

We are IntechOpen, the world's leading publisher of Open Access books Built by scientists, for scientists

6,900

Open access books available

185,000

International authors and editors

200M

Downloads

Our authors are among the

154

Countries delivered to

TOP 1%

most cited scientists

12.2%

Contributors from top 500 universities



WEB OF SCIENCE™

Selection of our books indexed in the Book Citation Index
in Web of Science™ Core Collection (BKCI)

Interested in publishing with us?
Contact book.department@intechopen.com

Numbers displayed above are based on latest data collected.
For more information visit www.intechopen.com



Entrepreneurship, Farming, and Identity: A Phenomenological Inquiry

Charles B. Hennon
Miami University,
USA

1. Introduction

When necessity dictates, families can often make adaptations to continue in a lifestyle promoting family farming and signalling traditional values and way of life choices. This chapter investigates this phenomenon, including the dynamics of assets enlargement (economic and human capital) and how adept families are in integrating other forms of gainful employment into the farming way of life. The research utilises an interpretative (hermeneutic) phenomenological approach to foster insights and understanding about entrepreneurship capacity and action strategies of the farmer and family. The chapter hence explores how entrepreneurship relates to identity as 'farmer' and the ability to stay in a valued, yet modified, way of life. The term farmer is used in a broad manner, and includes crofters in Scotland (see Hunter, 2000; Stewart, 2005).¹

¹ Farmers have been defined in multiple ways. McElwee (2008, p. 467) identified farmers "as those occupied on a part- or full-time basis and engaged in a range of activities that are primarily dependent on the farm and agriculture in the practice of cultivating the soil, growing crops and raising livestock as the main source of income" whilst noting this left out some key components such as pluriactivity. According to the United States Department of Agriculture [USDA], a farm is "any place from which \$1,000 or more of agricultural products were produced and sold, or normally would have been sold, during the year", a definition that is limited, especially in a global context. USDA notes that for analytical purposes, one is not necessarily constrained by this definition of a farm (Economic Research Service, 2011a). There is no hard-and-fast definition, but a conceptualization used by USDA indicates a 'family farm' is one with the majority of the business owned by the operator and individuals related to the operator by blood, marriage, or adoption, including relatives not living in the operator's household. Brookfield and Parson (2007) used a broad definition, characterising family farms as both owner-operated and tenanted, and large and small in land endowment. The principle component defining a family farm is family organization. Family farms can vary from small to large in terms of income, with some being 'residential/lifestyle farms', or 'hobby farms', with most income coming from activities other than agriculture, to 'farming-occupation farms' with operators having farming as their major occupation (Economic Research Service, 2010; Hennon & Hildenbrand, 2005a). A 'yeoman farmer' is one with goals derived from personal identity as farmer and family concerns, such as continuity or passing the farm to at least one heir. In contrast, an 'entrepreneur farming style' is driven by profit optimising goals, to have an efficient business that is profitable (Davis-Brown & Salamon, 1988). See McElwee (2008), Capitanio and Adinolfi (2010), and Hennon and Hildenbrand (2005b) for farm taxonomies that include entrepreneur functions. Scientific definitions or 'typifications' are applied by 'outsiders', and might not capture or reflect what common folk, including self-defined farmers, would argue.

Entrepreneurship is a charismatic concept, widely used and widely defined; for example, “as a creative and innovative response to the environment” (Chandramouli et al., 2007, p. 320). It is accepted that entrepreneurship, including family entrepreneurship, is an instrument driving economic development and creating wealth, developing technology, and producing employment (Baines et al., 2003; Chegini & Khoshtinat, 2010; García et al., 2007; Hennon et al., 1998, Hennon et al., 2000; Karlsson et al., 2010; Koveos, 2010; Moroz & Hindle, 2011; Nordqvist & Melin, 2010), including in rural areas and by farmers (Alsos et al., 2003; Chandramouli et al., 2007; de Wolf & Schoorlemmer, 2007; Dabson, 2008, 2011; McElwee, 2006a, 2008; Rudmann, 2008; Vesala & Pyysiäinen, 2008; Vik & McElwee, 2011). Farm resources can be put to use in entrepreneurial activities, such as tourism or food processing, to foster economic viability. Farmers are an “innovative reservoir in agricultural communities and a potential source of entrepreneurship” (Alsos et al., 2003, p. 436). Development agencies see rural entrepreneurship having employment potential whilst farmers favour it as a way for improving earnings. Rural women understand entrepreneurship as creating employment possibility near their homes, which fosters autonomy (Anitha, 2004; Chandramouli et al., 2007). Governments and organizations regard small enterprise development as a pleasing alternative for rural development, and often enact ‘planned social change’ policies to this end (Sandberg, 2003; Warren, 2002). Many rural enterprises are ‘micro enterprises’, employing 10 persons or less.

Improvement of agobusiness and subsistence farming is possible with effective exploitation of human and material resources. Farmers have different levels of skilfulness in use of entrepreneurial skills, can reflect on their strengths and weaknesses in these skills, and be trained in thinking from an entrepreneurial skills perspective (Dabson, 2011; Rudmann, 2008; The Foxy Farm Entrepreneur, 2008; Vesala & Pyysiäinen, 2008). Developing and improving skills among farmers is a feasible option and objective (McElwee, 2006a; Rudmann, 2008; Vesala & Pyysiäinen, 2008). Developing entrepreneurial skills of farmers can take two tracks. The first is to amend the social, economic, political, and cultural frameworks that hinders, and foster those that stimulates, their development. The second is encouragement of farmers, via their personalities and capabilities, to kindle the development of entrepreneurship. If farming competitiveness is to be improved by nurturing entrepreneurial behaviour, both tracks have to be considered (Rudmann, 2008; Vesala & Pyysiäinen, 2008). The skills and attributes a farmer must possess to maximise the entrepreneurial capacity of the farm business have been assessed. Various farm and non-farm activities could necessitate different types of entrepreneurial skills (Dabson, 2011; De Clercq & Voronov, 2011; de Wolf & Schoorlemmer, 2007; Hennon & Hildenbrand, 2005a; Hildenbrand & Hennon, 2008; McElwee, 2005; Rudmann, 2008; Vik & McElwee, 2011; Vesala et al., 2007).

The improvement of entrepreneurial skills in agriculture is an important condition to generate sustainable rural development (de Wolf & Schoorlemmer, 2007). If entrepreneurship is an instrument for improving the quality of life for families and communities, and for sustaining a fit economy and environment, fostering entrepreneuring skill must be regarded as an urgently needed development component (Chandramouli et al., 2007). Skills can include a person’s technical skills, behavioural attributes, or personality characteristics. ‘Entrepreneuring’ might be considered as the dynamics whereby persons elect to become involved in the gestation of a new or modified organisation, and eventually

succeeding or becoming discouraged and giving up (Wisconsin Innovation Network, 1993). Lumpkin and Dess (1996, p. 136) declared: "The essential act of entrepreneurship is new entry. New entry can be accomplished by entering new or established markets with new or existing goods or services. New entry is the act of launching a new venture, either by a start-up firm, through an existing firm, or via 'internal corporate venturing' ". The 'entrepreneurial process' is how a new element with new value is created through using creativity, time, and resources; taking risks; and applying other relevant elements such as social capital (Chegini & Khoshtinat, 2010; Moroz & Hindle, 2011). The concept of 'entrepreneurship' accents using individual abilities, and so empowerment, skill, and other human capital are vital. 'Entrepreneurial orientation' is the "processes, practices, and decision-making activities that lead to new entry" (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996, p. 136). 'Entrepreneurial self-efficacy' is the belief that one's agency can see a new venture through to its fruition (Wang et al., 2010).

Several personality factors are associated with entrepreneurial intentions and performance, and therefore the emergence and success of entrepreneurs (Cismariu & Mocan, 2010; Zhao et al., 2010). Identified traits associated with entrepreneurial orientation include proactiveness, autonomy, risk taking, innovativeness, and competitive aggressiveness (Covin & Wales, 2011; Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; McElwee, 2008). Among youth, traits forecasting potential entrepreneurs include revising important points after training, realising the significance of training, having high levels of competition orientation, being economically motivated, and showing capacity to bear well-planned risk along with a low level of nervousness about starting a business (Patel & Chauhan, 2009). Entrepreneurial skills are 'higher level' skills, having to do with initiating, managing, and advancing an enterprise. Several lower level skills related to production, administration, and marketing are needed. These are technical or managerial skills. Higher-level skills for farming related enterprises include developing and evaluating a business strategy, networking and utilising contacts, and recognising and realising business opportunities (de Wolf & Schoorlemmer, 2007; Vesala & Pyysiäinen, 2008). Not all skills and attributes need be present for successful entrepreneurship (Warren, 2002).

Some skills and qualities are of a preconditional nature, without which entrepreneurial behaviour is impossible. Without a risk-taking attitude, as an example, a farmer is not able to realise business opportunities. Absence of specific personal qualities and attitudes hinder the development of entrepreneurial skills. Motivation to learn, self-reflection, and attitude toward feedback are examples (de Wolf & Schoorlemmer, 2007).

There is no innate entrepreneurial aptitude; rather, given the right internal and external factors, a person might become an entrepreneur over time. People can express an intention to begin a business, and intention is a foundational aspect of entrepreneurial behaviour, but intention does not necessarily lead to action. The entrepreneurial process is 'triggered' (ie, initiated) when the person begins serious consideration about starting a business and dedicates time and resources for this to happen. Schutz (1967) enumerated the idea that when planning an undertaken to be completed in the future, the individual uses 'reflective projection'. Reflectivity permits imagining an endeavour as completed in the future, imagining what is realised after acting. Triggering this endeavour launches the 'in-order-to motive' of action. 'Because motives' are historical and environmental (*umwelt*) factors having influenced the decision to proceed with the endeavour.

What triggers the final decision to take action remains unclear. After the trigger phase, the entrepreneurial pathway needs correspondence to the person's aspirations and felt as desirable. Further, the person needs to believe the project is feasible and that she/he is capable of realising the initiative to completion, that is, having a sense of entrepreneurial self-efficacy or persistence (De Clercq & Voronov, 2011; Degeorge & Fayolle, 2011; Wang et al., 2010).

There are two types of triggers. The first type is 'intention'. Intention is a cognitive desire to act and a willingness to adopt a specific line of action. Intentionality can originate from a person's characteristics advantageous to entrepreneurship—optimism, internal locus of control, propensity for risk-taking, craving for achievement, wanting autonomy, wanting to be in control. Intentions are powered by motivations, which may or may not be stable and enduring over time. Possible motivations for initiating entrepreneurship include desire for autonomy, independence, and self-realization, and enjoying a challenge (Degeorge & Fayolle, 2011; Plant & Ren, 2010).

The second type of trigger is 'displacement', or a disruption of a person's life (see 'problematic' discussion later in chapter). The change in one's behaviour leading to initiation of an entrepreneurial action can proceed from either positive and/or negative factors. Examples of positive factors include potential funding sources, acquiring encouraging information about lifestyles of the self-employed, a family atmosphere promoting entrepreneurial adventures, and discovering an entrepreneurial opportunity. Negative factor examples include being made redundant, marital disruption, unstable income, debt, and bankruptcy. Negative displacements are often what motivate action, especially new entry ventures. A blending of positive and negative displacements, however, is what often leads to significant life changes. The displacements can be internal or external to the person. External displacements relate to changes in the individuals' social and employment life, one's *umwelt*; internal relate to things like personal dissatisfaction, the belief that one is not advancing professionally or career wise, or age-related feelings that it is 'now or never' (Degeorge & Fayolle, 2011).

Unlike the traditional entrepreneur having a mission to produce and distribute goods or a service in a unique way, self-employed entrepreneurs regularly elect this route to sustain themselves and their families (Aronson, 1991). Often they are 'survival entrepreneurs', who due to a drought of other income options take the course of action of creating enterprises (Dabson, 2008). Through 'purposeful enactment' (Van de Ven & Poole, 1995), people, including farmers, can undertake a generative process of what is termed the entrepreneurial function aimed at new-venture creation due to a perceived opportunity. A variety of triggers can set off pursuit of new enterprise creation. The 'entrepreneurial function' infers discovering, assessing, and exploiting opportunities. The function implies new products, services, or processes; new business or other strategies; and perhaps novel organisational structures as well as new markets for products and inputs that perhaps did not previously exist. An unexpected and/or unvalued economic opportunity characterises 'entrepreneurial opportunity' (García et al., 2007).

Much entrepreneurial work, especially cognitively and socially, takes place within a family system (Hamilton, 2011; Heck, n.d., 2004; Hennon et al., 2000; Nordqvist & Melin, 2010;

Renzulli et al., 2000; Rogoff & Heck, 2003). Families are important breeding grounds for entrepreneurial functions and activities that can enable seizing entrepreneurial opportunities. Members of business families experience “learning-in-practice” that “brings innovation and change as well as continuity” (Hamilton, 2011, p. 8). Entrepreneurship is quite often a family affair. “Entrepreneurship is the start and heart” of most family businesses (Heck, n.d.). An entrepreneurial family teaches, nurtures, promotes, and enhances the efforts of its members who recognised and realised opportunities and engage in entrepreneurship (Barnes & Lachapelle, 1997; Hamilton, 2011; Laferrère, 2001; Plant & Ren, 2010). Further on, family support can buttress ‘entrepreneurial persistence’ where the decision is taken to continue with an opportunity in the face of adversity, counterinfluences, or enticing alternatives (De Clercq & Voronov, 2011; Holland & Shepherd, 2011). The family business is an expansive view of entrepreneurship, as the morphogenesis of initial business efforts of one or more family members progresses (Baines et al., 2003; Entrepreneurship, n.d.; Heck, n.d., 2004). Wheelock (1993, p. 23) suggested, “Economic motivation must be examined in a family rather than an individual context. In relating lives to livelihood, a ‘familial economic unit’ and its distinctive work strategy are shown to be critical....” The Task Force of the International Family Business Program Association (n.d.) emphasized that the basic foundation on which to base analyses of the economy is not individual workers, entrepreneurs, or corporations, but rather families that create, control, and operate businesses. Even though family environment is an important contributor to incubating and sustaining entrepreneurship, families can experience challenges and strife as well as success and joy (Anderson & Miller, 2003; Baines et al., 2003; Bowman, 2001; Brown, 2011; Fairlie, 2009). Wheelock (1993, p. 33) warned, “families often need to adapt to a new way of life when they set up in business, and for some this...[is] much easier than for others”.

There is no lack of entrepreneurship throughout rural America, but this is not widely recognized (Dabson, 2011). The same can be said of farmers worldwide. Farmers have traditionally been entrepreneurial, especially pluriactive farmers, and are business owners and managers, including businesses in addition to the conventional farm business (Carter, 1998; Carter & Rosa, 1998; Eikeland & Lie, 1999; McElwee, 2008). Alsos et al. (2003, p. 436) asked, “Why do some farmers choose to start new business activities instead of limiting their engagement to farming or becoming employed?” and recognised, “a paucity of knowledge about which factors trigger the start-up of entrepreneurial activities among farmers”, a sentiment echoed by McElwee (2008). This chapter answers the call for adding to the knowledge base of entrepreneuring among farmers.

The content of this chapter displays how two couples prised opportunities and fulfilled the entrepreneurial function to create organisations in the service and retail sectors that have allowed the families to have economic viability whilst maintaining the self conceptions of traditional crofters and farmers. Issues investigated include entrepreneurial intentionality, what triggered the decisions to pursue entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial persistence and self-efficacy, awareness of entrepreneurial opportunities, some of the traits and abilities of the family members that foster entrepreneurial activities, their entrepreneurial orientations, use of their holding’s plant resources, and the types and nature of the new entries. Data for the analyses comes from interviews and participant observation of a crofting family in the western highlands of Scotland, and interviews and observations of a farm family in the Midwestern United States. Even though some people might not think of farmers as business

owners or entrepreneurs, they do own a business, though not of the traditional type. Agricultural business is risky with unstable incomes, farm economics differ from most other businesses, and farming is a way of life. Family farms are family businesses with signature family dynamics and special emotional attachments to the farm and business (Brookfield & Parsons, 2007; Feldman, 2009; Gasson & Errington, 1993; Hennon & Hildenbrand, 2005a; Kobzar, 2006; Marotz-Baden et al., 1988; McElwee, 2008). Family businesses, including family-farm business, are complex because individual, family, and business subsystems overlap. Boundaries are often diffused and individual issues become family issues, and family issues become business issues, and vice versa. Family dynamics influence the family and enterprise and contribute to success or failure. Farm families are characterised by an 'agifamily system' with unique affiliations and organisations (Bennett, 1982). Hildenbrand (2008) presented a case study of one such Germany farm family. Brookfield and Parsons (2007, p. 217) argued that family farms persist, in the face of capitalism and predictions of industrial farms becoming hegemonic, due to the bonds of family. Families can adjust and adapt to market forces and take advantage of new opportunities. Policy makers are often blind "to the adaptive flexibility of family-scale operation, its competitive ability and its contribution to sustaining wider rural economies".

