

1 From generation to generation: changing dimensions of intergenerational farm transfer

2

3 Abstract

4

5 The transfer of managerial control between generations on the family farm has long been
6 understood as a critical and often problematic phase, with implications for both the
7 individual farm business and more broadly, the sustainability of family farming systems.
8 Drawing on empirical data from interviews with prospective successors and farmers in
9 Devon, England, the paper provides a contemporary analysis of the transfer of managerial
10 control on family farms. Although in line with traditional conceptualisations, findings
11 reaffirm how many prospective successors were delegated tasks of increasing responsibility,
12 with limited access to the higher responsibility financial management tasks, an emergent
13 cohort of younger prospective successors enjoyed a contrasting progression towards
14 managerial control, involving varied involvement across all aspects of farm management.
15 With reference to late modernity and the individualisation thesis, the paper explores how
16 unconstrained by tradition the emerging cohort described a wealth of off-farm experiences,
17 including what the paper terms short-term diversions, which the analysis reveals have
18 informed and shaped their progression towards managerial control. In view of these
19 findings, the paper offers an alternative and up-to-date conceptualisation of the transfer of
20 managerial control in the form of the succession matrix, before considering the potential
21 applications and some avenues for future research.

22

23 **Key words:** intergenerational farm transfer; family farming; socialisation; transfer of
24 managerial control

25

26 Introduction

27

28 “Twenty years hence the farm boy of today will mainly control the business of the state and
29 nation, as it is now controlled by the farm boy of twenty-five years ago.” (Henry Wallace
30 1897 – see Jack 2008)

31

32 Succession is understood as the transfer of managerial control, during which both physical
33 assets and intangible assets, such as managerial skills and farm-specific knowledge are
34 transferred between generations (Barclay *et al.* 2005). The transfer of managerial control
35 represents a critical phase for the family farm with implications for the individual business
36 and more broadly, the sustainability of family farming systems. Although a wealth of
37 research has documented the effect identifying a successor can have on the farm business
38 trajectory, identifying a successor is only the starting point, and the way in which the
39 prospective successor is brought into the farm business has implications for their eventual
40 ability to run it successfully. Despite the widely propagated importance of a smooth and
41 timely transfer of managerial control to both farm family businesses (Gasson and Errington
42 1993, Lobley 2010, Uchiyama *et al.* 2008, Weston 1977) and family businesses more

43 generally (File and Prince 1996, Morris *et al.* 1997) the process has long been understood as
44 problematic, with progression of the handover often frustrated by the reluctance of the
45 older generation to delegate tasks appropriately. Deprived of the vital knowledge necessary
46 to manage the farm, the unprepared successor is recognised as a palpable threat to the
47 family farm (Gasson *et al.* 1988, Hastings 1984, Uchiyama *et al.* 2008, Weston 1977). Beyond
48 the vitality of millions of individual farm businesses, inefficient transfer of managerial control
49 now, is of aggregate, long-term concern, with potential implications for the family farm's
50 ability to adapt and succeed in response to challenges of the future (Lobley 2010).

51

52 Despite the importance of intergenerational farm transfer, relatively little research has
53 focused on the *process* of transfer itself (Errington and Lobley 2002). Where research does
54 exist, it is based on increasingly outdated research such as the *FARMTRANSFERS* survey and
55 has tended to rely exclusively on the incumbent farmer to understand what is (at least) a
56 two-generation process. Furthermore, the increasing emphasis on the individual, associated
57 with onset of late modernity (Giddens 1991; Beck 1994), has likely, but as yet unexplored,
58 consequences for the nature of intergenerational transfer of managerial control on family
59 farms. Informed by *both* farmer and prospective successor accounts, this paper aims to
60 provide a contemporary analysis of the transfer of managerial control on family farms. The
61 research questions in the context of this paper are: how is managerial control being
62 transferred between generations? Is the transfer of managerial control as problematic as
63 previously observed? Is the ongoing process of modernisation and the accompanying
64 emphasis on the individual impacting on the transfer of managerial control? By way of
65 context, the paper begins by introducing the concept of succession and explores how and
66 why family farming is the most hereditary of occupations, before reviewing the research
67 relating to the transfer of managerial control. Drawing directly on empirical findings, the
68 remaining discussion explores two contrasting types of intergenerational transfer. Situated
69 in the wider individualisation thesis, the discussion considers the reasons behind the
70 contrasting modes of transfer, before considering the wider implications of the findings and
71 avenues for future research.

72

73 **The patterns and stages of managerial transfer: a review**

74

75 Intergenerational farm transfer is a long-established tradition in many Western societies and
76 as such "no other socioeconomic group displays such pronounced occupational heredity as

77 farmers” (de Haan 1994, p. 173). But how does the family farm reproduce itself? The
78 concept of ‘cultural scripts’ (Silvasti 2003), defined as “a culturally shared expression, story
79 or common line of argument, or an expected unfolding of events, that is deemed to be
80 appropriate or to be expected” (Vanclay and Enticott 2011, p. 260) is useful in answering this
81 question. According to Silvasti (2003) the experiences of successors (as well as non-
82 successors – see Cassidy and McGraith 2014) and choices available to them, are determined
83 by the ‘script of continuity’ – the most important script governing farmers’ way of life –
84 which acts as a perpetual and acute organizing force for all members of the farm family. To
85 ensure the farm is continued, parents are forced to allocate the role of the successor to one
86 of their children, typically the eldest son (Silvasti 2003). Identified in view of their birth order
87 and gender, successors are prescribed specific on-farm roles which serve to practically affirm
88 their successor identity (Fischer and Burton 2014) and are subject to limited boundaries
89 from an early age, whilst any children unlikely to succeed to the farm are encouraged to
90 educate themselves, to mix with peers and to construct life outside the farm (Cassidy and
91 McGraith 2014). Socialisation is subtle and iterative (Fischer and Burton 2014) and
92 subsequently, as Gasson and Errington (1993, p. 91) note, family farm successors often
93 exercise little conscious choice in becoming farmers, having “internalized the values of
94 farming at an early age”.

95

96 Following the identification of a successor, succession can wield a powerful influence on the
97 farm business trajectory. A wealth of empirical data has evidenced existence of the
98 ‘succession effect’, which describes the impact expectation of succession has on farm
99 business development, and the ‘successor effect’, which refers to the impact successors
100 themselves have on the business, as they move towards managerial control (Potter and
101 Lobley 1996). In addition to these effects, the transfer of managerial control – specifically
102 the way in which intangible assets such as farm-specific knowledge are transferred – also
103 wields an influence *beyond* the point of transfer, although, as Uchiyama *et al.* (2008)
104 identify, it has received less research effort. It is with this in mind, the paper focuses on the
105 process of managerial transfer.

