



# 11

## Artisan Entrepreneurial Behaviour: A Research Agenda

Caren Crowley

### 11.1 Introduction

In recent years, there has been an increasing interest in ‘artisan’ entrepreneurship, which involves the marketing of creative assets in which manual techniques take precedence and the close link between products and a specific place or tradition (Hoyte 2018; Arias and Cruz 2018; Eriksson and Bull 2017; Ratten and Farreira 2017; Ashkenazy et al. 2018; Blundel 2002; Batterink et al. 2010; McAdam et al. 2014, 2015; Ni Fhlatharta and Farrell 2017). Research into the practices and products of artisan entrepreneurship is situated within the field of cultural entrepreneurship (Pret and Cogan 2018). Artisan entrepreneurs commonly draw on associations with tradition, place, quality and craftsmanship in order to differentiate their products from mass-produced counterparts (Carroll and Swaminthian 2000). While this growing body of artisan entrepreneurship research has yielded significant insight into artisan’s goals, motives and the benefits of networking to accrue needed resources (McAdam et al. 2014; Felzensztein et al. 2010; Parry 2010; Tregear 2005), there is

---

C. Crowley (✉)

Maastricht School of Management (MSM), Maastricht, The Netherlands

© The Author(s) 2019

M. McAdam, J. A. Cunningham (eds.), *Entrepreneurial Behaviour*,  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-04402-2\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-04402-2_11)

limited research on how entrepreneurial behaviour manifests within this particular domain of contemporary entrepreneurship. This is of both theoretical and managerial importance, as a more nuanced understanding of artisans' entrepreneurial behaviour results in more reliable theoretical models explaining and predicting behaviour which can then be operationalised by policymakers to shape and influence artisans' entrepreneurial actions (Bird et al. 2012). In addition, much of the extant research has focused on micro- (individual) and meso- (group, network) levels of analysis with little attention paid to the impact of macro-level institutional and contextual factors on artisans' entrepreneurial behaviour. The aim of this chapter is therefore to provide an overview of research at different levels of analysis, micro-, meso- and macro-levels, highlighting conflicting arguments and results, and provide an agenda for future research.

The chapter is structured in four main parts. First, research examining micro-level factors such as cognition and affect as antecedents and constraints on artisan entrepreneurial behaviour is analysed. Second, meso-level research on artisan entrepreneurial networking, an area of entrepreneurial behaviour that has received considerable empirical attention, is reviewed. Third, macro-level studies, which prioritise the impact of institutional factors on artisan entrepreneurship and the consequent potential for regional and rural development, are investigated. Finally, the chapter concludes with recommendations for future research.

## **11.2 At the Micro-Level: Cognition, Affect, Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Constraint**

In examining research on artisan entrepreneurs' behaviour at the micro-level of analysis, we present studies which highlight the importance of artisan entrepreneurs' motivation, goals and perceived legitimacy as significant antecedents and constraints on behaviour. As Bird et al. (2012) argue, entrepreneurial behaviour is shaped by cognition and affect (Bird et al. 2012). Significant attention has been paid to artisan entrepreneurs'

goals and motivations with the majority of studies arguing that artisan entrepreneurs are lifestyle rather than commercially oriented, valuing independence and risk averse, tied to a specific geographic location and as a result dependent on locally available resources (Johannisson 1992; Getz and Petersen 2005; Vesala and Vesala 2010; Bouette and Magee 2015). The general view then is that artisans pursue entrepreneurship to achieve personal well-being, independence and flexibility, often at the expense of commercial ends (Paige and Littrell 2002; Reijonen and Komppula 2007). By contrast, an archetype entrepreneur is commercially oriented, guided by vision and action, actively engaged in social networks, focused on continuing education, experiential learning and the exploitation of commercial opportunities (Johannisson 1992). This classification of artisan entrepreneurs and in particular the dichotomy of a lifestyle or commercial orientation represents artisan entrepreneurs as less concerned with the commercial aspects of the business. This view is underlined by Bouette and Magee (2015) who view artisan entrepreneurs as professional craftspeople, resistant to growth, in contrast 'entrepreneurs' are business focused, aiming to expand production and employment growth. A lifestyle orientation is perceived as in conflict with business growth, for instance, an artisan's choice to live in a rural location will restrict market access and engagement in handcrafted methods of production will limit the business scale and efficiency and compromise profitability (Parry 2010). Growth, particularly in terms of increasing the number of employees, is viewed as leading to a loss of direct control, and such beliefs are used to partly explain why artisan businesses tend to remain small and micro-firms with few employees (Mathias and Smith 2015).

