



LUND
UNIVERSITY

Local Food, Entrepreneurship, and Community (Re)connection

- *A Comparative Study between Small Food Entrepreneurs in Copenhagen and San Francisco*

Degree of Master of Science in Human Ecology:
Culture, Power and Sustainability
30 ECTS

CPS: International Master's Programme in Human Ecology
Human Ecology Division
Department of Human Geography
Faculty of Social Sciences
Lund University

Author: Heidi Holm
Supervisor: Thomas Malm
Spring Term 2014

Department:	Human Geography
Address:	Institutionen för kulturgeografi och ekonomisk geografi, Sölvegatan 12, SE-223 62 Lund, Sweden
Telephone:	+46-46-2228417

Supervisor:	Thomas Malm
-------------	-------------

Title and Subtitle:	Local Food, Entrepreneurship, and Community (Re)connection – A Comparative Study Between Small Food Entrepreneurs in Copenhagen and in San Francisco
Author:	Heidi Holm
Examination:	Master's thesis (two year)

Term:	Spring Term 2014
-------	------------------

Abstract:

Entrepreneurs are increasingly called upon to solve many of the social and environmental consequences induced by the conventional food system. However the means and visions driving entrepreneurial actions towards more sustainable food practices are various and influenced by various thought systems. This paper presents an empirical assessment of values driving small scale food entrepreneurs, operating in both Copenhagen and San Francisco, in their alternative business pursuits. It is also concerned with evaluating the barriers that external factors such as legal frameworks and public policy exert on small scale entrepreneurial practice. Small food entrepreneurs are driven by the vision of re-strengthening local community by seeking closer producer-consumer relations mediated by food. The thriving of these small scale initiatives may, however, be inhibited by external frames set up by governmental institutions. The forthcoming analysis and discussion seeks to interpret the food entrepreneurs' values underlying their actions, as well as to identify and comprehend some of the issues that have been causing hindrance to their pursuits.

Keywords: *human ecology, small food entrepreneurs, local food, sustainable production and consumption, alternative versus mainstream, re-connecting producer and consumer relations*

Acknowledgements

This thesis marks not only the end of one journey, but also the beginning of a new one. It is the accumulation of my entire academic life, from a bachelor's degree in public health, to courses in entrepreneurship and finally my master's in Human Ecology at Lund University. I could not have done this without the continuous encouragement, academic and emotional support from my family, friends and fellow students. For them I am grateful. This paper has been written as a tribute to those individuals, who dare to take risks and step out of their comfort zones in order to be the change they want to see in the world. As such, it is among these individuals that I found the key-informants for this study. I want to thank them for providing insight and sharing their knowledge, experiences and stories with me of why they started a small food business and the challenges met along the way, in respectively Copenhagen and San Francisco.

Finally I wish you will enjoy reading it, as much as I have enjoyed writing it.

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 RESEARCH AREA & PROBLEM STATEMENT.....	2
<i>1.1.1 Research Questions</i>	<i>4</i>
1.2 AIM AND RELEVANCE OF THE STUDY.....	5
1.3 DELIMITATION	5
1.4 CENTRAL TERMS AND CONCEPTS	6
2. METHODOLOGY	8
2.1 FIELD TRIP AND OBSERVATIONS	8
2.2 DEVELOPMENT OF QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS.....	9
2.3 LITERATURE SEARCH AND SECONDARY RESEARCH DATA	10
2.4 LIMITATIONS AND RESEARCH QUALITY	11
3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	12
3.1 LINKING THE ENTREPRENEUR WITH SUSTAINABILITY	12
3.2 DIRECT FOOD PROVISIONING - CLOSING THE GAP OF ALIENATION	15
3.3 EXTERNAL CONDITIONS.....	18
4. LOCATION OF RESEARCH.....	19
4.1 COPENHAGEN	19
4.2 SAN FRANCISCO	22
4.3 CONTRASTING COPENHAGEN AND SAN FRANCISCO	23
5. THE SMALL SCALE FOOD ENTREPRENEURS.....	25
6. RESULTS & ANALYSIS	27
6.1 SMALL FOOD ENTREPRENEURS BRIDGING PRODUCERS AND CONSUMERS.....	27
<i>6.1.1 Perceptions of the Conventional Food System.....</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>6.1.2 Outlining Personal Drive</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>6.1.3 Balancing Risk and Motivations.....</i>	<i>31</i>
6.2 OBSTACLES FOR SMALL SCALE FOOD ENTREPRENEURIAL ACTIVITY	32
<i>6.2.1 Public Policy Not Geared Towards Small Scale Food Entrepreneurs.....</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>6.2.2 Experience of the Localities in relation to Entrepreneurial Activity.....</i>	<i>34</i>
7. DISCUSSION.....	35
7.1 THE SMALL FOOD ENTREPRENEUR AS AGENTS OF CHANGE.....	36
7.2 THE EXTERNAL MILIEU	38
8. CONCLUSION	41
9. REFERENCES	43
10. APPENDIX	48

1. Introduction

Today much of the food sold on store shelves has traveled the world before ending up on our plates. The long supply chain from farm-to-fork has resulted in consumers becoming increasingly removed from nature, the understanding of how and where their food is produced, and the impact production and consumption choices has on the environment and local community (Marsden and Smith 2005).

Building closer links in the food system through local alternative provisioning platforms to promote an understanding of food production, sustainability issues, connectedness to nature and healthy food behaviors, can potentially provide an important space for consumers to see, smell, feel and taste diverse foods and connect with local producers (Hinrichs 2000). However the extent to which these spaces can promote for example human-environmental relations and influence more sustainable food consumption is intrinsically linked to the motivation and values of local producers and other stakeholders working with small scale food provisioning (Seyfang 2004; Seyfang 2005). In this thesis, these individuals are referred to as small scale food entrepreneurs.

Small food entrepreneurs, who operate on alternative platforms of provisioning, maneuver in a milieu dominated by the conventional food system. Thus, their function in providing alternative means of consumption might not be fully understood or recognized by the dominant institutions of society. For the thriving of these smaller and more local-oriented food businesses driven by entrepreneurial individuals, a concern is raised in relation to possible structural constraints posed by the larger power structures and society at large.

This thesis seeks to understand the potential role of small scale food entrepreneurs as agents of change in re-connecting consumer with the land and hands by which food has been produced. Drawing upon fieldwork in San Francisco and Copenhagen the thesis explores the ideas driving small food entrepreneurs operating within more alternative and local oriented food businesses, and what is perceived particularly challenging operating a small food business in a market dominated by larger players.

The following section presents the research area that led to the research problem, followed by the articulation of the research questions and overall aim of this study. The methods applied throughout the inquiry will then be outlined, proceeding with the theoretical framework that has guided the inquiry and analysis. The next chapter will provide a short overview of the food milieu in Copenhagen and San Francisco; this will be used as secondary data for the support and comparison of primary data retrieved from interviews. The six food entrepreneurs from respectively Copenhagen and San Francisco, who stand at the center of this thesis, will then be introduced; where after results will be presented, analyzed and discussed. Finally, concluding remarks will enclose the inquiry and present recommendations for further research.

1.1 Research Area & Problem Statement

Amidst the awareness of the growing social and environmental consequences imposed by large scale food production and globalized movements of food, strategies on sustainable production and consumption have become a core subject within the political debate of sustainable development (Seyfang 2006). The nature of the transformation needed to bring about changes is, however, subject to competing rationalities of ‘green thinking’ (Fox 1995). Reflecting competing beliefs of nature and society, the “mainstream” strain of thinking believes that it is possible to reconcile actual institutions and economy with ecology/sustainable society through technology, efficiency and rational use of natural resources. On the other side there is an ”alternative” approach which is more philosophical in its nature and concerned with a reorientation in the way people relate to each other and to the natural world (*ibid.*).

In relation to influencing sustainable food consumption, the mainstream policy approach often place emphasis on how consumers can influence the market and thereby the food system through purchasing decisions (Seyfang 2006). This approach assumes that consumers know and care about the means by which their food has been produced, and act on this through their purchasing habits. The problem herein is that consumers are increasingly disconnected from understanding the detrimental social and environmental consequences of conventionally produced foods (*ibid.*). In addition, the scope to change their behavior is limited by existing social infrastructural systems of food provisioning dominated by large retail stores (Maniates 2003; Marsden and Smith 2004; Seyfang 2006). In other words consumers are locked in by the

food provisioning channels of the mass market. Further, relying on large food companies to reduce their destructive food production practices is not enough, since these companies often lack the flexibility and necessary culture required to enable the fundamental changes called upon (Pascual et al. 2011). The task of creating and disseminating a more sustainable food paradigm is simply not suited for governments and policy makers alone; bottom-up innovators who through trial and error seek to define the next, hopefully more sustainable food system should also be included and given a chance to pave the way (Seyfang 2006; Ray 1999). In this context, new tools are needed to develop and enact such initiatives and individuals to emerge (Seyfang 2005).

A distinct approach to large food corporations' domination of production, distribution and consumption of food, is for example seen in bottom-up 'alternative' approaches (Kneafsey et al. 2001; Marsden and Smith 2005; Dubuisson-Quellier 2011). These small food businesses are led by entrepreneurial individuals operating outside the conventional food provisioning channels, seeking to transform existing systems of provisioning to better reflect the values they believe will better serve society. Local farmers markets, food trucks, pop-up restaurants, niche shops and other small food initiatives are visible examples of those alternative food businesses. These individuals and their businesses can be situated within a larger movement which seeks to counteract and tackle the social and environmental concerns induced by the conventional food system. In line with this, entrepreneurial individuals are increasingly being cited as significant conduits in facilitating sustainable development (Gibbs 2009; Hall et al. 2010; Schaltegger and Wagner 2011). However, though they are progressively being advocated as a panacea for many social and environmental concerns, Hall et al. (2010) nevertheless caution that:

We have little understanding of how entrepreneurs will discover and develop those opportunities that lie beyond the pull of existing markets. While the case for entrepreneurship having a central role in a transition to a more sustainable society has been proposed by many, there remain major gaps in our knowledge of whether and how this process will actually unfold (*ibid.*, 440).

Entrepreneurs as such are often being put under the category of being socially and/or sustainability driven; as opposed to the conventional understanding of entrepreneurs solely

seeking economic growth through large enterprises (Tilley and Young 2009). Yet, the extent to which the before mentioned have the potential to create sustainable development, how they are motivated and incentivized, still remains an open question (Hall et al. 2010).

Bearing in mind the ‘mainstream’ and ‘alternative’ stances through which entrepreneurs might seek sustainable development, this paper seeks to contribute to fill this gap of knowledge by placing food entrepreneurs operating on smaller and more local platforms of provisioning as center topic of inquiry.

The discourses by which entrepreneurial activities unfold are grounded on their underlying values influenced by various thought systems (Tilley and Young 2009). Therefore, understanding smaller food entrepreneurs’ values can contribute to understanding the means by which they operate towards a more sustainable food system as opposed to the mainstream strategies.

Secondly the thriving of entrepreneurial individuals is influenced by the external milieu in which they operate (Hoffmann et al. 2010). Given that small food entrepreneurs are enacted in a milieu dominated by larger market forces, this thesis seeks to understand possible institutional and structural¹ barriers inhibiting small food entrepreneurs to thrive.

1.1.1 Research Questions

In accordance to the above stated, this study will provide the answers to the following questions,

1. *How are small scale food entrepreneurs relevant in promoting more sustainable production and consumption?*

2. *What barriers do small scale food entrepreneurs perceive as particular challenging for enabling alternative food businesses to prosper?*

¹ Social, cultural and institutional factors that can either hinder or push entrepreneurial movement forward (Berglund 2005).

