



Norges miljø- og  
biovitenskapelige  
universitet

**Master's Thesis 2018 30 ECTS**

Department of Plant Sciences

# **The Experience of Members of European CSAs**

Erica Reisman

Master of Science in Agroecology

## Table of contents

Table of contents.....	1
Acknowledgements.....	2
Abstract.....	3
List of Tables.....	4
1. Introduction.....	5
1.1 Community Supported Agriculture: in Theory and in Practice.....	5
1.2 Research Questions and Theoretical Framework.....	6
1.3 SolidBase Research Project.....	6
2. Methodology.....	7
2.1 Choice of Methodology.....	7
2.2 Challenges and Limitations.....	8
2.3 Data Collection.....	9
2.4 Data Analysis.....	9
3. Results.....	10
3.1 Interviews.....	10
3.2 Survey.....	18
4. Discussion.....	26
4.1 Quality.....	27
4.2 Environment.....	27
4.3 Price.....	28
4.4 Connection with the Farmer and the Members.....	30
4.5 Involvement.....	32
4.6 Limitations and Weaknesses.....	33
4.7 Looking Forward.....	35
5. Conclusion.....	35
References.....	37
Appendix 1 – Interview Guide.....	39
Appendix 2 – Online Questionnaire.....	40
Appendix 3 – Interview Notes.....	44
Appendix 4 – Complete Interview Content Analysis.....	56
Appendix 5 – Complete Summary of Survey Results.....	66

## **Acknowledgements**

*The process of writing this thesis has been both challenging and rewarding, and I would not have been able to do it without the help, guidance, and support of many. Thank you to Peter Volz, who guided my project and helped me every step of the way. Thank you to Jocelyn Parot and the Urgenci network, and the rest of the SolidBase research team, for their interest, feedback, and encouragement. Thank you to my academic advisors Chuck Francis, Paola Migliorini, and Tor Arvid Breland, for their wisdom, advice, and patience. I am also grateful to my professors from NMBU and ISARA, who contributed to my knowledge base and helped inform my research. In addition to Chuck and Tor Arvid, thank you to Anne Marie, Geir Lieblein, and Alexander Wezel for coordinating such an excellent, progressive program. Thank you to my translators: Peter Volz, Grégoire Turpin, Vania Olmos Lau, Šarka Krčílková, and Gloria Passuello, for your time and help, with nothing but a vague promise in return for future help with English proofreading. I am grateful to the interviewees who took the time to share their experiences with me, and all of my anonymous survey respondents who did the same. I am also so thankful to my fellow Agroecology students, I could not have asked for a better or more supportive group of people to go through this journey with. Finally, I am grateful to my parents, my sisters, and my partner Ohan, who believed in me when I needed it most.*

## **Abstract**

Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) is an alternative food system that directly connects consumers with producers. Though in theory CSA ameliorates some of the negative environmental, social, and economic impacts of conventional food systems, some research has shown that in practice it can still give rise to similar ill effects that threaten their long-term viability, e.g., financial insecurity due to insufficient knowledge about consumer attitudes. This study aims to explore consumer attitudes towards CSA in order to contribute to the knowledge base of European CSA and promote its viability in Europe. I used semi-structured interviews and an online survey to investigate what aspects of CSA are most important to CSA members, and how their attitudes can support or deter CSA. The work was done within the SolidBase research project, comprising researchers from across Europe, which aims to study European CSAs in order to provide tools for their financial sustainability. The interviews underwent content analysis, and the survey data provided descriptive statistics to analyze these questions. Consistent with previous studies, the results showed that quality and environmental concerns feature heavily in consumers' motivations, whereas social considerations come second. The social component of CSA as split into the relationship with the farmer and with other members appeared to be of primary and secondary importance, respectively. Additionally, this research parses involvement in CSA into financial, crop planning, or coordinating involvement, thus illuminating differences in the members' participation in these aspects, as well as their desire to be involved in different parts of the CSA. The agroecological and small-scale methods of farming will most likely continue to be a draw for membership in the future, whereas the relationship with the farmer and other members should be studied further and augmented in order to continue to attract dedicated CSA members. Further research should also take a closer look at the ways that members are involved in CSA in order to bring a deeper understanding at how different types of members' participation affect their CSA experience.

**List of Tables**

Table 1 - Outline of interview codebook ..... 11

Table 2 - Interview Codebook Theme: Connection..... 12

Table 3 - Interview Codebook Theme: Environment ..... 13

Table 4 - Interview Codebook Theme: Money..... 14

Table 5 - Interview Codebook Theme: Personal Benefit..... 15

Table 6 - Interview Codebook Theme: Solidarity ..... 16

Table 7 - Country of survey respondents ..... 18

Table 8 - Reasons reported why the member changed their CSA ..... 19

Table 9 - Reported personal benefits from CSA..... 20

Table 10 - Reported motivations for food purchases, ranked ..... 21

Table 11 - Level of connection with farmers and other members ..... 22

Table 12 - Likelihood of staying with CSA..... 22

Table 13 - Farmer Connection: Likelihood of staying with CSA x Level of Connection..... 23

Table 14 - Reported Level of Trust in Farmer ..... 23

Table 15 - Member Connection: Likelihood of staying with CSA x Level of Connection..... 23

Table 16 – Members’ level of involvement in CSA planning activities..... 24

Table 17 – Members’ Trust of farmer x Involvement in financial planning ..... 25

Table 18 - Members' Trust of farmer x Involvement in crop planning ..... 25

Table 19 - Members' Trust of farmer x Involvement in volunteering/coordination ..... 26

Table 20 - Age distribution of survey respondents ..... 26

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Community Supported Agriculture: in Theory and in Practice

Community Supported Agriculture, or CSA<sup>1</sup>, is an alternative food system that directly connects consumers and producers in a long-term arrangement. CSA originated in Japan in the 1960s (there called “teikei”, which means “cooperation” or “partnership”), before spreading to Europe and the US a few years later (Schnell, 2007). In the purest conception of CSA, the farmers and consumers first work together to plan for production and distribution, the consumers pay directly to the farmer an upfront cost at the beginning of the season, and the farmer delivers installments (usually weekly) from the farm’s harvest to the consumers. Consumers have the benefit of receiving fresh and local food and connecting with their farmer, and farmers have the benefit of setting their revenue ahead of time in order to cover expenses, and allowing themselves a living wage. Additionally, farmers and consumers share the risk inherent in agriculture—because the consumers pay for a share of a harvest, and not for a specific quantity of product, even if the farmer has a bad harvest, they still are guaranteed a livable wage. (Schnell, 2007)

Because its arrangement and ethos differ from the dominant industrial food system, CSA is an “alternative food system” that seeks to redress the ills caused by industrial agriculture. Though not explicit in its definition, CSA almost always uses more environmentally sustainable methods of production, such as organic or biodynamic, and thus is not as extractive or damaging as industrial agriculture (McFadden, 1991 in Galt, 2013). But despite the different environmental approaches, perhaps the starkest difference between CSA and industrial agriculture is in its social and political ethos. CSA is a new paradigm of food system entirely, the core of which is the direct relationship between consumers and producers and better incomes for farmers (Ravenscroft et al., 2013).

While in theory CSA can better support the livelihoods of farmers, in practice the results have been more mixed. Netzwerk Solidarisch Landwirtschaft (2013, cited in Blättel-Mink et al. 2017) asserts “those that work in agriculture must either exploit nature or themselves.” While exploitation most likely exists along a spectrum, instead of in a binary, some researchers have explored the issue of farmer self-exploitation in CSA, which directly affects the long-term financial sustainability of the CSA (Galt, 2013; Galt et al., 2016). These studies (Galt, 2013; Galt et al., 2016) of farmer exploitation in CSA have come out of California, which has an established number of CSA relative to much of the United States (Galt, 2011). Galt (2013) analyzes farmer

---

<sup>1</sup> A note on nomenclature: the term “CSA” means both the general model of this alternative food system (e.g. “CSA links consumers and producers”), as well as a specific organization or initiative that uses this model (e.g. “The CSA has 50 members.”).

self-exploitation due to farmers' feelings of obligation to their customers, and Galt et al. (2016) look at perceived competition for CSA customers. But in CSA, there are both farmers *and* members, so contributing to farmer self-exploitation are the attitudes, or perceived attitudes of CSA members. This project, which is under the SolidBase research project (explained in Section 1.3), is the first of its kind that attempts to gather an overarching view of attitudes towards CSA in Europe, in order to understand the role members may play in farmer self-exploitation in European CSA.

## **1.2 Research Questions and Theoretical Framework**

The aim of my research is to better understand member attitudes towards CSA in Europe regarding price and non-price factors, in hopes that it can contribute to a more complete understanding of the role CSA members might play in farmer self-exploitation. This research will complement the SolidBase research (Section 1.3) and contribute to a body of knowledge that will ultimately help farmers and coordinators with the financial sustainability of their CSAs.

My research questions are as follows:

1. What aspects of CSA are most important to CSA members?
2. How do consumer attitudes towards CSA support or deter CSA in Europe?

To analyze these questions, I used the theoretical framework of social embeddedness in terms of the concepts of marketness and instrumentalism, which has previously been used to analyze CSAs (Hinrichs 2000, Galt 2013). As Hinrichs (2000) explained, social embeddedness occurs when there are non-economic considerations in the interaction. To more concretely understand social embeddedness, one can speak in terms of marketness and instrumentalism. Galt (2013) elucidated these two concepts as follows: marketness measures the importance of price in a market interaction (i.e. high marketness means price matters a lot in the interaction), whereas instrumentalism measures how much an individual prioritizes their own personal, economic interests (i.e. low instrumentalism means that factors like relationships and morals matter a lot in the interaction). These two concepts are particularly apt for discussing CSA precisely because of CSA's mix of economic and non-economic components.

## **1.3 SolidBase Research Project**

This research on CSA members was done under the SolidBase research project. SolidBase is an initiative from a team of researchers from Urgenci (the International Network for Community Supported Agriculture), and its partners in Hungary, Czech Republic, Germany and the European CSA research group. Aware of the potential benefits and the potential downfalls of CSA, and influenced by the research on farmer self-exploitation coming out of the U.S. from

Galt (2013) and Galt et al. (2016), these researchers set out to study CSA in Europe in order to understand how to best support it. Specifically, SolidBase intends to address the issues facing European CSAs and provide support in order to safeguard the longevity of CSA and other solidarity-based food systems in Europe (Urgenci, 2018). The first stage of this multi-year project comprises interviews and an extensive online questionnaire for European CSA farmers and CSA coordinators that explore topics such as farmer salaries, budgeting, communication with members, and the role of solidarity in CSA. My research is under the umbrella of the SolidBase project with the supervision of Peter Volz, but instead of focusing on farmers, I turn an eye towards the “community” in Community Supported Agriculture, namely: its members.

## **2. Methodology**

### **2.1 Choice of Methodology**

In order to understand CSA members’ feelings towards CSA, I choose a mixed methodology of semi-structured interviews and a questionnaire, which is the same methodology used for the larger SolidBase research project. I chose an online survey because it is widely distributable and generates quantifiable descriptive statistics. I chose semi-structured interviews because, by being able to ask follow-up and clarifying questions, the interview data can have more depth and nuance than that of the online questionnaire. The main data source was the survey, with the interviews meant to supplement. Together, these methods can contribute to an understanding of how much price and non-price considerations matter in CSA membership, which could thusly shine light upon the marketness and instrumentalism in their CSA membership.

I conducted five interviews, and then developed an online survey that asked many of the same questions and could be distributed via the Urgenci network to European CSAs. Having already talked to CSA members on these topics helped inform how to phrase questions and answers for the survey, and thus could be considered in some way exploratory for the larger survey. The survey could then be distributed to European CSAs with the help of the Urgenci network. I had the survey translated into German, Spanish, Italian, French, and Czech, which are the languages used in the larger SolidBase research project. The survey data was anonymous and no identifying information was included from the interview participants.

I chose semi-structured interviews because it would allow CSA members to explain, in their own words, their experience with their CSA. The questions followed the same themes used for the farmer interviews in the SolidBase project, and were also influenced by a prior literature review. With semi-structured interviewing, the respondents could choose which aspect to elaborate on, and to take as much time with each question. There were four main sections of the



interview: (1) the background information section asked about the member's reasons for joining their CSA; (2) the community section asked about the member's experience of the "community" part of their CSA; (3) the financial section asked about their relationship to the price of their CSA, and (4) the demographic section asked for basic demographic data (please see the complete interview guide in Appendix 1). The guide was shared with the researchers in SolidBase and open to their feedback.

I choose to do an online survey in order to gather data from a larger number of people in a statistically quantifiable manner. I also hoped it would reach a greater *range* of people than would be possible with the limited number of interviews that I was able to do. As interviews select only for people that agree to give a substantial portion of their time for the sake of scientific research, they could likely select for only the most engaged CSA members. However, a survey requires less logistics and can be completed on the respondent's own time, so it could perhaps capture the responses of people that would be not be willing to coordinate and sit for a half hour interview, but would complete a survey online. The survey was designed to target the same questions as the interview guide, but with discrete answer options. It had five sections: (1) Motivations and Benefits of CSA; (2) Connection with CSA farmer; (3) Connection with CSA members; (4) Planning of the CSA; and (5) Demographic data. The survey was shared with the researchers in SolidBase and open to their feedback. The survey questions are in Appendix 2.

## **2.2 Challenges and Limitations**

As described above, the voluntary nature of the interviews and questionnaire is a non-random sample, likely selecting only for the most enthusiastic members. Additionally, there were many chains of command between the survey respondents and me so that I had little control over who was responding, or even had access to the survey and I could not easily send follow-up emails to remind members to take the survey, or to take a more targeted approach to emailing the link in order to even out the distribution among countries. This is because the request for interviews or survey responses was filtered through the CSA farmers or coordinators. It's highly possible that some never forwarded it on, so that only the CSA members from farmers or coordinators who had the time or were enthusiastic about the research had the chance to participate. In many cases, there was even another layer on top of that, where in order to get a list of CSAs to email, I had to first go through researchers or another governing body who were sometimes reluctant to cooperate. In the case of Italy, the researchers were unwilling to forward the survey because they felt Italian CSAs had already been studied enough and they didn't see the benefit in additional research. So, the distribution of the survey link was uneven. Additionally, there are many models of CSA across Europe with different expectations and cultural norms, so that it can be hard to

generalize. However, demographic information (age, gender, location, education, and income) was collected in order to understand a general picture of who the survey participants are.

Like with any study that includes several languages, the validity of this research relies on the proper translation of the survey question so that all responses would be comparable. There is the possibility that a question could have slightly different meanings or implications in different languages, however, I attempted to minimize this problem by having the survey questions translated by native speakers of the language who work or are trained in agroecology and thus would be familiar with the nuances of different terminology.

For the survey, the reliability also depends on my ability to translate the more open-ended questions from the interview guide into a question with discrete answer options. Though there was the option to write-in additional answers if the respondent didn't find a suitable answer, it is still possible that this limits the depth of their answers.

There were a few problems encountered with data collection, both with the interviews and the survey. However, the survey allowed for write-in responses for some of the questions, so that respondents could elaborate on their answers.

## **2.3 Data Collection**

For interviews, I contacted CSAs in Sweden and asked if they would ask on my behalf if any of their members would be willing to be interviewed. The ones that were interested contacted me via email, and I conducted phone interviews using the interview guide (Appendix 1). I typed copious notes during the interview (reported in full in Appendix 3). In the end, I had conducted five interviews from Swedish consumers. I interviewed five people: four women and one man, all in their 30s or 40s, with education ranging from high school (gymnasium) to a master's degree.

For the survey component, the link was distributed via Urgenci to their network of CSAs in Europe, as well as through some researchers in the SolidBase project. There was only one initial push for the survey link, with no follow-up emails or reminders. The survey was open for two months before being closed and the results exported to Excel. After eliminating incomplete responses and those that fell out of the European region, I had 387 full responses.

## **2.4 Data Analysis**

The interviews were analyzed via thematic content analysis. As outlined by DeCuir-Gunby et al. (2010), I took an iterative data-driven approach, in which I worked with the raw data in order to see which themes and categories resulted. First I read the interview notes and

pulled out relevant units for analysis. I then drafted an initial set of themes and re-read the interview notes with the themes in mind, pulling out the initial interview notes into a table. Then, I sorted through the interview notes and translated them to codes, and then put those codes into categories and subcategories. Finally, I went through each interview note unit to ensure the accuracy of its placement.

