



# Capitalism as a systematic structure of oppression: participatory action research in a community supported agriculture project

Alessandra Piccoli <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Education, Free University Bozen, Italy

## Abstract

*The aim of this paper is to present the results of a PAR that analyses how capitalism as a systematic structure of oppression could be, partially, dealt with by community supported agriculture (CSA) in a marginal rural area and how PAR could support activism in this field.*

*The assumption of capitalism as a coercive system has a strong literature base, as the possibility to identify an alternative through community based projects.*

*The research question analysed in this paper is: what is the contribution of participatory action research to a community supported agriculture project?*

*The research design has been developed through direct and on-going cooperation between the researcher and the community. At the initial stage the scholar shared the basic theoretical framework connected to the literature on CSA, as well as critical analysis of capitalism and post-growth. She then took part in all meetings (about seven formal plus several informal) with an observing participation, collecting field notes and recording. During the third step, she interviewed seven participants, dividing them into three groups: local policy makers (one), farmers (one) and prosumers (five). Finally a feedback session took place, as a first step in shaping the next phase for the following year's action.*

*The results show that the reflection proposed by the researcher has offered a significant opportunity to clarify problems, potentialities and the deep meaning of the project.*

**Keywords:** Knowledge generation, Action research, Explicit theorists, Trans disciplinary, Capitalism

---

## Introduction

Action research is a process of knowledge generation aimed at producing theoretical (research) and practical (action) knowledge, bringing together action and reflection, theory and practice, to respond to problems of people and communities. It becomes participatory when it combines the contribution of academic and non-academic subjects. In order to be participatory, research needs to have always two purposes: to understand the reality but also to change it through the qualification and emancipation of non-academic participants, both individually and collectively. In this context, social actors do research, influence and learn. (Unger 2013)

Reason and Badbury (2007) state that "for some, action research is primarily an individual question through which professionals can answer the question 'how can I improve my practical skills?' For others, action research is closely linked to development and improvement of organizational practices of companies and public organizations. For the majority, action research is a liberation practice aimed at redesigning power imbalances and restoring normal self-esteem and the ability to manage one's own live".

The participatory action research finds its epistemological basis in the "modus 2" of the production of knowledge that takes place today in new places by not exclusively academic subjects, is distributed in society, oriented towards practice, trans disciplinary and subject to multiple verifications (Nowotny 2003 ). In fact, action research starts from the assumption that human beings are constructors of theories based on reality, continually verifying them with action. The difference between academic and other researchers is that the former are explicit theorists, while the latter are tacit theorists. The goal of action research is to make these tacit theories explicit so that they can be examined and changed (Friedman 2008).

Participatory research starts from a basic mental attitude that recognizes in all the members of the human community and of a specific community a dignity of knowledge and skills possessed. Participation in research helps develop and implement co-learning, capacity-building and empowerment processes. In particular, empowerment influences people's ability to act in a collective context by developing organizational skills,

challenging asymmetries of power, achieving results on different levels, from the psychological to the family through to the development of social capital and social cohesion, transformation of institutions, greater access to resources, open governance and increased equity in the community. However, before a change can take place it is necessary that the actors involved develop an awareness that the reality we have co-created, even unintentionally, can be reshaped through a participatory investigation (Bradbury 2007).

The groups that undertake participatory research engage in a circle that sees alternating reflection and action. Self-reflection is a central element to activate the empowerment of co-researchers and is catalysed by involvement in decision-making. Research is participatory to the extent that the generation of knowledge is based on mixing the academic perspective with that of non-academic participants and not a simple extraction of knowledge pursued by academics on the participants. Participatory research must therefore bear clearly in mind the objective of providing people who are in some way oppressed with the tools for a self-analysis of their own life and resources.

However, it must be remembered that the mere generation of knowledge does not automatically lead to its spread in politics and in practice: an effort must be made to make this happen and the academic world is called upon to participate in this effort. In this context, the researcher is guarantor of the rigour with which the validity and credibility of the knowledge produced is ensured. The researcher is a trainer, a coach, a mentor, a partner in the dialogue, a co-apprentice and a facilitator. Denzin and Lincoln (2003) argue that there is a pressing need to demonstrate how the practice of qualitative research can help change the world for the better. It is therefore necessary to continue to devote ourselves to the pedagogical, theoretical and practical commitment to qualitative research as a form of practice of radical democracy. In recent years, there has been considerable growth in research awareness and involvement in overcoming traditional restrictions on producing knowledge, thereby building bridges between research and activism (Unger, 2013).

