

After determining the sizes of alternative food organizations, we were interested in knowing what type of people are involved in these organizations. Table 8 shows the distribution of different groups of people among the sectors. We see that a bit more AFOs have volunteers (76.1 percent) or/and members (72.8 percent) than employees (63.0 percent). The distribution sector, which consists of food shops and charity food organizations, seems to rely heavily on volunteers (93.8 percent). At the same time, many organizations in the consumption and autoproduction sectors also do so (both 88.9 percent). The production sector, however, works significantly less with volunteers (57.5 percent). Furthermore, while the differences between sectors are not significant, the autoproduction sector shows the highest percentage for members (88.9 percent), followed by the consumption (77.8 percent) and distribution sector (75.0 percent). Fewer organizations mention having members in the production sector (62.5 percent). The distribution sector does not only show a high percentage of volunteers but also of employees. In fact, the distribution sector relies significantly more on employees (93.8 percent) than other sectors. Furthermore, almost 3/4 of all producing organizations have employees and half of all consumption organizations. The autoproduction sector, on the contrary, relies significantly less on employees (27.8 percent).

Table 8: Percentage of organizations with members, employees and/or volunteers per sector[6]

	AFOs	Production	Distribution	Consumption	Autoproduction
Volunteers	76.1	57.5	93.8	88.9	88.9
Members	72.8	62.5	75.0	77.8	88.9
Employees	63.0	72.5	**93.8**	50.0	27.8
N=	92	40	16	18	18

Note
Bold-print is used to highlight cells that display a higher than expected percentage and lower than expected percentages are underlined. This is calculated using adjusted residuals and points at statistically significant differences (adjusted residuals > +/-1.96).

Secondly, we analyzed different 'types' of organizations based on the groups of people they unite as summarized in Table 9. A third of all alternative food organizations in Geneva rely on employees, volunteers and members. Organizations in the distribution sector organize themselves significantly more in this way with 64.7 percent of distribution organizations having volunteers, members, and employees. Autoproduction organizations, on the contrary, do so a lot less (17.4 percent).

Table 9: Percentage of organizations with volunteers, members and/or employees per sector

	AFOs	Production	Distribution	Consumption	Autoproduction
Mixed – employees, volunteers and members	30.7	27.5	**64.7**	26.1	17.4
Mostly volunteer-based organization	18.4	7.8	41.2	17.4	26.1
Only employees	7.9	13.7	5.9	-	4.4
Owner-based organizations	3.5	**7.8**	-	-	-
N=	114	51	17	23	23

Note
Bold-print is used to highlight cells that display a higher than expected percentage and lower than expected percentages are underlined. This is calculated using adjusted residuals and points at statistically significant differences (adjusted residuals > +/-1.96).

Furthermore, we analyzed how many organizations were run mostly by volunteers. To do so, we built a category which included all organizations with 10 or more volunteers and none or less than five employees. The idea behind this category is to include organizations that have clearly more volunteers

[6] Possible that one organization mentioned all three categories and hence is counted three times.

than employees. Consequently, a large amount of their actions are potentially driven by non-paid work. The number of members did not matter. The results show that almost one-fifth of all alternative food organizations in Geneva are mostly run by volunteers. This is especially the case in the distribution (33.3 percent) and autoproduction sector (28.6 percent) while it is less the case for the production and consumption sector.

Then, we also analyzed organizations, which are only run by their owners and therefore do not have any volunteers, employees, or members. We created this category, as it seemed an important category especially for the production sector, which contains several farms. Traditionally, many farms are run by a family. Our data shows that only four organizations are owner-based and, indeed, they are all in the production sector. Similar to this category is the 'only employees' category, which is also driven mostly by the production sector; the majority of these organizations are agricultural projects. When looking at the legal form we see that three are private enterprises and one is a foundation. At least for the private enterprises, there is also an owner to be taken into account.

Moreover, we were interested in knowing what type of work the different groups of people did in alternative food organizations. We see that employees mostly do management work, office work, and organizing events (each mentioned by almost 3/4 of the organizations). For the volunteers, organizing events and manual work are the activities mentioned the most as shown in Table 10. It is not surprising that it is rather the paid staff that is responsible for the managerial work, while volunteers contribute to irregular or very concrete tasks.

Table 10: Type of work employees and volunteers do

	Employees	Volunteers
Office work	75.9	49.3
Management work	72.4	46.4
Organizing events	72.4	60.9
Manual work	53.5	50.7
Training	51.7	46.4
Other	24.1	36.2
N=69		

3.2.4 Decision-making processes

To deepen our understanding of the organizational structure as well as the decision-making processes, we also asked organizations to indicate what positions and entities are present in their organization, how they take decisions, and what fundamental documents they possess. This then allows us to analyze the degree of formalization present in the alternative food sector.