The chapter is structured as follows. First, background information about the crofting system in Scotland and the scale of family farming, and why for some families these remain a valued lifestyle and tradition, is offered. This section presents some important conceptualisations and reviews knowledge about entrepreneurship among farmers and farm families. Given that phenomenology is not widely utilised in the study of entrepreneurship, the next section provides an overview of this approach to research. The following section explains the methods employed for the research presented here in. Case-reconstruction analysis grounds the analytical approach, and the case reconstructions are presented next. Findings from the analysis of how two families, and by extension perhaps other families, make sense of their lifeworlds and can persist 'as if' they are still farm families rather than rural entrepreneurs, are offered. The conclusion section offers an explanation of how use of the 'as if' strategy can help during periods of difficult adjustments to emerging economic and other situations (in a sense, modernising to remain traditional). This section also presents the conceptualising of entrepreneurial vivacity and astuteness, two other themes that emerged. The chapter offers some understanding of the process by which families, struggling to survive in an economically peripheral area or whilst facing agro-economic changes and uncertain markets, can use entrepreneurial skills and attitudes to transform their livelihood and create new businesses, yet holding to identities of traditional crofter or family farmer.

2. Crofts and farms

The agricultural sector is fashioned by many contingencies impacting local economies—policy, geography, topography, climate, transportation systems, proximity to markets, and labour force size and skills for example. Other factors are culture, traditions, *habitus*, and availability of capital (Bourdieu, 1977; Brookfield, & Parsons, 2007; Hennon & Hildenbrand, 2005a; McElwee, 2008). Entrepreneurship orientation and opportunities also vary. Worldwide, farms and farming vary in many ways. Farmers and farms are not uniform, but represent heterogeneity, even in the same geographical area. In this chapter the focus is on crofts in Scotland and family farms in the U.S. Midwest.

2.1 Crofts

Approximately 85 per cent of Scotland is 'less favoured area', a European Union classification that acknowledges natural and geographic disadvantages. About 65,000 people are employed in agriculture, about eight per cent of Scotland's rural workforce; agriculture is the third largest employer in rural Scotland (National Farmers Union Scotland, n.d.).

Crofting is a form of regulated land tenure, unique to parts of Scotland (Busby & Macleod, 2010; Crofters Commission, n.d.; Scottish Crofting Federation, n.d.). Crofts are agricultural holdings in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland that are subject to the Crofting Acts. The word croft comes from the Gaelic *coirtean*, and means a small-enclosed field. In Scotland, a croft is a small individual holding of enclosed land with a share in a common grazing (Stewart, 2005). Crofters are entitled to have a dwelling house on the croft and to erect or use a building or other structure on the croft for an auxiliary occupation, such as a loom shed for weaving. Crofts range from less than one-half hectare to more than 50, with an average croft being five hectare of 'in-bye' (arable) land and a share in a larger area of common grazing. The common grazing land is subject to crofting legislation and used by crofters communally. There are about 800 regulated common grazings, usually managed by a Grazing Committee that makes Grazing Regulations to control their use. The crofters or others holding interests in common grazings are 'shareholders'. The number and kinds of livestock each crofter is entitled to graze is the 'souming' (Scottish Parliament Information Centre [SPIC], 2010). The Crofting Commission (n.d.) considers crofting to mean the "close and interlinked relationships between the land and the economy, agriculture, environment, heritage, culture and distinctive lifestyles of crofting communities".

A croft has been styled "a small area of land entirely surrounded by regulations" (Stewart, 2005, p. 1). Statutory conditions restrict the use of the croft land to farming, forestry, or putting the croft to a 'purposeful use'. Crofting agriculture is primarily rearing of lambs and cattle for sale to low ground farmers for breeding stock or fattening and finishing, as these are not cost-effective in the crofting areas due to climatic and soil quality shortcomings. Croft land is generally poor quality and the in-bye land is mainly permanent pasture. Crofts are typically small compared to other agricultural holdings in Scotland, and cannot sustain full time employment. A survey in 2007 found, on average, 30 per cent of a croft household's income came from crofting. Finding supplementary employment varies according to environment, climate, and other factors in the crofting counties. Many crofters have diversified into small-scale tourism and other enterprises, and others hold jobs in the public sector, tourism, rural industry, service sectors, and fishing (Scottish Crofting Federation, n.d.; SPIC, 2010).

The crofting lifestyle has a long history (Hunter, 2000; Stewart, 2005). The basic principle of crofting law is to furnish the crofter security of tenure at a reasonable rent. The crofter and landlord agree upon the amount of rent, normally before the start of a tenancy. Although technically a year-to-year arrangement, crofting tenancies have no time limit and are hereditary. Crofters can bequeath their tenancy to any one person (assignation). Different rules apply if that person is not a family member. The definition of family is restricted to certain relatives and includes a civil partner or cohabitant (SPIC, 2010).

Crofters are in danger of losing their tenancy only if failing to reside on or near their croft, breaching statutory conditions, failing to pay rent, or if the landlord 'resumes' part or the entire croft. The landlord must apply to the Scottish Land Court to do this, and permission is granted only if it is for the good of the croft or the estate, or is in the public interest or the interests of the crofting community (e.g., for building houses, harbours, churches, schools; planting trees; or for other purposes likely to provide employment in the locality). A crofter has the right to buy the site of his/her croft house. If the landlord refuses to sell or if failure to agree terms and conditions of sale ensues, the crofter can apply to the Land Court for an Order requiring the landlord to sell. When a crofter buys the croft, she/he essentially becomes the landlord (SPIC 2010).

Crofts are not intended to provide all the means of substance for a family through agriculture. The size of the croft was deliberately kept small so that the occupant would be available for work at kelping or fishing, or as hired hands on farms and estates, or engage in other economic activities that would benefit the landlord. This situation still exists, but the ancillary work of the crofter might not necessarily benefit the landlord. Many crofters have off croft work such as lorry drivers, tele-workers, postal workers, weavers, and teachers, and many have diversified in to small-scale tourism (Munk, 2006; Scottish Crofting Federation, n.d.). Some crofters have developed activities on or from the croft, such as weaving, creating jewellery or pottery, or retail sales of handicrafts or woollen sweaters.

The Crofters Commission (1998, p. 4) assessed "crofting is best described as a way of life. It is often equated with part-time agriculture. This is only partially true; agriculture links crofters with the land and crofting agriculture impacts significantly on rural economies. But crofting is more. It defines the economy, environment, culture, language and heritage for many rural communities. At the very heart of crofting are people. Our challenge is to work with them to enhance the crofting way of life."

2.2 Farms

In the U.S. Midwest, family farms can be large in terms of land endowment and income, but mostly are small in terms of income and land. Land is owned, and additional land often rented. Common products are soya beans, wheat, and corn, and beef and dairy farming. Most U.S. farms, 98 per cent, are family operations; the largest farms also are predominantly family run.² Large-scale family and nonfamily (often industrialised) farms are 12 per cent of U.S. farms, but account for 84 per cent of the value of production. Average net income for farm businesses (intermediate and commercial operations, including nonfamily farms) is projected to be \$83,100 in 2011, a 17 per cent increase from 2010. Smallholdings are less profitable than large-scale farms, on average, and their operator households often rely on off-farm income.³ Many family farms are part-time, small-scale operations with sales of

² The majority of farms in the European Union are family-owned and operated, as they are in Australia, most African nations, Canada, and the USA. The family-operated farm business prevails even in countries that are geographically and otherwise suited for industrialised farming (Hildenbrand & Hennon, 2008).

³ Off-farm as used here includes employment off the farm premises, as well as income earned on or from the premises from business enterprises owned and/or run by the farmer or family.

under \$250,000. The number of small family-farm operators who report farming as their primary occupation has declined. In 1993, these represented 37 per cent of farms; in 2003, 27 per cent. Residential farms (small farms with operators reporting off-farm work as primary occupation) increased to 42 per cent in 2003, from 36 per cent in 1993. Their average farm sales were low (\$12,000 in 2003), and represented five per cent of all U.S. farm production (Hoppe & Banker, 2006).

The median farm-household income in 2003 was \$47,600, 10 per cent greater than for all U.S. households. Farm business average income for all family farms in 2011 is projected at \$31,900. For almost all U.S. farm families, a significant proportion of income is earned off-farm, as is true for farm families in many other nations. U.S. farm operator households are not low-income when the combined farm and off-farm incomes are considered. Because small-farm households receive much income from off-farm work or self-employed operation of enterprises, general economic policies, such as tax or economic development policy, are as important as farm policy. Within the European Union, the Common Agricultural Policy presents farmers the opportunity for taking more responsibility for their businesses, and for having more freedom to farm as desired. This is generally true of the agricultural sector in the U.S. This means farmers have to adjust and be attentive to market forces (Barrett et al., 2001; Brookfield, 2008; Brookfield & Parsons, 2007; Economic Research Service, 2010; Hennon & Hildenbrand, 2005a; Hoppe & Banker, 2006, 2010; Hoppe et al., 2010; McElwee, 2005).

Hennon and Hildenbrand (2008, p. 481) asked: "Why, against the trend of modernisation and enlargement, and hence laden with risk, do many farming families continue to value and pursue a more traditional family pattern?" They provided two answers to this question: a) the family farm offers an advantaged way of living in regards to independence and the combination of life and livelihood, b) family tradition hampers surrendering a farm. The successor is expected to make a personal contribution to the farm. This tradition creates a dilemma not easily surmounted (Bourdieu, 1977). This, however, can be the motivation behind development of the farm, provided the generations living on the farm respectfully engage with one another (see Mishra et al., 2010, for a review of farm succession planning in the USA, and Bohak et al., 2010, for a review of succession in Europe).

Farm exits each year are approximately 10 per cent in the U.S. The same number of farms, mostly smallholdings, comes into existence (Hoppe & Korb, 2006). The number of farms has been stable since 1974. The exit probability is minimal for large farms in existence for 14 or more years and managed by people younger than age 65. This lower rate of exit supports the production concentration among fewer and larger family farms. Hampered by lack of capital and other resources, smaller family farms have difficulties adapting to globalised markets. Some do grow into larger operations (Newton, 2005).

'Getting big or getting out' is an applicable principle when judging the future of the family-operated farm business. Increasing the use of technology (e.g., geo-positioning systems for planting crops and computers for record keeping and forecasting), enlarging the land area, and expanding a mono-structure (specialising in one crop or type of livestock) can help secure survival (see for example, Fernandez-Cornejo, 2007; Halpin & Guilfoyle, 2005; Rossier, 2005). If these were only options available, the premise presented in this chapter, that farmers can be entrepreneurial in ways beside traditional agricultural activities, would

need discarded. The processes of concentration and/or enlargement restrict some reasons for maintaining a farm and its benefits to the family. Pluriactivity, multioccupation, and portfolio enhancement can be advanced via entrepreneuring.

2.3 Pluriactivity, diversification, multioccupation, and portfolio of activities

In an agricultural context, 'pluriactivity' describes "the phenomenon of farming in conjunction with another gainful activity, whether on- or off-farm" (Mackinnon et al., 1991, p. 59), "existence of other gainful activities for the farmer, ie. every activity other than activity relating to farm work, carried out for remuneration" (Barthomeuf, 2008, p. 3), or "any business activity that the farmer engages in which is off-farm activity" (McElwee, 2008, p. 478). Pluriactivity designates that farm households realise income from not only agricultural activities, but also non-agricultural on-farm and off-farm activities. Pluriactivity among farm households in the United States, Europe, and elsewhere is an established tradition and has become more common in recent decades (Alsos et al., 2003; Barrett et al., 2001; Shucksmith & Winter, 1990; Toynbee & Jamieson, 1989). Significant numbers of farmers and spouses have resorted to other sources of income at certain times and stages of the life cycle, as either a temporary tactic for income enlargement or as a more prevalent fixture of wage earning and lifestyle benefits (Barthomeuf, 2008; Bergmann et al., 2006; Fernandez-Cornejo, 2007; Rønning & Kolvereid, 2006). Pluriactivity as an economic strategy can enable families to persist in farming and living in the countryside, and can be motivated by many factors—desire to keep the family farm going, to stay at home to care for elderly parents, affinity with farm labour, or emotional or family bond reasons such as not wanting to sell the family homestead (Alsos et al., 2003; Hennon & Hildenbrand 2005a; Hildenbrand & Hennon, 2008).

One type of pluriactivity is 'diversification', an intrinsic attribute of many rural livelihood strategies, and promoted by Britain and European policy makers as a desirable trend among farmers (Warren, 2002). Farm diversification is the "on-farm use of the resources of the farm for producing either new agricultural products which are not in surplus or non-agricultural products" (Shucksmith & Winter, 1990, p. 429). Warren (2002) conceptualised diversification "as the exploitation of multiple assets and sources of revenue". McElwee (2008, p. 478) considered diversification as "on-farm or farming-related activity. Thus contracting or farm accommodation would constitute diversification". The Scottish Government (2010) defined diversification as the "entrepreneurial use of farm resources for the purpose of producing non-agricultural commodities". For this chapter, diversification includes any gainful activities that do not comprise farm work, but are directly related to the holding. Examples include handicrafts, piecework, weaving, wood processing, aquaculture, contractual work using equipment of the holding, retail sales of food products or other goods, and tourism such as a B&B (Barthomeuf, 2008).

'Rural livelihoods diversification' processes can encompass a broad brand of activities, including wage labour or enterprise development. 'Rural self-employment enterprises' are activities organised by mobilising labour and other household capital assets (e.g., savings, buildings, equipment, land). 'Rural agricultural enterprises' are built from inventive on-farm agricultural activities such as independent commercial production or contract farming. 'Rural non-agricultural enterprises' centre on pursuits like processing of commodities, manufacturing, retail or wholesale trades, home-based piecework, or providing services to

the community or to outsiders such as tourists. Rural enterprises can arise within a single household or a wider social network (Warren, 2002). Rural enterprise development requires higher investment and higher risk. Diversifying farmers and their families should select the alternative best suiting their risk-aversion needs. Farmers proficient in joining conventional farming with rural enterprises experience higher income and more secure livelihoods than do farmers with income from conventional farming alone, or combined with wage labour (Warren, 2002).

Pluriactivity also can be conceptualised as better use of space and other resources. A closely related concept is 'multioccupation', or a person (or a family) simultaneously being gainfully employed in more than one occupation. Traditionally, crofters in Scotland have been involved in multioccupation (both on and outwith of the croft) and pluriactivity as they combined a variety of gainful activities to assemble a livelihood (Hunter, 2006; Kinloch & Dalton, 1990; Toynbee & Jamieson, 1989). Fernandez-Cornejo (2007) noted that off-farm employment is regarded as a usual feature in most farming societies, more than one-half of U.S. farm operators work off-farm, and the majority of farmers regard off-farm employment as a permanent pursuit (ie, strategic versus occasional diversification; Warren, 2002). The average African and Asian rural household acquires about 45 and 30 per cent, respectively, of their income from non-farm income sources, whilst in rural Latin America it is about 40 per cent (Warren, 2002). About one-fifth of U.S. farmers with a second source of income are self-employed business owners.

Certain farmers choose off-farm employment or to start their own enterprises as a way to stabilise household income given the volatility of agricultural earnings (Barrett et al., 2001; Warren, 2002). A desire to realise vocational training drives some pluriactivity. The decision to seek other income sources as well as the sustainability of such endeavours are supported by several factors, including family support and encouragement, own financial resources or obtainability of credit, availability of premises on the holding for alternative uses, and the ease of operating a business from the home. The alternate source of income can be one's own family enterprise as it is created, nourished, and maintained, such as done by the two families observed for the analysis presented in this chapter.

2.4 Farmers as entrepreneurs

A European Union Green Paper defined entrepreneurship as "the mindset and process to create and develop economic activity by blending risk-taking, creativity and/or innovation with sound management, within a new or an existing organisation" (de Wolf & Schoorlemmer, 2007, p. 115). Research with European farmers used the following definition (de Wolf & Schoorlemmer, 2007, p. 119): "An entrepreneurial farmer is a person who is able to create and develop a profitable business in a changing business environment". Operationalizing farmers' entrepreneurial activity is difficult. Farmers do not operate in business activities similar to others. Additionally, farmers, and especially crofters, work in a highly regulated environment that is a barrier to entrepreneurship (McElwee, 2006a).

Regardless, many farmers are quite entrepreneurial if one accepts that it means creatively determining how, and then acquiring, additional income from strategic farm development, or service, retail, or wholesale new entries undertaken owing to entrepreneurial opportunities (Capitanio & Adinolfi, 2010; Haugen & Vik, 2008; Hennon & Hildenbrand,

2005a; Hildenbrand & Hennon, 2008; McElwee, 2005, 2008; Vesala & Pyysiäinen, 2008; Vik & McElwee, 2011). For the farm enterprise to remain viable and the family to sustain, additional sources of income besides the more common agricultural activities are frequent. These additional sources are components of the portfolio of earning activities for the individual and household, and include off-farm and on-farm occupations by multiply family members, and are more frequent when the family holding is closer to conurbations (Barrett et al., 2001; Rudmann, 2008; Sofer, 2001; Warren, 2002). A portfolio of activities can stabilise income flows and consumption (Barrett et al., 2001; Kobzar, 2006; Vesala et al., 2007). This type of pluriactivity and multioccupation is typical of crofters, farmers, and other households engaged in home-based employment (Hennon et al., 2000; Hillenbrand & Hennon, 2008; Scottish Crofting Federation, n.d.; Wheelock, 1993). One large-scale study in Europe concluded the farmers interviewed, for the most part, agreed entrepreneurial skills were important and relevant for one's business activities. Differences were found, however, about how skilful farmers were (Vesala & Pyysiäinen, 2008). Among farmers as potential entrepreneurs, portfolio farmers, in contrast to other farmers, see themselves as risk-takers, innovative, optimistic, growth-oriented, and possessing more personal control over their business activities (Vesala et al., 2007).

