

# Research protocol

**‘Food citizens? Collective food procurement in European cities: solidarity and diversity, skills and scale.’**

[www.foodcitizens.eu](http://www.foodcitizens.eu)



“This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 724151)”.

## Contents

General guidelines .....	3
Pre-Field Visual Documentation.....	4
Protocol for PhD research.....	6
The research questions .....	6
The proposed case studies:.....	7
The fieldwork techniques (as described in the project, part B1 and part B2).....	7
1. participant observation .....	7
2. Interviews, focus groups, cultural mapping .....	7
3. Career histories and documentary analysis .....	8
4. digital visual engagements .....	9
Summary and rationale of the overall project .....	10
PhD research .....	11
Critical theorization of food citizenship: .....	11
-Main project questions for COMPARISON .....	11
-Main project questions on CITIZENSHIP.....	11
Appendixes .....	12
Sharing data in the VRE in the shared folders .....	12
Sharing photos in the VRE for your digital documentation.....	14
Template Bi-weekly report .....	15
Template Logbook:.....	16

## General guidelines

- **Field notes**  
Make sure you write down your field notes every day, and digitalize them so you can analyze them in Atlas or Nvivo later.
- **Logbook**  
Keep a daily logbook that summarizes places and events that you went to, people you spoke with, and topics and questions that emerged. Later on, this can be a convenient overview and index of your field notes.
- **Contact List**  
Make a contact list with the contact information of people you met.
- **Be mindful about your data**  
Encrypt your computer and your external hard drive, and don't leave data linger in the cloud or random USB- sticks. Make sure to make frequent back-ups of your data in your private folder in the VRE.
- **Field reports**  
please send a field report every two weeks. Here below a contents outline:
  - **Briefly summarize the things you undertook the past week**  
(*events you participated in, locations you visited, conferences you attended, interviews or focus groups you conducted*)
  - **What kind of topics and questions emerged these weeks?**
  - **Which deliverables am I producing/targeting or have I produced?**
  - **What are your plans for the next two weeks?**
  - **How are you answering/relating to the questions listed in the research protocol? (page 6)**
- **Deliverables**  
Over the course of the research you need to do a minimum of interviews, focusgroups, network maps etc. as spelt out in yellow in the research protocol on page 8. Start with collecting these deliverables while you are doing your pre-fieldwork and report them in your logbook
- **Use your informed consent forms**  
If people participate in your research, make sure they sign the fitting form. Once people have filled in your form: give the form a number and scan the document and send it to the research assistant (later you will hand in the paper original).  
Store the digital form, alongside your data in the private folder of the VRE.  
Add the number to the metadata when you share the transcribed and anonymized interview in the VRE.
- **Uploading you data in the shared folders in the VRE**  
If you conduct an interview or a focus group, transcribe, anonymize and upload it within two weeks following the guidelines in the appendix.
- **Document the field visually**  
Following the guidelines on the next page

## Pre-Field Visual Documentation - Field Visual Documentation

In the Pre-Field, try to be as thorough as possible with visual documentation, so to save time during fieldwork. Take pictures, draw, and take notes about the images you take. While taking pictures, think about a possible caption you can give to the photo/drawing. However, do not rely on captions to tell your story. Try to think about ways to describe people and situations that require little verbal communication.

In the list I specified the types of shot size that you will have to use so that we, as a group, can achieve visual consistency among all field sites. At the end of the list you can find a guide to shot sizes (such as long shot, mid shoot, and close up).

When you take photos of people, make sure they have signed your informed consent form. Additionally, to save time later on, ask them if they would allow us to use the photo in the interactive documentary. If they do: let them sign a release form

Every person will get their own photo gallery in the VRE, where you can add captions, and the codes of the informed consent forms and release forms. Sharing guidelines are in the appendix.

Over the course of the pre-fieldwork, make the following photos:  
Do not leave them all to the end, and try to spread them out over the period you are in the field.

### **Places (at least 5):**

Try to depict a place and what activities take place there.