After the raw interview notes from the five interviews were coded, there were 138 units that were then analyzed and categorized into themes, categories, and sub-categories. Many of these themes and categories are related and use vocabulary that has many nuanced meanings. But in this case, I coded them for the most dominant, unambiguous theme. Some units were coded “ambiguous” because they could not to be categorized, often because they were phrased in the negative, e.g. “not there to meet new people” or that “the community is not important”, neither of which assert the reason they *were* there, or what *was* important. Additionally, some interview notes could be interpreted in one of the several ways, such as the example of “organic is the most important part.” I choose to categorize this as a theme for the environment, but it’s possible the interviewee meant it for health reasons, in which case it should have been categorized as a personal benefit. Or perhaps the interviewee meant both for the environment and health. Lastly, the distinction between the subcategories of *community* and *relationships* is that a unit was subcategorized as *community* if that word was mentioned in the unit, and *relationships* was used if the unit talked about knowing or meeting people, but not stating explicitly that it was a community.

The survey data was first “cleaned”, meaning that all incomplete responses and responses from those outside Europe were removed. Then, the data underwent descriptive analysis with pivot tables in Excel, calculating the percentages of respondents in each answer option. A few second-level statistics were also calculated, that looked at how the respondents answered across two different questions. The results were discussed via the theoretical framework of marketness and instrumentalism.

### **3. Results**

#### **3.1 Interviews**

The main themes emerging from the analysis of the interviews were: connection, environment, money, personal benefit, and solidarity, each of which will be elaborated on in the following sections. Table 1 shows the outline of all themes, categories, and subcategories. For the complete list coded interview notes, see Appendix 4. The next five sections explain each of the themes. (N.B. In Tables 2 through 6, some codings are repeated; this is due to several

interview notes getting the same coding. See Appendix 4 for the original interview note for each coding.)

Table 1 - Outline of interview codebook

Theme	Category	Subcategory
Connection	Communication	Digital Communication
	Connection with farmers	Community
		Relationship
		Trust
	Connection with Members	Community
		Relationship
	Connection with Members and Farmers	Community
Relationship		
Shared Values		
Welcome space	Community	
Environment	Production Methods	Environmental impact
		Sustainability
		Values
Money	Commerce	Transaction
	Value	Farmer income
		Farmer labor
		Price of product
Personal Benefit	Food Quality	Access
		Freshness
		Nutrition
		Origin
	Health	Emotional Health
		Healthy Food
	Style of food purchasing/preparation	Time
Creativity		
Solidarity	Responsibility	Choice
		Commitment
		Engagement
		Social responsibility
	Support	Future generations
		Mutual support
		Supporting the farmers
		Supporting the members
	Trust	Financials
		Management
	Understanding	Process
		Shift in perspective
	Values	Call to action
Engagement		
Individual Action		

### 3.1.1 Interview Theme – Connection

In the interviews, the level of connection that the members felt with their CSA varied both in strength and breadth. Some members felt a strong connection to the other CSA members, and enjoyed interacting with others that had a set of shared values (noted as “a health-conscious CSA family”), or stated the importance of being “part of a larger community.” However, for some members, their relationship with the producer was much more important, and they had little interest in connecting with the other members (“connection is mainly with the farmers, not with the other members”). Some members explicitly stated they trusted their farmer, while this subcategory also contains units where trust was inferred, stating that they wanted to know who is farming. Some members talked about “community” more generally, and it wasn’t clear how much the farmers and the other members played into this conception. A few members spoke of the importance of the physical space of the CSA, and how it was “a place could always go to” or as a “community gathering space.” Table 2 below shows the coding for the theme of “Connection.” See Appendix 4 for the codebook with initial interview notes.

Table 2 - Interview Codebook Theme: Connection

Coding	Subcategory	Category
Social media to connect	Digital communication	Communication
Social media makes sharing CSA info easy		
Have connection with producers	Relationships	Connection with farmers
Relationship with producers more important than with members		
Personal relation with farmer		
Know farmer better than other members		
Personal connection to farmer		
Trust the farmer already, followed to CSA operation		
Trust the farmer		
Closeness to grower		
Know your farmer		
Use CSA delivery as a social tool to bring people together	Community	Connection with members
Working together		
Community with members		
Community		
Community aspect doesn't enhance experience		

Be part of community	Community	Connection with members and farmers
Allows connection in isolationist modern life		
Emotional importance of community		
Be part of larger community		
Meeting new people	Relationships	
Meeting new people		
Shared values with CSA members	Shared values	
A place where you are welcome	Community	Welcome space
Community gathering place		
A place where you are welcome		
A place where you are welcome		
More than just getting food		

### 3.1.2 Interview Theme – Environment

Table 3 below shows the coding for the theme of *environment*. In order to clarify why there is only one category in this theme, it is helpful to conceive of what else could have been a category, but was not: for example, more environmentally-friendly transport, less food miles, or less food waste. So, the only environmental aspect mentioned in the interviews was about the production methods for the food. Within that, interviewees mentioned the farming methods, for example, a preference for “regenerative agriculture”, which I coded as *environmental impact* or more generally wanting to live an “environmentally conscious life”, which I coded as *values*. While there are not as many units with the theme of environment, this could be due to the interview guide asking more questions specifically about the community part of the CSA, so that the interviewees were not prompted to talk about their environmental concerns.

Table 3 - Interview Codebook Theme: Environment

Coding	Subcategory	Category
Environmental methods important in food choice	Environmental Impact	Production methods
Regenerative agriculture important		
Environmentally conscious life	Values	
Environmental responsibility as solidarity		
Supporting future generations and living in a sustainable way		
Good for our soil and our planet		
Organic is very important		

### 3.1.3 Interview Theme – Money

The theme of *money* was assigned to any units that talked about the value of or prices found in the CSA or farmer income, and is shown in Table 4 below. *Commerce* was applied to any unit that discussed the CSA as a commercial activity, and it has only one subcategory of *transaction*; in this category, interviewees mentioned whether or not the CSA felt like a transaction to them (i.e. a direct exchange of money for food). Three interviewees mentioned that the CSA did not feel transactional, or that they enjoyed the separation between payment and food, while one interviewee stated that the CSA still felt like a transaction, and one interviewee did not state one way or the other.

In the *value* category, several interviewees expressed that they were happy to support the farmer, and that they would even pay more just to support them. While a few interviewees expressed that the CSA was a good value for the money, others mentioned that price doesn't matter as much as quality or method of production, or that the food costs what it's supposed to cost. One interviewee recounted a story of the CSA members being present for the first harvest, and how it helped to underscore "the value of that one bunch", implying their appreciation for the value of the work that went into growing food. Another interviewee said that they don't have much money, but they were still able to afford the products, thus implying that affordability has to do with priorities.

Table 4 - Interview Codebook Theme: Money

Coding	Subcategory	Category
Separating payment from product	Transaction	Commerce
Freedom from commercial transaction		
CSA feels transactional		
More than just a transaction		
Ok with small harvest, but thinks that the farmer wouldn't be		
Farmers pay themselves too little	Farmer income	Value
Happy to support farmers		
Happy to support farmers		
Happy to support farmers		
Would pay more to support their work		
Farmers deserve the work benefits they want		
Understanding the value of a product in terms of work and effort	Farmer labor	
Support year-round farmer income		
They are giving us the best possible price		

Better price	Price of product	
Price is about priorities		
Production more important than cost		
Good value for the money		
Food is not "supposed" to cost a certain amount		
Fair price, but challenging payment structure		
Quality more important than cost		
Monetary value can depend on how you cook		

### 3.1.4 Interview Theme – Personal Benefit

In the *personal benefit* theme, interviewees talked about what they got out of the CSA. As shown below in Table 5, the quality of the food featured heavily, with interviewees saying that they liked the CSA for the freshness, with two interviewees linking this directly to nutrition. Other interviewees say they liked not having to spend as much time on food shopping, and that they liked the creativity of working with the CSA. One interviewee talked of the CSA as “emotional therapy”, and how it supplies the need people have to connect with the land.

Table 5 - Interview Codebook Theme: Personal Benefit

Coding	Subcategory	Category
Best quality available	Access	Food Quality
Freshly harvested	Freshness	
Food freshness		
Food quality, origin, freshness		
Nutrition maximized when eaten close to harvest	Nutrition	
Nutrition		
Local is important	Origin	
CSA for food, not community	-	
Healthy food	Healthy food	Health
CSA for emotional wellbeing	Emotional health	
Reconnecting people to the land		
Emotional support		
Personal health	-	
Less time for food purchasing	Time	Style of food purchasing/preparation
Likes the challenge of cooking creatively with CSA	Creativity	
Cook based on what produce is in season food		



There was one interview note that was coded for both *environment* and *personal benefit*: “method and origin are most important, then taste and freshness.” This interviewee thus expressed their ranking in importance, with the environment component rated as more important than the food personal benefit component.

### 3.1.5 Interview Theme – Solidarity

The final theme of *solidarity* was by far the largest, shown below in Table 6. As evidenced by the number of categories and subcategories, this theme is vast and complex, though considering that CSA is generally considered an example of solidarity economy (Bîrhală & Möllers, 2014a), the number of interview units dealing with this theme is not surprising. As per Bîrhală and Möllers (2014a), the solidarity economy is “based on new values and concepts that inspire forms of social innovation, self-management and alternative forms of exchange”. This theme contained the interview units that expressed value taking an active role in their food choices and investing in what they believe in (subcategory *engagement*). It’s also where interviewees expressed their desire to live sustainably for their children, or future generations. Many of the interviewees also talked about the importance of support within the CSA community, and how important it is to “work together.”

The *solidarity* theme is also where I placed expressions of *understanding* from the interviewees. This category contained units where the interviewees expressed understanding that the CSA may be young or experimenting, that the climate or soil has limitations, or that nature is fickle and sometimes it’s a bad year. Lastly, the *solidarity theme* is where I placed expressions of *support*, either for the farmers or other members. This subcategory overlaps with the *Money/Value* category, but the units that were framed as monetary support were in the *Money* theme, while the units that mentioned support more generally were placed in *Solidarity*. This is also where the expressions of trust of the farmers in how they were running the CSA were placed.

Table 6 - Interview Codebook Theme: Solidarity

Coding	Subcategory	Category
Social responsibility	Social responsibility	Responsibility
Solidarity is between freedom and responsibility	Personal responsibility	
Self reflection with regards to money		
Life choice		
Ownership	Engagement	
Responsibility for landscape and development		
Engagement		

Taking action		
Personal responsibility		
Working together		
Members have made a commitment and are on the same page	Commitment	
Farmers listening to consumers	Supporting the members	Support
Respect for farmer's job	Supporting the farmers	
Support the farmers		
Support the farmers		
Respect for farmer's profession		
Important to support the farmers		
Harvest size doesn't matter with support		
Working together; responsibility	Mutual support	
Working together		
Supports the farmers who support her		
Supporting with food		
Each person is accepted		
Mutually beneficial arrangement		
The CSA is for all of us	Future generations	
Support future farmers		
CSA to schools		
Investing in the future		
Pay it forward		
Want children to be more aware		
Experiment with alternative agriculture		
Trust the farmer with the financials	Management	Trust
Trust the farmer with running the CSA		
Trust the farmer's decisions		
Trusts the farmers	Financials	
Does not want to know about the financials		
Separation between farmers and members in financial matters		
Larger perspective	Shift in perspective	Understanding
Trying something new		
New idea		
Adapting to realities of farming		
Understanding of geographic realities		
Planning for the future		

Tolerance		
Some good years, some bad years		
Acceptance		
Sometimes it's a bad harvest year		
Understanding responsibility of outcome		
Accepting geographical limitations		
Geographical limitations		
Adapting to the CSA		
The CSA has the freedom to experiment		
The CSA has the freedom to experiment		
It's always being fine-tuned		
Everyone is learning		
Support a good cause	Engagement	Values
Act according to your values		
Invest in what you believe in		
Spreading ideas		
Individual choices as the political		

### 3.2 Survey

The survey was open for two months and received 531 total responses, but after eliminating incomplete responses and those from respondents that lived outside of Europe, there were a total of 387 complete, usable responses. Despite being translated into French, Spanish, Italian, German, and Czech, the survey was unevenly distributed and completed across Europe (as explained in section 2.3 *Data Collection*). However, the survey was not meant to capture each country perfectly, but rather to get a broad overview of the general trends across CSA members in Europe. Table 7 shows the number of respondents from each country.

*Table 7 - Country of survey respondents*

Country	Responses	Pct.
Austria	27	7%
Belgium	9	2%
Czech Republic	191	49%
France	58	15%
Germany	59	15%
Hungary	2	1%
Ireland	2	1%
Norway	24	6%
Poland	6	2%
Sweden	5	1%
Finland	1	0%

Greece	3	1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>100%</b>

An obvious characteristic of the listed country distribution is the number of Czech responses (49%). This skew echoed the SolidBase questionnaire for farmers, as well, which had a higher-than-proportional number of Czech surveys completed—15%, though they make up only 1% of European CSAs (Parot et al., 2018). At the request of the SolidBase researchers, the results were also tabulated without Czech data, the full summary of which is included in Appendix 5. Most of the results were similar with and without the Czech responses.

### ***Motivation and Benefits of CSA***

The first section of the survey asked about the member’s background with their CSA, and their motivations behind their food purchases. 67% of respondents reported being in at least the second season with their CSA, and 14% reported being part of a different CSA in the past. The top reason for changing CSA was because the member moved, with convenience cited as the second most important factor (49% and 26% respectively). The next group of reasons, with nearly the same number of responses for each, were wanting to try a different CSA, a CSA stopping their operation, liking the products better at the new CSA, and better quality at the new CSA. Price, community involvement, and quantity were the least reported reasons. The full summary of responses is shown in Table 8.

*Table 8 - Reasons reported why the member changed their CSA*

<b>Reason</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
I moved	26	49%
My new CSA is more convenient	14	26%
I wanted to try a different CSA	8	15%
My previous CSA stopped their operation	8	15%
I liked the products better at my new CSA	8	15%
My new CSA has better quality	7	13%
There is more involvement with the community	3	6%
My new CSA has a quantity of products that better suits my needs	2	4%
There is less involvement with the community	1	2%
Other	0	0%
My new CSA has a better price	0	0%

When asked about their financial contribution to the CSA, 4% said it was low and they would pay more, 82% it was the right amount, and 13% said it was too much. However, these results require a note about validity: these answers can only indicate their sentiment about the price, and cannot be used to gauge how the member would act if the price were raised. It’s

entirely possible that someone reporting that they would pay more wouldn't actually do so if the price were raised, or someone that said it was too much would still pay more if the price were raised. Even so, this shows that the vast majority (86%) do not *feel* that the price is too much, and that 14% *feel* that the price is too much.

When asked if there were other ways of getting local food in their area, 80% of respondents reported yes, 8% reported no, and 12% didn't know. Of the other ways of getting local food, farmers markets were the most reported (87%), followed by shops or supermarkets (62%), and then growing their own food or knowing someone that does (52%). The most common comments that respondents wrote in for "Other" were buying directly on a farm or through food coops.

Table 9 summarizes the reasons reported for personal benefits received by being part of the CSA. "Production methods in agreement with environmental concerns" was the most cited reason (87%), followed by food traceability (82%), then quality (81%), then freshness and seasonality (79%). It should be noted that this last answer option is vague, because freshness and seasonality—though related—are not the same attribute. A respondent could have selected that option for one or the other, and relatedly it's possible that a respondent didn't choose this option because they liked the freshness but not the seasonality. However, both "freshness" and "seasonality" speak to an attribute about the food. After, respondents cited the trust-based relationship with the farmer (59%), the connection with like-minded individuals (56%), the possibility to connect with a farm (48%), feeling of belonging to a community (39%), and connection to a rural area (27%). The last two selected were related to price: fixed price for the whole season and lower prices for organic products (22% and 21% respectively). The most common reasons give for "Other" were the variety of vegetables available, wanting to buy local, less shopping, gaining practical experience, and wanting to support an alternative consumption model.