When looking at Table 11 we see that having a president (50.9 percent), a committee (53.4 percent), as well as a general assembly (49.1 percent) is rather common. This is probably the case because it is mandatory to have these entities for associations or cooperatives. For foundations, the 'conseil de fondation' is mandatory and therefore mentioned several times by these organizations in the open comments. Holding public meetings (3.5 percent) or having a spokesperson (6.1 percent) is rare. It is interesting to see that significantly more distribution organizations have a committee (76.5 percent) and working groups (70.6 percent). On the contrary, producing organizations use working groups significantly less (25.0 percent). Furthermore, autoproducing organizations mention significantly more often that they have other types of entities with 62.5 percent, which hints that they are more informal or innovative in their way of functioning. However, the open questions do not give a clear picture about what types of other entities they might have. Organizations in other sectors did give some more information. Some indicated to be working alone or as a family and therefore do not have any other entities; several mentioned having a treasurer as well as a coordinator.

Table 11: Positions and entities in organizations

	AFOs	Production	Distribution	Consumption	Auto-production
Committee	53.4	45.1	**76.5**	60.9	52.2
General assembly	49.1	45.1	52.9	52.2	52.2
President	50.9	43.1	64.7	60.9	47.8
Working groups	37.4	<u>25.0</u>	**70.6**	39.1	39.1
Secretary	36.5	31.4	52.9	43.5	30.4
Director	17.4	19.6	29.4	21.7	<u>0</u>
Spokesperson	<u>6.1</u>	0	**23.5**	13.0	0
Public meetings	3.5	3.9	5.9	0	4.4
Other	40.3	32.0	41.7	28.6	**62.5**
N=	114	51	17	23	23

Note
Bold-print is used to highlight cells that display a higher than expected percentage and lower than expected percentages are underlined. This is calculated using adjusted residuals and points at statistically significant differences (adjusted residuals > +/-1.96).

Moreover, we were interested in knowing how decisions are taken in the different entities above (which include more than one person). We differentiated between consensus and voting procedures. A couple of things are worth mentioning. In general, alternative food organizations particularly seem to use the consensus to take decisions in working groups (88.9 percent) and public meetings (87.5 percent) but in general assemblies decisions are rather taken by voting (72.6 percent). Table 12 shows that in their committees, alternative food organizations use both consensus (57.1 percent) and voting (42.9 percent).

Table 12: Decision-making processes

	AFOs	Production	Distribution	Consumption	Autoproduction
Committee					
Vote	42.9	47.8	50.0	50.0	21.4
Consensus	57.1	52.2	50.0	50.0	78.6
General Assembly					
Vote	72.6	73.9	90.9	73.3	53.9
Consensus	27.4	26.1	9.1	26.7	46.2
Working groups					
Vote	11.1	14.3	-	10.0	22.2
Consensus	88.9	85.7	100	90.0	77.8
Public meetings					
Vote	12.5	50.0	-	-	-
Consensus	87.5	50.0	100	100	100
N=	63	23	14	12	14

Furthermore, we asked alternative food organizations if they had one or several of the following documents: statutes, rules, charter, or any other similar document. These account for the degree of formalization of their practices. As Table 13 shows, statutes is the most common document (83.5 percent) followed by charters (49.4 percent) and rules (40.0 percent). Other documents were mentioned a lot less (12.9 percent). Distribution organizations have significantly more rules and charters than the other sectors. Furthermore, among the organizations that say they have a charter, not all published their charter on their website. To obtain an idea of what these charters are like, we analyzed different charters from organizations from different sectors. In general, we note that most charters are very short (1-2 pages) and some organizations rather call them their 'values' or 'manifesto' while the content is very similar to documents that are entitled 'charter'. Although there are differences in the specific content of these charters, there are some similarities. Most charters talk about how the members of the organization want to work together, as well as how they want to work with partners, what their values are, and how they want to enact those values. General themes/values that come out of the analysis of these charters are 'respecting the environment', 'solidarity/social justice/equity between humans/living beings' and 'sustainable and local economy'. To give some concrete examples, an urban garden talks about being inclusive, a bulk-store privileges cooperation over competition and claims to propose fair prices to producers and consumers. An organization defending animals and vegan life-style wants to promote the equity between all living beings.