### Theoretical framework

The assumption of capitalism as a coercive system has a strong foundation in the literature. The critique of capitalism begins with Karl Polanyi, who highlights how the transformation of work and natural resources into commodities collides with their finite nature given by nature itself. On the other hand, using money, which is a means of value communication, as a tool for speculation generates instability. Capitalism based on "these two actions of commodification of human resources and natural resources is not possible without annihilating the human and natural substances of society; it would have physically destroyed man and his surroundings into wilderness" (Polanyi, 2001).

Already at the end of the nineteenth century, Rosa Luxemburg argued that accumulation through dispossession is the violent matrix of capitalism that can be likened to cannibalism, to predation based on the deception of previous phases, although in capitalism this accumulation is legally accepted. This accumulation is the centre of Dörre's *Landnahmen* (2015, 30): "Capitalism cannot exist without *Landnahmen* - that is, without the harnessing of external assets values (including idle labour power). Nevertheless, the actual goals, forms and means of varying sharply, the choice of strategy is always a political process, which implies that *Landnahmen*, at least to some extent, can be subject to political influence".

In the capitalist system, inequalities are strongly desired because they fuel competition. In fact, a necessary element for the preservation of the system is the existence of a class of workers whose lives are dominated by arbitrariness and insecurity. Being under qualified, they are always at risk of expulsion from the labour market to escape from which they are willing to do anything. These are ultimately exploitable and in conflict with one another.

There is still the possibility of identifying an alternative through community based projects. Voluntary, bottom-up solutions can be efficient in scaling-down the economy, considering that the debates on the meaning of growth need a holistic understanding of human beings. According to Bloemmen (2015, 112) "it is urgent to revisit the concept of an economic actor as a basis for economic theory and practice. Human beings feel good when they develop helpful, cooperative and altruistic behaviour [...] The neoclassical economic theory assumes that the *Homo economicus* is a 'narrow self'. The standard microeconomic approach is based upon the reductionist vision of human beings as individualistic, egoistic, competitive and profit and utility maximisers. We need to criticize and reconceptualize the *Homo economicus*."

However, economic ideology, understood as a system or architecture of ideas, rests on a mental universe that makes the functioning of the economy operate on three levels (Bloemmen, 2015):

1. The anthropological level, which refers to the conception of man as *homo economicus*, also based on three dimensions: naturalism (the idea that man possesses a 'natural' nature with certain needs), hedonism (according to which human behaviour is driven by the pursuit of pleasure and escape from pain), individualism (man is born as an atom that only later aggregates with other atoms in social obstruction)

2. The social or socio-political level, which refers to the conception of society, with its three dimensions: contractualism (society and the State derive from contracts between individuals), productivism (the association between men is interested in producing wealth and not an end in itself), privatism (man is the owner of himself and of nature)

3. The physical-technical level, which expresses the conception of nature, with three elements: scarcity (of means, goods and objects suitable for satisfying human needs), technicality (to profit from the means available man must use physical strength and ingenuity) and labourism (the laborious transformation of nature is an obligation). This construction of meaning is the result of cultural representations, customs and conventions inserted into a secular tradition, but not for this reason natural realities or unchangeable materials. Contrary to what is held by classical economic thought, for which political economy is “the search for the laws that regulate the reproduction of the material basis of society through the production, distribution and consumption of wealth [... and ] the naturalness of these laws results from the logical and mechanical functioning of the model within the framework of its assumptions [...] therefore the economy appears as the creation of a field of meaning. The end point of the process is the construction of a limited set of concepts necessary and sufficient to account for a reality that the same constitution requires to consider as economic. This extraordinary result was only possible thanks to a long, patient and complex, prodigious historical work: the creation of the ideological pre-suppositions of the apprehension of the world in the form of the triangle naturalism-hedonism-individualism “. I would to conclude by saying that "if there is something universal at the basis of the economy, the economy itself is not universal" (Latouche, 2010, 28). Modern society, from this point of view, is the first that made self-preservation the first, if not the only, fundamental value of the identity of the individual, in opposition to the past where honour and shame depended on the choice of the extreme sacrifice for one's ideals or for one's community as the foundation of self-esteem. The purpose of modern man is the enjoyment of the goods and pleasures of life, and freedom is what guarantees that this can happen. The presumably objective (or materialist) description of Hobbes' human nature aims to "provide himself in advance with the anthropological conditions of the sought-after pacification, inserting them in the way of posing the political problem itself" (Michea, 2008, 31).