However, by viewing artisan entrepreneurs as motivated primarily by lifestyle concerns the commercial realities of running a small business are ignored or minimised. Commercial goals are a central component in validating artisans as entrepreneurs rather than hobbyists (Bouette and Magee 2015), and artisans face the same commercial realities as all business owners. Financial objectives are generally not found to be the primary motivator for artisan entrepreneurs (Parry 2010) and artisans are primarily viewed as profit 'sufficers' rather profit maximisers (Sage 2003). While, Getz and Petersen (2005) find that artisan entrepreneurs may be

unwilling to increase their number of employees, they were found to demonstrate significant commercial orientation, strategically and proactively engaging in opportunity-seeking behaviour and market positioning activities with a focus on innovation and internationalisation. However, Hinrichs (2000) argues the need to sustain livelihoods ensures that 'marketness' and instrumentalism are necessary qualifiers of artisan entrepreneurial behaviour and cautions against an overly sentimental view of artisan entrepreneurship.

In addition, this view of artisan entrepreneurship as a lifestyle choice is also explained by the fact that much of the existing studies have involved samples taken from European and North American contexts (Blundel 2002; Sage 2003; Felzensztein et al. 2010; Eriksson and Bull 2017); few studies have examined the goals and motivations underlying artisan entrepreneurship in the context of developing countries. Notable exceptions are Igwe et al. (2018), who examine rural artisan entrepreneurship in Nigeria, and Arias and Cruz (2018), who examine chocolate making in Honduras. In both studies, artisan entrepreneurs are driven by the lack of other forms of paid employment and the need to develop a viable income. By examining the motivations and goals underlying artisan entrepreneurship in different contexts, it is clear that greater attention needs to be paid to commercial aspects of artisan entrepreneurship.

Prior work has also highlighted how an artisan identity and brand image can not only be leveraged as a resource but also act as a constraint on entrepreneurial behaviour. An artisan brand image can be leveraged as a significant resource in marketing artisan businesses and products, due to the positive associations with craftsmanship, place and tradition (Lounsbury and Glynn 2001; Sage 2003; Eriksson and Bull 2017). An artisan identity and brand image draws on aspects of historical tradition, manual production and natural ingredients (Carroll and Swaminthian 2000). Artisan entrepreneurs' identity and the stories they tell to support that identity and reinforce that identity are central to the development of an artisan brand image (Mathias and Smith 2015). Artisan entrepreneurs develop their identity and brand image through narratives and stories that emphasise artisan attributes, such as a focus on craft and manual production methods which are claimed as 'central, distinctive and enduring characteristics of the artisan firm' (Lounsbury and Glynn 2001: 551).

An artisan brand image draws on and amplifies the artisan elements of production while minimising the importance of technology and innovation in the production process, in order to differentiate artisan products which command a premium price, from cheaper mass-produced alternatives. For instance, Beverland (2005) demonstrates that artisan wine producers are early adopters of the latest scientific and technical developments in wine production; however, they tend to downplay this expertise in favour of discussing the use of traditional methods, dedication to quality and the importance of place, in order to reinforce their artisan brand identity. Artisan entrepreneur's decision to focus on certain attributes, which emphasise the importance of craft, tradition and non-commercial orientation, is not surprising given that consumers are likely to penalise businesses when they engage in actions and activities that consumers perceive to be in opposition to their artisan identity (Konrad 2013). Ibbery and Kneafsey (2000) found that some artisan entrepreneurs were unwilling to sell to supermarkets because of the risk to their artisan identity and brand due to the required increase in scale and consistency of production. In examining consumer perception of artisan businesses, Barlow et al. (2016) show that when artisan firms with a strong reputation develop products that are viewed by consumers as undermining their artisan image, they suffer a significant loss of legitimacy. Barlow et al. (2016) examine consumer perceptions in the US craft beer industry and demonstrate that when firms develop and sell 'American lager', a product viewed as at odds with their artisan identity, firms suffer a strong negative stigma which significantly damages the organisations artisan identity and reputation for quality.

Prior work examining the impact of cognition, affect and identity on entrepreneurial behaviour has highlighted the importance of critical reflection regarding how and why artisan entrepreneurs are primarily viewed as being lifestyle motivated. Future research can seek to address this gap by examining artisan entrepreneurs' motivations and goals in different contexts, particularly in terms of the motivations and goals that underlie artisan entrepreneurship in developed and developing country contexts. Igwe et al. (2018) and Arias and Cruz (2018) demonstrate that in developing countries with few paid employment prospects, artisan entrepreneurship is driven by the need to develop a sustainable income.

Indeed, as Getz and Petersen (2005) argue a focus on increasing employee numbers may obscure the artisan entrepreneur's commercial orientation and engagement in opportunity-seeking behaviour and market positioning activities. Future research should further develop these insights and examine how artisan entrepreneurs can both maintain their artisan identity and brand image while pursuing commercial interests and profitable opportunities.