The questions are addressed through interviews comprising six small food entrepreneurs in Copenhagen and San Francisco; two cities that, though far apart, are leading hubs engaged in finding solutions for more sustainable food production and consumption practices (Peters 2013; NIRAS 2013). In the process, this thesis moves from a more aerial view on the role small food entrepreneurs play in the move towards connecting people to sustainable consumption, to a more action-based perspective, in order to uncover barriers for these actors to thrive.

1.2 Aim and Relevance of the Study

The novelty of this inquiry lies in shedding light on entrepreneurial individuals, in two different urban locations, who are working with food outside the conventional food provisioning channels. Using small scale food entrepreneurs in Copenhagen and San Francisco as subject of research, the primary aim is to identify the driving factors behind their pursuance of running a local small scale food business. If the government and society at large is to promote an environment fostering these types of entrepreneurs, understanding the driving factors behind their initiatives are pivotal for comprehending how these individuals seek and can foster awareness and change among consumers.

The secondary aim is to understand if there are any noteworthy differences in each respective city that function as obstacles or enabling factors for them to flourish. This will give an insight into possible alterations that can be made in order to foster small food entrepreneurial activity, thus bringing more locally grown food alternatives on the market and shortening the distance between consumers and food production.

1.3 Delimitation

When pursuing any course of inquiry, regardless of field, other side questions and topics emerge along the way. There were for example many different parameters that could have been interesting to study in relation to this topic. I have chosen to limit myself to focus on the six food entrepreneurs in Copenhagen and San Francisco, investigating their personal experiences and perceptions of the food milieu in which they operate rather than e.g. doing a systems analysis, looking at consumers' experience of these food initiatives, or how the entrepreneurs overcome perceived obstacles of running a small food business.

This study is limited in time, in that it aims only to give a snapshot of the current situation and motivations of the informants, looking at what can be learned from them and by contrasting the two case studies. Pointing to the novelty of this research area on smaller scale food entrepreneurs, this paper seeks to capture some of common characteristics and experienced challenges, not providing an in depth analysis as such. Rather it seeks to unravel some issues which merit more attention and further research.

Entrepreneurship is regularly used in the field of economics, however pointing to the researcher's transdisciplinary background and nature of human ecology, this thesis seeks to combine the worlds of the economic sphere with that of the ecological in the understanding of how we are to move forward in reaching wider sustainability goals within food production and consumption practices. By doing this I prove and bring into the forefront that these two areas are interconnected and not segregated as many like to think.

1.4 Central Terms and Concepts

In an attempt to provide consistency of understanding for the reader, presented below are descriptions of how prevalent terms and concepts are used and understood throughout the thesis. The definitions are a combination of terms as they are traditionally understood combined with their intended application within the thesis.

Entrepreneurial Culture – Captures the society and the individual's perception of entrepreneurship, opportunities and desire to start a business (Berglund 2005; Hoffmann et al. 2012). The factors include amongst other the indicator for entrepreneurial public image, whether entrepreneurship is considered a feasible, acceptable and a desirable work path in the society; thereby also speaking to the norms of a society for engaging in entrepreneurial activities.

Food System – all the processes involved in the production, distribution, consumption and waste management of food. Food systems are either conventional or alternative according to their model of food lifespan from origin to plate. When referring to the conventional I refer to

a food system that operates on the economies of scale². The alternative is understood as a food system which operates on a more local scale contrasting to the conventional with reduced food transportation, and where the chain of production and consumption is closer, more accessible and direct.

Local - is socially constructed and therefore understood in various ways (Seyfang 2004). By local food production and consumption, I refer to a regional scale where consumers and food producers have the opportunity to interact directly and where food is being supplied and consumed according to local ecological cycles.

Small Scale Food Entrepreneurs - Individuals who are managing a small scale food business (less than 50 employees), focusing on local produce either through production, distribution or advocacy, and which operate on provisioning channels outside the domain of the conventional food system.

Sustainability – The concept of sustainability or sustainable development was developed for a UN summit in an attempt to combine the dimensions of economic efficiency, social justice and ecological balance referring to “development that meets the need of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (UNCSD 1994). This understanding is though often associated with ecological modernization theory which focuses on “mainstream” sustainability strategies that do not leave the path of large scale production and consumption.

Sustainable Food Production and Consumption – The United Nations’ formal definition is “[t]he use of goods and services that respond to basic needs and bring a better quality of life, while minimizing the use of natural resources, toxic materials and emissions of waste and pollutants over the life cycle, so as not to jeopardize the needs of future generations” (UNCSD 1994). In this thesis, it is interpreted as a movement away from the conventional food system to a food system focusing on improving dietary diversity and local produce for the benefit of humans and the environment, meaning the animals, plants, microorganisms and the landscape.

Values - Can reflect a person’s sense of right and wrong and can therefore be the basis for a certain course of action (Tilley and Young 2009). Accordingly values can be used to understand food entrepreneurs’ ideological belief and course of action in relation to the food system.

² Meaning producing food more efficiently by increasing size and/or speed in order to lower consumer costs and increase overall production, and by this compromise the ecosystem and the health of consumers (Chandler 1977).

2. Methodology

Providing clarity for the research design of this study, this chapter will present the overall methodological approach used throughout the research and analysis of findings. The methodology applied is in line with the primary aim of the research attempting to identify the values and driving factors of food entrepreneurs' pursuance of running a small scale food business, and secondary, to recognize what they perceive as particular challenging when operating in a market dominated by large scale provisioning channels.

Since the aim of the study is to explore the motivations and lived environment of food entrepreneurs in two locations, qualitative research was estimated to be the appropriate research design for the study. This was conducted in the form of semi-structured interviews and observations from field research in both San Francisco and Copenhagen.

2.1 Field Trip and Observations

My interest in the topic of study emerged during a three month stay San Francisco. This was partially influenced by living in a vibrant neighborhood where small food shops, food events and street foods³ were common. I also got inspired by the people I encountered, who were eager to share their ideas and involve me in their passion for food. It soon became apparent that the city was buzzing with food-interested individuals running their own small food businesses. I had not come across this vibrant activity and passion for food and entrepreneurship in Copenhagen, which sparked my initial interest in comparing the two cities.

Because of the lively food scene and entrepreneurial environment in San Francisco, this city seemed like the right place to be for conducting fieldwork in the area of food, sustainability and those individuals who are providing alternatives to the global food system. I brought my observations, experiences and research with me back to Denmark to compare them to the city in which I live, Copenhagen, and in which I would like to experience that same entrepreneurial activity related to the availability of more local food markets as alternative to retail stores.

³ Defined by the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations street foods are ' ready-to-eat foods and beverages prepared and/or sold by vendors especially in streets and other similar public places' (FAO 2014).

Having experienced both Copenhagen and San Francisco has allowed firsthand familiarity of the cities food milieu and the people partaking in them. As Bryman (2004) posits, entering a social setting where the researcher can observe and get firsthand experience of a phenomenon can aggregate a deeper understanding of the social setting. In line with this, I believe that field observations were an important part in my data collection. The main source of data in this study comes from interviews, by observing my informant's activities and partaking in the same social setting in which they live helped me to familiarize with the local setting, contextualize their utterances and thus better understand what they were talking about.

2.2 Development of Qualitative Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were chosen as appropriate due to their open structure enabling the interviewees to answer more elaborately as well as allowing the interviewer some latitude to ask further questions in response to what was seen as significant replies (Wengraf 2001; Weathington et al. 2010). Prior to the interviews, an interview guide was developed⁴. The guide was organized into themes; broadly covering the entrepreneurial motivation and the perceived obstacles for small scale entrepreneurial activity. The questions were open and open-ended, enabling more in depth understandings of the focus area (Bryman 2004; Kvæle 2007). This also gave space for spontaneity, both for me and the informants'. For example the informant could bring up aspects that were not considered previously and also given space for elaborating on specific issue in greater detail. Though the lose format, some suggestions were mentioned to steer the topic in the right direction, but not so much as to steer the interviewee towards preferred answers.

Three food entrepreneurs from each represented city were chosen. Though six interviews in total do not provide a valid number for generalizing the outcome from the interviews, they were still useful for providing an insight into the area of research and in this sense point out issues that could lead to further and more in depth inquiries. The sampling technique for the qualitative interviews was in the form of snowball and purposive sampling (Bryman 2004; Corbin and Strauss 2008). Snowball due to key-informants recommending other possible

⁴ See Appendix A

informants, and purposive due to only the representatives estimated to be the most productive sample in answering the research question were chosen (Corbin and Strauss 2008).

In order to match the respondents and avoid bias as such, the criteria were for all of them to be entrepreneurs and operate within small scale food initiatives (production, distribution or services) (see Chapter 5 for description of informants.). This information was established prior to interviews, through people in their network and an internet search on the informants' websites or articles written about them. Contact with the key-informants was established by e-mail or phone, where I introduced myself, explained the aim of the thesis and why they, in particular, were recognized as important for the inquiry.

The interviews took place between 3rd February and 18th September 2013 and were conducted at a quiet setting at the informant's work place. The structure and themes of the interview was explained. The informants were asked if a voice recorder could be used. The interviews were planned to take 45 minutes each. It should be noted, however, that the time varied among the interviews depending on when data saturation was obtained and how talkative people were. Transcription of interviews took place in the days following each interview. In order to minimize misinterpretation and misuse of what was stated during the interview, respondent's answers were written down word by word (Bryman 2004).

Informed consent was obtained for using the informants' names. English was the preferred language of inquiry, however, the Danish interviewees preferred to speak in their mother tongue, allowing them to express themselves better. Therefore careful interpretation and translation of their statements and formulation of questions from the interview guide has been taken into consideration.

2.3 Literature Search and Secondary Research Data

Literature search on existing data and theory covering the area of research was found through online sources in the form of Lund University's search engine LUBsearch as well as news articles and other official websites related to the topic of research. Danish and English resources were utilized throughout the inquiry. The literature search encompassed literature on current trends emerging as alternatives to the conventional food system, theories on

entrepreneurs and their role as change agents, and external factors influencing entrepreneurial activity.

Further literature studies were conducted with the intention of finding data to enable comparison between the two data sets on possible barriers experienced by the small food entrepreneurs. This phase was included in an attempt to better understand the possible barriers, but also finding data that could elucidate the entrepreneurial food scene of each city. Academic literature has been used alongside governmental reports. In evaluating the source and positions of literature as such, careful consideration has been taken into the means of how in which context this literature uses the term entrepreneurship.

2.4 Limitations and Research Quality

As recognized by Bryman (2004) and Miles (1979), qualitative data, here in the form of semi structured interviews give rise to a lot of unstructured textual data, which can be complicated to analyze. Miles describes this outcome as an ‘attractive nuisance’, since the richness of data provides a lot of material but poses a potential challenge to find an analytical path through it (Miles 1979). Attention was therefore put into narrowing down what, according to the research questions, was deemed most relevant. For the analysis, transcripts were thoroughly re-read. Knowing the interview data well, allowed for the recognition of consistent themes brought up throughout the interviews. It should also be mentioned that although an interview guide was used, questions and answers changed depending on the informants’ field of interest and expertise. Therefore attention was on finding the red thread combining their answers.

For the matter of comparing the results from the interviews, research on small scale food entrepreneurs per se is sparse. Given the novelty of this research area and lack of prior research to support the pursuit of the inquiry, the method of collecting primary data is paramount for addressing the research questions.

As this study revolves around entrepreneurs in two locations, there is an embedded geographical bias present. There are many factors influencing entrepreneurial activity, such as the regulatory environment, demographic situation and historical and cultural context, to name a few (Gibbs 2009; Hoffmann et al. 2012). Since it was considered beyond the scope of

this thesis to conduct a thorough examination of all these factors, the choice was made to instead focus on the individual entrepreneurs' and their experiences and perceptions.

