



**ROBERT GORDON
UNIVERSITY • ABERDEEN**

OpenAIR@RGU

The Open Access Institutional Repository at Robert Gordon University

<http://openair.rgu.ac.uk>

This is an author produced version of a paper published in

Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global
Economy (ISSN 1750-6204)

This version may not include final proof corrections and does not include
published layout or pagination.

Citation Details

Citation for the version of the work held in 'OpenAIR@RGU':

SMITH, R., 2012. Developing and animating enterprising
individuals and communities: A case study from rural
Aberdeenshire, Scotland. Available from *OpenAIR@RGU*. [online].
Available from: <http://openair.rgu.ac.uk>

Citation for the publisher's version:

SMITH, R., 2012. Developing and animating enterprising
individuals and communities: A case study from rural
Aberdeenshire, Scotland. *Journal of Enterprising Communities:
People and Places in the Global Economy*, 6 (1), pp. 57-83

Copyright

Items in 'OpenAIR@RGU', Robert Gordon University Open Access Institutional Repository,
are protected by copyright and intellectual property law. If you believe that any material
held in 'OpenAIR@RGU' infringes copyright, please contact openair-help@rgu.ac.uk with
details. The item will be removed from the repository while the claim is investigated.

Developing and animating enterprising individuals and communities: a case study from rural Aberdeenshire, Scotland

Robert Smith, Reader in Entrepreneurship, Aberdeen Business School, The Robert Gordon University, Garthdee Road, Aberdeen, AB10 7EQ

1.0. INTRODUCTION.

Issues of community entrepreneurship and development are central to our understanding of enterprising communities, peoples and places (Johannisson, 1990, Johannisson, 2007; Williams, 2007; Cooney, 2008; Stiles and Cameron, 2009; and Saunders and Dalziel, 2010). Indeed, entrepreneurship is an essential element in both regional and community development (Hindle, 2010), but our appreciation of exactly what actions and activities constitute entrepreneurship *per-se* is blurring as entrepreneurship theory matures and perhaps re-fragments. In considering issues affecting community development and socio-economic growth, entrepreneurship and community can come into conflict, particularly in rural areas affected by socio-economic decline. For example - entrepreneurship by its very nature initiates change which can alter rural traditions and threaten the rural idyll (Mingay, 1989). This can result in the closure of shops, business and services being denuded (Smith, 2008) but entrepreneurship alone cannot explain socio-economic growth.

Increasingly, models of economic growth which once stimulated business generation and regeneration no longer do so, accentuating the importance of developing new models of social and community enterprise. Simultaneously, theories of community based entrepreneurship and social enterprise as explanatory variables are emerging. These new theoretical variations on the theme of entrepreneurship are being used to label and explain all sorts of individual and collective enterprising behaviour enacted within our

communities. In some instances, the theoretical and rhetorical arguments underpinning these re-conceptualisations have to be stretched to permit such restorying of social action (Ollerenshaw and Creswell, 2002). Often the resultant explanations are not entirely convincing to scholars or practitioners alike. Is there a missing variable?

Consequentially, to identify the missing variable this case study reports on the activities of the Buchan Development Partnership (BDP) - a community based organisation situated in the Buchan area of Aberdeenshire, Scotland. In particular it articulates how individual and community enterprise can be utilised to develop enterprising individuals and communities by growing enterprises organically. The case bridges issues of entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial process, community and regional development and tells a story of community regeneration through the process of 'Animateurship' storying this process as it occurred over a five year period in a rural development partnership using a narrative based case study methodology to examine the activities and growth strategies used to foster and encourage the development of enterprising individuals and communities.

In doing so, this paper challenges existing conceptualisations of community based entrepreneurship and social enterprise by arguing that social entrepreneurship alone cannot explain all social aspects of entrepreneuring. This paper is set within the context of individual and community needs and enterprise as a means of responding to societal needs by engaging in wider notions of 'enterprise' as envisaged by Gibb (2002) because entrepreneurship is not solely the prerogative of business but is a community activity practiced by people in everyday situations and in this case - community workers and the community. This case explores how the workers and the community can be supported in

their development; and how community development can help regenerate, regeneration (Hoban and Beresford (2001).

This article is organized as follows. In the literature review section the author presents contrasting models of community regeneration – the traditional model and the community based enterprise model. Thereafter a methodology section explains the methods used to analyse the case study. This is followed by an analysis of the case to articulate what the story tells us about community. It introduces the concept of community animatorship as an explanatory variable and concludes with implications for theory and practice.

2.0. REVIEWING THE LITERATURE ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The literature on community development spans the literatures of regional development; community work; social enterprise; and locality. Korsching and Allen (2004) argue that local entrepreneurial initiatives have tremendous potential as economic development tools for rural communities with stagnating, or declining economies. Moreover, Lichtenstein, Lyons and Kutzhanova (2004) question the effectiveness of traditional developer-led models of community development and regeneration. They make a call for a systemic and transformational approach to enterprise development that can yield community-wide economic development.

There are many different models of community development (Rothman, 1968) but in this paper we consider only those which deal with socio-economic change. Blakley (1980) argued that the problem with community development is that it is not based upon well-articulated models, or theories, and because of this it remains more of a social movement than an applied but under researched behavioural science. Local

entrepreneurship includes the use of cooperatives as a development tools; community partnerships; and collective enterprises. The concept of cooperatives (and cooperation) is important because it is closely related to the notion of collective enterprise.

For Johannisson (1990) building a robust community is a social as well as an economic endeavour because such communities are vital contexts in which entrepreneurship and enterprise in its many varieties occur. Enterprise enacted in remote areas / environments stimulates cooperation between community groups as opposed to competition. Indeed, Johannisson stressed the importance of qualified community entrepreneurs who engage with the community in personal and innovative ways, thereby building support within the community. Community entrepreneurship is an integrative process and an approach suited to local economic development. This links with the literature on entrepreneurship and cooperatives (see Gassenheimer, Baucus and Baucus, 1996; Baucus, Baucus and Human, 1996; and Cook and Plunkett, 2006). In particular, Gassenheimer, Baucus and Baucus highlighted the importance of opportunism and participative communication. However, in this case, we examine issues of collective, social and communal benefit as opposed to commercial competitive advantage.

2.1. Reviewing the importance of socio-economics on community and place.

Entrepreneurship is about effecting change. Change is also an integral facet of development work. Moreover, development work is about changing spaces and places for the better (Cornwall, 2002). Yet social and economic change can disturb the equilibrium of communities as community context affects entrepreneurial process (Hindle, 2010). Nevertheless, in the literature of community development, entrepreneurship seldom features. Kuratko and Hodgetts (2004: 30) describe entrepreneurship as “*a dynamic*

process of vision, change, and creation, requiring an application of energy and passion towards the creation and implementation of new ideas and creative solutions". This definition does not privilege the role of the individual entrepreneur in heroic terms and acknowledges individual and collective examples of enterprising behaviour, irrespective of application or setting. Interestingly, whereas Peredo and Chrisman (2004) adopt the definition of entrepreneurship favoured by Gartner (1988) as the creation of a new organisation, the holistic definition of Anderson (1995) that it is the creation and extraction of value from an environment is more in keeping with the notion of the community as entrepreneur; and as the community as a motivating force in stimulating enterprise and enterprising behaviour.

Furthermore, according to Granovetter (2000) the literature of economic development assumes that locality, and in particular rurality, is a problem to be overcome in terms of economies of scale because the view of traditional development theory is that the embeddedness of economic action in non-economic obligations inhibits economic expansion¹. In regional and community development top-down approaches are common. A classic example of this approach is the EU 'Leader' Rural Development Programme (Ray, 2000). Indeed, Peredo and Chrisman (2004) argue that a major problem with development strategies is that they are invariably conceived and managed by development agencies as opposed to being 'birthed' and owned by their communities.

¹ This implies a dearth of individuals whom he refers to as "*homo economica*" for whom economic motivation is the primary driver. This implies that to be successful, entrepreneurs and small businessmen must develop a detachment from community and place because kinship and social obligations are seen as an entanglement. Clearly if money was the prime motivator for an entrepreneur then the position set out by Granovetter would hold true, but in evaluating CBE a different set of metrics congruent with the notion of "*homo communitas*" (altruistic individuals motivated by a need to give back to the community) is required.