### 11.3 At the Meso-Level: Artisan Entrepreneurs Networking Behaviour

The meso-level is an intermediate level of analysis that acts as a bridge between micro-level considerations and the macro-level context (Kim et al. 2016). At the meso-level, artisan entrepreneurs are embedded in social networks which influence access to relational social capital in terms of information and other resources gained through networking. Research on artisan entrepreneurs networking, a particular form of entrepreneurial networking behaviour, focuses largely on why artisans engage in networking and the potential and real benefits acquired. Networking is commonly viewed as a form of entrepreneurial bricolage 'making do by applying combinations of the resources at hand to new problems and opportunities' (Baker and Nelson 2005: 333). Predominantly small and rural artisan firms are likely to be significantly constrained in terms of internal resource and may benefit significantly from networking with external organisations. However, much of the research on artisan entrepreneurial networking has concentrated on why, the potential benefits of networking for artisan entrepreneurs, it remains unclear how artisan firms engage with peer firms and supporting organisations (Mckitterick et al. 2016).

Prior work has indicated that artisan entrepreneurs benefit from networking with peers (Ashkenazy et al. 2018; Blundel 2002; Felzensztein et al. 2010; Batterink et al. 2010; McAdam et al. 2014, 2015; Ni Fhlatharta and Farrell 2017). While some artisan entrepreneurs benefit from a traditional or hereditary knowledge base, others must access

external knowledge sources and learn through the process of doing (Cope 2003). However, access to external resources and networking is constrained by geographical location and entrepreneurs own willingness to trust others and commitment to community and craft development. Geographic proximity and co-localisation of specialised firms are viewed as an important means of networked learning and tacit knowledge exchange for artisan firms. Geographic specialisation in a specific industry creates a comparative advantage as artisan entrepreneurs learn through interaction (Marshall 1961; Minguzzi and Passaro 2001; Tregear 2005). Felzensztein et al. (2010) examine data from SMEs operating within the salmon farming industry in two different regions—Scotland and Chile—and find that peripheral rural firms interact more intensively with neighbouring firms, relative to less isolated businesses. While geographic proximity may provide an impetus for collaboration and cooperation, trust-based considerations and the extent to which artisan entrepreneurs prioritise independence and control over networking and collaboration will impact how and particularly with whom they choose to network (Balfour et al. 2016; Blundel 2002; Tregear 2005; Parry 2010). Early research in this domain viewed artisan entrepreneurs as prioritising independence, and averse to reliance on others, possibly leading to a ‘fortress mentality’ (Curran and Blackburn 1994; Sacraceno 1994; Johannisson 1992; Hornaday 1990). Such beliefs then cause artisan entrepreneurs to limit their engagement in entrepreneurial networking behaviour due to the risk of unintended information leakage and increased competition (Balfour et al. 2016; Blundel 2002; Parry 2010). However, Tregear (2005) argues that such a view is misleading, as artisan entrepreneurs’ commitment to developing their practice is likely to override such concerns and leads to ‘general proclivity towards cooperation and community involvement’. In this sense, commitment to their craft works to mediate self-interest in place of a concern for wider common good (Sage 2003). Pret and Cogan (2018) argue that research suggests that within craft communities, artisan entrepreneurs’ mutual commitment to their craft facilitates trust, knowledge sharing and socio-emotional support. This environmental context produces an ethos of collaboration and sets boundaries for acceptable behaviour (Drakopoulou Dodd et al. *in press*).

Kuhn and Galloway (2015) highlight the importance of peer firm cooperation in the same industry sector as important sources of context-specific knowledge and resources. Such context-specific or 'deep' knowledge is expected to be more beneficial to artisan entrepreneurs than 'broad' knowledge offered by supporting organisations. As Eriksson and Bull (2017) demonstrate, learning to produce artisan cheese requires close and deep interaction to ensure the continuation of craft-based practices and prevent the attrition of tacit knowledge. Kuhn and Galloway (2015) argue that artisan entrepreneurs' motivations impact how much networking they engage in and with whom they network, demonstrating that artisan entrepreneurs motivated primarily by commercial motivations are more likely to engage in joint promotion activities, whereas entrepreneurs motivated by love of their craft are more likely to seek out peers for emotional and psychological support. In examining how artisan firms interact with supporting organisation, an alternative to peer firm networking, Mckitterick et al. (2016) demonstrate that small artisan firms often lack understanding of how to access support networks and which agencies to approach arguing that supporting organisations may be unable to connect with and support artisan firms unless their programmes are tailored to suit the needs of small firms.