Owner-managers of a business who start new business activities are 'parallel' or 'portfolio' entrepreneurs. Farms are somewhat like other small rural businesses. Farmers are business owner-managers. Farmers, who initiate new business activities by realising and exploiting entrepreneurial opportunities and still maintaining the farm business, are therefore portfolio entrepreneurs (Alsos et al., 2003).

Various groupings of activities in rural livelihood portfolios have been suggested. One that captures an importance distinction is broadening through wage labour or broadening through growth of self-employment enterprises. The business idea, the resources available, and the lifestyle of the farm family influence the nature of the new enterprise. Alsos et al. (2003) identified three types of farmer entrepreneurs who contribute to society in different manners. 'Pluriactive farmers' take up the multifunctional of farming. 'Resource exploiting entrepreneurs' exploit distinctive resources to generate economic activity from the farm. 'Portfolio entrepreneurs' offer a greater contribution to household income, employment, and economic activity.

Pluriactive farmers identify as farmers, and they put their work effort into and receive their main income from farming. New business activities are started in order to maintain or expand the farm, and new business activities typically relate to the farm. The strong commitment to farming can be a choice of lifestyle—to staying on the family farm. The commitment can also be due to a belief of having no choice—due to a sense of duty or perceiving few other opportunities. Establishing new business activities is a way of increasing farm income. A new business activity is developed instead of waged employment because these farmers find off-farm employment difficult to combine with farm activities and difficult to fit into their lifestyle. The business started often emulate those of other farmers, are typically small in scale, and put up on competence and utilising spare capacity at the farm, such as work force or machinery. Pluriactive farmers pursue a traditional way of living whilst modernising it, and thusly contribute to the multifunctionality of agriculture (Alsos, et al., 2003; Barthomeuf, 2008; Bergmann et al., 2006; Hennon & Hildenbrand, 2005b; Hildenbrand & Hennon, 2008; Kinsella et al., 2000; Sofer, 2001).

The resource-exploiting entrepreneur wants to exploit available resources – material and/or immaterial, like particular buildings, unique premises or location, education, experience, vocational training, human and social capital – usually connected to the farm and/or family members. These could also be local community resources. These farmers have other opportunities including farm expansion or waged labour. These opportunities are forsaken for not allowing the person to utilise her/his unique resources. The farm is a place of residence, but strong ties to farming is lacking relative to pluriactive or yeoman farmers. A substantial portion of household income comes from the farm. The nascent business activity, however, can be just as, or even more, important concerning income, quality of life, lifestyle, and satisfaction. The activity is not necessarily rooted in farming and can be located on or outwith the farm. The businesses are often larger than pluriactive farmers' and require more capital. Family members own the businesses and typically only employ other family members. If these fresh activities utilise resources well, the businesses contribute to household income and local economic activity (Alsos et al., 2003; Capitanio & Adinolfi, 2010; Carter, 1999; Davis-Brown & Salamon, 1988; Hildenbrand & Hennon, 2008; Marotz-Baden et al., 1988; Rossier, 2005).

Portfolio entrepreneurs have weaker bonds to farming, and sometimes to the farm as a residence. These farmers view the farm as a business, a business not always necessary to keep, unlike the perspective of pluriactive farmers. The burgeoning business sometimes becomes bigger than the farm business and the greatest source of income. They consciously chose self-employment, and this is an important point for them. The main trigger for starting a new business is wanting to develop a business idea, not necessarily originating in the farm's resources. They set forth to create uniqueness by such means as differentiating their products from others, using unique design, marketing as a niche business, and focusing on sales, implying a market-oriented approach. Portfolio entrepreneurs can marshal resources, and often invest greater sums compared to pluriactive farmers and resource-exploiting entrepreneur. These people thereby take greater risks, financially, reputation wise (stigma of failure), and time use. They might shift resources from the farm to the business if a better return is expected. They might curtail employment and other activities, including time with family, to fulfil the business idea. The business is expected to contribute significantly to the family income, and can contribute to economic development and employment (Alsos et al., 2003; Damaraju et al., 2010; de Wolf & Schoorlemmer, 2007; Hennon & Hildenbrand, 2005b; Hildenbrand & Hennon, 2008; McElwee, 2006b, 2008; Nordqvist & Melin, 2010; Rossier, 2005; Vesala & Pyysiäinen, 2008; Warren, 2002).

Historically known for commitment to independence and entrepreneurial ideals, farmers have experience of self-employment and food production. Agricultural households have a tradition of combining other sources of income with farming activities (Alsos et al., 2003). Families engaged in agobusiness frequently weave lives and livelihoods from complex strands of living and earning. Entrepreneurship is a global hedge against 'farm exits' due to inadequate income (Bohak et al., 2010; Brookfield & Parsons, 2007; Chandramouli et al., 2007; de Wolf & Schoorlemmer, 2007; Economic Research Service, 2006; Glauben et al., 2003; Kimhi & Bollman, 1999; Rudmann, 2008; Stam & Dixon, 2004). Entrepreneurship, can however, lead to farm exits in the sense of the farmer giving up traditional farming to pursue other gainful activities.

3. Phenomenological method

Social sciences theories and concepts are 'second order', in that they are derived from and explain 'first order' everyday constructs and life. Schutz (1953, 1966, 1967) presented several postulates concerning the qualities of good social theory. The 'postulate of subjective interpretation' requires social scientific analysis and explanation to explain the subjective world of the actor. Schutz proposed (1953, p. 34), "compliance with this postulate warrants the consistency of the constructs of the social scientist with the constructs of common-sense experience of the social reality".

The postulate of subjective interpretation asserts theorists are not directly interested in a person's behaviour as observed. The description of a person's behaviour must be as if conceived through the mind of the person who enacted the behaviour. Theories of action construct images of actors' means and ends. The theory assumes, or hypothesises, the event or act is important to the actor as a means to achieve a particular end. The theorist's images must be reasonable and understandable to the actor and to others. The consequence for theory construction is that from observation of typical sequence of action, a model of the actor is constructed that includes realising 'in-order-to' and 'because of' motives attributed to the actor.

Schutz (1967) developed the idea of 'temporality' in the generation of an action theory. Passive experience (e.g., reflexes), spontaneous activity without a guiding project (e.g., noticing something in the environmental), and deliberately planned and projected activity (ie, action, such as seeking funding for a business) were demarcated. When planning an action to be future realised, the person depends on reflective 'projection'. Such reflectivity allows the person to imagine a project as completed in the future, imagining what will have been accomplished after purposeful action. Realising or triggering this project launches the 'in-order-to motive' of one's action. A person's 'because motives' entail environmental and historical factors that influenced the decision, now past as it was already undertaken, to start upon the project. This motive can only be discovered by investigating past factors that preceded the decision.

The 'postulate of logical consistency' argues that scientific theories must be logical and clear, superseding the language, constructs, typifications, and common-sense thinking used in everyday life. Theories of human action are fashioned through a process of typification, an idea Schutz (1962) derived from Husserl. Typification is a fundamental process in people's sense making about the world. Common-sense typifications are continuously employed and developed. Scientific typifications, or social types (e.g., types of actors or actions), serve a similar purpose within the investigative objectives of the social scientist. They offer a way of identifying, classifying, and comparing modes of social action using defined criteria for the designation of phenomena to type (Wilson, 2002).

The 'postulate of adequacy' holds that scientific descriptions or explanations of social situations and lines of action be comprehensible to those involved – well linked to the lived experience. It accordingly demands that constructs used by the theorist be articulated and consistent with the constructs used by the everyday actor. These scientific concepts must be comprehensible and give a comprehensive and trustworthy explanation of the acts observed. The postulate of adequacy represents, to its proponents, a transformative idea in

sociology in that it distinguishes phenomenology from positivistic modes of explanation (McLain, 1981). “ ‘Holding onto the subjective perspective’ offers...the only really sufficient guarantee that social reality is not replaced by a fictitious non-existent world constructed by some scientific observer”. Schutz did recognise that the perspective of another person could only be approximated, always remaining an unachievable ideal for social theorists (Hitzler & Eberle, 2004, p. 69).

Phenomenological researchers are looking for understanding of the essential truths or essences of lived experiences (Byrne, 2001a). They accept that knowledge and understanding are ingrained in the everyday world experienced by embodied humans. Furthermore, phenomenologists believe knowledge cannot be quantified, reduced to numbers and statistics. Rather, phenomenologists posit understanding of life and ‘truth’ emerges from people’s life experiences. It is furthered argued that people live in taken for granted realities that are subjective. The ‘lifeworld’ is of central concern in a phenomenological analysis. It is the “only real world, the one that is actually given through perception, that is ever experienced and experienceable—our everyday Lifeworld....What we know best, what is always taken for granted in all human life, always familiar” (Husserl, 1970, pp. 49 & 123). Lifeworld (*Lebenswelt*) is what is self-evident or ‘given’; it is a world that people can experience together, and thusly intersubjectivity, the sharing of subjective states by two or more people, is achievable (Scheff et al., 2006). Intersubjectivity occurs when a phenomenon is personally experienced (subjectively), but by more than one person (Intersubjectivity, n.d.). It allows for empathy, or the experiencing of another person as a ‘subject’ rather than just an object. It also provides for ‘common sense’, or shared meanings, raised through interaction. Shared meaning is a resource to interpret what ‘things’ mean in everyday life, a definition of the situation experienced. One way intersubjectivity occurs is through communication as people report on their experiences and negotiate the meaning of things. Language and ‘talk’, or communication in interactions with others, is vital in phenomenological analysis (Gubrium & Holstein, 1993). One’s way of talking about things and events—the objects of people’s conversation—are of paramount importance. Each person’s world is one of things “constituted by language in interaction” (Gubrium & Holstein, 1993, p. 655). Social organisation is produced through linguistic interaction (Radina et al., 2008). Each individual’s lifeworld consists of socially and culturally given meanings, a lived realm of culturally grounded understandings (Habermas, 1981).

Schutz (1967) used the term *umwelt* to point to the ‘surrounding world’ or environmental factors that can affect the behaviour of an individual actor. He also mentions ‘consociates’ or ‘fellow-men’ of the individual that share a community of space and time. Experienced social realities are vast, directly experienced as well as indirectly experienced—a social reality beyond the horizon of direct experience.

Phenomenological understanding underscores how people impart meaning to the life they are living, a focus on individual consciousness. Experience is a critical aspect of living, a consciousness of being a physical and psychological person (corporeality) and of one’s relationship to the physical and social world (relationality). It is also how the immediate world is realised spatially and temporally. Phenomenology scrutinises and seeks understanding of how people experience and accomplish everyday reality, and how it is intersubjectively structured. People’s perspectives, voices, meanings, and their lives as experienced are prioritised. In phenomenological analysis, attention to how individuals give

meaning to the objects of their consciousness or experiences is critical (Daly, 2007; Gubrium & Holstein, 1993). Research intends clarification of situations lived in everyday life and the meaning of experiences (Giorgi & Giorgi, 2003).

The research reported herein is a phenomenological analysis about how farming couples' identities are interactionally constituted and sustained. Each person's identity is influenced by his or her family paradigm, biography, and 'local cultures' and 'going concerns' (Gubrium & Holstein, 1993, 2000). These cultures are organisers of shared concepts and expectations about the world and life. Going concerns are "relatively stable, routinized, ongoing patterns of action and interaction" and a "way of being who and what we are in relation to the immediate scheme of things" (Gubrium & Holstein, 2000, p. 102). To be understood is how language in social interaction fashions a meaningful world and self-identity. In experiencing life as a process, people might use categories such as farmer or crofter, or business owner or entrepreneur, to identify self or to provide indicators of statuses in the life lived. What matters in the analysis and interpretation of the experiences of the people studied is not so much the status of farmer or others that people offer, or the fact of farming, crofting, or running a business, but rather what the individual 'makes' of it. That is, the language used to live within one's world and explain it to self and others. The aim of inquiry is to capture as closely as possible the way the phenomenon of crofting and farming are experienced within the context in which it ensues. From the contextual presentation of the phenomenon as lived by the participant, the analysis endeavours to determine the essence of the phenomenon and to interpret how one experiences the phenomenon. Direct descriptions of experiences provided by those having the experience are sought, rather than 'scientific' analysis or understanding (Daly, 2007). The subjective meanings that compose the phenomenon are pursued through analysing lived instances of the phenomenon (Giorgi & Giorgi, 2003). To do this, the researcher must 'enter' the world of the investigated individual, but trying to withhold own preconceptions and scientific concepts whilst getting in touch in a direct and primitive way with the 'natural attitude' of the individual living in a social world as constructed by her or his subjective and intersubjective reality.

3.1 Phenomenology

Phenomenology has become a commonly used term and it is not always clear if the reference is to the philosophy or to phenomenological inquiry as an approach to research. Phenomenological inquiry designates a research perspective distinct from more positivistic, hypothetico-deductive forms of inquiry. Cope (2005) demonstrated how the philosophy is translated into an interpretive research method. There are two major branches within phenomenology, stemming from two seminal thinkers who shaped the early stages of the philosophy. The descriptive or eidetic branch is associated with Husserl, and the interpretative or hermeneutics branch with Heidegger (Heidegger, 1962; Husserl, 2010, 1999; Lopez & Willis, 2004; Munhall, 2007; Wojnar & Swanson, 2007). Both were German philosophers. Heidegger was Husserl's student, but when he took over Heidegger's chair, he fostered a different understanding of what phenomenology could do (Lopez & Willis, 2004).

There are important differences between the two approaches, but a simplified explanation is offered here. Descriptive phenomenologists attempt to put aside, or 'bracket' knowledge, presuppositions, or biases they have about the subject of investigation so that these do not affect the study. Interpretative phenomenologists accept that previously held ideas and

knowledge cannot be put asunder, as they are a part of the person. It is not possible to approach a subject in a completely blank, neutral manner. It is recognised that people, including the researcher, use one's own experiences to interpret the experiences of others. The goal then is to become acutely aware of presuppositions and how they may affect the study (Ball, 2009; Connelly, 2010; Crist & Tanner, 2003; Lopez & Willis, 2004).

Phenomenology as a philosophy emphasises the nature of experience as known to the person experiencing the phenomenon. A phenomenon is anything that appears or presents itself to someone in consciousness (Moran, 2000). The 'known experience' is termed 'lived experience.' A descriptive phenomenological researcher thus examines and attempts to understand the qualities, or essence, of an experience. Interpretative phenomenologists focus on the lived experience, or the situated meaning of a human in the world (*dasein*) (Flood, 2010; Lopez & Willes, 2004). This is typically attempted via in-depth but loosely structured interviews, people's stories, or observations of people having the experience of interest to the investigator (Balls, 2009; Connelly, 2010). The goal is accurate describing and revealing the meaning of the lived experience in the context of what is being investigated, rather than constructing a nomothetic theory, developing a theoretical model, or confirming/disconfirming existing theory. Phenomenology is discover orientated. The aim is to develop inductive, interpretive theories indivisibly substantiated in the lived-world (Balls, 2009; Cope, 2005; Flood, 2010). Cognitive meaning is discerned from the informational, expository, and conceptual aspects of the examined text of the interview or other data source. These are the semantic and linguistic meaning, making understanding achievable. Non-cognitive aspects of the text include expressive attributes and emotions displayed during the interview or observation. Combined, these types of meaning enrich the investigators and reader's understanding of everyday life (van Manen, 1997).

An individual's 'natural attitude' is the attention given to the world as assumed and taken for granted. The natural attitude assumes a uniform and predictable day-to-day lifeworld exists. Individuals assume that others share, to some extent, a similar consciousness of reality. This intersubjectivity is a process of on-going accomplishment—interactions with others leads to those involved contributing to each person's shared meanings of the taken-for-granted world (Daly, 2007; Gubrium & Holstein, 1993, 2000). Individuals share common localised cultures and family paradigms for making sense of their worlds as objective experiences, but each individual's worldview is subjective and singular.

Phenomenology focuses on consciousness and conscious experience. These experiences include perceptions, emotions, judgements, and the like (Balls, 2009). People are 'embodied beings', experiencing life as corporal beings having a physical and cognitive existence. 'Problematics' are experiences, positive or negative, bringing into question one's 'stock of knowledge' (the subjective types of knowledge one holds of his/her world, serving as a reference point for living in this world; Daly, 2007). People hold 'typifications', grounded in experience, allowing for a sense of predictability. People expect that life in the future will correspond with the schema of the familiar life of the past; what was typical is anticipated to be typical in the future. When an event, interaction, or piece of information is incongruent with one's typifications, new meaning is often essential. Learning of being made redundant, realisation that one's income is inadequate, or becoming conscious that changes in agriculture are making one's effort inadequate, could be problematics requiring conscious reorienting of one's everyday

reality. New typifications become possible as this proceeds. It is in understanding this process that phenomenological analysis provides a framework for understanding entrepreneurship due to displacement and disjunctions.