What has been referred to as a spirit of ‘New Localism’ (Mosley, 1999) has a part to play in this developing literature. This brings us to consider issues of entrepreneurship in relation to community development and place. However, there is a misconception that rural communities must be self-sustainable in terms of supporting a viable business community because although businesses in the traditional sense are important social institutions their absence does not equate to a lack of enterprise, or entrepreneurial activity. In respect of place, Mitchell (1998) linked community development to entrepreneurship theory by discussing the social process of commodification, arguing that despite contributing to the accumulation of capital within the community such top-down investment often had a destructive impact upon the rural idyll (Mingay, 1989). The important message from these readings is that the business community *per-se* need not be the sole driver of enterprising behaviour in our communities as is often assumed. It is helpful to review models of community development.

2.2. Reviewing Models of Community Development.

The concept of “*Community Based Enterprise*” (CBE) or ‘*Community Based Enterprise Development*’ (CBED) as it impinges upon community development strategies is central to the core thesis of this article, albeit most examples in the literature emerge from the area of subsistence entrepreneurship and revolves around addressing issues of rural poverty and underdevelopment. Peredo and Chrisman (2004) define CBE as “*a community acting corporately as both entrepreneur and enterprise in pursuit of a common good*”. The community may also be the employee. All three being complimentary can be present at one time. However, Levitte (2004) argues that community relationships can also hinder entrepreneurship by creating barriers to

economic development. It is necessary to be cautious because CBE is not a universal panacea for regenerating local communities.

From a reading of the these literatures it is possible to identity three models of Community Development , namely - 1) the Business Model; 2) the Planned Growth Model: and 3) the Community Based Enterprise Model - all of which impact on local enterprise. See Table 1 below for details:-

TABLE 1 - A REVIEW OF MODELS OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT		
Model / Source	Explanation	Relevance to this case study
Business Model - Kilkenny, Nalbarte & Besser (1999). - Curran, Rutherford & Lloyd-Smith (2000).	In this paternalistic model, small businesses are central to community development due to the emergence of the stereotype of the local businessman as philanthropist and hero. This idea of the heroic benefactor gave rise to the notion of a thriving small business sector being essential to the maintenance of community life, as communities looked to business for patronage. Kilkenny <i>et al</i> refer to the reciprocal nature of community support for business, suggesting entrepreneurs who make non-market contributions to their community and who accrue community support are more likely to succeed than those who do not. Conversely, Curran <i>et al</i> suggest that many small business owners detach themselves from locality and from local economic initiatives.	Traditionally, in rural Aberdeenshire, ‘the small-business-community’ played a major role in encouraging and supporting community development ² . However, changing demographics and values combined with the ‘Age-of-Austerity’ caused shrinkage in the spending power of the rural small business community as philanthropy gives way to thrift. Kilkenny <i>et al</i> and Curran <i>et al</i> acknowledge these historical trends that have reduced the role of small business in local political and economic processes; and the logic(s) of modern business practice. As small rural businesses age and decline the gap in the market for socio-economic provision will inevitably widen albeit vestiges of this business driven model are still visible. It is the role of Enterprise Agencies and local Council’s to encourage new business growth and attract new businesses to an area via passive and reactive strategies such as the provision of business advice and rural business parks suggesting an overlap between the business model and the model of planned growth.
Planned-Growth Model: - Peredo & Chrisman (2004).	Communities have an attachment to place. According to Peredo & Chrisman (p 10) the history of a community impacts materially on the	In rural Aberdeenshire, the pattern of habitation is generally settled. Its towns and villages have long histories. In this proactive model, growth and thus

² For example most rural villages have a community hall, invariably donated by local businessmen with a philanthropic bent. Often these were sponsored by self-made-men returning to their birthplace after having made their fortunes elsewhere. Local businessmen often support local charities and organisations – meeting the cost of such institutions and thus saving the public purse. Moreover, many local businesses still sponsor football teams and local shows, gala’s and community events.

<p>- Blakely & Bradshaw (2002).</p>	<p>entrepreneurial proclivities of its inhabitants. Also social structures usually evolve for economic reasons and as industries or markets decline so do the communities. This explains why business growth is viewed as a key economic driver. In this policy driven model, growth is dependent upon the presence of amenities and the infrastructure to cope with the expansion. Growth in population can cause friction as well as synergy as an increase in the number of households' cause pressure in the provision of public services such as health and education.</p>	<p>sustainability are ensured through the activities of local planning departments, Council officials and property developers all via the provision of new housing developments. Such planned public and private housing projects trigger growth and thus development because new households sustain and increase the demand for new business provision. This is the predominant growth model in Aberdeenshire as the local authorities act as entrepreneur, in consultation with enterprise agencies and local politicians often drawn from the business community. Invariably those that can afford to buy houses in new developments come from middle class backgrounds or are in-migrants to the communities causing integration issues within local communities.</p>
<p>Community-Based Enterprise Model: - Bull & Winter (1991) - Johannisson & Nilsson (1989) - Peredo & Chrisman (2004) (2006) - Ricasio, (2005) (2009) - Helmsing (2002)</p>	<p>The ethos of this model is that the social capital(s) of individual people and groups in the community form a community's greatest resources and asset - natural and social capitals inseparable from economic considerations. CBE is complex because it encompasses social, civic and other forms of loose entrepreneurial behaviour. Thus it may entail extracting fiscal profit or psychic gain. It results from the product of incremental learning. For Ricasio (2009) the term 'Community Based Enterprise' is academic parlance for small, household or village level entrepreneurship but certain elements must be considered to make development sustainable. At the heart of the CBED approach lies the concept of cooperation rooted in community cultures. The community collectively becomes an entrepreneur to create and operate a new enterprise embedded in existing social structure.</p>	<p>This exciting new approach challenges the prevailing notion that intractable socio-economic problems can simply be solved by policy makers, politicians and philanthropists adopting a 'top down approach' by spending public money. Thus although economic aid is important it seldom addresses the underlying problems which cause rural decline and deprivation. CBE approaches are equally as valid for communities in rural Scotland as they are for the third and developing worlds particularly in relation to the development of <i>Organic Community Development</i> whereby entrepreneurial growth emerges from the 'bottom up. However, in many Scottish rural communities there is a perception of a decline in community spirit due to (in)migration which can prevent a community acting corporeally. If a community leader does not emerge to take on an entrepreneurial role then CBE may not occur. The notion of 'Community Enterprise Ecologies' (Ricasio, 2009) is also of interest because villages and their rural hinterlands are fragile ecologies.</p>

There is a need to integrate the community based entrepreneurship, communities and rural development literatures. From a reading of the literature there are individual, social and environmental pressures faced by communities and development officers, which

collectively hinder individual and community agency from being entrepreneurial and initiating change³. These exogenous factors do not take account of individual factors such as apathy, lethargy and ignorance of other ways of acting. Not all of these are harmful for instance - Social Enterprise and Business decline are opportunities, not threats but to overcome rural deprivation and poverty it is necessary for the community to work together with external change agents and government sponsors.

Peredo and Chrisman (2004) argue that it is essential to tackle issues of poverty and deprivation at a local level through local business development. It is also necessary to examine the interaction between communities, families and entrepreneurs (Cornwall, 1998) and to take a holistic approach in theory and practice. Thus in declining, or remote, rural areas the loss of a business can cause genuine hardship to those who live in the community and have to change established patterns of behaviour, particularly those who do not have a car or cannot access public transport but impoverishment is relative.

Studies of CBE are still rare, particularly in relation to the Scottish context. An exception is Haugh and Pardy (1999) who specifically studied the concept of community entrepreneurship in North-East Scotland before it became popular and concluded that these rural communities were economically fragile. They investigated 'group entrepreneurship' in a project (The Villages in Control Project) promoting social and economic regeneration in Aberdeenshire⁴. Haugh and Pardy argue that it is important to co-ordinate community members into a recognisable group to facilitate the production of

³ These are (1) lack of individual opportunity; (2) Social stagnation; (3) Social disintegration; (4) Social Alienation; (5) Environmental degradation; (6) Economic crises; (7) Reconstruction; (8) Social Enterprise; (9) Business decline and (10) stagnation.