*Table 9 - Reported personal benefits from CSA*

<b>Personal Benefit</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
Production methods in agreement with environmental concerns	87%
Traceability of food	82%
Quality of food	81%
Freshness and seasonality of food	79%
Fair price negotiated with the producer	59%
Trust-based relationship with farmers	59%
Connection with like-minded individuals	56%
Possibility to connect with a farm	48%
Feeling of belonging to a community	39%
Connection with a rural area	27%
Fixed price for whole season	22%

Lower prices for organic products	21%
Other	13%

(387 respondents)

The final question in this section asked respondents to rank what motivates their food choices. Similar to the question about the price of the CSA, this question can only indicate how the respondents think or feel about their motivations, and cannot be taken as a proxy for their actions when they purchase their food. Even so, it is useful to see how members conceive of their motivations with their food purchases. The complete set of results for this question is presented in Table 10.

Table 10 - Reported motivations for food purchases, ranked

	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	5 <sup>th</sup>	6 <sup>th</sup>	7 <sup>th</sup>	8 <sup>th</sup>	9 <sup>th</sup>	10 <sup>th</sup>
Quality	38%	17%	10%	14%	6%	9%	3%	2%	0%	0%
Supporting small-scale organic farming	18%	13%	13%	13%	15%	13%	7%	7%	6%	0%
Nutrition	12%	12%	11%	6%	7%	8%	16%	10%	13%	1%
Environmental impact	12%	18%	14%	17%	11%	10%	9%	9%	1%	0%
Localness	6%	13%	18%	15%	15%	13%	9%	6%	3%	0%
Traceability	6%	10%	11%	13%	14%	17%	12%	9%	6%	0%
Price	3%	5%	7%	5%	8%	10%	19%	18%	21%	3%
Convenience	2%	3%	3%	5%	6%	6%	8%	25%	38%	5%
Seasonality	2%	8%	11%	13%	16%	14%	16%	12%	8%	4%
Other	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	3%	87%
# answered	387	386	384	369	342	312	288	260	234	111

Food quality was the most-reported top motivation in food choice (38% ranked it as the number one motivation), and also ranked highly as the second most important motivator (17%). Supporting small-scale organic farming was ranked as the primary motivator by 18% of the respondents, and nutrition and environmental impact were each rated as the primary motivator by 12% of the respondents. Neither localness nor traceability featured prominently as a primary motivator (just 6% each), but each was placed more frequently in spots #2 through #6. Price, convenience, and seasonality were rarely listed as the primary motivator (3%, 2%, and 2%, respectively). In fact, the percentages of both price and convenience as the motivators for food choice increase with the numbers of their ranked spot, indicating that more respondents put them as low on their list of motivators. The picture of seasonality isn't as clear, though it tended to have similar percentages in the second through ninth spots. The answer of "other" captured just between 0% and 3% of the rankings until 10<sup>th</sup>, where 87% of respondents placed it. Unfortunately, there was no opportunity for respondents to write in their "other" motivators.

### ***Connection with CSA Farmer***

The second section of the questionnaire asked about the respondent’s relationship to their farmer, with regards to the level of trust and connection. When asked how connected they feel with the farmer, there were more respondents than not who felt at least some connection to their farmer. Specifically, 20% felt “very connected”, 28% felt “somewhat connected”, 24% felt “neutral”, 15% felt “somewhat unconnected”, and 13% felt “not at all connected”, as shown below in Table 11 (together with corresponding question regarding members).

*Table 11 - Level of connection with farmers and other members*

<b>Level of connection with the...</b>	<b>Farmer</b>	<b>Other members</b>
Very connected	20%	7%
Somewhat connected	28%	43%
Neutral	24%	29%
Somewhat disconnected	15%	11%
Not at all connected	13%	10%

Respondents were then asked how more connection with their farmer would influence their decision to stay with the CSA. Like the previous caveats around data validity, this question cannot be used to indicate their actions in the future. However, it can hint to the role that connection with the farmer plays in their feelings about their CSA membership. As shown below in Table 12, 37% said more connection would make them more likely to stay, 61% said more connection would make them equally likely, and 3% said more connection would make them less likely to stay.

*Table 12 - Likelihood of staying with CSA*

<b>More connection with...</b>	<b>Farmer</b>	<b>Members</b>
More likely	37%	41%
Equally likely	61%	56%
Less likely	3%	3%

If we cross the two above tables (for farmers), we can see how the level of connection corresponds with reported likeliness to stay with the CSA, shown below in Table 13. This table shows that, essentially, more connection with the farmer is associated with members reporting they would be more or equally likely to stay with the CSA in the future. While a small percentage (4%) report that they don’t feel at all connected with the farmer, but would be more likely to stay with the CSA with increased connection, there is 9% at this connection level to whom it would not make a difference.

Table 13 - Farmer Connection: Likelihood of staying with CSA x Level of Connection

	<b>Very connected</b>	<b>Somewhat connected</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Somewhat unconnected</b>	<b>Not at all connected</b>	<i>Total</i>
<b>More likely</b>	7%	9%	10%	6%	4%	37%
<b>Equally likely</b>	12%	18%	1%	9%	9%	61%
<b>Less likely</b>	1%	1%	13%	0%	1%	3%
<b>Total</b>	20%	28%	24%	15%	13%	100%

The last question in this section asked about the respondent’s level of trust in their farmer. Only 3 respondents said they don’t trust the farmer (one said not at all, two said they sort of don’t trust the farmer), whereas 7% of respondents were neutral. The rest reported to trust the farmer, either a little (31%) or a lot (61%), as summarized below in Table 14.

Table 14 - Reported Level of Trust in Farmer

<b>Trust</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
I trust them a lot	61%
I trust them a little	31%
Neutral	7%
I sort of don’t trust them	1%
I don’t trust them at all	0%
<i>Total</i>	100%

### **Connection with other CSA Members**

The third section of the questionnaire asked similar questions to the second section, but now focused on the respondent’s relationship to the other CSA members. Table 15 summarizes the responses to the question asking how connected the respondent felt with the other CSA members. As shown in the bottom row, the smallest segment of members reported feeling “very connected” to the other CSA members (7%), though 43% felt “somewhat connected. Fewer respondents felt disconnected, with 11% saying they felt “somewhat disconnected” and 10% saying they felt “not at all connected.” Responses for neutral were 29% of the total.

Table 15 - Member Connection: Likelihood of staying with CSA x Level of Connection

	<b>Very connected</b>	<b>Somewhat connected</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Somewhat disconnected</b>	<b>Not at all connected</b>	<i>Total</i>
<b>More likely</b>	3%	20%	10%	5%	3%	41%
<b>Equally likely</b>	4%	21%	18%	5%	6%	56%
<b>Less likely</b>	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	3%
<b>Total</b>	7%	43%	29%	11%	10%	100%

The final question in this section was if more connection would make the respondent more, less, or equally likely to stay with the CSA in the future. Again, a note on validity: once again the responses must not be read as how the CSA members would act, but rather is meant to illuminate their wishes with regards to the community with the other CSA members. As shown



in the right-most column of Table 15, the majority (56%) expressed that more connection would make them equally likely to stay with the CSA, while 41% felt that more connection with the CSA would make them more likely to stay. Only 3% felt that more connection would make them less likely to stay with the CSA in the future.

When considering the interior values of Table 15, which show the breakdown of how the respondents answered with the two above questions combined, we see that most of the people who say they would be more likely to stay with the CSA in the future are those that already feel somewhat connected to the members. Among members who don't feel connected to the other members, the prospect of more connection only prompted a small number to say it would make them more likely to stay with the CSA in the future.

### ***The Planning of the CSA***

The fourth and penultimate section of the questionnaire asked about the respondent's involvement in the CSA's financial planning, crop planning, or other volunteer tasks and if they use special software for these activities, as well as if the respondents think the CSA is financially sustainable. While these questions were included mainly for interest in the larger SolidBase project (e.g. for their arm of research looking at software for CSAs), they can nevertheless assess if the respondent takes a leadership role in the CSA and if so, what type, as well as gauge their thoughts on their CSA's financial sustainability.

*Table 16 – Members' level of involvement in CSA planning activities*

<b>Involvement in the...</b>	<b>Financial Planning</b>	<b>Crop or Product Planning</b>	<b>Volunteering or Coordination</b>
Yes	23%	28%	48%
No but I would like to be	15%	33%	12%
No and I don't want to be	62%	39%	41%

As shown in Table 16, while 48% of respondents take part in volunteering or other coordination, only 28% participate in crop planning, and even less in financial planning (23%). Crop planning had the highest share of respondents who would like to get involved with it (33%), then financial planning (15%) and volunteering (12%). When it comes to the respondents desire for separation, the majority (62%) did not want any part of the financial planning, while 41% didn't want to be involved volunteering or other coordination, and 39% would not want to be involved in crop or product planning. When asked if they thought the farms were financially sustainable, 34% thought they were, 45% were not sure, 17% thought they weren't but that it would be someday, and 3% thought that they wouldn't ever be.

The next three tables show a cross of the question about trusting the farmer and the questions regarding whether they wanted to be involved in the financial planning. Table 17 shows how trust of the farmer is distributed according to how the respondents wanted to be involved in the financial planning. The two highest percentages were of those respondents who reported trusting the farmer either a lot or a little and reported to not have a desire to be involved in the finances. It should be noted that the reverse is *not* reflected in the data: respondents with a lower levels of trust *do not* report to wanting more involvement in the financials. However, very few respondents even reported having low levels of trust, so the data in this area may be too thin from which to draw a conclusion.

*Table 17 – Members’ Trust of farmer x Involvement in financial planning*

<b>Trust/Desire for Involvement</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No but I would like to be</b>	<b>No and I do not want to be</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>I trust them a lot</b>	19%	8%	35%	61%
<b>I trust them a little</b>	4%	5%	22%	31%
<b>Neutral</b>	1%	1%	5%	7%
<b>I sort of don’t trust them</b>	0%	0%	1%	1%
<b>I don’t trust them at all</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Total</b>	23%	15%	62%	100%

Table 18 below shows a similar table, but for involvement in crop planning. Here we see a similar pattern, with the highest proportion of respondents answering that they trust the farmer a lot and do not want to be part of the crop planning. The next highest percentage is of those who trust the farmer a lot and are involved with crop planning.

*Table 18 - Members’ Trust of farmer x Involvement in crop planning*

<b>Trust/Desire for Involvement</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No but I would like to be</b>	<b>No and I do not want to be</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>I trust them a lot</b>	20%	16%	25%	61%
<b>I trust them a little</b>	7%	12%	12%	31%
<b>Neutral</b>	1%	3%	3%	7%
<b>I sort of don’t trust them</b>	0%	1%	0%	1%
<b>I don’t trust them at all</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Total</b>	28%	33%	39%	100%

The final table of this type (Table 19, below) shows a different pattern: the highest proportion of respondents fell in the camp of having a lot of trust for the farmer and already being involved in the volunteering or coordination part of the CSA. The next highest percentage also trust the farmer a lot, but don’t want to be involved at all—reverse of the previous two tables.

Table 19 - Members' Trust of farmer x Involvement in volunteering/coordination

Trust/Desire for Involvement	Yes	No but I would like to be	No and I do not want to be	Total
I trust them a lot	34%	6%	22%	61%
I trust them a little	12%	4%	15%	31%
Neutral	2%	1%	3%	7%
I sort of don't trust them	0%	0%	0%	1%
I don't trust them at all	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Demographic Questions

The majority of the respondents (71%) were female, 26% were male, 1% were gender non-conforming, and another 3% preferred not to say. With regards to where the respondents lived, 67% were urban dwellers, 18% lived in suburban areas, and 15% lived in rural areas. Concerning the highest level of education completed, 63% had obtained their Masters degree or a PhD, 15% had completed their Bachelors, 21% had completed high school or the equivalent, and only 1% reported only having completed primary school. For ages, the bulk of the respondents were in the range of 30 to 59. The full summary of ages is in Table 20.

Table 20 - Age distribution of survey respondents

Age	Pct.
0-19	1%
20-29	11%
30-39	43%
40-49	21%
50-59	15%
60-69	7%
70+	3%

## 4. Discussion

Having obtained and processed five interviews and 387 survey responses, I will now analyze the data with regards to the original research questions: (1) what aspects of CSA are most important to CSA members? And (2) how do consumer attitudes towards CSA support or deter CSA in Europe? The findings below will be discussed in the context of marketness (how much does price matter) and instrumentalism (how much do other personal benefits matter).

Regarding the demographics of the respondents, they majority were well-educated, lived in urban areas, and were women. This seems to fall in line with the reported demographics from other studies (Pole & Gray, 2012; Bîrhală & Möllers, 2014a, 2014b; Krčilková et al., 2016).

## 4.1 Quality

The quality of the food featured heavily in both the survey and the interviews, indicating that this is one of the key aspects of CSA that are important to CSA members, if not the most important. In the survey's question about motivations for food choices (Table 5), quality was the top-ranked first choice, and in the question about benefits of CSA (Table 4), the top four benefits were: production methods in agreement with environmental concerns, traceability of food, quality of food, and freshness and seasonality of food. Notably, three of the top four given benefits of CSA were ascribed to the food before any social concern was listed (the benefit regarding environment is discussed in the next section). In fact, there was a gap of 20% between respondents that listed freshness and seasonality as a benefit and fair-price negotiated with farmer (59%).

These results echo O'Hara and Stagl (2001), who found in their survey of 74 CSA members in upstate New York that "by far the strongest motivators for joining a CSA appear to be factors that address respondents' own physical health and concern for their own space/time context." Cone and Myhre (2000) found that freshness and production methods were the most important, and health was less so. Krčílková et al. (2016) found the same results with Czech consumers, where quality food and concern for the environment were the top motivators. These results suggest that within the CSA, the respondents demonstrate a high degree of instrumentalism, in which their own personal benefit of quality food outweighs other non-price considerations, such as the relationship with the farmer. With regards to how these attitudes support or deter CSA in Europe, the results indicate that if CSA continues to provide high-quality products, then they would continue to be attractive for CSA consumers.

## 4.2 Environment

The most highly reported benefit from the CSA membership was "production methods in agreement with environmental concerns" (Table 4), though it was only listed as the number one motivation for CSA by 12% of the respondents. These findings agree with Bougherara et al. (2009), whose study of French households found that the environment played "a major role" in CSA participation. However, though it was cited by the vast majority of survey respondents as being a benefit, the smaller percentage of those that listed it as the first, second, or third motivation (12%, 18%, 14% respectively) show that this may figure less prominently than Bougherara et al. (2009) suggest.

In the interviews, the importance of production methods was mentioned by most of the interviewees, but was not stressed as the primary motivator by any of them. There were,

however, most questions in the interview guide that asked about the relationship aspect of the CSA. Thus, it's possible that, had the interviewees been prompted to speak more about the importance of production methods, then it would have come through as more important and thus would more be more in line with the findings of Bougherara et al. (2009).

Concern for the environment would indicate low instrumentalism, because it goes beyond just accounting for personal benefit in an interaction. As was mentioned previously, CSAs generally use more environmentally conscious methods of productions (McFadden, 1991 in Galt, 2013), and will likely continue to do so going forward. If the production methods remain an important motivation for CSA consumers in the future, then this means that these attitudes will continue to support CSA in Europe going forward.

### **4.3 Price**

The questions about price help explore the concept marketness in the CSA, as it gave respondents a chance to weigh in on how much they believe that price affects their decisions (thus looking at their attitudes and not actions). In the survey, the two personal benefits that were related to the price of the product (fixed price for whole season and lower price for organic products) came out on the bottom of the list in importance, with just 22% and 21% respectively (Table 4). When ranked as a motivation in food choice (Table 5), price was much more common in the lower rankings of importance. At first blush, these statistics would indicate that within the CSA, the members operate with a low degree of marketness, meaning that they are insensitive to price.

However, one must be very careful in using the concept of the marketness when discussing interactions in a “solidarity economy”, of which CSA is a part (Blättel-Mink et al., 2017). In a solidarity economy, actors are not just in it alone for themselves, but are also (or instead) in it together for a common purpose. This can complicate the concept of marketness, because marketness only addresses the importance of a price in an interaction, but does not specify whether a lower or higher price is what matters. Indeed, how do you conceive of marketness in a CSA when some members could be in it for the lower price (for themselves), and some could be in it for the higher price (for the farmer)? It is in this situation that complementary concept of instrumentalism is particularly illuminating. Both of these situations could be categorized as high marketness, but on opposite sides of instrumentalism.

