



Who Do They Trust?

The legitimacy gap between research, entrepreneurship, and the communities that did not ask to be studied

The theme

Rigorous research and innovative entrepreneurial projects are increasingly expected to generate tangible social value. Yet many fails to become meaningful for the communities they intend to serve – not because they are poorly communicated, but because they lack legitimacy.

Communities are often invited to participate only after decisions have already been made. Researchers, entrepreneurs, designers and innovators, meanwhile, are encouraged to demonstrate impact through dissemination strategies that can resemble marketing more than collaboration. The paradox is clear: the more projects speak to communities, the less they are trusted by them.

This issue asks a simple but fundamental question:

Who do communities actually trust – and why?

We seek contributions that explore how trust is built through shared responsibility, methodological change, and genuine collaboration between knowledge producers and the people affected by their work.

The key idea of this issue is reshaping

We are not interested in projects that merely describe participatory intentions. We are seeking accounts of research, business, design, cultural, or social innovation projects that were substantially transformed because communities challenged their assumptions. A change in research questions, business models, design choices, governance, timelines, or outcomes is not a methodological weakness; it is the central finding.

Here, the researcher or entrepreneur is understood as a co-founder: someone who shares the risk of getting things wrong and allows the project itself to be reconfigured through community knowledge.

Topics of interest

- Possible themes include, but are not limited to:
- Participatory research and co-design Community-led innovation and entrepreneurship
- Projects reshaped by community feedback Cultural heritage, accessibility and inclusion
- Animal-assisted and place-based interventions
- Indigenous and local knowledge as evidence Ethical accountability in research and business
- New governance models between institutions and communities

What we are looking for

Every article must demonstrate a concrete problem-solving process. Successful submissions should illustrate:

the original research or project question;

the moment of community friction or disagreement;

what changed in response;

what has learned;

and what remains unresolved.

Community voice – a quotation, testimony, or co-authored passage – can be integrated into the article as a meaningful part of its narrative.