⁴ The ViC project was initiated in 1993 as a joint initiative between the local authorities of the region and the Local Enterprise Company (LEC). It was designed to encourage rural and coastal communities to diversify away from existing economic patterns via entrepreneurial activity at community level. The project involved a group of individuals from each village developing and implementing a strategic plan for the economic regeneration of their own community. Their study predates the setting up of the BDP.

a strategic community document. They stress that for ideas of economic regeneration and growth to be sustainable they must develop from within the community, albeit Cox and Mair (1988) argue that economic development programs can pose threats to locals.

The issues of 'Entrepreneurial Leadership' and 'Community Based Leadership' in the third and public sectors as well as (see DoE, 1993, Selsky and Smith, 1994; Purdue, 2000; Purdue, Razzaque, Hambleton, Stewart, Huxah, and Vangen, 2000; and Purdue, 2001) are also of interest. We turn to consider Rural Development Partnerships.

2.3. Examining the role played by Rural Development Partnerships

It is necessary to peruse the academic literature in relation to RDPs and entrepreneurship because the former is oft ignored in relation to enterprising activity in a wider sense. In particular the works of Shortall and Shucksmith (1998, 2001); Shucksmith (2000); and Shortall (2004: 2008) are relevant because the BDP is a rural development partnership. Although Peredo and Chrisman (2004) argue that community development is often driven by government agencies, Radin and Romzek (1996) in reviewing the National Rural Development Partnership (NRDP) movement noted that such partnerships invariably operated in an organizationally messy realm of inter-governmental relations. There is a move away from bureaucracy towards individual enterprise. The NRDP movement was designed to emphasise the relationship between processes and substantive outcomes. However Radin and Romzek (1996) argued that in practice RDPs are often reliant on professional and political accountability relationships that have little to do with formal responsibilities or communities themselves. A key issue is that of integrated rural development. Indeed, Shortall and Shucksmith (2001) examined key elements within a

model of endogenous rural development to understand the role of partnerships, community involvement, animation and capacity-building. They questioned the legitimacy of rural development partnerships and local governance; considered the goals and processes of rural development; and challenged the articulation of integrated rural development programmes with other government programmes.

Moreover, Shucksmith (2000) identified a need for endogenous development in rural areas to be built upon a bottom-up, sustainable approach. Similarly, Shortall (2004) examined the emphasis given to social and civic development alongside economic development; and the idea that civic partnerships represent increased democracy. Social and civic capitals are linked and the social capital debate clarifies the importance of economic goals vis-à-vis social and civic goals. Shortall concluded that the rural development process is mired by difficulties because of unrealistic expectations; inadequate specification of goals, and a lack of central government responsibility for the process. Shortall opines that the problems posed by area-based development do not represent questions for local partnerships to address, but ones that must be taken up by national governments. Social inclusion is central to the community development literature (Shortall, 2008). To read more about development work in rural partnership see Westholm, 1999; Westholm, Moseley and Stenlas, 1999; Nelson and Zadeck, 2000; Smith and Beazley, 2000; and Edwards, Goodwin, Pemberton and Woods, 2001. The key to success for rural partnerships appears to be focusing upon innovative solutions (Black and Conway, 1995). We now turn to consider methodology.

3. METHODOLOGY

The primary organizing principle used in this study is the qualitative methodology of case study (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2008; Yin, 2011). Numerous methodology books detail ‘how-to-do’ case studies (see George and Bennett, 2005; Gerring, 2006; and Simons, 2009). From a close reading of these the authors interest was drawn to the subject of longitudinal case study because it was apparent from preliminary fieldwork that the BDP story has a longitudinal element to it as a study of CBE, despite the fact that the respondents reject the title of entrepreneur⁵. Longitudinal studies have more power than other types of observational studies, in that they allow a temporal ordering of events. This case highlights the development work of two Rural Development Officers, Dawn Brodie and Nicky Donald who at the time of the research were employed by the BDP, a community led RDP, which operates in the Buchan area of Aberdeenshire, Scotland.

Case study methodology was identified as an ideal method for studying the longitudinal nature of the development partnership because 1) studying the behaviour over time allowed important underlying mechanisms to emerge thus providing the basis for future theory building; and 2) the case was building on previous research and its exposition was felt likely to generate new ideas and lead to new frameworks and models (Yin, 2008, 2011). Having settled on the methodology and decided upon a multiple level of analysis (Miles and Huberman, 1994; Silverman, 2001) issues of sampling were simplified as the BDP is a micro-organisation.

⁵ Certain aspects of this study are so closely related to the topic of inquiry that they became part of the research and in this case the concept of sustainability is one such aspect. When community development is researched the aspect of sustainability is inherently part and parcel of the process but sustainability remains under researched. The case is a mixture of the illustrative-demonstrative and interpretative because it was designed to illustrate a phenomenon by incorporating real experience and was built around an ethnographic framework.

Two structured but informal, face-to-face interviews (Chilban, 1996; Johnson, 2001) were conducted and triangulated by two further informal in-depth interviews augmented with telephone interviews with stakeholders; and documentary material from the website www.buchanddevelopmentpartnership.org.uk; and annual reports etc. This documentary approach (Platt, 1981, Scott, 1990 and Mogalakwe, 2006) permitted a fascinating story of collective community enterprise to emerge anchored in the literature of community enterprise, as opposed to social enterprise⁶. The taped interviews were transcribed and following Miles and Huberman (1994), document summary forms were completed and coded. This was repeated with the documentary data.

The collected data was then subjected to a process of constant comparative analysis to generate themes and protean theories from the stories, as well as highlighting interconnections between themes (Miles and Huberman, 1994; Zhang and Wildemuth, 2009). It is also relevant that data emerged from stories (Bleakley, 2005). It was necessary to define the unit of analysis (Silverman, 2001) and because the BDP is an organisational entity it made sense to consider its constituent parts e.g. The Board; The Development Officers; Clients; Sponsors; and Communities. An analytical framework suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994) for developing codes was adopted. The codes chosen were - Acts; Activities; Participation; Relationships; Setting; and Meaning. In conducting early stage analysis the author sought to explore, explain, describe and order the data. It is relevant that analysis occurs simultaneously with collection and transcription (DiCicco-Bloom and Crabtree, 2006: 17). From this iterative, cyclical intra-

⁶ Nevertheless, there is clearly a need to conduct further interviews with other stakeholders in the process to move from case study to theory building.

case analysis the themes of selflessness, communion and community action emerged. But first we must present the BDP story.

4.0. THE BDP CASE STUDY

Dawn and Nicky are the public face of the BDP⁷ albeit a ‘Management Committee’ of Volunteer Directors takes care of management issues and in line with the changing landscape of social enterprise they now take a more active part by volunteering their time to work on management project groups to grow the enterprise. Their ethos is to develop enterprising individuals and sustainable rural communities by encouraging local and regional development and community regeneration. This is summed up thus:-

“With the continuing downturn in the Buchan economy, communities increasingly recognise the necessity to stimulate economic development in other sectors and to encourage social development in order to retain or develop vibrant local communities”.

(BDP Annual Report, 2003-2004: 2).

These words were written prior to the recession and third sector social enterprise mania. This case study retrospectively examines the work of the respondents over a five year period as they learned the new rhetoric of social enterprise and struggled to reinvent them-self as a sustainable social enterprise, incubating community based entrepreneurship. Development officers create sustainable growth strategies to arrest economic decline. In Buchan, recession and rural decline are ever present.