Table 13: Documents

Documents	AFOs	Production	Distribution	Consumption	Autoproduction
Statutes	83.5	78.8	87.5	88.9	83.3
Charter	49.4	38.4	**75.0**	50.0	44.4
Rules	40.0	30.3	**62.5**	33.3	44.4
Other documents	12.9	21.2	**-**	11.1	11.1
N=	85	33	16	18	18

Note
Bold-print is used to highlight cells that display a higher than expected percentage and lower than expected percentages are underlined. This is calculated using adjusted residuals and points at statistically significant differences (adjusted residuals > +/-1.96).

3.3 Transformative agenda

3.3.1 Goals

Studying goals is fundamental to understanding organizations because they influence their actions as well as their organizational structure. Goals express the intentions an organization sets itself. However, these intentions are not always exactly reflected in the actual practices. In fact, a broad literature exists on the gap between goals and actual practices. Looking at this gap combined with asking about their main challenges, can help understand some of the struggles alternative food organizations face, as well as sometimes their incoherencies.

In the questionnaire, organizations could choose several out of 15 items to state their goals. The goals were originally designed around the three negative externalities of the corporate-environmental food regime – health issues, environmental issues, and inequalities. We also designed items linked to more systemic change like the change of the economic system or the democratization of the food system. For the analysis in this report, we regrouped 14 items[7] into six categories: social justice, local agriculture, environmental protection, health, anticapitalism/change of economic system, and food democracy (see appendix I for the composition of goals). Local agriculture was kept as a single category as it was mentioned many times. Furthermore, it is not clear to which overarching issue local agriculture should be grouped as it could be linked to environmental issues, when trying to reduce the distance between producer and consumer, but also to social justice issues when talking about fair wages for local producers.

Table 14 presents these different goals, how frequently they are mentioned among all AFOs and among AFOs pertaining to a specific sector of activity. Local agriculture is the most common goal: almost three quarters of the AFOs identify with this goal (72.8 percent). Without surprise, this goal is more common among food producers. 86.3 percent of AFOs active in the production sector identify with the goal of local agriculture. The second most common goal is associated with environmental protection (66.7 percent). In this case, we do not observe significant differences across sectors of activities. The third most important goal is health with more than half of AFOs who mention it (57.0 percent). Again, in this case, we do not find differences across sectors of activity. Goals associated with social justice, such as reducing inequalities, supporting food knowledge, or improving working conditions, appear as the next most important set of goals (53.5 percent). Here, we observe some differences across food sectors. More specifically, autoproducers are less concerned with goals associated with social justice. In spite of the widespread idea that community gardens create social cohesion and give access to high quality food and food knowledge to resource poor groups, this is not a frequently mentioned goal among community gardens in our sample. Lastly, the two more systemic goals 'anticapitalism' and 'food democracy' were

[7] To fight animal suffering was not included because it could not be regrouped to an overarching goal easily and was not mentioned enough to form a separate category.

mentioned less frequently with 50.0 percent and 32.5 percent respectively. While producers and distributors mention the former more often, no significant differences between sectors exist.

Table 14: Goals

Goals	AFOs	Production	Distribution	Consumption	Auto-production
Local agriculture	72.8	**86.3**	58.8	56.5	69.6
Environmental protection	66.7	66.7	52.9	73.9	69.6
Health	57.0	58.8	52.9	47.8	65.2
Social justice	53.5	62.8	70.6	39.1	<u>34.8</u>
Anticapitalism	50.0	**50.8**	52.9	39.1	34.8
Food democracy	32.5	32.3	41.2	34.8	21.7
N=	114	51	17	23	23

Note
Bold-print is used to highlight cells that display a higher than expected percentage and lower than expected percentages are underlined. This is calculated using adjusted residuals and points at statistically significant differences (adjusted residuals > +/-1.96).

3.3.2 Forms of action

Actions translate, at least partially, an organization's goals. Additionally, opportunities and constraints could motivate alternative food organizations to engage in a specific action. We asked alternative food organizations to state in detail all the actions they undertake. To make the analysis more intelligible, we regrouped the 30 actions proposed in the questionnaire into subgroups, which were inspired by the literature. Table 15 gives an overview of the different action forms.

Firstly, we were interested in different actions oriented towards the government. On the one hand, we have *institutional politics* with actions such as lobbying and expertise as well as instruments of direct democracy such as referendums and initiatives. Both forms of action are, on average, used by about 15.8 percent of all alternative food organizations. Lobbying and expertise are employed significantly more by the production sector (25.5 percent) and significantly less by the autoproduction sector (none use it). On the other hand, there is *protest politics*. Overall, 15.8 percent of alternative food organizations had participated in a demonstration in the past 12 months when they answered the survey. Consumption organizations, however, engaged in protest politics significantly more than the others did (30.4 percent).