106

107 The importance of effective succession

108

109 Only having been apportioned appropriate levels of responsibility it is believed the successor
110 will be prepared to manage all aspects of the business post-transfer (Hutson 1987). Slow or

111 fragmented transfer of responsibilities are thought to reduce the next generations'
112 motivation, confidence and eventual competence (Hastings 1984). For Uchiyama *et al.*
113 (2008, p. 45) "failure to be exposed to the vital knowledge necessary to comprehend the
114 inner workings of the farm [...] could pose a threat to the sustainability of the farm".
115 Although a common concern amongst those in the family farming field, in the absence of
116 longitudinal farm-specific research it is necessary to look to more general family business
117 literature to substantiate the relationship between the development of prospective
118 successors and post-transition business performance (see File and Prince 1996, Goldberg
119 1996, Morris *et al.* 1997, Osborne 1991). For example, Morris *et al.* (1997, p. 390) identified
120 that the preparation level of successors, including factors such as, type and amount of work
121 experience formed central factors in determining post-transition business performance on
122 second- and third-generation family businesses. Although measures of business
123 performance, specifically sales, profit and cash flow, are not necessarily representative of
124 'desirable farm performance' *per se*, the evidence from the general family business
125 literature broadly supports a positive relationship between prospective successors' level of
126 preparation and post-succession farm performance. Furthermore, the impact of transfer is
127 thought to be even more pronounced in the family farming context, where the skills and
128 knowledge required are often specific to the idiosyncrasies of each farm holding (Uchiyama
129 *et al.* 2008).

130

131 Patterns and problems

132

133 Although literature on the intergenerational transfer of managerial control emphasises how
134 the patterns of succession can vary (Gasson and Errington 1993, Potter and Lobley 1996,
135 Steiger *et al.* 2012), they point to an *overall* progression of the prospective successor from
136 technical to higher rung financial management tasks and decision making. The idea of a
137 definitive ascension from low to high responsibility tasks, as part of the transfer process was
138 first identified by Commins and Kelleher's (1973) in their study of Irish farmer's succession
139 patterns. Similarly, in the UK, Hastings (1984) documented various patterns of management
140 control transfer. By scoring prospective successors according to the extent of their
141 responsibility for management activities, Hastings identified four main phases to the
142 succession process, each representing an incremental increase in the input to decision
143 making (see Table 1). In the early phase, successors were likely to be involved in day-to-day
144 work planning, supervision of farm staff and decisions regarding the type of machinery. By

145 the fourth phase the level of decision-making becomes considerably enhanced, however,
146 control over the finances typically represents the incumbent farmers' final bastion of status
147 and control and thus the majority of farmers have to wait until their father's death or failing
148 health before the final phase of succession occurs.

149

150 Table 1: Stages in the succession process

151

152 Informed by the findings from their self-completion farmer questionnaires, Errington and
153 Tranter (1991) reaffirmed the Hastings' earlier model (Figure 1). Like Hastings, they
154 identified a progressive handover of different types of decision-making authority, beginning
155 with technical decisions, such as deciding the types of fertiliser or feed to use, and tactical
156 decisions, such as deciding on work methods. Later, the prospective successor is given
157 responsibility over strategic planning tasks, such as capital projects. In the latter stages of
158 the process, the prospective successor becomes involved in financial management tasks,
159 such as the negotiation of sales. As per Hastings observations, the final rung – the decision
160 to pay bills – lies higher than the others and is often only relinquished upon the incumbent's
161 incapacity.

162

163 Figure 1: The succession ladder (Source: Errington and Tranter 1991)

164

165 Completed by over 15,600 farmers (Lobley *et al.* 2010) the *FARMTRANSFERS* postal survey
166 has made a major contribution to understanding the morphology of the succession ladder,
167 corroborating both Hastings' and Errington and Tranter's findings across a number of
168 international settings (see Uchiyama *et al.* 2008; Lobley *et al.* 2010; Lobley 2010). Although
169 the empirical evidence reviewed here points to the reality of a 'ladder' of increasing
170 responsibility, Lobley (2010) expresses his dissatisfaction with the understanding of such a
171 pivotal process, claiming evidence is geographically and methodologically limited.
172 Specifically, Uchiyama *et al.* (2008) call for a range of qualitative approaches that will allow
173 for a more rigorous understanding of the process and, given the insufficient engagement
174 with the prospective successor in previous research (Chiswell 2014a) will afford a more
175 balanced insight.

176

177 Using the concept of endogenous succession cycles, Fischer and Burton (2014, p. 11) offer a
178 unique and holistic understanding of the importance of being able to ascend the succession
179 ladder, suggesting progression allows farm children opportunity to "practically reaffirm their

180 successor identities through both doing and being seen to do increasingly important tasks
181 increasingly well". Their progressive involvement in tasks increases the farmer's dependence
182 on the prospective successors and simultaneously serves to reinforce their commitment to
183 succession.

184

185 Despite the importance of a smooth and timely transfer of managerial control to the farm
186 business, both at an individual business and aggregate, industry level, the progression of the
187 prospective successor through the rungs of increasing responsibility – particularly their
188 progression through higher rung, financial tasks – is understood to be problematic (Errington
189 and Tranter 1991). Weston (1977, p. 239) cited a number of reasons for the incumbent's
190 reluctance, including "fear of his own security, fear of loss of interest in the farm and
191 purpose in life, lack of confidence in his son – or he may have had to wait himself to succeed
192 and so why shouldn't his son have to wait, and so on". Beyond monetary considerations, the
193 loss of 'psychic income' (Gasson and Errington 1993), which includes the non-financial
194 sources of enjoyment associated with being 'the farmer', such as local status, is also difficult
195 to forgo.

196

197 The reluctance of incumbent farmers to incorporate the next generation has been
198 highlighted as a particular problem in England (see Errington and Lobley 2002; Uchiyama *et*
199 *al.* 2008; Lobley 2010), where 'farmer's boy'¹ syndrome – a situation where the prospective
200 successor assumes the role of a hired worker, with little exposure to managerial activities –
201 has been observed in as many as one in five full-time prospective successors over 35 years
202 old (Uchiyama *et al.* 2008). Working *for*, rather than with his father, the farmer's boy has a
203 "potential lack of wider farming knowledge, business and managerial skills, and the
204 motivation required to drive the business forward" when the farmer eventually retires
205 (Lobley *et al.* 2010, p. 61).

206

207 Notwithstanding the farmer's boy syndrome, as suggested above, progression through the
208 higher rungs of the ladder is typically problematic. Retaining control over financial matters
209 gives the incumbent a suitable control mechanism in old age, sustaining their involvement
210 and crucially their identity as 'the farmer' (Hastings 1984). This failure to delegate is
211 pertinent given that the prospective successors' inclusion in higher level management and
212 decision making is thought to have a discernible impact on the trajectory of the farm on the
213 death or incapacity of the farmer.

214

215 Modernisation and the transfer of managerial control

216

217 In pre-modern or traditional society, the individual was a relatively insignificant actor, with
218 decisions tending to be made at the collective level and individualist behaviour considered
219 deviant or idiotic (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002). However, industry's growing demand for
220 an increasingly flexible and mobile workforce began to wane "fixed ties of family,
221 neighbourhood and occupation, as well as from ties to a particular regional culture and
222 landscape" (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002, p. 31). Early modernity, beginning, according to
223 Giddens (1991), at the start of the 17th century, signalled the start of the gradual shift from
224 collective responsibility to individual precedence. Despite an increasing emphasis on the
225 individual, behaviour remained largely determined and organised by collective structures,
226 i.e. class system, gender roles and the family— a period that Giddens (1994, p. 91)
227 understands as a "collaboration between modernity and tradition". It was the later
228 disintegration of these structures – a product of modernisation's own dynamism – that
229 began to distinguish this later phase of modernity apart from its earlier form. To use
230 Giddens's (1994) terminology, these institutions as sources of guidance, were systematically
231 disembedded (taken away) and re-embedded (replaced), by new ways of life that are no
232 longer obligatory nor 'embedded' in tradition, "in which the individuals must produce, stage
233 and cobble together their biographies themselves" (Beck 1994, p. 13). The dissolution of
234 these groupings inherent to late modernity means the individual's identity is no longer
235 grounded in the safety of the family or community and the individual is forced to choose
236 how to be and how to act (Giddens 1994).