The question on personal benefits of CSA (Table 5) is able to shed some light on this distinction. As mentioned above, the two price items related to personal cost were listed low, but “negotiating a fair price with the farmer” was cited much more often (by 59% of respondents). This indicates that, in fact, price *does* matter, but not in the traditional economic (or non-

solidarity) manner. For these respondents, citing a benefit as a fair price negotiated with the farmer indicates high marketness but low instrumentalism, i.e. there is more to the interaction than purely selfish gain.

This was echoed in the interviews, in which many of the interviewees were either unconcerned with price, saying the food costs what it's supposed to cost (Appendix 4, Interview 4), or that the manner of production matters more (Interview 2), or that they don't look at cost, they look at quality (Interview 3). One interviewee elaborated that affordability is about priorities (Interview 1), and another (Interview 5) that the price was fair, but it was the payment structure that proved more challenging (i.e. paying the entire share upfront). Still, none of the interviewees expressed a desire for lower prices, though one described it as a good value for the money (Interview 2), indicating some framing of value of products and a monetary amount. Overall, the results indicate that price should follow (or reflect) quality, and a lower price isn't strictly preferable.

Price can be a tricky point in discussion of CSA, as it finds itself in the crossroads of money and value, and solidarity and support. Pole and Gray (2012) assert, there are some CSAs where members truly see their share as investment in the land, where the "return" to that investment is the harvest, but it's also true that there are CSAs where members ultimately still see the CSA as an exchange: money for product. Among the members interviewed, one stated that they enjoyed how the CSA disconnected the money from the product, and it felt like a freedom from transaction (Appendix 4, Interview 1) but another (Interview 4) explicitly stated that it did still feel like a transaction. Regardless of how they perceived the transactional nature of their CSA membership, all of the interviewees reported being happy to support the farmer—but this is still ultimately economic (i.e. monetary) support.

Even if a CSA operates within a solidarity economy on the inside, the CSA farms still exist in a wider economic context, which *does* boil down to the hard numbers of cost and revenue. This is why that, despite any lofty ideals of eliminating the transaction in a CSA, the price of the CSA ultimately matters. Some researchers (Cone & Myhre, 2000; Feagan & Henderson, 2009; Galt, 2013) have explored this tension, and it was one of the inspirations for the SolidBase project, whose researchers want to know how to ensure the long-term financial sustainability of CSA. But the results from my interviews and survey indicate that if members care about price more in the sense that it helps farmers, and less in the sense that they want the lowest price, then this is good news for CSAs who may want to raise prices but fear doing so. In fact, the SolidBase farmer questionnaire found that the majority of farmers reported that members

understood and accepted a price raise (Parot et al., 2018). Knowing that many CSA members want to support farmers with a fair price can help support CSAs in the future.

#### **4.4 Connection with the Farmer and the Members**

The results from the survey and interviews paint a nuanced picture of the “community” in Community Supported Agriculture. The “community” part of CSA encompasses both the relationships between the members, and the relationships between the members and the farmer, but this research shows that these can actually be experienced quite differently, and occupy different levels of importance for the member, and thus point to different levels of instrumentalism. Among the survey respondents, a higher proportion felt “very connected” to their farmer than they did to their other members (20% versus 7%, Table 11), indicating that among the respondents, it was more likely that the closest bond was obtained with the farmer. This was also reflected in the interviews, where all interviewees stressed the importance of the relationship with the farmer, but two of the interviewees (Appendix 4, Interviews 3 and 4) reported that the connection with the other members was inconsequential. These results indicate lower instrumentalism for the relationship with the farmer than with the other members. Cone and Myhre (2000), had found previously that community ranked low in importance to CSA members, though they did not distinguish between the relationship with the farmer and with the other members.

While a higher percentage of survey respondents reported being very close with the farmer than with the other members, when one looks at overall positive levels of connection, a similar percentage was reported for both farmers and members. 48% of respondents felt “very connected” or “somewhat connected” to the farmers, whereas this number was 50% for the other members—so a slightly *higher* percentage felt connected to the other members. This differs slightly from the findings of Pole and Gray (2012), who found that “CSAs do not necessarily promote or facilitate community for their members.” While “connection” and “community” aren’t the exact same, it appears that the CSA from the survey respondents perhaps are doing a better job at promoting community for the members. Cone and Myhre (2000), also found that community ranked low as a reason for joining (though found that more participation in the CSA led to more member retention.)

However, these results just present a birds-eye view. The differences among CSAs are vast: it is possible that the relationship with the farmer may look similar across different types of CSAs (e.g. urban/rural, size, country, CSA structure) but that the structure of the CSA varies greatly and thus the relationship with the other members varies greatly. For example, some CSAs

may more easily facilitate the interaction with other members via workdays or meetings, whereas others do not; some may have a very close bond with some members, and not a strong one with others. Even so, it's useful to keep in mind that the same member can have a very different experience in the relationship to the farmer and to the other members.

In addition to asking about the level of connection with the farmers and with the other members, the survey also asked about how the level of connection would factor into their decision to stay with the CSA in the future. As mentioned previously, this can't be taken as a proxy for their decisions, but nonetheless can indicate their satisfaction with the level of connection in their CSA, as well as speak to the degree of instrumentalism present in their CSA membership. 41% of respondents reported that having a closer connection with members would make them more likely to stay with the CSA in the future (Table 10), whereas only 37% reported the same if they had more connection with farmers (Table 8)—this suggests that, again contrary to Pole and Gray (2012), there may be more of a desire for a CSA community than other research indicates.

This is further supported by Table 15, which breaks down the level of connection the respondent feels with the other members with how likely they would be to stay (reported) with the CSA with more connection. Particularly notable is that 23% of the members who report being “very connected” or “somewhat connected” to the other members would be more likely to stay with the CSA with more connection, as opposed to the analogous 16% who report the same with farmers (Table 8.) Once again, this indicates that CSAs may be doing a better job connecting members with farmers than they are members with members, and indeed, many members *want* more connection with the other members.

The fact that over a third of members report that more connection would make them more likely to stay with the CSA shows that these two sets of relationships are an important part of the CSA experience, and could perhaps help indicate as to why these members are part of the CSA, even though 80% of respondents reported having other ways of obtaining local food. And, as Pole and Gray (2012) found, the longer a member has been involved, the more connected they feel, so this measure could be strengthened over time. The fact that the relationships matter for their CSA membership shows low levels of instrumentalism—that is to say, there is more to the interaction than purely personal gain. In particular, the results indicate that there may be more CSA members who feel that having increased connection with the other members would make them more likely to stay with the CSA in the future. This sentiment is supported by the findings of Flora and Bregendahl (2012), who found that members “who experienced greater levels of



social capital benefits were more likely to stay.” CSAs could leverage this component of the CSA experience and work to cultivate stronger relationships with the farmers and the other members could increase a member’s devotion to their CSA, and thus strengthen it in the long-term.

## **4.5 Involvement**

Another aspect of CSA membership is involvement in the CSA, this study has broken it down to three categories: financial planning, crop planning, or coordinating of other activities, and the results illuminate how this aspect of CSA also varies depending on which aspect of involvement is considered. As shown in Table 16 in the Results section, one notable feature is that of the three categories, crop or product planning was the one with the highest amount of people who would like to be involved (33%), as opposed to 15% who want to be involved with financial planning and 12% who want to be involved with volunteering (though the highest percentage of respondents reported they were already involved with volunteering). This may indicate higher instrumentalism—people want to have a control in planning because they want to have a say in what products they get from the CSA. However, there were no further questions that asked the respondents to elaborate on their reasons for wanting or not wanting to be involved in any of the different types of planning for the CSA, so this is only conjecture.

The fewest proportion of respondents answered that they are or would like to be involved with the financial planning of the CSA. This was echoed in the interviews, where none of the interviewees expressed a desire to be part of the financial planning. Some said they didn’t want to burden the farmers by wanting to be involved with the financials, and several stated that they trusted how the farmer was handling the finances. With the survey, Table 17 shows that indeed the highest percentage of people fell into the category of trusting the farmer a lot do not want to be involved with financial planning (35%). The reluctance to be involved in the financials could be evidence of low instrumentalism, where elements like relationship and trust factor into the interaction. It could also reflect the members desire to maintain the feeling of a non-transactional relationship with the farmer, as some interviewees mentioned.

There’s a similar pattern with Table 18, which looks at level of trust and desire to be involved with crop planning. Here the highest proportion of respondents (25%) answered that they trust the farmer a lot and do not want to be part of the crop planning. For the third table in the series, looking at trust and desire to be involved in other parts of the CSA, there is a slightly different pattern: the highest percentage of respondents reported that they trust the farmer a lot and they do volunteer. It is possible that the higher levels of trust are due to the member’s

volunteering at the CSA and thus getting a better sense of how it runs, or that those that trust the farmer are more likely to want to volunteer, or the association is due to some other third factor.

In this study, there are more members involved, or that want to be involved, than Pole and Gray (2012) reported in their study of a CSA in New York. Similarly, Feagan and Henderson (2009) found in their study of a CSA in Canada that few members, even the most supportive, want to be involved with the CSA, but that it's also shown to be one of the most enjoyable parts of the CSA. Combined with Pole and Gray's (2012) assertion that more involvement means more loyalty, then the relatively high proportion of respondents who report to be involved or want to be involved in various parts of the CSA would bode well for the CSAs involved in this study. However, as mentioned before, it's likely that the survey respondents represented the most dedicated members of the CSA, and so may not be representative of all members.

Analyzing member involvement in CSA is important because it is one of the ways in which CSA is set apart from another avenues of food consumption. Bîrhală and Möllers (2014a) place CSA in the realm of solidarity economy, which rests on the pillar of collaboration, and thus goes beyond a simple monetary transaction. This moves the members from consumers, who have the choice of to buy or not to buy, with their cash as their only instrument, to food citizens, in which they are engaged in the process, and maintain both rights and responsibilities (Welsh & MacRae, 1998; DeLind, 2002; Lozano-Cabedo & Gómez-Bonito, 2017). Despite the complexity of being a food citizen, involvement or participation in the CSA is often seen as a binary: either a member is involved, or they aren't. But this study illuminates that there are many facets to involvement, and each in turn deserves a close look so that we can further understand how it affects the relationship the member has to the CSA.

#### **4.6 Limitations and Weaknesses**

While contemplating the above points, it is important to keep in mind the limitations and weaknesses of the study. As was discussed previously, there is an uneven distribution among countries and communities, each of which has their own deep and nuanced set of cultural norms and values, as well as a wide variety of types of CSA—generalizing across all of them is difficult. The timing of the study could also be rethought—the interviews and survey largely required the help of farmers to pass the word along to their members, but this took place as many CSAs were just beginning of harvest or in the height of the season. Perhaps future studies could take place after the season, during which time the farmers may have more bandwidth to connect members with researchers.

The interviews and surveys are more of a broad overview, and thus only have a few questions on each topic, and so are unable to give a complete picture of what is a very complex topic. The questions also focused on the relationships within the CSA, despite the fact that environmental practices were rated quite highly in importance—this could skew the analysis in favor of the importance of relationships in CSA, without adequately acknowledging the role of other, non-relationship factors. Furthermore, it is likely that it was only the more dedicated members of the CSA that answered the interviews and surveys, and thus the data may show more dedication to the CSA than if all members had been interviewed.

As with any study involving several languages, there are also issues that can arise in translation. Though each survey was translated from the original English version by students or researchers in the agroecology field, there are nevertheless differences in how a question can be interpreted. In particular, the Czech translator Šarka Krčilková felt that at least one question was very difficult to translate into Czech, but this isn't accounted for in the analysis.

There were some questions that could have been phrased more clearly, or had fuzzy boundaries; for example, in the question about connection with the other CSA members: a member could be very close with some members and not at all close with others. Would they have responded that they felt “very connected”? Or would they have averaged it out to “somewhat connected” or even “somewhat disconnected”? Without a clearer framing and more questions, it's hard to say. More questions on each topic would have allowed for a deeper understanding of the issues at hand, and allowed to better triangulate the data. Similarly, some questions could have benefited from a numeric scale instead of worded options (for example, “how much do you trust your farmer?”). It's possible that a respondent could have gotten tripped up by the worded options, but would have better understood a numeric scale (this would have also helped with potential issues with translation).

In addition to sampling and scope, we must also take care with the question of validity. While some questions asked how the member would act in the future (for example, regarding price increases or small harvests), this can't be taken as a prediction of how they would actually act. It can only indicate their feelings, but not their actions. One would have to observe the members actual responses in order to actually measure the link between beliefs and behaviours.

Despite the limitations and weaknesses, the research does identify several areas for further research, specifically with the members' relationships with the other CSA members. The lessons learned about how to better phrase questions can inform the creation of a questionnaire with a narrower focus and better triangulation of data. Additionally, it's apparent that there are better ways to disseminate the survey; perhaps a closer look could be paid to the Czech Republic

so that we could learn how to emulate their better-than-average response rate. Identifying all of these improvements will be valuable to researchers who wish to study this topic in the future. Finally, the study does complement the SolidBase researcher on farmers, and provides a fuller understanding of CSA in Europe that will contribute to the tools they develop for CSA farmers in the later stages of the research project.

#### **4.7 Looking Forward**

There is still much to explore in the areas of the consumer experience in CSA, and each of the aspects touched upon in this study could garner further attention on much smaller scale, while taking more care to place the study in a more specific context, both nationally and even regionally. As the issue of price is ever-present in the discussion of the financial sustainability of CSA, researchers could look carefully at consumer attitudes and behaviors before and after a price increase, and could also see if this is affected by involvement with or knowledge of farm financials, or other types of involvement in the CSA. Researchers could also turn an eye to involvement in the CSA, either through volunteering, managing, or planning, and see how that affects the CSA experience and the level of trust. There could also be studies that look to find ways to increase connection with the other CSA members. All of these factors could then be studied to see how they affect long-term commitment to the CSA.

### **5. Conclusion**

CSA is an alternative food system that provides promising opportunities for consumers and producers alike that wish to operate pursue a model of production and consumption that promotes agroecological farming, relationships between consumers and producers, and sharing the risk of farming. Despite the potential, there are still many ways in which CSAs can fail to live up to their expectations, thus threatening their long-term viability. While there are increasingly more studies about CSA in Europe, the SolidBase research project, the first of its kind in Europe, is taking a comprehensive approach and looking at all of European CSA in order to help these sorts of alternative systems thrive, and this research specifically looks at the consumer's role. Specifically, this research looked at what aspects of CSA are important to members, and how do their attitudes support or deter CSA in Europe. The fact that CSA operates within the solidarity economy makes it appropriate for using the concepts of marketness and instrumentalism for analysis, which discuss the importance of price and non-price considerations in economic interactions.

My findings corroborate the findings of previous studies, in that quality and environmental concerns feature heavily in consumers' motivations for joining a CSA, whereas social considerations come second. While desire for quality products demonstrates high instrumentalism, the social component would balance that with lower instrumentalism as expressed in the relationships embedded in the interaction. However, social considerations themselves are parsed between relationship with the farmer and the other members. Fostering a relationship with the farmer is important to many members, but doing so with members seems less important. Additionally, this research clarifies that involvement in the CSA can be fulfilled in several ways beyond farm work, from financial planning, crop planning, or coordinating other activities.

CSA almost always already use more agroecological, small-scale methods of farming, which is important for most CSA members and thus will continue to be a draw for membership in the future. Many members are also seeking connection with their food producers, so further research could analyze the best ways to promote connection between farmers and members in way that is sustainable for both. While it appears unlikely that members have as strong a bond with the other members than they do with the farmer, it nevertheless remains part of the CSA experience, and one that could be enhanced in order to promote CSA. Further research could also take a closer look at the ways that members are involved in CSA, and how this affects both their relationship with the CSA, as well as how it supports the CSA itself. CSA is an ever-evolving and adaptable model that allows farmers and members to step outside the dominant food system, and by continuing to study its numerous facets, researchers can help ensure that it remains viable in the long-term.