3. Theoretical Framework

This chapter will present the theories which governed the development and execution of the research and thereby functions as the framework used to interpret the primary and secondary data. The theories and concepts presented weaves together various authors and theories and do thereby not fit in a single frame of reference. Rather the lenses through which I look upon the topic of research are influenced by the holistic approach of Human Ecology, of which is committed to integrate often disparate worlds and encourage the breakdown of traditional disciplinary boundaries.

In order to recognize the role small food entrepreneurs can play in the push towards more sustainable production and consumption, the first theoretical foundation elucidates some common characteristics of entrepreneurs coupled with the understanding of sustainability. This has been found important because of the distinct value systems that inform the concepts. The following section will look into theory concerning the means by which the alternative platforms of food provisioning can influence more sustainable consumption. Finally, theoretical insight on external barriers for such alternative businesses will also be considered.

3.1 Linking the Entrepreneur with Sustainability

Given that entrepreneurs stand as centre topic of this paper as well as their advocated role in leading the way to a more sustainable society (Hall et al. 2010; Schaltegger and Wagner 2011), understanding what drives and characterises such entrepreneurial individuals is critical to address the first research question.

There is no clear or universally accepted definition of the term entrepreneurship; a possible explanation is the many forms and various fields' within entrepreneurs operate, and likewise personal ideals and interests attached to their actions (Tilley and Young 2009). The word 'entrepreneur' however originates from French and can be understood as 'taking the initiative to bridge" (Schaltegger and Wagner 2011). In other words, entrepreneurs have the ability to

create innovative approaches to resource control, thus bringing about something new in the society (Schlange 2009; Tilley and Young 2009). In addition to this they often portray a willingness to take great risks, for example financial, in order to pursue their ideas. Further, due to their abilities of generating new ideas and taking initiative, entrepreneurs are increasingly expected to bring about positive change among people and society at large (Berglund 2005; Hall et al. 2010). As Michael Shaper (2010) describes,

[e]conomies – and societies, for that matter – do not change simply because of an inevitable set of circumstances or trends; they can only transmute when there are people who individually set new directions, suggest new ways of doing and then successfully become role models (ibid., 10).

The notion of entrepreneurship has its origins in economics where entrepreneurship refers to opportunity recognition with the purpose of creating economic value (Schlange 2009; Tilley and Young 2009). However there has been a growing call for broadening entrepreneurship as a concept, moving away from the conventional understanding of entrepreneurs as solely being profit driven. As pointed out by Steyaert and Hjort (2003),

The difference in how entrepreneurship is defined, studied and conceived, need not lead to a cacophony and be seen as a major weakness to overcome. They could form an important opening, which requires that we not only accept and recognize different (paradigmatic) positions but also systematically develop them (ibid., 5).

The fields of sociology and anthropology have contributed with a different understanding of the value entrepreneurial activity can have for the well-being of a society. Schlange (2009, 16) argues that “the creation of social and cultural values replaces, in part, the limited function of economic value creation”. Opportunity recognition is therefore also understood differently from a social perspective, with the word opportunity being regarded as having the potential to create value for the society; tackling social issues and offer ideas for wide-scale societal change.

From an economic, through social to the ecological realm, there are entrepreneurial individuals who seek to create value in the ecological sphere (Marsden and Smith 2004). For example, they seek a regeneration of natural systems through eco-friendly products and

processes. They have the ability to influence pro-environmental consumer attitudes and behaviours through their vision sharing commitment but also through their own products (*ibid.*). According to Pascual et al. (2011, 13) these individuals are “driven to create an impact on society and leave a heritage of improved environmental and social conditions”, and differ from conventional entrepreneurs in their attempt to combine environmental, economic and social issues of sustainability in a holistic manner (Marsden and Smith 2004; Schaltegger and Wagner 2011). Here though, it is important to understand the ideas and values of those individuals who are advocated to set new directions in relation to more sustainable means of production and consumption. This is because though innovation and entrepreneurship go hand-in-hand, they are merely empty categories in relation to sustainable food production and consumption without values being attached to them. Theories and research on sustainability-oriented entrepreneurs are to a large extent to be found in the context of ecological modernization theory (Tilley and Young 2009). Ecological modernization is defined by Hajer (1995) as,

[T]he discourse that recognizes the structural character of the environmental problematique but none the less assumes that existing political, economic and social institutions can internalize the care for the environment (*ibid.*, 25).

Such visions are, according to Martinez-Alier (2002, 5), “concerned with [...] the sustainable management of natural resources, and not so much with the intrinsic values of nature”. In line with this Tilley and Young (2009) argue that, entrepreneurs working under the mainstream paradigm of sustainability are concerned with sustainable resource control without leaving the path of modernization. These often comprise multinational enterprises which, according to Pascual et al. (2011), lack the flexibility, willingness and necessary culture to enable sustainable solutions that go beyond the industrial paradigm. In same vein, one can contrast mainstream conventional and alternative approaches of food production and consumption to the ecological problematique. This can be coupled with Fox’s (1995) description of the dual streams of ‘green’ thinking towards tackling environmental issues, namely the anthropocentric versus eco-centric approach. Such dual thinking currents are also referred to as ‘shallow ecology’ and ‘deep ecology’. The first is supported by dominant corporations which have an instrumental view upon nature, believing that it is possible to reconcile infinite growth with ecology. Therefore sustainability-oriented entrepreneurs operating within the ecological

modernization paradigm still fosters alienation, obscurity and incomprehensible feedback loops (Tilley and Young 2009). The latter, on the other hand, rather seeks change in how humans relate to nature, focusing on more local, smaller-scale production towards environmental protection and human wellbeing (Schumacher 1993).

In line with the alternative stance on ‘green’ thinking, Bjørghaug and Kvam (2011) and Gibbs (2009) address the topic of individuals engaging in small and local food businesses in a way which portrays a very different mentality towards sustainability than that exhibited by larger food business owners. According to the aforementioned authors, instead of being profit-oriented, these entrepreneurs seek profit-sufficiency, meaning getting by with less while feeling a strong stewardship towards their community and land. They are sustainability-driven in the sense that their passion and interest in social and environmental wellbeing goes beyond the interest in profit. Therefore, they display an interest in wider social issues than bottom-line profits and show a concern for the longer-term implications of their business activities (Gibbs 2009). Continuing on this path, the following section will look into theory concerning the means by with the platforms in which these food entrepreneurs operate generate closer ties between consumers and producers and thereby can influence sustainable consumption.

3.2 Direct Food Provisioning - Closing the Gap of Alienation

The conventional food system has resulted in consumers becoming increasingly disconnected from the understanding of how and where food is produced. This entails a process of alienation whereby consumers only perceive food as a commodity, not comprehending the underlying environmental and social consequences of their purchasing decisions. Karl Marx (1887) describes a commodity as a service produced by human labor, which is being sold or offered as a product on the general market. Human labor, according to Marx, is what establishes the value of a commodity. Through the process of production the consumer does not ‘see’ the human labor put into the product in the market. According to Marx, then, the human labor has become objectified in the commodity. This can also be referred to as commodity fetishism, that is, the idea of commodity fetishism being part of a larger process of alienation (Graeber 2005). Considering the process of food production and consumption, people do not see the land being destroyed due to conventional farming practices, chemical destruction, farmers health, and in the end understand what they put in their mouth. This

opacity obstructs consumers' experiences of environmental responsibility and negatively impacts food choices which in turn impinge on health, the environment, agriculture and on the viability to re-enact sustainable production and consumption (Hinrichs 2000; Seyfang 2004; Marsden and Smith 2005).

According to Maniates (2003), governmental strategies put forward in altering patterns of unsustainable consumption, turn towards the importance of consumers 'voting with their money' in making purchasing decisions that are based on environmentally and socially sound production. The problem herein is that the scope of changing current alienation through purchasing decisions is limited by the channels of conventional food provisioning, which 'lock in' consumers into particular patterns of consumption of the mass market (*ibid.*). In relation to this Hinrichs (2000) and Dubuisson-Quellier (2001) contend that emphasis is on reversing the downsides of the conventional food system, bringing food production and consumption closer; such is done through alternative retail experiences that, going beyond convenience, influence consumers in embracing local food. Farmers markets, grow your own food initiatives⁵, and other food venues where consumers have direct contact with local food producers and distributors are examples of alternative provisioning channels. These channels, in opposition to large retail chains, function as platforms where consumers have the ability to interact directly to the person producing their food. As put forward by Hinrichs (2000),

Direct [...] markets promise human connection at the place where production and consumption of food converge, an experience not available either to consumers shopping at "superstores" [...] or to farmers selling through conventional wholesale commodity markets (*ibid.*, 295).

Food markets which seek direct interaction between producers and consumers are seen as central components of local food systems. In this regard Hinrichs (2000) further posits that,

If relations between producers and consumers are distant and more anonymous in more 'global food systems', in local, direct markets, they are immediate, personal and enacted in shared space (*ibid.*, 295).

⁵ Community- and urban gardening, and community supported farming are examples of initiatives which encourage people to grow their own food.

These shared spaces are, according to Seyfang (2006), of great importance in fostering more consumer awareness and sustainable consumption. Local alternative food provisioning offers a platform for strong social and ethical-community building which in turn functions as a means of nurturing social engagement, and generating active citizenship within participative communities. Active citizenship, according to O'Riordan (2001), includes the means by which consumers of a community recognize the political implications of private decisions and so defines everyday consumption practices as a potential way of influencing the bigger picture. This is also recognized by Holloway and Kneafsey (2000) who describe these spaces as those enabling simultaneous alternative and interactive consumption. Further they argue that through these spaces, small and locally driven food businesses invite community participation and offer a place for people to ground themselves in the biological and social realities of living on and off the land. In addition, they posit that the spaces invite people to get a real sense of food diversity and quality, as they can taste and purchase foods that have been produced with care and respect for the land and expand their horizon of what quality foods is available in the local community.

Marsden and Smith (2005) and Hinrichs (2000) also refer to the active citizenship as being a social space; a place of defence from the conventional food system which devalues the interconnectedness between land, food and people. Most importantly, not only do small local food businesses provide local and diversified food, but they also represent and give rise to new forms of consumer awareness (Ray 1999; Kneafsey et al. 2001; Seyfang 2004; Marsden and Smith 2005). The local products made available by the local food producers can, as argued by Bjørkhaug and Kvam (2011, 37), provide “the link between the product, the landscape and the culture of a region”. In this way, one can say that local food production and the people making this possible can generate what Van der Ploeg and Renting (2000, 534) refer to as a “cluster of compatible and mutually reinforcing activities”.

The existence and prevalence of these initiatives, however, do not solely depend on people's willingness to become entrepreneurial within the small scale food scene, but also depends on the context in which they operate (O'Neill et al. 2009). As emphasized by Gibbs (2009), there must be congruence between personal ideals and context for entrepreneurs to emerge.

3.3 External Conditions

Small scale food entrepreneurs, operate within a marginal market dominated by bigger players (Hinrichs 2000). These market conditions may prove particular challenging for small entrepreneurs to prosper. As Gibbs (2009) formulates it, without a supportive socioeconomic environment within which to operate, internal drivers may lay dormant. In line with this, Seyfang (2004) argues that how governments and society as a whole respond to this niche of local food production and consumption is crucial for the success or failure of sustainable food initiatives. Therefore identifying support for small scale food entrepreneurs is imperative as they bring into practice non-mainstream principles and beliefs, representing an upsurge of action for a more sustainable food system (Seyfang 2006).

There are many indicators that influence the activity of entrepreneurial initiatives in a society (Gibbs 2009). Literature on entrepreneurial theory can to a great extent be divided into two broad camps, one focusing on the internal traits of entrepreneurs that enable them to start a business (described in Chapter 3.1.), the other on the external conditions i.e. in how social, cultural and political structures influence entrepreneurial action (Berglund 2005).