Prior work has indicated that small artisan firms benefit from networking with peers (Ashkenazy et al. 2018; Blundel 2002; Felzensztein et al. 2010; Batterink et al. 2010; McAdam et al. 2014, 2015; Ni Fhlatharta and Farrell 2017). However, little attention has been paid to how entrepreneurs engage in networking behaviour, particularly with whom they network and why. Kuhn and Galloway (2015) offer important insights into the importance of peer networking for artisan firms. Future research can further develop this insight and examine the impact artisan entrepreneur's engagement in peer networking. In addition, a longitudinal focus involving the collection of data at different points in time would enable the capturing in real time of the emergence, development/ change, in the ability of artisan entrepreneurs to engage in networking at different stages of business development.



## 11.4 At the Macro-Level: Institutional Context, Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Regional Development

In examining the impact of macro-institutional context on artisan entrepreneurship, we build on prior work which has argued for greater attention to be paid to the impact of the institutional context on entrepreneurs' behaviour (Welter and Smallbone 2011). In particular, we highlight research which examines how artisan entrepreneurs' behaviour fits within and is influenced by the wider context of regional and rural development policy. Artisan entrepreneurship often has low revenues but represents high value in a region (Acheson et al. 1996; Ratten and Farreira 2017). Prior studies examining artisan food firms have highlighted the significant potential of such businesses in facilitating socio-economic, rural and regional development (Blundel 2002; Felzensztein et al. 2010; Batterink et al. 2010; McAdam et al. 2014, 2015; Ni Fhlatharta and Farrell 2017). Cultural enterprises contribute to the economic and social fabric of a region by encouraging the longevity of local customs and traditions (Ratten and Farreira 2017: 166). Artisan entrepreneurs are argued to play a key role in their regions economies and competitiveness by contributing to tourism, and employment, in so doing, they augment the identity, reputation and competitiveness of their home regions (Pret and Cogan 2018).

While the contribution of artisan firms to rural and regional development is potentially high, their contribution is contingent on a supportive institutional context. Institutional analysis of organisational behaviour argues that firm behaviour is shaped by broader cognitive, normative and regulatory forces that are supported and enforced by powerful actors such as government agencies, trade associations and special interest groups (Lounsbury and Glynn 2001: 556). Rural areas have significant limitations with regard to business development due to underdeveloped infrastructure, shortage of skilled workers and the small scale of the local market (Bouette and Magee 2015). Regional supporting organisations and cooperatives can ameliorate some of these limitations by facilitating

market access, attracting buyers, organisation of trade fairs, providing funding and training opportunities (Iberrry and Kneafsey 2000).

In particular, a number of studies have examined the contribution of geographical indicators (GIs) as place and quality branding initiatives to support and market regional artisan food products (Bowen and De Master 2011; Bowen and Zapata 2009). The EU's Committee of Regions (1996) recognises the promotion of regional quality products as a means of developing rural regions (Iberrry and Kneafsey 2000). Specifically, place branding involves the promotion of a distinctive local identity and marketplace image to outsiders (Lee et al. 2015). While a number of studies have shown that labelling regions and producers as GI's may facilitate socio-economic sustainability (Van Der Ploeg et al. 2000), Bowen and Zapata (2009) detail the negative impact of extra-local actors on the agave-tequila industry arguing that such actors have largely failed to protect the link between local firms and resources and quality of the tequila. Bowen and Zapata (2009) highlight that the official boundaries of the agave-tequila-producing region include areas not suitable for growing agave and small farmers in particular receive poverty wages, with 20% households included in the study reporting net annual incomes of less than zero (Bowen and Zapata 2009: 114). In addition, intermediaries, known as coyotes, buy agave at very low prices from farmers and then resell to the tequila companies, further undermining the value for the local community. Gaytan (2018) similarly examines the mishandling of the Denomination of Origin (DO) certification system in the production of agave-tequila and mezcal in Mexico. The purpose of certification is to protect regional products from destructive international competition and maintain traditional methods of production (Gaytan 2018). In 2011, the Mexican Institute of Industrial Property applied to trademark the agave plant species. The proposed legislation was widely viewed as benefitting large industrial and multi-national corporations to the detriment of small local producers who have harvested agave and produced drinks in a traditional manner for hundreds of years. However, the legislation was recalled in 2012 due to national and international protest and proposals were put forth to put local farmers and artisan mezcal and tequila producers in preparing new legislation. It was argued that officials should 'make an open call for those non-DO producers of agave spirits to discuss

... with them the regulations, and form, in accordance with them, a working group for the joint development of legislation' (Colunga et al. 2012 as cited in Gaytan 2018: 109). Johannisson (1993) asks under what conditions can local businesses keep a community viable. He argues that a basic requirement is that firms are locally owned, if this is not the case and extra-local businesses have significant power, with few ties to the community, the benefits of regional development initiatives for locals will be minimal. Power relations are important, as in the absence of legislation which prioritises local artisan entrepreneurs any attempts to promote regional products will be exploited by large-scale multi-national businesses. No single firm should dominate the local community. A wide distribution of ownership and production will generate a dynamic regional development context and facilitate efficient access to advice, markets and supporting resources and organisations.