3.2 Analytical approach

There is a predominance of objectivist approaches in the entrepreneurship literature, including farm entrepreneurship (McElwee, 2006b; McElwee & Atherton, 2005). Grant and Perren (2002) argued that new perspectives on entrepreneurship would be achieved when one escapes the 'paradigmatic cage' of positivism. Phenomenological or closely related interpretative approaches are being used in entrepreneurship and management research (Cope 2005; Devins & Gold, 2002; Ehrich, 2005; Hamilton, 2011; Rae, 2000, Rae & Carswell, 2000). McElwee (2008) and Hildenbrand and Hennon (2008) used a phenomenology technique in their investigations of farmer entrepreneurship.

There is no accepted lock-step approach to using phenomenology for understanding social phenomenon (Groenewald, 2004). Analysis of the data, or interpretation, can take different approaches. The intention is detecting meaningful information and totalising this information into themes once all transcriptions of the interviews and field notes have been analysed. Themes are subjects or topics common among several of the people interviewed (Byrne, 2001b; Wertz et al., 2011). This approach is thematic analysis.

It is common when reporting thematic analysis for the author to make hefty use of direct quotes from the people interviewed. Such use of quotes is to verify or to make transparent the development of themes and assist the reader more fully understand and appreciate the experience as it was lived. Phenomenological research is judged for its quality based on its transparency and if it can be audited (Balls, 2009). Trustworthiness, or rigour, is important (Graneheim & Lundman, 2004; Jootun et al., 2009; Koch, 2005). Rigour focuses on objectivity and neutrality. Techniques include bracketing if doing descriptive research, having others including the people interviewed confirm findings to certify their credibility, as well as discussions with colleagues to help ensure awareness of biases along with help to prevent premature closure of the analysis undertaken. Reflexivity is important to further understanding of the phenomenon of interest and the researcher's role in selecting the subject matter and doing the analysis. Careful record keeping about the analysis and memoing about aspects of the study (including what the investigator was seeing, hearing, questioning, and doing) and emerging insights helps in tracking progress and identification of presuppositions and the basis for drawing conclusions and identification of themes. Importantly, the investigator should reflect upon the articulation of the research with the philosophy, answering questions such as: "Do the findings reflect as fully as possible the experience of the participants? Do the findings relate all feasible aspects of what it is like to be the person (in a body) who has experienced a certain phenomenon...?" (Connelly, 2010, p. 128; Cope, 2005). Phenomenological investigations endeavour to understand what an "experience was like to *live it*, not just the person's reaction to the experience" (Connelly, 2010, p. 127; *Italic in original*). Ideally, the findings are written in a way that communicates to the reader the participants' experiences as fully as they can be comprehended without having experienced them oneself. However, there is difficulty in understanding and interpreting the words and stories of the people having the experiences of interest. Denzin and Lincoln (2011, p. 21) pointed out, people "are seldom able to give full explanations of

their actions or intentions; all they can offer are accounts or stories about what they did and why. No single method can grasp the subtle variations in ongoing human experiences”.

A person can interpret things differently at different times and in different contexts; interpretations could change with time. Phenomenological studies are situated in a specific context at a certain time, reflecting existentialist concern for understanding the ‘human-being-in-the-world’, with human existence explained by the experiential context in which it occurs (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975). The knowledge of the researcher is developed through a personal, interactive, linguistic relationship between the person investigated and the person doing the investigation. Descriptions casted by the investigator are interpretations of the interpretations of the investigated.

Bogdan and Taylor (1975, pp. 13–14, italics in original) encapsulated phenomenological inquiry: “The phenomenologist views human behavior—what people say and do—as a product of how people interpret their world. The task...is to capture this *process* of interpretation....In order to grasp the meanings of a person’s behavior, *the phenomenologist attempts to see things from that person’s point of view*”.

4. Material and methods

Two case studies were effected in order to illustrate the complex interrelation between families and farms, entrepreneuring activities, and self-identities. Case reconstruction, based on the theory of social action, was employed. The method is grounded on the dialectic of the general and the particular. The general represents the possibilities for action of the case family. The particular is the choices of the family in regard to these possibilities. These choices made are not random; they establish and reinforce the social order of the family, thusly shaping a pattern specific to the family and the decision-making process. This pattern is the case structure. Using case analysis, case reconstruction entails recognising and recounting case structures. The case structure is regarded as a hypothesis (ie, case structure hypothesis) and evidence for verification is sought in the data collected about the case. Hypotheses from a theoretical model or supplying empirical proof are not employed. Rather, ideographic theories of the action orientation of the cases are derived from empirical study of the families. Case reconstruction can identify structural issues, but a survey is necessary to determine the prevalence of the occurrence (Hildenbrand, 1999).

The analysis scrutinises how a couple constructs, through language in interaction, a family reality from individual experiences and sense making. The concern is how individual’s subjective experiences become a negotiated intersubjective experience. “Experience is not ‘raw’; people choose meanings and inquire of significant others as to how to make meaning of experiences and thus understand their experiences within the context of family life” (Hildenbrand & Hennon, 2008, p. 493). Families have an element of choice to create the reality of life lived together, to fashion life experienced what they choose to make it. The interest in this chapter includes holistic sense making and resulting lines of social action, or the family reality.

Two agricultural couples were investigated, one in Scotland and one in the USA. Interviews were transcribed and analysed through sequential analysis, observations were undertaken,

and extensive field notes were recorded and consulted. Each case was analysed separately, with eidetic descriptions of important events, emic concepts, and emergent themes identified. Cross analysis was then performed to identify common and signature themes and strategies that the families used to modify their income generating processes, and, as a result, changes in lives and livelihood.

The aim of this study is to learn about the characteristic nature of the entrepreneuring farmer/family. Human's subjective viewpoints, the taken-for-grantedness of knowledge and the social world, and how this knowledge is created are the concern of phenomenological inquiry. People's experiences are of 'something', characterised by 'aboutness', or what awareness is about or directed. The analytical charge of scientific inquiry is to understand the experiencing of this something within the context in which it occurs. This context includes the lived-life, present situation, and future intentions. The analysis presented in this chapter is attentive to the process by which farmers and farm families 'make sense' of their lifeworld (*Lebenswelt*), and their social position as 'self' and 'family' within this world. The theorists must 'enter' the world of the farmer and achieve intersubjectivity whilst best withholding, or at least being keenly aware of, preconceptions and judgements, and not applying scientific concepts a priori. This entering of the families' world requires adapting a 'phenomenological attitude' to better undertake the investigation. The farmer and family are the experts on the topic investigated (Cope, 2005; Glendinning, 2007; Hildenbrand & Hennon, 2008).

However, investigators are not naïve when entering the farmer's world and experience the interview (Cope, 2005; Cope & Watts, 2000). Previous research as well as experiences, values, and language inform the investigator's lifeworld and natural attitude. The investigator owns an agenda concerning why to conduct the investigation. The investigator attempts openness to insights and novel ways that farm families existentially establish and experience their worlds. Nevertheless, knowledge and experiences help form interview questions and interpretation of the interview. Awareness and reflexivity is promoted by the hermeneutic or interpretative tradition, the approach taken for this study. Interpretative phenomenologists accept that previous knowledge, hunches about what will be discovered, and biases cannot be stricken from the investigator's mind. Holding these presuppositions in abeyance to the extent possible by adopting a phenomenology attitude is attempted so to not unduly affect the research. The attempt is to reconstruct the meaning that is in the data, and then develop a theoretical explanation from this reconstructed meaning that is true to, and comprehensible by, the people investigated.

4.1 The cases

The worlds of the people investigated were entered in multiple manners. The methodological approach is interactive and interpretative (Hildenbrand & Hennon, 2008; McElwee, 2005). With phenomenological research, the indispensable criteria for participant selection are the persons have experienced the investigated phenomenon and are willing and able to describe the experiences (Polkinghorne, 1989). The investigator asked people in pubs and stores, and members of the Scottish Crofting Commission, for recommendations as to a crofting family to interview. The investigator approached a family identified and inquired about the possibility of being interviewed. Confidentiality was promised. Permission was granted, and informed consent obtained. The family ran a B&B so the

investigator rented a room for several days. One formal, recorded, interview lasting approximately three hours was conducted with Don (aged 58 at the first interview) the husband and Mary (aged 56) the wife, as well as Don's brother and sister-in-law who were visiting. Informal interviews were also conducted, and observations made, over several days. Field notes were taken. The transcribed interview was given to the family the following year and they clarified and corrected it. During this visit, additional interviews (a total of three hours) were conducted and observations made. Three years later the investigator conducted a participate observation study, working on the croft for six days. Follow up phone calls and email allowed for updates. Interviews were also conducted with the former president of the Crofter's Union and with members of the Crofting Commission staff. Local newspapers, agricultural papers, and other materials such as Commission reports, were read to learn more about the agricultural and crofting situation in Scotland. Interviews were transcribed and analysed using case reconstruction methods. A reconstructed case summary or 'story' of the family based on the interviews and other data was produced.

A third-generation farm family living in Ohio (USA) was asked if they would be interviewed. The author's knowledge of the geographical area and its social milieu, plus interaction with farmers, helped to select the family considered representative of other farm families in the area. The family is well known and respected. The author has had some farm business transactions with the husband. The purpose of the proposed interview and interview logistics were explained and confidentiality assured. Informed consent was obtained. The interview was conducted in the family's home on a winter Sunday evening. Present were the husband (Keith II aged 42) and wife (Kathy aged 38), as well as their son (aged 9) who did not participate in the interview. The interview was recorded and lasted approximately 2.5 hours. A draft genogram was constructed during the interview and finished after the interview was transcribed. Follow-up visits and telephone calls determined the accuracy of the interview and interpretation, and to learn of new developments. Observations of interactions in the family's place of business also occurred. These observations were of naturally occurring events and provided opportunities for insights of spontaneous and authentic daily life. The family was studied over a three-year period. A reconstructed case summary or story of the family based on the interview and observations was developed.

The formal interviews with both cases used a hybridisation of the phenomenological interview (Cope, 2005; Ryba, 2007; Thompson et al., 1989). The phenomenological interview creates a dialogue to enable a flow of questions arising from the intersubjective 'space' of the investigator and the investigated's conversation. Questions were formulated based on the experiences of the person being interviewed, the researcher's interpretation of the meaning of experiences being disclosed, and to reconnoitre topics stated by the interviewee. To focus the discussion on 'something' (an agreed upon phenomenon; aboutness), not 'anything', the interviews began with a 'funnelling' technique—to commence a story (or narrative) about the history of the farm/croft and family. The interview started with "I have four questions for you: who are you, where did you come from, where are you now, and where do you want to go"? The interviews followed in the manner of a conversation, with follow-up questions asked to obtain information such as dates of events and changes in the history of the croft/farm. Two other techniques were used—'delineating and illuminating'.

Delineating keeps the conversation from departure too far from the phenomenon of interest, or the something/aboutness; after exploring a new line of conversation enough to determine its importance, the conversation was refocused to the agreed upon topic. An illuminating technique brings clarity to ideas and language of the participants not familiar to the researcher, or to get more detail about a topic mentioned.

Part of the interviews was devoted to gathering of relevant data on the family business over three generations (one for the Scottish couple). These data were integrated into a genogram that was analysed sequentially (Hildenbrand, 2005a). Starting from a given datum (e.g., date of birth, occupation of the grandfather) the investigator asked, "what are the 'objectively' given possibilities for this person (e.g., whom will he marry; will he continue the farm in the way of his father)? These potential answers were compared with the actual decisions taken. From this the investigation explored the now given possibilities until an action and meaning pattern relating the lifeworld of the family under study was discerned. This pattern was then confronted with interpretations of the family's history amassed during the interview. Comparing these with the pattern developed from the genogram offered a 'thick description' allowing formulation of hypotheses for this family. Comparing these hypotheses with those fashioned in case reconstructions of other families will allow developing grounded theory on the world of entrepreneuring farm families.

5. Case reconstructions

The goal is seeking understanding of the thoughts and behaviour patterns of family members to illustrate, in one case, how a crofting family could adapt over a period of years into a 'modern' business family integrating pluriactivity whilst maintaining the image of traditional crofters. In the second case the inquiry illustrates how the family could sustain their image as a farm family even when transforming within a year from farming devoted to cereal crops and livestock, into a family running a rural business in the tree nursery, vegetable, and flower trade. Both families engage in strategies of pluriactivity, including diversification and multioccupation, to weave a variety of employment opportunities together in order to maintain a lifestyle that is economically precarious, but personally satisfying. Instead of presenting thematic topics with supportive quotes, the families stories are presented and interpretations offered.

5.1 Don and Mary Cotts, a crofting family

The family lives in a remote but scenic area on the northwest coast of Scotland, in Ross-shire, an economically peripheral area. The croft lies alongside a winding road, a one-lane track with passing places. The croft is located about 8 kilometres from a small village and about two hours drive from Fort Williams and Inverness. This village has two small food stores, a pub, and a couple of other small retail establishments. The croft, which is rather large as crofts go due to it consisting of two and one-half previous crofts, is of approximately 32 hectares, located adjacent to a loch, with little flat land. The croft abuts a set of hills, which are steep and rough, with lots of rocks, bracken, and water. There are many trees on the croft in-bye land, some planted by the Cotts as an ecological move. This was part of a forest management scheme where the person bought and planted trees in designated areas. If the trees were of a certain height in five years, the person was paid. For

five additional years the person was paid a forest management fee. The Cotts pay rent – the amount set by the Land Court is minimal – to a landlord for 405 hectare of grazing land.

Don grew up in Edinburgh and met Mary in Switzerland when both were working for a multinational corporation. Don received technical training as an engineer and worked in Africa for a U.S. based corporation, and later was transferred to Geneva. Mary, who is German, was a dental assistant and worked for her father in Asia. She married a Swiss man at age 20, but soon divorced. She moved to Switzerland (became Swiss citizen by marriage) and was employed as English typist for the same company that employed Don. Later she becomes assistant to her boss. Mary had a serious automobile accident and in hospital agreed to marry Don (she had said no earlier). They were 28 and 26 at the time. Offices in Geneva were closing and Don was transferred to Edinburgh, as was Mary due to her being his wife. They were paid less in Edinburgh and Mary did not like living there. They had their honeymoon on Isle of Skye and decided they would like to croft, so wrote letters to landlords seeking a croft.

The Cotts moved to the croft in 1977, living in a caravan until the house was built. They have two sons, one now living in London and one in Edinburgh. The croft was purchased in 1990 for £80,000. Don is in a somewhat exceptional position of being both landlord and tenant for his croft (because it was purchased). Owner-occupancy has become more common since 1975, but typically the tenant crofter pays rent to a landlord upon whose land the croft resides (Crofters Commission, n.d.; Scottish Crofting Federation, n.d.). At one time there were five families in the Cott's village with about five hectare of out-run for winter grazing and a share in the common grazing. Each croft had one-half hectare of land. In the late 1950s, there were three crofts in the village. When Don bought his croft, he basically bought the total village. Don in effect is his own landlord. He could rent to someone else, and in fact does rent a small building for a shop to his wife Mary for legal reasons, including taxes. His application to buy the land was approved by the Crofting Commission as they considered local interests. To prepare for the land court appearance when he was trying to buy the land, Don dictated and recorded his speech on tape, listened, and wrote it down to edit. This was to remove slang and to sharpen its focus.

The croft has a house and a few small outbuildings, including a small retail outlet for wool and sweaters. A recently built shed/barn is over one kilometre away on other side of carriageway. The house was built in the late 1970s and expanded in the 1980s, with money obtained through a Crofting Commission housing scheme, so the Cotts could offer B&B accommodations. Three or four rooms are let for bed and breakfast. The couple also owns a house a couple kilometres away, purchased for Mary's mother. It is now let to tourist with the idea that one day it can be sold. There is also a caravan located between the house and the loch that is a tourist accommodation.

The croft is worked with the help of three border collies; there is very little mechanical equipment. Livestock consists of five cattle and about 150 sheep (lambs are not counted). Some sheep are of a rare breed raised for their wool. This wool is sold in the retail establishment run by Mary Cott. Angora rabbits are also kept for their fur, which Mrs Cott sells throughout Great Britain or to weave sweaters that are sold from the small retail shop located adjacent to the house. Mrs Cott mostly has other women do the weaving. Some of

these women live some distance from the croft and wool, patterns, and sweaters are sent by post. Tourists stop by to shop. Sweaters and wool can be sent by post to customers.

Crofts are not meant to provide all the means of substance for a family through agriculture. Don and Mary have preformed a variety of income generating activities over the years of their living on the croft. This family has engaged in such activities as raising sheep, rabbits, and cattle; harvesting seaweed; picking whelks; delivering the post; owning a small textiles retail establishment; running a propane business; letting a caravan and house to tourist; and operating a bed and breakfast. They have also worked in a hotel, for the county building roads, and for a large estate owner in a variety of capacities.

Mary indicated that the various sources of family income were in the following proportions: the bed and breakfast 50 per cent, letting a caravan and a house 15-20 per cent, the sheep and cows five per cent, the forestry two-three per cent, hiring out of Don's labour 25 per cent, and selling LP gas one per cent. Mary noted the shop was not a source of income because the money earned has been "going back into the shop...I want to get it good and established". This family's entrepreneuring, home-based employment, and hiring out of labour have created employment for themselves and others. This type of pluriactivity and multioccupation is typical of crofters, farmers, and other households engaged in home-based employment (Hennon et al., 2000; Hillenbrand & Hennon, 2008; Scottish Crofting Federation, n.d.).