Berglund draws on the work of David McClelland's 'The Achieving Society' (1961) which argues that some societies have cultural attitudes that translate into primary socialization practices that foster entrepreneurial individuals. The structural tradition of entrepreneurial theory seeks to understand how social, cultural and institutional factors can push entrepreneurial movement forward (Berglund 2005). The cultural factors for example encompass a society's approach and perception of entrepreneurs while the institutional aspects cover regulatory support and other support mechanisms provided by the government (Berglund 2005). These external indicators playing a role in fostering an entrepreneurial milieu, includes amongst other, regulations, market, finance, knowledge, skills and culture encompassing the society's attitude towards entrepreneurship (Gibbs 2009). Therefore, there are many factors that come into play in the fostering of a thriving entrepreneurial society.

To better understand some of the established external frames within which the small food entrepreneurs of this study operate, the following chapter will provide a brief outline of each city's food milieu.

4. Location of Research

With 5,455 miles between them, Copenhagen and San Francisco have different cultures, demographics, political landscapes, geographies, climate etc.; all these factors add to the nuance of an entrepreneurial milieu. A short description of each location and the external factors that may have an influence on the food entrepreneurial activity in each city will be presented here. To limit the number of variables sought out for providing a snapshot of each city's food scene, the challenges that were mentioned by the informants during the interviews guided the inquiry of what was sought out.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the external frames in which an entrepreneur operates has a profound influence on entrepreneurial activity (Berglund 2005; Gibbs 2009). For the purpose of shedding light on the possible barriers for small food entrepreneurs to thrive, particular attention will be paid to the regulatory and cultural milieu regarding food entrepreneurship.

4.1 Copenhagen

Though the Copenhagen⁶ area is only a fraction of the San Francisco Bay Area⁷, it has in recent years obtained increasing attention on the international food scene, amongst other for being innovative with focus on local food sourcing and foraging (Newnordicfood 2013; Nordicfoodlab 2013). Countries throughout Europe and the world have therefore started looking towards Denmark when it comes to bringing sustainable food production and consumption practices on the forefront. As such Denmark despite its northern climate with large seasonal fluctuations and short harvest time shows willingness towards putting attention on the possibility and opportunity of eating the food provided by the surrounding nature. Taking part in the local setting, however, this proclaimed sustainable food-oriented city does not display streets buzzing with omnipresent direct food markets, to the same extent as San Francisco. An explanation to this is that Danes are accustomed to purchasing most of their groceries in the retail supermarkets and thereby do not have the tradition of vivid food markets (Wright 2007).

⁶ Capital of Denmark covers an area of 74.4 km² with a population of 541,989 (European Commission 2014).

⁷ With a population of 825,111 the San Francisco Bay Area, California, covers an area of 18,088 km² (World Population Statistics 2013).

Denmark is putting great efforts into encouraging and supporting food entrepreneurs and to shift to more sustainable food production and consumption practices (NIRAS 2013; Tveit and Sandøe 2011). In fact, Denmark was among the first countries to establish laws for the support of organic farming and local agriculture (Tveit and Sandøe 2011). Also, in the years following 2000, the Ministry of Food, in particular, sought to strengthen the organic food sector through information, advisory facilities and the development of a certification system for organic producers (*ibid.*). Other countries have had similar reforms and activities, but Denmark was relatively early in promoting this field, and has continuously followed up with appropriate support. This shows that Denmark is on the forefront in relation to other European countries, prioritizing sustainable food production and consumption.

According to the World Bank, Denmark is one of the easiest countries to register a business (The World Bank 2013). When it comes to the support of smaller food entrepreneurs, however, a study on food entrepreneurs in Denmark indicates that smaller producers find it difficult to distribute their products due to limited access to the shelves of major supermarkets (Hoffmann et al. 2012; NIRAS 2013). As a consequence of the market economies of scale existing both on the production and marketing side, small producers partly experience monopolistic competition and conditions at the retail level, and as a result very few of these entrepreneurial food businesses succeed (NIRAS 2013). However the report reveals that a growing number of Danish food entrepreneurs are ever more in opposition to the conventional food industry and thereby seek to make themselves visible through alternative provisioning channels, seeking new ways to distribute and sell their goods. This response is gradually visible in the new and growing food movements appearing in the Copenhagen area (Nordicfoodlab 2013; Denmark 2013). Functioning as an alternative to the ordinary profit-driven supermarket chains, initiatives like urban gardening and member-driven food co-operatives focus on offering seasonal, organic foods from local farmers (NIRAS 2013). This also includes amongst other, selling directly to restaurant owners, or opening their own small food shops. By doing this, they can sometimes avoid some of the legal barriers that are in place and that tend to serve larger companies better (*ibid.*).

Still, public regulations and certifications concerning food pose challenges for small food entrepreneurs (NIRAS 2013). Denmark is known for its extensive regulations and legislations

concerning food production and provisioning which functions both as a high quality stamp but also a barrier for food entrepreneurs (Tveit and Sandøe 2011). With this follows long, inflexible processing times of certificates and other paperwork required for running a business. The large amount of regulatory control and bureaucracy limits the food entrepreneurs' freedom of action by slow processing times, extensive rules and lack of helpfulness (*ibid.*).

Bringing together data from local, regional and national high growth enterprises, the Danish Business Authority releases annual reports on the current situation for entrepreneurial activity in Denmark (Hoffmann et al. 2012). Though the sample is high growth enterprises, the obstacles also affect smaller food businesses. Developed in conjunction with the other OECD countries, the report emphasizes six factors which have a significant impact on a country's entrepreneurial environment. Factors include the image of entrepreneurs among the population, whether entrepreneurship is seen as a potential career path, valuation of risk-taking and the seeing of opportunities to start a business in the society at large (*ibid.*). Denmark is putting significant efforts into developing an environment that encourages entrepreneurial activity, and has, according to the Entrepreneurial Index report, a relatively good framework for entrepreneurs. According to the Danish Business Authority the main area in which Denmark is lacking is the cultural environment for entrepreneurs (*ibid.*).

Entrepreneurial culture is understood as the individual's perception of entrepreneurship and people's own ability and desire to start and succeed in a business (Hoffmann et al. 2012). According to the Danish Entrepreneurial Index report, Danes perceive entrepreneurship positively and assess the possibility for starting a business as good. However, the desire amongst Danes to be independent and their view on entrepreneurship as a possible career-path is low compared to the other OECD countries (*ibid.*). From this it seems evident that Danes in general have a smaller desire to be self-employed compared to citizens of similar countries. One reason for this is the relatively high job satisfaction and strong social safety net in the Danish society, which ensures that unemployed people do not feel 'forced' to become entrepreneurial. Further, there is a low level of risk-taking due to fear of bankruptcy. As understood from above findings, the high level of societal support provided by the Danish government does not compel the citizens towards entrepreneurial actions, as the necessity is simply not there. Another explanation to the cultural perception of entrepreneurship and the willingness to start on your own can be explained through the Law of Jante (*ibid.*). In short,

the concept suggests that the culture within Scandinavian countries discourage people from promoting themselves over others (Avant and Knutsen 1993). This concept is generally used as a sociological term to negatively describe an attitude towards individuality and success, referring to societal mentality that de-emphasizes individual effort and places all emphasis on the collective, while discouraging those who stand out from the norm as achievers (*ibid.*).

4.2 San Francisco

The city of San Francisco is famous for its entrepreneurial scene, with a reputation of actively welcoming and encouraging all forms of businesses, and being a buzzing city with doers and dreamers, innovators, and trend setters (Kenney 2000; SFgov 2013). As a result, academics have for decades been trying to describe what it is that makes this city a unique place for starting movements and businesses, drawing in creative, hopeful and idea-rich people from all over the world. The resulting theories are difficult to define concisely since the development of the city's business life is determined by many mutually re-enforcing factors (Kenney 2000).

Being referred to as the fruit and vegetable basket of the United States due to the fertile agricultural land surrounding the city, San Francisco is also renowned for its vibrant food milieu and food movements (Peters 2013). As any other urban area, large retail chains selling conventional mass produced foods partake the food scene. What I felt penetrated the city, however, was the availability of small niche shops and restaurants on street corners, farmers markets, food trucks and underground food markets; a characteristic of the city also recognized by Linnekin (2012). Linnekin nevertheless points out that this plethora of small food shops and other alternative food institutions have not always been there. As he further explains, food entrepreneurs of San Francisco have struggled with strict regulations surrounding food. Throughout the years though, the food entrepreneurs have worked towards re-writing both the societal norms and the regulative environment around food provisioning channels (*ibid.*).

What is particularly noteworthy in regards to the regulatory environment encompassing food production in San Francisco is the goodwill of the government, expressed in the new Californian Home Made Food Act, also referred to as the Cottage Food Act laws (Theselc 2012; Bjerg 2013). The Cottage Food Act permits people to cook and sell a wide range of

products without having to invest in a commercial kitchen space. Nor do they have to comply with all the regulatory measures that govern larger food producers. This has positively influenced smaller food entrepreneurs in starting their food businesses, and provides excellent insight into the environment in which small food entrepreneurs of San Francisco operate (*ibid.*). The law enabling citizens to produce food at home and then to sell to retailers came out of a response to the economic recession, aiming to enable people to make a living and thrive in their local community. The law also allows home cooks or food enthusiasts to experiment with food, which in turn can trigger the development of a small food business, adding diversity in the food scene. This law is increasingly being passed in other US states, which indicates that changes are happening in the legal regulations posed on small local food production.

Because San Francisco for so many years has been a centre for inventive people wanting to make a difference, testing out other and better ways to grow, prepare and eat food, the entrepreneurial mentality seems to be embedded in the society (Gorbis 2013). The constant flocking of food entrepreneurs to the city also means that there is a large group of people in the Bay Area of San Francisco who are questioning and working towards alternatives to the current dominant food paradigm (Tozzi 2009). This encourages constant innovation, which is the other part of this unique environment (*ibid.*). The entrepreneurial culture embedded in San Francisco acts as a magnet in attracting other like-minded people. Thus, thousands of new entrepreneurs are constantly moving there. This constant flow of new optimistic entrepreneurs leaves very little room for pessimistic thoughts, and might be a crucial difference between the Bay Area and any other major hubs, like for example Copenhagen (Malik 2009). In addition to the many inspiring success stories, the completely different take on failure and the remarkable ability to brush off the dirt and get back up on the horse is determining the level of success which makes the Bay Area of San Francisco stand out (*ibid.*).

4.3 Contrasting Copenhagen and San Francisco

Given the external influences on entrepreneurial activity it was found important illustrating some of the similarities and differences of the two locations regarding the external frames influencing entrepreneurial initiatives (Table 1). What was most apparent was the regulative environment concerning food production.

COPENHAGEN	SAN FRANCISCO
GEOGRAPHICS & MARKET	
Northern climate with large seasonal fluctuations and short harvest time.	With a Mediterranean climate, contains some of the most productive land in the world. Three seasons of farming ensures high volume of produce available year round.
Copenhagen does not host many local food markets, rather Danes do most of their grocery shopping in retail chains.	The streets of San Francisco are home to numerous farmers markets, niche shops and street food pop-ups.
INSTITUTIONAL INDICATORS - REGULATIONS	
Both cities are known to be some of the easiest places on earth to register a new company.	
Smaller businesses beholden to same regulations as large corporations making it challenging for early stage companies.	Last year California passed a law allowing small food vendors in San Francisco to sell food produce at home. Meaning they do not have to follow the same regulations being posed on larger food businesses
Has strict food regulations, but has one of the best welfare support systems in the world. In Copenhagen we clearly see how the reliance on government can be a reason for limited entrepreneur activity.	The financial crisis has influenced limited governmental regulations on food production and provisioning.
STRUCTURAL INDICATORS - ENTREPRENEURIAL CULTURE	
Denmark lacks a national entrepreneurial culture. The Danes are not willing to test the entrepreneurial path for their career. They don't want to leave safe jobs and the high level of freedom afforded by their world known welfare system.	San Francisco is the city center for the entire Bay Area and the most entrepreneurial city in the world acting as a hub for innovation and creativity. In San Francisco people are willing to take great risks given its dominant entrepreneurial culture.
Looked upon for inspiration in regards to sustainable food production and consumption, e.g. the foraging of food.	The Bay Area invites entrepreneurial initiatives and movements.