In addition, to ensure that legislation is developed which adequately protects and shields local artisan firms from powerful extra-local competitors, attention should also be paid to the compatibility between the behaviours advocated by legislation designed to promote and protect artisan entrepreneurship and what artisan entrepreneurs actually do. The importance of such a fit is well documented in the case of artisan cheese production in the context of an institutional framework designed to support industrial cheese production. Eriksson and Bull (2017) examine the development of artisan cheese in Sweden, arguing that while the variety and taste of raw unpasteurised cheese are valued by consumers, Sweden's rural development policy, regulation and hygiene standards prioritise pasteurisation, standardisation and centralised distribution. Eriksson and Bull (2017) provide an example of a producer of Getost, a local raw milk cheese, which develops mould in an uncontrolled way during the maturation process, giving the cheese a distinct taste and variability, being asked to store her cheeses in plastic instead of wood containers. A practice which she refused to comply with as it would interfere with the transfer of mould from the local environment, which gives the cheese a distinctive taste. Eriksson and Bull (2017) find that, as a result of a regulatory framework incompatible with artisan cheese production methods, no regional artisan cheese in Sweden has been registered under a geographical protection framework due to the complexities of the process and requirements.

Rather Sveica, a non-regional industrially produced cheese, is registered; however, this is argued to be explained by pressure at the EU level to ensure that all member states benefit from GI certification.

The example of artisanal cheese production in Sweden provides a clear example of how the institutional context, at both a national and European level, finds it difficult to support small-scale artisan entrepreneurs who rely on manual and traditional methods. A similar outcome is shown by Mancini (2013) in the context of artisan cheese production in Nicaragua, a developing country. Like Sweden, artisan cheese is produced using unpasteurised milk; however, milk quality and hygiene levels are low; most producers have no specialised milking area and often unclean wooden or plastic containers are used for storing milk with milk often left in the sun and unrefrigerated (Mancini 2013). In the context of a developing country such as Nicaragua, artisan entrepreneurs are similarly constrained by institutional context, not in terms of unsupportive regulations but by lack of access to necessary information and finance to enable investment in necessary equipment and upgrading of premises, milk quality and hygiene standards. Mancini (2013) finds that as a result of self-interest of some participants, absence of necessary support initiatives to develop a collective rural development process was unsuccessful and artisan cheese was successfully registered under the GI scheme. The examples provided by Eriksson and Bull (2017) and Mancini (2013) highlight the importance of taking the national context into consideration in order to understanding the likely impact of institutional framework on artisan entrepreneur's behaviour and outcomes.

Our review has highlighted research which demonstrates that institutional supports to promote artisan entrepreneurs in a specific region can have limited and even negative effects when extra-local organisations have significant power and influence (Bowen and De Master 2011; Bowen and Zapata 2009). The institutional context clearly has a significant impact on artisans' entrepreneurial behaviour. Future research should further examine the relationship between institutional context, artisan entrepreneurship and regional development. For instance, regulation, which may have been developed with the intention of protecting and promoting artisan businesses, is forcing specialist producers to upgrade their scale and methods of production and may have the opposite

effect, creating a significant burden which weighs especially heavily on small artisan firms (Sage 2003). However, in the context of developing countries, such regulations need to be matched with a system of structural supports, enabling access to information and finance creating a viable development for artisan firms rather than acting simply as a barrier to growth and export.

## 11.5 Conclusion and Future Research Agenda

The aim of this chapter was to explore the manifestation of entrepreneurial behaviour in the context of artisan entrepreneurship studies. In conclusion, the chapter discusses the implications of this new context in terms of what we understand by the term entrepreneurial behaviour. As Bird et al. (2012: 212) note ‘no opportunity is exploited nor does any venture come to exist, survive or grow without entrepreneurs taking action’. However, to date there remains significant debate regarding how artisan entrepreneurs behave. A broad range of studies have been presented which explore artisan entrepreneurship from a variety of perspectives (see Table 11.1 for a summary).

In critically reviewing research on artisan entrepreneurial behaviour, three main perspectives were identified. First, research examining micro-level factors such as cognition and affect as antecedents and constraints on artisan entrepreneurial behaviour is analysed. Second, meso-level research on artisan entrepreneurial networking, an area of entrepreneurial behaviour that has received considerable empirical attention, is reviewed. Third, macro-level studies, which prioritise the impact of institutional factors on artisan entrepreneurship and the consequent potential for regional and rural development, are investigated.