For each place:

- Take 2 pictures of the place (long shots)
- Take 2 pictures showing what use people make of the place (mid shots).
- Take 2 pictures of interesting details of the place - they can be anything that can help you tell a story about the place (close ups).
- Draw a picture of the place.
- Draw a map of the place, and then draw a map of people's activity distribution within the place.

### **Portraits (take at least 15):**

Try to depict the people who populate food procurement (avoid extreme close ups).

- Think of possible characters and main informants.
- Think of people who look like they are marginal to the event/scene/social network/etc... (*who is it that I am not noticing?*)
- Think of diversity (gender, ethnicity, occupation, age, etc...)

### **Animals:**

are there any animals? What do they look like?

### **Relevant materials (take at least 10):**

Take pictures of the objects that people are using in their work, meeting, etc.

For each object:

Try, if possible, to take one while the object is being used, and one when it is at rest.

### **Practice (at least 5):**

For each practice:

Try to take 4 pictures to depict how a practice looks.  
What happens? Who is involved? What do they do?  
Take at least 1 long shot and 1 close up (if possible).

**Routines (at least 5)**For each routine:

Try to depict people's routines. What moments compose their routine? Take a picture for each moment of the routine.

**Events**

If there are one-of-a-kind events, take pictures of the place and the people who take part in the event. If possible, try to take pictures at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of the event.

for shot sizes consult <http://www.umontanamediaarts.com/MART101L/shot-types>

# Protocol for PhD research

## The research questions

The PhDs investigate four main dimensions (solidarity, diversity, skill, and scale) that frame the project analysis of collective food procurement

1. *Solidarity*: its interpretations, practices, and limits

1. How do local meanings of solidarity emerge from local histories?
2. How are collective food procurement networks perceived differently in different communities?
3. Which shared imaginaries underlie practices of collective food procurement? For example, how do ‘community gardens’ re-cast ‘allotments’? (self-sufficiency, gentrification, social inclusion, etc.?)
4. Do/How do CFP networks re-cast direct or informal supply in terms of reciprocity obligations?
5. Are/How are such resignifications embedded in definitions of food as culturally appropriate (e.g. as ‘traditional’, ‘local’, or ‘genuine’)?

2. *Diversity*: within and among networks.

1. Are CFP networks concerned with social, economic and/or cultural diversity?
2. What is the role of socioeconomic and/or cultural diversity in shaping the practices of collective food procurement?
3. Do/how do CFP networks serve the cultural needs and expectations of sociability of specific groups of city dwellers (e.g., communities of faith, gender dynamics, ethnic groups, networks of young families, or retired professionals)?
4. Do different types of CFP networks co-exist adjacently? Are they too diverse to mingle?
5. Are specific measures for social inclusion discussed or applied in CFP networks?

3. *Skill*: the acquisition, transmission of relevant expertise (not only in growing food, but also managing food chains, setting governance agendas, collaborating within/across networks, etc.).

1. Which repertoires do CFP networks develop for collective food procurement and which expertise do they need for it?
2. Which relevant skills do the CFP network participants have and which do they lack?
3. Do/ How do CFP networks make existing or novel relevant expertise (such as homesteading) available in a collective? More specific questions under this heading could be: Do/ How do CFP networks obviate imperfect intergenerational knowledge transmission of relevant skills? Are existing skills (e.g., from ongoing allotment gardening practices) overlooked or endangered through gentrification?
4. Are (newly acquired) skills (considered) transformative of the network participants’ lifestyles, and if so how?
5. Are/How are skills pertaining to ‘foraging’ (e.g., growing, sharing, cooking, and selling) made relevant to ‘short food chains’ (e.g., managing, selling, pricing) and ‘governance’ (e.g., liaising, planning, negotiating)?

4. *Scale*: scale of action and scaling strategies (up or out) – and debate *whether* to scale up or out.