The geographic area covered by the BDP is the Aberdeenshire Council Administrative area of Buchan which is predominantly rural with a population of approximately 39,160 (2001 census) and an area of 547 km. Buchan encompasses the

⁷ Initially there were 4 part-time members of staff - 2 development officers, a research officer and an administration officer. In 2004, the research and administration officers left and were not replaced. The loss of research capability reduced development time considerably. Adapting to change is a key theme and in 2009, Nicky left the area but still works remotely on BDP projects.

coastal towns of Peterhead and Fraserburgh⁸ and has a distinctive hard-working culture. Although farming is the predominant industry the importance of village entrepreneurship to regional economies cannot be over stated (Haugh and Pardy, 1999; Smith, 2008). Obviously the needs of such diverse communities vary, which heightens the challenges faced by the BDP. Yet, rural communities possess a heightened sense of community. People help each other to preserve rural ways of life for future generations.

4.1. An overview of the BDP and its work

The BDP was founded in 2000 by locals encouraged by the success of partnership working in Central Buchan between project groups. They wanted to expand this approach Buchan wide. The partnership is described as a “*loose concordat*” of individual agencies and community groups⁹. The BDP was initiated as a limited company with charitable status but are in transition to social enterprise status. Simultaneously they pursue Service Level Agreements with Aberdeenshire Council. The BDP help verbalise the aims and visions of community groups by helping groups find their voice by acting as “*facilitators for social enterprise and community well being*”. The BDP help community groups’ trade with a community purpose but recognise the danger of third sector organisations becoming distracted from their core values when re-inventing themselves as a social enterprise. BDP philosophy entails getting communities to believe that collectively they can make a difference by challenging and changing institutionalised beliefs that

⁸ There are fourteen villages, namely - Crimond; St Fergus; New Leeds; Fetterangus; Strichen; New Pitsligo; Auchnagatt; Maud; Old Deer; Mintlaw; Longside; Hatton; Cruden Bay and Boddam. In addition, there are several distinctive rural communities and hamlets with village halls, including Rora; Clolla; Longhaven; Whinnyfolds; and Slains. The BDP are not however constrained by boundaries and help groups in nearby villages such as St Combs and Cairnbulg as well as working in Peterhead.

⁹ Albeit concordat is a word seldom heard in the lexicons of enterprise and entrepreneurship.

communities cannot achieve anything. They seek to build individual and collective confidence by showing an interest in what other people are doing. The BDP have developed an ability to speak to people at different levels in the community. The BDP approach to development is a blend of proactive and reactive strategies linked to community need. They attend Aberdeenshire Councils Local Area Planning Group; Community Planning Executive Meetings and initiate and develop projects as they present. Such work is time consuming and prevents time being spent on proactive measures such as business planning and training. The reactive nature of their work ensures that healthy projects emerge from real community needs. To date, the BDP have helped over 100 community groups and projects.

4.2. Funding rural development the BDP way

The original funding came through the Scottish Executive's Rural Strategic Support Fund with support from Aberdeenshire Council at Area Manager level. They attracted core funding through Scottish Enterprise and European Union Structural Funds. Over the years, Aberdeenshire Council increased their funding to the BDP via core funding through a Service Level Agreement and Grant through Economic Development. In Scotland, the NRDP initiative was partially funded by Scottish Enterprise.

Funding remains problematic since ESF funding ceased. This caused the BDP to diversify by bringing in extra money via facilitation; the provision of training courses; and conducting feasibility studies although the BDP only charge financially buoyant client groups. In 2009, the BDP undertook secretarial work at the New Deer Show but found the activity too time consuming because it diluted capacity to do development work. The BDP strategy works because they understand the local situation, targeting

work in relation to the Scottish Executives Single Outcome Agreement (SOA); and because they deliver on the community aspect of such work. To survive in a reduced funding environment, the BDP are engaged in consultancy work which builds upon their expertise and experience.

The BDP ‘bottom up’ approach to community development does not sit readily within traditional ‘tick box’ funding approaches. For a social enterprise to succeed there has to be passion injected from the owner, or team. Thus in seeking to fund other activities, social enterprise is not always the best course of action because the necessity of operating as a social enterprise whilst relying upon volunteers makes the concept problematic for many poorly funded third sector organisations. Without passion, a budding enterprise is unlikely to succeed - research by the Development Trust Association of Scotland confirms this. Marrying the two concepts can be difficult.

4.3. Assessing BDP activities, outputs, impacts and success stories

Socio-economic development is the core business of the BDP albeit in practice the emphasis is more upon social aspects of development. For enterprise based models to succeed there must be competitors. The BDP lack obvious competitors although their activities cross over with those of other third sector organisations such as BRIDGE¹⁰ and Aberdeenshire Council’s Community Learning Department (CLD). Thus although the BDP is theoretically an independent organisation they compete locally with both organisations for funding and work because the strategic policies of BRIDGE and CLD

¹⁰ BRIDGE acts as an advocacy service for the voluntary sector and although they have traditionally focused upon ‘social needs’ they are now reinventing themselves as a social enterprise. This is a necessity based decision due to the harsh funding environment faced by third sector organisations in the North of Scotland. As such, BRIDGE now organise a successful social enterprise network.

determine that they too have an enterprise focus. They may become direct competitors unless a strategic alliance materialises.

The BDP services such as the Buchan Toolbox and Community Planning impact on the local communities. See table 2 for an outline of BDP Services and Activities:-

TABLE 2 – AN OUTLINE OF BDP SERVICES / ACTIVITIES

SERVICE	DESCRIPTION	IMPACT
The Buchan Toolbox	This is a web based tool for signposting local community groups towards funding opportunities. This is an under resourced area of work.	Community wide and also at a group and individual level.
The Buchan Bulletin	A quarterly magazine (of 500 copies) which provides a window of opportunity to the community and acts as a propaganda mechanism linking the BDP to the people and the communities.	Community wide. Businesses sponsor and advertise in the bulletin.
Community Planning	The BDP are proud of is the community planning and planning for real projects. It is important to stress that community planning is not just about drawing up wish lists. In this respect, the BDP help the process by putting community groups in touch with Agencies and Council Departments who can help them achieve their visions. This helps the groups draw up realistic and achievable Community Action Plans. This is a Shire wide process. There are many problems in developing in rural areas in relation but the problem of rural poverty and deprivation is a major focus of future BDP activity.	Community wide but also at local levels
Workshops / Forums	Workshops are arranged as and when required to disseminate knowledge and an annual forum of community consultation regularly brings together people and communities (80+).	All levels.
Project Based Work	The work of the BDP can be categorised into several types :- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pleasure Park Developments - Hall Developments - Tourism Projects - Renewable Projects - Community Cafes - Youth Outreach Projects. 	These make a real difference to villages and communities

There are many success stories including the Planning for Real® projects; the Maud Mart project; BITES; Rora Village Hall; The Harvest Hall; and the Roads Community Café are newsworthy. See table 3 below:-

Table 3 – BDP Success Stories

BITES (Buchan IT and E-Learning Services)	Evolved from the Buchan Web Project and was made possible by a £ 286,000 grant from the Big Lottery over 5 years.
Buchan Community Dial A Bus	This group started in 2002 and shared a desk in the Maud Area Office with the BDP. It has now attracted Scottish Executive funding until 2011. The group

	have formed DAB+ a community interest company and social enterprise arm and are an independent social enterprise.
Maud Village Trust (MVT)	BDP worked with them from 2002 when they gained funding from the Scottish Land Fund to buy the former Maud Mart Site. A visit to a Social Enterprise Conference was the tipping point which led to the building of confidence within the group. This project has flowered over the years with a community garden, the building of a community service centre which now houses two other social enterprises namely BITES and Dial a Community Bus. MVT raised funds by selling part of the site to Cornerstone Housing for special needs housing. Other partnership working has seen a deal with NHS for a rural resource centre. The NHS funded the build, the Village Trust own and manage the building which includes office space for Social Work and Health workers, treatment rooms which can be used by local GPs and alternative therapists etc and a gymnasium - all this from one man approaching the BDP in 2001 with a vision for the community (BDP Report, 2008 –2009).
Hatton Hall Committee	BDP have helped the community with their project to develop and upgrade the hall and provide an all weather football pitch. According to the BDP annual report 2008-2009 the hall committee have been ‘very entrepreneurial in selling of some land for housing’ (BDP Report, 2008 –2009).
ROADS Community Café.	A purpose built community café in St Combs made possible by drawing down on £250,000 funding (BDP Report, 2008 –2009).