The B&B is run year around, but doing busy times on the croft, such as lambing, the B&B is secondary and Mary stated, is on a "if we are available to answer telly or met a car that drives in" bases. Although there are four rooms that could be let, the number of guests is typically limited to six due to space availability at the table. With more guests, it is crowded and Mary feels this is not good for the guests. Because there is limited options to purchase meals nearby, one very expensive restaurant and one costly café, Mary cooks and serves an evening meal to guest for an extra charge above the B&B rate, securing another source of income. She bakes the bread served at meals.

The house is two storey, functional and simple. There are four guest bedrooms and two baths. The centre part of the house is a large sitting room with comfortable chairs, a fireplace, and the dining table. The kitchen is located at the rear of the house (the side facing the carriageway) with a rear door off a hallway. The couple spends a great deal of their time in the kitchen. The kitchen table is a work area. This is where most of the interviews and visiting took place, often over tea and a few times whiskey. The kitchen also affords a view of the drive and is convenient to exiting the house to go to the shop or out to tend to the crofting activities.

Don was asked about the advantages of crofting. He indicated that crofting should cost less to get into than farming. This is because the crofter does not have to buy the land, only the improvements made to the land and buildings by the current tenants. With housing grants and loans, people can afford nice housing. The grants and loans can pay for materials and the person can self build or pay for construction. There is a shortage of lower cost housing in the remote areas of Scotland. On a croft, the crofter can buy the house and a small amount of land. Buying the whole croft is more difficult. This purchase would include payments for the land to the landlord, for solicitors, and so forth. Any one landlord could own many crofts. In the Cott's area there are two landlords and perhaps 100 crofts. Each croft has a

share in or right to the common grazing. There are grazing officers who over see this grazing and settle disputes. Mary is a grazing officer.

There are many regulations and legalities involved with agriculture and crofting. Some come from the European Union and some from the Crofting Commission as well as the UK. Local ordinances also play a role. Don noted “there was a thick book of regulations” and “no one knows all the regulations, but don’t matter as long as you get along with the neighbours”. The rules often come into play during disputes between crofters and landlords. The post brings news of regulations and modifications (“a letter a day on new regulations”), as well as reports and newsletters discussing grant schemes and regulations. The Cottis receive several newspapers and newsletters (some pertaining to rare breeds due to the animals they raise) as well as information from the Scottish Crofters Commission and Scottish Crofters Union. Don offered that whilst he paid money to the Union, “they were of marginal assistance”. Learning about the regulations is possible through the Crofters Union, farmers’ press, and talking to people. These sources also “help in learning how to get around regulations”. There are many forms to be completed and records kept. Books must be up to date. Mary stated that “we can be fined or subsidies lost if mistakes are made. Some of the forms are complex and hard to fill out”. Don offered, “It is hard to keep up”. He mentioned he is sceptical of people. He has reservations about the government seeking to make regulations and laws. He commented many times over the years of visiting the croft the amount of paperwork, laws, and restrictions that do not make sense to crofters or to common people. He believes that if people used more common sense, things would be better.

Building a shed illustrates the complexity of crofter life as well as the regulations that Don repeatedly mentioned as one of the most problematic aspects of crofting. The shed or barn is about 9 x 14 metres and has a concrete paddock for cattle feeding. At the time, government grants helped pay for building sheds at the rate of 60 per cent if for animals and 50 per cent if for storage. Because this shed was for both, different amounts were granted. First Don had to “beg” his landlord (the person who owns the grazing land) to be able to build, and then he had to get permission from the local council as well as their approval for its location. He revealed there were “lots of hassles over this”. He could not build where he wanted because the building would be visible from the road and distract from the scenic values of the countryside. Another location was approved farther away, approximately one kilometre. Consequently, the new structure has neither electricity nor running water. The area is wet and large lorries have trouble getting in and out due to the hills and curve on the road. Don reported there were “lots and lots of problems” with getting the shed built so he did much of the work himself. Due to a variety of delays, he could not get the grant money when he wanted to pay for materials and workers. Inspections had to be done and approvals obtained before the grant moneys were forthcoming. They had to borrow from the bank. Don did admit that because of grant schemes “people could now have nice buildings”.

The B&B business is also regulated by laws as well as influenced by forces outside the Cott’s control. The Cottis were concerned about a possible inspection from the tourist board. They make surprise visits by booking a room for the evening. Don said Mary likes to try to keep him away during inspections because he argues with the tourist board. He believes “the board should be working for me, not the other way around, should be doing all they can to give people, people like us, a break and get tourist wanting to stay in this area. We have a

lot to offer, but people don't know it". The tourist board has changed its rating systems over the years. The Cottis had to have three different signs in six years on the road advertising their B&B. They also pay £100 a year to have the B&B listed without a picture in the Highlands Tourist Board Book. The B&B is mentioned in various travel guides, often without the couple knowing about it. Mary reported, "About half our guests just stop by to ask for a room, the rest book ahead. I have to turn people away sometimes because we don't have space. Other times, no one here. Its up and down...you can't plan, like how much food to get for meals and such".

The B&B has received a score of seven out of ten by the board over the last few years. At the time of the first interview, rooms were £14 per night per person. If the guest booked a room through the tourist board, the board received 10 per cent of the B&B rate plus charged the person a £3 fee. Mary felt the Board "was leaning on them" to increase the charge to £16 per person with an increase over 10 years to £21. When preparing the business plan for the B&B with a 10-year projection, they had indicated that the rate would go from £9 to £16. The officials said it should be higher and go to £21. Don believes this is too high – "this is not a hotel and we don't have the services like a hotel does. People know this or quickly learn it". He indicated that if the Tourist Board wanted to make these kinds of accommodations available, "the board should help build hotels. Other tourists could use cheaper B&Bs if they wanted". Mary revealed the cost of doing business included banking fees. There is a charge to cash cheques, including a £5 charge if the cheque was drawn on a different bank plus a 10 per cent fee for cash deposits. There is also a three per cent fee for each credit card transaction.

Don runs a small LP gas distribution business. He took it over soon after moving to the croft, and gave it "a bit of a boost" and it becomes main source of income. Construction in area was booming and there was demand for gas for heaters, etc. He stores cylinders of gas in a shed convenient to the drive near the road. People can stop by to purchase or he delivers with help from "a young lad...strong boy...does the lifting". This business was started because Don figured he could make money from it, as the nearest distributor was in a town some distance away. More recently, the demand has slowed, and the income from the business is now minor. For a time they sold doors for homes and made "good pay" building beds for workers building drilling platforms.

Both Don and Mary work hard all day. Mary seldom sits down even though she has some trouble with arthritis and her feet. In response to questions about a typical day, Mary indicated that the alarm goes off at 6 a.m. They lie in bed and listen to the news on the radio until about 7 a.m. Don said this was to hear the weather and find out what was going on in the world. They have a cold shower. Don begins to take care of the animals. As he noted, around 7 a.m. they start "to sort out people and animals". The table is set for breakfast for the B&B guests. At 7:30 they have their own breakfast and Don opens the shop. Coffee is made and breakfast cooked for the guests. Between 8 and 9 breakfast is served and this is a hectic time. Between 9 and 10 the guests typically leave, but there is no set time for this and sometimes guests linger, especially those staying more than one night. The breakfast dishes are cleared, beds are made, and the daily laundry begins. Bed clothing, etc. are hung to dry and are ironed. Their bed is made and the house is dusted and hoovered. There are interruptions to this work as people stop in to visit the shop or inquire about rooms. Sometimes as people are leaving the B&B, they visit the shop. When cars are heard on the

drive, either Don or Mary will typically go out to greet them. Don helps in the house, carrying out ashes from the fire as well as tending to the fire. He also fixes things around the house, talks to guests, offers ideas on tourist attractions, and helps with cleaning and other chores as necessary. Mary cares for the house, cooks, and participates in outside crofting chores, such as medicating sheep and helping with lambing, a demanding and tiring time. Don does most of the outside work, except for cutting the grass in the garden, done by Mary. Decision-making is joint. One example was deciding on where to put a park for the cows (an enclosed area that was to be built somewhere across the road). As appears to be true with so much that occurs on this croft, Mary and Don jointly assessed the situation in order to come to a decision. The issue was if they were to run one fence for several metres along the road, or to make two bits of fenced in area, with an area between closed off to the cows. Don was concerned that part of the area was too rough for the calves and they would be injured. He thought it was better and cheaper to do two bits; Mary wanted one.

As they walked along where the park would be talking about it, sometimes at great distance from each other (as Mary was walking on the hill several metres from the road as Don walked along the road), they discussed the pros and cons of each idea. Mary walked the rough land on the ridge to show that it would be okay for the cows. At issue also was where to put the gate, as the area is quite rocky with several peat bogs (where the couple used to cut peat for fuel). The gate would have to be in an area where there was lorry access. A bulldozer would have to be hired and materials purchased. No decision was reached, but as Don said, "It was a draw at half-time. We both get our words in and then we compromise". Observations showed the couple often would sit at the kitchen table and discuss what was to be done that day. Many times Don would ask Mary's opinion about what he should do that day. The couple seems to discuss together and seek consensus about longer-term planning and monetary expenditures, such as purchasing a vehicle or entering into a crofting scheme.

As for the future, there is some uncertainty. Don mentioned that it is hard to project income based on tourism. In comparison, even though the price of lambs fluctuated and was down, there were subsidies as well as other programs that helped make predicting income easier. Mary noted that though sales at the shop have recently been good (about 100-150 sweaters are sold each year), this income also was hard to predict. Don would like to improve the appearance of the shop (it is a small wooden building), believing people drive down the lane after seeing the sign and then see the small shop and have a negative reaction. He indicated, as did Mary, that people must talk positively about the shop as they have many sales including return customers. People also mention that they have heard about the shop from others.

The couple had to learn how to be crofter and care for animals. Mary said local people are polite and "not in your business". She indicated the way to ask for help from locals was to "drop hints". They have borrowed ideas from others and it took time to learn, but people have been good about letting them learn; "Just ask if you want something". Don said the local way is people are suppose to notice if someone needs something and then offer to help. He also reported that over the years he has become an innovator, for example, being the first in the area to use movable electric fencing for the cows, and people have sought him out for advance.

5.2 Précis

There have been many changes in the local community as well as in crofting during the time that the Cotts have lived on a croft. More transformations are underway. Both Mary and Don's individual biographies are at the centre of an expanding set of forces that impinge upon their lives. Whilst these are economic, social, and political in nature, and some are distant and others more local, they impinge on their daily lives and plans for the future. Their lifeworlds have undergone change, but they have adapted, finding sources of income and living a desired but physically demanding lifestyle. Pluriactivity and multioccupation have been common, and entrepreneurship has played its part. They saw an opportunity with the LP gas business, as they did with building beds, raising rare breed animals for their unique fur and wool, and starting a small sweater retail business. They are not 'typical' crofters, but have identities and act as if they were. Both have technical training and worked in other countries. Neither come from an agricultural or crofting background. Intention appears to be the main motivator for their entrepreneurial endeavours, realising that crofters have to seek out multiple sources of income. Their entrepreneuring in terms of improvements to the croft and its income generating abilities, combined with creating new businesses, has allowed them to live a life they desire in an economically precarious area. In a sense, they are survival entrepreneurs and lifestyle entrepreneurs, as they selected businesses favourable to long-term and viable participation in areas where they had interest, talent, and expertise (Peters et al., 2009). They have experienced multiple problematics requiring conscious reorienting of their everyday reality. New typifications are created and applied as life proceeds.

The bed and breakfast start-up is an example of how they used their entrepreneurial attitudes and skills. They were alert and realised there were few tourist facilities in the area, discussed the possibility of entering into this aspect of tourism, sought out information and funding possibilities, assessed the risks, and made the decision to move ahead. They were able to recognise an entrepreneurial opportunity, trigger it, and it became the greatest source of household income. In terms of McElwee's (2008) typology of entrepreneurial farmers, the Cotts would be Type II, Farmer as Entrepreneur. They possessed and further developed the requisite skills for engagement in entrepreneurial activity. Their backgrounds and human capital situated in a 'surrounding world' or *umwelt*, fostered the entrepreneurial function. The croft is in a geographical and cultural region that facilitates certain types of entrepreneuring, such as the expectation of pluriactivity and the increase in tourism. Mary and Don, however, did not self describe as entrepreneurs. The word was not used during either the interviews or observations. They did use terms like 'having to do something', 'saw an opportunity and took it', and being 'innovators'.

5.3 Keith and Kathy Cropland, a farming family

A third-generation farm family living in Ohio (USA), the Cropland farm is located in a USDA labelled '1' county on its rural-urban continuum, meaning it is a fringe county within a Metropolitan Statistical Area with a population of 1 million. The family lives on the extreme edge of the MSA, the area is rural, and a small town (20,000 people) is about 5 kilometres from the farm. The largest town (60,000 population) in the county (370,000 population) is 34 kilometres distance. Within the county, 13 per cent of the population is

below the poverty level (Economic Research Service, 2011a, 2011b; U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.).

The farm is located on a paved single-carriageway connecting the two towns. In recent years, raising dairy cows, hogs, and beef, and growing hay and crops such as corn and soya were common. The county has experienced a decline in agricultural activity with farms converted to housing or commercial development activities. Several farms remain, the majority having a farmer also occupied in off-farm wage-earning activities. Both smaller (8–16 hectare) and larger farms exist. In Ohio, the average farm is 74 hectare with 60 per cent of farms between 1–40 hectare, and 90 per cent below 202 hectare. Most farms (56 per cent) have sales of \$9,999 or less, 75 per cent below \$50,000. The vast majority (90 per cent) are family farms, with the farmer's average age being 56, and 43 per cent having farming as their primary occupation.

Immigrants from Germany, the previous generations of the Cropland family helped settle a town about 35 kilometres from the current Cropland farm. Keith Cropland I purchased a farm of 100 hectare of land near this town in the 1920s, and was distinguished for breeding draught horses. His son Neil worked on the farm where they also raised corn. Keith I's second and youngest son, Martin, managed another farm and then entered the transportation sector. Keith I's oldest son Neil was a cattle breeder. Neil wanted to be in farming but his father was still living, so over about 20 years starting around 1960, he purchased four adjacent farms, cultivated over one connected area covering 2.6 sq. kilometres (approximately 250 hectare). He fattened pigs, sometimes having 2,000. His son, Keith II, who was interviewed for the study reported here, said "a semi [lorry] load of hogs would come into the farm...and between my mom, my sister and then me and Derrick, we were young then, would take care of them hogs and then dad would go to the sales, send the trucks in, and we were running thousands of heads of hogs through here every week. But the market on that fell through".

The family leased farmland and in a peak period had 21 farms totalling 680 hectare. During the 1970s, Neil traded in calves (approximately 8,000–10,000 per year) and grew corn and soya beans. Neil with his son Keith II hauled the calves from a 14-hour drive distance and sold them within days to two weeks. Keith II observed, "but see livestock...you either gotta be big or you're out... 20 years ago, I knew of at least 10 dairy farms within a 5 mile [8 kilometres] radius of here, and I knew of 30 hog farmers within a 5-mile radius of here. There's none now".

During the 1980s, Neil ran a USA-wide truckage company and later a construction business in addition to operating the farm. Neil is now semi-retired, owns the farm, and raises a few cattle. Two of the three sons (Derrick and Keith II) have worked for the business in its various sectors; the youngest son manages a steel firm and owns a construction company. All three sons built houses on the farm and live there with their families. The daughter married a metalworker and lives in a nearby town. Specialising in different agriculture areas, the two oldest sons engaged in the daily farm business. Each child is to inherit one of the four farm segments (about 65 hectare each). The two brothers rent the farmland from their father at below market value. This rent is the parents' main source of retirement income.

The two brothers assisted their father with the farm, including the leased land within a 48-kilometre radius. For a three-year period during the 1980s when his father retired from farming, the tillable land was leased to others, so Keith II worked as a driver in his dad's truckage company, and occasionally worked as a plumber, on a dairy farm, and in other occupations. Still driving a lorry for wages, at age 30, he and his brother took over the home farm and started farming together. They also leased 17 farms (a total of about 809 hectare) to grow hay and crops, mostly corn and soya beans, whereas the father still raised livestock. The two also raised about 1,500 hogs each year for five years and until 2004, hauled grain.

The brothers kept losing the leased land because it was sold to construct houses, until there was about 405 hectare. Derrick had more equipment and so farmed more land, whilst Keith II had about 121 hectare of crop. Keith II reminisced that with this amount of land, "for two families to make a living on that it can't be done...you just...there's just not enough there, so I hauled grain...I had semis [lorries] and I was hauling grain and hay...150, 200 loads for other farmers and that would help pay for my truck, plus I would get an income off the truck plus the farming and then we were baling hay 30...35,000 bales of hay here...and that was our best crop. We'd sell all that. My wife and I have an apartment house [they let the flats for income]...ah, still not enough income to support a family and ...we live average...I mean we don't have new vehicles". He also mentioned that when he married Kathy he expected her to have a 'town job' because "you got to have that second income...you have to have more than one income to farm...so you need the off the farm income". He further stated that in the 1940s a family could live on subsistence farming, but "nowadays you better have a full time job. At 160 acres [65 hectare, the size of the home farm], unless you do what I did...diversify...and go into specialty crops...then you can make it".