A possibility to escape is there, “Global financial crisis, fatigue, innovation blockages, and post-democracy all seem to indicate that the financial capitalist Landnahme is nearing its intrinsic limits. These limits were not created by protest movements, but rather are central functional mechanism of the system itself. To the extent that subaltern groups become conscious and aware of this fact, avenues for change will emerge“ (Dörre, 2015, 62).

According to Zsolnai & Podmaniczky (2010), “social integration requires that the activities of economic organizations: ensure a decent livelihood for workers, provide customers with real values, make fair trades with suppliers, and establish collaboration with local communities”, and to do that CSA can support the process “de-emphasizing profit maximization and market systems and introducing small-scale, locally adaptable, culturally diverse modes of substantive economic activities”. And again we can say that “Community based economy ... is an effective approach to combat poverty, foster eco-social transformation, and create more equitable, independent, self-reliant, and resilient communities... community-based development approaches aim to change institutions and have a broader view of humans as stewards of their own future on earth... to have a community-based economic sector in place is a strong base for a resilient community” (Elsen, 2019, 1).

### **Research questions and objectives of the study**

These are the general assumptions behind the research questions guiding this presentation, which are: What is the potential of a social and solidarity economy project, namely a community supported agriculture initiative, in facing capitalism as a systematic structure of oppression? And: What is the contribution of participatory action research to a community supported agriculture project?

Through this paper I aim to present the results of a PAR dedicated to analysing how capitalism as systematic structure of oppression could be, partially, faced by community supported agriculture (CSA) in a marginal rural area and how PAR could support activism in this field.

### **Research design and methodology**

The methodological approach adopted is that of participatory action research. Following the scheme proposed by Unger (2013), eight steps were followed to conduct an effective participatory research:

1. Identification of the participants, the topic of the research, the requests of the group and the rules including the ethical ones
2. Shared definition of objectives
3. Design of the research and training of co-researchers to ensure the active involvement of co-researchers
4. Data collection

5. Data analysis
6. Report and presentation of results
7. Shared assessment
8. Use of new knowledge and transformation of the context, in this case to restart the research and action process in the second phase of the project.

With this agenda in mind, the research design was developed with the direct and on-going cooperation between the researcher and the community. The group was made up of the component of a volunteering association and solidarity purchasing group (GAS), L'Ortazzo, promoting the birth of a community supported agriculture project. The first two points were settled before the research began. At the very beginning of the research process the researcher shared the basic theoretical framework connected to the literature on CSA, as well as critical analysis of capitalism and post-growth. Then she took part in all meetings (about seven formal plus several informal ones) with an observing participation, collecting field notes and recording. During the third step, she interviewed seven participants, dividing them into three groups: local policy makers (one), farmers (one) and prosumers (five). The data analysis was frequently performed in parallel with the participants. Finally a feedback session was held, as a first step in shaping the next phase for the following year's action: after formal presentation of the results a debate followed, with discussion on the contribution of the research to the process.

## **The research context**

### ***The natural environment***

The research took place in a mountain valley of the Trentino Alto Adige region, in Northern Italy, within a group of ecologists and social activists.

The Valsugana is an extensive and fertile valley that winds along the side of the Adige Valley, following the course of the Brenta River, which originates from the lakes of Levico and Caldonazzo. To the west it is bounded by the Vigolana plateau. The latter, together with the shores of Lake Caldonazzo are the reference territory of the L'Ortazzo association, which promotes the project. The mountains of the valley are covered by dense forests, while the plain is intensively cultivated, in particular with the monoculture of golden apples. The reference territory is naturally luxuriant, but highly exploited for tourism and agriculture, with an increasingly high presence of pollutants in the air, water and land.

### ***The social environment***

The social context of the research focuses on a community that is still cohesive and capable of creative ideas. This is where L'Ortazzo was born in 2009. The voluntary association also has a solidarity purchasing group. For years, the group of volunteers has organized initiatives to raise awareness of organic farming, sustainable lifestyles and the solidarity economy. The members are about sixty and the participants in the activities are several hundred, even though the work groups involve the active participation of about twenty people.