In order to further research in this area, we argue that research should apply a multi-level focus, explicitly examining how macro-meso-micro factors interact and influence artisan entrepreneurs’ behaviour. For instance, changes in the institutional framework and regulations can be made possible by meso-level networking and organising; however, engagement in networking is affected by micro-level conditions such as individual entrepreneur’s motivation and goals.

**Table 11.1** Artisan entrepreneurship research

Main focus	Author(s)	Setting	Method	Findings
Micro level: antecedents and constraints on artisan entrepreneurial behaviour	Getz and Petersen (2005)	Multiple, craft firms	Quantitative	Focus on lifestyle rather than growth with focus on strategic market positioning
	Tregear (2005)	UK, food & drinks	Qualitative	Artisan firms simultaneously pursue commercial and lifestyle goals
	Barlow et al. (2016)	US, food & drink	Qualitative & Quantitative	Products that do not fit with the firm's artisan image undermine organisational legitimacy
Meso-level: networking as entrepreneurial behaviour	Kuhn and Galloway (2015)	Online, craft firms	Qualitative and Quantitative	Peer networking is an important source of advice and emotional support
	McAdam et al. (2014)	UK, food & drinks	Qualitative	Horizontal networking facilitates knowledge sharing and innovation
	Felzensztein et al. (2010)	Scotland, Chile, food & drinks	Qualitative	Firms located in rural and peripheral regions network intensively with geographically proximate firms in the same sector

*(continued)*

Table 11.1 (continued)

Main focus	Author(s)	Setting	Method	Findings
Macro-level: impact of rural and regional development policies	Bouette and Magee (2015)	Ireland, mixed craft firms	Qualitative & Quantitative	Artisan firms receive limited benefit from interaction with supporting organisations
	Bowen and De Master (2011)	France, Poland, food & drinks	Qualitative	Quality food initiatives established can have negative consequence – reduces diversity and focus on extra-local markets
	Bowen and Zapata (2009)	Mexico, food & drinks	Qualitative	Efforts to promote regional artisan businesses may have limited benefit for local environment due to powerful extra-local organisations and intermediaries

At the micro-level of analysis, studies need to move away from assumptions viewing artisan entrepreneurs as lifestyle oriented and growth averse (Sage 2003; Johannisson 1992); rather greater attention needs to be paid to the commercial realities of running a profitable enterprise (Bouette and Magee 2015) and the possible tensions and concessions that arise. While prior research has highlighted the benefits of an artisan identity in terms of developing a positive brand image, Beverland (2005), Konrad (2013) and Barlow et al. (2016) demonstrate that an artisan identity can also be a significant constraint on entrepreneurial behaviour. Future research should further unpack these findings and examine the link between identity, branding and legitimacy in the context of artisan entrepreneurship.

At the meso-level, we presented conflicting research regarding artisan entrepreneurs' engagement in networking. On the one hand, artisan entrepreneurs are believed to limit their engagement in networking due to the risks of unintended knowledge leakage and loss of control (Alvarez and Busenitz 2001; Balfour et al. 2016; Blundel 2002; Parry 2010). The alternative view argues that artisan's commitment to the development of their craft outweighs their self-interest (Drakopoulou Dodd et al. [in press](#)) and networking with peer firms is believed to be especially beneficial in terms of access to 'deep', sector specific knowledge (Kuhn and Galloway 2015). In order to advance research in this area, future studies should critically examine differences in artisan entrepreneurs networking behaviour and why these differences emerge. Finally, at the macro-level, we provide an overview of research examining the link between artisan entrepreneurship and regional development. Significant prior work has highlighted the link between artisan firms and regional and rural development (Ashkenazy et al. 2018; Blundel 2002; Felzensztein et al. 2010; McAdam et al. 2014, 2015). However, as Bowen and De Master (2011) and Bowen and Zapata (2009) point out, artisan entrepreneurship and regional development efforts will benefit local interests only when there is a well-functioning institutional framework and extra-local firms do not have significant power and influence. Future research should focus on further examining the relationship between institutional context, artisan entrepreneurship and regional development. Moreover, in order to drive the artisan entrepreneurship field forward greater attention needs to be paid to conceptual rigour and theory development. As outlined in Table 11.1, and argued by Pret and Cogan (2018), studies of artisan entrepreneurial behaviour are highly focused on empirical analysis with few conceptual papers. Future research should focus on enhancing our theoretical models of entrepreneurial behaviour in the artisan context.

## References

- Acheson, K., C.J. Maule, and E. Filleul. 1996. Cultural entrepreneurship and the Banff Television Festival. *Journal of Cultural Economics* 20 (4): 321–339.
- Alvarez, S., and L. Busenitz. 2001. The entrepreneurship of resource-based theory. *Journal of Management* 27 (6): 755–775.



