

CONSTRUCTING AND NEGOTIATING ENTREPRENEURIAL AGENCY

**A SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACH TO
ENTREPRENEURSHIP DISCOURSE IN THE FARM
CONTEXT**

Jarkko Pyysiäinen

DISSERTATION

To be presented, with the permission of the Faculty of Social Sciences of
the University of Helsinki, for public examination in Auditorium XII,
University main building, on December 10th, 2011, at 10 a.m.

University of Helsinki
Department of Social Research
2011

Publications of the Department of Social Research 2011:10
Social Psychology

© Jarkko Pyysiäinen

Cover: Jere Kasanen
Photo: Antero Olakivi & Jarkko Pyysiäinen

Distribution and Sales:
Unigrafia Bookstore
<http://kirjakauppa.unigrafia.fi/>
books@unigrafia.fi
PL 4 (Vuorikatu 3 A) 00014 Helsingin yliopisto

ISSN-L 1798-9140
ISSN 1798-9132 (Online)
ISSN 1798-9140 (Print)
ISBN 978-952-10-6704-4 (Print)
ISBN 978-952-10-6705-1 (Online)

Unigrafia, Helsinki 2011

ABSTRACT

Entrepreneurship, understood as the autonomous, effective pursuit of opportunities regardless of resources, is currently subject to a multitude of interests, expectations, and facilitation efforts. On the one hand, such **'entrepreneurial agency' has broad appeal to individuals in Western market democracies** and resonates with their longing for an autonomous, personally tailored, meaningful, and materially rewarding way of life. On the other hand, entrepreneurship represents a tempting and increasingly popular means of governance and policy making, and thus a model for the re-organization of a variety of societal sectors. This study focuses on the diffusion and reception of entrepreneurship discourse in the context of farming and agriculture, where pressures to adopt entrepreneurial orientations have been increasingly pronounced while, on the other hand, the context of farming has historically enjoyed state protection and adhered to principles that seem **at odds with aspects of individualistic 'entrepreneurship discourse'**. The study presents an interpretation of the psychologically and politically appealing **uses of the notion of 'entrepreneurial agency'**, reviews the historical and political background of the current situation of farming and agriculture with regard to entrepreneurship, and examines their relationships in four empirical studies.

The study follows and develops **a social psychological, 'situated relational'** approach that guides the qualitative analyses and interpretations of the empirical studies. Interviews with agents from the farm sector aim to stimulate evaluative responses and comments on the idea of entrepreneurship on farms. Analysis of the interview talk, in turn, detects the variety of evaluative responses and argumentative contexts with which the interviewees relate themselves to the entrepreneurship discourse and adopt, use, resist, or reject it.

The study shows that despite the pressures towards entrepreneurialism, the diffusion of entrepreneurship discourse and the construction of entrepreneurial agency in farm context encounter many obstacles. These obstacles can be variably related to aspects dealing with the individual agent, the action situation, the characteristics of the action itself, or to the broader social, institutional and cultural context. Many aspects of entrepreneurial agency, such as autonomy, personal initiative and achievement orientation, are nevertheless familiar to farmers and are eagerly related **to one's own** farming activities. The idea of entrepreneurship is thus rarely rejected outright. The findings highlight the relational and situational preconditions for the construction of entrepreneurial agency in the farm context: When agents demonstrate entrepreneurial agency, they do so by drawing on available and accessed relational resources characteristic of their action context. Likewise, when agents fail or are reluctant to demonstrate

entrepreneurial agency, they nevertheless actively account for their situation and demonstrate personal agency by drawing on the relational resources available to them.

TIIVISTELMÄ

Yrittäjyys ymmärrettynä itseohjautuvaksi ja tehokkaaksi mahdollisuuksien tavoitteluksi on tällä hetkellä monenlaisten, keskenään ristiriitaistenkin odotusten ja edistämisyritkimysten kohteena. Yhtäältä tällainen ”yrittäjämäinen toimijuus” houkuttelee länsimaisissa markkinademokratioissa kasvaneita yksilöitä; se puhuttelee ihmisten yksilöllisiä toiveita itsenäisestä, henkilökohtaisesti merkitykselliseksi koetusta ja materiaalisesti palkitsevasta elämäntavasta ja -tyylistä. Toisaalta yrittäjyys ja vastuun siirtäminen yksilöille edustaa houkuttelevaa ja yhä yleisempää yhteiskunnallisen hallinnan ja politiikan tekemisen mallia, jonka mukaiseen muottiin yhteiskunnan eri osa-alueiden toiminnot pyritään istuttamaan.

Väitöstutkimukseni tarkastelee tätä tematiikkaa ja sen ilmenemismuotoja maatalojen ja maatalouden kontekstissa. Tutkimuksessa luodaan katsaus suomalaisen maatalotoiminnan historiallisiin ja poliittisiin taustoihin sekä viljelijöihin yhä voimakkaammin kohdistuneiden ”yrittäjämäisten odotusten” luonteeseen. Nämä maatalotoiminnan kontekstuaaliset tekijät muodostavat taustan, jonka valossa yrittäjyyteen suhtautumista ja sen saamaa vastaanottoa maatalotoiminnassa eritellään ja tulkitaan empiirisesti. Kukin tutkimuksen neljästä, laadullisen haastattelututkimuksen menetelmin toteutetusta osatutkimuksesta tarkastelee hieman eri näkökulmasta tapoja, joilla maanviljelijät ja yrittäjyyspolitiikan toimeenpanijat suhtautuvat yrittäjyyteen ja siihen liittyviin käytäntöihin (eli ”yrittäjyysdiskurssiin”) ja sovittavat niitä toimintaansa tai torjuvat ne.

Tutkimus osoittaa, että yrittäjyyden ja yrittäjämäisen toiminnan kytkeminen maatilakontekstiin ei ole ongelmaton, vaan kohtaa monenlaisia haasteita, jotka voivat liittyä niin maatalotoiminnan luonteeseen, toimijaan itseensä kuin toimijaa ympäröivään sosiokulttuuriseen ympäristöön. Haastatellut toimijat kuitenkin vievät yrittäjyyspuhetta ja -diskurssia omien toimintatilanteidensa ja päämääriensä nojalla monenlaisiin yhteyksiin, jolloin yrittäjyys saa monenlaisia käyttöjä ja merkityksiä. Yrittäjyyspuheen yleisyys ei siis tarkoita, että yrittäjyys esimerkiksi ”uusien liiketoimintamahdollisuuksien valppaana tunnistamisena” olisi välttämättä sitä, mihin maatilakytkeäisessä yritystoiminnassa ollaan ensi sijassa halukkaita. Sen sijaan yrittäjyyteen liittyviä ideoita omaksutaan ja kytketään maatalotoiminnan todellisuuteen kulloistenkin toimintatilanteiden ja niille ominaisten sosiaalisten suhteiden ehdoilla ja niitä apuna käyttäen.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thinking back on the journey that has culminated in this dissertation, I'm struck by an obvious resemblance between the key findings of the study and my reflections upon my trip: I would **definitely not have been able to 'make this dissertation happen'** without the relational situations and supportive environments that, for me, have been inseparable from the venture and the result. I have had the privilege and pleasure to work with and learn from a number of skillful and inspiring senior academicians, scholars and colleagues. First and foremost, I am grateful to my brilliant supervisor, Adjunct Professor, Dr. Kari Vesala, who has familiarized me with a great many inspiring research themes, theories and approaches to the journey that began way back when I was pondering **my master's thesis and has now culminated** in the writing of this dissertation. **Kari's wise mentoring, insight and help** have been invaluable not only in tackling intellectual questions and puzzles, but also in many practical academic issues, not least in questions concerning funding and the material resources needed for the realization of any research work. Luckily, I have been able to avoid much of the traditional, wearing academic uncertainty due to the opportunities I have had in working as a researcher on the research projects supervised and managed by Kari.

My other supervisor, Associate Professor, Dr. Darren Halpin, has provided me invaluable help with the reality and issues of political science and policy research, as well as with many practical academic issues concerning publishing, writing style, and the explicit and implicit rules of the international academic scene. **Darren's razor sharp analytical eye**, logical clarity and relaxed (Aussie, Scottish, Danish, or a combination thereof?) attitude have served as an orientation model for me to follow – and a healthy mind-set with which to survive such situations as the infamous Aberdeensian **'cabin fever'**.

I wish to express my warmest thanks to the external examiners of the thesis, Professors Elizabeth Chell and Stephen Reicher, for their valuable and helpful suggestions for improving the manuscript. It was a real privilege to have such prominent scholars of the field as my examiners.

Throughout my research process, I have been lucky to have had the opportunity to work and collaborate with wonderful people and top class experts in fields that were previously less familiar to me. Professor Hilikka Vihinen from MTT Agrifood Research has been actively involved in interdisciplinary research projects from which much of the data used in this thesis was collected. My understanding of rural and agricultural policy would **still be (embarrassingly) rudimentary without Hilikka's articulate and kind** sharing of her thorough expertise and knowledge of these issues. I also owe my warm thanks to Hilikka because of her constructive comments on the early versions of the original publications of this study. I have also had the

pleasure of deepening my understanding of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship research through collaboration with Professors Alistair Anderson and Gerard McElwee, who, among other things, served as co-authors in one of the original articles (publication III). Thank you, gentlemen – I deeply appreciate your contribution and expertise!

My research journey through its various phases has fortunately seldom been a lonely ride; I would never have reached the final destination without the benefits of collaborative agency and great company along the way. My closest and most long-standing workmate and doctoral student ‘partner in crime’ has been Miira Niska, with whom I have tackled countless number of intellectual and not-so-intellectual puzzles, and the practicalities and frustrations of doing research and being a doctoral student. Without her companionship I would not have **been able to ‘make it happen’; and worse,** the trip would have been much more boring. **The ‘Social Psychology of Entrepreneurship’** research group, headed by Kari Vesala, has provided me with the most immediate research and collaboration environment at the Department of Social Research at the University of Helsinki. In addition to Kari and Miira, I owe thanks to other members of our group, especially Soili Peltola and Hannu Vesala. Thank you for making the group an inspiring and fun place to work! The late Department of Social Psychology of the University of Helsinki, now a discipline at the Department of Social Research, has been a stimulating and supportive working environment over the years; it has begun to feel almost like a second home for me – and not only because of the **sometimes (too) frequent ‘night shifts’ spent there.** Professors Klaus Helkama, Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman and Karmela Liebkind have, each in their turn, served as the head of the department/discipline and contributed to facilitating the fluency of the research work. I especially thank some of my long-standing colleagues and friends who have helped to make the world a brighter place over these years, both inside and outside the workplace: Marja Ahokas, Salla Ahola, Anna Bäckström, Päivi Berg, Eerika Finell, Nelli Hankonen, Eeva Kolttola, Hanna Konttinen, Emilia Kujala, Tuuli Anna Mähönen, Ann Ojala, Antero Olakivi, Anneli Portman, Tuija Seppälä, Mia Silfver-Kuhlampi, Sakari Tamminen, Mia Teräsaho and Jukka Tontti.

As regards funding of the research, I wish to thank the Finnish Rural Policy Committee for supporting the thesis financially. In addition, several colleagues and people who have participated in research collaboration over the years are to be thanked for their inspiration, help and contributions. Researchers Eila Mustakangas, Elina Vehmasto and Olli Voutilainen from MTT Agrifood Research shared the workload of data collection with me during years 2004-2007. The whole project staff in the EU-funded research project **‘ESoF’** (2005-2008) is to be thanked for the common collaborations and discussions concerning the study of entrepreneurial skills in farm context. During the final stages, my current employer MTT Agrifood Research and the people at Economic Research unit have provided me with support and encouragement in the finalization efforts. And last but not least,

I am grateful for the interviewees who participated in the interviews included in this study; in the end, your participation and cooperation have made this project possible.

Finally, I must, of course, thank the diverse group of family and friends, among whom I have luckily been embedded over these years. This group of **Significant Others has included, on the one hand, the ‘extended family’, that is, the Pyysiäinen gang: Liisa, Markku, Jaana, Tommi, Inkeri, Pekka, Anniina, Sari, Ile, Miihkali, Milja and grandpa Jussi; and the Karilas gang: Juhani, Viivi, Pauli, Aino and Felipe. On the other hand, the group has included dear friends, such as Laura Ahola, Tuomas Brock, members of the Foucault Reading Circle, Antti Gronow, Sami Järvinen, Katri Kaitainen, Ilkka Karisto, Sampo Luoto, Ville Löfman, Sami Mattila, Juha Mikkonen, Outi Olakivi, Toivo Peppanen, Jussi Perälä, Semi Purhonen, Max Rynänen, Kim Siljamäki, Mikko Sillfors, Minna Suutari, Tuula Teräväinen, Saku Tiainen, Sampo Villanen, Kim Wikström and Tuomas Ylä-Anttila. Despite the differences, you guys share a rare quality: a striving to understand things while also keeping **the lighter and funny side of things onboard. Let’s keep it that way!****

Helsinki, November 11th, 2011

Jarkko Pyysiäinen

CONTENTS

Abstract.....	3
Tiivistelmä	5
Acknowledgements	6
Contents.....	9
List of original publications	11
1 Introduction	13
2 The context	17
2.1 The farm context in historical perspective: Peasant tradition, productivist ethos and pressures towards entrepreneurialism	17
2.2 The policy context of farming: Competing policy discourses and expectations of the agency of farmers	21
3 The approach.....	26
3.1 ‘The enterprising self’: The means and the end of enterprise discourses?.....	26
3.2 Delineating the cornerstones of a contextually oriented social psychological approach to the construction of entrepreneurial agency	29
3.2.1 From passive discursive subjugation to active argumentative agency.....	30
3.2.2 The usage, resources and functions of discourses in the construction of agency.....	32
3.2.3 Characterizing the approach as ‘situated, relational constructionism’	34
4 Materials and methods.....	36
4.1 Project 1: On-farm business diversification in municipal rural development policy	36
4.2 Project 2: Developing entrepreneurial skills of farmers.....	37
4.3 Central methodological and analytical principles and their application in the articles.....	38

5	Original studies	41
5.1	I study.....	41
5.2	II study.....	42
5.3	III study.....	43
5.4	IV study.....	44
6	Summary of the original studies: Obstacles to the construction of entrepreneurial agency	45
7	Discussion and conclusions.....	49
	References.....	60
	Appendix A.....	70
	Appendix B.....	72
	Appendix C.....	75

LIST OF ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS

This thesis is based on the following original publications:

- I Jarkko Pyysiäinen & Kari Mikko Vesala (2011). Activating farmers: Uses of entrepreneurship discourse in the rhetoric of policy implementers (Unpublished manuscript under review process).
- II Jarkko Pyysiäinen, Darren Halpin & Kari Mikko Vesala (2011). Entrepreneurial skills among farmers: Approaching a policy discourse. In: Alsos, G. A., Carter, S., Ljunggren, E. & Welter, F. (Eds.) *The Handbook of Research on Entrepreneurship in Agriculture and Rural Development* (pp. 109–128). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- III Jarkko Pyysiäinen, Alistair Anderson, Gerard McElwee & Kari Mikko Vesala (2006). Developing the entrepreneurial skills of farmers: some myths explored. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 12 (1), 21–39.
- IV Jarkko Pyysiäinen (2010). Co-constructing a virtuous ingroup attitude? Evaluation of new business activities in a group interview of farmers. *Text & Talk*, 30 (6), 701–721.

The publications are referred to in the text by their roman numerals.

1 INTRODUCTION

In Western culture it has become commonplace to hail success stories as the fruit of the unique personal characteristics and capacities of individual protagonists. The credit for success and the blame for failure are attributed to the inner dispositions, or the self, of the individual. In social psychological terms, we are accustomed to making dispositional attributions, to attribute actions to the enduring personal dispositions of the individual agent. A popular and clichéd example of such an individualistic myth is the image of the hero-entrepreneur, which glorifies the powers of the self-made entrepreneur and attributes the success to his or her exceptional inner dispositions. Entrepreneurship as an exceptional ability to pursue **opportunities ‘regardless of resources currently under control’** (Stevenson & Jarillo, 1991; cf. Shane & Eckhardt, 2005) and thus to **‘make it happen’** (Sarasvathy, 2004; see also Steyaert, 2007) becomes an inherent disposition of exceptional, natural-born entrepreneurs.

Yet such a tendency, even bias, towards favoring the dispositions and characteristics of the individual at the cost of the action situation and social **context is not limited to modern cultural imagery and ‘mythology’**. A similar tendency is also evident in the sphere of academic research and theorizing. In modern entrepreneurship research, for example, individual-centric approaches have dominated until recent decades.¹ For instance, according to Shaver (1995; see also Chell, 1985, 2008: 81-141), there was a period when entrepreneurship research devoted itself to the search for an **‘entrepreneurial personality’ in order to** explain entrepreneurial behavior and successful entrepreneurial ventures and careers.² However, when **research failed to identify such an ‘entrepreneurial personality’, the scope of**

1 The tendency can be identified also more generally in the field of behavioral and social sciences. In social psychology, for example, the dominant paradigms and approaches persistently focused on the **individual, firstly, on the individual’s capacities and regularities in responding to stimuli (e.g. under the influence of ‘physicalistic’ and ‘behavioristic’ ideals), and later on, in the processing of cognitive information (after the so called ‘cognitive turn’)**. Focus on the cultural, social and linguistic construction of social psychological phenomena has been of more recent origin, but once the theoretical paradigms and approaches have diversified, they have also tended to become isolated and remain unconnected from each other. (See Farr, 1996; Gergen, 1997a; Jost & Kruglanski, 2002.)

2 Early research on entrepreneurial personality was characterized by a striving to identify a personality trait that would explain entrepreneurial behaviors, and three personality traits emerged as **the most notable candidates from these discussions (so called ‘big three’): need for achievement; locus of control; and risk-taking propensity** (Chell, 2008: 81-110). More recently also other personality traits **beyond the initial ‘big three’ have been suggested as candidates, including tolerance of ambiguity; opportunity recognition or innovativeness; autonomy; and self-efficacy, among others** (Rauch & Frese, 2007; Chell, 2008: 111-141).

entrepreneurship research broadened to encompass the study of the cognitive, behavioral, and experiential aspects associated with entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial activity (Chell, 1985, 2008; Rauch & Frese, 2007; see also Gartner, 1988; Shaver 2005). It also became more **common to view the ‘entrepreneurial personality’ as a particular** kind of social construction, albeit one with concrete experiential content lived by real-life entrepreneurial agents (see Chell, 2000, 2008; Drakopoulou Dodd & Anderson, 2007).

