Developing an Effective Management System for Agricultural Enterprises: a Synergetic Approach

Svitlana Sudomyr[1], Paulina Kolisnichenko[2]

[1]*Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor, Professor Separate Subdivision of NULES of Ukraine «Berezhany Agrotechnical Institute», Berezhany, Ukraine, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2574-1724*

[2]*Ph.D. (Economics), Vice Rector for International Cooperation, WSHIU University, Poznan, Poland, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6730-1236*

Citation:
Sudomyr, S., & Kolisnichenko, P. (2025). Developing an Effective Management System for Agricultural Enterprises: a Synergetic Approach. *Economics, Finance and Management Review*, (4(24), 91–100. https://doi.org/10.36690/2674-5208-2025-4-91-100

Received: November 23, 2025
Approved: December 29, 2025
Published: December 29, 2025

Abstract. *In the context of global economic transformations, volatile markets, and increasing ecological and social challenges, agricultural enterprises require innovative management systems to ensure competitiveness, sustainability, and resilience. This study aims to develop a theoretical and methodological framework for an effective management system for agricultural enterprises, utilizing a synergetic approach to integrate ecological, social, intellectual, and economic components for holistic development. The research employs a systemic-comprehensive analysis, SWOT analysis, expert evaluations, statistical methods, and synergetic modeling to examine development trends in agricultural enterprises in Ukraine's Ternopil region. The methodology integrates philosophical and specialized methods to model dynamic interactions within management systems, ensuring strategic alignment with regional and global trends. The results propose a comprehensive management system that enhances strategic competitiveness by 10%, operational efficiency by 15%, and long-term sustainability. For instance, the implementation of cluster cooperation strategies in regional enterprises, such as PP "Urmanske," led to a 20% increase in export revenues. Practical recommendations include establishing innovation hubs to foster research and development, promoting cluster-based collaboration for resource sharing, and attracting investments through public-private partnerships. These strategies were tested in the Ternopil region, demonstrating significant improvements in resource utilization and market positioning. The findings provide actionable insights for policymakers, enterprise managers, and researchers aiming to strengthen the agricultural sector in dynamic economic environments, offering a scalable model adaptable to other regions and sectors.*

Keywords*: agricultural enterprises, effective management, synergetic approach, competitiveness, sustainability, Ternopil region, innovation, cluster cooperation.*
JEL Classification: M11, O13, Q10, Q18
Formulas: 2; fig.: 0; table: 2; bibl.: 30

Introduction. The agricultural sector operates in a rapidly changing global environment characterized by market volatility, ecological challenges, and socio-economic transformations. Effective management systems are critical for agricultural enterprises to adapt to these conditions, ensuring competitiveness, sustainability, and resilience. Traditional management approaches often focus on isolated economic or operational aspects, neglecting interconnected ecological, social, and intellectual components. This study addresses the challenge of developing an effective management system for agricultural enterprises by applying a synergetic approach, emphasizing systemic interactions and holistic development. The research focuses on Ukraine's agricultural sector, specifically in the Ternopil region, where enterprises face challenges such as limited access to innovation, fragmented resource management, and insufficient strategic coordination. By leveraging synergetic principles, this study proposes a framework to enhance enterprise efficiency and promote regional economic development.

Literature Review. The management of agricultural enterprises is a multifaceted topic encompassing organizational efficiency, strategic planning, and institutional frameworks. Classical management theories, such as Taylor's (1911) principles of scientific management, emphasize process optimization, while Fayol (1916) highlights administrative functions for coordinating enterprise activities. Mintzberg (1979) advocates adaptive strategies, particularly relevant for agriculture due to its vulnerability to external shocks like climate change and market fluctuations. North (1990) underscores the role of institutional frameworks in shaping economic efficiency, a critical perspective for understanding agricultural enterprises in transitional economies like Ukraine.

In the Ukrainian context, scholars such as Hudzynskyi (2015), Malyk (2008), and Kirieytsev (2010) have explored management challenges in the agricultural sector, focusing on economic efficiency and resource utilization. However, their studies often overlook a systemic approach integrating ecological and social factors. International research by Drucker (1993) and Porter (1998) emphasizes innovation and competitiveness, but their frameworks are rarely tailored to the agricultural context. Recent works by Sirenko (2010) and Osovska (2005) highlight the need for holistic models addressing socio-economic and ecological challenges, yet they do not fully incorporate synergetic principles.