A positive facet of these success stories is that they have created sustainable jobs in the community. In Maud alone, the new Community Service Centre and Rural Resource Centre buildings now houses BITES and Buchan Dial-A-Community Bus social enterprises. Thus the MVT initiative has merged with other projects and there is now a Manager and three part time fitness instructors not to mention the staff for BITES. The Dial-A-Bus project currently has nine staff, four volunteer Directors and a Company Secretary as well as a volunteer management committee of six. Together the three projects have breathed new life into the village, collectively creating 10 jobs. This is a very real achievement given that that no new jobs have been created in Maud as a result of work undertaken by traditional enterprise agencies.

4.4. Discussing BDP’s links with small business, enterprise agencies and networks

Although the BDP do not work directly with small businesses they have a sound working relationship with local business via ‘The Shell Small Grants Scheme’; and ‘The SCORE Initiative’. The Shell scheme underpins the BDP work providing small scale funding to

community groups in the Buchan Area which allows them to continue operating and providing local services to their communities. The SCORE initiative works with Fetterangus Community Association to develop a wind turbine. SCORE provide help-in-kind and carry out free maintenance work. The BDP encourage 'linked' contributions and acknowledge the help of small businessmen and retired businessmen who are active in community affairs.

Collaborative work with Scottish Enterprise, The Business Gateway and The Enterprise Trust North East has occurred in the past but is rare. The BDP worked with Business Gateway on the Maud Business Plan on a one off basis but pass on queries about new business start ups to appropriate agencies. There is a need to develop better links with other agencies and enterprise service providers to grow community capacity within the rural areas. There is a gap in strategic community focus. The BDP welcome engaging with enterprise agencies because government support makes a big difference in rural communities. Despite the need to avoid duplication of effort, there is a need for organisations to provide training in business planning; facilitation training; Social Return on Investment training; and Social Auditing at a pre-business stage.

The BDP lack expertise in business planning and finance and do not have the wherewithal to finance, resource or retrain locals. However, they have recruited business orientated professional people on to their Board to act as mentors. More could be done to help members of the community start businesses. They see these issues as crucial in generating a sustainable income stream. They are networking and engaging with the Social Enterprise Academy to develop leadership qualities; and are conducting joint training with other social enterprises and third second organisations. Future plans include

developing an affordable rural housing strategy. There is a need to increase funding to enable the BDP to revamp in-house resources and methods of disseminating useful information to those in need in rural communities. Developing an internet repository of useful documents and reports to enhance the existing toolbox is a priority. There is a need to become more efficient in organising time and resources to be able to box off periods of time because their “can do” mentality makes reading and writing up time, difficult to find. Small things make a big difference to communities.

A plethora of risk-averse agencies compete for work in rural communities but the BDPs successes can be attributed to their willingness to take risks and be involved in community projects from inception to birth. They liken development work to assembling a jigsaw – it is not just about funding, it is about getting people onboard and eliciting verbal commitment and support to make a difference. Other challenges include capacity building and encouraging people to volunteer their time. The BDP are successful because their ‘bottom-up’ organic approach grows sustainable enterprises and the narrative that unfolds is a heady mixture of mentoring and mothering. The BDP act as the communities friends, allowing individuals and the groups to develop at their own pace. Their approach is a hybrid of a community focused incubator approach and a befriending model. Once a group identifies a need and approaches the BDP they are given friendly help and advice on a step-by-step, needs basis including the provision of office space and supportive mentoring. Their organic, person-centered approach is central to their success and they derive a deep sense of satisfaction in working with people and from seeing them coming in with an idea, building up their self-confidence and in ultimately helping them fulfil their visions. The BDP do not run projects for people. As a result, projects take longer to

reach fruition (4-6 years). However, those that do are sustainable. This differs from the traditional approach of problem-solving and fixing issues via a 'top down' solution. Community based enterprises thrive on a sense of shared locality, of kinship and filial networks.

Patton (1990) argues that qualitative research should be evaluated. Nevertheless, it is difficult to evaluate the impact of the work of the BDP because of the collective and incremental nature of the achievements. How does one evaluate collective achievement and assign individual merit? Following Lincoln and Guba (1985), the author used the criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. The BDP story (and thus this piece of interpretative research) broadcasts these criteria because it features as a case study (Partnership and Empowerment in Buchan) in the Scottish Government's Community Empowerment Action Plan (2009) in relation to the themes of partnership and empowerment and for their role in building communities of interest and identity¹¹.

The testimony of Pat Buckman, Secretary of the Maud Village Trust is telling:–

“We feel we've put the heart back into Maud. It has been hard work and taken a long time, but all our efforts are now paying off. Buchan Development Partnership was with us every step of the way - helping us organise the initial community consultations and then secure the £2.5 million we needed to make it all happen”.

The BDP success story has become a skilfully, artfully, and persuasively crafted story (Miles and Huberman, 1994), accepted by a wider community. The vibrancy of the partnership is palpable and visible and can be accessed online at the BDP Picture Gallery¹² and the Rural Gateway website¹³. These illustrate that entrepreneurship is not

¹¹ See the websites - <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/264771/0079288.pdf>

¹² Visit - <http://www.buchandevlopmentpartnership.org.uk/gallery2.htm>.

the sole prerogative of the entrepreneur. The enactment of CBE instils a spirit of collective action where none existed before and bolsters existing community spirit but it is clear that another social force is at play in encouraging rural community development. Although the case study presented above is a practical example of CBE in action, the relative success elements as discussed in section 4.3 are difficult to evaluate clearly.

5. ANALYSING THE CASE

The initial analysis emphasised the role of selflessness; being in communion; and community enterprise. See figure 1 for details.

Insert figure 1 here please.

In making sense of the case it is helpful to consider several levels of analysis, including the role of the individual; the community; local business; and the State.

5.1. The role of the individual in community based entrepreneurship:

The importance of selflessness and individual enterprise in collective community based entrepreneurship is the most striking finding to emerge. Nicky and Dawn are “*can do*” individuals and although formal training may have helped them carry out their duties, development work is about engaging and inspiring people to do their best. When asked if she considered herself to be an entrepreneur, Dawn replied, “*an entrepreneur has to really believe in what they’re doing, and so do I. It is not a 9-5 job. There is no end to the*

¹³ Visit - <http://www.ruralgateway.org.uk/en/node/1109>

opportunities that BDP could become involved in if time permitted". The concept of emergence is important because the entrepreneurial emerge and are not appointed¹⁴.

5.2. The role of the community in community based entrepreneurship:

Community enterprise entails people collectively taking between and in engaging in "*Community Asset Building*" (Green, 2007). The CBE approach works because of participative and democratic elements and because activists belong to the community. Narratives relating to CBE emphasise the notion of struggling to come into existence thus aligning actors to entrepreneurial narrative and mythology. Thus although we could label Dawn and Nicky as social entrepreneurs, or agents of entrepreneurial change working with communities, they do not seize control but advise, guide, counsel, mentor, protect and nurture their charges. They practice a paternalistic form of entrepreneurial mothering. Although CBE is about taking control they develop and nurture extant community skills.

5.3. The role of business in community based entrepreneurship

Another interesting aspect is the low level of leadership displayed by the established small business community in the rural areas – albeit many of the people active in the rural civic arena are connected to the business community for example - holding office in Community Councils; on Gala Committees; or as a Councillor. Alternatively, they may be the retired businesspeople or family members who choose to wear a 'community hat' instead of a 'business hat'. This illustrates the transference of social and business skills

¹⁴ Interestingly the stories of the animateurs, the BDP and their clients mirror those of conventional entrepreneur stories thus anchoring micro-level entrepreneurial practices to entrepreneurship narrative because the development managers were self-taught developers who by dint of hard work and passion nurtured community based projects which emerged naturally from rural communities.

into community projects and the potential for greater non-paternalistic collaboration between business and communities (Tracey, Phillips and Haugh, 2005).