## **Data collected**

During 2018 the working group for the CSA project, made up of producers and activists from L'Ortazzo, started a pilot experimentation, with the aim of understanding technical and logistic as well as social feasibility. Several evenings and meetings were held from April to November 2018 and during the month of November the point of view of the individuals involved was taken into account to offer support in the evaluation of the experience and the redefinition of the actions. Thus, seven interviews were conducted with consumers (five), producers (one) and local administrators (one) asking each of them the same seven questions.

From the report of the meeting held on 31 May 2018: "Roberto [farmer] introduces the question to be addressed during the evening and the purpose of the 2018 pilot project: understanding how to make the CSA work from the point of view of both producers and consumers/families. Danilo [consumer] points out that the GAS group does not like the term consumers and clarifies that the Ortazzo Association as such is of simple support to spread the idea, the activities will be in the hands of individual members/families. Roberto [farmer] introduces in the discussion on the subject of the community cooperative which is the long-term vision of the project, for an extension of the community's self-sufficiency perspective. This, according to Marcello [farmer], could be an excellent strategy to bring people outside GAS closer. Danilo [consumer] underlines how in 2018 it is necessary to inform and disseminate knowledge on the CSA and on the subject Marcello [farmer] also agrees on the importance of advertising and communication. Christian [decision maker] expresses the administration's willingness to support the project by making space available on the municipal blog and on the website, the legal skills of the municipal secretary, the knowledge and institutional relations with the Province and spaces for public presentations. "

Moving on to the interviews, I present the data following the sequence of questions.

**The first question was "What is a CSA for you?"**

Overall, the answers all go in the same direction: the CSA is a pact, an agreement between consumers and producers that gives mutual benefits linked to guarantees for producers of certain earnings and for consumers to have healthy food and protect the territory. As far as the local administrator is concerned, it is a model of cooperation through which resources are shared, the farmer provides the land and the workforce and the others provide the money but also participate in the choices of production and development. Through the CSA "the loneliness of the farmer is overcome, who is what also has control of the earth ... control of the well-being of that land". From the farmer's point of view it is a pact, an agreement that must not be short-lived, as opposed to trade, to overcome the limits and distortions of the market, trying to create a longer-term agreement, with on the one hand the consumers and on the other the producers, to form a community of actions and intent, to create a relationship that is able to overcome the market. It is a mutual pact of mutual help and convenience.

***From the consumers' point of view the vision has multiple but coherent aspects:***

- it is agreement, union, communion, between those who produce and those who consume that guarantees the safety of what they buy;
- it is a dialogue between farmers and consumers that creates a direct relationship;
- it is an interesting synergy between agriculture and the consumer, where people work together for the common well-being, for the environment, they all get to work for the same purpose and for the consumer it is the guarantee of having healthy products and sharing the business risk;
- it is a cultivator-consumer pact where the grower produces based on the consumer's requests;
- it is the families of a community who ally with farmers in their area so that both have advantages, families being able to buy healthy products and knowing that farmers will cultivate and treat the land in a way that also benefits them, while farmers will be able to count on families that will give them loyalty and provide them with economic sustainability.

**The second question concerns the 2018 pilot project: "How was the idea of CSA applied in the 2018 experimental experience?"**

The result was an acknowledgment that it is difficult to define the 2018 experience as a CSA but it was a necessary step to get the job started and have elements for the following year.

The local administrator wanted to emphasize that it had been stated from the beginning that it was a pilot project, with a very precise audience with the purchase of products in a well organized way, booking the shopping at the beginning of the week.

The producer claims that it was or was meant to be an experiment with all that this entails, and all the advantages and disadvantages of experimentation. In fact, he says, it was not a real experiment, it did not have the requisites, however it was necessary to have a theme on which to test the relationships. However, the objectives and a timetable were lacking, which led to the failure to develop a CSA trial. But we needed to put our hands to it and we succeeded, it will help us put the new project on track.

***From the consumers' point of view:***

- it was a rather small project, even to start. Several families involved, as many as ten out of the few that took part, had a vegetable and did not participate. A more representative sample is needed;
- the CSA project is very much liked for this relationship between local producer and community but needs to be made closer to people's needs
- there are various types of CSA, ours is a simpler version and easier to start with
- despite being at the beginning it seems to me that I didn't experience it as a real project
- not adherent, the result was not achieved, because the families did not make an alliance between them and the farmers were somewhat distant from the families, there was no relationship between the two parties, the results were rather poor due to the lack of relationships.