Table 1 – Copenhagen and San Francisco, similarities and differences of the entrepreneurial food localities.

The following chapter will introduce the small food entrepreneurs who are operating their small food business within the above described milieus.

5. The Small Scale Food Entrepreneurs

This chapter will present the cases used as the basis for the primary data of the research. The empirical case study comprises six interviews with three food entrepreneurs living in the Copenhagen Area (CPH) and three in San Francisco (SF).

All informants run their own food related business, by producing, selling, distributing and/or advocating for local foods. They all have experience operating, organizing and starting up a small scale food business. The provisioning channels through which they operate are spread across partaking in food pop-ups, developing niche products and selling in smaller stores, farmers markets, restaurants and food events e.g. educating about urban farming or cooking events; channels of provisions where they are interacting directly with the local community. A short presentation of each informant is outlined below.

The Food Entrepreneurs in Copenhagen

Per (age 55) is currently managing a small malting and brewing business on his farm. The brewing is based on homegrown grains, malt and hops. The hops are grown small scale and are old Danish varieties that have never been used commercially. In addition to running his brewery, *Per* has years of experience in starting small food businesses, and is active on various platforms communicating about the benefits of local food production. For example, he is chairman of Organic Denmark⁸ and has published books on local organic farming. He also teaches courses and run university seminars in his area of expertise and has an active presence in the Danish media.

Signe (age 46) also has experiences of running a small food business. Her business revolves around advocating for local organic food production and consumption. At present, she is

⁸ Organic Denmark is a community of farmers, businesses and consumers, which aim at strengthening and developing organic production of food in accordance with the association's core values, which works towards strengthen research in organic agriculture, the development of new food products and consumer access to organic food in stores (økologisk landsforening 2014).

particularly involved with initiating urban farming events. Through her many initiatives she can be referred to as an author, blogger, urban farmer, consultant, award winning journalist and keynote speaker in the area of local organic food consumption and urban farming.

Katrine (age 26) is, in contrast to *Per* and *Signe*, new to the field of food entrepreneurship. She has recently started on her own, arranging food events with the purpose of influencing the participants to cook their food for thus to influence them towards a more appropriate diet based on local seasonal foods. These cooking events are aimed at facilitating learning, interaction and community building, while the participants have fun and cook together.

The Food Entrepreneurs in San Francisco

Angelo (age 65) describes himself as a traditional old style food enthusiast, who lives and eats in tune with the seasons and who hunts and gathers food in the local forest. Through his activities within San Francisco's food scene he has become a person of reference for many well known chefs and food writers in the Bay Area (Renaissance Forge 2013). With his philosophy of bringing people back to the timeless essentials of local organic food, he has currently initiated a small salt production using local and organic ingredients.

Jeff (age 44) has partaken in many food start-ups and took part in the starting of the underground food movement in San Francisco. *Jeff*'s passion for quality food has led him to starting his own small pizzeria, serving gourmet pizza baked solely using local and organic ingredients, which he buys directly from local farmers since it is important to him to know the people he buys his produce from.

Mitch's (age 46) passion for cooking, community and home-style American flavors has made him a pillar of the San Francisco culinary world (Batliwalla 2011). He is a chef, successful in starting various restaurants which aim at providing customers with quality food, which he purchases from local producers because he finds the foods at farmers markets have more flavor, but at the same he wants to support local farmers and establish relationship with the people producing the food.

6. Results & Analysis

The following chapter addresses the results and analysis of the empirical data. In line with the research questions, the analysis has been bifurcated. The first part encompasses reflections on the informants' values, with specific focus on the ideas underpinning their pursuit of running a small food business. The second part revolves around the external barriers perceived to hamper small-scale food entrepreneurial activity, reflecting upon the possible differences influencing small scale food entrepreneurial activity in each city. The chosen citations from interviewees are meant to be indicative rather than exhaustive presentations of the narratives, reflecting key aspects of informants' answers.

6.1 Small Food Entrepreneurs Bridging Producers and Consumers

For understanding how small scale food entrepreneurs are relevant for bringing closer consumers to the production of food and thereby the role in influencing more sustainable food production and consumption; their values underlying their actions were sought out. This is because motives can explain their disposition towards the current food system, functioning as reasoning for their own actions partaking in alternative food provisioning channels. The semi-structured interviews allowed them to, in their own words, express and share their perceptions of the 'mainstream' food system, and their motivation for running a small scale food business through alternative provisioning channels.

6.1.1 Perceptions of the Conventional Food System

As put forward by Hinrichs (2000), Seyfang (2006) and Dubuisson-Quellier (2011), people involved in alternative food channels stand as examples that are emerging as a response to the conventional food system. These are fueled by values that are underpinned with ideas of reconnecting consumers and producers, their communities and their local foods. Such reconnections stand as a counterpoint to conventional food production (*ibid.*). The small food entrepreneurs' frustrations in regards to the consequences of conventional food system came across in the interviews (exemplified below). This was expressed in terms of how mainstream production has alienated people from understanding the origins of the food they consume.

[I]ndustrial agriculture has removed itself drastically from the world of organic farming and the ideals of ecology with the outcome that farmers producing large-scale do not understand that they are working with food to be eaten; rather they see it as a commodity produced for the market (Per, DK).

People have just swallowed raw the norms of industrialization, in that more technology and transport is good, and that producing [...] food far away with big chimneys is good (Signe, DK).

[I]f you ask a nine year old today, where a turkey comes from, they think it comes from Safeway⁹ and not from the farmer, the people that really grow the food" (Angelo, SF).

These statements go in line with the arguments of how the conventional food system has distanced people from the production of food resulting in alienation (Hinrichs 2000; Graeber 2005; Seyfang 2006). The problem herein is that, as *Angelo* (SF) stated, "if you don't know where the food comes from, you don't value people or the land that is being used for the product". Further he emphasized that if consumers, on the other hand, are more conscious about the people producing the foods they eat and understand the labor being put into the production, they learn to respect not only the people that are growing their food but also the environment. This was supported by *Mitch* (SF) who referred to the direct food provisioning channels as being great platforms for re-connecting producers and consumers.

Pertaining to the informants' thoughts about the industrial food system all of them agreed on the importance of small and local-oriented food initiatives and businesses being present in the food milieu. They argued that such local food initiatives can foster a sense of local community; by bringing people together around food and deepening people's understanding on how and who is producing their food. According to the informants this builds up the potential so that the relationship between local people and their land becomes more cohesive and integrative.

⁹ Safeway is the second largest supermarket chain in America, with approximately 1,300 stores throughout the United States.

6.1.2 Outlining Personal Drive

As stated earlier, there is limited knowledge about how sustainability entrepreneurs, or in this case, how small scale food entrepreneurs are motivated and incentivized in contrast to conventional entrepreneurs (Tilley and Young 2009; Hall et al. 2010). It was therefore deemed important to understand what these food entrepreneurs are driven by. As conveyed by Gibbs (2009) and Bjørghaug and Kvam (2011) sustainability oriented entrepreneurs and local food businesses have a different organizing logic than conventional entrepreneurs, in that instead of being profit-oriented they are motivated by social and environmental stewardship. This correlates with findings from interviews.

What has driven *Per* (DK) to be a small scale food entrepreneur is his idea of contributing to food diversity and to make the best of the heritage of land provided. He has always found it rewarding to understand the whole cycle of producing food, from planting a seed to the whole complexity of organic farming. *Katrine's* (DK) wish and ambition is to spread the joy of food and create love for fresh produce, through which she can educate people about food and cooking while at the same time providing a place where people can socialize and enjoy themselves. *Signe* (DK) is driven by the idea that she has the ability to open people's eyes to the wonders of eating locally produced food and teach people to grow their own, and by this involve people to become active in changing the current food production paradigm through the food they choose to eat. As she puts it,

When you have the work that I have, where I believe that I can make the world a better place, you want to do everything you can and not only preach to the saved, but reach those who did not know what they did not know (Signe, DK).

In San Francisco, *Mitch*, *Jeff* and *Angelo* are all driven by the love for food rich in flavor and which is produced by farmers who are passionate about their produce and respect the environment. Along with this, they prefer to nurture personal relationships with the farmers whose produce they purchase directly through farmers markets or direct sales at the farms. *Angelo* for example pointed towards the importance of appreciating people and the environment more than goods and, as he stated,

Ultimately, it is good business when you work in a community [...]. When you have a relationship with the product and people you are giving and getting an incredible contribution to life (Angelo, SF).

Mitch (SF) also mentioned the importance of the personal relations created at the direct food markets, which has a big influence on why he loves farmers markets;

Not only do you get better tasting food, you are impacting the environment through your purchasing decisions and it is all produced within a 100 miles. It makes it easy to talk to the producer and I can hear why [the food] tastes the way it does (*Mitch*, SF).

According to *Mitch*, this influences people to want to buy local for so many reasons, e.g. for supporting the local economy, the environment and it makes people feel more connected to the food.

Signe (DK) stressed the importance of not only increasing people's awareness about current food production and consumption practices that are causing damages to our health and environment, but she also pointed to how healing it is for people to take part in their own small food production. By teaching people how to grow their own food, they also get connected to how plants grow, and by this can connect to the land and the wider community. She added her vision of seeking to bring people closer to their local community but also to the environment, through dealing directly with food.

From these statements it can be concluded, that different factors have influenced the informants on the path of starting as food entrepreneurs. What they all have in common, is an interest in local food, which they pursue by advocating, producing and/or distributing it. Making available and bringing local food to the attention of people was mentioned by everyone. A conclusion here is that the driving force for working within the small scale food milieu is to increase food diversity, taking into account the well-being of local economy and people through sustainable food production and consumption practices. This portrays their holistic approach towards a more sustainable food system, and can therefore be coupled with the alternative 'green' thinking of sustainability; which according to Fox (1995), is more concerned with the seeking change in how humans relate to nature.

A conclusion can therefore be that these individuals, whether running a local food business in the area of production, distribution or initiation of food events, seek to initiate spaces for community involvement, localisation and knowledge creation about the local and wider community and land. These answers are in line with theory on the community-building contributions provided by local food producers (Seyfang 2006), and as Marsden and Smith (2005) and Ray (1999) argue, a place which invite new forms of consumer awareness, inviting people to interact and re-connect with their land and local community.

6.1.3 Balancing Risk and Motivations

All of the informants except one, referred to themselves as entrepreneurs by heart, in the sense they have always been taking part in different food- and community initiatives, starting businesses and being actively engaged in bringing change within those things they have close at heart. *Katrine* (DK) had not seen herself becoming entrepreneurial, but when she became aware of the lack of food initiatives that seek to engage people, particularly men, into cooking, this path seemed like the natural way to go.

Being an entrepreneur involves seeing opportunities even when the odds for success can be against you (Berglund 2005; Gibbs 2009). It therefore involves taking risks, which may result in periods where money is scarce. This did not seem to be an obstacle for the interviewees and speaks to the entrepreneurial character they possess. For example, *Per* (DK) said, “[t]here are no proper ecologists that haven’t tried being bankrupt” and added that if you think it is too hard, you do something else. *Signe* (DK) added to this saying, “[t]here are days where you earn money, and then there are other days where you don’t earn anything” but emphasized, it feels good anyways. *Katrine* (DK) also spoke about the sparse income however pointed towards the importance of working with what she believes in. The entrepreneurs in San Francisco also mentioned the thin monetary income, but as described by *Angelo* (SF), “it is like when you are born and then you decide on being a singer, you don’t sing because you aim at million dollar records, but you sing because you enjoy it”.