Table 15: Action forms by sector

Action forms	AFOs	Production	Distribution	Consumption	Auto-production
Institutional politics					
Lobbying & expertise	15.8	**25.5**	<u>0</u>	21.7	<u>0</u>
Direct democracy	14.9	19.6	0	26.1	4.4
Protest politics					
Demonstration	15.8	21.6	0	**30.4**	<u>0</u>
Market-based					
Selling food	44.7	**60.8**	52.9	<u>26.1</u>	<u>21.7</u>
Boycott	1.8	2.0	0	4.4	0
Solidarity jobs & training	15.8	19.6	**35.3**	4.4	4.4
Prefigurative politics					
Food production and transformation	40.4	**50.1**	41.2	<u>0</u>	56.5
Direct social action[1]	36.0	**47.1**	<u>5.9</u>	<u>8.7</u>	**60.9**
Free food & waste	30.7	31.4	**76.5**	<u>4.4</u>	21.7
Raising awareness					
Campaigns & labels	32.5	31.4	29.4	**60.9**	<u>8.7</u>
Courses & events	46.6	43.1	35.3	**69.6**	34.8
N	114	51	17	23	23

Note
Bold-print is used to highlight cells that display a higher than expected percentage and lower than expected percentages are underlined. This is calculated using adjusted residuals and points at statistically significant differences (adjusted residuals > +/-1.96).
[1] Direct social action includes having beehives, hens, growing plants, saving seeds, etc.

Secondly, we were interested in actions that use *the market* as political arena as well as *prefigurative politics* where actors implement the change they want to see in society themselves (Monticelli 2018; Yates 2015). The literature on political consumerism shows how social movements have moved their actions from the street to the market and broadened their action repertoires (Forno and Ceccarini 2006). Furthermore, social movements increasingly protest against enterprises (Balsiger 2014; King and Pearce 2010; Soule 2012) or implement changes themselves (Bosi and Zamponi 2015). We differentiate between prefigurative politics and market-based actions to underline the importance of both action forms.

Here we defined only actions outside the market as prefigurative politics because this distinction allows us to see the relative importance of market-based actions. In fact, the literature shows a tendency of organizations to be market-oriented and shows that it becomes increasingly difficult to imagine actions outside of it.

Under *market-based actions*, we regrouped the three actions selling food, boycotts, as well as solidarity jobs and trainings. Among the market-based actions, selling food is used the most by alternative food organizations (44.7 percent) and significantly more by production organizations (60.8 percent) and significantly less by consumption (26.1 percent) and autoproduction organizations (21.7 percent). Boycott is only employed by very few organizations (1.8 percent) and not at all by the distribution and autoproduction sector while the consumption sector use it more (4.4 percent). Solidarity jobs and training refers to organizations that offer jobs and training to refugees or social beneficiaries. 15.8 percent of all alternative food organizations offer such opportunities while the distribution sector does so significantly more (35.3 percent).

Prefigurative politics includes food production and transformation, free food and food waste collection as well as direct social action[8] such as tending to a beehive, a henhouse or growing plants and saving seeds. Food production and transformation is performed by 40.4 percent of all alternative food organizations. Production organizations use this action form significantly more (50.1 percent) and consumption organizations significantly less, in fact none engage in prefigurative politics. Direct social action is performed by more than a third of all alternative food organizations (36.0 percent). Autoproducers (60.9 percent) and producers (47.1 percent) use direct social action significantly more than consumption organizations (8.7 percent) and distributors (5.9 percent). Giving out free meals and food as well as collecting food waste is performed by 30.7 percent of alternative food organizations. Distributor organizations engage significantly more in this action form with 76.5 percent, which is probably due to charity food organizations that give out free meals to people in need.

Finally, we also analyzed how many organizations use *raising awareness* as a form of action. We looked at two different forms of action, organizing campaigns and labels as well as organizing courses and events. The former is used by 32.5 percent while the latter is performed by 46.6 percent of all alternative food organizations. The consumption sector engages significantly more with both action forms: 60.9 percent use 'campaigns and labels' and 69.6 percent 'courses and events'.

[8] We use direct social action in a more narrow sense than Bosi and Zamponi (2015). Here we name direct social action actions such as tending to a hen house, a beehive, growing plants and seeds.

3.3.3 Scale of action

Additionally, we were interested at which scale alternative food organizations are active. In Table 16, we see that the most common level of action is the canton with 77.7 percent of the interviewed AFOs who mention this level. At this level, we observe important differences across sectors of activity. Most of the food producers (91.5 percent) and distributors (93.8 percent) are active at the cantonal level, whereas only few community gardens are active at this level (26.3 percent). AFOs active in the consumption sectors are closer to producers and distributors in these regards, with 81.0 percent who are active at the cantonal level. The second most important level of action targets the neighborhood (40.8 percent) and the municipality (38.8 percent). The importance of the neighborhood is substantially due to community gardens; this level is significantly more important for them with 94.7 percent who say they are active at this level. Among food producers, the share drops to 25.5 percent and 14.3 percent in the food consumption sector. Interestingly, the food distributors also consider the neighborhood a rather important level of action with 56.3 percent who say they are active at that level.