## References

- Bîrhală, B. and Möllers, J., 2014a. *Community supported agriculture: Is it driven by economy or solidarity?* (No. 144). Discussion Paper, Leibniz Institute of Agricultural Development in Central and Eastern Europe.
- Bîrhală, B. and Möllers, J., 2014b, August. Community Supported Agriculture in Romania: Solidarity partnerships as viable innovations for small farms. In *prepared for presentation at the EAAE 2014 Congress "Agri-Food and Rural Innovations for Healthier Societies* (pp. 26-29).
- Blättel-Mink, B., Boddenberg, M., Gunkel, L., Schmitz, S. and Vaessen, F., 2017. Beyond the market-New practices of supply in times of crisis: The example community-supported agriculture. *International Journal of Consumer Studies* , 41 (4), pp.415-421.
- Bougherara, D., Grolleau, G., Mzoughi, N., 2009. Buy local, pollute less: What drives households to join a community supported farm?. *Ecological Economics* 68, 1488-1495. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2008.10.009
- Cone, C.A. and Myhre, A., 2000. Community-supported agriculture: A sustainable alternative to industrial agriculture?. *Human organization*, pp.187-197.
- DeCuir-Gunby, J., Marshall, P., McCulloch, A., 2010. Developing and Using a Codebook for the Analysis of Interview Data: An Example from a Professional Development Research Project. *Field Methods* 23, 136-155. doi:10.1177/1525822x10388468
- DeLind, L.B., 2002. Place, work, and civic agriculture: Common fields for cultivation. *Agriculture and Human values*, 19(3), pp.217-224.
- Feagan, R. and Henderson, A., 2009. Devon Acres CSA: Local struggles in a global food system. *Agriculture and human values*, 26(3), pp.203-217.
- Flora, C.B. and Bregendahl, C., 2012. Collaborative Community-supported Agriculture: Balancing Community Capitals for Producers and Consumers. *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture & Food*, 19(3).
- Galt, R.E., 2011. Counting and Mapping Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) in the United States and California: Contributions from Critical Cartography/GIS. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 10(2).
- Galt, R.E., 2013. The moral economy is a double-edged sword: explaining farmers' earnings and self-exploitation in community-supported agriculture. *Economic Geography*, 89(4), pp.341-365.
- Galt, R.E., Bradley, K., Christensen, L., Van Soelen Kim, J. and Lobo, R., 2016. Eroding the Community in Community Supported Agriculture (CSA): Competition's Effects in Alternative Food Networks in California. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 56(4), pp.491-512.
- Hinrichs, C.C., 2000. Embeddedness and local food systems: notes on two types of direct agricultural market. *Journal of rural studies*, 16(3), pp.295-303.

- Krčilková, S., Janovská, V., Wranová, A., Pohle, C., 2016. Be Part Of CSA! What Is The Motivation To Join Community Supported Agriculture In The Czech Republic?, In: Sustainability Of Rural Areas In Practice. Slovak University of Agriculture, Nitra, Slovakia, pp. 234-243.
- Lozano-Cabedo, C. and Gómez-Benito, C., 2017. A theoretical model of Food citizenship for the analysis of social praxis. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 30(1), pp.1-22.
- McFadden, S. 1991. The farm of tomorrow: Reconnecting people with the earth. *Natural Food and Farming* 37 (10):15–16.
- Netzwerk Solidarische Landwirtschaft, 2013. Home, Die Idee. [http:// www.solidarische-landwirtschaft.org/](http://www.solidarische-landwirtschaft.org/). Accessed: 11.07.2014.
- O'Hara, S.U. and Stagl, S., 2001. Global food markets and their local alternatives: A socio-ecological economic perspective. *Population and Environment*, 22(6), pp.533-554.
- Parot, J., Volz, P., Winter, J., Gruber, C., Richter, J., Strüber, K., Kraiss, K., Krčilková, S., Gulyás, E., Haraszti, A., Elizalde, B., Bigler, G., Drathen, A., Reisman, E., Cressot, N. (2018). Financial sustainability of Community Supported Agriculture and other Solidarity-based Food Systems in Europe: Guide for trainers of the Solid Base training programme. Unpublished.
- Pole, A., Gray, M., 2012. Farming alone? What's up with the "C" in community supported agriculture. *Agriculture and Human Values* 30, 85-100. doi:10.1007/s10460-012-9391-9
- Ravenscroft, N., Moore, N., Welch, E., & Hanney, R. (2013). Beyond agriculture: the counter-hegemony of community farming. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 30(4), 629–639. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-013-9437-7>
- Schnell, S.M., 2007. Food with a farmer's face: community-supported agriculture in the United States. *Geographical Review*, 97(4), pp.550-564.
- Urgenci.net., 2018. *Urgenci » Solid Base*. [online] Available at: <https://urgenci.net/solid-base/> [Accessed 22 Jun. 2018].
- Welsh, J. and MacRae, R., 1998. Food citizenship and community food security: lessons from Toronto, Canada. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies/Revue canadienne d'études du développement*, 19(4), pp.237-255.

## **Appendix 1 – Interview Guide**

### ***Background Information***

1. Please explain your initial decision to join the particular CSA that you are now a part of. (If not in their response, as the follow-up: how did you hear about your CSA?)
2. What is the commitment for the CSA? (Membership price, required work days, loan, fee, etc.) How do you feel about the required commitment?
3. Was there an explicit understanding or agreement about the terms and philosophy of the CSA between you and the farmer, or you and the head of the CSA?
4. What are other ways of getting local food in your area? Why did you choose your CSA? What are the advantages of being a part of CSA over other ways of getting food?
5. What motivates your food choices? For example, is it price, convenience, quality, local, the season, etc.?
6. Are you satisfied with your CSA? Why or why not?

### ***Understanding of the Community in CSA***

7. Please describe the “community” aspect of your CSA? Does your CSA have group activities (i.e. member work days, dinners, etc.)? What do you feel is the importance of these activities?
8. What is your understanding of the term “solidarity”? Do you see your choice to join the CSA as an act of solidarity? Why or why not?
9. What means of communication does the CSA use (i.e. newsletters, emails, face-to-face meetings), and who participates (i.e. member to farmer, member to head of CSA, member to other members)? How often do these exchanges occur? Do these help you feel more connected to the CSA?
10. Does the community aspect of the CSA make you more, less, or equally likely to stay with the CSA in the future?

### ***The Financials of the CSA***

11. Please describe the extent to which you, as a member, participate in the financial planning of the CSA. How would more (or less) involvement in, or knowledge about, the financials improve the CSA? And how would it affect your relationship to the CSA?
12. How do you feel about both the monetary and non-monetary value of your CSA?
13. Do you think that the farms in the CSA are financially sustainable? Why or why not?
14. If the harvest was smaller than expected, would that make you less likely to stay with the CSA in the future?
15. Is there anything else that I haven't asked but that you would like to add?

### ***Demographic Questions***

16. Age
17. Gender
18. Yearly combined family income
19. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?
  - a. Primary school
  - b. High school (or what it's called in their country)
  - c. Bachelors
  - d. Masters or PhD



## Appendix 2 – Online Questionnaire

### *Motivation and Benefits of CSA*

This section will ask about what motivates your food choices and information about your experience with CSA.

1. Is this your first season with your current CSA?
  - Yes
  - No
2. Have you been part of a different CSA in the past?
  - Yes
  - No
3. \*Why did you change your CSA? (Please select all that apply.)
  - I wanted to try a different CSA
  - I liked the products better at my new CSA
  - My new CSA is more convenient
  - My new CSA has better quality
  - My new CSA has a better price
  - My new CSA has a quantity of products that better suits my needs
  - My previous CSA stopped their operation
  - There is more involvement with the community
  - There is less involvement with the community
  - I moved
  - Other: \_\_\_\_\_
4. How do you feel about the your financial contribution to the CSA?
  - The payment is too much for me.
  - The payment is the right amount for me.
  - The payment is low and I would pay more.
5. Are there other ways of getting local food in your area?
  - Yes
  - No
  - I don't know
6. \*What are other ways of getting local food in your area? (Please select all that apply.)
  - Farmers markets
  - Shops or supermarkets that carry local products
  - I grow my own food or know someone that does
  - Other: \_\_\_\_\_
7. What personal benefits do you receive as a result of being a part of your CSA? (Please select all that apply.)
  - Traceability of food
  - Quality of food
  - Freshness and seasonality of food
  - Possibility to connect with a farm
  - Connection with like-minded individuals
  - Connection with a rural area
  - Trust-based relationship with farmers
  - Feeling of belonging to a community
  - Lower prices for organic products
  - Fixed price for whole season
  - Fair price negotiated with the producer
  - Production methods in agreement with environmental concerns
  - Other \_\_\_\_\_

8. What motivates your food choices? Please rank in order of most to least important.
- Price
    - Convenience
    - Quality
    - Nutrition
    - Localness
    - Traceability
    - Seasonality
    - Environmental impact
    - Supporting small-scale organic farming
    - Other

### ***Connection with CSA Farmer***

The following questions ask about your relationship with your CSA farmer.

9. What means of communication does the CSA farmer use to contact the members? (Please select all that apply.)
- Regular print or email newsletters
  - Occasional print or email updates
  - Face-to-face CSA group meetings
  - Face-to-face interaction at weekly pickups
  - Social media posts
  - Phone calls
  - Other \_\_\_\_\_
10. How often do you communicate with your CSA farmer?
- Several times a week
  - About once a week
  - A few times a month
  - About once a month
  - Once a season
  - Never
11. How connected do you feel with your CSA farmer?
- Very connected
  - Somewhat connected
  - Neutral
  - Somewhat unconnected
  - Not at all connected
12. Would more connection with your CSA farmer make you more or less likely to stay with your CSA in the future?
- More likely
  - Equally likely
  - Less likely
13. How much do you trust your CSA farmer?
- I trust them a lot
  - I trust them a little
  - Neutral
  - I sort of don't trust them
  - I don't trust them at all

### ***Connection with other CSA Members***

14. Does your CSA have any of the following group activities? (Please select all that apply.)
- Member work days

- Community get-togethers (for example, an end-of-season harvest dinner)
  - Facebook or other social media group
  - Social gathering based around weekly pickups of food
  - Other: \_\_\_\_\_
  - The CSA has no group activities
15. How do you communicate with the other CSA members? (Please select all that apply.)
- Email
  - Social media
  - Face-to-face at the CSA group meetings
  - Face-to-face at the weekly pickups
  - Other \_\_\_\_\_
  - I don't communicate with the other CSA members.
16. How connected do you feel with the other CSA members?
- Very connected
  - Somewhat connected
  - Neutral
  - Somewhat disconnected
  - Not at all connected
17. Would more connection with the other CSA members make you more or less likely to stay with your CSA in the future?
- More likely
  - Equally likely
  - Less likely

### ***The Planning of the CSA***

This section asks about your knowledge of and participation in the planning of the CSA, both financially and logistically.

18. Are you involved in the financial planning of the CSA?
- Yes
  - No but I would like to be
  - No and I do not want to be
19. \*Is there any innovative software your CSA uses for its financial planning?
- Yes (please list the software in the comment box)
  - No
20. Do you participate in the planning of the CSA crops and/or products?
- Yes
  - No but I would like to
  - No and I do not want to
21. \*Is there any innovative software your CSA uses for the planning of its production?
- Yes (please list the software in the comment box)
  - No
22. Do you participate in other volunteer tasks for coordination of the CSA, (such as logistics, communication with members, pickup and delivery, etc.)?
- Yes
  - No but I would like to
  - No and I do not want to
23. \*Is there any innovative software your CSA uses to organize volunteering for the CSA?
- Yes (please list the software in the comment box)
  - No
24. Do you think that the farms in the CSA are financially sustainable?
- Yes

- No, but they will be at some point
- No, and I don't think they ever will be
- Not sure

### ***Demographic Questions***

The following questions are for demographic purposes. All data is anonymous.

25. What country do you live in? \_\_\_\_\_
26. Would you classify the area you live in as... (Please select one.)
  - Rural
  - Suburban
  - Urban
27. What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_
28. What is your gender? (Please select one.)
  - Male
  - Female
  - Other/gender non-conforming
  - Prefer not to say
29. What is your yearly combined family income? (Please answer in the currency of your country.) \_\_\_\_\_
30. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?
  - Primary school
  - High school or equivalent
  - Bachelors
  - Masters or PhD

## Appendix 3 – Interview Notes

### Interview 1

#### *Background Information*

1. Please explain your initial decision to join the particular CSA that you are now a part of. (If not in their response, as the follow-up: how did you hear about your CSA?)
  - a. Wanted life to be as environmentally conscious as possible—larger perspective (hard in northern country for vegetables, especially in winter) “nutrition hunter”—nutritionally dense food. Would want to grow it herself, or have freshly harvested.
  - b. Also know about Swedish landsbr----? Small farms are dying out—want to stop that trend, need to be engaged.
  - c. Social responsibility, and for health.
  - d. Friends with the people that started her CSA—personal connection.
  - e. Interested in the new take—permaculture gardens, more a kind of life—wanted a community to work with.
2. What is the commitment for the CSA? (Membership price, required work days, etc.) How do you feel about the required commitment?
  - a. No required work days, but two voluntary work days a week
  - b. A few events for priority seats—May to mid-summer, early vegetables, then pause for three weeks, then next end up November
  - c. 5600 kr (more delivery to Stockholm)—can break up into four
  - d. Lowers vegetable price
  - e. Feel good about the commitment? Swedish way—don’t push people too much, just invite them. Sort of a new idea—“the more I work there, the more ownership I can feel”
3. What are the advantages of being a part of CSA over other ways of getting food?
  - a. Nutritionally
  - b. The disconnection between paying the bill and getting food every week—separate the money and the food has been very freeing—the first time she didn’t worry about money and food—very freeing to have pre-paid food situation
  - c. Community around picking up the food—seeing others, talking with them, a health-conscious CSA family
  - d. Local, know exactly who is farming it.
  - e. Best would garden yourself, but this is the next best thing, have a connection to the person to a connection to your
4. What other CSAs that you are aware of in your immediate area? Why did you choose this one?
  - a. There’s one other one that you can order a box, commit weekly, have more normal fruits and vegetables—biodynamic farm, can combine. Also know the people. It’s further away too.
5. What are other ways of getting local food in your area?
  - a. At the grocery store, but at a higher price and a limited range
  - b. Health food store—tries to take in a lot from other farms
    - i. 2-3 other farms that deliver there, or one person delivery Järna
6. From what other sources do you get your food? Does this vary by season and/or by product?

- a. Vegetables from food store, otherwise big supermarket for pantry staples (boring vegetables at big store)
  - b. Budget for health food store.
7. What motivates your food choice? For example, is it price, convenience, quality, local, etc.
- a. Nutritionally dense, local, having a connection to the farmer, environmental impact, regenerative
8. Are you satisfied with your CSA? Why or why not?
- a. Can be a challenge when there is only salad or leaves, that's why they complement with the other box
  - b. Also want to be true to what grows in Sweden
  - c. Started by three

### ***Understanding of the Community in CSA***

9. Please explain what being part of a CSA means to you.
- a. First the friends
  - b. Starts not wanting to be alone with the responsibility with fixing the planet/healing the planet
  - c. Have a mom's group, too
  - d. Everything else is so anonymous, there is so much separation. So many chances to be alone these days. The heart needs community
  - e. What we build in the summer gets us through the winter. Work together gets the work done faster.
10. What defines "community" in your particular Community Supported Agriculture (CSA)? For example, is it the relationship with the farmer, or with the other members?
- a. During CSA pickup time, it's a social event—meeting new people.
  - b. Small town? But people still don't know each other.
  - c. Farmers explain
11. What means of communication does the CSA use (i.e. newsletters, emails, face-to-face meetings), and who participates (i.e. member to farmer, member to head of CSA, member to other members)? How often do these exchanges occur?
- a. Newsletter every 3 months or so
  - b. Facebook page
  - c. Texts if something went wrong
12. What is your understanding of the term "solidarity"? Do you see your choice to join the CSA as an act of solidarity? Why or why not?
- a. Environmental and social responsibility—there is a lot of solidarity
  - b. Engage and do my best
  - c. Part of it is tolerance—accepting that maybe green tomatoes
  - d. See this is personal responsibility, no one is here to serve me.
  - e. Solidarity is between freedom and responsibility
13. What type of activities does the CSA perform as a group (or subgroup)? What do you feel is the importance of these activities?
14. Does the community aspect of the CSA make you more, less, or equally likely to stay with the CSA in the future?
- a. More likely

### ***The Financials of the CSA***

15. Please describe the extent to which you, as a member, participate in the financial planning of the CSA. How would more (or less) involvement in, or knowledge about, the financials improve the CSA? And how would it affect your relationship to the CSA?