So even though the focus of research was no longer limited to the personality of the entrepreneur, it nevertheless remained persistently focused on the individual, on his or her psychology, cognitions, emotions, and behavior. Indeed, even current influential descriptions of entrepreneurship are articulated through formulations that can serve to profile the actions, behaviors, cognitions and emotions of an individual entrepreneur: alertness to opportunities (Gaglio & Katz, 2001), cognitive heuristics (Krueger, 2005; Shaver, 2005), intentions (Krueger & al., 2000) and mindset (Haynie & al., 2010), entrepreneurial competences and skills (Markman, 2007), and contact utilization (Starr & McMillan, 1991).

One way to summon and capture the variety of descriptions associated with entrepreneurship as effective individual activity is provided by the **notions of ‘agency’ and ‘entrepreneurial agency’**. Essential to the various definitions of agency is the capability of an agent/actor to effect change in the circumstances where he or she is embedded by drawing on the resources provided by the action context (see, e.g. Giddens, 1979, 1984; Bandura, 1989; Emirbayer & Mische, 1998; Baumeister, 1999; Allen, 2002; Gillespie, 2010). Agency is thus closely related to (but distinguishable from) concepts such as **action (and ‘creative action’, cf. Joas, 1996)**, the self (cf. Baumeister, 1999), self-regulation (cf. Boekaerts & al., 2005), subjectivity (cf. Allen, 2002), intentionality (cf. Emirbayer & Mische, 1998), and intersubjectivity (cf. Gillespie, 2012). Such a notion of agency can be interestingly paralleled with the definition of entrepreneurial agency; for instance, Chell (2000: 71) defines **an entrepreneurial act as ‘an attempt to respond to, and thereby change, a set of circumstances (perceived in a positive or negative light) with a view to creating a desired outcome’**. Viewed in this way, **entrepreneurial act and entrepreneurial agency come close to a kind of ‘tuned up’ or ‘super’ agency. The emphasis is on initiative and effective actions that ‘make it happen’ in terms of manifest business transactions, driven by a particular experiential content that functions as their ‘motor’ or source (cf. Sarasvathy, 2004)**.

Viewed this way, one is struck with the close resemblance between these characterizations of the entrepreneurial agency and the ideals and values of contemporary Western individualism that are currently hailed as virtues across cultural arenas: the profile of an initiative, effective, autonomous and responsible agent is part and parcel of the cultural core of Western individualism and the debates surrounding it (see Bellah & al., 1985;

Sampson, 1988; Heelas & Morris, 1992a; Honneth, 2004). Notably, the individual-centric approaches of entrepreneurship research provide us with **findings delineating a generic ‘psychological/agentive profile’ that can be, and indeed is, politically and governmentally connected to broader social contexts beyond small entrepreneurship and economic activity.** Thus the **‘psychological profile of an entrepreneur’ can be viewed as representative and indicative of core aspects of the psychology and efficient agency expected of individuals living in individualistic market democracies.** But, as Sampson (1988) emphasizes, **the debate around Western individualism and ‘the indigenous psychologies of the individual’ would not be a true controversy, unless there actually existed influential, competing interpretations of the core values of individualism, and the nature of agency that ought to stem from them (e.g. controversy between ‘self-contained’ and ‘enssembled’ forms of individualism).** We are thus reminded that if viewed from a perspective that takes into consideration political and cultural aspects, the construction of entrepreneurial agency emerges as a highly multifaceted and contested process, which has several roots and extends in different directions.

Indeed, perhaps more than ever in history, entrepreneurship and forms of entrepreneurial agency are currently subject to a multitude of interests, expectations and attempts at their mobilization. Correspondingly, entrepreneurship can be seen as serving potentially many interests, purposes and ends, from the vantage point of both individuals and social actors (organizations, states or economic regions, for example). Notions such as **‘ecological entrepreneurship’ (Marsden & Smith, 2005), ‘social entrepreneurship’ (Chell, 2007), and ‘growth entrepreneurship’ (Wennekers & Thurik, 1999)** are indicative of this versatility.

This study emphasizes the political aspects of entrepreneurship in particular due to the nature of the context in which entrepreneurship is empirically studied, that is, the context of **farming** and **agriculture**. In this context, entrepreneurship emerges as a matter of diverse interests, political and cultural controversies, and (re)interpretations, as well as struggles for their political and collective mobilization. These struggles involve mobilizations of competing **discourses**, understood as alternative representations and framings of the phenomena of which they speak (i.e. farming, agriculture and entrepreneurship in the case of this study) as well as associated institutional and policy practices deployed to shape the understandings and actions of the target audiences and agents (cf. Potter & Wetherell, 1987: 6-8; Fairclough, 2001: 14-35; Wilson, 2003; Buckler, 2007; in the context of entrepreneurship research, see Hjorth & Steyaert, 2004). In other words, in the context of farming, the construction of entrepreneurial agency is neither a neutral issue nor a matter of individual farmers alone.

Significantly, this side of the coin (i.e. the political and cultural construction of entrepreneurship discourses and entrepreneurial agency) has also received considerable scholarly attention and should be taken into account when seeking to understand the preconditions for the construction

Introduction

of entrepreneurial agency. Some established traditions of social scientific research [e.g. under the labels of *enterprise culture* (see Keat & Abercrombie, 1991; Heelas & Morris, 1992; Della-Giusta & King, 2006), *governmentality* (see Dean, 1999; Miller & Rose, 2008) and *entrepreneurship policy* (see Storey, 2005; Audretsch & al., 2007)] view entrepreneurship predominantly from a political perspective. Entrepreneurship emerges then as a multifaceted and controversial vehicle for effecting social, cultural, or ideological change, in addition to the sphere of economic (ex)changes. As a political phenomenon, entrepreneurship may emerge as a means of governance and exercise of societal power as well as a means to pursue or increase the relative autonomy and independence of various agents. Indeed, critical research on entrepreneurship discourse (see Jones & Spicer, 2009) has focused on analyzing the actual and potential disadvantages that diffusion and harnessing of entrepreneurship discourses may entail. It has been noted, on the one hand, how one-sided or aggressive diffusion of entrepreneurship discourses easily tends to increase inequalities and favor some fractions of the population at the cost of others (Ogbor, 2000; Steyaert & Katz, 2004). On the other hand, research has also indicated how entrepreneurship discourses may serve as means of exercising power through **'subjugation' or 'responsibilization'**, where individuals or communities are left with the burden of governing themselves without proper resources or means with which to succeed in this task of self-governing (Herbert-Cheshire, 2000; Herbert-Cheshire & Higgins, 2004; Perren & Jennings, 2005). Viewed in this way, it becomes obvious that other agents (e.g. individuals, social groupings, institutions, ideas or values) in addition to the entrepreneurial agent play a crucial role in the construction and definition of entrepreneurial agency as well. Analysis that aims to understand the social construction of entrepreneurial agency should thus somehow address, whether and how power, mobilization of collective identities (**'identity leadership' and 'identity entrepreneuring', cf. Haslam & al., 2011**) and social inclusion and exclusion are at stake in the processes where entrepreneurial agency is being constructed, negotiated and resisted or ignored.

By juxtaposing and testing these two research perspectives on entrepreneurship (the psychology of entrepreneurship and politically oriented approaches to entrepreneurship) in the light of empirical analyses presented in the research articles, I examine whether and how these perspectives could be integrated to yield a synthetic, social psychological interpretation of the construction of entrepreneurial agency. In the empirical analyses, I apply a contextual approach to critically examine the preconditions for the construction of entrepreneurial agency in the farm context and for the integration of the two research perspectives.

2 THE CONTEXT

The recent policies of the EU, as well as the policies of the national governments in Europe, have explicitly aimed to promote entrepreneurship on farms and rural areas (see, e.g. EC, 2010; van der Ploeg & al., 2002; North & Smallbone, 2006). *'Treating farms as firms'* (Phillipson & al., 2004) has entailed the use not only of practical measures provided through legislation, funding, and advisory services, but also of recommendations and persuasive communication directed towards the farming population. Policy makers and stakeholders have encouraged farmers to see themselves as entrepreneurs, **thus indicating the aim of attitude change or awakening the 'entrepreneurial spirit' in the minds of farmers.** The rationale behind persuasive communication is the assumption that farmers would be reluctant or resistant to change. How are we to understand this then? Have not farmers long been entrepreneurs or sole traders of a sort, making their living by selling or exchanging products whose production depends on their initiative, vision, skills and craft? What is specifically novel in this recent entrepreneurial emphasis? Light to this question can be shed by reflecting on farming and agriculture from two directions: from the historical perspective and from the perspective of the current policy context.

2.1 THE FARM CONTEXT IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE: PEASANT TRADITION, PRODUCTIVIST ETHOS AND PRESSURES TOWARDS ENTREPRENEURIALISM

Historically viewed, the kinship between farming and entrepreneurship – as currently understood – turns out to be anything but self-evidently close. In fact, farming has always remained a special case among occupations and business sectors. The traditional *peasant* and *yeoman* cultures, for example, could be conceived of as collectively binding and coherent agrarian ways of life, where the attachment to and continuity of family-run farming and family land as well as ties among the farming community formed an inseparable whole that structured the lives of the people³ (see Geertz, 1961; Salamon, 1992; in the Finnish context, e.g. Granberg, 1989; Peltonen, 1992; Silvasti, 2001). On the other hand, societal modernization involved deeply felt changes in the life world of the farming population, as farming became more

3 The classical *gemeinschaft/gesellschaft* distinction (Tönnies, 2001/1887) can serve to highlight **the differences in collective and communal dynamics: the 'gemeinschaft' mode** is characteristic of traditional communities where ties between members are close, norms salient, and conformity high, **unlike in more individualistic and differentiated, but less cohesive, 'gesellschafts'.**

industrially driven, instrumentally efficient and governed by the regimes of the national economy; state subsidies meant that farming began to resemble wage work, with the guarantee of an income proportionate to the production level (see Wilson, 2001; Burton, 2004; for the Finnish situation, see Granberg, 1989; Alasuutari, 1996). Indeed, the historical layers of peasant and *productivist* cultures form a background that still provides elements for the organization of the lives and experiences of farmers (see Silvasti, 2001; Vesala & Vesala, 2010). So to understand the challenges and aspirations regarding the reception and construction of entrepreneurial agency in the farm context, it is useful to briefly review the composition and constitution of the essential elements of these cultural layers, with a particular view to the specificities of the Finnish situation.

Some conceptual ambiguity exists in the definitions of the terms that refer **to traditional agrarian culture and its people (e.g. ‘peasant’ and ‘yeoman’)**. The differences in meaning and conceptual extension stem mostly from historical and cultural specificities that characterize different geographical and linguistic areas. **In the European context, for example, the term ‘peasant’** has often referred to the totality of the whole traditional agrarian population, including landowners, tenants, and wage workers. A more abridged meaning is **common in the Nordic countries, for instance, where ‘peasant’ (‘bonde’ in Swedish)** has traditionally referred to an independent, autonomous farmer who owns his or her own farmlands. This distinction between landowning and tenancy has also played an important historical role in Finland, where the relationships between and rights of independent landowners and **tenant farm workers (or ‘crofters’) were a source of societal and political tensions** and struggles at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. (Alapuro, 1988; Granberg, 1989; Peltonen, 1992; Silvasti, 2001.) These distinctions **concerning landowning are also reflected in the term ‘yeoman’, which refers** to an independent landowner in a generational chain of family farmers. Sonya Salamon (1992), who has studied farming communities in the American Midwest, concludes that the continuity of the family farm and the family land form the underpinnings of the yeoman culture. Consequently, a successful transfer of the family farm to the next generation is a crucial concern, hence the aversion to taking economic risks (on the other hand, see Dudley, 2003).

Despite the differences in conceptual extension and nuances of meaning, a common denominator in these traditional agrarian notions is the primacy of a traditional agrarian way of life. Of prime importance is the existence of larger socio-cultural wholes beyond the individual farmer and their influence on the organization of farming as a way of life. Emphasis is on the over-generational continuity of the farm, attachment to the land, relationships within the family and farming community, and kinship traditions. Furthermore, the life-career of a peasant cannot be conceived of as a self-selected, instrumental occupation, but more as a way of life in connection with the lives of other creatures, nature, tradition, and the fate of larger

collectives. In this respect, peasant and yeoman traditions are based on values that stand in sharp contrast to those that constitute the individualist ethos of the enterprise culture (cf. Heelas & Morris, 1992b). On the other hand, despite the close social ties within the confines of the immediate farm community and family, the aspiration to achieve or secure relative independence and self-sufficiency from the yoke of others structures the lives of peasant and yeoman farmers. And in this respect, points of convergence vis-à-vis enterprise culture can also be indicated: the desire for autonomy, self-sufficiency, and the inclination to assume responsibility may be seen as ideals common in both cultures (cf. Dudley, 2003).

As a historical background for the development of farming and agriculture in the Finnish context, the structural changes associated with societal modernization in Finland occurred relatively late by European standards, but once underway, the transformation to an industrial market democracy occurred rapidly and effectively permeated the society. On the other hand, influential practical and political reasons throughout the 20th century emphasized the importance of small-scale farming and rural settlement as a means to solve social, regional and political security issues. Title to land and opportunity to small-scale farming, for example, served as solutions to questions concerning the settlement, first, of the landless rural population after the Finnish civil war and, second, of the evacuees and victims of warfare after the Second World War. Further, the aim to keep the whole country populated – including remote areas – also served regional and political purposes in the uncertain conditions after the Second World War. To guarantee the viability of the settlement policies and to facilitate self-sufficiency in food production, the state implemented a range of protective policies and tariffs.⁴ (Alestalo, 1986; Alapuro, 1988; Granberg, 1989; Peltonen, 1992; Alasuutari, 1996.) Consequently, a considerable proportion of the total number of Finnish farms has quite persistently consisted of relatively small, often family-run farms.

Along with societal modernization, an era, or ethos, of agricultural *productivism* gradually set in. This era saw the impact/influence on farming of the values and principles characteristic of industrialized capitalism, techno-scientific rationalization, and welfare state regimes. In Finland, the relatively unproductive and small-scale farm structure that stemmed from the settlement policy era met new challenges and opportunities due to technological development and advances as well as pressures to increase the efficiency of production. On the one hand, technological advances and development as well as productivity enabled a single-generation family unit to manage the farm work, while on the other, they also created pressures to increase farm size in the face of increasing cost-price squeezes. (Granberg, 1989; Peltonen, 1992; Alasuutari, 1996; Silvasti, 2001.)

⁴ The question concerning the appropriate support and protective policies in Finnish agriculture has figured as a nearly classical source of dispute and political debate (see, e.g. Alasuutari, 1996).

The context

For farmers, the ethos (Burton & Wilson, 2006) or regime (Wilson, 2001) of productivism in agriculture established a strong expectancy of and reliance on state intervention, governmental protection, and subsidies for primary production. The identity of a waged worker more aptly described the experience and position of a farmer in Western, post-war welfare societies, where the state guaranteed a secure income proportionate to those of waged workers. The contributions of farmers were also viewed as essential elements in the development of the nation and the wellbeing of the whole population; farmers were encouraged to view themselves as contributing to the common good of the nation and safeguarding self-sufficiency in national food-production. These aspects also served as arguments in debates concerning the legitimacy of expensive state support for agriculture. (Alasuutari, 1996.) The farming population came to value not only state intervention, protection, equality, and solidarity, but also many industrial virtues, such as effectiveness, rationalization of production, technological optimism, and growth orientation. Hence, productivism relied on many values and principles that can be contrasted with those of enterprise culture, notwithstanding some obvious points of convergence, such as effectiveness, profitability, and growth orientation.

More recently, farming as work and as an occupation has encountered profound pressures and transformations due to trends related to, for example, market liberalization, globalization, and reorganization of the economic drivers of post-industrial societies. The incorporation of a more pronounced market orientation and an emphasis on entrepreneurial and business thinking, in turn, have entailed a focus on economic profitability, recognition of viable, alternative opportunities, and the competitive advantages of the farm (Bryant, 1989; van der Ploeg, 2003; Phillipson et al., 2004; Blandford & Hill, 2006; for an account of the Finnish context, see Alasuutari, 1996; Ruuskanen, 1999). Traditional small-scale family farms focusing solely on agricultural primary production are decreasing in number. Many farms strive to intensify their production, thereby relying on cost-reduction or economies of scale. Others diversify the activities on the farm, thus aiming to add value by processing products or engaging in other branches of business.

To summarize, the ongoing trends on farms towards effectiveness, growth, the adding of value, the pursuit of alternative opportunities, and the diversification of business can all be captured under the term ***entrepreneurship***. Even though some of them are mutually contradictory, they conform to some of the dimensions of the entrepreneurship model: taking the initiative, assuming responsibility; pursuing new opportunities, markets, and customers; seeking innovation across activities; and striving to secure a sustainable, yet economically profitable way of life. Consequently, a broad consensus seems to prevail over the need to enhance entrepreneurial orientations on farms (Phillipson et al., 2004; North & Smallbone, 2006). On the other hand, evidence also suggests that not all actors and groups are

enthusiastic about the ideas of entrepreneurship and business thinking in the farm context (Burton & Wilson, 2006; Vesala, 2004: 183-187, 195-196; van der Ploeg, 2003: 340-341; 2008). That said, the shift towards entrepreneurship is nevertheless perceptible on the level of policies, services, and communication directed at farmers: training focuses increasingly on improving general business and managerial skills, extension services offer counseling in business thinking and planning, and the entire support network treats the farmer more as an entrepreneur running a firm (Phillipson et al., 2004; North & Smallbone, 2006).

Unsurprisingly, such a transformation process has its challenges. As some authors have observed, the identity and subjective experience of farmers remains strongly attached to productivist (Burton & Wilson, 2006; cf. Vesala & Vesala, 2010) or peasant (van der Ploeg, 2003, 2008) agency, and farmers are apt to assign priority to more traditional forms of agriculture. Before we can properly understand the nature of these ongoing attempts at change, we must first reflect more thoroughly the policy context around farming: What kind of political framings, policy discourses and instruments, and institutional arrangements do farmers currently encounter?