Synergetic principles, defined as the cooperative interaction of system components leading to emergent outcomes greater than the sum of individual contributions (Haken, 1983), offer a novel lens for integrating these dimensions, unlike traditional linear models.

Synergetics, as a scientific paradigm, has been applied to economic systems by Haken (1983) and Prigogine (1980), who explore self-organization and emergent properties in complex systems. In agriculture,

synergetic approaches remain underexplored, with limited studies integrating ecological, social, intellectual, and economic components. For instance, Audretsch and Feldman (1996) discuss cluster-based innovation to enhance competitiveness, but their frameworks require systemic coordination. Ukrainian regulations, such as the Law of Ukraine "On Agricultural Cooperation" (2020), provide a legal foundation for cluster formation, yet methodological guidelines for implementation are lacking.

Further analysis reveals that contemporary studies, such as Barney (1991), emphasize a resource-based view of competitive advantage, where unique enterprise assets, including intellectual capital (Stewart, 1997), are critical. Freeman (1984) advocates a stakeholder approach, highlighting the importance of social dimensions in management. Kaplan and Norton (1992) propose the balanced scorecard, adaptable for assessing multifaceted agricultural enterprise performance. Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) underscore knowledge management as a source of innovation, relevant to the intellectual component of synergetic systems. Prahalad and Hamel (1990) focus on core competencies, which can underpin cluster cooperation. Teece (2007) explores dynamic capabilities, enabling enterprises to adapt to changes. Recent studies further advance these concepts. For instance, Popp et al. (2018) highlight precision agriculture's role in ecological sustainability, while Wojcieszak-Zbierska et al. (2020) emphasize cluster-based innovation in Polish agriculture, offering insights into scalable models. Adewale et al. (2021) explore digital technologies in African agriculture, underscoring their potential for resource efficiency. Darnhofer (2021) integrates resilience and sustainability in farm management, aligning with this study's holistic approach, while Wojcieszak-Zbierska et al. (2023) discuss social capital's role in cooperative success, complementing the stakeholder perspective.

Despite significant progress in the literature, gaps remain in developing comprehensive management models that integrate synergetic principles to address the multifaceted challenges of agricultural enterprises. This study fills these gaps by proposing a methodology combining synergetic theory with practical tools tailored to the agricultural sector.

Aim. The aim is to develop theoretical and methodological foundations for an effective management system for agricultural enterprises, ensuring strategic competitiveness and sustainability through a synergetic approach, emphasizing the harmonization of ecological, social, intellectual, and economic components.

Methodology. The study employs a systemic-comprehensive and synergetic approach, integrating philosophical, general scientific, and specialized methods to analyze and model effective management systems. The methodology includes:

- *Systemic analysis* - to assess interconnections among ecological, social, intellectual, and economic components of agricultural enterprises.

- *SWOT analysis* - to identify internal strengths and weaknesses, as well as external opportunities and threats guiding strategic development.
- *Expert evaluations* - conducted with 20 managers and experts from the Ternopil region's agricultural sector to assess competitiveness and investment attractiveness.
- *Statistical analysis* - applied to financial reports, production data, and regional economic indicators (2018–2023) using SPSS (version 26) to evaluate productivity trends. Descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and regression models were used to identify relationships between variables (e.g., R&D investment and competitiveness).
- *Synergetic modeling* - to develop a model of management system interactions, using differential equations to represent dynamic processes (Formula 1). Coefficients (α,β,γ,δ,ϵ) were calibrated using least-squares optimization based on empirical data from enterprise performance metrics, ensuring model fit to real-world conditions.
- *Dialectical and abstract-logical methods* - to synthesize theoretical insights and formulate practical recommendations.

Formula 1: Synergetic Interaction Model

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = \alpha E + \beta S + \gamma I + \delta Ec - \epsilon S^2 \quad (1)$$

where: S – system efficiency; E – ecological component; S – social component; I – intellectual component; Ec – economic component; – interaction coefficients; – damping coefficient for system stabilization.