1. Do CFP networks connect (with other CFP types) and/or expand?
2. If they do, how are CFP transformative capacities redefined or renegotiated? Do CFP networks re-organize their practices and re-think their mission, and if so, how? For example, are the practices of groups perceived as more sustainable if they do not ‘scale up’?
3. Are local practices influenced by transnational examples/models? (at any of the three levels of urban foraging, short food chains or food governance)
4. Do CFP networks negotiate access to resources with local or higher-level government?

## The proposed case studies:

**pre-fieldwork checks viability of these case studies and if needed proposes additional/alternatives within the comparative framework**

	Case study type A:	Case study type B:	Case study type C:
Rotterdam	-Allotments (food gardens); - <i>SkillCity</i> (NGO youth food gardens and kitchens)	-City farms, -Urban agriculture hubs (e.g. Eetbaar Rotterdam)	-Rotterdam Food Council
Turin	-Collective allotments and City allotments: <a href="http://www.ortiurbanitorino.it/">www.ortiurbanitorino.it/</a> -Ex-shipyard	-Solidarity Economy Network: <a href="http://www.GASstorino.org">www.GASstorino.org</a>	- <i>Nutrire Torino Metropolitana</i>
Gdansk	'community gardens' and -urban allotments (food gardens)	- Informal direct supply from farmers and - through food collectives.	-European Solidarity centre: <i>Europejskie Centrum Solidarności</i>

## The fieldwork techniques (as described in the project, part B1 and part B2).

The four dimensions of solidarity, diversity, skill and scale have been operationalized in a shared research protocol with specific sub-questions and areas of observation. Pre-field visits will test this protocol for observation and will feed back in pre-fieldwork, mid-term fieldwork, and post-fieldwork team workshops.

The nine case studies will be investigated and documented with multiple fieldwork techniques: **1.** participant observation, **2.** in-depth interviews, focus groups, and cultural mapping, **3.** career histories and documentary analysis, **4.** digital ethnographic documentary media.

### 1. participant observation

Longitudinal participant observation in the native languages (15 months fieldwork) focuses on all four target dimensions, in the everyday. The key method of ethnographic research, participant observation, consists in settling long-term into a given community or social network, establishing rapport and sharing everyday activities. The researcher observes and records daily behaviour while actively participating in the subjects' practices. Through daily field notes, the development of the community's outlook and plans is recorded.

Other fieldwork techniques used in the project (such as mapping the network and its relevant key members, and video-elicitation – see below) work better with first-hand experience of the network. Participant observation guarantees this, since it means becoming part of the network as a member, attending events and meetings, being present while alternatives are debated and decisions are made, and having informal conversations with network members in the context of their practice, thus gaining direct insight into their hurdles and motivations.

### 2. Interviews, focus groups, cultural mapping.

Through focus groups we investigate the networks' **diversity and solidarity**: how internally diverse are they? how differently do they interpret solidarity? In-depth interviews will supplement and contextualize information obtained from participant observation and informal conversations.

At least 20 in-depth interviews per network will be conducted with members of each of the three network-types in each location. Sub-questions will be operationalised in topic lists, allowing for coding, keeping a broad focus on membership, recruitment and diversity.

At least two focus groups per network will address solidarity through gathering, sharing, or eating food, asking who is left out and if the groups feel the need to reach out beyond their routines.

Interview techniques vary according to the situation, including unstructured conversations but also semi-structured audio-recorded interviews.

For each network type, all interviewees will also sketch their own networks, naming nodes and links (cultural maps, one per interviewee). This is necessary to trace the often multiple affiliations and cross-cutting paths that, in the PI's research experience, characterize the successive attempts of food activists at creating networks of alternative procurement - often with overlapping initiatives in the same territories.

In particular, we want to articulate how different networks envisage themselves and each other as 'food citizens', if at all: which implicit imaginary of citizenship is put to cultural work through collective food procurement? What kind of 'citizens-consumers' are in their visual field?