These statements go in line with theory on the risk-taking abilities of entrepreneurs (Berglund 2005; Gibbs 2009). Despite the high risk of setting out on one’s own, this has still been a natural way for them to go – working for something they enjoy, with the motivation for doing what they believe in being stronger than the fear of financial insecurity.

6.2 Obstacles for Small Scale Food Entrepreneurial Activity

Being an entrepreneur involves stepping out into unknown territory and therefore requires great willingness to take risks in the pursuit of a good idea, but an entrepreneur's ability to get an idea across can be determined by various external factors (Schlange 2009; Tilley and Young 2009). Obstacles come in many forms; this chapter will look into the institutional aspects which covers the regulatory barriers and the structural factors which refer to a society's perception of entrepreneurs (Berglund 2005). As Gibbs (2009) pointed out, without a supportive socioeconomic environment within which to operate, the internal entrepreneurial drivers may lie dormant.

By looking at the external conditions within which the food entrepreneurs operate, it is possible to conceive of potential factors that hinder small scale food initiatives to further oppose the mainstream. Identifying some of the barriers encountered by the interviewees illustrates the ways in which policy regimes and cultural perceptions may influence the capacity of alternative systems of provisioning to provide sustainable consumption opportunities.

6.2.1 Public Policy Not Geared Towards Small Scale Food Entrepreneurs

The Danish report on food entrepreneurs in Denmark, points towards how smaller food entrepreneurs are increasingly maneuvering on alternative platforms of provisioning in order to avoid some of the legal barriers that are in place and serve larger companies (NIRAS 2013). However, the extensive regulatory requirements enforced by governments were clearly identified as an obstacle by the informants of this study.

The Danish informants in particular expressed frustrations in regards to the strict food regulations of the Danish government. *Signe* stated, “I think that Denmark is a developing country in relation to supporting entrepreneurs [...] I feel like you are being punished for taking an initiative”. In line with this *Per* expressed, how the regulations are so extensive and demanding, that he was sure that not even the Danish authorities understand them. He continued elaborating on this matter in regards to being a small food entrepreneur,

You fight and hope you can do something different from what the bigger companies have to do, because you are a small business, but there is no way around it. You have to do everything and do exactly the same as the large companies which have billions in turnover. It is grotesque somehow (Per, DK).

The influence strict and extensive regulations pose on smaller scale food businesses was also recognized by the informants in San Francisco. *Mitch* for example pointed to how, a decade ago, strict food regulations made it impossible to start a small food business. This is in congruence with data on San Francisco's regulative food milieu in which point towards how the food regulations have loosened in the years following the financial crisis (Linnekin 2012; Theselc 2012; Bjerg 2013). The loosened regulations have, according to *Mitch*, turned things increasingly back to what they 'used' to be, making it easier to deal directly with the farmers, with the additional benefit of more social connection.

Denmark is putting a great deal of resources into improving the legal framework within which Danish food entrepreneurs operate (NIRAS 2013, Hoffmann et.al. 2012). Yet what can be understood from above statements and the secondary data is that there seems to be more focus on large scale oriented food entrepreneurs operating in large food companies. Legal frames, according to the interviewees, are an obstacle for smaller food entrepreneurs who do not have the same capital and resources as the bigger food corporations. This was clearly perceived to be an immense hurdle and also supported by the Danish report on Food Entrepreneurship (NIRAS 2013). Continuing on this path *Per* (DK), for example, stressed that smaller scale and more alternative food development is a much neglected area by the government which only focuses on large scale food enterprises and their success in exporting food. According to him, something radical must be done in the area of ecology, innovation and entrepreneurship as the current way of dealing with it is made very complicated by all the regulations and the different permits needed. This, he also believes, has resulted in a declining number of entrepreneurs: "[i]f you look at the overall statistics, it has become harder than ever before to be an entrepreneur [...] as far as I know, the number of [food] start-ups is declining".

The answers provided by all the informants confirm the influence the regulatory milieu has on the thriving of smaller food businesses. Where San Francisco seems to have overcome the challenges by loosening the regulations for small food entrepreneurs, food entrepreneurs in

Copenhagen are still subject to regulations and permits that are extensive and developed in mind of larger food businesses.

6.2.2 Experience of the Localities in relation to Entrepreneurial Activity

What set me out on the journey of understanding the importance of local oriented food entrepreneurs and the possible barriers hindering their activity was the ubiquitous entrepreneurial milieu I encountered in San Francisco and which I had not experienced in Copenhagen. As put forward by Berglund (2005), some societies have cultural attitudes which translate into practices that foster entrepreneurial individuals. This can in other words also refer to how a society perceives entrepreneurs, for example in how entrepreneurship as a potential career path is desirable or not; and ultimately contribute to the entrepreneurial activity in a society. Seyfang (2006) also argues that how a society responds to this niche of local food producers is vital for the thriving of these. Taking into account the answers yielded by the informants, there seems to be great difference in how they perceived the welcoming and acceptability of entrepreneurship in each city respectively.

There was an agreement among the Danish entrepreneurs, that the Danish culture does not in particular encourage entrepreneurial behavior. Comments pointing to the perception that Danes have prejudice towards entrepreneurs, came to light with statements like “a common attitude is that people are shaking their heads”, or “people see it as strange that one wants to operate outside the safe, fixed framework, with no fixed salary”. This kind of perception of society towards entrepreneurs was seen by all Danish informants to have great influence on the entrepreneurial activity in Copenhagen. *Per* (DK) for example referred to the Law of Jante (Avant and Knutsen 1993), a societal mentality which discourages those who stand out from the norm as achievers, as to being an explanation towards Danes not being as entrepreneurial as in San Francisco. This can also be compared to results from the Danish reports on entrepreneurship in Denmark, pointing towards how one reason for the ever decreasing number of individuals starting a food business might be that Danish citizens do not find it natural to do something on their own, as they feel too comfortable in the Danish welfare state (Hoffman et al. 2012; NIRAS 2013). This was also recognized by *Signe* who referred to how scared Danes are to step out of the fixed frames. Along this she was the only informant able to compare Copenhagen and San Francisco, having lived in both cities, and

emphasized that, as a small food entrepreneur, she felt more at home in San Francisco. However, she found the reason difficult to pinpoint “there was just this whole mentality and vibe of making what you believe is possible”. She exemplified by referring to the great help she was offered by the community in San Francisco as opposed to in Copenhagen. She stated that Danes do not have the mentality of asking how they can help you to get your idea across.

Turning to the interviewees from San Francisco, they all saw San Francisco as the best city in the world for encouraging food entrepreneurial activity. This was explained by referring, for example, to how everyone is ready to help you get started. This can also be explained referring back to Malik (2009) and Tozzi (2009) who describe that a crucial difference between San Francisco and other cities is that it is a hub for entrepreneurial individuals. This means, that there is a large group of people who are willing to question the current status quo and work towards alternatives to the current conventional food system. *Mitch* described this food scene by stating:

There are food pop-ups everywhere and the food industry has changed so much in the last five years. We are really on a wave right now. [...] Every week someone has come up with an idea of how to reach people through food initiatives, bringing people together around food. We have moved away from only being restaurants selling meals, now we have street vendors, pop-up events, shared kitchen spaces etc. People have realized that they have to adapt to this movement, and people have realized that this is the future.

From this a conclusion can be drawn, that the Danish informants see the cultural perception of entrepreneurial activity as an undesirable work path in Denmark and therefore can explain that not many Danes go out of the fixed frames and start a small business on their own. While the entrepreneurs in San Francisco praise the milieu in which they operate due to the great willingness among people to help each other get started.

7. Discussion

This chapter will discuss the results obtained from the empirical data in combination with the literature used throughout the thesis, taking into account the research questions. The pursuit of answers required a deep understanding of the central actors of the paper. For this reason, as I bring all the aspects of the study together, it is important to begin with the entrepreneur. Once

their make-up and motivation is examined, the context in which they operate and how that influences them requires discussion. In doing this, I will touch on the external influences present in the two locales of research, which can explain somewhat the nuances of small food entrepreneurial activity in Copenhagen and San Francisco.

7.1 The Small Food Entrepreneur as Agents of Change

In line with awareness on the broader social and environmental consequences of the conventional food system, entrepreneurs have increasingly been turned towards as a panacea for many social and environmental solutions (Schaltegger and Wagner 2011). But despite the role they have been given in fostering change and paving the way towards a more sustainable society, our understanding of how they are incentivized and how changes may unfold beyond the existing markets is blurry (Hall et al. 2010).

As outlined in the beginning of this paper, there are different types of entrepreneurs operating within different sets of visions and values and therefore it also results in different courses of actions towards the development of a more sustainable food system (Tilley and Young 2009). In mainstream literature on sustainability-oriented entrepreneurs, the attention seems at large to encompass entrepreneurs who operate under the ecological modernization paradigm of food production and provisioning. Such approaches take into account sustainability measures such as technological efficiency coupled to rationalization of resources but without leaving the path of large scale production and far-reached food miles. In other words, continuing on the path of commodified produce, getting nowhere further in closing the gap of alienation between the final consumer and food production. One such example can be exemplified by how the concept of organic has been widely adopted by consumers and mainstream provisioning channels. Supermarkets are for example increasingly offering organic produce for the consumers to have the choice of practicing sustainable consumption. However, one can argue that these products are still largely produced within mainstream production practices, produced on economies of scale and flown across the globe. These strategies take into account sustainable management of natural resources but not the social aspects of supporting the more local and smaller scale producers, and do not close the gap of alienation which is largely influencing consumers purchasing decisions.

Steyaert and Hjort (2003) argue that the various ways in which entrepreneurship is defined and understood does not need to lead to dissonance, but rather seen as an opening for recognizing different paradigmatic understandings of the concept. However it was still found important to take a stance in relation to how the term “entrepreneur” was used, along with sustainability, due to the various understandings surrounding the concepts. That is, with focus on entrepreneurial individuals who operate outside the mainstream paradigm on more alternative platforms of provisioning and who seek change in how humans relate to nature in opposition to the more instrumental view (Schumacher 1993). Based on the primary and secondary findings, field trip and observations of this thesis, a major insight is that the entrepreneurs in both Copenhagen and San Francisco share commonalities as entrepreneurs and their visions about the food system, despite their different backgrounds and nationalities. They all possessed the common ideas and values about re-connecting producers and consumers, establishing personal relations to the local community through the more direct food provisioning channels. These ideas have served as the fuel for them in starting their small food business.

The small food entrepreneurs base their businesses upon ideals that encompass valuing land and community. Though still taking part in the market, they are, as we have seen, operating on more ‘alternative’ and direct platforms. Instead of aiming at selling their produce on local supermarket shelves dominated by the bigger players, they see opportunities in activities such as arranging food events, street-food pop-ups, farmers markets and niche shops and restaurants. Not only are they making available local food produced with care and respect for the natural and social environment, they are also visible in the streets enabling direct contact between producers and consumers. Establishing this contact with consumers’ gives small scale food entrepreneurs a chance to inspire and share knowledge, not only indirectly through the food they are selling and promoting, but also directly, and through their ability to share ideas about a system that values the local connection between producers and consumers.