A crisis developed when Keith II, then aged about 40, learned from his wife (who manages a hotel in the near by town) that his brother Derrick was to take over the farm business on his own. He was to lease it from the parents at a special price. After coming to accept this situation, Keith II purchased one-half hectare and leased 16 hectare from his father. On the purchased land he established a landscape nursery and a store for agricultural produce and 'country' items including handicrafts. The store also sells provisions such as artisan bread, specialty cheeses, preserves, Amish prepared items and produce, and seasonal items such as pumpkins and Christmas trees. A corn maze is cut and a fee charged for its use. The store is located on the carriageway fronting the farm. He continues to drive a lorry hauling grain from local farmers to a transportation hub. He buys and resells hay. In the winter he has worked as plumber at the construction firm of his youngest brother. More recently, Keith II purchased a 'box' truck used for delivering produce from about a score of farms, including Amish, to farm markets and grocery stores. He reported that he saw an opportunity and decided to pursue it, and this now ensures another revenue stream for the family. Since opening the nursery, the building, what is termed a 'pole barn' in the U.S., has been expanded to twice its original size, and a large green house constructed. The building has a walk in cooler, but not heat. The business is open from spring until Christmas.

Keith II: "Got to the point where I knew I wasn't going to be able to stay in the farm, unless we found a lot of ground and dad always said do the landscape nursery and produce...well...[dad] always said we should do it, he said me and Derrick should do it...that acreage that I had...I, I knew I had to do something else, ...not that me and my

brother didn't get along, but it couldn't...we were butting heads, not feuding or nothing, but there just wasn't enough ground for both of us and we knew something was going to happen and finally I'm done...I'm going to do this, I don't know what she thought, but..."

Asked what she thought, Kathy replied that she did not think he was serious about opening a market until he sold a piece of farm equipment. "That's when I said, 'Mom, he sold the planter'...we're not doing this anymore... yeah, I think that's when it hit me was when he sold it".

Keith II turned over to Derrick the land he was leasing and his brother farms about 404 hectare and earns enough from that. Even without enough land, Keith II wants to remain in an occupation related to agriculture. He comments, "the way I look at it to me, tomorrow I could be doing something else, I mean I could...would if there was something comes along that I feel like I want to...we...I'm thinking about putting up a farm restaurant. I mean we're going to stay into the farming and into produce and the like, but...I'm open for suggestions....I mean if I see something...who knows. Perhaps buying and selling equipment...or... any way to bring another source of income into the farm, I mean...the farming. Since we've went to the nursery, this will be our third season...and we're making more off of this than we were off of farming and I think if I get a couple more years to really get established, it would carry us...I could retire off of that...but we're always open for new adventure...I mean, I can't see me as being one that said okay this is the way I'm going to retire...it's like the hay, it's like the trucks, it's that's the way of my dad. My dad has showed cattle, he's farmed, he's built houses, he's drove trucks, he did produce, he had a farm market...he plays in the stock market. I mean, dad is one that he would get into something when it was good and get out and try something else".

Interviewer: "If I would ask this question to your brother, what would he say"?

Keith II: "He's more cautious, I guess you'd say, he will stay in the farming...he's three years older, he's pretty well set, I'm a little more risky, riskier I guess you'd say in the family, and that's the way my dad did, I mean I'd want to stay...we will stay with the nursery and market, but if there's something else out there that I can try, I'll try it".

Even with the crisis resulting from the way his father worked out a deal with Derrick about the farm business, and despite the entrepreneuring and many facets of pluriactivity that were undertaken previously, Keith II still considers him self a farmer. He abridges his philosophy on life in two notions: "I have to keep control" and "farming is in our blood". Despite adjusting his activities to the altered conditions, habitus (a system of durable and transposable dispositions that form the principle of generating and structuring of practices and representations of the lifeworld) and self-conception do not automatically change.

Keith II discloses his modus of structuring and parleying his identity of farmer within the family milieu. Kathy is asked, "When someone asks you what your husband does, what do you say"? She responds with "self-employed farmer".

Interviewer: "I'm thinking about in the future; what are you going to say"?

Kathy: They [people in the community] say, "You're a Cropland".

The following conversation reveals that the name Cropland is synonymous with being a well-established farm family – accordingly, this is one's identity. The interviewer asks, "But

again, in five years from now, would you say he's a self-employed farmer or would you say he owns a..."

Kathy: "A nursery and farm market. Yeah that's what I say now, yeah, I have the last year".

Keith's rejoinder: "To me, like I say, I'm still farming".

Interviewer: "Farming"?

Kathy: "We own the nursery and farm market".

Keith II: "You're fertilizing...probably they're talking it's supposed to get down to about 19 degrees [-7 Celsius] Monday night. I'll drive a tractor all night Monday night. I'll go over and plough the garden while the ground is frozen, so I'll be in a tractor from 8 o'clock, 9 o'clock till 10-11 o'clock the next morning and that's farming. I mean you go out to the barn out here there's planters, there's equipment, it's not that great big 12 row planter, there's a four row but I'm still putting seed in the ground and I'm watching it grow and I'm picking harvest off of it so I am...the yield is not the old yield, but instead of having them say, and the government and the mills saying okay we're going to give you \$2 a bushel, when I sell mine I'll say I'm selling them for \$4 a bushel or a dozen, or I set my price and if I set it too high and I don't sell it, well that's my fault I overpriced it, or if I don't make enough, it's my fault...it's more, it's in my hands, I control my destiny, if I sell something bad, if I try to cheat somebody..."

A few minutes later, Keith II says: "My future is being a farmer". Keith II stills identifies as a farmer, and hopes that his son follows in this style. Both he and his wife think that trying to force their son to farm is a bad idea, and are accepting to whatever job he would like. This is revealed by Keith's observation "...cause if you were forced into it you wouldn't do it...the time, the hours, the headaches, the nightmares, of farming you gotta have it in your blood, you gotta want to do or you're not gonna do it". He further remarks, "I mean, it's too, it's too demanding of a job, you gotta love it and do it". He also comments that with the price of farmland and many people in his area exiting from farming, their son might not have the opportunity to farm. He mentions trying to purchase nearby farmland but cannot compete with the price offered by housing developers. He comments his father's farm (for which he paid perhaps one-half million dollars over several years) is now worth millions of dollars and if it was sold, his parents and all the children could be millionaires. Keith II is unequivocal that this will not take place in his lifetime.

Keith II: "It will never happen in my day as long as I am alive, I will own my farm that I get and I think my brothers are the same way, but you know, a big contractor comes in and gives you a number that...well, like the neighbours there. They have 300 acres [121 hectare], it'll bring 6 to 10 million [dollars]..."

Regarding his type of livelihood for his son, Keith II also says, "like I said, I'd like to see him carry on...to get into what I'm doing, I think...it's a good life, don't get me wrong. It's...I think it's you're out, you're not in a building, you're not sitting in an office, it's a good way of living, it's a proud way of living when you start with nothing in the fields and you do the work and you see it grow and you harvest it. I mean it, it's in your blood...more or less it's passed down from your dad from his dad. But farming, since dad passed it down to us till

when I pass it down to him, has changed 100 per cent". He also offers it is great to pass on specialised knowledge across the generations, but that large farms are "shoving the little guy out".

He is optimistic about the lost of farms in his area. This creates business opportunities for him and hopefully his son. As farms are converted into housing estates, there is more vehicle traffic driving by his nursery and market, more need for trees and other landscaping items, and people are interested in buying fresh farm produce.

5.4 Précis

Coming from a farming tradition, Keith II regards himself as a farmer although he is now the owner and manager of a profitable rural enterprise. Farming is 'in his blood', and his entrepreneurship savvy has allowed him and his wife (also from a farming background) to remain in a familiar lifestyle, albeit transformed from crop growing and animal husbandry to growing vegetables for retail sales and running a new business. The new business is additional to other income earning activities such as hauling grain and selling hay. Kathy still maintains her 'city job' but helps in the market and does the bookkeeping.

With a long running, but rather latent, entrepreneurial intention, a displacement triggered action to realise the new entry. The problematic calling into question Keith's taken for granted world was the discovery that he would not have enough land to support his family through the agricultural activities that had become common place for him. An entrepreneurial opportunity was seized, as the nursery and farm market is a unique enterprise for the area. Moving rather quickly, the family obtained funding and land, and had a building constructed. Both spouses' human capital and previous experiences with pluriactive (including record keeping and tax issues) allowed for seeing the feasibility of undertaking the new line of action. Family dynamics and history supported the entrepreneurial function, and Keith II had the experience of seeing what his dad had accomplished in business, and to learn from him. The business has been explaining as Keith II has entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and the full support of his wife. Keith's portfolio of marketable skills is well developed, and these are applied so the going concerns of life are managed and new typifications applied as needed. Although their life has changed, Keith II uses an 'as if' strategy to find commonalities permitting a continuity to life. The present life is perceived as if it is the same as the past-lived life, and the future is assumed to be much the same.

In McElwee's (2008) typology of entrepreneurial farmers, this family would be Type II, Farmer as Entrepreneur. Keith II had, or developed, requisite skills to engage in entrepreneurial activity. The farm has advantaged location, being in an area facilitating the activity undertaken. There is access to infrastructure, the location is easily reached, and there is drive by sales opportunities as people can see the nursery and market from the carriageway. The business fills a niche in the local economy. The couple identified and exploited a non-farming opportunity, despite Keith's insistence that he is a farmer. Whilst being entrepreneurial, the family did not use the term during the interview or during follow-up visits. Terms like 'risk taker' or 'had to do something' were used. The Cropland couple fit the survival entrepreneurial mould, as well as being lifestyle entrepreneurs (Peters et al., 2009).

6. Conclusions

Two agifamilies operating in two distinct and different agricultural traditions (Crofting and Midwestern farming, one basically using dogs and the other a wealth of expensive machinery) developed pluriactivity, diversification, and multifunctioning strategies allowing for continuity in a valued lifestyle. Each family developed distinctive lines of action and income generating strategies, specified to the environmental constraints and opportunities. Both are entrepreneurial, but used different levels of capital and distinct resources. Both, however, did employ a similar cognitive strategy—use of ‘as if’. The interviews and observations revealed two other themes, entrepreneurial vivacity and entrepreneurial astuteness.

The analysis of the Cott and Cropland families allows a feasible interpretation of possible choices for survival as agricultural businesses. These choices are founded on a habitus (Bourdieu, 1977) with farm and land, and on the type of relationships within the couples and between the generations that provide a framework of possibilities. With this foundation, Don and Mary and Keith II and Kathy confront their lived world, negotiate a meaning for it, and choose lines of action allowing for increased financial remuneration and continuity of desired lifestyles. These people also develop and defend identities that could be considered, by some people, fictions. These identities, however, serve good purpose for presentation to customers and for continuity of the croft and farm, in a modernised manner, and persistence in living a valued lifestyle in a desirable location. Both couples recognised and realised entrepreneurship opportunities and created new entries. Each couple supported the entrepreneurship intentions of a spouse, and provided encouragement and human capital once the entreprenuring was triggered. The spouses assist each other, providing labour and skills such as bookkeeping, in the rural enterprises created. The new enterprises provide income for the families and employment for a small number of people. The businesses contribute to the local economies in other ways such as purchasing provisions, equipment maintenance and petroleum, taxes, and attracting tourist who spend money in the community.

The Cottis present themselves to tourist and the local community as typical crofters, but innovative. This is not deception, as the investigation revealed that Don and Mary identify as typical, in a sense bracketing their history as educated, travelled, ‘interlopers’ into the crofting way of life. Their daily activities and language shows they believe and act as if they were traditional crofters. Concerning the Croplander family, the habitual patterns of action of Keith II relate to his farming ancestors, whilst the current operations are apart from that of these ancestors. Keith II self identifies as a farmer; Kathy refers to him as a self-employed farmer, mentioning the business they now own and operate. It would be mistaken to attribute self-deception and irrationality. Research (cf. Hennon & Hildenbrand, 2005) indicates that such a stance, ‘as if’ certain facts still are valid (ie, endurance of a family farm as a business although gainfully employed in another activity, or continuity of a family business as if family-operated farm), can be of assistance in mastering a transformation process in the family business. This use of ‘as if’ has mostly been observed with traditionally operated family farms at the margin of profitability (Hennon & Hildenbrand, 2005). The Cropland case demonstrates this strategy can function in businesses open to transformation with more than one option. Once the transition has been completed, the fictive as if can be

discarded, but does not need to be. It is not whether something is true in some empirical-objective fashion, but if it is pragmatic to act as if were true. Humans act as if the world corresponds to their models of it, and their place with in it—their lifeworlds are their realities (Vaihinger, 1913).

Both couples used what is commonly referred to as entrepreneurship over their life course. They recognised opportunities and initiated new or improved income activities, including new businesses. From this observation, two themes are apparent. These themes are captured by two constructs, entrepreneurial vivacity (*Lebendigkeit*) and entrepreneurial astuteness (*Scharfsinn*). These constructs are helpful devices for classifying the characteristics and line of social action of both the Cott and Cropland families. These are higher order concepts that encapsulate aspects of what is needed for successful and sustainable entrepreneuring as displayed by both couples. The terms are imprecise concepts, conceptualised here to offer a more abstract conceptualisation of the entrepreneurial phenomenon.

‘Entrepreneurial vivacity’ includes entrepreneurial orientation, or the preconditioned attitudes and skills without which entrepreneurial action will not ensue. Vivacity includes human capital and traits like high tolerance for risk taking, motivation to learn, self-reflection, acceptance of critical feedback, intentionality, networking and utilising contacts, and being alert for and recognising entrepreneurial opportunities. It allows for perceiving problematics and disruptions as opportunities. Entrepreneurial vivacity also captures the attitude and motivation that can see embryonic entrepreneurial activity through to success. It includes ‘because of’ and ‘in order to’ motivations. Because of motives could awaken entrepreneurial vivacity. Vivacity can carry one through setbacks and disappointments, allowing for entrepreneurial persistence. Entrepreneurial self-efficacy is captured by this concept, as is reflective projection and passion. Vivacity fosters reflectivity, imagining an endeavour as it would be when completed in the future, imagining what is realised after acting. Vivacity becomes part of the natural attitude and lifeworld, giving meaning to objects and ideas in the surrounding world, or *umwelt*. The families’ lifeworld consists of socially and culturally given meanings, a lived realm of understandings that recognises, permits, and fosters entrepreneuring.

Once intention is triggered or sparked (ie, initiated) into purposeful action, ‘entrepreneurial astuteness’ is critical. Astuteness includes the skills and knowledge prerequisite for entrepreneurial success. It includes marshalling resources and deploying them in constructive ways. It is knowing how to best use creativity, time, and other material and nonmaterial resources; assessing and taking appropriate risks; searching for and triaging information, learning necessary skills, and using other relevant inputs such as social capital. Astuteness permits management of entrepreneurial ambiguity as part of going concerns, pregiveness of life lived. The construct thusly includes what has been conceptualised as entrepreneurial process and function.

7. Acknowledgment

I wish to thank Lori Horstman for her assistance with this chapter. I also express my gratitude to the two case families for their willing participation. My physicians and surgeons, their support teams and staffs, the many nurses who have cared for me, and Bernice Klaben, my speech therapist, have been essential contributors to my well being over

the past few years. My sincere appreciation is also offered to my academic department and division dean for their emotional support, and to the Office for the Advancement of Research and Scholarship at Miami University for their financial support. My family and friends have been sources of inspiration.