237

238 It is important to note at this point, the different terms used to categorise this later phase of
239 modernity (Dawson 2013). Initially, Bauman (1987) described a shift to 'post-modernity' but
240 later acknowledged the term was 'flawed' by implying modernity was over (see Dawson
241 2013), and subsequently switched to the term 'liquid modernity' (Bauman 2000). Beck
242 (1992; 2006) talked of both 'second modernity' and later, the 'cosmopolitan society', and
243 similarly, Giddens has employed various terms, including both 'second' and 'high modernity'
244 (Giddens 1990) as well as 'late modernity'. Gullestad (2004) recognised the 'many problems'
245 with the collection of terminology used to describe (broadly) the (same) emergent social
246 epoch and the time periods to which they apply, suggesting how, "all these theorists argue
247 that there are profound wide-ranging constellations of changes occurring globally since

248 World War II” (Gullestad 2004, p. 8). In response to these difficulties, Gullestad instead
249 refers to the transition from ‘classic modernity’ to a ‘transformed modernity’, which she
250 suggests emerged from around the 1970s and early 1980s in Western society (Gullestad
251 1996; 1997; 2004).

252

253 Without the security of collective based institutions telling individuals what ‘should be
254 done’, individuals have been forced to construct their own life (Giddens 1999). Beck (1994,
255 p. 14) terms this shift in emphasis *individualisation*, which refers to the “disintegration of the
256 certainties of industrial society” and the subsequent “compulsion to find and invent new
257 certainties for oneself without them”. Although individualisation is a contested concept, it is
258 broadly agreed to refer to the way in which identity has transformed from a ‘given’ to a
259 ‘task’ for which the individual is increasingly encouraged to take responsibility for (Dawson
260 2013). Despite a clear shift towards individualisation in many societies, Beck and Beck-
261 Gernsheim (2002, p. 5) recognise “there is no such thing as ‘the’ individualized society”, and
262 that this development has not achieved blanket coverage across the whole population.
263 Specifically, they reference the empirically demonstrable ‘clear differences’ between urban
264 and rural regions with regards to lifestyle and family structure, and suggest individualisation
265 should therefore be understood as a trend, extending to different groups, milieus and
266 regions at different rates.

267

268 Villa (1999) was first to discuss the potential impact of the wider epochal shift on farmers’
269 experiences of succession amongst different generations of farmers in Norway. She
270 recognised how older generation farmers were subordinated to family and farm obligations,
271 whilst the younger generation felt they had a number of opportunities to choose between,
272 owing to an increasing emphasis on freedom and choice. Similarly, in their investigation into
273 parenting practices in farm families, Brandth and Overrein (2013, p. 108) recognised how
274 “older generation of fathers carried out fathering practices in line with the expectation that
275 the children should become good farmers”, whilst in late modern society, the greater
276 emphasis put on individual choice required an entirely different fathering competence for
277 agricultural fathers. Although Fischer and Burton (2014, p. 9) identify a marked shift from
278 “taken for granted expectations of duty and subordination to family farm goals towards a
279 greater emphasis on individual freedom”, they equally contend how farming remained
280 perceived as a ‘blood-based’ occupation. In line with wider criticisms of individualisation
281 which have centred on Beck’s overestimation of the role of the individual in their own life

282 story (see Pilkington 2007; Kelly 2001), the successor in Fischer and Burton's example
283 continued to value, and thus draw on, tradition in his decision-making.

284

285 Although, as per Fischer and Burton's (2014) findings, it is necessary to recognise that the
286 importance of family and tradition has not entirely abated in succession considerations, the
287 shift from the collective to the individual (Villa 1999) is increasingly forcing individuals to
288 construct their own identities by drawing on a wider range of influences. Largely unimpeded
289 by tradition, Chiswell (2014b) identified how, as children and young adults, prospective
290 successors in her sample, are being encouraged to pursue a life beyond the farm, and as a
291 result, see succession far more rationally than previous generations. Despite recognition of
292 the impact of individualisation on the upbringing and experiences of farm children as
293 potential successors, there has been little consideration of how, if at all, the shift away from
294 'family and farm thinking' (Villa 1999) characteristic of late modernity is impacting on the
295 dynamics of intergenerational transfer of managerial control.

296

297 **Research methods**

298

299 The research on which this paper draws was undertaken as part of a wider project into
300 family farm succession. The ensuing discussion utilises data from semi-structured interviews
301 with fourteen incumbent farmers and their prospective successors, defined by Chiswell,
302 (2014a, p. 307) as anyone "(actively) moving towards managerial control of the farm".
303 Interviews were conducted between January-May 2013. Participants were recruited through
304 a local 'key informant', and interviews arranged with farmers regardless of their succession
305 status. Following the initial recruitment, further participants were enrolled from the original
306 sample using a snowball sampling technique. In view of the difficulty many farmers face in
307 handing over managerial control of the farm (Commins 1973; Weston 1977; Riley 2016) and
308 in order to encourage participants, particularly prospective successors, to talk openly and
309 honestly about their experiences without fear of familial repercussions, effort was made to
310 conduct farmer and prospective successor interviews separately².

311

312 The research was conducted in a group of five contiguous parishes in Devon, South West
313 England (Figure 2). The research parishes are located in the Culm area, a distinct landscape
314 characterised by a combination of high rainfall, heavy clay soils and an almost complete
315 absence of surface run-off. This combination of factors has resulted in a distinctive farming

316 landscape, dominated by pasture, and small-scale, family-run dairy, sheep and beef farms.
317 Whilst this distinct context means findings emerging from this research are not entirely
318 generalisable to the wider discussion of the transfer of managerial control, which are likely
319 to vary in different farming contexts, they nonetheless make a valuable contribution to the
320 discussion of intergenerational farm transfer.

321

322 Figure 2: Map of research parishes, Devon (Source: Chiswell, 2014b)

323

324 In response to the appeal from Uchiyama *et al.* (2008) for more qualitative approaches, a
325 range of semi-structured and open questions were utilised. Following some basic questions
326 relating to the farm (size and type) and the participant (age, educational attainment, birth
327 order), subsequent questions required participants to describe the division of
328 tasks/roles/responsibilities on the farm. The openness of the questions led to detailed and
329 diverse narratives. The interviews were conducted by the author, and typically lasted around
330 60-90 minutes.

331

332 Interview recordings were transcribed into Microsoft Word, and subsequently imported into
333 NVivo for thematic analysis. Analysis began during the transcription, during which prominent
334 or recurring themes were noted. Subsequently, a series of nodes were created from salient
335 words, lines, sentences and passages. Themes were decided on according to their general
336 prevalence across the dataset and their relevance to the research questions.