2.2 THE POLICY CONTEXT OF FARMING: COMPETING POLICY DISCOURSES AND EXPECTATIONS OF THE AGENCY OF FARMERS

As noted, the popularity and appeal of entrepreneurialism and entrepreneurial ideas in the context of farming, agriculture, and rural businesses can be related to trends and changes taking place in the immediate or macro-level environments of farming/agriculture. Indeed, several factors have been associated with the need for restructuring in agriculture and rural development, including international market **liberalization, 'globalization' and increasing interdependence between** regions and economies, changes in political and legislative regulation systems, changes in production technologies and principles, environmental and climate concerns, questions of food sufficiency and quality, and broadly, the reorganization of economic drivers in the world economy. However, none of these factors per se can determine or dictate how the pressure from restructuring is translated into agricultural and rural development policies, for example, without their being reflected, interpreted, and articulated in a (political) *discourse* that provides a coherent representation of their meaning, an evaluation of their alternatives and implications, and social distinctions and related prescriptions for how to deal with them; following Buckler (2007), one could term these three levels of political discourse **'theoretical', 'ideological' and 'rhetorical'** (cf. Lemke, 2001: 191; Wilson, 2003). Thus, for any 'pressure' or 'need for change' to become real and have particular effects, they must be articulated and presented discursively at the

level of a communicative and argumentative reality. To gain theoretical, ideological and rhetorical currency and legitimacy, the ideas and discourses must be articulated coherently vis-à-vis existing political, ideological, and institutional forms and rationalities, their alternatives, and rivals. Political elites, for example, must provide their audiences with a convincing framing – an idea about what is going on (Goffman, 1986) – that accounts for problems encountered and how they are best solved, if they wish to render initiated or implemented actions, policies and decisions legitimate. (See Dryzek, 2001; Finlayson, 2004, 2007; Buckler 2007). Therefore, I turn next to sketching out the main features of the policy context around farming, those discursive and institutional settings that provide agents with not only building material and resources, but also sanctions and restrictions for their constructions of agency, be it of the entrepreneurial, productivist, or other type.

In the context of Finland, as well as in Europe more generally, the definition of agricultural policy and rural development is largely set by the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) of the European Union. For the member countries of the European Union (Finland has been a member since 1995), commitment to the EU and to the CAP has meant a relinquishment of the authority to regulate the market price of agricultural products, as well as support for farm businesses by means of independently tailored national policies.⁵ Under the CAP, agro-food production and markets in any given member country can no longer be protected through nationally defined policy measures such as import restrictions, tariffs, subventions, or export subsidies. Instead, the minimum price levels guaranteed within the EU market, for example, have been approaching world market prices step by step. (Vihinen, 2001: 61-82; Pyysiäinen & Vesala, 2008; EC, 2010; Niemi & Ahlstedt, 2010.) In this respect, European agricultural policy and the development of the farming sector are clearly geared towards open markets, competition, and trade freed from expected state support. Single farms and farmers, for example, feel shifts in the world market prices of agricultural products more directly without price buffers guaranteed by the state, as occurred during the era of productivism.

However, even though a major trend in the policy context has thus focused on liberal deregulation of and competition in open, increasingly global markets, competing goals, discourses and definitions of policy nevertheless exist, even within the CAP. Indeed, the Common Agricultural Policy of the EU, for example, remains a policy system that, on the one hand, serves to maintain certain commodity price levels within the EU while, on the other hand, subsidizing other rural activities besides agricultural production on the basis of criteria not limited to mere economic concerns (e.g.

⁵ Even though the policies defined in the CAP are funded from the agricultural budget of the EU, the EU nevertheless allows its member countries to support their national agricultures to a limited extent. In Finland, for example, the amount/proportion of national support has thus far exceeded the support received from the EU.

environment, food safety, social viability, and sustainability) (Winter, 1996; Vihinen, 2001: 61-82; EC, 2010). The European agricultural policy stance has therefore been characterized as one of partial resistance to unfettered liberalization (Potter & Tilzey, 2005), in contrast to those of countries such as Australia, where commitment to the deregulation of international agri-food trade has been a leading and overarching principle of successive governments (e.g. Vanclay, 2003; Pritchard, 2005). Consequently, in the European context one can discern competing policy discourses which articulate and represent rival objectives and interests. Potter and Tilzey (2005), for example, point out three types of influential policy discourses, each pulling in different directions and enjoying the support of different institutional and policy arrangements: the neoliberal, the neomercantilist, and the multifunctionality policy discourses.

The *neoliberal* agricultural policy discourse exemplifies the basic principles and virtues of the neoliberal ideology, understood as a political project that aims to address economic and social issues primarily through unrestricted, free-market relations and transactions. The rationale behind this political project is the view that the interests and common good of communities are best served by creating more space for capital and by opposing interventions – especially by the state – in the operations of the market economy. (Harvey, 2005; see also Potter & Tilzey, 2005; Tilzey, 2006; Pritchard, 2005). In the European context, this has been reflected in the socio-economic governance of the entire EU, including its Common Agricultural Policy, where international competitiveness and growing world market share have been major drivers. During the past couple of decades, an influential aspect and discourse in the CAP has increasingly been defined in market-oriented terms and legitimated with arguments that emphasize the freedom of the agro-food sector to compete globally, to gain access to new export markets, and to find new regions from which to source inputs. (Potter & Tilzey, 2005; Potter, 2006; Tilzey, 2006.) Even though it may be difficult to **point out the most obvious and ‘purest’ manifestations of such a neoliberal** discourse in terms of policy instruments and institutional arrangements, reductions in price support, the shift away from production-based payments, and gradual reductions of export subsidies all exhibit this trend, encouraging the farmers to adapt their output to market demands.

Significantly, from the perspective of farmers and the expectations directed at their agency, the neoliberal agricultural policy discourse has been associated with the interests and growing power of an increasingly global and vertically integrated agro-food industry (e.g. processors, retailers, and distributors) geared to supplying world markets (Potter & Tilzey, 2005). Thus, from the point of view of farms/farmers choosing to – or having to – operate as producers for the effectively integrated industry, the position may leave them few options for maneuver besides efforts toward the efficient, large-scale production of unprocessed raw materials.

Despite its strong support and advocacy by fractions of the agro-food industry and trade interests, neoliberal agricultural policy nevertheless remains heavily contested and debated. Potter and Tilzey (2005), for example, point out that agricultural neoliberalism has strong contenders, at least in the European context, where a long-standing discourse of agricultural neomercantilism and more recently a developed agricultural multifunctionality view have contested the legitimacy of the neoliberal policy project. **Neomercantilism**, as a policy regime, resembles almost the antithesis of neoliberalism: its central principles resonate with protectionism as it aims to encourage and support exports, discourage imports, control capital movement, and favor centralized decision-making in financial issues. As an agricultural policy discourse, neomercantilism focuses on productivist principles and sets demands for the state – including the EU – to continue safeguarding and supporting the productive capacity and export potential of agriculture. The favoring and prioritization of domestic products and production is considered justified, for example, by means of subsidization and levies. (Potter & Tilzey, 2005: 591-592.) On the level of the CAP, examples of policy instruments that exhibit neomercantilist principles include, for example, export subsidies, import levies, compensatory **allowances (e.g. ‘less favored area support’)**, and **baseline state assistance in the form of commodity programs**. Also instruments such as production quotas and support entitlements may be used to enforce these principles.

From the perspective of farmers, neomercantilist agricultural policy discourse may provide them opportunities to engage in defending their vocation as essentially based on productivist principles: a vocation that serves the interests of the whole community and economy, and should thus entitle producers to, for example, state protection and compensation. However, since neomercantilist policy resonates with productivist principles, farms and farmers are expected to stay focused on primary production and to strive for profitability within primary production.

Another counterdiscourse not only to the neoliberal policy project, but also to many neomercantilist principles, has been developing around the concept of **multifunctionality**. The term has served to point out that besides its primary production function, agriculture also serves multiple other functions considered valuable because of their nature as public goods or non-market commodities. The range of such functions is understood to include, for example, impacts on the environment, landscape and biodiversity, the socio-economic viability of the countryside, food safety, the welfare of production animals, and cultural and historical heritage (Potter & Tilzey, 2005; see also OECD, 2001; Brower, 2004). Agricultural multifunctionality discourse thus suggests that, in some cases, the prime added value of farming should be considered the result of functions other than traditional food and primary production outputs, and that these other outputs may be the basis for **‘rewarding’, compensating, or subsidizing farmers**. **On the level of policy instruments and institutional arrangements**, aspects associated with

multifunctionality are incorporated, for example, in the rural development programs of the CAP (under Pillar 2; policies under Pillar 1, in contrast, deal mostly with primary production). These policy instruments can serve to support and encourage farms to engage in activities that foster environmental concerns, service provisions, or diversify their businesses to meet demands arising in the region or local markets. (Potter & Tilzey, 2005; see Brower, 2004.)

From the perspective of farmers, agricultural multifunctionality discourse may be seen as providing not only potential opportunities for, but also challenges and threats to a variety of different types of farms ranging from small-scale family farms to large units, and from those with market orientation to others with more pronounced non-market interests. A noteworthy feature here is that these novel opportunities and challenges for farms may differ considerably from those that farmers are used to pursuing in the context of conventional primary production.

Taken together, the identified competing policy discourses indicate that the policy context around farming is currently a matter of debate and unsettled controversy. Further, these policy discourses indicate that many features and characteristics stemming from the successive historical layers of farming culture (cf. chapter 2.1) are still manifest in the formulations of policy discourses, either as something to be advocated, defended, and maintained or as something to be opposed, transformed, and phased out. Significantly, this debate and controversy seems to be reflected, even accentuated, in the question of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial agency: first of all, there is obviously a substantial demand for entrepreneurial agency, at least in the sense of general agency that is able to **effect change and ‘make it happen’ amidst the changes and uncertainties** of the agricultural sector. Second, however, the question of expectations of more specific forms and constructions of entrepreneurial agency in connection with farming is clearly a source of conflicting views and mixed **interests. Different constructions of ‘entrepreneurial’ or ‘farming’ agency are implied and suggested depending on the policy discourse.**

Thus, in the context of farming, entrepreneurship clearly emerges as a political issue. Furthermore, as existing and enforced political projects, each policy discourse also relies to some extent on the assumption that the aim of influencing the farmers and how they construct their agency is a viable and feasible task. This inevitably brings into focus the farmer as an individual agent. After all, it is individual farmers on the farm who now encounter pressure to modify their established action trajectories or to pursue new opportunities. Consequently, an acute question emerges: How are discourses expected to work upon and construct the agency of their targets towards entrepreneurial directions? Alternative answers and theoretical approaches to this question are introduced in the next section which simultaneously serves to outline the theoretical approach assumed in the empirical studies presented in chapter 5.

3 THE APPROACH

In this section I sketch the theoretical cornerstones of the approach applied and demonstrated in the articles. I start with a brief presentation and examination of a quite influential theoretical interpretation of the working of **‘entrepreneurial’ policy/cultural discourses (cf. chapter 2) upon the selves and agency of their targets.** Thereafter I move to present a more social psychologically informed approach that addresses some of the problems and weaknesses identified in the first theoretical alternative. This latter approach is then empirically put into practice and demonstrated in the four research articles.

3.1 **‘THE ENTERPRISING SELF’: THE MEANS AND THE END OF ENTERPRISE DISCOURSES?**

Reflecting on the problem of the implementation and influence of entrepreneurial policy discourses on their targets from the perspective of the **notions of the ‘enterprising self’ and ‘enterprise discourse’ (Rose, 1992, 1999; Du Gay & Salaman, 1992; Du Gay, 1996a, 1996b; see also Fairclough, 1991; Burchell, 1993; Doolin, 2002),** developed in connection with theorizing inspired by the Foucauldian *governmentality* approach⁶ (see Foucault, 1991; Burchell et al., 1991; Rose & Miller, 1992; Dean, 1999; Rose et al., 2006; Miller & Rose, 2008), may lead to a better understanding of the problem. This strand of theorizing offers a special angle on the appeal of **‘entrepreneurship’ and ‘enterprise’ to policy/political discourses, as the discursive harnessing of ‘entrepreneurship’ and ‘enterprise’ are viewed as ideal means or vehicles for the governing of the complex social, economic and political processes of liberal market democracies.** The governance of such complex, multifaceted social processes cannot, so the rationale goes, be based on simple authoritative or coercive formulas of rule, but instead **increasingly resorts to and relies on the ‘enterprising’, self-steering capacities of individuals.** (Ibid.)

‘The enterprising self’ has been viewed, for instance, as a central goal and building block in the British ‘enterprise culture’ project spearheaded by Margaret Thatcher’s conservative government in Britain in the late 1970s and

⁶ The neologism ‘governmentality’ (‘gouvernementalité’ in French) was originally developed by Michel Foucault in the late 1970s and has since nearly spawned a subdisciplinary field of scholarship within the social sciences and humanities. In general terms, governmentality approaches focus on analyzing the particular mentalities, regimes, and techniques of government and administration that **have been influential in the direction, governance, and shaping of human conduct since ‘early modern’ Europe.** (See Dean, 1999: 1-5; Rose 1999: 3-5; Foucault, 1991.)

1980s (Rose, 1992; see also Burrows, 1991; Keat & Abercrombie, 1991; Heelas & Morris, 1992a). The radical political program of the time was characterized as an attempt to transform attitudes, values, and forms of self-understanding embedded in both individual and institutional activities (Heelas & Morris, 1992b: 1-10; Della-Giusta & King, 2005). **'Changing the souls'** (a famous slogan coined by Thatcher) of individuals promised a transformation of citizens towards an initiative, responsible, and autonomous mode of acting and orienting – an enterprising or entrepreneurial self. Consequently, besides aiming at economic reconstruction, the project was also characterized as an attempt to transform Britain into a highly individualistic enterprise culture. (See Keat & Abercrombie, 1991; Heelas & Morris, 1992b; Della Giusta & King, 2005.)

Of course, commentators have viewed the feasibility and results of the British enterprise culture project with suspicion. Some, for instance, have questioned the assumption of a profound cultural change deliberately catalyzed by means of policy interventions as untenable and unrealistic (Della-Giusta & King, 2005; Watson, 2009). However, despite the eventual outcome of that particular project, several commentators have noted the lasting or even growing popularity and attractiveness of principles akin to those of **the 'enterprising self' and the 'enterprise culture'** (du Gay, 1996a, 1996b; Wasson, 2004; Ainsworth & Hardy, 2008). According to these interpretations, the enterprising self represents a tempting means – as well as a useful end per se – with which to govern politico-economic, organizational, and individual lives by means of pursuing an ideal mode of self and agency: an autonomous self that seeks to maximize its potential, be self-reliant and personally responsible for its destiny, and actively work upon itself and regulate its conduct by making its own choices, albeit typically with **the help of expert authorities (e.g. 'experts of subjectivity')** (Rose, 1992, 1999; du Gay, 1996a, 1996b; Ainsworth & Hardy, 2008). An enterprising self is thus to be free and autonomous in, but actively responsible for, its own government. On the one hand, enterprise discourses that appeal to such an image of the self resonate with the personal goals and aspirations of individuals and the ethos of expressive individualism (cf. Bellah & al., 1985). On the other hand, the ideal of the enterprising self is in line with general politico-economic goals, such as the promotion of economic efficiency and growth, wealth creation, employment, and public health, and suggests itself as an effective way to pursue such goals (Rose, 1992; see also Rose, 1999).

A couple of striking features emerge in the theorizing about enterprising selves and associated enterprise discourses when viewed from the perspective of the question of this study (i.e. the construction of entrepreneurial agency in the farm context). To begin with, the prime interest in the theorizing and analyses of the construction of enterprising selves rarely seems to focus on the context of small businesses or the activities of entrepreneurs running a firm. Rather, the emergence and ways of constructing and governing enterprising selves have been studied, for

example, in the contexts of public sector management (du Gay, 1996a), **consumer culture and ‘consumerism’** (du Gay & Salaman, 1992; Du Gay, 1996b), unemployment (Dean, 1995), education (Peters, 2001; Komulainen, 2006), and health care (Cohen & Musson, 2000; Doolin, 2002). In other words, the interest seems to focus on analyzing and documenting the effects of liberal market principles and competitive individualism invading in contexts that have previously been organized on other forms of logic, yet remained intact. It is understandable, then, that in such contexts, observations of the emergence and increasing popularity of an ill-fitting type of **‘enterprising’ agency, portrayed as, for example, overly self-steering and self-interested, self-reliant and opportunistic at the cost of social solidarity and the common good, and perhaps disturbingly risk-seeking and aggressive in its competitiveness,** have raised concerns.

In the context of farming and agriculture, however, the situation seems somewhat different. As noted in the previous chapter, it is not obvious that farmers would have to submit themselves to the invasion of an unambiguously liberal – or neoliberal – market principle or discourse alone, at least in the European context. Rather, neomercantilist and multifunctionality policy discourses, for example, represent and provide **alternative means with which to frame and govern the ‘farming self’**. Further, according to some commentators, many actors in the farming sector have **already long ‘bought into’ the liberal thinking of the competitive market** under the ethos or regime of productivism. Indeed ever since the Second World War, central trends characteristic of agricultural productivism have gradually but steadily increased commercialization, industrialization, and the intensification of production (Wilson, 2001; Burton & Wilson, 2006). In this respect, some have suggested that entrepreneurship embedded in the multifunctionality line of thinking, for example, may represent a more sustainable and tenable alternative to excessive market liberalism or deregulated global capitalism (van der Ploeg, 2003; Marsden & Smith, 2005; van der Ploeg & Marsden, 2008).

Consequently, even though the notion of the enterprising self embedded **in ‘enterprise discourse’ may help us understand better the political value** and seemingly emancipatory appeal of an autonomous, self-steering model of agency for individuals, the notion nevertheless leaves important questions open from the perspective of this study (i.e. the context of small businesses and farms). For example, from the perspective of a farmer who faces pressures to come up with novel opportunities or to increase the profitability of production, a focus on mere autonomous self-steering is hardly sufficient and may yield only little if any added value. Nevertheless, it seems obvious that farmers are currently facing pressures to assume a more entrepreneurial and autonomous agency in their activities, to orient themselves proactively rather than reactively. In this respect, contemporary policy discourses seem to converge, but importantly, besides pressures towards entrepreneurialism **on the level of the ‘mentality’** (e.g. attitudes, cognitions, and affects) pointed

out by theorizing on the ‘enterprising self’, another level is also crucially at stake in the case of entrepreneurship on farms: the level that involves the actions and the action situation of the farmer, including, for example, the nature of the production and business activities on the farm.