8. References

- Alsos, G. A., Ljunggren, E., & Pettersen, L. T. (2003). Farm Based Entrepreneurs: What Triggers the Start Up of New Business Activities? *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 10, No. 4, (December 2001), pp. 435–443, ISSN 1462-6004
- Anderson, A. R., & Miller, C. J. (2003). "Class Matters": Human and Social Capital in the Entrepreneurial Process. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, Vol. 32, No. 1, (March 2003), pp. 17–37, ISSN 1053-5357
- Anderson, J., & Eppard, J. (1998). van Kaam's Method Revisited. *Qualitative Health Research*, Vol. 8, No. 3, (March 1998), pp. 399–403, ISSN 1049-7323
- Anitha, B. (2004). *A Study on Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Market Participation of Farm Women In Bangalore Rural District of Karnataka*, Masters thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore, India
- Aronson, R. (1991). *Self-employment*, ILR Press, ISBN 0875461751, Ethic, New York, USA
- Balls, P. (2009). Phenomenology in Nursing Research: Methodology, Interviewing and Transcribing. *Nursing Times*, Vol. 105, No. 32-33, (August, 2009), pp. 30–33, ISSN 0954-7762
- Baines, S., Wheelock, J., & Gelder U. (2003). *Riding the Rollercoaster: Family Life and Self-employment*, The Policy Press, ISBN 1861345038, Bristol, England
- Barnes, L. B., & Lachapelle, K. (February 1997). *Entrepreneurial Family*, Harvard Business School Publication, Prod. #: 897157-PDF-ENG, Harvard Business School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA
- Barrett, C. B., Reardon, T., & Webb, P. (2001). Nonfarm Income Diversification and Household Livelihood Strategies in Rural Africa: Concepts, Dynamics and Policy Implications. *Food Policy*, Vol. 26, No. 4, (August 2001), pp. 315–331, ISSN 0306-9192
- Barthomeuf, L-T. (June 2008). *Other Gainful Activities: Pluriactivity and Farm Diversification in EU-27*, 09.18.2011, Available from http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/analysis/markets/gainful/slides_en.pdf
- Benner, P. (1994). *Interpretive Phenomenology: Embodiment, Caring, and Ethics in Health and Illness*, Sage Publications, ISBN 9780803957220, Thousand Oaks, California, USA
- Bennett, J. W. (1982). *Of Time and the Enterprise: North American Family Farm Management in a Context of Resource Marginality*, University of Minnesota Press, ISBN 0816668353, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA
- Bergmann, H., Dax, T., Hovorka, G., & Thomson, K. J. (2006). *Multifunctionality and Pluriactivity Across Europe – A Comparison between Scotland and Austria*, Available from http://oega.boku.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/Tagung/2006/06_Bergmann.pdf
- Bogdan, R., & Taylor, S. J. (1975). *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods: A Phenomenological Approach to the Social Sciences*, John Wiley and Sons, ISBN 0471085715, New York, New York, USA

- Bohak, Z., Borec, A., & Turk, J. (2010). An Appraisal of Family Farm Succession Studies: A Review. *Agricultura Scientific Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 9–13, ISSN 1581-5439
- Bohler, K. F., & Hildenbrand, B. (1997). *Landwirtschaftliche Familienbetriebe in der Krise* [Farm Families in Crises], LIT, ISBN 3825828913, Münster, Germany
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge University Press, ISBN 052129164X, Cambridge, England
- Bowman, D. D. (2009). The Deal: Wives, Entrepreneurial Business and Family Life. *Journal of Family Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 2, (August 2009), pp. 167–176, ISSN 1322-9400
- Brookfield, H. (2008). Family Farms Are Still Around: Time to Invert the Old Agrarian Question. *Geography Compass*, Vol. 2, No. 1, (January 2008), pp. 108–126, ISSN 1749-8198
- Brookfield, H., & Parsons, H. (2007). *Family Farms: Survival and Prospects. A World-Wide Analysis*, Routledge, ISBN 0415414415, Abingdon, England and New York, New York, USA
- Brown, C. M. (February, 2011). 8 Tips on Preparing Your Family for Entrepreneurship, Inc, 05.09.2011, Available from <http://www.inc.com/guides/201102/how-to-prepare-your-family-for-entrepreneurship.html>
- Busby, N., & Macleod, C. (2010). Rural Identity in the Twenty-first Century: A Community of Crofters or Crofting Communities? *Journal of Law & Society*, Vol. 37, No. 4, (December 2010), pp. 592–619, ISSN 0263-323x
- Byrne, M. (2001a). Understanding Life Experiences Through a Phenomenological Approach to Research. *AORN*, Vol. 73, No 4, (April 2001), pp. 830–832, ISSN 0001-2092
- Byrne, M. (2001b). Hermeneutics as a Methodology for Textual Analysis—Nursing Applications. *AORN*, Vol. 73, No. 5, (May 2001), pp. 968–970, ISSN 0001-2092
- Capitanio, F., & Adinolfi, F. (2010). Profile of the Italian Farmer: The Main Entrepreneurial Types. *Food Economics, Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica C*, Vol 7., No. 1, (April 2010), pp. 25–35, ISSN 1650-7541
- Carter, S. (1999). Multiple Business Ownership in the Farm Sector: Assessing the Enterprise and Employment Contributions of Farmers In Cambridgeshire. *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 4, (October 1999), pp. 417–429, ISSN 0743-0167
- Carter, S., & Rosa, P. (1998). Indigenous Rural Firms: Farm Enterprises in the UK. *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 16, No. 4, (July 1998), pp. 15–27, ISSN 0266-2426
- Chandramouli, P., Meti, S. K., Hirevenkangoudar, L. V., & Hanchinal, S. N. (2007). Comparative Analysis of Entrepreneurial Behaviour of Farmers in Irrigated and Dry Land Areas of Raichur District of Karnataka. *Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Science*, Vol. 20, No. 2, (April 2007), pp. 320–322, ISSN 0972-1061
- Chell, E. (2007). Social Enterprise and Entrepreneurship: Towards a Convergent Theory of the Entrepreneurial Process. *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 25, No. 1, (February 2007), pp. 5–26, ISSN 0266-2426
- Chegini, M. G., & Khoshtinat, B. (2011). Study of Relationship between Entrepreneurial Skills and Organizational Entrepreneurship. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, Vol. 5, No. 4, (October 2011), pp. 165–172, ISSN 1991-8178
- Cismariu, L., & Mocan, M. L. (2010). The Entrepreneurial Potential in the Western Region of Romania: The Results of a Research Study, In: *Annals of DAAAM for 2010 &*

- Proceedings of the 21st International DAAAM Symposium*, B. Katalinic, (Ed.), pp. 889–890, DAAAM International Vienna, ISBN 9783901509735, Vienna, Austria
- Connelly, L. M. (2010). What is Phenomenology? *MEDSURG Nursing*, Vol. 19, No. 2, (March 2010), pp. 127–128, ISSN 1092-0811
- Cope, J. P. (2005). Researching Entrepreneurship through Phenomenological Inquiry: Philosophical and Methodological Issues. *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 2, (April 2005), pp. 163–189, ISSN 0266-2426
- Cope, J., & Watts, G. (2000). Learning by Doing—An Exploration of Experience, Critical Incidents and Reflection in Entrepreneurial Learning. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 104–124, ISSN 1355-2554
- Covin, J. G., & Wales, W. J. (2011). The Measurement of Entrepreneurial Orientation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 35, No. 5, (September 2011), pp. 855–872, ISSN 1042-2587
- Crofters Commission. (n.d.). *About Crofting*, 14.09.2011, Available from <http://www.crofterscommission.org.uk/What-is-Crofting.asp>
- Crofters Commission. (1998). *Annual report 1997/98*, The Crofters Commission, Inverness, Scotland
- Crist, J. D., & Tanner, C. A. (2003). Interpretation/Analysis Methods in Hermeneutic Interpretive Phenomenology. *Nursing Research*, Vol. 52, No. 3, (May 2003), pp. 202–205, ISSN 0029-6562
- Dabson, B. (May 2008). *Entrepreneurs, Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, Australian Regional Economies Conference 2008 Terrigal, NSW, Australia, 09.15.2011, Available from http://www.rupri.org/Forms/Dabson_Australia_May08.pdf
- Dabson, B. (2011). Rural Regional Innovation: A Response to Metropolitan-Framed Place-Based Thinking in the United States. *Australasian Journal of Regional Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 1, (February 2011), pp. 7–21, ISSN 1324-0935
- Daly, K. J. (2007). *Qualitative Methods for Family Studies & Human Development*, Sage Publications, ISBN 9781412914031, Thousand Oaks, California, USA
- Damaraju, N. L., Barney, J., & Dess, G. (June 2010). *Stigma and Entrepreneurial Risk Taking*, Paper presented at the Summer Conference 2010, Opening Up Innovation: Strategy, Organization and Technology, Imperial College, London Business School, June 16 - 18, 2010, 10.09.2011, Available from <http://www2.druid.dk/conferences/viewpaper.php?id=502023&cf=43>
- Dana, L. P., & Dana, T. E. (2005). Expanding the Scope of Methodologies Used in Entrepreneurship Research, *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, Vol. 2, No. 1, (January 2005), pp. 79–88, ISSN 1476-1297
- Davis-Brown, K., & Salamon, S. (1988). Farm Families in Crisis: An Application of Stress Theory to Farm Family Research, In: *Families in Rural America: Stress, Adaptation and Revitalization*, R. Marotz-Baden, C. B. Hennon, & T. H. Brubaker, (Eds.), pp. 47–55, National Council on Family Relations, ISBN 0916174212, St. Paul, Minnesota, USA
- De Clercq, D., & Voronov, M. (2011). Sustainability in Entrepreneurship: A Tale of Two Logics. *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 4, (August 2011), pp. 322–344, ISSN 0266-2526

- Degeorge, J.-M., & Fayolle, A. (2011). The Entrepreneurial Process Trigger: A Modelling Attempt in the French Context. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 18, No. 2, (May 2011), pp. 251–277, ISSN 1462-6004
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (4th ed.), Sage Publications, ISBN 9781412974172, Thousand Oaks, California, USA
- de Wolf, P., & Schoorlemmer, H. (Eds.). (September 2007). *Exploring the Significance of Entrepreneurship in Agriculture*, Research Institute of Organic Agriculture FiBL, ISBN 9783037360088, Ackerstrasse, Switzerland
- Economic Research Service/USDA. (June 2006). *Understanding U.S. Farm Exits* (ERR-21), Economic Research Service/USDA, 30.08.2011, Available from <http://www.ers.usda.gov>
- Economic Research Service/USDA. (August 2010). *Farm Income and Costs: Farm Business Income*, Economic Research Service/USDA, 29.09.2011, Available from <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Briefing/FarmIncome/Businessincome.htm>
- Economic Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture. (November 2010). *Farm Household Economics and Well-Being: Glossary*, 09-25.2011, Available from <http://www.ers.usda.gov/briefing/wellbeing/glossary.htm#types>
- Economic Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture. (February 2011a). *Farm Income: Partitioning the Definition of a Farm*, 09.23.2011, Available from <http://www.ers.usda.gov/data/farmincome/Sizedefinition.htm>
- Economic Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture. (March 2011b). *County-Level Population Data for Ohio*, 01.10.2011, Available from <http://www.ers.usda.gov/data/population/PopList.asp?st=OH&longname=Ohi>.
- Economic Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture. (September 2011c). *State Fact Sheets: Ohio*. 01.10.2011, Available from <http://www.ers.usda.gov/StateFacts/OH.htm#FC>
- Ehrich, L. C. (2005). Revisiting Phenomenology: Its Potential for Management Research, In: *Proceedings Challenges for Organisations in Global Markets, British Academy of Management Conference*, pp. 1–13, (September 2005), Oxford University, Saïd Business School, Oxford, England
- Eikeland, S., & Lie, I. (1999). Pluriactivity in Rural Norway. *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 4, (October 1999), pp. 405–415, ISSN 0743-0167
- Entrepreneurship, Family Firms and Economic Development*. (n.d.). 09.11.2011, Available from <http://conference.researchbib.com/print.php?category=event&id=13226&uid=18>
- Fairlie, R. W. (May 2009). The Importance of Family for Entrepreneurial Success, In: *The American*, 09.13.2011, Available from <http://www.american.com/archive/2009/may-2009/the-importance-of-family-for-entrepreneurial-success>
- Feldman, D. (November 2009). *Succession Planning for the Family Farm*, 02.09.2011, Available from <http://www.exitplanningtoday.com/2009/11/succession-planning-for-the-family-farm.html>
- Fernandez-Cornejo, J. (February 2007). *Off-Farm Income, Technology Adoption and Farm Economic Performance*, Economic Research Report No. (ERR-36), 36 Economic Research Service/USDA, Washington, DC, USA, 09.13.2011, Available from

- <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Publications/ERR36/>
- Flood, A. (2010). Understanding Phenomenology. *Nurse Researcher*, Vol. 17, No. 2, (April 2010), pp. 7-15, ISSN 1351-5578
- García, Á. C., Ribeiro, D., & Roig, S. (Eds.). (2007). *Entrepreneurship: Concepts, Theory and Perspective*, Springer-Verlag, ISBN 9783540485421, Berlin, Germany
- Gasson, R., & Errington, A. (1993). *The Farm Family Business*, CAB International, ISBN 0851988598, London, England
- Glauben, T., Tietje, H., & Weiss, C. (October 2003). *Agriculture on the Move: Exploring Regional Differences in Farm Exit Rates*, Working Paper EWP 0308, Department of Food Economics and Consumption Studies, University of Kiel, Kiel, Germany, 30.08.2011, Available from <http://ideas.repec.org/p/zbw/caufew/0308.html>
- Glendinning, S. (2007). *In the Name of Phenomenology*, Routledge, ISBN 9780415223386, London, England
- Giorgi, A., & Giorgi, B. (2003) Phenomenology, In: *Qualitative Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods*, J. A. Smith, (Ed.), pp. 25-50, Sage Publications, ISBN 9781412930840, Thousand Oaks, California, USA
- Graneheim, U. H., & Lundman, B. (2004). Qualitative Content Analysis in Nursing Research: Concepts, Procedures and Measures to Achieve Trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today*, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 105-112, ISSN 0260-6917
- Groenewald, T. (2004). A Phenomenological Research Design Illustrated. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (January 2004), 10.10.2011, Available from http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/3_1/pdf/groenewald.pdf
- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (1993). Phenomenology, Ethnomethodology, and Family Discourse, In: *Sourcebook of Family Theories and Methods: A Contextual Approach*, P. G. Boss, W. J. Doherty, R. LaRossa, W. R. Schumm, & S. K. Steinmetz, (Eds.), pp. 651-672, Plenum Press, ISBN 9780306442643, New York, New York, USA
- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (2000). The Self in a World of Going Concerns. *Symbolic Interaction*, Vol. 23, No. 2, (Spring 2000), pp. 95-115, ISSN 1533-8665
- Habermas, J. (1981). *The Theory of Communicative Action*, Beacon Press, ISBN 0807014001 Boston, Massachusetts, USA
- Halpin, D., & Guilfoyle, A. (2005). The Attribution of Self Amongst Australian Family Farm Operators: Personal Responsibility and Control. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, Vol. 36, No.3, pp. 475-487, ISSN 0047-2328
- Hamilton, E. (2011). Entrepreneurial Learning in Family Business: A Situated Learning Perspective. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 18, No. 1, (February 2011), pp. 8-26, ISSN 1462-6004
- Haugen, M. S., & Vik, J. (2008). Farmers as Entrepreneurs: The Case of Farm-Based Tourism. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, Vol. 6, No. 3, (Fall 2008), pp. 321-336, ISSN 1476-1297
- Heck, R. K. Z. (n.d.). *The Cornell University Family Business Research Institute*, 09.20.2011, Available from <http://www.fambiz.com/Orgs/Cornell/default.cfm>
- Heck, R. K. Z. (2004). A Commentary on Entrepreneurship in Family vs Non-Family Firms: A Resource-Based Analysis of the Effect of Organisational Culture. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 28, No. 4, (June 2004), pp. 383-390, ISSN 1042-2587

- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and Time*. Harper and Row, ISBN 0061475593, New York, New York, USA
- Hennon, C. B., & Hildenbrand, B. (2005a). *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* [Special issue: Farm Family Responses to Changing Agricultural Conditions: The Actors' Point of View]. Vol. 36, No. 3, (Summer 2005), ISSN 0047-2328
- Hennon, C. B., & Hildenbrand, B. (2005b). Modernising to Remain Traditional: Farm Families Maintaining a Valued Lifestyle. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (Summer 2005), pp. 505–520, ISSN 0047-2328
- Hennon, C. B., Jones, A., Roth, M., & Popescu, L. (1998). Family-Enterprise Initiatives as a Response to Socioeconomic and Political Change in Eastern and Central Europe. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, Vol. 19, No. 3, (Fall 1998), pp. 235–253, ISBN 1058-0476
- Hennon, C. B., Loker, S., & Walker, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Gender and Home-Based Employment*, Auburn House, ISBN 0865692718, Westport, Connecticut, USA
- Hildenbrand, B. (2005). *Fallrekonstruktive Familienforschung. Anleitungen für die Praxis* [Case reconstruction in family research. Guidance for practice]. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, ISBN 3531322869, Wiesbaden, Germany
- Hildenbrand, B. (2008). Diversity in Families: Germany, In: *Families in a Global Context*, C. B. Hennon & S. M. Wilson, (Eds.), pp. 71–98, Routledge, ISBN 9780789027078, New York, New York, USA
- Hildenbrand, B., & Hennon, C. B. (2008). Beyond the Concept of 'Getting Big or Getting Out': Entrepreneurship Strategies to Survive as a Farm Family. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, Vol. 6, No. 3, (Fall 2008), pp. 479–495, ISSN 1476-1297
- Hitzler, R., & Eberle, T. S. (2004). Phenomenology and Life World Analysis. In: *A Companion to Qualitative Research*, U. Flick, E. von Kardorff, & I. Steinke, (Eds.), pp. 67–71, Sage Publications, ISBN 0761973745, London, England
- Holland, D. V., & Shepherd, D. A. (2011). Deciding to Persist: Adversity, Values, and Entrepreneurs' Decision Policies. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 09.29.2011, Available from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2011.00468.x/abstract>
- Hoppe, R. A., & Banker, D. E. (2006). *Structure and Finances of U. S. Farms: 2005* (EIR-12), United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, Washington, DC, USA
- Hoppe, R. A., & Banker, D. E. (July 2010). *Structure and Finances of U.S. Farms: Family Farm Report, 2010 Edition*, Economic Information Bulletin No. (EIB-66), United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, Washington, DC, USA
- Hoppe, R. A., Banker, D. E., & MacDonald, J. M. (July 2010). *America's Diverse Family Farms, 2010 Edition*, Economic Information Bulletin No. (EIB-67), United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, Washington, DC, USA
- Hoppe, R., & Korb, P. (June 2006). *Understanding U.S. Farm Exits* (ERR-21), United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, Washington, DC, USA
- Hunter, J. (2006). *The Making of the Crofting Community* (2nd ed.), John Donald, ISBN 0859765377, Edinburgh, Scotland