The theoretical foundation draws on neoclassical economic theory, institutional theory (North, 1990), synergetic theory (Haken, 1983), and property rights theory (Williamson, 1985). Empirical data were collected from 15 agricultural enterprises in Ternopil, selected based on size (medium to large), production focus (grain and livestock), and adoption of sustainable practices, ensuring representativeness of the region's agricultural sector. Data included financial reports, production metrics, and surveys of 50 stakeholders (farmers, managers, local authorities), selected through stratified sampling to capture diverse perspectives. Ukrainian regulations, notably the Law of Ukraine "On Sustainable Rural Development" (2015), were analyzed.

Additional methods include:

- *Sensitivity analysis* - to evaluate variable impacts on efficiency, using Monte Carlo simulations in SPSS to test parameter variations.
- *Scenario modeling* - to forecast cluster strategy outcomes, using optimistic, baseline, and pessimistic scenarios based on investment levels and policy support.
- *Matrix analysis* - to prioritize strategic development based on sustainability, innovation, and economic efficiency criteria.

These methods provide a robust foundation for developing a comprehensive management system, accounting for regional specifics and global trends.

Results. The study developed a comprehensive methodology for establishing an effective management system for agricultural enterprises, emphasizing synergetic principles. Key results include:

The concept of "development" was redefined as an organic integration of ecological, social, intellectual, and economic components, ensuring balanced growth (Table 1).

Table 1. Components of an Effective Management System

Component	Description	Indicators	Impact on Efficiency
Ecological	Sustainable resource use, waste reduction	Soil health, carbon footprint, water usage efficiency, pesticide reductio	Enhances long-term viability
Social	Employee welfare, community engagement	Job satisfaction, community trust	Improves reputation, loyalty
Intellectual	Innovation, knowledge management	R&D investments, patent applications	Drives competitive advantage
Economic	Financial efficiency, cost savings	Profit margin, ROI	Ensures profitability

Source: systematized by the authors

Synergetic Management Model. A synergetic model was developed to optimize resource flows and decision-making, using differential equations (Formula 1). The coefficients were derived from regression analysis of enterprise data, with $\alpha=0.25$, $\beta=0.20$, $\gamma=0.15$, $\delta=0.30$, and $\epsilon=0.10$, reflecting the relative influence of each component based on empirical performance metrics. Simulations showed an 18% efficiency increase under varying scenarios.

Analysis of 15 enterprises (2018–2023) involved financial reports, production metrics, and stakeholder surveys (n=50). Key outcomes include:

- *Operational Efficiency*: A 15% increase, with PP "Urmanske" reducing input costs by 12% via cluster cooperation.
- *Market Competitiveness:* A 10% rise, with 20% export revenue growth for PP "Urmanske" due to supply chain coordination.
- *Sustainability:* A 10% carbon emission reduction in five enterprises, an 8% reduction in pesticide use, and a 7% improvement in water usage efficiency, measured through irrigation system audits and chemical application records. Employee satisfaction increased by 8%.

Evaluation System. A 12-indicator evaluation system was developed, tested on five enterprises, showing a 12% improvement in strategic coordination (Table 2).

Table 2. Management Efficiency Indicators

Indicator	Unit of Measure	Baseline (2018)	Post-Implementation (2023)
Return on Investment (ROI)	%	8.5	10.2
Innovation Adoption Rate	% of new technologies	25	40
Staff Turnover	%	15	10
Carbon Emission Reduction	%	0	10
Pesticide Use Reduction	%	0	8
Water Usage Efficiency	%	0	7

Source: systematized by the authors

Practical Recommendations. Practical recommendations are grounded in evidence from pilot implementation and are oriented toward strengthening innovation capacity, operational coordination, and investment readiness. First, the creation of innovation hubs was tested in three enterprises and demonstrated measurable results, as the number of patent applications increased by 15%. Second, cluster cooperation was institutionalized through a network that united five enterprises and two supporting institutions, which improved supply chain efficiency by 18% and confirmed the value of coordinated logistics, shared infrastructure, and joint planning. Third, the investment attraction component proved feasible in practice, because two enterprises secured €500,000 through public private partnerships, indicating that structured collaboration with public actors can expand access to capital and reduce financing barriers.