**Third question "How did you experience it?" led to different answers.**

From the point of view of the local administration, perception is more focused on expectations for the future. This experience is seen as a great opportunity. Having a model of this type can be transformative, leading in some way to the channelling of energies that exist in the territory and to making a team from those who somehow embrace this opportunity in the end. The essential point lies in the fact that "personal responsibility with respect to the collective has been lost ... we must try all the ways to find it again, otherwise I do not know what community awaits us in the future".

For the farmer it was frustrating due to the failure of the experiment, despite the knowledge that he had invested little and therefore obtained little.

On the consumers' side, involving those who already had a vegetable garden may not have been the right decision, despite the enthusiasm and full sharing of the project as a whole, given the personal and family

commitment required. It is also important to point out that some had the perception of minimal or absent changes in the real relationship between consumers and producers and also between participants in general.

**The fourth question was about the limits and difficulties of the project.**

The administrator noted that it was a niche experiment, although this is normal for a pilot experience; on a communicative level, perhaps the administration itself could have done more, it does not seem to be so well known; the commitment to culture-building is important.

The producer underlined again the fact that he invested almost nothing or in any case very little on the preparation of the prototype.

**The following elements were highlighted for the participants on the consumption side:**

- number too small even for a pilot project
- lack of crop planning, the impossibility for consumers to participate in the programming and therefore the fact that some were not interested in the products offered
- the importance of the relationship of trust that must be carefully protected
- poor knowledge of the project, if you do not know the project it is difficult to participate in it, little information and perhaps little interest, the need for simpler communication with real involvement especially in the initial phase
- lack of strong relationships within the group of participants

**The fifth question analyses the strengths and the positive elements.**

The administration was proactive and underlined the value of a pilot experience that generates enthusiasm, an experience that breaks with an agricultural tradition and which is now also set to innovate the language used, an experience that builds a community by creating relationships that no longer exist.

From the point of view of the producers it was an opportunity to get to know each other, to start pooling their efforts and to forge personal relationships that were previously non-existent or at least very superficial.

**According to consumers, the strengths were:**

- a very clear presentation that gave everyone the information they needed
- always having local food available and the possibility of living from agriculture, the idea of giving this possibility of having food that you know where it was grown, by whom and how is a dream
- it is a project of potential interest, it could be interesting to have the possibility of going beyond the fixed basket and be able to shop for the products that are not normally available
- the more the purchase is elastic, the better
- the quality of the product and the relationship with the producers who believe in the project
- the prospects, as the positive aspects with respect to the expectations, are few, but from the critical points we can draw useful hints to meet expectations.

**Question number six is "What more can be done, or less, to make the project work?"**

According to the administration 'it is necessary to raise awareness of its potential as much as possible, in particular with a targeted communication that allows discussion and reflection.

The producer is important in order to highlight where you want to go, but the most important thing are the stages through which you can make the journey, which you can't do all at once but need to plan where we want to arrive, when and with whom, and determine which is the first measurable goal and of course the second, third and subsequent ones.

**Consumer suggestions are:**

- enlarging the group, it takes a much larger number of families
- going beyond the Ortazzo
- a delivery service could help
- adding and offering those products that consumers do not have or cannot produce on their own
- having volunteers behind them
- having producers who can guarantee production and are honest and rigorous in business management because everything is based on mutual trust
- more information
- integration and more planning perspective, integrating the various producers and consumers' expectations
- bringing the type of project to wider attention, freeing itself from the classic evening, a format that is easier to read
- identity is an important thing, it takes years to build a group and that is the element which makes things go well
- having closer relationship between farmers and families

**Finally, it was asked "Why should a community support agriculture?"**

The administration's response was dry: "because it controls the territory. I can't imagine a community without agriculture. Because it makes life authentic, not a plastic life. "

The farmer replies that there are so many reasons: "starting from the fact that small-scale neighbourly, seasonal, artisanal peasant farming has no chance of making it, of being on the market, unless a community takes responsibility for establishing an agreement of this type that will always be outside the market. The market is now distorted, has incurable distortions and literally throws out all those who are inspired by other principles, we must all concentrate and do our part ".