In order to map the 'aesthetic formation' and the variation of shared imaginaries (Meyer 2009) of food citizens, we will adapt the 'storyworld' template derived from design anthropology (Kimbell 2014:190). This is a visual brainstorming technique that pinpoints how individuals and groups are imagined - their gender, education and lifeworld - through concrete templates: imagining what they would eat, how they would use specific tools, which spaces they would inhabit, and who would be their 'friends'. Articulating the imaginaries of 'who is your neighbour' can then guide visual and relational associations in a digital ethnographic documentary (see below) and take concrete shape in multimedia navigation.

### 3. Career histories and documentary analysis

Longitudinal observation allows to see leadership and conflicts emerge, as well as to note how problems are solved and how power is distributed and managed in the network.

Leaders' career histories (two per network), public and internal documentation (meeting minutes, organization's web site and statutes) and a comparative history (one per case) of the three types of initiatives across the three contexts juxtapose strategies and debates on **scale** (scaling 'up' or scaling 'out').

Both public and internal documentation will be gathered (with permission, see Ethical Annex).

Documentary analysis includes meeting minutes, organization's web site and statutes, media presence during fieldwork and media exposure (namely documentable media 'traces' of the networks and organization, whether textual or digital, as well as media coverage about them). All these types of documents build a comparative history of the three types of collective food procurement in each of the three field sites, highlighting strategies and debates on **scale** (scaling 'up' or scaling 'out'). Following permission, each network's digital communication (mailing lists and organizations' websites, fora and blogs) will be additional sources for coding and conversational analysis (employing data analysis software such as Nvivo).

Career histories of the scheme leaders (two per network) will position them vis-à-vis the nodes and paths of intersection of the cultural maps gathered from all interview participants. Specific questions will regard: the history and transformations of the networks (in composition, roles, and legal profile), and their positioning vis-à-vis local institutions

(through institutional sponsorship or dialogue with unions and administrations), as well as trajectories and plans for ‘scaling up’ or ‘out’.

4. **digital visual engagements** reproduce user-centred paths of meaning-making, combining the documentary material gathered in an open-access platform, with participants’ permission. At least 20 video-elicitation sessions per case (Herzfeld 2004: 92-3) focus specifically on **skill**: how do network members produce/distribute/consume food? do they have/acquire adequate expertise and in which fields (growing/sharing/cooking/selling)? How do they disseminate it?

## Summary and rationale of the overall project

This project links collective food procurement networks to citizenship through a set of concepts and methods. As a team, we assess the role of collective food procurement networks in shaping the experience and practice of citizenship based on fieldwork ethnographies. The final result of this project will be a reconceptualization of ‘urban foraging’, ‘short food chains’ and ‘local food governance’ and cognate phenomena such as ‘urban agriculture’ and ‘alternative food networks’, which the projects places under the novel framework of ‘collective food procurement’. This reconceptualization, based on comparison, takes into consideration regional, cultural, and societal contexts.

The ultimate research goal of this project is to develop a critical theory of ‘food citizenship’. This will be developed by the PI and postdoc by giving a reasoned association of collective food procurement with citizenship - and the several related notions such as sovereignty and belonging. The idea is that the concept of ‘food citizenship’ does not speak for itself: it needs clarification and contextualization because its meaning is grounded in practices. Expressing and practicing citizenship through collective food procurement takes distinctive routes in different contexts, its conceptualization depends on its rooting in local cultures and histories of participation and in relevant food systems.

We have assumed that a relationship between forms of collective food procurement and citizenship exists, in Europe. This relationship is argued for in the framework project. We have hypothesized this relationship as one of ‘co-production’. The field results will test this hypothesis. We set out to explore in the field this relationship, through the lenses of four main focus of interest: solidarity, diversity, skill, and scale.

The project has further specified the framework hypothesis by articulating expectations. These can be confirmed or denied by the results of fieldwork.