5.4. The role of the State in community based entrepreneurship

Another interesting theme to emerge was the apparent lack of collaboration between the Scottish Executive and the Enterprise Agencies. Midgely *et al* (2005) argue that much of the Scottish rural development strategy depends upon the assumption that rural local authorities will work in partnership with economic development agencies. This does not always happen. Although the approach adopted by the BDP is an organic ‘bottom up’ approach which does not just measure the number of community enterprises which emerge from the process, but takes cognisance of the level of community enterprise nurtured within a given community – it does not provide a full explanation. From an analysis of the actions and activities discussed it is apparent that the missing social force at play which explains their actions is ‘*Animateurship*’.

5.5. Towards a model of community animateurship

Animateurship is of interest in community development because ‘animation’ means, literally, to breathe life into something. Animation can be defined as the act, process, or result of imparting life, interest, spirit, motion, or activity. It is the quality, or condition, of being alive, active, spirited, or vigorous. An animateur organises cultural projects, or social events, engaging people in them. This fits the narrative described above. Simpson (1989: 54) articulates animation as:-

“...that stimulus to the mental, physical, and emotional life of people in a given area which moves them to undertake a wider range of experiences through which they find a higher degree of self-realization, self-expression, and awareness of belonging to a community which they can influence”.

(The Report of the European Cultural Foundation, 1973)

According to Smith (2009) amateurship is linked to the activities of informal educators, community workers and others. Of relevance is the concept of *Socio-cultural animation*. Animateurs work with people and groups to help them participate in and manage the communities in which they live. This aligns animation with notions of community development, education and learning and also with entrepreneurship and enterprise in that it is transformative, liberating philosophy which makes use of community action as well as of psycho-social methods to advance the expressive capacities of people. Animateurs help develop individual and group ability to participate in and to manage the social and political reality in which they live' (Pollo 1991: 12).

The animator operates in an intimate relationship with the group (Poujol, 1981: quoted in Toynbee 1985, 11) acting as a facilitator, moderator or motivator making things happen by inspiring a quickening of action (Boud and Miller, 1997). Animateurs act alongside others in learning situations to assist them to work with their experience (Boud and Miller, 1997: 7). Animation, in this sense, is a social practice oriented towards the development of repressed, deprived or latent potential in individuals, small groups and communities (Contessa: quoted in Maurizio, 1991). The active amateur stimulates, motivates and inspire others to bring about change - working with others as opposed to doing things for them and as informal educators orchestrate situations and people, building environments and relationships in which people can grow. They direct energies

in a focused way and spend time in the company of others developing lives, emotional, social and the moral relationships.

This is an entrepreneurial mindset and skill and according to Smith and Smith (2008) it involves patience, openness and listening. Animateurs should therefore “*not seek to act on the other person but join with them in a search for understanding and possibility*” (Smith and Smith 2008: 20). By engaging in group conversation they empower individuals to help each other as a group thus influencing and changing community issues (Brown 1992, 8). Animateurs (like Dawn and Nicky) cultivate and manipulate latent qualities in settings and foster groups that allow people to flourish, to learn and to make changes. According to Palmer (1998) animateurs and communities must work together to clear away the clutter whether that is meaningless words, pressure to get on with the daily round, obstructive feelings, or whatever. Animateurs thus impose boundaries to prevent community projects from descending into confusion and chaos; marshal community resources; and unite individual and community voices via entrepreneurial leadership.

6. IMPLICATIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND APPROACHES TO DEVELOPING COMMUNITY BASED ENTERPRISE

In relation to implications for research, practice and/or society it is necessary to discuss and evaluate the sustainability of the approach. The provision of social projects such as those discussed above is but one aspect of entrepreneurship and community development. However, the crucial question remains - are such projects sustainable? Whilst funds are available, the process will continue but at a certain stage in their lifecycle all community projects must become self-sustainable. The CBE model presented here is sustainable in the short term, but only time will tell if it is sustainable longer term; and whether the jobs

created by social projects will make a lasting impact. Sustaining the provision of an animateur model is financially more viable than funding individual projects (such as the Village SOS scheme) because funding a viable support network which ‘births’ new projects is clearly more efficient and cost effective. The job creation aspect of the project is sustainable in the short term because the projects provide in demand services and social projects. Furthermore the new buildings provide a community focus and have a life beyond that of the services provided, thus partially addressing the issue of sustainability of the social projects in the long term. Moreover, the new social and community based enterprises have undoubtedly contributed to the overall well-being of the community in terms of resources used over the period under review with the main costs involved being mainly confined to the wages of the development officers. The Shell Small Grants Scheme encompasses a wider corporate social responsibility argument. Granted there are shortcomings in that a higher level of funding and engagement could have produced even better results but it serves no purpose to speculate. Although the BDP leave a legacy of empowered communities there is a need for a detailed longitudinal study.

There is a need to be patient and to take a slow, long-term approach to stimulating growth in rural communities mirroring the bucolic approach of the locals who prefer slow but steady growth to unsustainable quick fixes (Budge, Irvine and Smith, 2008). Whilst such a capacity building approach offers the possibility of real sustainable growth by encouraging social enterprises there is a need for a more joined up inter-agency approach. Moreover, this study challenges the contemporary approach to local enterprise development through encouraging social enterprise carte blanche when a more viable model of community based entrepreneurship, or even animateurship may offer better

results. Patient, common-sense, ‘bottom up’, organic approaches as advocated by Haugh and Pardy (1999) and Granovetter (2000) for developing rural community groups obviously work. The words of Haugh and Pardy - “...*developing community entrepreneurship requires a supportive infra-structure and a long term commitment of people and resources to facilitate the process of releasing the entrepreneurial spirit of each individual community*” are prophetic and relevant here because the BDP model provides such an infra-structure. Indeed, the vibrant proto-entrepreneurial culture encouraged by the BDP in Buchan villages and communities created real jobs with a sustainable future. These jobs were generated by the actions of the collective agency of individuals and communities working together not individual entrepreneurs, local businesses, nor jobs brought into the area by enterprise agencies. There are obviously policy, training and resourcing issues to be considered but the BDP friendship model has patently incubated new sustainable enterprise¹⁵ injecting a vital spark of enterprise into Buchan communities.

This case illustrates what Burnett (1998) refers to as ‘local heroics’ in the field of rural development. The lessons learned have implications far beyond Buchan for how rural development partnerships are operated, because they are distanced from the enterprise development model and because developing enterprising individuals and communities is not merely the responsibility of entrepreneurs, enterprise agencies or universities - it is everyone’s. This study addresses the concerns of Gibb (2002) by

¹⁵ Prospective entrepreneurs would benefit having a ‘business friend’ in their formative years. Paradoxically, if the BDP common-sense approach to rural development were to be replicated mechanistically and dispassionately it may become a top down approach. The Scottish Executive ‘Local Heroes’ campaign of 1995 raised the public level of appreciation towards entrepreneurs in a Scottish society who had been disengaged with the rhetoric of enterprise. Since then Scotland boasts numerous renowned entrepreneurs such as Sir Tom Hunter and Sir Tom Farmer. As a people, the Scots now appreciate the entrepreneurs in their midst but there is a need to inform them about social entrepreneurs and community based entrepreneurs like Dawn and Nicky.

recognising that researching entrepreneurship does not always necessitate engagement with entrepreneurs in the traditional sense. However, community involvement in the regeneration process is not a universal panacea (Burton, 2003).