- Arias, R., and A. Cruz. 2018. Rethinking artisan entrepreneurship in a small island: A tale of two chocolatiers in Roatan, Honduras. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-02-2018-0111>.
- Ashkenazy, A., T. Calva-o Chebach, K. Knickel, S. Peter, B. Horowitz, and R. Offenbach. 2018. Operationalising resilience in farms and rural regions: Findings from fourteen case studies. *Journal of Rural Studies* 59: 211–221.
- Baker, T., and R. Nelson. 2005. Creating something from nothing: Resource construction through entrepreneurial bricolage. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 50 (3): 329–366.
- Balfour, B., M. Fortunato, and T. Alter. 2016. The creative fire: An interactional framework for rural arts-based development. *Journal of Rural Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2016.11.002>.
- Barlow, M., J. Verhaal, and J. Hoskins. 2016. Guilty by association: Product-level category stigma and audience expectations in the U.S. craft beer industry. *Journal of Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316657593>.
- Batterink, M.H., E.F.M. Wubben, L. Klerkx, and S.W.F. Omta. 2010. Orchestrating innovation networks: The case of innovation brokers in the agri-food sector. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 22 (1): 47–76.
- Beverland, M. 2005. Crafting brand authenticity: The case of luxury wines. *Journal of Management Studies* 45 (2): 1003–1029.
- Bird, B., L. Schjoedt, and R. Baum. 2012. Editor's introduction. Entrepreneurs' behavior: Elucidation and measurement. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 36 (5): 889–913.
- Blundel, R. 2002. Network evolution and the growth of artisanal firms: A tale of two regional cheese makers. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 14 (1): 1–30.
- Bouette, M., and F. Magee. 2015. Hobbyists, artisans and entrepreneurs: investigating business support and identifying entrepreneurial profiles in the Irish craft sector. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* 22 (2): 337–351.
- Bowen, S., and K. De Master. 2011. New rural livelihoods or museums of production? Quality food initiatives in practice. *Journal of Rural Studies* 27 (1): 73–82.
- Bowen, S., and A. Zapata. 2009. Geographical indications, terroir and socio-economic and ecological sustainability: The case of tequila. *Journal of Rural Studies* 25 (1): 108–119.
- Carroll, G., and A. Swaminthian. 2000. Why the microbrewery movement? Organizational dynamics of resource partitioning in the U.S. brewing industry. *American Journal of Sociology* 106 (3): 715–762.

- Cope, J. 2003. Entrepreneurial learning and critical reflection: Discontinuous events as triggers for 'higher-level' learning. *Management Learning* 34 (4): 429–450.
- Curran, J., and R. Blackburn. 1994. *Small firms and local economic networks*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Drakopoulou Dodd, S., J. Wilson, C. Mac an Bhaird, and A.P. Bisignano. in press. Habitus emerging: The development of hybrid logics and collaborative business models in the Irish craft beer sector. *International Small Business Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242617751597>.
- Eriksson, C., and J. Bull. 2017. Place-making with goats and microbes: The more-than-human geographies of local cheese in Jamtland, Sweden. *Journal of Rural Studies* 50 (2017): 209e217.
- Felzensztein, C., E. Gimmon, and S. Carter. 2010. Geographical co-location, social networks and inter-firm marketing co-operation: The case of the salmon industry. *Long Range Planning* 43 (5–6): 675–690.
- Gaytan, M. 2018. The perils of protection and the promise of authenticity: Tequila, mescal, and the case of NOM 186. *Journal of Rural Studies* 58: 103–111.
- Getz, D., and T. Petersen. 2005. Growth and profit-oriented entrepreneurship among family business owners in the tourism and hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 24 (2): 219–242.
- Hinrichs, C. 2000. Embeddedness and local food systems: Notes on two types of direct agricultural market. *Journal of Rural Studies* 16 (3): 295–303.
- Hornaday. 1990. Dropping the c-words from small business research: An alternative typology. *Journal of Small Business Management* 28: 22–33.
- Hoyte, Cherisse. 2018. Artisan entrepreneurship: A question of personality structure? *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEER-02-2018-0099>.
- Iberry, B., and M. Kneafsey. 2000. Producer constructions of quality in regional speciality food production: A case study from south west England. *Journal of Rural Studies* 16 (2): 217–230.
- Igwe, Paul Agu, Nnamdi O. Madichie, and Robert Newbery. 2018. Determinants of livelihood choices and artisanal entrepreneurship in Nigeria. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEER-02-2018-0102>.
- Johannisson, B. 1992. Entrepreneurs as learners – Beyond education and training. *Internationalising Entrepreneurship Education and Training Conference*, Dortmund, Germany, June 23–26.