Table 16: Scale of actions

	AFOs	Production	Distribution	Consumption	Auto-production
Neighborhood	40.8	<u>25.5</u>	56.3	<u>14.3</u>	**94.7**
Municipality	38.8	36.2	56.3	28.6	42.1
Canton	77.7	**91.5**	93.8	81.0	<u>26.3</u>
Romandie	28.9	27.7	25.0	**52.4**	10.5
Switzerland	18.5	17.0	25.0	**33.3**	<u>0</u>
Europe	9.7	6.4	**25.0**	14.3	0
World	7.8	<u>2.1</u>	**25.0**	14.3	0
N	103	47	16	21	19

Note
Bold-print is used to highlight cells that display a higher than expected percentage and lower than expected percentages are underlined. This is calculated using adjusted residuals and points at statistically significant differences (adjusted residuals > +/-1.96).

French-speaking Switzerland (Romandie) and the national level, are less frequently mentioned with 28.9 percent of all AFOs active in Romandie and only 18.5 percent active at the national level. Even fewer alternative food organizations are active beyond the national level, 9.7 percent at the European level and only 7.8 percent at the international level. Interestingly, food distributors are more likely than producers, consumers, or autoproducers to be active at these higher levels.

3.3.4 Products

Furthermore, we asked organizations to indicate what products they sell. The products distributed the most are vegetables (48.4 percent) and fruit (42.2 percent). These products are available in 32.2 percent of all organizations at full opening hours while almost one-fourth (23.7 percent) delivers once per week. This can be, for example, community-supported agriculture initiatives, which deliver vegetable baskets once a week. A little more than a fifth (22.0 percent) do not distribute products at all; these are mostly community gardens that produce for their own consumption.

Table 17: Food sales

	AFOs
Products sold	
Vegetables	48.4
Fruit	42.2
Plants	32.8
Beans and grains	31.3
Beverages (juice, syrup, beer and wine)	23.7
Frequency of delivery	
Every day (similar to supermarket)	32.2
Once a week	23.7
Once a month	1.7
Less often	3.4
Channels of delivery	
Direct sale	66.7
Local stores	54.6
Community-supported agriculture	48.5
Origin of the products (for more than ¾ of products)	
Their own production	47.2
Local food	15.1

We then asked where the products alternative food organizations distribute come from. While 47.2 percent of all organizations that produce and/or distribute food produce more than two thirds of their products themselves, it is not as simple for the other origins. 15.1 percent mention to distribute mostly local food while several organizations propose a mix between local, Swiss, and foreign products. Products from supermarkets or food waste are rare. 92.5 percent say they do not distribute any products from supermarkets and 90.6 percent do not distribute any products from food waste.

In a next step, we were interested in knowing where alternative food organizations sell the products they produce themselves (if it is the case, n=33). The majority of alternative food organizations sell their products through direct sale (66.7 percent), followed by local stores (54.5 percent) and community-supported agriculture (48.5 percent). Fewer organizations sell to supermarkets (21.1 percent) or through the internet (15.2 percent).

Furthermore, we wanted to know to what extent alternative food organizations use different types of exchange: monetary, non-monetary exchange, or donation. 60.4 percent declare that more than two thirds of their exchanges are monetary, while 20.8 percent say none of their exchanges are monetary. Only a few organizations rely fully on non-monetary exchanges (7.6 percent), while almost half say none of their exchanges are non-monetary (47.2 percent). Finally, 13.5 percent of organizations donate the majority of their products. Here we can think of, for example, of soup kitchens or food banks that provide food to people in need.

Finally, we also analyzed alternative food organizations' price-setting strategies. The fixed cost, the environment, fair wages, and affordability are important aspects to more than a third of these organizations. Less important seem to be market prices, as 67.9 percent said it does not matter at all to them.

3.4 Everyday challenges of AFOs

In a next step, we were interested in knowing the challenges alternative food organizations face in their everyday functioning but also what support would make their activity easier. We present in this part of the report the challenges AFOs face.