The analytical component of the recommendations is supported by scenario and sensitivity modeling that clarifies how the proposed measures may perform under varying conditions. Scenario analysis suggests that, in an optimistic trajectory, efficiency may increase by 8% by 2030, while baseline assumptions still allow competitiveness to grow by 10%, which indicates resilience of the proposed approach even without exceptionally favorable external factors. Sensitivity analysis further shows that targeted levers have differentiated effects: a 10% increase in research and development investment is associated with a 5% rise in competitiveness, whereas a 5% improvement in water efficient irrigation increases viability by 7%, highlighting the strategic importance of resource efficiency measures for long term stability.

Finally, the recommendations have a demonstrable regional dimension that extends beyond firm level performance. Regional agricultural output increased by 6%, and the implementation contributed to the creation of 120 jobs, which strengthens social sustainability by supporting employment, local incomes, and community resilience. Taken together, these results indicate that innovation ecosystems, cluster based coordination, and investment mechanisms can form an integrated package that simultaneously advances enterprise competitiveness and regional development goals.

Discussion. The proposed management system extends Mintzberg's (1979) adaptive strategies by incorporating synergetic principles, ensuring

resilience in dynamic conditions. Unlike Porter's (1998) framework, which focuses on market positioning, this study emphasizes systemic balance across multiple dimensions, aligning with Haken's (1983) synergetic theory. Empirical findings from the Ternopil region support Hudzynskyi's (2015) conclusions on integrated management but add a synergetic dimension previously unexplored. The 15% increase in operational efficiency aligns with international cluster model studies (Audretsch & Feldman, 1996), though challenges like resistance to innovation and limited funding persist.

Formula 2: Competitiveness Dynamics:

$$C = f(Ec, S, I, E) = k_1 Ec^{0.4} + k_2 S^{0.3} + k_3 I^{0.2} + k_4 E^{0.1} \quad (2)$$

where C – competitiveness; Ec, S, I, E – economic, social, intellectual, ecological components; k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 – weighting coefficients based on expert evaluations.

This formula illustrates the nonlinear interplay of components, with the economic dimension exerting the greatest influence, as evidenced by the 20% export revenue growth in PP "Urmanske" through cluster strategies. However, the intellectual and social components, though weighted lower, are critical for long-term sustainability, aligning with Barney's (1991) resource-based view and Teece's (2007) dynamic capabilities, which emphasize the strategic value of unique assets and adaptive capacities. The model's practical viability in Ternopil confirms its applicability yet scaling to national or international levels requires addressing regulatory barriers, such as inconsistent agricultural policies, and infrastructural gaps, particularly in the digital domain.

International comparisons demonstrate the model's scalability. In Poland, cluster-based agricultural cooperatives, as studied by Wojcieszak-Zbierska et al. (2020), have increased productivity by 12% through shared resources and digital tools, similar to the 18% supply chain efficiency gain in Ternopil's clusters. However, Poland's success is bolstered by EU funding and advanced digital platforms, which Ukraine lacks. In Hungary, precision agriculture initiatives (Popp et al., 2018) have reduced pesticide use by 15% and water consumption by 10%, surpassing Ternopil's 8% and 7% reductions, respectively, due to better access to IoT technologies. These cases suggest that the proposed synergetic model could be adapted to other transitional economies by integrating digital infrastructure and securing financial support, though local policy alignment is critical.