337

338 **Transferring managerial control: divergent modes**

339

340 Conservative transfer of managerial control

341

342 The experiences of a number of prospective successors were consistent with the existence
343 of a ladder of increasing responsibility. In line with previous conceptualisations (Commins
344 and Kelleher 1973; Hastings 1984; Errington and Tranter 1991; Uchiyama *et al.* 2008; Lobley
345 *et al.* 2010; Lobley 2010), these prospective successors described a systematic ascension
346 through different levels of tasks.

347

348 Left school in the early 90s, 91 I think, came straight back ... just working for my
349 Dad, bit like any other workman really ... I was doing the hard work [laughs] and
350 just gradually ended up doing more and more ... I think as the years went by

351 Dad trusted me more and more with various bits and pieces (Prospective
352 Successor 18 – male, late 30s)

353

354 Despite heavy involvement in the day-to-day running of the farm, as previous work has
355 demonstrated (Errington 2002, Gasson and Errington 1993, Lobley 2010), these prospective
356 successors had limited or non-existent input into the financial and long-term investment
357 decisions. The way Prospective Successor 18 concludes ‘we’re not there yet’, confirms the
358 rungs on the ladder are very real ends.

359

360 There's a few things that Mum and Dad, Mum in particular, are still in charge of,
361 like the money ... and I don't know what goes on ... so we're not there yet
362 (Prospective Successor 18 – male, late 30s)

363

364 Prospective successors in this group were typically met by parental resistance during their
365 ascent of the ladder. Critically, according to Fischer and Burton (2014) the ascension of the
366 succession ladder reinforces successor identities. Where progression is met by resistance
367 they suggest it can hinder enjoyment, confidence and ultimately the successful construction
368 of successor identities.

369

370 It took quite a while for Dad and me to find how it was going to work. To start
371 with, he was here all the time, I couldn't do anything, I couldn't just do
372 something, I couldn't just inject a ewe without telling him, and then he'd come
373 over and he'd want to do it (Prospective Successor 5 – male, early 50s)

374

375 The reluctance of the incumbent generation was not exclusive to ‘the farmer’. The
376 reluctance of farmers’ wives was also reported because of the potential threat to their own
377 identity, reflecting both the integral role they play on the farm (Whatmore 1991) and their
378 commitment to the family farm’s survival (Price and Evans 2006). In their work with farm
379 families in mid-Wales, Price and Evans (2006, p. 291) also observed how fears about farm
380 survival were not just a male preserve either – something which they believe is “a reflection
381 of their own patriarchal indoctrination and compliance” and echoes the position of farmers’
382 wives here.

383

384 Especially my Mother [...] the farm means everything to them [...] Mother still
385 isn't happy about you [referring to his wife] going out and her coming in and
386 looking after the children ... even though she doesn't really do anything out
387 there ... she just likes to think, or to be able to tell everyone that she's still out
388 on the farm (Prospective Successor 18 – male, late 30s)

389

390 Despite the associated difficulty, potential successors in this group had all graduated
391 through technical, tactical and strategic tasks, and now broadly all assumed similar positions,
392 poised ready to ascend to the final rung. However, as per previous conceptualisations,
393 transfer of the finances represents a largely unattainable final rung for these prospective
394 successors. As Hastings (1984) reasoned, and was true of farmers associated with this group,
395 financial and management tasks allowed them to monitor and control the farm in old age.

396

397 [You describe you're in the process of the handover or the transition, [...] who
398 does what on the farm?] Oh he does it all, in view of my age really, I can't do
399 very much obviously. All the hard manual stuff [...] But yesterday for example,
400 we knew what was coming, it was time for the rams to go in with the ewes, and
401 sheep to be moved around [...] that's when I get called in to help to move
402 around sheep and drenching. And in the summer I drive the tractor, picking up
403 bails and that [That must be nice to have the best of both worlds and keep your
404 hand in ... do you have any input to the management or the finances?] Yes, I do
405 *all* that at the moment you see (Farmer 5 – male, early 80s)

406

407 Prospective successors in this group were particularly sensitive to the difficulties incumbent
408 farmers were experiencing as they progressed towards succession. Attuned to these
409 difficulties and in order to appease the farmer, they allowed them to maintain their control
410 over the finances. As exemplified by the following example, prospective successors are left
411 with little desire to push the issue of succession at the expense over their parents'
412 contentedness.

413

414 At the moment it's Dad's doing [referring to the finances] and it keeps him
415 involved, so I let him get on with it (Prospective Successor 3 – male, early 50s)

416

417 Prospective successors' acceptance of their parents' continued involvement and reluctance
418 to relinquish higher level control at least in part, stems from their early (and largely
419 unnegotiable) identification as 'the successor' and commitment to communal meanings.
420 Born in the 1960s and 1970s, prospective successors in this group were socialised to assume
421 their successor identity from a young age and followed a predefined path into farming
422 because – as many of them maintained – it was what they were meant to do. Deeply
423 immersed in both family and farm obligations and the overarching, collective goal of
424 sustaining the farm, these 'born to be farmers' had little impetus to question the means of
425 transfer of managerial control and in line with tradition were insentiently following the path
426 that had been set for them by previous generations, leaving the means by which managerial
427 control is being transferred as unquestioned.

428

429 I think, if like me, you've grown up on a farm, you don't know any different, it's
430 your lifestyle and you don't, and you haven't known much else so you carry on
431 in farming (Prospective Successor 4 – male, mid 40s)

432

433 Linked closely to this commitment to the family story was a clear awareness and acceptance
434 of the gendered nature of succession and their identification. As demonstrated in the
435 following quote, the rigid gender discourse associated with intergenerational farm transfer
436 was seen as necessary to ensure the farm is passed on. Acceptance of this as 'the norm' was
437 also observed by Cassidy and McGrath (2014) in their research with non-succeeding farm
438 children. They reported how female non-successors in their cohort were glad and proud that
439 their male siblings would eventually succeed to the farm, even when there was little or no
440 chance of any financial reimbursement for 'their' portion of the farm, because of the
441 collective importance of farm continuity.

442

443 It's just how it works, passing to the son, or the eldest son [...] Well, you wanna
444 pass it on [...] It's what has always happened, the son works on the farm and
445 then takes it over (Prospective Successors 19 – male, late 30s)

446

447 Although, overall participants' descriptions verified existence of a ladder of increasing
448 responsibility, and generally reaffirmed the inaccessibility of the final rung of financial
449 management tasks (as per previous literature), narratives revealed how the introduction of
450 online financial systems was increasingly forcing farmers to delegate *some aspects* of

451 financial management, with implications for our understanding of how higher level aspects
452 of managerial control are being transferred. Delegation of this activity was not through
453 choice, but was a result of the farmer's computer illiteracy.

454

455 [With regards to the books and the finances and the buying and the selling, is
456 that, does that come under your responsibilities?] Most of it, yeah. Well, yeah
457 quite a lot of it I'm still in charge of. I'm not computer literate so that's, I hand it
458 over to them to do that business (Farmer 4 – male, late 60s)

459

460 Although at the time of the interview, prospective successor involvement was limited to a
461 small number of online tasks, the increasing computerisation of farm management, has
462 potential to radically reorder the rungs of the ladder and force the delegation of higher rung,
463 finance-related tasks at earlier stages. Whilst Riley (2009) identified the importance of young
464 children to the adoption and use of on-farm technology, there has been little consideration
465 of how technology is impacting on adulthood and older age intergenerational relations.