This problematic is further reflected and elaborated in the following section, where the elements, or cornerstones, of the applied social psychological approach are presented.

3.2 DELINEATING THE CORNERSTONES OF A CONTEXTUALLY ORIENTED SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF ENTREPRENEURIAL AGENCY

The theorizing that seeks to explain the construction of entrepreneurial agency or selfdom by means of the analytical ideas of the ‘enterprising self’ and ‘enterprise discourse’ seems to rely on relatively narrow conceptions of ‘entrepreneurship’ and its discursive-cultural construction.⁷ First of all, as already noted, the meaning of enterprising or entrepreneurial selfdom tends to be limited to the level of the ‘mentality’ and to the individual’s relationship to his or her own selfdom/subjectivity in particular. In a sense, then, it seems as if individuals were tempted to assume and to embrace the liberal, self-steering- and self-reliance-focused enterprise discourse because of the ‘empowering’ rewards it promises for the individual’s reflexive self-knowledge and self-identity: knowledge of the self and its subjective secrets, the promise of their revelation and cultivation, and the desire to better the self and to maximize its (self-steering) potentials. The means – or the costs – with which this is to be achieved, in turn, entail efforts to control one’s self (with various technologies of the self), assuming personal responsibility and turning one’s self into a kind of project. ‘Enterprising’ thus approximates to controlled, self-steering efforts to liberate and to maximize the potentials of individual selves. If understood thus, the construction of entrepreneurial selfdom remains peculiarly acontextual and limited to the confines of the subjective consciousness, mentality, desires, and self-identity of the

7 From the perspective of qualitative empirical research it may be noted that Foucauldian approaches to discourse and discursive practices (e.g., historically oriented ‘governmentality’ analysis) may lend themselves rather poorly to the qualitative analysis of the construction of specific modes of agency by individuals in concrete action contexts. If such Foucauldian, ‘archeological’ and ‘genealogical’, analyses focus on the conditions of existence of certain historically specific ways of knowing, thinking, and experiencing (cf. Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982), then the level of analysis differs from an analysis that focuses on the construction of specific modes of agency (from these historically specific elements) in particular action situations.

individual. Action in specific situations with other agents – ‘agency’⁸ in the strict sense of the term – does not necessarily come into the purview of such theorizing.

If however, entrepreneurship is understood more broadly as embedded in concrete social contexts and specifically as culminating in social action, in ‘making it happen’ (cf. Sarasvathy, 2004) in specific business situations and transactions, we may well ask why entrepreneurs should be so excited about and focused on the shaping of their selfdom, unless this would directly affect their business actions. Even though autonomous, reflexive agency and effective self-steering probably do indeed aptly characterize the (trans)action situations of the entrepreneur, for this to be sufficient to make a successful entrepreneur would seem peculiarly solipsistic. This inevitably raises a series of questions that lie at the core of the research problem concerning the contextualized construction of entrepreneurial agency. Unpacking these questions and the assumptions behind them begins to delineate the cornerstones of an alternative, contextually oriented qualitative social psychological approach to the construction of entrepreneurial agency. These cornerstones are briefly reviewed in the following and then examined, elaborated further, and built upon in the empirical articles.

3.2.1 FROM PASSIVE DISCURSIVE SUBJUGATION TO ACTIVE ARGUMENTATIVE AGENCY

First of all, there is the broad question concerning the relationship between discourses and the construction of agency. In particular, why would a liberal enterprise discourse, for example, emerge as the dominant – perhaps even hegemonic – explanatory mechanism that accounts for the construction of entrepreneurial agency in the case of concrete business contexts – and in the context of farms?

In tackling this question we may begin with the observation that the enterprise discourse which allegedly fosters the construction of enterprising selves is typically portrayed as a fairly uniform, hegemonic discourse (see Watson, 2009; Jones & Spicer, 2009; Armstrong, 2001; cf. Ogbor, 2000) **that embodies no troubling contrary themes or ‘ideological dilemmas’ (cf.**

⁸ Even though the notion of human agency and its conceptual elucidation have been subject to much scholarly work and theoretical interest, the definitions vary according to the emphases and perspectives assumed in various disciplines and theoretical traditions (see, e.g. Emirbayer & Mische, 1998). As noted, essential to various definitions is nevertheless the capability of an agent/actor to act upon the circumstances where the agent/actor is embedded and thereby to effect (prospective) change in them; however, the definitions differ with respect to the role and emphasis granted, for instance, to conscious deliberation, intersubjectivity and engagement with other agents/actors, or the subordination of the agent/actor to the structural features and relationships of the action context or the environment (see, e.g. Giddens, 1979, 1984; Bandura, 1989; Emirbayer & Mische, 1998; Baumeister, 1999; Allen, 2002).

Billig & al., 1988) nor is seriously challenged by rival discourses recognized by the agents. Notably, the agents who are depicted as the targets of the enterprise discourse seem not to be puzzled or troubled by the strikingly one-sided emphasis inherent in the discourse. Rather, the embracing of entrepreneurial ideals, such as individual freedom, calculative choice, and maximization of the subjective potentials of individuals, emerge as unquestionable virtues. However, quite a different picture of the reception of discourses with one-sided argumentative structure could be painted on the basis of *rhetorical social psychology* (Billig, 1987, 1991, 2009; Billig & al. 1988). This line of thinking portrays the individual as an active rhetorician who engages in argumentation and actively searches for justifications and criticisms when encountering or being persuaded to digest discursive stances or positions. Even the subjugation to a relatively simple discursive stance typically involves an argumentative act, a search for potential justifications, and criticisms. If the target/subject of the discourse is thus assumed to be an active argumentative agent, discourses, in turn, emerge as calling forth dilemmatic thinking and a variety of alignments between subjects and discourses. Passive subjugation to a single one-sided discourse would more likely be an exception, limited perhaps to situations where one-sided discourses meet with already like-minded **'believers'**.⁹

In addition, another closely related social psychological insight, or cornerstone, attests to the view that (enterprise) discourses are seldom **capable of totally subjugating the agent's self. This insight concerns the reflexive relationship of the agent, not only to him- or herself and self-identity, but also to others: in addition to the self-identity or personal identity, there is also the aspect of social identity** (i.e., not only how the agent views and positions him- or herself in terms of shared social categories, but also how he or she is viewed and positioned by others and relates to these views and positions). Identity thus emerges as a multifaceted, relational, and situational construct. (Tajfel & al., 1981; Stets & Burke, 2000, 2003; Reicher, 2004; Reicher & al., 2008). Depending on the situation, different socially recognizable self-categories become available and more or less tenable, while their insensitive or abrupt application, ignoring, or repudiation is often something that begs for accounts by fellow agents. Identity categories are

9 Some commentators (e.g. Rose, 1992; Honneth, 2004) have, of course, pointed out that the underpinnings of Western culture are aligned with individualistic conceptions and presuppositions of **the self, even to an extent where the 'enterprising self' or individual 'self-realization' emerge as indisputably persuasive ideals when thinking about what people should be and strive for. Even then, however, it would seem puzzling if the very appeal and potential that self-realization represents were discursively captured or located in one hegemonic discourse or master narrative (e.g., 'enterprise discourse'). Could it rather be that increasing individualization and self-realization necessitates a rich diversity, a multitude, of cultural discourses that are available and accessible to individuals so that they may use them to reflect and work upon their selves, and thereby strive to recognize and to realize their unique or 'true' potentials and secrets?**

thus also reflexive vehicles for relationship regulation and facework (cf. Goffman, 1967). In some contexts, openly embracing entrepreneurial identity, for example, is more easily tolerated and encouraged than in others.

This view implies that the issue of (entrepreneurial) agency construction may be a matter of negotiation, both in terms of an inner identity negotiation of the agent him- or herself and in the interactions between the agent and others. Consequently, we may encounter situations where entrepreneurship remains a peripheral aspect in the overall, multifaceted personal and social identity, whereas in some cases it may figure as a focal aspect in both the personal and social identity of the agent. (Cf. Watson, 2009.) In different cases and contexts, entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship discourse probably serve very different functions for the agent, and in the construction of his/her agency (see Jones & Spicer, 2009: 23-26; Hjorth & Steyaert, 2004; Hjorth, 2005). This leads us to the next cornerstones of the approach.

3.2.2 THE USAGE, RESOURCES AND FUNCTIONS OF DISCOURSES IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF AGENCY

If then, rather than assuming passive reception or subjugation to hegemonic discourses or master narratives, the existence of alternative discourses and their active and multiple use by agents is acknowledged and taken seriously, then the analytical focus shifts to the usage, contextual resources, and functions of discourses in the construction of entrepreneurial agency. Indeed, certain preconditions enable and limit the ways in which agents may use discourses in the first place. In brief, the action situation, context, and activities that the agent masters provide him/her with resources to adopt, substantiate and use discourses more or less skillfully and creatively. These resources include, for example, habits [in both unreflected (e.g., corporeal) and reflected (e.g., discursive habits/knowledge) forms], skills, experiences, cultural knowledge and values, social relationships, and material resources. From the perspective of discourses and discourse use, these resources can be called *rhetorical resources*: they are resources (or argumentative loci) that can potentially be drawn upon in the rhetorical mobilization and use of discourses. Rhetorical resources can serve as building material in such processes of agency construction as the making of self-presentations, for example (Goffman, 1959; see Vesala & Peura, 2005): a credibly enterprising or entrepreneurial self is someone who can present him-/herself as having realized viable opportunities with the help of relevant entrepreneurial skills.

On the other hand, if and when mastered, discourses may have several functions and serve different purposes. Of interest here is the point that discourses accessible to and mastered by the agent may serve to reflect on his or her own action (e.g., habits, skills, underlying values) and action situation and to act upon them in order to adjust or change them [cf. the pragmatist action theoretical tradition (C.S. Peirce, W. James, G. H. Mead, J. Dewey) as understood, e.g., in Joas, 1996: 126-144]. In this way, discourse use requires

a certain level of agency, but discourses, in turn, may be used in multiple ways to act upon or construct the agency further. Entrepreneurial agency as **'making it happen' (Sarasvathy, 2004), for example, requires that the agent** master at least some discourses associated with entrepreneurship (i.e., entrepreneurship discourses) and can connect ideas, meanings and practices associated with entrepreneurship to his/her own activity. However, the **critterion of entrepreneurship as 'making it happen' in terms of business transactions is clearly something that cannot be achieved or evaluated purely at the level of entrepreneurial discourse use or 'mentality' nor at the level of** mere mechanical, unreflected habits or skills, but must proceed as a dialogical process between the two levels and manifest itself in the action and action situations of the entrepreneur (cf. Chell, 2008: 244-267; for a general action theoretical account of the idea, see, e.g. Joas, 1993: 20–26). Thus, even though many alternative or competing entrepreneurship discourses may exist, the entrepreneurial agent is someone who manages to use some or several of the discourses in such a way **as to 'make things happen' (i.e., demonstrate entrepreneurial agency).**

One should remember that entrepreneurship discourses are used and distributed not only by entrepreneurs, but also by other agents with various political, institutional, or personal interests or incentives to distribute and implement them. If the usage of entrepreneurship discourses is viewed in this way, from the perspective of communicative implementation (Grin & de Graaf, 1996; Bang, 2003) between the targets (e.g., entrepreneur candidates) and implementers of the discourse, the aspect of negotiation (and mutual relationship regulation between targets and implementers) becomes ever more relevant. The targets may reject a discourse if it is distributed by agents who are incompetent, untrustworthy, or lack credibility in the eyes of the targets, for example. Or vice versa, the implementers may function as gatekeepers who control the access of the targets to the subject position of an entrepreneur, thus providing access more readily to members of some particular category (e.g., large-scale industrial farms), for example, than to others (e.g., small-scale organic farms). In this vein, one could imagine complicated framings of and negotiations concerning entrepreneurship discourses. The use of (neo)liberal enterprise discourse, for example, might function as an appealing rhetorical cover-up, an effective discursive practice **with which the implementers or 'elites' (e.g., policy makers, experts, and stakeholders)** could try to frame the challenges and changes of the **agricultural sector in order to tame the farmers' resistance and enroll them in** assuming responsibility for the risks, losses, or hardships upon themselves (cf. Herbert-Cheshire, 2000; Herbert-Cheshire & Higgins, 2004; Halpin & Guilfoyle, 2004). If so, would the farmers actually be so easily persuaded or allured as to engage in constructing such an entrepreneurial agency? Also, such questions call for a qualitative, situated, and relational analysis of real-life enterprising farmers in their action contexts.

3.2.3 CHARACTERIZING THE APPROACH AS ‘SITUATED, RELATIONAL CONSTRUCTIONISM’

Taken together, unpacking these thorny questions and the assumptions behind them have led me to adopt an approach in which the analytical focus is on the relationships between the agent, the social context and the action situation, on the one hand, and entrepreneurship discourses, their reception and use for various purposes – in particular the construction of agency and the identity of the agent – on the other. I have chosen to call such an **approach ‘situated, relational constructionism’, a choice motivated by a distinction: the approach can be distinguished from variants of ‘social constructionism’ or ‘discursive psychology’ that focus predominantly on the cultural, linguistic or conversationally ordered *determination* of social construction processes with little regard for the role played by the activity of the agent him-/herself and his/her relationship to the qualities of the action situation, including other agents (cf. Burr, 1995: 1–32; Billig, 2009: 10–15).** Regarding the role and use of discursive materials as empirical data, the making of analytical interpretations is grounded in – but not limited to – the level of what can be observed in the recordings of conversational settings (characteristic of strands of conversation analysis, for example). Rather, the approach enables one to make interpretations that draw upon aspects of the micro or macro context of the conversational situation or communicative event (cf. Wetherell, 2007). The approach employed in this study thus enables one to examine the construction of (entrepreneurial) agency in context, as constituted in and through the use of different resources (habits, skills, discourses, values, cultural distinctions) characteristic of the agent and his/her situation. In other words, the individual agent is studied not as a separate entity, but as a phenomenon constructed and defined in the interaction, communication, and transaction processes between the individual and the environment (see Dewey & Bentley, 1949; Emirbayer, 1997; cf. Thomas & Znaniecki, 1974; Harré, 1993; Burr, 1995; Gergen, 1997: 119-125; Seeman, 1997).

In terms of the ontological perspective employed, and the assumptions guiding the qualitative analysis of empirical materials, this approach emphasizes communication. Communication emerges as the means by which the individual relates and links him-/herself to the social world. Social **communication underpins individual’s orientation** to and actions in the social world and, moreover, since thinking can be viewed as a form of internal conversation and argumentation (Billig, 1987), social communication serves as a basis for internally reflecting on and psychologically processing the social reality. Correspondingly, it is assumed that the construction and maintenance of this relatedness between the individual and his/her social context can be studied and detected through an analysis of communication and observable communicative processes. Further, such a perspective implies that concepts characteristic of the social psychological research tradition, such as the self, agency, identity, attitude,

values, skills, or cognitions about actions, are interpreted as descriptions about the *relationship* between the individual and his/her environment and situation (Vesala, 1996; Bateson, 1972, 1979). As relational concepts, they are viewed as descriptions of the ways with which the individual is linked to the social world: how the individual orients him-/herself to and acts in the social world, and how the social world is reflected in the individual (Thomas & Znaniecki, 1974: 22-24; Vesala & Rantanen, 2007b). Thus, according to the approach, the construction of the relationship between the individual and his/her social reality can be meaningfully interpreted and studied from the perspectives of several contexts, such as from the perspective of the individual and the psychological context (e.g. cognitions), from the perspective of the social context (e.g. social groups and relations) or from the perspective of the cultural context (e.g. cultural values and systems of meaning). Presumably, such a relational approach entails the opportunity to incorporate and utilize interpretive concepts from different research approaches and traditions (e.g. variants of post-structuralism, discursive psychology, social psychological attitude research, social identity theory) insofar (but *only* insofar) as the relational perspective and its application to the reading of the concepts is systematically maintained.¹⁰

¹⁰ This may seem unconventional, especially to researchers who are operating within a single one clearly demarcated paradigm and might caution against integrating analytical and conceptual tools from different traditions. However, integrative efforts have proponents as well. (See Billig, 1987, 2009; Wetherell, 1998, 2007.)

4 MATERIALS AND METHODS

The contextually oriented social psychological approach delineated above is variously applied across a range of qualitative interview material that lies at the focus of the empirical analyses of the sub-studies I-IV. This interview material originates from two broader data corpuses collected in connection with two research projects. Even though the background settings, questions, and objectives of the projects differed, the methodological principles applied to the data collection and in conducting the interviews were broadly similar. In both cases, the logic of qualitative interview data generation followed a semi-structured procedure, where specifically formulated interview stimuli concerning aspects of entrepreneurship and farming served as prompts (Speer, 2002) to the interviewees. In both cases, then, the interview situations simulated a current socio-political situation in which entrepreneurship policy/discourse is being served and diffused to the context of farming and agriculture. With the help of systematical, similarly arranged **interview settings, the interview situations aimed to ‘provoke’ and record the** variety of responses and ways in which agents operating in the farm sector relate themselves to the entrepreneurship discourse and adopt, use, resist or reject it. Even though this interview material is treated and analyzed differently according to the specific purposes and questions of each research article and are described in detail therein, briefly reviewing the settings and context of the research projects from which the interview data originally stem is nevertheless illustrative.