International comparisons provide additional context. Cluster models in the Netherlands and Germany achieve higher efficiency due to advanced digital infrastructure, enabling real-time data integration (e.g., IoT in precision agriculture), a gap in Ukraine's agricultural sector. This aligns with Adewale et al. (2021), who highlight digital platforms' role in enhancing resource efficiency in African agriculture, suggesting potential for Ukraine to adopt similar technologies. This underscores that digitalization is critical

for amplifying synergetic effects in cluster systems, as supported by Nonaka and Takeuchi's (1995) work on knowledge creation. Freeman's (1984) stakeholder approach underscores the social component's role in securing community support, as evidenced by an 8% increase in employee satisfaction in Ternopil enterprises. Ecological sustainability, with a 10% carbon emission reduction, 8% pesticide use reduction, and 7% improvement in water usage efficiency, aligns with global sustainable development goals, as supported by Darnhofer (2021), who emphasizes resilience in farm management. However, further analysis of long-term environmental impacts, such as soil fertility trends or biodiversity effects, is needed to fully validate the model's ecological claims.

The study's synergetic approach also highlights the importance of institutional frameworks, as North (1990) advocates, in facilitating cluster cooperation and innovation adoption. In Ukraine, the Law of Ukraine "On Agricultural Cooperation" (2020) provides a legal basis, but its implementation lacks methodological clarity, limiting cluster scalability. Wojcieszak-Zbierska et al. (2023) note that Polish cooperatives benefit from clear regulatory guidelines, suggesting that Ukraine could enhance scalability by developing similar frameworks. Additionally, sensitivity analysis showing a 5% competitiveness increase from a 10% R&D investment underscores the intellectual component's pivotal role, suggesting that policymakers prioritize funding for innovation hubs. These insights position the proposed system as a scalable model, adaptable to other transitional economies facing similar challenges, provided local contextual barriers are addressed.

Conclusions. This study provides a robust theoretical and methodological framework for developing an effective management system for agricultural enterprises, using a synergetic approach to integrate ecological, social, intellectual, and economic components. The proposed system enhances strategic competitiveness, operational efficiency, and sustainability, as evidenced by empirical results from the Ternopil region, where enterprises achieved a 15% efficiency increase and a 10% boost in competitiveness.

Practical recommendations based on the establishment of innovation hubs and the development of cluster cooperation provide a coherent set of actionable strategies for strengthening the agricultural sector. These instruments support the consolidation of knowledge, the coordination of supply chains, and the diffusion of innovations by linking enterprises with research and institutional partners within an integrated management framework. At the same time, the effectiveness of such recommendations depends on contextual conditions, which makes further research necessary to validate transferability, refine implementation mechanisms, and assess longer term outcomes.

Future research should therefore prioritize several interrelated directions. First, it is important to examine how the proposed model can be scaled and adapted across diverse economic contexts, including regions with different levels of market maturity, institutional capacity, and resource availability. Second, additional attention should be given to the role of digital technologies in enabling synergetic management systems, particularly in relation to data driven coordination, transparency of transactions, and real time decision support. Third, researchers should analyze barriers that constrain innovation adoption, including regulatory limitations, fragmented governance, skills deficits, and inadequate physical and digital infrastructure, because these factors can neutralize the expected benefits even when the conceptual model is sound. Finally, longitudinal studies are needed to evaluate the long-term impact of the proposed strategies on ecological sustainability and social welfare, with an emphasis on measurable indicators such as resource efficiency, biodiversity outcomes, employment quality, and the resilience of rural communities.

Acknowledgments. The authors express gratitude to the Department of Agro-Industrial Development of the Ternopil Regional State Administration for data provision and support, and to PP "Urmanske" managers for facilitating the case study.

Funding. This research was conducted under the scientific program "Development of Theory and Methodology for Management System Formation in the Context of Ukraine's Institutional-Structural Economic Transformation" (State Registration Number 0107U004874) at the National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine. The authors declare that no financial support was received for publication of this article.

Conflict of interest. The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Generative AI statement. The authors declare that no Generative AI was used in the creation of this manuscript.

Publisher's note. The publisher clarifies that all statements made in this article reflect the author's views alone and do not necessarily represent the positions of their affiliated institutions, the publisher, the editors, or the reviewers. Any products discussed or claims made by their manufacturers are neither guaranteed nor endorsed by the publisher.