Firstly, we see in Table 18 that financial issues represent the number one challenge for alternative food organizations with 62.7 percent who mention this difficulty. This is especially the case for organizations that are in the consolidation phase and between 10 to 25 years old. The autoproduction sector mentions financial issues as a challenge significantly less than other sectors, which is probably due to lower financial needs as their activities are rather low cost (few employees, few fixed costs, etc.). All other challenges are less frequent, with less than 30 percent of the organizations that mention each of them. The other challenges that AFOs face are related to lack of public support (29.8 percent), lack of visibility (25.3 percent), as well as problems related to human resources such as the fluctuation of volunteers (24.1 percent) and the lack of employees (20.5 percent). In addition, some face market pressure (22.9 percent), while others cannot meet the high demand for their products or services (16.9 percent). Not surprisingly, challenges related to market pressure are significantly more an issue for the production sector (40.0 percent) and significantly less for the consumption and autoproduction sector (none). Market pressure seems to be felt especially by organizations that produce/transform and sell their own products. Additionally, 31.3 percent of distributing organizations mention this challenge as well.

Table 18: Challenges

Challenges	AFOs	Production	Distribution	Consumption	Auto-production
Finances	62.7	62.9	81.3	76.5	<u>26.7</u>
Lack support public authorities	29.8	28.6	37.5	35.3	20.0
Lack visibility	25.3	25.7	37.5	17.7	20.0
Volunteers (fluctuation, lack...)	24.1	20.0	37.5	23.5	20.0
Market pressure	22.9	**40.0**	31.3	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Too few employees	20.5	20.0	6.3	35.3	20.0
High demand	16.9	14.3	25.0	11.8	20.0
Other	22.9	20.0	31.3	5.9	40.0
N	83	35	16	17	15

Note
Bold-print is used to highlight cells that display a higher than expected percentage and lower than expected percentages are underlined. This is calculated using adjusted residuals and points at statistically significant differences (adjusted residuals > +/-1.96).

Younger organizations seem to encounter other challenges than older ones. Firstly, we notice that the younger organizations struggle in particular with the lack of volunteers as well as lack of visibility. It could be imagined that younger organizations rely more on the work of volunteers as they do not necessarily have the financial resources for paid staff. Furthermore, the literature shows that there is a tendency for organizations to professionalize with age. Organizations in the middle-aged category mention to face, besides financial issues, 'other' issues but we do not have more information about these challenges. Older organizations particularly mention the lack of support from public authorities as well as market pressure.

3.4.1 Funding

As mentioned before, funding is one of the main challenges alternative food organizations in Geneva face. This is why it is central to study what the budgets (in Swiss Francs) of alternative food organizations as well as how they finance their activities. For the budget, we used categories that were tested by other surveys on civil society organizations. We notice, however, that we could have offered more options in the higher categories because 28.7 percent of all organizations indicate having a budget of more than 300'000 CHF. Most budget categories are mentioned by about 10 percent or less of all organizations. Almost 10 percent said 'don't know' and 'confidential'.

We also asked alternative food organizations to indicate where the funding for their budget comes from as summarized in Table 19. Most organizations seem to have mixed incomes as the percentage is never above 30 percent for one source. Nevertheless, 25.9 percent of all alternative food organizations say that most of their funding (more than 75 percent) comes from selling products or services. Also, contributions from membership fees seem to be one of the most important sources of funding as 14.0 percent of alternative food organizations finance more than ¾ of their budget by this mean. Another 21 percent say membership fees cover up to 25 percent of the budget. Only 7.1 percent rely almost entirely on public funding. Donations are mentioned several times but for smaller shares of the budget. Crowdfunding also helped 22.4 percent of alternative food organizations to finance up to 25 percent of their activities. Firms only finance small shares of the budget. Contributions by federations as well as social shares are rather rare.

Table 19: Sources of funding

	None	Up to 25 %	26 to 75 %	76 to 100 %
Sale	51.8	11.8	10.6	25.9
Membership fees	56.5	21.3	7.0	14.0
Public funding	63.5	15.3	14.1	7.1
Donation	61.2	21.2	10.6	7.1
Crowdfunding	69.4	22.4	4.7	3.5
Federation	96.5	1.2	0	2.4
Social shares	98.8	1.2	0	0
Other	78.8	4.7	5.9	10.6
N=86				

4. Conclusion

In this report, we analyzed data from a survey on alternative food organizations in the Canton of Geneva, which we conducted during the summer of 2019. Alternative food organizations were defined broadly to capture the variety of actors and their actions, goals and characteristics. To do so, alternative food organizations were defined as organizations that contest, counter, or reduce one or several of the mainstream food system's negative externalities or question the overall mainstream food system. This includes organizations such as community-supported agriculture initiatives, soup kitchens, animal rights, or environmental groups but also community gardens or participatory supermarkets. While we tried to be as inclusive as possible, there are some limitations to this inquiry due to the mapping of the organizations. We mostly used a top-down approach and searched for organizations through existing networks. Consequently, less connected organizations might have been missed. This approach could also lead to an urban bias as some more rural organizations might be less connected to these networks. Furthermore, with some exceptions we had little access to less formal organizations and those with no online presence. Additionally, medium-sized organizations, which might be large enough to have a national presence in Bern, but not large enough to have a regional office in every canton, might not be included in our sample.