- a. Don't get shown orders, but I'm pretty sure we could ask for it
  - b. Mainly they are just not organized enough to do this
  - c. Before everyone looks at everyone's finances, everyone needs to look at their relationship to money
  - d. She trusts that they pay too little and they are scraping by somehow
  - e. They are giving us the best price possible
  - f. "I don't have much money but I can still afford it"
  - g. Wish that people would pay what they can—that people would give double—some day? People would probably do it anonymously. The price has gone down since last year.
16. How do you feel about both the monetary and non-monetary value of your CSA?
- a. Really good
17. What should be included in fair compensation for the farmer?
- a. Everything! Everything they want and choose. Don't think they take a single day off. Would be great if they could be paid through the winter.
18. If the farm in the CSA has a bad year and thus the harvest is small, what safeguards does the CSA have in place? Have you ever experienced this? If so, what was your reaction? What was the reaction of other members of the CSA?
- a. Last year horrible dry season.
  - b. In the bigger picture, it evens out.
  - c. They are happy to talk through it, but when you sign up you agree to the CSA, break the norms
19. Anything else that you would like to add?
- a. This specific CSA is so good because they are doing so much social stuff—arts and community events, very important for farms—not being the only gardener. That's what makes it different from others.

### ***Demographic Questions***

- Note to be made clear for interviewees: the data will be anonymous.

20. Age: 33

21. Gender: F

22. Yearly combined family income: 280,000/yr for family — 1 full time job

23. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

- a. Primary school
- b. High school (or what it's called in their country)**
- c. Bachelors
- d. Masters or PhD

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Interview 2**

### ***Background Information***

1. Please explain your initial decision to join the particular CSA that you are now a part of. (If not in their response, as the follow-up: how did you hear about your CSA?)
  - Started by really good friends, started from nothing, and now it's been 5-6 years. Main reason: want to eat local veggies, not buy from all around the world. Want to eat healthy food—studies holistic food. Want to eat as soon as harvested, minute-by-minute the nutrition and life force declines.

- All about supporting people with her money, and then supporting us with vibrant and nutritious food.
  - The CSA is also a place where you can just go on Tuesdays and Thursdays—use it as therapy. A community gathering place and supporting people with food.
  - Also want to support these people that are doing this.
2. What is the commitment for the CSA? (Membership price, required work days, loan, fee, etc.) How do you feel about the required commitment?
    - One basket per week starting in May. 5600 kroner.
    - Don't have to go any day.
  3. Was there an explicit understanding or agreement about the terms and philosophy of the CSA between you and the farmer, or you and the head of the CSA?
    - You do sign a contract.
    - If a bad harvest? "I agree" generation—it's mentioned, or verbal.
  4. What are other ways of getting local food in your area? Why did you choose your CSA? What are the advantages of being a part of CSA over other ways of getting food?
    - Husband/sister are also gardeners
    - Four people sharing the basket.
    - No farmers market, but ICA is way cheaper. There is an ecological shop that sell a lot of the local producers, good quality stuff for most of the year.
    - Advantages of the CSA: a lot more than just going to the shop for veggies. Important to be part of a larger community. It's a place that you can always go to—hosting a place, holding place. It feels like it's supporting the future generation of living in a sustainable way. Investing in my children and grandchildren's future. One of the most political things I can do to live more sustainably.
    - Last year, got an extra subscription of cabbage—so many ways to personalize, open to collaboration and trading.
    - Wouldn't care if the harvest went to shit—it's also about stepping into a place. Gifting economy/sacred economy—this is part of the future and development. Will do it unconditionally. Pay it forward, giving and the universe will provide. Rather support that it's there.
    - It's political, emotional, supporting a really good cause.
    - They've been having trouble with the municipality, community is coming forward.
  5. What motivates your food choices? For example, is it price, convenience, quality, local, the season, etc.?
    - Price doesn't factor much—she's super poor, she's a student, paying for her course. Would never buy anything that's not eco. Would always go for biodynamic—more nutrition than something that is non-organic.
    - It has the most value.
    - Also forages, there is often a giveaway box.
    - Nothing goes to waste.
    - Convenience: love cooking and alternative eating. Getting all at once: either lacto-ferment. Boil it and freeze it. Invite friends over, could have two baskets a week. Going to pick it up: four people that are sharing, it's not that hard.
  6. Are you satisfied with your CSA? Why or why not?
    - Of course. Still young, experimenting, don't have their methods totally down. (husband is a gardener and can tell)
    - Last year: small campaign—send recipes.



### ***Understanding Community in CSA***

7. Please describe the “community” aspect of your CSA? Does your CSA have group activities (i.e. member work days, dinners, etc.)? What do you feel is the importance of these activities?
  - Facebook and Instagram account.
  - Workdays 8-13 on Tuesdays and Thursdays
  - Not sure if there is a dinner?
  - Love the part that she feels like she’s welcome and can go and work. People have the need to go outside and physically work with nature.
  - You’re not supposed to just go.
  - Working hours for community is really important, really nice.
  - In summer will have greens from the gardener.
8. What is your understanding of the term “solidarity”? Do you see your choice to join the CSA as an act of solidarity? Why or why not?
  - Not really.
9. What means of communication does the CSA use (i.e. newsletters, emails, face-to-face meetings), and who participates (i.e. member to farmer, member to head of CSA, member to other members)? How often do these exchanges occur? Do these help you feel more connected to the CSA?
  - Newsletter, Instagram, email, Facebook
  - Helps with connection—even invoices have personality, like they just stepped in.
10. Does the community aspect of the CSA make you more, less, or equally likely to stay with the CSA in the future?
  - More likely.

### ***The Financials of the CSA***

11. Please describe the extent to which you, as a member, participate in the financial planning of the CSA. How would more (or less) involvement in, or knowledge about, the financials improve the CSA? And how would it affect your relationship to the CSA? s
  - Not a part of it.
  - Would you want to know? No.
  - There are so many other things in their head. Happy to give them money and sustain the community.
  - Trust the way that they are handling the planning.
12. How do you feel about both the monetary and non-monetary value of your CSA?
  - Good value for the money.
13. Do you think that the farms in the CSA are financially sustainable? Why or why not?
  - They are getting there. All of them have other jobs (have to for the winter)—do sell almost all year round.
  - Not fully economic sustainable now, but will be. Getting in contact with restaurants.
  - Think that the municipality should be giving them more support—being a role model—don’t make them pay really high rents. The municipality isn’t really backing them.
14. If the harvest was smaller than expected, would that make you less likely to stay with the CSA in the future?
15. Is there anything else that I haven’t asked but that you would like to add?

### *Demographic Questions*

16. Age: 32
17. Gender: female/ She-male
18. Yearly combined family income: Not sure, but hers: 80,000 kr + 160,000 kr + 100,000 kr + 150,000 kr
  - a. But live in a yurt—very minimal
19. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?
  - a. Primary school
  - b. High school (or what it's called in their country)
  - c. **Bachelors**
  - d. Masters or PhD

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Interview 3**

#### *Background Information*

1. Please explain your initial decision to join the particular CSA that you are now a part of. (If not in their response, as the follow-up: how did you hear about your CSA?)
  - a. Best quality vegetables available, very hard to get access to them in Sweden. Saw them doing the drop-off in the city. Live your life according to your values, and make decisions have the consequence that you want.
2. What is the commitment for the CSA? (Membership price, required work days, loan, fee, etc.) How do you feel about the required commitment?
  - a. 5600kr/15 weeks. Happy to pay it. Likes to spend money for food. Don't look at cost, look at quality.
3. Was there an explicit understanding or agreement about the terms and philosophy of the CSA between you and the farmer, or you and the head of the CSA?
  - a. There was something but it wasn't that important.
4. What are other ways of getting local food in your area? Why did you choose your CSA? What are the advantages of being a part of CSA over other ways of getting food?
  - a. There aren't really other ways of getting good vegetables.
  - b. It fits his way of cooking, loves going to the market and getting what's good, just cook what's available, not choosing what you are going to eat
5. What motivates your food choices? For example, is it price, convenience, quality, local, the season, etc.?
  - a. Freshness
  - b. One thing that is really important is being in touch with the producers
  - c. Also want to support selling food, it's a proper job. Don't think supermarkets that sell everything are doing it right at all, there is expertise in growing and keeping food—it's a skill. When he visit the supermarket he's horrified at the way they treat the food.
6. Are you satisfied with your CSA? Why or why not?
  - a. I'm delighted with my CSA. I wish they could be all year round, but that's Sweden.

#### *Understanding of the Community in CSA*

7. Please describe the “community” aspect of your CSA? Does your CSA have group activities (i.e. member work days, dinners, etc.)? What do you feel is the importance of these activities?

- a. It's a very new CSA, so they've only recently started developing that. Last year there was an end of the season lunch. The community side isn't that strong in this CSA, beyond weekly pickups. He doesn't count on the CSA, the CSA is for the food. Much more about relationship with producers and not the other members.
- 8. What is your understanding of the term "solidarity"? Do you see your choice to join the CSA as an act of solidarity? Why or why not?
  - a. Being empathetic and helping each other achieve goals. No, I think of it as a selfish thing.
- 9. What means of communication does the CSA use (i.e. newsletters, emails, face-to-face meetings), and who participates (i.e. member to farmer, member to head of CSA, member to other members)? How often do these exchanges occur? Do these help you feel more connected to the CSA?
  - a. Only emails, probably post on Instagram but he's not a big Instagram person. Send list of vegetables that are coming with a nice picture. Really likes getting them, can share the emails to get more people involved.
- 10. Does the community aspect of the CSA make you more, less, or equally likely to stay with the CSA in the future?
  - a. Doesn't make a difference

***The Financials of the CSA***

- 11. Please describe the extent to which you, as a member, participate in the financial planning of the CSA. How would more (or less) involvement in, or knowledge about, the financials improve the CSA? And how would it affect your relationship to the CSA?
  - a. Absolutely not
- 12. How do you feel about both the monetary and non-monetary value of your CSA?
  - a. For me it's really essential, it's one of the big things that makes Sweden more bearable.
- 13. Do you think that the farms in the CSA are financially sustainable? Why or why not?
  - a. They rely a lot on subsidies and they don't pay themselves as much, but they've been around for a few years, they are obviously not doing great, they are struggling for sure. But they also rely on other jobs in the restaurant industry. He finds it really cheap, but he also uses the whole vegetables—uses the leaves too—it's a crazy amount of food.
- 14. If the harvest was smaller than expected, would that make you less likely to stay with the CSA in the future?
  - a. He thinks he'd be ok with it, but he doesn't think it would happen that way, it's more commercial—you pay and you get what you pay for. They wouldn't imagine it any other way.
- 15. Is there anything else that I haven't asked but that you would like to add?
  - a. La Ruche Qui Dit Oui in France – they have a really good system on paper.

***Demographic Questions***

- 16. Age - 31
- 17. Gender - male
- 18. Yearly combined family income – 35000sek/mo
- 19. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?
  - a. Primary school
  - b. High school (or what it's called in their country)
  - c. Bachelors**
  - d. Masters or PhD

\*\*\*\*\*

## Interview 4

### *Background Information*

1. Please explain your initial decision to join the particular CSA that you are now a part of. (If not in their response, as the follow-up: how did you hear about your CSA?)
  - a. Under Tallarna
  - b. Was part of Oslo Kooperativ since it started
  - c. Have visited where they were and so heard about them that way
  - d. Have arranged trips to Järna before
  - e. Worked in a restaurant there called Matbygge
  - f. Worked for a company in Stockholm a year ago to help foraging Syfft fabriken Södra...? Made a traditional Swedish dish—used Under Tallarna—also the same pickup place
  - g. Heard about it from there
2. What is the commitment for the CSA? (Membership price, required work days, loan, fee, etc.) How do you feel about the required commitment?
  - a. Membership price only
  - b. No required work days
  - c. Can join on events—would love to do them, maybe four times a year
3. Was there an explicit understanding or agreement about the terms and philosophy of the CSA between you and the farmer, or you and the head of the CSA?
  - a. Not sure, but she trusts them and supports them
  - b. They know them personally, also know the other people at the pickup points.
4. What are other ways of getting local food in your area? Why did you choose your CSA? What are the advantages of being a part of CSA over other ways of getting food?
  - a. Rosendals Trädgård in season
  - b. Store a bit outside the city in Järna
  - c. Kysavari??
  - d. Bondens market at Söder every Saturday in May
  - e. Favorite butcher in Järna: wild game (Vilda)
  - f. Järna Meijieri
  - g. At Söder – local produce
  - h. Advantages: to be able to have the best produce. Also nice to support something newish and different ways to farm—see if it can be scaled and more people can do it in the future. Test, is it sustainable and economic?
5. Are you satisfied with your CSA? Why or why not?
  - a. NA
6. What motivates your food choices? For example, is it price, convenience, quality, local, the season, etc.?
  - a. How and where it is produced
  - b. Taste and freshness
  - c. Price not that important—it costs what it's supposed to cost

### *Understanding of the Community in CSA*

7. Please describe the “community” aspect of your CSA? Does your CSA have group activities (i.e. member work days, dinners, etc.)? What do you feel is the importance of these activities?
  - a. Haven't interacted with the other members
  - b. Connection is mainly with the farmers, not with the other members

- c. Group activities aren't just for members
- 8. What means of communication does the CSA use (i.e. newsletters, emails, face-to-face meetings), and who participates (i.e. member to farmer, member to head of CSA, member to other members)? How often do these exchanges occur? Do these help you feel more connected to the CSA?
  - a. Emails and Facebook—help feel more connected and up to date
  - b. Can pay in installments
- 9. Does the community aspect of the CSA make you more, less, or equally likely to stay with the CSA in the future?
  - a. The community doesn't matter much, more about the relationship with the farmer. Not there to meet new people. Not there to help with the practicalities, trust them.
- 10. What is your understanding of the term "solidarity"? Do you see your choice to join the CSA as an act of solidarity? Why or why not?
  - a. This CSA is a test for the future—is it something that more people can do? Right now it's quite exclusive. Same amount of money from the store. This is more to help Under Tallarna.
  - b. Haven't thought about solidarity or not.

***The Financials of the CSA***

- 11. Please describe the extent to which you, as a member, participate in the financial planning of the CSA. How would more (or less) involvement in, or knowledge about, the financials improve the CSA? And how would it affect your relationship to the CSA?
  - a. Not sure, but have no desire to be involved in that way
  - b. But she pays in advance to get the best produce, don't feel like a member—still a transaction.
  - c. She has lived on farms, not exotic.
- 12. How do you feel about both the monetary and non-monetary value of your CSA?
  - a. Not sure yet—it's so important to support them, glad to spend the money on them. Not good at knowing what things cost.
- 13. Do you think that the farms in the CSA are financially sustainable? Why or why not?
  - a. No idea, but probably not. They have other jobs.
- 14. If the harvest was smaller than expected, would that make you less likely to stay with the CSA in the future?
  - a. Wouldn't matter
- 15. Is there anything else that I haven't asked but that you would like to add?
  - a. no

***Demographic Questions***

- 16. Age: 34
- 17. Gender: Female
- 18. Yearly combined family income: 60,000/mo after taxes together with her partner
- 19. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?
  - a. Primary school
  - b. High school (or what it's called in their country)
  - c. Bachelors
  - d. Masters or PhD**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Interview 5**

### ***Background Information***

1. Please explain your initial decision to join the particular CSA that you are now a part of. (If not in their response, as the follow-up: how did you hear about your CSA?)
  - a. Faithful customers of Hornudden for 6/7 years. Have moved more and more away from non-organic food as the first step. Looked around for local produce and got in touch with them. We just love them, basically. They are people that I would love to support in general. They have good ideas that I think need to be more public. Want children to be more aware of where their food comes from and how it is produced. Got first harvest—we all stood around it, really lovely feeling. To understand the value of that one bunch. The whole point of the CSA is healthy for society to not be dependent on imports. Plan to counterweight to encourage possibility to grow more food. Good for our soil and our planet.
2. What is the commitment for the CSA? (Membership price, required work days, loan, fee, etc.) How do you feel about the required commitment?
  - a. Pay 6000kr for summer weekly June to September
  - b. No required work days. At this point last year they decided that anyone can come out when they want to. This year tried to organize optional workdays. I feel goodwill among members to help out going from their general interest for each of them. That grows the community.
3. Was there an explicit understanding or agreement about the terms and philosophy of the CSA between you and the farmer, or you and the head of the CSA?
  - a. Not particularly. Nothing written. Just talked with them. Were having trouble finding staff, business couldn't function on just the summer café stuff. How could they be more sustainable. Have offsets for vegetables, have an income. One of the ideas was try to engage new members—more this year than last year. It's exploratory and open learning process from all sides.
4. What are other ways of getting local food in your area? Why did you choose your CSA? What are the advantages of being a part of CSA over other ways of getting food?
  - a. They make their own eggs. There are a few local farmers around that are in the same area. They grow organic vegetables. On meat side: more options, cattle, sheep, wild game in fenced in areas. Also use Reko ring.
  - b. An emotional thing as well. We have so much land around here that is unused, farmers aren't surviving—there are people that want to farm—need to show them ways of offsetting products.
5. What motivates your food choices? For example, is it price, convenience, quality, local, the season, etc.?
  - a. Mainly organic—that's the most important part
  - b. Quality
  - c. Local
  - d. Fresh
6. Are you satisfied with your CSA? Why or why not?
  - a. Extremely
  - b. Can't be improved—except more organization around workdays and social part. It's a growing process.