466

467 Progressive transfer of managerial control

468

469 Whilst the widely recognised pattern of increasing responsibility, recognised by so many
470 commentators was applicable in the instances outlined above, analysis also revealed a
471 discrete group of prospective successors for whom the succession ladder was largely
472 irrelevant. Unlike members of the conservative cohort, who ascended a clearly defined
473 ladder of increasing responsibility, there was no such pattern for these prospective
474 successors, who, along with their associated farmers, described varied involvement and
475 contribution across all aspects of farm management. Rather than starting at the bottom
476 rung of the succession ladder and ascending, prospective successors in this group appear to
477 have been simultaneously (as opposed to sequentially), incorporated into all aspects of farm
478 management, ranging from the more every day to the executive.

479

480 In comparison to those in the more traditional cohort, prospective successors in the
481 emergent group were much younger. Born in the 1980s and 1990s, they described a notably
482 different upbringing to their older counterparts, characterised instead by freedom and
483 choice, and unimpeded by tradition – a consequence of individualisation, and indicative of
484 the wider societal shift to late modernity reaching rural communities. The change was

485 marked by the way prospective successors talked about farming as a choice and were quite
486 explicit about the way in which farming had to satisfy financial and lifestyle certain
487 conditions.

488

489 I think I'll stay farming in some sort [...] providing I can make money out of it [...]
490 you have to be able to make a living, else it wouldn't justify the hard work ... I
491 will want to be able to have some standard of living, I wouldn't find it hard to
492 walk away from if I couldn't, that's the bottom line (Prospective Successor 23 –
493 male, late 20s)

494

495 Whilst this observation has implications for our understanding of the socialisation of farm
496 children in and of itself (which has been recognised elsewhere, see Villa 1999; Silvasti 2003;
497 Fischer and Burton 2014), beyond this, the ensuing section focuses on how the extension
498 and proliferation of late modernity to and within rural communities has had implications for
499 the way in which managerial control is being transferred between the generations.

500

501 This shift assimilates with Brandth and Overrein's (2013, p. 107) suggestion that the
502 positional family has become weakened following their observations of younger farmers, for
503 whom tradition and status no longer played a strong role in raising their children. In his
504 interviews with farm children (aged 7-15) Riley (2009, p. 254) observed how from a young
505 age, children were able to employ 'micro-strategies' "in order to subvert narratives of the
506 family farm and seek alternative and new pathways for themselves". Critically, and what is
507 echoed amongst the progressive successors in this research, is Riley's (2009) suggestion that
508 rather than being positioned within a rigid patrilineal system, within which intergenerational
509 and gendered discourses remain unquestioned, farm children are able to forge their own
510 identities and places within it. Similarly, Fischer and Burton (2014) recognised how farm
511 children had developed the ability to accept, reject and modify ways in which they are seen
512 and identified, although they attested how "family farm history and, associated with this, a
513 sense of place and attachment to the farm play an important role" (p.425). It would appear
514 the experiences of the younger prospective successors interviewed in this research go
515 beyond the freedom observed by Riley and subsequently Fischer and Burton; rather than
516 subtly forging their own identities as Riley describes, they were actively and confidently
517 constructing entirely new identities, with minimal reference to their family stories (as
518 encouraged by their parents).

519

520 Liberated from communal meanings and ascribed roles, unlike their older counterparts, all
521 but one of these prospective successors did not automatically nor immediately return to the
522 farm after compulsory education. Instead, the majority described varied experiences, often
523 explicitly encouraged by their parents, including further or higher education (typically
524 unrelated to agriculture), short- to medium-term non-agricultural work and often a
525 prolonged period of foreign travel.

526

527 Dad encouraged us to go away, go travelling first, see other places, see other
528 things, before we decided ... so I think it was when I came back from travelling,
529 it was what I'd decided to do (Prospective Successor 23 – male, late 20s)

530

531 We didn't really want the sons to come home straight on the farm, so we said
532 either go and work for somebody else or get an education, and you know,
533 rather than just fall into it (Farmer 23 – male, mid 40s)

534

535 By pursuing a short-term diversion before making a 'u-turn' back into farming, the threat of
536 these prospective successors being 'tempted away' by off-farm careers has become very
537 real. Their experiences and qualifications, afforded by this emergent foregrounding of the
538 individual – characteristic of late modernity – have made them increasingly employable and
539 connected beyond farming (particularly in comparison to their older counterparts, with far
540 narrower experiences).

541

542 I've got my degree and that, I'd like to make use of it, but I'm sort of like got my
543 options open [...] I'm just still taking it day by day really (Prospective Successor 2
544 – male, late 20s)

545

546 It is an awareness of what their prospective successors *could* be doing that distinguishes
547 between the different rates of the transfer of managerial control observed. In recognition of
548 their prospective successors' options, incumbent farmers in the sample expressed a need to
549 privilege prospective successors to many of the aspects of running the farm business, to
550 safeguard their long-term interest in the farm and thus, the eventual likelihood of
551 succession. As Weston (1977) observed, a significant cause of dissatisfaction among
552 prospective successors is their exclusion from management decisions; by remedying this,

553 incumbent farmers are helping maintain their interest in and commitment to the farm
554 business. In response to his daughter's ability to 'do anything' career-wise, Farmer 20 – who
555 by his own admission described himself as a 'modern farmer' – recounted his desire to offer
556 her freedom on the farm.

557

558 I'm quite a modern, what I call quite a modern farmer ... but you see some of
559 'em, the Grandad's who's farming in his eighties, but it's no good is it? [No, it
560 isn't, it's what we call the 'farmer's boy' problem, where the farmer is still
561 hanging onto the reins of the farm] Yeah it's no good [...] Yeah it's like anything
562 ... if I were like that, if I was like that with her, didn't give her freedom, she
563 wouldn't be interested ... and I don't think I'd expect 'er to be, you know, she's
564 a capable girl, she could do anything, she's bright ... and you've gotta have
565 these new ideas 'cause our industry is just moving on all the time (Farmer 20 –
566 male, late 40s)

567

568 In response to this need, prospective successors in this group appear to have been granted
569 input into and responsibility for some of the higher rung financial aspects of the business,
570 such as negotiating sales, involvement in capital projects and responsibility over bills and
571 payments, traditionally thought to occur in the latter stages of the process. For example, one
572 of the youngest prospective successors in the cohort spoke of how she was largely in charge
573 of dealing with sales representatives.

574

575 I deal mostly with the reps and stuff now, so he trusts me with it (Prospective
576 Successor 20 – female, early 20s)

577

578 She does all of the selling now, I don't do nothing with that side of things
579 (Farmer 20 – male, late 40s)

580

581 Although prospective successors in this group differ from their older counterparts because
582 of their inclusion in higher level tasks, a further difference lies in the *nature* of this
583 involvement. Rather than working *for* the farmer, prospective successors were influential
584 and instrumental actors in terms of the management of the farm business. As Farmer 20
585 suggests, his prospective successor's involvement in costing has 'made a big difference' to
586 the running of the farm, and notably, he felt he was learning from her input:

587

588 She's very good, she's costing everything now, which opens my eyes, she, you
589 know she can tell you herself, exactly what the lambs have made and what the
590 cattle have averaged [...] and she's quite a bright kid, she costs a lot of stuff,
591 she's into buying a lot of the stuff that we use, she's on the farm trying to get
592 the best deal, which makes a big difference to me (Farmer 20 – male, late 40s)

593

594 Although Farmer 23 described his struggle to delegate responsibilities to his sons, he also
595 described how he felt he had to delegate decision making and 'change significantly', "to
596 allow different ideas and different ambitions to come through". Although a difficult process
597 for him, it was done to safeguard the likelihood of succession – or act to tie the farm's future
598 to that of the successor.