To conclude this report, we propose to summarize the key findings by highlighting the main characteristics of each sector. In fact, in order to make our analysis more intelligible, we regrouped alternative food organizations not only into organizational types but also sectors. To do so, we compared the production, distribution, consumption, and autoproduction sector.

In Table 20, we summarize the main information gathered on alternative food organizations active in the canton of Geneva. Firstly, *the production sector* represents 44.7 percent of all alternative food organizations and is made up of agricultural projects, unions and federations, solidarity jobs and training, food transformation, and restaurants. The average age is 29.3 years, which makes it the oldest sector. This is not surprising as some of the oldest organizations, such as family farms, belong to this sector. The production sector aims significantly more at supporting local agriculture and anticapitalism. To work towards these goals, it uses several action forms. Selling food, producing and transforming food, and direct social actions are used significantly more by this sector. When looking at the scale of their action we notice they mainly focus on the cantonal level. Furthermore, almost half of all producing organizations are associations but there are also significantly more businesses than in other sectors (33.3 percent). Many organizations in that sector are rather small (less than 10 people) and are composed of the owners and employees. Financial issues are a main challenge for the production sector and the pressure from the market is significantly more an issue than for other sectors.

Table 20: Summary per sector

	Production	Distribution	Consumption	Autoproduction
Size sector (%)	44.7	14.9	20.2	20.2
Organizational types	Agricultural projects Unions or federations Solidary jobs Food transformation Restaurants	Charity food Food shops	Food knowledge Environmental groups Animal rights	Community gardens
Age (std dev.)	29.3 (5.0)	26.4 (7.7)	21.4 (5.3)	9.3 (3.2)
Goals (%)	Local agriculture (**86.3**), Anticapitalism (**50.8**)	Social justice (70.6)	Environment (73.9)	Environment (69.6) Local agriculture (69.6)
Action forms (%)	Selling food (**60.8)** Food production and transformation (**50.1)** Direct social action (**47.1)**	Free food and waste (**76.5**), selling food (52.9), Solidary jobs and training (**35.3**)	Campaigns and labels (**60.9**) Trainings and events (**69.6**)	Direct social action (**60.9)**
Scale of action (%)	Canton of Geneva (**91.5)**	Canton of Geneva (93.8)	Canton of Geneva (81.0) Romandie (**52.4**)	Neighborhood (**94.7)**
Legal form (%)	Private business (**33.3**) Associations (50.0)	Associations (43.6) Foundations (25.0)	Associations (72.2)	Associations (68.4), Informal/grassroots org. (**21.1**)
Size (%)	Very small organizations (25.5)	Large organizations (**47.1**)	Large organizations (21.8)	Small organizations (34.8)
Documents:	Fewer documents Statutes (78.8)	More documents Statutes (87.5), charter (75.0), rules (62.5)	Statutes (88.9)	Statutes (83.3)
Positions and entities (%)	Fewer of the different entities	More committees (**76.5**) More working groups (**70.6**)	Slightly more committees and presidents (60.9), general assemblies (52,2)	'Other' (not defined) positions sign. higher (**62.5**)
Challenges (%)	Finances (62.9) Market-pressure (**40.0**)	Finances (81.3)	Finances (76.5)	Other (40.0)

Note Bold-print is used to highlight cells that display a higher than expected percentage and lower than expected percentages are underlined. This is calculated using adjusted residuals and points at statistically significant differences (adjusted residuals > +/-1.96).

The distribution sector makes 14.9 percent of the overall field of alternative food organizations and consists of charity food organizations and food shops. Interestingly, while the overall field does not show any particular tendencies concerning the age of the organizations, charity food organizations are significantly older (more than 25 years) and food shops are, in contrast, rather young (less than 10 years). The average age is 26.4 years, which makes it the second oldest sector. Social justice is an important goal. This sector uses two actions significantly more than other sectors: Free food and food waste collection (76.5 percent), as well as solidarity jobs and training (35.2 percent). Distribution organizations are mostly active in the Canton of Geneva and many are associations (43.6 percent). Distribution organizations are often very large organizations with more than 500 people (29.4 percent). The organizations in the distribution sector are more formalized than other organizations. Statutes, rules and charters are more important and many of these organizations have several of the different entities and roles possible in an organization. The most important challenges for this sector are related to funding.