4.1 PROJECT 1: ON-FARM BUSINESS DIVERSIFICATION IN MUNICIPAL RURAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY

The first research project, “On-farm business diversification in municipal rural development policy” (2004-2007), carried out as a collaboration between the University of Helsinki and MTT Agrifood Research Finland (Economic Research), focused on the phenomenon of ‘on-farm business diversification’, its role, challenges, and means of facilitation as part of municipal rural development policy in Finland. ‘On-farm business diversification’ (OFBD) refers to a situation in which farms involved in primary production also take on some business activities beyond conventional primary production (e.g., machine contracting, cottage hiring, landscape management). Geographically, the project focused on two municipalities in Eastern Finland where agricultural restructuring has posed acute challenges and farms have also managed to find some novel solutions by broadening their activities and businesses in new directions (see Vihinen

& Vesala, 2007). In the project, a qualitative interview data corpus was generated by utilizing both individual and group interviews. The interviewees represented, on the one hand, municipal and regional decision makers, officials, experts, and stakeholders, and on the other hand, local farmers (both conventional and business diversifiers). In the first round of interviews the interviewees (N=23) were interviewed individually on the general situation of OFBD in the municipality, as well as how it has been and should be facilitated. This provided us with a picture of the variety of views, opinions, and controversies concerning OFBD in the municipalities. In the second round, the interviews focused on the most salient controversies, challenges, and opportunities revealed in the first round interviews, but this time in group interview settings (N=6): three group discussions were arranged in both municipalities, so that the first group comprised representatives of experts and officials, the second group consisted of farmers active either in conventional agriculture or in OFBD, and the third group was a mixed group involving both experts/officials and farmers.

In terms of the interview procedure, the interviews (in both individual and group situations) consisted of discussions stimulated by questions or statements presented one by one to the interviewees, both verbally and printed on separate sheets of paper or shown on an overhead projector (see Appendix A for the list of interview questions). The interviewers (one or two involved per interview) requested the interviewees to comment freely on the questions and statements, but refrain from commenting on the substantial topics themselves. Instead, the role of the interviewers was to participate in the conversation by encouraging rich, diverse commenting and argumentation on the topic, by eliciting justifications for stands taken, clarifications, accounts, examples, personal experiences, and counter-arguments (see Vesala & Rantanen 2007a, 2007b). Consequently, each question or statement was followed by a discussion lasting from approximately five to twenty minutes.

4.2 PROJECT 2: DEVELOPING ENTREPRENEURIAL SKILLS OF FARMERS

The second research project, ‘Developing entrepreneurial skills of farmers’ (ESoF; 2005-2008), was an EU-funded research project carried out as an inter-European, comparative research project between six countries (England, Finland, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, and Switzerland). The project aimed to examine the nature of the socio-cultural, political, and economic challenges and possibilities for developing the entrepreneurial skills of farmers in various parts of the EU region (for details on the project, see Rudmann, 2008; <http://www.esofarmers.org/>). The empirical part of the research carried out in the project followed a uniform, qualitative interview and analysis method reminiscent of the procedure described above in

connection with Project 1. Firstly, relevant decision makers, stakeholders, and experts were interviewed (individually) in each country about their opinions and views on the trends and factors affecting the development of the farming sector and the skills that farmers need to succeed in farm businesses. These expert interviews, combined with a theoretical elaboration of the concept of entrepreneurial skills, revealed to the researchers of the project three entrepreneurial skills considered as important from the perspective of farming success: 1) recognizing and realizing opportunities, 2) utilizing networks and contacts, and 3) creating and evaluating a business strategy (see De Wolf & Schoorlemmer, 2007; Vesala & Pyysiäinen, 2008; Rudmann, 2008). In the second stage, the personal relevance, manifestation and development of such skills were then discussed with 25 farmers in individual interviews, similarly in each country (altogether 150 interviews). The interviewed farmers were selected as to represent the essential variation of the farm strategies considered relevant to contemporary farm businesses: cost reduction and enlargement within primary agricultural production, adding value to agricultural products, and non-food business diversification.

In this study, I present and analyze material only from Finland and, specifically, from interviews with farmers from two municipalities in Southern and Western Finland.

In terms of the interview procedure, the interviews followed a procedure roughly similar to that in Project 1, except that in this case the interviews consisted of two types of questions/interview sections (see Appendix B for the list of interview questions). In the first section, the interviewees were requested to self-assess their own entrepreneurial skills, and in the second section, they were requested to explain and attribute cause to the presence or absence of these skills among farmers (including themselves).

4.3 CENTRAL METHODOLOGICAL AND ANALYTICAL PRINCIPLES AND THEIR APPLICATION IN THE ARTICLES

As described previously, the interview material was produced in situations that stimulate argumentative talk. As such, the interview material does not consist of naturally occurring conversations favored by conversation analysts (Speer, 2002: 784–785) or thematic qualitative interviews that would encourage interviewees to speak completely freely about their experiences and opinions on a given topic. Rather, a noteworthy feature of this method of interview data generation and its further treatment was the semi-structured logic of the interviews and the use of argumentative stimuli (Vesala & Rantanen, 2007b) or prompts (Speer, 2002) to ‘provoke’ comments on selected topics. The arrangement of the interview situation thus bears some resemblance to a ‘test’ or even an ethnomethodologically informed experiment (Heritage, 1984) in which respondents’ evaluative reactions,

accounts and sense-making practices concerning entrepreneurship and farming are stimulated and recorded. In this case, however, the reactions were recorded in the form of talk and evaluative commenting.

The interview material thus generated was then transcribed verbatim, by applying a notation procedure that allows one to make analytical observations about social interaction and conversational details (see Appendix C). In the transcribed interview talk, a range of situated rhetorical **constructions and usages of discourse concerning ‘entrepreneurship’, ‘farming’, and their relationships, become discernible. Of special interest in the articles are analytical concepts such as evaluative stands, argumentative justifications, social categories, subject positions and rhetorical resources (cf. Vesala & Rantanen, 2007b) and interpretive concepts such as reflexive and interactive positioning, entrepreneurial skill, self-presentation, attributions concerning the self, and attitude. The analytical interest is, essentially, to detect and establish the qualitative and contextual variety discernible in the interview talk with the help of such categories and concepts. Table 1 below briefly summarizes the application of these analytical principles in the articles.**

Table 1. Summary of the research questions, empirical materials, and methodological approaches of the articles.

Articles	Research questions	Main materials	Methodological / analytical approaches
<p>Activating farmers: Uses of entrepreneurship discourse in the rhetoric of policy implementers.</p>	<p>How do implementers in charge of the implementation of farm-level entrepreneurship policies make sense of and argue for the rationale of entrepreneurship facilitation and policy intervention?</p>	<p>A group interview involving four local / regional policy implementers serves as the main material, which is complemented with findings from individual (N=23) and group (N=6) interviews (Project 1).</p>	<p>Application of qualitative analysis of argumentation to group interview talk, with a focus on detailed analysis of the rhetorical uses and constructions of ‘entrepreneurship policy intervention’ in interactive group situation.</p>
<p>Entrepreneurial skills among farmers: Approaching a policy discourse.</p>	<p>How can ‘entrepreneurship’ and the aim to facilitate entrepreneurial skills be understood as a policy discourse in the context of farming? How do individual farmers engage with such a discourse?</p>	<p>25 individual interviews of Finnish farmers; from this total number of interviews, three ideal typical cases are examined more closely (Project 2).</p>	<p>Application of qualitative analysis of argumentation to interview talk that is analytically treated as ‘self-presentation’. By analyzing the self-presentations and the quality of rhetorical resources used in their making, the personal importance and manifestation of entrepreneurial skills is detected.</p>
<p>Developing the entrepreneurial skills of farmers: Some myths explored.</p>	<p>What is the nature of the skills that farmers need to become entrepreneurial, viewed both conceptually and from a farmer’s perspective and action situation?</p>	<p>A literature review of the uses and understandings of the notion of ‘skills’ in connection with entrepreneurship, and a case study of a farmer who has recently quit his on-farm business (Project 1).</p>	<p>Conceptual analysis of the notion of ‘skills’ in entrepreneurship literature, and a case study of a farmer’s situation and personal accounts of his quitting of the business.</p>
<p>Co-constructing a virtuous in-group attitude? Evaluation of new business activities in a group interview of farmers.</p>	<p>How do farmers collaboratively construct attitudes towards new business activities on farms?</p>	<p>A group interview involving four farmers, two of whom practice conventional farming, one business diversification, and one who has returned from diversification to conventional farming (Project 1).</p>	<p>Application of the ‘qualitative attitude approach’ to group interview talk about new business activities, with a focus on the detailed analysis of evaluative stand-taking in interactive group situation.</p>

5 ORIGINAL STUDIES

This section presents the four original studies, three of which appear in other publications and one (I study, Pyysiäinen & Vesala, 2011) has been submitted to a journal for publication.

5.1 I STUDY

Authors: Jarkko Pyysiäinen & Kari Mikko Vesala (2011).

Publication: Activating farmers: Uses of entrepreneurship discourse in the rhetoric of policy implementers (Unpublished manuscript under review process).

5.2 II STUDY

Authors: Jarkko Pyysiäinen, Darren Halpin & Kari Mikko Vesala (2011).

Publication: Entrepreneurial skills among farmers: Approaching a policy discourse. In: Alsos, G. A., Carter, S., Ljunggren, E. & Welter, F. (Eds.) *The Handbook of Research on Entrepreneurship in Agriculture and Rural Development* (pp. 109–128). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

5.3 III STUDY

Authors: Jarkko Pyysiäinen, Alistair Anderson, Gerard McElwee & Kari Mikko Vesala (2006).

Publication: Developing the entrepreneurial skills of farmers: some myths explored. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 12 (1), 21-39.

5.4 IV STUDY

Author: Jarkko Pyysiäinen (2010).

Publication: Co-constructing a virtuous ingroup attitude? Evaluation of new business activities in a group interview of farmers. *Text & Talk*, 30 (6), 701–721.

6 SUMMARY OF THE ORIGINAL STUDIES: OBSTACLES TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF ENTREPRENEURIAL AGENCY

Viewing the findings of the four studies synthetically from the perspective of the process of entrepreneurial agency construction paints a consistent picture: the construction process in the farm context encounters several obstacles as a consequence of aspects that may be variably related to both the individual agent and the action situation or context. Clear-cut attributions to either dispositional or situational factors emerge as problematic, however, for the studies showed that, even if the farmer were willingly to engage in pursuing entrepreneurial agency (and business opportunities), such an enterprise could nevertheless turn out to be futile. On the other hand, all articles similarly showed that it is nevertheless possible for a farmer to engage and succeed in constructing entrepreneurial agency. Despite the obstacles and challenges, the idea of constructing entrepreneurial agency on farms has – in one way or another – emerged as an idea that has enjoyed broad support, especially among policy implementers, and was not unfamiliar to farmers either. The idea of linking *certain* aspects of entrepreneurship to farming was rarely rejected out of hand. That said, it is important to acknowledge the variation in how entrepreneurship and the pursuit of entrepreneurial agency in connection with farming was both understood and attempted.

Bearing in mind the influence of different cultural layers and competing policy discourses (see Chapter 2), entrepreneurship in the farm context was, unsurprisingly, constructed as not just one, but many things. The farmers actively linked the idea of entrepreneurial agency to their primary production activities and achievements, even though it proved rather difficult to convincingly demonstrate the fundamental entrepreneurial skill of business opportunity recognition and realization by means of the activities of this context. One way to interpret this observation of the multiple constructions of farmer agency in the farm context is to view it from the perspective of the obstacles and challenges to its construction as discovered in the articles. These obstacles were variably related to factors and issues dealing with the individual agent, the action situation, the characteristics of the action itself, or the broader cultural, socio-normative and institutional context. In the following, I briefly discuss how these aspects were manifested in the articles.

The first study, ‘Activating farmers’, was closest to the level of policy implementation and focused on the perspective of agents involved in implementing of entrepreneurship policies on farms. Viewed from the perspective of the policy implementers and their rhetoric, the characteristics of individual entrepreneur candidates themselves (i.e. target farmers of the

entrepreneurship policy/discourse) were emphasized. The enterprise rhetoric of the experts demonstrated rather fluent use of entrepreneurship discourse and emphatic individual-centric **'entrepreneurialism'**. **In a vein reminiscent of the individualistic, dispositional tones (familiar from the entrepreneurship research in the quest for 'entrepreneurial personality'), the experts argued that substantial entrepreneurial potential resides within the farming population (if only this often latent potential could be realized and activated). Despite such individualistic emphasis and ethos, the experts also expressed considerable reservations for – and even raised obstacles to – the construction of farmers' entrepreneurial agency. Interestingly, these obstacles were typically attributed to the self, or personality, of the entrepreneur candidates (i.e. farmers). The first reservation concerned the inherent 'entrepreneurial dispositions' of farmers, as the experts expressed a particularization to their general entrepreneurial enthusiasm: not all farmers were viewed as being inclined towards entrepreneurship, but rather as prone to fail if attempting to construct entrepreneurial agency (e.g. small, unprofitable family farmers focusing on crop production). The second reservation concerned the need of the implementers and policy interventions to protect the target's sense of personal autonomy, initiative and integrity, and thus also to avoid the potential of resistance and reactance (Brehm & Brehm, 1981) on the part of the target farmers. The reactions of the individual targets were therefore viewed as potential obstacles to the diffusion of entrepreneurship discourse and to the construction of entrepreneurial agency.**

When this kind of intervention rhetoric is interpreted from the **perspective of the policy context of farming, the construction of farmers' entrepreneurial agency does not emerge as a mere unproblematic routine. Instead, the experts showed that they actively tackle dilemmas inherent in their task and seek to create practical strategies to manage the challenges of entrepreneurship policy implementation. As a result, however, the implemented version of the policy does not necessarily fully correspond to the original entrepreneurship discourse/policy that served as the starting point for attempts to diffuse entrepreneurship in the context of farming. Moreover, if the focus of this policy implementation effort remains overly individualistic and agent-centered, it risks ignoring the broader contextual, situational or relational aspects. If the individual-centric emphasis were systematic and generalized, conceivably the actors of the policy context would risk being selective – even biased – to perceive entrepreneurship deterministically, as though entrepreneurial opportunities could be perceived and realized only by particular, stereotypical farmer-entrepreneurs, but not by others who fail to conform to the norm.**

In the second study, 'Entrepreneurial skills among farmers', the analysis revealed another kind of perspective on the construction of entrepreneurial agency. Because the issue was studied from the perspective of farmers, promotion of entrepreneurial agency was no more an obvious premise of

argumentation (as it was in the case of the first article). This time, the premise of argumentation was the **self-presentation of one's own** entrepreneurial skills (as constituents of entrepreneurial agency) and the use of rhetorical resources for the demonstration such skills in self-presentations. The results indicated that, on **the one hand, the farmers'** presentations of themselves as entrepreneurial may fail: even if the farmer were not to reject the entrepreneurship discourse out of hand and were to make an effort to substantiate it, he might simply lack the rhetorical resources required to mobilize the discourse for the purposes of a convincing self-presentation. However, the study also showed that farmers are capable of making quite convincing entrepreneurial self-presentations, somewhat more fluently when provided with access not only to rhetorical resources from the marketing and sales arena, but also to rhetorical resources drawn from the context of primary production. In other words, the second article showed that obstacles to the construction of entrepreneurial agency can arise from the action situation as well as from the broader situational and **relational factors in which the farmer's activities are embedded. The nature** of the farm enterprise and the line of business, its relationship to markets and other farms/businesses, the quality and quantity of social relationships (especially customers), and the modifiability of the product(s) all represent potential rhetorical resources that either restrict or enable them to make entrepreneurial self-presentations.

The third study, **'Developing the entrepreneurial skills of farmers'**, deepened our understanding of entrepreneurial skills, their development and use for purposes of on-farm businesses. The focus of the analysis was limited to neither situational nor individual factors in the development of relevant entrepreneurial skills, but rather elucidated the relationships between factors concerning the situation and those concerning the individual. The case study analysis revealed that obstacles to the successful construction of entrepreneurial agency were linked to the business activity itself: the on-farm business was unprofitable and had to be dissolved. However, the analysis showed that obstacles to the development of entrepreneurial skills (which would enable a farm business to run successfully) could not be unproblematically attributed to either the individual or the situation without **considering the nature of the action, action context and the agent's** relationship to them. Thus, the action played a mediating role through which factors related to the individual as well as those related to the situation were intertwined and further interpreted as potential obstacles to the development of entrepreneurial skills.

In the fourth and last study, 'Co-constructing a virtuous in-group attitude?', the analysis focused on the attitudes that farmers interactively constructed towards new business activities. The study showed that the topic of new businesses on farms could be opposed by appealing to a variety of arguments that draw from the collectively appreciated cultural values and historical layers of farming. However, research has shown that these very

same resources also enabled the construction of a particularization of the dismissive attitude: entrepreneurial agency associated with new business activities could be evaluated positively if particularized as a personal choice of the farmer him/herself and supported by his/her action situation. In other words, the construction of entrepreneurial agency could be advocated to the extent that it was not considered threatening the collectively appreciated in-group virtues of conventional family farmers. The collectively shared and valued, virtuous aspects stemming from the broader cultural context (e.g. values, norms and practices of conventional primary production) emerged in this case as obstacles that questioned the meaningfulness and appeal of entrepreneurial agency for farmers.

7 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Whether viewed from the perspective of the agents themselves (i.e. farmers) or the actors involved in policy implementation, the findings of the studies showed that the construction of entrepreneurial agency in the context of farming emerged as a viable but intricate task. Obstacles to the construction process were variably related to aspects of the individual agent, the action situation, the characteristics of the action itself, or the broader cultural, socio-normative and institutional context. As noted, the findings of the analyses supported no clear-cut attribution of the obstacles to any one cause.

Taken together, these obstacles and potential paths for the construction of entrepreneurial agency could be observed because the analytical perspective provided by the contextually oriented social psychological approach (**'situated, relational constructionism'**; see Chapter 3.2.3) made the obstacles and processual pathways analytically visible. According to this approach, the subjects were viewed – and provided the opportunity to perform – as active speakers (or rhetoricians) capable of using discourse for various purposes.¹¹ As a result, the aspect of relational, situated construction manifested itself in the context of the interview situation, in which the interviewed subjects demonstrated active, argumentative agency and critical usage of the discursive stimuli provided to them. Indeed, the subjects were active in constructing and demonstrating their agency in one way or another, even if it was not particularly entrepreneurial in nature. In such a research setting, different elements highlighting the active, relational construction process could be detected as the result of a detailed, contextually sensitive qualitative analysis. Let me briefly review how these different aspects revealed themselves in the case of each study.