There are also obvious limitations with the study being one of micro-entrepreneurial activity open to claims of subjectivity. Being a story, it was constructed for a specific purpose and may be considered suspect. Nevertheless, it is a heartening story reflecting the achievements and realities of individuals working in rural community development projects. This study set in a community context, also strengthens the ties between entrepreneurship and macro social theory and is a classic example of bringing together social networks to build community capacity (McKnight and Kretzmann, undated). Furthermore, it highlights the need for future studies in which other examples of enterprising behaviour in the social third sectors in rural areas can be documented and assessed using novel methodologies such as participant observation; shadowing; ethnography (including auto-ethnography) and other forms of documentary evidence. Moreover, the paper bridges a gap between theory and practice and the research has practical implications as an indicator of ways to improve practice in the areas discussed. However, the impact upon society is still unknown. Finally, the study extends the literatures of entrepreneurship and community development by taking cognisance of community based entrepreneurship, and animateurship, in rural settings proving enterprising individuals, and communities can be supported in their development. This case demonstrates how committed communities supported by visionary entrepreneurial community leaders can grow rural communities and local economies.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, A. R., (1995), *'The Arcadian Enterprise: an enquiry into the nature and conditions of rural small business'*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Stirling.
- Baucus, D. B., Baucus, M. S., Human, S. E., (1996), Consensus in franchise organizations: A cooperative arrangement among entrepreneurs, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 11(5), 359-378.
- Black, S., Conway, E., (1995), 'Community-led rural development policies in the Highlands and Islands: the European Community's Leader Programme', *Local Economy*, 10(3), 229-245.
- Blakely, E. J (1980). *'Building theory for CD practice'*. In J. A., Christenson & J. W., Robinson, Jr. (Eds.), *Community development in America*. Ames: Iowa State University Press.
- Blakely, E. J., Bradshaw, T. K., (2002), *'Planning local economic development'*, Sage.
- Bleakley, A. (2005) "Stories as data, data as stories: making sense of narrative inquiry in clinical education", *Medical Education*, 39:534-40.
- Boud, D., Miller, N. (1997). *Working with experience: Animating learning*, London: Routledge.
- Brown, A., (1992) *Groupwork*. London: Heinemann.
- Budge, A., Irvine, W., Smith, R., (2008), 'Crisis plan – what crisis plan? How micro entrepreneurs manage in a crisis', *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 6(3), 337-354.
- Bull, I., Winter, F. (1991), 'Community differences in business births and business growths', *Journal of Business Venturing*, 6(1), 29-43.
- Burnett, K. A., (1998), 'Local heroics: reflecting on incomers and local rural development discourses in Scotland', *Sociologia Ruralis*, 38(22), 204-224.
- Burton, P., (2003) *'Community involvement in neighbourhood regeneration: stairway to heaven or road to nowhere'*, ESRC Centre for Neighbourhood Research, Paper 13.
- Chilban, J. (1996) *"Interviewing in Depth: the Interactive Relational Approach"*, Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Cook, M. L., Plunkett, B., (2006) Collective entrepreneurship: an emerging phenomenon in producer-owned organizations, *Journal of Agricultural and applied Economics*, 38(2), 421-428.
- Cooney, T., (2008), 'Why is community Entrepreneurship Worth Debating', *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 2(2).
- Cornwall, J. R., (1998), 'The entrepreneur as a building block for community', *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 3: 141-148.
- Cornwall, A., (2002) *'Making Spaces, Changing Places: Situating Participation in Development'*, IDS Working Paper 170.
- Cox, K. R., Mair, A., (1988), 'Locality and community in the politics of local economic Development', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 78(1), 307-325.
- Curran, J., Rutherford, R., Lloyd Smith, S., (2000), 'Is there a local business community? Explaining the non-participation of small business in local economic development', *Local Economy*, 15(2), 128-143.

- DiCicco-Bloom, B., Crabtree, B. F., (2006) "Making Sense of Qualitative Research", *Medical Education*, **40**:314-321.
- DoE., (1993) 'Community Leadership and Representation: Unlocking the Potential. The Report of the Working Party on the Internal Management of Local Authorities in England': July 1993. London: HMSO.
- Edwards, B., Goodwin, M., Pemberton, S., Woods, M., (2001) 'Partnerships, Power and Scale in Rural Governance', *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 19: 289-310.
- Gartner, W. B. (1988). 'Who Is an Entrepreneur?' Is the Wrong Question'. *American Small Business Journal*, Spring, 11-31.
- Gassenheimer, J. B., Baucus, D. B., Baucus, M. S., (1996), Cooperative arrangements among entrepreneurs: An analysis of opportunism and communication in franchise structures, *Journal of Business Research*, 36(1), 67-79.
- George, A. L., Bennett, A., (2005) 'Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences', MIT Press.
- Gerring, J., (2006) 'Case Study Research: Principles and Practices', Cambridge University Press; 1 edition.
- Gibb, A., (2002), In Pursuit of a New 'Enterprise' and 'Entrepreneurship' Paradigm for Learning: Creative Destruction, New Values, New Ways of Doing Things and New Combinations of Knowledge, *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 4, 213-231.
- Granovetter, M. (2000), 'The Economic Sociology of small firms and the entrepreneur', in Swedberg, R., (2000) 'Entrepreneurship: The role of economic and quality of life values in rural business location', Oxford University Press.
- Green, G. P., (2007) 'Asset building and community development', London: Sage.
- Haugh, H. M., Pardy, W., (1999), 'Community Entrepreneurship in North East Scotland', *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, **5**(4), 163 – 172.
- Helmsing A. H. J. B., (2002). 'Decentralisation, enablement, and local governance in low-income countries'. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 20(3) 317 – 340.
- Hindle, K., (2010) How community context affects entrepreneurial process: A diagnostic framework, *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, **22**(7), 599-647.
- Hoban, M., Beresford, P., (2001) 'Regenerating regeneration', *Community Development Journal*, **36**(4): 312-320.
- Johannisson, B., (1990) Community entrepreneurship - cases and conceptualization, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development: An International Journal*, **2**(1), 71 – 88.
- Johannisson, B., (2007) 'Enacting local economic development – theoretical and methodological challenges', *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, **1**(1), 7 – 26.
- Johannisson, B., Nilsson, A. (1989) 'Community entrepreneurship – networking for local development', *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, **1**(1), 1-19.
- Johnson, J. M. (2001) "In depth interviewing", in J. Gubrium and J. Holstein (eds.) *Handbook of interview research: context and methods*, Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Kilkenny, M., Nalbarte, L., Besser, T., (1999), 'Reciprocated Community Support and Small Town Small Business Success', *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, **11**(3), 231 – 246.

- Korsching, P. F., Allen, J. C., (2004) 'Local Entrepreneurship: A development model based on community interaction field theory', *Journal of the Community Development Society*, **35**(1).
- Kuratko, D.F. and Hodgetts, R.M., (2004), 'Entrepreneurship: Theory, Process, Practice' Mason, OH; South-Western Publishers.
- McKnight, J. L., Kretzmann, J. P., (1996), 'Mapping Community Capacity', Unpublished Report, Institute for Policy Research, North Western University.
- Levitte, Y., (2004) 'Bonding Social Capital in Entrepreneurial Developing Communities – survival networks or barriers', *Journal of the Community Development Society*, **35**(2).
- Lichtenstein, G. A., Lyons, T. S., Kutzhanova, N., (2004) 'Building Entrepreneurial Communities: The appropriate role of enterprise development activities', *Journal of the Community Development Society*, **35**(1).
- Lincoln, Y. S., Guba, E.G. (1985) "*Naturalistic Inquiry*", Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Midgley, J. L., Shucksmith, D. M., Birnie, R. V., Geddes, A., Bayfield, N., Elstone, D., (2005), 'Rural development policy and community data needs in Scotland', *Land Use Policy*, **22**, 163–174.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., (1994) "*Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook*", London: Sage Publications.
- Mingay, G. E., (1989) '*The Rural idyll*', London: Routledge.
- Mitchell, C. J. A., (1998) 'Entrepreneurialism, commodification and creative destruction: a model of post-modern community development', *Journal of Rural Studies* **14**(3), July 1998, 273-286.
- Mogalakwe, M., (2006) 'The Use of Documentary Research Methods in Social Research', *African Sociological Review*, **10**(1), 221-230.
- Moseley, M., (1999) '*The New Localism as a Response to Rural Decline*', In Westholm, E., Moseley, M., and Stenlas, N. (eds) *Local Partnerships and Rural Development in Europe: A literature review of practice and theory*, pp. 25-44. Cheltenham: Countryside and Community Research Unit.
- Nelson, J., Zadek, S., (2000) '*Partnership Alchemy: New Social Partnerships in Europe*', Copenhagen: The Copenhagen Centre.
- Ollerenshaw, J. A., Creswell, J. W., (2002) 'Narrative Research: A Comparison of Two Restoring Data Analysis Approaches', *Qualitative Inquiry*, **8**(3), 329-347.
- Palmer, P. J., (1998) '*The Courage to Teach*', San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 73 – 77.
- Patton, M.Q. (1990) "*Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*", 2nd Ed. Newbury Park: CA, Sage.
- Peredo, A. M., Chrisman, J. J., (2004), 'Toward a Theory of Community-Based Enterprise', *Academy of Management Review*, **31**(2), 309-328.
- Peredo, A. M., Chrisman, J. J. (2006). Toward a Theory of Community-Based Enterprise. *Academy of Management Review*, **31**(2): 309-328.
- Platt, J., (1981) 'Evidence and Proof in Documentary Research', *Sociological Review*, **29**(1), 31-52.
- Pollo, M. (1991) '*Educazione come animazione*', Turin: Libreria Dottrina Cristiana.