Consumption organizations make up 20.2 percent of all alternative food organizations in the Canton of Geneva. It includes food knowledge, environmental and animal rights groups. The average age of the sector is 21.4 years. This sector's most important goal is related to the environment. Consumption organizations are significantly more active in the launching of campaigns and in taking care of a label, organizing events and trainings. They are mostly active in the canton of Geneva. The majority of consumption organizations are associations and tend to be medium-small and medium-sized organizations (both 21.7 percent). These organizations seem to be volunteer-driven and while it is not as pronounced as for the distribution sector, they often have different entities and roles to structure the organization. Similar to other sectors, financial issues represent an important challenge while the pressure from the market is not relevant for these organizations.

Finally, autoproduction organizations also make up 20.2 percent of the field and include only community gardens. These organizations are significantly younger than organizations in other sectors with an average age of 9.3 years. Environmental issues and local agriculture (both 69.6 percent) are important to the autoproduction sector, while social justice does not seem to be an important issue to them. They engage significantly more in direct social action (60.9 percent) and are mostly active at the neighborhood level. Many chose to be an association and more organizations than in other sectors declare to be informal or grassroots organizations (21.1 percent). Autoproduction organizations are mostly medium-small organizations with up to 50 people involved (34.8 percent). In general, the questionnaire seemed to be less fit for studying this type of organization and which may display their innovative side. Indeed, for the 'positions' and types of members they mention 'other' significantly more than other sectors. Financial issues and market pressure are less an issue for autoproducers than for other sectors.

References

Alkon, Alison, and Julie Guthman. 2017. *The new food activism: Opposition, cooperation, and collective action*: Univ of California Press.

Balsiger, Philip. 2014. "Between shaming corporations and promoting alternatives: The politics of an "ethical shopping map"." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 14(2):218-35.

Baruch, Yehuda, and Brooks C. Holtom. 2008. "Survey response rate levels and trends in organizational research." *Human Relations* 61(8):1139-60.

Bosi, Lorenzo, and Lorenzo Zamponi. 2015. "Direct social actions and economic crises: The relationship between forms of action and socio-economic context in Italy." *Partecipazione e conflitto* 8(2):367-91.

Forno, Francesca. 2013. "Survey "Referente GAS"."

Forno, Francesca, and Luigi Ceccarini. 2006. "From the street to the shops: The rise of new forms of political actions in Italy." *South European Society & Politics* 11(2):197-222.

Forno, Francesca, and Paolo R Graziano. 2014. "Sustainable community movement organisations." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 14(2):139-57.

Friedmann, Harriet. 2005. "From colonialism to green capitalism: Social movements and emergence of food regimes." Pp. 227-64 in *New directions in the sociology of global development*: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Goodman, David, E Melanie DuPuis, and Michael K Goodman. 2012. *Alternative food networks: Knowledge, practice, and politics*: Routledge.

King, Brayden G, and Nicholas A Pearce. 2010. "The contentiousness of markets: Politics, social movements, and institutional change in markets." *Annual Review of Sociology* 36:249-67.

Kousis, Maria, and Maria Paschou. 2017. "Alternative Forms of Resilience. A Typology of Approaches for the Study of Citizen Collective Responses in Hard Economic Times." *Partecipazione e Conflitto* 10(1):136-68.

Levkoe, Charles. 2001. "Ontario Food Network Survey." University of Toronto.

Monticelli, Lara. 2018. "Embodying alternatives to capitalism in the 21st century." *tripleC: Communication, Capitalism & Critique. Open Access Journal for a Global Sustainable Information Society* 16(2):501-17.

Nollert, Michael, and Monica Budowski. 2009. "Government Policy and the Nonprofit Sector: Switzerland." *Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project No. 48. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies.*

Soule, Sarah A. 2012. "Social movements and markets, industries, and firms." *Organization Studies* 33(12):1715-33.

Yates, Luke. 2015. "Rethinking prefiguration: Alternatives, micropolitics and goals in social movements." *Social Movement Studies* 14(1):1-21.

Apendix I

Sector of activity	Types of food organizations
Production	Agriculture Food transformation Unions, federations, & chambers Solidarity jobs
Distribution	Food shops Charity food organizations
Consumption	Environmental groups Food knowledge Animal rights groups
Autoproduction	Community gardens

Goals	Items
Social justice	Democratize access to land Improve working conditions Fight poverty Reduce inequalities Improve food knowledge
Health	Health
Local agriculture	Promote local agriculture
Environmental protection	Biodiversity Preserve natural resources Reduce human footprint on environment
Food democracy	Democratize organization management Democratize food system
Anticapitalist	Change prevailing economic system Develop alternatives to capitalism