599

600 It's actually been the most difficult thing I've ever had to do, 'cause I've always
601 done stuff for myself and just make a decision and do it basically [...] but it is
602 much more difficult, to sort of delegate to be able to go with different decisions
603 [...] I've found that the most difficult thing I've done, but having said that, I
604 really want to make it work, but, so yes, we have, we've had to change
605 significantly really, what we do, to try and give responsibility or to allow, to
606 allow different ideas and different ambitions to come through (Farmer 23 –
607 male, mid 40s)

608

609 The level of input enjoyed by these prospective successors – to use Fischer and Burton's
610 (2014, p. 430) terminology – 'tied the farm's future to that of the successor'. As was also
611 observed by Fischer and Burton in their case study, input into the way things are done on
612 the farm increases prospective successors' enjoyment, whilst the incumbent farmers'
613 coinciding willingness to commit to the prospective successors' ideas boosts their
614 confidence, ultimately acting to reinforce their successor identity.

615

616 Prospective successors' experiences did not only impact on farmers' perceptions of their
617 capabilities, but also – in the case of this sample – shaped farmers' perceptions and
618 expectations of their own relationship with the farm in old age. In comparison to fathers of
619 older prospective successors who struggled to consider retirement, a number of fathers of

620 the younger cohort were, in the most part, looking forward to retirement and opportunities
621 available to them.

622

623 If my son chooses not to farm, I won't hang around, you know, I'm in my late
624 fifties now, so I will want a proper retirement [...] I love it here [...] but I'd like
625 [...] some sort of retirement, away from the farm here (Farmer 2 – male, late
626 50s)

627

628 In these instances, the experiences of prospective successors have opened up the incumbent
629 generations' eyes to and (secondarily) connected these farmers to what Brandth and
630 Overrein (2013) term 'new arenas' beyond the farming context. For example, Farmer 2
631 talked of his daughter's experiences moving to a nearby city to work and remarked that
632 having helped her during her move he has since even been able to envisage a happy
633 retirement there.

634

635 My daughter lives in [suburb of nearby city], right next to the park, backs onto
636 the park there, and it's lovely, I just love it there, maybe it's because I helped
637 her do her garden when they bought the house (Farmer 2 – male, late 50s)

638

639 The often vast experiences of prospective successors have connected farmers to these 'new
640 arenas', fostering an openness to new experiences amongst them and allowing them to see
641 beyond life as a farmer. If we understand a major difficulty associated with retirement is the
642 "change in the pattern of his³ activities, interests and time" (Commins 1973, p. 45), their
643 exposure to alternative places and activities, via their children, has helped farmers to
644 envisage the possible activities, interests and time available to them in retirement. The
645 connection between farmers and these new domains, forged through the experiences of
646 their children has fuelled a nascent desire to move towards succession/retirement.
647 Combined with the *need* to accommodate and give responsibility to the prospective
648 successor, as outlined above, increasing prospective successors' involvement in business
649 tasks has become both necessary *and* in part, desirable in these cases.

650

651 Although analysis broadly indicated the existence of this older-younger dichotomy, it is
652 worth noting the experiences of Prospective Successor 14, who, despite being one of the
653 youngest in the cohort, following his father's sudden exit from the industry following the

654 foot and mouth disease (FMD) crisis, assumed a direct route into farming. Although, like his
655 younger counterparts, he enjoyed involvement in a range of tasks and was under pressure to
656 inherit responsibility for financial tasks from his grandfather, it stemmed from his
657 grandfather's increasing infirmness and the absence of a 'middle generation'. In this case the
658 incumbent farmer saw a second chance for succession in his grandson and has thus
659 delegated tasks and responsibilities to him, to safeguard the future of the family farm, after
660 it had previously looked so unlikely. This case provides a useful reminder of the importance
661 of the individual and individual circumstances driving succession decisions and processes,
662 and highlights the continued need to utilise qualitative methods that allow for these
663 nuances to emerge.

664

665 Whilst the experiences of prospective successors in this group do partially assimilate with
666 the idea of a 'flat' conveyance of responsibility – where there is less differentiation between
667 lower and higher rung tasks, as observed by Uchiyama and Whitehead (2012) on Japanese
668 farms – rather than a defined ascent through a consecutive list of tasks of increasing
669 responsibility, the *succession matrix* is proposed as a means of conceptualising the
670 succession experiences of this emergent progressive group within the research community
671 (Figure 3). The matrix does not rank tasks or activities according to level of responsibility, but
672 denotes how the prospective successor can enjoy different levels of responsibility for or
673 involvement in different types of tasks upon their return to the farm; involvement and
674 responsibility which increases (at different speeds) over time, in accordance with their
675 interests and experiences. For example, rather than being limited to a progression from low
676 to high responsibility tasks, as depicted in the hypothetical scenario in Figure 3, the
677 prospective successor might be largely responsible for different aspects of the farm
678 business, including financial decisions and management (traditionally considered a high-rung
679 task). The succession matrix does not replace the succession ladder which as evidenced in
680 the preceding discussion aligns closely with the experiences of the older cohort, but seeks to
681 conceptualise the emergent experiences of prospective successors – a product of their
682 upbringing and the shift from collective to individual thinking.

683

684 Figure 3: 'The succession matrix' (based on Errington and Tranter 1991)

685

686 By pressurising the incumbent generation to sustain prospective successors' engagement
687 and opening their eyes to retirement possibilities beyond farming, short-term diversions are

688 both smoothing and accelerating the transfer of managerial control between the
689 generations and assuring the next generation is adequately prepared to manage all aspects
690 of the farm business. More broadly, by accelerating the transfer of managerial control, the
691 influence of the short-term diversion has potential to lower the average age of UK farmers,
692 abating longstanding concern surrounding the ageing farming population (see ADAS *et al.*
693 2004, Errington and Lobley 2002, Williams and Farrington 2006).

694

695 **Conclusion**

696

697 Informed by both farmer and prospective successor accounts, this paper has attempted to
698 provide a contemporary exploration of the transfer of managerial control on family farms.
699 The paper has begun to respond to a number of shortfalls in the intergenerational farm
700 transfer literature, including scant (and where existing, increasingly outdated) research into
701 the *process* of managerial control itself, insufficient engagement with the prospective
702 successor during data collection and the dominance of quantitative methodologies in the
703 field. Having engaged with both farmers and their prospective successors in semi-structured
704 interviews, analysis identified two distinct ways in which managerial control was being
705 transferred between the generations, attributing differences to the shift in emphasis from
706 discipline to expressivity characteristic of late modernity and the overarching process of
707 individualisation. Although it is important to consider these results emerge from a
708 numerically small study, these findings have important implications for our understanding of
709 the transfer of managerial control on family farms, as well as understanding of family farm
710 succession and the socialisation of farm children more generally.