What characterises entrepreneurial individuals is their ability to inspire people to adapt new visions for the future, acting as the facilitators of bridging people from an old way of doing to a new one (Tilley and Young 2009; Gibbs 2009). Pertaining to the informants values, such individuals present on the food scene could arguably be seen them as important actors in engaging people with food, initiating activities, and creating a milieu for people to interact

with each other through ‘new’ retail experiences. These entrepreneurs see the importance of bringing people together around food, fostering community feeling and increase consumers’ understanding of and care for environmental wellbeing with food as the mediator. As Seyfang (2006), states, creating new distribution channels to bypass the supermarket supply chains are a particular challenge for small food producers. But as she argues, a way to overcome this is through the promotion of local food, which nurtures a new sense of connection with the land, and through which a concern for the authenticity and source of the food we eat can grow among people. Marsden and Smith (2005, 442) also agree that local food provisioning channels offer a space where people can meet, share and generate ideas of future visions for the food system, and “build and cement mutually beneficial relationship between suppliers, producers and consumers”. Returning to the community building function of alternative food systems coupled with answers yielded by the informants, such alternative places can be argued to invite people to interact with their local community, which can add to a sense of belonging to a community and responsibility for its viability and preservation; and thereby influence awareness and consumption habits.

The prevalence of these entrepreneurial individuals also provides platforms for people to enact on active citizenship that counteracts the conventional food system. By adopting this form of food provisioning, as argued by Seyfang (2006, 5), “the (re)localisation or shortening of food supply chains explicitly challenges the industrial farming and global food transport model embodied in the conventional food consumption”. Looking at all these factors I believe the initiatives made available by the small scale food entrepreneurs discussed in this thesis are an example of initiatives that are pivotal if we are to make the move towards a food system which bases production closer to production for the benefit of the environment and local community.

7.2 The External Milieu

The entrepreneurs’ drive and underlying values for running a small food business did not differ across the geographical locations of research. But their presence is not only dependent on themselves; the external environment also has an influence (Berglund 2005). As argued by Gibbs (2009) there is therefore a concern, that although these individuals are highly passionate and motivated, the enthusiasm for strengthening local production and consumption through entrepreneurship may be dampened by institutional obstacles and a failure by governments to

adopt coherent strategies suited to smaller food entrepreneurs. These obstacles came into particular focus regarding Danish food regulations. Informants in both locations recognized how regulations enforced by the government have an influence on activity in the small scale food sector. However, a constraint recognized and felt particularly by the Danish informants is the high level of control imposed by the Danish government on food production. One can argue about the pros and cons of these regulations, since they often are imposed for the sake of food safety. It should also be considered that many of the regulations evolving around food production have been developed with the intention of large-scale export (Seyfang 2004; NIRAS 2013). This reflects that, though Denmark advocates for a more sustainable food system, current legislation on food production and consumption reflects the mainstream paradigm of large-scale industrial food production for export and mass consumption with seemingly little significance given to the smaller food entrepreneurs.

Contrasting this argument with primary and secondary material from San Francisco, it becomes clear how changing legislation has enabled the small scale food sector to thrive, giving people new economic opportunities, a greater chance to follow their passion for local food, and establish small food initiatives which create the opportunities to foster closer relationships between producers and consumers. For that reason, one could argue, that the Danish government should reconsider if small food production for local consumption should go through same procedures as the large scale and export oriented food enterprises. As also suggested by the NIRAS report on food entrepreneurs in Denmark, the solution is not to loosen the control, but to enable more adaptable and flexible case management which is responsive to criticism (NIRAS 2013). This is also supported by Seyfang's (2006) concern, that while organic food is supported by government policy, this is within the context of global trade, and that policies fail to address more locally oriented, small scale food production. San Francisco provides, in this regard, a great example for where the government has loosened its grip, somewhat, for the benefit of a lively entrepreneurial food scene. As the San Francisco respondents agreed, great changes have happened in regards to a flourishing food scene since the Cottage Food Act which has allowed people to produce food from their own kitchens and sell on the streets, enabling a more diverse, direct and vibrant food scene. This shows the importance of support from existing policies, giving alternative food businesses space to thrive. As argued by Seyfang (2005),

“alternative initiatives for sustainable consumption do not require top-down government control, but rather the ability to grow and flourish externally to the mainstream without being squeezed out of existence by a policy-making process which is blind to their contribution to sustainable consumption” (*ibid.*, 303).

Another area given attention to by the informants was the structural factors perceived to influence entrepreneurial activity. While the Danish entrepreneurs commented on the lack of entrepreneurial culture in Denmark, the entrepreneurs in San Francisco commented on the great accept towards entrepreneurial activity in San Francisco. One can argue, that because San Francisco is a hub for entrepreneurs and therefore a city where entrepreneurs flock to for realizing their ideas, this gives rise to a milieu where a great amount of people work independently and therefore ignites a somewhat normalcy to being entrepreneurial. This can again be coupled with the informants’ view upon the help they’ve been given in starting their business. While the informants in San Francisco agreed upon great support from people around them, the Danish entrepreneurs saw it as a rather lonely task and showed frustrations in regards to Danish citizens not taking more responsibility by stepping out of their comfort zones to get involved in improving the food system through smaller food businesses. However, here one can refer back to the strict regulative control posed by the Danish government which also can have an influence, in that people who might want to start a small business get discouraged due to the extensive regulations.

Pertaining to some of the perceived hindrances for smaller scale entrepreneurial activity, this brings to attention that not all individuals are able nor willing to take the risks involved in stepping out of the fixed frame in order to be a part of the change they want to see in the food system. Bearing in mind the dual stances of ‘green’ thinking and how food is an essential component of life, the production practices and values people involved in our food system have, are pivotal if we are to usher forward more alternative means of sustainable food production and consumption. In addition, given that everyone interacts with food on a daily basis, entrepreneurs advocating local food produced on smaller scale and offered through alternative provisioning channels, can arguably be seen as a good media for promoting the transitioning of closer producer consumer relations, community connection and food awareness.

8. Conclusion

For the prospect of a vibrant food scene buzzing with small local food vendors offering local, seasonal and diverse produce as an alternative to the conventional food system, this thesis sought to understand the role of small scale food entrepreneurs as agents of change in closing the distance between consumers and producers, with food as the mediator. In understanding this, exploring the driving force from which small food entrepreneurs operate was important, as well as what might function as particularly challenging in their pursuit of operating a small scale food business.

Though there is mounting interest in alternative and more sustainable food production and consumption practices, along with the emphasis on entrepreneurs as a panacea for solving social and environmental issues, there is dearth of empirical research on what values these entrepreneurs are driven by, how they operate and their role in changing the current food paradigm. This thesis has therefore contributed to an area of research which merits more focus and attention.

Based on obtained results and analysis, it is apparent that small scale food entrepreneurs create a platform for people to interact with local producers, while seeking to increase peoples' knowledge of food and reconnect them with the local land and community. These entrepreneurs can therefore be said to play a role in mitigating peoples' alienation in relation to food. Through their activities, they contribute to an understanding of the different processes involved in food production, and hence create awareness which hopefully can play a role in consumers' food choices in the future.

Rather than being profit-driven, local food entrepreneurs are driven by social and environmental benefits of a more local food system. Through their bottom-up approach and engagement, charisma and willingness to share their vision of a better and more just food system, the food entrepreneurs are themselves taking part in the change they want to see in food production and consumption of food. Therefore, they can be seen as great role models, leading the way by providing platforms for influencing consumers' understanding of food; a great manifestation in counteracting the alienation created by the globalized food paradigm.

While both groups of interviewees were fairly similar in their motivation for being food entrepreneurs, the divergence of entrepreneurial activity seems to have less to do with who they are as entrepreneurs and more to do with their external conditions, here investigated in the form of regulatory constraints and cultural perceptions of entrepreneurs. From the obstacles perceived by the food entrepreneurs of this study, it seems reasonable to conclude that Copenhagen can learn something from San Francisco, when it comes to regulations. For example, by limiting the regulations on small food entrepreneurs by adopting an equivalent of the California Cottage Act could impact the Copenhagen food scene positively.

The lesson for policymakers from this research is clear. Local food initiatives undertaken by food entrepreneurs provide a welcome supply of sustainable food for their community. But their efforts and impacts could be taken further if policy frameworks and social mentality would adapt to allow them to thrive; that is, making space for enthusiastic individuals and allowing them to grow and develop on their own terms, rather than being incorporated and appropriated by mainstream provision channels. Small food entrepreneurs have an important role to play and could be a potential powerful vehicle in the transition towards a more sustainable food system, reconfiguring people's relationship to food, the land and the people producing it.

9. References

- Avant, Gayle E., and Karen Patrick Knutsen, 1993. Understanding Cultural Differences: Janteloven and Social Conformity in Norway. *ETC: A Review of General Semantics* 50 (4): 449-460.
- Batliwalla, Shyla, 2011. Chef Mitchell Rosenthal on his New Book and the Secret to his Legendary Fried Chicken. *Huffington Post*, 28 November 2011, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/09/28/chef-mitchell-rosenthal_n_940577.html (accessed January 25, 2014).
- Berglund, Henrik, 2005. *Toward a Theory of Entrepreneurial Action: Exploring Risk, Opportunity and Self in Technology Entrepreneurship* Goteborg: Chalmers tekniska högskola 2005, <http://www.henrikberglund.com/thesis/Literature%20review.htm> (accessed December 3, 2013).
- Bjerg, Alexandra, 2013, *California Homemade Food Law Opens Up Tasty Small Business Opportunities* [Homepage of California Economic Summit], <http://www.caeconomy.org/reporting/entry/california-homemade-food-law-opens-up-tasty-small-business-opportunities> (accessed 25 January, 2013).
- Bjørkhaug, Hilde and Gunn T. Kvam, 2011. Local Small-scale Food Enterprises: Ambitions and Initiatives for Achieving Business Growth Among Male and Female Owners and Managers. *Journal of Depopulation and Rural Development Studies*, October 2011, pp. 29-55. http://www.cedar.org/content/files/articulof_339_03_29-56.pdf (accessed September 1, 2013).
- Bryman, Alan, 2004. *Social Research Methods*. 2nd ed., New York: Oxford University Press,.
- Chandler, Alfred D., 1977. *The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap.
- Corbin, Juliet M., and Anselm L. Strauss, 2008. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory* Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Denmark, 2013. Food Co-Op Takes Over Denmark. The official website of Denmark, <http://video.denmark.dk/video/6940601/food-co-op-takes-over> (accessed November13, 2013).
- Dubuisson-Quellier, Sophie, 2011. Scaling Up/Scaling Down. *Limn*. <http://limn.it/scaling-upscaling-down/> (accessed January 18, 2014).
- European Commission, 2014. European Green Capital. The European Commission, Environment, <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/europeangreencapital/winning-cities/2014-copenhagen/> (accessed January 18, 2014).
- FAO, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2014. Street Foods. <http://www.fao.org/fcif/food-processing/street-foods/en/> (accessed Des. 12, 2013.)

Fox, Warick, 1995. *Toward a Transpersonal Ecology: Developing New Foundations for Environmentalism*. New York: Green Books Ltd.

Gibbs, David, 2009. Stakeholder Entrepreneurs, Ecopreneurs and the Development of a Sustainable Economy. *Greener Management International*, Issue 55: 63-78.

Gorbis, Mariana, 2013. The Reality of What Makes Silicon Valley Tick. *Harward Business review*, <http://blogs.hbr.org/2013/04/the-reality-of-what-makes-sili/> (accessed January 25, 2014).

Graeber, David, 2005. Fetishism as Social Creativity: or, Fetishes are Gods in the Process of Construction. *Anthropological Theory* 5(4): 407-438

Hajer, Maarten A., 1995. *The Politics of Environmental Discourse: Ecological Modernisation and the Policy Process*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hall, Jeremy K., Gregory A. Daneke, and Michael J. Lenox, 2010. Sustainable Development and Entrepreneurship: Past Contributions and Future Directions." *Journal of Business Venturing* 25(5):439-448.

Hinrichs, Clare C., 2000. Embeddedness and Local Food Systems: Notes on Two Types of Direct Agricultural Market. *Journal of Rural Studies* 16(3):295-303.