- Husserl, E. (1970). *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*. Northwestern University Press, 081010458X, Evanston, Illinois, USA
- Husserl, E. (1999). *The Idea of Phenomenology*, Kluder, ISBN 0792356918, Dordrecht, The Netherlands
- Husserl, E. (2010). *Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology*, Routledge, ISBN 041560656X, New York, New York, USA
- Intersubjectivity. (n.d.). 01.10.2011, Available from <http://pediaview.com/openpedia/Intersubjectivity>
- Jootun, D., McGhee, G., & Marland, G. R. (2009). Reflexivity: Promoting Rigour in Qualitative Research. *Nursing Standard*, Vol. 23, No. 25, (February 2009), pp. 42–46, ISSN 0029-6570
- Karlsson, C., Johansson, B., & Stough, R. (2010). *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development: Local Processes and Global Patterns*, Edward Elgar Publishing, ISBN 9781847209320, Cheltenham, England
- Kimhi, A. & Bollman, R. (1999). Family Farm Dynamics in Canada and Israel: The Case of Farm Exits, *Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 21, No. 1, (August 1999), pp. 69–79, ISSN 0169-5150
- Kinsella, J., Wilson, S., De Jong, F., & Renting, H. (2000). Pluriactivity as a Livelihood Strategy in Irish Farm Households and its Role in Rural Development. *Sociologia Ruralis*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (October 2000), pp. 481–496, ISSN 0038-0199
- Kobzar, O. A. (2006). *Whole-Farm Risk Management in Arable Farming: Portfolio Methods for Farm-Specific Business Analysis and Planning*, PhD thesis, Wageningen University, Wageningen, The Netherlands, ISBN 90-8504-478-2
- Koch, T. (2005). Establishing Rigour in Qualitative Research: The Decision Trail. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, Vol. 53, No. 1, (January 2005), pp. 91–103, ISSN 0309-2402
- Koveos, P. (2010). Entrepreneurship and Economic Development: The Relationship Revisited. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 16, No. 2, (June 2011), pp. 165–167, ISSN 1084-9467
- Laferrière, A. (2001). Self-Employment and Intergenerational Transfers. *International Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 31, No. 1, (Spring 2001), pp. 3–26, ISSN 00207659
- Lopez, K., & Willis, D. (2004). Descriptive Versus Interpretive Phenomenology: Their Contributions to Nursing Knowledge. *Qualitative Health Research*, Vol. 14, No. 5, (May 2004), pp. 726–735, ISSN 10497323
- Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (1996). Clarifying the Entrepreneurial Orientation Construct and Linking it to Performance. *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 21, No. 1, (January 1996), pp. 135–172, ISSN 0363-7425
- MacKinnon, N., Bryden, J. M., Bell, C., Fuller, A. M., & Spearman, M. (1991). Pluriactivity, Structural Change and Farm Household Vulnerability in Western Europe. *Sociologia Ruralis*, Vol. 31, No. 1, (April 1991), pp. 58–71, ISSN 0038-0199
- Marotz-Baden, R., Hennon, C. B., & Brubaker, T. H. (Eds.). (1988). *Families in Rural America: Stress, Adaptation and Revitalization*, National Council on Family Relations, ISBN 0916174212, St. Paul, Minnesota, USA
- McElwee, G. (2005). *Developing Entrepreneurial Skills of Farmers. D2: A Literature Review of Entrepreneurship in Agriculture* (SSPE-CT-2005-006500), University of Lincoln, Brayford Pool, England


- McElwee, G. (2006a). Farmer's as Entrepreneurs: Developing Competitive Skills, *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 11, No. 3, (September 2006), pp. 187–206, ISSN 1084-9467
- McElwee, G. (2006b). The Entrepreneurial Farmer: A Pandora's box. *Rural Enterprise and Management*, Vol. 2, No. 2, (April 2006), pp. 25–42, ISSN 1749-5598
- McElwee, G. (2008). A Taxonomy of Entrepreneurial Farmers. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, Vol. 6, No. 3, (Fall 2008), pp. 465–478, ISSN 1476-1297
- McLain, R. (1981). The Postulate of Adequacy: Phenomenological Sociology and the Paradox of Science and Sociality. *Human Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 2 (April 1981), pp. 105–130, ISSN 0163-8548
- Mishra, A., El-Osta, H., & Shaik, S. (2010). Succession Decisions in U. S. Family Farm Business. *Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (April 2010), pp. 133–152, 0162-1912
- Moran, D. (2000). *Introduction to Phenomenology*, Routledge, ISBN 0415183723, London, England
- Moroz, P. W., & Hindle, K. (May 2011). Entrepreneurship as a Process: Toward Harmonizing Multiple Perspectives. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 08.03.2011, Available from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2011.00452.x/abstract>
- Munhall, P. L. (2007). *Nursing Research: A Qualitative Perspective* (4th ed.), Jones & Bartell, ISBN 0763711357, Boston, Massachusetts, USA
- Munk, J. (2006). We Must Look Again at How Crofting can Sustain People of Rural Scotland. *Times Higher Education Supplement*, Issue 1774, (December 2006), p. 2, ISSN 0049-3929
- National Farmers Union Scotland. (n.d.). *Scottish Farming*, 29.09.2011, Available from <http://www.nfus.org.uk/farming-facts>
- Nordqvist, M., & Melin, L. (2010). Entrepreneurial Families and Family Firms. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, Vol. 22, No. 3/4, (May 2010), pp. 211–239, ISSN 0898-5626
- Odbert, C., & Brie Hensold, B. (April 2011). The Road To Opportunity: A Family's Entrepreneurial Journey to Financial Stability, *Forbes*, 05.09.2011, Available from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/megacities/2011/04/25/the-road-to-opportunity-a-family-s-entrepreneurial-journey-to-financial-stability/>
- Patel, M. C., & Chauhan, N. B. (2009). Entrepreneurial Attitude Of Youth. *Agricultural Science Digest*, Vol. 29, No. 3, (July 2009), pp. 212–214, ISSN 0253-150X
- Peters, M., Frehse, J., & Buhalis, D. (2009). The Importance of Lifestyle Entrepreneurship: A Conceptual Study of the Tourism Industry. *PASOS: Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, Vol. 7, No. 3, (October 2009), pp. 393–405, ISSN 1695-7121
- Plant, R., & Ren, J. (2010). A Comparative Study of Motivation and Entrepreneurial Intentionality: Chinese and American Perspectives. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 15, No. 2, (June 2010), pp. 187–204, ISSN 1084-9467
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1989). Phenomenological Research Methods, In: *Existential-Phenomenological Perspectives in Psychology: Exploring the Breadth of Human*

- Experiences*, R. S. Valle & S. Halling, (Eds.), pp. 41–60, Plenum Press, ISBN 9780306430442, New York, New York, USA
- Radina, E., Hennon, C. B., & Gibbons, H. M. (2008). Divorce and Mid- and Later Life Families: A Phenomenological Analysis with Implications for Family Life Educators. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, Vol. 49, No. 1/2, (October 2008), pp. 142–170, ISSN 1050-2556
- Renzulli, L. A., Aldrich, H., & Moody, J. (2000). Family Matters: Gender, Networks, and Entrepreneurial Outcomes. *Social Forces*, Vol. 79, No. 2, (December 2000), pp. 523–546 ISSN 0037-7732
- Rogoff, E. G., & Heck, R. K. Z. (2003). Evolving Research in Entrepreneurship and Family Business: Recognizing Family as the Oxygen that Feeds the Fire of Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 18, No. 5, (September 2003), pp. 559–566, ISSN 0883-9026
- Rønning, L., & Kolvereid, L. (2006). Income Diversification in Norwegian Farm Households: Reassessing Pluriactivity. *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 4, (August 2006), pp. 405–420, ISSN 0266-2425
- Rossier, R. (2005). Role Models and Farm Development Options: A Comparison of Seven Swiss Farm Families, *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 3, (Summer 2005), pp. 399–417, ISSN 0047-2328
- Rudmann, C., (Ed.). (March 2008). *Entrepreneurial Skills and their Role in Enhancing the Relative Independence of Farmers. Results and Recommendations from the Research Project Developing Entrepreneurial Skills of Farmers*. Research Institute of Organic Agriculture, ISBN 978-3-03736-028-6, Frick, Switzerland
- Ryba, T. V., (2007). Cartwheels on Ice: A Phenomenological Exploration of Children's Enjoyment in Competitive Figure Skating. *Athletic Insight*, Vol. 9, No. 2, (June, 2007), pp. 58–73, ISSN 1536-0431
- Sandberg, K. W. (2003). An Exploratory Study of Women in Micro Enterprises: Gender-Related Differences. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 10, No. 4, (December 2003), pp. 408–417, ISSN 1462-6004
- Scheff, T. J., Kincaid, H., & Phillips, B. (2006). *Goffman Unbound! A New Paradigm for Social Science (The Sociological Imagination)*, Paradigm Publishers, ISBN 1594511969, Boulder, Colorado, USA
- Schutz, A. (1953). Common-Sense and the Scientific Interpretation of Human Action. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, Vol. 14, No. 1, (September 1953), pp. 1–38, ISSN 0031-8205
- Schutz, A. (1962). *Collected Papers Vol. I. The Problem of Social Reality*, Springer-Verlag, ISBN 902475089X, New York, New York, USA
- Schutz, A. (1966). *Collected Papers Vol. III. Studies in Phenomenological Philosophy*, Nijhoff, ISBN 9789024750900, The Hague, The Netherlands
- Schutz, A. (1967). *The Phenomenology of the Social World*. Northwestern University Press, ISBN 0810103907, Evanston, Illinois, USA
- Scottish Crofting Federation. (n.d.). *Crofting FAQs*, 14.09.2011, Available from <http://www.crofting.org/index.php/faqs/67#land-use>
- Scottish Government. (June 2010). *Farm Business Income*, 29.29.2011, Available from <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2010/06/14153938/13>

- Scottish Parliament Information Centre. (January 2010). *Crofting Reform (Scotland) Bill*, 29.09.2011, Available from <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/business/research/briefings-10/SB10-01.pdf>
- Shucksmith, M., & Winter, M. (1990). The Politics of Pluriactivity in Britain, *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 4, (October 1990), pp. 429–435, ISSN 0743-0167
- Sofer, M. (2001). Pluriactivity in the Moshav: Family Farming in Israel. *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 3, (July 2001), pp. 363–375, ISSN 0743-0167
- Stam, J. M., & Dixon, B. L. (2004). *Farmer Bankruptcies and Farm Exits in the United States, 1899-2002*, Agriculture Information Bulletin no. 788, United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, Washington, DC, USA, 09.12.2011, Available from <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/aib788/aib788.pdf>
- Stewart, K. (2005). *Crofts and Crofting*, Mercat Press, ISBN 1841830712, Edinburgh, Scotland
- Task Force of the International Family Business Program Association. (n.d.). *Family Business as a Field of Study*, The Cornell University Family Business Research Institute, Ithaca, New York, USA, 29.09.2011, Available from <http://www.fambiz.com/Orgs/Cornell/articles/real/ifbpa.cfm>
- The Foxy Farm Entrepreneur – An E-Learning Tool for Entrepreneurial Skills in Farming*. (2008). 17.09.2011, Available from <http://etraining.esofarmers.org/>
- Thompson, C. J., Locander, W. B., & Pollio, H. R. (1989). Putting Consumer Experience Back into Consumer Research: The Philosophy and Method of Existential-Phenomenology. *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 16, No. 2, (September 1989), pp. 133–146, ISSN 0093-5301
- U.S. Census Bureau. (n.d.). *State and County QuickFacts*, 01.10.2011, Available from <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/39/39017.html>
- Vaihinger, H. (1911). *Die Philosophie des Als Ob. System der theoretischen, praktischen und religiösen Fiktionen der Menschheit auf Grund eines idealistischen Positivismus. Mit einem Anhang über Kant und Nietzsche* [The Philosophy of As If, a System of the Theoretical, Practical and Religious Fictions of Mankind due to an Idealistic Positivism. With an Appendix Covering Kant and Nietzsche], Reuther & Reichard, Berlin, Germany
- Van de Ven, A., & Poole, M. S. (1995). Explaining Development and Change in Organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20, No. 3, (July 1995), pp. 510–540, ISSN 0363-7425
- van Manen, M. (1997). *Researching the Lived Experience: Human Science for an Action Sensitive Pedagogy* (2nd ed.), Althouse Press, ISBN 0791404269, Ontario, Canada
- Vesala, K. M., Peura, J., & McElwee, G. (2007). The Split Entrepreneurial Identity of the Farmer. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 14, No. 1, (February 2007), pp. 48–63, ISSN 1462-6004
- Vesala, K. M., & Pyysiäinen, J., (Eds.). (February 2008). *Understanding Entrepreneurial Skills in the Farm Context, Final Report on the Main Study of the EU-Funded Project Developing Entrepreneurial Skills Of Farmers SSPE-Ct-2005-006500*, Research Institute of Organic Agriculture FiBL, ISBN 9783037360200, Ackerstrasse, Switzerland
- Vik, J., & McElwee, G. (2011). Diversification and the Entrepreneurial Motivations of Farmers in Norway. *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 49, No. 3, (July 2011), pp. 390–410, ISSN 0047-2778

- Wang, L., Prieto, L., & Hinrichs, K. T. (2010). Direct and Indirect Effects of Individual and Environmental Factors on Motivation for Self-Employment. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 14, No. 4, (December 2010), 481–502, ISSN 1084-9467
- Warren, P. (2002). *Livelihoods Diversification and Enterprise Development: An Initial Exploration of Concepts and Issues*, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, LSP Working Paper 4, 09.20.2011, Available from <http://www.fao.org/docrep/008/j2816e/j2816e00.htm>
- Wertz, F. J., Charmaz, K., McMullen, L. M., Josselson, R., & Anderson, R. (2011). *Five Ways of Doing Qualitative Analysis: Phenomenological Psychology, Grounded Theory, Discourse Analysis, Narrative Research, and Intuitive Inquiry*, Guilford Publications, ISBN 9781609181420, New York, New York, USA
- Wheelock, J. (1993). Survival Strategies For Small Business Families in a Peripheral Local Economy: A Contribution to Institutional Value Theory, In: *Artful Practices: The Political Economy of Everyday Life*, H. Lustiger-Thales & D. Salée, (Eds.), pp. 21–40, Black Rose, ISBN 189543193X, Montréal, Canada
- Wilson, T. D. (2002). *Alfred Schutz, Phenomenology and Research Methodology for Information Behaviour Research*, Paper delivered at ISIC4 - Fourth International Conference on Information Seeking in Context, Universidade Lusitana, Lisbon, Portugal, September 11–13, 2002, 07.04.2011, Available from <http://informationr.net/tdw/publ/papers/schutz02.htm>
- Wisconsin Innovation Network, Inc. (June 1993). *Wisconsin's Entrepreneurial Climate Study: Final Report*, Wisconsin Innovation Network, Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, 09.21.2011, Available from <http://dx.doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR06241.v1>
- Zhao, H., Seibert, S. E., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2010). The Relationship of Personality to Entrepreneurial Intentions and Performance: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 36, No. 2, (March 2010), pp. 381–404, ISSN 0149-2063

IntechOpen



Entrepreneurship - Gender, Geographies and Social Context

Edited by Prof. Thierry Burger-Helmchen

ISBN 978-953-51-0206-9

Hard cover, 306 pages

Publisher InTech

Published online 14, March, 2012

Published in print edition March, 2012

Entrepreneurship is a main driver of economic growth and of social dynamics. However, some basic characteristics like the gender of the entrepreneur, the geographical location, or the social context may have a tremendous impact on the possibility to become an entrepreneur, to create a firm and to prosper. This book is a collection of papers written by an array of international authors interested in the question of entrepreneurship from a gender point of view (male vs female entrepreneurship), a geographical point of view (Africa, Europe, America and Latin America, Asia...) or a specific social context point of view (agricultural economy, farming or family business, etc.).

How to reference

In order to correctly reference this scholarly work, feel free to copy and paste the following:

Charles B. Hennon (2012). Entrepreneurship, Farming, and Identity: A Phenomenological Inquiry, Entrepreneurship - Gender, Geographies and Social Context, Prof. Thierry Burger-Helmchen (Ed.), ISBN: 978-953-51-0206-9, InTech, Available from: <http://www.intechopen.com/books/entrepreneurship-gender-geographies-and-social-context/entrepreneurship-farming-and-identity-a-phenomenological-inquiry>

INTECH
open science | open minds

InTech Europe

University Campus STeP Ri
Slavka Krautzeka 83/A
51000 Rijeka, Croatia
Phone: +385 (51) 770 447
Fax: +385 (51) 686 166
www.intechopen.com

InTech China

Unit 405, Office Block, Hotel Equatorial Shanghai
No.65, Yan An Road (West), Shanghai, 200040, China
中国上海市延安西路65号上海国际贵都大饭店办公楼405单元
Phone: +86-21-62489820
Fax: +86-21-62489821

© 2012 The Author(s). Licensee IntechOpen. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

IntechOpen

IntechOpen