### ***Understanding of the Community in CSA***

7. Please describe the “community” aspect of your CSA? Does your CSA have group activities (i.e. member work days, dinners, etc.)? What do you feel is the importance of these activities?

- a. She feels the community between all of them, we have made a wonderful commitment to this. All of the members on the same page.
  - b. It's still very easy.
  - c. Have private Facebook group to communicate, Hornudden has open group. Lots of logistics through email.
8. What is your understanding of the term "solidarity"? Do you see your choice to join the CSA as an act of solidarity? Why or why not?
- a. Mutual beneficial arrangement.
  - b. Of course. It's for all of us.
9. What means of communication does the CSA use (i.e. newsletters, emails, face-to-face meetings), and who participates (i.e. member to farmer, member to head of CSA, member to other members)? How often do these exchanges occur? Do these help you feel more connected to the CSA?
- a. Yes, communication really helps. Likes recipe sharing and idea sharing
10. Does the community aspect of the CSA make you more, less, or equally likely to stay with the CSA in the future?
- a. It's a huge importance, there are other ways of getting a local box. But this provides so much more, it gives us a joined home base. Working together to start it is extremely satisfying.

### ***The Financials of the CSA***

11. Please describe the extent to which you, as a member, participate in the financial planning of the CSA. How would more (or less) involvement in, or knowledge about, the financials improve the CSA? And how would it affect your relationship to the CSA?
- a. We've had discussion about what we would like them to grow. They have limitations with the type of soil they have. Regretfully accept that carrots aren't an option but they've worked out a deal with another organic supply so they can get their carrots anyway.
  - b. They've been very attentive to what we've wanted.
  - c. With CSA starting, they can experiment more and learned more.
12. How do you feel about both the monetary and non-monetary value of your CSA?
- a. I think it's a very fair price, it's a lot to pay in one go, but if I were to buy quality produce in the shop. It would also be time to search around. She's lucky to be able to invest in things that she believes in. If they are paying a little too much, I would still pay it because they are doing good things. Absolutely trust the farmer.
  - b. I like the creativity, like talking to the local store owners, too.
  - c. They never send recipes.
13. Do you think that the farms in the CSA are financially sustainable? Why or why not?
- a. We know that they have gone through a lot of difficult financial times lately—they had to get help from outside consultant. This was one of the ways they've been doing.
14. If the harvest was smaller than expected, would that make you less likely to stay with the CSA in the future?
- a. This happened a little bit in the spring (things froze) that's just the way things are, isn't it? Nature is like that. It's part of it. You go into knowing that you're learning. I don't have a problem with that at all. If it was in their *ability* that would be different.
15. Is there anything else that I haven't asked but that you would like to add?
- a. I think that I would like the CSA to approach the local schools. When I grew up they had workdays, I would love if the CSA had that. Bringing in the kids in the area to help out and learn. Putting on the wishlist. Would like to help out with that part.

### *Demographic Questions*

16. Age: 49
17. Gender: female
18. Yearly combined family income: Don't make much, 10000kr/mo. Husband after tax 50000/mo. So 60000/mo.
19. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?
  - a. Primary school
  - b. High school (or what it's called in their country)**
  - c. Bachelors
  - d. Masters or PhD



## Appendix 4 – Complete Interview Content Analysis

#	Initial Interview Note	Coding	Subcategory	Category	Theme
4	not there to meet new people	not for other members	(Ambiguous)	(Ambiguous)	(Ambiguous)
4	the community doesn't matter	community not important	(Ambiguous)	(Ambiguous)	(Ambiguous)
2	want to eat local veggies, not buy from all around the world	eat local, don't buy global	Local	(Ambiguous)	(Ambiguous)
4	emails and Facebook help feel more connected and up to date	social media to connect	Digital communication	Communication	Connection
3	uses social media to share with more people	social media makes sharing CSA info easy	Digital communication	Communication	Connection
3	being in touch with the producers	have connection with producers	Relationships	Connection with farmers	Connection
3	the community side isn't that strong in this CSA	lack of community in CSA	Community	Connection with farmers	Connection
3	Much more about the relationship with producers and not the other members	relationship with producers more important than with members	Relationships	Connection with farmers	Connection
4	knows the farmer personally	personal relation with farmer	Relationships	Connection with farmers	Connection
4	connection is mainly with the farmers, not with the other members	know farmer better than other members	Relationships	Connection with farmers	Connection
1	friends with the people that started the CSA—personal connection	personal connection to farmer	Relationships	Connection with farmers	Connection
5	had been faithful customers of farm	trust the farmer already, followed to CSA operation	Relationships	Connection with farmers	Connection
5	absolutely trust the farmer	trust the farmer	Trust	Connection with farmers	Connection
1	the best would be to garden yourself, but this is the next best thing—to have a connection to the person	closeness to grower	Trust	Connection with farmers	Connection

1	know who is farming	know your farmer	Trust	Connection with farmers	Connection
2	invite friends over	use CSA delivery as a social tool to bring people together	Community	Connection with members	Connection
2	working hours for community is really important	working together	Community	Connection with members	Connection
1	community around picking up the food	community with members	Community	Connection with members	Connection
1	friends	community	Community	Connection with members	Connection
3	community aspect doesn't make a difference in choice to stay with CSA	community aspect doesn't enhance experience	Community	Connection with members	Connection
1	wanted community to work with	be part of community	Community	Connection with members and farmers	Connection
1	everything else is so anonymous, there is so much separation	allows connection in isolationist modern life	Community	Connection with members and farmers	Connection
1	the heart needs community	emotional importance of community	Community	Connection with members and farmers	Connection
2	important to be part of a larger community	be part of larger community	Community	Connection with members and farmers	Connection
1	meeting new people	meeting new people	Relationships	Connection with members and farmers	Connection
1	meeting people in the same town	meeting new people	Relationships	Connection with members and farmers	Connection
1	a health-conscious CSA family	shared values with CSA members	Shared values	Connection with members and farmers	Connection
2	a place you can just go on Tuesdays and Thursdays	a place where you are welcome	Community	Welcome space	Connection
2	a community gathering place	community gathering place	Community	Welcome space	Connection
2	place you can always go to	a place where	Community	Welcome space	Connection

		you are welcome			
2	feels like she's welcome and can go and work	a place where you are welcome	Community	Welcome space	Connection
5	there are other ways of getting local food, but this provides so much more, it gives us a home base	more than just getting food	Community	Welcome space	Connection
1	food choice motivated by environmental impact	environmental methods important in food choice	Environmental Impact	Production methods	Environment
1	regenerative agriculture important for food choice	regenerative agriculture important	Environmental Impact	Production methods	Environment
1	Wanted life to be as environmentally conscious as possible	Environmentally conscious life	Values	Production methods	Environment
1	environmental responsibility as solidarity	environmental responsibility as solidarity	Values	Production methods	Environment
2	supporting future generations and living in a sustainable way	supporting future generations and living in a sustainable way	Values	Production methods	Environment
5	good for our soil and our planet	good for our soil and our planet	Values	Production methods	Environment
5	organic is the most important part	organic is very important	Values	Production methods	Environment
4	how and where the food is produced is the most important, followed by taste and freshness	method and origin are most important, then taste and freshness	Values; Freshness	Production methods; Food Quality	Environment; Personal Benefit
1	disconnection between paying the bill and getting food every week	separating payment from product	Transaction	Commerce	Money
1	separating the money and the food has been very freeing	freedom from commercial transaction	Transaction	Commerce	Money
4	it still feels like a transaction	CSA feels transactional	Transaction	Commerce	Money
5	members have made a	members have	Commitment	Responsibility	Solidarity

	commitment and are on the same page	made a commitment and are on the same page			
2	CSA is a lot more than just going to the shop for veggies	more than just a transaction	Transaction	Commerce	Money
3	he would be ok with a small harvest, but feel that the farmers would not, and see it as more commercial and so would supplement	ok with small harvest, but thinks that the farmer wouldn't be	Transaction	Commerce	Money
1	she trusts that they pay themselves too little and they are scraping by	farmers pay themselves too little	Farmer income	Value	Money
2	happy to give them money	happy to support farmers	Farmer income	Value	Money
3	happy to pay it, likes to spend money for food	happy to support farmers	Farmer income	Value	Money
4	glad to spend money on the farmers	happy to support farmers	Farmer income	Value	Money
5	would still "overpay" because they are doing good things	would pay more to support their work	Farmer income	Value	Money
5	to understand the value of that one bunch	understanding the value of a product in terms of work and effort	Farmer labor	Value	Money
1	they are giving us the best possible price	they are giving us the best possible price	Price of product	Value	Money
1	lowers vegetable price	better price	Price of product	Value	Money
1	"I don't have much money but I can still afford it"	price is about priorities	Price of product	Value	Money
2	price doesn't factor much, but manner of production	production more important than cost	Price of product	Value	Money
2	good value for the money	good value for the money	Price of product	Value	Money
4	price is not that important,	food is not	Price of	Value	Money

	it costs what it's supposed to cost	"supposed" to cost a certain amount	product		
5	fair price, but a lot in one go	fair price, but challenging payment structure	Price of product	Value	Money
3	don't look at cost, look at quality	quality more important than cost	Price of product	Value	Money
3	he finds the vegetables really cheap, but he uses the whole vegetable	monetary value can depend on how you cook	Price of product	Value	Money
1	local	local is important	Origin	Food Quality	Personal Benefit
1	would want to grow it herself, or have freshly harvested	freshly harvested	Freshness	Food Quality	Personal Benefit
2	want to eat as soon as harvested, minute-by-minute nutrition	nutrition maximized when eaten close to harvest	Nutrition	Food Quality	Personal Benefit
3	best quality vegetables available that are hard to access in Sweden	best quality available	Access	Food Quality	Personal Benefit
3	freshness is important	food freshness	Freshness	Food Quality	Personal Benefit
3	the CSA is for food	CSA for food, not community	-	Food Quality	Personal Benefit
5	food choice: quality, local, fresh	food quality, origin, freshness	Freshness	Food Quality	Personal Benefit
1	"nutrition hunter"/nutritionally dense food	nutrition	Nutrition	Food Quality	Personal Benefit
1	health	personal health	-	Health	Personal Benefit
2	CSA as therapy	CSA for emotional wellbeing	Emotional health	Health	Personal Benefit
2	want to eat healthy food	healthy food	Healthy food	Health	Personal Benefit
2	people have the need to go outside and physically work with nature	reconnecting people to the land	Emotional health	Health	Personal Benefit

5	it's an emotional thing as well	emotional support	Emotional health	Health	Personal Benefit
5	saves on time for food shopping	less time for food purchasing	Time	Style of food purchasing/preparation	Personal Benefit
5	likes the creativity	likes the challenge of cooking creatively with CSA	Creativity	Style of food purchasing/preparation	Personal Benefit
3	fits his way of cooking, loves going to the market and getting what's good, just cook what's available, not choosing what you are going to eat	cook based on what produce is in season food	Creativity	Style of food shopping/preparation	Personal Benefit
1	the more I work there, the more ownership I feel	ownership	Engagement	Responsibility	Solidarity
1	Small farms are dying out, want to stop that trend	responsibility for landscape and development	Engagement	Responsibility	Solidarity
1	need to be engaged	engagement	Engagement	Responsibility	Solidarity
1	engage and do my best	taking action	Engagement	Responsibility	Solidarity
1	see this as personal responsibility, no one is here to serve me	personal responsibility	Engagement	Responsibility	Solidarity
5	working together is extremely satisfying	working together	Engagement	Responsibility	Solidarity
2	political, emotional, supporting a really good cause	support a good cause	Engagement	Values	Solidarity
3	live your life according to your values, make decision that have the consequence you want	act according to your values	Engagement	Values	Solidarity
5	invest in things she believes in	invest in what you believe in	Engagement	Values	Solidarity
5	they have good ideas that I think need to be more public	spreading ideas	Engagement	Values	Solidarity
2	political act to live more sustainably	individual choices as the political	Engagement	Values	Solidarity
3	does not want to know about the financials	does not want to know about the financials	Financials	Trust	Solidarity

2	don't want to know about financials	separation between farmers and members in financial matters	Financials	Trust	Solidarity
5	farmers aren't surviving, there are people that want to farm, need to show them ways	support future farmers	Future generations	Support	Solidarity
5	would like to bring CSA to local schools	CSA to schools	Future generations	Support	Solidarity
2	investing my children's and grandchildren's future	investing in the future	Future generations	Support	Solidarity
2	pay it forward	pay it forward	Future generations	Support	Solidarity
5	want children to be more away of where their food comes from and how it is produced	want children to be more aware	Future generations	Support	Solidarity
4	CSA as a test for the future	experiment with alternative agriculture	Future generations	Support	Solidarity
2	trust the way they are handling the planning	trust the farmer with the financials	Management	Trust	Solidarity
4	not there to help with the practicalities, trust them with that	trust the farmer with running the CSA	Management	Trust	Solidarity
4	no desire to be involved with planning	trust the farmer's decisions	Management	Trust	Solidarity
4	trusts and supports farmers about the terms and philosophy of CSA	trusts the farmers	Management	Trust	Solidarity
1	not wanting to be alone with the responsibility with fixing the planet/healing the planet	working together; responsibility	Mutual support	Support	Solidarity
1	work together gets the work done faster	working together	Mutual support	Support	Solidarity
2	supporting people with her money, then being supported by vibrant and nutritious food	supports the farmers who support her	Mutual support	Support	Solidarity

2	Supporting people with food	supporting with food	Mutual support	Support	Solidarity
5	I feel goodwill among members to help out going from their general interest for each of them, it grows the community	each person is accepted	Mutual support	Support	Solidarity
5	mutually beneficial arrangement	mutually beneficial arrangement	Mutual support	Support	Solidarity
5	the CSA is for all of us	the CSA is for all of us	Mutual support	Support	Solidarity
1	solidarity is between freedom and responsibility	solidarity is between freedom and responsibility	Personal responsibility	Responsibility	Solidarity
1	before everyone looks at everyone's finances, everyone needs to look at their relationship to money	self reflection with regards to money	Personal responsibility	Responsibility	Solidarity
1	being part of a CSA is a kind of life	life choice	Personal responsibility	Responsibility	Solidarity
5	CSA can experiment more	the CSA has the freedom to experiment	Process	Understanding	Solidarity
2	farmers are still experimenting	the CSA has the freedom to experiment	Process	Understanding	Solidarity
5	it's a growing process	it's always beign fine-tuned	Process	Understanding	Solidarity
5	it's exploratory and an open learning process from all sides	everyone is learning	Process	Understanding	Solidarity
1	larger perspective	larger perspective	Shift in perspective	Understanding	Solidarity
1	interested in the new take	trying something new	Shift in perspective	Understanding	Solidarity
1	sort of a new idea	new idea	Shift in perspective	Understanding	Solidarity
1	challenging when there are only salad leaves	adapting to realities of farming	Shift in perspective	Understanding	Solidarity
1	want to be true to what grows in Sweden	understanding of geographic realities	Shift in perspective	Understanding	Solidarity
1	what we build in the	planning for	Shift in	Understanding	Solidarity



	summer gets us through the winter	the future	perspective		
1	part of it is tolerance—accepting that there may be green tomatoes	tolerance	Shift in perspective	Understanding	Solidarity
1	in the bigger picture, the amount of food from season to season evens out	some good years, some bad years	Shift in perspective	Understanding	Solidarity
5	acceptance and alternative solution for crops	acceptance	Shift in perspective	Understanding	Solidarity
5	bad harvest, that's just the way things are, nature is like that	sometimes it's a bad harvest year	Shift in perspective	Understanding	Solidarity
5	difference between farmers ability and nature	understanding responsibility of outcome	Shift in perspective	Understanding	Solidarity
3	wish the CSA could be all-year round, but that's Sweden	accepting geographical limitations	Shift in perspective	Understanding	Solidarity
5	limitations on what they can grow	geographical limitations	Shift in perspective	Understanding	Solidarity
2	sharing the CSA with others	adapting to the CSA	Shift in perspective	Understanding	Solidarity
1	Social responsibility	social responsibility	Social responsibility	Responsibility	Solidarity
3	support selling food, it's a proper job	respect for farmer's job	Supporting the farmers	Support	Solidarity
1	would be great if farmers could be paid through the winter	support year-round farmer income	Farmer labor	Value	Money
1	farmer compensation should include everything they want and choose	farmers deserve the work benefits they want	Farmer income	Value	Money
2	Want to support people that are doing this	support the farmers	Supporting the farmers	Support	Solidarity
5	they are people that I would want to support in general	support the farmers	Supporting the farmers	Support	Solidarity
3	there is expertise in growing and keeping food	respect for farmer's profession	Supporting the farmers	Support	Solidarity
4	important to support the farmers	important to support the farmers	Supporting the farmers	Support	Solidarity
4	a small harvest wouldn't matter	harvest size doesn't matter	Supporting the farmers	Support	Solidarity

		with support			
5	CSA listening to what the consumers want	farmers listening to consumers	Supporting the members	Support	Solidarity