- . 1993. Swedish evidence for the potential of local entrepreneurship in regional development. *European Small Business Journal* 1 (2): 11–24.
- Kim, P.H., K. Wennberg, and G. Croidieu. 2016. Untapped riches of meso-level applications in multilevel entrepreneurship mechanisms. *Academy of Management Perspectives* 30 (3): 273–291.
- Konrad, E. 2013. Cultural entrepreneurship: The impact of social networking on success. *Cultural Entrepreneurship* 22 (3): 307–319.
- Kuhn, K.M., and T.L. Galloway. 2015. With a little help from my competitors: Peer networking among artisan entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 39 (3): 571–600.
- Lee, A., G. Wall, and J. Kovacs. 2015. Creative food clusters and rural development through place: Culinary tourism initiatives in Stratford and Muskoka, Ontario, Canada. *Journal of Rural Studies* 39: 133–144.
- Lounsbury, M., and M. Glynn. 2001. Cultural, entrepreneurship: Stories, legitimacy, and the acquisition of resources. *Strategic Management Journal* 22 (6–7): 545–564.
- Mancini, M. 2013. Geographical indications in Latin America value chains: A “branding from below” strategy or a mechanism excluding the poorest? *Journal of Rural Studies* 32: 295–306.
- Marshall, A. 1961. *Principles of economics: An introductory volume*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Mathias, B., and A.D. Smith. 2015. Autobiographies in organizational research: using leaders’ life stories in a triangulated research design. *Organizational Research Methods* 19 (2): 204–230.
- McAdam, M., R. McAdam, and A. Dunn. 2014. Development of small and medium-sized enterprise horizontal innovation networks: UK agri-food sector study. *International Small Business Journal* 32 (7): 830–853.
- McAdam, M., R. McAdam, A. Dunn, and C. McCall. 2015. Regional horizontal networks within the SME agri-food sector: An innovation and social network perspective. *Regional Studies* 50 (8): 1316–1329.
- Mckitterick, B., R. McAdam, and A. Dunn. 2016. Innovation networks and the institutional actor-producer relationship in rural areas: The context of artisan food production. *Journal of Rural Studies* 48: 41–52.
- Minguzzi, A., and R. Passaro. 2001. The network of relationships between the economic environment and the entrepreneurial culture in small firms. *Journal of Business Venturing* 16 (2): 181–207.
- Ni Fhlatharta, A., and M. Farrell. 2017. Unravelling the strands of ‘patriarchy’ in rural innovation: A study of female innovators and their contribution to rural Connemara. *Journal of Rural Studies* 54 (1): 15–27.

- Paige, R., and M. Littrell. 2002. Craft retailers' criteria for success and associated business strategies. *Journal of Small Business Management* 40 (4): 314–331.
- Parry, S. 2010. Smalltalk: Rhetoric of control as a barrier to growth in artisan micro-firms. *International Small Business Journal* 28 (4): 378–397.
- Pret, T., and A. Cogan. 2018. Artisan entrepreneurship a systematic literature review and research agenda. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-03-2018-0178>.
- Ratten, V., and J. Ferreira. 2017. Future research directions for cultural entrepreneurship and research directions. *International Journal of International Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management* 21 (3): 163–169.
- Reijonen, H., and R. Komppula. 2007. Perception of success and its effect on small firm performance. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* 14 (4): 689–701.
- Sacraceno, E. 1994. Recent trends in rural development and their conceptualisation. *Journal of Rural Studies* 10 (4): 321–330.
- Sage, C. 2003. Social embeddedness and relations of regard: alternative 'good food' networks in south-west Ireland. *Journal of Rural Studies* 19 (1): 47–60.
- Stenholm, P., and U. Hytti. 2014. In search of legitimacy under institutional pressures: A case study of producer and entrepreneur farmer identities. *Journal of Rural Studies* 35: 132–142.
- Tregear, A. 2005. Lifestyle, growth or community involvement? The balance of goals of UK artisan food producers. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 17 (1): 1–15.
- Van Der Ploeg, J.D., H. Renting, G. Brunori, K. Knickel, J. Mannion, T. Marsden, K. De Roest, E. Sevilla-Guzmán, and F. Ventura. 2000. Rural development: From practices and policies towards theory. *Sociologia Ruralis* 40: 391–408.
- Vesala, H., and K. Vesala. 2010. Entrepreneurs and producers: Identities of Finnish farmers in 2001 and 2006. *Journal of Rural Studies* 26 (1): 21–30.
- Welter, F., and D. Smallbone. 2011. Institutional perspectives on entrepreneurial behavior in challenging environments. *Journal of Small Business Management* 49: 107–125.