The first study, which focused on the entrepreneurship policy rhetoric of the policy implementers, portrayed the implementers as active constructors and negotiators of their own role and agency as expert-implementers. In their argumentation, the implementers engaged in legitimating their own actions and interventions as necessary and meaningful to facilitate entrepreneurship on farms. The way they rhetorically constructed and **represented the agency of the farmers as 'nascent entrepreneurs' who need** awakening by the implementers was inseparably linked to the ongoing active argumentative construction (and legitimation) of their own role and agency as expert-implementers. Furthermore, by representing policy implementation as a tactful negotiation that ought to support the autonomy of the farmer, the implementers performed rhetorical face-work and face saving (cf. Goffman, 1967) and safeguarded their own autonomy as

¹¹ It should be emphasized that the approach as such does not entail any normative implications or connotations concerning the construction of agency (or entrepreneurial agency).

facilitators and implementers of entrepreneurship policies. Notably, the painting of such a picture of policy implementation as **'activation by means of tactful negotiation'** was made possible by the application of the analytical approach, which made such situated processes of relationship construction and communication analytically visible.

In the second study, the application of the approach helped to reveal that farmers actively engage in demonstrating and constructing their agency when making self-presentations of their own entrepreneurial skills. Consequently, analysis of the self-presentations in this case examined and revealed variation in the active construction of (entrepreneurial) agency. As noted earlier, in two of the three cases analyzed in detail, the making of an entrepreneurial self-presentation was quite convincing. Interestingly, however, in these two cases, the self-presentations were made using very different kinds of rhetorical resources. The implication of such an observation is that a convincing presentation of oneself as entrepreneurially skillful allows considerable variation in its demonstration, and in this variation, the active effort of the agent also manifested itself: the skill discourse allowed the farmers to substantiate it creatively in a variety of ways. Significantly, the aspect of active construction of personal agency was no less evident when the making of an entrepreneurial presentation failed. Of the three cases analyzed, the pig farmer who failed to present himself as entrepreneurially skillful made a considerable effort to substantiate the entrepreneurial skill discourse presented to him. In this case, however, the farmer actively presented himself as locked up in an exceptional situation dictated by the powerful food industry, where the employment of entrepreneurial skills is impossible. In fact, he did not openly claim that he did not have the skills in question, but presented himself as having tried nearly every possible trick, and consequently settled on conventional pig farming as the most viable solution for him. Thus, he also actively and persistently constructed his agency through self-presentation, even though he did not claim it was particularly entrepreneurial.

A similar situation was observed in the third study, which examined how the farmer who quit his cheese business and returned to conventional farming made sense of his situation and attributed the causes of this change in circumstances. In addition, he consistently constructed himself as an agent able to make things happen, even though he (had to) quit his business: he attributed the predicament of his cheese business to the unbearably unbalanced power relations within the agro-food sector (comprising processors, distributors and retailers) and presented his return to conventional farming as a wise move whereby he will be better able to make things happen in the future. He actively made sense of his situation in a way that contributed to constructing himself as agentic.

In the fourth study, the approach was applied a bit differently in order to analyze the interactive co-construction of attitudes in group interview settings. In this case, the approach also demonstrated that the construction

of attitudes towards business activities in a group situation was the result of active, situated and relational agency. Firstly, the dismissive attitude towards business activities was actively constructed with various, multifaceted arguments in which the members of the group, each in their own ways, **willingly engaged in constructing themselves as ‘servants’ of a common in-group** (conventional family farmers) as well as the **in-group’s virtues**. Secondly, even though each of the four group members could mobilize himself to the cause of the common in-group and actively argue for the importance of protecting its allegedly threatened virtues, they were far from being unthinking victims of ideology or rigid reproducers of a discourse (cf. Billig, 1991). When the argumentative context changed, the members could fluently make particularizations on the issue and also construct affirmative attitudes towards entrepreneurship on farms.

Reflecting on these aspects from the perspective of the usage of entrepreneurship discourse by the agents, we noticed that the policy implementers of the first study were in fact the only ones who did not actively construct a critical distance from the entrepreneurship discourse and question the premise that entrepreneurial agency and new businesses on farms are positive things insofar as they can be successfully realized. The farmers, instead, spontaneously came up with the view that entrepreneurship discourse could also be put into practice within the confines of conventional primary production; when questioning the facilitation of non-farm businesses on farms or the usefulness of certain entrepreneurial skills, they nevertheless readily advocated and demonstrated agency that makes things happen in the sphere of primary production. The more uncritical stance towards entrepreneurship discourse demonstrated, in turn, by the policy implementers is understandable, since it is part of their role to promote and facilitate entrepreneurship policies. However, the implementers nevertheless took critical distance from the *implementation* of the entrepreneurship policy and actively pondered how promotion and implementation of the policies could and ought to be done. Entrepreneurship discourse, its adoption and usage were thus not unproblematic or unambiguous issues for **any of the subjects but matters entailing ‘ideological dilemmas’** (cf. Billig & al., 1988) concerning, for example, dilemmatic relationships between authority and autonomy, self-determination and cooperation, risk and security, and personal and collective interest.

The analyses in the studies thus demonstrated that the individual agent actively aims to construct his/her own agency with the resources available and accessible to him/her in his/her situation. This active effort and initiative of the individual as a user of (entrepreneurship) discourses is something that other commentators have pointed out as well (Jones & Spicer, 2009; Watson, 2009; see also Burr, 1995; Billig, 2009). Watson (2009), for example, elucidates on the multifaceted, relational and situated character of the concept of identity (and the distinction between self-identity and social identity) in making the point about the personal activity of the

entrepreneur in the construction of his/her agency and identity. In this case, however, the situated construction process was analyzed and elucidated with **the help of analytical concepts, such as ‘stance taking’ (Studies I and IV; see also Billig, 1991: 142-167), ‘reflexive/interactive positioning’ (Study I; see also Davies & Harré, 2001: 264-267; Harré & Langenhove, 1999), ‘self-presentation’ (Study II; see also Goffman, 1959, Carsrud & Johnson, 1989; Downing, 2005), ‘attribution’ and ‘accountability’ (Study III; see also Ross, 1977; Semin & Manstead, 1983), and ‘attitude co-construction’ (Study IV; see also Lalljee & al., 1984; Vesala & Rantanen, 2007b).** As analytical lenses, all of these conceptual tools contributed to highlighting a similar point about the activity of the agent in the construction of his/her agency. This observation applied to both more and less entrepreneurial farmers (Studies I-IV) as well as to policy implementers (Study I).

The observation about the active effort and initiative of the individual both as a user of discourses and as a constructor of his/her own agency leads us back to the discussions and debates concerning the competing views of and approaches to the construction of entrepreneurial agency taken up in the introductory chapter (i.e. the *psychology* of entrepreneurship and *politically or culturally oriented approaches to entrepreneurship and ‘enterprise’*). Even though the individual agent consistently emerged as an active constructor of his/her agency, such an emphasis on the role of individual agent differs radically from the individualistic emphasis typical of the literature on the **‘psychology of entrepreneurs’**.¹² Such literature has at times aimed to identify and isolate psychological traits or characteristics that would help to explain entrepreneurial behavior (see Chell, 1985, 2008; Rauch & Frese, 2007). Simplistically viewed, it seems as if the search for underlying psychological traits or characteristics of entrepreneurs would presume that the construction of entrepreneurial agency is purely a matter of structures and processes located within the individual. Given the right mix of suitable traits, **an ‘entrepreneurial personality’ would spring forth, as if of inner causal necessity.** Such a simplistic picture is exaggerated, of course, and several scholars in the field of psychology of entrepreneurship have cautioned against erroneously focusing on mere inner personality traits at the expense of interactions between behavior, cognition, and the environment (Carsrud & Johnson, 1989; Shaver, 2005). Moreover, some have suggested that in order **to meaningfully study and explain the notion of ‘entrepreneurial personality’**, it is useful to view it from the perspective of social construction (Chell, 2008).

In the same vein, the picture of the individual as an active constructor of his/her agency revealed in Studies I-IV clearly lends support to the

¹² To paraphrase a definition of entrepreneurial agency by Stevenson and Jarillo (1991) who characterize it as a pursuing of opportunities regardless of the resources currently under control, in studies I-IV the agents could be seen as pursuing to construct their *personal* agency with the help of *situationally accessible rhetorical resources*.

‘interactionist’ and relational alternative where the construction of entrepreneurial agency is a matter of interactions between the individual agent and aspects located in the various spheres where the individual is embedded: the action itself, the action situation, and the broader environment and socio-cultural context. Indeed, application of the approach served to attest that the individual him-/herself does indeed play a crucial role in the construction process, and not as a ready-made or isolated unit, but, on the contrary, as an active, intentional agent who uses – and must thus access – resources for the construction process from these various spheres. Respectively, the construction of entrepreneurial agency presumes that the **agent can access and draw on relevant ‘entrepreneurial’ resources, such as** customer relations, contacts with colleagues, partners and support networks, knowledge and plans about market opportunities and product development, and so on. Mostly in that sense is it justified to view the active role of the individual as a precondition for the construction of entrepreneurial agency. However, if the individual typically emerges as an inherently active agent, we **may ask why there should be a particular need to ‘activate’ him/her by means** of external policy interventions, as the policy implementers commonly argued in Study I? An inherent lack of activeness did not seem to be among the key obstacles on the way to constructing entrepreneurial agency. On the whole, no individual factors could be identified as clearly responsible for either successful or failing constructions of entrepreneurial agency. Instead, the various situational aspects – and access to their utilization – obviously played a far more critical role in the construction process.

If the analyses thus emphasized the importance of situational and contextual aspects in the construction of entrepreneurial agency, how could we elucidate their role in the construction process? Was it possible to identify a cultural process or source, or the mobilization of a policy discourse, for example, from which the construction of entrepreneurial agency would flow or stem? Firstly, one is reminded of the variety of different types of action situations observed in the studies: the action situations of the farmers differed considerably depending on the type of production/business activity pursued (e.g. whether the focus was on mere primary production, processing and value-adding or on non-food diversification activities) and the nature of the opportunity structures associated with the activity. Moreover, depending **on the type of action situation, farmers’ situational resources, experiences,** and their evaluations of the cultural practices and traditions surrounding them varied as well.

Situations where the farmer remained steadfastly subordinated to (a few) hierarchical (customer) relations and scarce opportunity structures did not seem favorable to the construction of entrepreneurial agency unless a change could be affected in the relationship between the action situation and the broader contextual structures where it is embedded. However, such situations could nevertheless serve as settings in which farmers might pursue **an agency that effectively and autonomously strives to ‘make it happen’ in the**

sphere of primary production. Resources for the construction of such an agency are provided, for instance, by the still influential cultural ethos and practices related to peasant and productivist cultures (see Chapter 2.1), as well as competing policy discourses (see Chapter 2.2) that emphasize the importance of efficient, nationally or regionally based primary production (e.g. ‘neomercantilism’) or globally efficient agro-food industry (e.g. ‘neoliberalism’). **In other words, one striking feature of farming as a social context** (whether viewed discursively, culturally or politically) revealed in this study was the multiplicity of different kinds of elements that farmers can use to construct their agency.¹³ And when used for the construction of entrepreneurial agency (as many policy makers and implementers expect, for instance), elements may still be combined variably to construct different kinds of agency or identity constellations (cf. Watson, 2009). For example, as Study IV showed, striving for the autonomous, self-sufficient, efficacious and responsible running of a farm (characteristic of peasant and productivist cultures) may well be linked together with particular constructions of entrepreneurship.

Taken together, the studies indicated no particular cultural process or policy discourse alone – hegemonic or otherwise influential – would have been responsible for the affected constructions of (or failures to construct) entrepreneurial agency. A particular discourse could well be perceived as popular among a certain group of actors, as occurred among policy implementers who enthusiastically used individualistic, dispositional entrepreneurship rhetoric in Study I. But such cases were not instances where a particular discourse would have been identified as solely responsible for actual, attempted or effected constructions of entrepreneurial agency. **‘Enterprise discourses’ [or related individualistic or (neo)-liberal discourses]** hailing the virtues of autonomous self-realization, self-shaping or **optimization of an ‘enterprising self’ (see Chapter 3.1), for example, did not** figure as evident (not to mention sufficient) resources in the construction of **farmers’ agency. Such discourses failed even to become particularly appealing amongst farmers. On the contrary, the importance of relational aspects (with regard to immediate community, farming community, customers or stakeholders) seemed to undermine the appeal of ‘opportunistic self-realization’ and other one-sidedly ‘self-contained’ individualistic ideals (cf. Sampson, 1988). The steering and optimization efforts of the agents appeared to focus on their farming and business activities rather than on their ‘selfdom’. The aspect of negotiation and the task of successfully reconciling the different – and often challengingly divergent – discursive, political, cultural and practical elements entailed in**

¹³ Of course, viewed from the perspective of a particular farmer located in specific settings (e.g. in a sparsely populated, remote rural area), the elements for agency construction may appear very fixed or limited.

the action situation emerged as more acute objectives in these farmers' agency construction and identity work.

These findings can be meaningfully related to the research discussions concerning the implications and consequences of current processes of agricultural restructuring and social change from the perspective of farmers. Of particular interest are studies that comment on the experienced relevance of entrepreneurial identity vis-à-vis other potential identifications, and meanings that farmers more generally attached to entrepreneurship. Based on an analysis of two nationwide survey datasets from Finland (collected in 2001 and in 2006), Vesala and Vesala (2010) reported that farmers (both conventional primary producers and farmers with on-farm business diversification activities) typically conceive of themselves as both producers and entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurship was not experienced as something distant from farmers, even though diversified farmers identified themselves more strongly as entrepreneurs than conventional primary producers did; and respectively, conventional farmers identified themselves more strongly as producers than diversified farmers did. In other words, the type and share of agricultural and other business activities practiced by farmers were strongly, though not mechanically, related to the reported identifications (the results were essentially the same in 2001 and 2006). These results are in line with the findings of the present study: the nature of the activity and the action situation play a crucial role as resources that both enable and restrict the construction of certain kinds of farming agency. Activities that engage the farmer with the market arena and diverse customer relationships both provide important resources for the construction of entrepreneurial agency (for the requisite mobilization of discourses and a demonstration of entrepreneurial skills, cf. Study II) (see also Vesala & Peura, 2005). But, should the agency of the farmers rely and draw more strongly from the resources characteristic of productivist or peasant cultures, even such resources will include elements that can be linked to aspects of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial agency (e.g. autonomy, self-reliance, the propensity to assume responsibility; cf. Dudley, 2003). In line with the conclusions of Lia Bryant (1999), who studied the detraditionalization of farming identities in Australia, the results of this study warrant a view of the increasing complexity and diversity of farming as paving the way for multiple constructions of farmer identity and agency.

In order to understand better the **sources and dynamics of farmers'** potentially complex identity negotiations associated with the construction of entrepreneurial agency, we should look more carefully at the characteristics of the **context** in which these identity negotiations and agency constructions occur (cf. Reicher, 2004). As noted in the introductory chapter, the context of farming and agriculture highlights the political potential associated with entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship in its traditional SME business context, for example, is hardly a controversial and politicized issue, but using or understanding entrepreneurship as a means of transforming or governing

sectors or contexts thus far organized on other (e.g. non-economical) principles, renders it controversial and political. Indeed, the common use of entrepreneurship discourse as a vehicle for transformation and social change has contributed to the proliferation of a variety of different, competing framings, meanings and uses, and thus to the debatable and controversial status of the very notion of entrepreneurship (Jones & Spicer, 2009; see also Hjorth & Steyaert, 2004). In such a situation, then, mere individualistic approaches or analyses that tend to isolate the experience of the individual entrepreneur from his/her surroundings are clearly insufficient to account for and explain the developments and dynamics at stake. The empirical studies of this dissertation have shown that in the context of farming entrepreneurship is indeed subject to various interests, expectations, definition-struggles and framings, and is thus clearly a political phenomenon. In the farm context, an appealing framing of entrepreneurship (or formulation of entrepreneurship discourse) revealed in the studies was associated with agency and, more specifically, with the inclination of agents to demonstrate, maintain and protect a sense of personal agency. **Entrepreneurship as initiative action that ‘makes it happen’** (Sarasvathy, 2004) and effectively realizes opportunities (Stevenson & Jarillo, 1991) resonates strongly with the idea of agency – and with a yearning for a sense of agency. Such aspects of entrepreneurial agency as autonomy, achievement orientation, self-efficacy and assuming responsibility (Rauch & Frese, 2007; Chell, 2008), for instance, resonate with values that have been historically dear to farmers as **both ‘peasants’ and ‘producers’**. **This is one** explanation for why the idea of entrepreneurship is rarely opposed outright or rejected out of hand. Viewed from the perspective of farmers, however, entrepreneurship and instances of entrepreneurship discourse also include ideas, objectives and values, such as propensity to risk-taking (e.g. Palich & Bagby, 1995), aggressive competitiveness (e.g. Covin & Covin, 1990), and market orientation and dynamic innovativeness (e.g. Verhees & Meulenbergh, 2004) that can be considered threats to the sense of agency that farmers have constructed by, for instance, drawing on the situational resources **characteristic of ‘peasants’ or ‘producers’**. Significantly, policy implementers **also noted and acknowledged such a threat as well as farmers’ vulnerability** to aspects of entrepreneurship discourse, even though they did not question the idea of entrepreneurship facilitation as such (Study I). The implementers were nevertheless aware of the problems that entrepreneurship discourse and its diffusion may pose for farmers. This finding suggests that despite the **salient pressures towards ‘entrepreneurialism’ at the policy level**, farmers may not necessarily encounter the most intense expressions of this pressure; instead, the intermediate level of policy implementers may function as a buffer that filters or moderates the pressure to more digestible forms. As such, the existence of moderating buffers does not, of course, remove the political nature of the setting itself.