Hoffmann, Anders, Katrine Pedersen, Julie Haslam Nielsen, Majken Caroline Jacobsen, and Henrik N. Piester, 2012. Iværksætter Index 2012 – Vilkår for iværksætttere i Danmark. *Erhvervsstyrelsen*, Nov. 2012, 3-45, <http://erhvervsstyrelsen.dk/file/291799/Ivaerksaetterindeks-2012-endelig-version.pdf> (accessed October 5, 2013).

Holloway, Lewis. and Moya Kneafsey, 2000. Reading the Space of Farmer's Market: A Case Study from the United Kingdom, *Sociologica Ruralis* 40: 285-299.

Kenney, Martin, 2000. *Understanding Silicon Valley: The Anatomy of an Entrepreneurial Region* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Kneafsey, Moya, Brian Ilbery, and Tim Jenkins, 2001. Exploring the Dimensions of Culture Economies in Rural West Wales. *European Society for Rural Sociology* 41(3): 296-310.

Kvale, Steinar, 2007. Planning an Interview Study. In O. Flick (ed.), *Doing Interviews*, pp. 34-50. London: SAGE.

Linnekin, Baylen, 2012. San Francisco's Libertarian Food Market is Closing – But the Movement it Inspired will Continue. *Reason, Culture*, 08.12.2012, <http://reason.com/archives/2012/12/08/foraging-a-new-path/1> (accessed November 27, 2013).

Malik, Om, 2009. What Makes Silicon Valley Special? Eternal Optimism of the Innovative Mind. 02.12.2009, <http://gigaom.com/2009/12/02/what-makes-silicon-valley-special-eternal-optimism-of-the-innovative-mind/> (accessed November 17, 2013).

- Maniates, M, 2002. Individualization: Plant a Tree, Buy a Bike, Save the World? In T.Princen, M. Maniates and K. Konca (eds), *Confronting Consumption*, pp. 43-66. London: MIT Press.
- Marsden, Terry and Everard Smith, 2005. Ecological Entrepreneurship: Sustainable Development in Local Communities through Quality Food Production and Local Branding. *Geoforum* 36(4):440-451.
- Martinez-Alier, Joan, 2002. *The Environmentalism of the Poor: A Study of Ecological Conflicts and Valuation*. Cheltenham; Edward Elgar.
- Marx, Karl, 1887. *Capital*: Volume I. Part 1: Commodities and Money. <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch01.htm#S4> (accessed 12.12.2013)
- McClelland, David Clarence, 1961. *The Achieving Society*. Princeton: Van Nostrand.
- Miles, M. B., 1979. Qualitative Data as an Attractive Nuisance. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 24: 590-601.
- Newnordicfood, 2013. New Nordic Kitchen Manifesto. New Nordic Food, <http://newnordicfood.org/about-nnf-ii/new-nordic-kitchen-manifesto/> (accessed 31 October, 2013)
- NIRAS, 2013. *Vækstiværksættere i fødevarebranchen*, Erhvervs- og Vækstministeriet, Denmark, Januar 2013, <http://www.evm.dk/~media/oem/pdf/2013/2013-publikationer/25-04-13-vækstteam-fødevarer-anbefalinger/niras-2013-vækstivaerksaettere-i-fødevarebranchen.ashx> (accessed October 23, 2013).
- Nordicfoodlab, 2013. About Nordic Foodlab. Copenhagen, <http://nordicfoodlab.org/> (accessed October 12, 2013).
- O'Neill Jr, Gerald D., James C. Hershauer, and Jay S. Golden, 2009. The Cultural Context of Sustainability Entrepreneurship. *Greener Management International* no. 55: 33-46.
- O'Riordan, Timothy, 2001. *Globalism, Localism and Identity: Fresh Perspectives on the Transition to Sustainability* London: Earchscan.
- Pascual, Oriol, Arhen van Klink, Julio A.R. Grisales, 2011. *Create Impact! Handbook for Sustainable Entrepreneurship*. COLOPHON, Envio - innovators for sustainability
- Peters, Erica J., 2013. *San Francisco: A Food Biography*. Lanman, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield/AltaMira.
- Ray, Christopher, 1999. Towards a Meta-Framework of Endogeneous Development: Repertoires, Paths, Democracy and Rights. *Sociologia Ruralis* 39(4):521-535.

Renaissance Forge, 2013. About Angelo Garro, <http://renaissanceforge.com/index.html> (accessed 10 October, 2013).

Schaltegger, Stefen and Marcus Wagner, 2011. Sustainable Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Innovation: Categories and Interactions. *Business Strategy & the Environment* 20(4):222-237.

Schlange, Lutz E., 2009. Stakeholder Identification in Sustainability Entrepreneurship. *Greener Management International* no. 55: 13-32.

Schumacher, Ernst F., 1993. *Small is Beautiful: A Study on Economics as if People Mattered*. London: Vintage.

Seyfang, Gill, 2004. *Local Organic Food: The Social Implications of Sustainable Consumption*. Norwich: Centre for Social and Economic Research on the Global Environment (CSERGE) working paper, University of East Anglia pp. 1-15.

Seyfang, Gill, 2005. *Shopping for Sustainability: Can Sustainable Consumption Promote Ecological Citizenship?* Norwich: Centre for Social and Economic Research on the Global Environment, Environmental Politics, Vol. 14, No. 2, 290-306.

Seyfang, Gill, 2006. *Sustainable Consumption, the New Economics and Local Organic Food*. Norwich: Centre for Social and Economic Research on the Global Environment (CSERGE) working paper EDM 06-12, University of East Anglia pp. 1-10.

SFgov, 2013. Quick Guide – Doing Business in SF. City and County of San Francisco. <http://www6.sfgov.org/index.aspx?page=3> (accessed November 21, 2013).

Shaper, Michael (ed.), 2010. *Making Ecopreneurs: Developing Sustainable Entrepreneurship*. 2nd ed. Corporate Social Responsibility Series, Gower, http://www.google.dk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=AIRILhGp3yUC&oi=fnd&pg=PR9&dq=entrepreneurship+for+sustainable+food&ots=bEnN2Iqewo&sig=PchhtZeBRsCwW8FOHqKZM3eHVa8&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false (accessed Nov 10, 2013).

Steyaert C., and D. Hjort, 2003 ‘Creative Movements of Entrepreneurship’, in C. Steyaert and D. Hjort (eds.), *New Movements in Entrepreneurship* (Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar): 3-19.

Theselc. ,2012. Cottage Food Law Bill Language, The Sustainable Economic Law Center, <http://www.theselc.org/cottage-food-laws/cottage-food-law-bill-language/> (accessed 23 January, 2014).

The World Bank, 2013, *Ease of Doing Business Index (1=most business-friendly regulations)*, The World Bank, http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/IC.BUS.EASE.XQ?order=wbapi_data_value_2009+wbapi_data_value+wbapi_data_value-last&sort=asc (accessed January 25, 2014).

Tilley, Fiona, and William Young, 2009. Sustainability Entrepreneurs. *Greener Management International* no. 55: 79-92.

Tozzi, John, 2009. Entrepreneurs Keep the Local Food Movement Hot."BusinessWeek.com, December 18, 2009,
http://www.businessweek.com/smallbiz/content/dec2009/sb20091217_914398.htm
(accessed November 10, 2013)

Tveit, Geir and Peter Sandøe, ed. 2011. *Økologiske Fødevarer – hvor bevæger forbrugeren sig hen?* Center for Bioetik og Risikovurdering.,
http://www.bioethics.dk/~media/Bioethics/Dokumenter/Publikationer/Okologiske_fodevarer_CeBRA.ashx (accessed October 3, 2013).

United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD), 1994. Symposium on Sustainable Consumption, Oslo.

Van der Ploeg, J.D. and Renting, H.,2000: Impact and Potential: A Comparative Review of Rural Development Practices. *Sociologia Ruralis*40(4)529-543.

Weathington, Bart L., Christopher J.L. Cunningham, and David J. Pittenger, 2010. *Research Methods for the Behavioural and Social Sciences*. Hopboken NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Wengraf, Trisha, 2001. *Qualitative Research Interviewing: Biographic Narrative and Semi-Structured interviews*. London, SAGE Publications.

World Population Statistics 2013. San Francisco Population 2013, California,
<http://www.worldpopulationstatistics.com/san-francisco-population-2013/>
(accessed November 20, 2013).

Wright, R. 2007. Danes demand organic, *Irish Farmers Monthly*, pp.18-18.

Økologisk Landsforening, 2014. Om os. <http://www.okologi.dk/om-oekologisk-landsforening.aspx> (accessed December 12, 2013).

10.Appendix

Appendix A - Interview Guide

Frame for Research Questions

Basic info:

Date:
Location:
Interviewer:
Interviewee:

BASIC INFO ABOUT INTERVIEWEE AND HIS/HER BUSINESS

Business situation

- ❖ Can you shortly describe what you are working with at the moment?
- ❖ Are you running your own business? Or have been?
 - if yes... can you quickly describe the overall of what you are working on.
- ❖ Is your work important to you?
 - If yes, why is it important to you?
- ❖ For how long have you been working within this field?
 - How long has your business existed – numbers of co-founders? numbers of employees?
 - What is your task?
 - What is the goal with the business?
- ❖ Did you get support from your network i.e. family, friends, co-workers etc.?
- ❖ What were your biggest frustrations in relation to getting started?
- ❖ Looking back to when you started, what advice or what help did you need the most?

POLITICAL/REGULATIVE ASPECTS – PROS & CONS

Research questions: What are the enabling factors and barriers when it comes to regulations for entrepreneurial activities in Denmark?

Interview questions:

- ❖ Do you think that Denmark is doing well in supporting food entrepreneurial start-ups?
 - If yes.... Can you describe what you think they are doing correct
 - IF no.... how do you think they can improve
 - Why do you think it is important for DK to foster an encouraging environment for food entrepreneurs?
 - Do you think that food entrepreneurs play a vital role towards a more sustainable food sector?
 - How?
 - What do you see as the main challenges when launching a sustainability driven business, in this aspect organic products to the market?

Research questions: What are the funding possibilities in Denmark

- Start-up entrepreneurs are often heavily dependent on external funding in order to get started. Do you find it easy for food entrepreneurs to get funding?

PERSONAL PERSPECTIVE ON BEING AN ENTREPRENEUR

Research questions: What are the driving forces as a small food entrepreneur?

Interview questions:

- ❖ In your business, what are your core values?
 - Do you see yourself as an entrepreneur?
 - If yes,....
 - If no,

- Have you always been enthusiast about local organic farming/products?
- Throughout your work within organic farming, what would you say has been the main driving factor?
- Have you always been valued the environment?
- Working within the field of organic farming and have you been forced to change some of your core values in order to make it go round?
- In what way do you see the trends is moving in relation to organic consumption? (Supermarkets vs. farmers markets).
 - Have you in recent years experienced a change in consumer behaviour in relation to organic and local foods?
 - How do you think we best possible reconnect and make organic mainstream?
- Do you think that Denmark/SF has a good frame for fostering food entrepreneurship?
- Do you have any suggestions for how Denmark/SF could improve the entrepreneurial environment/culture? Both politically and culturally

Research questions: How would you describe your internal entrepreneurial side of you? (did it come naturally, because you felt something missing, coincidental)

Interview questions:

- ❖ Do you see yourself as an entrepreneur?
 - If yes, how...
 - If no, why....
- ❖ Have you always wanted to be your own boss
 - If yes, why?
 - ◆ Have you been running other companies before this one?
 - ◆ When did you start your first business?
 - If no, how did you end up here?
- ❖ How come you went independent, i.e. was it because you wanted to be your own boss, or because you saw that there was something missing and that you could do it better?
- ❖ What motivated you throughout the whole process of starting up your business?

Have you been in San Francisco? Can you compare the entrepreneurial environment?

The Cultural/ Outside Perspective/Mentality towards entrepreneurial acitivity

- How do you feel people in general are looking upon entrepreneurship?