## **Appendix 5 – Complete Summary of Survey Results**

*All data reported with and without Czech data (Diff. = With - Without)*

Appendix Table 1 - Country .....	67
Appendix Table 2 - Gender.....	67
Appendix Table 3 - Area.....	67
Appendix Table 4 - Education .....	67
Appendix Table 5 - Is this your first season with your CSA? .....	68
Appendix Table 6 - Have you been part of a different CSA in the past? .....	68
Appendix Table 7 - Why did you change your CSA? .....	68
Appendix Table 8 - How do you feel about your financial contribution to the CSA? .....	68
Appendix Table 9 - Are there other ways of getting local food in your area? .....	69
Appendix Table 10 - What are other ways of getting local food in your area?.....	69
Appendix Table 11 - What personal benefits do you receive as a result of being part of your CSA?.....	69
Appendix Table 12 - (Full dataset) What motivates your food choices? (Ranked).....	69
Appendix Table 13 - (Without Czech data) - What motivates your food choices? (Ranked).....	70
Appendix Table 14 - What means of communication does the CSA farmer use to contact members? .....	70
Appendix Table 15 - How often do you communicate with your CSA farmer? .....	70
Appendix Table 16 - How connected do you feel with your CSA farmer?.....	71
Appendix Table 17 - Would more connection with your CSA farmer make you more or less likely to stay with your CSA in the future? .....	71
Appendix Table 18 - How much do you trust your CSA farmer? .....	71
Appendix Table 19 - Does your CSA have any of the following group activities? .....	71
Appendix Table 20 - How do you communicate with the other CSA members?.....	71
Appendix Table 21 - How connected to you feel to the other CSA members?.....	72
Appendix Table 22 - Would more connection with the other CSA members make you more or less likely to stay with the CSA in the future?.....	72
Appendix Table 23 - Are you involved in the financial planning of the CSA?.....	72
Appendix Table 24 - Do you participate in the planning of the crops or products in the CSA?..	72
Appendix Table 25 - Do you participate in other volunteer for coordination of the CSA, (such as logistics, communication with members, pickup and delivery, etc.)? .....	72
Appendix Table 26 - Do you think that the farms in the CSA are financially sustainable? .....	73

**All data reported with and without Czech data (Diff. = With - Without)**

*Appendix Table 1 - Country*

(387 responses with Czech data, 196 without)

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>	
Austria	27	7%	14%	
Belgium	9	2%	5%	
Czech Republic	191	49%		
France	58	15%	30%	
Germany	59	15%	30%	
Hungary	2	1%	1%	
Ireland	2	1%	1%	
Norway	24	6%	12%	
Poland	6	2%	3%	
Sweden	5	1%	3%	
Finland	1	0%	1%	
Greece	3	1%	2%	

*Appendix Table 2 - Gender*

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>		<b>Diff.</b>
Female	269	71%	128	67%	4%
Male	97	26%	53	28%	-2%
Other/gender non-conforming	2	1%	2	1%	0%
Prefer not to say	12	3%	8	4%	-1%
<i>Total</i>	<i>380</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>191</i>	<i>100%</i>	

*Appendix Table 3 - Area*

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>		<b>Diff.</b>
Rural	58	15%	42	21%	-6%
Suburban	68	18%	42	21%	-3%
Urban	261	67%	112	57%	10%
<i>Total</i>	<i>387</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>196</i>	<i>100%</i>	

*Appendix Table 4 - Education*

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>		<b>Diff</b>
Bachelors	59	15%	43	22%	-7%
High school or equivalent	80	21%	35	18%	3%
Masters or PhD	244	63%	114	58%	5%
Primary school	4	1%	4	2%	-1%
<i>Total</i>	<i>387</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>196</i>	<i>100%</i>	

*Appendix Table 5 - Is this your first season with your CSA?*

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>		<b>Diff</b>
No	257	67%	150	77%	-10%
Yes	128	33%	45	23%	10%
<i>Total</i>	<i>385</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>195</i>	<i>100%</i>	

*Appendix Table 6 - Have you been part of a different CSA in the past?*

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>		<b>Diff</b>
No	331	86%	154	80%	6%
Yes	53	14%	39	20%	-6%
<i>Total</i>	<i>384</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>193</i>	<i>100%</i>	

*Appendix Table 7 - Why did you change your CSA?*

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>		<b>Diff.</b>
I moved	26	49%	20	51%	-2%
My new CSA is more convenient	14	26%	9	23%	3%
I wanted to try a different CSA	8	15%	7	18%	-3%
My previous CSA stopped their operation	8	15%	6	15%	0
I liked the products better at my new CSA	8	15%	4	10%	5%
My new CSA has better quality	7	13%	3	8%	5%
There is more involvement with the community	3	6%	1	3%	3%
My new CSA has a quantity of products that better suits my needs	2	4%	0	0%	4%
There is less involvement with the community	1	2%	1	3%	-1%
Other*	9	17%	2	5%	12%
My new CSA has a better price	0	0%	39	0%	0%
<i>Total</i>	<i>53</i>		<i>39</i>		

*\*N.B. Most of the "other responses" elaborated on their selections and did not provide new reasons for changing the CSA.*

*Appendix Table 8 - How do you feel about your financial contribution to the CSA?*

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>		<b>Diff.</b>
Low and I would pay more.	16	4%	13	7%	-3%
Right amount for me.	314	82%	162	84%	-2%
Too much for me.	51	13%	17	9%	4%
<i>Total</i>	<i>381</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>192</i>	<i>100%</i>	

*Appendix Table 9 - Are there other ways of getting local food in your area?*

	With		Without		Diff.
I don't know	47	12%	14	7%	5%
No	30	8%	10	5%	3%
Yes	308	80%	170	88%	-8%
<i>Total</i>	<i>385</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>194</i>	<i>100%</i>	

*Appendix Table 10 - What are other ways of getting local food in your area?*

	With		Without		Diff.
Farmers markets	267	87%	144	85%	2%
Shops or supermarkets	190	62%	119	70%	-8%
Grow own food or know someone that does	159	52%	176	45%	7%
Other	54	18%	37	22%	-4%
<i>Total</i>	<i>308</i>		<i>170</i>		

*Appendix Table 11 - What personal benefits do you receive as a result of being part of your CSA?*

	With		Without		Diff.
Production methods in agreement with environmental concerns	338	87%	165	84%	3%
Traceability of food	319	82%	147	75%	7%
Quality of food	312	81%	158	81%	0%
Freshness and seasonality of food	306	79%	178	91%	-12%
Fair price negotiated with the producer	228	59%	92	47%	12%
Trust-based relationship with farmers	228	59%	126	64%	-5%
Connection with like-minded individuals	217	56%	118	60%	-4%
Possibility to connect with a farm	186	48%	105	54%	-6%
Feeling of belonging to a community	149	39%	90	46%	-7%
Connection with a rural area	104	27%	53	27%	0%
Fixed price for whole season	85	22%	46	23%	-1%
Lower prices for organic products	83	21%	43	22%	-1%
Other	51	13%	36	18%	-5%
<i>Total</i>	<i>387</i>		<i>196</i>		

*Appendix Table 12 - (Full dataset) What motivates your food choices? (Ranked)*

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th
Quality	38%	17%	10%	14%	6%	9%	3%	2%	0%	0%
Supporting small-scale organic farming	18%	13%	13%	13%	15%	13%	7%	7%	6%	0%
Nutrition	12%	12%	11%	6%	7%	8%	16%	10%	13%	1%
Environmental impact	12%	18%	14%	17%	11%	10%	9%	9%	1%	0%
Localness	6%	13%	18%	15%	15%	13%	9%	6%	3%	0%
Traceability	6%	10%	11%	13%	14%	17%	12%	9%	6%	0%

Price	3%	5%	7%	5%	8%	10%	19%	18%	21%	3%
Convenience	2%	3%	3%	5%	6%	6%	8%	25%	38%	5%
Seasonality	2%	8%	11%	13%	16%	14%	16%	12%	8%	4%
Other	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	3%	87%
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>387</i>	<i>386</i>	<i>384</i>	<i>369</i>	<i>342</i>	<i>312</i>	<i>288</i>	<i>260</i>	<i>234</i>	<i>111</i>

*Appendix Table 13 - (Without Czech data) - What motivates your food choices? (Ranked)*

	<b>1st</b>	<b>2nd</b>	<b>3rd</b>	<b>4th</b>	<b>5th</b>	<b>6th</b>	<b>7th</b>	<b>8th</b>	<b>9th</b>	<b>10th</b>
Quality	25%	18%	10%	14%	8%	10%	4%	1%	0%	0%
Supporting small-scale organic farming	23%	16%	13%	13%	13%	12%	8%	5%	4%	4%
Nutrition	17%	10%	11%	6%	8%	9%	17%	8%	8%	0%
Environmental impact	15%	19%	14%	17%	10%	11%	10%	8%	1%	0%
Localness	8%	15%	18%	15%	16%	8%	7%	10%	4%	0%
Traceability	4%	6%	11%	13%	12%	20%	16%	13%	10%	0%
Convenience	3%	2%	7%	5%	7%	5%	10%	28%	34%	6%
Seasonality	3%	13%	11%	13%	18%	17%	10%	3%	4%	4%
Price	2%	1%	3%	5%	7%	7%	19%	23%	30%	0%
Other	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	6%	86%
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>196</i>	<i>196</i>	<i>196</i>	<i>183</i>	<i>164</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>133</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>106</i>	<i>50</i>

*Appendix Table 14 - What means of communication does the CSA farmer use to contact members?*

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>		<b>Diff.</b>
Face-to-face CSA group meetings	236	61%	10%	64%	-3%
Regular print or email newsletters	200	52%	13%	49%	3%
Face-to-face interaction at weekly pickups	146	38%	11%	53%	-15%
Occasional print or email updates	122	32%	14%	28%	4%
Social media posts	81	21%	18%	32%	-11%
Phone calls	40	10%	11%	9%	1%
Other	48	12%	7%	13%	-1%
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>387</i>		<i>196</i>		

*Appendix Table 15 - How often do you communicate with your CSA farmer?*

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>		<b>Diff.</b>
Several times a week	9	2%	8	4%	-2%
About once a week	89	23%	65	33%	-10%
A few times a month	70	18%	42	21%	-3%
About once a month	77	20%	45	23%	-3%
Once a season	98	25%	30	15%	-10%
Never	44	11%	6	3%	8%
<i>Number of responses</i>	<i>387</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>196</i>	<i>100%</i>	

*Appendix Table 16 - How connected do you feel with your CSA farmer?*

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>		<b>Diff.</b>
Very connected	77	23%	67	37%	-14%
Somewhat connected	108	33%	81	45%	-12%
Neutral	91	28%	28	16%	12%
Somewhat disconnected	59	15%	17	9%	6%
Not at all connected	52	16%	3	2%	14%
<i>Number of responses</i>	387	100%	196	100%	

*Appendix Table 17 - Would more connection with your CSA farmer make you more or less likely to stay with your CSA in the future?*

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>		<b>Diff.</b>
More likely	142	37%	70	41%	-4%
Equally likely	235	61%	117	54%	7%
Less likely	10	3%	9	6%	-3%
<i>Number of responses</i>	387	100%	196	100%	

*Appendix Table 18 - How much do you trust your CSA farmer?*

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>		<b>Diff.</b>
I trust them a lot	238	61%	151	77%	-16%
I trust them a little	120	31%	32	16%	15%
Neutral	26	7%	12	6%	1%
I sort of don't trust them	2	1%	1	1%	0%
I don't trust them at all	1	0%	0	0%	0%
<i>Number of responses</i>	387	100%	196	100%	

*Appendix Table 19 - Does your CSA have any of the following group activities?*

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>		<b>Diff.</b>
Member work days	9	63%	149	76%	-13%
Community get-togethers (for example, an end-of-season harvest dinner)	89	81%	152	78%	3%
Facebook or other social media group	70	44%	96	49%	-5%
Social gathering based around weekly pickups of food	77	44%	60	31%	13%
Other	39	20%	8	14%	6%
The CSA has no group activities	44	3%	27	4%	-1%
<i>Number of responses</i>	387		196		

*Appendix Table 20 - How do you communicate with the other CSA members?*

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>		<b>Diff.</b>
Email	280	72%	118	60%	8%
Social media	103	27%	62	32%	-5%
Face-to-face at the CSA group meetings	187	48%	104	53%	-5%
Face-to-face at the weekly pickups	250	65%	116	59%	6%



Other	31	8%	18	15%	-7%
I don't communicate with the other CSA members.	32	8%	19	9%	-1%
<i>Number of responses</i>	387		196		

*Appendix Table 21 - How connected to you feel to the other CSA members?*

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>		<b>Diff.</b>
Very connected	29	7%	22	11%	-4%
Somewhat connected	165	43%	100	51%	-8%
Neutral	111	29%	44	22%	7%
Somewhat disconnected	44	11%	20	10%	1%
Not at all connected	38	10%	10	5%	5%
<i>Number of responses</i>	387	100%	196	100%	

*Appendix Table 22 - Would more connection with the other CSA members make you more or less likely to stay with the CSA in the future?*

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>		<b>Diff.</b>
More likely	142	41%	159	41%	0%
Equally likely	235	56%	215	54%	2%
Less likely	10	3%	13	6%	-3%
<i>Number of responses</i>	387	100%	196	100%	

*Appendix Table 23 - Are you involved in the financial planning of the CSA?*

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>		<b>Diff.</b>
Yes	90	23%	68	35%	-12%
No but I would like to be	57	15%	32	16%	-1%
No and I do not want to be	240	62%	96	49%	13%
<i>Number of responses</i>	387	100%	196	100%	

*Appendix Table 24 - Do you participate in the planning of the crops or products in the CSA?*

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>		<b>Diff.</b>
Yes	109	28%	68	35%	-7%
No but I would like to be	126	33%	55	28%	5%
No and I do not want to be	152	39%	73	37%	-2%
<i>Number of responses</i>	387	100%	196	100%	

*Appendix Table 25 - Do you participate in other volunteer for coordination of the CSA, (such as logistics, communication with members, pickup and delivery, etc.)?*

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>		<b>Diff.</b>
Yes	184	48%	123	63%	-15%
No but I would like to be	45	12%	23	12%	0%
No and I do not want to be	158	41%	50	26%	15%
<i>Number of responses</i>	387	100%	196	100%	

*Appendix Table 26 - Do you think that the farms in the CSA are financially sustainable?*

	<b>With</b>		<b>Without</b>		<b>Diff.</b>
Yes	132	34%	90	46%	-12%
No, but they will be at some point	67	17%	56	29%	-12%
No, and I don't think they ever will be	12	3%	6	3%	0%
Not sure	176	45%	44	22%	-23%
	387	100%	196	100%	



**Norges miljø- og biovitenskapelige universitet**  
Noregs miljø- og biovitenskapelige universitet  
Norwegian University of Life Sciences

Postboks 5003  
NO-1432 Ås  
Norway