Such a diverse and mixed discursive setting, then, includes the potential for both entrepreneurial agency construction and its rejection. The mediating role played by the policy implementers, for example, suggests that the accentuation of a rejecting tendency and open conflict between incompatible positions is currently unlikely. The dynamics of the setting nevertheless raise potential opportunities for collective, and even political, mobilization. In particular, the setting can provide opportunities for efforts which aim to mobilize collective identities (Study IV; cf. Haslam & al., 2011; Watson, 2009) and virtues (Study IV; cf. Reicher & al., 2008) and thus to influence the ways in which entrepreneurship in the farm context becomes understood and possibly incorporated into or rejected from the process of agency construction [cf. the rise of novel entrepreneurship categories, such as ‘ecological entrepreneurship’ (Marsden & Smith, 2005), ‘social entrepreneurship’ (Chell, 2007), and ‘growth entrepreneurship’ (Wennekers & Thurik, 1999)]. Consequently, agents who are willing and able to serve as **leaders in the sense of ‘entrepreneurs of identity’** (Haslam & al., 2011: 137–164), to engage in defining **the prototype of ‘us’, the boundaries of ‘us’ and the commonly valued experiential content for ‘us’ as an in-group of farmers, or as one of its sub-in-groups (e.g. ‘us’ engaged in organic farming)**, may be able to influence considerably the direction of this **‘entrepreneurial transformation’ in the making. A couple of examples of such an ‘identity leadership’** (Haslam & al., 2011: 197–217) appear in the empirical studies. Study I portrays the role played by the policy implementers as moderators of entrepreneurship discourse in this light: the policy implementers moderated too drastic a formulation and obtrusion of the entrepreneurship discourse for all farmers, thereby discounting the image of the **‘aggressive growth-entrepreneur’ as an apt new prototype for the category of all farmers**. The category of the implementers themselves, in turn, was collaboratively defined as indispensable to the important yet delicate task of entrepreneurship diffusion and facilitation. Interestingly, the implementers found that a successful performance of the delicate task requires skills associated with effective leaders, that is, the ability to constrain **one’s own agency in order to enable the agency of followers** (Haslam & al., 2011: 215–218): the implementers argued that in order to increase the success potential of entrepreneurship policy implementation, they voluntarily discount the impression of their own efforts and constrain their own agency, which, in turn, serves to support and maintain a sense of agency of the farmers (considered essential for potential entrepreneurs).

In a similar vein, Study IV identifies an aspect of collective identity (and agency) leadership: three conventional farmers gradually articulated the **‘virtues’ of the category of good farmers** (the primacy of primary production work, autonomy and self-sufficiency, the continuity of the farm and family-centered way of life) so that they posed no threat to the face of the sole business diversifier present, but so that also he could recognize and cherish the significance of these virtues as boundary markers for good farmers. Thus,

the three farmers, spearheaded by ‘Don’ as the most verbally active, demonstrated an instance of collaborative leadership and identity entrepreneurship that quickly gained momentum among the small-group of farmers. All in all, the cultural and structural features of the farm context thus seem to provide potential for collective, and perhaps even political, mobilization which, in turn, could lead either to the acceleration of further social differentiation or to a polarization between dominant orientations and identifications (e.g. a polarization between more liberal entrepreneurial identities and more conservative producer/peasant identities).

The particularly relational and situated nature of the construction of entrepreneurial agency under the circumstances described justifies viewing it as a task of negotiation rather than as a simple or straightforward construction. This perspective has been reflected in the choice and formulations of the theoretical and analytical approach of the present study: the **‘situated relational’ approach has provided the opportunity to direct the focus of the empirical analyses variably to different aspects between the agent and his/her action context, without limiting the perspective solely either to the individual and his/her psychology, or to the social context, or to the cultural context.** I hope this study has shown that such an approach entails the opportunity to participate meaningfully in – and hopefully build some bridges between – several discussions on agency, entrepreneurship and their psychological, social and political construction.

The research setting (and the research problems) of each of the empirical studies have been based upon a theoretical thematization or problematization of an aspect related to the construction of entrepreneurial agency. The qualitative analyses carried out in the studies have explored or demonstrated these thematizations against qualitative (text/talk) interview material. Epistemologically, the studies have probed and searched for theoretical generalizations (i.e. tested theory-derived conceptualizations, ideas and phenomena against systematically produced qualitative data and data analysis; see Chapter 4). Such an epistemological logic of generalization differs clearly from the logic of statistical generalization, for example. One should therefore bear in mind the nature of the empirical findings as demonstrations and illustrations of the variety of ways with which agents in farm context can relate themselves to the ideas associated with **entrepreneurship**. The studies do not permit conclusions concerning the extent to which the reality of farmers (or policy implementers) may follow or be organized on principles that are more peripheral to the issue of entrepreneurship. Neither have these studies indicated or delineated the more specific characteristics of the contexts (be they psychological states/structures/processes or social settings) in which an entrepreneurial identity or action receive their most emphatic affirmations or rejections. What these studies have shown are response- and sense-making patterns that should depict the basic variation of the ways available to agents when

making sense of, and relating themselves to the increasingly influential entrepreneurship discourse in the context of farming.

REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, S. & Hardy, C. (2008). The enterprising self: An unsuitable job for an older worker. *Organization*, 15 (3), 389-405.
- Alapuro, R. (1988). *State and Revolution in Finland*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Alasuutari, P. (1996). *Toinen Tasavalta. Suomi 1946–1994*. Vastapaino: Tampere.
- Alestalo, M. (1986). *Structural Change, Classes and the State. Finland in an Historical and Comparative Perspective*. Research Group for Comparative Sociology, University of Helsinki. Research Reports, No. 33.
- Allen, A. (2002). Power, subjectivity, and agency: Between Arendt and Foucault. *International Journal of Philosophical Studies*, 10, 131-149.
- Armstrong, P. (2001). Styles of illusion. *Sociological Review*, 49 (2), 155-173.
- Audretsch, D. B., & Beckmann, I. A. M. (2007). From small business to entrepreneurship policy. In D. B. Audretsch, I. Grilo & R. A. Thurik (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on Entrepreneurship Policy* (pp. 36-53). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Audretsch, D. B., Grilo, I. & Thurik, R. A. (Eds.), (2007). *Handbook of Research on Entrepreneurship Policy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American Psychologist*, 44 (9), 1175-1184.
- Baron, R. A. (1998). Cognitive mechanisms in entrepreneurship: Why and when entrepreneurs think differently than other people. *Journal of Business Venturing* 13, 275-294.
- Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. New York: Ballantine.
- Bateson, G. (1979). *Mind and Nature: A Necessary Unity*. Toronto: Bantam.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1999). The nature and structure of the self: An overview. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.) *The Self in Social Psychology*. Philadelphia: Taylor and Francis.
- Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A. & Tipton, S. M. (Eds.), (1985). *Habits of the Heart. Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. New York: Perennial Library, Harper & Row.
- Berglund, K. (2006). Discursive diversity in fashioning entrepreneurial identity. In C. Steyaert & D. Hjorth (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship as Social Change* (pp. 231-250). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Billig, M. (1987). *Arguing and Thinking: A Rhetorical Approach to Social Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Billig, M. (1988). Common-places of the British royal family: A rhetorical analysis of plain and argumentative sense. *Text* 8, 191-217.
- Billig, M. (1991). *Ideology and Opinions: Studies in Rhetorical Social Psychology*. London: Sage.
- Billig, M. (2009). Discursive psychology, rhetoric and the issue of agency. *Semen*, 27.
- Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, D., Gane, M., Middleton, D., & Radley, A. (1988). *Ideological Dilemmas: A Social Psychology of Everyday Thinking*. London: Sage.

- Blandford, D. & Hill, B. (2006). *Policy Reform & Adjustment in the Agricultural Sectors of Developed Countries*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Boekaerts, M., Pintrich, P. R. & Zeidner, M. (2005). Self-regulation. An introductory overview. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation* (pp. 1-9). Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Boyd, N.G. & Vozikis, G.S. (1994). The influence of self-efficacy on the development of entrepreneurial intention and actions. *Entrepreneurial Theory and Practice*, 19, 63-77
- Brehm, S.S. & Brehm, J.W. (1981). *Psychological Reactance: A Theory of Freedom and Control*. New York: Academic Press.
- Brockhaus, R. H. & Horwitz, P. S. (1986). The psychology of the entrepreneur. In D. L. Sexton & R. W. Smilor (Eds.), *The Art and Science of Entrepreneurship*. Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Brower, F. (Ed.), (2004). *Sustaining Agriculture and the Rural Environment: Governance, Policy and Multifunctionality*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Bryant, C. R. (1989) Entrepreneurs in the rural environment. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 5 (4), 337-348.
- Bryant, L. (1999). The detraditionalization of occupational identities in farming in South Australia. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 39 (2), 236-261.
- Buckler, S. (2007). Theory, ideology, rhetoric: Ideas in politics and the case of “community” in recent political discourse. *British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, 9 (1), 36–54.
- Burchell, G. (1993). Liberal government and techniques of the self. *Economy and Society*, 22 (3), 267-282.
- Burchell, G., Gordon, C., & Miller, P. (Eds.), (1991). *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Burr, V. (1995). *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*. Routledge: London and New York.
- Burrows, R. (Ed.), (1991). *Deciphering the Enterprise Culture. Entrepreneurship, Petty Capitalism and the Restructuring of Britain*. London: Routledge.
- Burton, R. J.F. (2004). Seeing through the 'good farmer's' eyes: Towards developing an understanding of the social symbolic value of 'productivist' behaviour. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 44, 2, 195-215.
- Burton, R. J.F. & Wilson, G. A. (2006). Injecting social psychology theory into conceptualisations of agricultural agency: Towards a post-productivist farmer self-identity. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 22, 95-115.
- Carland, J. W., Hoy, F., Bouton, W. R. & Carland, J. C. (1984). Differentiating entrepreneurs from small business owners. *Academy of Management Review*, 9, 354-369.
- Carsrud, A. L. & Johnson, R. W. (1989). Entrepreneurship: A social psychological perspective. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 1 (1), 21-31.
- Chell, E. (1985). The entrepreneurial personality: A few ghosts laid to rest? *International Small Business Journal*, 3 (3), 43-54.
- Chell, E. (2000). Towards researching the “opportunistic entrepreneur”: A social constructionist approach and research agenda. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 9, 63-80.

- Chell, E. (2007). Social enterprise and entrepreneurship: Towards a convergent theory of the entrepreneurial process. *International Small Business Journal*, 25, 5-26.
- Chell, E. (2008). *The Entrepreneurial Personality. A Social Construction*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Chen, C. C., Greene, P. G., & Crick, A. (1998). Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy distinguish entrepreneurs from managers? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13, 295-316.
- Cohen, L. & Musson, G. (2000). Entrepreneurial identities: Reflections from two case studies. *Organization*, 7 (1), 31-48.
- Covin, J. G & Covin J. C. (1990). Competitive aggressiveness, environmental context, and small firm performance. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 14 (4), 35–50.
- Dean, M. (1995). Governing the unemployed self in an active society. *Economy and Society*, 24, 559-583.
- Dean, M. (1999). *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage.
- Dewey, J. & Bentley, A. F. (1949). *Knowing and the Known*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Della-Giusta, M. & King, Z. (2006). Enterprise culture. In M. Casson, B. Yeung, A. Basu & N. Wadeson (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Entrepreneurship* (pp. 629-647). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Doolin, B. (2002). Enterprise discourse, professional identity and the organizational control of hospital clinicians. *Organization Studies*, 23, 369-390.
- Downing, S. (2005). The social construction of entrepreneurship: Narrative and dramatic processes in the coproduction of organizations and identities. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 29 (2), 185-204.
- Drakopoulou Dodd, S. & Anderson, A. (2007). Mumpsimus and the mything of the individualistic entrepreneur. *International Small Business Journal*, 25 (4), 341-360.
- Dreyfus, H. L. & Rabinow, P. (1982). *Michel Foucault. Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Brighton: Harvester.
- Dryzek, J. S. (2001). Legitimacy and economy in deliberative democracy. *Political Theory*, 29 (5), 651-669.
- Du Gay, P. (1996a). Organizing identity: Entrepreneurial governance and public management. In: S. Hall. & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of Cultural Identity* (pp. 151-169). London: Sage.
- Du Gay, P. (1996b). *Consumption and Identity at Work*. London: Sage.
- Du Gay, P. & Salaman, G. (1992). The cult[ure] of the customer. *Journal of Management Studies*, 29 (5), 615-33.
- Dudley, K. M. (2003). The entrepreneurial self. Identity and morality in a Midwestern farming community. In J. Adams (Ed.), *Fighting for the Farm: Rural America Transformed*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- EC (2010). *Situation and Prospects for EU Agriculture and Rural Areas*. European Commission, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/publi/situation-and-prospects/2010_en.pdf.
- Emirbayer M. (1997). Manifesto for a relational sociology. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103 (2), 281-317.

- Emirbayer, M. & Mische, A. (1998). What is agency? *American Journal of Sociology*, 103 (4), 962–1023.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power* (2nd ed.). London: Longman.
- Farr, R. M. (1996). *The Roots of Modern Social Psychology 1872-1954*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Finlayson, A. (2004). Political science, political ideas and rhetoric. *Economy and Society*, 33, 528-549.
- Finlayson, A. (2007). From beliefs to arguments: Interpretive methodology and rhetorical political analysis. *British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, 9, 545-563.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (pp. 87-104). London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Gaglio, C. & Katz, J. (2001). The psychological basis of opportunity identification: Entrepreneurial alertness. *Small Business Economics*, 16, 95–111.
- Gartner, W.B. (1988). “Who is an entrepreneur?” Is the wrong question. *American Journal of Small Business*, Spring 1988, 11-32.
- Geertz, C. (1961). Studies in peasant life: Community and society. *Biennial Review of Anthropology*, 2, 1-41.
- Gergen, K. J. (1997a). Experimentation in social psychology: A reappraisal. In M. Hewstone, A. S. R. Manstead & W. Stroebe (Eds.), *The Blackwell Reader in Social Psychology* (pp. 43-66). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gergen, K. J. (1997b). Social psychology as social construction: The emerging vision. In: C. McGarty & S. A. Haslam (Eds.), *The Message of Social Psychology* (pp. 113-128.) Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Giddens, A. (1979). *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis*. London: MacMillan.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gillespie, A. (2012). Position exchange: The social development of agency. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 30: 32–46.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Goffman, E. (1986/Originally 1974). *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Granberg, L. (1989). *Valtio maataloustulojen tasaajana ja takaajana*. Helsinki: Suomen Tiedeseura.
- Grin, J., & Van de Graaf, H. (1996). Implementation as communicative action: An interpretative understanding of interactions between policy actors and target groups. *Policy Sciences*, 29, 291-319.
- Halpin, D. & Guilfoyle, A. (2004). Attributions of responsibility: Rural neoliberalism and farmers’ explanations of the Australian rural crises. *Rural Society*, 14 (2), 93-111.
- Harré, R. (1993). *Social Being*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Harré, R. & Langenhove, L. van (1999). *Positioning Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Haslam, S. A., Reicher, S. D. & Platow, M. J. (2011). *The New Psychology of Leadership: Identity, Influence and Power*. Hove and New York: Psychology Press.
- Haynie, J. M., Shepherd, D. A., Mosakowski, E., & Earley, P. C. (2010). A situated metacognitive model of the entrepreneurial mindset. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25, 217–29.
- Heelas, P. & Morris, P. (Eds.), (1992a). *The Values of The Enterprise Culture: The Moral Debate*. London: Routledge.
- Heelas, P. & Morris, P. (1992b). Enterprise culture: Its values and value. In P. Heelas & P. Morris (Eds.), *The Values of The Enterprise Culture: The Moral Debate*. London: Routledge.
- Herbert-Cheshire, L. (2000). Contemporary strategies for rural development in Australia: a governmentality perspective. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 16, 203–215.
- Herbert-Cheshire, L., & Higgins, V. (2004). From risky to responsible: Expert knowledge and the governing of community-led rural development. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 20, 289-302.
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hjorth, D. (2005). Organizational entrepreneurship: With de Certeau on creating heterotopias (or spaces for play). *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 14 (4), 386–398.
- Hjorth, D. & Steyaert C. (Eds.), (2004). *Narrative and Discursive Approaches in Entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Honneth, A. (2004). Organized self-realization. Some paradoxes of individualization. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 7 (4), 463-478.
- Joas, H. (1993). *Pragmatism and Social Theory*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Joas, H. (1996). *The Creativity of Action*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Jones, C. & Spicer, A. (2009). *Unmasking the Entrepreneur*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Jost, J. T., & Kruglanski, A. W. (2002). The estrangement of social constructionism and experimental social psychology: History of the rift and prospects for reconciliation. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6 (3), 168-187.
- Keat, R. & Abercrombie, N. (Eds.), (1991). *Enterprise Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (1977). The entrepreneurial personality: A person at the crossroads. *Journal of Management Studies*, 14, 34-57.
- Komulainen, K. (2006). Neoliberal educational policy: A case study of Finnish textbooks of entrepreneurial education. *Nordisk Pedagogik*, 26, 212-228.
- Krueger, N. F. Jr. (2005). The cognitive psychology of entrepreneurship. In Z. J. Acs & D. B. Audretsch (Eds.), *Handbook Of Entrepreneurship Research. An Interdisciplinary Survey and Introduction* (pp. 105-140). New York: Springer.
- Krueger, N., Reilly, M. D., & Carsrud, A. L. (2000). Competing models of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 15, 411–432.
- Lalljee, Mansur, L. B. Brown & G. P. Ginsburg. 1984. Attitudes: Disposition, behaviour or evaluation? *British Journal of Social Psychology* 23(3). 233-244.