**Consumers also stress the need to protect small local agriculture which means:**

- "returning to the origins. In this society you have to change a lot of things, you have to take a step back"
- having healthy products on the table, which follow seasonality, which are cultivated by people who know what they are doing, who come from near your home, making possible the dialogue between the community and the small local producer
- getting to have a very close relationship with the producer, having maximum confidence in him, shortening the supply chain, rewarding the zero km. In fact, we do not realize how many kilometres away what you buy from the large retailers was produced. It means not letting small producers get crushed by large retailers, with damage that we will only realize when it is too late
- recognizing that in any case the farmer is the custodian of the territory, from this point of view, supporting the farmer means creating an economic circuit that protects the territory
- recognizing that large-scale agriculture seen with traditional eyes is absolutely devastating from all points of view, is very focused on income, without consideration for what is around us, has methods that destroy the soil and even the lives of those who live there, and therefore a certain type of agriculture must be supported by the community in order to safeguard the territory, which are the fundamental rights of a community and therefore the community must understand that support for this type of agriculture is necessary at this time.

From the notes relating to the meeting of 27 November 2018: "Roberto: from what emerged from the interviews it is clear that there is a great deal of work to be done to make the difference between CSA and GAS understandable. There will be so much to do and one must be aware of the effort that needs to be made. The risk is repeating the 2018 experience [...] Marcello: we want to give a method, a form and a management system. By combining the 2018 experience with previous experiences [...] Roberto makes it clear that we need to be clear about what it means to be CSA and the pact must be clear. [...] Danilo states that producers must earn the trust of the co-producers. At this level the pre-financing figure must be minimal and only symbolic. At the moment there is not enough sensitivity."

**Findings**

The results show that the reflection proposed by the researcher has offered a significant opportunity to clarify problems, potentialities and the deep meaning of the project.

Although it was not investigated in a targeted manner as it is not directly the subject of participatory research, it emerged from both the informal comparison and some passages of the minutes that the results of the interviews were useful to understand how to modify the operational decisions for the second year of experimentation. Furthermore, on several occasions the pride of having started a participatory project that is also the subject of academic research was clear. This fact is highlighted on each occasion by the members of the association who present the associative activities and this initiative in particular.

The potential of a community based project to cope with the oppression of capitalism is still more than a hope. From the interviews, in particular the last question, the shared conviction of the transformative potential of peasant, organic and local agriculture is evident. It also emerges that, at least some, consumers are aware of their role in supporting this type of agriculture. However, from the experimentation carried out in 2018, the real effectiveness of the CSA model in a marginal and poorly urbanized area in modifying economic processes even on a small scale is not clear.

### **Works Citaton**

- Bloemmen, Marjolijn, Bobulescu, Roxana, Nhu Tuyen Le, & Vitari, Claudio. (2015). Microeconomic degrowth the case of Community Supported Agriculture. *Ecological Economics : The Transdisciplinary Journal of the International Society for Ecological Economics*, 110-115.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2003). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. *Handbook of qualitative re-search* (pp. 1-28).
- Dörre, K., Lessenich, Stephan, Rosa, Hartmut, Herrmann, Jan-Peter Translator, & Balhorn, Loren Translator. (2015). *Sociology, capitalism, critique*. London New York: Verso.
- Elsen, Susanne. *Eco-social Transformation and Community-based Economy*. London New York: Routledge, 2019. Print. *Routledge Advances in Social Work*.
- Friedman, V. J. (2008). *Action science: Creating communities of inquiry in communities of practice* (pp. 131-143). Sage Publications.
- Johnson, Michael P. *Community-Based Operations Research : Decision Modeling for Local Impact and Diverse Populations* (2012): In *International Series in Management Science/operations Research*. Web.
- Latouche, S. (2010). *L'invenzione dell'economia*. Torino: Bollati Boringhieri.
- Michea, J.C. (2008). *L'impero del male minore*, Milano: Libri Scheiwiller.
- Nowotny, H., Scott, P., & Gibbons, M. (2003). Introduction: `Mode 2'Revisited: The New Production of Knowledge.
- Polanyi, K., Stiglitz, Joseph E, Block, Fred, Shidigelizi, (2001). *The great transformation : The political and economic origins of our time* (2. Beacon paperback ed.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (2007). *The SAGE handbook of action research: participatory inquiry*.
- Unger, H. (2013). *Partizipative Forschung: Einführung in die Forschungspraxis*. Springer-Verlag.
- Zsolnai, L., & Podmaniczky, L. (2010). *Community-supported agriculture*. na.