References:

1. Adewale, C., Higgins, D., & Wakunuma, K. (2021). Digital platforms and agricultural transformation: Evidence from smallholder farmers in Nigeria. Journal of Rural Studies, 84, 12–22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2021.02.005
2. Audretsch, D. B., & Feldman, M. P. (1996). Innovative clusters and the industry life cycle. Review of Industrial Organization, 11(2), 253–273. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00157670
3. Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management, 17(1), 99–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108
4. Darnhofer, I. (2021). Farming for resilience: A systems approach to sustainable agriculture. Agricultural Systems, 188, 103048. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2020.103048
5. Drucker, P. F. (1993). Post-capitalist society. New York: HarperCollins.

6. Fayol, H. (1916). General and industrial management. London: Pitman.
7. Freeman, R. E. (1984). Strategic management: A stakeholder approach. Boston: Pitman.
8. Haken, H. (1983). Synergetics: An introduction. Berlin: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-88338-5
9. Hudzynskyi, O. D. (2015). Результативне управління аграрних підприємств (Rezultatyvne upravlinnia ahrarnykh pidpryiemstv) [Effective management of agricultural enterprises]. Kyiv: Komprint.
10. Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1992). The balanced scorecard: Measures that drive performance. Harvard Business Review, 70(1), 71–79.
11. Kirieytsev, H. (2010). Управління сільськогосподарськими підприємствами в Україні (Upravlinnia silskohospodarskymy pidpryiemstvamy v Ukraini) [Management of agricultural enterprises in Ukraine]. Ahrosvit, 17, 36–37.
12. Law of Ukraine "On Agricultural Cooperation" (2020). Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine.
13. Law of Ukraine "On Sustainable Rural Development" (2015). Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine.
14. Malyk, M. (2008). Економічні механізми розвитку аграрного сектору (Ekonomichni mekhanizmy rozvytku ahrarnoho sektoru) [Economic mechanisms for agricultural sector development]. Kyiv: Institute of Agrarian Economics.
15. Mintzberg, H. (1979). The structuring of organizations. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
16. Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). The knowledge-creating company. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-6301(96)81509-3
17. North, D. C. (1990). Institutions, institutional change and economic performance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511808678
18. Osovska, H. V. (2005). Організаційне управління (Orhanizatsiine upravlinnia) [Organizational management]. Kyiv: Kondor.
19. Popp, J., Oláh, J., & Kiss, A. (2018). The role of precision agriculture in sustainable farming: Evidence from Hungary. Sustainability, 10(12), 4472. https://doi.org/10.3390/su10124472
20. Porter, M. E. (1998). Competitive advantage: Creating and sustaining superior performance. New York: Free Press.
21. Prahalad, C. K., & Hamel, G. (1990). The core competence of the corporation. Harvard Business Review, 68(3), 79–91.
22. Prigogine, I. (1980). From being to becoming: Time and complexity in the physical sciences. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.
23. Sirenko, N. M. (2010). Управління інноваційним розвитком аграрного сектору (Upravlinnia innovatsiinym rozvytkom ahrarnoho sektoru) [Management of innovative development in the agricultural sector]. Mykolaiv: Mykolaivska Typohrafiia.
24. Stewart, T. A. (1997). Intellectual capital: The new wealth of organizations. New York: Doubleday.
25. Sudomyr, S. M. (2015). Результативне управління соціально-економічними системами аграрного сектору економіки (Rezultatyvne upravlinnia sotsialno-ekonomichnymy systemamy ahrarnoho sektoru ekonomiky) [Effective management of socio-economic systems in the agricultural sector]. Kyiv: Komprint.
26. Taylor, F. W. (1911). The principles of scientific management. New York: Harper & Brothers.
27. Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. Strategic Management Journal, 28(13), 1319–1350. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640
28. Williamson, O. E. (1985). The economic institutions of capitalism. New York: Free Press.
29. Wojcieszak-Zbierska, M., Sadowski, A., & Juchniewicz, M. (2020). Agricultural clusters as a model for regional development: The case of Polish fruit and vegetable sector. European Journal of Sustainable Development, 9(1), 45–56. https://doi.org/10.14207/ejsd.2020.v9n1p45
30. Wojcieszak-Zbierska, M., Jęczmyk, A., & Zawadka, J. (2023). Social capital in agricultural cooperatives: The role of trust and cooperation. Journal of Rural Studies, 97, 32–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2022.11.005.