- Lemke, T. (2001). 'The birth of bio-politics': Michel Foucault's lecture at the Collège de France on neo-liberal governmentality. *Economy and Society*, 30, 190-207.
- Markman, G. D. (2007). Entrepreneurs' competencies. In R. J. Baum, M. Frese & R. Baron (Eds.), *The Psychology of Entrepreneurship* (pp. 67-92). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Marsden, T. K., Smith, E. (2005). Ecological entrepreneurship: sustainable development in local communities through quality food production and local branding. *Geoforum*, 36 (4), 440-451.
- Miller, P. & Rose, N. (2008). *Governing the Present*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Niemi, J. & Ahlstedt, J. (Eds.), (2010). Finnish Agriculture and Rural Industries 2010. Helsinki: Agrifood Research Finland, Economic Research, Publications 110a.
- OECD (2001). *Multifunctionality. Towards an Analytical Framework*. Paris: OECD.
- Ogbor, J. O. (2000). Mythicizing and reification in entrepreneurial discourse: Ideology-critique of entrepreneurial studies. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37, 605-635.
- Palich, L. E. & Bagby, D. R. (1995). Using cognitive theory to explain entrepreneurial risk-taking: Challenging conventional wisdom. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 10, 425-438.
- Peltonen, M. (1992). *Talolliset ja torpparit. Vuosisadan vaihteen maatalouskysymys Suomessa*. Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura, Historiallisia Tutkimuksia 164.
- Perren, L., & Jennings, P. L. (2005). Government discourses on entrepreneurship: Issues of legitimization, subjugation, and power. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29, 173-184.
- Peters, M. (2001). Education, enterprise culture and the entrepreneurial self: A Foucauldian perspective. *Journal of Educational Enquiry*, 2, 58-71.
- Phillipson, J., Gorton, M., Raley, M., & Moxey, A. (2004). Treating farms as firms? The evolution of farm business support from productionist to entrepreneurial models. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 22, 31-54.
- Phillipson, J., Gorton, M., & Laschewski, L. (2006). Local business co-operation and the dilemmas of collective action: Rural micro-business networks in the North of England. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 46, 40-60.
- Pyysiäinen, J. & Vesala, K. M. (2008). Important trends and required skills in Finland. In P. de Wolf & H. Schoorlemmer (Eds.), *Exploring the Significance of Entrepreneurship in Agriculture*. Frick: Research Institute of Organic Agriculture, FiBL.
- Ploeg, J. D. van der (2003). *The Virtual Farmer: Past, Present and Future of the Dutch Peasantry*. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.
- Ploeg, J. D. van der (2008). *The New Peasantries: Struggles for Autonomy and Sustainability in an Era of Empire and Globalization*. London: Earthscan.
- Ploeg, J. D. van der, Long, A. & Banks, J. (Eds.), (2002). *Living Countrysides. Rural Development Processes in Europe: The State of the Art*. Doetinchem: Elsevier.
- Ploeg, J. D. van der & Marsden, T. (Eds.), (2008). *Unfolding Webs: The Dynamics of Regional Rural Development*. Assen: Van Gorcum.

- Potter, J. & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Potter, C. & Tilzey, M. (2005). Agricultural policy discourses in the European post-Fordist transition: neoliberalism, neomercantilism and multifunctionality. *Progress in Human Geography*, 29 (5), 1–20.
- Pritchard, B. (2005). Implementing and maintaining neoliberal agriculture in Australia (Part I). Constructing neoliberalism as a vision for agricultural policy. *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, 13 (1), 1-14.
- Rauch, A. & Frese, M. (2007). Born to be an entrepreneur? Revisiting the personality approach to entrepreneurship. In R. J. Baum, M. Frese & R. Baron (Eds.), *The Psychology Of Entrepreneurship* (pp. 41-65). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Reicher, S. (2004). The context of social identity: Domination, resistance, and change. *Political Psychology*, 25 (6), 921-945.
- Reicher, S., Haslam, S. A. & Rath, R. (2008). Making a virtue of evil: A five-step social identity model of the development of collective hate. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2 (3), 1313-1344.
- Rose N. (1992). Governing the enterprising self. In P. Heelas & P. Morris (Eds.), *The Values of the Enterprise Culture: The Moral Debate* (pp. 141-164). London: Routledge.
- Rose N. (1993). Government, authority and expertise in advanced liberalism. *Economy and Society*, 22, 283-299.
- Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, N., & Miller, P. (1992). Political power beyond the state: Problematics of government. *British Journal of Sociology*, 43, 173-205.
- Rose, N., O'Malley, P., & Valverde, M. (2006). Governmentality. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 2, 83-104.
- Ross, L. (1977). The intuitive psychologist and his shortcomings: Distortions in the attribution process (pp. 173-220). In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 10. New York: Academic Press.
- Rudmann, C. (Ed.), (2008). *Entrepreneurial Skills and Their Role in Enhancing The Relative Independence of Farmers*. Frick: Research Institute of Organic Agriculture, FiBL.
- Ruuskanen, P. (1999). Rural development policy in Finland in the 1990s: Towards flexible specialization or spatial Taylorism? In C. Kasimis & A. G. Papadopoulos (Eds.), *Local Responses to Global Integration* (pp. 223-244). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Salamon, S. (1992). *Prairie Patrimony. Family, Farming, and Community in The Midwest*. North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Sampson, E. E. (1988). The debate on individualism: Indigenous psychologies of the individual and their role in personal and societal functioning. *American Psychologist*, 43, 15-22.
- Sarasvathy, S. D. (2004). Making It Happen: Beyond Theories of the Firm to Theories of Firm Design. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 28 (6), 519-531.
- Seeman, M. (1997). The elusive situation in social psychology. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 60 (1), 4-13.
- Semin, G. R. & Manstead, A. S. R. (1983). *The Accountability of Conduct. A Social Psychological Analysis*. London: Academic Press.

- Shane, S. & Eckhardt, J. (2005). The individual-opportunity nexus. In Z. J. Acs & D. B. Audretsch (Eds.), *Handbook Of Entrepreneurship Research. An Interdisciplinary Survey and Introduction* (pp. 161-191). New York: Springer.
- Shaver, K. G. (1995). The entrepreneurial personality myth. *Business and Economic Review*, 41, 20-23.
- Shaver, K. G. (2005). The social psychology of entrepreneurial behaviour. In Z. J. Acs & D. B. Audretsch (Eds.), *Handbook Of Entrepreneurship Research. An Interdisciplinary Survey and Introduction* (pp. 331-357). New York: Springer.
- Silvasti, T. (2001). *Talonpojan elämä. Tutkimus elämäntapaa jäsentävistä kulttuurisista malleista*. [Peasant life. A study of the cultural models organizing the way of life.] Helsinki: SKS.
- Skinner, E. (1996). A guide to constructs of control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 549-570.
- Speer, S. A. (2002). What can conversation analysis contribute to feminist methodology? Putting reflexivity into practice. *Discourse & Society*, 13 (6), 783–803.
- Stets, J. E. & Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63, 224–237.
- Stets, J.E. & Burke, P. J. (2003). A sociological approach to self and identity. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of Self and Identity* (pp. 128–152). New York: The Guildford Press.
- Steyaert, C. (2007). ‘Enterpreneuring’ as a conceptual attractor? A review of process theories in 20 years of entrepreneurship studies. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 19, 453-477.**
- Steyaert, C. & Katz, J. (2004). Reclaiming the space of entrepreneurship in society: Geographical, discursive and social dimensions. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 16 (3), 179–196.
- Stevenson, H. H. & Jarillo, J. C. (1991). A new entrepreneurial paradigm. In A. Etzioni & P. R. Lawrence (Eds.) *Socio-Economics. Toward a New Synthesis* (pp. 185-208). Armonk: M.E.Sharpe.
- Starr, J. A. & MacMillan, I. C. (1991). Entrepreneurship, resource cooptation and social contracting. In A. Etzioni & P. R. Lawrence (Eds.) *Socio-Economics. Toward a New Synthesis* (pp. 167-184). Armonk: M.E.Sharpe.
- Storey, D. (2005). Entrepreneurship, small and medium sized enterprises and public policies. In: Z. J. Acs & D. B. Audretsch (Eds.), *Handbook Of Entrepreneurship Research. An Interdisciplinary Survey and Introduction* (pp. 473-511). New York: Springer.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, W. I. & Znaniecki, F. (1974/Originally 1918). *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*. New York: Octagon Books.
- Tilzey, M. (2006). Neo-liberalism, the WTO and new modes of agri-environmental governance in the European Union, the USA and Australia. *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, 14 (1), 1-28.
- Tjeder, D. (2002). When character became capital: The advent of the self-made man in Sweden, 1850-1900. *Men and Masculinities*, 5, 53-79.
- Tönnies, F. (2001/Originally 1887). (Ed. Jose Harris), *Community and Civil Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Vanclay, F. (2003). The impacts of deregulation and agricultural restructuring for rural Australia. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 38 (1), 81-94.
- Vesala, K. M. (1996). *Yrittäjyys ja individualismi: Relationistinen linjaus*. [Entrepreneurship and individualism: A relational alignment]. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopiston Sosiaalipsykologian laitoksen tutkimuksia, 2/1996.
- Vesala, K. M. (2004). Yrittäjyys ja uhkakuvat. EU maanviljelijöiden asenteissa. In: J. Nirkko & K. M. Vesala (Eds.), *Kirjoituksia maan sydämeltä*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Vesala, K. M. (2008). A theoretical and methodological approach to the study of the assessment and development of entrepreneurial skills in the farm context. In K. M. Vesala & J. Pyysiäinen (Eds.), *Understanding Entrepreneurial Skills in the Farm Context*. Frick: Research Institute of Organic Agriculture FiBL.
- Vesala, K. M. and Peura, J. (2005). Presentation of personal control in the rhetoric of farm families engaged in business diversification in Finland. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 36: 443-473.
- Vesala, K. M., & Rantanen, T. (Eds.), (2007a). *Argumentaatio ja tulkinta: Laadullisen asennetutkimuksen lähestymistapa* [Argumentation and Interpretation: The Qualitative Attitude Approach]. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Vesala, K. M., & Rantanen, T. (2007b). Laadullinen asennetutkimus: Lähtökohtia, periaatteita, mahdollisuuksia. [The qualitative attitude approach: Starting points, principles and possibilities.] In: K. M. Vesala & T. Rantanen (Eds.), *Argumentaatio ja tulkinta: Laadullisen asennetutkimuksen lähestymistapa* [Argumentation and Interpretation: The Qualitative Attitude Approach] (pp. 11-61). Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Vesala, K. M. & Pyysiäinen, J. (Eds.), (2008). *Understanding Entrepreneurial Skills in the Farm Context*. Frick: Research Institute of Organic Agriculture, FiBL.
- Vesala, H. T. & Vesala, K. M. (2010). Entrepreneurs and producers: Identities of Finnish farmers in 2001 and 2006. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 26, 21-30.
- Verhees, F. J. H. M. & Meulenbergh, M. T. G. (2004). Market orientation, innovativeness, product innovation and performance in small firms. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 42 (2), 134-154.
- Vihinen, H. (2001). *Recognising Choice. A Study of the Changing Politics of the Common Agricultural Policy through an analysis of the MacSharry Reform Debate in Ireland and the Netherlands*. Helsinki: Agrifood Research Finland, Economic Research (MTTL), Publications 99.
- Vihinen, H. & Vesala, K. M. (Eds.), (2007). *Maatilyritysten monialaistuminen maaseudun elinkeinopolitiikassa ja sen rakentuminen kuntatason kehittämiskohteena*. Maa- ja elintarviketalous 114, Maa- ja elintarviketalouden tutkimuskeskus: Helsinki.
- Warren, L. (2004). Negotiating entrepreneurial identity: Communities of practice and changing discourses. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 5, 25-37.
- Wasson, C. (2004). The paradoxical language of enterprise. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 1 (2), 175-199.
- Watson, T. (2009). Entrepreneurial action, identity work and the use of multiple discursive resources: The case of a rapidly changing family business. *International Small Business Journal*, 27, 251-274.
- Wennekers, S. & Thurik A. R. (1999). Linking entrepreneurship and economic growth. *Small Business Economics*, 13, 27-55.

- Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society*, 9 (3), 387–412.
- Wetherell, M. (2007). A step too far: Discursive psychology, linguistic ethnography and questions of identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11 (5), 661–681.
- Wilson, G.A. (2001). From productivism to postproductivism... and back again? Exploring the (un)changed natural and mental landscapes of European agriculture. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 26 (1), 77–102.
- Wilson, J. (2003). Political discourse. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. E. Hamilton, (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Winter, M. (1996). *Rural Politics: Policies for Agriculture, Forestry & the Environment*. London and New York: Routledge.

APPENDIX A

Interview questions and stimuli presented to the interviewees in the individual interviews in Project 1.¹⁴

-
1. Pitäisikö maatilojen monialaistumista ylipäätään edistää kunnassanne?
[On the whole, should business diversification on farms be facilitated in your municipality?]
 2. A. Kunnassa A elintarvikkeiden jatkojalostus ohjaa maatalouden kehittämistä. Maatilojen muun yritystoiminnan kehittäminen saattaa jäädä tästä syystä vähemmälle huomiolle.
[In municipality A the development of farm businesses is dominated by food processing. The development of other business activities on farms may suffer from this state of affairs.]
B. Kunta B haluaa profiloitua kesämökki- ja kulttuurikunnaksi. Maatilojen muun yritystoiminnan kehittäminen tuntuu jäävän siksi vähemmälle huomiolle.
[Municipality B aims to profile itself with images associated with summer tourism and culture activities. Therefore the development of other business activities on farms seems to receive less attention.]
 3. Hankemuotoinen kehittäminen on tehokas keino maataloilla harjoitettavan yritystoiminnan edistämiseksi.
[Development projects are an effective means to facilitate business activities on farms.]
 4. Maatilojen monialaistumista edistetään parhaiten koulutuksella, neuvonnalla ja tiedottamisella.
[Business diversification on farms is best facilitated through training, counseling and information.]
 5. Maanviljelijöiden verkostoituminen on riittämätöntä monialaisen yritystoiminnan kannalta katsottuna.
[Social networks and networking among farmers are insufficient, if viewed from the perspective of business diversification.]
 6. Maatilojen monialaistuminen on kiinni viljelijöistä itsestään. Sen edistäminen tulisi jättää heidän oman aktiivisuutensa varaan.

¹⁴ The questions and stimuli were originally formulated and discussed in Finnish in the interviews. English translations are provided in brackets.

[Business diversification on farms depends merely on the farmers themselves. The facilitation should thus be left up to the activity of the farmers.]

7. Monialaistumisen edistäminen hoituu tehokkaammin seudullisella kuin kunnallisella tasolla.

[Business diversification on farms can be more effectively facilitated and developed on the level of the region than on the level of the municipality.]

8. Maatiloilla harjoitettavan yritystoiminnan edellytykset riippuvat valtakunnallisen ja EU-tason politiikasta ja markkinoista, eikä niihin siksi voida kunnissa juurikaan vaikuttaa.

[Since the preconditions for the business activities undertaken on farms depend on national and EU-level policies and markets, actions taken on the level of municipality may have only very limited impact.]

9. Mikä on mielestänne maatalouden ja maaseudun välinen suhde?
[What is the relationship between agriculture and the countryside, in your opinion?]

APPENDIX B

Interview questions and stimuli presented to the interviewed farmers in Project 2.¹⁵

ESoF the main study interview

Sheet 1

A few months ago we interviewed experts in six EU-countries (20 interviews in each country), and asked them: What are the most important skills that a farmer needs in order to succeed in the farm business?

[Muutama kuukausi sitten haastattelimme asiantuntijoita kuudessa EU-maassa (20 haastattelua joka maassa) ja kysyimme heiltä: Mitkä ovat tärkeimmät taidot, joita viljelijä tarvitsee menestyäkseen yritystoiminnassaan?]

When we made a synthesis of all the entrepreneurial skills they listed, three kinds of skills emerged.

[Kun teimme yhteenvedon kaikista yrittäjätaidoista joita asiantuntijat toivat esille, ne kiteytyivät kolmenlaisiin taitoihin.]

The aim of this interview is to discuss these skills:

[Tämän haastattelun tarkoituksena on keskustella näistä taidoista:]

Creating and evaluating a business strategy

[Liiketoimintastrategian luominen ja arviointi]

Networking and utilising contacts

[Verkostoituminen ja kontaktien hyödyntäminen]

Recognising and realising opportunities

[Mahdollisuuksien tunnistaminen ja toteuttaminen]

ESoF the main study interview

Sheet 2

Do you have a business strategy and do you evaluate it?

[Onko sinulla liiketoimintastrategia ja arvioitko sitä?]

Do you consider this important?

¹⁵ Originally formulated in English and then translated into (and discussed in the interviews in) the native language of each country. The Finnish translations are provided in brackets.

[*Onko tämä mielestäsi tärkeätä?*]

ESoF the main study interview

Sheet 3

Are you good at networking and utilising contacts?

[*Oletko hyvä verkostoitumisessa ja kontaktien hyödyntämisessä?*]

Is this one of the most important skills, from your own perspective?

[*Onko tämä yksi tärkeimmistä taidoista, omasta näkökulmastasi?*]

ESoF the main study interview

Sheet 4

Are you able to recognise and realise opportunities?

[*Osaatko tunnistaa ja toteuttaa mahdollisuuksia?*]

Is this one of the most important skills, from your own perspective?

[*Onko tämä yksi tärkeimmistä taidoista, omasta näkökulmastasi?*]

ESoF the main study interview

Sheet 5

In your experience, do some farmers have these skills more than others?

[*Onko kokemuksesi mukaan joillain viljelijöillä enemmän näitä taitoja kuin toisilla?*]

If so, what causes the difference?

[*Jos on, niin mistä erot johtuvat?*]

ESoF the main study interview

Sheet 6

How did you develop your own skills?

[*Miten kehität omat taitosi?*]

Why did you develop your own skills?

[*Miksi kehität omia taitojasi?*]

According to the experts whom we interviewed, the development of these skills depends heavily on the attitudes and personality of the farmer.

[Haastattelemiemme asiantuntijoiden mukaan näiden taitojen kehittyminen riippuu paljon viljelijän omista asenteista ja persoonallisuudesta.]

What do you think?

[Mitä ajattelet tästä?]

What could be done to develop these skills among farmers?

[Mitä olisi tehtävissä, jotta nämä taidot kehittyisivät viljelijöiden keskuudessa?]

APPENDIX C

Notations used in the transcription of the interviews:

Notation	Explanation
word.	Dot indicates a downward intonation in the end of an utterance
word,	Comma indicates a constant intonation in the end of an utterance, i.e. brief breaks within or between speech sequences
word?	Question mark indicates an upward intonation in the end of an utterance
wo[rd	Left-side brackets indicate where overlapping talk (between two or more speakers) begins
wo]rd	Right-side brackets indicate where overlapping talk (between two or more speakers) ends
(word)	Word(s) in parentheses are used to indicate transcriber's best estimate of what is being said in an obscure or vaguely heard section
((laughter))	Word(s) in double parentheses are not transcriptions, but are used to indicate transcriber's clarifying remarks, e.g. comments on what is happening in addition to talk (e.g., laughter)
...	Three dots are used to indicate short pauses within talk
<u>word</u>	Underlining is used to indicate an emphasis or accentuation of the underlined word(s) or sound(s)
wo-	Hyphen indicates an interruption of talk or word
- -	Two hyphens indicate a point where some part of the commenting has been omitted