- Purdue, D., (2000) *'Community leadership in area regeneration'*, Policy Press.
- Purdue, D., (2001) 'Neighbourhood Governance: Leadership, Trust and Social Capital,' *Urban Studies*, **38**(12): 2211-2224.
- Purdue, D., Razzaque, K., Hambleton, R., Stewart, M., with Huxham, C. and Vangen, S., (2000) *'Community Leadership in Area Regeneration'*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Radin, B. A., Romzek, B. S., (1996) "Accountability Expectations in an Intergovernmental Arena: The National Rural Development Partnership", *Publius*, **26**(2): 59-81.
- Ray, C., (2000) Editorial - The EU leader Programme: Rural Development Laboratory, *Sociologia Ruralis*, **40**(2), 163–171.
- Ricasio, V. R., (2005) 'A Social Enterprise Approach to Combating Poverty'.
- Ricasio, V. R., (2009), 'Community Based Enterprise Development', accessed on 14.5.2009 at www.nextbillion.net/blog/2006/08/28/guest-post-community-based-enterprise-development
- Rothman, J. (1968). *'Three models of community organization practice' in Social Work Practice*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Saunders, C., Dalziel, P., (2010) 'Local planning for sustainable development: A small rural district case study from New Zealand', *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, **4**(3), 252 – 267.
- Smith, M., Beazley, M., (2000) 'Progressive Regimes, Partnerships and the Involvement of Local Communities: a Framework for Evaluation', *Public Administration*, **78**(4): 855-878.
- Scott J., (1990). *'A matter of record: documentary sources in social research'*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Selsky, J. W., Smith, A., (1994). 'Community Entrepreneurship: A Framework for Social Change', *The Leadership Quarterly*, **5**(3/4), 1994, 277-296.
- Shortall, S., Shucksmith, M., (1998). 'Integrated rural development: issues arising from the Scottish experience', *European Planning Studies*, **6** (1): 73-88.
- Shortall, S., Shucksmith, M. (2001), 'Rural development in practice: issues arising in Scotland and Northern Ireland', *Community Development Journal*, **36**:122-133.
- Shortall, S., (2004) Social or Economic Goals, Civic Inclusion or Exclusion? An Analysis of Rural Development Theory and Practice, *Sociologia Ruralis*, **44**(1), 109–123.
- Shortall, S., (2008) Are rural development programmes socially inclusive? Social inclusion, civic engagement, participation, and social capital: Exploring the differences, *Journal of Rural Studies*, **24**(4), 450-457.
- Shucksmith, M. (2000), 'Endogenous development, social capital and social inclusion: perspectives from LEADER in the UK', *Sociologia Ruralis*, **40**(2), 208- 218.
- Silverman, D. (2001) *"Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction"*, 2nd edn. London: Sage.
- Simons, H., (2009) *'Case Study Research in Practice'*, Sage Publications Ltd.
- Simpson, J. A. (1989) 'Sociocultural animation'. In J. Titmus (ed). *Lifelong Education for Adults: An International Handbook*: Oxford, Pergamon Press.
- Smith, H., Smith, M. K., (2008) *'The Art of Helping Others'*, London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Smith, M. K., (2009) *'Animateurs, animation and fostering learning and change', the encyclopaedia of informal education.* [www.infed.org/animate/b-animat.htm]

- Smith, R. (2008) ‘Zzzzz....Reflections on Village Entrepreneurship’, *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship*, 6(3), 370-389.
- Stake, R. E., (1995) *The Art of Case Study Research*, Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Stiles, D., Cameron, G., (2009) ‘Changing paradigms?: Rural communities, agriculture, and corporate and civic models of development in Atlantic Canada’, *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 3(4), 341 – 354.
- Toynbee, W. S. (1985) ‘*Adult Education and the Voluntary Associations in France*’, Nottingham: University of Nottingham Department of Adult Education.
- Tracey, P., Phillips, N., Haugh, H., (2005) Beyond Philanthropy: Community Enterprise as a Basis for Corporate Citizenship, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 58(4).
- Westholm, E., (1999) ‘*Exploring the Role of Rural Partnerships*’, In Westholm, E., Moseley, M., and Stenlas, N. (eds) *Local Partnerships and Rural Development in Europe: A literature review of practice and theory*, pp. 1-24. Cheltenham: Countryside and Community Research Unit.
- Westholm, E., Moseley, M., Stenlas, N. (eds), (1999) ‘*Local Partnerships and Rural Development in Europe: A literature review of practice and theory*. Cheltenham: Countryside and Community Research Unit.
- Williams, C. C. (2007) ‘Socio-spatial variations in the nature of entrepreneurship’, *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 1(1), 27 – 37.
- Yin, R. K., (2008) “*Case Study Research: Design and Methods*”, London, Sage Publications.
- Yin, R. K., (2011) “*Applications of Case Study Research*”, London: Sage Publications.
- Zhang, Y., Wildemuth, B. M.(2009) “*Qualitative analysis of content*”, in B. Wildemuth (Ed.), *Applications of Social Research Methods to Questions in Information and Library Science* (308-319), Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.

Reports

- The Buchan Development Partnership: Support to Local Partnership 2002 to 2009.
Fetterangus Community Action Plan.
BDP Annual Report (2003-2004).
Report of the European Cultural Foundation (1973).
Scottish Community Empowerment Action Plan (2009)
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2009/03/20155113/0>

Figure 1 – An Analysis of the activities of the BDP

Actors	Acts	Activities	Participation	Relationships	Settings	Meaning
Board	Give of their time, effort and expertise. Act as volunteers on community projects.	Develop proactive and reactive strategies.	On an individual basis.	- Superintendence - Oversight - Professional responsibility	- Organisational - Individuated	The work of the BDP Board provide meaning and structure to the organisation and ensure that the books balance at the end of the year. They ensure that the aims of economic and social development are achieved and that the BDP help develop vibrant local communities. The key idioms are giving, selflessness and being in communion with clients and the community.
Development Officers	- Manage. - Mentor. - Challenge institutional belief. - Act as a community voice.	- Implement proactive and reactive strategies. - Improvise. - Animate. - Arrest rural decline. - Capacity Building.	- Manage. - Mentor. - Network. - Community Leadership. - Provide personal touch.	- Project Manager - - Mentor - Friend - Professional Partner	- Community Based. - Organisational. - Individuated.	The tireless work of the DO's mirrors tht of the classic entrepreneur. The Do's are at the hub of the activity. They work selflessly and animate community action by working in communion with others -The Board, Clients, Sponsors and communities.
Client Groups	Initiate idea.	Give of their time and effort	Provide help	Community Based	Community based	Their continued financial and moral support means a lot to the BDP and the local communities in terms of sustainability and well being.
Sponsors	Council – SLA Shell – Small Grants SCORE	Provide Funding and support. Help-in-kind.	By providing funding and publicity	Sponsor-Client relationship	Organisational and Political	Their continued financial and moral support means a lot to the BDP and the local communities in terms of a wide range of issues such as sustainability, well being and community presence.
Communities	Local people helped set up the BDP	Support client groups and BDP via fundraising.	By patronage or withdrawal of help.	Community Based and ultimately as customer base.	Community based and localised. Predominantly village based.	The individuals who make up local communities are the lifeblood of community enterprise because the latter must meet the needs of individuals. This makes it about self and selflessness because to meet those needs other individuals have to be selfless in undertaking community action.