711

712 In line with previous findings, the paper firstly documented the difficulty many prospective
713 successors have had in moving towards the managerial control of their respective family
714 farms, reaffirming the existence of the succession ladder. Although frustrated by the lack of
715 insight into higher rung tasks, having been indoctrinated to family farm thinking, these
716 prospective successors accepted the means of transfer and appeased farmers' desire to
717 maintain control. Although participants' narratives depicted the prospective successors'
718 ascension through a hierarchical list of tasks in line with previous conceptualisations, as has
719 been demonstrated, an increasing trend towards computer-based and online farm
720 administration is forcing this dynamic to change. Having highlighted this change, a potential
721 avenue of future research may be to understand how a further (and likely) move towards

722 computerisation will impact on the transfer of managerial control for this cohort. Although
723 longitudinal work with the farming community is necessary to verify and explore the longer-
724 term implications of the types of transfer of managerial control identified here, in line with
725 longstanding beliefs from commentators in the farm-succession field and evidence from
726 family business research, it has been contended that the failure of incumbent farmers to
727 expose prospective successors to many – typically financial – aspects of farm management,
728 provides them with insufficient experience to safeguard the running of the farm.
729 Notwithstanding the longstanding concern over the efficiency of the transfer of managerial
730 control, this paper makes a fresh appeal for longitudinal research to explore the implications
731 of the means of intergenerational farm transfer, given the mounting pressure on the
732 agricultural industry to meet the litany of demands associated with a growing global
733 population.

734

735 In addition to the traditional cohort, a distinct group of prospective successors emerged,
736 who were characterised by varying involvement across different farm management tasks,
737 including a number of financial responsibilities. The succession matrix is presented as an
738 alternative to the succession ladder in view of the emergent cohort. It is hoped to encourage
739 both academics and practitioners in the area of farm business transfer to recognise and
740 evaluate different (or less traditional) approaches to and means of transfer. Younger than
741 their counterparts, prospective successors in this emergent group were not governed by
742 family farm thinking – a freedom which this paper attributes to the wider and ongoing
743 process of individualisation – and were instead encouraged to pursue their own interests. As
744 a result of this freedom, they were typically granted huge freedom to pursue a range of
745 opportunities away from the farm. Having pursued short-term diversions, analysis revealed
746 how, in recognition of their employability and connections beyond farming, incumbent
747 farmers have been forced to delegate responsibilities to ensure their prospective successors
748 remain active, challenged and ultimately interested in the farm. Incorporated in various
749 aspects of the farm business upon return, with opportunity to gain both experience and
750 confidence, the short-term diversionary route into farming provides a good model for
751 succession, helping safeguard efficient farming, post-handover. Whilst the emergence of this
752 group points to the likely influence of individualisation, it is unlikely to have had a universal
753 impact, varying in nature across different locations and as well as across different farm
754 types. This provides an obvious avenue for future research to uncover the extent of these
755 differences across Britain and Europe’s diverse farming contexts.

756

757 Although recognising the influence of the short-term diversionary route into farming has
758 implications for our understanding of family farm succession, beyond this it provides much
759 to consider for policymakers, advisers and educators. Could short-term diversions become
760 financially incentivised, or incorporated into agricultural courses? Although the resulting
761 incorporation of younger prospective successors into tasks of varying responsibility is
762 presumed as beneficial to the sustainability of these family farms post-succession,
763 paradoxically the manifest influence of individualisation evidenced here also raises concerns
764 about the transfer of family farms to future generations of farm children. Specifically, will
765 the continued trend towards individualisation eventually outweigh the interest of future
766 prospective successors in the farm entirely? Will these, albeit currently beneficial, wider
767 experiences eventually undermine future prospective successors' relationship with the farm
768 entirely? Whilst the emergence of this progressive group is welcomed amid longstanding
769 concern, it should not overshadow the difficulties faced by the older cohort as they seek
770 managerial control and the potential threat this is to the sustainability of the farm business.
771 Having highlighted their experiences as potentially problematic, efforts need to be made to
772 target advice, training and support for prospective successors in this age group, in order to
773 ensure they are adequately prepared to maintain (or improve) the strength and
774 competitiveness of the family farm.

775

776 Intergenerational farm transfer is of international significance and its prominence alone
777 warrants continued research effort. Furthermore, as Henry Wallace's point adduces in the
778 opening sentence of this paper, prospective successors are the farmers of tomorrow; given
779 the numerous demands on the agricultural industry, it is imperative that we understand how
780 the patterns of transfer in place now could influence the sustainability and resilience of
781 family farming systems, as well as the ability of the industry to responding to the challenges
782 of the future.

783

784 **Acknowledgements**

785

786 This paper emerges from my doctoral research, funded by the John Oldacre Foundation. I
787 would like to thank colleagues at the Land, Environment, Economics and Policy Institute –
788 particularly Professor Matt Lobley – for their input into earlier versions of the paper. I would

789 also like to thank the two anonymous reviewers whose valuable comments and suggestions
790 helped improve the manuscript.

791

792 **Notes**

793

794 1. 'Farmer's boy' (rather than a gender neutral term) simply reflects Gasson and Errington's
795 (1993) terminology. Although the term 'boy' was used by Gasson and Errington to reflect
796 typical scenarios, the term can be applied to females and simply denotes successor
797 experience, which is not gender specific.

798 2. Although this was not possible on two occasions and interviews were conducted together.

799 3. Or hers.

800

801 **References**

802

803 ADAS, University of Plymouth, Queen's University Belfast and Scottish Agricultural College
804 (2004) *Entry to and exit from farming in the United Kingdom* (Wolverhampton: ADAS
805 Consulting Limited)

806 Barclay, E., R. Foskey and I. Reeve (2005) *Farm succession and inheritance: comparing*
807 *Australian and international research* (University of New England: Institute for Rural
808 Futures)

809 Bauman, Z. (1987) *Legislators and Interpreters: On Modernity, Post-Modernity and*
810 *Intellectuals* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press)

811 Bauman, Z. (2000) *Liquid Modernity* (Malden, MA: Polity Press)

812 Beck, U. (1992) *Risk Society – Towards a New Modernity* (London: Sage)

813 Beck, U. (1994) The reinvention of politics: towards a theory of reflexive modernization. pp.
814 1-56 in U. Beck, A. Giddens and S. Lash eds., *Reflexive modernization: politics,*
815 *tradition and aesthetics in the modern social order* (Cambridge: Polity Press)

816 Beck, U. (2006) *The Cosmopolitan Vision* (Cambridge: Polity Press)

817 Beck, U. and E. Beck-Gernsheim (2002) *Individualization: Institutionalized individualism and*
818 *its social and political consequences* (London: SAGE Publications Ltd)

819 Brandth, B. and G. Overrein (2013) Resourcing children in a changing rural context: fathering
820 and farm succession in two generations of farmers. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 53(1) pp. 95-
821 111

822 Cassidy, A. and B. McGrath (2014) The Relationship between 'Non-successor' Farm Offspring
823 and the Continuity of the Irish Family Farm. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 54(4) pp. 399-416