1. Collective food procurement networks articulate multiple discourses and practices of solidarity. Field research will reveal a variety of local experiments that practice food sharing, budgeting, and value creation. Implicit in these systems are local values such as notions of community, neighborhood, normality, equality, and sameness.
2. Not all forms of networks will be inclusive, in the sense of social and cultural diversity. Indeed, diversity may be overlooked in network models, or accepted best practices of urban agriculture. This may require reconceptualizing urban agriculture relative to regional, cultural, and societal contexts.
3. Collective food procurement networks may produce and disseminate skills and expertise that go beyond food procurement per se, which would have important implications for the opportunities that they mobilize and for knowledge transmission (re-skilling). Not all of these implications will necessarily be transformative. In fact, ‘culturalized’ understandings of food may be used to confirm hegemonic or populist views on skill, such as the moral value of eating or cultivating in accepted ‘traditional’ ways.
4. Collective food procurement networks may have relevant connections with other networks both across multiple levels of complexity and perhaps also in other sites. We will observe *if* and *how* each network type interacts with the others across and within the three field site locations. This may allow us to uncover the importance of strategic nodes in local networks (e.g., leaders, bridge-builders, recognized models or best practices).

## PhD research

Following the research protocol, starting on page 6 of this document.

## Critical theorization of food citizenship:

Done by PI (based on own fieldwork) and postdocs (contents and methods) in conversation with PhDs on the basis of their own ethnographies. This should synergize into an edited book and journal special issue, see deliverables of the project.

### -Main project questions for COMPARISON

1. Who are ‘food citizens’? [Socio-economic characteristics, motivation, repertoires]
2. How do they differ within and across the three European contexts we are taking into consideration?
3. How do their specific types of collective food procurement networks *interact, interface, or interfere* with each other? Specifically:
  - a. do urban foragers in affluent Northern Europe differ from their peers in crisis-challenged Southern Europe?
  - b. how do direct consumer-farmer transactions in post-socialist cities differ from the ‘farmers markets’ of Western cities?
  - c. is the idea of ‘Local Food Policy Council’ appealing to Western Europe only (projects exist in Rotterdam and Turin, but so far non found in post-socialist cities)? Why?

### -Main project questions on CITIZENSHIP

- a. Does working collectively on procuring food enable/confirm/perform/question shared understandings of citizenship? How? Which ones?  
Subquestions may include:
  - do in fact CFP networks co-produce new significations, experiences, and practices of citizenship? Which ones?
  - do in fact CFP networks co-produce hegemonic imaginaries of belonging and participation? Which ones?
  - is collective food procurement in fact a form of self-reliance?
  - does it confirm (certain specific forms of) neoliberal hegemony? Which ones?
  - does it confirm (specific forms of) sociocultural segregation? Which ones?
- b. Do collective food procurement co-produce diverse and even conflicting discourses and imaginaries of citizenship? How? Which ones?
- c. What is at stake in linking food procurement to citizenship? In other words, does linking food procurement to citizenship in fact help unravel/articulate core questions of contemporary European society, namely the shared or hegemonic imaginaries underlying the following issues: Who belongs? How are entitlements earned? How can a polity be ‘united in diversity’? [And if so, how?]

## Template Bi-weekly report

**Briefly summarize the things you undertook the past week**

*(events you participated in, locations you visited, conferences you attended, interviews or focus groups you conducted)*

**What kind of topics and questions emerged from your meetings this week?**

**Which deliverables am I producing/targeting?**

**What are your plans for the next two weeks?**

## Template Logbook:

Day	What I did	People I spoke with
Mo (date)	PO at allotment gardens	- Naam - Naam - Naam
Tu (date)	PO Skillcity lunch	
We (date)	Lecture at Voedsel Anders on food waste	- Person X - Naam - Naam - Naam - Naam
Thu (date)	Interview with Pietje Puk	
Fri (date)	Coffee with Person X Transcription & administration day	
Sat (date)	PO at allotment gardens	
Sun (date)		
Mo (date)	PO at allotment gardens Dinner at vegan restaurant	
Tu (date)	PO Skillcity lunch	
We (date)	Conference	
Thu (date)	Conference	
Fri (date)	Conference	
Sat (date)	Transcription & administration day	
Sun (date)		