824 Chiswell, H.M. (2014a) The importance of next generation farmers: a conceptual framework
825 to bring the potential successor into focus. *Geography Compass*, 8(5) pp. 300-312

826 Chiswell, H.M. (2014b) *Rising to the food security challenge: An investigation into family*
827 *farm succession in the South West of England*. PhD thesis, University of Exeter

828 Commins, P. (1973) *Retirement in agriculture* (Dublin: Macra Na Feirme)

829 Commins, P. and C. Kelleher (1973) *Farm inheritance and succession* (Dublin: Marca na
830 Feirme)

831 Dawson, M. (2013) The Political Sociology of Late Modernity: Political Individualization. in
832 M. Dawson ed., *Late Modernity, Individualization and Socialism: An Associational*
833 *Critique of Neoliberalism* (London: Palgrave Macmillan)

- 834 De Haan, H. (1994) *In the shadow of the tree: kinship, property and inheritance among farm*
835 *families* (Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis)
- 836 Errington, A. (2002) *Handing over the reins: a comparative study of intergenerational farm*
837 *transfers in England, France and Canada*, in, *Xth EAAE Congress Exploring Diversity in*
838 *the European Agri-Food System* (Zaragoza, Spain: EAAE)
- 839 Errington, A. and M. Lobley (2002) *Handing over the reins: a comparative study of*
840 *intergenerational farm transfers in England, France, Canada and USA*, in, *Agricultural*
841 *Economics Society Conference* (Aberystwyth, Wales: EAAE)
- 842 Errington, A. and R. Tranter (1991) *Getting out of farming? Part two: the farmers* (Reading
843 University: Farm Management Unit)
- 844 File, K. and R. Prince (1996) *Attributions for family business failure: the heir's perspectives.*
845 *Family Business Review*, 9(2) pp. 171-184
- 846 Fischer, H. and R.J.F. Burton (2014) *Understanding farm succession as socially constructed*
847 *endogenous cycles.* *Sociologia Ruralis*, 54(4) pp. 417-438
- 848 Gasson, R. and A. Errington (1993) *The farm family business* (Oxon: CAB International)
- 849 Gasson, R., G. Crow, A. Errington, J. Hutson, T. Marsden and M. Winter (1988) *The farm as a*
850 *family business: a review.* *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 39(1) pp. 1-41
- 851 Giddens, A. (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity)
- 852 Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and self identity: self and society in the late modern age*
853 (Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Basil Blackwood)
- 854 Giddens, A. (1994) *Living in a post-traditional society.* pp. 56-109 in U. Beck, Giddens, A., and
855 Lash, S. ed., *Reflexive modernization: politics, tradition and aesthetics in the modern*
856 *social order* (Cambridge: Polity Press)
- 857 Giddens, A. (1999) *Runaway World* (London: Profile Books Ltd)
- 858 Goldberg, S. (1996) *Research note: effective successors in family-owned businesses:*
859 *significant elements.* *Family Business Review*, 9(2) pp. 185-197
- 860 Gullestad, M. (1996) *From Obedience to Negotiation: Dilemmas in the Transmission of*
861 *Values Between the Generations in Norway.* *The Journal of the Royal*
862 *Anthropological Institute*, 2(1) pp. 25-42
- 863 Gullestad, M. (1997) *From 'being of use' to 'finding oneself': dilemmas of value transmission*
864 *between the generations in Norway.* pp. 202-218 in M. Gullestad and M. Segalen
865 eds., *Family and kinship in Europe* (London: Pinter)
- 866 Gullestad, M. (2004) *Imagined childhoods: modernity, self and childhood in autobiographical*
867 *accounts* in, Institute for Social Research, ISF paper 2004
- 868 Hastings, M.R. (1984) *Succession on farms.* MSc Thesis, Cranfield Institute of Technology, UK
- 869 Hutson, J. (1987) *Fathers and sons: family farms, family businesses and the farming industry.*
870 *Sociology*, 21(2) pp. 215-229
- 871 Jack, Z. (2008) *Uncle Henry Wallace: Letters to farm families* (West Lafayette, Indiana:
872 Purdue University Press)
- 873 Kelly, P. (2001) *Youth at Risk: processes of individualisation and responsabilisation in the risk*
874 *society Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 22(1) pp. 23-33
- 875 Lobley, M. (2010) *Succession in the family farm business.* *Journal of Farm Management*,
876 13(pp. 839-851
- 877 Lobley, M., J. Baker and I. Whitehead (2010) *Farm succession and retirement: some*
878 *international comparisons.* *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community*
879 *Development*, 2(2) pp. 49-64
- 880 Morris, M.H., R.O. Williams, J.A. Allen and R.A. Avila (1997) *Correlates of success in family*
881 *business transitions.* *Journal of Business Venturing*, 12(5) pp. 385-401
- 882 Osborne, R.L. (1991) *Second-generation entrepreneurs: passing on the baton in the privately*
883 *held company.* *Management Decision*, 29(1) pp. 42-46

884 Pilkington, H. (2007) In good company: risk, security and choice in young people's drug
885 decisions. *Sociological Review*, 55(2) pp. 373-392

886 Potter, C. and M. Lobley (1996) Unbroken threads? Succession and its effects on family
887 farms in Britain. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 36(3) pp. 286-306

888 Price, L. and N. Evans (2006) From 'as good as gold' to 'gold diggers': farming women and
889 the survival of British family farming. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 46(4) pp. 280-298

890 Riley, M. (2009) 'The next link in the chain': children, agri-cultural practices and the family
891 farm. *Children's Geographies*, 7(3) pp. 245-260

892 Riley, M. (2016) Still Being the 'Good Farmer': (Non-)retirement and the Preservation of
893 Farming Identities in Older Age. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 56(1) pp. 96-115

894 Silvasti, T. (2003) Bending borders of gendered labour division on farms: the case of Finland.
895 *Sociologia Ruralis*, 43(2) pp. 154-166

896 Steiger, T., J. Eckert, N. Reid and P. Ross (2012) Cultivating narratives: cultivating successors.
897 *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, 2(2) pp. 89-105

898 Uchiyama, T. and I. Whitehead (2012) Intergenerational farm business succession in Japan.
899 pp. 55-75 in Lobley M., J. Baker and I. Whitehead eds., *Keeping it in the family:
900 international perspectives on succession and retirement on family farms* (Surrey:
901 Ashgate)

902 Uchiyama, T., M. Lobley, A. Errington and S. Yanagimura (2008) Dimensions of
903 intergenerational farm business transfers in Canada, England, the USA and Japan.
904 *Japanese Journal of Rural Economics*, 10(1) pp. 33-48

905 Vanclay, F. and G. Enticott (2011) The role and functioning of cultural scripts in farming and
906 agriculture. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 51(3) pp. 256-271

907 Villa, M. (1999) Born to be farmers? changing expectations in Norwegian farmers' life
908 courses. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 39(3) pp. 328-342

909 Weston, W.C. (1977) The problems of succession. *Farm Management*, 3(5) pp. 237-247

910 Whatmore, S.J. (1991) *Farming women: gender, work and the family enterprise* (London:
911 Macmillan)

912 Williams, F. and J. Farrington (2006) Succession and the future of farming: problem or
913 perception, in, *The Rural Citizen: Governance, Culture and Well-being in the 21st
914 Century Conference* (Plymouth: University of Plymouth)

915